

The Ultras in the USA

Viacheslav Aleksandrovich **Nikitin**

Moscow : Progress Publishers

5	PREFACE
	FROM ANTICOMMUNISM TO ANTI- LIBERALISM
11	[introduction.]
18	Anti-Labor Politics
22	The Persecution of the Communist Party USA and the Split in the Unions
27	Loyalty Tests of Government Employees
35	The Committee on Un-American Activities
46	The Local Inquisitions
55	Rightists and the Government
	MCCARTHYISM
72	Senator Joseph McCarthy and the Democratic Administration
84	Anti-Constitutional Legislation by Congress
95	McCarthyism in Action
104	McCarthyism and the Republican Administration
125	The Right Regroups
	THE RISE OF THE ULTRA-RIGHTIST MOVEMENT IN THE 60s
142	[introduction.]
145	The John Birch Society
151	The Right-Wing Fundamentalists
159	Other Ultra-Rightist Organizations
171	The Right and the Military-Industrial Complex
183	Racism and the American Nazis
194	The Right's Propaganda Machine
200	The American Right and Youth

- [208](#) **Rightists on the March: the 1964 Elections**
- [227](#) **The George Wallace Movement**
- [241](#) **The Rightist Movement in Recent Times**
- [278](#) **The Ideology of the Right**
- [299](#) **The Class Roots and Social Base of Right Extremism**
- [333](#) **NAME INDEX**
- [338](#) **SUBJECT INDEX**

PREFACE

This book attempts to trace the evolution of the right in the United States, and to make clear the place the right has held and the role it has played since the Second World War. As the general crisis of capitalism has grown more acute, the right has become more active in the political life of the USA, emerging as a significant influence on the social climate of the country.

The rightist camp is a hodgepodge of sometimes antagonistic organizations and groups. But despite their social, class, national, and religious differences rightists are united by a number of common traits.

In the realm of foreign policy rightists are characterized by an extremely negative attitude toward peaceful coexistence and businesslike cooperation with the socialist countries, toward detente, and toward the liberation movement among oppressed nations. As the Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 26th Party Congress points out:

“Visibly more active of late are the opponents of detente, of limiting armaments, and of improving relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

“Adventurism and a readiness to gamble with the vital interests of humanity for narrow and selfish ends—this is what has emerged in a particularly bare-faced form in the policy of the more aggressive imperialist circles. With utter contempt for the rights and aspirations of nations, they are trying to portray the liberation struggle of the masses as ‘terrorism.’ Indeed, they have set out to achieve the unachievable—to set up a barrier to the progressive changes in the world, and to again become the rulers of the peoples’ destiny.”¹

The American right marches in the vanguard of the enemies of detente and peaceful coexistence.

In the sphere of domestic politics they reject social maneuvering, which is the grand strategy of modern state-monopoly capitalism, in favor of a strengthening of police repression, an intensification of the coercive functions of the bourgeois state and the military. Anti-liberalism. unwillingness to undertake reforms, hostility to those who stand for civil rights and to unions, unreasoning resistance to any sort of limitation on Uneconomic and social policies of the ruling class, advocacy of total non-interference with the interests of private property—this is, in general terms, the domestic policy platform of the American right.

Rightists attack, on the one hand, the working class, the unions, and the Communist Party, the principal groups demanding radical social and economic change, and on the other hand, the government, liberal groups, and those representatives of the ruling class

who, as a result of the present balance of forces within the nation and in the international arena, are at times forced to make concessions to the working people.

p The more moderate right-wing politicians and ideologues sometimes mask the unequivocal demands of the extremists with talk about states' rights, the decentralization of federal power and the fight against government bureaucracy, shoring up individual responsibility, respect for the law, for tradition, and for religion, patriotism, resistance to totalitarian trends in government, etc. But all of their words cannot hide the fact that rightists represent those forces in American society that are ready to use "the method of force, the method which rejects all concessions to the labour movement, the method of supporting all the old and obsolete institutions, the method of irreconcilably rejecting reforms."

p Rightist ideology, with its homage to the principle of government non-interference in social and economic relations, is rooted deep in American history; it goes back to the time of the first settlers, for whom (as Karl Marx put it) "the practical application of right to liberty" meant "man's right to *private property*." This was the ideology of the progressive, ascendant bourgeoisie, eager to enjoy the advantages of a free market. This class was well suited by a government whose functions were limited to creating favorable conditions for the development of private initiative and individual success and ensuring domestic peace and the security of the nation.

p In their own time these ideas expressed the revolutionary aspirations of the bourgeoisie and coincided with the demands of social progress. But the concept of free enterprise, because of its class limitations, has now been taken up by the right to justify stagnation, routinism, militant bourgeois individualism, and reaction. There is a logical connection between demanding a laissez-faire policy toward business and rejecting social and economic reform, attacking the rights and freedoms of citizens, repudiating unions, and perpetuating racism.

p These characteristic right-wing trends appeared back at the beginning of this century, when the largest industrial and financial corporations, in the guise of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), put up a furious resistance to government social and economic measures. Later, in the 30s, the NAM, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and UnAmerican League of Liberty took up arms against every social and economic project under Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal that met, in any degree, the demands of the working people. Increasing the role of government in society and the economy ran counter to capitalist individualism; it threw the captains of American industry into a panic.

p During the Second World War and afterwards American monopolies made huge profits through government orders and subsidies; their attitude toward government regulation of the US economy changed. Then came the scientific and technological revolution, the search for new energy sources, and the intensification of the struggle between communism and capitalism; under these conditions big capital no longer questioned the

necessity of cooperating with the federal government. The only question was in which direction it should be developed.

p The business partnership between big capital and government (to personify the state-monopoly stage of capitalism's development) led to the coalescence of the financial oligarchy with the government machine and strengthened the monopolies' influence in every area of national life. The petty and middle bourgeoisie were now faced with an assault on their interests by the combined forces of the monopolies and the government. As the class struggle intensifies some members of these groups, with their deep attachment to the institutions of private property, tend more and more to adopt a rightist position. Their spokesmen demand not only that the rule of big capital be limited but also that unions be weakened as far as possible, collective-bargaining agreements nullified, minimum-wage laws repealed, and government expenditures for social needs (which they directly associate with tax pressure) sharply reduced.

p The comparatively favorable economic climate of the war and postwar years and the industrial boom of the 60s brought about a rapid growth of the petty bourgeoisie and heightened the conservative mood in its ranks.

p American ultra-rightists made use of the petty-bourgeois dislike of the monopolies' domination of the economy and politics and of the government's state-monopolist methods, which smacked of a "collectivism" alien to individualistic private enterprise. They were able to rally petty-bourgeois elements and the nonmonopolist bourgeoisie to their standard; they created a mass movement associated with the names of reactionary politicians such as Barry Goldwater and George Wallace.

p The economic development of the USA was marked by relatively late development of the South and West; because of this it was primarily the financiers of the East, centered in Wall Street, who allied themselves with the government. As a result the Southern and Western monopolist coalitions, which emerged considerably later, found themselves outside the structure of the existing machinery of state-monopolism. Wall Street was their rival. The "new" capital of the West and South adheres, like the ultra-rightists, to the ideology of government non-interference in social and economic relations, and thus gravitates to the politics of the right. Ultra-rightism found strong allies in the enormously wealthy families of the South and West; it became a powerful political force.

p As a rule the influence of the right on the ruling class of the USA as a whole and on the government's domestic and foreign policies increases significantly at those times when the historical fates of the world's nations come to dramatic turning points. Thus the ruling class of the USA and the administration of Woodrow Wilson responded to the revolutionary fervor and the upsurge in mass democratic movements that the October Revolution in Russia produced in America with a "red hunt." the infamous Palmer raids, and repressive steps against the leaders of the workers' movement and those public representatives who supported Soviet Russia.

p The influence of the right on the policies of the American government was even greater after the Second World War. The formation of the world socialist system and the further worsening of the general crisis of capitalism brought on an unprecedented wave of reaction in the form of a broad attack on democracy in the USA. of which the McCarthyism of the 50s was the most concentrated expression. No other period in the nation's history had seen such crude and all-pervasive violations of American citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms.

p The influence of the right—overt and covert—has become a constant in the domestic politics of the USA. As the Watergate affair showed, that influence makes itself felt not only during crises (as in the McCarthy years or the period of stormy antiwar demonstrations by young people and a powerful civil rights drive by black Americans) but also when domestic conditions are relatively tranquil (as in the 70s).

p The Watergate scandal itself is only part of a gigantic iceberg whose true dimensions can only be guessed at.

p Democratic forces in the USA were placated to a certain degree when the ruling clique, after a long fight, yielded to their persistent demands and abolished certain malign symbols of McCarthyism and the cold war: the House Committee on UnAmerican Activities, the Subversive Activities Control Board, the Justice Department's lists of "subversive organizations."

p At the same time, under the direct influence of the right and in deep secrecy from the people, an ubiquitous police force was being equipped with the latest in surveillance technology. The components of this hypertrophied snooping machine were the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Pentagon's intelligence services, and special sections in many government departments and agencies. Flouting the basic norms of bourgeois legality they invaded the private lives of citizens in an attempt to put not only the actions but also the thoughts of virtually all adult Americans under police control.

p Throughout the 70s rightists vehemently attacked detente, which had become a reality thanks to the ceaseless efforts of the forces of progress and democracy. Nonetheless rightists, with the support of their adherents in Congress and working hand in glove with their formidable ally, the military-industrial complex, managed to get an increase in the military spending despite the spirit of the times. As the 70s gave way to the 80s the right's continual labors against peaceful coexistence bore poison fruit: the government of the USA began speaking the language of cold war, as it did decades ago.

p This outbreak of anticommunism and anti-Sovietism in the USA is proof of the power and influence of the right. And the history of the political struggle shows that although reaction always begins with an outcry about the "communist menace" the crusades that follow are directed against all the forces of democracy, progress, and liberalism.

p REFERENCES

[p](#) 1. *Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy* (Moscow: Novosti Press Agency, 1981), pp. 35–36.

[p](#) 2. V. I. Lenin, "Differences in the European Labour Movement", *Collected Works*, Vol. 16. Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1967, p. 350.

3. Karl Marx, "On the Jewish Question", in: Karl Marx. Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 163.

FROM ANTICOMMUNISM TO ANTI-LIBERALISM

[introduction.]

p In the USA the politics of concessions to working people and of social and economic reform have always evoked a negative reaction from the great majority of the ruling class. The extreme right wing of the American bourgeoisie long ago identified reform with the "red menace" and branded reformers "subversives," "traitors," and "communist agents." The American journalist I. F. Stone noted that "the red menace in our history is older than the Reds. . . In the 1890s the first federal income tax law was attacked before the Supreme Court as Communistic."^^1^^

p During the world economic crisis of 1929–1933 class tensions became acute in the USA, and once again the ruling class was haunted by the specter of a "red menace"; rightists both in Congress and outside it used the politics of anticommunism to discredit the liberal and democratic measures of Roosevelt's New Deal. Rightists opposed American participation in the war against Hitler and in fact aided fascist regimes. Many of these rightists later became energetic supporters of Senator Joseph McCarthy and leaders of the ultra-rightist movement.

p At the end of the 30s and beginning of the 40s Congress and the administration, yielding to unremitting pressure from the right, adopted a number of measures that can hardly be called democratic but were then considered to be necessary for the fight against fascism. The McCormack Act of 1938 required that all "foreign agents" be individually registered. The Voorhis Law of 1940 prescribed that all organizations dedicated to the violent overthrow of the United States government or operating under foreign control register with federal agencies and submit regular accounts of their activities. The Hatch Act of 1939 barred Communists and members of so-called subversive organizations from work in government agencies.

p In 1940 the Alien Registration or Smith Act was adopted at the suggestion of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This law made it a crime to call for the overthrow of the government by force and, unlike the measures adopted by Congress earlier, required that all aliens be registered and that persons who belonged, or had ever belonged, to organizations advocating the violent overthrow of the United States government be deported. In the years after the war the Smith Act became one of the right's chief weapons in its struggle against the Communist Party.

p However during the war the Roosevelt administration showed a certain caution in applying these measures in practice. Most of the people fired had connections with the German secret service, while members of various democratic and progressive organizations were allowed, in a number of cases, to continue working in government jobs. The government tolerated, to a certain degree, the activities of the Communist

Party, which favored a system of collective security and in every way supported the USA's effort in the war against the Axis.

p After the war international developments did not go as the American ruling class would have liked, but it was unable to alter their course. A decisive change in favor of socialism took place in the international balance of power, and the USA emerged as the economic and political leader of the generally weakened capitalist system. These circumstances occasioned a radical change in the policies of America's rulers.

p The victory of people's democratic revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries stunned and confused the American ruling class. The imperialists saw this as a challenge to their interests, a direct threat to their well-being. The rulers of the USA grew more reactionary with every success of the international revolutionary and national liberation movements. Anticommunism became the guiding principle of American domestic and foreign policies; the international struggle against communism was proclaimed America's highest purpose.

p Through the distortions of American propaganda the revolutionary changes that took place in the world after the war were presented to the average citizen as a series of "plots inspired by Moscow" against the peoples of Europe and Asia, as "communist aggression." The Committee on Un-American Activities maintained that a "communist plot" threatened the very existence of the United States. Spies, it was claimed, were in 13 every federal agency, gathering information from high officials. The committee was unable, however, to name a single name; it confined itself to the unsupported assertion that "at a time of national crisis, the United States would have nearly 823,000 persons who are either spies, traitors, or saboteurs working against us from within."² Successful tests of atomic weapons in the Soviet Union were used by the United States government and Congress to start a scare campaign about the "Soviet threat."

p The most reactionary groups within the imperialist bourgeoisie of the USA went even further. The government had been compelled to take certain domestic and foreign policy measures dictated by a sober assessment of the emerging situation. Now, in the light of the revolutionary changes that had taken place around the world, these measures were alleged to have been consciously and deliberately taken to serve the ends of the world communist movement.

p The postwar shift to the right in the political life of the USA also affected liberal groups. In 1946–1947 the question of cooperating with the Communists was the center of political discussion. Many liberals were against it; another, much smaller, group insisted that the alliance with the Communists be continued in peacetime. An organizational split along these lines was made as early as the latter part of 1946, leading to the formation of an anticommunist liberal organization, the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), and an opposing group, the Progressive Citizens of America. In early January of 1947 the ADA issued a program statement rejecting "any association with Communists or sympathizers with communism in the United States." In 1946 Henry A. Wallace, who

had continued to stand for cooperation among all of the country's progressive forces, was forced to resign.

p At the same time the fight against fascism in the USA became noticeably less active. In 1945 the military administration in Germany possessed lists of thousands of Americans whom the Nazis considered their friends and supporters. Official bodies showed no interest whatever in calling these persons to account for pro-Nazi activities. The government halted official probes into ties between the USA's largest corporations and the Third Reich's monopolies, and prevented new investigations from being 14 opened. It also put various obstacles in the way of private citizens trying to hunt down Nazis who had made their way into the USA after the war. Certain members of Congress began to equate any mention of connections between American monopolies and German cartels during the war with the Communist Party line. A number of advocates of the complete eradication of Nazism and fascism were forced to resign.⁴

p Racist and anti-Semitic organizations continued to exist in the United States, and new ones arose. They were allowed to freely disseminate publications such as the "Memorandum on Anti-Semitism," which suggested that after the war Jews be deported, segregated, and sterilized.⁵

p Influential forces in Congress were highly energetic, in publishing anticommunist material: *Communism in Action* was issued in six hundred thousand copies in 1949. Meanwhile the publication of *Fascism in Action*, prepared by the Library of Congress, was delayed for several years; it finally appeared in an edition of only one hundred thousand copies. Moreover, not a single fascist organization in the USA and not a single American fascist was mentioned in it.⁰

p The rulers of the USA were less interested in the lessons to be drawn from the bloody war against fascism than in the struggle against progressive and democratic forces in their country and abroad. Indeed there were some in America who openly defended German Nazism.

p The stern but just punishment meted out at Nuremberg met with the approval of the overwhelming majority of the world's people. But it was not to the liking of many of those who had opposed American participation in the war against Germany. This group was represented in the House by (among others) the Republicans Schwabe, Shipstead, Luce, Willis, Dondero, and Langer, and the Democrats Wheeler and Rankin. Their leader was Republican Senator Robert A. Taft, who regarded the executions resulting from the trials as "a blot on the American record."⁷ Taft's group maintained that the trials at Nuremberg were not legal and that they were "most ardently supported by Communist-front organizations."⁸ For Taft Nuremberg was nothing more than an act of vengeance by the victors against the vanquished. The senator's attitude toward the war-crimes trials was a logical consequence of his belief that the victory of 15 communism was "far more dangerous. . . than the victory of fascism."⁹

p After the Second World War American imperialism assumed responsibility for the fate of world capitalism; the USA became the world's policeman. This posture, together with the growing reactionary trend, created in the country a very favorable climate for the rise and development of various sorts of chauvinistic and extremist organizations.

p The Committee for Constitutional Government (CCG), which was founded in 1937 to combat Roosevelt's New Deal, was highly active in the 40s. The CCG was the connecting link between the prewar generation of ultra-rightists, represented by the American League of Liberty and America First, and the right extremists of the 60s. The CCG set forth its view of America and of the nation's future in the "Platform for Americans,"¹¹ which defined the basic stance of right extremists for decades to come. This program document contained nearly all the demands being made by ultra-rightists in America; in particular it reflected the discontent of important groups of American businessmen with the government's growing role in running the economy, with its economic and social concessions to working people, and with the increasing influence of unions.

p The CCG was closely connected with the Du Pont family. Both Du Pont brothers, Irene and Lamont, were "hard-headed Tories" in America, and contributed generously to the CCG. Among the organization's other financial backers were J. Howard Pew, a shipbuilder, Edward F. Hutton, a Wall Street broker and former member of America First, and Robert B. Dresser, a member of the National Republican Committee.¹¹

p The generous backing of rich patrons made it possible for the CCG to set up a huge reserve fund and spend more money each year for propaganda and lobbying. At the end of the 40s the CCG had received contributions totaling \$5,500,000 from 75,000 persons.¹²

p The CCG used its copious funds to fight against the social and economic measures introduced during the New Deal. Ed Ramey, vice-president of the CCG, announced that everything that had taken place in the country under Roosevelt and since—the New Deal and the Fair Deal—was "socialism" and "communism," in particular the National Labor Relations (Wagner) Act and federal housing construction. The CCG also condemned the minimum wage law, the graduated income tax, and rent control.¹¹ Between 1937 and 1950 the CCG sent out eighty-two million booklets, pamphlets, letters, and reprints of editorials and articles. 760,000 books, more than 10,000 transcripts of radio broadcasts, 350,000 telegrams, and many thousands of newspaper releases.¹¹ What is more, above fifty million pieces of mail from rightist organizations were sent out under congressional franking.¹⁵

p The committee had a close ally in the National Economic Council (NEC), an ultra-rightist organization created in 1930. The NEC fought tirelessly against the New Deal, and thus enjoyed the steadfast support of big capital. Its position on the basic questions of domestic and foreign policy was identical to the CCG's.¹¹

p Data furnished by Merwin K. Hart, the head of the NEC, showed that it was supported in the postwar years by more than forty corporations, two foundations, and twenty-four private citizens. One of the Congressional committees that investigated the NEC's activities, however, found that in 1947 alone it took in contributions from three thousand private persons and corporations. Hart's principal backer was the Du Pont family, which gave tens of thousands of dollars. In November 1949 Lamont Du Pont addressed a letter to the American public in which he lauded the council's "outstanding work toward stemming the tide of communism and socialism in this country" and appealed to industrialists for contributions.¹⁷ A Kansas corporation accompanied its \$6,000 check to Hart with a letter explaining that the money was "payment for work in opposing socialism and communism in America, and for the maintenance and strengthening of America's private enterprise, private property, and individual initiative."¹⁸

p Hart regularly resorted to scare tactics in soliciting contributions from businessmen and average Americans. "Will you start the ball rolling, dear American?" read one of his standard appeals. "Your family and home are in danger. Everything in which you believe is threatened, even your life may be in jeopardy."¹⁹ A letter to businessmen, after asking for financial help, went on to explain that the NEC was fighting the 17 administration's socialistic measures, "which will bankrupt this country and eventually your company."²⁰

p Hart was adamant against democracy, which he identified with "mobocracy"; he opposed to it the concept of a "republic". He believed that any organization that had the word "democracy" in its name was subversive and under Communist control.²¹

The Committee for Constitutional Government and the National Economic Council, acting in concert with other right-wing organizations, generated an atmosphere of anticommunist hysteria and bigotry, which served as a convenient background for an officially conducted campaign of persecution and harassment against the country's democratic institutions.

* * *

p In 1947 the American Communist Morris wrote, "The 'Red Scare' . . . is the key to the entire strategy against labor. The Communist Party is only the bullseye. The target is much wider. It extends to everyone in labor, politics, science, arts or religion who is even mildly progressive."²²

p In 1938–1940, when the first legislative acts against subversion were adopted, it could hardly have been foreseen that they would set off a chain reaction affecting large numbers of Americans who in one way or another had expressed discontent with the existing order. Most of these people belonged to groups maintaining that capitalism could be "improved" by introducing certain reforms.

p As the general crisis of capitalism worsened, criticism of the bourgeois order, even from a liberal position, came to be regarded as an act of treason. Discussing race

relations, expressing sympathy for Russia and its people, defending the interests of unions, criticizing the Committee on Un-American Activities, taking part in radical publications—such actions were considered incriminating evidence. In several cases the fact that a person read the liberal *New Republic* was presented as compromising. "Dangerous ideas," similar to the communist point of view, were held criminal.

And thus the campaign to stamp out communism inevitably led to the persecution of democratic and liberal organizations and of individuals.

Anti-Labor Politics

p In the postwar period the ruling class, using the bugbear of the "red menace," directed its first and main blow against the working class, the unions, and the Communist Party USA. The organized labor movement had moved to a new and higher stage of mass struggle. The labor unions, hardened in class battles, were now in a condition to win victory through well-organized strikes. The Wagner Act faced the giants of the steel, automobile, electronics, and other industries, after decades of stubborn and even violent resistance, with the necessity of bargaining collectively with the representatives of workers. The law thus became the object of fierce attacks. "If we want to keep communism out of America," declared Representative Robert F. Rich on July 19, 1945, "you must change the Wagner Act."²³

p The National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the Committee for Constitutional Government, and other organizations of American businessmen who had also opposed the New Deal in its time spent millions of dollars to foster anti-union sentiment and thus prepared the way for the adoption of anti-labor legislation. A special committee investigating the activities of lobbyists learned that the Committee for Constitutional Government alone spent some two million dollars between 1946 and 1950 for anti-union propaganda.²⁴

p No less impressive was the campaign of the National Association of Manufacturers, which used radio broadcasts, special publications for teachers and clergymen, programs for women's clubs, etc. and reached an audience of forty million. The association supplied 7,500 weekly newspapers with materials intended to influence public opinion in favor of the adoption of an anti-union law by Congress. And the American sociologists Mosen and Cannon point out that "these were only a few of many such actions by the business groups."²⁵ By 1947 the Chamber of Commerce of the United States had reason to believe that the Eightieth Congress would probably "modify the Wagner Act so that employers can work more effectively, and without fear of law violation, with American-minded employees in opposing Communists within the labor movement."²⁰

p Many national and local newspapers and magazines joined the harassment campaign against the unions and the National Labor Relations Board, and in every way supported the country's rightist forces. The prevailing hostility toward workers' organizations made possible the passing of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947.

p One of the most reactionary provisions of that law was Section 9, which put the internal affairs of workers' organizations under strict government control. Unions were required to submit written declarations that their leadership included no Communist Party members, had no connections with organizations that were in sympathy with the Communists, and did not subscribe to the overthrow of the United States government by violence or other "illegal" methods. This section was intended to isolate the Communist Party from the unions and weaken its influence among the masses. The ruling cliques wanted to make use of anticommunist hysteria to crush or at least weaken the most powerful unions with militant and progressive leaders. The Taft-Hartley Act made it possible for employers to accuse any progressive union leader of sympathy for communist ideas (if not of Party membership); in this way they could emasculate the unions. Any union that refused to state that its leaders were not Communist Party members was deprived of all rights and made illegal.

p The Taft-Hartley Act greatly inhibited the further growth of unions and the increase of their memberships; it helped the reactionaries to draw unions into a cold war that hampered them in organizing resistance to monopoly's offensives.

p The new law significantly limited workers' right to strike. Solidarity strikes, strikes to win recognition of unions, and strikes by government employees were declared illegal. Other strikes, formally allowed by the law, were obstructed by complex and time-consuming procedural requirements; this was especially the case with nationwide strikes. The difficulties of concluding collective agreements increased after 1947. The law hindered the organization of unions in states where they had not previously existed and among government employees. Weak unions found themselves in a difficult position because the law allowed "free speech" to employers provided they did not use "threats or promises of rewards"; in practice this untied the hands of owners for the struggle against workers' organizations.

20

p Legislation passed by the individual states was also a powerful tool for the monopolies in their fight to weaken unions. Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act gave state legislatures the right to forbid closed shops and other forms of agreement with unions if they were not in accord with state law. This article, upheld as constitutional by the Supreme Court in 1949, was a serious concession to the extreme right. The National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States showed a hypocritical concern for the freedoms of individual workers who supposedly suffered the despotism of unions; in a number of states they secured passage of so-called right-to-work laws, which made it possible for employers to ignore the unions in hiring and firing workers.

p The materials released by the special Congressional subcommittee that investigated the effects of the Taft-Hartley Act on the relations between labor and management show that owners used the new anti-worker legislation to destroy existing unions and to keep new ones from forming. Companies refused outright to negotiate with union representatives. The struggle was especially hard in the South, where textile companies waged an all-out war against workers. As a result unions were able to recruit only 70,000 members from among the South's 800,000 textile workers.²⁷

p In 1953 anti-worker "right-to-work" laws were adopted in nineteen states; this led to a reduction of union membership. In 1953, 18 percent of the work force in those states were union members (1,962,000 workers); in 1960, only 15 percent (1,920,000).²⁸

p The USA's three million agricultural workers found themselves in a disastrous position: the minimum wage law did not apply to them, and they were not eligible for old-age pensions or unemployment insurance. They were refused the right to conduct collective bargaining and to conclude collective agreements. In California, the nation's richest state, farm workers lived in hovels, and deaths from malnutrition were common among them. Local police and the private guards of the farming companies stood watch over them night and day.²⁹

p The owners of the big farms refused to deal with the National Farm Labor Union. When in 1947 the union called a strike, they announced that disorders were being provoked by subversive, 21 communistic elements, and brought in strikebreakers. A protest the union made to the National Labor Relations Board was turned away on the grounds that the Taft-Hartley Act did not apply to agricultural workers. But this technicality did not prevent the board from acting against the union at the behest of the farm owners: in response to an action brought by the board, a district court issued an injunction against the striking workers on July 14, 1948.³⁰

p Employees at enterprises working on government contracts who went on strike to win higher wages were confronted not only with the Taft-Hartley Act but also with the Antiracketeering Law and the Hobbs Act. In 1953 two Congressional committees opened an investigation of actions by workers in Kansas City, and charged them with racketeering and extortion.³¹

p Despite the Taft-Hartley's fierce anti-union bias many manufacturers felt that it was still not a sufficient safeguard for their interests. The Standard Oil Company (Indiana), General Electric, and other big corporations, mindful of the lessons the class struggle of the late 40s and early 50s had taught, demanded laws that would "insure the continuance of collective bargaining within the framework of established and traditional local collective bargaining units," and prohibit bargaining, and also strikes, from being conducted on an industrywide basis. The companies also considered the anticommunist provisions of existing legislation too weak; they called on the administration to take more decisive measures against Communists in the unions, and to leave the regulation of relations between labor and management within the competence of the states.³²

p The promotion of all these suggestions was intensively financed. In 1950, 152 industrial corporations reported that they had spent \$32,125,000 for lobbying in Congress between January 1947 and July 1950. But the Committee on Lobbying Activities estimated that the corporations' expenditures had actually been much greater: not less than \$1 billion."'''

The unwillingness of employers to recognize unions and to conclude agreements with them was one of the main reasons for many strikes. In 1948 alone more than four million workingdays were lost because of strikes/'^^1^^ By and large, however, the collaborationism of union bosses deprived the working class of the ability to resist reaction on a nationwide scale.

The Persecution of the Communist Party USA and the Split in the Unions

p Throughout the years of the Communist Party's existence in the USA Communists had fought steadfastly and consistently for the democratization of the country and for constructive social and economic reforms. The ruling cliques, in order to create favorable conditions for crushing the party, decided to use provocateurs and agents from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to discredit it in the eyes of the people. This was the goal, specifically, of an extraordinarily noisy campaign against "espionage" and "subversive activity" allegedly directed at the overthrow of the government by "force and violence." The leaders in this campaign were the FBI and the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In 1947 the committee's chairman, J. Parnell Thomas, demanded that the General Secretary of the Communist Party USA, Eugene Dennis, appear before the committee to give evidence about the Communists' "subversive activities." When this demand was rejected Thomas called for the Justice Department to bring legal proceedings against Dennis, who in early July of that year was sentenced to one year in prison, and a \$1,000 fine for contempt of Congress. The arrest of Dennis was the prelude to a full-scale campaign whose ultimate goal was the destruction of the party. For decades the FBI had been gathering material purporting to show that the Communist Party's leaders were seeking to overthrow the US government by force. The Department of Justice praised the FBI highly for services of "incalculable value," which had supposedly helped it, in the interests of "internal security," to determine the "true nature" of the Communist conspiracy in America/'^^5^^ Having compiled this dossier the ruling cliques could institute proceedings against American Communists under the Smith Act of 1940, which made it a crime to consciously defend the idea of overthrowing the government by "force and violence." But even under this law, which was in violation of the First Amendment of the Constitution, the government could only make a case against Communists by distorting Marxism and the politics of the Communist Party.

p On January 17, 1949, eleven Communists went on trial in New York. Using the false testimony of FBI agents and provocateurs who had infiltrated the party, the

authorities maintained that the aim of its program was the overthrow of the government by "force and violence." [23•*

p Not one of the charges was proved by the government or the Committee on Un-American Activities. The court convicted the party leaders of conspiracy to overthrow the government, claiming that the Communists had used allegorical language. On October 14, 1949, the eleven Communists (among whom was Eugene Dennis, General Secretary of the Communist Party USA) were each sentenced to five years in prison and a fine of \$10,000.³⁶ In 1951 the Supreme Court upheld the New York court's decision, giving *de facto* recognition to the conspiracy theory being propagandized by the most reactionary segments of the American bourgeoisie. The New York court also initiated an action against the attorneys of the National Lawyers Guild who had defended the Communists; the attorneys were convicted of "deliberate efforts. . . to inject Communist propaganda into the trial."³⁷ But even representatives of the bourgeoisie were unable to conceal that the trial was a political reprisal. As Roger Baldwin, director of the American Civil Liberties Union, justly pointed out: "They are not being tried for a secret conspiracy. They are being tried for openly advocating the Communist program and objectives."³⁸

p The leadership of the American Federation of Labor and of the Congress of Industrial Organizations fully supported the officially conducted purge of progressive elements from union organizations.

p Many energetic leaders, devoted to the cause of the working class, were driven out of organizations at this time; others, caught 24

p up in the antiromunist hysteria, actively abetted the leaders of the AFL and CIO in persecuting progressives in the workers' movement.

p The conviction of eleven Communists was not an isolated phenomenon. By 1956 about 150 Communist Party leaders had been arrested under the Smith Act. At the beginning of the 50s the threat of similar proceedings hung over the heads of many thousands of American citizens.³⁹

p At the same time that Communists were being persecuted under the Smith Act, Congress was feverishly working out measures whose real purpose was the destruction of the Communist Party. In 1948 the House Committee on Un-American Activities published a completely false report asserting that the Communist Party USA was "an agent of a foreign power."⁴⁰ From February 5 to 20 its subcommittee on legislation, headed by future President Richard M. Nixon, reviewed legislative steps that could be taken "to counteract the menace of the Communist fifth column within the United States."⁴¹ Some of the committee's members considered it unproductive to debate the question of whether the Communist Party was a threat to national security; they suggested that Communists simply be forced "out of our educational institutions, off the radio, out of labor unions, and from every position of trust or confidence which they can use to spread their poisonous propaganda."⁴²

p The Rankin Bill barred Communists from federal and state office and made it illegal to defend or to express sympathy with communist ideology in the nation's schools and colleges. Ten years imprisonment or a fine of \$10,000 was the penalty suggested for expressing sympathy with communism. The no less reactionary Sheppard Bill outlawed membership in the Communist Party or in any other organization that stood for the "overthrow of the government by force and violence," and also political activity directly or indirectly serving the ends of a foreign power or a foreign political party. During the several years of debate that took place in the committee in connection with these bills, and that concluded with the adoption of the McCarran-Wood Act in 1950, hundreds of organizations and thousands of persons were accused of "subversive activity."

p The ruling cliques used the intensification of anti-communist sentiment to undermine progressive unions from within, to split and weaken them as far as possible. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States formulated these goals explicitly in the brochure *Communists Within the Labor Movement* (see note 26), circulated throughout the country in hundreds of thousands of copies. This policy of division was extensively used against the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, the National Maritime Union, the United Shoe Workers, and the United Furniture Workers.

p The case of the United Electrical Workers (UE) may be used to illustrate this tactic. The UE's leadership refused to take the anti-communist oath required by the Taft-Hartley Act. In 1948 a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor investigated "communism" in labor unions. James B. Carey, former president of the UE and current secretary-treasurer of the CIO, charged the UE with being a "Communist front." The subcommittee repeated this charge in its report, declaring that the UE's national and local leadership was under Communist control.⁴³

p Thereupon the Atomic Energy Commission demanded that General Electric refuse to recognize the UE as the representative of workers in the atomic industry. Because its leaders had violated Section 9 of the Taft-Hartley Act the UE was unable to protest before the National Labor Relations Board. Court action also met with no success: the Atomic Energy Commission's demand was upheld. From August to December 1949 the Committee on Un-American Activities conducted an investigation of the UE. The leadership of the CIO made use of this circumstance to expel the UE from its ranks on November 2, 1949. A new union was formed, the International Union of Electrical Workers; James B. Carey was its president. It was recognized by the National Labor Relations Board as the representative of a number of groups of electrical workers.

p In 1950 Julius Emspak, Secretary-Treasurer of the UE, and sixty other union leaders were cited for contempt for declining to answer several questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities. The resolution citing Emspak and the others was passed in the House by a vote of 372 to 1." This was not the end of the UE's trials, which will be taken up again below. This investigation and others like it made it easier for the ruling cliques in the USA to divide the union movement. The CIO's 26 leaders, following the government's official line, broke ties with the World Federation of Trade Unions and,

together with the American Federation of Labor, began a cold war against the international trade union movement. In addition to the UE ten unions with a total membership of one million were excluded from the CIO in 1949.

[p](#) The great majority of the unions, yielding to pressure from the government, investigators in Congress, and their own anticommunist leaders, refused to fight the Taft-Hartley Act. By May 1950, 206 national and 11,830 local unions had submitted affidavits that their leaders were not connected with the Communists.⁴⁵ In 1950 the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of Section 9, the Act's anticommunist provision. This despite the fact that Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson recognized that Section 9 set First Amendment rights at naught.⁴⁰

[p](#) The persecution of progressive trade unions grew still greater. In 1953, at the request of the heads of General Electric, Senator McCarthy investigated the United Electrical Workers. Hearings were held in Albany and Boston. General Electric supported the investigation and announced that it would fire any employee who refused to answer questions before McCarthy's committee. GE kept its promise, discharging a number of "undesirables." In 1954, not without the help of the National Labor Relations Board, 40,000 employees switched from the UE to Carey's organization. The UE went to court to have the GE firings declared illegal, but without success. In 1954 Communists and persons belonging to "subversive organizations" were banned from Carey's International Union of Electrical Workers.¹⁷

[p](#) Similar events took place in the automobile industry. The leaders of the United Automobile Workers, headed by Walter Reuther, adopted a resolution barring Communists from leadership posts in the organization. This resolution was used against five leaders of Ford Local 600 (embracing the River Rouge plant) who were opposed to Reuther's leadership, but these leftists fought for, and kept, their positions. In 1952 and 1954 the Committee on Un-American Activities turned its attention to this union. Two inquiries were conducted in Michigan, and the materials of these sessions published.

[p](#) Reuther and those around him accused those who protested against the committee's interference of anti-union activity. Under this pretext General Motors fired two "undesirable" leaders of a local in Flint.

[p](#) The concerted efforts of the government, Congress, the companies, and the union bosses compelled a substantial number of unions to introduce into their constitutions provisions barring Communists from membership. According to government data forty workers' organizations with a total of six million members had adopted such measures by 1954. Communists were barred from holding office in fifty-one unions with a total of ten million members.¹⁸

A deep split and a weakening of the fighting spirit in the workers' movement—this was the outcome of the "struggle against communism" in the USA's labor unions. The cooperation of the leaders of the AFL and CIO with the government and the committees

encouraged the ruling cliques to prepare a new assault on the position of the working class, which was launched at the end of the 50s.

* * *

Notes

[23•*] The Program of the Communist Party USA, adopted June 28, 1945, read: "The purposes of this organization are to promote the best interests and welfare of the working class and the people of the United States, to defend and extend the democracy of our country, to prevent the rise of fascism and to advance the cause of progress and peace with the ultimate aim of ridding our country of the scourge of economic crises, unemployment, insecurity, poverty, and war through the realization of the historic aim of the working class—the establishment of socialism by the free choice of the majority of the American people." Quoted in: Harold W. Chase, *Security and Liberty: The Problem of Native Communists 1947–1955* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1955), p. 6,

Loyalty Tests of Government Employees

p One of the most significant measures adopted by the United States government in response to the demands of extreme rightist groups was the testing of the loyalty of government employees. It gave official sanction to an unprecedentedly wide campaign of political persecution against American citizens. Truman's purge of progressives from the government, begun in 1947, coincided with reactionary offensives against Communists in France, Italy, and other countries; it was part of a concerted postwar attack on democracy by imperialist groups.

p There was steady pressure from the right for loyalty tests of government employees. In 1946 the Committee on Un-American Activities recommended that "the Congress create an independent commission to investigate and order discharge of any employee of any Federal agency whose loyalty is in doubt."¹⁹ The pamphlet (*'oin»iujii.sts Witlihi tlie Government*, published by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in 1947, set forth basic principles for ridding the federal government of disloyal persons. It was demanded that loyalty tests be made a mandatory condition for employment in government organizations. Responsibility for the loyalty of staff was to be placed on department and section heads and on the Civil Service Commission. The FBI was to fingerprint all employees and give its opinion on the loyalty of individuals. It was suggested that application forms include information on relatives, former addresses, and use of aliases. The Chamber of Commerce insisted that all materials on the loyalty of federal employees be systematized and centralized. Finally, it was demanded that "Communist front organizations" should be clearly denuded and listed.⁰⁰ These were the circumstances that lay behind Truman's Executive Order 9835 of March 21, 1947, which provided for loyalty tests of government employees.

p The government maintained that the purpose of the order was to ensure the security of the USA and to guarantee the rights of federal employees by protecting them from "unfounded accusations of disloyalty."⁵¹ But in fact the whole system of loyalty tests was a crude violation of the rights of the employees who were forced to demonstrate their innocence. Six criteria for disloyalty were established: three related to crimes such as treason and espionage, the fourth to advocating the violent overthrow of the government (this was already covered by the Hatch Act), the fifth to breaches of official duty (such as disclosure of confidential information), and the sixth to membership in or any connection with "subversive organizations." The basic criterion for firing persons accused under any of these points was "reasonable grounds for belief" in their disloyalty.⁵²

p To implement the order loyalty boards, consultative bodies under department heads, were created in every agency. By 1952 the number of such boards was nearly two hundred; fourteen regional loyalty boards had also been established.⁵³ The overall guidance of the loyalty boards was in the hands of the Loyalty Review Board (the highest body for appeal), which reported on its work and made recommendations to the Civil Service Commission.⁵⁴ The executive order prescribed that loyalty be determined on the basis of the files of the FBI, the Civil Service Commission, military and naval intelligence, and the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The order officially sanctioned the use of information obtained from undercover informers.⁵⁵ These informers could not be cross-examined in the presence of the accused; suspected persons were thus rendered defenseless. Moreover Seth W. Richardson, chairman of the Loyalty Review Board, declared that investigators were under no obligation to inform employees of the reasons for their discharge. "No person," read the board's statement, "has an inherent or Constitutional right to public employment. Public employment is a privilege, not a right."⁵⁶

p The security act adopted by Congress on August 26, 1950 permitted the heads of eleven departments and agencies to dismiss unreliable persons for national security reasons. The employee did not lose the formal right to seek or accept work in another government organization, but before he could be accepted for such a position a consultation with the Civil Service Commission was required.⁵⁷

p The government fulfilled, in practice, virtually every one of the demands made by the Chamber of Commerce in the pamphlet mentioned above; nevertheless rightists in Congress and outside it regarded the loyalty-test program as insufficient, and suggested that a special law be passed on this matter.⁵⁸ Bill HR 3813, providing for loyalty tests of government employees, was sponsored by reactionary Republicans; its cutting edge was directed against the administration.⁵⁹ It was debated in the House during summer 1947. In the end the bill failed to pass, but it influenced the Truman administration to move still further toward the right, extending the persecution to persons who held democratic and liberal views. On July 31, 1947 Congress, at Truman's request, made an appropriation of \$11,000,000 for carrying out the loyalty program (\$7,500,000 for the FBI and \$3,500,000 for the Civil Service Commission); the program was put into effect immediately afterwards.⁶⁰

p The most common basis for accusations of disloyalty was association with persons engaged in subversive activity or with groups listed by the Justice Department as "subversive." But in several cases even having worked for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in 1933 or for the La Follette Commission on Civil Rights was viewed as a disloyal act. By June 30, 1950, the government had processed 2,833,846 loyalty forms⁶¹; by the time Eisenhower entered the White House the FBI had run 4,722,278 name checks on government employees and job applicants.⁶² The loyalty tests, which were meant to purge the government of spies and unreliable persons, were eventually used to persecute those who favored reform.

p The compilation of lists of "subversive organizations," ordered by the Truman administration, was a crude violation of the Constitution. In 1948 Attorney General Clark's list included nearly a hundred organizations; that of his successor, J. Howard McGrath, included 192.⁶³ Most of these groups were working for social reform in the interests of working people, for business cooperation with the socialist countries, for international security and peace, and against fascism. The American League for Peace and Democracy was designated a "communist organization": it supported labor legislation, defended blacks, and called for the repeal of the poll tax, the outlawing of anti-Semitic propaganda, the creation of a collective security system, and the curbing of fascism. Eight groups that had supported republican Spain against Franco's fascist dictatorship were included on the list, as were several organizations for the promotion of mutual understanding between the people of the USA and the people of the USSR.⁶⁴ [30*]

p After the war membership in these and many other groups came to be regarded as a sign of disloyalty and sufficient grounds for dismissal from work. The Justice Department blacklists were a crude violation of the traditional right of Americans to organize. The organizations listed were in effect condemned to extinction: they rapidly lost members, which almost automatically led to their disbandment. Nonetheless the constitutionality of Executive Order 9835 and of the Justice Department's compiling of lists of "subversive organizations" was upheld in a series of court decisions between 1948 and 1950.⁶⁵

31

p The harassment of "disloyal" persons gradually spread to employees in state and local government; by 1951 eighteen states had made loyalty tests obligatory for their employees.⁶⁶

p The Republicans came to power in 1953; they strengthened the government's machinery for investigating employees. The new administration was highly critical of Truman's executive order of March 21, 1947, which it held to be totally inadequate as a guarantee of America's security, an insufficient barrier against the infiltration of the federal government by undesirables. Truman's security program had been based on the principle of "reasonable doubt"; Eisenhower instituted a new and broader criterion: a person was to be barred from employment as unreliable "if his employment was not

clearly consistent with the national security."'' The administration could use this standard against any employee that displeased it.

p Eisenhower's security program was formulated in Executive Order 10450, issued on April 27, 1953. The new program streamlined the investigative procedure. It abolished the Loyalty Review Board (the highest body for appeal) and the regional boards. Departmental loyalty boards also ceased to exist in their earlier form: they were now to be made up of specially appointed members rather than of employees from the particular department. In this the administration was guided by the wishes of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which considered the departmental loyalty boards set up by the Truman administration the weakest link in the employee loyalty-test program.

p Eisenhower's order extended the provisions of the security act passed on August 26, 1950, which permitted eleven government departments and agencies to dismiss employees for national security reasons, to all government organizations. Candidates for certain positions were to undergo a full security check by the Civil Service Commission and the FBI; department heads were given the right to determine these positions at their own discretion. In accordance with legislation on national security Executive Order 10450 prescribed that the Civil Service Commission compile cumulative lists of persons investigated. The Civil Service Commission was to report twice a year on this work to the National Security Council.⁸⁸

p The provisions of Truman's order were somewhat less strict for 32 employees of long standing and for those not occupying responsible posts; the new system prescribed security checks for all groups of Federal employees without exception.⁸⁹ The system introduced by the Republicans dealt more harshly with employees whose views showed even a hint of unorthodoxy. It deprived them of the right to appeal, which the previous administration had provided at least in form. Those placed in charge of security checks assumed the powers of investigator, prosecutor, and judge. They could almost unfailingly blacken the name of anyone who displeased them, ruin his chances for promotion, or drive him from his job—all without detriment to themselves. The order particularly stressed that federal employment was a privilege, not a right. The administration took secret denunciation under its wing as an essential institution in the national security system. At times even departmental boards were unable to judge the reliability of information obtained from secret informers.

p On October 13, 1953 Executive Order 10450 was augmented with a new criterion for disloyalty: anyone refusing to answer questions from investigators under the protection of the Fifth Amendment thereby lost the right to federal employment. One of the consequences of the measures adopted by the administration was a lengthening of the Justice Department's list of "subversive organizations," which grew to include 279 groups during Eisenhower's years as president.⁹⁰ The list's significance reached far beyond the federal government: it was widely used by state and city authorities, even by private organizations. It became a mighty weapon against the groups and individuals named.

p It is not surprising that the new loyalty-test program gave fresh impetus to the blacklisting begun under Truman. In three months the administration announced that 1,456 employees had been dismissed; by 1955 the number had reached 8,000. Security checks were soon conducted on a still greater number of persons. The State Department made loyalty checks on the UN's American employees, and the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission demanded checks on several million blue and white-collar workers in those branches of industry that filled government orders. J. Robert Oppenheimer's dismissal attained international notoriety. The renowned physicist's protests against the use of the atomic bomb in Japan and his refusal to take part in the development of even more deadly thermonuclear weapons put official Washington on guard. But because there were no facts compromising him he passed the Truman administration's loyalty test. The new investigation of the "Oppenheimer case" undertaken in accordance with Eisenhower's Order 10450 also failed to uncover any evidence of disloyalty, but the majority of the committee found that the scientist's employment on the Atomic Energy Commission was not in the interests of national security.⁷¹ This decision brought suspicion on many persons who associated with Oppenheimer.⁷²

p The Communists Julius and Ethel Rosenberg fell victim to McCarthyism and to the spy mania of those years. The couple was accused of atomic espionage, and in January 1951 sentenced to death in the electric chair. There was a huge international outcry. Campaigns to get the sentence reviewed began in the USA and abroad. Noted scientists expressed skepticism about the charges against the Rosenbergs.⁷³ Up to 15,000 letters and telegrams arrived at the White House each week from public organizations, prominent scholars, and political leaders all over the world urging that the death sentence pronounced against these Communists be commuted through presidential clemency. All in vain. The Court of Appeals, the Supreme Court, and President Eisenhower refused to review the decision. The death sentence was executed on June 19, 1953.

p The purge of "disloyal" elements affected many branches of industry; it extended to some state and local governments. By 1956 forty-two states required loyalty oaths from their employees.⁷⁴

p The loyalty tests cost the government vast sums. The lowest estimate of federal expenditures for the program is \$37.4 million per year. Some American authors, however, think this figure far too small: between 1952 and 1954 the Atomic Energy Commission alone spent an average of \$12.8 million per year on security.⁷⁵ Moreover, expenditures by private firms are not taken into consideration.

p The system of loyalty tests, which recognized "guilt by association," was a plain violation of the right of citizens to form organizations. A study published in the USA in 1951 noted that in the current situation "it is dangerous to join an organization unless you know that all the other members—past and future as well as present—are above suspicion."³⁴ Many Americans, frightened by purges in government and private organizations, came to view the Bill of Rights as a subversive document. On July 5, 1951, a Wisconsin newspaper, the *Journal Tribune*, reported that only one citizen out of 112

approached was willing to sign a petition made up entirely of sections from the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. "That may be the Russian Declaration of Independence," said one of those who refused, "but you can't tell me it's ours." Another said, "You can't get me to sign that—I'm trying to get loyalty clearance for a government job."⁷⁷

The government's blacklists and investigations by Congressional commissions resulted in harassment of progressive organizations. The Truman and Eisenhower administrations, in trying to dissociate themselves from reactionary groups and organizations, actually gave them support.

Legal proceedings were instituted against a number of organizations. Many prominent people with democratic ideals went to prison. Those who had opposed fascism in Spain were put behind bars; those who had supported it remained at large. The many reactionary organizations also named in the Justice Department's list experienced no particular difficulty in pursuing their activities, while most of the progressive organizations, deprived of steadfast leadership, broke up or lost their significance.

The weakening of the First Amendment resulting from the loyalty-test program and the refusal to observe the procedural guarantees of the Sixth Amendment are witness to the anti-constitutional bias of the whole system of loyalty tests of government employees. It was roundly condemned by democratically inclined segments of society, the liberal press, and representatives of the academic community. The *New Republic* called the program of loyalty tests for government employees the worst aspect of the country's anticommunist hysteria.⁷⁸

The explanation most frequently offered for this abridgement of the democratic freedoms of millions of Americans was the need to assure government security, to fight spies and saboteurs in the government. It was of this need that Truman spoke at the time he implemented his Executive Order; but he himself did not believe in the "red menace." In answering charges of "communism" against his administration Truman repeatedly said that 35 they were being used by the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress to divert attention from the acute social and economic problems that it did not want to face, and that there was no communist threat to the country from within. On April 5, 1950, Seth W. Richardson, Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Relations that "the loyalty investigations had not produced 'one single case' of espionage, or turned up any evidence 'directing towards espionage.'"⁷⁹ Many American authors acknowledge that the loyalty tests had very little to do with national security, that the main thrust of these measures was to enforce conformity and combat liberalism and unorthodoxy.⁸⁰

Notes

[30*] The Justice Department's blacklists also included a number of fascist organizations, but not the Silver Shirt Legion or the Knights of the White Camellia—well-known groups that flooded the country with fascist propaganda in the 30s. After the

Second World War Congress did not conduct a single investigation of these or other fascist organizations. Legal proceedings begun by the Roosevelt administration in the early 1940s were discontinued. In 1946 a district court failed to find anything criminal in the activities of Hitler's followers in the USA; in the next year the Justice Department, with the approval of President Truman, dropped all charges against them. (*Lobbying, Direct and Indirect*, pp. 246–250.)

The Committee on Un-American Activities

p In the 30s the work of committees investigating so-called subversive activities had no serious influence on government policy. Toward the end of the war the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC), headed by Martin Dies, showed itself to be a tool of the country's reactionary forces. Professor William Gellermari rightly called it "a 'front organization' for the reactionaries in both major parties."⁸¹ It was not communism but democracy and the Constitution that were the real targets of its attacks. Many democratic and liberal organizations demanded that it be dissolved. Citizens of Massachusetts, in a letter to Congress, pointed out that instead of investigating the activities of pro-fascist organizations in the USA the committee was attacking progressive organizations, calling them communistic. "It divides the progressive forces. It intimidates the liberals, particularly those in Government service. It is a menace to civil liberty."⁸²

p But the forces of the right mobilized in support of HUAC. Representative John E. Rankin introduced an amendment to make the committee a permanent part of the House organization. The Daughters of the American Revolution, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and other right-wing groups supported the Rankin amendment. On January 3, 1945 the House voted 207 to 186 in favor of it.⁸³

p After the war HUAC's role grew immeasurably. Allocations for its work were increased: between 1938 and 1944 they varied from \$100,000 to \$200,000 per year; in the postwar years they reached \$300,000, and in some years were even greater. This inquisitorial committee became more than the "undisputed leader in its field"; it was "adjudged by many, both in and out of Congress, 'the most powerful Committee in Congress.'"⁸⁴

p The committee formulated its basic goals as follows: to expose Communists and their supporters and drive them out of the federal government, to fight against progressive unions that it considered to be under Communist control, to work out a system of propaganda measures against the ideology and politics of the communist movement, to investigate the activities of all persons and organizations connected with the making of atomic weapons, to investigate "communism" in Hollywood and in the educational system, and to provide an uninterrupted flow of current information for members of Congress, federal investigative agencies, and state commissions dealing with "subversive activities."

p This far-reaching program went considerably beyond Washington's official domestic policy; it aimed at the complete abrogation of bourgeois-democratic freedoms and at the destruction of not only progressive-democratic, but also liberal organizations.

p In the years after the war HUAC waged a frantic propaganda campaign whose purpose was to discredit socialist and communist ideas with Americans in every way. This was the goal, in particular, of five pamphlets published by the committee titled *100 Things You Should Know About Communism*; in [1] *the U.S.A.*; [2] *Religion*; [3] *Education*; [4] *Labor*; [5] *Government*.⁸⁰ In 1950 alone HUAC distributed two million copies of these publications⁸⁰; the next year it issued a *Guide to Subversive Organizations* listing 625 groups and 204 publications. It included the blacklists compiled by the Justice Department and by investigative bodies in the state legislatures.⁸⁷

p HUAC, as the largest and most experienced investigative committee, set the standards for the work of other such bodies. In the postwar years it compiled a huge blacklist, bearing the names of hundreds of progressive organizations and hundreds of thousands of individuals. By 1961 HUAC had published "more than 50,000 pages of hearings and reports—easily outdistancing all other congressional committees combined."⁸⁸ By 1948 it had a file of 300,000 cards on the activities and affiliations of 37 individuals. Forty-eight reports, based on the testimony of nearly a thousand persons, had been published. Separate files were maintained on 3,040 "top leaders" and "prominent fellow travellers of the Communist Party." The committee's files included the names of 363,110 persons in twenty states who had signed Communist Party nominating petitions in various years. In 1949 the committee had dossiers on one million American citizens; these materials were identical in content with those of police departments.

p In the postwar period HUAC became, in practice, a Congressional political police force. In 1956 and 1958 Southern congressmen used the committee's materials to support their accusations that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) was under Communist control; they branded the movement for school integration a "red plot." HUAC condemned many other democratic organizations, and published accounts of their "Communist activities." The National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, the National Lawyers Guild, and many other unions and their leaders were attacked by the committee.⁸³

p Between 1949 and 1959 HUAC gathered information on more than 60,000 persons and 13,000 organizations, thus rivaling the FBI. "Rivaling," however, is not precisely the right word: as a rule the two organizations cooperated closely. In the 50s, for example, four of HUAC's eight investigators were FBI agents.

p The committee's materials were also used against progressive citizens by private persons and organizations, although HUAC claimed that these materials could not possibly find their way into private hands.

p One of HUAC's first victims was the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee—the "Barsky Committee," [37]* which was actively engaged in helping those fighting

fascism in Spain. In 1946 HUAC declared the Barsky Committee a "subversive organization" and its members "Communists" or "fellow travelers." John Stephens Wood, the head of HUAC, tried to give more weight to these charges by declaring in Congress on March 28, 1946, that HUAC had received 8,000 requests that the Barsky Committee's activities be investigated.⁸⁹

p There was nothing new in this reference to demands from 38 reactionary groups and individuals: Congressional investigating committees regularly cited the demands of those whose views accorded with their own, depicting them as the will of the American people.

p HUAC insisted that Barsky and the committee's members register as "agents of a foreign power" under the Voorhis Law of 1940. HUAC investigators ordered the Barsky Committee's executive board to submit lists of its members and also all materials relating to its activities. Barsky protested that his committee could not make public the names of aid recipients: those living in Spain would be subject to persecution, even to extermination. Barsky and his associates also refused to answer questions put by HUAC in an attempt to compromise them. As a result all of them—Barsky, Lyman R. Bradley (a professor at New York University), Doctor Louis Miller (a prominent specialist in cardiovascular diseases), Manuel Magana (a businessman), and others—were found guilty of contempt of Congress and sentenced to a prison term and a fine of \$500 each. In May 1950 the Supreme Court refused, with no explanation, to consider the appeal of the Barsky Committee, thus upholding the sentence. Barsky remarked that the Supreme Court's action affirmed "the theory of Rankin and Thomas that to be anti-Franco and pro-Spanish Republican is to be disloyal to the United States."⁹⁰

p In 1947 HUAC, headed by J. Parnell Thomas, decided to realize its plan, conceived long before, to destroy a group of progressives in the Hollywood film industry. The committee believed that the Communists had "elected the film industry as the principal vehicle for poisoning the American mind."⁹¹ HUAC asserted that hundreds of directors, actors, and writers had been drawn into a "Communist conspiracy" against the US government.⁹²

p How had the film artists brought the wrath of HUAC down upon themselves? In 1936 progressive actors in Hollywood had formed the Anti-Nazi League. They had protested the arrival in the film colony of persons connected with Nazism. In 1938 the League, which supported the creation of a collective security system, had appealed to Congress and the President to take concrete measures that would force Nazi Germany to refrain from acts of aggression.

p On the basis of these and similar data Thomas announced in May that "scores of screen writers were Communists, that they had injected Communist propaganda into movies," and they had "prevented the making of other pictures that would have glorified America and the American system."⁹³ It was further asserted that "some of the most flagrant Communist propaganda films were produced as a result of White House pressure."⁹⁴

p The Committee for the First Amendment, which was formed in Hollywood in connection with the investigation, made a protest to Congress against the reprisals being prepared.

p The committee was unable to prove that such Hollywood films as *Mission to Moscow* and *Song of Russia* were inspired by Communists and the White House. Even “friendly” witnesses regarded these films as an expression of the feeling of friendship for the USSR—the USA’s Ally against Hitler—that was widespread among Americans during the war years, and refused to call them Communist propaganda.

p Ten film artists refused to answer questions with which HUAC investigators tried to compromise them; in November the “Hollywood ten” were cited for contempt of Congress. On May 29, 1950, the Supreme Court refused, without explanation, to consider the group’s appeal. The famous playwright John Howard Lawson made a courageous declaration regarding the Supreme Court’s decision: “For the first time in one hundred and fifty years of American history, writers are being sent to prison because a committee of Congress does not like their work, their opinions, and their activities as American citizens.”⁹

p Most of Hollywood’s producers, frightened by the investigation, refused to oppose HUAC. On November 26, 1947, Eric Johnston, president of the Association of Motion Pictures, who had said at the start of the investigation that he would never support a blacklist of film artists, issued the “Waldorf Declaration,” which deplored the actions of the “Hollywood ten.” The Association vowed that it would not employ any of the ten again “until such time as he is acquitted or has purged himself of contempt and declares under oath that he is not a Communist,” and suggested that laws be passed to help the film industry rid itself of “subversive” and “disloyal” elements.⁹¹

p In 1950 loyalty oaths for entering employees were introduced; they were later required for everyone working in films.

p In 1951 investigators paid another visit to Hollywood: some of the people branded “Communists” in 1947 were still working 40 there. Twenty-three more firings resulted; they were later upheld by the courts.

p In 1952 HUAC published a blacklist naming 324 persons, most of whom finally lost their jobs. Many people who had been blacklisted found that they could not get work, try as they might, unless they repudiated their convictions.

p The noted actress Marsha Hunt, who up to 1947 worked in the Hollywood studios of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, was among those who had protested in the name of the Committee for the First Amendment against the investigations in Hollywood. In 1949 she signed a petition asking that the Supreme Court review the Lawson case. The Studio One Company suggested that she make a written apology for her participation in these campaigns. She refused, and was fired. She was charged with belonging to several progressive organizations. In every place where she sought work she was asked to

publish a statement repudiating her previous activities. Sam Katz, head of the board of the Stanley Kramer Company, told her she would "never work again in films" if she did not sign such a statement. For two and one half years she was unable to obtain work in films. She then submitted a loyalty statement to Roy Brewer, head of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators (IATSE). But Brewer refused to help her: "nowhere in her statement was there any recognition that she had erred and been used by the Communists."^^97^^

p HUAC relied on the support of reactionary union leaders and various "patriotic" groups and societies in its persecution of progressive film artists. The Motion Picture Alliance, a militant anticommunist organization, supported the committee from the very beginning. Its members appeared before the investigators as "friendly" witnesses, accusing certain screen writers of communist sympathies. Another supporter of the committee was the IATSE, headed by Roy Brewer.

p The American Legion actively harassed film artists. In December of 1953 *American Legion Magazine* began publication of an article by Joseph Brown Matthews on the "Communist influence" in Hollywood. Local Legion posts all over the country picketed to prevent showings of Charlie Chaplin's films. The Legion and representatives of eight of the country's largest studios met in Washington on March 31, 1952, to coordinate their efforts against 41 progressive cinema. Shortly thereafter the Legion sent these studios a blacklist naming approximately three hundred persons.^^98^^

p The film *Salt of the Earth*, made in 1953 by a group of exiles from Hollywood, provoked the anger of HUAC. Donald L. Jackson, a member of HUAC, denounced it as "un-American propaganda." A Mexican actress who appeared in the film was deported, at the committee's instigation, even before shooting was finished. Brewer's IATSE pressured the country's theater owners into refusing to let the film be shown on their screens."

p In evaluating the investigations of the committee in Hollywood Dorothy B. Jones, who served as the chief of the film review and analysis section of the Office of War Information during the Second World War, wrote that "none of the 159 films credited over a period of years to The Hollywood Ten contained Communist propaganda."^^100^^ The real purpose of the investigations was to force filmmakers to turn away from criticism of the country's social order, to direct them toward the glorification of the free-enterprise system.

p The Hollywood purges did not remain an isolated phenomenon: they soon were paralleled in radio, television, and the theater. The anticommunist organization American Business Consultants, created in 1947, took a leading role in the harassment of artists in these fields. Its weekly magazine, *Counterattack*, published in New York, assailed virtually all of the city's liberal periodicals, but workers in radio and television were the main objects of its attention.

[p](#) In December 1947, after the Justice Department published its list of “subversive” organizations, *Counterattack* listed thirtyfour groups that had not been included. Several months later the Consultants’ list had grown to include 192 organizations, of which 119 had not been named by the Justice Department. The political reprisals carried out in Hollywood by Thomas and HUAC met with understanding and complete approval among the American Business Consultants; quite on its own. this private organization launched a campaign of harassment against workers in the arts.

[p](#) On June 22, 1950, *Counterattack* published an article, titled "Red Channels," on "Communist influence" in radio and television. It named 151 people in the arts who were connected with 42 “subversive organizations" on the Justice Department’s list. The magazine demanded that these people prove their anticommunism or leave their jobs. This demand was soon taken up by all the owners of radio and television stations; "Red Channels" became the bible of Madison Avenue—the center of the radio and television industries in New York.

[p](#) But the matter did not end with "Red Channels". Lists were soon published by the American Legion in its weekly, *Firing Line*, and by other organizations. Blacklists were supplemented with "graylists." which differed from the former only in that they were used by a circumscribed group of radio and television station owners.¹⁰¹

[p](#) On Madison Avenue blacklists became universal as a means for dealing with "undesirables." For the owners of radio and television companies the question was not whether an actor or script writer belonged to a "subversive organization"; for most of them it was enough that his name had appeared on a blacklist. A remark made in 1954 by Charles E. Martin, a radio and television producer, is quite characteristic: Martin said that although he did not maintain that a blacklisted actor was a Communist he was not interested in employing people with labels attached to them.¹⁰²

[p](#) Blacklisted persons could remove the label from themselves and go back to work only at the price of treachery. They were required not only to repent of their actions before HUAC and admit their connection with "Communist front" organizations but also to name other persons who belonged to those organizations.¹⁰³

[p](#) As a result of the activities of private investigatory groups in the radio and television industries the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) introduced loyalty oaths and established a special vice-presidency with police powers. The National Broadcasting Company (NBC) and a number of advertising agencies established departments with the same function. "Independent consultants"—specialists in the harassment of the unorthodox— appeared in various organizations connected with the arts.

[p](#) The anticominunist offensive in the realm of the arts by private groups attracted the attention of official bodies. In 1951 the McCarran subcommittee conducted an investigation of the "infiltration by subversive elements" of radio and television. In 43 1955 HUAC investigated "Communist influences" in the theaters of New York. But this

time there were no arrests or firings, as in Hollywood: theater owners had already driven out all those who might displease the investigators.

p Investigative committees searched with great energy for "subversive elements" in schools, colleges, and universities. Senator Homer Ferguson formulated the attitude of the ruling class toward the educational system: "The training of our youth today determines the security of the Nation tomorrow."¹⁰¹ Each time the USA's ruling cliques were seized by fear of any great social changes taking place within the country and abroad they turned an inquiring eye toward the loyalty of teachers.

p The American liberal philosopher Morris R. Cohen wrote of the position of scholars in the USA after the Second World War: "Nowhere else is the scholar subjected to such petty surveillance in both private and public life as in America. . . It is taken as a matter of course by most people that an able man should be barred from teaching because of his social manners or because he is not theologically orthodox."¹⁰⁵

p The intensity of the attack on intellectuals was due to their support for the New Deal and subsequent social and economic concessions to working people.

p In 1953, after a victory by reaction at the polls, Harold M. Velde, a violent enemy of education, became head of HUAC. He and William Jenner, chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, set themselves the goal of revealing "the Communist conspiracy against the educational process." Jenner declared: "There can be no academic freedom until this Soviet conspiracy hidden in our schools and colleges is exposed to the light, and the rule of Moscow over its adherents in the educational world is broken."¹⁰⁰ In 1952–1953 both these Congressional committees investigated a number of the country's educational institutions, which resulted in the persecution of persons connected with liberal and democratic organizations. HUAC studied the activities of the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York and the Abraham Lincoln School in Chicago, and also groups such as the Labor Youth League; it looked for Communists at Yale University, MIT, and Ohio State University.¹⁰⁷ Senator Jenner alleged, on the basis of testimony from friendly witnesses, that hundreds of teachers in the USA were 44 involved in "a secret underground operation, the plan for which had been imported from abroad by high Communist leaders."¹⁰⁸ Senator McCarthy was also active in the harassment of progressive scholars and educators; before the end of 1952 he had unveiled a "program to root Communism from the colleges."¹⁰⁹ Immediately afterwards the Young Republicans demanded that subversive groups be banned from campuses.¹¹⁰

p Members of the peace movement were viciously attacked by HUAG. The ranks of this broad democratic movement were made up of people from many races and nationalities, people with diverse political and religious convictions—workers and farmers, writers, workers in the arts, scholars, businessmen, and clergy. It had only one political goal: to expose the machinations of the imperialists to start a new world war.

p Its humanitarian goals were familiar and understandable to the simple people who had suffered all the trials of the previous war; it spanned nations and continents. In the USA the National Labor Conference for Peace, the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, the Peace Information Center, the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, and similar organizations were active in collecting signatures for the Stockholm Appeal; as an alternative to world thermonuclear war they called for a revival of the spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding between the USA and the USSR.

p The ruling cliques turned their enormously powerful machinery for repression against the peace movement; they were determined to discredit it, thus assuring support for their aggressive policies among the masses in America. HUAC lost no time in depicting the peace movement as a psychological onslaught against the USA, an "organic and strategic part" of a " Communist drive for world conquest."^^111^^ In the HUAC's eyes the demands of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress, such as a halt to the arms race, the cessation of military intervention, and the liquidation of the threat of atomic war, constituted an "international Communist conspiracy" against the peoples of the "free world." HUAC noted and thoroughly studied the organizers of all peace demonstrations in the USA and also the leading participants in international peace forums. The names of many eminent American scholars, such as Albert Einstein, William Du Bois, and Linus Pauling, attracted the particular attention of the investigators. HUAC considered the many actions for peace in which they had been involved indisputable proof of their guilt before the nation. The committee published the names of those who had collected signatures for the Stockholm Appeal, thereby exposing these people to the attacks of the chauvinists.

p The hysteria created around those who stood for peace made it easier for the government to use anticommunist legislation against them. The Justice Department included organizations working for peace in its blacklists, which was essentially the equivalent of outlawing them, and called their members to account on the basis of the laws concerning the registration of foreign agents.

p The government's position was wholeheartedly supported by rightist and ultra-rightist groups. The National Commander of the American Legion characterized the Stockholm Appeal as a "coldly calculated, Kremlin-directed plot to soften up the minds, morale, and will power of the American people to resist aggression," and "to disrupt. . . national unity."^^112^^

Because of the wave of chauvinism that swept the country in connection with the war in Korea (which began in 1950) and the harassment and repression of peaceloving people by government bodies and voluntary watchdogs the peace movement did not attain wide popularity in the USA. But even under these highly adverse circumstances 1,350,000 courageous persons signed petitions calling for the banning of atomic weapons. HUAC was an essential part of the police apparatus of the USA, which grew prodigiously after the war. This apparatus was intended to crush political opposition to the reactionary domestic and foreign policies of the USA's ruling cliques. Without HUAC the country would not have been infected with spy mania. Without HUAC, writes Robert K. Carr,

"President Truman would not in 1947 have established the loyalty program in the federal service, under which hundreds of civil servants have been dismissed from their jobs and thousands more have resigned. The most far-reaching law against subversion in American history would not today be found upon the federal statute books."¹¹³ Many of HUAC's recommendations were approved by Congress and embodied in reactionary legislation and administrative decisions.

* * *

Notes

[37•*] Alter Edward K. Barsky, a New York surgeon.—*Editor's note.*

The Local Inquisitions

p The Committee on Un-American Activities had militant supporters in many states. In the state of Washington, for example, a Joint Legislative Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities was set up in 194-7. It was chaired by Albert F. Canwell, formerly a deputy sheriff in Spokane. The degree of Canwell's political cynicism may be judged from *a.* remark he made during the election campaign in 1946: "If someone insists there is discrimination against Negroes in this country, or that there is inequality of wealth, there is every reason to believe that person is a Communist."¹¹⁴ In early 1948 Canwell's committee conducted its first investigation, attacking the Washington Old Age Pension Union and other liberal and democratic organizations. But it was the purge of the University of Washington that made the committee "famous" all over the country.

p On July 19, 1948, the committee began public hearings on "Communist infiltration" of the campus. Neither university administrators nor the committee had a single fact indicating "communist" activity on the campus; Canwell nonetheless declared at the start that 150 faculty members were Communists or fellow travelers. Raymond B. Allen, president of the university, urged those called before the committee to be "straightforward and frank in their testimony."¹¹¹³ The investigators also called for candor, promising that persons who testified against disloyal colleagues would not themselves be censured. Anyone who refused to cooperate with the committee, however, was threatened with dismissal and measures to prevent his being employed elsewhere.¹¹⁵ The Board of Regents of the university fired three professors on the basis of the committee's accusations. Three others were asked to sign statements that they were not and never had been Communist Party members. The Board of Regents approved the committee's actions, and President Allen cynically declared that the investigation did not constitute "any abridgement of academic freedom or civil rights."¹¹⁰

p A similar inquisition was conducted in California by a committee created in 1939; its head was state Senator Jack B. Tenney. Using the loyalty standards worked out by HUAC this body labeled dozens of organizations fighting against racism and 47 fascism

and for democracy, peace and social justice "communistic." In 1949 there were fifteen "thought control" bills, introduced by Tenney, before the California State Legislature.

p The Tenney committee nourished a special hatred for the University of California. In 1947 it demanded that the university purge itself of the "disciples of Moscow" and break ties with progressive organizations and individuals in Hollywood. In 1949, when it was learned that the Canwell committee had called for the dismissal of certain faculty members at the University of Washington, Tenney introduced a resolution before the California Legislature approving the investigators' activities. The regents of the university, guided by this resolution, asked that all faculty members present loyalty affidavits or leave the university. In the summer of 1950 thirty-two professors were fired for refusing to take the oath. Thirty-seven more left the university in protest against the regents' demands, and forty-seven scholars who had been offered positions declined them. As a result fiftyfive courses were dropped because of a lack of specialists. The regents later admitted that "none of the numerous distinguished professors they discharged were Communists."¹¹⁷

p In 1952 the Tenney committee investigated subversion in California's principal colleges and universities. University administrators used former FBI and military intelligence agents to ferret out "Communist infiltrators." These sleuths, together with the committee, decided on the advisability of employing all teachers who had aroused the suspicion or displeasure of the committee. Between June of 1952 and spring of 1953 about one hundred teachers were fired, and a like number not accepted for work, all at the insistence of the committee.¹¹³ The fear inspired by the investigators in the state's educational authorities was so great that the Los Angeles City School Board, on its own initiative, asked the committee to run checks on all 29,500 of its academic and administrative employees.¹¹⁹

p The Seditious Activities Investigation Commission was created in August 1947 by a resolution of the Legislative Commission of the American Legion, Department of Illinois. Its head was Illinois State Senator Paul Broyles (Republican; Mount Vernon). The commission conducted a two-year secret investigation covering the whole state, and worked out a program for fighting the Communist Party and other progressive organizations. The 48 commission consulted with representatives of the American Legion and took part in a conference held by the Legion in Indianapolis on the struggle against "subversive activities." It studied the experience of Congressional investigators and listened carefully to representatives of other right-wing groups, who demanded that they devote special attention to educational institutions—the greatest threat to the "American way." The commission reached the conclusion that "the Communistic movement seizes upon all types of welfare programs."¹²⁰

p In February 1949 Broyles put before the state legislature a series of bills to combat "sedition." Hundreds of students from Chicago, representatives of the Americans for Democratic Action and the Student Republican Club, came to Springfield (the state capital) to protest against these bills. They organized a demonstration on the streets of the city and a sit-in at the Abraham Lincoln Hotel, which refused to serve blacks. The

legislators responded with a resolution to investigate the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College, the institutions at which most of the demonstrators were students.

p Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, was called before the commission. Undaunted, he gave the investigators a stern rebuke. He called the bills proposed by Broyles "an un-American attempt to impose a pattern of thought control on the people of Illinois," and declared: "The University of Chicago does not believe in the un-American doctrine of guilt by association. . . It is entirely possible to belong to organizations combating fascism and racial discrimination, for example, without desiring to subvert the government of the United States."^^121^^

p Teachers at institutions of higher learning and representatives of various organizations took part in the protest movement. Thanks to the courageous stand taken by university administrators—a comparative rarity in those years—and by democratic elements in society the Broyles bills were defeated and the commission ceased to exist.

p In 1948 an investigation of "communism" was undertaken in Michigan under the provisions of the Callahan Act, which called for the supervision of foreign agents.

p With the support of the Knights of Columbus, the American Legion, and other rightist organizations state legislators attacked student groups and the Michigan Unemployment Compensation 49 Commission. This was not enough for the Disabled American Veterans, which suggested that the legislators themselves be scrutinized: some of the laws they had proposed were, in that organization's view, "socialistic." A Subversive Activities Division of the Michigan State Police was created on September 1950 to aid the Callahan commission.^^122^^

p Detroit, center of the state's automobile industry, won an ill fame for Michigan with its persecutions of progressive organizations and individuals. In September 1949 the city fathers created their own Loyalty Investigating Committee to vet municipal employees. The city's charter forbade the gathering of information on the political convictions of candidates for municipal office; this article was amended.

p The target of the loyalty commission's attack was the United Public Workers of America and its local leader, Yale Stuart, who refused to answer questions about his political affiliations. Stuart denounced the investigation, indicating that its real goal was to lower the salaries of employees, first and foremost of blacks and Jews. He characterized the accusations of communism made by the investigators against their opponents as a political maneuver to capture the votes of confused individuals in the upcoming municipal elections.^^123^^

p Detroit was the first large city in the USA to adopt a plan for fighting "communism," but not the last. Beginning in 1950 thirty cities adopted resolutions against the "reds." City authorities in Birmingham, Jersey City, McKeesport (Pennsylvania), Miami, Los Angeles, and elsewhere showed great energy in persecuting Communists. Special resolutions required that Communists register with the police department; in several cases

harsher measures were taken. The City Commission of Birmingham, Alabama, voted on July 17 to "outlaw the Communist Party within the city limits, giving Communists 48 hours from the publication of the notice to get out of town or risk arrest and a possible \$100 fine and 180 days in prison. . . The City Council of Atlanta, Georgia, copied the Birmingham ordinance outlawing the Communist Party."^^121^^

p The commissions enumerated here do not exhaust the list of so-called anti-subversive organizations. Arizona, Florida, New Hampshire, and other states adopted laws and resolutions setting up commissions on un-American activities, as did certain cities. 50 Some of these commissions did not publicize themselves, and were little known; this was the case, for example, in New Jersey and the District of Columbia.

p In 1949 an attempt was made to coordinate the activities of these investigative bodies. The First Interstate Legislative Conference on Un-American Activities, sponsored by the California and Washington committees, was held in Los Angeles on April 20 and 21; it was attended by representatives of nine states, not all of which had un-American activities committees. A National Permanent Organization's Committee on the conference was created; Jack B. Tenney was named its chairman. The delegates to the conference adopted a resolution urging that committees to investigate "subversive" activities be created in each of the states.^126^ This program was not successfully realized, since committees in a number of states discredited themselves; nonetheless the efforts of its initiators were not in vain. Such committees promoted anticommunist legislation all over the country and, taken together, had an enormous influence on public opinion.

p The most ominous result of the committees' activities was the elaboration of anticommunist legislation in several states. Maryland's Ober Law was one of the first acts to outlaw the Communist Party USA. Its author maintained that the struggle between the United States and Russia justified the most severe measures against those who did not share faith in the American way of life. The Ober commission took its inspiration from Congressional and FBI investigations, their materials, and discussions of anticommunist legislation on Capitol Hill. The commission, which was made up of businessmen and jurists, copied the most reactionary provisions of the Smith Act of 1940, the anticommunist Mundt-Nixon Bill, and Truman's executive order on loyalty tests of federal employees. In December 1948 it submitted for discussion the draft of a statute (which was to become the Ober Law) dealing with "subversive activities." This proposal was characterized as being "as full of teeth as an alligator's jaw."^^120^^ The article on the necessity for the Ober Law was borrowed intact from the Mundt-Nixon Bill. The law forbade activities aimed at the overthrow of the government by force (as well as the advocating of such activities) and membership in so-called subversive organizations. Persons found guilty under this law were deprived of their 51 rights as citizens and were punishable by a fine of up to \$20,000 and a prison term of up to twenty years. Those found guilty of membership in a "subversive organization" were subject to a prison term of up to five years, a fine of up to \$5,000, or both. All persons working in administrative bodies were required to submit affidavits affirming that they were not, and had never been, members of "subversive organizations." All private institutions receiving state

funds were to take measures to drive out unreliable elements and report on these measures regularly; otherwise they would be deprived of their subsidies.

[p](#) In 1950 the Maryland State Bar Association (of which Ober had been elected president in 1949) unanimously endorsed the law; they maintained that it was within the constitutional powers of the US Congress and the state legislature.¹²⁷ The Ober Law was supported by veterans' organizations, the local divisions of the Chamber of Commerce, certain Catholic organizations, and the local press. Its constitutionality was upheld by an appellate court. Forty-five organizations, including those named, formed the Maryland Committee against Un-American Activities to defend the law against the forces of democracy.¹²⁸

[p](#) The Ober Law served as the standard for anti-democratic measures in other states. It was copied by legislation against "subversive activities" in New Hampshire, Georgia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Washington, Alabama, Michigan, Texas, and Mississippi.

[p](#) Of special prominence among the anticommunist measures was the state of New York's Feinberg Law, which was directed against teachers. The law required that school boards report regularly to specified organizations on the activities of their teachers, and that boards of regents compile lists of "subversive organizations" and fire anyone found to be involved in antiAmerican activities.¹²⁹ Over 250 teachers in the state's schools and colleges were fired on the basis of this law. Beginning with 1950 New York City authorities, basing themselves on the Feinberg Law, demanded that all teachers starting work there present certifications of their loyalty from the administrations of the institutions where they had worked previously. The law prescribed that investigations be undertaken of the character of applicants for work in the school system. School administrations were required to affirm the loyalty of their teachers annually. In 1952 the Supreme Court upheld this law and other measures directed against progressive university and school teachers by New York state authorities.¹³⁰ New York schools also made a practice of firing those who refused to answer questions from investigative committees and those who had made "false applications"—that is, who were accused of belonging to subversive organizations by friendly witnesses before investigators.¹³¹

[p](#) The Tenney committee in California tried to use simpler (in its view) but more radical means: it threatened to cut off school appropriations unless "Communist influences" were driven out.¹³² In Georgia the Council on Education gave school authorities the right to fire any teacher who did not support segregation in the educational system. State legislators took the tastes of local right-reactionary groups into account in setting up their loyalty criteria. Potential grounds for dismissal were indeed diverse: having voted for Henry A. Wallace's Progressive Party in the 1948 elections, supporting federal plans to reconstruct the Missouri valley, or simply holding liberal views.

[p](#) In 1948 the National Council for American Education was formed, its head was Allen A. Zoll, a pro-fascist and comrade-inarms of Charles E. Coughlin. This organization kept dossiers on thousands of persons whom it disliked.¹³³ In Texas and some other states the Minute Women—a reactionary group made up mostly of housewives—was

very active. It intimidated persons who disagreed with it, blacklisted books, and harassed democratically inclined educators.¹³¹ In 1953 this organization counted one thousand members in Houston alone, most of them women from well-to-do families.¹³⁵ Local chapters of the American Legion and similar organizations set themselves up as censors of school texts.¹³⁰ Such groups had enormous influence in their communities. State legislatures enacted laws that put schools under the unblinking supervision of right-wing groups. Principals, with few exceptions, bowed to the control of these self-appointed guardians of the "American way." Yielding to demands from rightist groups the Association of American Universities issued a statement asserting that membership in the Communist Party "extinguishes the right to a university position."¹³⁷

p The battle against so-called subversive literature was an essential part of the campaign against academic freedom in the USA. Dr. Luther H. Evans, a former Librarian of Congress, noted that 53 librarians everywhere were being pressured by groups and individuals who wanted to keep books of which they disapproved off the shelves. Many American authors admit that these pressures on libraries were far stronger than reported in the public prints. Robert M. Maclver wrote, "The search for 'subversiveness' is indeed a flourishing business."¹³⁸

p Books were labeled subversive whose authors favored socialized medicine, criticized inequalities among the USA's races and nationalities or insufficient housing construction, called for peace and defended the UN, demanded that free hot breakfasts be provided in schools, and so on and on. The California Senate Committee on Education branded the historian Charles A. Beard (1874–1948) a "red" and banned a textbook on the Constitution that cited his work in several places. The American Library Association reported hundreds of attempts by self-constituted public guardians to destroy all teaching materials and books that they deemed "subversive" or "un-American."¹³⁹ Organized groups of local "patriots" demanded the banning not only of books that called for social change but also of those that merely criticized the conduct of businessmen. These groups, noted the *New York Times*, were active in almost every state, "doing great harm in their communities."¹⁴⁰ (In some regions of the USA Darwin's *Origin of Species* is not allowed in school libraries to this day.)

p The American Library Association protested against the exclusion from libraries of books that were not to the liking of rightist groups. In 1952 it sponsored the First Conference on Intellectual Freedom, at which the Library Bill of Rights was adopted. In this document the association firmly states that "in no case should any book lie excluded because of the race or nationality, or the political or religious views of the writer."¹¹¹

p In 1953 the association, together with the American Book Publishers Council, issued a statement on the "freedom to read."² But these protests produced no perceptible results at the time.

p The *New York Times*, having examined the state of academic freedom at seventy-two of the country's colleges, concluded that "a subtle, creeping paralysis of freedom of thought and speech is attacking college campuses in many parts of the country."¹⁴³ After an examination of over 520 school systems the National Education Association announced that "American freedom—to study, to think, to discuss—is in danger."¹⁴⁴

p Political supervision of educators in the 40s and 50s was far more extensive than ever in the past. In 1940 twenty states had loyalty legislation for teachers; by 1951 thirty-three states had such legislation.¹⁴⁵

p Robert M. Maclver, a professor at Columbia University, made a study of the deeper reasons for assaults on academic freedom and the persecution of university teachers; he concluded that they were stimulated by private interests. He wrote: "Anyone who examines the numerous and not infrequently successful attempts to censor textbooks and to discredit their authors cannot fail to observe that the main objective of the promoters of these attacks is to penalize and if possible to silence criticisms directed against the unfettered freedom of particular economic interests."¹⁴⁰

p The anticommunist fever in federal, state, and local government proved highly infectious. The search for "subversive elements" touched every area of American life and practically all segments of the population. Thousands of people volunteered information to investigators, sure that they were serving a good cause. Various scrutiny systems affected (according to some estimates) as many as twenty million Americans¹⁴⁷; many American authors speak of a national attack of paranoia. In some places the illness resulted in curiosities. In Texas editors were supposed to vouch for the loyalty of deceased authors, including Shakespeare. In Indiana professional wrestlers were barred from practicing their trade if they belonged to "subversive organizations." In California anticommunist oaths were required of clergymen and amateur archers, and in Wisconsin a bill was considered requiring them of saloon keepers. In Hollywood Monogram refused to make a film on the life of Hiawatha, fearing that it would be regarded as peace propaganda. In Wheeling, West Virginia, candy in wrappers with geographical information about the USSR was removed from sale.

p This short analysis cannot exhaust the facts on the outrages of local investigatory commissions. The assault on the freedoms of Americans swept the entire country. By the end of 1950 state legislatures had enacted over 300 laws against "subversive activities."¹⁴⁸

55

p In a number of states the forces of reaction went a good deal further in their search for "reds" than the federal government. Rightists and ultra-rightists had enormous power in local governments. State legislatures and local bodies were outside the domain of national and international factors; more often than not they fell into the hands of political groups motivated by narrow local interests. Such groups were the instigators of the most

reactionary measures. Their weight was considerably more significant in the states than in the federal system, where it was countered by a greater number of influences.

It may well be that in the late 40s and early 50s the greatest fear troubling most Americans was that of being identified with the Communists. To be so identified would mean the loss of their jobs and isolation from society. This fear, which people of higher social standing also knew, was a mighty weapon in the hands of the political demagogues acting in the interests of various powerful economic groups.

Rightists and the Government

p The right had many points of contact with the Truman administration, which was not to be outdone in its anticommunist fervor. Despite the President's lavish declarations of respect for the Constitution the loyalty tests to which government employees were subjected amounted to a conscious disregarding of the Constitution and a persecution of those same groups of citizens being attacked by the rightists and ultra-rightists. Moreover the administration's actions served as an example for state and local governments, thus promoting loyalty checks all over the country. The government institutionalized secret denunciation and, by compiling lists of so-called subversive organizations, lent support to the idea of "guilt by association," which was widely used by reactionary groups against people they disliked. During the 1948 election campaign Truman and his party machine accused Henry Wallace, the candidate of the Progressive Party, of being in league with the Communists. On March 17 Truman rejected Wallace's support, calling an alliance with "the enemies of American security too high a price to pay for election."¹⁴⁹ The administration's anticommunism encouraged ultra-rightist reaction and 56 created favorable conditions for its growth; nonetheless the rightists, as the most militant opponents of social reform, were still bound to attack the administration. In the postwar years the right's bellicosity toward the Democratic administration went beyond the antagonisms and recriminations in which American political life so abounds. For many prominent figures in the administration it ended in dismissal, even in imprisonment. The ultimate goal of the right's attacks was the repeal of social legislation favoring working people.

p The offensive against the Truman administration began in the fall of 1945. In a September 6 message to Congress, which provoked a storm of indignation, the President proclaimed the right to a just wage, the right of each family to a decent dwelling and adequate medical care, and the right to education. Truman suggested the adoption of laws to maintain full employment, to raise the minimum wage, to extend unemployment insurance to new groups of citizens, to raise the price of farm products, and to increase housing construction by private companies and the government. It was further suggested that broader measures be taken in health care, education, and social welfare. The administration proposed that a commission on fair hiring practices be created to realize the principle of equal opportunity for all, including blacks. In order to fight inflation it was suggested that wartime price controls be preserved.¹⁵⁰

p Truman's suggestions were put forward in the form of a declaration, lacking the essential support of effective practical measures; nonetheless they were fiercely denounced in Congress. Joe Martin, Republican leader in the House, exclaimed: "Not even President Roosevelt ever asked so much at one sitting." As one of Truman's biographers wrote, "This message ended Truman's honeymoon with Congress."¹⁵¹

p Toward the end of his first year in the White House Truman asked Congress to raise the minimum wage from forty to sixtyfive cents per hour. In 1946, with the active support of the administration, Congress adopted a series of other measures that displeased rightists. The Atomic Energy Act transferred control over fissionable materials from the War Department to the civilian Atomic Energy Commission. Under the Hill-Burton Act \$375,000,000 in federal grants was allotted for hospital construction.¹⁵²

57

p The Truman administration's efforts to alleviate racial problems met with fierce opposition, especially in the South. In December 1946 the President's Committee on Civil Rights was appointed; it prepared a report on the status of black Americans and made recommendations. The report declared: "Freedom can exist only where the citizen is assured that his person is secure against bondage, lawless violence, and arbitrary arrest and punishment." Figures were presented that eloquently characterized the plight of blacks in America. In 1946, according to the committee's data, at least six persons, all black, were lynched in the USA, and twenty-two attempted lynchings had been prevented. Forty-three lynchings took place between 1936 and 1946; most of those who took part in these crimes were never called to account before the law. "For seven of the years from 1937 to 1946 for which statistics are reported, the conservative estimates of the Tuskegee Institute show that 226 persons were rescued from threatened lynching. Over 200 of these were Negroes."¹⁵³

p On February 2, 1948, Truman sent a message dealing with civil rights to Congress. He proposed laws providing federal protection against lynching and establishing a Fair Employment Practice Commission to prevent racial discrimination in hiring, as well as other measures.¹⁵⁴ And although the administration's proposals could be viewed as formal declarations, unsupported as they were by adequate efforts for their realization, business circles in those parts of the country where blacks made up a significant part of the work force were seriously disturbed. The conflict between the administration and the racists became so acute that it led to a split in the Democratic Party. On July 17, 1948, as the presidential elections approached, representatives from thirteen Southern states met in Birmingham, Alabama, to form the reactionary States' Rights Party. The party's platform declared: "We stand for the segregation of the races and the integrity of each race."¹⁵⁵ Its candidate for president, Strom Thurmond, called the administration's civil-rights proposals an attack on the traditions, customs, and institutions of the South and a violation of the principle of free enterprise, the basis of the economic structure of the USA. A resolution adopted at the Southern Governors' Conference of March 7, 1948 recommended that the people of the South "fight to the last ditch" to prevent the election of a president favoring a civil-rights program.¹⁵⁶

p The platform worked out by the Truman administration in the course of the campaign came to be known, after Truman's victory, as the Fair Deal. The president declared that "every segment of our population and every individual has a right to expect from our Government a fair deal."¹⁵⁷

p Thus from the very beginning the Truman administration announced its intention to continue the social and economic policies of Franklin Roosevelt. The position of world capitalism had, in general, weakened, while the world socialist system had become stronger; the Truman administration considered reformism the most preferable means of maintaining the influence of bourgeois ideology over the minds of the working people.

p A favorable economic climate made it possible for working people to win certain economic concessions, and for the capitalist class to preserve its influence over them. In the second half of the 40s the minimum wage rose from forty to seventy-five cents per hour. The number of persons covered by Social Security increased significantly. But the administration's modest social programs were furiously opposed by rightists on Capitol Hill. Administration proposals such as the stabilization of farm income (the Brannan Farm Plan), civil rights measures, and the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act were flatly rejected. The discussion of others dragged on for decades. A national health insurance program, which Truman had proposed, was adopted by Congress only twenty years later. A similar amount of time was required for the building of 810,000 units of low-income housing for which federal funds were allocated in 1949. The idea of federal aid to education became a reality only in 1965.¹⁵⁸

p With the economy in an upswing thriving businessmen were infuriated by any proposed measure that would deprive them of a part of their huge profits. Relations between Congress and the President grew strained. The legislators rejected Truman's proposals one after the other; he in turn vetoed sixty-two measures they had passed.¹⁵⁹

p The question of "full employment" was the center of the most serious conflict between the administration and the rightists. The Roosevelt administration had been faced with the problem of averting a postwar depression; with peace at hand the 59 Economic Bill of Rights had revived the spirit of the New Deal. The "full employment bill," worked out by liberal Congressmen with the help of the Bureau of the Budget and introduced by Senator Murray in January 1945, was in accord with that spirit. The purpose of the bill was (in its own words) to "establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, state and local governments, and the Federal government." It proclaimed the right to "useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment" for all Americans able and willing to work.¹⁶⁰

p Murray and his supporters believed that the bill would help to stabilize and stimulate free enterprise. Rightist groups, however, found it alarming. Organizations such as the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States (particularly the local divisions), the Committee for Constitutional Government, and the American Farm Bureau Federation saw the Murray Bill as a "Marxist nightmare imported

to bring about an end to free enterprise in a free society.” They maintained it would dangerously increase the power of the federal government and legalize "socialistic federal spending.”¹⁶¹ Under the pressure of rightist opposition the bill was radically changed in the House; the main provisions on government responsibility for "full employment" were cut out. The President signed this emasculated version into law on February 20, 1946.

p Organizations of big and small businessmen joined in a united front to resist the administration’s social and economic programs. In addition to the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States the ranks of Truman’s opponents included the National Committee to Limit Federal Taxing Powers, the National Apartment Owners Association, the Southern States Industrial Council, the National Tax Equality League, the Conference of Small Business Organizations, the American Medical Association (AMA) and many other groups. The American bourgeoisie’s desire to assure the inviolability of its profits as far as possible was behind the hue and cry raised by the right about “communism” in the administration.

p Bourgeois reformism in itself did not evoke a negative reaction among the broad masses of the USA’s working people; thus rightists and ultra-rightists set out to depict members of the 60 administration and persons connected with it as agents of a foreign power, traitors, and spies. To this end Congressional committees conducted, in the years after the war, a series of investigations into "subversive activities" in the government, the most publicized of which was the "Alger Hiss affair.”

p In 1948 the House Committee on Un-American Activities accused Alger Hiss, a former employee of the State Department, of having belonged to a "Communist underground" in the 30s. Congressman John Rankin of Mississippi announced melodramatically that HUAC had "uncovered one of the greatest spy rings in history, one that reached into the vitals of the State Department and probably other departments of the Government.”¹⁶² Hiss refused to confess to the trumped-up charges against him; for this he was found guilty of perjury and sentenced to five years’ imprisonment. In 1951 the Supreme Court refused to review the case. Hiss went to prison; Richard M. Nixon, who as a member of HUAC played an important part in his conviction, went from obscurity to fame almost overnight. Hiss soon became a symbol of the Democrats’ "treason.”

p A great furore surrounded the show trials of government figures for "subversive activities”; its purpose was to convince the public that there really was a "Communist plot" afoot in the country. Truman expressed his attitude toward these investigations at a press conference on August 5, 1949. He told reporters that "all these investigations were merely a red herring, flaunted by the Eightieth Congress to distract people from noticing that it was doing nothing.”¹⁰³

p The history of disagreement between the government and the right over foreign policy goes back to the beginning of the 30s, when the USA, despite the opposition of reactionary groups, moved toward establishing diplomatic relations with the USSR.

American participation in the war against Nazi Germany deepened this division. Right-wing American business and private anticommunist groups saw these policies as a fatal mistake. For them the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, which the US government had signed, were synonymous with betrayal of the nation. If the USA had not gone to war with Germany, they maintained, events might have taken a different course, and America might not have been faced with the problem of communism in the postwar world. Many conservative Americans took this point of view on the radical changes in favor of socialism that occurred after the Second World War.

[p](#) Franklin Roosevelt's far-sighted policy toward the USSR was completely reversed after the war. The Truman administration rallied to Winston Churchill's call for the creation of a heavily armed Anglo-American alliance against the Soviet Union. All those who believed that the USSR's intention was peaceful were forced to resign. In the summer of 1947 George F. Kennan formulated the "containment of communism" as the official foreign policy of the USA. [\[61\]*](#) In practice this meant that the United States would suppress socialist revolutions in any part of the world and create conditions making it impossible for communist ideas to influence its own domestic politics. The Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine, and the fourth point of another Truman program, which called for technological assistance to underdeveloped countries, were components of this policy. NATO was created at the urging of the USA in 1949; this political-military organization worked out plans for a war against the Soviet Union. In 1951 the Mutual Security Act was adopted; it proclaimed an official US policy of espionage and subversion against the socialist countries. At the same time the USA virtually suspended trade with the socialist countries. The administration turned its back on the agreements about European and Asian politics signed at Yalta and Potsdam. Germany was divided. A separate peace was concluded with Japan. A "quarantine zone" of military pacts and bases was set up around the socialist countries. The United States proclaimed anticommunism as an official government policy, allying itself with corrupt regimes that had discredited themselves in the eyes of their peoples by collaborating with the imperialists and betraying national interests.

[p](#) But although the foreign policy of the Democratic administration was undoubtedly aggressive and reactionary the right favored a still less rational course: to seek the destruction of socialism no matter what the dangers involved.

[p](#) The right rejected "containment" as utterly inadequate. The extremists denied the possibility of compromise; they rejected peaceful coexistence and the maintenance of the international status quo as an alternative to a nuclear holocaust. For them peaceful coexistence was a "technique of Communist subversion," a "temporary phase of Communist strategy." ¹¹ Senator McCarran declared: "Nothing can stop the Reds except war. That is my view and the view of many of us. I hold that view very, very seriously. Nothing will stop them except bullets, and the sword and the bayonet."¹⁵

[p](#) The extremist position on postwar developments in the world was based on an overestimation of the military might of the USA and an underestimation of the opposing

forces. The USA, their reasoning went, was the world's greatest military power; thus if the course of history ran counter to the wishes of the right this could only be the result of criminal negligence at the highest level of government. As Dean Acheson later wrote, the extremists in Congress "could find only one explanation for the seeming failures of foreign policy—incompetence and even betrayal by successive administrations." Unscrupulous politicians played on this illusion about US military superiority. Such was the climate in the USA when the ominous figure of Senator Joseph McCarthy appeared on the political horizon.

[p](#) REFERENCES

[p](#) 1. I. F. Stone, *The Truman Era* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1953), p. XX.

[p](#) 2. *Spotlight on Spies*, prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives (Washington: 1949), pp. 1, 2, 11.

[p](#) 3. Allen Yarnell, *Democrats and Progressives: The 1948 Presidential Election as a Test of Postwar Liberalism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1947), pp. 88–89.

[p](#) 4. *Congressional Record* 1945, 91 (13) :A5645-A5646; *ibid.*, 1947, 93(7):8563–8564); O. John Rogge, *Our Vanishing Civil Liberties* (New York: Gaer Associates, 1950), pp. 17–28; Howard Blum, *Wanted! The Search for Nazis in America* (New York: Quadrangle, 1977).

[p](#) 5. *Congressional Record* 1945,91(10) :A859.

[p](#) 6. *Fascism in Action: A Documented Study and Analysis of Fascism in Europe Prepared at the Instance and under the Direction of Representative Wright Patman of Texas 63 by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress under the Direction of Ernest S. Griffith* (Washington: US Government Printing Office, 1947).

[p](#) 7. William J. Bosch, *judgment on. Nuremberg: American Attitudes Toward the Major German War-Crime Trials* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1970), pp. 75, 83.

[p](#) 8. *Congressional Record* 1950, 96(12) :16708–16709.

[p](#) 9. Ronald Radosh, *Prophets on the Right: Profiles of Conservative Critics of American Globalism* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975), pp. 149–152. Today's ultra-rightists, by the way, praise Taft's opposition to the trial of Hitler's main henchmen, which they see as a "fatal exercise of arbitrary power." Russell Kirk and James McClellan, *The Political Principles of Robert A. Taft* (New York: Fleet Press, 1967), p. 103.

[p](#) 10. *Congressional Record* 1948, 94(11) :A3860.

[p](#) 11. *Congressional Record* 1950, 96(17) :A6246.

- [p](#) 12. *Congressional Record* 1950, 96(10) :13787.
- [p](#) 13. *Congressional Record* 1948, 94(11) :A3813; 1950, 96(10): 13786; 1950, 96(17) :A6247.
- [p](#) 14. General Interim Report of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950), p. 31.
- [p](#) 15. *Congressional Record* 1950, 96(17) :A6247.
- [p](#) 16. House of Representatives, *Lobbying, Direct and Indirect: Part 4 of Hearings before the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950), pp. 60–61.
- [p](#) 17. Quoted *ibid.*, p. 85.
- [p](#) 18. Quoted *ibid.*, p. 82.
- [p](#) 19. Quoted *ibid.*, p. 91.
- [p](#) 20. Quoted *ibid.*, p. 96.
- [p](#) 21. *Ibid.*, p. 100.
- [p](#) 22. George Morris, *The Red Baiting Racket and How It Works* (New York: New Century, 1947), p. 7.
- [p](#) 23. *Congressional Record* 1945,91 (6):7495.
- [p](#) 24. U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Lobbying Activities, *Report and Recommendations* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951), p. 6.
- [p](#) 25. R. Joseph Monsen, Jr., and Mark W. Cannon, *The Markers 64 of Public Policy: American Power Groups and Their Ideologies* (New York: McGraw-Hill 1965), p. 60.
- [p](#) 26. *Communists Within the Labor Movement: A Handbook on the Facts and Countmeasures*, Report of the Committee on Socialism and Communism Approved by the Board of Directors, Chamber of Commerce of the United States (Washington: 1947), p. 43.
- [p](#) 27. *Hearings of the Special Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor: Investigation of Labor-Management Relations* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950), pp. 48, 212, 215, 287, 279, 354.
- [p](#) 28. *NAM Report*, 15 November 1965, p. 20.

- p 29. *Investigation of Labor-Management Relations*, pp. 542, 563, 564.
- p 30. *Ibid.*, pp. 571–576.
- p 31. U.S. Congress, House, *Strikes and Racketeering in the Kansas City Area: Hearings before Special Subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Government Operations* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1953).
- p 32. U.S. Congress, House, *Hearings of the Committee on Education and Labor: Labor-Management Relations, Part 10* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1953), pp. 3487, 3690, 3693.
- p 33. U.S. Congress, House, *Committee on Lobbying Activities: Report and Recommendations* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951), p. 42.
- p 34. Emily Clark Brown, *National Labor Policy: The TaftHartley Act after Three Years, and the Next Steps*
(Washington: Public Affairs Institute, 1950), p. 34.
- p 35. *Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1950*, p. 24.
- p 36. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
- p 37. U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, *Committee on Un-American Activities: Report on the National Lawyers Guild* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950), p. 5.
- p 38. *New Republic*, 31 January 1949, p. 8.
- p 39. *Political Affairs*, September-October 1969, pp. 133–134; Herbert Aptheker, *Dare We Be Free? The Meaning of the 65 Attempt to Outlaw the Communist Party* (New York: New Century, 1961), pp. 82–83.
- p 40. U.S. Congress, House, *Committee on Un-American Activities, Report on the Communist Party of the USA* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1948).
- p 41. *Congressional Record* 1948, 94 (H) :A3473.
- p 42. Harold W. Chase, op. cit., p. 57.
- p 43. *Congress and the Nation 1945–1964: A Review of Government and Politics in the Postwar Years* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1965), p. 1695.

p 44. Vito Marcantonio, *I Vote My Conscience: Debates, Speeches and Writings 1935–1950* (New York: Book Craftsmen Associates, 1956), p. 356.

p 45. Emily Clark Brown, op. cit., p. 44.

p 46. Ralph S. Brown, Jr., *Loyalty and Security: Employment Tests in the United States* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958), p. 321.

p 47. Ibid., pp. 135, 136, 141.

p 48. Ibid., p. 141.

p 49. *Congressional Record* 1948, 94(11) :A3474

p 50. *Congressional Record* 1947, 93(1):1399.

p 51. *The Truman Administration: Its Principles and Practice*, Louis W. Koenig, ed. (Washington: New York University Press, 1956), pp. 59, 61–62; United States Civil Service Commission, *65th Annual Report. Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1948*, p. 10.

p 52. Cabell Phillips, *The Truman Presidency: The History of a Triumphant Succession* (New York: McMillan, 1966), pp. 361–362.

p 53. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists: A Magazine for Science and Public Affairs*, December 1951, p. 365.

p 54. United States Civil Service Commission, *65th Annual Report: Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1948*, p. 13.

p 55. *The Truman Administration: A Documentary History*, Barton J. Bernstein and Allen J. Matusow, eds., (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), pp. 358–362.

p 56. Eleanor Bontecou, *The Federal Loyalty-Security Program* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1953), p. 206.

p 57. *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(4) : 4519.

p 58. *Congressional Record* 1947, 93(3) : 4006.

66

p 59. *Congressional Record* 1947, 93(7) : 8942.

p 60. United States Civil Service Commission, *65th Annual Report. Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1948*, p. 10.

- p 61. U.S. Department of Justice, *Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1950*, p. 25.
- p 62. *Joseph R. McCarthy*, Allen J. Matusow, ed. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 5; Cabell Phillips, op. cit. p. 364.
- p 63. *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(12) :4389.
- p 64. U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Un-American Activities, *Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications*
(Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951), pp. 161– 164.
- p 65. United States Civil Service Commission, *67th Annual Report. Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1950* (Washington: Government Printing office, 1951), pp. 29–30.
- p 66. Thomas I. Emerson and David Haber, *Political and Civil Rights in the United States: A Collection of Legal and Related Materials* (Buffalo: Dennis & Co., 1952), pp. 576–577.
- p 67. Robert J. Donovan, *Eisenhower: The Inside Story* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956), p. 286.
- p 68. *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(4) : 4519–4521; *Communism: Where Do We Stand Today? A Report of the Committee on Communism, Chamber of Commerce of the United States* (Washington: 1952), pp. 17–18.
- p 69. Dwight D. Eisenhower, *The White House Years: Mandate for Change, 1953–1956* (London: Heinemann, 1963), p. 315.
- p 70. U.S. Congress House. Committee on Un-American Activities. *Guide to Subversive Organizations*, pp. 238–245.
- p 71. Dwight D. Eisenhower, op. cit., pp. 311–312.
- p 72. For more detail see: Charles P. Curtis, *The Oppenheimer Case: The Trial of a Security System* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955). Later the government of the USA acknowledged the groundlessness of its accusations against Oppenheimer. President Kennedy, just before his assassination, approved the decision to award the Fermi Medal to Oppenheimer; President Johnson actually made the presentation. James R. Killian, Jr., *Sputnik, Scientists, and 67 Eisenhower: A Memoir of the First Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1977), pp. 37–38.
- p Peter Lyon, *Eisenhower: Portrait, of the Hero* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974), p. 493. Harold M. Hyman, *To Try Men's Souls: Loyalty Tests in American History*

(Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959), p. 338. Ralph S. Brown, Jr., op. cit., p. 194.

[p](#) “The Pragmatic Necessity for Freedom,” in *Civil Liberties Under Attack*, Henry Steele Commager, ed. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951), p. 17. Quoted in: Alpheus Thomas Mason, *Security through Freedom: American Political Thought and Practice* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1955), p. 198. *New Republic* 13 December 1948, p. 6. *New Republic* 14 August 1950, p. 12.

[p](#) Carey McWilliams, *Witch Hunt: The Revival of Heresy* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1950), p. 17; Alpheus Thomas Mason and Richard H. Leach, *In Quest of Freedom: American Political Thought and Practice* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1959), p. 541; Eleanor Bontecou, op. cit., p. 155.

[p](#) *A Quarter-Century of Un-Americana: 1938–1963*, Charlotte Pomerantz, ed., (New York: Marzani & Munsell, 1963), p. 10.

[p](#) *Congressional Record* 1945, 91(13) : A5379. *Congressional Record* 1945, 91(10) : A212, A333, A493. Frank J. Donner, *The Un-Americans* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1961), p. 9.

[p](#) *Congressional Record* 1948, 94(11) : A4053. Charlotte Pomerantz, ed., op cit., p. 48. *Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications*, pp. 1, 9-27, 127–159.

[p](#) Frank J. Donner, op. cit., pp. 9, 263, 264, 265. . See, for example: U.S. Congress House, Committee on UnAmerican Activities, *Report on the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill*, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950). Report on the National Lawyers Guiled. Washington, 1950 and others.

75 76

77

78. 79. 80.

81.

82. 83. 84.

[p](#) 85. 86. 87.

68

[p](#) 89. *Congressional Record* 1946, 92(2) :2744–2747.

[p](#) 90. *Daily Worker* 30 May 1950, p. 2.

p 91. Cahell Phillips, quoted in: Robert K. Carr, *The House Committee on Un-American Activities: 1945–1950* (Ithaca Cornell University Press, 1952), p. 57.

p 92. U.S. House of Representatives, *Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the Year 1953* (Washington: 1954), p. 23.

p 93. John W. Caughey, *In Clear and Present Danger: The Crucial State of Our Freedoms* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), p. 50.

p 94. *Congressional Record* 1947, 93(11) : A2688.

p 95. *Daily Worker* 30 May 1950, p. 2.

p 96. John Cogley, *Report on Blacklisting Vol. I: Movies* (The Fund for the Republic, 1956), p. 22; *Congressional Record* 1962, 108(17) :A817.

p 97. John Cogley, op. cit., p. 97, 152, 154.

p 98. Ibid., pp. 119, 124, 125.

p 99. Ibid., p. 15; Ralph S. Brown, Jr., op. cit., p. 156.

p 100. John Cogley, op. cit., p. 226.

p 101. John Cogley, *Report on Blacklisting Vol. II: Radio– Television* (The Fund for the Republic, 1956), p. 49.

p 102. Ibid., p. 51.

p 103. Michael Dorman, *Witch Hunt: The Underside of American Democracy* (New York: Delacourte Press, 1976), pp. 81–88.

p 104. Eighty-Second Congress, Senate, *Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, Second Session on Subversive Influence in the Educational Process* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952), p. 1.

p 105. Morris R. Cohen, *American Thought: A Critical Sketch* (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954), pp. 34–35.

p 106. *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(9) : A1112-A1113.

p 107. *Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the Year 1953*, pp. 9, 13, 76–78.

108. Eighty-Third Congress, Senate, *Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Com-*

69

109.

p 110. 111.

p *mittee on the Judiciary*; First Session, Part 2 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1953), p. 413. Reinhard H. Luthin, *American Demagogues. Twentieth Century* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1954), p. 288; see also: *The Nation* 28 June 1952, p. 639.

p Eighty-Third Congress, Senate, *Hearings*. . . Part 2 (1953), p. 428.

p *Report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive: A Campaign to Disarm and Defeat the United States*, prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives (Washington: 1951), p. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 47.

p Robert K. Carr, op. cit., p. 2. Quoted in: Carey McWilliams, op. cit., p. 141. *Communism and Academic Freedom: The Record of tin: Tenure Cases at the University of Washington* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1949), p. 14. *New Republic* 9 August 1948, p. 11.

p Carey McWilliams, op. cit., p. 140; *Communism and Academic Freedom* . . . pp. 11, 18, 19.

p Zecharian Chafee, Jr., *The Blessings of Liberty* (Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincot, 1956), p. 242. Eighty-Third Congress, Senate, *Hearings*... Part 5 (1953), pp. 607–608, 615. *Ibid.*, p. 615.

p Quoted in: E. Houston Harsha, "Illinois: The Broyles Commission," in: *The State and Subversion*, Walter Gellhorn, cd., (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1952), pp. 55–65. Carey McWilliams, op. cit., pp. 222–224, 226. Robert J. Mowit/, "Michigan: State and Local Attack on Subversion." in: *The State and Subversion*, pp. 191–193, 201–203.

p *Ibid.*, pp. 210, 216. 222, 223. *New Republic* 28 August 1950, p. 7.

p E. Houston Harsha, op. cit.. pp. 87–88; Edward L. Barrett, Jr., *The Tcnncy Committee: Legislative Investigation of Subversive Activities in California* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1951), pp. 41–42.

p WilliamB.Prendergast, "Maryland: The Ober Anti- Communist Law," in: *The State and Subversion*, pp. 141, 147–148.

112. 113. 114. 114"

115. 116.

117. 118.

119. 120.

121. 122.

123. 124.

[p](#) 125.

70

[p](#) 127. Ibid., p. 142; *The Nation* 28 June 1952, pp. 653–654.

[p](#) 128. William B. Prendergast, op. cit., p. 158.

[p](#) 129. U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, *Hearings before the Subcommittee on Subversive Influence in the Educational Process: Part 13* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1953), p. 1154.

[p](#) 130. David L. Kirp and Mark G. Yudof, *Educational Policy and the Law: Cases and Materials* (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1947), p. 227.

[p](#) 131. Eighty-Third Congress, Senate, *Hearings...* Part 5 (1953), pp. 647–648.

[p](#) 132. *New Republic* 29 October 1951, p. 14.

[p](#) 133. *Congressional Record* 1962, 108(1) :1031.

[p](#) 134. *Look I* September 1954, p. 24.

[p](#) 135. Warren Leslie, *Dallas Public and Private: Aspects of an American City* (New York: Grossman, 1964), pp. 114–115.

[p](#) 136. Cabell Phillips, op. cit., p. 373.

[p](#) 137. Eighty-Third Congress, Senate, *Hearings...* Part 7 (1953), pp. 739–740.

[p](#) 138. Robert M. Maclver, *Academic Freedom in Our Time: A Study Prepared for the American Academic Freedom Project at Columbia University* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), pp. 36, 38; *The New York Times* 21 October

[p](#) 1951, p. L151.

- p 139. *The Nation* 28 June 1952, p. 620.
- p 140. *The New York Times* 25 May 1952, p. 1.
- p 141. William Dix and Paul Bixler, eds., *Freedom of Communication: Proceedings of the First Conference on Intellectual Freedom* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1954), p. 131.
- p 142. *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(12) : A 4707-A4708.
- p 143. Kalman Seigel, "College Freedoms Being Stifled by Students' Fear of Red Label," *The New York Times* 10 May 1951, p. 1.
- p 144. *Look* 7 September 1954, p. 24.
- p 145. Thomas I. Emerson and David Habcr, op. cit., p. 872.
- p 146. Robert M. Maclver, op. cit., p. 123.
- p 147. Donald J. Kemper, *Decade of Fear: Senator Hennings and Civil Liberties* (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1965), p. 112; Walter Gellhorn, *American 71 Rights: The Constitution in Action* (New York: McMillan, 1960), p. 73.
- p 148. *The State and Subversion*, pp. 171, 177, 359, 373, 375, 397.
- p 149. Richard M. Freeland, *The Truman Doctrine and the Origins of McCarthyism: Foreign Policy, Domestic Policies, and Internal Security* (New York: Schocken Books, 1974), p. 299.
- p 150. *Congressional Record* 1945, 91 (6) :8364–8375.
- p 151. Alfred Steinberg, *The Man from Missouri: The Life and Times of Harry S. Truman* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1962), p. 262.
- p 152. *Politics in America: 1945–1964* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1965), pp. 2-3.
- p 153. Thomas I. Emerson and David Haber, op. cit., pp. 1-3.
- p 154. *Congressional Record* 1948, 94(1) :927–929.
- p 155. *Politics in America: 1945–1964*, p. 6.
- p 156. *History of U.S. Political Parties Vol. IV: 1945–1972. The Politics of Change*, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., general ed. (New York and London: Chelsea House, 1973), pp. 3409– 3410, 3413–3414.

[p](#) 157. *Congressional Record* 1949, 95(1) :76.

[p](#) 158. Leonard Freedman, *Power and Politics in America* (Belmont, California: Duxbury Press, 1971), pp. 74–75.

[p](#) 159. Eric F. Goldman, *The Crucial Decade—and After: America, 1945–1960* (New York: Vintage, 1961), p. 65.

[p](#) 160. Quoted in: Karl Schriftgiesser, *Business Comes of Age: The Story of the Committee for Economic Development and Its Impact upon the Economic Policies of the United States, 1942–1960* (New York: Harpek & Brothers, 1960) pp. 86–88.

[p](#) 161. *Ibid.*, pp. 90–92.

[p](#) 162. *Congressional Record* 1948, 94(12) : A5351, A5353.

[p](#) 163. H. Hart, *McCarthy Versus the State Department* (Durham: University of North Carolina, 1952), p. 26.

[p](#) 164. William F. Buckley, Jr., *The Committee and Its Critics: A Calm Review of the House Committee on Un-American Activities* (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1962), pp. 84–85.

[p](#) 165. Quoted in: Herbert Aptheker, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

166. Dean Acheson, *A Citizen Looks at Congress* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956), p. 112.

* * *

Notes

[61•*] In later years Kennan revised this position, repeatedly criticizing it in print. At present he is an active supporter of the broadening and strengthening of Soviet-American business cooperation and of further detente.

MCCARTHYISM

Senator Joseph McCarthy and the Democratic Administration

p On February 9, 1950, Joseph McCarthy, a little-known senator from Wisconsin, appeared before the Republican Women's Club of Wheeling, West Virginia; flourishing a sheet of paper, he declared: "I have here in my hand a list of two hundred and five . . . names that were made known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist party and who nevertheless are still working and shaping policy in the State Department."^^1^^ The next day he appeared in Salt Lake City, Utah; following that, in Reno, Nevada. On February 20 McCarthy announced in the Senate that he had "penetrated 'Truman's iron curtain of secrecy' and described, without naming, 81 'persons whom I consider to be Communists in the State Department.'"^^2^^ The senator's name soon appeared in widely read newspapers and magazines, and he was spoken of on radio and television.

p McCarthy made many mutually exclusive assertions in his impromptu speeches. For example, he declared in Wheeling that there were 205 "Communists" in the State Department; in Denver, 205 "unreliables"; in Salt Lake City, 57 "card-carrying Communists." In *McCarthy Versus the State Department* Harnell Hart tallies at least fifty false charges made by the senator." But this opinion was far from universal. Through enormous efforts by the rightist press and by journalists and radio commentators such as George Sokolsky, Westbrook Pegler, Fulton Lewis, Jr., and Walter Winchell, McCarthy was presented as the leading figure in the fight against the "reds" in the American government.

p In 1950 McCarthy became the nation's most popular senator. He received over 2,000 invitations—more than all the other Republican senators put together—to speak on behalf of his party. In October alone he made speeches in nine states.^^4^^ In a short time the little-known senator from Wisconsin rose to dizzy heights, becoming a national figure of the first rank. In 1953 73 William Z. Foster wrote: "Three years ago McCarthy was virtually a political nobody, but now he's a real power in the land, able to dictate policies to powerful newspapers and broadcasting concerns, to infringe upon the foreign policy prerogatives of the President, and to terrorize large sections of the population."^^5^^

p In 1950 a new word, with far-reaching and portentous connotations, was added to the political vocabulary: McCarthyism. Aided by the deft hand of cartoonist Herbert Block its use spread rapidly; it came to express, in its broadest sense, the political reaction that swept the USA after the Second World War.

p McCarthyism as a political phenomenon was not confined to the activities of Senator McCarthy. McCarthy and his henchmen did not represent an isolated aberration in American society. This reign of terror and omnipresent suspicion could not have been instituted by a few fanatics if existing social forces had not prepared the way for them.

McCarthyism developed and became strong in a period when the capitalist system was experiencing new and profound shocks, the result of the worsening of the general crisis of capitalism and the development of the world socialist system. McCarthyism is inseparable from the outburst of reactionary politics in the USA after the Second World War and from the policies of the Truman and Eisenhower administrations and of both bourgeois parties, although it is not to be entirely attributed to these phenomena.

p McCarthyism was a rejection not only of the Declaration of Independence but also of the basic provisions of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights setting forth fundamental political and constitutional guarantees. As a reflection of the intensification of reaction among the ruling cliques in the USA as the general crisis of capitalism grew more acute McCarthyism showed certain traits characteristic of fascism. It was the apogee of reaction in America during the 50s.

p In the realm of economics McCarthyism meant a repudiation of all the social and economic reforms of the 30s and 40s. It fought determinedly against strong unions, trying to weaken them as far as possible. McCarthyism also struck a blow against those segments of the American bourgeoisie (and against the majority of the intelligentsia) that had made a sober estimate of the balance of class forces within the country and internationally⁷⁴ and had seen the need to make concessions to the working people.

p In ideology McCarthyism reflected a lack of faith, prevalent among the most reactionary ruling cliques, in capitalism's ability to withstand peaceful competition with socialism; this amounted to recognizing that American capitalism's ideology was weak—the bourgeoisie feared that it would lose its power over the minds of Americans. This fear led to an abrupt suspension of the exchange of ideas within the country, to the use of draconian measures against the spread of communist thought, and to the reinforcement of immigration barriers.

p In international politics McCarthyism took as its basic premise the military superiority of the USA, but admitted that time was on the side of socialism: hence the demand that world socialism be destroyed before it was too late. Any seeking of compromises or policy of peaceful coexistence was depicted by McCarthyism as "appeasement" and "treason."

p And finally, in psychological terms McCarthyism expressed the mood of a society ridden with suspicion, obsessed with "plots," afflicted with spy fever and anticommunist hysteria, with obtuse, irrational fanaticism, and with intolerance toward the forces of progress and toward unorthodox thought. During the reign of McCarthyism anticommunism became a national psychosis. This mania colored every aspect of the politics of the ruling cliques. It became "an almost unconscious habit of mind."⁶ Its other side was the dismay, confusion, and fear felt by the American bourgeoisie in face of the new problems that had arisen in the country and abroad after the Second World War.

p This atmosphere did not come about at once. It arose and developed, as has already been noted, under the influence of numerous internal factors whose roots went back to

the 30s. The postwar policies of the ruling cliques and the shift in the balance of the world's class forces in favor of socialism were also enormously important in its shaping.

p McCarthy and the others who rode the sordid wave of anticommunism were politicians of a common type: deficient in intellect and in character, unscrupulous in their choice of means against their political opponents, they were distinguished by high ambition and great skill in self-aggrandizement. They 75 combined unthinking fanaticism and hatred for the forces of progress with an ability to use striking slogans, lies, and demagoguism to frighten people with imaginary threats and to turn to their own ends militant individualism, national and racial antagonisms, anti-Semitism, selfish drives, and religious bigotry.

p They directed their efforts against opposition of every kind; in the end this would also mean the suppression of political opposition to the reactionary domestic and international course of the ruling cliques. Moreover, attacks on democratic institutions were disguised as defense of the Constitution, which was supposedly being threatened by "subversive". McCarthy and his followers saw their brutal stifling of political dissent as one of their main contributions to the defense of the American ideals of "freedom" and "justice."

p The high priests of anticommunism were the members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and (for a short time) of the Senate Investigative Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee. These persons were responsible for the enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, the Communist Control Act of 1954, and other anti-democratic measures. And it was people of this sort who became the arbiters of patriotism in the USA after the war, who set themselves up as judges of the loyalty of American citizens.

p Their leader was Senator Joseph McCarthy, whose name became synonymous with the most shameful period in the USA's history.

p Despite the disreputableness of the means McCarthy used against his political opponents he found many supporters, even admirers. Many Americans offered him their services and money. Richard H. Rovere wrote of him: "He was a fertile innovator, a first-rate organizer and galvanizer of mobs, a skilled manipulator of public opinion, and something like a genius at that essential American strategy: publicity."^^7^^

p McCarthy became a US senator in 194fi. The Voluntary Republican Committee, made up of Wisconsin industrialists, gave over \$100,000 to his campaign fund. He was supported by American Action Incorporated, which was connected with Robert R. McCormick (the head of the *Chicago Tribune*), General 76 Robert E. Wood, and the Du Fonts—staunch opponents of the Roosevelt administration. As the historian David M. Oshinsky correctly notes, McCarthy was elected to Congress on an antilabor and anti-Roosevelt platform.^^8^^

p McCarthy's frontal attack on the administration in early 1950 helped to create the illusion that a monstrous plot was afoot in the State Department, and paved the way for public harassment and persecution of various persons and organizations. Fantastical charges were leveled at Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Secretary of Defense George Marshall, Philip Jessup (representative to the US delegation of the United Nations), and other high officials. Many of these accusations were seconded by prominent Republican Congressmen. Robert Taft allied himself with McCarthy, calling State Department policies "pro-communist" and declaring that Acheson had "offered an especially obvious green light to the Communists" in the Far East.⁹

p The cries of "treason" in high places issuing from the right became still more shrill and insistent after America's military failure in Korea. The extremists used the replacement of General Douglas MacArthur as military commander in the Far East (April 11, 1951) to step up their attack on the administration.

p MacArthur, upon his return to the USA, gave vent to his displeasure with the administration's policy in a dramatic speech before a joint session of Congress (April 19), where he was given a hero's welcome. His numerous charges created an explosive political scandal, and the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees launched investigations. In May they heard testimony from MacArthur, who called the Truman administration's actions in the Far East a policy of appeasement of communism. He argued that the USA had not done all it could have to prevent the 1949 revolution in China; in his opinion this was the administration's "greatest political mistake." As for Korea, MacArthur maintained that the USA would have emerged victorious if the administration, following his advice, had taken the war into the People's Republic of China, blockaded the Chinese coast, and used the forces of Chiang Kaishek.¹⁰

p On June 14, at the very height of the scandal over the replacement of MacArthur, McCarthy accused Secretary of Defense George Marshall of organizing a far-reaching conspiracy that had led to the capitulation (from his supporters' point of view) of the West in Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam.¹¹ Later McCarthy developed these accusations in a book; he noted that in 1945 Marshall had taken no action on intelligence reports that the Soviet Union's entry into the war against Japan would undermine America's position in the Far East, and that in 1948 he had ignored the Internal Security Subcommittee's finding that Communists were infiltrating the USA under the aegis of the United Nations. In 1942, as Chief of Staff of the United States Army, Marshall had urged that a second front be opened in Europe, and in Teheran he had supported the Soviet Union's position on this question against Churchill.¹² McCarthy regarded these actions as clearly treasonable. The repercussions from his charges were so extensive that Marshall was soon forced into retirement.

p These attacks on the State Department were intended to block all possible paths to the easing of international tensions, to create a climate that would keep the government of the USA from embracing compromise solutions. It is not for nothing that Acheson swore before the Senate that he "would never so much as consider the recognition of Communist China."¹³

p Owen Lattimore, a leading specialist in Far Eastern affairs, was subjected to harassment and persecution by McCarthy's followers in connection with the attack on the administration's Far East policy. McCarthy called him the "top architect" of US foreign policy in the Far East, and "one of the top Communist agents in this country." In their testimony before the Senate Committee four former Secretaries of State unanimously denied these charges. They declared that Lattimore had not occupied any official post in the State Department, and so could not have shaped US policy in the Far East. Another of McCarthy's charges collapsed when it was discovered that the testimony of Budenz, an agent provocateur whom the senator had cited, was based on hearsay. Henry Cabot Lodge, a member of the Senate committee investigating McCarthy's charges against the State Department, called Budenz's testimony "insincere or untruthful," and said the motives behind it were political and manipulative.¹¹

p In 1951–1952 Senator McCarran's Internal Security Subcommittee investigated the Institute of Pacific Relations, which was made up of scientific councils representing ten countries. The institute was financed by Rockefeller and Carnegie funds (48 percent) and also by dues from the member countries. In 1934 the Pacific Ocean Institute of the USSR had joined this organization and every year since had, like the other members, paid between \$2,000 and \$3,000 into its treasury. The McCarran subcommittee seized the institute's financial papers, found the record of one such payment, and on this basis spread the sensational report that "the institute was a paid agent of Soviet propaganda."¹⁵ The subcommittee maintained that the institute was under communist control and that it had greatly influenced America's Far Eastern policy. McCarran declared: "I am convinced, from the evidence developed in this inquiry, [that] but for the machinations of the small group that controlled and activated that organization [IPR] China today would be free."¹⁰ William L. Holland, the institute's secretary-general, appeared before the subcommittee in October of 1951; he characterized the investigators' charges as "slanderous and manifestly absurd."¹⁷ The ridiculousness of this "expose" became fully clear on August 2, when Edward K. Carter, the institute's former head, testified before the subcommittee that FBI agents had looked through the institute's archives a year earlier and had found nothing prejudicial in its activities.¹

p The attack made by McCarthy's adherents on America's Far Eastern policy was inspired by a powerful coalition. On one side were the China lobby, unscrupulous politicians hungry for publicity, professional anticommunists, and isolationists; they had maintained throughout the postwar period that the US government was purposely abetting the revolution in China. On the other side were the old-guard opponents of Franklin Roosevelt, who grouped themselves around Senator Robert Taft. William J. Goodwin and Alfred Kohlberg were particularly influential members of the China lobby. In 1949–1950 Chiang Kaishek's propaganda machine paid Goodwin \$65,000 for help in getting new American loans. In an interview with the *Washington Post* he boasted that he had converted no less than fifty members of Congress to Chiang Kaishek's cause.¹⁸ Goodwin also boasted that he had "helped materially" to lay the groundwork for McCarthy's attacks on the State Department.¹⁹ The historian Selig Adler also notes that the China lobbyists received financial support from the Taiwan government. In

particular he writes that Madame Chiang, on departing from the USA after a visit in 1950, "left more than one million dollars in cash for the Lobby's use.""

p There was nothing really original in McCarthy's charges against the State Department; at bottom they were a repetition of the arguments of Alfred Kohlberg, who in the 40s had depicted the Institute of Pacific Relations as the evil genius of American foreign policy in the Far East. It is also known that a week before McCarthy launched his attack *America Betrayed* had been distributed in Congress; this pamphlet, the work of Joseph P. Kamp, the head of the Constitutional Educational League, contained "all the same charges against the same people in almost the same words."^^21^^

p Closely connected to these attacks on foreign policy were the Jenner and McCarran subcommittees' investigations of the 2,000 Americans working at the UN. Senator Eastland, following the general line of McCarthyism, maintained that the "greatest concentration of Communists" was to be found in that group. He hinted broadly that all of them had held "high and sensitive positions" in the US government, where (he said) they were known to be Communists. He declared in mock wonderment that this state of affairs was "more than strange."^^22^^ In January 1953, at the urging of McCarthy and his followers, all Americans employed at the UN were fingerprinted.^21^ The liberal journal *The Nation* described McCarthyism's invasion of this international organization in an article titled "Dark Days at the U.N." The investigators crudely violated international law by demanding that witnesses reveal confidential information. Some of the UN's American employees were confronted with a choice: their loyalty to the United States or to the UN. The committee, with the consent of the UN Secretary General, had some of those who refused to answer discharged.^24^^

p McCarthyism's attack on the foreign policies of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations was part and parcel of its general offensive against the social and economic policies of the New Deal and against later measures associated with the so-called Fair Deal. It was claimed that Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan and Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, as well as Acheson and Marshall, had Communist connections; later 80 such accusations were made against the Truman administration as a whole. On April 11, 1951, William Jenner, one of McCarthy's comrades-in-arms, declared in the Senate: "I charge that this country today is in the hands of a secret inner coterie which is directed by agents of the Soviet Union. . . We must cut this whole cancerous conspiracy out of our government at once. Our only choice is to impeach President Truman and find out who is the secret invisible government which has so cleverly led our country down the road to destruction."^^25^^ The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in a report released on August 24, 1953, asserted that "the Communists actually controlled the State Department, the Treasury Department, the National Labor Relations Board, the Office of War Information, and the Office of Strategic Services among others and had even a dominant voice in White House circles."^^20^^

p McCarthyism's attacks on the policies of the Roosevelt and Truman (and later Eisenhower) administrations were an expression of the conflicts within American state-

monopoly capitalism, of the opposition of certain monopolistic groups to government involvement in the private sector. All those who felt that government regulation was counter to their economic interests supported McCarthy's campaign against the administration.

[p](#) The Truman administration tried to fight back. A paper titled "A Study of 'Witch Hunting' and Hysteria in the United States" was circulated with an eye to discrediting McCarthy and his supporters. Generalizing from material on outbreaks of political hatred in the past, the study concluded that witch hunting was a "periodically recurring phenomenon, of which the McCarthy uproar was yet another manifestation."²⁷

[p](#) But Truman's counterattack was doomed from the outset: his own program for loyalty tests of government employees sanctioned the "witch hunting" that he attributed, not without reason, to McCarthyism. The administration acknowledged that some loyalty boards had violated the principles of due process, but took no practical measures to avert further violations.²⁸

[p](#) McCarthyism was opposed by liberals in Congress and the press. Thanks to them many unsavory sides of the investigators' activities came to light. The liberal press repeatedly pointed out that McCarthy and his followers were ignoring the Constitution, and widely publicized their financial machinations. In 1950 the 81 subcommittee headed by Senator Millard E. Tydings, which was looking for "subversive activities" in the State Department in connection with McCarthy's charges, declared in no uncertain terms that those charges were groundless, and directed the public's attention to the obvious contradictions within them.

[p](#) On August 6, 1951, Senator William Benton of Connecticut moved that McCarthy be expelled from the Senate. "Freedom to lie," Benton said, "is not a freedom which membership in the U.S. Senate confers upon any man."²⁹ Benton cited ten cases in which McCarthy had lied. Revelations were also made about McCarthy's financial maneuverings, about his use of dishonest means in the election campaign against Senator Tydings of Maryland, etc. It became known that in McCarthy's six years in the Senate he had deposited \$172,000 in banks—this on an income of \$15,000 a year. In 1948, as a member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Monetary Affairs, McCarthy had aided passage of a measure loaning \$50,000,000 to private construction firms. For this he received a bribe of \$10,000, in the form of an honorarium for a pamphlet on housing construction, from the Lustron Corporation. He had also accepted a bribe of \$20,000 from the Pepsi-Cola Corporation.

[p](#) By August 31, however, Senator Hennings, and perhaps also Benton, appeared to drop the motion against McCarthy. In a letter to Tom F. Baker, president of the Missouri Cotton Producers Association and an ardent supporter of the Benton resolution, Hennings wrote: "There are some complications ... in terms of party policy and even Bill Benton has suggested that he would be happy to see his resolution somewhat modified."³⁰ Many Democratic Congressmen wanted Benton to refrain from attacking McCarthy; they feared that his resolution would provoke an adverse reaction and hurt them in the

upcoming elections. In early September "the Senator from Connecticut shifted his objective from expulsion of McCarthy to censure. 'A resolution of censure,' he stated, 'would provide the moral grounds to encourage the voters of Wisconsin to expel him in 1952.' "^^31^^

p The Senate battle over the Benton resolution began on September 28, 1951. McCarthy ignored the subcommittee headed by Senator Guy M. Gillette, to which the resolution had been sent, and its members did not show the persistence to pursue the matter to its end. Moreover there were McCarthy 82 supporters even on the subcommittee, and many of its members did not wish to bring down upon themselves the wrath of the senator from Wisconsin. McCarthy tried persistently to "unmask" the communist influence working against him. Such half measures by Congressional liberals could not seriously affect McCarthy's prestige in the eyes of the electorate. On September 8, 1952, he received more votes than all of his opponents combined.

p The only thing that McCarthy's critics were able to accomplish in the Eighty-Second Congress was to suggest a "code of conduct" to be followed by Congressional investigating committees."^^2^^ But it was only in March 1955, after McCarthy's defeat, that such a code was adopted.^^33^^

p In November 1952 Gillette was replaced as head of the subcommittee investigating McCarthy by Senator Hennings of Missouri. Under his guidance it compiled a report, which was circulated among the senators of the new (Eighty-Third) Congress. But William Jenner, a McCarthy supporter, now assumed leadership of the Senate Rules Committee, to which the Hennings subcommittee was subordinated; he quickly put a stop to the report's spread. Only by the efforts of a number of liberal organizations, which duplicated the report entire or in part, did it reach the public. The report was four hundred pages long, and well documented. But it made no recommendations concerning McCarthy; it merely set forth two conclusions: "First, that McCarthy had obstructed the whole investigation and had repeatedly abused the members of the subcommittee; second, that the subcommittee had gathered a considerable body of unrefuted evidence indicating highly irregular financial transactions on McCarthy's part."

p The liberal press openly expressed disappointment with the report; right-wingers in Congress saw it as a "smear" against their hero. Hennings himself explained the report's leniency toward McCarthy by pointing out that there were not sufficient votes in the Senate at that time to sustain a move against McCarthy. "Any attempted showdown would have resulted in a vote of confidence in the Wisconsin Republican and a repudiation of the subcommittee. Such a result, Hennings concluded, would have been disastrous for the Senate and for the country." '*

p The liberals' struggle against McCarthyism proved ineffectual. The generally positive contribution made by liberals to the fight 83 against reaction in the USA is not to be disparaged; nonetheless the extreme inconsistency of their position in the postwar period cannot escape comment. The liberal movement was in a state of siege in those years, and its ranks dwindled greatly. Many who had earlier supported Roosevelt's policies began to

oppose them with vigor. This shift was related to an overall strengthening of reaction among the bourgeoisie. Most liberals turned away from the battle, not wishing to draw the ire of the investigating committees; only a minority continued to defend their beliefs actively.

p The progressive sociologist C. Wright Mills characterized the liberal movement of those years in very unflattering terms. He wrote that the internecine political struggle "revealed a decayed and frightened liberalism weakly defending itself from the insecure and ruthless fury of political gangsters."¹¹³

p It is quite possible that Mill's assessment is too gloomy, or that it does not do justice to some liberals. But it accurately describes a general tendency. The liberals' struggle in those years was directed not so much against McCarthyism as toward the vindication of their own loyalty, their anticommunism. This tendency manifested itself even in some of McCarthyism's staunchest opponents. Herbert H. Lehman, speaking before the liberal Americans for Democratic Action on May 23, 1953, called McCarthyism a threat to democratic freedoms; at the same time he felt it necessary to exhort his audience to fight Communism "both from outside our borders and within our country."¹¹⁴

p Some legislative proposals by liberals were no less reactionary than those made by McCarthy's supporters. What can be said, for example, of their proposal that suspicious persons be placed under preventive custody in concentration camps, which became part of the reactionary McCarran Act of 1950?

Some liberals showed a degree of courage and steadfastness in the struggle against McCarthyism; but the liberal movement as a whole suffered from at least two grave defects. First, all liberals did homage, to some extent, to the reactionaries' big lie: that world communism was threatening the USA. Indeed the views of some liberals on relations with the USSR were close to those of the overt reactionaries. Because of this the liberals' opposition to McCarthyism was inconsistent and ineffective. ⁸⁴ The enormous social upheavals taking place throughout the world in the mid-twentieth century inevitably pushed bourgeois liberalism toward the right, toward reaction. Second, the liberal movement of those years tried to divorce McCarthy and McCarthyism from the political climate in the country, from the policies of the USA's ruling cliques. Liberals saw McCarthy and his kind as an isolated phenomenon; they overlooked (or perhaps ignored) the forces that sustained McCarthyism. While criticizing McCarthy the liberals, along with the other members of the Senate, confirmed (on February 2, 1954) a new budget giving his subcommittee \$214,000 for investigative activities. The only opposing voice was that of William Fulbright of Arkansas. By paying tribute to anticommunism the liberals contributed to the aggravation of anticommunist hysteria and to the cold war; thus in some measure they helped to create the atmosphere in which McCarthyism flourished.

Anti-Constitutional Legislation by Congress

p In the McCarthy years Congress became the center of anticommunist and anti-democratic activities. Many restrictive measures were enacted between 1950 and 1954 in attempts to destroy the Communist Party, to weaken the democratic movement as much as possible, to reinforce government control over the unions, to revoke (in practice) the political rights proclaimed in the Constitution, and to put more of the personal lives of Americans under police supervision. Congress also wanted to cut Americans off completely from progressive influences from abroad. Many of these goals were achieved.

p The most shameful page in the history of the Eighty-First Congress (1949–1950) was the adoption of the anticommunist McCarran-Wood Act—the Internal Security Act of 1950. This law was prepared by a special subcommittee, headed by Richard Nixon, of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Its prototype was the Mundt-Nixon Bill, developed during the Eightieth Congress on the basis of a welter of anticommunist 85 proposals. In 1948 the House voted 319 to 58 to approve the Mundt-Nixon Bill, but Republican leaders in the Senate postponed discussion on it until after the 1948 elections.³⁷

p The election restored Democratic control over both houses of Congress, but the legislators' anticommunist fever was not lessened. McCarran, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and Wood, the new chairman of HUAC, both Democrats, proved to be faithful followers of Republicans Mundt and Nixon. During the debate on anticommunist legislation liberals introduced, with Truman's approval, the Kilgore Bill, which provided for police surveillance of "dangerous" persons during "internal security emergencies." In the further course of the discussion the Kilgore Bill was incorporated into the McCarran-Wood Bill. As Congressman Vito Marcantonio (New York) justly remarked on July 17, 1950, this anticommunist bill proved once again that "defense of tyranny abroad only means reaction at home."³⁸ In a message to Congress on September 22 Truman called the bill's provisions "a clear and present danger¹" to Americans' democratic institutions, as well as "ineffective and unworkable."⁹ Warnings were heard that to pass the bill would make a mockery of the Bill of Rights.

p The McCarran-Wood Act, adopted on September 23, 1950, was marked by an overt anticommunist bias. Its introduction stated that the purpose of the world communist movement is "by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups, espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and many other means ... to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship . . . throughout the world."⁴⁰ Title I of the act made unlawful any "activity" which would "contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship" under foreign control.

p Under the McCarran-Wood Act the Communist Party was defined as a "Communist-action organization"—one which is "controlled by the foreign government." Groups that supported the Communists or shared their view on any question were defined as "Communist-front organizations." Both types of organization were required to register with the Justice Department.¹ Under the McCormack Act of 1938 and the Voorhis Law of 1940, organizations and individuals engaged in spying, sabotage, and the fomenting of rebellions were bound to register; Communists were now grouped with

criminal conspirators and traitors. Refusal to register 86 was punishable by a fine of up to \$10,000 and a prison term of five years for each day lapsed.

p The McCarran-Wood Act's definition of a "Communist-front organization" opened the way for an attack on hundreds of democratic and liberal organizations working against fascism and war and for social reform, the broadening of the educational system, and racial equality.

p The act created the Subversive Activities Control Board, which was made up of five members appointed by the president and approved by the Senate. This board had discretionary powers to determine what groups should be considered "Communist-action" or "Communist-front" organizations. A staff of investigators and "experts on Communism" was placed at the board's disposal.

p The act gave the president the right, during an "internal security emergency," to suspend the Bill of Rights—to use police measures against any citizen who was suspected by the government of being a threat to the USA.¹²

p In accordance with the act the government set up camps for preventive detention in Allentown (Pennsylvania), El Reno (Oklahoma), Florence and Wickenburg (Arizona), Tulalake (California), and Avon Park (Florida). The Department of Justice did not deny that these camps were "ready to confine American Communists in case of an emergency."

p Members of "Communist-action" and "Communist-front" organizations were not allowed to travel outside the country or to work in the civil service, or at defense facilities. Such organizations were required to identify materials sent through the mail as "disseminated by ... a Communist organization." Similar rules applied to their radio and television broadcasts.⁴

p The Communist Party USA showed up the demagoguery of the ruling cliques about a "Communist threat," pointing out that the new law promoted militaristic hysteria, regarded working for peace and business cooperation with the socialist countries as a subversive activity, and made it easier for the ruling cliques to fight individuals and organizations demanding the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the enactment of social and economic measures favoring the working people.⁵

p The state legislatures emulated the anticommunist fervor of Congress, and in a number of cases even surpassed it. By the end of 1950 thirty-one states had adopted laws similar to the Smith Act. Michigan's "Little Smith Act," adopted in 1950, made it a crime to advocate the overthrow of the US government by force and violence. The penalty prescribed was a fine of up to \$10,000 and a prison sentence of up to ten years. Another Michigan law, enacted in 1951, threatened life imprisonment for all members of "subversive organizations" and all persons connected with them. Anyone refusing to answer questions before a Congressional committee would be considered "a communist or a knowing member of a communist front organization" by the state legislature, and

would be liable to all the consequences of such affiliation.’¹⁰ The governor of Texas, Allan Shivers, demanded the death penalty for all Communists; membership in the Communist Party was made a criminal offense in the state, punishable by a \$20,000 fine and twenty years in prison. By the beginning of 1951 fifteen states had barred the Communist Party from participation in elections. Registration laws appeared in five states.

p These acts by lawmakers met with full support from rightist organizations. At its October 1950 convention the American Legion adopted two resolutions demanding that Communists be "interned and tried as traitors and that the death penalty be made to apply to anyone convicted of espionage, sabotage or sedition, in time of peace as well as war.”⁴⁷

p As has been noted Truman denounced the McCarran Act in the strongest terms. But this did not prevent the Justice Department from instigating proceedings, in November 1950, for the registration of the Communist Party on the basis of that law. On October 20, 1952, the Subversive Activities Control Board found the party to be "communist-action organization" and demanded that it register with the Justice Department.⁴⁸ American Communists began a dramatic struggle, lasting for almost a decade and a half, in the course of which the party exploded the officially sanctioned myth that the communist movement was conspiratorial, thus assuring its own further existence and development.

p In 1951 democratic organizations too were persecuted under the McCarran Act. The Peace Information Center, which was collecting signatures for the Stockholm Appeal, was indicted for refusing to register as a foreign agent.¹⁹ In the fall of 1953 the 88 Subversive Activities Control Board, at the urging of the Department of Justice, instituted proceedings against fourteen more so-called Communist-front organizations. At the same time materials were being prepared for actions against twenty-five other democratic and liberal groups.

p After two years of investigation the board suggested that the Jefferson School of Social Science, the Labor Youth League, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, and the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade register as "Communist-front" organizations. [88* In June 1955 the board opened hearings on the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born.

p The Internal Security Act of 1950 was not the last link in the chain of Congressional anticommunist actions. In January 1954 President Eisenhower asked that measures depriving Communist Party members of American citizenship be worked out. A group of prominent Congressional liberals headed by Hubert H. Humphrey introduced a proposal "to declare the Communist party an illegal conspiracy.”⁵⁰ The ultra-right Congressmen Francis Walter, Reed, Charles Halleck, and Robert C. Byrd suggested that the Communist Party be outlawed.⁵¹ But these suggestions were not carried out for tactical reasons: a number of Congressional and administration figures maintained that provisions for registration were the most effective means in the struggle against

communism, and opposed the outlawing of the party. This point of view was expressed, in particular, by President Eisenhower, Herbert Brownell, and J. Edgar Hoover.⁵²

Compromise measures developed in the course of Congressional debates were incorporated into the Communist Control Act, which was adopted almost unanimously at the end of 1954. This shameful act was the logical continuation and development of earlier anti-democratic laws. Congress declared the Communist Party "an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States." Its existence was claimed to be a "clear present and continuing danger" to the country. The Communist Party was deprived of all rights accorded to political parties in the USA, and completely barred from participation in political campaigns, including presidential, Congressional, and local elections.

The almost complete unanimity with which Congress approved these laws troubled sober-minded Americans every bit as much as the doings of fanatical investigators. Telford Taylor remarked that this extraordinary bill would always be a blot on American history. It was adopted at a time when the USA was tirelessly proclaiming to the world that it ardently supported free elections and self-determination.⁵ Congress filled out the McCarran Act of 1950 by introducing a new term, "Communist-infiltrated organization," which could be used against any progressive organization, and in particular against militant labor unions. The legislators encouraged unions to exclude Communists by allowing them to petition for the removal of the "Communist-infiltrated" label. The law allowed members to leave such an organization; upon request by 20 per cent of the union's membership the National Labor Relations Board would conduct elections of new representatives for collective bargaining. A union judged to be "Communist-infiltrated" was deprived of all of its legal rights.⁵⁵

Congress's anticommunism in the McCarthy years also found expression in fierce attacks on the Fifth Amendment, which guarantees the right of persons accused in criminal cases to refuse to answer questions when this might incriminate them. McCarthy and his supporters, who used committees to persecute their political opponents, cherished a special hatred for the constitutional rights of American citizens; they branded anyone who refused to answer their questions a "communist." In the first half of the 50s the term "Fifth-Amendment Communist" found a secure position in the political vocabulary. The ultra-rightist James Burnham, expressing McCarthyism's point of view, wrote that the Fifth Amendment's "relevance and desirability in normal juridical proceedings are not self-evident."¹ Congressman Kenneth B. Keating introduced a bill by which any federal employee who refused, under the protection of the Fifth Amendment, to answer investigators' questions would be dismissed.⁵⁷

In the 50s a person who provoked a committee's special ire was in danger of almost certain punishment under one of three points: for violation of the Smith Act, if he acknowledged membership in the Communist Party; for perjury, if he denied 90 association with the Communists; or for contempt of Congress, if he refused to answer the committee's questions.

p In order to cover up this obvious violation of the Constitution the ruling cliques began to demand that a special law be enacted making it possible to circumvent the Fifth Amendment, which Senator Jenner claimed had been turned into a screen for hiding the facts about the "Communist conspiracy." The investigators declared that no one had the right to refuse to give testimony on the grounds that it might be used to bring charges against him.^^58^^

p The bill proposed by McCarran fully met this requirement. In certain cases, to be determined by the appropriate authorities, persons called to give evidence were guaranteed immunity from prosecution for actions to which they admitted. In July 1953 this bill was passed by the Senate and then by the House. On August 20, 1954, Eisenhower signed it into law as the Immunity Act. The ruling cliques tried to present (his law as not being contrary to the Bill of Rights. This point of view was expressed by Samuel H. Hofstadter, a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, who called the law a "rational compromise" between individual freedom and the interests of the nation, which demanded that vital security information be obtained/^^9^^

p On September 14 of that year Brownell, on the basis of the Immunity Act, asked Communists to describe their activities without fear of prosecution. In August 1954 Congress enacted a law prohibiting the payment from federal funds of salaries or pensions to persons who had pleaded the protection of the Fifth Amendment.^^00^^

p This portrait of arbitrary police power would be incomplete without at least a short characterization of the USA's immigration policy in those years. Over many decades the USA had freely admitted tens of millions of immigrants. The increased antipathy toward foreigners was connected with the onset of the general crisis of capitalism. It led to such scandalous measures as the Palmer raids and the forcible deportation of persons for spreading "un-American" ideas. This drive slackened in the second half of the 20s, and was renewed only in connection with the beginning of the Second World War.

91

p The Smith (or Alien Registration) Act of 1940 made all aliens who were or had been members of "subversive organizations" subject to deportation. Mandatory fingerprinting came into practice under this law.^^01^^ After the war three million foreign-born Americans underwent this humiliating procedure. Facts about their lives were recorded by the FBI. They were forbidden to travel within the country without informing the Justice Department, and they were strictly obliged to quit, upon demand, any organization whose activities displeased the FBI. Under existing legislation the Truman administration arrested 135 persons and instituted deportation proceedings against them for political reasons (this group included 41 active members or leaders of unions, two black leaders, four Mexicans, and six Communists); similar actions were threatened against 3,500 more non-citizens.^^02^^ By 1950, 2,554 aliens had been investigated with an eye to deporting them."-'^1^^ But the ruling cliques considered these measures insufficient; in the years after the war they worked out even more repressive and anti-democratic immigration laws.

p The McCarran-Wood Act of 1950 forbade current or former members of the Communist Party, as well as all other persons who presented a “threat” to the security of the USA, to enter the country. It further prescribed that all Communist aliens be deported. All persons liable to deportation were placed under the supervision of the Department of Justice.

p Persons naturalized after January 1, 1951, and who joined the Communist Party or any “Communist-front” organization within five years of their naturalization could, under the new law, be deprived of their citizenship and deported.^^111^^

p In his message to Congress concerning the McCarran Bill Truman expressed disapproval of its provisions dealing with aliens. But his disapproval was certainly not founded on a concern with justice. He was mainly worried that the bill would make it difficult for Francoists, who would be considered members of a totalitarian party, to come to the USA, and that it would deprive the government of the right to offer political asylum to traitors from the socialist countries, as a result of which the USA would lose valuable- intelligence information.^^05^^

p In the practical enforcement of the law these cautions were taken into consideration: the principle of "nominal membership" 92 was applied by the Justice Department in dealing with representatives of the fascist, falangist, and nazi organizations. This principle covered membership in fascist organizations up to the age of sixteen, and also membership in order to obtain work, ration cards, etc. The joining of nazi and fascist organizations while serving in the army was also considered pardonable. In granting entry visas the State Department gave the law a still broader interpretation, advancing the idea that joining totalitarian organizations was sometimes an “involuntary” act.^^01^^

p The McCarran-Walter Act on immigration and naturalization, which became law in December 1952, placed still further limits on the presence of “undesirables” in the country. It threatened with loss of citizenship persons who, within ten years after naturalization, were convicted of contempt of Congress for refusing, under the protection of the Fifth Amendment, to answer questions before investigating committees.^^67^^

p The McCarran-Walter Act reinforced the proscriptions of earlier laws dealing with foreigners. It threatened fourteen million foreign-born Americans with loss of citizenship and deportation. It gave the Justice Department the right to arrest, without a warrant, any person suspected of being in the USA illegally, to deny such persons bail, and to deport, without any formal legal proceedings, persons suspected on the basis of anonymous information. Congress worked out a stringent system of discriminatory quotas limiting the entry of “undesirable” aliens into the country. Thus over 65,000 immigrants were permitted each year from Great Britain (population 47,000,000), while only 2,000 were permitted from twenty Asian countries with a total population of 1.5 billion.’^^18^^ The 1952 law modified the provisions of the McCarran Act of 1950 concerning immigration. In particular, persons who had terminated their affiliation with the Communist Party and for the past five years had actively opposed communist ideas were now permitted to become citizens.’^^9^^

p The McCarran-Walter Act was well received by rightist organizations. The American Legion, for example, expressed satisfaction that a law providing effective weapons in the fight against subversion had finally been enacted. It maintained, however, that the provisions against Communists should be made stronger.⁷⁰

93

p In 1953 the Eisenhower administration announced that deportation proceedings were being considered against 12,000 aliens and 10,000 naturalized American citizens.⁷¹ Senator Herbert H. Lehman declared that "it is better to deport ten innocent aliens than to permit one subversive or criminal alien to remain."⁷²

p A striking example of the way in which laws on aliens were applied is furnished by the repeated attempts of reactionaries to deport Harry R. Bridges, president of the Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, who became an American citizen in 1945. He was convicted three times in federal courts of "perjury" and "conspiracy," but higher courts overturned these convictions because of a lack of evidence. It was only in 1956, however, that the federal court finally ordered deportation proceedings against Bridges cancelled.⁷³

p Before October 1917 the US government had no established policy on denying passports for political reasons.⁷¹ From that time until 1931 the government barred Communist Party members from travel outside the country. In 1947 the State Department revived this policy. For the next decade persons belonging to "Communist-front" organizations and who had not registered with the Justice Department were refused passports. In practice this prevented not only Communists but also a much larger group of persons from making trips abroad. Passports were denied to Paul Robeson and Dr. Ralph W. Spitzer (a chemist) in 1950, to Columbia University professor Corliss Larnont, to Linus Pauling (president of the American Chemical Society), and to many, many others.

p On May 25, 1952, it was reported that in the past twelve months the State Department had denied passports to nearly three hundred American citizens. According to the Federation of American Scientists, moreover, over an eighteenmonth period more than two hundred foreign scientists were unable to visit the United States because of visa restrictions.⁷⁵

p The government's policy provoked discontent among the public; by spring of 1955 over forty bills had been introduced in Congress for the repeal or revision of the McCarran-Walter Act.⁷⁰

p But the rightists did not relax their efforts. New reactionary proposals appeared on the agenda of the Eighty-Third 94 Congress. In particular, a bill was discussed that would legalize the tapping of telephone conversations—a crude invasion of the private lives of citizens. Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes described wiretapping as a "dirty business," contrary to the Fourth Amendment, and unbecoming a democratic

government.⁷⁷ The Federal Communications Act of 1934 forbade wiretapping and also the publication of information so obtained.⁷⁸ But the FBI did not deny that it engaged in wiretapping, and that the Justice Department was aware of its activities. This was revealed by J. Edgar Hoover in 1949, and confirmed by Attorney General Tom Clark (and later by his successor, J. Howard McGrath). In 1949 the *New York Times* reported that wiretapping, both illegal and with the required New York Supreme Court order, had reached such proportions in the city that "astute city officials have abandoned the use of the telephone for any conversation that even borders on the confidential side."⁷⁹

p The suggestion that this police tactic be legalized was justified, once again, by the needs of national security. The supporters of such measures pointed to America's interests, and expressed genuine amazement that Americans mistrusted evidence obtained in such a manner. Congress did not venture to sanction overt spying on American citizens: that would be to challenge the Constitution too obviously. But at the same time they took no measures to limit wiretapping.

In 1959 the Pennsylvania Bar Association published new information on the invasion of private life by police. Although wiretapping had been formally banned by Congress it was widely practised in all parts of the country. In particular it was revealed that eavesdropping on telephone conversations had become an everyday phenomenon in New York. According to the Bar Association, New York City police "applied anywhere from 13,000 to 26,000 wire taps annually." State investigators were less restricted by Congress's limitations, since in a number of states such procedures were considered admissible. In 1958 six states explicitly allowed their police to tap telephones, five demanding a court order beforehand and one, Louisiana, making no such qualification. Thirty-three states explicitly prohibited wiretapping, while eleven had no statutes bearing on the matter.⁸⁰

Notes

[88*] Up to the end of 1955 not a single group was registered as a "Communist-front" or "Communist-action" organization.

McCarthyism in Action

p Loyalty tests of government employees and measures purporting to safeguard the security of the USA led to the strengthening of police forces: they were granted extensive powers and placed in supervision of millions of Americans. Blacklists of so-called subversive organizations compiled by the Justice Department and by investigating committees in Congress and in the state legislatures were widely disseminated; they were used by many private organizations, schools, and colleges, as well as government institutions. In some cases the mere suggestion of a connection with any of these organizations was considered entirely adequate grounds for dismissal. Besides the FBI

and HUAC a multitude of new bodies, whose sole purpose was to probe into the political reliability of Americans, were created in the postwar years by orders from Truman and Eisenhower and by anticommunist legislation. The FBI kept records on millions. Local investigators were engaged in the same type of work.

p The use of paid informers became an integral part of the political persecution. Some of the darkest pages in the history of the American people are connected with this practice. Where the "crime" was harboring "dangerous" thoughts secret denunciation was the only possible source for the information the government needed to convict "undesirables." In the years that followed the war the government did not hide the fact that it used secret informers and gave them its protection.

p Any attempt by liberal or progressive groups to criticize the system of paid informers was viewed as a Communist-inspired activity. Despite protests from the public the administration, with the help of the FBI and HUAC, actively encouraged the formation of that system. The budget for the FBI grew by leaps and bounds: from \$3 to \$90 million between 1932 and 1952. In the same period the bureau's staff increased from 800 to almost 15,200.⁸¹ The FBI was transformed from an organization for fighting crime into a political police force employing great numbers of provocateurs and other riffraff. Professor Thomas I. Emerson of the Yale Law School wrote that the FBI was on the verge of becoming "a grave and ruthless menace to democratic processes."⁸²

p Paid informers were depicted as heroes whose "patriotism" was proved by cooperation with government investigators and Congressional committees. The renegade Louis F. Budenz was presented with the keys to the city of Boston; the provocateur Herbert A. Philbrick was also honored in Massachusetts. For many provocation and informing became a profitable business.

p The informer system was highly offensive to the majority of Americans. Members of every segment of the population were indignant about it. "The fact is plain," wrote Zecharian Chafee, Jr., "that a government star witness is a liar."⁸³ D. N. Pritt, a British journalist, considered secret denunciation the most characteristic feature of McCarthyism, the focal point of all its evils.⁸⁴

p The paid informer Harvey Matusow admitted, in his book *False Witness* (New York: Cameron & Kahn Publishers, 1955), to having fabricated his testimony with the help of FBI agents and Senator McCarthy. He revealed the truth about a whole series of court proceedings against Communists and union leaders. Matusow was the main witness for the government in 1952 during an investigation conducted by the Subversive Activities Control Board. On the basis of his testimony thirteen New York Communists were found guilty. In the days of his "popularity," when he was (in the words of Senator McCarthy) "a great American," he worked as a consultant for the Justice Department, the commissioner of the New York Police Department, and the *New York Times*. He made several radio and television broadcasts, wrote articles for the Hearst papers, and gave lectures before the American Legion.

p The use of paid informers by the Truman and Eisenhower administrations served political ends. It was part of the big-lie policy being aimed against Communists. But in the end it also affected the bases of democratic society. Some of those who openly or secretly approved the conviction of Communists on the basis of testimony by paid informers were later forced to acknowledge the deep malignancy of the practice.

p The realm of investigative committees was considerably extended during the McCarthy years. It came to include the liberal press, philanthropic foundations, the church, and the government itself.

p A number of newspaper and magazine publishers were attacked by committees in the 50s. The *New York Times*, the *New York Daily Worker*, the *New York Daily Mirror*, and other newspapers, magazines, and publishing houses were forced to dismiss employees who had aroused the ire of the investigators. Angus Cameron, editor-in-chief at Little, Brown and Co., left his post in 1951. After charges were advanced against him by Budenz. He was accused of having campaigned for Henry Wallace, of having helped organize the Samuel Adams School of Social Studies in Boston, of being on the Justice Department's list of "subversives," and of having defended the "Hollywood ten," who had been thrown into prison at the demand of HUAC. He was also accused of having been "a member of a committee to welcome the Reverend Hewlett Johnson, the Red Dean of Canterbury, on September 22, 1948." On August 31, 1951, *Counterattack* devoted an entire issue to Little, Brown and Co.; thirty-one authors connected in one way or another with the publisher were branded Communists.

p Faced with this assault Douglas Black, president of the American Book Publishers' Council, called representatives of thirteen publishing houses together in New York. It was decided that a "Book Publishers' Bill of Rights" should be made up and distributed around the country. But by the fall of 1951 most publishers had adopted a policy of silence in the hope of avoiding further difficulties with investigators.⁸¹

p Senator McCarthy's attacks on the liberal press were no less savage. At various times he slapped the "red" label on many newspapers and magazines that criticized his doings. Among them were the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, the *Washington Post*, the *Milwaukee Journal*, the *New York Post* and the *Christian Science Monitor*. He invariably compared any paper that dared find fault with him to the *Daily Worker*. He called the *Washington Post* the Washington edition of the *Daily Worker*, the *Milwaukee Journal* the Milwaukee edition of the *Daily Worker*, and so on. He also assailed the Associated Press, United Press, and International News Service.

p McCarthy called for a listener boycott of the Adam Hat Company if it continued to employ the journalist Drew Pearson, who had spoken out against him. The company was forced to discontinue Pearson's services, although it denied that it had done so under pressure from McCarthy.⁸⁷

p After the 1952 elections McCarthy launched an investigation of the editorial board of the *New York Post* and of James A. Wechsler, its editor. The American Society of

Newspaper Editors protested against this interference in the affairs of the press.⁸⁸ Most publishers, however, saw no infringement of the freedom of the press in the Wechsler affair.

The position of the liberal press in the fight against McCarthy was not entirely consistent. By supporting the government's campaign against the Communist Party USA it contributed to the anticommunist hysteria to which it fell victim itself in the end. Under the onslaught of McCarthyism in the 50s the liberal press lost more and more of its influence. The following data on the loss of readership by liberal magazines after 1950 are presented by Alan P. Grimes. In 1945 the *Nation* had a circulation of 37,425; in 1950 the figure was 39,439; in 1960, 23,148. In 1945 the *New Republic* had a circulation of 37,253; in 1950, 52,000; in 1960, 23,663. The *New Leader*: 1945, 43,000; 1960, 15,900. The *Progressive*: 1945, 30,000; 1960, 26,000.⁸⁹

But despite opposition to McCarthyism by liberal newspapers and magazines the press played a most important role in creating an atmosphere favorable to McCarthyism and in spreading absurd rumors and alarms about "conspiracies." A number of papers specialized, throughout the postwar period, in various horror stories about the activities of "red" agents. These papers were a powerful tool for McCarthyism in the shaping of public opinion. Many fanatical anticommunist investigators won national fame through the press.

Educational foundations also came under fire from Congressional investigators in the 50s. In the 30s and 40s some foundations, with their vast resources, had significantly influenced the formation and further development of liberal thought in the USA. The essence of the recommendations made by many studies in economics and the social sciences was that measures in the spirit of the New Deal should be continued and carried further. The Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie Foundations, and others like them, contributed in some degree to the growth of liberalism in colleges and universities. Some of them were headed by prominent liberals—Robert M. Hutchings, president of the University of Chicago, is an example. The equation of liberalism with socialism common in those years made many of these foundations targets for vicious attacks by the right.

99

In the McCarthy years the foundations were depicted as an instrument of "red propaganda." In 1951 Congressman E. E. Cox of Georgia accused the Rockefeller Foundation of financing persons and organizations that were popularizing communist ideas in the nation's public and private schools. It was claimed that the foundation acclaimed the successes of the Soviet Union, thus helping to discredit America. In the spring of 1952 Cox got authorization to set up a special committee to look into "subversive and un-American activities" by the administrations of philanthropic foundations. The committee concluded that some foundations had subsidized persons belonging to "Communist-front" organizations. The Cox committee's report, which was presented to the House in January 1953, warned foundations not to finance any "researcher whose political opinions might be tinged with unorthodoxy."⁹⁰

p In 1954, at the urging of Congressman Carroll B. Reece of Tennessee, a new committee was created to continue the investigation of educational foundations. The committee maintained that Communists and their fellow travelers had infiltrated the administrations of the largest foundations and were leading the country down the path to a "non-violent revolution," which was embodied in the policies of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. Reece asserted that the "nerve center of subversion in America" was "the left-wing intellectuals, whose prestige and influence seemed to be the product of the tax-exempt foundation grants."⁹¹ The New Deal and the largest foundations, the investigators claimed, were parts of a conspiracy that had exerted a constant influence on the American people, the Congress, the Supreme Court, and the US government since 1932.

p The Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford foundations, along with other organizations of the same type, were alleged to be engaging in subversive activities and financing Communists. The committee charged that major foundations had recommended Communists and fellow travelers for responsible government positions, and that the authors they financed were supporters of the New Deal, socialists, and pro-communists. The committee inveighed against studies criticizing big business and its organizations. The activities of "a group of American radical intellectuals" were called "the greatest betrayal which has ever occurred in 100 [BEGIN] American history": the committee claimed that they had tried, through educational reform, to change the social order in the LISA.¹¹

p The opponents of the committee asked the investigators to comment on three quotations, taken from the works of anonymous authors, criticizing the free-enterprise system and the wealthiest members of the ruling class. The authors spoke of the need to carry out social reforms that would guarantee working people the necessities of life. As was to be expected, the investigators found that these words were "closely comparable to Communist literature." The names of the authors were then revealed: Pope Pius XI and Pope Leo XIII.⁹³ This example is highly characteristic of its time: McCarthyism, like the ultra-rightist forces behind it, saw even liberal criticisms of the bourgeois order as hostile communist propaganda. The investigators' rightist connections were shown up with especial clarity when it was suggested that they undertake a study of the Facts Forum, a "non-profit" ultra-rightist organization created by H. L. Hunt, a millionaire arch-reactionary from Texas. The suggestion was rejected out of hand.³¹ Dan Sinoot, Facts Forum's chief administrator, declared that the organization "has presented—and will continue to present—the views of such outstanding Americans as Senator Bricker, Senator Jenner, Senator McCarthy, and Senator McCarran."⁹⁵

p The upshot of the McCarthy-inspired probes of foundations was the McCarran amendment to the tax bill, which was unanimously approved by the Senate in 1954. Every organization receiving financial aid from a foundation was required to present an affidavit that it was not "subversive." Foundations that funded organizations included on the Justice Department's blacklists were to be deprived of their tax exemptions.⁹⁰

p The liberal administrations of some foundations, however, refused to be intimidated by the investigators. In 1953 the Ford Foundation allocated \$15,000,000 to the Fund for the Republic for a study of the effect of the struggle against "communism" on politics and civil liberties in the USA.⁹⁷ In the years that followed, the foundation helped to publish a series of works analyzing in detail the government's programs for loyalty tests of employees and for national security. A clear conclusion emerged: witch hunters in federal, state, and local government bodies had enormously damaged the rights and freedoms of Americans and had significantly weakened the country's democratic institutions.

p Investigative committees attacked programs of action by various religious groups (Protestant churches, for example) in connection with social and ethical demands and with the struggle for union rights, for progressive legislation in the interests of the mass of the working people, and for the prevention of another world war. Reactionary religious groups supported HIIAC's charges of "subversive activity" against the liberal clergy. In January 1954, a Gallup Poll showed that 49 percent of the Protestants and 58 percent of the Catholics in the USA were in favor of McCarthyism.⁹⁸ Francis Cardinal Spellman repeatedly expressed his confidence in McCarthy. Even in April of 1954, when the senator's authority was on the wane, Spellman did not change his attitude. Six thousand Roman Catholic policemen cheered McCarthy at a reception in New York, and the Cardinal gave him a friendly handshake.⁹⁹

p Despite the serious religious differences dividing them Catholics and fundamentalist Protestants united in helping investigative committees in their efforts against hundreds of liberal clergymen.

p In the early 50s HUAC issued a report on the National Council of Churches of Christ labeling ministers who had incurred its displeasure "not only subversive but betrayers of their faith to the powers of darkness." The committee had advanced this thesis for the first time in the pamphlet *100 Things You Should Know About Communism in Religion*, which was reissued, in an edition of 50,000 copies, in 1951. The pamphlet asserted that the "social gospel" was "a cover for the spread of Communist ideas," and called on true Christians to "enlist in a holy war against the Reds."¹⁰⁰

p On February 17, 1952, HUAC published a *Review of the Methodist Federation for Social Action*. This report was put together by HUAC and the Circuit Riders, Inc., an organization of Methodist laymen formed in 1951 to fight liberal trends in the church. Publication was timed with an eye to the Methodists' quadrennial national conference. The report attempted to discredit the federation, asserting that for several years its activities had run along the lines of Communist Party policy. HUAC charged that the federation advocated "social-economic planning in order to develop a society without class distinctions and privileges."¹⁰¹

p In early 1953 HUAC declared that it intended to investigate liberal churches. This announcement touched off a storm of protest among representatives of various religious groups. In May 1953 *Outlook*, the official organ of the National Council of Churches of

Christ, deplored the fact that liberal Christians and advocates of social reform were being confused with Communists.¹⁰² HUAC's plans were supported, however, by a number of chapters of the American Legion,¹⁰³ and a petition signed by 100,000 "loyal Americans of all faiths" in twenty states was presented in the House on July 7, 1953, asking that HUAC "investigate Communists in religion."¹⁰⁴

Feelings of intolerance toward liberal clergymen increased. J. B. Matthews, a member of the McCarthy subcommittee (who had begun his career as an investigator on the Dies committee, and later set himself up as the Hearst papers' head expert on communism), published an article titled "The Reds in Our Churches" in the July issue of *American Mercury*. "The largest single group supporting the Communist apparatus in the United States today," wrote Matthews, "is composed of Protestant clergymen." He continued: "It hardly needs to be said that the vast majority of American protestant clergymen are loyal to the free institutions of this country," nevertheless, "some 7,000 protestant clergymen have been drawn during the past 17 years into the network of the Kremlin conspiracy."¹⁰⁵ According to Matthews Harry F. Ward (head of the Methodist Federation for Social Action), Jack R. McMichael (executive secretary of the same organization), Kenneth Ripley Forbes (executive secretary of the Episcopal League for Social Action), and Willard Uphaus (co-director of the World Peace Council) were "pro-Soviet propagandists," while 253 clergymen who had signed the Stockholm Appeal, and likewise the 528 who supported the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act, were "fellow travelers."¹⁰¹¹

Matthews's article generated an unprecedented wave of protest. Dozens of churchmen sent expressions of their displeasure to Congressional representatives. A political scandal was developing. In a telegram to Eisenhower church leaders called McCarthy's 103 proteges the "chief inquisitor" of the Senate subcommittee.¹⁰⁷ Doctor John A. McKay, president of the Princeton Theological Seminary, rightly pointed out that all sorts of crimes were being justified in the USA as anticommunist actions. He said: "I am not ashamed of any document I ever signed or any cause I ever sponsored, whether it was in the interest of Republican Spain, or in favor of Spanish refugees from Fascist tyranny, or to advocate the repeal of the McCarran Act."¹⁰⁸ It was only after the president personally intervened that McCarthy, with great regret, agreed to the dismissal of Matthews. [103•*

On the basis of false testimony from "friendly witnesses" HUAC reported in 1953 that "Communists and Communist sympathizers have actually infiltrated themselves into the ranks of the loyal clergy."¹⁰⁹ But circumstances were now clearly unfavorable for HUAC; in order to avoid further scandal Harold H. Velde decided to hold closed hearings on "communism" in the clergy.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam took a courageous stand before the committee's investigators. On July 21, 1953, he told them that the committee's actions had given rise "to a new and vicious expression of Ku-Kluxism, in which an innocent person may be beaten by unknown assailants, who are cloaked in anonymity and at times immunity."¹¹⁰ Forty-two counts of "subversive activity" were charged against Bishop Oxnam. His

alleged crimes included addressing an American-Soviet meeting in 1942, signing a protest against the convictions of the Hollywood Ten and the Barsky group (the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee), and being among the sponsors of a rally held by the American League Against War and Fascism at Madison Square Garden on October 1, 1937, to protest the Japanese invasion of China.¹¹¹ Representative Donald L. Jackson, a member of HUAC, said that Oxnam "served God on Sunday and the Communist front for the balance of the week."¹¹² The investigators' charges were so absurd that even J. Edgar Hoover rejected their fabrications, declaring that there were no Communist agents whatever among the American clergy.¹¹³

* * *

Notes

[103*] Considerably later Matthews was employed with *American Opinion*, the official organ of the, reactionary John Birch Society; later he joined Edgar Bundy's fundamentalist organization,

McCarthyism and the Republican Administration

Public opinion in America associated McCarthyism with the Republican right, whose representatives had long held leadership in their party. In the twenty years separating the elections of 1932 and 1952 they insistently equated the New Deal, and subsequently the Fair Deal, with socialism and communism. Thus McCarthy's ferocious attacks on the Truman administration fully coincided with the basic tenets of the Republican leadership. "Communism in the government," the victory of the Chinese revolution, the testing of an atomic bomb by the USSR, the USA's defeat in Korea—this is far from being a complete list of the charges laid against the administration by the Republican leaders. With the help of McCarthy they were able to convince the majority of Americans that their charges were justified. Right Republicans, and the party as a whole, found in McCarthy an effective instrument with which to discredit political opponents. On June 10, 1950, the Wisconsin Republican Convention praised McCarthy's "courage, patriotism and loyalty," and endorsed his "untiring efforts to expose, root out and destroy the treasonable, Communistic, disloyal elements" in the Truman-Acheson administration.¹¹⁴ Robert Taft fully approved of McCarthy's investigations. By his search for Communists in the State Department, Taft said, McCarthy had "dramatized" the issue and "done a great service to the American people."¹¹⁵

In 1952 McCarthy was re-elected to the Senate. His campaign was financed by the Republican Party machine. He was strongly supported by the Wisconsin Republican establishment. The McCarthy Club of Milwaukee, the largest organization working for him in the state, contributed \$160,000 to his campaign.

p For a number of years, however, another group of Republicans had been fighting persistently against the unrealistic antireform policy of the party's leadership, which had resulted in repeated losses in presidential elections. The Republican leaders' use of McCarthyism for their own narrow ends deepened this conflict. The internal struggle manifested itself in a statement read on June 1, 1951, on the Senate floor by Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine. She and six other Republicans accused the leadership of their party of having sought to exploit "fear, bigotry, ignorance and intolerance" for political ends.¹¹⁰

p In March of the previous year Henry Cabot Lodge had suggested that Republicans, in order to win the votes of the majority of the electorate, turn away from their outmoded platform and support "modification of the Taft-Hartley Act, increased old-age and health benefits, and a guaranteed annual wage to stabilize employment." But the GOP strategy committee would have none of this, and declared unanimously that the party was "irreconcilably opposed to the welfare state."¹¹⁷

p Moderates and extreme right-wingers clashed at the Republican National Convention in 1952. Eisenhower emerged the victor: he promised to cut taxes and tame inflation. Although the rightists controlled the party machine they settled on Eisenhower, whose immense popularity among ordinary Americans guaranteed the party against a rout at the polls. The general's candidacy signified, on the whole, a defeat for the right and a victory for the party's moderates. But for tactical reasons Eisenhower did everything possible to prevent a pre-election break with the right, which in the McCarthy years had enormous influence throughout the country. Without the right, Eisenhower's advisors warned him, he would lose control of Congress.

p After the convention Eisenhower reached agreement with the leader of the right, Robert Taft, on a unified campaign platform. Eisenhower promised to fight determinedly against "creeping socialism," that is: to cut government spending from \$80 billion to \$60 billion over the next two years (mainly at the expense of social and educational programs), to lower taxes accordingly and balance the budget, and to preserve the basic provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Further, agreement was reached on rewarding free enterprise, limiting the power of the executive branch of government, and broadening states' rights. The nomination of Richard Nixon for vice-president was also a concession to the right. All this made it possible for the old guard of conservative Republicans and for Southern Democrats to place in Eisenhower hopes for the realization of their fondest dream: the annulment of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.¹¹¹ Furthermore Eisenhower himself repeatedly criticized the Truman administration, describing it as "bureaucratic" and as paving the road to despotism.¹¹⁹ Like Nixon, who tried to discredit Adlai Stevenson for his confidence in Hiss, Eisenhower "charged that the Administration had permitted spies of the Soviet Union to steal secrets."¹²⁰ Eisenhower refused to dissociate himself from McCarthy, who accompanied him on a tour of Wisconsin. In Green Bay he emphasized that he supported all Republican candidates, saying: "The differences between me and Senator McCarthy are well known to him and to me, and we have discussed them."¹²¹ He told the audience that he shared McCarthy's goals, and disagreed only with his methods.

p McCarthy's personal contribution to Eisenhower's campaign was to discredit Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic candidate. In October 1952 McCarthy made a half-hour radio and television broadcast in which he attempted, by distorting the sense of certain documents, to show that Stevenson was a Communist sympathizer.¹²² In those years such accusations were a formidable, and usually foolproof, weapon. The unbridled anticommunist campaign conducted by McCarthy and his disciples helped to sharply reduce the prestige of Democratic leaders, whom many Americans began to associate with betrayal of the nation, and to assure Eisenhower's victory. The Republican administration took possession of the White House in the midst of an unprecedented outburst of anticommunism, which inevitably led to the strengthening of McCarthyism's influence in Congress and in the nation. Not a single objection was voiced during the ceremony of McCarthy's installment for another six-year term in the Senate. The *New Republic* described the scene: "When his name was called to take the oath there was a hush. The cowed Senate sat mute."¹²³ After the 1952 elections it was calculated on Capitol Hill that at least eight senators owed their election to McCarthy.¹²⁴ He and his supporters assumed the chairmanships of the leading investigative committees.

p From the first days of Eisenhower's presidency the Republicans were faced with a question: what to do with the Democrats' legacy of social policies, which they had earlier excoriated as "socialism" and "communism." The administration's concrete attempts to fulfill the promises made to Taft showed the illusoriness and impracticability of conservative doctrines. Reality proved stronger than the new president's personal wishes; on the whole the administration was forced to follow the path of its 107 predecessors in domestic policy. The politics of the Eisenhower administration had nothing in common with the spirit of the New Deal, of course, but it proved impossible to nullify the gains won by working people, to turn back the clock to the pre-Roosevelt era.¹²⁵ This was enough to create indignation on the right, which resulted in a climate favorable to McCarthyism and made McCarthy's break with the administration and the Republican party a virtual certainty.

p The president's very first message to Congress outraged the rightists. Its proposals differed very little, in their opinion, from the social and economic policies of the Democrats. Eisenhower tried to explain his position. He invited Republican party leaders to the White House, and tried to convince them that a balanced budget was an impossibility. Taft listened to the president with growing anger; at last he burst out, "You're taking us down the same road Truman traveled. It's a repudiation of everything we promised in the campaign."¹²⁰

p But a still greater disappointment awaited rightists. The administration was soon forced to take one more step toward the Democratic platform by creating a new federal agency: the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, whose very existence was an affront to right-wingers. In January 1954, with the country in the midst of an economic slump that had begun in the summer of the previous year, Eisenhower asked Congress to adopt a four-year program for housing construction, to broaden social security, to increase foreign aid, and to help develop international trade. The president declared: "Government must use its vast power to help maintain employment and purchasing power as well as to

maintain reasonable stable prices. . . The arsenal of weapons at the disposal of Government for maintaining economic stability is formidable. . . We shall not hesitate to use any or all of those weapons as the situation may require.”¹²⁷ And use them he did. Economic stagnation forced the government to increase spending for social insurance and unemployment benefits; as a result the budget deficit grew to \$20 billion.

p Reality forced many conservatives to reconsider their views on the role of government in the economy and in society. Many had a change of heart. Republican National Committee Chairman Leonard Hall, who had been an ultra-conservative, categorically opposed to the Democrats’ “welfare state,” became an advocate of social reform. He said, “In the past we have been accused of opposing social progress. This charge can never be made again. Under the leadership of President Eisenhower we are becoming the party of social progress.”¹²⁸ Richard Nixon, who had been tireless in indicting the Truman administration for “communism” now saw his way clear to adopt its slogans. The Republican administration, he said, would “build more roads . . . schools . . . and houses, provide better medical care and develop more power and water resources than our predecessors ever dreamed of.” Nixon declared: “We oppose the programs of our predecessors not because they were too high but because they were too low.”¹²⁰

p The Eisenhower administration’s course was dubbed “moderate republicanism”; in essence this meant the adoption in practice of the fundamental ideas of the New Deal and active American participation in international affairs. In January 1957 the president proposed a budget calling for expenditures of \$72 billion—\$12 billion over the figure promised in 1952. He asked more for foreign aid, more for social needs, more for school construction, etc. The Republican right was outraged. To be sure Eisenhower did not display remarkable determination or energy in pursuing the course he had adopted, and frequently did not stick to his decisions. (This was the case, for instance, with an attempt to introduce certain modifications into the Taft-Hartley Act, which was bogged down completely by interference from Nixon.) Nevertheless conservatives never forgave him for this apostasy. In April of 1954 Senator Jenner declared that “the Soviet fifth column is a secret army engaged in continuous advance along every avenue leading to every sector of American life.”¹³⁰

p Thus the president turned his back on the promises made earlier. McCarthy and his adherents saw this as a capitulation to the liberals, who had forced their own intentions on the president, and as an expression of unwillingness to fight communism within the nation.

p The Eisenhower administration’s foreign policy came under fire from the right for two basic reasons.

p First, the ultras demanded that the USA not enter into any international agreements that would be counter to law and order within the country. On this ground they repudiated the government’s participation in the work of the UN, since several of that organization’s documents condemned racism.

p Second, right extremists rejected the doctrine of "containing communism" as fundamentally unsound, believing that it paralyzed the USA. They demanded official revocation of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. The Kersten committee, which investigated the circumstances leading up to the victory of revolutions and the establishment of people's democracies in Central and South-East European countries, demanded that diplomatic and trade relations with the socialist countries be broken off and that "national military units" (composed of reactionary emigres) be created with an eye to restoring capitalism in the people's democracies.¹¹

p In early December 1953 rightists held a National Conference on Freedom and Peace Through Liberation in Washington. Its organizers demanded that Eisenhower refuse to recognize the existing international situation and give support to those working to restore capitalism in the world's socialist countries.¹²

p In certain respects the administration's foreign policy moved in the direction of these demands. Eisenhower made a series of belligerent declarations against the imaginary foe. In February 1953, without naming the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, he proposed to Congress a resolution making it clear that his administration did not recognize any "secret understandings" recognizing socialism's rights in Europe and Asia.¹³ The administration put aside the doctrine of "containment" in favor of a more aggressive political and military stance: the doctrine of "liberation," "massive retaliation," and "brinkmanship." It unhesitatingly supported the reactionaries' campaign for the "liberation" of the socialist countries. It urged that "the will for freedom" be strengthened in those who were unhappy about the establishment of socialism in Central and South-Eastern Europe; Eisenhower believed that Radio Free Europe was destined to play the leading role in this effort.¹³ In response to a Congressional resolution the president proclaimed "Captive Nations Week, 1959."¹⁴

p For all this the US government could not undertake the dismantling of the world order established after the war; the plan on which McCarthy and his disciples insisted was unrealizable. The USA maintained diplomatic relations with the socialist 110 countries, and in the summer of 1953 was forced to settle on a truce in Korea, which was seen all over the world as a victory for peace, democracy, and socialism. In 1954 an agreement was concluded to end the bloodshed in Vietnam. (July 21, the day the cease-fire was signed in Geneva, was called a "black day for freedom" by right-wing congressmen.) In the next year, moreover, the administration took its first steps toward establishing mutual understanding between the USA and the USSR; this led to a summit conference and the "spirit of Geneva," both fundamentally antipathetic to McCarthyism. Thus in the overall view McCarthy and his followers found the Republican administration's foreign policy no more acceptable than that of its predecessors. They maintained that the administration's active internationalism (in the language of reactionary isolationists "internationalism" implies the opposite of isolationism) did not hinder the world revolutionary process, but rather promoted it by playing into the hands of the world communist movement.

p This was the underlying cause of the investigations launched by McCarthyism into "subversive activity" in the Eisenhower administration.

p The Republican leadership foresaw the possibility of conflict between McCarthy and the administration. For this reason (asserts Richard H. Rovere, a highly informed journalist and the author of a big book on McCarthy [see note 7 above]) thought was taken in advance as to how the senator could be occupied when Eisenhower came to the White House. It was decided to follow the suggestion of Senator Robert Taft and place McCarthy at the head of the Committee on Government Operations and of Its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. In this job, Taft claimed, McCarthy would busy himself with reports from the General Accounting Office; questions of subversive activity would be the province of Senator Jenner, chairman of the Internal Security Coinmittee, and Senator Velde, who would take charge of HUAC. If Rovere's account is correct, Taft played a nasty trick on the Eisenhower administration before his death in 1953: McCarthy's new post put his inquisitions on a sound legal footing. The committee and subcommittee he now chaired had wide powers to investigate any executive body in Washington. Earlier McCarthy had been a self-appointed 111 watchdog over the USA's security; now interference in White House affairs became practically his duty.

p The redoubtable senator's first skirmishes with the administration took place in the early months of 1953. In February and March investigations of the Voice of America were conducted. The radio station was called the "Voice of Moscow," a conscious slanderer of American reality. Employees of several of the station's sections were accused of using "subversive literature." Technical miscalculations in the building of two transmitting stations in Seattle and on Cape Hatteras (North Carolina) were labeled "deliberate sabotage" by the subcommittee.^^1^^"^^0^^

p In March an attack was mounted against Charles E. Bohlen, Eisenhower's ambassador to Moscow. Bohlen had been Roosevelt's advisor at the three-power conference in Yalta; for McCarthy and the right this was equivalent to treason against the nation. By appointing Bohlen, in the reactionaries' view, the administration reneged on its promises to put the government's house in order.

p Between May and November an intensified struggle was waged against the administration's Far Eastern policy. In a radio and television address McCarthy charged that American foreign policy was one of "whining, whimpering appeasement."^^137^^ McCarthy's speech was studded with phrases like "perfumed notes," "phony truce," and "blood trade." He demanded that the administration force Great Britain and the other capitalist countries to break off trade with the socialist states.

p In June the State Department's overseas information services and libraries came under scrutiny. Roy Cohn (a top advisor to the McCarthy committee) and G. David Schine (a consultant) made a lightning tour of Western Europe's largest cities. They searched feverishly for "subversive activities" in State Department agencies, drawing caustic comments from the European press, which regarded their trip as the beginning of an

invasion of Europe by McCarthyism. Cohn and Schine reported that they had found 30,000 volumes of "communist literature" in State Department libraries abroad.

p In July-August an inquiry into the Central Intelligence Agency was attempted, but CIA chief Allen Dulles protested so vehemently that McCarthy was compelled to abandon this venture.

112

p In September the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee published a report on its investigation into subversive activities in the government; it was claimed that "literally scores" of agents had penetrated the United States government up to the highest level.¹³⁸ The Texas billionaire. H. L. Hunt bought 50,000 copies of this report for mass distribution.¹

p Bypassing the State Department McCarthy carried on direct negotiations with Greek shipping magnates about an economic blockade of the socialist countries. Harold Stassen, director of the Mutual Security Agency, declared indignantly that such actions undermined the authority of the State Department. McCarthy openly disparaged the USA's West European allies; the irritation and unanimous protest this provoked overseas jeopardized the unity of the North Atlantic Pact. Secretary of State Dulles declared on December 1, with the president's approval, that McCarthy's remarks struck at "the very heart of American policy"; he assured the USA's allies in NATO that their cooperation was of vital importance. At a press conference on December 4 Eisenhower emphasized that Western unity was the USA's only hope in the battle against the "communist conspiracy."

p A Congressional campaign to limit the foreign-policy power of the executive came as a logical consequence to McCarthy's forays against the State Department. The Bricker Amendment proposed that Congress be given the right to pass judgement on all agreements made by the White House with other governments or with international organizations. McCarthy and his followers wanted to forestall the administration from taking positive action, under pressure from groups favoring peace, to ease international tensions. When the amendment failed to pass, rightists began to threaten the Republican Party with a schism. They met at the Harvard Club of New York to announce their plans to form an American Action Committee. Hamilton Fish, a rabid isolationist who had tirelessly opposed Roosevelt's foreign and domestic policies in the 30s, declared in the name of those gathered that "if the Republican Party in 1956 again nominates an internationalist for President and adopts an internationalist platform, there automatically will be a third party with machinery set up in every state."¹¹ It was rumored in the press that McCarthy would be a candidate for president in the next election.

p From August 1953 to October 1954 an inquiry was conducted into "subversive activity" in the army. High-ranking officers appeared before McCarthy's subcommittee. The investigators told the public that they had found "all the earmarks of extremely dangerous espionage" in the USA's armed forces.¹⁴² Secretary of the Army Robert

T. Stevens denied these charges, but nevertheless dismissed several persons who had come under fire from the subcommittee. Brigadier General Ralph Zwicker, after being insulted by investigators, refused to answer their questions. McCarthy then summoned Stevens himself to give an explanation. Stevens was infuriated; he forbade his subordinates to appear before the subcommittee, and prepared a speech denouncing McCarthy. The Eisenhower administration interceded, and on February 24, 1954, the subcommittee and the Department of the Army reached a compromise—which did not, however, prove lasting. Both sides agreed that Communists, wherever and whenever discovered, should be driven out of the army. Stevens revoked his previous order, and conceded the subcommittee's right to call military men to testify.¹⁴³ Most of America's newspapers regarded this as capitulation by the military; it might well have been said that it was capitulation by the entire administration. On March 3 Eisenhower, admitting that the subcommittee was right, acknowledged the need for heightened vigilance.

p In this instance as in most others the administration sought to placate McCarthy, which amounted to condoning his inquisition. Dulles was forced to accept a McCarthy protege, W. Scott McLeod, as Personnel and Security Officer of the State Department. McLeod interfered high-handedly in the selection of staff. Three times the State Department replaced the director of the International Information Administration to suit McCarthy. Everyone who displeased the senator, even if a known anticommunist, was fired.

p The president, in connection with attacks on information centers in other countries, issued a special order redefining their goals. The State Department gave orders that books by "communist authors" be removed from its libraries abroad.¹⁴¹ Some officials proved so eager to gratify McCarthy that such books were burned, although this had not been required by the order. Robert M. MacIver wrote that "one of the most deplorable features of the situation" that arose under McCarthyism was 114 "the subservient manner in which so many officials and administrators . . . played safe in order to find favor with or at least to avoid the attentions of the Congressional inquisitors."¹⁵

p The administration also adopted a conciliatory position concerning McCarthy's negotiations with Greek shipowners. At Nixon's urging Dulles and McCarthy issued a joint statement declaring that the senator's actions had been "in the national interest."¹¹⁰

p The Republican party leadership had used McCarthyism to discredit the Democratic administration, but had certainly not planned to undermine the prestige of a Republican administration. The evil genie they had released now began to cause them serious concern. As has been seen Eisenhower, up to a point, was compelled to make concessions to the senator, to seek peace with him. This docility is to be explained by McCarthy's extraordinary popularity. In January 1954 he was at the zenith of his power. A Gallup poll showed that 50 percent of all Americans supported the senator and believed his influence on the country to be beneficial. No definite opinion was expressed by 21 percent; only 29 percent were opposed to McCarthy. The administration, fearing for the

unity of the Atlantic Pact, could not follow the prescriptions of McCarthyism; at the same time it could not, in the current situation, safely dissociate itself from McCarthyism.

p But the upcoming 1954 Congressional election demanded action from the administration. Campaigns were already underway; because of the right the question of "subversive activity" in the government had become acute. Eisenhower's advisors feared that continued attacks by McCarthy would lead to the creation of a powerful coalition of rightist Republicans that would challenge and paralyze the administration, and finally bring about a split in the Republican Party.

p The atmosphere was charged with anticommunist hysteria; in its panic the administration hit upon the idea of using the methods of McCarthy, the symbol of this hysteria.

p In a speech in Chicago on November 6, 1953, Herbert Brownell, Jr., Eisenhower's Attorney General, accused President Truman of treason. It was claimed that the president, although he knew that Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Harry Dexter White had engaged in espionage, had appointed him executive director for the United States in the International Monetary Fund.

115

p Truman, in a radio address, denied Brownell's accusation, and described it as manifestation of McCarthyism.¹⁴⁷ Harold Velde, the chairman of HUAC, thereupon suggested that Truman, South Carolina Governor James F. Byrnes (Truman's Secretary of State), and Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark (Truman's Attorney General) appear before his committee to give testimony. Eisenhower, who at first had gone along with the investigation, soon dissociated himself from Brownell, saying that he did not doubt Truman's loyalty.

p Early in the election campaign Nixon, following the line of McCarthyism, declared that the Republican administration "had been 'kicking Communists and fellow travelers and security risks out of the government' by the thousands, and warned that they would all be hired back if a Democratic Congress was elected." At the Hollywood Bowl Eisenhower "won wild applause from a crowd of 20,000 ... by saying, 'This administration does not look upon the Communist menace as a red herring.'"¹⁴⁸

p But McCarthy's anticommunist fantasies were not to be easily surpassed. In February he proclaimed the thesis of "Twenty Years of Treason" by the Democrats.¹⁴⁹ A whole party branded traitors! No one had ever dreamed of such a thing; it was too much for the average American. McCarthy had clearly overreached himself. But he was no longer able to control his actions: from now on everything he did or said would serve to lessen his prestige and thin the ranks of his supporters.

p Anti-McCarthy forces had been quietly gathering strength for years. The Republican administration's first clashes with McCarthy heartened liberal and democratic groups. It

was now plain that a break between the senator and the administration was certain, and that McCarthyism's opponents were in the ascendant. Those who had been intimidated and immobilized gradually emerged from their lethargy.

p Unions had organized against McCarthy immediately after his 1950 speech in Wheeling. The CIO's national Political Action Committee distributed anti-McCarthy material that " pictured the senator as an unscrupulous liar who was being manipulated by the conservative Republican forces in Congress." At its 1950 and 1951 conventions the CIO adopted resolutions criticizing McCarthy. Throughout the McCarthy years "CIO publications were filled with anti-McCarthy articles and editorials."¹⁵⁰

116

p The AFL's position on McCarthyism was more reserved. AFL leaders made their first formal attempt to condemn McCarthy only in 1953. But the anti-McCarthy resolution proposed at the national convention by A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, was rejected in favor of another that made no reference to the senator. At the next year's national convention AFL leaders limited their criticism of McCarthy to a resolution condemning his conduct as "alien to the American tradition." This was the leaders' first and last official statement against McCarthy.¹

p But despite the collaborationist!! of the AFL's bosses its locals spoke out energetically against McCarthy. McCarthyism's assaults on libraries, universities, religious groups, and the army alienated many highly conservative union leaders. Most of Wisconsin's union members voted against McCarthy in 1952. Many unions passed anti-McCarthy resolutions.¹⁵² But the position of the AFL and the preoccupation of both the AFL and the CIO leaderships with the struggle against leftist elements in the ranks made it impossible for workers to coordinate their opposition to McCarthy on a national scale.

p For democratic and liberal segments of the population the fight against McCarthyism was one of the main issues of the 1954 election campaign. More and more groups felt antipathy toward McCarthyism. After Matthews's attack on the Protestant clergy influential church groups spoke out against McCarthy. McCarthyism was condemned by Bernard J. Sheil, the auxiliary bishop of Chicago; this helped greatly to draw Catholic workers into the struggle.¹⁵³

p Of signal importance was the mass "Joe Must Go" movement in Wisconsin. Participants collected 335,000 signatures on petitions demanding that McCarthy be recalled from the Senate. But the movement was sabotaged by the AFL leadership and fell short of number (over 400,000) of signatures required to achieve its goal.¹ A demand that McCarthy's activities be investigated was published in twenty-five of the nation's daily newspapers by the "I-Believe-Benton" organization. The liberal Committee for an Effective Congress, which included leaders of the New Deal, was active in disseminating anti-McCarthy materials around the country and in campaigning against Congressional candidates who supported McCarthyism.¹⁵⁵

p The Eisenhower administration had lost confidence in its ability to stop McCarthy from attacking it; in view of the prevailing situation it made up its mind to mount a counterattack. On March 12 the Defense Department issued a report asserting that the McCarthy subcommittee's search for "subversive" elements in the army was due to the failure of attempts by McCarthy and Roy Cohn, his top advisor, to win special privileges for G. David Schine, who had been drafted as a private. McCarthy and Cohn tried to counter this by claiming that the "Schine affair" had been specially engineered to interfere with the investigation of communism in the army. The Senate asked McCarthy's subcommittee, which was headed by Karl Mundt, to study these charges and countercharges.

p The subcommittee began work on April 22. The hearings were televised. "It was incredible theater, a drama with heroes and villains, excitement and pure corn, suspense and unexpected twists."¹⁵⁰ Senators, top Pentagon officials, jurists, and many other persons in high places were directly involved. For thirtyfive days twenty million viewers across the nation contemplated the high-priced spectacle. But the end justified the means: in those weeks McCarthy's stature was greatly reduced in the eyes of those people who believed that the charges he had made were justified. Even Cohn, who kept faith in McCarthy, was forced to agree that "McCarthy did indeed make a poor impression."¹⁵⁷

p The administration, thanks to these circumstances, was now able to act more decisively. On May 17, 1954, while the hearings on the "Schine affair" were in progress, Eisenhower ordered the Defense Department to forbid its employees to give any information to McCarthy, or to submit documents or copies to him.¹⁵⁸ The senator responded by accusing the president of pulling an "Iron Curtain" around the truth, and the administration as a whole of hiding behind a "kind of Fifth Amendment" (Eisenhower had appealed to executive privilege in issuing his order).¹⁵⁹ Attorney General Brownell "reiterated, with the President's approval, the principle of the security of Executive branch files," whereupon "Senator McCarthy charged that such a policy of secrecy would hamper his investigation of traitorous activities in the government. His exact phrase was: 'treason during the last twenty or twenty-one years.'"¹⁶⁰

p McCarthy had crossed the Rubicon. Moderate Republicans had felt for some time that McCarthy was a disgrace to the party. The party's leaders, however, had supported him, using him in their own narrow interests against the Democrats. But McCarthy's attacks on the Eisenhower administration, which were perceived as a real threat to party unity, finally turned them against him. On April 4 an Associated Press feature article reported that "for the first time influential Republicans are saying privately that Joe has become a party liability. And now it is not 'pinkos.' It is a solid, conservative opposition."¹⁰¹ Many of the senator's loyal followers were dismayed by his accusations of treason against the Eisenhower administration. Many who had accepted at face value his account

of developments inside the country and abroad began to have doubts. Gallup polls showed that McCarthy's popularity in various sectors of the public had declined sharply. This was enough to convince the Republican leadership to dissociate itself from him.

[p](#) Republican National Committee Chairman Leonard W. Hall declared on March 2 that he could not side with McCarthy against those who, like himself, were fighting communism.¹⁶² Republican Senator Ralph Flanders said in a speech on March 9 that McCarthy's crude methods did not represent respectable conservatism. McCarthy, he maintained, was neither a Republican nor a Democrat; "one must conclude that his is a oneman party, and that its name is 'McCarthyism.'"¹⁶³

[p](#) On July 30 Flanders introduced Senate Resolution 301, which demanded that McCarthy be relieved of the chairmanship of the Committee on Government Operations and its investigative subcommittee and that he be censured for conduct unbecoming a member of the Senate. On August 2 it was decided to set up a special bipartisan committee, chaired by Arthur V. Watkins (R-Utah), to study the resolution and the proposed amendments to it.

[p](#) The committee passed over many irrefutable charges against McCarthy—bribe-taking, tax evasion, defamation of persons who had appeared before his committee. Of all the charges advanced against McCarthy the committee sustained only two: refusing to appear before the Gillette-Hennings subcommittee and insulting its members. The Senate at first decided to condemn McCarthy's methods while noting his services in the fight against 119 communism. McCarthy, for his part, was to apologize for insulting his colleagues. McCarthy rejected these conditions, but it was only on December 2, after the Republicans had lost control of both Houses of Congress in the election, that he was censured by a vote of 67 to 22.

[p](#) Senator Flanders's claim that McCarthy's was a one-man party, without backing in the Senate, was an oversimplification. McCarthy was far from being alone—or even original—in his attacks on the administration. "Communism" in government and in other areas of American life was not his invention. Long before his time influential organizations of American capitalists—the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States—had worked out a wideranging program for persecuting progressive and liberal organizations and for driving "reds" out of government, education, and cultural institutions. Numerous investigative bodies in the administration, in Congress, in the state legislatures, and in local governments drew inspiration from the materials of NAM and the Chamber of Commerce.

[p](#) Long before McCarthy and McCarran launched their assault on the State Department, a widely distributed United States Chamber of Commerce pamphlet (issued in 1947) had called for Congress to make an "exhaustive study" of foreign policies which it regarded as being "more pro-Soviet than pro-American."¹⁰¹ In another of its many pamphlets the Chamber of Commerce warned "patriots" to "be on guard chiefly against *liberals*, who speak too much for civil liberties."¹⁰⁵ The Republican Party's preliminary platform spoke of Communists and fellow travelers in high posts within the

Democratic administration and of the Democrats' "leniency" toward federal employees who held communistic views.

[p](#) George F. Kennan, one of the fathers of the cold war, wrote that what is known as McCarthyism "existed well before the prominent appearance of Senator Joseph McCarthy on the national scene. . . lie was its creature, not its creator." The movement that bore his name had been incubating for many years. This, as Kennan remarked, is why millions of people would say: "We don't like his methods, but we think what he is doing needs to be done and he deserves great credit for it."^^160^^

[p](#) The idea of "treason in high places" was current in 120 highly influential groups within society, but before the 50s it was not shared by the public at large. McCarthy's "service" was to foist off this idea, which he had adopted as a weapon, on the majority of Americans, making the question of "communism in the government" into a national hysteria.

[p](#) When McCarthy failed to prove his accusations millions of people who had accepted his account of developments inside the country and abroad turned away from him. But even after his censure the groups in which his ideas originated remained on his side, undismayed by his contradictions, by his unsupported asseverations. These groups made themselves clearly heard during the Senate debate on the motion to censure McCarthy in the fall of 1954. The Watkins committee received tens of thousands of letters from business people, who revealed "an amazing willingness to believe the wildest and most fanciful accusations." One of Watkins's aides had estimated that the mail coming into Congress favored McCarthy thirty-five to one.^^107^^

[p](#) Rallies were held in support of McCarthy: by 2,000 American Legionnaires in Washington on August 7; by 700 Catholic War Veterans in New York on November 7; by 3,000 members of the American Jewish League against Communism in Washington on Veterans Day—November 11.^^1^^8^^ The New York chapter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars gave McCarthy \$30,000 "to carry on his good work"; an American Legion post in that city awarded him its Bill of Rights Gold Medal for "exceptional protection and defense of our way of life."^^1119^^

[p](#) On November 29 a huge rally in support of McCarthy, organized by the American Legion, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and right-wing servicemen, was held in Madison Square Garden. The organizers, expecting an overflow crowd, had loudspeakers set up on the street. Madison Square Garden had the appearance of a political convention, with signs spotted for state delegations. A prominent sign read: "Senator Joe McCarthy for President of our great Christian nation in 1956. Keep it Christian in the interest of America first."^^170^^

[p](#) Not long before, on November 14, the rally's organizers created a new pro-McCarthy group: Ten Million Americans Mobilizing for Justice. Its goal was to collect ten million signatures on petitions, circulated throughout the country, demanding that Flanders's resolution censuring McCarthy be rejected. Retired 121 Lieutenant General George

Stratemeyer urged McCarthy's supporters to enlist the aid of "patriotic" groups and war veterans. By early December—in just two weeks—petitions in support of McCarthy bearing one million signatures were sent to Congress.

p There were numerous demonstrations of solidarity with McCarthy by groups ranging, as Watkins remarks, from the American Legion to religious organizations.^^1^^'^1^^ But the local movements in support of McCarthyism did not achieve effective consolidation on the national level. McCarthy, the natural center for such consolidation, did not have and did not attempt to create the organization necessary to bring them together; the existing organization—the Republican Party—refused to place confidence in McCarthy, and thus made his eclipse a certainty. Sympathy from millions of supporters was to no avail.

p The Congressional campaign to censure McCarthy set powerful forces in motion. The right, as the *New York Times* commented on November 21, showed more vigor than at any time since the 30s. Numerous "patriotic" organizations, fundamentalist groups, war veterans, and retired servicemen made up the right's rank and file. Their chief spokesman was Senator McCarthy, whose search for "communism" in the Truman administration they unquestioningly approved.

p The forces that erupted in open support for McCarthy in 1954 were highly active in the 60s. Just a few years after the hysteria created by McCarthy had spent itself these forces would regroup and launch their own crusade to "save" America. It could be said that McCarthy was the godfather of the reactionary right in America. McCarthyism and the ultra-rightist movement were alike in their origin, in their workings, in their basic demands, and in the social makeup of their grass roots; the main difference between the two was that McCarthyism was largely associated with government bodies while the ultra-rightist extremist movement was led by private anticommunist groups.

p American scholars and journalists have devoted much thought to the rise and fall of McCarthy and to the sources of McCarthyism's power in the country's political life during the 50s. Some, focusing on McCarthyism's external manifestations, have compared it to fascism; others have identified it with the populist movement; still others have connected the development of McCarthyism with the emergence of the "new rich" into the political arena or with "status politics."

p In the 50s journalists and liberals, among others, often likened McCarthy to Hitler and McCarthyism to fascism. But this was more an emotional protest than a realistic appraisal of the situation. It is true that the general crisis of capitalism makes fascism a threat to democracy in all capitalist countries. But a mass fascist movement can develop only in extraordinary circumstances. The crises of the 40s and 50s were not protracted or grave enough in the USA to bring about a significant radicalization of the masses. Although the class struggle intensified perceptibly in the years immediately after the war the working class as a whole did not go beyond purely economic demands. The political activity of the unions was limited to supporting the Democratic Party. Henry Wallace's Progressive Party, which won a little more than one million votes in 1948, was the last, rather weak,

effort of a democratic coalition that collapsed shortly afterwards; most of the coalition's members returned to the bosom of the two-party system. Under these conditions the ruling class had no need to resort to extreme measures to preserve its position. Because of the comparatively favorable economic situation of the 40s and 50s fascist groups in the USA were small and isolated during those years. Looking for ways to draw the public to themselves these groups usually found no better alternative than to support rightist and ultra-rightist politicians who had a significant following in the country. Thus although McCarthy's admirers included members of fascist groups that had disbanded during the war these groups in themselves had no influence in the postwar years. The weakening of the world capitalist system after the Second World War and the worsening of the general crisis of capitalism undoubtedly made the American ruling class more reactionary. But only in combination with a national economic and political crisis could this shift have brought about a mass fascist movement in the USA.

p The fears felt by various segments of the American bourgeoisie, which found expression in McCarthyism and later in the ultra-rightist extremist movement, were of a different kind. They developed not during an economic crisis or depression but in a relatively favorable economic climate. Thus the bourgeoisie was mainly concerned not with establishing economic order through 123 strict government control, as in the early 30s, but rather with ending government interference in the nation's economy. This mood has its roots in the prewar years.

p This question will be explored more fully in what follows; for the present it will suffice to note the essentials. The Roosevelt administration, which came to power at the height of a world economic crisis, adopted a series of measures aimed at saving the capitalist economy. The ruling class accepted these measures in a state of shock. Without going into the details of the many laws Congress passed with feverish haste it may be said that they significantly increased the government's influence over the economy, which had been, with few exceptions, the domain of private enterprise. Once the decline in production had halted private capital recovered its confidence and began to fight fiercely for a return to the precrisis situation. The struggle against government interference in the economy was interrupted by the Second World War.

p The war demanded that all the country's material and human resources be mobilized to the fullest and subordinated to its needs. In effect this gave still broader scope to federal prerogatives. The war forced the opponents of this trend to tolerate it for the time being, but they were determined to fight for a return to pre-Roosevelt policies as soon as the war ended.

p Every postponement was bound to make the decisive clash, when it came, still more dramatic. The war brought unprecedented profits for American imperialism. The emergent "new rich" were often staunch adherents of laissez faire, the ideology of the rising bourgeoisie. New money transfused fresh blood into the movement against Roosevelt, against reform.

p The struggle against the legacy of the New Deal was renewed immediately after the war; it reached its height in the McCarthy years. The comparative prosperity of the postwar years in the USA served to make that struggle still more bitter.

p Certain historians and sociologists have come forward with explanations of McCarthyism that put the "new rich" in a favorable light. The historian Peter Viereck, for example, basing his arguments on the zeal with which this group fought social legislation, has depicted McCarthyism as a "revolt against the elite." In 1955 he wrote: "McCarthyism... is a radical movement trying to overthrow an old ruling class and replace it 124 from below with a new ruling class."^^172^^ Viereck's thesis is a modification of "status politics"—Richard Hofstadter's suggested explanation for McCarthyism. The essence of status politics is that groups that are advancing in social position, just like groups that have reached the top and do not want to give up their prestige and privileges, are anxious and politically volatile. During economic upswings, this theory holds, the fight for status intensifies and spreads to every sector of society.

p There is no denying that the unsatisfied social ambitions of the "new rich" had something to do with their attacks on the US government and on the Eastern establishment. But at the center of the conflict in which the ruling class is embroiled are the workers of America and their social demands. The real basis of the antagonism that vented itself in McCarthyism is the attitude of various groups within the ruling class toward working people, not the fight for social prestige. This antagonism arises out of the structure of society; it is a direct manifestation of the class struggle. The working class and its organizations are the decisive force in wresting concessions from the ruling cliques; therefore McCarthyism's main thrust was directed against militant workers' organizations, against the working people, and against those members of the ruling class who considered concessions to workers inevitable. "Status politics" obscures the essence of the antagonisms within the bourgeois camp and fails to take the class struggle into account in assessing McCarthyism. Thus the sociologist Talcott Parsons wrote that "the focus of the strain expressed by McCarthyism lies in the area of political responsibility—not ... in the structure of the economy as such, nor in the class structure ... in Marxian-tinged sense."^^173^^

p Official US government policy was also of prime importance in the genesis of McCarthyism. The cold war being waged by the ruling cliques fostered reaction in the USA. The Truman administration unilaterally interrupted the development toward business-like relations with the USSR begun by cooperation between the two countries during the war. Democratic forces in American society were convinced that Soviet-American cooperation could continue in peacetime. But the administration labored mightily to change that conviction. As the general crisis of capitalism worsened, and as the movement for liberation spread in colonies and dependent nations, radical social and economic 125 changes took place in a number of European and Asian countries; official US propaganda presented these changes as the outcome of "Soviet treachery" and "Communist aggression." Thus a distorted view of the USSR's policies, which were claimed to threaten the USA's security, was instilled into the American public.

p The Democratic administration was one of the principal culprits in spreading anticommunist hysteria within the country. It instituted proceedings against Communists under the Smith Act, and began a campaign to deport Communist non-citizens. During the 1948 election campaign Truman and his party machine charged the Progressive Party candidate, Henry Wallace, with being "in league with the Communists." In fact, as the historian Richard M. Freeland rightly notes, in 1947–1948 Truman and his advisors used against their political enemies "all the political and programmatic techniques that in later years were to become associated with the broad phenomenon of McCarthyism."¹⁷⁴ [125•*]

Thus in speaking of the sources of McCarthyism it should be kept in mind that the psychological climate necessary for its development resulted from the official domestic and foreign policies of the US government. Only in the midst of the cold war could anticommunism have brought forth its most irrational mutation—McCarthyism.

* * *

Notes

[125•*] This work (see, for example, its introduction) somewhat underestimates the importance of the Republican right and HUAC in promoting anticommunist feeling in the USA.

The Right Regroups

p The censure of Senator McCarthy in December 1954 reflected the deep displeasure of democratic elements in the USA with the flagrant violation of citizens' Constitutional rights by numerous federal, state, and local investigative bodies.

p In 1955 the Fund for the Republic (a branch of the Ford Foundation) subsidized a New York Bar Association study whose goal was to carefully analyze the legality of the government's security program. Adam Yarmolinsky, a Washington jurist, undertook publication of fifty cases that had ended in firings 126 under that program. Rowland Watts, secretary of the Workers Defense League, brought out materials on the purges in the army. A large number of cases resulting from the government's dismissal of "suspicious" persons came before the federal courts.

p Another blow was dealt by Harvey Matusow, who had been the government's star witness against thirteen Communist Party leaders sentenced in 1952. Matusow now confessed that he had fabricated his testimony with the help of FBI agents and Senator McCarthy. Attorney General Brownell said, "The Matusow case is unique. It is part of the concerted drive to discredit Government witnesses, the security program, and ultimately our system of justice."¹⁷⁵

p On July 27, 1955, Congress approved a measure setting up a bipartisan commission to study the whole government security program.¹⁷⁰ Loyd Wright, former president of the American Bar Association, was made chairman. Senator Hennings Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights set out to study the degree to which legislation enacted in the past several years affected the Bill of Rights—the right to privacy and the freedoms of speech and of the press—and the extent to which these laws could be enforced without violating the principle of due process. In two days of testimony before the subcommittee Harry P. Cain, a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, argued that the loyalty tests of federal employees and prosecution of individuals that the government's security program involved were not in keeping with the Constitution.¹⁷⁷

p In June 1956 the Hennings subcommittee concluded that Eisenhower had exceeded his authority in ordering that the provisions of the security law passed on August 26, 1950, be extended to all departments and agencies of the civil service. The Supreme Court also ruled, in *Cole v. Young*, that Executive Order 10450 violated the law passed by Congress, which had given the heads of only eleven departments and agencies the power to dismiss "security risks." But the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights did not follow through with what it had begun: Hennings thought the anonymity of government undercover agents should be protected, and that only other anonymous witnesses should be made subject to cross-examination.¹⁷⁸ On June 23, 1957, Wright's Commission on Government presented its final report. By and large the commission favored keeping the 127 Justice Department lists of subversive organizations, recommending only that certain provisos be made to slightly restrict their use.¹⁷⁹ The indecisiveness of the liberals in condemning McCarthyism's methods showed that they were not ready to strike at its roots; they only wanted to eliminate its most negative manifestations.

p One of McCarthyism's rear-guard actions in the latter half of the 50s was the movement against the Supreme Court. It began in 1954, when the court declared racial discrimination in public schools unconstitutional; since that time embittered Southern racists had repeatedly urged that the court's powers be limited.

p In the years that followed a series of new decisions increased the number of the Supreme Court's enemies. In April 1956 it ruled (in *Pennsylvania v. Nelson*) that state sedition and so-called anti-subversive laws were invalid. A contempt of Congress citation issued for refusing to answer questions before HUAC was invalidated in *Watkins v. United States*. In 1957 the court issued another decision that outraged rightists: reversing a conviction under the Smith Act, it indicated that advocating the forceful overthrow of the government in the abstract was not forbidden by that law—only advocacy in action was punishable.¹⁸⁰

p On June 13, 1958, the Supreme Court upheld the right of citizens to receive passports and condemned the State Department's practice of barring supposedly disloyal persons from traveling abroad. In *Cole v. Young* (1956) and *Greene v. McElroy* (1959) the court ruled that many federal employees had been dismissed illegally, and forbade the use of anonymous witnesses for the enforcement of the security program in defense

industries.¹⁸¹ [127]* As a result a number of agencies were forced to restore 109 persons to employment and to award over \$579,000 in back pay.¹⁸²

p These decisions, issued at a time when McCarthyism was visibly weakening across the country, galvanized the rightist forces in Congress. June 17, 1957—the day the Supreme Court issued its decision in the Watkins case—was called "Red 128 Monday" and "Treason's Greatest Victory."¹⁹³ Throughout the next several years rightists in Congress sought to enact legislation limiting the prerogatives of the Supreme Court. Especially active in this campaign were Senators William Jenner, Howard W. Smith, James O. Eastland, Joseph McCarthy, Francis Walter, and John M. Butler. But not one of the bills proposed by rightist Congressmen against the decisions of the Supreme Court became law. Moreover seven of the Supreme Court's bitterest enemies were defeated in the 1958 elections. For the first time in the long years of anticommunist hysteria the country's democratic forces had won an impressive victory.

p In the second half of the 50s government organizations gradually curtailed their struggle against so-called subversive activities and their search for "reds" in various segments of American society.

p The government cannot be said to have fully abandoned the practices it had adopted in the McCarthy years. In the early 60s the Justice Department still had a list of 283 so-called Communist-front organizations, and the FBI had 185 bothersome organizations under investigation.¹⁸¹

p The government was also loath to give up McCarthyism's policy toward the Communist Party USA. Proceedings against Communists under the McCarran Act continued into the 60s. But the courts did not find for the Justice Department in a single case. Moreover in 1962 laws barring Communists from holding leadership positions in unions were struck down, and on June 17, 1964, the Supreme Court ruled (in a suit brought by Herbert Aptheker) that Section 6 of the McCarran Act, which denied passports to Communists, was unconstitutional.¹⁸⁵

p In March 1967 an appellate court ruled that requiring the Communist Party to register was unconstitutional. As a result the Justice Department was forced to renounce its persistent attempts to convict Communists on these grounds; charges against the Communist Party USA under the notorious McCarran Act were formally dropped in spring of 1967. A number of other judicial decisions nullified legislation prohibiting Communists from working in the federal government. On January 23, 1967, the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional provisions of the Feinberg Law forbidding the employment of so-called subversive elements in public schools and state colleges. Legal requirements that any employee belonging to the Communist Party be fired were disaffirmed; affidavits of non-affiliation with the Communist Party and dismissal for "treasonable and seditious" utterances were also done away with.¹TM

p Once again Communists were able to present their position on issues of the country's domestic situation and on international affairs. The American Institute of Marxist Studies

was created in 1964 through the efforts of the Communist Party USA; it brought together hundreds of progressive and liberal scholars from the USA and other countries. By the mid-60s the party had broken out of isolation; it began, for the first time after the long, bleak reign of anticommunist hysteria, to actively participate in the work of a number of progressive organizations, especially among young people. American Communists took part in many discussions held on college campuses and in student clubs. [[129](#)•*]

p The Supreme Court had overturned several of the McCarran Act's main anticommunist provisions; the question of doing away with that law's most prominent offspring—the Subversive Activities Control Board—now arose in Congress. For several years the board had done almost nothing, turning into a sinecure for its members. It cost taxpayers up to \$300,000 each year. Senators Young of Ohio and Proxmire of Wisconsin accordingly introduced a bill abolishing it.^{^^187^^}

p But HUAC, despite emphatic protests from the public, continued to work with undiminished vigor. In the second half of the 50s and in the 60s it investigated "subversive activities" in many of the country's cities, leading to new persecutions of "troublemakers." In 1961 the committee published a *Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications* listing 818 groups and 147 newspapers and magazines.^{^^188^^}

p Even after the defeat of McCarthyism HUAC remained true to its anti-Soviet and anticommunist doctrines. In May 1956 it declared: "There is no third way: either we prevent the achievement of Communism's 'historic mission'—or we perish."^{^^189^^} In 1963–1964 HUAC introduced nine bills calling for the establishment of a Freedom Commission and Academy; the authors of these bills wanted "to improve the ability of the United States, and the free world generally, to wage the cold war in which it is presently engaged with the international forces of communism.

p Although they cut back investigations by other agencies the ruling cliques did not cut HUAC's budget. Indeed expenditures for the committee increased during the 60s. From 1957 to 1965 the average annual outlay was over \$327,000; in 1965 the committee's budget was \$370,000; in 1967, \$350,000; in 1971, \$750,000. In 1961 the Americans for Democratic Action noted that Americans were still being sent to prison for refusing to appear before HUAC's theatrical hearings, that the right to petition was being threatened by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, and that anonymous informers were still being used by the government.

p In 1964, while considering a bill declaring "war on poverty," Congress approved an amendment to that measure requiring all persons who would receive assistance to present an affidavit that they did not subscribe to the forcible overthrow of the US government. On September 1, 1967, the Taylor Act went into effect; it prohibited strikes by public employees, making it possible to fine municipal unions that went on strike \$10,000 a day, and to jail their leaders. In late 1967 this law was used against the United Federation of Teachers in New York City, which had 49,000 members.^{^^191^^}

p In June 1962 the *Progressive* declared, "We are still living on our legacy of McCarthyism, whose Big Lie spawned the Big Fear."¹⁹² In 1966, despite the decisions of the Supreme Court, HUAC demanded lists of persons who had demonstrated against the Vietnam war from student organizations at the universities of California and Michigan. The lists named members of the Students for a Democratic Society, of the Committee to Aid the Vietnamese, and of a local chapter of the Du Bois Club. In a letter to presidents of universities and colleges the American Civil Liberties Union called HUAC's subpoenas to the universities "one of the most serious breaches of academic freedom of students in recent decades."¹⁹¹

p During the 60s more attempts were made in Congress to 131 revive anticommunist legislation. In 1966 Senator Eastland introduced an "anti-subversive" bill designed to update the McCarran Act of 1950. Under this measure all groups working for peace in Vietnam, for a more effective war on poverty, or for civil rights would have been considered "Communist– infiltrated."¹⁹ In the 70s HUAC continued its attacks, which many saw as a serious threat to the democratic process, on democratic and progressive organizations. The Black Panthers Party, the Young Workers Liberation League, and many other groups were probed. The committee's activities provoked angry objections from democratic elements in society.

p In early 1965 one hundred prominent liberals, in the name of the National Committee to Abolish HUAC, put their names to a petition demanding that the committee be dissolved. The petition's authors included Professor Thomas I. Emerson of the Yale University Law School, the noted liberal jurist Alexander Meiklejohn, President of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions Robert M. Hutchins, and Columbia University history professor Henry Steele Cornmager. The existence of HUAC, the petition charged, "is irreconcilable with a system of free expression."¹⁹⁵ In 1967 opponents of HUAC introduced eighteen bills to abolish it.¹⁹⁰ The American Civil Liberties Union presented a closely reasoned indictment of HUAC's operations as a whole.¹⁹⁷ But HUAC continued its work. A political crisis loomed: opposition to the war in Vietnam and blacks' struggle for their rights made it impossible for the ruling cliques to dispense with HUAC. A number of measures were taken to save the committee. In late 1965 and early 1966 HUAC conducted a mock investigation of the Ku Klux Klan (which will be discussed in a later chapter); in March of 1967 HUAC member Richard Ichord suggested that the committee's name be changed. In the 60s HUAC continued to pursue, although more quietly, the same ends as during the McCarthy years. At times it was forced to act openly—as for example in the struggle against opponents of the Vietnam war—but for the most part it remained in the background. Leadership was now in the hands of private anticommunist groups: the American ultras.

132

p REFERENCES

p 1. Booth Mooney, *The Politicians: 1945–1960* (New York and Philadelphia: Y. B. Lippincott, 1970), pp. 102–103.

- [p](#) 2. *Congress and the Nation 1945–1964: A Review of Government and Politics in the Postwar Years* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1965), pp. 1707–1702.
- [p](#) 3. Harnell Hart, *McCarthy Versus the State Department* (Durham: University of North Carolina, 1952).
- [p](#) 4. Donald J. Kemper, *Decade of Fear: Senator Hennings and Civil Liberties* (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1965), pp. 27–28; *New Republic* 30 October 1950, p. 7.
- [p](#) 5. William Z. Foster, "The McCarthy Danger," *Daily Worker* 24 April 1953, p. 5.
- [p](#) 6. *Anatomy of Anti-Communism; A Report Prepared for the Peace Education Division of the American Friends Service Committee* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1969), p. xii.
- [p](#) 7. Richard H. Rovere, *Senator Joe McCarthy* (London: Methuen & Co., 1960), pp. 14–15.
- [p](#) 8. David M. Oshinsky, *Senator Joseph McCarthy and the American Labor Movement* (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1976), pp. 9, 37, 38, 54, 55, 59.
- [p](#) 9. Eric F. Goldman, *The Crucial Decade—and After: America 1945–1960* (New York: Vintage, 1960), p. 164.
- [p](#) 10. U.S. Congress. Senate. The Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, *Hearings on the Military Situation in the Far East, Part 1* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951), pp. 12, 32, 39, 40, 44, 66, 174.
- [p](#) 11. *Congressional Record* 1951, 97(5) :6556–6565.
- [p](#) 12. Joseph R. McCarthy, *America's Retreat from Victory: The Story of George Cattlett Marshall* (New York: Devin-Adair, 1954), pp. 5, 14, 19, 29.
- [p](#) 13. U.S. Congress. Senate. The Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, *Military Situation in the Far East: Part 3* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951), pp. 1778, 1820, 2140.
- [p](#) 14. *Ibid.*, pp. 3313–3314. U.S. Congress. Senate. State Department, *Employees Loyalty Investigation. Mr. Lodge 133 Individual Views* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950), pp. 16–17.
- [p](#) 15. *Truth and Fancy about the Institute of Pacific Relations: Two Statements Made before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, on Internal Security by William L. Holland, Secretary-General, Institute of Pacific Relations, Executive ViceChairman, American*

Institute of Pacific Relations (New York: American Institute of Pacific Relations, 1953), pp. 4, 14.

p 16. Quoted in: Ralph S. Brown, Jr., *Loyalty and Security: Employment Tests in the United States* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958), p. 366.

p 17. *Truth and Fancy*... p. 1.

p 17^a. U.S. Congress. Senate. The Committee on Judiciary. Institute of Pacific Relations. *Hearings before the Subcommittee. Part 1* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951), p. 43.

p 18. U.S. Congress. Senate. The Committee on Armed Services... pp. 2117–2119.

p 19. Jack Anderson and Ronald W. May, *McCarthy: The Man, the Senator, the "Ism"* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1952), pp. 192–193.

p 20. Selig Adler, *The Isolationist Impulse: Its Twentieth-Century Reaction* (London and New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1957), p. 414.

p 21. U.S. Congress. Senate. The Committee on Judiciary. Institute of Pacific Relations. *Hearings before the Subcommittee. Part 1* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951), p. 46; Owen Lattimore, *Ordeal by Slander* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1950), pp. 7, 8, 31, 32, 97; Joseph Keeley, *The China Lobby Man: The Story of Alfred Kohlberg* (New Rochelle: Arlington House, 1969), pp. 3-4.

p 22. Eighty-Second Congress, Senate, *Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, Second Session on the Activities of United States Citizens Employed at the United Nations* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952), pp. 181–182.

134

p 23. *Ibid.*, Part 2 (1953), p. 449.

p 24. Leonard B. Boudin, "Dark Days at the U.N." *The Nation* 6 December 1952, p. 517; see also: *Pravda* 24 October 1952.

p 25. *Congressional Record* 1951, 97(3): 3619.

p 26. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(4): 4849.

p 27. Richard M. Fried, *Men Against McCarthy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976), p. 155.

[p](#) 28. *Ibid.*, p. 169.

[p](#) 29. *New Republic* 8 October 1951, p. 5.

[p](#) 30. Donald J. Kemper, *op. cit.*, pp. 41–42.

[p](#) 31. *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[p](#) 32. *Congressional Record* 1951, 97(8) :10602–10605.

[p](#) 33. *Congress and the Nation 1945–1964*, p. 1683.

[p](#) 34. Donald J. Kemper, *op. cit.*, pp. 58, 59, 60–61.

[p](#) 35. G. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 333.

[p](#) 36. *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(11): A2983-A2984.

[p](#) 37. Michael Dorman, *Witch Hunt: The Underside of American Democracy* (New York: Dclacourte Press, 1976), pp. 94, 97.

[p](#) 38. Vito Marcantonio, *I Vote My Conscience: Debates, Speeches, and Writings. 1935–1950* (New York: Book Craftsmen Associates, 1956), p. 356.

[p](#) 39. Harry S. Truman, "Text of President's Message Vetoing the Communist-Control Bill," *The New York Times* 23 September 1950, p. 6.

[p](#) 40. Subversive Activities Control Board, *Second Annual Report: 1951–52* (Washington: Government Printing Office,

[p](#) 1953), pp. 3-4.

[p](#) 41. *Congressional Record* 1950, 96(18): A7125; *Ibid.*, U.S. Subversive Activities Control Board, *Annual Report* (Washington: 1953) pp. 3-4; *Congress and the Nation 1945– 1964*, p. 1650.

[p](#) 42. *Ibid.*, pp. 7125, 7126.

[p](#) 43. Eric Mass, *The Reactionary Rights: Incipient Fascism* (New York: New York Labor News Company, 1963), p. 53.

[p](#) 44. *Congressional Record* 1950, 96(18): A7125; U.S. House of Representatives, *Annual Report of the Committee on UnAmerican Activities for the Year 1950* (Washington: 1950), p. 162.

- p 45. *Daily Worker* 22 March 1950, pp. 1-2.
- p 46. William Albertson, *The Trucks Act: Michigan's Blueprint for a Fascist State* (New York: New Century, 1952), pp. 4, 5, 16.
- p 47. *New Republic* 23 October 1950, p. 9.
- p 48. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(180): A6901; Subversive Activities Control Board, *Second Annual Report: 1951-52*, p. 8.
- p 49. *The New York Times* 21 November 1951, p. 3.
- p 50. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(167) :A6736.
51. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(117) :A4642; 100(11):
p 14643.
- p 52. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(12): 15109.
- p 53. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(11): 14639-14640.
- p 54. Telford Taylor, *Grand Inquest: The Story of Congressional Investigations* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1953), p. 281.
- p 55. *Congressional Record* 1954 100(11): 14640-14641.
- p 56. James Burnham, *The Web of Subversion: Underground Networks in the U.S. Government* (New York: John Day Company, 1954), p. 23.
- p 57. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(159) :A6055.
- p 58. *Subversive Influence in the Educational Process*, pp. 855- 857.
- p 59. Samuel H. Hofstadter, *The Fifth Amendment and the Immunity Act of 1954: Aspects of the American Way* (New York: The Fund for the Republic, 1954), pp. 33, 43-45.
- p 60. *Congress and the Nation: 1945-1964*, p. 1669.
- p 61. *Congressional Record* 1940, 86(8): 9034.
- p 62. Abner Green, *The Deportation Terror: A Weapon to Gag America* (New York: New Century, 1950), p. 5; *Daily Worker* 25 April 1950, p. 3.

p 63. Harold W. Chase, *Security and Liberty: The Problem of Native Communists 1947–1955* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1955), p. 68.

p 64. *Congressional Record* 1950, 96(18): A7125.

p 65. *The New York Times* 23 December 1950, p. 5.

p 66. Harold W. Chase, op. cit., p. 70.

p 67. Ralph S. Brown, Jr., op. cit., p. 327.

p 68. Abner Green, *The Walter-McCarran Law: Police-State*

136

p *Terror Against Foreign-Born Americans* (New York: New Century Publishers, 1953), pp. 3, 8, 9, 31.

p 69. Harold W. Chase, op. cit., p. 71.

p 70. *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(10) :A2617.

p 71. Abner Green, *The Walter-McCarran Law*, p. 8.

p 72. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(4): A161.

p 73. *The Worker* 25 February 1964, p. 4.

p 74. C. Herman Pritchett, *The American Constitution* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), p. 340.

p 75. *The New York Times* 30 April 1952, p. L11.

p 76. Corliss Lamont, *Freedom Is as Freedom Does: Civil Liberties Today* (New York: Horizon Press. 1956), p. 117.

p 77. Donald J. Kemper, op. cit., p. 201.

p 78. Thomas I. Emerson and David Haber, *Political and Civil Rights in the United States: A Collection of Legal and Related Materials* (Buffalo: Dennis & Co., 1952), pp. 214, 216.

p 79. Joseph Ingraham, "Wiretapping So Widespread Officials Use Phones Cagily," *The New York Times* 14 March 1949, p. 1.

p 80. Donald J. Kemper, op. cit., pp. 200, 202.

- p 81. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(10) :A403-A404.
- p 82. *The Worker* 18 February 1964, p. 7.
- p 83. Zecharian Chafee, Jr., *The Blessings of Liberty* (Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincot, 1956), p. 99.
- p 84. D.N. Pritt, *Spies and Informers in the Witness-Box* (London: Bernard Hanison Limited, 1958), pp. 54–55.
- p 85. *Congressional Record* 1950, 96 (17):A5708.
- p 86. *The Nation* 28 June 1952, pp. 623–624.
- p 87. *The Progressive*, April 1954, p. 59.
- p 88. *Daily Worker* 8 May 1953, p. 3; 12 May 1953, p. 3.
- p 89. Alan P. Grimes, "Contemporary American Liberalism," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, November 1962, p. 26.
- p 90. Alan Barth, *Government by Investigation* (New York: Viking Press, 1955), pp. 143, 144, 145–146.
- p 91. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(12): 15522.
- p 92. U.S. Congress, House, *Tax-Exempt Foundations: Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations* (Washington: 137 Government Printing Office, 1954), pp. 54, 57, 92, 93, 135, 148, 167.
- p 93. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(129) :A5021.
- p 94. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(126) :A4943.
- p 95. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100 (19): A788.
- p 96. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(8): 10688; 100(9): 12529.
- p 97. *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(9): A1065.
- p 98. Vincent P. De Santis, "American Catholics and McCarthyism," *The Catholic Historical Review*, April 1965, pp. 2, 24.
- p 99. Peter Kihss, "City Police Cheer Talk by M'Carthy," *The New York Times*, April 1954, p. 12.

- p 100. Frank J. Donner, *The Un-Americans* (New York: Ballantine, 1961), pp. 240–241.
- p 101. Vern Countryman, "The Bigots and the Professionals," *The Nation* 28 June 1952, p. 642; *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(11):A3906.
- p 102. Frank J. Donner, op. cit., p. 242.
- p 103. *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(10): A1676.
- p 104. *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(6): 8114.
- p 105. Quoted in: *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(11): A3904– A3906.
- p 106. Ibid.
- p 107. *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(12): A5007.
- p 108. Quoted in: Frank J. Donner, op. cit., p. 244.
- p 109. U.S. House of Representatives, *Annual Report of the Committee, on Un-American Activities for the Year 1953* (Washington: 1954), pp. 95–96.
- p 110. Quoted in: *Thirty Years of Treason: Excerpts from Hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1938–1968*, Eric Bentley, ed., (New York: Viking Press, 1971), p. 673.
- p 111. *Congressional Investigations of Communism and Subversive Activities: Summary-Index 1918 to 1956* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1956), pp. 238–239.
- p 112. Quoted in: *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(12) :A5331.
- p 113. Richard M. Fried, op. cit., p. 269.
- p 114. Quoted in: Harnell Hart, *McCarthy Versus the State Department: Toward Consensus on Certain Charges Against the State Department by Senator Joseph McCarthy and 138 Others* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, 1952), p. 1.
- p 115. Quoted in: Richard M. Fried, op. cit., p. 269.
- p 116. Quoted in: *Congress and the Nation 1945–1964*, p. 1703.
- p 117. Conrad Joyner, *The Republican Dilemma: Conservatism or Progressivism* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1963), pp. 77, 78.
- p 118. Herbert S. Parmet, *Eisenhower and the American Crusades* (New York: McMillan, 1972), p. 169.

- p 119. Alpheus Thomas Mason and Richard H. Leach, *In Quest of Freedom: American Political Thought and Practice* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1959), p. 525.
- p 120. Earl Latham, *The Communist Controversy in Washington: From the New Deal to McCarthy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 3.
- p 121. Merlo J. Pusey, *Eisenhower: The President* (New York: MacMillan, 1956), p. 29.
- p 122. Richard J. H. Johnston, "M'Carthy Terms Stevenson Unfit: Senator Accuses Governor of Sympathy With and Aid to Communist Cause," *The New York Times* 28 October 1952, p. 1.
- p 123. Quoted in: Donald J. Kemper, op. cit., p. 60.
- p 124. Richard H. Rovere, op. cit., p. 35.
- p 125. Gary W. Reichard, *The Reaffirmation of Republicanism: Eisenhower and the Eighty-Third Congress* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1975), p. VIII.
- p 126. Quoted in: Booth Mooney, op. cit., p. 179.
- p 127. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(1) :965, 738.
- p 128. Quoted in: Conrad Joyner, op. cit., p. 81.
- p 129. Quoted *ibid.*
- p 130. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(11) :14468.
- p 131. *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(3) :754; 1954, 100(7): 9755 and 100(10) :13822–13823.
- p 132. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(29): A1248-A1249.
- p 133. Peter Lyon, *Eisenhower: Portrait of the Hero* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974), p. 529; *Congressional Record* 1953, 99(1): 451–452.
- p 134. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States. Dwight D. Eisenhower: 1955* (Washington: 1959), pp. 250– 251.

139

- p 135. Dwight D. Eisenhower, *The White House Years: Waging Peace: 1956–1961* (London: Heinemann, 1966), p. 408.

p 136. James Rorty and Moshe Decter, *McCarthy and the Communists* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1954), pp. 20, 21–23, 24.

p 137. Quoted in *The Progressive*, April 1954, p. 83.

p 138. Quoted in: *But We Were Born Free* (Indianapolis and New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1954), p. 83.

p 139. Dan Gillmor, *Fear the Accuser* (New York: Abelard Schuman, 1954), pp. 44–45.

p 140. *The Progressive*, April 1954, p. 84.

p 141. *The Progressive*, April 1954, p. 70.

p 142. Quoted in: Telford Taylor, op. cit., p. 114.

p 143. Ibid., pp. 114–121.

p 144. U.S. Congress, Senate, *Hearings before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations: Part I* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1953), p. 41.

p 145. Robert M. Maclver, *Academic Freedom in Our Time: A Study Prepared for the American Academic Freedom Project at Columbia University* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966), p. 36.

p 146. Quoted in: Richard H. Rovere, op. cit., p. 33.

p 147. James Rorty and Moshe Decter, op. cit., p. 47.

p 148. Booth Mooney, op. cit., pp. 207, 209.

p 149. John W. Caughey, *In Clear and Present Danger: The Crucial State of Our Freedoms* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), p. 85.

p 150. David M. Oshinsky, op. cit., pp. 102–103, 107.

p 151. Ibid., pp. 128–130.

p 152. Ibid., pp. 125, 126, 145.

p 153. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(69): A2806-A2808.

p 154. David M. Oshinsky, op. cit., pp. 156, 158.

p 155. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(146) :A5639; 100(158): A6035.

[p](#) 156. Roy Cohn, *McCarthy* (New York: The American Library, 1968), p. 137.

[p](#) 157. *Ibid.*, p. 207.

[p](#) 158. Donald J. Kemper, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

[p](#) 159. Quoted in: James Rorty and Moshe Decter, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

[p](#) 160. *Ibid.*, p. 85.

140

[p](#) 161. Quoted in: Lately Thomas, *When Even Angels Wept: The Senator Joseph McCarthy Affair—A Story Without a Hero* (New York: William Morrow & Company, 1973), p. 491.

[p](#) 162. *The Progressive* April 1954, p. 58.

[p](#) 163. *Congressional Record* 1954, 100(3): 2886.

[p](#) 164. Quoted in: I. F. Stone, *The Truman Era* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1953), p. 84.

[p](#) 165. Quoted in: Matthew Josephson, "The Battle of the Books", *The Nation* 28 June 1952, pp. 622–623.

[p](#) 166. George F. Kennan, *Memoirs: 1950–1963. Vol. II* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1972), pp. 190, 197.

[p](#) 167. Arthur V. Watkins, *Enough Rope: The Inside Story of the Censure of Senator Joe McCarthy by His Colleagues—the Controversial Hearings that Signaled the End of a Turbulent Career and a Fearsome Era in American Public Life* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969), pp. 11–12, 115.

[p](#) 168. *Ibid.*, pp. 116, 117.

[p](#) 169. Elmer Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 101, 102.

[p](#) 170. Arthur V. Watkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 118, 119.

[p](#) 171. *Ibid.*, p. 118.

[p](#) 172. Peter Viereck, "The Revolt Against the Elite," in: *The Radical Right: The New American Right*, Daniel Bell, ed. (New York and Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1963), p. 150.

[p](#) 173. Talcott Parsons, "Social Strains in America," in: *The Radical Right. The New American Right*, p. 190.

[p](#) 174. Richard M. Freeland, *The Truman Doctrine and the Origins of McCarthyism: Foreign Policy, Domestic Policies, and Internal Security* (New York: Schocken Books, 1974), p. 359.

[p](#) 175. Quoted in: Don Whitehead, *The FBI Story. A Report to the People* (New York: Random House, 1956), pp. 352, 353.

[p](#) 176. *Congress and the Nation 1945–1964*, p. 1666.

[p](#) 177. Donald J. Kemper, op. cit., pp. 136–139.

[p](#) 178. Ibid., pp. 134–135.

[p](#) 179. *Congress and the Nation 1945–1964*, p. 1667.

[p](#) 180. Donald J. Kemper, op. cit., pp. 143–144, 146–147.

141

[p](#) 181. *Congress and the Nation 1945–1964*, pp. 1666, 1667, 1668.

[p](#) 182. *Congressional Record* 1973, 119(45): E1760.

[p](#) 183. Rosalie M. Gordon, *Nine Men Against America: The Supreme Court and Its Attack on American Liberties* (New York: Devin-Adair Company, 1958), pp. 128, 144.

[p](#) 184. *Congressional Record* 1962, 108(2): 1631.

[p](#) 185. Milton Mayer, "Where Was It I Wanted to Go?" *The Progressive*. November 1964, p. 28.

[p](#) 186. John Abt, "Revised McCarran Act Ready to Strike Again," *Political Affairs*, March 1968, p. 11; Douglas Robinson, "A New Teacher Loyalty Law Is Sought in Albany," *The New York Times* 25 January 1967, p. C32.

[p](#) 187. *Congressional Record* 1967, 113(15): 19756–19757.

[p](#) 188. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Un-American Activities, *Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, Revised and Published December 1, 1961* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961), p. 10.

p 189. *Soviet Total War: "Historic Mission" of Violence and Deceit: Vol. I*, prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives (Washington: 1957), pp. VI, IX.

p 190. Eighty-Eighth Congress. House, Second Session, *Hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964), pp. 933–934.

p 191. *Congress and the Nation 1945–1964*, p. 1670; Sam Gould and Joel Marvin, "The New York Teacher Walkout," *Political Affairs*, January 1968, p. 47.

p 192. *The Progressive*, June 1962, p. 4.

p 193. Quoted in: *The Progressive*, January 1967, p. 7.

p 194. *The Progressive*, June 1968, p. 7.

p 195. Quoted in: *The Progressive*, January 1965, pp. 5-6.

p 196. *The Progressive*, March 1967, p. 7.

197. *The Progressive*, April 1965, p. 10.

* * *

Notes

[127•*] In 1960 Eisenhower's Executive Order 10865 reaffirmed the government's right to use anonymous witnesses in cases involving intelligence activities. The Kennedy administration retained this order without change.

[129•*] By this time several universities had revoked rules, adopted during the McCarthy years, forbidding Communists to speak on campus. The regents of the University of California, for example, annulled such a ban by a vote of fifteen to two.

THE RISE OF THE ULTRA-RIGHTIST MOVEMENT IN THE 60s

[introduction.]

p In the early 60s, after a short lull resulting from the defeat of McCarthyism, a new wave of reaction—the right-extremist movement—began to gather strength rapidly. As government bodies moved away from the bankrupt policies that McCarthy had symbolized ultrarightist groups, which remained whole-heartedly devoted to his views, moved into the foreground. These numerous small groups, which had sprung up in all parts of the USA during the McCarthy years, were galvanized by the Congressional campaign to censure their hero. Fred J. Cook writes that 1954, the year of McCarthy's downfall, brought right extremism to the end of its incubation period.¹ The movement's ranks grew rapidly in the years that followed, and especially between 1957 and 1961. One hundred and twenty-one right-wing groups were formed in 1961 alone.

p The position of world imperialism continued to weaken; the relative weight of the USA in the economic system of world capitalism diminished, colonialism foundered, and dozens of nations won their independence and emerged into the arena of international politics. In capitalist countries the proletariat resisted exploitation more and more determinedly. All of these circumstances contributed directly to the momentum of the rightextremist movement in the USA. The revolution in Cuba, which established the first socialist state in the Western hemisphere, was a rude shock to all of capitalist America. The rightists were incensed: they demanded that this rebellious island, which had dared to raise the banner of socialism on America's doorstep, be wiped off the face of the earth.

p On October 4, 1957, the Soviet Union launched the first artificial satellite. This event took Americans by surprise; the right used it to dramatize fantasies about a "Soviet threat," to heighten international tensions, and to create an atmosphere of near-panic in the USA. Aneurin Bevan, a 143 prominent figure in Britain's Labor Party, visited the United States shortly after the first sputnik was launched. He later wrote that the state of mind he found there frightened him; America was obsessed with the fear of communism and without hope."

p The Kennedy administration's energetic attempts to bring the country out of its crisis with a number of vigorous measures supplied the ultras new ammunition for their struggle against "communism" in every area of American life.

p The recession that gripped the USA in 1960–1961 gave special urgency to the question of the rate of economic growth. During the election campaign both Democrats and Republicans suggested measures for overcoming stagnation. Kennedy, the Democratic candidate, argued that more rapid economic growth must be assured through active government involvement in production. He also promised to help chronically depressed areas to raise the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour and to extend it to new categories of workers, to lengthen the term over which unemployment benefits were paid, to organize a

national program for training laid-off workers in new skills, to repeal Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act (which allowed state right-to-work laws), to provide free medical care for the aged, and to broaden Social Security and aid to education. Not least among the many promises made in the Democrats' program for social reform were to find, at long last, a real solution to the farm problem and to enact civil-rights legislation.

p In its first two years the Kennedy administration did not hurry to keep its promises of social reform; indeed it suggested a number of measures that catered to the interests of big business and even to the demands of the extreme right (the attempted invasion of Cuba in 1961, for example). Nonetheless its policies as a whole were strongly opposed by the right. And proposals the Kennedy administration made, under the pressure of circumstances, in its last year—such as the civil rights bill and talks on a nuclear test ban—welded the armaments industry, the military-industrial complex, the racists, and sundry extremist groups into a powerful coalition against it. Kennedy was accused of giving in to communism and of treason. His programs were characterized as nothing less than socialist and ruinous for the country.^3^^

144

p The USSR's successes in space exploration and in social and economic development, and the growing strength of the socialist camp, on the one hand, and the USA's economic stagnation, consecutive foreign-policy debacles, and hopeless, ignominious war in Vietnam, on the other, so exasperated the most rabidly reactionary groups that they began to seek radical means with which to undo, at one blow, the Gordian knot of insoluble problems, to recover the stability of the past, and to have done, once and for all, with the forces of world socialism.

p The international and domestic violence that the USA's ruling cliques cultivated so assiduously in the postwar years was turned against the government itself in the 60s. There were threats against the president—then came the shots in Dallas.

The mood of violence [144.*] that had been fostered in the USA made it possible for the principal ultra-right organizations to expand their activities extensively and rapidly. Today's ultras have retained filial ties not only with McCarthyism but also with a number of the reactionary groups of the 30s and 40s. Some of the prominent ultras of the 60s (such as Gerald L. K. Smith, Verne P. Kaub, Merwin Hart, Joseph P. Kamp, Gonde McGinley, Allen Zoll, and General Robert Wood) had come to extremism in the days of Charles E. Coughlin and Huey Long; they were a link between the right extremism of the 30s and that of the 60s. But new times, as always, brought new leaders. The old-guard extremists were joined by others who far surpassed their predecessors and exemplars in fanaticism, bigotry, and irrationality. Drawing on the ample experience of earlier generations of reactionaries in working with the masses, they quickly established a solid base among America's petty bourgeoisie, enlisted the support of influential business groups, found 145 friends and sympathizers in the military-industrial complex, closed ranks with strong allies among racists, and began to play an important part in the domestic politics of the USA.

* * *

Notes

[144.*] In the USA assassination is a widespread method of dealing with political foes. The shooting of President Kennedy was followed by a whole series of political killings. Medgar Evers, one of the leaders of the civil-rights movement in Mississippi, was killed in 1965; Martin Luther King in April 1968; Robert Kennedy in June of the same year. FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover was forced to admit that "violence is a reality in America today." Since 1900 about 800,000 persons have been shot to death in the USA—considerably more than the total of American battlefield casualties in all wars since 1776. *Congressional Record* 1968, 114 (156): S11282; 114 (117): S8308.

The John Birch Society

p The doyen of the ultra-right in the 60s was the John Birch Society (JBS). Its founder was Robert Henry Winborne Welch, a Boston candy manufacturer. Mark Sherwin, the author of a work on the ultras, describes Welch as one of the most colorless and reserved demagogues ever to appear on the American scene. Welch was born in 1899 into a wealthy North Carolina farming family. He passed his early days among fundamentalist Southern Baptists, noted for their fanaticism, and he adhered to the basic tenets of that creed all his life. Welch studied at the University of North Carolina, the Naval Academy, and Harvard Law School. In 1919 he established a candy factory in Boston. For many years he was a leading figure in the National Association of Manufacturers.

p In 1952 Welch enthusiastically supported the rightist Republican Robert A. Taft for the presidency. In 1954, when the star of the rampaging senator from Wisconsin began to fade, Welch came to believe in the necessity of fighting "subversive activities" in government. He traveled a good deal in the 40s and 50s, visiting South Korea and Taiwan. In 1956 he met with Konrad Adenauer. About this time he became convinced that he was called to devote himself to the cause of anticommunism.

p On December 8 and 9, 1958, eleven men, most of them from the business world, met in Indianapolis to create an anticommunist organization. Welch wrote somewhat later, "the ultimate reason that brought each man here was a sense of patriotic duty, and deep concern for the future of ... his country." The cause of this concern was the "Communist conspiracy"; Welch believed that "both internationally and within the United States, the Communists are much further advanced and more deeply entrenched than is realized by even most of the serious students of the danger among the anti-Communists."⁴ According to Welch's "authorities" there were "at least thirty huge 146 Communist espionage rings" at work in the USA "against the only two or three that have been only partly exposed."⁵

p In those two days Welch presented his views on the world situation and a plan of action for the new organization, which he proposed to name for John Birch, an American spy

and fundamentalist missionary who met his death in China in 1945. For Welch this man represented the ideal American, "a perfect fusion of rural virtues, fundamentalist faith, and dedicated patriotism."⁰ Welch urged that he himself be made leader of the John Birch Society. "I want to convince you," he told his audience, "as I am convinced, that only dynamic *personal* leadership offers any chance for us to save either our material or our spiritual inheritance. ... I intend to offer that leadership to all who are willing to help me."⁷

p The JBS, according to Welch's plan, was to be a secret, monolithic organization; it would "operate under completely authoritative control at all levels."⁸ Members' loyalty toward their leader was proclaimed as the main principle of the society's operation. All of the organization's leaders, from top to bottom, were to be appointed by Welch or his hand-picked deputies. A JBS leader in Connecticut said, "We are looking to build our membership with dedicated and zealous Americanists." Members must be made to understand that "the time for debate was long ago, and that the time for action is here."⁹ Welch maintained that "democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud."¹⁰ "We are not going to be in a position of having the Society's work weakened by raging debates," he stated. For Welch a democracy was synonymous with chaos; the opposite was a republic, which he identified with order.¹¹

p In order to accomplish his grand purpose—to save the country from the communist conspiracy—Welch set out to create a mass organization (one million members) capable of rousing the nation from its apathy and inspiring in it the will to actively oppose communism in its midst.

p Shortly after the Indianapolis meeting the Council of the John Birch Society was created; five of its twenty-six members became the Committee of Endorsers. The society's leadership was made up mostly of businessmen.¹² It included three former presidents of the National Association of Manufacturers and others who had 147 been active members of that organization or belonged to local manufacturers' groups. Welch's nearest deputies, the so-called head coordinators, launched a vigorous campaign in several states. The society's first chapter was established in January 1959; by the end of the JBS's second year it had 500 chapters. In 1962 the JBS had one hundred chapters in Michigan alone. By 1964, according to Welch, there was a total of several thousand chapters in forty-eight states. Each chapter had between ten and twenty members, and was headed by a leader appointed by Welch or one of his coordinators. Members were to work actively among the citizenry and to recruit new members. The greatest concentration of JBS chapters is found in the strongholds of Protestant fundamentalism. California has the most chapters; then come Illinois, Texas, New Jersey, Florida, Michigan, Arizona, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, Louisiana, Ohio, Indiana, and Kansas. In 1963 membership began to grow rapidly in Southern states such as Alabama and Georgia. At the beginning the JBS was weakest in the North East and the Middle Atlantic states; in 1963 Welch's coordinators began a drive in those areas. Los Angeles and Houston, together with their suburbs, are the cities with the most Birchers. The

society also has many members in Dallas, Wichita, Stamford (Connecticut), Amarillo, Miami, Palm Beach, Fort Lauderdale, and St. Petersburg.

p One of the most notable features of Welch's group was that while it included many Protestant fundamentalists it also sought support among Catholics; in this it differed from many rightextremist Protestant organizations, whose attitude was anti- Catholic. Richard Cinder and Francis E. Fenton, both Catholics, were once members of the Council of the John Birch Society. It is estimated that 25 percent (Welch himself claims 40 percent) of the society's members are Catholics. Prominent figures in the church hierarchy such as Cardinal Gushing of Boston and Cardinal McIntire of Los Angeles have spoken in support of the JBS.¹³

p The JBS came to the limelight in 1961, when the manuscript of Welch's *The Politician*¹¹¹⁵ (better known as the *Black Book*) reached the public. The book was directed mainly against former President Eisenhower and his nearest associates but many other political figures, including all presidents beginning with 148 Roosevelt, also came under attack. Roosevelt was said to have deliberately induced Japan to bomb Pearl Harbor. George Marshall was "a conscious, deliberate, and dedicated agent of the Soviet conspiracy." Truman had been used, "with his knowledge and acquiescence," by the Communists who controlled his administration. Eisenhower had been "knowingly receiving and abiding by Communist orders, and consciously serving the Communist conspiracy, for all of his adult life." John Foster Dulles, Allen Dulles, Milton Eisenhower, and many other noted and high-placed people were also involved in the Communist plot.¹⁰

p Liberals were outraged. National newspapers and radio networks commented on Welch and the JBS; for the first time the society came to the notice of the nation as a whole. The charges against Eisenhower and his administration shocked even the most conservative groups. In September of 1960 the National Association of Manufacturers passed a resolution expressing confidence in Eisenhower and declaring that the association would have nothing to do with persons or organizations that questioned the loyalty of the president.

p The JBS and its followers were undaunted by the uproar over Welch's allegations. "The publicity", said Tom Hill (one of Welch's coordinators), "brought us to the attention of a lot of people who never heard of us and who want to join."¹⁷ Surveys of public opinion showed that in 1962 the JBS was supported by 5 percent of Americans, in 1964, by 11 percent.¹⁸

p The society's finances were likewise undamaged by the furore. In 1959 the JBS treasury held \$129,000; by 1961, \$534,000; in 1964, more than \$3,000,000. Over the same period the society expanded its paid staff from fourteen to two hundred, of whom one half worked at the main headquarters. In 1965 the JBS's members numbered between 80,000 and 100,000. The JBS is financed by donations, membership dues, and the sale of propaganda literature.

p Welch's headquarters are situated in a two-storey house in Belmont, Massachusetts, a suburb of Boston. The organ of the JBS is the monthly *American Opinion*, among whose contributors and editors are liberal-hating luminaries ranging from Martin Dies, Westbrook Pegler, and J.B. Matthews to the new generation of ultra-rightist intellectuals. Welch himself denies any 149 connection between the society and the journal, and with good reason: the editors and board of publishers of *American Opinion* include not only a fair share of former followers of McCarthy and overt reactionaries but also right-conservative ideologues such as Ludwig von Mises, for whom identification with the JBS would be unwelcome. For the same reason Welch warns readers that the board of publishers is not responsible for the contents of the journal. Besides *American Opinion* Welch publishes the *John Birch Bulletin*, which contains the monthly programs of all the society's chapters (an annual volume of this publication is known as the *White Book*), and the weekly *Review of the News*.

p The society has its own publishing house, Western Islands, which puts out hundreds of books and pamphlets by rightists. It maintains a staff of highly active propagandists—the American Opinion Speakers Bureau. It operates over four hundred book stores, which are called libraries. The JBS collects newspaper clippings on various topics and prepares posters and films. The widest possible use is made of these propaganda tools. Birchers represent themselves as patriots; on Independence Day many of them appear in Revolutionary costume.¹⁹

p The programmatic document of the JBS is the *Blue Book*, written by Welch. This work applies a conspiracy theory to events both within the country and abroad. American life is so permeated with communist influence, Welch maintains, that little hope remains for the existing political system.²⁰ Subversive elements control both the major political parties as well as the Congress, the executive, and the judiciary. "America is becoming increasingly socialist," declares *American Opinion*. "It is obvious that socialist government increasingly controls us from the cradle to the crematorium."²¹

p Welch traces the conspiracy in the US government back almost to the beginning of the twentieth century. The federal reserve system and the progressive income tax, he argues, were the "first huge parts of (the Marxian program)" put into effect by the federal government. The measures taken by the Roosevelt administration were also a manifestation of "subversion" in high places; the New Deal's institutions were teeming with Communists. The dismissal of General MacArthur, the "snatching of the Republican nomination from Taft in 1952," the 150 cease-fire in Korea, the Supreme Court's May 17, 1954 decision desegregating public schools, the censure of McCarthy, the summit conference in Geneva, the demands that HUAC be abolished and the powers of the FBI limited—all of these events, and many more, are seen by Welch as proof positive of treason in the US government.²²

p Welch's main demand in the realm of domestic policy is that America return, "for its own further growth in prosperity, freedom, and happiness," to the true path of limited government²³; by this he means that all of the social and economic reforms of the twentieth century should be set aside, and laws limiting free capitalist enterprise repealed.

p In the realm of foreign policy Welch, like many other reactionaries, demands that the USA withdraw from the UN. that UN headquarters be removed from the country (ultra-rightists look on the UN as a Trojan Horse crammed with subversive forces), that ties with international trade, labor, medical, and other organizations be severed, and that American aid to other countries (which the JBS characterizes as financing socialism abroad) be cut off. Welch sees no value in America's belonging even to arch-reactionary groups such as NATO. The head of the JBS was an active opponent of business relations with the socialist countries. In May of 1960, on the eve of the USAUSSR summit conference in Paris, the *John Birfli Bulletin* carried an open letter to Eisenhower telling him "If you go, don't come back!"²⁴

p The means that the JBS officially advocates for realizing its program are "educational" work and propaganda by its members and organizations, selling subscriptions to conservative newspapers and magazines, organizing campaigns to bombard lawmaking bodies with letters and petitions, creating JBS affiliates under other names (such as the Committee to Impeach Earl Warren), forming right-wing speakers groups, aiding conservative candidates to local, state, and federal offices, and infiltrating the education system.²⁵

p Since its founding the JBS has regularly published a "Scoreboard" showing the degree to which various countries are supposed to be under communist control. These tables show the USA as being 20–40 percent communist-controlled in 1958, 60– 80 percent in 1978. In December of 1967 Welch declared that 151 communist influence in Washington was "stronger than ever before," although he declined to identify any Communists in the US government.²⁶ The "Scoreboards" also show the degree of alleged communist control in other capitalist countries. The purpose of these tables is clear: to frighten ordinary citizens and draw them into the ranks. Welch assures his followers that the trend toward socialism and communism in America can be reversed if they stand firm, work hard, and remain dedicated to his principles.²⁸

Federal and state authorities have found nothing prejudicial, in the activities of the JBS, and have opposed efforts by democratic elements to have it banned.²⁹

The Right-Wing Fundamentalists

p The largest bloc of right-extremist organizations in the USA today is made up of various religious groups, most of them of the Protestant fundamentalist persuasion. Protestant orthodoxy has been crossed with ultra-right politics to produce a curious hybrid: a religious-political movement professing fervent nationalism, free enterprise, and anticommunism in conjunction with the traditional Christian doctrines. The leaders of this movement regard all the changes that have taken place in the world since the 1917 October Revolution in Russia as the work of the forces of evil, which Christians should resist without pause or compromise. The Biblical injunction to love righteousness and hate wickedness, translated by the fundamentalists into politics, has become a summons to a crusade against social reform, the national liberation movement, and socialism. '

p «...

p Fundamentalism as a distinct trend in the USA's Protestant churches dates from the end of the nineteenth century. The mounting class conflicts that resulted from the monopolization of the economy faced the church with a dilemma: either to support the social and economic demands of the working people or to lose their support among the masses. A significant part of the clergy accordingly began to call for social reform, for a struggle against poverty. At the same time moves were made toward ecumenism, the modernization of church services, and a more liberal interpretation of the Bible. This was the course taken by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, the Methodist Church Federation for Social Action, and other associations.

p Other groups of Protestants (the fundamentalists) insisted that the canons of religion were immutable; they roundly condemned modernizing trends in ritual, and church support of the working people's social and economic demands. Many thought it inappropriate to connect questions of social justice with Christianity; thus they directed the brunt of their indignation against the social and economic programs sponsored by the government and part of the American clergy. Edgar Bundy, a modern ultraright fundamentalist leader, proclaims that "Jesus Christ . . . left his followers no legacy in the form of material comforts and a high standard of living. He left them only a cross and an eventual crown, to be obtained through persecution and martyrdom."

p As to the fundamentalists' foreign policy program it may be said that since the Second World War the leaders of this movement have been among America's leading advocates of an unscrupulous and dangerous political attitude toward the world socialist system and the communist movement. It would be no exaggeration to call fundamentalist bigotry an indispensable part of the ideology of the whole ultra-right movement. Some American scholars see religious fundamentalism as one of the factors differentiating America's right radicals from other segments of the population.³³ Richard Hofstadter has noted that the entire right-wing movement is "infused at the mass level with the fundamentalist style of mind" and that "leading right-wing spokesmen have brought into politics the methods and the style of the evangelical revivalists."³²

p Anticommunism is the heart of the militant fundamentalist ideology. The *Progressive* remarked in 1965 that "any cleric, church official, or church member who supports liberal points of view—on civil rights, Medicare, the war on poverty, the United Nations, or ecumenism—or who opposes the views of the right and its spokesmen is automatically categorized as . . . a Communist."³³ The rapid growth of fundamentalist sects during and after the Second World War prepared the ground for a postwar renaissance of fundamentalism.³⁴ The economic "prosperity" of those years, which somewhat eased the urgency of social demands, in combination with the belligerent anticommunism of the cold war made it possible for fundamentalist groups to overcome their parochial isolation and emerge, in the 60s, onto the national scene.

p In 1941 Carl McIntire, who had been driven out of the Presbyterian Church, founded the American Council of Christian Churches (ACCC), a militant fundamentalist coalition.

p In the postwar years the ACCC, whose member churches had some 200,000 members, directed its criticism mainly against the Federal Council of Churches of Christ (after 1950 known as the National Council of Churches of Christ). The ACCC maintains that this organization is attempting to spread the ideas of "state socialism" in the USA by discrediting private property and the profit motive, which liberal churchmen find anti-Christian. McIntire's council, on the contrary, claims that commandment "Thou shalt not steal" is "God's sanction for private ownership." The ACCC believes its mission is to expose the Federal Council and to neutralize its ruinous influence on the nation.¹¹⁵

p After the war the American Council, supposedly a religious organization fighting modernist influences in the churches, became more and more actively involved with political and economic issues. The council called the strike movement that swept the country in the second half of the 40s "lawless," and claimed that it had been incited by "Communist partisans. . . to pave the way for a totalist Communist economy" in which workers would lose their freedom. At its annual convention in 1946 the ACCC pleased employers by proposing that laws be enacted that would put the actions of radical elements in the workers' movement under surveillance. The council declared that "irresponsible labor action is leading the Nation into numerous violations of the Ten Commandments in disregard of life, property, and civil order."³⁰ McIntire's newspaper, the *Christian Beacon*, justified attacks on social legislation by asserting that "Jesus was not a collectivist, nor a socialist or statist, but an individualist."³⁷

p As for foreign policy, in 1947 the ACCC called for the speedy restoration of West German military-economic potential, and the nullification of the Yalta Agreements and similar agreements.³⁸ In the following year it sent a letter to Congress suggesting that a preventive atomic war be unleashed against the USSR.³⁹

154

p Another fundamentalist association is the Church League of America, headed by the Baptist Edgar Bundy. The league was established on March 24, 1937. At that time one of its founders, George Washington Robnett, warned of "communist infiltration" into Protestant churches and urged that a National Laymen's Council be created under the league's sponsorship to keep an eye out for "subversive activities" among the clergy. The declared aim of the Church League of America was to "rekindle the spirit of valiant Christian Americanism" and to confront "the challenge of destructive, organized radicalism." The league saw as the epitome of such radicalism "a desire to centralize and expand Federal authority," which would "inevitably eventuate into some form of collectivism."¹⁰ In the postwar years more than 6,000 clergymen of various faiths and over 50,000 laymen rallied to the league's banner. *News and Views*, the league's organ, had a circulation of 6,500 in 1973.

p Like other ultra-rightist groups the league strives to influence public opinion. It offers readers a profusion of materials setting forth its positions; these include Bundy's pamphlet *Collectivism in the Churches* and J. B. Matthews's *Facts about the Activities of 1,014 Congregational Ministers*. The league also broadcasts programs each week on

seventeen radio stations in eight states, and conducts paid seminars in “countersubversion”. In the fall of 1966 Bundy’s admirers in South Africa invited him to give a series of talks there.

p The league’s chief activity, the pride and joy of its leaders, is the dissemination (meaning of course the sale) of information on "subversion." Bundy regards anyone holding liberal views on economic, political, or religious issues as a Communist and hence an enemy of America. He has set up a card index of democratic and liberal organizations, and has collected a library of publications by “subversive” groups and individuals. The league’s research division was headed by J. B. Matthews until his death in 1966; thereafter the league acquired his archive.

p Christian Crusade was instituted in 194-8 by Billy James Hargis. John Harold Redecop writes, "Of all American evangelists propagandizing for the Radical Right, Hargis is the most zealous and energetic and perhaps leaves the greatest impact."^^41^^ Religious modernism, high taxes, increased government influence in society and the economy—for Hargis these are all direct manifestations of a communist plot in Washington.

p Christian Crusade’s annual gatherings invariably turn into orgies of hatred and fanaticism. The usual targets include not only the socialist countries but also democratic institutions within the USA. Property rights, free enterprise, and limited government, according to Hargis, are all sanctioned by the Bible. Thus anyone who believes in the Bible must be a conservative in politics. Christianity and political conservatism are inseparable.^^42^^

p By appealing to the superstitions and ignorance of provincial audiences, to the emotions of people ridden by doubt and fear, Hargis has made ultra-rightist propaganda a big business.

p Christian Crusade conducts its operations on a grand scale. Its annual income during the 60s hovered around \$1,000,000. About 100,000 well-off patrons supply financial backing. The organization’s Tulsa headquarters, with a paid staff of fiftyfive, houses a library of anticommunist literature and a file of information on 30,000 persons’^^1^^; records are kept on thousands of ministers and teachers belonging to “Communist-front” organizations. The National Council of Churches is the object of Hargis’s special hatred. In one of his pamphlets he repeats the charge, first made by McCarthy’s faithful disciple J. B. Matthews, that 7,000 Protestant ministers are Communists. He insists that the liberal churches’ social gospel is at bottom a socialist gospel.’^^1^^’^^1^^

p Christian Crusade publishes the monthly *Christian Crusade Magazine* and the *Weekly Crusader*. It puts out other propaganda materials in gigantic quantities. In the 60s Hargis’s organization broadcast radio programs on between 400 and 500 stations located in almost every state.^^45^^

p In early April 1962 Hargis held the first of his Annual AntiCommunist Leadership Schools in Tulsa. The tuition-paying students included clergymen, businessmen, farmers, and housewives from twenty-three states. The school's program concentrated on the social reforms introduced in the USA over the past thirty years, which were characterized as links in a chain of treason. Hargis told a visiting correspondent from the Saint Louis *Post-Dispatch* that economic, political, and religious liberals were more dangerous than the "reds" themselves. 156 Members of the John Birch Society, leaders of the Minutemen (an ultra-rightist underground organization) and of the racist White Citizens Council of Louisiana, and the vice-president of the Manion Forum (an ultra-rightist propaganda center) came to Tulsa as speakers or guests. W. H. Rutledge, the executive secretary of the White Citizens Council of Louisiana, spoke very highly of Hargis's undertaking, saying "the school was valuable."⁴⁰

p In 1963 Hargis, together with General Edwin Walker, staged a "Midnight Ride" in twenty-seven cities in seventeen states; super-patriotic meetings were organized with the help of local reactionaries and, in the South, the Ku Klux Klan.⁴⁷

p To further his work among young people Hargis established an Anti-Communist Youth University in Manitou Springs, Colorado, which holds seminars for high-school and college students. Graduates are expected to set up cell groups in their schools and to distribute *The Torch*, an ultra-rightist publication.⁴⁸

p Another fundamentalist group very active in the 60s was the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, with headquarters in Long Beach and regional offices in Houston and Sidney, Australia. Frederick C. Schwarz, head of this organization, makes several hundred speeches a year. His audience is largely composed of "middle Americans." The crusade's purpose is to fight communism through propaganda work in schools, colleges, civic clubs, veterans' groups, seminaries, schools for missionaries, and churches, as well as through radio and television programs and the publishing of books and pamphlets. At the beginning of the 60s the organization had assets totaling \$1,300,000.⁴⁰

p Schwarz works with the public mostly through anticommunist schools. Together with membership dues (\$10 per person) they are the crusade's main source of income. Each person enrolling makes a gift or contribution of about \$20 to the organization. Classes are conducted for twelve hours a day over four or five days.

p Renegades, Birchers, and professed anticommunists often take the podium in these schools. In essence the crusade's so-called theoretical work amounts to developing the thesis that Communists have extensively "infiltrated" America's institutions.

p Most of Schwarz's invited lecturers profess extremist views¹⁵⁷ and speak out, in the spirit of the John Birch Society, against the government, the Supreme Court, the educational system, the unions, and various segments of the intelligentsia. When charged with extremism Schwarz usually pleads that "academic freedom" prevails in his schools.

p By mid-1961 Schwarz had established eight anticommunist schools, most of them in the South-West; there they enjoyed the support of local authorities and numerous “patriotic” groups. In 1962 Schwarz organized a school session in Oakland. A group of seventy-five local businessmen took the initiative in handling arrangements. Fifty-five mayors of nearby cities and towns, including George Christopher, the Mayor of San Francisco, marked the occasion by proclaiming “anticommunism week.” Later on, however, some of the mayors thought it wiser to disassociate themselves from Schwarz. In Saint Louis the mayor, the chief of police, the publisher of the principal local newspaper, industrialists, bankers merchants, and members of the John Birch Society took part in organizing a session of Schwarz’s school.

p Seminars—one-day sessions, usually held on Sundays—are another of Schwarz’s vehicles for reaching the public. The lecturer makes use of films and taped speeches by rightist leaders, which are also offered for sale at prices from \$5 to \$75. Officials of the crusade reported in the early 60s that it had about five thousand groups all around the country for the “study” of communism.

p In the 60s Harding College (Searcy, Arkansas) became one of the fundamentalist right’s most potent propaganda centers in America. Its head, George Stuart Benson, was formerly a missionary in China for the Church of Christ. Benson believes that the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are in constant peril from socialism, which has found its way into America under the guise of the “welfare state,” public ownership, and government control. To save America (meaning of course American capitalism) it is imperative that high taxes, social legislation, labor monopolies (that is, the union movement), and finally the federal government be done away with.

p In 1949 the college, with energetic support from advertising agencies, sponsored a Freedom Forum (an admission fee was 158 charged); the purpose was to work out means by which business circles could effectively mold the political and economic views of white- and blue-collar workers. Subsequent Freedom Forums were attended by executives from more than a thousand industrial concerns.

p At the twenty-fifth Freedom Forum, which was held in Little Rock on February 4 and 5, 1964, Milwaukee industrialist William Grede (a former president of the National Association of Manufacturers) declared that industry is morally obliged to make the highest possible profit and that corporate activity cannot be regulated by government.

p In the first half of the 60s Harding College’s National Education Program (NEP) published materials in 3,600 weeklies with a total circulation of one million. Radio propaganda was conducted on a similar scale; Land of the Free, an NEP program, was carried by 368 stations. The NEP took part in working out study programs in several hundred school districts. One of its guides, for teachers of history, was intended to nurture an understanding of the “Republican form of government,” which the works of ultra-rightist ideologues contrast with democracy.^^50^^

p With the help of state chambers of commerce and of the Farm Bureau Federation (an important farmers' organization) Harding College holds numerous one-day seminars in various parts of the country. Benson has very close ties with the Farm Bureau, whose newspapers in Missouri, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, Virginia, Kansas, Tennessee, and other states gladly print his articles.⁵¹

p The NEP also produces emotional right-wing propaganda films. Some business leaders were so taken with the idea of using the cinema for their purposes that they offered virtually unlimited credit for the making of films that would glorify the free enterprise system. In 1949 Alfred P. Sloan, the president of General Motors, gave Harding College \$300,000 to embody Benson's ideas about free enterprise in films that would convince viewers that the government's economic policies were leading to "socialism and totalitarian communism." Others followed suit. The college became well known for interpreting Americanism in the spirit of the National Association of Manufacturers. 159 By 1964 NEP had made thirty-five films made to order for business. The most objectionable, in the opinion of many liberals, was the color film (*'ommunism on the Map*). Democratically inclined citizens of America rightly saw this inflammatory outpouring of ultra-rightist paranoia as a cinematic version of the *Blue Book of the John Birch Society*.

Today's ultra-right fundamentalist organizations, with their up-to-the-minute propaganda techniques, have considerable sway in the West and South, where many remain faithful to the dogmas of old-fashioned Protestantism. For such people the breakdown of their way of life, the dissolution of rural and small-town ties, and the rise of new trends, hostile to traditional values, in family life, culture, and morals are bound up with modernism and liberalism—which in the gospel of radical fundamentalism are identified with the forces of evil, socialism, and communism.

Other Ultra-Rightist Organizations

p August 3, 1958 saw the birth of yet another ultra-rightist organization: Americans for Constitutional Action (ACA). ACA seeks to accomplish its main goal—to counter the "shift toward socialism"—by electing "Constitutional conservatives" to Congress. Admiral Ben Moreell, spokesman for ACA Board of Trustees, takes every opportunity to stress that his organization is respectable and has no affiliations with extremist groups. But Birchers and like-minded persons have sat on the ACA Board of Trustees, and there is no essential difference between Moreell's views and those of the John Birch Society.

p The ties between the ACA and the Birchers were pointed out by Senator Gale McGee. In a 1963 interview Moreell asserted that the right to private property, like the right to life, derives from God, and that "any effort to equalize the social and economic states of all individuals by the coercive power of government is a contradiction of nature's laws and can be achieved only by destroying individual freedom."⁵²

p Like the Birchers the admiral believes that America's liberals are a fifth column: in theory they reject communism, while in practice they advocate "measures which differ little from those 160 propounded by Karl Marx." Moreell declared that a study of the Communist Manifesto of 1848 had brought him to a striking conclusion. "There is a remarkable parallel between the ten planks of the Manifesto and the things we have been doing to ourselves during the past half century!"⁵³

p In 1960 ACA set up offices in the immediate vicinity of the Capitol and began to make itself felt in Congress. The *ACA Index*, issued periodically between elections, indicates the position of every member of Congress on the main issues of foreign and domestic politics from the mid 50s to the present. The compilers of the index say that its purpose is to promote "sound economic growth, through strengthening Constitutional government" and to combat "collective morality, and a socialized economy through centralization of power."⁵⁴ The ACA uses the index to bend public opinion to the right, support extreme reactionary candidates to Congress, and oppose liberal and democratically inclined candidates.

p The first *ACA Index* was published shortly before the 1960 election. It characterized John F. Kennedy's voting record as 89 percent socialist and Lyndon Johnson's as 90 percent. In 1974 even rightist senators such as Thurmond of South Carolina, Tower of Texas, and Goldwater of Arizona failed to meet the standard of 100-percent conservatism. The Index has become well known among rightists. In 1960, with a circulation of 3,000, it began to be regarded as an important ultra-rightist weapon in the election campaign. In the years that followed it reached a still broader audience. *Life Line*, H. L. Hunt's circular, has reprinted the Index regularly for years.

p In June 1968 many Congressmen saluted ACA on the tenth anniversary of its founding. Congressman Durward G. Hall said, "I hope the Americans who share conservative philosophy and who wish to regain for America the greatness that has been dissipated through modern-day 'liberalism' will support ACA and help make it a more effective voice in the mainstream of good government in the United States."⁵⁵

p Senator Byrd of Virginia called the *ACA Index* "a permanent feature of the Washington scene." He noted that of the 807 Congressional candidates backed by ACA up to 1968 a total of 569 were elected.⁵⁰ The great majority of the Congressional candidates ACA endorses are Republicans; in 1976, for example, 143 of the 162 candidates the ACA backed were Republicans/⁷

p While representing itself as a respectable organization, no kin to (he John Birch Society, ACA nevertheless shows its true face on occasion. On May 19, 1968, retired Major-General Thomas A. Lane, president of ACA, presented his views in the Manion Forum, an ultra-rightist radio program. Lane placed special emphasis on "law and order"—the leitmotif of George Wallace's racist presidential campaign. He attributed the uprisings in black ghettos to the government's "toleration of vandalism," and accused the news media of creating unrest among blacks, the great majority of whom, he asserted, "are working and prospering."⁵⁸

p In the 60s the name Kent Courtney was often heard in rightist circles. Courtney, a powerfully built redhead, is National Chairman of the Conservative Society of America, which was founded in 1961; he has figured in the ultra-right since 1954, when he headed the New Orleans section of Ten Million Americans Mobilizing for Justice—the nationwide organization for the defense of Senator Joseph McCarthy. The Conservative Society of America is closely associated with the John Birch Society, of which Courtney is a member.

p The Conservative Society is supported by contributions and by members' dues (\$20). Its resources are growing steadily: \$180,000 in 1961, \$460,000 in 1968. The society's founders report that it has members in forty-six states, but its main strength is in California.

p Pennsylvania Governor William W. Scranton called Courtney and his wife "radical extremists" who "traded on fear and bigotry." The Conservative Society's leaders believe that the government and both major political parties are chock-full of Communists and traitors, and that the threat of a communist takeover hangs over America. They "see both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party trying to outdo each other in appeasing communism, and trying to outbid each other as to who can spend the largest amount of taxpayer dollars in Federal handouts in order to buy votes in future elections."^^59^^

p The Conservative Society's leaders call on "patriotic Americans" to "save" the country by drastically restructuring 162 society. Their program is summed up in fifteen points: re-evaluate the political and military stance of the USA; break ties with governments that are the "creatures" of Communist parties; quit all international organizations; repudiate agreements banning nuclear tests; "free" Cuba; cut off foreign aid to countries that do not side with the United States in its fight against communism; tighten immigration laws; abolish public ownership; enact right-to-work laws; repeal the Sixteenth Amendment (authorizing federal income tax); rid the government of "subversive elements"; and so on.

p The society's newspaper, *Independent American* (established in 1954), is so extremist that even some rightist ideologues (for example Russell Kirk) regard it as a "hate sheet." The society also publishes *The Conservative Political Action Handbook*, which gives practical advice on conducting meetings and rallies and on writing letters to Congressmen. Following the example of Americans for Constitutional Action, the Courtneys periodically publish an index of their own; in the eyes of the Courtneys, Drew Pearson notes, even anticommunists and reactionaries such as HUAC chairman Francis Walter and Congressmen Walter Judd and Charles Halleck are liberals or even socialists.

p The Courtney index for 1962 rates the voting records of only thirty-eight House members 70–100 percent conservative; meanwhile the records of forty-seven members representing big cities are rated 90–100 percent "socialist." The index applies the "socialist" label to all Congressmen who voted for an increase in the minimum wage, for cultural exchange with the socialist countries, for foreign aid, or for funds to develop chronically depressed areas.^00^^

p The Conservative Society of America's chief activity is ' preparing and distributing the ultras' propaganda. In 1961 it sent out 950,000 letters and 40,000 pamphlets warning that the Department of Housing and Urban Development was destroying citizens' right to private property. Much of the society's propaganda has a racist tone; the group was born, say its founders, the day the first black man crossed the threshold of the University of Mississippi.

p All right-wing organizations from the moderately conservative to the ultras regard abolishing the income tax as a 163 cardinal point in their programs. The income tax has become one of the main bones of contention between the admirers of Keynesian economics and the right-wing conservatives. "Abolish the [Income Tax]" is a very popular slogan in America, and a powerful weapon in the hands of the right in its battle against liberal ideology and policies. A large part of America's petty bourgeoisie has taken this slogan to heart; the ultras, of course, have always looked on income tax as a "diabolical Marxist scheme to destroy Western civilization."^^01^^

p In the postwar period the leader of the ultra-rightist movement to repeal the Sixteenth Amendment (authorizing income taxes) has been the Liberty Amendment Committee, which was established in 1963; it is headed by Willis E. Stone, an elderly Los Angeles engineer who is also an active member of the American Legion. The committee believes that abolishing the income tax would curtail government activity in the realm of business and lead to "denationalization." The committee's agenda calls first for the government to forswear any broadening of the public sector in trade or industry and to refuse to be bound by international agreements violating this principle; then government enterprises are to be closed down and handed over to the private sector; finally the Sixteenth Amendment is to be repealed, and the income tax abolished. The right's cherished goal in its fight against the income tax is to put an end to all government social and economic programs and 'to government interference in business affairs.

p The executive board of Stone's organization was made up largely of Californians, among them many big industrialists and ranchers. Walter Knott (Knott's Berry Farm) was one of the committee's leaders. (He also laid out funds to set up the Freedom Center, which extols the free-enterprise system.) In 1966 the John Birch Society established an affiliated Organization for Repeal of the Federal Income Tax to work in league with Stone's committee.^^02^^

p The movement to abolish the income tax has made no appreciable headway in Congress; but the Liberty Amendment has been ratified by six Southern and Western state legislatures,^^63^^ and has an impressive numbers of backers in many other states.

p Notable among the host of smaller ultra-rightist groups is For America, whose members, staunch isolationists, want to get 164 the US out of the UN and the UN out of the US, and also to build up the air force. For America's main domestic targets are powerful unions and the federal income tax.

p We. The People clamors against social reforms.

p Freedom-in-Action, a semi-secret Houston group, berrets out "pinkos." Like the John Birch Society, with which it is connected, Freedom-in-Action equates liberalism with communism.

p It would be impossible to fully enumerate America's extremist organizations. There are countless tiny, ephemeral groups: some (about twenty around the country) see a communist plot in fluoridation, others in the establishment of government-supported mental hospitals.

p Separate consideration should be given to groups that are not ultra-rightist in the literal sense but have nonetheless made resisting government social and economic programs and spreading extremist ideas virtually their main field of endeavor. Foremost among such groups are associations of war veterans and health-care workers, and certain farmers' organizations.

p The American Medical Association (AMA) has been waging a fierce battle against government health-care programs for several decades. The AMA is large and highly influential. In early 1971 about 170,000 of the 334,000 physicians in private practice were members; their annual dues (\$110) alone brought the AMA \$18 million dollars.⁰¹ Together with the John Birch Society and other ultra-rightist organizations the AMA denounces every government health-care program as a conspiracy aimed at establishing socialism in the USA. Even measures such as fluoridation are represented to the public as a "red plot" for turning America into a nation of obedient robots. When the government ordered that polio shots be given in schools, the AMA darkly hinted of a long-range communist plan to take over America.

p In 1935, as the class struggle intensified, a special commission set up by Franklin D. Roosevelt worked out a health insurance plan, but because of opposition from the right it was not included in the Social Security Act of 1935. Truman proposed a similar plan in 1945; it was labeled "socialized medicine" and rejected by Congress. In 1949, at the insistence of the working people, the administration proposed the National Health Program, developed by prominent medical specialists. 165 The AMA spent some \$1.5 million in its successful drive to defeat "socialized medicine" in Congress.¹⁵

p In 1950–1951 the AMA spent \$4 million to discredit an administration health-insurance program. It pledged to spend another \$20 million in coming years to bring its "Message of Freedom" to the public. The *New Republic* called it "the largest and loudest campaign ever prepared by a professional organization."⁰¹¹

p Under pressure from the AMA and other rightist groups Congress rejected the Murray-Pepper Bill, which provided for a health-insurance system. Other proposals met the same fate. In 1965 Congress finally enacted a federal program for hospitalization insurance. Thirty years of determined struggle by working people had finally overcome the resistance of the AMA and other rightist and ultra-rightist groups. But the influence of the reactionaries was still perceptible—Medicare covered only persons over sixty-five.¹⁷

p Excessively high-priced medical care, a severe and chronic shortage of medical personnel, limited provisions for health insurance—such is the state of health care in America today. For this the working people of the USA are obliged to the AMA and other reactionary groups.

p No less inimical to the people is the position of the American Association of Physicians and Surgeons, which opposed all forms of government regulation, including federal hydroelectric projects, housing, and health-insurance programs. It financially supported Congressional candidates who share its views. It also used radio and television propaganda to actively promote its legislative program.

p Robert Welch spoke very warmly of the American Association of Physicians and Surgeons in his *Blue Book*. He expressed confidence that the association would help the John Birch Society disseminate ultra-rightist literature both among its members and among their patients.'^^18^^

p The leaders of the American Legion have from time to time made bellicose declarations in the spirit of the darkest days of the cold war. On May 12, 1962, on the forty-third anniversary of the legion's founding, National Commander Charles L. Bacon declared: "Our goal can be nothing less than complete defeat of the Communist conspiracy to rule the world," Some 166 legion posts have made still more truculent pronouncements: in January 1962 Patrick Henry Post No. 144, American Legion, "adopted 'a declaration of war' on the international Communist-Socialist conspiracy. . . and its army of fellow travelers, dupes and red liberals who serve Communist purposes and objectives."^^09^^

p Many local chambers of commerce have adopted ultra-rightist views. The anticommunist seminars they have conducted in several states were ultra-rightist in content. Many of their publications show the same bias. In 1959 the Chamber of Commerce of Fremont, Nebraska, issued a "Declaration of Independence from Federal Dependence," whose central theses fully coincide with those of the ultras. "We believe the present trend in political thinking and fiscal policy will ultimately destroy our free institutions and the savings of our people," announce the declaration's authors. They call on all groups that hold to the principles of a free market and limited government "to steadfastly resist further encroachment upon these principles by the Federal Government" and "to limit . . . use of Federal funds and to seek a corresponding reduction in tax levies and Government controls."^^70^^ As Senator Metcalf of Montana noted, the Fremont Chamber of Commerce allies itself with ultra-rightist organizations such as the National Right-to-Work Committee and the John Birch Society in advocating the enactment of anti-union right-to-work laws in all states.^^71^^

p The American Farm Bureau Federation conducts an intensive propaganda campaign in the spirit of the far right. According to Senator Milton R. Young of North Dakota there are many Birchers among the federation's leaders. Allan B. Kline, a former president, was on the board of trustees of Americans for Constitutional Action. The federation is closely connected with the National Education Program, whose materials it uses regularly.

p The voice of the ultras can be clearly heard in the official statement promulgated at a statewide youth meeting held by the federation at Rock Springs Ranch, Kansas, in August 1966: "We are disturbed by the apathy and complacency with which many of our citizens view the advance of communism and the infiltration of communists and communist sympathizers into our public life, We particularly deplore the socialistic trends and the expansion of welfare statism which are all too evident in all segments of our society and government."⁷²

p Among the multitude of ultra-rightist organizations active in the 60s, the Minutemen attained special notoriety. This was an extremist group preparing for partisan warfare against communism should it triumph in the USA. The Minutemen saw themselves as America's last line of defense. If the Communists come to power tomorrow, said their leader, "we'll be ready tomorrow to go underground and begin fighting them. If it comes 100 years from now our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren will be ready."⁷³

p The Minutemen were organized as a secret group in 1959 by Robert Bolivar De Pugh, who not long before had been a low-ranking employee in a pharmaceuticals firm. At the time the Minutemen were organized De Pugh had his own pharmaceuticals firm, with a capital turnover of \$400,000 a year, in Norborne, Missouri.

p By 1961 partisan bands of ultras had sprung up in California, Vermont, Virginia, Nebraska, Florida, Illinois, and several other states. The most frenzied champions of free enterprise and "Americanism" came together in these local groups. They went by many different names—the Internal Security Force (Illinois) or the Loyal Order of Mountain Men (San Diego), for example. In October 1961 the head of the Los Angeles Minutemen, Troy Houghton, wrote to De Pugh asking that the Los Angeles Minutemen be considered part of the national organization.⁷⁴ A separate association included the Minutemen of New Orleans, the Minute Women of the USA and the US Rangers, a racist group with ties to the Ku Klux Klan.

p Numerically the Minutemen organization was comparatively small: it had something between a few hundred (according to official data) and 25–30,000 members.⁷⁵ The question of the Minutemen's backers is murky, but it is believed that in the early 60s 500 persons were contributing financial support.

p Members were required to pass a thirty-two-hour course in partisan warfare, to familiarize themselves with the local terrain, to achieve proficiency in using weapons of various makes (including models from the USSR), to be able to prepare and use incendiaries and explosives, and to train in hand-to-hand combat and in counterespionage techniques.

168

p The Minutemen operated in strict secrecy. Often members did not know one another and used aliases.

p For training they relied mostly on maneuvers in remote areas outside San Antonio, Omaha, Philadelphia, Columbus, Kansas City, and New York. The Minutemen also took advantage of legal gun clubs and associations in perfecting their riflemanship. In 1964 the USA had 5,643 gun clubs with about 400,000 members. In a series of speeches on extremism Representative Henry Gonzales warned Congress that through the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and local gun clubs (the Minutemen, other extremist groups, and even known criminals could obtain government surplus weapons fairly easily under the existing rules. Between 1959 and 1964 gun clubs bought \$7.2 million worth of ammunition—247 million rounds—from the government, and \$2.3 million worth of firearms. Gonzales's words, however, have not produced any response from Congress. The *Progressive* remarked, "We may have bitter cause to regret that the warnings of valiant Representative Gonzales have fallen on deaf ears in Washington, the capital that already has begun to forget the lesson of Dallas—November 22, 1963." ^7^

p Against whom were the Minutemen planning to use their weapons? They regarded as their enemies everyone included on the lists of "communists" and "fellow travelers"—that is, of democratically and liberally inclined Americans—drawn up by the nine chief "patriotic" organizations. In 1964 twenty Congressmen voted against the Committee on Un-American Activities; the Minutemen called their action treason and made threats against their lives. Plans considered by the Minutemen included assassinating Senator Fulbright, bombing the UN building, bombing summer camps operated by left-wing groups, and robbing banks in order to have money to finance their activities."

p In an interview with *Kansas City Star* correspondent J. Harry Jones, De Pugh revealed that the Minutemen had singled out twenty-five or thirty "members of the Communist 'hidden government'" for assassination. He said that another 1,500 persons had been placed under surveillance.^78^

p To fight the "liberal-communist" conspiracy De Pugh created the Patriotic Party. Four hundred delegates came to the founding convention in July 1966. They represented various extremist organizations, but the great majority were Minutemen. " month 169 later the Patriotic Party held meetings in Seattle, Chicago, Scottsdale (Georgia), Dallas, Montgomery, and Washington. State meetings were held in Arizona and Alabama. In 1968 the party supported the racist George Wallace for president.

p The Minutemen were first mentioned in the American press in late 1961, when police discovered a camp near Collinsville, Illinois, where maneuvers were being conducted under the guidance of De Pugh himself. In November and December of that year articles on the Minutemen's activities appeared in several newspapers. Later stores of weapons and ammunitions were uncovered in a number of states. It became known that besides ordinary rifles the Minutemen had bazookas, flame-throwers, mortars, machine-guns, bombs, grenades, etc. In December 1961 the governors of Illinois and California ordered probes into the activities of these secret groups. Around the same time Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, sent a memorandum to Attorney General Robert

Kennedy warning of the danger from the right and calling on the administration to suppress the Minutemen.⁷⁹

p In late 1964 a group of Democrats (Senator Stephen Young of Ohio and Representatives Charles S. Joelson of New Jersey and Ronald Brooks Cameron of California) demanded that the Minutemen's activities be forbidden. On June 11, 1965, the *Washington Star* characterized the Minutemen as "the potential 'brown shirts' of America."⁸⁰ The Justice Department's answer to the inquiries and demands concerning the Minutemen was that after extensive observation it had found nothing in their activities that was not protected by the First Amendment, and that currently there were not sufficient grounds to include the Minutemen on its "subversive list."⁸¹

p It was only in the second half of the 60s that persons were arrested in several states on charges of belonging to the Minutemen. In early June of 1965 Virginia state police and FBI agents found a Minutemen camp just twenty miles from Washington. This cell consisted of 15–18 persons, two of whom were thought to be members of George Lincoln Rockwell's American Nazi Party.⁸² On August 20, 1966, De Pugh and his nearest associates were arrested after a store of automatic weapons and explosives was unearthed in Missouri. On October 30 a group of Minutemen was taken into custody in New York; 115 170 rifles, 9 machine-guns, 26 pistols, 5 mortars, over 1,000,000 rounds of ammunition, and other armaments were seized at the same time. De Pugh and several other Minutemen leaders received prison sentences for possessing unregistered automatic weapons and failing to pay applicable taxes.

p De Pugh's conviction forced the Minutemen to reorganize. Secrecy was tightened; "detachments" and "brigades" gave way to "resistance networks." On January 23, 1967, De Pugh announced his resignation as head of the Minutemen. He said that thereafter the Minutemen would operate completely underground, and that leadership would be assumed by a seven man "executive council."⁸³

p Federal investigations of the Minutemen and the subsequent arrests forced many rightist leaders to be more cautious toward them. In 1962 De Pugh attempted to establish contacts with several rightist organizations. He repeatedly offered his services to Welch, but was turned down each time. In January he went to Tulsa to meet with Hargis; in the spring he went to Dallas, where he hoped to confer with several rightist leaders, including Welch. The trips produced no results. Moreover the leaders of the semi-fascist National States Rights Party announced in April 1964 that the organization rejected the use of armed force and would have nothing to do with the Minutemen. The right, they said, would come to power by Constitutional means.

p Around the same time the John Birch Society refunded De Pugh's six-dollar membership fee. The Minutemen's tactics could not shock the Birchers, whose own leader espoused dirty tricks. Clearly the society's attitude toward the Minutemen was adopted for the sake of appearances: the JBS itself was threatened with investigation, and although Welch put up a brave front, and even demanded that the society be investigated, he plainly did not want to complicate things by establishing ties with an overtly terrorist

organization. The society's local chapters seem to have understood this policy. It is known, for example, that in 1964, the same year Welch disassociated the JBS from the Minutemen, Birchers in St. Petersburg were urged to stock up guns and to join secret Minutemen groups.⁸⁴

[p](#) In 1965 the press caught wind of ties between the Minutemen and George Lincoln Rockwell's American Nazi Party. DC Pugh confirmed these reports, saying that in Pennsylvania about a dozen 171 Nazis had joined the Minutemen. In March 1967, not long before his death, Rockwell acknowledged this fact. This news too put rightist leaders on their guard: being linked with the USA's Nazis, who openly paid homage to Hitler, could hurt their reputation even among conservatives.

In the 70s, having been deprived of their leader and driven into isolation, the Minutemen ceased to exist as a national organization.⁸⁵

The Right and the Military-Industrial Complex

[p](#) The right's views on a number of foreign and domestic policy questions are shared by representatives of the so-called military-industrial complex; this fact provokes serious concern among the forces of democracy in the USA. Today's gigantic war machine and extensive arms industry, which are without precedent in American history, are relatively recent developments. As is well known it was the Second World War that actuated the militarization of the economy and the creation of a ramified military organization. After the war the USA became the citadel of international imperialism and the world's policeman; this change welded the military and the monopolies into a solid bloc under the aegis of the federal government.

[p](#) The US Department of Defense, which embodies US militarism, is one of the newest and most vigorous outgrowths of the executive branch. In the 70s it maintains the largest army in the capitalist world. Nearly 4.5 million persons belong either to the military bureaucracy (the largest segment of the federal work force) or to the armed services. The financial and material resources of the Pentagon have no parallel: its property is valued at \$200 billion; its land holdings have roughly the area of Great Britain.

[p](#) In the 60s the Pentagon's yearly budget averaged between \$70 and \$80 billion; in the 70s it reached \$130 billion. The Department of Defense deals with more than 100,000 contractors and subcontractors, and has branch offices in more than a hundred countries.⁸⁶ The *New Republic* noted in February 1969 that over the past twenty years between fifty and eighty cents of every tax dollar had gone to feed the military machine.⁸⁷ To paraphrase President Calvin Coolidge, today "America's business is military business." The military-industrial complex, as *Political Affairs* rightly observed

in June 1968, is the most glaring manifestation of the irrationality of the American system.⁸⁸

p In the mid 60s the economies of at least twenty-two states depended mainly on military contracts. In seven states military production accounts for more than 20 percent of all manufacturing. In the decades since the Second World War America has reared a whole generation whose livelihood is bound up with the arms industry. According to US Department of Labor figures the Vietnam war created one million jobs in 1967 alone, and more than four million from 1965 to 1967. In total America's war in Vietnam made work for nearly 8.5 million military personnel and civilians.

p In the 60s workers in war-related industries were subjected to an intensive propaganda campaign by the right. It is not surprising that many of them, unable to resist the prolonged ideological and political pressures, fell under the sway of chauvinism; this produced a large reserve from which the right could recruit support.

p The Second World War and America's aggressions in Korea and Vietnam radically changed the relations between civilian authority and the military elite. Military pressure on the government became so strong that President Eisenhower, in his farewell speech (1961), was forced to warn: "In the councils of Government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex."⁸⁹

p The militarized economy brought the military elite into close contact with the industrial hierarchy. Large corporations increasingly feel the need to hire retired top-ranking officers as executives.

p In mid 1959 the House Armed Services Special Investigations Subcommittee, headed by F. Edward Hebert, studied the connections between the military and large industries. It discovered that more than 1,400 retired officers in the rank of major or higher (including 261 generals) were employed by the top one hundred military contractors—who received 73 percent of the 173 government's military orders. The subcommittee also established a direct relation between the number of high-ranking retired officers firms employed and the total value of the contracts they received." Exactly ten years later, in mid 1969, the top ten military contractors employed about 700 retired generals, admirals, and Navy captains.

p Militaristic hysteria, systematically fed with scare stories about the threat of "communist aggression," further cements the personal union of big capitalists and the military. The professional interests and sympathies of the Pentagon and of several other US government departments find a natural counterpart in the politics, ideology, and military outlook of the right. In the 50s an anonymous survey of 576 Pentagon staff officers showed that only 5 percent thought of themselves as liberals, while 21.6 percent thought of themselves as conservatives.⁹¹ Many representatives of the military-industrial bloc subscribe to the "conspiracy theory" and approve of searches for "subversive elements" in high places. Irwin Suall stresses that "this warped version of

reality has roots in both corporate and military life.”⁹² Thus the American reactionary right is a very real danger: it is no handful of crazed fanatics, but a significant force in society.

p In the realm of foreign policy representatives of the American military-industrial complex have greatly imperiled the cause of peace by demanding "victory over communism." This battle cry has been taken up by all segments of the right—from the opponents of fluoridation to the academically respectable conservatives who advocate a hard-line policy toward the socialist countries. Any hint of uncertainty about the wisdom of huge military allocations is perceived as a threat to the interests of the nation.

p In the realm of domestic policy representatives of the military-industrial complex, like the right, apply the "conspiracy theory"; for them, resorting to social maneuvers is giving in to communism.

p The basic position of the military-industrial complex on questions of "national security" has been formulated in directives, information bulletins, and educational materials and programs. Various seminars and ready-made courses for reserve officers served the same purpose; most prominent among these were the 174 patently extremist educational programs of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces and the National War College.

p The Industrial College began conducting "National Security Seminars" in 1948. These programs were authorized by the Joint Chiefs of Staff; they were attended by officers of the National Guard, by Army, Navy, and Air Force reserve officers, by executives in war-related industries, and by educators. Local arrangements were made by chambers of commerce, by rightist and extremist organizations, and by active-duty and reserve officers. Seminars were held regularly each year from October through May in cities all over the country; average attendance was about 200. By the fall of 1963 the Industrial College program had reached about 70,000 persons.

p The National War College held its first "Defense Strategy Seminar" in 1959. The Reserve Officers Association and the Institute for American Strategy took active part in organizing this program. The seminars accented the use of military force against the socialist countries. The historians Gene M. Lyons and Louis Morton noted that this bias led the military, in several instances, into "dangerous partnerships with movements of the radical right.”⁹³

p The military-industrial complex is fervently supported by a number of private organizations; the most important of these is the American Security Council, which in fact is a lobby for the US military establishment. The council was founded by William F. Carroll, a former FBI agent, in 1955—around the time that the administration and Congress found it necessary to dispense with the services of Senator McCarthy and trim back the investigations he had inspired. The council was conceived as a private loyalty board for industry. Five former FBI agents were on the executive staff; some authors suggest that the council had access to the files of the FBI, the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the Senate Internal Security Committee. In 1962 the council

had a blacklist of more than a million names.⁹⁴ Its officials make no attempt to deny that its system of loyalty tests is tailored to the standards of the right, or that its card index is used by the arms industry as a source of information on employees. Irwin Suall calls this privately operated witch hunt "one of the most irresponsible, dangerous attacks on freedom of opinion in the nation today."⁹⁵

175

p The council's office in Washington is headed by retired Rear Admiral Chester Ward; its main purpose is to maintain close contact with the executive and legislative branches of the government and with the armed forces.

p The council's basic political and military positions are worked out by its National Strategy Committee. This body includes highranking military men, among them three retired chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: Generals Lemnitzer, Twining, and Wheeler. Edward Teller (a professor of physics), Robert Galvin (chairman of the board at Motorola, Inc.), Bennett Archambault (chairman of the board at the Borg-Warner Corp.), Patrick J. Frawley, and Henry Salvatori (West Coast financiers) are also members of the committee.⁰⁰

p Frank Rockwell Barnett, one of the committee's leaders, made a notable contribution to whipping up the hysteria of the McCarthy years. In 1951 he urged that \$100 million be allocated to form renegades from the socialist countries into a "Legion of Liberation." He also suggested that a Joint Congressional Committee on Cold War Strategy be set up to guide America toward victory over communism, and called on all public and private organizations to work together to strengthen national security.⁹⁷

p The organ of the American Security Council is the *Washington Report*, edited by Frank J. Johnson, a former naval intelligence officer. Johnson gained fame as the author of *No Substitute for Victory*, in which he proclaimed the necessity of destroying the world socialist system and the international communist movement.⁹⁸ A radio program with the same name is carried by 350 stations five times a week, under the sponsorship of the Schick Safety Razor Company.

p The council actively recruits members in the business world. In 1960 the council's members included only 450 businessmen; in 1966 the overwhelming majority of its 3,500 members were businessmen. Membership dues vary from \$30 for enterprises with under twenty-four employees to \$900 for enterprises with over ten thousand. In the 70s the council's treasury held about \$1,750,000.

p Another influential rightist organization reflecting the position of the US military is the Institute for American Strategy. It grew out of a symposium held in March 1955 by the Chicago 176 Association of Commerce and Industry, the Society of American Military Engineers, the Illinois Institute of Technology, and other rightist groups. The symposium, which was called the National Military-Industrial Conference, was transformed into the Institute for American Strategy in 1958.⁹⁹ In the following year the institute,

together with the Reserve Officers Association, held a seminar at the National War College on the "all encompassing nature of the Soviet-Communist challenge."¹⁰⁰ The seminar has been repeated each summer since. Its program was devised by the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania. The seminar's leaders have reached broad masses of Americans through organizations such as the Association of the US Army, the Air Force Association, and the Navy League.

The institute favors stepping up the arms race so as to assure "total victory" for the USA, which is to be won, if need be, with nuclear weapons. Disarmament talks and bans on nuclear weapons tests are spurned as "defeatism." The institute recommends that every possible means be used to instigate disturbances in the socialist countries: strikes, undergrounds, hired agents, acts of terrorism against government figures, etc.

The institute's work is funded by the Pentagon and by the Richardson Foundation, which Vick Chemical set up and endowed with \$13 million to support research in ultra-rightist ideological centers. An example of the type of publication backed by the Richardson Foundation is *A Forward Strategy for America*. Its authors are Robert Strausz-Hupe (Director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, where the book was written), Colonel William Kintner, and Stefan Possony (Director of International Political Studies at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University). They write: "Our policy must be based upon the premise that we cannot tolerate the survival of a political system which has both the growing capability and the ruthless will to destroy us. We have no choice but to adopt a Catoic strategy."¹⁰¹ Cato used to end his speeches in the Roman Senate with the phrase "Carthage must be destroyed"; the authors are demanding the destruction of the USSR and the other socialist countries.

The ideologues of "victory over communism" find important patrons and large audiences for their inflammatory speechifying. In 1961–1962 high-ranking military men, with the help of local chambers of commerce, the American Legion, and rightist groups, organized anticommunist and anti-Soviet seminars in Pittsburgh, Chicago, New York, Cleveland, New Orleans, and other cities in California, Florida, Texas, Massachusetts, Washington, and Kansas. This campaign also extended to certain military units stationed abroad. Major General Edwin A. Walker was particularly active in spreading rightist ideas among his soldiers. He liked to repeat the words of Major General Orvil A. Anderson: "Give me the order to do it and I can break up Russia's five A-bomb nests in a week. And when I went up to Christ ... I think that I could explain to Him that I had saved civilization."¹⁰²

General Walker was known as a stern commander; many rightists were inclined to see him as a knight in shining armor—a strong personality who could lead their movement. Walker is a professional soldier. He graduated from West Point in 1913. During the Second World War he served in the Aleutian Islands, then in Italy. After the war Walker became head of the Pentagon's section for Greece, and later was chief military advisor in South Korea and Taiwan. He fought in the USA's war in Korea.

p Walker's career reached a turning point in the McCarthy years: he embraced the idea that war must be waged on "subversive elements" within the USA. He joined the John Birch Society in 1959. He actively championed the society's ideas while commander of an American division stationed in West Germany. He recommended that his subordinates read books by Welch and other ultras. Walker's office became virtually an overseas branch of the John Birch Society. Lists of liberal Congressmen were made up. A Frankfort newspaper reported that Walker's staff included an officer who propagandized the ideas of the *Blue Book* among the troops.

p Walker sought to influence the voting of his subordinates in the 1960 elections; in particular, he made special efforts to circulate the *AC A Index*, according to which 172 Representatives and a number of senators were underserving of re-election. His activities suited the mood and views of some high-placed men in the Pentagon. General Lyman L. Lemnitzer, who was then Army Chief of Staff, and later Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said that he found the *AC A Index* "most 178 interesting and useful."¹⁰ On April 6, 1961, the Army's Chief of Information at the Pentagon, Major General William Quinn, wrote Walker that the Pentagon had been following the progress of his Birchist program "with interest and pleasure."¹⁰⁴ Further advancement and a third star for Walker seemed assured.

p But unforeseen events interfered. On April 12, 1961, the *Overseas Weekly* informed its readers about Walker's doings. Soon the whole country knew about Walker. Liberal and democratic groups found these ultra-rightist activities in the army not a little alarming. In the summer of 1961 Senator Fulbright sent a memorandum to the Department of Defense; he noted that "there has been a strong tradition in this country that it is not the function of the military to educate the public on political issues." Fulbright emphasized that the right's thesis of a "Communist menace" is often developed "by equating social legislation with socialism, and the latter with communism." Having reviewed the content of the seminars conducted by the Pentagon and its departments he concluded that the programs were dominated by ultras who focused on "subversive activities" within the country.¹⁰⁵

p Fulbright's remarks drew fire from the American Legion and a number of rightist Congressmen, including Senator Barry Goldwater. Strom Thurmond called the Fulbright memorandum "one of the most shocking documents" he had ever read and the *Overseas Weekly's* attacks on Walker "a great success for the Communists."¹⁰⁶ Most of the rightists in Congress demanded that Fulbright's activities be investigated. Many liberals sat silent, unwilling to openly defend Fulbright. The *Progressive* characterized their timidity as "one of the saddest commentaries in our time."¹⁰⁷

p In the meantime some very interesting facts came to the surface. It became known, for example, that Walker and many other high-ranking officers had conducted anti-communist seminars in accordance with a secret National Security Council directive of 1958, which authorized the military services to undertake an intensified effort to increase public awareness of the dangers of the "Soviet threat."¹⁰⁸

p In light of these circumstances the Kennedy administration decided to show once again that it wanted nothing to do with 179 extremists. Walker was reprimanded for exceeding his authority, and transferred to Hawaii. In November 1961 he tendered his resignation; it was accepted. The politicians and press of the radical right saw Walker's dismissal as an attempt by the administration to gag a great patriot whose "only crime" was that he was a "zealous anti-Communist."¹⁰⁹

p The administration furthermore ordered that speeches by certain military commanders be screened in advance for incendiary remarks against the Soviet Union that might provoke the right to new actions. Speeches by Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, Air Force Chief of Staff Thomas D. White, assistant director of Naval Intelligence for Security Samuel B. Frankel, and dozens of others were censored.

p In late 1961 Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara was forced to forbid officers to propagandize rightist ideas in the armed forces or among the public. This order was incongruous at best: that same year fiery exponents of "victory over communism," among them William Kintner and Frank Rockwell Barnett, were consulted by McNamara's special advisory committee on "improving" political education in the armed forces. As for the spreading of rightist ideas in the armed forces, it is known to have quietly continued in some places after McNamara's order; the National War College, for example, held "national strategy seminars" for reserve officers every summer at Fort McNair (Washington state).¹¹⁰

p A special Senate subcommittee, headed by John Stennis, was created to investigate activities of the ultras in the armed forces. The John Birch Society, Billy James Hargis's Christian Crusade, and other right-wing groups bombarded Congress with letters—147,000 in three days—protesting the investigation of General Walker¹¹¹. Nevertheless Walker was called before the subcommittee on April 4, 1962. He made no attempt to hide his connections with the John Birch Society. Having lost all sense of proportion he declared that the case against him was concocted by the Communists. His remarks were so inconsistent and absurd that sympathy for him cooled even among rightists; many of his supporters turned away from him. In 1962 Walker ran for governor of Texas. Even former friends such as Senators Thurmond and Tower did not support him. He drew only 10 percent of the votes in the May primaries.

180

p As a private citizen Walker toured the country with other extremists, tirelessly propounding his views. In 1963 he and Billy James Hargis made a sweep through seventeen states to sound the alarm about the "communist menace" in America. But even the John Birch Society, whose teachings Walker pushed so insistently, dropped him from its rolls.

p The Walker affair was one more clear proof of a fact that Washington finds most unpleasant: certain high-ranking military men have close ties with rightist groups. These ties continue to exist, albeit in more subtle form, despite measures the government has

taken to end them. John Swornley's *The Military Establishment*, published in 1964, devotes many pages to the simple enumeration of persons and organizations linking the military and the right. And retired officers, many of them with considerable leverage in official circles, are still to be found in important positions in the John Birch Society and other ultrarightist organizations.

p The war unleashed by US imperialism in Vietnam lent new vigor to the growth of the right's power in the country. The steady escalation of the USA's military effort in Southeast Asia was paralleled by gigantic increases in military spending. The military budget of the Eisenhower administration in its last year (fiscal 1960/61) was \$47.5 billion; that of the Kennedy administration averaged \$53.7 billion a year. Half of the sum went to pay for orders from the twenty-five biggest military contractors—corporations such as General Dynamics, General Electric, Lockheed, McDonnell Douglas, and United Aircraft.

p The Pentagon's awesome financial might allows it to propagandize militarism on a grand scale. In 1964 the Pentagon spent \$31 million on public relations; it operates 250 radio and 34 television stations overseas.¹¹² Senator Fulbright reported that in 1968–1969 the US Air Force alone made 148 films and 36 programs for television, at a cost of \$10.9 million. The combined services released 284 news-film stories in 1969. The Department of Defense and its dependent organizations employed at least 2,800 military and civilian journalists, who waged a concerted propaganda campaign for the military-industrial complex and its needs. The Pentagon's speakers bureau sent officers all over the country to almost every type of public gathering. The Army mounted a series of touring exhibits that 181 reached some 13.5 million Americans in the second half of 1969 alone.¹¹¹

p The Pentagon's activities are backed by a powerful bloc of military associations and numerous veterans' groups whose views on foreign policy largely coincide with those of the right and the extreme right. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, for example, whose members numbered 1.4 million in 1967, made the following demands at its sixty-eighth national convention: victory in Vietnam; the further development of nuclear weapons "to achieve and preserve world leadership"; the strengthening of anti-missile defenses; opposition to communism in all forms, both at home and abroad; the rejection of economic cooperation with the socialist nations; the reversal of the Cuban revolution and of the gains made by socialism in Central and Eastern Europe; the tightening of anti-democratic legislation; the continuation of the work of the FBI, the House Un-American Activities Committee, and other bodies created to combat "subversive organizations"; the suppression of internal resistance to the war in Vietnam; the modernization of the navy and the establishment of an Indian Ocean fleet; and the pressuring of other capitalist countries to make "a comparable contribution to our common effort in defeating Communism, both by military and economic means."¹¹¹

p After the Walker affair the American Security Council continued to promote the heightening of international tensions. In 1966, together with the Schick Safety Razor Company and Motorola, the council undertook a series of measures designed to widen

business participation in the conduct of the cold war. This idea was energetically approved by the ultras in Congress. Strom Thurmond expressed the conviction that if American business as a whole focused its efforts on the cold war, US victory would be much closer.¹¹⁶

[p](#) At Thurmond's request one of the council's statements, "The Will to Win—An Objective in the Cold War," was entered into the *Congressional Record*. This inflammatory declaration was issued at a time when the Johnson administration, with the presidential elections approaching, was forced to make certain concessions to America's progressives, who were demanding an end to the war in Vietnam. The council argued that America's vast expenditures of money and lives in that war had been fruitless because of a loss of the will to win, and of the administration's half-heartedness, its reluctance to proclaim victory over communism the main goal of its policies. In the spirit of right extremism the council inveighed against the doctrine of "containment of communism," whose fundamental error was held to be "a belief in the possibility of permanent peaceful coexistence between communist and non-communist nations." And further, "Containment, if retained as the governing U.S. response to communist aggression, could bankrupt the American people. . . There is a . . . knee-jerk of shock and dismay in some quarters when the word 'victory' is mentioned. . . A fearridden mentality lies behind some of the tragic policy mistakes of recent years. It lies behind the abandonment of Cuba to the communist government of Fidel Castro. It certainly lies behind the unwillingness of the present administration to apply the degree of military pressure needed to win the war in Vietnam."¹¹⁷

[p](#) After the 1968 elections the American Security Council came into closer contact with government bodies. In December 1968, at the request of the House Armed Services Committee, the council published a paper on "The Changing Strategic Naval Balance: U.S.S.R. versus U.S.A." in the *Washington Report*. The paper was the work of H. D. Felt, co-chairman of the council's National Strategy Committee, a retired admiral. Felt contended that if the USA did not exert itself to modernize its Navy it would lose leadership in the "free world."¹¹⁸ On March 10, 1969, the *Washington Report* restated this demand more concretely. Citing tensions in the Middle East (for which the USA was to blame) the council called for a change in the balance of power in the eastern Mediterranean and for "U.S. and NATO counter-measures against the Soviet Union" in that area.¹¹⁹

[p](#) Congressman Rivers made reference to Felt's paper in introducing a bill authorizing construction of nineteen warships, at a cost of \$3.8 billion, in fiscal 1970.¹²

[p](#) The council and the administration were in complete accord about increasing the USA's nuclear-missile force. On March 14, 1969, the Nixon administration, at the prompting of the military, decided to modify the Johnson administration's proposal for the Sentinel antiballistic missile system. The new program, dubbed Safeguard, required huge additional allocations, which after protracted and heated debates were finally granted by Congress.

p The speedup of the arms race proposed by the administration was enthusiastically supported by the American Security Council. In May 1969 a special subcommittee of the council published a paper on "The ABM and the Changed Strategic Military Balance: U.S.S.R. vs. U.S.A." The council firmly backed Nixon's March 14 proposal; it intimated that building the new weapon system was "the single most important step the United States can take towards a real and lasting peace."¹²¹ Known rightists and ultra-rightists were among those directly involved in compiling the paper.

Thus government, big business, and the military drew closer together in the 60s and early 70s; their rapprochement was itself a powerful factor in heightening the mood of extremism, and materially strengthened the ultra-rightist movement.

Racism and the American Nazis

p Throughout American history political reaction has flourished in the soil of national, religious, and racial bigotry. The Ku Klux Klan (which recrudesced in the 20s), the Dixiecrats (an arch-reactionary Congressional group), White Citizens' Councils, various anti-Semitic organizations, and last but not least the American Nazi Party are all rooted in bigotry. It is to be stressed that racists are among the most militant and aggressive of the USA's reactionaries.

p The racists of the South are closely tied with the military, whose traditions they greatly honor. Many top military commanders are Southerners.¹²² Racists wholeheartedly second the far right in opposing social and economic planning, the "welfare state," trade unionism, and democracy. Racists and ultrarightists alike profess anticommunism, and are inclined to regard the civil rights movement among black Americans as part of a "communist plot." In 1954 the Supreme Court's decision ordering desegregation of public schools brought the anathema of both racists and right extremists upon Chief Justice Earl Warren; for many years Robert Welch led a campaign to impeach Warren,

184

p Virulent anti-Semitism is the natural ally of racial hatred toward blacks and right extremism; the anti-Semites, however, prefer the formulation "communist-Jewish plot."

p Studies have shown that religious conviction is the main source of anti-Semitism among Americans. It is estimated that 17.5 million Americans hold anti-Semitic views on religious grounds.¹²³ This segment of the public is the target of intense ultra-rightist propaganda. The Communist Party USA calls anti-Semitism "a major weapon of reaction," and notes that "with the upsurge of the rabid ultra-Right in the United States, violently anti-Semitic propaganda has risen."¹²⁴ The extreme right's fostering of racism and anti-Semitism creates a constant danger of violent outbreaks. The sinister triple alliance of the ultras, the military, and the racists is the greatest threat to democracy in America today.

p The Christian Nationalist Crusade, an American racist and anti-Semitic organization, was instituted in 1941. Its leader is Gerald L.K. Smith, a fundamentalist preacher who began his career as an extremist in 1933 with the pro-fascist Silver Shirts. He was later associated with Huey Long's so-called Share-Our-Wealth movement in Louisiana and with Charles E. Coughlin, the "radio priest" who defended the aggressive policies of Hitler's Germany. Smith ardently supported Senator Joseph McCarthy, whose downfall and death he ascribed to a Jewish-inspired plot. Smith's weekly, *The Cross and the Flag* (published in Los Angeles since 1942; circulation 34,000–40,000), ceaselessly "recites harrowing instances of the multiple conspiracy to de-Christianize and mongrelize the country."¹² Since 1954 *The Cross and the Flag* has been warning that America's Christian institutions are menaced by a "treasonable Supreme Court controlled by Socialists, pro-Communist and even anti-Christ elements."¹²⁶ Smith's racist propaganda does not go begging for an audience in the USA: according to Internal Revenue Service records Smith's crusade took in around \$300,000 in 1966.¹²⁷

p In the 60s and early 70s Smith took to more subtle forms of anti-Semitic propaganda. He erected a gigantic statue of Christ in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, opened a "Christ Only Art Gallery," and mounted the *Great Passion Play*. A cast of between two and three hundred presents the legend of Christ's death at the hands of the Jews some 100 times a year from late May to 185 October. The statue is floodlighted at night; religious music plays. A million people visited the site between June 25, 1966, and November 9, 1967. In the late 60s the federal government set aside funds for the construction of a highway to Smith's "sacred project," which became the biggest tourist attraction in Arkansas.

p Scenes from the life of Christ were broadcast on television and on 429 radio stations. These programs reached some two million Americans.

p The increasing resistance of black Americans to discrimination in the 50s and 60s strengthened existing racist and nationalist organizations and gave rise to new ones. The Supreme Court, by calling for the desegregation of public schools (May 17, 1954) gave new impetus to racism. Racists argued that the Court had violated states' rights and sacrificed the individual liberties of citizens to the "tyranny of equality and fraternity."¹²⁸

p Initially the Citizens' Councils of America, or the White Citizens' Councils, were the main organizations around which racism consolidated.

p The first White Citizens' Council was formed in Indianola, Mississippi, two months after the desegregation decision; this development was applauded by the state legislature. In a pamphlet issued in November 1954 the council declared itself categorically opposed to integration. By 1956 White Citizens' Councils had sprung up all over the South. They were organized as the Citizens' Councils of America at a convention in New Orleans; this association was based originally in Greenwood (Mississippi), later in Jackson. The councils were allied with the National Association for the Advancement of White People (Washington) and the White Brotherhood (Atlanta). Roy Harris, a twenty-year veteran of the Georgia legislature, was made president of the Citizens' Councils of America.

p The Citizens' Councils of America oppose the mingling of races; they seek to preserve and restore "lawful" segregation, and to broaden states' rights. The councils' leaders (unlike those of the Ku Klux Klan) repudiate violence, but their deeds often contradict their words.

p The councils headed by Asa (Ace) Carter in Alabama and John Kasper in Virginia were especially militant. Kasper's pamphlet *Virginians on Guard* urged: "Hang the nine Supreme 186 Court swine; destroy all Reds, Rooseveltian dupes, and death to usurers." Kasper exhorted all Southerners to defy the federal government, and demanded that local authorities arrest any federal judge or FBI agent who meddled in the affairs of the South.¹²⁹ Kasper and his like appealed to white paupers and sharecroppers in backward areas, urban vagrants, and other poor people in the South—groups prone to lawlessness and violence. In practice their outlook is the same as the Ku Klux Klan's. Indeed Kasper headed a Birmingham Klan group in 1956. The White Citizens' Councils attempts to forcibly prevent school integration caused shameful racial incidents in Little Rock (where Kasper was a leading instigator), Montgomery, Clinton (Tennessee), Sturgis (Kentucky), Beaumont (Texas), Orangeburg (South Carolina), and New Orleans. Elsewhere racists resorted to economic measures; city authorities in Birmingham responded to a boycott of stores by blacks with a cut in the surplus produce donated to the needy (mainly to black families).

p The weekly radio program of the Citizens' Councils is carried by 450 stations. Their journal, *The Citizen* (published in Jackson since 1955), has a circulation of 40,000. The 550 local councils also circulate their own literature. *Black Monday*, by Mississippi Supreme Court justice Tom P. Brady, was especially popular. Brady argues that desegregation is a communist plot, that miscegenation will lower the intelligence and culture of the white race and breed potential Communists.¹³⁰

p Most of the councils' supporters are well-to-do: bankers, businessmen, planters, lawyers, tradesmen, politicians, police officers. But small farmers, sharecroppers, workers, and people from the middle strata of society were also drawn in. The councils had about a million members in the mid 60s.¹³¹

p The crisis grew more acute. Racists desperately resisted desegregation; black Americans fought with still greater determination for equal rights. The White Citizens' Councils proved inadequate for the struggle. Racists looked around for a more active, combative organization. The Ku Klux Klan had been languishing; now it gathered new strength and raised its head once again. There were more torch processions, cross burnings, and attacks on blacks. The Klan was held responsible for one hundred and thirty-eight bombings in the South between January 1, 1956, and June 1, 1963. In Birmingham alone twenty-nine churches, synagogues, schools, and black homes were bombed between 1957 and 1965.

p In 1961 Robert Shelton, formerly a worker, joined together a large number of racist groups; thereafter the Klan grew quickly. In the 20s the Klan had recruited most of its members from the middle classes; in the 60s the Klan, though financed by wealthy

citizens, was made up principally of the urban poor. There were some fifteen Klan organizations with a total membership of between 50,000 and 100,000 in the 60s. Gallup polls conducted in 1946 and 1965 showed that 6 percent of Americans, over ten million people, approved of the Klan's work.¹²

The largest Klan association is the United Klans of America—Knights of the Ku Klux Klans, Inc. In early 1957 it had 40,500 members. Robert Shelton is its "Imperial Wizard." The other Klan associations are considerably smaller. The National Association of Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, headed by James K. Venable, was made up of nine Georgia Klans with a total of 7,000 members. There are 12,000 Klansmen in Alabama (led by Robert Creel); 9,000 in Atlanta (led by Calvin Craig); 8,000 in North Carolina (led by James Robertson Jones); 2,500 in South Carolina; etc.

According to the FBI, 90 percent of the Klan's members are armed and have heavy automatic weapons at their disposal. KKK "action groups" for special assignments are known as "wrecking crews," "killer squads," "holy terrors," and so on. Nacirema, Inc., was the most bellicose Klan group; members wore black robes, and were armed.¹³ Imperial Wizard Shelton has repeatedly claimed that the KKK is opposed to violence, that the mass media have falsely represented the Klan as "living on a theory of hate and fear." At the same time he maintains that segregation will endure, and that the movement for integration and civil rights is part of a communist plot.¹⁴

But Shelton's protestations do not jibe with the words of other Klan leaders, or with the deeds of the KKK. "Grand Dragon" Calvin Craig of Georgia has said: "The Negroes will not be satisfied until we have openly declared a racial war. . . The Whites have been betrayed, and in Georgia most of them are ready to take up arms."¹⁵

188

The Klan's revival of the practices of the 20s during black Americans' intensifying struggle for freedom created a potentially explosive situation. The danger finally forced the ruling cliques to launch an investigation of the KKK.

It soon became known that the House Un-American Activities Committee would handle the investigation. This news troubled many who upheld the cause of black equality. They understood that HUAC would not move to take effective measures against Klan terror; it was HUAC, after all, that supplied the libels used against the civil rights movement at countless gatherings throughout the South. Only one of the five committee members probing the Klan had voted for the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The *Progressive* wrote: "The Committee is an ancient foe of civil rights and the Constitution. For HUAC to preside over an inquiry into the Klan's offenses against both is a witless and obscene joke, from which little good and much harm can come."¹⁶

On the whole the investigation, conducted in October and November 1965 and January 1966, was very superficial. Nonetheless certain facts came to light. The Klan has

infiltrated police departments, and has ties with sheriffs and with local and state government bodies. KKK fronts—“rifle” or “hunting” clubs—get weapons through the National Rifle Association. Some local klans hold maneuvers like the Minutemen. The Klan’s leaders engage in financial double-dealing. The long-known fact that the Klan uses violence against its victims was confirmed.

p The investigation, limited as it was, upset the leaders of the KKK. Shelton refused to answer a number of the committee’s questions, which he complained were “unethical and unChristian,” even “un-American.” He suggested that the press “find out who the true manipulators” behind the investigation were. James R. Jones, the Grand Dragon of North Carolina, conducted himself like a man betrayed by his best friends; he praised the committee’s racist film *Operation Abolition*, which the Klan had been showing all over the South.¹³⁷ As expected, the investigation yielded almost no results, although in October 1966 Shelton was sentenced to a year in prison and fined \$1,000 for contempt of Congress.

p The leaders of America’s ultras were profuse in their declarations that they had nothing to do with racial, national, or 189 religious bigotry. Robert Welch declared: “We are not anti-Jewish, and by the very nature of things we cannot be made anti-Jewish. We are not. . . anti-Negro, nor anti-Mongolian, nor anti any member of any race or creed. We are anti-Communist.”¹³⁸ In 1965 Welch found it necessary to shore up this position by asking for the resignation of Rev. P. Oliver, a Council member of the John Birch Society whose racist and anti-Semitic views had become an embarrassment.¹³⁹ The Jewish Society of Americanists—a branch of the Birch Society—came into being in February 1966. It was intended to prove that Birchers were not anti-Semitic. In March 1967 John H. Rousselot, the society’s public relations director, declared that there were about 400 Negro Birchers, some of them in staff positions.¹⁴⁰

p Billy James Hargis said: “We cannot tolerate anti-Semitic statements or anti-Negro statements. We are not here to fight Jews or Protestants, white people or Negroes. We are here to fight communists. One wild, bigoted statement could sabotage this entire effort.”¹⁴¹

p But the extreme right’s disclaimers cannot change the facts: Hargis’s anticommunist schools deal in racist propaganda of the most virulent kind. Allen Zoll, a known anti-Semite who in the 40s headed American Patriots, Inc., in the early 60s became a leading figure in Fred C. Schwarz’s Christian Anticommunist Crusade. Merwin K. Hart, who set up the ultra-rightist National Economic Council and has repeatedly spoken of the “Zionist plot,” is also head of a Manhattan chapter of the Birch Society.

p Both Welch and Hargis, despite their professed rejection of racism and anti-Semitism, actively circulate the blatantly anti-Semitic *American Mercury* and other such publications among their followers.

p In the 60s—particularly after the adoption of the 1964 Civil Rights Bill—leading rightist organizations, among them the John Birch Society, began to ally themselves

openly with the racists. In the pamphlet *Two Revolutions at Once* (1965), a half-million copies of which were distributed all over the country, Welch characterized the civil rights movement as part of a Communist-inspired plot, and Hargis called it a "Communist civil war."¹⁴² Birchers in Los Angeles began to push this theory with especial vigor after the Watts riots. A similar view of the civil rights 190 movement was presented in the Birch Society film *Anarchy— U.S.A.* The Liberty Lobby came out with a pamphlet titled *Black Revolution is Red Revolution*. Hargis, Bundy, and other rightists vilified Martin Luther King as a communist agent and a traitor.

p The American Nazi Party (now the National Socialist White People's Party) was founded in 1959 by George Lincoln Rockwell of Bloomington, Illinois. He was an ardent admirer of Hitler, busts and portraits of whom were prominently displayed at his headquarters in Arlington, Virginia (a suburb of Washington). He believed that Adolf Hitler was the gift of an inscrutable Providence to a world on the brink of catastrophe.¹⁴³ The Führer "produced the thoughts which propel me," he wrote, and "future generations will look upon Adolf Hitler as the White Savior of the twentieth century." Rockwell styled himself an "open, arrogant, all-out Nazi."¹⁴⁴

p Rockwell's chief patron was Harold Arrowsmith, a wealthy citizen of Baltimore, with whose backing he founded the National Committee to Free America from Jewish Domination (renamed the American Nazi Party in 1959). A 1958 synagogue bombing in Atlanta first brought Rockwell to the attention of the authorities and the press. Soon afterwards he began to appear on the streets of the capital with an entourage of youths in Stormtrooper uniforms. He made rabid speeches against the Jews and the blacks. Young Nazis picketed the White House carrying signs that read "save Ike from the Kikes!" and "Fight Race-Mixing."¹⁴⁵

p The fascist swastika, banned in probably every other civilized country, has found a home right next to the Statue of Liberty. In 1961 Attorney General Robert Kennedy opposed branding the American Nazi Party a subversive group.¹⁴⁰ The majority of Americans, however, find overt Nazi propaganda offensive. In the summer of 1960 a Nazi rally in Washington turned into a literal rout: the speaker's stand was wrecked, and Rockwell beaten up. In New York a Nazi gathering was forbidden at the insistence of the public; afterwards an angry crowd surrounded Rockwell, who had to be rescued by the police.

p In 1961 Rockwell and his young thugs set off on a tour of the South with the object of recruiting new members. They got as far as New Orleans, where their bus was stopped. Rockwell 191 was fined and imprisoned for disturbing the peace (the sentence was later overturned by an appellate court).

p Rockwell's organization never attained any real importance. Most of its 3,000 members were concentrated in Arlington, New York, Chicago, Boston, and Los Angeles. In 1965 Rockwell ran for governor of Virginia; he received a mere 1.2 percent of the vote.

p The World Union of National Socialists was formed at an international fascist meeting near London. Colin Jordan was its head; after his arrest Rockwell was made "world fuhrer."

p The American Nazi Party platform proposed, first of all, to "investigate, try and execute all Jews proved to have taken part in Marxist or Zionist plots." The media, government, education, entertainment, and the courts were to be purged of "disloyal Jews." The Nazi government would establish a National Eugenics Commission to discourage "the unlimited breeding of the least desirable elements" and to sterilize all those considered, for one reason or another, "biologically dangerous" to future generations. The commission would also encourage the reproduction of the "best stock." This would halt the population explosion and keep the "inferior races in their place."^^147^^

p In short Rockwell's program repeated the ravings of the Hitlerites, who were prevented from putting it into practice. Neither was Rockwell's solution to the "Negro question" original: he wanted to settle black Americans in Africa. Those who did not want to leave would become "rigidly segregated non-citizens."

p The American Nazis' social platform was eclectic and riddled with contradictions. Many of its ideas were borrowed from the far right: "free enterprise," the abolition of the Federal Reserve System and the progressive income tax, and the elimination of bureaucratic government controls. But to gain popular support the Nazis also promised to "enact laws that will protect every honest working citizen from unforeseeable and ruinous catastrophes of all kinds; to assure him of education and training to the top level of his capacity ... to assure him of vital medical and hospital facilities."^^143^^

p The party's openly proclaimed Hitlerite heritage scared off even dyed-in-the-wool conservatives. The racism of the American Nazis knew no bounds; even Barry Goldwater, the darling 192 of the ultras, drew their fire. During the 1964 presidential campaign they circulated anti-Semitic attacks on him, and called him a "phony conservative."^^140^^

p Rockwell's leadership also contributed to the isolation of the American Nazis from the right. Rockwell refused to recognize Robert Welch, and detested KKK leaders who rejected his authority. His eccentric pranks and utterly baseless claims brought him into conflict with many rightists. Gerald L. K. Smith, no less racist and anti-Semitic than Rockwell himself, objected to the American Nazi Party mostly because of his personal antipathy for its leader. An American Legion post in Washington demanded that Congress investigate the American Nazis. In New Jersey a certain Sidney Lansing, himself a Nazi, waged a struggle against Rockwell. In 1962 John Patler, publisher of the *Stormtrooper* (the organ of the American Nazis), quit the party to create the American National Party. Patler returned to the American Nazis the next year, but the main body of his followers—a New York splinter group calling itself the National Party—continued to oppose Rockwell. This group's newspaper was the *Nationalist*. It may be supposed that Rockwell's murder was due precisely to the fact that he did not suit certain members of the party and those who stood behind them.

p In practice the National States Rights Party (NSRP) is also fascist. The NSRP, which American authors say is larger and more active than Rockwell's group, was formed in 1958 by a merger of Jesse B. Stoner's Anti-Jewish Party and Edward R. Fields's Christian Anti-Jewish Party. Stoner, a Georgia lawyer, had been a member of the Columbians, a fascist organization that emerged in Atlanta just after the war. Earlier still, in 1942, Stoner was head of the US Klans of Florida; in 1959 he was made Imperial Wizard of the Christian Knights of the KKK in Kentucky. Fields also had a hand in the creation of several racist groups. The United White Party, South Carolina Klan, US Klans of Florida, Conservative Party (Tampa), Citizens' Councils and many other small racist groups also joined the NSRP. The NSRP's proclaimed purpose is to "save America and the white race"; its hard core is made up of Klansmen.

p The NSRP's organ, the *Thunderbolt* (Georgia, circulation 12,000–16,000), deals in unbridled anti-Semitic and racist 193 propaganda. It has asserted that the movement to end the war in Vietnam, the mass confrontation during the 1968 Democratic Convention in Chicago, and other student demonstrations were inspired by "the Jews." Some local branches of the NSRP also publish newspapers—the *White Marylander* and the *Illinois American Nationalist* are examples—carrying the same type of material.

p At a NSRP gathering held near Jacksonville in 1967 Reverend Connie Lynch, a prominent figure in the party, told the audience to be ready to kill if that was the only way to stop the "niggers and Jews" and to "hate, hate, hate the enemies of God and the white man." The NSRP combines rabid anticommunism with its racism and anti-Semitism. At the same time the NSRP, in quest of support among whites, calls itself the party of workers and farmers. Its leaders proclaim, "We have a Social Security program that is much more generous than the present program." In March 1969 the *Thunderbolt* declared, "When the National States Rights Party comes to power, we will solve the race problem and have a white Christian America." The same year it stated that all Negroes, Jews, and Asians are foreigners, and thus cannot be part of white America.

p About a hundred delegates from nineteen states attended the NSRP convention in August 1967. The party's immediate aim is to gain control of local governments.

p In the 70s the NSRP (whose headquarters are in Marietta, Georgia, near Atlanta) had several hundred members. Its head, Jesse B. Stoner, ran for governor of Georgia; although he drew only 18,000 votes the campaign helped to further the party's propaganda drive in the state. In 1972 Stoner ran as a Democrat for the United States Senate; his racist and anti-Semitic views were aired in radio and television announcements. This hate campaign won Stoner over 40,600 votes in the primaries.

p Noteworthy among the other Nazi groups in the L'SA is the National Renaissance Party (the name comes from Hitler's political legacy), whose slogan is "One Race, One Nation, One Leader." It was formed in Yorkville, New York, in 1949. Its program includes "purging the Jews from cultural, economic, and political life, returning Negroes to Africa, and subsidizing the birth of healthy, white children."

These fascist groups, like the American Nazis, have until now remained isolated from the leading rightist groups, and without popular support.

The Right's Propaganda Machine

p America's right extremists want to spread their views among the broad masses of ordinary citizens, little by little creating a climate that will favor their establishing control over the executive and legislative branches of government. The millions of dollars in contributions that have poured in since the 50s have made it possible for the extreme right to propagandize its views on a grand scale. In 1962 there were around a thousand rightist organizations regularly publishing and disseminating literature.

p One of the ultras' principal publications is the newspaper *Human Events*. This weekly had only 13,000 subscribers in the 50s, but by 1963 it had grown into a million-dollar business with a circulation of over 100,000.

p The principal financial backers of *Human Events* included New Jersey governor Charles Edison and the industrialists William J. Crede, Walter Harnischfeger, H. L. Hunt, and J. Howard Pew. The National Foundation for Education in American Citizenship also made a large donation. The journalists Westbrook Pegler and Fulton Lewis, Jr., who had earlier supported Senator Joseph McCarthy, frequently published in *Human Events*, as did Rosalie Gordon, secretary of the ultra-rightist organization America's Future Inc. and author of a book attacking the Supreme Court.

p *Human Events*, like every other ultra-rightist periodical, has consistently opposed the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the social policies of each succeeding administration. The paper maintains that the Roosevelt administration, wittingly or unwittingly, followed the Soviet line, that the liberals welfare state is destroying the character of many Americans, and that the only way to relieve suffering and provide for the needy is voluntary Christian charity. Special issues have been devoted to assaults on the income tax and "socialized medicine."

p *Human Events* prints the views of extreme conservatives, but does not publicly associate itself with their most absurd demands and assertions. Thus it did not call for the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren or, with Robert Welch, brand Eisenhower a traitor, but it made room in its pages for those who did. It does not cry treason in Washington, but it does charge the administration with being soft on Moscow.

p *American Opinion*, the organ of the John Birch Society, savagely attacks every manifestation of liberalism in American politics. In the spirit of Senator Joseph McCarthy it labels "communist" large philanthropic foundations (which in Welch's view are financing the student revolutionary movement and spreading communist ideas in the schools); leading bourgeois newspapers such as the *New York Times*, the *Los Angeles*

Times, and the *Washington Post* (often referred to as the Washington edition of *Pravda*); and the National Council of Churches of Christ, the Methodist Federation for Social Service, and other religious organizations.¹⁵⁰ In its crusade against the forces of peace, democracy, and socialism *American Opinion* finds an inexhaustible supply of ammunition in the materials of the FBI and the investigative committees of the McCarthy era.

p The *National Review*, with a circulation of nearly 112,000, has assumed the mantle of intellectual leadership in the far right. It was created by William F. Buckley, son of an oilman, who was a loyal supporter of McCarthy. At various times its staff has included Brent Bozell (comrade-in-arms of Joseph McCarthy and of Barry Goldwater), James Burnham (an extremist professor), Frank Meyer, William F. Rickenbacker and Clarence Manion (well-known rightist leaders), Godfrey Schmidt (a legal expert with extreme rightist views), Morrie Ryskind (a playwright), and General A. C. Wedemeyer. No less reactionary are the journal's contributors, who include theologian Will Herberg, Henry Hazlitt, philosopher Russell Kirk, historian John Chamberlain, and professor of political science Willmoore Kendall. Articles by members of America's academic community have made the *National Review* the intellectual standard-bearer of the right. Buckley himself is considered a most accomplished journalist; he writes for dozens of newspapers with a circulation of millions. He styles himself a "radical conservative." Buckley's journal acclaimed the birth of the John Birch Society, which "stirred the slumbering spirit of patriotism in thousands of Americans, roused them from lethargy."¹⁵⁷ Its editors are sober enough to reject the ultra-rightist myth that the "reds" are already in control of Washington, but they are convinced that liberalism is leading the USA down the primrose path. Thus the journal wages constant ideological war against the liberal aspects of the policies of the American ruling class, which the right terms the "liberal establishment."

p The *Dan Smoot Report* is one of the right's best-known publications, and one of its least restrained. It was created by Dan Smoot, a former FBI agent and a close associate of Texas billionaire H. L. Hunt, in 1955.

p Many rightist and ultra-rightist organizations have their own periodicals: in 1965 the journal of Billy James Hargis's *Christian Crusade* had 130,000 subscribers; *Farm and Ranch*, a reactionary newspaper published by Thomas J. Anderson (a member of the Birch Society's National Council), had a circulation of 1.3 million; the Conservative Society of America's *Independent American*, 50,000; and so on. Most states, especially in the South, have rightist journals: the *American Eagle* in Kentucky, the *Crusader* in Florida, the *Alarm* in West Virginia, the *Alabamian*, etc.

p The *American Mercury* has a tradition of conservatism and racism. In the mid 30s its publishers opposed Roosevelt and reform. In the early 50s Russell Maguire, a fervently anticommunist millionaire, bought the journal. Since then the *American Mercury* has become a mouthpiece for racists and ex-Nazis. In January 1961 it came into the hands of the Defenders of the Christian Faith, Inc., a fundamentalist organization formed in 1952 by Gerald Winrod, who supported Hitler in the 30s. William F. Buckley and other far-

right ideologues of today passed their apprenticeship here,¹⁵⁸ side by side with George Deathrage, Robert Edward Edmundson, and others who in the 30s enthusiastically proclaimed Hitler to the American people.¹⁵⁹

[p](#) In addition to the usual fare offered by ultra-rightist periodicals the *American Mercury* regularly prints articles defending Rudolf Hess and other Nazi criminals. It claims that the mass extermination of Jews by the Nazis during the Second World War, the ovens at Dachau, and other such horrors never really existed. The journal praised *The Iron Curtain Over America* by John O. Beaty, a colonel in military intelligence. Beaty parrots the anti-Semitic fabrication that a Zionist-communist 197 conspiracy is threatening Western civilization; marshals facts from archeology, anthropology, and modern genetics in an attempt to justify segregation; and argues that only war can effectively regulate population growth.¹⁰⁰

[p](#) The gospel of political extremism, racism, nationalism, and anti-Semitism is also preached by publications such as the *American Nationalist*, *Common Sense* (Christian Educational Association), and the *Citizen* (Citizens' Council of America). In 1968 the circulation of the *Councilor* (the organ of the White Citizens' Council of Louisiana) reached 213,500, making it one of the ultras' most widely read periodicals.

[p](#) The Daughters of the American Revolution, the Sons of the American Revolution, the American Flag Committee, the National Renaissance Party, the Farmers Liberty League, the National Small Businessmen's Association, local chambers of commerce and manufacturers' associations, the American Legion, and numerous other rightist and ultra-rightist groups publish periodicals and also pamphlets and full-length books presenting their views.

[p](#) Right-wing book stores appeared in many American cities during the 60s. Poor Richard's Book Shop in Hollywood, the largest such store in southern California (later moved to Hamilton, Montana), was established by Frank Ranuzzi, owner of an insurance agency. Its shelves are stocked with titles such as *The Art of Shooting, Explosives and Homemade Bombs, We Shall Fight in the Streets, Blaster's Handbook, Modern Guerilla Warfare*, and *How to Go Live in the Woods on \$10 a Week*. This literature was chosen in the spirit of the Minutemen, the shock troops of the extreme right. Ranuzzi himself has been a member of the Birch Society since 1959.¹⁶¹

[p](#) The California organization Constructive Action is one of the largest purveyors of rightist ideas; it handled distribution of 2.6 million books in 1964. In 1966 Constructive Action helped to distribute all over the country 250,000 copies of a book attacking the government's "War on Poverty."

[p](#) In New York the Bookmaker (established in 1953 by Lyle Hugh Munson, a former CIA agent) claims customers in all fifty states and in 109 foreign countries. In 1961 alone it sold about two million anticommunist books. The store itself publishes a thirty-five-volume "freedom library" selling for a hundred dollars. Farm Bureaus and many corporations have bought 198 sets and donated them to libraries and schools.¹⁰² An

example of the sort of literature in which the Bookmailer trades is the *John Franklin Letters*, a manual of arms for those who are ready to form an underground army to overthrow the US government. This book, written by a former CIA agent is a best seller among Birchers.¹⁶³

Other book stores disseminating ultra-rightist literature are the Joe McCarthy Bookstore (Boston), the Freedom Bookshelf (Lombard, Illinois), the Patrick Henry Book Store (Los Angeles), and the Freedom Center Book Store (Kansas City). At the start of 1966 there were as many as 360 such stores around the country.

The ultras spend enormous sums on disseminating their literature; many corporations have lent a hand.

The Christian Freedom Foundation, the Foundation for Economic Education, and the American Economic Foundation are also active in diffusing the ultras' ideas. They spend between \$1 and \$1.5 million each year on a campaign for government noninterference in business affairs. Big business eagerly backs such foundations; through them it hopes to influence economic and social thought, and to shape the political opinions of average Americans. The Christian Freedom Foundation publishes a column syndicated in 225 daily and 450 weekly newspapers. It describes labor unions as "stemming from socialism," the income tax as "Communist doctrine," foreign aid as subsidizing "Socialistic schemes and experiments," and the UN as a tool "to promote Marxist philosophy throughout the world" and to destroy a free society.

The Foundation for Christian Education was formed in Irvington, New Jersey, in 1946 to encourage studies showing the necessity of avoiding government interference in business, which the foundation equates with "socialism" and "communism." It is supported by 1,200 industrialists. Its monthly, the *Freeman* (circulation 60,000), is mailed free to students, teachers, clergymen, and business executives. Leonard Read, head of both the foundation and its journal, declared in a Dallas speech that the purpose of his organization is to reverse America's present unholy trend toward all-out Statism. The foundation has an annual budget of \$500,000; it is financed by such corporations as General Motors, Du Pont, Chrysler, Gulf Oil, and US Steel.¹¹¹¹

199

Data gathered by a private organization, Group Research, Inc., show that between 1960 and 1965 circulation of right-wing publications grew faster than that of left-liberal publications, and twice as fast as that of the mass press as a whole. According to the *Progressive* "the combined paid circulation of the sixteen leading 'left-of-center' periodicals for the year ending with issues of September, 1965 was 557,852. The combined total for the sixteen leading publications of the right was 856,244."¹⁶⁵ Over the same period the circulation of publications recommended by the Birch Society increased from 101,261 to 332,886.¹⁰⁸

p The ultras do not, of course, limit their propaganda effort to the press; they also reach an audience of millions each week over radio and television. Rightist propaganda is a staple of the 20th Century Reformation Hour (with the redoubtable Carl McIntire), the Manion Forum, H.L. Hunt's Life Lines, the Dan Smoot Report and certain other radio programs.

p No detailed description of the far right's propaganda arsenal will be made here, but its particular strength in the use of radio should be noted. America's Future broadcasts a fifteen-minute commentary over 365 stations in forty-eight states; the Conservative Society of America's daily Independent American was carried by thirty-nine stations in eighteen states (mostly in the South); the Church League of America's program, by twenty-nine stations in sixteen states; Hargis's daily program, by almost 300 radio and seven television stations; the Christian Freedom Foundation, which was supported by millionaire oilman Howard Pew, sponsored the weekly radio program of one Howard Kershner, carried by 148 stations in forty-one states; and so on. It has been calculated that in the second half of the 60s rightists organizations and allied conservative groups pushed their ideas over 7,000 radio stations in no less than 10,000 broadcasts a week at a yearly cost of between \$30 and \$40 million.

The press, radio, and television are not, of course, the only means the ultras use to influence the public; their leaders frequently speak at meetings and rallies, and organize various schools, seminars, clubs, reading rooms, and libraries. Even a brief survey of the activities of the main extremist organizations in this field is enough to show clearly that rightist propaganda in the USA is a powerful offensive weapon.

The American Right and Youth

p In the McCarthy years American students were passive, their demonstrations against the spiritual terror few and isolated. In the 60s this situation gave way to a massive mobilization of young people against the aggressive policies of the USA abroad and social injustices at home. But the rightist reaction to this movement also caught up certain segments of America's youth.

p The rise of this right-extremist trend among young people is bound up with the activities of the American far right as a whole, which hopes to increase its power over the political life of the entire country by drawing youth into its orbit. In February 1962 the *Progressive* wrote that the radical right's effort to influence the young had grown to an unprecedented scope, and noted that "the 'Conservative Club' boom in the colleges is generously financed by wealthy adults and powerful corporations."¹⁶⁷

p The John Birch Society and other extremist groups have published and widely disseminated many books and pamphlets in an attempt to turn students away from liberal ideas.

p Billy James Hargis, leader of the Christian Crusade, believed that youth, in order to be "saved," must be involved as much as possible in the anticommunist effort; he set up an anticommunist university for young people at Manitou Springs, Colorado, which held six two-week seminars for students each summer.

p In a number of states wealthy citizens funded "freedom schools" for college and senior high-school students. In 1965 one of these schools, held near Colorado Springs, attracted rightist lecturers such as Frank Chodorov, Leonard Read, Milton Friedman, and Ludwig von Mises.

p The American Farm Bureau Federation has also directed an intense propaganda campaign toward young people.¹⁰⁷ This campaign is closely connected with Benson's National Education Program, whose materials it regularly uses. Under the guise of patriotism and citizenship the federation, in conjunction with local chambers of commerce, holds yearly "conferences," "citizenship seminars," and "freedom forums" (lasting from two to five days) for farm youth. In 1967 Benson himself appeared at seminars in North and South Dakota, Missouri, and Kansas. 201 The federation, in turn, makes large contributions to Harding College, which Benson heads.

p In 1960 Robert Welch urged Birchers to join local ParentTeacher Associations so as to gain control over them. In 1965 Mrs. Jennelle Moorhead, president of the National PTA Congress, cautioned that the Birch Society's attempts to infiltrate PTAs in at least thirty-five states were "a clear and present danger to freedom and democracy," and not to be underestimated. The National Congress sent out to its 47,000 chapters (12,000,000 members) a pamphlet on the struggle against right extremists.¹⁰⁸

p Rightists take active part in the selection of boards of education; in some places they exert direct pressure, recommending tendentious films for pupils and teachers, and demanding that school curricula and texts be made to comply with their principles. Welch frequently reminds his followers of the need to work with young people; he himself has spoken on many occasions at important universities—Howard, Berkeley, etc.¹⁰⁹ The Christian Anti-Communist Crusade makes special efforts to bring the message of Frederick C. Schwarz, its guiding spirit, to students: it particularly encouraged teachers and students to attend its forums in Dallas and Phoenix. Most of the 10,000 people who came from three states to Shreveport, Louisiana, to attend Schwarz's "school of anti-Communism" were senior high-school students.

p The National Education Program, one of the extreme right's largest propaganda centers, maintains close contacts with educational institutions. In the mid 60s its films were shown in more than 3,000 schools in thirty-five states, and its lectures were heard all over the country. Every summer high-school students from all parts of the USA attended Benson's "Week of Harding." One-day anticommunist seminars were held during the rest of the year. Benson claimed that over a hundred private colleges had programs patterned after his.¹⁷⁰

p In the early 70s the Birch Society began to publish a handbook for educators and students on ways to drive democratically minded persons and liberals off campus.¹⁷¹ The society set up camps throughout the country in an effort to to recruit young people; attendance was approximately 1,000 in 1973.

202

p Instructors who fight the spread of rightist ideas are branded "pinkos," "reds," or "traitors," and are threatened and harassed. The right has been especially successful in forcing "undesirables" out of their jobs in small towns and rural areas.¹⁷² The National Education Association reported that in several Arizona communities extremists had hounded teachers out of their jobs.¹⁷³ "W. R. Fulton, University of Oklahoma professor of education, said that a survey he had made revealed that in thirty-four states the PTA Congress reported it had faced 'rabble rousing tactics of the extremists.'¹⁷⁴

p The right also strives to control school programs, texts, and teaching aids. In February 1962 the *Progressive* reported, that almost every week brought another story from some part of the country about harassment of authors whose books or teaching aids displeased local ultra-rightist groups.¹⁷⁵ In 1961 Texans for America, headed by J. Evetts Haley (a cattle and oil millionaire), forced the state's educational authorities to review all the history texts in use with an eye to the demands of the right; the criteria used were worked out by the House UnAmerican Activities Committee. Some members of Haley's organization turned up on the Texas State Board of Education. In Midland, Texas, local rightists got several books removed from school libraries.

p In Wichita a group of businessmen prevailed upon educational authorities to accept printed materials and films from the National Educational Program. Educators in California were so busy negotiating with rightist leaders that they had no time left for the school program. Several teachers were anonymously threatened with lynching. Coast Federal Savings and Loan Association's "free enterprise department" sent out materials to many of Los Angeles County's 1,500 public schools; not content with this, it also held "forums on Americanism" all summer long. Rightists gained control of Pepperdine College (Los Angeles), which held California Freedom Forums, cooperated with Harding College, worked with teachers, and produced a film. In Louisiana a law requiring all school students to view Birch Society films was adopted. The study of works by rightist ideologues was mandatory in Florida schools. In Wisconsin the right tried to push through a resolution creating a commission to investigate the contents of school textbooks.

203

p The Textbook Evaluation Committee of America's Future, having studied several hundred texts in the social sciences, concluded that most of them devoted too much attention to civil rights, political freedoms, and the role of government in the economy, while slighting the "right to acquire and hold property,"¹⁷⁰ the "right to work," and

the economic importance of free enterprise. A special commission of the National Education Association, which became the target of continual attacks by the Birchers, ascertained that in 1965 29 percent of the books objected to by the right were taken out of schools.¹⁷⁷

In the 60s so-called Courses on Communism became one of the chief means for inculcating anticommunist ideas in schools. They were introduced in almost every state; in some places they became mouthpieces for anticommunism, weapons in the cold war. These courses were mandatory in several states. The *Progressive* reported that their reading lists often included literature approved by the Birch Society, and that Birchers such as Clarence Manion, Thomas Anderson, and E. Merrill Root were regarded by the organizers of such courses as authorities on communism.¹⁷⁸

The American journalist Irwin Suall pointed out that in the 60s literally millions of schoolchildren throughout the nation wrote essays on "patriotism" and "free enterprise" for contests. Suall, like many other American authors, noted that although the impact of these rightist-sponsored contests is hard to measure, they must certainly have "a serious effect."¹⁷⁹

The right's drive to reach students had succeeded, by the early 60s, in establishing several dozen rightist and ultra-rightist youth organizations. Students for America, founded in 1952, had 2,500 members in 160 schools and colleges in thirty-five states. Its honorary president was General Douglas MacArthur, a man highly honored in ultra-rightist circles. The group held no elections; all chapters were rigidly subordinated to the central leadership. It maintained contact with official anticommunist investigative bodies, and was unscrupulous in gathering information on international leftist organizations. Students for America had a National -Security Division, whose makeup was kept strictly secret. Its program—"Students' Answer to the Marxist Challenge"—declared that the leftist movement among young people was inspired by Communists. The group disseminated the materials of the Foundation for Economic Education and of other ultra-rightist organizations.

But the influence of most rightist student organizations did not extend beyond individual universities or even departments. The Student Committee for Congressional Autonomy at Northwestern University may serve as an example. Its members, unlike the great majority of young people, held that congressional committees had the right to probe the politics and ideology of American citizens. The committee considered distributing the materials of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee its main goals. The Phoenix Student Anti-Communist League fought "communist influence" among college and senior high-school students.

In March 1961 the Students Associated Against Totalitarianism was formed at the University of California at Berkeley. In 1963 its newspaper, *Tocsin*, had 2,000 subscribers around the country and a general circulation of 5,000.

p The Crusade for God and Freedom may be named among the small student extremist organizations formed in the early 60s. Its anticommunist newspaper, the *Student Statesman*, was sent out to the libraries of all American and Canadian institutions of higher learning. Students for Freedom, a small group at San Diego State College, has been publishing the bulletin *Evolve* since October 1960; with the help of wealthy patrons *Evolve* is distributed to students free.

p In January 1960 the National Student Committee for the Loyalty Oath was formed to oppose the democratic forces fighting the established practice of requiring a loyalty oath from students receiving financial aid from the federal government. M. Stanton Evans, a young rightist ideologue of that time, called creating the committee the first real step from philosophical speculation to political action.

p The largest ultra-rightist youth organizations are the International Studies Institute (ISI) and the Young Americans for Freedom. The ISI was born in 1953. Its founder, Frank Chodorov, dedicated it in his manifesto, "A Fifty Year Project," to spreading militant individualism among young Americans.

p By 1956 the ISI had carried its message to 400 of the nation's universities and colleges. Around 60,000 students had received its literature. Many of today's right-extremist intellectuals and 205 ideologues are graduates of the school of journalism organized by the ISI in conjunction with the managers of *Human Events*.

p At several universities clubs came into being through the influence of the LSI: at the universities of Wisconsin and Michigan they were called Conservative clubs; Queens College had the Robert A. Taft Club; Cornell University, the Gentlemen of the Right; and so on. In 1963 there were about seventy such clubs; by 1968, over one hundred. The clubs of the Mid West were especially active. By late 1967 the ISI had approximately 35,000 members across the country; no less than 14,000 new members joined during the 1966/67 academic year alone. According to M. Stanton Evans the ISI became "the largest explicitly ideological group on the American campus."¹⁸⁰

p In the late 60s fourteen student bulletins and magazines were being published under the aegis of the ISI: *Insight and Outlook* at Wisconsin, the *New Individualist Review* at Chicago, *Analysis* at the University of Pennsylvania, etc.¹⁸¹ The *Intercollegiate Review*, published by the ISI itself, has a circulation of 45,000.

p The ISI has been conducting "summer schools" since 1960; students hear lectures from prominent rightist ideologues and ultra-reactionary Congressmen. Diverse topics are considered: "A Conservative Approach to American Foreign Policy" (Indianapolis, summer 1961); "The Responsible Right" (Princeton University, 1962). Four "schools" were held during the summer of 1971—at Stanford, Marian College (Indianapolis), American University, and Manhattan College—to "examine issues of continuing importance to the preservation of a free society." The teachers included right-wing ideologues Frank S. Meyer, Ludwig von Mises, Stefan Possony, and Ernest van den Haag.¹⁸²

p The lectures presented at such "schools," like the ISFs main publications, excoriate the ideas of bourgeois reformism and its practice in the USA over the past forty years.

p The ISI, like other ultra-rightist organizations, favors the use of federal and local police to suppress the democratic movement in the USA. In particular it approved the breaking up—with police cudgels—of a May 1960 student demonstration against the House Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco, and maintained, with FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover, that it had been inspired by communist agitators.¹¹¹ The ISI has regarded 206 in the same light all subsequent demonstrations for peace and democracy in the USA.

p The ISI is generously financed by several right-leaning foundations and by companies such as Gulf Oil, Sun Oil, United States Steel, and the Allen-Bradley Corporation. It received over \$200,000 in contributions in 1962.

p The most influential ultra-rightist youth group in the USA at present is the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF). Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater, who in the early 60s emerged into the limelight of American politics, figures largely in the story of its origin. After the 1960 Republican convention in Chicago he thanked young conservatives for their support, and suggested that they form an organization. About a hundred representatives from forty-four campuses met in Sharon, Connecticut (home of William F. Buckley), on September 9 through 11 of that year to found the YAF. Eloquent witness to the orientation of the new group is the fact that its national council included eleven members of the John Birch Society.

p The ideology and politics of the YAF are based on the theories of well-known rightist economists such as Ludwig von Mises, F. A. Hayek, and Milton Friedman, who have been trying since the Second World War to rewrite the past fifty years in the economic and political history of the USA. These authors hold that the right to private property should be absolutely unlimited. Their demagoguery is directed against the very modest social and economic concessions the ruling class has been forced to make to the working people; they condemn the progressive income tax, minimum wage laws, various forms of social security, price controls, etc.—everything that runs counter to the immediate interests of property owners—as fatal to capitalism and the American way of life.

p The Sharon Statement, adopted at the YAF's founding conference, repeats the basic tenets of the ultra-conservative credo. It maintains that the free market is the only economic system compatible with personal freedom and constitutional government, and also the best way to supply human needs, and that government interference with it tends to break down the moral and physical fiber of the nation.

p Practically speaking, these demands for laissez-faire free enterprise are an anachronism, wholly unrealizable under the 207 conditions of state-monopoly capitalism. Politically, however, they remain attractive to many among the middle and especially the petty bourgeoisie, who are forced to shoulder the tax burden of the USA's immense government bureaucracy. With the help of such demagoguery rightists seek to gain the

support of America's numerous petty bourgeoisie for their struggle against the working class—the main force within the country fighting for social and economic change.

p As to foreign policy the Sharon Statement urges that the USA concentrate its efforts not on peaceful coexistence but on victory over communism all around the world.

p The Sharon Statement is the fullest exposition of the ideology of America's ultra-rightist youth as a whole. But its significance goes beyond that. Its basic theses were adopted unchanged by the American Conservative Union, a rightist organization that was formed in 1964 and carried considerable political weight in later years. The Sharon Statement became the manifesto of America's most reactionary forces, the battle standard of conservatism. Its authors see as their mission the preparation of young people "for the struggle ahead with Liberalism, Socialism and Communism"—which are the same in the eyes of the YAF.

p The YAF's members include both young Republicans at Eastern colleges who hope to make a career in that party and young people who tie their future hopes to the formation of a new, conservative party. By 1968 the YAF had about 600 chapters, with 25,000 members, in universities, colleges, and high schools. It reached its peak in 1969, but at the national convention that year a part of its membership split away, announcing support for the student and black movements and for the struggle of the American people against the USA's aggressive war in Vietnam. Order was restored to the ranks of the YAF in the 70s.

p The YAF is well financed; its national advisory committee includes many well-known backers of the right associated with the John Birch Society and the National Security Council. It also receives numerous small contributions.

p The YAF is highly active in organizing meetings and circulating sundry petitions. It vigorously supports conservative candidates to local and national office. In January 1961 it picketed the Capitol in support of the House Un-American Activities Committee, driving off pickets opposing that inquisitorial body. In 208 February 1962 YAF members from the University of Arizona picketed the Mexican consulate in Tucson over Mexico's refusal to vote to exclude Cuba from the Organization of American States. The YAF also exerted itself on behalf of Goldwater's presidential campaign, which will be discussed in the next section.

p Youth for Wallace, which arose during the 1968 presidential campaign, helped the Alabama racist win the votes of about 15 percent of Americans between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-nine.^^1^^'^^1^^ The group did not disband after Wallace's defeat: in 1969 it became the National Youth Alliance, claiming 3,000 members between fourteen and thirty years of age. It publishes a monthly bulletin, *Action*, and a quarterly, *Attack!*^^185^^ The alliance's leaders advance the usual arguments against left-radical and democratic organizations. Like the YAF it points to the chronic social problems of the USA as the direct result of the government's "liberal" policies.

The alliance, like many other ultra-rightist groups, seeks to recruit new members with talk about fighting drug addiction, restoring law and order, and neutralizing (and where possible, crushing) the black civil-rights movement. Such tactics, writes S. R. Koeppen, mark the beginning of a new stage in the rightextremist movement.¹⁸⁰ The alliance stands out because of its fascist cast: its leaders call on America's youth to finish what the Fiihrer started.

Rightists on the March: the 1964 Elections

p “Heavily financed and better organized than ever before, the far right has been recruiting new members at an alarming rate,” wrote the *Progressive* in August 1965.¹⁸⁷

p In the 60s the far right set out to save America from the "communist plot." To this end it worked to muster as many supporters as possible from diverse segments of society and to fuse all rightist groups into a unified political force capable of decisively influencing the policies of the American government. In the late 50s and early 60s the USA had about a thousand rightist 209 and ultra-rightist organizations with a total membership (according to journalists Donald Janson and Bernard Eismann) of approximately one million. A Gallup poll showed that at that time the John Birch Society had the approval of three million Americans. At the beginning of the 60s the right was a real political force with representatives in federal, state, and local government.

p By the reckoning of American journalists about one-third of the Eighty-Seventh Congress—162 Representatives and 25 Senators—belonged to the right or ultra-right, and about fifty right-wing organizations were lobbying in Washington against liberal legislation.¹⁸⁸

p In 1964 numerous organizations of the right and far right, formerly local, joined hands nationally to support Barry Goldwater, the Senator from Arizona, for President of the United States.

p The main force of Goldwater's adherents was made up of the nouveaux riches of the West and South, prosperous businessmen, big provincial bankers, oil millionaires, the owners of flourishing clinics, AMA members in private practice, and the publishers and editors of small-town newspapers. Those who blamed the Eastern establishment for the decay of nineteenth-century values also rallied to him.¹⁸⁹

p Barry Goldwater began his political career in his native Arizona. He joined the Republican Party in 1930; at that time Arizona was virtually a one-party state, with twelve Democrats to every Republican. In 1949 Goldwater was elected to the Phoenix city council. The next year he managed the governor's election campaign. He gained

influence among Arizona Republicans and began to prepare for a Senate seat, which he won in 1952. His campaign expenses, \$44,700, were largely met by the millionaires H. L. Hunt, Elliott Richardson, and Client Murchison, and also by Americans for America, an ultra-conservative organization. Goldwater openly allied himself with the isolationists and the backers of McCarthy, whom he called "a faithful, tireless and conscientious American."¹⁹⁰ Goldwater's unstinting support of McCarthy won him national note as America's "Mr. Conservative."

p As a senator, Goldwater stood solidly against the unions and social reform. On April 8, 1957, during the debate on the 210 national budget, he called the administration's proposed outlays for social needs "a betrayal of the people's trust."¹⁹¹

p Goldwater opposed federal aid to chronically depressed areas and to higher education, federal appropriations for construction of housing and schools and for training unemployed workers, wage increases for federal employees, the minimum wage law, the Youth Employment Act, Medicare, and any weakening of the Taft-Hartley Act; he was not on hand to vote on the Civil Rights Bill.¹⁹²

p He faithfully defended the monopolies. In May 1961 he declared in Flint, Michigan, that "big business must be preserved if America was to remain the defensive shield for the world."¹⁹³ And further: "In the face of our struggle for survival in an increasingly hostile world, we must no longer ask ourselves whether an industrial organization is too big, but rather is it big enough to do the job. . . Who can do these jobs if we continue to pursue the suicidal antibigness mania of some of our professional reformers? The only alternative is to turn die tasks over to big government."¹⁹⁴

p Goldwater became a sought-after speaker at the conferences, conventions, and promotional dinners of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers, and other organizations of businessmen.

p The senator's militaristic views accorded with the spirit of the right's foreign policy program and with the needs of the powerful military-industrial complex.

p In 1962 he published a book pretentiously titled *Why Not Victory?* It was hypocritically dedicated "To my children and all the children of the world, to whom tomorrow belongs." Goldwater wrote: "At this moment in history, the disarmament concept is an effective weapon in the hands of the communists and a danger to the freedom of mankind."¹⁹⁵ He argued that America should "announce in no uncertain terms that we are *against* disarmament. . . We need weapons for both the limited and the unlimited war."¹⁰⁰ He blamed the steady unfolding of the world revolutionary process, the victory of national liberation revolutions, and the downfall of colonialism on the US government's "no-win policy." If the world revolutionary process is to be stopped, he wrote, "victory over communism must be the dominant, proximate goal of American policy."¹⁹⁷ To secure this victory military 211 potential must be built up, no matter what the cost to average Americans.

p Goldwater proposed that diplomatic relations with the USSR and the other socialist countries be broken off and an economic, political, and psychological war unleashed. He said, "We should encourage the captive peoples to revolt against their Communist rulers. . . We should establish close liaison with underground leaders behind the Iron Curtain, furnishing them with printing presses, radios, weapons, instructors—the paraphernalia of a fullfledged resistance." To back up these preparations, Goldwater wanted the United States to be ready to undertake military operations against the socialist countries. He said that "if there were a situation such as occurred in Budapest in 1956 we ought to present the Kremlin with an ultimatum forbidding Soviet intervention and be prepared, if the ultimatum is rejected, to move a highly mobile task force equipped with appropriate nuclear weapons to the scene of the revolt."¹⁹⁸

p During the Cuban crisis Goldwater charged President Kennedy with indecisiveness. He demanded support for Cuban counterrevolutionaries, an economic blockade of the island, and—if these measures failed—the forcible overthrow of the Castro government.

p Goldwater was highly popular among Republicans in the early 60s. He worked hard to build the party's prestige. He felt that the Republicans should leave liberalism to the Democrats and embrace conservatism. But he argued that the fight for conservatism should not be taken beyond the party: this would weaken the Republicans at the polls.

p The senator's tender concern for Republican unity sprang from his intention of turning the party into a bastion of conservatism and reaction, a rallying point for right extremists of every stripe. He regarded the John Birch Society as an important Republican reserve. In a letter (dated October 26, 1960) to Leonard Hall, chairman of the Republican National Committee, he recommended that Nixon include in his campaign platform a series of planks that would win the backing of the far right. He called Birchers "good people," and "the kind we need in politics."¹⁹⁹ He was equally warm in his sympathy with other extremists. But he disagreed with those rightist leaders who called for the creation of a third, conservative party, and in 1960 turned down the suggestion that he run for president as a third-party candidate. He urged conservatives to work for their goals within the Republican party.

p Goldwater's continually growing popularity in the party during the early 60s was met with unfeigned delight in rightist circles. On February 3, 1961, the aged General Douglas MacArthur wrote to Goldwater, "I am watching with growing hope and enthusiasm your political strategy. A great vacuum exists [in the Republican leadership] that you can fill."²⁰⁰ Goldwater received up to 800 letters a day, many of them from ordinary Americans who believed him to be a respectable politician and the true defender of their interests. His public appearances invariably attracted huge crowds. The speeches of the tall, erect, well-dressed senator, with his actor's sense of the audience, were highly effective and often ended with enthusiastic demonstrations of approval for his views.

p Goldwater was first tapped as a presidential candidate in 1959, when Gregory D. Shorey, Jr., South Carolina Republican Party chairman, invited him to speak at a dinner in his own honor at Greenville. Textile magnate Roger Milliken nominated Goldwater for

president at the South Carolina Republican convention in Columbia on March 26, 1960. In early July Independent Americans for Goldwater was established by Arizona banker Frank Cullen Brophy, Milwaukee industrialist Walter Harnischfeger, California rancher Hubbard Russell, and real-estate tycoon Paul H. Talbert, also of California. They got support from various ultra-rightist groups, among them the Birch Society. Welch wrote, "I know Barry fairly well. He is a great American. . . I'd love to see him president of the United States."²⁰¹

p But the senator recognized that the time was not ripe for him to run for president. On July 27, 1960, he thanked his disappointed backers at the convention for their confidence in him, and asked them to cast their votes for Richard Nixon, "the most intelligent, dedicated, and experienced leader" in the fight against the "communist conspiracy."²⁰²

p Almost immediately after Nixon's defeat Goldwater's adherents resumed their struggle for power in the Republican Party. In October 1961 businessmen and politicians, mostly from the South and West, met at the Avenue Motel in Chicago; they 213 decided that the Republican candidate in 1964 should be Barry Goldwater.²⁰³ A group of businessmen and politicians headed by F. Clifton White set out to rally the entire American right around Goldwater, to turn the Republican Party into an effective instrument of their politics. In early December 1962 this group called together over fifty representatives of wealthy families, most of them from the South, West, or Mid-West. Together they worked out a concrete plan for gaining control of the Republican Party at all levels.

p White's draft committee did not seek publicity, but after the December meeting its activities became known. Its existence was officially announced on April 8, 1963.²⁰⁴

p The draft committee began an active fund-raising campaign. The "oil kings" of the South and West were generous; hardly less so were the lords of the aerospace and other military industries, whose factories and laboratories stretch across the South and South-West. Californians contributed \$1.5 million to Goldwater's fund. The Republican campaign treasury received \$18.5 million in all. Goldwater "had eastern money, but he did not depend on it. He represented a new force—the suddenly burgeoning and supremely powerful economic dynasties of the South, the South-West and the West. This was space age and warfare state money."²⁰⁵

p But only 28 percent of individual contributions to the Republican Party came in sums of \$500 or more. The main part of the Republicans' funds came from 650,000 contributions of \$100 or less. The party got more financial support from the South and South-West, and less from the North and East, in 1964 than in 1960. Furthermore some traditionally conservative Republican sources remained closed to Goldwater.²⁰⁰

p At the polls Goldwater failed to carry rural New England, and lost part of the votes in the wheat belt—both conservative, usually Republican areas. The Hearst and Scripps-

Howard papers, the *New York Herald Tribune*, and other conservative and Republican papers came out for Johnson.²⁰⁷

The White committee's strategists could count on the ultraconservative intellectuals—William F. Buckley, Russell Kirk, Frank S. Meyer, William Rusher—for whom Goldwater was a hero. L. Brent Bozell, one of Buckley's nearest associates on the *National Review*, helped Goldwater write *The Conscience of a Conservative*. The book was a best seller in 1960; 3.5 million copies were sold in 1964.

Goldwater had the endorsement of the Young Republican National Federation (also known as the Young Republicans). According to some estimates, this group had as many as 600,000 members in the 60s. In 1970 it had 4,000 chapters across the country.²⁰⁸

The Young Republicans was founded in 1931. In the 50s and 60s it was dominated by its highly active right wing, which marched under the ultras' banner. At its 1957 convention in Washington it declared against federal aid to education, cultural exchange with the USSR, and trade with the socialist countries. This position was confirmed and extended at the next convention, in Denver. At the 1963 convention, in San Francisco, the Goldwater forces took command.²⁰⁹ On that occasion the John Birch Society was represented by delegates from California, Illinois, Iowa, and several other states. Addressing those assembled Goldwater labeled the Soviet Union's supplying of missiles to Cuba military occupation. He declared that the liberal Kennedy administration was moribund and incapable of acting decisively against Cuba. These incendiary remarks were cheered by the 3,000 delegates and guests.²¹⁰

The rise of the extremist Young Americans for Freedom is intimately linked with Goldwater's presidential campaign. His speeches were met with ovations at mass gatherings of young conservatives in New York in 1961 and 1962. It was the support of young rightists that gave Goldwater's 1964 effort its remarkable energy and stridency.

White's committee maintained close contacts with conservative women's organizations. Goldwater got an important boost from the National Federation of Republican Women, which at a conference at the Sheraton Park Hotel in New York (April 25 to 27, 1963) expressed agreement with his position on the basic issues of foreign and domestic policy.²¹¹ The delegates at the conference were well known in their party; back at home they showed great drive in circulating petitions and holding meetings in support of Goldwater.

The most fanatic contingent of the Goldwater forces was recruited from numerous ultra-rightist groups. They were behind many organizations around the country agitating for Goldwater. Many Goldwater backers belonged to the Birch Society, but the White committee, recognizing that any identification with the society would irreparably harm their candidate's chances, decided not to appoint Birchers to leadership posts in the election campaign. If Goldwater was to be serious contender he would have to win over American moderates. Therefore the White committee tried to keep its extremist allies quiet, although it did not spurn the Birchers.²¹²

p Goldwater's strategy departed from the traditional Republican reliance on the Mid-Western and Eastern states. He hoped, while retaining Republican influence in the Mid-West, to capture the "solid South"—up to then a Democratic stronghold. "Operation Dixie" had long been planned by the Republican leadership, which in 1957 had created a Southern section under J. Lee Potter of Virginia. But it was only with the advent of Goldwater that their efforts began to bear fruit. The 1964 Republican campaign, with its open racism, won support in rural areas of the deep South.²¹⁵

p A number of factors favored the Republicans' "Southern strategy." The Roosevelt and Truman administrations had brought a weakening of Southern power in the Democratic party that was bound to rankle. The government's social and economic policies and the race question were more significant sources of discord. The attempt to pass a civil rights bill in 1948 split the Democrats and led to the creation of the States' Rights Party, whose racist candidate, Strom Thurmond, won in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and South Carolina. Thurmond's was "a party of obstruction" opposing the administration's social and economic projects; in this sense its platform was purely negative. It was also an "anti-Negro party," appealing to the fear and bigotry of the poor Southern whites who made up its mass base.²¹⁴

p The Dixiecrat movement established a two-party system in the South. The Republican Party, which had gathered to itself the discontent rising from the growth of federal power, was naturally attractive to racists and the South's new industrial bourgeoisie, who were displeased with the Truman administration's social measures. And although the four states that Thurmond had carried returned to the bosom of the Democratic Party in 1952, four so-called marginal Southern states (Texas, Tennessee, Virginia, and Florida) went for Eisenhower.

216

p Goldwater seemed made to order for the South; his ultraconservative stance on social and economic questions, and tireless defense of states' rights struck a resounding chord in the "black belt." In Georgia the Democrats for Goldwater organization was headed by party chairmain James Gray himself. As Donald S. Strong puts it, "He ran triumphantly in the Deep South where neither Eisenhower nor Nixon had scored impressively."²¹⁵

p The Kennedy administration's proposed civil rights bill brought Goldwater and the racists still closer together. In 1963 public surveys showed that Goldwater was favored over other Republicans in most of the Southern states (including Arkansas, Florida, Tennessee, Kentucky, and North Carolina) and had solid support in the West.

p American authors' analysis of the social makeup of the delegations from the Deep South at the 1964 Republican convention in San Francisco makes it possible to form an idea of who guided Goldwater's campaign in that region: 74 percent of the Southern delegates were businessmen or professional people (doctors in private practice and lawyers), 20 percent housewives, and 6 percent farmers. The annual income of 43 percent

of the delegates was \$20,000 or more; of 17 percent between \$20,000 and \$15,000; of 29 percent between \$15,000 and \$10,000; of 11 percent under \$10,000. Not one of them could be called a representative of the working class.²¹⁸ The great majority of the delegates saw private initiative as the solution to America's basic social problems; only 3 percent saw the federal government in this role.

The contributions and enthusiastic support Goldwater received from a number of organizations proved crucial in the primary campaign. By summer 1963 young, aggressive conservatives from the South and West had effected a "quiet revolution" and gained leadership in the party. Democratic National Chairman John M. Baily remarked that "the real trend in the Republican party is not to bury Barry but to glorify Goldwater as the spokesman of dynamic reaction."²¹⁷

The new Republican leadership increased the staff of its national committee nearly fivefold—to 618. The Democratic National Committee had a staff of 302 in 1964.²¹⁸

After extensive organizational work by Goldwater's backers the White committee staged a grand rally for its candidate on July 4, 1963, in Washington. More than 9,000 people, representing forty-four states, jammed the hall; several thousand more were left standing in the street. Peter O'Donnel, chairman of the committee, told those assembled: "You and dedicated people like you in every state of the Union are beginning to write a new chapter in American political history. We are embarking on a great crusade together. This evening marks the first step toward our goal—to put Goldwater in and Kennedy out."²¹⁹

The unanimity and enthusiasm shown at the rally convinced Goldwater to run. Polls conducted that fall showed continuing growth in his popularity within the Republican Party. Fully 71 percent of the Republican state chairmen and 1,194 of the 1,404 Republican leaders who responded were behind Goldwater.²²⁰ It was now perfectly clear that the senator from Arizona would be President Kennedy's most serious opponent at the polls in 1964.

Goldwater's strength came from a bloc of the ultras, Southern racists, rightist military men, arms manufacturers, and those elements of the American business community that found the government's social and economic concessions to working people unacceptable. I. F. Stone regarded Goldwater's appeal to such "upper middle class solid citizens" as an omen of an alarming political situation in the USA.²²¹

But Goldwater's backers could not rest content with this bloc; to get to the White House their candidate would have to win over the majority of the American people. They were faced with the difficult task of building an acceptable image for Goldwater, something more substantial than his personal charm. His opposition to unions, defense of the monopolies, sympathy for the far right, and demands for "victory over communism" all betrayed him as an extremist. To compound the problem Goldwater did not hide his likes and dislikes.

p White and his helpers tried mightily to present Goldwater as a sober politician, to give him a patina of respectable conservatism. They managed to influence their candidate to some extent. His speeches became more cautious and restrained. He began to stress the need to defend the rights of ordinary citizens. He sought to exploit the liberals' failure to solve acute social problems, declaring, "When history is written, we Conservatives will be called the Liberals, since we are truly concerned with the freedom and rights of the people. The so-called Liberals profess to be humanitarians, yet they admit that 17,000,000 people go to bed hungry every night, and that 30 percent of our people are poorly housed and clothed. If, after 30 years of their Welfare State legislation, these facts are so, what is their answer? Is it for more giveaway legislation?"²²²

p No less self-serving were Goldwater's indictments of the federal bureaucracy and its social and economic programs, which he said "cover every major activity of state and local governments." On September 16, 1964, he declared in Montgomery. "We must bring government back closer to the people."²²³

p Goldwater remained the enemy of the unions, but he began to claim that he was not the enemy of working people. "I heartily subscribe to labor's trade union principle," he said. He represented himself as opposing racketeers and gangsters in the unions. If Goldwater was to be believed he only wanted to purge workers' organizations of bad leaders, to preserve the freedom of the individual working man and woman and to protect them against abuse and coercion by union bosses. But he inveighed against "compulsory unionism" (as the right calls the closed and union shop systems) calling it "a breach of our concepts of freedom."²²⁴ Behind this hypocritical defense of the "individual rights" of working people lay the intention of depriving unions of the right to represent workers and destroying the collective bargaining system.

p In *The Conscience of a Conservative* Goldwater had unreservedly denounced the Social Security system; during the election campaign he spoke of "modernizing" it. Earlier he had demanded that the graduated income tax be abolished but now, as one of his supporters put it, "he recognized that in the political world of the present such a revolutionary proposal would never be accepted."²²⁵ So he back-pedaled on this question, calling for reform of the tax structure as a whole.

p He was similarly equivocal on civil rights. "I am utterly opposed to discrimination in any form"—a nod toward the foes of segregation; "but I think it is not my business as a Senator from Arizona to be going around telling people in other states what they should do"²²⁰—that was for the South. Being against discrimination in words alone—not in deeds—was a position that suited the racists very well.

219

p Goldwater's campaign machine began talking about the "new" Goldwater, about his "new" approach to domestic, and foreign policy, about "progressive conservatism."

p But by and large the attempt to pass a reactionary off as a moderate was unsuccessful. Goldwater's stance on the main issues remained the same. On September 24, 1963, he was one of the nineteen senators who voted against the Moscow Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (which prohibited tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water). Five days earlier he had struck a rhetorical posture: "I do not vote against the hope of peace, but only against the illusion of it. I do not vote for war, but for the strength to prevent it";²²⁷ he also remarked that "fallout is less a present danger than [the] smog and fumes of everyday life."²²⁸

p The tragic events of November 1963 somewhat altered the course of the election campaign. They opened the eyes of many Americans to the truth about the Goldwater movement, and caused some shrinkage of its ranks. It was clear that John Kennedy had fallen victim to the anticommunist hysteria, bigotry, and fanaticism fed by the right. [219•*

p But Goldwater had no intention of breaking with the far right. In late 1962 and early 1963 he had put together a small personal staff, which he consulted on all practical matters; its head was Denison Kitchel, a member of the John Birch Society. Once Goldwater became an official candidate this group was transformed into the Goldwater for President Committee and took over all the work of the White committee, which was dismantled.²²⁹ Persons from Goldwater's home state, nicknamed the Arizona Mafia, were appointed to the new committee's chief posts.²³⁰

p On January 3 the Senator officially announced his candidacy. His position on the main domestic and international issues remained unchanged. On July 18, despite pressure from his backers, he voted against the Civil Rights Bill.

p In Manchester (January 1964) he asserted the right of NATO's European commander to discretionary use of nuclear weapons.²²⁰ In Concord he urged a new invasion of Cuba. He returned to the latter idea on February 9 in Washington, and further proposed that force be used against Britain and France, which were trading with Cuba in defiance of US demands. On May 23 he spoke of the possibility of using nuclear weapons as defoliants in Vietnam. He assured the public that the atomic bomb was nothing extraordinary in the history of warfare—just the most efficient means of destruction. These cynical remarks outraged progressives all over the world; Republican strategists were forced to plead that their candidate had been misunderstood.

p The party's campaign platform, framed to Goldwater's wishes, showed the same spirit. The Platform Committee, under the chairmanship of Representative Melvin R. Laird of Wisconsin, condemned "federal extremism" in domestic policy, called for a "limited, frugal and efficient" government, and in foreign policy demanded a "dynamic strategy aimed at victory."²³¹ Party moderates fought in vain for planks condemning the Birch Society, supporting civil rights legislation, etc.²³² The hard core of Goldwater delegates at the convention was "filled with hot scalding hatred for the Eastern establishment."²TM

p Goldwater's irresponsible comments, and the whole Republican platform, caused serious concern in the country. But this mood, clearly enough felt at the polls in November, was entirely absent at the Republican convention.

p July 17, 1964. San Francisco's Cow Palace boiled over with emotions. Two men, arms raised in the traditional victory salute, stood on the blindingly lit stage: Barry Goldwater, who had just been named the Republican Party's candidate for president, and Richard Nixon, who had nominated him to the convention. Goldwater said: "I would remind you that extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice! And let me remind you also that moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue!"²³⁴ These Words produced a roar of approval. The audience well understood that under his disguise as a defender of liberty Goldwater was an extremist in the defense of the right to property, of precisely the sort of liberty that H. L. Hunt, one of the pillars of the nouveaux riches, stood for.

p The proportions of Goldwater's victory at the convention were imposing. He won 883 of the 1,308 votes, receiving all the votes of nineteen states, and almost all those of thirteen more. (He lost thirteen states, among them nine in the North-East.) After the convention Dean Burch, a member of the Arizona Mafia, became chairman of the Republican National Committee.

p The 1964 elections were an impressive demonstration of the increased sway of the right in the USA. A rightist presidential candidate won 27,000,000 votes (38.5 percent of the electorate). But the elections also showed that the right's program was unacceptable to the great majority of voters. The Democratic candidate swamped Goldwater: 43,000,000 votes to 27,000,000. The Democrats now had 68 seats in the Senate and 295 in the House; the Republicans, 32 and 140. The Republicans' losses amounted to no less than 38 seats in the House, and 530 in the state legislatures.

p Looking back, Goldwater's strategists saw the cause of his defeat not in the candidate himself but in the caricature of him they accused the media of creating. They maintained that the words on extremism cited above got into his acceptance speech by chance. In White's opinion these words frightened the average voter, and proved fatal to Goldwater's whole campaign. In fact, of course, the senator knew what he was saying; his words truly expressed his beliefs, which were rejected by the American people.

p The lesson the Republicans extracted from the Goldwater debacle was that their platform had been too overtly extremist for the voting public. The party's committee in Washington adopted a resolution renouncing the Birch Society and all its works. On November 5, 1965, Ray C. Bliss, the new National Committee Chairman, asked all Republicans to reject membership in any radical organization which attempts to use the Republican Party for its own ends.

p In practice, however, it was not so simple to shake off the grip of the ultras, which despite the shock of 1964 was still quite strong. The far right's determination to work actively within the Republican Party was reaffirmed at the Congress of Conservatives organized by Kent Courtney in 1965.²³⁵ In the years that followed a virtual

internecine war raged as the right strove not just to hold on to its power but even to increase it. California and several other Western and Southern states remained citadels of the right. The Republican Assembly of California invited a Birch Society spokesman to make the keynote speech at its April 222 1965 convention, and "wildly applauded his assertion that if Goldwater were to run again he would win overwhelmingly."¹

p The ultra-rightist Liberty Lobby expressed the intention of working actively within the Republican Party. Its executive director, W. B. Hicks, called on conservatives to tighten their hold on local party organizations.

p The 1966 elections proved that the right and the far right had retained their power both in the Republican party and in the country as a whole. Goldwater loyalists defeated liberal Republicans in a number of state primaries. Conservative Republicans won in Wisconsin, Michigan, Colorado, New Hampshire, and Wyoming.²³⁷ They won resounding victories in gubernatorial race. Nearly all of the Republican governors re-elected in 1966 (seven in Southern and Western states) were markedly rightwing.

p Overt racists running on the Democratic ticket were at the helm in other Southern states. The rabid segregationist Lester Maddox was elected governor of Georgia; in Alabama Lurleen Wallace, the wife of George C. Wallace, became the first woman governor. At her swearing-in, on January 16, 1967, she promised to continue the struggle against integration and against the "federal bureaucracy," which she said was trying to take over the state school system. She declared, "As your Governor and as a mother, I shall resist it."¹⁸ Thousands of people, waving Confederate flags, applauded when she accused the Johnson administration of undermining the Constitution.

p The new influx of rightism displaced the center of gravity in the once liberal Republican Governors' Association. As the Ripori Society (a liberal Republican group) noted, the association came to be dominated by persons who had been identified with Goldwater in 1964.²⁹

p In the aftermath of the 1966 elections the only genuine liberal remaining in the Republican Party leadership was Senator Thomas Kuchel of California. (Somewhat earlier on Ray C. Bliss had replaced Dean Burch as chairman of the National Committee; this was a blow to the right, but no great victory for the liberals.) The great majority (especially in Congress) owed allegiance to the late Senator McCarthy or to Barry Goldwater.

p The elections of 1964 and 1966 led to a complex sorting out of the right's forces. Some, as has been seen, continued to put 223 their hopes in the Republican Party. With the lesson of 1964 in mind the most respectable representatives of this faction, such as William F. Buckley, decided to distance themselves from the John Birch Society, which they now regarded as pernicious, the cause of the right's defeat. Earlier Buckley had objected to Welch alone; now he censured the whole society. He declared, "The John Birch Society, judged objectively, above all things is a drag on the conservative

movement in America.”²¹⁰ The October 19, 1965 issue of the *National Review* was given over entirely to criticism of the Birchers.

p A group sharing Buckley’s view came together at Washington’s Statler Hilton in December 1964 to found the American Conservative Union. The union’s stated aims were to stimulate “responsible political action on behalf of conservative candidates for offices at all levels,” to increase the influence of conservative ideas on the public, and to enhance the power of conservatism “through unified leadership and action.” Its chairman, outgoing Representative Donald C. Bruce (R-Indiana), stressed that it had “no relation” to the Birchers.²⁴¹

p The Conservative Union politicians decided that their candidate for president in 1968 must be a man who on the one hand would satisfy the right and the extreme right, and on the other would not scare away the ordinary voter by categorically rejecting social and economic concessions to working people. They saw just such a man in former vice-president Richard Nixon.

p Other rightist factions did not agree. They believed that neither of the bourgeois parties would serve their purpose, and that the only solution was to create their own party, a conservative party. The Conservative Society of America called a Congress of Conservatives in Chicago toward the end of April 1965. This gathering of extremists and overt racists proved unable to form a unified conservative party, but a committee was established to coordinate work in the states toward the creation of such parties. It was suggested that their programs demand US withdrawal from the UN, the breaking off of diplomatic relations with the socialist countries, the “liberation” of Cuba and China, the repeal of civil rights legislation and the income tax, and the limiting of immigration.

p The Birch Society continued to be a leading force among the ultras after the 1964 elections. For it and groups like it Goldwater’s defeat was a reverse, but not a calamity. The JBS lost some members, but on the whole it prospered. It opened new regional offices in Washington, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, and New York. During 1964–1965 the number of JBS coordinators was increased from twenty-five to fifty-five. The society had \$6,000,000 in assets in 1965: in September of that year it formally opened a Washington office.²⁴²

p The society’s leaders, looking for new members, tried to represent it as a respectable, moderate-conservative organization; some of Welch’s earlier extremist declarations were toned down.*¹¹¹

p The Birch Society made a point of dissociating itself from the Minutemen, the KKK, and other terrorist groups. It tried to clear itself of charges of anti-Semitism and racism by setting up the Jewish Society of Americanists (mentioned above) and a scholarship fund for black students. A number of blacks were taken onto the propaganda bureau staff, and several rabid antiSemites and racists who had come into the public eye were expelled.

p The JBS's John Roussetot attempted to overcome the alienation and enmity feeling between it and the press. Public relations posts were created in San Marino (California), White Plains (New York), Dallas, Chicago, and Washington; they worked hard at building a more acceptable public image for the society and bringing about conditions favorable to recruiting.²⁴⁴

p In the second half of the 60s ad hoc committees became the Birchers' favorite device for drumming up popular support. These committees were given innocuous names, and their connection with the JBS was carefully hidden. People who joined them were not aware that they were being manipulated. One of the first such front groups was the Committee Against Summit Entanglement, whose purpose was to mobilize public opposition to the 1959 exchange of top-level visits between the USA and the USSR.²⁴⁵ TACT (Truth About Civil Turmoil), which was intended to cripple the civil rights movement, was put together somewhat later. TACT had chapters all over the country; the JBS's instructions prescribed that they be headed by well-known and respected figures from the American Legion and other veterans' groups. Members used pamphlets, meetings, the mass media, seminars, and letters to warn the public that the civil rights movement was a communist plot. Blacks from the JBS 225 propaganda bureau were brought forward to substantiate this claim. The film *Anarchy—U.S.A.*, shown all over the country, was an important tool in promoting TACT's thesis.

p The most successful of the JBS fronts were the Support Your Local Police Committees. This slogan became extremely popular in a nation troubled by anti-war and black unrest; it appeared on hundreds of thousands of bumper stickers and on billboards in several states. Schools held essay contests on this theme; radio stations devoted programs to it. Mayors in all parts of the country declared Support Your Local Police Weeks.²¹⁰ This drive brought the JBS into contact with police departments in Salisbury (Massachusetts), Trenton (New Jersey), and Town Hall (New York). In Los Angeles and Santa Ana (California) policemen joined the JBS. Some police authorities made no bones about their sympathy with the ultras; for example Los Angeles police chief William H. Parker said on the Manion Forum (a radio program) that he saw nothing wrong with policemen being Birchers.²¹

p Among the other committees that brought the JBS new members were TRAIN (To Restore American Independence Now), whose goal was to discredit the UN, and MOTOREDE (Movement to Restore Decency), which was created to offer nationwide resistance to sex-education courses in public schools—Welch called such courses "subversive monstrosities."²¹⁸

p By the close of the 60s such efforts had stopped, and even reversed, the decline in JBS membership.²⁴⁹ Some researchers in the USA believe that by the mid 60s 12 percent of the American public was in sympathy with the Birchers (up from 5 percent in 1962).²⁵⁰

p The cosmetic changes made after the 1964 elections did not affect the JBS's deep extremism. Gerald Schomp writes, "I can . . . say with certainty . . . that the top

leadership of the Society deliberately allows bigots, anti-Semites, and ignorant kooks and degenerates to remain in the organization—even when staff members, chapter leaders or good members try to get them out.”²⁵¹ And despite the JBS’s formal repudiation of racism it was actually, like other groups of its kind, pursuing a course toward rapprochement and merger with the racists in the second half of the 60s.

p In the late 60s and early 70s the Birch Society and kindred groups were still a force to be reckoned with in a number of 226 Western states. Birchers and like-minded persons infiltrated the board of regents of the University of Arizona. In 1970, together with the local chapter of the Young Americans for Freedom and the state legislature, they caused the firing of Professor Morris Starsky, who supported the civil rights movement. They had the approval of Governor Jack Williams, who made no secret of his warm regard for the JBS.²⁵²

p Part of the liberals’ effort to counter the increase in extremist activity was the National Council for Civic Responsibility, formed in September 1964. The council was headed by Arthur Larson, director of the World Rule of Law Center at Duke University, and former advisor to President Eisenhower.²⁵⁷ Larson noted that radical reactionary propaganda could no longer be discounted as the ravings of a small, closed hate group; it was reaching a wider audience, people who in no way could be called extremists.²⁵⁴

p The council decided to broadcast counter-propaganda twice a week over one hundred radio stations, mostly in the West and Mid-West. But a lack of funds forced it to close its New York offices in February of 1965, and this plan was given up. One of the council’s organizers, Dewey Anderson, said that interest had dropped off markedly after Goldwater’s defeat. He added, “The rightists can literally raise millions, but the educational side can’t raise a couple of hundred thousand.”²⁵⁵ In September of 1965 it became known that another liberal organization, Group Research Inc. (created in 1962 to probe the right’s activities), was in financial trouble.²⁵⁰

p Thus the right encountered no serious opposition, and continued to gather strength. By the mid 60s there were 3,105 rightist and ultra-rightist organizations in the USA. These organizations had 1.5 million members and between five and six million sympathizers.²⁵⁷

p In 1968 the work of the Birch Society was being done by one hundred coordinators, around a thousand section heads, and almost 4,000 chapter leaders. Its propaganda and that of other ultra-rightist organizations was being marketed at 450 stores around the country.²⁵⁸

The *Progressive* commented: “The growing influence of the Birch Society, and its many allies and imitators over the past ten years is more than the product of Cold War tensions, racial frictions, and the frustrations of a more complex century than any in 227 history. It is the result of the political and social illiteracy built into millions of citizens by the press, the schools, and the patterns and leaders of community life in the United States.”²⁵⁹

* * *

Notes

[219•*] On November 22, 1963, the day Kennedy arrived in Dallas, an attack on him, framed in black, appeared in the *Dallas News*. Among those who paid for its publication was Nelson Bunker Hunt, son of Texas millionaire H. L. Hunt. *Congressional Record* 1965, 111 (3): 3492.

The George Wallace Movement

p The 1968 presidential elections brought a fresh rightist offensive. This time the standard bearer was Alabama Governor George Corley Wallace. The Wallace movement was a serious setback to the Republicans' "Southern strategy"; it also split the ranks of the extremists—those who had lost faith in the Republican Party defected to Wallace. The Wallace movement was due to at least two factors: a powerful surge in the black civil rights movement, and the limited ability of the KKK to withstand that surge under new conditions.

p Wallace was born into a poor family. He worked his way through the University of Alabama. During the Second World War he served as a flight engineer in a B-29 bomber. In 1946, with the sponsorship of Governor James Elsha Folsom, he gained a seat in the Alabama legislature, where he became known as a liberal. In those days they called him a "pinko" and a "dangerous representative of the left." In 1955, as a district judge, he sentenced a racist who had killed a black to life imprisonment— an unprecedented occurrence for Alabama. In 1958 Wallace made his first and last unsuccessful try for the office of governor. He refused help from the KKK, and was supported by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and several unions. But at some time in these years Wallace began to lean toward reaction. He broke with Folsom, which greatly weakened his position and cost him the support of former friends. The disappointment hastened the evolution of Wallace the liberal into Wallace the racist.

p In 1962 he ran for governor as a Negro-hater. The Klan gave him its approval and collected for his campaign fund. On January 14, 1963, he became governor of Alabama, and pronounced the words that became his motto: "Segregation now—segregation tomorrow, and segregation forever."^^260^^ These words were heard round the country; they made Wallace a hero to Southern racists. That same year Wallace made headlines nationwide by taking up 228 a stand in the doorway to the University of Alabama, blocking the path of black students whom a federal court had allowed admission. The Kennedy administration was forced to send in Army regulars to hack up the court's decision.

p As a politician and as governor Wallace relied on strong-arm tactics. Under his leadership Alabama was turned into a police state. He set up a Sovereignty Commission, which the authors of a book on the 1968 elections describe as a "secret tribunal," to carry

out investigations at his orders. He made the State Highway Patrol, with close ties to the Klan, into a private police force answerable to him alone. Economic pressure and intimidation were an essential part of Wallace's system. Newspapers that criticized him lost their advertisers; people who opposed him had their barns burned or their cattle ponds poisoned. Armed Highway Patrolmen visited the governor's most vehement foes by night, threatening them with physical harm.²⁶¹

Wallace's philippics against the federal bureaucracy, shrill championing of free enterprise, and trenchant criticism of US foreign policy brought him to the attention of the far right. In the winter of 1963–1964 he was invited to speak in several states. Many rightists already regarded Wallace as their leader, and were ready to vote for him in the 1964 presidential race. In the primaries he won 34 percent of the vote in Wisconsin; 30 percent in Indiana, and 43 percent in Maryland. He ran well in big-city suburbs where the Birch Society was strong. In Milwaukee, Gary, and Baltimore he won the votes of semi-skilled and unskilled workers, some of them recent migrants from the South.²⁰²

After Goldwater's defeat Wallace became the leader of America's ultras, and their hope for 1968.

As governor, Wallace wooed Alabama's poor whites. He increased expenditures for old-age assistance, medical aid, and unemployment compensation. He gave teachers a significant raise, and expanded the budgets for public schools and higher education. He built many junior colleges and trade schools, and instituted a free textbook policy.²" In this respect his policies recalled those of Huey Long. During Wallace's governorship a strange coalition of extreme conservative and liberal groups began to take shape. The binding force was racism: 73 percent of Wallace's backers wanted progress for blacks to be halted.²¹

229

Wallace's building of schools, hospitals, and roads brought him a solid political profit—popularity among ordinary citizens, and their votes. They approved of these construction projects, which to a certain extent guaranteed them jobs and incomes. His antielitist rhetoric, directed against Wall Street and the entire Eastern establishment, responded to their mood. On this basis Wallace was called a defender of the "little guy," and even a populist, although his state continued to be last or near last in the union in standard of living, literacy, and medical care. Alabama also had the highest taxes on the sale of food and fuel, and the lowest on property and big business earnings.

The Wallace treasury's main sources of income were contracts with industry. In 1964 a federal agency investigated the awarding of consultant engineering contracts for highway work in Alabama; it found that state authorities were taking bribes, sometimes as much as \$80,000. In several cases firms had been forced to hire one of the governor's friends as an agent, at a handsome price. One such friend was Klan leader Robert Shelton, who received a fee of \$4,000. In early 1968 the Waugh Asphalt company filed suit against Alabama's finance director, Wallace's bosom friend Seymore Trammel. Trammel was

accused of demanding kickbacks of fifty cents to one dollar on every ton of asphalt, or an equivalent amount in contributions to Wallace's campaign. Another hotbed of corruption was the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board, where commissions on sales of whisky to the state were used to fill the Wallace treasury.²¹¹⁵ Such were the true colors of Wallace's populism.

[p](#) The Wallace for President drive got started almost immediately after Goldwater's defeat. It was launched by the racists of the South: on November 15, 1965, the Shreveport (Louisiana) *Councilor*, a newspaper published by the United Citizens' Council of America, announced the start of the campaign. The initiative was taken up by the KKK in several Southern states. Clubs of Wallace supporters arose in many states in 1967. Kent Courtney, the head of (the Conservative Society of America, was particularly active; his slogan was "Win with Wallace in 1968" ^V¹ he published a Wallace for President bulletin regularly during 1967– 1968. Wallace's candidacy was approved by rightist leaders in Alabama on January 25, 1967; on July 4, he received the blessing of the Minutemen's Patriotic Party. Wallace was also the candidate 230 of the American Nazis; not long before his death George Lincoln Rockwell spoke favorably of the possibility that Wallace might become president of the USA.

[p](#) The ultra-rightists and racists who stood behind Wallace, not wishing to work with the Republicans, created their own party, which figured under different names in different states. In Georgia and Louisiana it was the American Party, in Michigan and Utah the American Independent Party, in Maine and Indiana the George C. Wallace Party, in Kansas and Washington the Conservative Party, in New York the Courage Party, in Illinois and Massachusetts the Independent Party, in Texas the Constitution Party. In January 1968 the national American Independent Party emerged to coordinate the forces working for Wallace.

[p](#) The front ranks of the Wallace movement were made up of Birchers and members of the White Citizens' Councils, the Minutemen, the KKK, and the Liberty Lobby. Wallace declared that the Birchers he knew in Alabama were "some of our finest citizens."²⁰⁷ Thus it is no coincidence that the national committee of Wallace's party was made up almost entirely of Birchers.

[p](#) The right collected 1,662,000 signatures (according to Wallace's staff 2,717,000), which got Wallace's name onto the ballot in all fifty states. Some political commentators were astounded by this turn of events; not many believed that a racist politician would find any real backing outside the South. But in the end even sceptics were forced to admit that Wallace was becoming a national candidate. This set the Wallace movement apart from the South's other political drives, which had remained basically regional.

[p](#) The explanation is to be sought in the changes that had taken place in the USA's population structure over the past thirty or thirty-five years. More than four million black Americans left the South between 1940 and 1970; almost all of them settled in the industrial centers of the North-East and the Mid-West. In the mid 60s more than half of the black population lived outside the South. According to census data there were

2,167,000 blacks in (he state of New York in 1970 (11.9 percent of the population), 1,426,000 in Illinois (12.8 percent), 991,000 in Michigan (11.2 per cent), 970,000 in Ohio (9.1 percent), and 1,017,000 in Pennsylvania (8.6 per cent).²⁶⁸ It is also very important to note that blacks have become more urbanized than whites. According to 231 Census Bureau estimates nearly 70 percent of American blacks lived in cities in 1966. Only in four Southern states (Arkansas, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina) did rural blacks continue to outnumber urban.²⁶⁹

p For white workers in the industrial centers of the North this influx of cheap labor, ready to do any work, meant stiff competition in the job market and helped to strengthen anti-Negro feelings among some of the more backward segments of the working class. This feeling was also heightened by the arrival of another group of migrants from the South—impoverished white farmers, most of them infected with racial prejudice. Wallace's strongest support in the cities of the North came from white neighborhoods bordering on fast-growing black ghettos.²⁷⁰ Thus racism, earlier confined largely to the South, spread to many other regions of the USA.

p The tactics of the ultra-right and of George Wallace, its candidate, in the election campaign reflected the aggravated social and racial tensions of the 60s. Since the mid 60s the country had been shaken by a powerful anti-war movement among young people, and the struggle of blacks for their civil and social rights. Dozens of cities had seen spontaneous student demonstrations, which at times turned into open clashes with police, the National Guard, or units of the regular army. Between April 4, 1968 (the assassination of Martin Luther King) and June 5 of that year (the assassination of Robert Kennedy) 34,000 National Guardsmen and 20,000 regular army troops, in addition to police forces, were used against blacks in dozens of cities. According to the National Student Association there were 221 large demonstrations and confrontations with police at 101 colleges and universities between January 1 and June 15, 1968; fifty-nine times in that period students forcibly seized campus buildings.²⁷¹

p Street confrontations between young people and the police, racial conflicts, widespread lawlessness, violence, crime, and drug addiction were added to the worries of ordinary Americans: inflation eating up their incomes, fierce competition in the job market, and uncertainty about the future. In many cities the normal rhythm of economic and public life broke down. Millions felt a real longing for stability.

p Right extremists skillfully exploited this situation. With the defeat of Goldwater it became axiomatic for many of them that 232 their earlier classic capitalist stance was not enough to attract the attention of the American masses. They decided, while remaining true to their fundamental theories, to spice their antistate rhetoric with demands for law and order, which millions of Americans found much to their taste. This recipe was the distinctive specialty of the ultra-rightist movement of the second half of the 60s and the early 70s. The right began to speak of a "communist plot" underlying not only the social measures of the liberals, not only uprisings in black ghettos and unrest on campuses, but also crime, drug addiction, the "sexual revolution," pornography, avant-garde art, and other manifestations of the decay of bourgeois morals and culture.

p The Wallace campaign was quick to catch up this tune. There was much talk about law and order, stopping crime, and supporting the police. Wallace was painted as the sole political hope for the lives, freedom, and property of American citizens: "The Democrats Won't the Republicans Can't . . . Wallace Will Save America!"²⁷² He promised the anxious population that he would step up police repression against student demonstrators and civil rights activists. He also called for taxes to be cut back as far as possible. Well-to-do suburbanites applauded: they were as much worried about high taxes, which were swallowing up a good deal of their income, as about robbers. What they wanted was fewer pensions and more prisons. The Wallace faithful set new words to the *Battle Hymn of the Republic*:

p He stands up for law and order,
The policeman on the beat.
He will make it safe to once again
Walk safely on the street
...
He'll restore the courts of law, So justice can prevail.
Won't you stand up with George
Wallace!
...
So all men can be free!²⁷³

p The fear of violence that swept America pushed white workers and members of the middle classes into the Wallace ranks, as 233 these groups were increasingly concerned with law and order.²⁷⁴ The most prosperous segments of the working class, which regarded blacks' demands for equality with whites as a threat to their position, were especially susceptible to Wallace's demagoguery. "Steel-workers, automobile workers, all the aristocracy of the industrial working class, seemed infected with the Wallace virus. There were reports of enthusiasm for Wallace from plant after plant," wrote Chester, Hodson, and Page. A union official at the United States Steel plant in Homestead, Pennsylvania, estimated that 92 percent of the workers there were for Wallace. At a Ford plant in New Jersey 62 percent were for Wallace; sentiment ran the same way at a General Motors Plant in Flint, Michigan.²⁷⁵ A September Gallup poll found that in the South 50 percent of the union members and 35 percent of the non-union workers were for Wallace; the figures for Humphrey were 29 percent and 26 percent, respectively; for Nixon, 16 percent and 33 percent.²⁷⁶

p Polls also showed that about half of the American public did not consider Wallace a racist. The workers who supported him hoped he would protect their economic interests and stabilize the situation in the country.²⁷⁷

p Most of the workers who backed Wallace thought that he would create "a real labor party."²⁷⁸

p *Time* noted that Wallace's following was "heaviest among those with limited education and modest income."²⁷⁹ Working Catholics with Italian or East European

backgrounds were among Wallace's most loyal adherents,²⁸⁰ to whom he promised good jobs. Some of the organizers of the Wallace campaign tried to represent their candidate as the leader of a populist movement against the overlordship of the monopolies and the federal bureaucracy. During the 1968 race Wallace called for the direct election of federal judges (something the populists had suggested in 1890), arguing that the courts must be made responsible to the people.²⁸¹ He spoke of his drive for the White House as "a movement of the people," and said it made no difference whether political leaders approved of that movement or not.²⁸²

p This pose was meant to win the votes of low-paid working whites, both urban and rural. According to figures published in the USA there were twenty-five million white Americans earning less than \$3,000 a year in 1963, and thirty million in 1968; half of them lived in the South.²⁸³ Many of America's poor whites, 234 workers not excepted, were disposed to regard their black fellowcountrymen as rivals in the job market; Wallace's racism was in keeping with this mood. The failure of Johnson's widely acclaimed "War on Poverty" helped Wallace to further strengthen his hold on this segment of the electorate.

p Wallace got a considerable boost from police forces. As governor he had placed the Birch Society slogan "Support Your Local Police" on Alabama license plates. John Harrington, president of the Fraternal Order of Police (whose 130,000 members make it the USA's largest police organization), publicly endorsed Wallace for president.²⁸¹ Wallace, with his demands for law and order in the land, brought Southerners to the polls who had previously been non-voters.²⁸⁵

p Wallace's 1968 campaign was distinguished by an effort to camouflage his racism. Many of his speeches contained almost no hint of the racism that marked his governorship. His vocabulary was purged of words such as "nigger" and "segregation." Even in his home state he steadfastly maintained that he had never been a racist. He now explained his opposition to civil rights laws by claiming that they were "an attack on property rights . . . free enterprise and local government."²⁸⁶ He depicted his earlier demands for segregation as advocacy of states' rights. His speeches stressed respect for the constitution, law and order, and limited federal spending. "I don't talk about race or segregation any more," he admitted. "We're talking about law and order, and local control of schools, not those other things."²⁸⁷

p There were at least two reasons for Wallace's change in tactics. First, the 1968 effort was not local, but national; in many of the places where Wallace campaigned race was not an issue in community life. In Rhode Island, where race prejudice had not become entrenched, he demonstrated his goodwill toward blacks by catching up a little black boy and cuddling him before the cameras. Another, and no less important, reason was that by 1968 the black vote had become an important force at the South's polls. This change in the makeup of the electorate came about after 1965, when the Voting Rights Act was passed over the opposition of the racists. In 1940 only 5 percent of the South's eligible blacks (250,000) were registered to vote; in 1952, 20 percent (1,008,000); in 1965, 25 percent (1,238,000); in 1960, 28 percent (1,412,000); in 1964, 38 percent

(1,907,000); but in 1968, 62 percent (3, 112,000); and in 1970, 67 percent (3,357,000). If it is remembered that in the five states of the deep South (Georgia, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina) blacks made up from 25.9 percent (Georgia) to 36.8 percent (Mississippi) of the population, and that more than half of the inhabitants of sixteen large cities (among them Washington and Atlanta) were black,²⁸⁸ it becomes clear that even racists could not ignore the black vote.

p For the same reason Wallace made every effort to hide his connections with the Ku Klux Klan. At a meeting in an Alabama backwater in June 1968 his followers destroyed a film print that showed him giving Robert Shelton a friendly handshake. Such actions, like Wallace's flirtations with black voters, did not alarm the racists. They understood his real motives. They knew what he meant by "states' rights," "law and order," and "constitutionalism" : in the language of racism this was a call to crush uprisings in the black ghettos.²⁸⁹ Marshal Frady, a journalist who worked for Wallace in 1968, admitted that the American Independent Party "amounted to a kind of massive unspoken collaboration of racism in all its varieties, from blatant to furtive, deliberate to unwitting, malevolent to amicable."²³⁰

p Although the American Independent Party refused to report to the federal government on the sources of its campaign fund it is known that the Wallace movement was well financed. Between ten and twenty thousand letters poured into Wallace headquarters in Montgomery daily; many of them contained checks for \$5, \$25, or \$50. They brought the party between \$50,000 and \$100,000 daily; there was one week (September 30-October 6, 1968) when half a million came in. Wealthy people in suburbs and small towns gave copiously. In Eufaula, Alabama (population 8,300), fifty-one citizens contributed a total of \$11,000—and this case was not unique. There is evidence that some of Wallace's angels were show-business stars whose gifts were in the tens of thousands of dollars. Breakfasts and luncheons in the candidate's honor were another important funding source: a breakfast in Dallas netted \$50,000; a luncheon the same day, \$30,000.

p As Senator James O'Hara of Michigan remarked, many of Wallace's supporters who thought of him as a representative of the "little guy" would have been shocked to discover that the 236 real forces behind him were "the power inen of the ultra right," and "the race-baiting segregationists."²⁹¹ Wallace had friends among the South's richest industrialists. H. L. Hunt gave \$500 to his campaign. Colonel Sanders, Edward Ball (closely tied to the Southern States Industrial Council), and Texas oil magnate Paul Pewitt were among Wallace's main financial backers; Lcander Perez, who agitated for him in Louisiana, and textile king Roger Milliken also gave large sums. The Wallace campaign, according to Gerald L. K. Smith (its fund-raising chief), cost ten and a half million dollars.²⁹² It is believed that between \$12 million and \$13 million was collected in all; the unused portion was spent in 1972.

p Wallace's strategy was to mobilize Southern racists, to win over (with the help of the right extremists) the traditional conservative constituency that had voted for Goldwater in 1964. and finally to woo the military-industrial complex. He planned to garner support among the masses by waving the banner of "law and order" and playing on race

prejudice. Wallace could not afford to ignore the needs of the South's numerous poor; but he also counted on its ultras and big capitalists, who were demanding that the policy of social and economic concessions be repudiated. Add to this that Wallace was forced to play the part of a man tolerant to blacks, while in fact remaining a racist, and it is possible to get some idea of the violent internal contradictions that marked his campaign.

p The incongruity of the Wallace coalition made for continual bickering. The arrogance of the movement's Alabama satraps again and again brought them into conflict with its Northern followers, thus weakening its leadership.

p The choice of a vice-presidential candidate was at the center of one of the skirmishes within the Wallace camp. Wallace himself favored Texas governor John Connally, Eisenhower's ultraconservative Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, or "Mr. Law and Order"—J. Edgar Hoover. But for various reasons all these choices had to be set aside. Wallace's comparatively moderate followers suggested Albert Benjamin Chandler, a former governor of Kentucky, whose attitude toward school integration may be roughly described as forbearance. But the racists strongly opposed Chandler, who was unwilling to publicly abjure his tolerance toward blacks; he was dropped from consideration.

237

p A candidate who more or less suited most of Wallace's supporters was Air Force Major-General Curtis Emerson Le May. He had held high military posts for a number of years: after the Second World War he had commanded the US Air Force in Europe; somewhat later, the Strategic Air Command; during the Kennedy years he was Air Force Chief of Staff. In 1968, after his retirement, he wrote *America Is in Danger* which condemned the military policy of the Kennedy administration and declared that none of the current military doctrines was sufficient for victory over communism. The salient point in Le May's proposed strategy was a pre-emptive nuclear strike that would supposedly bring the socialist countries to their knees.

p On October 3 Wallace announced that Le May would be his running mate. In a national television appearance with Wallace Le May declared that if necessary nuclear weapons must be used to attain victory in Vietnam. Wallace's opponents began to assert that his election would push the USA and the entire world over the brink of nuclear catastrophe. This was a very dangerous turn of events for Wallace. He understood the lesson of 1964: the American public did not approve of nuclear saber rattling. He set forth the basic principles of his foreign policy program in an address to the National Press Club in Washington on October 7. He called for victory in Vietnam, but without the use of nuclear weapons; at the same time he did not reject negotiation. He deplored excesses in foreign aid, but defended military assistance. He sharply opposed any sort of economic sanctions against South Africa and Rhodesia, which he called "good friends and allies of this country."

p The American Independent Party's campaign platform was published on October 13. It reflected the internal conflicts dividing the party. Because of the considerations outlined

above it did not follow the classic rightist line. This was especially true of the part dealing with domestic issues. Wallace's party was represented to ordinary voters as the only one capable of resolving the problems facing the nation: the rising cost of living, unemployment, high taxes, uprisings in the black ghettos, student unrest, and the growing crime rate.

p The platform passed over civil rights in silence, and emphasized the use of police force for maintaining order. It appealed to racists by proposing to halt federal interference in education. 238 Special concern was shown for the home, family, and property of the "average American." The party vowed to develop a public works program, if necessary, to provide full employment. The unions were promised the guaranteed right to conclude collective bargaining agreements, an end to federal meddling in their internal affairs, and support for legislation setting aside funds for the retraining of workers and creating fair minimum standards for wages, hours, and work conditions. Planks on public health care and social security were also adopted.

p As to foreign policy, the platform basically coincided with the position Wallace had taken in Washington on October 7. In answer to the needs of the day the party proclaimed that it would strive to "secure a just and lasting peace." "We feel," the platform's authors declared, "that the road to peace lies through international cooperation and understanding."^^295^^

p Wallace's demagogic platform was torn apart and ridiculed by the forces of democracy. How could he restore order in the country, when the crime rate in Alabama had increased by 42.4 percent during his years as governor?^^290^^ How could he champion respect for the law, when he himself had repeatedly and knowingly violated it? How could he root out corruption, when bribetaking had been a source of his campaign fund? The mass protest demonstrations touched off by Wallace's public appearances broke up a number of his rallies; in several places only strong police lines prevented violence between Wallace's admirers and j his opponents.

An analysis of the 1968 election returns showed that Wallace got the support of 57 percent of the farmers, 46 percent of the blue-collar workers, and 30 percent of the white-collar workers who had voted for Johnson in 1964; the figures among those who had voted for Goldwater were 67 percent, 51 percent, and 35 i percent respectively. The largest group of Wallace voters was made up of Southern farmers.^^297^^

p ,

p The liberal journal the *Progressive* called the favorable response that Wallace and the right evoked from millions of Americans a national tragedy. "They fail to realize," it lamented in November 1968, "that the far-rightists and racists who have done ! so much to organize and finance the Wallace campaign would, if he came to power, seize the opportunity to destroy unions and cut wages, starve the public schools, make the rich richer at the 239 expense of the middle and lower middle classes, and conceivably take the nation down the road to the world's first—and last— nuclear war."^^208^^

p “The Wallace campaign,” declared Henry Winston, chairman of the Communist Party USA, "is the political spearhead of the drive of the ultra-Right, racist elements in our country today. It is a campaign designed to foster racism, to build a base for reaction among the white workers in our cities, to counter the advance of the growing movements for peace and freedom.”²⁹⁹

p The American bourgeois sociologist James McEvoy admits: "The formation of the AIP and the success of its candidate in the South and in some urban areas in the North suggests that the development of a national political apparatus with totalitarian overtones is certainly not impossible within contemporary American society. The replacement of economic expansion by recession or depression, with concomitant disruption of the economic security of the working and marginal middle class, could . . . enable this apparatus, or one very much like it, to transform the existing symbolic and newly emerging economic grievances of this segment of the society into political power at the national level.”³⁰⁰

p No accurate idea of the extent of the ultra-right movement can be formed by examining the Wallace campaign alone. A part of the ultra-right, not wishing to break with the Republican Party, tied its hopes to Richard Nixon.

p Nixon, who had the backing of rightist leaders Barry Goldwater and Strom Thurmond, hoped to carry the South and neutralize the influence of Wallace. Nixon spoke for integration, but maintained that it was a matter to be worked out by the states. Thurmond also wanted Nixon to promise that he would build up military potential to fight "communist aggression" (after Goldwater's defeat Nixon's allies on the far right thought it impolitic to speak of "victory over communism"). Nixon accepted this condition: he pledged to strengthen the USA's anti-ballistic missile system (ABM). Thurmond was satisfied; he worked hard for Nixon's nomination/¹⁰²

p Goldwater remembered well Nixon's loyalty in 1964, and now did his best to return the favor. He declared in a number of speeches and written statements that although Wallace was saying the 240 right things, and appealed to him personally, there was no chance that Wallace could bring success for the right.

p The question of Nixon's running mate was highly important to his right-wing followers. The Florida delegation, for example, said that it would give him its thirty-three votes only if his vicepresidential choice was to the South's liking. The candidate that best met that description was Spiro Agnew. The right later came to regard him as one of the most trustworthy men in the Nixon administration. He became more popular than the president with some Southern politicians. The American Conservative Union, Senators Goldwater, John Tower, Robert Dole, James Buckley, and other leading conservatives endorsed Agnew's candidacy. The Young Americans for Freedom even nominated him for president at their 1971 convention.³⁰³

p Nixon got important aid from the American Conservative Union. Its head, John M. Ashbrook, tried to turn conservatives away from Wallace; reviewing the American

Independent Party's platform, he said. "Wallace is not a conservative. . . . At heart he is a populist with strong tendencies in the direction of the collectivist welfare state."³⁰⁴ Meanwhile Nixon and Humphrey, the Democratic candidate, strove to diminish Wallace's influence among ordinary Americans by characterizing him and his associates—not without reason—as irresponsible fanatics ready to plunge the world into a nuclear war.³⁰

On the whole respectable conservative businessmen, who subscribed to the laissez-faire ideology, rejected Wallace's "populism" and gave their votes to Nixon. Many Northerners defected from the Wallace camp. In the South almost four-fifths of Wallace's original followers voted for him; in the North, only 43 percent did so.⁰⁰.

Nixon won at the polls in 1968. He received 31,770,000 votes (43.4 percent); Wallace 9,906,000 (13.53 percent); Humphrey 31,271,000 (42.72 percent). Wallace carried four of the five states of the Deep South (Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia); South Carolina, thanks to the efforts of Strom Thurmond, gave its votes to Nixon. Texas remained true to the Democrats. Other Southern states, such as North Carolina, Florida, Virginia, and Tennessee, were steeped not only in racism but also in extreme economic conservatism and the allied ideology of non-interference. They could not accept the so-called populist 241 planks in Wallace's platform. Nixon, with his conservative approach to domestic economic and social problems, suited them better, and he got their votes. Wallace's play for black voters proved a total failure: 88 percent of the black voters favored Humphrey; 12 percent, Nixon.

Wallace was also unsuccessful at winning over former Goldwater backers in the West and Mid-West. For much the same reasons as the states of the Marginal South—and also because of Goldwater's own labors—they gave their support to Nixon. Thus various subjective factors induced many millions of potential Wallace voters to cast their ballots for Nixon. Even many Birchers, as Robert Welch acknowledged, were working for Nixon.

Wallace's loss of votes to Nixon was due to the latter's adroitness and to strategic miscalculations by the Wallace campaign staff. There was an objective reason too: Wallace, unlike Goldwater, ran on a third-party ticket; American political history shows that voters slight such candidates. Many families traditionally back one or the other of the established parties, even if they do not always agree with its platform. This inertia played a part in the 1968 election too. But even under these adverse conditions Wallace was able to rally almost ten million Americans—proof that the right's sway was no less in the late 60s than during Goldwater's campaign.

The Rightist Movement in Recent Times

With the end of the 60s and the beginning of the 70s the rightist movement entered a new phase. The prolonged economic boom of the 60s gave way in 1974–1975 to the most serious crisis since the war, a crisis that affected all the main branches of American

industry. A sharp drop in production, coupled with mass unemployment, lessened the appeal of the conservative ideology of unlettered free enterprise, and deepened the internal conflicts dividing the right.

[p](#) Another important influence on the right in the 70s was detente, which brought healthier relations among governments with different social systems and created the conditions necessary for stamping out the remaining hotbeds of war. The rulers of the West gave up their saber rattling, blackmail, and threats against the socialist countries, and set about establishing mutually beneficial business relations with them and finding solutions to persistent problems through peaceful negotiation.

[p](#) Historically speaking the demise of the imperialists' decades-old policy of military confrontation and the dawn of the "era of negotiation," with its easing of international tensions, was a signal victory for the active diplomacy of the socialist countries and for all democratic and peace-loving forces. By the same token it was a defeat for reaction. The USA's rightists—the champions of the cold war and "victory over communism"—were discomfited by their country's involvement in this positive international development. Detente made it hard for them to use the arguments of the cold-war years; they were forced to look for other ways to recruit support. The influence of detente proved so great that even some die-hard opponents of international cooperation had to bow to the spirit of the time.

[p](#) But while the economic crisis and detente undoubtedly retarded the growth of the right's power a number of factors in domestic politics helped it survive with minimal losses. The most important of these factors is the ever growing weight that the traditionally conservative "Sunbelt" carries in American political life. According to indirect estimates made by the Census Bureau in recent years the majority of Americans now live in the South and West.³⁰⁷

[p](#) The mounting importance of the Sunbelt in American life results primarily from its rapid industrialization. Conditions there are favorable for entrepreneurs: the union movement is still in its infancy; expenditures for social needs are small; all sorts of tax benefits are extended to investors; there is adequate raw material and energy; land prices are low; laws protecting the environment are not as strict as elsewhere; links with domestic and foreign markets are good; and so forth. From California to Virginia, new capital and developers eager for quick success have flooded in. In a matter of decades huge chemical, electronics, and aerospace plants have sprung up in areas once inhabited mainly by ranchers and cowboys. Formerly middle-sized towns—Phoenix, Memphis, Atlanta, Birmingham, Dallas, Houston, and 243 others—have grown into sprawling giants with affluent suburbs. At present California, Florida, and Texas are first, second, and third in the pace and value of construction.^{308–309}

[p](#) The industrialization of the South and South-West dates back to the time of the Second World War. But its political consequences have been felt to an ever greater degree in the past few decades, and the process is far from complete.

p The appearance of new and still expanding wealth in the South has given rise to financial centers that challenge the might of Wall Street. The economic antagonism between the NorthEast and the Sunbelt was bound to crop out, as eventually it did, in the realm of politics. Because of certain objective considerations the representatives of "new money" who have emerged in recent years profess the sort of crudely individualistic ideology of free enterprise that is by and large characteristic of the early stages of capitalism. Thus in their struggle with Wall Street Southern groups have adopted a highly conservative stance: they abhor "big government," regulation, bureaucracy, social spending, unions, taxes—in short anything that interferes with getting rich quickly. Whatever is counter to their interests they attribute to foreign influences, and damn as un-American or even communist.

p This attitude is common to "new money" and the right; it makes them allies in the fight against the "liberal establishment" of the North-East, which both consider anti-American and communistic. [243•* "New money" has reinforced the traditional conservatism of the South and South-West, making these vast regions into a bastion of reaction.^^1110^^

p The New South is epitomized in the moneyed families that have made their fortunes in the past several decades. The most prominent figure in this group is Texas oilman H. L. Hunt—the richest man in America. He made his first millions in the 20s and 30s, when big corporations were waging a pitched battle against the organized workers' movement. A federal law of the 20s 244 providing a 27.5 percent reduction in taxes on the income from oil—the so-called depletion allowance—had a great deal to do with the rise of oil fortunes.

p After the Second World War Hunt and other entrepreneurs who had grown rich under protectionism launched a crusade against federal economic, and social programs, and hacked lightweight politicians critical of the government. They lent enormous material support to McCarthy, who branded the Truman administration "communist." But Hunt did not rest content with that; in 1951 he brought out his own radio and television series. Facts Forum, which was aired in almost all the states. In 1959 Facts Forum was transformed into the Life Line Foundation, Inc. By the end of the 60s the foundation had put together more than 4,000 programs, which reached millions of Americans over 530 stations.^^11^^ The foundation's radio programs, like its bulletin of the same name, parroted McCarthy's attacks on America's democratic institutions in the 50s, and the propaganda of the far right in the 60s and 70s. Hunt died November 29, 1974; till the end of his days he remained a vigorous foe of social reform and detente.

p Patrick J. Frawley, another generous backer of the ultras, was born in Nicaragua. His father, a prosperous small businessman, took the family to California after the Second World War. There he began to produce an improved ball-point pen; in five years his Paper Mate Pen Company was doing \$26 million worth of business annually. By 1970 Patrick Frawley, Jr., who inherited his father's business, had acquired conglomerates manufacturing electric shavers, safety razors, and color film, with an annual turnover of \$200 million. Since then pressure from competitors and a Justice Department action have

forced him to relinquish part of this empire, but Schick Electric Shavers and Frawley Enterprises, which remain in his hands, bring in over \$100 million a year.

p Frawley has aided nationally important organizations of the right and their local branches. Like Hunt he has also created his own propaganda tool, the Twin Circle Company, which pushes rightist ideas in magazines and books, at student conferences, and over radio and television. With all this he has still found the means to make substantial contributions to the election campaign.”^^2^^

245

p In recent years Joseph Coors, an enormously wealthy industrialist from Colorado, has become a figure of national note. For this he is indebted to Richard Nixon, who just two days before resigning appointed him director of the government-owned Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Up to that time Coors was little known in Washington, though he had a reputation as an archconservative in his home state.

p Coor’s grandfather, a German, came to the USA shortly after the Civil War and set up a brewery in Golden, Colorado. Today’s Coors Brewery is perhaps the largest family corporation in America; it occupies fourth place in the beer business. The family invested in agriculture, coal mining, construction, and other industries; it owns huge plants turning out aluminum dishes, chemical glass, and porcelain. The family’s total assets were put at \$250 million in 1972.

p Not content to simply conduct business, Coors has pushed his way into the political arena. He acquired Television News, Inc., and made it into the largest private news agency in the East. In 1973 he established the Heritage Foundation, which became the coordinating center in an elaborate network of private organizations he had a hand in creating. In addition to Television News, Inc., this network includes the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress and the Committee of Nine, which orchestrates the activities of conservative senators. All this machinery is busy trying to slant public opinion to the right and form a conservative majority in Congress.

p Coor’s people work closely with the Young Americans for Freedom and the American Conservative Union. They also contribute heavily to the John Birch Society and place advertisements in its weekly, *Review of the News*. Asked by a senator if he approved of the Birchers, Coors replied: "I have at times supported them with funds and I support some of their thoughts and ideas."”*

p The catalog of "new tycoons” could be continued, but those already mentioned give a more or less complete picture of the political sympathies and antipathies of the lot.

p The US government’s continuing war in Vietnam, the growth of military spending, and the closely associated speed-up in the arms race stimulated the rightist movement tremendously in the early 70s. The Nixon administration’s military budget was hard 246 by the \$100 billion mark; the Ford administration’s reached \$113 billion; and that of the

Carter administration, which undertook the building of new types of weaponry, \$130 billion. These record outlays and pronouncements by official representatives of the armed services about a "communist threat" encourage rightist propaganda and lend credibility to it.

p A direct result of the government's aggressive foreign policy and the arms race was the strengthening of reactionary trends in domestic politics. In the 60s and 70s the USA's ruling cliques tried to re-create the stifling, conformist atmosphere of fear and suspicion that prevailed earlier; they built up police forces, worked out methods for total surveillance over citizens who protested against the war in South-East Asia and political and social injustice at home, and carefully planned tactics for crushing demonstrations of every type. There was a sharp increase in allocations for police work: between 1969 and 1972 the FBI's budget was expanded from \$219.6 million to \$334.5 million, and its staff enlarged by more than 3,000. In the mid 70s the bureau had the fingerprints of eighty million persons, and dossiers on more than half a million.^^1114^^

p The FBI operation COINTELPRO, carried out over a number of years, sought to cripple movements among young people and blacks through illegal means: groups were infiltrated by agents who provoked them to violence, which served as a pretext for using harsh repressive measures against them; documents intended to sow dissension among those fighting for the civil rights and among anti-war and pacifist groups were fabricated and distributed; various sorts of defamatory and libelous materials about leaders of the black liberation movement were circulated among their followers; the most militant opposition spokesmen were threatened and blackmailed/'^^15^^

p The FBI also resorted frequently to other unlawful methods. Among them: the installation of listening devices in violation of the Constitution; burglaries with the object of purloining compromising materials from the premises of organizations that antagonized the government (in this perspective Watergate is only an episode, albeit the most sensational in recent years'); and attempts to turn (he Mafia on the leaders of the Communist Party USA. In Operation Hoodwink, conducted in California, "the FBI organized and recruited the Secret Army Organization, a 247 right-wing terrorist group, and paid it to attack anti-war activists."^^3111^^

p At one time the FBI's so-called Security Index, which named the most active adversaries of the government's foreign and domestic policies, listed 26,174 Americans who might be locked up in time of war or emergency.^^317^^

p In the midst of mass demonstrations against reaction, racism, and war the government activated the internal police functions of the CIA, the Pentagon, and the National Guard. In 1963, overstepping its legal authority, the CIA created the Domestic Operations Division, which launched Operation Chaos against the democratic movement. CIA agents infiltrated anti-war, radical, and religious groups; they compiled a list of 300,000 organizations and individuals, and dossiers on 10,000 people. They systematically violated the confidentiality of first-class mail over several years, opening 215,820 letters."^^18^^ They consulted with police department employees in California, Illinois,

New York, and the District of Columbia. The Justice Department was aware of these contacts.³¹⁰

p Crudely flouting the norms of international law, the CIA worked out plans to assassinate or oust a number of foreign leaders. In 1961 the agency entered into a criminal partnership with the Mafia with the object of assassinating Fidel Castro. It interfered in the internal affairs of Chile at Nixon's personal orders; eight million dollars were spent on the destabilization and overthrow of Salvador Allende's government.³²⁰ Beginning immediately after the Second World War American intelligence monitored the development of events in Italy; no less than \$65 million were spent to prevent a turn to the left in the country's internal politics and to keep Communists out of the government. It also came to light that the CIA had been regularly contributing funds for the subversive activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, which were formally considered private organizations. Many of the CIA's crimes against other countries and people were sanctioned by the Committee of 40, a secret interagency organization that managed the USA's covert operations abroad.

p Military intelligence also undertook similar actions within the country. In the summer of 1967 the Pentagon set up a special department whose operatives established themselves in several 248 of the USA's largest cities and began to infiltrate anti-war and radical groups. No less than one thousand agents of the Pentagon were involved in surveillance over American citizens, including members of Congress, governors, and heads of democratic organisations. By the fall of 1969 data files had been compiled on 18,000 Americans.¹ In its fight against the anti-war movement Army intelligence joined hands with the Legion of Justice, an ultra-right terrorist group, which was supplied with tear gas and other equipment for breaking up demonstrations.¹ Today Army intelligence has information on the membership, program, and actions of every political group active in the country.¹

p Keeping tabs on dissidents and spying on them was not enough for the Pentagon. During the 60s regular army units took part, together with the National Guard, in suppressing demonstrations by young people and blacks. The generals elaborated plans for the large-scale use of military force to quell "civil disorders," and gave special training to soldiers, policemen, and guardsmen in fighting a mass democratic movement under big-city conditions.¹ The National Guard, which as a rule has close ties with local business, was actively involved in punitive operations against the radical and democratic movements, and was repeatedly used against striking workers.²

p The FBI, the CIA, and the Army were the main federal organizations engaged in repression and police surveillance, but not the only ones. At least twenty government agencies and services, and a multitude of private groups, had a hand in such activities. Extensive card files on millions of persons were put together by the Internal Revenue Service, the US Passport Office, the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Transportation, and the Social Security Administration. Credit rating bureaus, according to expert estimates, hold information on 110 million Americans.²⁰ Other organizations—banks, insurance companies, businesses, and newspapers—also maintain

dossiers, There were repeated moves in the 60s and 70s to establish an electronically equipped National Data Center, in which information on the private lives and public activities of all citizens would be centralized. Democratically minded persons rightly considered such plans a giant step toward the creation of a totalitarian society in the USA'^^27^^

p Nixon's administration attempted to use this colossal police apparatus to fight his personal opponents. Important members of the White House staff compiled lists of the president's enemies; the Internal Revenue Service then undertook an exacting revision of these persons' finances. In a special memorandum Tom Charles Huston, a Nixon staff assistant, recommended the following measures for uncovering secret opposition to government policy: burglaries of homes and offices, the use of informers, the placing of listening devices, and the opening of correspondence. These suggestions were approved by Nixon and became the basis for a presidential order to federal intelligence agencies/-^^1^^* According to incomplete data federal agencies engaged in surveillance employed between 100,000 and 150,000 persons in 1975. More than \$6 billion was being spent on the intelligence system each year'^^29^^

p The 60s and 70s provide an abundance of other examples of the arbitrary exercise of police power and flagrant violations of the democratic rights and freedoms of American citizens. The FBI waged a blackmail campaign against Martin Luther King, Jr., for many years. In 1970 students protesting against the Vietnam war in Kent, Ohio, and Jackson, Mississippi were fired on by the National Guard. In 1972 the Justice Department used trumped-up charges to jail the Wilmington Ten, who were fighting for equal rights for blacks. During the Democratic Party's convention in Chicago in August of 1968 police mounted a bloody battle against demonstrators demanding an end to the war in South-East Asia. In May of 1971 the government used raids, beatings, and wholesale arrests against the anti-war movement; 13,000 persons were put behind bars in just three days. In its function, manner of operation, and spirit the machinery of repression is the ally of the right.

p The government, having created a ramified police apparatus and placed millions of Americans under scrutiny, could afford to make a liberal gesture; it abolished certain odious organizations that had thoroughly discredited themselves and become the object of active and continual opposition by the forces of democracy and progress. Some of the most ill-famed symbols of the McCarthy hysteria and the cold war lost their meaning and were removed during the 70s: in 1973, the Subversive Activities Control Board, which was established in 1950 in accordance with the McCarran Act; in 1975, the House Internal Security Committee, better known as the Un-American Activities Committee. The powers of the latter were delegated to the House Judiciary Committee. The Justice Department's blacklists of subversive organizations were done away with by an executive order dated June 4, 1974.

p But during the same years, in parallel with these reforms, reactionary forces in Congress and the administration were trying to lay a new legal basis for mass repression. Since the downfall of McCarthy there have been unremitting efforts in Congress to bring

back, in one form or another, the sort of legislation he promoted. Bills have been placed before Congress that epitomize the anti-democratic attitude of the cold war years. In particular, they would restore most of the provisions of the Smith Act aimed at the freedoms of speech, of the press, and of assembly."^^0^^ The adoption of such bills, as Americans themselves acknowledge, would take the USA a considerable distance down the road toward becoming a police state. *The Nation* writes that one of these legislative projects. Senate Bill 1, "began as an innocent attempt to reform the criminal laws and has ended up as a repressive monstrosity"^^331^^ that seriously threatened the democratic freedoms of the American people. This bill evoked a negative reaction among many segments of American society; this made it necessary to postpone discussion of it in Congress, and then to introduce certain alterations. The new bill (S-1437), which kept most of the provisions of the old. condoned most of the types of criminal acts connected with the Watergate scandal.^^3^^"^^2^^

p The broadening of the government's police functions, the setting up of an all-encompassing surveillance network, attempts to revive the laws of the McCarthy years under some guise, the contempt shown by official government bodies for the rights and freedoms of ordinary Americans—together all of these have brought about a climate that helps breathe life into various reactionary groups and mobilize the forces of the right.

p In the 70s, as at other times, the ultras tried to capitalize on people's prejudices and superstitions. Worthy of particular note are the extraordinary activeness of ultra-right and religious groups in the battle against abortion, their opposition to the equal rights amendment, and the desperate resistance of certain parents to the introduction of sex-education courses in high schools.

p The National Right-to-Life Committee came into existence as a result of the Supreme Court's decision of January 22, 1973, which made abortion legal throughout the country. It publishes the *National Right-to-Life News*, which agitates for the adoption of a Constitutional amendment prohibiting abortions. Opposition to abortion unites broad segments of the American public; their organization, headed by Mildred Jefferson, a black woman, has figured regularly in various sorts of ultra-rightist rallies.^^31^^" As the bulletin of the Institute for American Democracy rightly points out, the anti-abortion movement has presented the far right with a rare opportunity to form a mass political alliance."^^4^^ Opponents of equal rights for women have also established a national organization that acts in concert with the ultra right.

p For the leaders of the ultras, negative sides of American life such as drug addiction, corruption, pornography, prostitution, and crime are an important means for mobilizing public support for their position on the concrete questions of the political struggle. They blame all of these plagues of bourgeois society on domination by the federal bureaucracy, liberal politics, and the "communist conspiracy." The ultras politicize the actions of backward segments of the public, winning over and making them into an extensive reserve for reaction.

p These are some of the factors in domestic and international life that have stimulated or retarded the development of the rightist movement in the USA over the past few years. On the whole it is possible to say that in the 70s rightists continued to be a constant and significant force in the domestic politics of the USA. There is probably no large city in the country that does not have some kind of ultra-rightist group.

p The John Birch Society remains the largest and most influential of the organizations of the far right. The anti-state rhetoric of its leaders, which is directed against the widening of federal powers in the economy and society, still finds a response in the heartlands of the country, where the traditions of the frontier survive.

p In the 70s the Birch Society intensified its propaganda campaign among young people. Week-long camps were held throughout the summer months. In all there were about 100 such camps; they were located in the South and West.

p In 1973 the society had some 5,000 chapters around the country with about 100,000 members, and a paid staff of 225. Between 1961 and 1970 the number of persons in sympathy with the Birchers grew from three to eight million. Enormous sums continue to pour into the society's treasury. The contributions of some rich patrons run to five figures; this makes it possible for the society to spend \$6 million a year—\$10 million according to other estimates—toward the spread of its views. Birchers hold seats in Congress and elective offices in at least a dozen states.

p The society's council is, as earlier, made up mostly of prosperous businessmen and financiers. The overwhelming majority of them belong to the new consortia of the South and West—the rivals of Wall Street. In recent years the makeup of the council has altered several times in favor of the regions vying with the North-East. In 1976, for example, William H. Cies, a thriving California realtor, and Nelson Bunker Hunt, son of the late H. L. Hunt, became members.

p In the second half of the 60s Welch began to propagandize a new conception of the "communist conspiracy" as part of an "insider conspiracy," whose roots he traced back to the activities of secret societies in Western Europe and the French bourgeois revolution of the eighteenth century. The UN, NATO, and the USA's multinational corporations are depicted as international tools of the worldwide "insider conspiracy." The Trilateral Commission, organized in 1973, which includes representatives of the most influential groups in American, West European, and Japanese business, was placed under that same indictment by the Birch Society in the 70s.

p The center of the international "insider conspiracy" is the US establishment: the Morgans, Rockefellers, Warburgs, and other moneyed American families, the multinational corporations, private organizations such as the Committee on Economic Development, and the exclusive aristocratic clubs serving the allpowerful corporations. It also includes the intellectual elite, the mass media, and the largest foundations, which the Birchers maintain are financing a bloodless revolution in the country and undermining

traditional American values. The main instrument of this secret government in the USA is the Council on Foreign Relations."'^1'^'

p The goal of the "insider conspiracy"—that is to say, of the "communist conspiracy"—is to establish a world government, which would put an end to the sovereignty of the USA and the 253 oilier Western countries and enslave their citizens. In their struggle for power the insiders use the strategy "divide and rule." They are responsible for both world wars, the Russian revolution, the rise of the world socialist system, and the collapse of colonialism.

p The manifestations of this "conspiracy" in domestic politics are highly diverse: from the establishment of the Federal Reserve System in 1913, the introduction of the graduated income tax, and the diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union to government social programs, economic "planning," and the attempted assassination of George Wallace. The insiders are to blame for the economic disaster of 1929; at present they are leading the country toward a new crisis.'^341'^'

p According to Welch's theory the policy of detente adopted by the US government spells suicide for Western civilization: it would disarm the United States, and give aid and comfort to the enemy.'^112'^' A large section of the American public, business circles included, favors trade with the socialist countries; the Birch Society regards such trade as saving the Soviet economy. John Schmitz, a Bircher in the House of Representatives, has introduced a bill that would require that the names of American businessmen who do substantial business with the Communists be published. He accused Nixon of treason, and demanded that an investigation be conducted into the aid that official and business groups were giving toward the building of the Kama automobile factory/'^11'^'

p To back up his absurd thesis about a "communist plot" on Wall Street Welch uses the works of Antony G. Sutton—*Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, *Wall Street and F. D. R.*, and others—in which US trade with the socialist countries is depicted as treason, and the participation of some American firms in the building of industrial sites in the USSR during the first five-year plans is equated with abetting the revolution in Russia.'" Sutton asserts that the United States and the Western countries have built the Soviet Union's technology and its industrial and military capabilities."'^1'^'^1'^'

p But it would be wrong to believe that the Birch Society's enmity toward Wall Street reflects its attitude toward big capital in general. H. L. Hunt (the wealthiest man in America), A. P. Giannini (founder of the Bank of America, now the 254 country's leading bank), and other important industrialists and bankers of the West and South-West have never been denounced as communists, like attacks on Wall Street are an expression of the struggle within the ruling class; they are a weapon in the hands of the relatively new monopolies of the South and West, which are seeking to replace their North-Eastern rivals at the helm of power.

p The position of the Birch Society has found support in Congress; in 1976 its views were shared by Lawrence Patton McDonald (D-Georgia), Ron Raul (R-Texas), George Hansen (R-Idaho), Steven Symms (R-Idaho), and others.³⁴⁶

p In recent years the Birchers have also attacked new targets: the Department of Agriculture and the Environmental Protection Agency. Modest attempts to limit the predatory exploitation of land and other natural resources by private companies, and to restore the ecological balance destroyed by the unrestricted activities of the monopolies have drawn sharp criticism from the society. It charges that federal regulation of the use of land amounts to "new feudalism." The new agency, notes *American Opinion* with dismay, has already closed down some 350 foundries and thousands of small businesses, and "seems to desire a repeal of the industrial revolution." It concludes: "The policies of the Environmental Protection Agency endanger our freedom, jobs, and pocketbooks."¹⁷

p Carl McIntire's Twentieth Century Reformation and Billy James Hargis's Christian Crusade waged active ultra-rightist fundamentalist propaganda campaigns in the 70s. The incomes of both increased significantly and reached the \$3 million mark.

p Generous contributions enabled McIntire to considerably broaden his organization's material base. The Twentieth Century Reformation now holds real estate whose overall value is estimated at up to \$25 million.¹⁸ It also has its own publishing house, the Christian Beacon Press. The seminary McIntire heads acquired a radio station, but the Federal Communications Commission deprived it of its broadcasting license because of violations of the Fairness Doctrine. [254*] Refusing to be bested, McIntire outfitted a special ship, the *Columbia*, to broadcast from international waters under the name Radio Free America.¹

p With the huge sums at his disposal Hargis enlarged his organization's paid staff to something over a hundred. In 1973 he established a Christian college in Tulsa, and became its president. In 1974 Hargis's ill health forced a reduction in Christian Crusade's activity, but a fresh period of expansion followed. New fundamentalist organizations were formed under Christian Crusade's aegis: the Evangelical Association (headquarters in Washington and Tulsa) and the Evangelism-in-Action foundation.² Christian Crusade's broadcasts are carried by one hundred radio and forty television stations; it is regarded as one of the ultras' biggest successes.

p Other important ultra-rightist fundamentalist propaganda centers in the 70s were Oral Roberts University (Tulsa), Pepperdine College (Los Angeles), Bob Jones University (Greenville, South Carolina), and Harding College, which was discussed above. All are handsomely equipped for spreading their views among the American people.¹⁵¹

p In the 70s the struggle of black Americans for their rights, continued to be a principal target of the rightist-fundamentalists' furious attacks. The fundamentalists, the Birchers, and the racists were unanimous in demanding that the civil-rights movement be suppressed through armed force.³

p The struggle of dependent and enslaved peoples for liberation is likewise anathema to the rightist-fundamentalists, whose sympathies lie with the dictators, imperialist puppets, and reactionary military juntas of South America and the racists of Africa. Their attitude is typified by the ties between Carl McIntire and the Reverend Iair Paisley, one of the leaders of the rightextremist movement among the Protestants of Northern Ireland. McIntire is undismayed by the terror unleashed against Ulster's Catholics; he has called Paisley a "man of God," sent to Ulster in its "hour of decision."'^53^

p Fred C. Schwarz believes that the victory of the people of Angola over the colonialists and their puppets is a threat to the security of the United States so obvious that only the "wilfully blind" can fail to see it. In his eyes members of Congress who suggested that the USA stop interfering in Angola's affairs were guilty of capitulation, and the demonstrations by working people 256 who demanded that federal funds be used for fighting unemployment rather than a war in Africa were staged by Communists."^1^

p Like other ultra-rightist leaders Schwarz deplored the dishandment of the Subversive Activities Control Board (1973), which was created in accordance with the anticommunist McCarran Act of 1950, and of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (late 1975). For them the demise of these two bodies, together with exposes, of FBI and CIA activities, constituted "Operation Blindfold"—the dismantling of the machinery that guaranteed the stability America needed."^1^

p But Schwarz well knew that there had been no weakening, let alone dismantling, of the USA's police machinery. The truth was that the ruling cliques had been forced to make at least a few adjustments in the vast apparatus of repression that they had constructed behind the people's backs over the years, to adapt it to the changed international situation and the needs of detente. The spirit of the times demanded that they disassociate themselves from the most odious and cynical of the operations that the FBI and the CIA, under the pretext of concern for national security, had conducted against both the American people and the interests of other countries.

p Detente and the mass democratic movement caused significant changes in racist organizations. Colonialism was defeated; independent states rose in Asia and Africa; former colonies became an important factor in international politics; and the world's progressive forces called attention to the racist order in the USA. Furthermore, the struggle of American blacks for their rights attained unprecedented scope. Taken together these events brought a regrouping and reorganization in the racist camp. The change most noticeable in the 70s was a sharp decline in the influence of the existing terrorist organizations. The split between them and those racists who aspired to respectability was a mere disagreement over tactics; nevertheless, for the reasons just named, violent extremist groups found themselves without meaningful support.

p By the mid 60s twenty-two states had forbidden the wearing of the Ku Klux Klan's white robes. In the early 70s Klansmen were responsible for a number of terrorist acts: in 1971 they dynamited school buses in Pontiac (Michigan) in an attempt to prevent school integration; in 1973 they murdered a black clergyman in Alabama; in January 1975 they

injured nine persons during a 257 local Klan rally in South Carolina. FBI agents arrested the most active terrorists, including Robert E. Miles, grand dragon of the Michigan Klan. The immediate consequence of these measures and of others taken by the individual states was a drop in the Klan's membership: in 1976, according to estimates by law-enforcement agencies, the ranks of the once mighty "invisible empire" had dwindled to less than 2,000.^{356–357}

The figure cited, however, hardly reflects the true state of affairs: in several states the Klan has gone underground, keeping its membership strictly secret, or uses religious or sporting organizations as fronts. But it is true that the Klan lost much of its influence, even in the South. Adapting to circumstances, the KKK as a rule no longer stages torch processions and night-time rallies, and tries to give itself a more respectable look. Most of the Klan's leaders now claim to have given up violence, and to be working for their goal—the perpetuation of racism—through political means. These days the Klan usually meets under a cross lit by electric bulbs or neon tubing. Meanwhile the most violent racists, who refuse to countenance the Klan's "liberalization," have gone deep underground to watch and wait.³⁰⁸ From time to time they call attention to their existence with a night-time meeting around the traditional burning cross.

Federal court orders that racial balance be achieved in school systems through busing gave new and powerful impetus to the racist movement in the US/V during the 1970s.

Racists seeking to nullify the Supreme Court's decision formed more than fifty groups to boycott integrated schools. The wealthiest of them began to open private schools for their children in the suburbs, where there are virtually no blacks. In February 1972 the group Save Our Schools, under the guidance of the Reverend Stanley Andrews, led a school boycott in protest against busing in Augusta, Georgia.⁵⁹

Not content with this, segregationists in the North as well as the South began to intimidate and terrorize blacks. Racial frenzy erupted in Boston—to the chagrin of Senator Edward Kennedy, who had repeatedly spoken for integration. Howling mobs threw stones and bottles at buses carrying black children; nine students were hurt. Some four hundred policemen were needed to contain the enraged racists.³⁰⁰ At times regular army units had to be used to subdue racists; their furious resistance to integration made busing one of the central issues in the 1972, 1974, and 1976 election campaigns.

Thus racism and anti-Semitism became more widespread and less covert among the ultras in the 70s. In 1972–1973 the leading ultra-rightist organizations used anti-Semitism for their political ends. The John Birch Society, for example, was actively disseminating anti-Semitic literature in 1972.

The movement in Boston against busing gave rise to a new racist group, ROAR (for Restore Our Alienated Rights), which in time grew into a national organization with branches in all parts of the country. ROAR's leadership was made up of educated people

with considerable weight in state and local government, and especially in the prosperous white suburbs.³⁰¹

p The anti-Semitic Liberty Lobby has been highly active among the ultras since the second half of the 60s. It was founded in the late 50s by Willis A. Carlo, a fervent admirer of Hitler. Fanatical anti-Semites such as Joseph Kamp, Richard B. Gotten, and Kenneth Goff soon joined. Adopting the guise of respectable conservatism, the Liberty Lobby obtained financing from rich patrons such as Conrad Chapman of Boston, Evelyn Beck and E. H. Mettler of California, and J. Howard Pew, the head of Sun Oil.³⁰² Carlo deliberately stays in the background (officially he is the Liberty Lobby's treasurer), delegating leadership to Curtis B. Dall, a retired colonel.

p The Liberty Lobby's "communist plot" theory agrees with Robert Welch's in almost all particulars. Both attribute all of America's present woes to a "worldwide conspiracy," the principal parties to which are Wall Street, the international banks of the Morgans, Rockefellers, and Rothschilds, the Federal Reserve System, the Council on Foreign Relations (the Eastern Establishment), the liberal press, and the major philanthropical foundations. The Liberty Lobby differs from the Birch Society in regarding international Zionism as an essential part of the world "communist plot," the goal of which is to destroy free enterprise and national sovereignty, and to set up a world government under the aegis of Communists and Zionists.³⁰³

p In the 70s the Liberty Lobby was second in size only to the Birch Society among the organizations of the ultras. It had 25,000 members and an annual budget of \$1 million. Its newspaper, the *Liberty Letter*, became one of the ultras' most widely distributed publications. The racist and anti-Semitic *American Mercury*, the *Washington Observer Newsletter*, and the publishing house Noontide Press were all under its sway. Its daily radio program, This Is Liberty Lobby, was heard by more than a million people on eighty-one stations in twenty-eight states.

p The spokesmen of the Liberty Lobby miss no chance to flaunt their anti-Semitism, which also extends to the present government of Israel. They recently presided at the birth of a new, and thoroughly anti-Semitic, racist organization: Citizens for American Survival. Like the Liberty Lobby this new organization, ignoring the rabid anti-Sovietism of Zionist leaders and the Israeli government, espouses the absurd thesis that Moscow and Tel Aviv have concluded a secret pact to gain control of the world. To support these wild charges they have enlisted the services of certain Israelis who for one reason or another are dissatisfied with their country's government.³⁰⁴

p The Liberty Lobby tries to win backing among the middle classes with ceaseless attacks on the federal bureaucracy, tax policies, useless government expenditures, and the largest philanthropic foundations and private fortunes. A report it has published on the federal income tax is most instructive. The government's tax policies are called "the great tax fraud": they allow the rich to avoid paying taxes altogether or to pay less than their fair share, thus placing a heavy burden on the average citizen.³⁰⁵

p And in truth, taxes in the USA have grown to colossal dimensions over the past forty or fifty years. In 1932 they averaged \$65 per capita; in 1972, \$1,502. The total amount of taxes collected increased 233 percent between 1952 and 1972: from \$71 billion to \$236.9 billion.⁰⁰ Between 1929 and 1975 Federal spending increased from \$2.6 billion to \$300 billion. Thus when the rightist press presents its readers with an impressive list of “useless” and ever-growing government expenditures—for maintaining the bureaucracy, for social needs, education, scientific research, and foreign aid¹⁰—this makes a strong impression on the middle classes who shoulder most of the tax burden.

p In the 70s certain rightist organizations were extremely active in a mass movement, known as the tax revolt, which sabotaged the government’s tax policies. The Director of Internal Revenue stated that over four million taxpayers failed to file income tax returns for 1972.³⁶⁸ Coordinating the tax revolt was the Tax 260 Rebellion Committee of America, whose head, James Walter Scott, was brought before a United States District Court in Fresno, California, in December 1973 for tax evasion.³⁰⁹

p The ultras’ sharp criticism of the government’s tax policies helps them to gather support among the broad masses of Americans, especially among the petty bourgeoisie, but their uncompromising position forces official Washington to keep them at a distance. Far closer to the Republican administrations of the 70s were the “respectable ultras,” who have considerable influence among conservatives and superb opportunities to spread their views. *On the Right* by William F. Buckley, founder of the *National Review*, was syndicated in 350 newspapers in the mid 70s. Buckley’s television program *Firing Line*, was carried by 200 stations. He is chairman and co-owner of the Star Broadcasting Group, whose holdings include radio and television stations and a book publisher, Arlington House.

p Order was restored to the ranks of the Young Americans for Freedom after the shock of the 1969 schism, and the YAF continues to be the most important ultra-rightist youth group in the USA. In 1973 it had 60,000 members and more than 500 chapters in all parts of the country. Some thirty-eight Congressmen endorse the YAF. The organization is well financed: in the mid70s its yearly budget was a million dollars, and contributions were received from more than 100,000 persons.³⁷⁰

p About 1,500 delegates from various states attended the YAF’s national convention in Houston on September 2-5, 1971. They reaffirmed the YAF’s faith in the doctrines set forth in the Sharon Statement, which are based on the principles of classical eighteenth- and nineteenth-century political economy. The leaders of the YAF and the other speakers at the convention asserted that the liberals are incapable of solving the acute social problems of the day. In their view all the negative aspects of American life— inflation, unemployment, the growth of crime, drug addiction, even demonstrations by blacks and students—are born not of the capitalist system but only of the administration’s liberal policies.³¹

p During the Nixon years rightists, and especially the “respec- i table” rightists, gained a somewhat firmer foothold in official ’ circles. Goldwater became the president’s

unofficial advisor. Melvin Laird, who had worked for Goldwater—and who zealously advocated victory over communism by any means, even the use of nuclear weapons—was Nixon's first Secretary of Defense.³⁷² After the 1972 election that post was given to another hawk, James R. Schlesinger, and Laird became the president's advisor on internal security problems. W. P. Clements, a Texas oilman, was made Assistant Secretary of State; Howard H. Callaway, a textile manufacturer who headed the ultra-rightist Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge, was made Secretary of the Army. In 1973 Callaway's organization, which has ties with the Birch Society, gave a special award to the American Security Council's television film *Only the Strong*, which advocated dealing with the socialist countries from a "position of strength." Tom Charles Huston, who became the president's Special Assistant on Internal Security, was a leader of the YAF and the founder of the World Youth Crusade for Freedom. Until the Subversive Activities Control Board was abolished in July 1973 it was headed by Otto Otepka, who was associated with the Birchers.

[p](#) After the 1968 election there was an influx of ultras into the United States Information Agency (the organ of foreign policy propaganda), and William F. Buckley became one of its consultants. Just before Nixon resigned he named Joseph Coors, a Colorado millionaire and supporter of the Birch Society, to head the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. (A Senate committee failed to confirm this appointment.)

[p](#) At the beginning of the Nixon years the White House reached a certain degree of understanding with its conservative and rightist supporters on the question of the USA's war in Vietnam. Accompanying its acts with talk about the start of an era of negotiation with the socialist countries, the administration tried to do what Goldwater had urged in 1964—win victory for the USA in Vietnam. Before sitting down at the conference table the US made a last desperate attempt to crush the revolutionary– democratic forces of Indochina. Military aid to the puppet regime in South Vietnam was stepped up; American aggression spread into Laos and Cambodia; North Vietnam was subjected to fierce bombing; scorched-earth tactics were used against the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front.

[p](#) The USA's rightists met these actions with approval. They held numerous demonstrations in support of the administration's policies in South-East Asia. The YAF created the Student Ad Hoc Committee to Support the President's Policy in Vietnam, and 262 tried to claim that most of America's students were not opposed to the administration's course. The committee sent a letter to 1,200 universities and colleges urging student leaders to stand behind the US government's war effort in South-East Asia.

[p](#) The YAF also took out a full-page advertisement to praise Nixon for his decision to invade Cambodia.³⁷³ Even the Birchers, whose attitude toward the Nixon administration was on the whole negative, called mining Haiphong harbor "a step in the right direction."³⁷¹ The position of the ultra-right fundamentalists was an affront to those, both in America and around the world, who were demanding an immediate end to the dirty war in Vietnam and the withdrawal of all US forces from SouthEast Asia. On

April 4 and October 3, 1970, Carl McIntire organized demonstrations on the streets of Washington demanding "total victory" for the USA in Indochina.³⁷⁵

p These instances are far from exhausting the Nixon administration's ties with the ultras. The administration demonstrated its loyalty to the principles of conservatism at every opportunity, especially in its domestic social and economic policies. Nixon vetoed many of the legislative projects of his liberal opponents.

p Nonetheless the few positive social and economic measures the president was forced to take generated opposition among Congressional conservatives. George Wallace called Nixon's Family Assistance Plan, promulgated on August 8, 1969, Washington's scheme for giving "a guaranteed income to people even if they are healthy and refuse to work."³⁷⁶ The Occupational Safety and Health Administration, set up by the Nixon administration, was regularly attacked by the Birch Society. The "new economic policy" adopted on August 15, 1971, to fight inflation got an equally hostile reception.

p The Texas billionaire H. L. Hunt called Nixon "the absolute worst President we ever had."³⁷⁷ The Birch Society's *American Opinion* noted with undisguised vexation that Nixon's 1971 budget "is more planned, has more welfare in it, and has a bigger predicted deficit than any other Budget in this century."³⁷⁸ *Life Lines*, a bulletin put out by Hunt's Line Foundation, called the wage and price controls introduced by Nixon "the Russification of the Economy,"³⁷⁹ and the respectable ultras at the *National Review* saw these controls not only as repudiation of the doctrines the administration had promised to put into practice but also as an attack on the freedoms of citizens, as a step toward authoritarianism.³⁸⁰

p The recession that hit the USA in the 70s demanded larger federal expenditures. The number of persons receiving unemployment compensation increased considerably. The administration, despite its constant promises to cut spending, was forced to increase it. In his 1973 State of the Union message Nixon asked \$122 billion for social programs—\$13 billion more than in the previous fiscal year. Satirizing the administration's continual assurances that it would slash federal spending and return to the Hoover era, the *National Review* wrote that if such cutbacks continued it would not be long until the budget for social programs was down to \$ 200 billion.³⁸¹

p The Nixon administration's proposed 1974/75 budget horrified its allies among the ultras. In 1962 federal spending exceeded \$ 100 billion for the first time; now it had reached \$ 304 billion.³⁸² "What's got into Nixon?" voices on the right were heard asking. "Why hasn't the mandate for conservative politics that the voters gave him in 1968 been carried out in concrete political decisions?" Patrick J. Buchanan, a former special assistant to Nixon, tried to attribute the yawning gap between the president's conservative rhetoric and his actions to the ever increasing claims of blacks, to the traditional enmity of the intellectuals and the media to capitalism, to the devotion of Washington's huge bureaucratic apparatus to the policies of the Democrats, to indecisiveness and vacillation among business leaders, and finally to miscalculations by the White House, which the liberals had tricked into trying to pacify opposition from the

left. Like the author of a confidential memorandum from the United States Chamber of Commerce, Buchanan urged businessmen to unabashedly and unhesitatingly "use their wealth to reward their supporters and punish their adversaries."³⁸³

p All of these things, of course, were factors: the opposition press, the unfriendliness of certain intellectuals to the Nixon administration, and concessions from the White House. But the heart of the matter lay elsewhere. The rightists saw Nixon as one of their own, and expected him to adhere to conservative doctrines. Their disappointment was due to the unrealisticness of what they were asking, which became especially clear during the economic crisis of the 70s. The demands that the government not interfere in society and the economy, and the calls for a return to the days of free competition come down to nothing other than a repudiation of the politics of social reform; they are irreconcilably at odds not only with the aspirations of the working people but also with objective reality, with the system of state-monopoly capitalism, which the ultras' ideologues and politicians term the "collectivist government."

p The inability for as the right would put it, the unwillingness) of the administration to fully realize the ultras' conservative program and dismantle the machinery of state-monopoly regulation cooled relations between Nixon and his rightist confederates. The concrete measures the administration took to fulfill its campaign promises about bringing the USA into an era of negotiation made things even worse.

p On August 10, 1971, the leaders of the American Conservative Union, the Young Americans for Freedom, the Southern States Industrial Council, and the New York Conservative Party, together with the most important figures of the *National Review* and *Human Events* published a declaration condemning certain aspects of the administration's actions and announcing their refusal to support its policies as a whole.³⁸⁴

p At the end of Nixon's first term the main point of disagreement between the administration and its allies among the ultras was detente. Facts that have already gone down in history show that the turn toward peace was not an expression of goodwill on Washington's part. During the 1968 campaign Nixon announced that the time of confrontation was drawing to a close, and that the world was entering into an era of negotiation. This was a tribute to the spirit of the times, to the mood of the great majority of Americans; it was not, however, a reflection of the candidate's real intentions. And so the road to negotiation and to peace in Indochina proved long and rocky. While talking of peace the administration widened its aggression in South-East Asia. Only vigorous new actions by the war's opponents both within the USA and abroad forced the administration to take real steps toward peace.

p In the spring of 1971 Washington was inundated by demonstrators demanding an immediate end to the shameful war. There were stormy anti-war protests in the capital at the start of May; police and regular army units were used to subdue them. The determination of the broad masses to stop the criminal war was met by the administration with repression reminiscent of the McCarthy years, with tear gas and billy clubs.

p The administration did not place all its hopes for stemming the tide of anti-war demonstrations in repressive measures; it also used a stratagem designed to draw the public's attention away from the war in Indochina. Plans to open negotiations with the People's Republic of China had long been debated in the USA's ruling cliques. Now the administration saw political advantage in realizing those plans. Contacts between the USA and the PRC and Nixon's trip in the summer of 1971 helped the administration convince Americans that the "era of negotiation" was dawning; under cover of this smokescreen military efforts in Indochina were escalated in the hope of reaching a breaking-point in the war and eventually winning it. The USA fought the recognition of the PRC in the UN for a quarter of a century; only after it had become clear that the Maoist leadership had adopted a fanatically anti-Soviet course did the US government consider revising its position. But this policy shift nonetheless roused the ire of the right; despite reassurances from the administration that contacts with the PRC would not affect relations with Taiwan American rightists, who traditionally supported Chiang Kaishek, saw Nixon's negotiations with Peking as a betrayal of the USA's best ally.

p American conservatives were shocked to see Nixon "playing soft with our avowed enemies, but risking the friendship and support of our proven allies." They believed his policies were undermining the effectiveness of anticommunist forces in Asia, and threatening the USA with a loss of its "strategic superiority." They were also astonished by the hopeful remarks of administration spokesmen about the prospects for concluding a disarmament agreement with the USSR.^^385^^

p The national convention of the Young Americans for Freedom held September 2-5, 1971 in Houston condemned the principal steps the administration had taken toward detente. The YAF's leaders asserted that the establishment of contacts with the socialist countries and negotiations on limiting strategic offensive weapons would lead to a weakening of the USA's military might and the loss of national sovereignty. Invoking the bugbear of a "red menace," the convention called on the administration to increase 266 military spending for the continuation of the war in Indochina, to expand aid to the USA's allies in Asia, and to step up production of strategic and conventional armaments. As for domestic problems, the YAF urged the administration to leave their resolution to the "unfettered forces of the free market."^^386^^

p The upshot of the differences between Nixon and his rightist and conservative allies was Congressman John Ashbrook's bid for the 1972 Republican presidential nomination. The irritation of the right with the policies of the Republican administration had long been growing; Ashbrook's candidacy provided an outlet. Ashbrook was under no illusions about his real chances; he and those behind him hoped that through this campaign they could change the course of the Nixon administration, and get their demands included in the Republican's campaign platform.

p But many prominent conservatives did not second the criticisms of the administration made by Ashbrook and his backers. Indeed the new policy toward the People's Republic of China was upheld by the leaders of the Republican right. Barry Goldwater, Strom Thurmond, John Tower, Peter Dominick, and other members of Congress discerned in

the administration's policies an excellent opportunity to use Maoism against the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community. Goldwater called on all "responsible conservatives" to stand behind the administration's China policy, and scheduled speeches for the Nixon-Agnew ticket in a number of Southern states.³⁸⁷ He called opposition to Nixon from the right a threat "to the entire party, the entire country, the entire free world and freedom itself."³⁸⁸

Soon afterwards circumstances within the country and around the world forced the administration to take another step—this time a real one—toward detente. The heroism of the Vietnamese people, the active assistance of the USSR and the other socialist countries, the growth of sympathy all over the world for the just war of the peoples of Indochina against American aggression, the mass anti-war movement within the USA—all of this compelled the administration, on the eve of the new elections, to return to the promises it had made four years earlier. By now it was completely clear that the war in Vietnam was hopeless; the fact was so obvious that influential business groups turned against the war. Economic troubles continued to get worse, and sentiment for broadening business contacts with the socialist countries became considerably stronger. The administration was also moved to take positive steps in foreign policy to somehow regain the voters' trust, which it had lost through its unpopular, anti-worker social and economic policies.

Such were the considerations that paved the way for a meeting of the leaders of the USA and the USSR in 1972. In May of that year Nixon visited the USSR. The Moscow talks marked the beginning of a new stage in relations between the two countries, and laid the foundation for genuine detente and an end to the war in Vietnam. For the first time after long years of the cold war the American side expressed a desire for more business cooperation with the USSR. The document "Basic Principles of Mutual Relations Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America," signed in Moscow on May 29, 1972, expressed a common desire to develop Soviet-American relations on the basis of peaceful cooperation and equal security for both sides. A treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems and an interim agreement on certain measures involved in limiting strategic offensive arms were also concluded. The spirit of the agreements signed in Moscow made it impossible for the USA to continue its aggression in Vietnam, and thus favorable conditions came about for attempts at a peaceful solution. In January of 1973 an Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam was signed, and the right of the heroic people of Vietnam to choose their destiny without any outside interference was recognized.

The Soviet-American summit meeting opened the door for the development of mutually beneficial business relations. A number of US firms and banks opened offices in Moscow to promote trade and economic cooperation. Major American corporations created the USSR-US Commercial Commission, a private organization that advocated the removal of all discriminatory barriers to trade with the socialist countries.

p The forces of democracy in the USA were pleased with the outcome of the Soviet-American summit meeting, and this helped Nixon a good deal to winning re-election in 1972. The right, however, actively opposed plans for detente.

p On August 4, 1972, the *National Review* published a "Statement by a Group of Sober Americans," which characterized Nixon's 268 policies as "populist and defeatist." The authors, controverting the opinion of the vast majority of Americans, asserted that negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms were a threat to the national security of the United States; they argued that the "interests of the entire non-communist world depend on American strength and resolution."³⁸⁹ The journal urged that the trend toward detente be counteracted by establishing, under the auspices of the aggressive military-political alliances, a "Department of Irregular Warfare"—a special police force for combating the national liberation movement.³⁹⁰

p The economist Murray Rothbard has written that the *National Review* and its friends would like to annihilate the Soviet Union with nuclear weapons, to drop the bomb on Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi. A prominent editor of the journal once told him: "I have a vision, a great vision of the future: a totally devastated Soviet Union."³⁹¹ William F. Buckley states in no uncertain terms: "Better the chance of being dead . . . than the certainty of being Red."³⁹²

p After the 1972 election Nixon sought to placate the administration's extreme conservative allies by turning over all the leadership posts in the Office of Economic Opportunity—an agency created by President Johnson as part of his "war on poverty"—to prominent people in the Young Americans for Freedom and the Conservative Union, who were sworn enemies of organizations such as OEO. Randal Teague, who as national director of the YAF had denounced Nixon's Vietnamization policy and accused the president of "doubledealing," became Deputy Director for Operations at OEO. It is hardly surprising that not long afterwards OEO ceased to exist entirely.

p One sign of reconciliation between Nixon and his extreme conservative allies was William F. Buckley's acceptance, in 1973, of an appointment to the UN Commission on Human Rights. There Buckley took an extreme reactionary and anti-Soviet stance, which he duly expounded in his next book.

p The American Security Council and the Institute for American Strategy—lobbies for the military-industrial complex—also joined the fight against detente. The ASC worked to build broad popular support for every American government action in Indochina that worsened the international situation; it also maintained dossiers on democratic and liberal organizations.³⁹³ John M. 269 Fisher, president of the ASC and the IAS, considered the politics of arms limitation "suicide." The ASC's principal thesis was that detente is impossible. Consequently the USA should use every means at its disposal to gain superiority over the Soviet Union in all types of weaponry. In order to counter detente the council launched Operation Alert—a complex of propaganda measures (cost: half a million dollars) aimed at bringing back the cold war. The film *Only the Strong* was an integral part of this drive; it advocated dictating to socialist countries. But the

administration was able to appease the military-industrial complex to some extent by maintaining, and even enlarging, the Pentagon's huge budget.

p Although the ultras had a certain influence on the administration's domestic and foreign policies they were at that time unable to turn public opinion in the USA against detente and the development of business relations with the socialist countries. But they found unexpected support in Congress among politicians known in the US as liberals or near-liberals. This was a manifestation of the deep anticommunist bias characteristic of the liberal camp. Prominent among those who opposed the trend toward peaceful coexistence was Senator Henry Martin Jackson of Washington.

p Ultra-conservative members of Congress such as Goldwater, Thurmond, and Tower were forced by party loyalty and their long-time ties with Nixon to hold back in airing their discontent with the administration's foreign policy; Jackson, a Democrat, was subject to no such constraints.

p The senator from Washington favors the continued growth of the USA's military might and a hard line toward the socialist countries. He is an ardent backer of extremely high-cost programs to equip the US armed forces with the latest weaponry, including rearming the nuclear submarine fleet with Trident missiles and building the B-1 bomber. This stance has won him the support of the military-industrial complex.

p From the very start of the Middle East conflict Jackson has steadfastly championed the aggressive policies of Israel, and has battled to get as much financial and military assistance as possible for that country.

p Jackson is no newcomer to politics: he has been in the Senate for nearly thirty years. He is quite well known in the oil, 270 aerospace, and Zionist lobbies. At present he is one of the most determined foes of detente in Congress.

p Jackson opposed the Soviet-American summit talks. When they nonetheless took place he did everything he could to discredit them in the eyes of the American public, asserting, contrary to the facts, that the agreements signed were not in the USA's national interest but one-sidedly advantageous to the Soviet Union. And yet Jackson wants to pose as a champion of peace. He sets up conditions he knows will be unacceptable to the socialist countries, and then tries to accuse them of undermining detente, in which he himself is a "true believer." Jackson and those like him wanted to nip detente in the bud and lay the blame on the socialist countries, thus returning the country to the days of the cold war and to dealing with the socialist camp "from a position of strength."

p Jackson's position has found approval in Congress. Seventyseven senators and 287 members of the House voted for his proposed amendment to the Trade Act. Among those who stood with him were not only representatives of the right in Congress (such as Goldwater, Buckley, Thurmond, and Tower) but liberals too (Javits, Humphrey, and others). The administration could not overlook the support the Jackson amendment got, and began to consult with him. *Time* commented that although Jackson could not stop

detente he had put many obstacles in the way of friendlier relations between the USA and the USSR/^^94^^

p The senator's anti-Sovietism has also led him to encourage contacts between the USA and the Maoist leadership. He visited the PRC in July of 1974, and again in early 1978. In his reports on these trips Jackson painted a rosy picture of the situation in China, and expressed sympathy with Peking's anti-Sovietism.

p The opponents of detente in the USA are rather a motley group. Besides the rightists and their confederates in the Pentagon, they include the Zionists, many liberals, and the reactionary bosses of the union bureaucracies. They have no single coordinating center, and some of them are openly hostile to others, but they all favor an anticommunist, anti-Soviet foreign policy line, and a return to the darkest days of the cold war.

p The power that the idea of detente had within the USA, the way that the basic groups of the population and the main 271 social and political organizations looked at it, could not, of course, fail to be reflected in the position of rightist and ultra-rightist leaders who took part in the 1972 elections.

p President Nixon, with his unpopular, extremely conservative views on social and economic questions, was forced to add a plank calling for detente to his platform in order to secure victory. The rightist leaders who stood behind him—Goldwater, Thurmond, Tower, and other right wingers in Congress—were forced to act contrary to their personal convictions: for them there was no realistic course but to go along with the president in the interests of party unity. This was the only chance they saw for one of their own (as they still considered Nixon to be) to win.

p John Ashbrook and the bloc of "respectable" ultras that backed him were not out to capture the White House; their goal was to push Nixon as far as possible to the right. For this reason Ashbrook's stand on the basic questions of domestic and foreign policy was in strict keeping with conservative ideas.

p The position of George Wallace was more ambiguous. Right before Nixon's 1968 victory he had said of his movement: "Don't think it will die after the election. It can't. It's already too big."^^395^^ But events that followed showed that this sanguine estimate was not entirely justified. Wallace and his party evolved considerably, but in opposite directions. After the 1968 election divisions deepened within the Wallace movement, which had never been sufficiently unified. The American Party began to play a role apart from the American Independent Party; the sway of the Birchers over the AP increased. Both parties remained ultra-rightist and racist. For the time being Wallace remained the nominal head of the AP, but the party, weakened by internal bickering, was hardly a reliable base for his presidential ambitions.

p The power of the black vote grew still greater in the 70s. In 1968 twenty-nine cities had black mayors; in 1972, eighty-six. More than a third of the blacks elected to office, including 206 state legislators, were from the South. In the states of the Deep South

blacks made up from 22 to 30 percent of the electorate.³⁹⁶ All this had its effect on Wallace's campaign tactics. With his eye on the Democratic Party he altered his political stance still further, and hid his racism and antipathy for Washington's social programs. He personally placed the Miss Alabama crown on the head of a black girl at the University of Alabama. When 272 reminded of his famous words on segregation he said that times had changed and that now he preferred "freedom of choice" in the school system.³⁹⁷ In practice "freedom of choice" means turning integration over to local authorities, who are dominated by the racists.

p In order to run as a Democrat Wallace had to develop a "new image." Wallace's campaign strategists carefully reviewed the whole arsenal of tactics that he had used in 1968. It was decided that he should speak, as earlier, in the name of the "little guy," the average American. Much more attention was to be paid to national minorities than in the previous race. Wallace set himself the task of winning over the country's Germans, Italians, Poles, Chinese, and even blacks. His campaign staff, which had about one hundred paid employees and was headquartered near Montgomery, began to publish five newspapers and prepared to publish materials in Chinese, Polish, and Yiddish. Norman E. Jones, a black man from St. Petersburg, Florida, who headed the National Black Citizens Committee for George Wallace, became an active member of the campaign staff.

p The claim that Wallace spoke for the people became central to his campaign. The governor declared that his efforts were "concentrated on trying to straighten out the Democratic Party, trying to make it the party of the people again." He said that he would cut taxes for the middle classes, raise the ceiling on non-taxable income to \$1,200, tax the major foundations, and cut the tax benefits enjoyed by oil companies. While not directly attacking the federal government's various social programs, he promised to review the welfare rolls to weed out free-loaders.³⁹⁸

p The governor made firm resistance to busing the center of his campaign; busing and criticism of the tax structure and the federal bureaucracy became the main points in his speeches.

p Wallace promised to end the war in Vietnam; in view of the voters' anti-war mood he no longer demanded "victory." He promised, as an economy measure, to make the USA's Western allies pay a fairer share of the cost of NATO.

p Wallace had to exercise some restraint in expressing his hatred for academics, whom he had earlier called do-nothings and intellectual midgets. At one point he said he would create a "brain trust" to solve the nation's problems, and declared that he was not against intellectuals, but only "pseudo-intellectuals."

p The Wallace campaign was more successful than many observers had expected. For the other Democratic contenders. Humphrey and McGovern, this came as an unpleasant surprise. The governor beat his rivals in the Maryland, Alabama, Florida, Michigan, North Carolina, and Tennessee primaries. He was second in Indiana, Pennsylvania, West

Virginia, and Wisconsin. But an assassination attempt on May 15 took him out of the race.

p The support that Wallace got in the primaries was due to widespread discontent with high taxes and the dominion of the federal bureaucracy. Wallace also found sympathy among conservatives, who were unhappy with the government's social and economic measures. But the lion's share of his success was due to the racists' mass resistance to busing. Wallace was able to muster many Democrats for this fight, and also influenced the Republicans, who built opposition to busing into their campaign platform. The issue became so significant that on March 17, 1972, Nixon sent a special message on it to Congress.

p The American Party, which Wallace had abandoned, named Congressman John G. Schmitz as its presidential candidate at its 1972 convention in Louisiana. Schmitz was one of the Birch Society's leaders, and his program was permeated with the spirit of Birchism. He opposed social and economic programs, called for a reduction in taxes and federal spending, attacked busing, and supported demands that the power of the federal courts over education be limited. Schmitz charged that US foreign policy was being shaped by people "dedicated to one-world totalitarian socialism," and that the Democratic and Republican parties, "the two wings of the Socialist Party," were leading the country in precisely that direction."^^99^^

p Schmitz hoped to win at least as many votes in 1972 as Wallace had in 1968. But his hope was not realized: he got only about one million votes, which showed a considerable weakening of the party. Somewhat later Schmitz left the American Party and returned to the Republicans; he was criticized for this by AP Party Chairman Tom Anderson, who also belonged to the Birch Society's executive committee. After Wallace left the party it announced that it no longer regarded him as its leader. At present the AP is in the throes of a profound internal crisis.

274

p One of detente's important consequences was to strengthen centrifugal forces in the rightist camp. Some groups, as has been seen, were forced to adapt to the situation; others, on the contrary, were brought to step up their struggle to defend the cold war dogmas shaken by detente. This was bound to create sharper conflicts within the ultra-rightist movement, which found their concrete manifestation in a stronger push for the creation of a third party.

p The Watergate scandal and the advent of the Ford administration, regarded with dismay by the rightists and the ultras, made some conservatives the more determined to break with the Republicans and form a party dedicated to conservative principles. As soon as it became apparent that Nixon could not escape impeachment his conservative friends grouped around the Conservative Union and the *National Review*, disassociated themselves from him. In March 1974 James Buckley declared at a closed meeting of Republican senators that it was imperative that the president resign voluntarily.^^400^^

In August 1974, after Nixon's resignation, the *National Review* published statements by six prominent conservatives, including William Buckley, William A. Rusher, and Ernest van den Haag, approving the move. The journal's editors called on readers to look for ways "to bind the wounds of the conservative community, and remobilize for the ongoing struggle against those who, catapulting us toward the socialist state and a precarious sovereignty are. . . ignoring the bases of human freedom."^^1101^^ (This comes down to a declaration of intent to fight social reforms that encroach in one way or another upon the right to private property.)

[p](#) In February 1975 the Committee on Conservative Alternatives was organized under the leadership of Jesse Helms, a rabid anti-Semite and racist. Some time later this committee was replaced by the Committee for a New Majority, headed by William A. Rusher, the publisher of the *National Review*.TM- Both Helms and Rusher strongly favored forming a new party. Rusher, pointing to public opinion surveys that show more than half of the adults in the USA as considering themselves conservatives, declared that the time had come to put into practice the principles Barry Goldwater enunciated in 1960 in *The Conscience of a Conservative*. He expressed certainly that this goal could be achieved by a new party that would rally to the banner of conservatism all who had 275 retained faith in traditional American values and had not accepted modern liberal doctrines.^^403^^

[p](#) The social base of this new party, in Rusher's view, would be made up of "economic conservatives" and "social conservatives." The first group comprises the traditional conservative nonmonopolist bourgeoisie and well-to-do people in the free professions (doctors in private practice, lawyers, and so on). The second group would be a broad coalition of farmers and Catholic workers of Polish, Czech, and Italian descent who had voted for Wallace in 1968. Rusher would not turn away the Birchers' support, but he insisted that they should not be dominant in the new organization.^^404^^

[p](#) But although a conference of conservatives held in February 1975 repudiated the Ford administration., it reached no consensus on forming a new party.

[p](#) As the 1976 elections approached, the American Conservative Union and allied groups created several new organizations: the Conservative Victory Fund, the National Conservative Political Action Committee, and the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress. Their purpose was to collect money to finance the campaigns of reactionary candidates to Congress.^^405^^

[p](#) The Birch Society and similar organisations acted apart from the respectable right. The American Independent Party, which held its convention in Chicago on August 26–28, sought to destroy the GOP in order to forge the wreckage into a new major party committed to the principles of conservatism and having nothing to do with Nixon and Watergate.^^40^^" The AIP's candidate for president was former governor of Georgia Lester Maddox, a fanatic racist. His name appeared on the ballot in nineteen states.

p The American Party, although it had no differences with the American Independent Party as to principles, held its own convention. Its candidate for president was Tom Anderson. The AIP's candidates were on the ballot in seventeen states.

p The campaign platforms of the AP and the AIP were similar; the central point in both was the categorical demand that federal spending for the needs of working people be stopped. At the same time both insisted that the huge military budget be kept up.⁴⁰⁷

p The influence of these two parties on the course of the 276 election campaign was so insignificant that even Birchers who were candidates for Congress preferred to run as Republicans.

p The Libertarian Party, which arose out of the schism in the Young Americans for Freedom in 1969, named its own candidate for president in 1976: Roger L. MacBride. His name appeared on the ballot in thirty-one states. The Libertarians, like the ultrarightist groups from which they sprang, demanded that the government strictly refrain from interfering in society and the economy. But unlike other ultras they extended this principle to the realm of politics. Thus they favored the abolition of police forces like the FBI and the CIA. In keeping with their cardinal principle of maintaining and defending the individual's freedoms the Libertarians demanded that the US government not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, and adopt a foreign policy that would make it possible to turn the USA into a giant Switzerland.¹⁸ But the Libertarian ideologues take the principle of non-interference so far that they oppose everything that, as they see it, interferes with the free expression of human individuality—including government measures such as fighting racism, narcotics addiction, pornography, and so on.

p The George Wallace movement continued into 1976 as a center of attraction for ultrarightist forces. After the attempt on Wallace's life it seemed that he would no longer be able to be active in politics, and many wanted to count him out entirely. For this or some other reason there were attempts to divide up his "legacy." Many observers in the US began to say that the outcome of future elections would depend on who his former supporters would go with. Some Democrats who had once condemned Wallace as a fanatic now tried to establish contact with him. In July of 1973 Senator Edward Kennedy appeared with him in Decatur, Alabama. In February of 1974 Senator Henry Jackson made a trip through the South and announced that he would be glad to run on the same ticket with Wallace in the 1976 election. The ultras at the *National Review* also wondered whether it would be possible to capture Wallace voters. They concluded that at any rate an effort should be made.¹⁰⁹

p But Wallace himself did not see his position as hopeless, and continued his drive for the White House. In March of 1974 he appeared at the national Democratic governors' conference in Washington and announced that he wanted to run for president in 1976 on the Democratic ticket. According to Gallup polls he was second only to Kennedy in the number of his supporters. Wallace brought his position still closer to the center, which caused a break with his former faithful. "We are glad to be rid of the kooks," said a close

Wallace aide. "We were never comfortable with that crowd. We may have been segregationists at one time, but we weren't crazy. They didn't fit well at all with the Governor's new image."¹¹⁰

p Wallace took measures to win the support of Alabama's black voters. He was applauded at a conference of black Southern mayors in Tuskegee. Many blacks holding elective office (and there have been more than 1,800 such in the South since 1975), including the mayors of a number of cities, believed that Wallace's views on the race question had changed, and expressed willingness to work with him.¹¹¹ After Senator Kennedy announced that he would not run for president in 1976 Wallace headed the list of potential Democratic candidates. Although he had not officially announced his candidacy his campaign actually began in late 1974.

p In early 1976 the *New York Times* considered Wallace the Democrat's most likely choice for a presidential candidate. Public opinion surveys showed that he was still the favorite of one American in five. Wallace's campaign staff, with almost sixty paid employees, was better organized than ever before. As early as 1975 it had collected \$ 3 million in financing. The campaign's principal theme was protecting the interests of the "middle class" from "big government" and excessive, inflationary federal spending. Wallace remained firmly opposed to busing. He suggested that law and order be restored by bringing back capital punishment. He warned of "false detente," which would supposedly give a one-sided advantage to the Soviet Union.¹¹² All in all this was a highly conservative platform. It appealed to the same kind of voters who had been courted by Barry Goldwater. "It is no surprise that there were many Birchers, and even fascists, in local Wallace groups."

p The candidacy of the Alabama governor, which had looked so promising at the start, soon collapsed in the primaries. There was no improvement in Wallace's health; he remained semi-paralyzed. Even his supporters were not sure he could cope with 278 presidential duties. Shortly after the election the Wallace movement disintegrated completely.

Though Wallace dropped out of the presidential race, the 1976 elections showed once more that there were powerful elements in the country that wanted to reverse the course of international relations, revive the cold war, and muzzle democratic and progressive forces. Therefore the efforts of the people of America to expose and isolate the ultra-rightists developed into a battle for true democracy, a battle to bridle the military-industrial complex and other US reactionary forces that are trying to poison the climate of international confidence.

* * *

Notes

[243*] This is generally true of the division of political forces within the USA's ruling class. But some scions of old monopolistic dynasties are to be found on the right, and

there are also nouveaux riches among the liberals. Furthermore there is a significant number of liberals among the petty bourgeoisie.

[254•*] In the USA any private radio station that criticizes organizations or individuals must make available to them, free of charge, sufficient broadcast time to answer such criticism. Failure to do this is punishable by revocation of broadcasting licenses.

The Ideology of the Right

p Rightists base their theoretical constructs on the cult of private property and of free enterprise unrestricted by anyone or anything. They count the right to private property among the natural, inalienable rights of the individual, and equate freedom with the absolutely unrestricted right to hold and dispose of property. For them this right represents the force that effectively holds the entire bourgeois order together. Rightists also maintain that the welfare of society is automatically provided for through the profit motive, which is the force behind social progress and the source of the nation's strength and prosperity.

p Medford Slanlon Evans, a modern ideologue of the right, declares that personal freedom, by which he means the freedom to own and dispose of property, is the American people's Christian heritage, and that it should be jealously safeguarded. ⁴¹⁴–⁴¹⁵^{^^}

p Ultras regard any infringement of the right to property (and most of all social and economic concessions to working people) as an infringement of the freedom of the individual. Without property, they argue, there is no freedom.

p In explaining the social injustices of the bourgeois order the rights ideologues proceed from the premise of "original sin" They maintain that the faults of society are inherent in mankind's "sinful nature." Thus Russel Kirk declares that the real cause of social ills is man himself: liberals who try to deal with social reforms are pulling the cart before the horse. In the right's view reforms are not only useless but pernicious; the graduated income tax and social and economic concessions to working people undermine private initiative (and with it the whole edifice of bourgeois society) and also give rise to idleness and parasitism. The ultras believe that the way to control mankind's "flawed nature" is through strong authority and strict laws.

p The ultras stand on the extreme right flank of conservatism in the USA; by and large the two groups are agreed on theoretical questions. Rightist ideologues hold that the foundations of capitalism are unshakable; they argue that the USA's existing institutions are immutable, since they are founded on political principles that are eternal. Circumstances may change, principles never. This approach is especially characteristic of their economic views, which have found concentrated expression in the works of ultra-conservatives such as F. A. Hayek, Ludwig von Mises, and Milton Friedman—the apologists of free enterprise.

p These authors depict the present tax structure in the USA as a system for redistributing wealth and equalizing incomes—the same thing, supposedly, that the Communists are demanding. In 1953 E. Parmaler Prentice (of Murray, Prentice & Aldrich) asserted that the New Deal had used (he graduated income tax to confiscate all large incomes and estates. From the point of view of private capital these trends toward “equalizing” forebode the end of personal freedom, and lead to despotic government and universal impoverishment incompatible with civilization.⁴¹⁰ Over the last several decades the “unconstitutional power” of the federal government has grown steadily. If this ruinous tendency is not halted, warn the extreme conservatives and rightists, America’s Constitution will be destroyed, and its people deprived of their freedom and prosperity.

p The ideology that extreme conservatives profess today was the essence of American liberalism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Thus the leaders of the modern right quote the liberals of those times (Jefferson, Lincoln, and so on) far more often than they quote the fathers of American conservatism (Hamilton, John Adams, and the like). In Jefferson’s day the freedom and equality proclaimed in the American Revolution had a perfectly definite meaning. For the American colonist and frontiersman freedom meant first of all freedom from the system of government monopolies and rents, from the petty regulation characteristic of a shop economy. For the great majority of settlers it meant freedom from any attempt to interfere with their exploitation of the vast “free lands” of the West. It was assumed that a social order based on private initiative and free enterprise unlimited by anything or anyone would guarantee the welfare of society as a whole, and for each of its members happiness, freedom, and an equal opportunity to obtain the necessities of life. The ideal was a bourgeois democracy based on economic freedom (or in other words on free competition). For a long time the best possible conditions for establishing this ideal in the consciousness of Americans were provided by the specific conditions in which the USA developed: the enormous virgin territories and the huge stores of mineral resources; and the absence of any significant elements of feudalism, the immaturity of class relations, and the relative lack of fixed boundaries among the different levels of society.

p In the age of the entrepreneur the idea that government should not interfere in business affairs (*laissez faire*) was held as an article of faith not only by industrialists but also by many sincere democrats. Among the so-called anti-imperialists of the late nineteenth century, who fought persistently, from within the bourgeois camp, against the USA’s colonial expansion (Edwin Godkin is an example), there were many who believed that *laissez faire* was the only economic policy compatible with a free society.

p But even in the time of industrial capitalism there was no substance to the appearance of equal opportunity created by the free enterprise system. Most of the farmers and the urban petty bourgeoisie had become dependent on the railroads, the big manufacturers, and the banks. The petty bourgeoisie adopted *laissez faire* as its banner in the struggle against the dominance of industrial corporations and the arbitrary exercise of authority; at the same time the owners of the railroads and the industrialists used it to shield their predatory exploitation of working people and dispossession of small property owners.

p The advent of imperialism brought new, qualitatively different changes in US society and the economy. The petty and middle bourgeoisie, who had championed the ideas of political equality, were pushed aside by big capital, which concentrated enormous economic power and political influence in its hands. The monopolies were the rulers; equal opportunity was no more than a myth. Free enterprise had been thought capable of bringing prosperity for all, and for society as a whole; by the end of the nineteenth century it had arrived at its own antithesis: free competition gave way to monopoly.

p As class battles heated up in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the free enterprise system, which had been the foundation of bourgeois democracy in the USA, came more and more sharply into conflict with the aspirations of the great majority of the American people. Demands that government not interfere in the economy now clearly served the ends of reaction. In essence they meant that all social and economic concessions to working people were to be rejected; they were a weapon directed primarily against the working class.

p But at the same time the spontaneous development of capitalism under the "natural law" of supply and demand had ceased to satisfy fully the needs of the bourgeois order itself. It could not give the capitalist system of the twentieth century the stability it required. The furious growth of the monopolies destroyed the traditional "equilibrium" of the bourgeois social and economic mechanism. If competition in the marketplace continued unregulated, the unprecedented economic strength the monopolies were amassing and the deeper impoverishment of working people that went with it might result in conditions that the ruling cliques would be unable to control. The more foresightful of the monopolists realized in time that such a turn of events was possible.

p In the early twentieth century what the "advanced," "educated" bourgeoisie was demanding was, in Lenin's words, "reform *versus* revolution."¹¹⁷ The ruling cliques, in the interests of the monopolies themselves, began to organize and regulate the anarchic development of capitalism, and consequently to place a degree of limitation on the actions of individual corporations.

p Lenin noted this new trend in the development of capitalism. In 1911 he wrote: "Capitalism in its imperialist stage leads directly to the most comprehensive socialisation of production; it, so to speak, drags the capitalists, against their will and consciousness, into some sort of a new social order, a transitional one from complete free competition to complete socialisation."¹¹⁸

282

p But until 1933 government regulation of the economy was no more than a tendency. Free competition continued to be the rule; it was the principle behind the unheard-of boom the USA enjoyed in the 20s. In 1929 came a world economic crisis that shook the whole system of imperialism to its foundations; it was especially severe and destructive in the USA. "The moral and intellectual bankruptcy of liberalism in our time needs no

demonstration”; "modern Western civilization is a failure"—such were the bourgeoisie’s reactions to the crash of 1929.⁴¹⁹

p The crisis forced the US government to set aside its doubts and step boldly into the realm of economics. It exerted a decisive influence in transforming the old liberal doctrines so that they might serve the ruling cliques. The basic outlines of the policies that came to be called modern liberalism were worked out, after the long and agonizing hesitations of the first decades of the twentieth century, in the course of implementing practical measures, dictated by experience, aimed at stabilizing capitalism in the 30s and at providing for its development in the immediate future.

p As the ideologues of the right see things it was precisely from the time of the New Deal that the US government started down the road to "treason." What was unavoidable, or even expedient, from the point of view of the bourgeoisie’s overall class interests—for example, the Roosevelt administration’s National Labor Relations (Wagner) Act—was regarded by many capitalists as a chain of fatal errors, or perhaps of deliberate betrayals.

p As government interference in business affairs, and the social maneuvering that accompanied it, became more pervasive, resistance to these policies grew stronger among the most reactionary American industrialists. This resistance reached its acme after the Second World War; it found expression in McCarthyism and the American extremist movement. The struggle within the ruling groups over the question of social concessions was in essence a reflection of the emergence of state-monopoly capitalism.

p The transition to monopoly, and then to state-monopoly capitalism was complex and extremely contradictory.

p On the one hand, the centralization of economic and political power that takes place under state-monopoly capitalism is objectively conditioned; it is an expression of the inner logic of capitalism’s development. Concentrating vast wealth in the hands of the few inevitably heightens the monopolies’ power over government, and gravely endangers democratic institutions. Monopoly capital, using the machinery of government for its own self-serving ends, was enabled to exploit working people as never before. By doing so it set itself up against the overwhelming majority of the country’s people.

p On the other hand, the enrichment of the monopolies is far from being the only goal of state-monopoly capitalism. Another, and no less important goal is to survive, to withstand the social upheavals of an era when socialism is winning historic victories throughout the world, while the position of capitalism is generally weakening. And so modern capitalism seeks to preserve its influence among the masses both through repression and through establishing a minimum wage, providing for social insurance, guaranteeing employment for the able-bodied, and so on. (The scale on which measures of the second type are carried out depends not, of course, on the goodwill of the ruling cliques but on the intensity with which the working class struggles for its vital interests.)

p But the steps that bourgeois government takes to shore up the position of capitalism and help solve the urgent problems facing it lead steadily toward a further socialization of production and in the end to a negation of the principle of an economy based on private ownership. In other words the goals of state– monopoly capitalism and the means it uses to achieve them are mutually contradictory. [283•*

p It is this conflict, which became highly acute in the USA after the Second World War, that lies behind the battle now going on within the ruling groups. With greater and greater insistence ultra-rightist ideologues are opposing to the politics of social maneuvering an unvarnished apology for the principles of totally unlimited private ownership and free competition. They regard the social reforms that the US government has enacted under 284 pressure from working people as nothing other than a communist conspiracy. This view of bourgeois reformism has been common among reactionary extremists in the USA throughout the twentieth century; it became particularly widespread, however, in the postwar years.

p Opposition to reform found outlet in the numerous probes of alleged communism conducted by Congressional committees from the 30s through the 50s. As applied to certain questions (to labor legislation, for example) this tactic had the full approval of monopolistic capital; in other cases certain spokesmen of the ruling cliques disassociated themselves from the highly dangerous demands of the ultras, who for this reason counted them among the "subversive elements."

p The clash between the liberals and the ultras ranges over a broad field of questions: the prerogatives of the federal government, states' rights, the federal bureaucracy, social and economic legislation, taxes, the budget, government indebtedness, aid to education, health care, and so on.

p The liberals maintain that because of the scientific and technological revolution and the struggle between communism and capitalism the US government must make certain concessions to working people. "In a society as productive as our own," writes Harry K. Girvetz, "every worker can and should be assured of a wage at least sufficient to provide him and his family adequate food, shelter, clothing, recreation, and leisure, while all who are prevented from working can and should be assured of adequate support.'"" The government, he continues, can resolve the difficulties confronting it by promoting the growth of unions capable of negotiating on equal terms with management, providing for a minimum wage, and guaranteeing full employment. It should seek, through flexible use of its monetary and fiscal powers, to achieve the "best use" of the USA's human and physical resources.'^^1^^"^^1^^ Liberals also suggest that the government prevent serious disproportions from arising in the national economy by strictly controlling wages, prices, and profits. Such measures are intended to prevent a new economic crisis, ensure growth, and entrench the rule of the bourgeoisie.

p In recent years the need for cooperation between government and business has been argued still more strongly by liberals who see the USA entering into an era of intense competition for the 285 world's resources and markets. Under such conditions the USA's

progress, and possibly its survival as a world power, they maintain, will depend on effective collaboration between the public and private sectors.'""

p Such a course would inevitably entail limiting the excessive ambitions of some businessmen, expanding the government apparatus, increasing the budget and taxes, and strengthening the federal government at the expense of the powers of the states. Coupled with a gargantuan military budget it would mean inflation and a deepening government debt.

p The ultras' ideologues are opposed to this sort of cooperation; they argue that it would completely subjugate business to government, or that it is a "communist plot." They call social and economic reforms "creeping socialism," and the expansion of the federal government's power "statism"; both are slowly but surely leading away from free enterprise and toward a totalitarian government or socialism.

p As for relations with the world socialist system, the liberals put their bets on forming military blocs and preventing the rise of socialist states in new areas of the globe. They recognize peaceful coexistence in principle, although they hope to weaken socialist countries from within by "bridge-building" and the like. To this end they are not against using subsidies and loans to the developing and socialist countries.

p The rightists regard peaceful coexistence as ruinous, and foreign aid in certain cases as "subsidizing revolution and socialism." They demand that socialism be destroyed with armed force, including nuclear weapons if necessary.

p The position the rightists take on the main social and economic questions is a negative one; they offer no constructive solutions. What they insist on is nothing other than a return to the nineteenth century. This makes them highly vulnerable to attacks by the liberals. What the modern Western world needs, wrote the sociologist Samuel Lubell, is not to look for formulas for escaping reality but to learn a new art of government. The more quickly Americans free themselves from the fetters of the old ideology the more fully they will be able to utilize democracy's most valuable asset: the ability to change what can be changed, and to adapt what can not to the needs of the day.^423^

p The radical right's numerous liberal critics have presented 286 manifold variations on this argument. Nonetheless ultra-rightist ideology has undergone a vigorous revival since the Second World War, and considerably expanded its sphere of influence. At least two objective factors contributed to this.

p First, capitalism, with its cult of private property, is constantly and unavoidably reproducing conditions that foster the ideology of individualism, which is a cornerstone of rightist thought among the masses. As noted above, these conditions have been especially marked in America since the war. No doubt the crisis of bourgeois ideology, the modernization of the classical principles of capitalism that accompanies it, and attempts to deal with the problems facing American society through state-monopoly

regulation helped turn the rightist movement into a jingoistic crusade to save America's heritage.

p Second, the ideological struggle now going on as the general crisis of capitalism worsens has brought about a split within the USA's ruling cliques, making some well-to-do segments of American society fearful of any changes whatever in social and economic relations; Irwing Horowitz has remarked that their identification of change with socialism is almost pathological.⁴ The global clash of the two ideologies has made rightists more fanatical and bigoted than ever; they interpret any move toward compromise by their government, whether at home or abroad, as a compact with the enemy and a betrayal of Americanism.

p The views held by the ultras are rooted in capitalist production, and thus are inseparable from bourgeois ideology as a whole. But not all of those who speak for the bourgeoisie absolutize these principles or apply them in day-to-day practice. Apart from ideology there is also historical reality to be reckoned with—the American proletariat and its demands as a class', and the influence of the world socialist system and the world revolutionary movement. This gives rise to liberalism and reformism, which have a considerable following among the ruling class.

p The recognition by some members of the ruling cliques that concessions are imperative does not, however, imply that they have in any degree turned away from the basic principles of capitalist production that are relentlessly championed by the ultras. Liberal practice is very frequently to be seen in tandem with conservative thinking. Liberalism, to put things figuratively, is the mind of capital; conservatism is its soul. In this light the liberals' hopes that the ruling cliques will set aside their obsolete ideology and adopt alien ideas and doctrines seem as Utopian as the rightists' insistent calls for a return to the 'golden age' of free enterprise.

p The principal schools of modern conservatism in the USA were formed in the 50s and 60s. The foundations of conservatism had been laid back in the 40s by Hayek and von Mises, but their ideas did not find significant recognition until after the war.

p The extreme conservatives, who stand on the economic platform of nineteenth-century liberalism, call themselves "real liberals" or "libertarians." The main body on this contingent is grouped around the *National Review*. Conservatives differ from overt extremists in that they are sober enough to reject the assertions of Robert Welch and those like him that the American government is controlled by Communists or that it is in immediate danger of a communist takeover, but they are unable to shake off the old delusion about a "communist threat" from without. The extremists depict the radical changes that occurred on the international scene after the Second World War, and also the foreign policy failures of the USA, as the outcome of a chain of plots and treasons in high places; the conservatives attribute these reverses to the incompetence, indecision, cowardice, and unparadonable blundering of the government. And there the differences between the two groups end. What Goldwater, Buckley, and others call liberalism, the Birchers call communism. Both groups consider it disastrous for America; both believe

that the Democrats in Washington have undermined the nation's strength in the face of an invasion. In principle there are no firm lines of demarcation between extreme conservatism and ultra-rightism, and at times it is hard to tell their adherents apart. They go to the same meetings and applaud the same speakers. The extreme conservatives may deplore some of Welch's irresponsible outbursts, but they do not condemn those who follow him; indeed, they often say that there are many good Americans among the Birchers. While they may not be members of the Birch Society, they concur with it in condemning the government's social and economic programs.

p One of the most prolific conservative ideologues of the laissez-faire school is William F. Buckley; some authors see him as 288 the virtual head of the organized right-wing movement in America.⁴²⁵

p Buckley was born in 1921 into the family of a Texan who made a fortune exploiting oilfields from South America to Canada, from Israel to the Philippines. In 1958 the value of Buckley senior's holdings was estimated at no less than \$100 million. He was a self-made man, an American tycoon of the classic type; he acted alone, and at his own risk.

p Together with his father's wealth Buckley inherited his rigid ideology, based on free enterprise and the survival of the fittest.¹²⁰ Later in life he was to set forth his credo in the *National Review*, which he began publishing in 1955. "To save the Republic," declared an editorial article in the first issue, "conservatives must rescue America from the corrupting and ubiquitous fallacies of liberalism."⁷ "The competitive price system," Buckley maintains, "is indispensable to liberty and material progress. It is threatened not only by the growth of Big Government, but also by the pressure of monopolies—including the union monopolies."⁴²⁸

p But Buckley has not been active in fighting the monopolies. Indeed, as James Wechsler, editor of the *New York Post*, wrote, "he adeptly finds high social justification for every antisocial practice of the business community."¹²⁹ His attitude toward the unions is another matter: Buckley is known as one of the foremost enemies of working-class organizations. He advocates adopting new anti-union measures, in particular laws guaranteeing the "right to work" and the "rights of individual workers." Such laws would serve to limit the strength of the unions, which Buckley argues blindly concentrate dictatorial power in the hands of a few irresponsible and self-perpetuating union bosses.

p Buckley received an excellent education, first in London, then in New York. From 1943–1950 he continued his studies in Mexico City and at Yale. He studied history, economics, and the social sciences. He passed his apprenticeship as an ideologue and popularizer of the doctrines of the ultras at *Human Events* (1951) and the *American Mercury*.

p Buckley attained national note in 1951 with the publication of his first book, *God and Man at Yale*, subtitled *The Superstitions of "Academic Freedom."* The book was one of the year's best 289 sellers, and brought its author loud acclaim from the right. It attacks the university and its administration for despising religion, repudiating economic

individualism, and abusing academic freedom. The author calls for a “revolution” against liberalism, which is termed “the new orthodoxy.”

p Buckley made an especially vehement assault on the textbook *Economics: An Introductory Analysis*, by Paul A. Samuelson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who he claimed propagandized collectivism and government interference in the economy. The universities’ main purpose, Buckley argued, is to instill Christianity and individualism. They should not only eradicate every influence contrary to this goal, but also hire professors who actively uphold religious and economic orthodoxy. “The duel between Christianity and atheism,” wrote Buckley, “is the most important in the world.” And furthermore: “The struggle between individualism and collectivism is the same struggle reproduced on another level.”™ After the appearance of Buckley’s book many began to regard him as the right’s “official philosopher.”

p In 1954 Buckley, in co-authorship with L. Brent Bozell, brought out a book defending McCarthy. The ardor with which Buckley went about this task gave James Wechsler reason to call him McCarthy’s “emissary to the elite”; Buckley, he said, “translated McCarthy’s disorganized clatter into the patter of intellectuality.”“^1^^ While admitting that McCarthy was guilty of certain “exaggerations” and improbities, Buckley and Bozell painted him as a figure of national importance; McCarthyism, they argued, was “a weapon in the American arsenal” and “a movement around which men of goodwill and stern morality can close ranks.”“ And further: “We cannot avoid the fact that the United States is at war against international communism, and that McCarthyism is a program of action against those in our land who help the enemy.”“ How well their words accord with the trumpeting of McCarthy himself, who in 1952 published a book with the title *McCarthyism—The Fight for America!*

p By upholding the right of Congressional investigators such as McCarthy to take arbitrary action against persons and organizations that stood for democracy, Buckley and Bozell meant to justify mass firings, in disregard of Constitutional guarantees, of federal employees. Buckley and others like him looked on the 290 presumption of innocence as “the major barrier in the way of an effective security program.”“

p Here once again the contradictoriness of rightist ideology shows through. Buckley and the other conservative ideologues speak as adversaries of “statism” and “big government.” They protest against government price controls, minimum-wage and civil-rights legislation, and the graduated income tax. But this stance does not inhibit them from demanding that the government use its might to drive the unorthodox out of various spheres of public life, or enact “right-to-work” and “anticommunist” laws. Although a superficial acquaintance with the writings of the right’s ideologues and leaders might suggest that they oppose the strong centralized power of the federal government, this is not the case. They simply want to keep it from tampering with the economic interests of business, while using its full force against the havenots.

p In *Up From Liberalism*, published in 1959, Buckley began in earnest to impugn bourgeois democracy as a form of government. “Democracy,” he wrote, “is nothing more

than a procedural device.” It is “not necessarily nor inevitably a good form of government”: it “must be justified by its works.” Buckley’s main target continued to be the liberals—who he claimed were in complete control of public life and government. “The salient economic assumptions of Liberalism are socialist,” he wrote.”⁵

p Buckley warned that liberals in key government posts were steering the country toward catastrophe in domestic affairs and self-destruction in foreign policy. He argued that if the prevailing tenor of the USA’s foreign policy were not changed in time the West could not survive. In an attempt to define his suggested alternative to liberalism’s “suicide” course, Buckley wrote: “We consider ‘co-existence’ with Communism neither desirable, nor possible, nor honorable; we find ourselves irrevocably at war with Communism and shall oppose any substitute for victory.”³ No comment needed.

p In 1962 Buckley and the editors of the *National Review* brought out a book defending the House Committee on Un-American Activities. They upheld the right of investigators to ignore the Constitution in going about their work. In a polemic against the historian Henry Steele Commager, who had called for greater tolerance of heterodoxy, they declared: “Even if we should take it 291 for granted . . . that tomorrow our society will believe differently, we do not believe less strongly today, nor cease to assert our views, or to protect them, by the use of the common sanctions, legal, moral, and social.” And further: “In time of emergency Congress may . . . declare implicitly what is and isn’t un-American . . . in behalf of the survival of the nation, understood as the survival of a nation implicitly dedicated to a set of values. . . . If the Constitution is not, as presently understood, resilient enough to cope with the contemporary requirements of survival, then the Constitution should be modified.”⁷ Buckley is openly and clearly demanding that the democratic form of government be repudiated; in this he is at one with those from whom he would disassociate himself.

p The works of Buckley and his followers laid the foundations for modern extreme conservatism, whose elements are laissezfaire economics, orthodox Christianity, and anticommunism. In the eyes of many Americans Buckley continues to be the “chief lancer” in conservatism’s tilt with communism.”⁸

p The position of Buckley and his journal is an irresponsible and reckless one, although he himself considers it the only chance to “save” Western civilization. Willy-nilly it matches up with the position of the extremists. And so it is not at all surprising that Robert Welch places his full confidence in the editors of the *National Review*, and would like to see their publication in every college library in the United States/” Irving Brant, writing in the *New Republic*, rightly called the *National Review* the “identical twin of the John Birch Society, wearing a Roman toga instead of a Mother Hubbard.” Richard Dudman, who cites this remark, adds that “for all its intellectualism, the ‘National Review’ makes its own bows to the sillier and more emotional side of the conservative movement.”⁹

p Among the ideologues of the right there is a group that feels the “libertarians” are oversimplifying things with their insistence on an unlimited right to private property.

These are the "traditional conservatives," or simply the "traditionalists." In their writings no direct connection is made between freedom and the interests of private property. They accuse the libertarians of "dehumanization of society," "vulgar materialism," and "economic determinism." They prefer to focus their attention on tradition, culture, religion, education, and morality.

292

p Among the traditionalists are both moderate conservatives and archreactionaries such as M. Stanton Evans and Russell Amos Kirk. Although they condemn the crude individualism and "vulgar materialism" of Buckley, Goldwater, von Mises, and Hayek, the traditionalists, like the libertarians, assail the theory and practice of liberalism over the past thirty or forty years. They reject the idea of using government as an instrument for improving the social and economic position of working people. In the realm of economics they oppose "arbitrary" government action, and favor "constitutionalism." They condemn "statism" on the federal level, and support it on the level of state government. They are willing to make an exception, however, for investigations (such as McCarthy's) conducted for political motives by federal bodies. Evans, one of the youngest conservative ideologues, calls for changing present conditions by whatever means necessary, and defeating the politics of reform. In this his program accords with that of the Birch Society and other extremist groups.

p The most prominent spokesman of traditional conservatism who shares the conviction that progressively and democratically minded citizens must be persecuted is Russel Kirk. His first book, *The Conservative Mind*, appeared in 1953, when this theme had been almost completely forgotten in scholarly writing. Two years later he published *Academic Freedom: An Essay in Definition*. With the appearance of his *Program for Conservatives* (1962) Kirk came to be seen as a conservative ideologue, although he does not regard himself as such, and denies that conservatism is an ideology."

p In Kirk's view conservatism is a "state of mind" shared by people in different segments of society. He considers Americans the world's chief conservative nation, "immeasurably influenced by the spirit of religious veneration, firm in traditional morality, hostile to arbitrary power whether possessed by a monarch or a mob, zealous to guard against centralization . . . convinced of the necessity and beneficence of the institution of property."¹⁴²

p The traditional conservatives trace their lineage to the eighteenth-century philosopher Edmund Burke, who strongly opposed the French Revolution and upheld the so-called Glorious Revolution of 1688, which was based on the principle of class compromise. Burke called succession in working out political solutions "the healthy habit of the British Constitution." In this 293 light Burke regarded the bourgeois English Revolution not as a decisive break with the past but as an attempt to preserve ancestral laws and liberties.¹⁴⁴ Applying Burke's views to the American Revolution, Kirk argues that the War begun in 1775 was fought "to preserve the traditions of American society . . . not to create a new order."¹⁴⁴

p But while they adopt Burke's ideas about succession and conservation, those modern traditionalists who lean toward the ultras disregard his remark about correction,"⁵ which, if applied to social and economic conditions, could be the starting point for a policy of compromise and democratic reform. Kirk and those like him, ignoring this side of Burke's philosophy, approach the question of social justice with the premise that existing institutions are eternal, that they are preordained for mankind. Kirk expresses his standard of justice this way: "To each man the things that are his own." The Christian ideal, he asserts, presupposes that "men have a right to the product of their labor," and that "no man shall seize the property and the rights that belong to other classes and persons, on the pretext of an abstract equality." " That some are richer than others, have more leisure, and receive a better education is as natural as the fact that some are better looking, stronger, fleeter, or healthier than others. Nothing can be done about this; it is the way life is. But Kirk does hold out consolation for the poor, the wretched: "Poverty, even absolute poverty, is not an evil; it is not evil to be a beggar."⁴¹⁷

p Kirk does not recommend correcting the defects of society— and he admits that bourgeois society does have its defects—in the way the liberals go about it, with social legislation. "The outward signs of disorder," he writes, "very often are no more than the symptoms of an inner ravaging sickness, not to be put down by ointments and cosmetics." He maintains that the real cause of the trouble should be sought "in the heart of man—in our ancient proclivity toward sin."⁸ Kirk believes that some social maladies are completely incurable; others can be remedied only by time, the great healer. He also warns that human reason cannot be wholly trusted in considering the prospects for social development, since "our future depends in considerable part upon Providence, or chance." Kirk offers still more arguments against "meddling" with the natural course of things. For example, he holds that each generation should honor its ties with those that went before, while recognizing that it has no right to decide the fate of those that will follow.'¹⁵⁰

p Like Buckley, Kirk sees it as the conservative's duty to stoutly defend private enterprise, "the only really practicable System, in the modern world, for satisfying our economic wants" and for achieving a just and free society."¹

p Kirk does not, however, embrace the extreme individualism to which the adherents of the libertarian school are carried by their devotion to free enterprise. Such a shift of emphasis, he cautions, may do a disservice to the conservative cause. One of the biggest mistakes of Buckley and others like him, according to Kirk, is that they are too much taken with the economic doctrines of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century liberals, whose arguments they use in defending the principles of modern conservatism. Overemphasis on individual rights turns people away from conservatism and toward the alternative—"collectivism." This "crude individualism" is contrary to the cardinal principle of Christian ethics, "Love thy neighbor," which is the binding force of society and guarantees its functioning. "The enlightened conservative," he writes, "always has stood for true community . . . through love and common interest, for the common welfare."¹²

p In Kirk's conception the opposite of "collectivism" is "community." Community is based on goodwill, love, and diversity, while collectivism is based on force, hatred, and uniformity. Kirk sees many of the odious signs of collectivism in modern American society, and warns that trying to restore union with social legislation will only make things worse.⁴⁵³

p Kirk has no constructive alternatives to offer; his program is almost entirely negative. His ideal would be a return to the primordial principles of politics and ethics, that is to say, to the days when there was no organized workers' movement or social legislation. Some of today's laws do meet his approval, an example being the Taft-Hartley Act, which he says partially restored fairness in relations between labor and management.⁴⁵¹

p Kirk's heart goes out to various corporations that he claims are "doing all in their power to encourage a sense of loyalty and continuity among their employees," and thus to shore up the community of men." But the proletariat is behaving shamefully. It has "lost the very concept of order," and is wrecking the social community. Order can be restored only by force.⁴⁵ Or perhaps there is one other way: borrowing an idea from Wilhelm Röpke's work *The Social Crisis of Our Times*, Kirk suggests that the economy be "humanized" by turning workers into small property owners.⁴⁴⁴

p The stunt Professor Kirk proposes to deproletarianize the working class (which is obviously intended to win the backing of the petty bourgeoisie), as well as his insinuations about "Soviet imperialism" and a "communist plot" may be left to his conscience. It is clear that he stands for the ideas of the right just as much as those he criticizes—Buckley, Goldwater, von Mises, and numerous other "libertarians." He too is worried about "creeping socialism," which will inevitably end in "totalitarianism." He too believes there is a danger that the liberals whom he calls "socialists" will bring about the downfall of American society. And he too urges conservatives to take up arms against this danger.⁴⁴⁴

p A number of right-radical philosophers adopt a position intermediate between the "libertarians" and the "traditionalists." Willmoore Kendall, for instance, is essentially a traditionalist although he does not, like Kirk, pay reverence to Burke. Like most conservatives Kendall thinks that any viable society must have an "orthodoxy"—a set of fundamental beliefs. The USA's orthodoxy found expression in the social order that emerged after the War for Independence; this order must be altered only with the aim of more perfectly realizing the "American heritage." Kendall is adamantly opposed to changes that would transform that heritage into something contradictory to its essence; the "liberal revolution," he maintains, threatens American society with just this sort of radical change.⁵⁰

p Frank S. Meyer, another rightist ideologue, is a great admirer of nineteenth-century liberalism (that is, of the classical principle of free enterprise). In this he stands nearer to Buckley than to Kirk, whom he charges with undervaluing individual freedom and placing too much emphasis on such concepts as duty, obedience, and authority. Meyer is

afraid that Kirk's attitude could serve as an indirect justification for "totalitarianism"—by which he means limiting the economic independence of capital. But like Kirk, Meyer rejects the utilitarian philosophy of free enterprise because it does not recognize moral principles.

p Unlike some conservative politicians, who depict their views as 296 virtually revolutionary, Meyer says forthrightly that conservatism is counter-revolutionary: "We are living in the midst of a revolution which is directed towards the destruction of Western civilization. Conservatives are by definition defenders of that civilization; and in a revolutionary age this means that they are, and must be, counter-revolutionaries."""

p Rightist ideologues of every stripe are alike, however, in trying to discredit the policy of social reforms that working people have pressed upon the government, and to show the necessity of reverting to the classic capitalist order. George P. Loweke writes that "a return to robust capitalism is the only cure" for what ails the USA.^^4^^"^^1^^ Establishing this claim is the main objective of the USA's rightist ideologues on the domestic policy front.

p Isolationism has also played a part in shaping the ultras' ideology. Social consciousness in the American colonies was directly affected by emigration from Europe—by flight from poverty, oppression, and persecution, political and religious. Many of the groups that came to America regarded Europe with deep mistrust, and associated it with disorder and war of every description.

p Isolationism also flourished in rural areas, where bigotry made everything foreign the object of suspicion, even of hatred. There was a special enmity toward England, which had tried to foster in America the same sort of regime that the settlers had left Europe to escape. Anglophobia was strongest among the Irish, and then among the Germans, of the Middle West. English influence was especially great in the Eastern states, which had close financial and industrial ties to European, and particularly English, capital. Thus isolationism also had in it a perceptible strain of distrust for the East.

p Although on the whole progressive, the Populist movement, which battled the monopolies in the late nineteenth century, was unable to shake off the prejudices of isolationism. The farmers of the West condemned the concentration of capital, but they thought of it as a foreign plot. The Populists believed that Wall Street and the London bankers had deliberately brought misery upon the people. In rural areas there were many who shared the hatred of international bankers and "urban parasites" vented by Ignatius Donnelly, a leader of the Populists' left wing.^^4^^"^^1^^ Donnelly stood for the interests of the farmers, he angrily denounced 297 the "devilish conspiracy of bloated Easterners and Britishers."^^463^^

p McCarthy made highly effective use of these prejudices, which persist to this day among plain folk in the Middle West. The portrait of a "Communist" that he painted in his infamous speech in Wheeling^^10^^"^^1^^ was a transparent likeness of the so-called Eastern elite—moneyed people of Anglo-Saxon descent, graduates of the finest schools.

His attacks on the State Department and the British government appealed to this traditional anti-English bias. "Where have we loyal allies?" McCarthy asked. "In Britain? I would not stake a shilling on the reliability of a Government

[p](#) ¹¹ which, while enjoying billions in American munificence, rushed to the recognition of the Chinese Red regime, traded exorbitantly with the enemy through Hong Kong and has sought to frustrate American interest in the Far East at every turn."¹⁰⁵ Thus McCarthyism struck out at the same groups as did its liberal predecessors.

[p](#) Americanism, a peculiar form of patriotism, evolved under the influence of the isolationist mood in the USA. It was first of all an expression of loyalty to the American way of life and the American political system, which is claimed to be indisputably superior to the old, reactionary, monarchic order of Europe. Eventually ideological orthodoxy came to be seen as the main criterion of Americanism, and a requisite of good citizenship. "The concept of Americanism," wrote Seymour Martin Lipset, "has become a compulsive ideology rather than simply a nationalist term."¹¹⁰ Anything that departed from the orthodox was considered un-American, or even a "conspiracy." This point of view found enthusiastic adherents in the ruling cliques, who in the wake of the October Revolution began to interpret Americanism in an anti-Russian, anti-Soviet, and anticommunist spirit, and to energetically propagandize this version of patriotism among the masses in the USA. In their minds Americanism came to be the antithesis of socialism and communism.

[p](#) Today's rightists have taken the interpretation of Americanism still further. Equating liberalism with socialism, they have branded the liberals too as anti-Americans, as conspirators and traitors. Fighting "disloyalty" and "treason" has become the right's principal means of expressing its "patriotism" and "one-hundred percent Americanism."

[p](#) Isolationism has also greatly affected the USA's foreign policy. ²⁹⁸ In the years between the two world wars it was the basis for a movement against diplomatic recognition of the USSR and the creation of a collective security system in Europe. While playing on the American people's love of peace, this movement in fact had a pro-fascist, pro-Hitler orientation.

[p](#) With certain exceptions, isolationist sentiment distinguishes those who followed McCarthy and the radical right of the 60s and 70s from those who opposed them. As Samuel Lubell has noted, the greatest outpouring of anticommunist feeling came from those who had opposed US involvement in the Second World War, while the voices loudest against McCarthyism were those that had insisted that the US enter the war.⁴⁰¹

[p](#) After the war delusions about the USA's economic and military might gave rise to neo-isolationism, and many rightists adopted this position. This does not mean, however, that they have given up the fight against socialism; the difference is that while, in the battle against the socialist system, others look to the combined strength of the imperialist powers, in the battle against the socialist system, represented by NATO and other

military blocs, the neo-isolationists trust in the military and economic potential of the USA alone. Colonel McCormick, an ardent supporter of McCarthy, said that America did not need friends; Senator Robert Taft put it this way: America did not need friends much.⁴⁰⁸ Neo-isolationism underlies the demands made by some rightist organizations that the USA withdraw from international bodies and cut off aid even to its military allies. They think the best bet would be a preventive atomic strike against the USSR and the other socialist countries, which they hope would secure victory and thus do away with the world communist movement once and for all.

[p](#) In 1960 William S. Schlam, a rightist intellectual and *National Review* staffer, travelled to several European countries to preach the gospel of the Birch Society on the need for a preventive war against the USSR. In one of his talks he declared that the USA could sacrifice 700 million lives to defend the West and its territorial aspirations in Eastern Europe.⁴

This attitude represents an especial danger for the entire world; many extremists are ready to risk the annihilation of all mankind to wipe out socialism through armed force. Their motto is "Better dead than red."

* * *

Notes

[283*] These questions have been treated quite, extensively in Soviet economic literature. See, for instance, the remarks of N. N. Tnocmscv and Ye. L. Khmel'nitskaya at the international conference held in Moscow to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of Lenin's work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (in *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhnatsionnyye otnosheniya*, 1967, No. 6), and also the articles of A. G. Mileikovsky and Ya. A. Pevned (ibid., 1970, No. 4, pp. 22, 46–53).

The Class Roots and Social Base of Right Extremism

[p](#) A survey made shortly before the 1964 election showed some 20 percent of the American electorate inclining towards right extremism; in addition to rightists this group included those voting for racists and anti-Semites. Between 25 and 30 percent actively opposed rightism. These estimates were confirmed at the polls in 1964, and elections since have not indicated any essential change in the balance of political forces within the USA.

[p](#) The right-extremist movement draws support from quite diverse social groups. Its mainstay are those arch-conservative American business circles whose fierce resistance to the New Deal in the 30s earned them the name of economic royalists. Side by side with this old guard marches the legion of those who have made their fortune in the past several

decades. Both groups readily avail themselves of the benefits of the scientific and technological revolution while resolutely ignoring its social consequences.

p In the 40s and 50s highly influential organizations of big capital such as the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States stood with the ultras under the banner of McCarthyism.

The National Association of Manufacturers is the oldest American business organization; in the early 70s some 14,000 companies were members. The position formulated and espoused by the NAM in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, at the dawn of bourgeois reformism, is the quintessence of modern right-extremism. The materials of the association's conventions abound in declarations about an ironclad right to private property, and references to "human nature" as the source of social ills. In 1913 the NAM characterized the social legislation (which it termed "class legislation") of the "progressive era" as socialist, contrary to the first principles of individual freedom, and unAmerican, and warned that it would lead to anarchy. The association protested loudly against the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, laws regulating work hours and wages, the graduated income tax, and other such "idiotic acts" by state and federal legislators, as well as against the closed shop and the collective bargaining system.⁴⁷⁰

300 [BEGIN]

p At its 1914 convention the NAM declared that the greatest threat to individual freedom and property was arbitrary regulation of labor-management relations, and that proposed reforms that had gained attention and support would mean a radical departure from the vital principles of the American way of life. The convention recommended intensified educational efforts, using a wide range of means, to influence public opinion. It also adopted a resolution that called for condemning and driving out the "self-appointed or politically promoted demagogues" who were trying to win votes with economic measures.⁴⁷¹

p The negative attitude taken by business toward the first attempts at government regulation of social and economic relations makes it proper to say that the modern ultra-rightist movement originated at the beginning of the twentieth century, when the foundations of state-monopoly capitalism were being laid in the USA. All of the movement's development since has been directly related to the scope and depth of the federal government's involvement in social and economic affairs.

p During the Second World War the NAM Postwar Committee put out a pamphlet arguing that the government should limit its role in the economy to creating conditions that would help the private sector to fulfill its mission—providing Americans with jobs and services. The publication also urged that unions, which it called labor monopolies, be made as weak as possible, and that government corporations be liquidated once the war was over.⁴⁷²

p In 1952 NAM President William White, speaking before the association's national convention, solicited support for the fight against "creeping socialism." His plea did not go unheeded; in 1953 US corporations spent \$7.9 billion to advertise not only their products but also their opposition to social and economic concessions to working peoples.⁴³

p Another organization representing the American bourgeoisie is the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; it comprises more than 3,700 local and state Chambers of Commerce, which include 33,000 individual companies.⁴⁴ Like the NAM, the Chamber of Commerce is under the sway of big industry; the members of both organizations come mainly from the petty and middle bourgeoisie.

p The Chamber of Commerce sees "socialism" in government price controls, federal planning, and the very existence of 301 government enterprises that compete with private business. It maintains that the graduated income tax, inheritance taxes, Social Security, minimum wage laws, federal housing construction, rent control, and certain other government measures amount to a policy of redistributing wealth and "socializing" incomes."

p Like the NAM, the Chamber of Commerce considers competition the best regulator of prices and stimulus for improving production. Competition is regarded as a guarantee of equal opportunity for all and an effective curb on economic abuses.⁴⁵

p In the first decade after the war the Chamber of Commerce published a series of pamphlets that later became guides to action for many of McCarthyism's probes into "communism." Later the chamber said proudly that it had "pioneered in warning the nation against the menace of Communism"⁴⁶ In 1947 it brought out *Communists Within the Government* (discussed earlier in this book), and shortly thereafter loyalty tests were instituted for all of federal officials. At the same time it circulated the pamphlet *Communists Within the Labor Movement*, which exhorted business owners to drive Communists out of the unions with the help of anticommunist groups within workers' organizations, experts on anticommunism, and the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and printed and oral appeals to workers.⁴⁸ Congress was receptive, and built many of the chamber's suggestions into the Taft-Hartley Act.

p Even before McCarthy appeared on the scene, propaganda by the largest organizations of industrialists had evoked charges of "communism" against those spokesmen for business who on the whole supported the government's policies. Right extremists furiously attacked the Committee for Economic Development, a highly influential organization of American big business that had called for the federal government to take a more active role in resolving pressing social and economic problems.⁴⁹

p Although the NAM and the Chamber of Commerce claimed to be against a strong federal government, they in fact supported every government measure that favored the monopolies. For them big unions were the main enemy. They and organizations like them

extolled individual action, and championed agreements doing away with "compulsory unionism" and defending the "individual rights" of workers. In later years, invoking the same reasons, they fought the closed shop and all systems of that type, 302 nationwide labor contracts, and solidarity strikes. The NAM demands that anti-trust laws be made applicable to the unions. As a result of such efforts nineteen states still had so-called right-to-work laws in the 70s, and court orders were still being used against strikes in over half the states. To this day three-fourths of the American proletariat remains un-unionized, largely because of the resistance of the bourgeoisie.⁴⁸⁰

[p](#) And so the politics of the NAM and the Chamber of Commerce in the first postwar decade were essentially identical to McCarthyism.

[p](#) In early 1951, according to the Gallup Institute, 49 percent of America's industrialists approved of McCarthy. Among the senator's adherents sociologist Daniel Bell has singled out the new rich—automobile dealers, real-estate manipulators, oil wildcatters, and the like—who felt that they had gained their fortunes without any help from the government, and feared that now they might be robbed of their wealth by taxes.* "We can hardly go wrong," said the *Monthly Review* in January 1954, "in assuming that the phenomenon of new wealth is nationwide in scope and impressive in proportions."¹⁴ In the years following the war the nouveaux riches were remarkably active in defending their economic interests. In the words of the American sociologist C. Wright Mills, they were imbued with "those noisy political emotions and status frustrations which, on a national scale and in extreme form, have been so readily observable in The Investigators."¹⁴

[p](#) Surveys conducted by *Fortune* magazine in early 1954 (253 representatives of big industry and banking from thirty cities in the USA's main economic centers were canvassed) showed how various industrial groupings looked at McCarthy and McCarthyism. McCarthy's appeal to the anticommunist bias of big business had evoked a lively response from all those questioned. Business leaders were particularly taken with McCarthyism's attacks on intellectuals—"longhairs" and "eggheads" who had argued that the New Deal and subsequent social and economic reforms were necessary.

[p](#) Sentiment for McCarthy was strongest in the Middle West and in Texas. Some 2,500 members of Chicago's business elite came to hear McCarthy speak at a breakfast held in December 1953. Of twenty-three businessmen polled there (most of them 303 board members or presidents of large corporations) twelve declined to comment, but nine spoke out in favor of McCarthy. Among the latter were General Robert E. Wood and John T. Beatty, the president of a company manufacturing machinery. Wood told the *Fortune* correspondent: "My opinion of him [McCarthy] hasn't changed one iota. McCarthy is doing a job that had to be done to get the traitors and spies out of our government. . . McCarthy went on although he knew he would be smeared especially along our great eastern seaboard."¹⁴ Republican Party boss T. Coleman Andrews was a staunch McCarthy man, as was Milwaukee industrialist Walter Harnischfeger. McCarthy also had ties with Chiang Kaishek's lobbyists, with housing construction firms, and sugar refiners.

p Big business in Texas was not to be outdone in enthusiasm for McCarthy. In February 1954 more than a thousand Texas industrialists, bankers, and ranchers attended a lavish reception in Dallas at which McCarthy spoke on "Twenty Years of Treason" by the Democrats. The senator was introduced as "the greatest one-man show on earth"; even Martin Dies, a native son of Texas, admitted that he had never been accorded so much attention as McCarthy, the "first defender of the Republic." Most of the Texas businessmen belonged to the Democratic Party, but because of their opposition to its leadership were lining up behind the Republican right.

p Texas oilmen were especially active political backers of McCarthyism. They spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to fight the Eisenhower administration once it became clear that in principle it accepted all of the social and economic legislation of the past twenty years. H. L. Hunt, the richest man in America, bought thousands of copies of Senator Jenner's report on "subversion" in the government, and distributed them all over the country. He gave McCarthy steady financial backing, paid for the senator's radio and television appearances, and popularized investigations of progressive and liberal organizations on his radio show, Facts Forum. "I like McCarthy," said Hunt in 1954. "His idea of getting the Reds out of the government—well, I think that's wonderful." Clint Murchison of Dallas and William Keck of Houston (president of Superior Oil) had personal bonds with McCarthy. The former gave the senator from Wisconsin \$10,000 and spent another \$25,000 according to his directions; the latter put his Douglas B-26 aircraft at McCarthy's disposal. Ross Biggers, owner of a Houston publishing house and a rabid anti-Semite, was another ardent disciple of McCarthy. He organized a very successful drive to collect funds for McCarthy among Texas millionaires; a Cadillac was bought with the money collected in Texas and other states, and Biggers, acting for the Texas millionaires, presented it to McCarthy, expressing regret that the honor had to be shared with other states.

p Big business in the Eastern states showed the least willingness to back McCarthy. Of fifty major industrialists polled in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia only two said they were for him. One of them, Boston financier John Fox, was a highly colorful figure in his own right. Like McCarthy, he was born into a poor Irish family; before the war he barely managed to make ends meet. For a time he was a jazz pianist; later he became an insurance salesman. After the war he rose with dizzying speed to control of the Western Union Company, which at that time had assets valued, at \$18 million.

p Although most of the industrialists of Detroit, Pittsburgh, Wilmington, and New York took a dim view of McCarthy, they did not want to interfere with him, and so declined to answer the survey questions. This reflected the hostility of the old Wall Street consortium toward the new money of the West and South, whose spokesman McCarthy was.

p In the 60s ties between the radical right and the business world grew still stronger, and as a result the amount of financial assistance rightist and ultra-rightist groups received increased considerably. Alan F. Westin estimated that corporations gave \$10 million to the right in 1961; between 1958 and 1963 the combined income of the thirty most important rightist organizations tripled. In the mid 60s the ultras were

receiving the bulk of their financing from at least 70 foundations, 13 firms and corporations, and 25 public utilities; there were also some 250 individuals on record as having given \$500 or more each in recent years.⁴⁹⁰ Oil and steel corporations and the military– industrial complex are regular benefactors of the right extremists, as are the owners of heavy engineering, and motor-building works and of chemical, textile, and tobacco factories. Agribusiness in California, Texas, and Florida, heir to the traditional conservatism of farming regions, also makes large gifts to right-wing organizations.⁴⁰¹ Most right-leaning industrialists live in the Southern and Western states.

p One of the most generous private donors to the right is J. Howard Pew, the head of Sun Oil; the Christian Freedom Foundation alone received more than \$1,000,000 from him and his family in the mid 60s. D. B. Lewis of Los Angeles left \$1,000,000 to the John Birch Society; Ed Scheubert of Chicago left \$200,000.⁴⁹²

p In the 60s a number of corporations had highly significant business ties with extremist groups. For many years the Boeing Company actively aided the ultras in their struggle for the "right to work." General Motors worked in cooperation with the National Education Program. Both these companies, and many others too, showed films made by extremist organizations to their employees. In some industrial firms the management spread ultrarightist anti-union propaganda among employees. George Benson delivered a lecture on the "Communist menace" to "free enterprise" before industry magnates in Chicago. The Allen Bradley Company worked openly with the Birch Society; Allen Bradley himself promoted a meeting in Milwaukee at which Robert Welch appeared. Cherokee Textile Mills of Tennessee regularly placed advertisements in *American Opinion*, the organ of the Birch Society.¹⁹³

p In assessing the social forces that sustain the ultras it must be kept in mind that although a part of capital has been forced to grant working people a modicum of rights, and to reconcile itself to government regulation of social and economic relations, these concessions remain undesirable from capital's own point of view. This is why a number of the largest monopolies, while in everyday practice recognizing unions, the collective bargaining system, social legislation, and current tax policy, nonetheless finance ultrarightist organizations that campaign vehemently against the unions and the government's social policies. Many companies make their contributions anonymously.TM And so it is quite possible for the ultras to have more support than the available data would indicate. This support gives the right– extremist movement its vital force; this is the source from which it may recruit fresh allies.

p The nucleus of today's ultra-rightist movement is made up of prosperous businessmen, members of the so-called upper 306 middle class, retired officers, and elderly ladies from the moneyed aristocracy.TM (The leaders of rightist organizations are not representatives of the giant corporations; most of them are middle-sized businessmen. And most of the people who attend the meetings also belong to the middle levels of society. Thus the Birch Society and organizations like it are supported by relatively well educated and

well-to-do citizens. In the main they are owners of family businesses and successful self-employed people. They are the prime force behind the right-extremist movement.'""

[p](#) Studies by American authors show that while 50 percent of all Americans were making less than \$6,000 a year in 1964, only 14 percent of the Birch Society's members nationally, and none of them in California, fell into this category. Conversely, only 4 percent of all Americans reported incomes of \$15,000 or more, while 22 percent of Birchers nationally, and 40 percent in California, had such incomes. In the mid 60s 22 percent of all Americans had at least some college education; the figure for the Birch Society nationally was 63 percent, in Michigan 66 percent, and in California 74 percent. Fully 78 percent of Christian Crusade's members in California fell into this category. On the whole the supporters of Senator McCarthy came from a lower stratum of society than the right radicals of the 60s.⁴⁹

[p](#) The least affluent of today's ultras are the racists and fundamentalists. Half of the members of the racist, fundamentalist Portland Freedom Center earned less than \$4,500 a year; by contrast, only 10 percent of the Birchers earned less than \$4,000.'° But these figures do not mean that all racists and fundamentalists come from among the indigent. Twenty percent (in California, one third) of the Birch Society's members are fundamentalists; most of them (in California, the great majority) are well-off.

[p](#) The mass base of the right-extremist movement is made up of the many strata of the petty bourgeoisie in small towns and rural areas. Richard Hofstadter rightly says that the extreme right is animated by the parochial conservatism of small business.⁴⁹⁹ The growth of the petty bourgeoisie in the USA after the Second World War strengthened the individualist bias of its members in rural and urban areas alike; this was an important factor in the development of the ultra-rightist movement. Although the 307 petty bourgeoisie has undergone considerable erosion under imperialism its absolute numbers increased significantly in the postwar USA. During the war, noted C. Wright Mills, "little fortunes became big and many new little ones were created."⁵⁰⁰

[p](#) In 1972, 9.2 million, or 94 percent, of the USA's 9.7 million corporations were small businesses. Each year the number of small businesses in the USA grows by some 50,000 (350,000 to 400,000 businesses are formed, and 300,000 to 350,000 are discontinued). Nearly 60 percent of all workers are employed by small businesses.⁵⁰¹

[p](#) Some of the USA's small businessmen are people whom the favorable economic situation of the war and postwar years enabled to amass the small amount of capital they needed to get started. [\[307*\]](#) For them the main goal was to keep the status they had attained. The boom of the war and postwar years breathed new life into the creed of "individual opportunity"; it brought the interests of the thriving petty bourgeoisie into conflict with those of the working class. This was the objective factor behind the breakup of the popular coalition that had backed the New Deal in the 30s.

[p](#) The new property owners were openly hostile to the collective bargaining system and to government proposals for what they called "socialist" measures: a minimum wage, social

insurance, increased allocations for education and so on. Any advocacy of changes that would bring a reduction in their profits, or any criticism of the existing social system, even from a reformist position, was regarded as a betrayal of Americanism. "The political aim of the petty right formed among the new upper classes of the small cities," wrote C. Wright Mills, "is the destruction of the legislative achievements of the New and Fair Deals."⁵³ And so all the property owners' anger and hatred was directed against the advocates of reform.

p Official anticommunist propaganda was quite effective under such conditions. It struck a responsive chord among the USA's prosperous petty bourgeoisie; they became active proponents of anticommunist ideology. The fear generated by an imaginary Soviet threat, and the strengthening of the property-holding ethic among many Americans were of enormous importance in reorienting public opinion in the USA after the Second World War: in the 30s there was much ill will toward big capital, which had brought the country to the verge of bankruptcy; in the postwar years the ruling cliques succeeded in diverting the attention of some segments of society toward the "communist menace."

p The upsurge of individualism in the USA brought about by the rapid growth of the petty bourgeoisie during and after the war coincided with the collapse of obsolete social institutions in various parts of the world. This no doubt had an effect on the political behavior of the thriving petty bourgeoisie. In these years the impassioned talk about "Americanism" and "patriotism" carried with it, more clearly than ever before, a social import: these words were being used as synonyms for anticommunism. In a number of states where the petty bourgeoisie had considerable influence politicians associated with the New Deal were voted out. In particular, Robert M. La Follette, Jr., who had once enjoyed the boundless confidence of his constituents, was defeated in 1946 by McCarthy, at that time an unknown.

p In the USA today, as in any developed capitalist country, an objective antagonism exists between the interests of big monopoly capital and those of the petty bourgeoisie. Thus it comes as no surprise that anti-monopolist feeling is widespread among the USA's petty bourgeoisie. Furthermore the petty bourgeoisie harbors a traditional mistrust of the federal government, which it rightly believes stands for the interests of the monopolies. For example, 51 percent of all government contracts awarded during the Second World War went to thirty-three of the largest corporations. Between July 1950 and the end of 1951 one hundred of the most powerful companies received \$26,339 billion in government contracts—59.9 percent of the total value of contracts awarded.⁵⁴ The machinery of state-monopolism, which came about through a merger of the financial elite with government, destroys thousands of fortunes each year. It places an ever growing tax burden on property owners, while spiraling inflation eats away at their savings. Even under the comparatively favorable conditions of 1945–1948 nearly 30 percent of the 309 businesses in the United States were discontinued; most of them, of course, were small businesses.¹⁰

p This state of affairs causes discontent. The anti-monopoly protests of the USA's petty bourgeoisie these days often take the form of a rightist diatribe against the whole system

of modern bourgeois government, since faith in free enterprise and personal success remains strong in the minds of many Americans. But in fact for the vast majority of small property owners enterprise is no longer free. This is the age of the giant corporation, of computerization and automation. Greater and greater obstacles are rising up in the way of individual initiative and entrepreneurial success; much depends on obtaining sophisticated and costly machinery. The transformation that the bourgeois social and economic structure has undergone in the USA since the end of the nineteenth century has made the once self-reliant small businessman the toy of the faceless power of the monopolies and of the giant federal bureaucracy, their close ally. He feels hopelessness, bafflement, and despair in the face of inimical forces to which he is a helpless victim.

p Under these circumstances the petty bourgeois's petulant cries about free enterprise are an expression of his passionate desire to survive. This desire is strongest not during economic crises and depressions but in years of prosperity (such as the boom the USA enjoyed after the war), when the illusion of individual success is revived. At such times the petty bourgeois suffers with especial bitterness from the ruin of his hopes, and the accumulated disaffection bursts forth in assaults on individuals and organizations that symbolize the hostile order.

p Robert Felix, Dean of the School of Medicine at St. Louis University, who has studied the psychology of right extremism, rightly notes that it springs from very real processes in the life of American society: the decay of the traditional way of life, the breakdown of personal ties, and the ironing out of national distinctions under the pressure of technology and the so-called mass culture.⁵⁰⁰ Often the individual's alienation from society, his spiritual homelessness (so to speak), and his bewilderment among impersonal and alien forces find an outlet in extreme hostility and aggressiveness towards the people around him. In his book about the Birch Society Gerald Schomp, who was once its Florida state coordinator, says that he came to the 310 ultrarightist camp because he was disappointed in the traditional means of seeking an illusory happiness, and did not (or could not) find a way of adapting to the system as it was.⁰⁷

p McCarthy and other leaders of the right turned such emotions against democratically-minded persons and progressive organization, and also against their own political opponents in the government.

p Small business is a resolute foe of the unions; it has unfailingly supported every anti-union measure before Congress. Organizations such as the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, the National Woodwork Manufacturers' Association, the Woodwork Jobbers' Service Bureau, the National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association, the National Foundry Association, and the Associated Industries of Minneapolis, the great majority of which spoke on behalf of small business, not only applauded the Taft-Hartley Act at Congressional hearings in 1953 but also suggested that the law's anticommunist and anti-union provisions be strengthened. In particular they asked that states be given broader rights for fighting strikes, pickets, and solidarity boycotts, that "communist influence" in the unions be investigated by the Subversive Activities Control Board rather than the National Labor Relations Board, that closed shop agreements, and

all other such agreements on union rights, be nullified, that employers' right to stage lockouts be restored, and that nationwide strikes and collective bargaining for entire industries be restricted or forbidden.⁵⁰⁸

p Small business directly aided McCarthyism, and later the ultras, with its adamant resistance to every sort of social and economic measure—whether wider rights for unions, fair hiring practices, a higher minimum wage, a shorter work day, or social insurance.

p In 1949 F. Virkus, speaking for the Conference of American Small Business Organizations, anticipated McCarthy's accusations against the Truman administration; he declared that if the Republicans did not win in the upcoming elections the US Congress would be full of workers, controlled by Communists, in 1950, and that a representative of labor or a socialist, in deed if not in name, would become president in 1952.⁵⁰⁹

p The National Federation of Independent Business, an influential organization of small businessmen, was founded in 1943; it has about 300,000 members. It maintains an office in Washington, which acts as a Congressional lobby. The federation's chief aims are to strengthen anti-trust legislation, limit the might of the unions and the federal government, and work out legislative measures to help small business, which in its view is virtually the sole legitimate form of government interference in the economy.

p Small business is opposed to the federal government and the monopolies, on the one hand, and to the unions, on the other. It is also inclined to regard these two forces as allies. Small business believes not only that its troubles are due to collusion against it between the monopolies and the government (which is true enough) but also that workers' organizations are parties to that collusion (which is false). It sees the recognition of unions by the government and the big corporations, the widespread practice of concluding labor contracts for entire branches of industry, laws establishing a minimum wage and a maximum work day, and various other social programs as proof positive that the interests of the government, the monopolies, and the unions are identical. R. Harland Shaw, one of the leaders of the Conference of American Small Business Organizations, publicly declared that big business is the partner of big labor unions and big government."⁵¹⁰

p In the early 50s court proceedings were instituted on behalf of small business against several electronics corporations that had allegedly conspired with unions to create an illegal monopoly. Between January 1951 and June 1952 thirty-one suits involving "conspiracies" between labor and management were brought to court."⁵¹¹

p The anti-monopoly bias of the petty bourgeoisie, together with its fierce opposition to the unions and to government social and economic programs, enabled the ultras to rally a considerable number of its members to their banner, thus creating a mass movement.

p Some farmers joined the urban petty bourgeoisie in backing McCarthy and the right. In considering relations between farmers and the right it must be kept in mind that in the

USA farmers are dying out as a social group. Each year tens of thousands of them, overwhelmed by the competition, give up farming and move to the city. In 1933, 20 percent of America's population lived on 312 farms; in 1973, 5 percent. Between 1948 and 1973 the number of farms dropped from 5,803,000 to 2,844,000." In the USA agriculture has become an industry; it is no longer an individual enterprise. The family farm, with its few hundred acres, has proved unable to compete successfully with vast farms equipped with highly productive and expensive machinery. The postwar years were particularly bad: despite significant advances in farm technology, animal husbandry, and land cultivation the average net income of a single farm remained almost unchanged throughout the 50s (\$2,273 in 1950, \$2,796 in 1960). In the 60s farm incomes grew 1.7-fold, the average reaching \$4,750 for a single farm.⁵¹³ In every case these incomes were less than the average subsistence wage. Every measure the government took in these years to stabilize farm prices was ineffective; this created a degree of skepticism among farmers toward federal government policies. In the 50s and 60s the idea of returning to a free market economy and doing away with all government farm programs gained wide popularity.

p In the years after the war such ideas were energetically promoted by the largest farmers' organization, the American Farm Bureau Federation. The federation mainly represented big commercial farms, whose owners opposed all forms of government interference in agriculture. Many of them were fanatical believers in free-market competition.⁵ The federation's president, Allan B. Kline, wrote in the *American Agriculturalist*, its journal, that some means must be found to stop the trend toward government control of the economy. "We believe . . . farmers, properly informed and educated . . . can do a better and more profitable job of producing this country's food and fibre than could be done under a system of bureaucratic regulation of agriculture."⁵

p The federation agrees with the ultras on many questions. It favors making anti-trust laws applicable to unions, and adopting so-called right-to-work laws, which are directed against the unions' very existence. It stands with the rightists against legislation providing social insurance and against unemployment insurance, federal aid to education, and government subsidies for health care. Like McCarthy's backers and the right extremists of today, the federation argues that the federal government has usurped the rights and powers of the states. The second largest 313 farmers' organization, the National Grange, falls into line with the federation on many of these issues. The Grange's point of view was articulated by A. S. Gross, one of its leaders, who spoke out against workers' demands for higher wages, against an increase in unemployment benefits, and against the strike movement.⁵¹⁶

p McCarthyism's numerous exposes of "communism" in the government, and those of the rightists of the 60s, appealed to many among the petty and middle bourgeoisie; in their minds big government is associated with socialism.

p McCarthy's popularity with some parts of the petty bourgeoisie was in no little measure due to the fact that he himself belonged to that segment of society. McCarthy grew up in the family of a Catholic farmer, an immigrant from Ireland. Many farmers saw him as

one of their own, as the embodiment of an enterprising man of the people. He had risen from a simple farmer to an allpowerful senator who could challenge the president himself; he seemed to be a living advertisement and practical confirmation of the ideals of "equal opportunity."

p McCarthy's Catholicism was another important factor. Most of the USA's Catholics were people on the lowest rungs of the social ladder. In the recent past they had been poor immigrants from Catholic countries; Protestants of English descent continued to look on them as less than full Americans. As a rule the great masses of Catholics that concentrated in the USA's big industrial centers made up the least prosperous part of the population. McCarthy knew how to appeal to the victims of religious and national bigotry. And the policy of militant anticommunism formulated by Pius XII and vigorously put into practice by the USA's prelates ensured McCarthy of the support of the country's Catholics.

p The rightists pretend to speak in the name of the ordinary people of the USA, and pose as radical critics of the monopolies and the government. Almost any rightist document contains words in defense of the Constitution, and angry protests against the abuse of power by the government bureaucracy. An example is the Sharon Statement, the programmatic document of the Young Americans for Freedom. In 1969 the Liberty Lobby, one of the most active ultra-rightist organizations, published a report criticizing the USA's tax system,⁵⁵ and showing how it lets 314 multimillionaires shirk paying taxes and places the burden on the middle strata of society.

p The ultras' battle against high taxes and government "waste" is conducted in a form that follows logically from their general principles. They believe that limiting the government's power to tax would put an end to spending for the social and economic needs of working people. It is motives like these, rather than any sort of altruism, that inspire the ultras in their struggle with the "Washington bureaucracy" and its "spendthrift policies."

p Barry Goldwater, the ultras' presidential candidate in 1964, has often resorted to demagogic attacks on the government and the monopolies to win votes. On May 3, 1958, in Prescott, Arizona, he spoke of a "growing concentration of power in the business community" of industrial America, and noted that "the tax structure of the last 25 years has contributed tremendously" to this process. "Power is an intoxicant," the senator said. "It gives its possessor a feeling of omnipotence, it shouts down criticism, it dismisses failure contemptuously, it refuses to admit mistakes, it denies the dignity and importance of the individual." He continued: "If we follow the trend of the past 25 years, the independent businessman will disappear to be replaced by a managerial class operating the properties of gigantic corporate structures. The independent craftsman will disappear to become a number in the union organization."¹⁸ Goldwater told his audience that he was almost entirely in agreement with Robert La Follette, and practically so with Thomas Jefferson, whom he contrasted with the modern liberals. John Tower, another leader of the ultras, also makes repeated references to Jefferson in his *Program for*

Conservatives, and depicts the ultras' position as being in keeping with the views of that great democrat.⁵¹

p It is not by chance that ultra-rightist ideologues and politicians invoke the name of Jefferson. For a large part of the USA's petty bourgeoisie, which is still under the spell of illusions about free enterprise, the preindustrial America of Jefferson remains to this day the ideal—a land of small, independent manufacturers, each the master of his fate. But in the USA today, where only the giant monopolies flourish, free enterprise by independent businessmen is in danger of extinction. Under the yoke of modern government and the monopolies denying that society can progress outside the framework of capitalism, the petty bourgeoisie tends to look to the right for its salvation. It denounces big government, big business, the unions, and the whole system of modern bourgeois government, and upholds an ideal that is essentially Utopian and reactionary—a return to the preindustrial age. The unorganized strength of the petty bourgeoisie found expression in McCarthyism and the ultra-rightist movement of the 60s.

p Like the politicians of the ultra-right, major groups of monopolists in the South and West tend the fires of "outraged individualism" among property owners, and skillfully direct it against their own competitors on Wall Street. Their use of the slogans of free enterprise is sheer demagoguery; it is intended to rally confused and angry people around ultra-rightist leaders such as McCarthy, Goldwater, and Wallace. In the 50s and 60s the forces of reaction turned a significant part of the USA's petty bourgeoisie into rabid anticommunists by appealing to their property-holding instincts and individualism.

p Certain segments of the working class have also fallen under the influence of the ultras. This is partly because McCarthy, Goldwater, and Wallace have all portrayed themselves as virtually the best friends of the working man.

p Although McCarthy was on the whole very favorably inclined toward employers, and relied on the support of those business circles most hostile to the unions, he nonetheless spoke repeatedly in public of defending workers' organizations from "hard-headed, short-sighted men in industry." Moreover he tried to accuse Robert La Follette, Jr., his Republican rival in the 1964 election, of being anti-union.⁵²

p For some time a certain number of unionized workers were taken in by McCarthy's tactics. In November 1952, for example, workers in six of Milwaukee's electoral districts gave him their votes.⁵³ The illusions that some segments of the working class had about McCarthy were also fostered by the AFL, as was mentioned earlier in this book. The staunchest support came from the Building and Construction Trades Department (AFL), whose publications for July and August 1953 carried articles defending McCarthy and McCarthyism—this at a time when even the most conservative unions had turned away from him. McCarthyism had more influence among non-union workers, especially among Catholics from Italy and Eastern Europe.⁵⁴

p The rightward drift of certain groups within the American proletariat can also be traced to their disenchantment with the policies of the ruling cliques, which have proved unable to resolve pressing social problems. This has helped the right to discredit the politics of social reform and to draw indigent people into its ranks.

p The ultras' extreme social and economic conservatism is utterly at odds with the vital needs of working people. The gap is so wide that union boss George Meany, who is by no means a progressive himself, compared Goldwater to Hitler.⁵³

p Nonetheless the position of certain segments of the working class was not unified during the upsurge of the mass democratic movement in the 60s and 70s. There were many factors behind this. The favorable wartime economic climate of those and of preceding years had given rise to a whole generation of workers whose livelihood was closely connected with military production. To end the war in Vietnam and cut military output—as was being demanded at mass demonstrations—would be to threaten the prosperity of this category of working people. Given this circumstance the warlike pronouncements of the spokesmen for the military-industrial complex and the demagoguery of Goldwater, and especially of Wallace, were bound to have some effect.

p A part of the working class thus remained impassive in the face of the threat from the right, and some of its members even became involved in the political campaigns of the ultras. There is one more factor behind this that must not be overlooked.

p Union members are in a minority among the USA's working class. There were eighty million workers in the country in the early seventies; only twenty million of them belonged to unions.⁵⁴ What is more, there was a downward trend in the proportion of unionized workers between 1970 and 1972. In nineteen states, mostly in the West and South, "right-to-work" laws are still in force. Unions have no real influence on the local political climate in these states. Moreover the right, by constant, active propaganda, is winning over a certain number of workers, both unionized and non-unionized. As in the past the decisive factor in bringing about such unnatural alliances is the extraordinary ideological disorientation of the working masses in the USA, which results from the course of class cooperation, racism, and nationalism that the collaborationist bosses of the American unions systematically pursue. It divides the USA's working class into hostile groups, which remain under the ideological sway of the bourgeoisie. This state of affairs is due to temporary factors, however, and cannot create a lasting unity of the classes: the social positions of the bourgeoisie and the working class are diametrically opposed.

p REFERENCES

p Fred J. Cook, "The Ultras," *The Nation* 30 June 1962, p. 565.

p James R. Killian, Jr., *Sputnik, Scientists, and Eisenhower: A Memoir of the First Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press 1977), pp. XV, 10; Robert Rosamond, *Crusade for Peace*.

Eisenhower's Presidential Legacy with the Program for Action (Philadelphia and New York: Lexington Publishing Company, 1962,) p. 18.

p "Civil Rights," in: *The Fear of Conspiracy: Images of Un-American Subversion from the Revolution to the Present*, David Brion Davis, ed. (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1971), pp. 341–348.

p ^^1^^ Robert H. W. Welch, *The Blue Book of the John Birch Society* (Belmont, Massachusetts: Western Islands Publishers, 1961), p. XIV.

p Ibid., p. 14.

p J. Allen Broyles, *The John Birch Society* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964), p. 25.

p *The Blue Book of the John Birch Society*, pp. 114–115.

p *Congressional Record* 1961, 107 (21):15870.

p Quoted in: Gene Grove, "The Americanists," *The Progressive*, August 1961, p. 8.

p *The Blue Book of the John Birch Society*, p. 147.

p Robert Welch, *The New Americanism and Other Speeches and Essays* (Boston and Los Angeles: Western Islands Publishers, 1966), p. 100.

p *Congressional Record* 1961, 107(4):4606.

p Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, *The Politics of Unreason*

p (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1973), pp. 261–262. "Robert Welch, *The Politician* (Belmont, Massachusetts: Privately printed, 1963).

p Ibid., pp. 13, 15, 259, 278, 279.

p Quoted in: Gene Grove, op. cit., p. 8.

p Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, op. cit., p. 325.

p Gerald Schomp, *Birchism Was My Business* (London: McMillan,

p 1970), pp. 23–24, 27–28.

p *Congressional Record* 1961, 107(13): 17036.

p *American Opinion*, July-August 1970, p. 9.

p Robert Welch, *The New Americanism*, pp. 105, 106, 108, 21, 22.

318

p L. C. Hutchins, *The John Birch Society and United States Foreign*

p *Policy* (New York: Pageant Press, 1968), p. 26. Quoted in: Allen Broyles, op. cit., p. 103.

p *The Blue Book of the John Birch Society*, pp. 64, 96. -" Quoted in: *The New York Times* 9 December 1967, p. 16; *American*

p *Opinion*, "July-August Scoreboard 1969.1979," p. 72.

p Gene Grove, *Inside the John Birch Society* (Greenwich: Fawcett Publications, 1961), p. 73.

p *Congressional Record* 1961, 107 (12) :15869–15872.

p Quoted in: Ralph E. Ellsworth and Sarah M. Harris, *The American*

p *Right Wing* (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1962), p. 14.

p James McEvoy III, *Radicals or Conservatives* (Chicago: Rand Mc-

p Nally & Company, 1971), p. 48.

p Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics* (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), p. 73.

p H. and A. Eisenberg, "The Far Right and the Churches," *The Progressive*, July 1956, p. 16. ^^1^^ Charles Y. Clock and Rodney Stark, *Religion and Society in Tension*

p (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1955), p. 77. ' *Lobbying, Direct and Indirect: Part 4 of Hearings before the House*

p *Select Committee on Lobbying Activities* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950), pp. 295–297. U.S. Congress. House. *Hearings of the Committee on Education and*

[p](#) *Labor: Labor-Management Relations, Part 10* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1953), pp. 3366–3368. ’ Quoted in: *From Radical Left to Extreme Right*, Robert H. Muller,

[p](#) ed. (Ann Arbor: Campus Publishers, 1968), p. 107. ’ *Lobbying, Direct and Indirect*, pp. 264–265. J Ralph E. Ellsworth and Sarah M. Harris, *The American Right Wing*

[p](#) (Washington: University of Illinois, 1960), pp. 21–22. ’ Quoted in: Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, *Danger on the*

[p](#) *Right* (New York: Random House, 1964), p. 145. ¹ John Harold Redecop, *The American Far Right: A Case Study of*

[p](#) *Billy James Hargis and Christian Crusade* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968), Preface. ’ Ibid., p. 43. ³ Richard Dudman, *Men of the Far Right* (New York: Pyramid Books,

[p](#) 1962), p. 89.

[p](#) George Thayer, *The Farther Shores of Politics: The American Political*

[p](#) *Fringe Today* (London: Penguin Press, 1968), p. 232. ’ John Harold Redecop, op. cit., pp. 23–24. ’ *Congressional Record* 1962, 108(5):6577. ’ John Harold Redecop, op. cit., pp. 24–25, 18. ’ Ibid., pp. 24–25.

[p](#) ¹ *Congressional Record* 1962, 108(12): 15751. ’ Donald Janson and Bernard Eismann, *The Far Right* (New York:

[p](#) McGraw Hill, 1963), p. 98.

[p](#) ’ *Congressional Record* 1967, 113(20) :26606.

319

[p](#) Quoted in: Corinne Jacker, *The Black Flag of Anarchy* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1968), p. 178. *Congressional Record* 1967, 113(106–107) :A3464. Quoted in: Richard Dudman, op. cit., p. 60. *Congressional Record* 1968, 114(111) :H5789. *Congressional Record* 1968, 114(109) :S7778; 114(111) :E5924. Samuel A. Kirkpatrick, David R. Morgan, and Thomas G. Kielhorn, *The Oklahoma Voter. Politics, Elections and Parties in the Sooner State* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1977) p. 170. *Congressional Record* 1968, 114(97) :E5089-E5090. *Congressional Record* 1962, 108(6) :8254. Ibid.

[p](#) Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, op. cit., p. 164. Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, *The Politics of Unreason* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1973), p. 249.

[p](#) Emanuel M. Josephson, *The "Federal" Reserve Conspiracy and Rockefellers* (New York: Ghedney Press, 1968), p. 308. *The Progressive*, August 1971, p. 7.

[p](#) Francis X. Sutton, Seymour E. Harris, Carl Kaysen, and James Tobin, *The American Business Creed* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), p. 294; *General Interim Report of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950), p. 8.

[p](#) Jean Begeman, "The Crude Big Lie," *New Republic* 2 October 1950, p. 15; *New Republic* 10 September 1951.

[p](#) For more detail about the AMA's position on government social policies see: Stephen P. Strickland, *Politics, Science, and Dread Disease* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972). ^^1^^ *The Blue Book of the John Birch Society*, p. 67. *Congressional Record* 1962, 108(6) :8315; 108(1-4) :A216. *Congressional Record* 1962, 108(112-115) :A5152. *Congressional Record* 1962, 108(4) :5212. *Congressional Record* 1961, 113-(20) :26607.

[p](#) Quoted in: Mark Sherwin, *The Extremists* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963), pp. 160-161.

[p](#) J. Harry Jones, *The Minutemen* (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1968), p. 67.

[p](#) *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 7; *Congressional Record* 1967, 113(16) :22037; *ibid.*, 113(3):3880; Mark Sherwin, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

[p](#) *The Progressive*, July 1964, p. 6; *Congressional Record* 1965, 3(10'): 13755.

[p](#) John Charles Cooper, *The Turn Right* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970), p. 120. J. Harry Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 122. *Homefront*, October 1973, p. 43.

[p](#) Quoted in: *Congressional Record* 1965, 111 (10) :13756. J. Harry Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 126. *Congressional Record* 1965, 111 (10) :13757.

320

[p](#) " *The New York Times* 24 January 1967, p. 38.

[p](#) !t *The Progressive*, December 1964, p. 7.

[p](#) " Kirkpatrick Sale, *Power Shift* (New York: Random House, 1975). p. 92.

[p](#) '" James W. Canan, *The Superwarriors* (New York: Weybright and Talley, 1975), p. 41; R. Joseph Monsen, Jr., and Mark W. Cannon, *The Makers of Public Policy: American Power Groups and Their Ideologies* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1965), pp. 226, 264.

- p “ *The New Republic* 8 February 1969, p. 20.
- p ¹⁸ *Political Affairs*, June 1968, p. 57.
- p ’ Quoted in: Robert Rosamond, op. cit., p. 202.
- p ¹⁰ *Congress and the Nation: 1945–1964*, p. 1579.
- p “ Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, op. cit., pp. 315–316.
- p ¹² Irwin Suall, *The American Ultras* (New York: New America, 1962), P. 4.
- p Gene M. Lyons and Louis Morton, *Schools for Strategy: Education and Research in National Security Affairs* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965), pp. 116–117, 122.
- p ⁴ Richard Dudman, op. cit., pp. 126–127.
- p ¹⁵ Irwin Suall, op. cit., p. 54.
- p ³ *Homefront*, June 1973, pp. 23, 25.
- p ¹ *Congressional Record* 1961, 107 (10) :13596–13598.
- p “ Frank J. Johnson, *No Substitute for Victory* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1962), p. 3. ’ *Congressional Record* 1961, 107(10) :13599–13600.
- p ⁰ Gene M. Lyons and Louis Morton, op. cit., p. 118.
- p Robert Strausz-Hupe, William R. Kintner, and Stefan T. Possony, *A Forward Strategy for America* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961), pp. 405–406.
- p ² Quoted in: Mark Sherwin, op. cit., p. 128.
- p ³ Richard Dudman, op. cit., pp. 58, 59, 61.
- p ¹ Quoted in: Jack Raymond, *Power at the Pentagon* (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 122.
- p ’ *Congressional Record* 1961, 107(11) :14433–14437. ’ *Congressional Record* 1961, 107 (153–155) :A6950-A6573; (10):13594. ’ *The Progressive*, November 1961, p. 6. * Gene M. Lyons and Louis Morton, op. cit., p. 114. ¹ *The Progressive*, November 1961, p. 6. ’ Donald Janson and Bernard Eismann, op. cit., p. 193. ’ *Ibid.*, pp. 90–91.
- p LI" James Avery Joyce, *End of an Illusion* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968), pp. 108–109.

p ' *The Progressive*, January 1970, p. 4.

p ' *Proceedings of the 68th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968), pp. 31, 79, 84, 101–103. *Congressional Record* 1966, 112(13): 16968; (15): 19820. *Congressional Record* 1968, 114(161) :E8429-E8430.

321

p *Congressional Record* 1969, 115(10) :E291.

p *Congressional Record* 1969, 115(47) :E2127-E2128.

p *Congressional Record* 1969, 115(1):H27.

p *Congressional Record* 1969, 115 (84) :H4050-H4051; (127):E6368-

p E6369.

p Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, op. cit., pp. 315–316.

p Leo Rosten, ed., *Religions of America* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975), p. 606.

p *New Program of the Communist Party USA* (New York: New Outlook Publishers, 1970), p. 70.

p Mark Sherwin, op. cit., p. 216.

p Quoted in: Robert H. Muller, ed., op. cit., p. 93.

p Walter B. Mead, *Extremism and Cognition* (Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt Publishing Company, 1971), p. 161.

p Ralph E. Ellsworth and Sarah M. Harris, op. cit., p. 21.

p Quoted in: Mark Sherwin, op. cit., pp. 177–178.

p Tom P. Brady, *Black Monday* (see: George Thayer, op. cit., p. 110).

p Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, op. cit., p. 277.

p *Ibid.*, p. 276.

p *Congressional Record* 1966, 112(13): 16892; George Thayer, op. cit., p. 91.

p Quoted in: Gary E. McCuen and David L. Bender, *The Radical*

[p](#) *Left and the Far Right: Fringe Groups Speak on the Problem of Race* (Anoka, Minnesota: Greenhaven Press, 1970), pp. 41–44.

[p](#) Quoted in: Angelo del Boca and Mario Giovanna, *Fascism Today*:

[p](#) *A World Survey*, translated by R. H. Boothroyd (New York: Pantheon Books, 1969), p. 351.

[p](#) *The Progressive*, May 1965, p. 5.

[p](#) Quoted in: H. Johnson, "HUAC and the KKK," *The Progressive*,

[p](#) January 1966, pp. 26–28; *Congressional Record* 1966, 112(13) :16892.

[p](#) Quoted in: Arnold Foster and Benjamin R. Epstein, op. cit., p. 37.

[p](#) George Thayer, *The Farther Shores of Politics* (London: Allen Lane the Penguin Press, 1968), p. 184.

[p](#) *The New York Times* 5 March 1967, p. 37.

[p](#) Quoted in: Richard Dudman, op. cit., p. 83.

[p](#) *The New York Times* 15 January 1967, p. 37; John Charles Cooper,

[p](#) op. cit., p. 73.

[p](#) See: Mark Sherwin, op. cit., p. 140. ¹ Quoted in: George Thayer, op. cit., pp. 19, 27. ² Ibid., pp. 13, 19, 27; Mark Sherwin, op. cit., p. 140. ³ George P. Loweke, op. cit., p. 375.

[p](#) Quoted in: Mark Sherwin, op. cit., pp. 139–145. ¹ Ibid. ² Lionel Lokos, *Hysteria 1964* (New Rochelle: Arlington House, 1967),

[p](#) p. 153; *The New York Times* 21 July 1964, pp. 1C, 21C. ³ John Charles Cooper, op. cit., p. 127.

[p](#) ¹ *Congressional Record* 1967 113 (26) :35482–35483.

[p](#) ² George Thayer, op. cit., p. 42.

322

[p](#) ¹⁵³ Gary McCuen and David L. Bender, eds., op. cit., p. 18.

[p](#) ¹⁵¹ *Congressional Record* 1967, 11 (26) :35482–35485.

[p ^155^](#) Robert H. Muller, ed., op. cit., p. 96.

[p ""](#) *American Opinion*, November 1969, pp. 2-12; February 1970, pp. 49-68; September 1970, pp. 9-14; November 1970, pp. 5-9.

[p 1=7](#) Gerald Schomp, op. cit., p. 35.

[p ^158^](#) *The American Mercury*, Spring 1974, pp. 7-12.

[p ^153^](#) Mike Newberry, *The Fascist Revival* (New York: New Century Publishers, 1961), pp. 6-7.

[p ^100^](#) *The American Mercury*, Fall 1974, p. 33; Summer 1975, pp. 22-23, 31-32, 39, 59-61; Spring 1974, p. 33; Spring 1976, pp. 26-27; Fall 1973, p. 63.

[p ^161^](#) *The Progressive*, April 1965, p. 10.

[p ^102^](#) Richard Dudman, op. cit., p. 143.

[p ^103^](#) Mike Newberry, op. cit., p. 4.

[p ^101^](#) See George Thayer, op. cit., p. 282.

[p ^165^](#) *The Progressive*, December 1966, p. 7.

[p ^100^](#) James McEvoy III, *Radicals or Conservatives* (Chicago: Rand Mc-

[p Nally & Company, 1971\), p. 18. ""](#) *The Progressive*, February 1962, p. 7. ""7a
Congressional Record 1967, 113(20) :26605-26607; 1968, 114(173):

[p E9420.](#)

[p ^108^](#) *The Progressive*, March 1965, pp. 7-8; *Congressional Record* 1965, 111(15):19770.

[p ^169^](#) Gerald Schomp, op. cit., p. 31.

[p ^170^](#) Edward Cain, *They'd Rather Be Right: Youth and the Conservative Movement* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), pp. 164-165.

[p ^171^](#) *The Progressive*, January 1971, p. 30.

[p m](#) D. Hess, "The Slander of Dan O'Brien," *The Progressive*, December

[p 1964, pp. 25-28. ^173^](#) Donald Janson and Bernard Eismann, *The Far Right* (New York:

p McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963) p. 170. ¹⁷¹ *The Progressive*, October 1964, p. 8. ¹⁷⁵ *The Progressive*, February 1962, p. 7.

p “ Donald Janson and Bernard Eismann, op. cit., pp. 160–161. * *The Progressive*, March 1966, p. 6; Donald Janson and Bernard Eismann, op. cit., pp. 160–161. ¹⁷⁸ P. Schrag, "Cold War in the Classroom," *The Progressive*, October

p 1963, p. 38; *Congressional Record* 1962, 108(1):428. ¹⁷⁰ Irwin Suall, op. cit., p. 37; Donald Janson and Bernard Eismann,

p op. cit., p. 164. ¹⁸⁰ M. Stanton Evans, *The Future of Conservatism* (New York: Holt,

p Rinehart, and Winston, 1968, pp. 106–108. ’ Edward Cain, op. cit., p. 168.

p ¹⁸² *National Review* 1 June 1971, p. 571.

p ¹⁸³ *The Individualist*, Special Supplement to *New Individualist Review*, April 1961, Vol. 1, No. 1.

p ¹⁸⁴ *The Progressive*, June 1971, p. 28.

323

p ¹ *Encyclopedia of Associations*, 1970, Vol. III, No. 1, p. 58.

p S. R. Koeppen, "The Republican Radical Right," *The Annals of the*

p *American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, March 1969, Vol.

p 382, p. 82.

p ’ *The Progressive*, August 1965, p. 6.

p ’ Fred J. Cook. "The Ultras," *The Nation*, 30 June 1962, p. 571. ’ Norman Mailer, *Some Honorable Men* (Boston and Toronto: Little,

p Brown and Company, 1976), p. 61.

p ’ Quoted in: Fred J. Gook, *Barry Goldwater: Extremist of the Right* (New York: Grove Press, Inc. 1964), p. 74; *Congressional Record*

p 1957, 103(5) :6572. : *Congressional Record* 1957, 103(4) =5258–5259.

p Jack Bell, *Mr. Conservative: Barry Goldwater* (New York: MacFad-

p den-Bartell Corporation, 1964), pp. 57, 60, 61, 66; Fred J. Cook,

p *Barry Goldwater*, pp. 108–109. ^1^ Jack Bell, op. cit., p. 108. ^1^ *Congressional Record* 1961, 107(6):7593. ’ Barry M. Goldwater, *Why Not Victory? A Fresh Look at American*

p *Foreign Policy* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 113. ^1^ Ibid., pp. 121–122.

p Ibid., p. 39. ’ Quoted in: Jack Bell, op. cit., p. 196.

p Arthur Frommer, *Goldwater from A to Z: A Critical Handbook*

p (New York: Pocket Books, 1964), pp. 25–26. ^1^ Quoted in: F. Clifton White with William J. Gill, *Suite 3505* (New York: Arlington House, 1967), p. 27.

p *The Blue Book of the John Birch Society*, pp. 108–109.

p Quoted in: Jack Bell, op. cit., p. 14.

p Stephen Shadegg, *What Happened to Goldwater?* (New York: Holt,

p Rinehart and Winston, 1965), pp. 43–44.

p F. Clifton White with William J. Gill, op. cit., p. 132.

p Fred J. Cook, *Barry Goldwater*, pp. 175–176.

p Bernard Cosman and Robert J. Huckshorn, eds., *Republican Politics*

p (New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 1968), pp. 117–118.

p Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics* (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), p. 101.

p *Encyclopedia of Association*, 1976, Vol. 1, p. 857.

p M. Stanton Evans, op. cit., pp. 113–114.

p F. Clifton White with William J. Gill, op. cit, p. 170.

p Ibid., pp. 136–137, 139.

p Ibid., p. 133.

p Edward W. Brooke, *The Challenge of Chance* (Boston and Toronto:

[p](#) Little, Brown and Company, 1966), pp. 13, 15.

[p](#) Emile B. Ader, *The Dixiecrat Movement* (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1955), pp. 5, 8, 10.

[p](#) *The Journal of Politics*, May 1971, p. 243.

[p](#) Bernard Cosman and Robert J. Huckshorn, eds., op. cit., pp. 84–85.

[p](#) Quoted in: Jack Bell, op. cit., p. 168.

324

[p](#) John H. Kessel, *The Goldwater Coalition* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1968), p. 126.

[p](#) Quoted in: F. Clifton White with William J. Gill, op. cit., pp. 183–184.

[p](#) *Ibid.*, pp. 223, 240.

[p](#) I. F. Stone, *In a Time of Torment* (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 33.

[p](#) Quoted in: Mark Sherwin, op. cit., pp. 26–27. Quoted in: John H. Kessel, op. cit., p. 196. Quoted in: Jack Bell, op. cit., pp. 102, 104. Stephen Shadegg, op. cit., p. 29. Quoted in: *The Progressive*, November 1963, p. 6. Quoted in: F. Clifton White and William J. Gill, op. cit., p. 198. Quoted in: Arthur Frommer, op. cit., p. 21.

[p](#) Bernard Cosman and Robert J. Huckshorn, op. cit., pp. 17–19. Stephen Shadegg, op. cit., p. 87. Quoted in: *Politics in America. 1945–1964*, p. 5. Norman Mailer, op. cit., pp. 77–78. *Ibid.*, p. 60.

[p](#) Quoted in: *History of U.S. Political Parties*, p. 3107. S. R. Koeppen, op. cit., p. 81.

[p](#) George F. Gilder and Bruce K. Chapman, *The Party That Lost Its Head* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966), p. 6. *Congressional Record* 1966, 112(19) :26119. *The New York Times* 17 January 1967, pp. 1, 17. M. Stanton Evans, op. cit., p. 81.

[p](#) Quoted in: *Congressional Record* 1967, 113(25) :33835. Quoted in: Lawrence Stern, "The Far Right Regroups", *The Progressive*, February 1965, pp. 12–13.

[p](#) *The Progressive*, February 1965, p. 13; *Congressional Record* 1965, 111(21):28796.

[p](#) Gerald Schomp, op. cit., p. 37. *Ibid.*, p. 133.

[p](#) James McEvoy III, op. cit., p. 6. Gerald Schomp, op. cit., pp. 163–167. *The Progressive*, October 1965, p. 17. Quoted in: Gerald Schomp, op. cit., pp. 164–166. Walter B. Mead,

op. cit, pp. 180–181. James McEvoy III, op. cit, pp. 12, 15. Gerald Schomp, op. cit, p. 100.

[p](#) Thomas Ford Houtt, *The March to the Right: A Case Study in Political Repression* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1972), pp. 3-6, 45–46, 210. *The Progressive*, November 1964, p. 6. *The Progressive*, February 1965, p. 14. Quoted in: *The Progressive*, April 1965, p. 6. *Congressional Record* 1965, 111 (19) :25471.

[p](#) Walter B. Mead, op. cit, pp. 165, 166.

325

[p](#) ' *The Progressive*, December 1968, p. 7. » Ibid., p. 7.

[p](#) ⁰ Quoted in: *Congressional Record* 1968, 114(163) :H9488.

[p](#) ¹ Lewis Chester, Godfrey Hodson, Bruce Page, *An American Melodrama: The Presidential Campaign of 1968* (New York: The Viking Press, 1969), pp. 268, 269.

[p](#) ² Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, op. cit, p. 358.

[p](#) ³ Ibid., p. 342. ¹ Ibid., p. 346.

[p](#) Lewis Chester, Godfrey Hodson, Bruce Page, op. cit, pp. 273–275. ' *Congressional Record* 1968, 114(172) :E9204-E9210. ⁷ Quoted in: *Presidential Election 1968*, Edward W. Knappman, ed., (New York: Facts on File, 1970), p. 8.

[p](#) Mark R. Levy and Michael S. Kramer, *The Ethnic Factor. How America's Minorities Decide Elections* (New York: Simon and Schuster,

[p](#) 1972), p. 35. ' *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: Bantam Books, 1968), p. 243. ¹ Samuel Lubell, *The Hidden Crisis in American Politics* (New York:

[p](#) W. W. Norton & Company, 1970), pp. 75–76. ' John Charles Cooper, op. cit, pp. 105, 115, 116.

[p](#) Lewis Chester, Godfrey Hodson, and Bruce Page, op. cit., p. 691. ¹ Ibid., p. 651.

[p](#) Jules Archer, *1968: Year of Crisis* (New York: Julian Messner, 1971),

[p](#) p. 140. ¹ Lewis Chester, Godfrey Hodon, Bruce Page, op. cit, p. 705.

[p](#) *Presidential Elections 1968*, p. 184.

[p](#) Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, op. cit, p. 412.

[p](#) Samuel Lubell, op. cit, p. 85.

[p](#) *Time* 20 September 1968, pp. 22–23.

[p](#) Richard Krickus, *Pursuing the American Dream* (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1976), pp. 12, 15.

[p](#) Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, op. cit, p. 355.

[p](#) Lewis Chester, Godfrey Hodson, and Bruce Page, op. cit, p. 280.

[p](#) James Hepburn, *Farewell America Frontiers*, 1968, pp. 61–62.

[p](#) Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, op. cit, p. 366.

[p](#) Samuel Lubell, op. cit, p. 74.

[p](#) Quoted in: *Jules Archer*, op. cit, p. 138.

[p](#) Quoted in: Lewis Chester, Godfrey Hodson, and Bruce Page, op. cit,

[p](#) p. 662.

[p](#) Mark R. Levy and Michael S. Kramer, op. cit, pp. 51, 35–36.

[p](#) Samuel Lubell, op. cit, pp. 70–71.

[p](#) Marshall Frady, "The American Independent Party," in *History of*

[p](#) *U.S. Political Parties ...* p. 3432.

[p](#) *Congressional Record* 1968, 114(172) :E9402.

[p](#) Lewis Chester, Godfrey Hodson, Bruce Page, op. cit, pp. 665–666.

[p](#) Curtis Emerson Le May, Dale O. Smith, *America Is in Danger* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1968).

326

[p](#) Quoted in: *Congressional Record* 1968, 114(166) :E8747-E8748. ' Quoted in: *History of U.S. Political Parties ...* pp. 3447–3474.

[p](#) *Congressional Record* 1968, 114(163) :H9489.

[p](#) Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, op. cit., pp. 361, 387.

[p](#) *The Progressive*, November 1968, pp. 5-6.

[p](#) *Political Affairs*, August 1968, p. 12.

[p](#) James McEvoy, op. cit., p. 51. -*" Quoted in: Lewis Chester, Godfrey Hodson, and Bruce Page, op.

[p](#) cit., p. 447.

[p](#) Theo Lippman, *Spiro Agnew's America* (New York: W. W. Norton

[p](#) & Company Inc, 1972), pp. 244, 246.

[p](#) Quoted in: *U.S. News and World Report* 28 October 1968, p. 46.

[p](#) Jules Archer, op. cit., p. 152.

[p](#) Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, op. cit., p. 395.

[p](#) *The New York Times* 13 January 1977, p. 53. -m *The New York Times* 9 February 1976, pp. 1, 24.

[p](#) Kirkpatrick Sale, *Power Shift* (New York: Random House, 1975),

[p](#) pp. 91–92.

[p](#) *Life Line*, 10 November 1969.

[p](#) Kirkpatrick Sales, op. cit., pp. 102–103.

[p](#) *Homefront*, September 1975, pp. 35–39; October 1975, p. 42.

[p](#) *U.S. News and World Report* 15 May 1972, p. 40; *Time* 3 February

[p](#) 1975, p. 31; David Wise, *The American Police State* (New York: Random House, 1976), p. 314.

[p](#) Sanford I. Ungar, *FBI* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1975), p. 468; Judith F. Buncher, ed., *The CIA and the Security Debate: 1971–1975* (New York: Facts on File, 1976), pp. 195–196.

[p](#) David Wise, op. cit., pp. 144, 145, 314, 319. Ibid., p. 313. *Time* 13 January 1975, p. 23; *The New York Times* 26 January

p 1976, p. 15; David Wise, op. cit., p. 184.

p Jonathan Schell, *The Time of Illusion* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976), pp. 61, 142; *The New York Times* 12 January 1976, p. 24.

p David Wise, op. cit., pp. 176, 210, 224; Judith F. Buncher, ed., op.

p cit, pp. 22, 23.

p Lester A. Sobel, ed., *War on Privacy* (New York: Facts on File,

p 1976), p. 27.

p Judith F. Buncher, ed., op. cit., p. 139.

p Thomas Ford Hault, ed., *Social Justice and Its Enemies* (New York,

p etc.: Schenkman Publishing, 1975), p. 458.

p *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: Bantam Books, 1968), pp. 506–508.

p Alan Wolfe, *The Seamy Side of Democracy: Repression in America*

p (New York: David McKay Company, 1973), pp. 48, 114.

p Judith F. Buncher, ed., op. cit., pp. 143–144.

p Lester A. Sobel, ed., op. cit., p. 11.

327

p David Wise, op. cit., pp. 154–156.

p James W. Canan, *The Superwarriors* (New York: Weybright and Talley, 1975, p. 110; *Time* 3 February 1975, p. 31. *Daily World* 8 January 1976, p. 6.

p *The Nation* 24 January 1976. p. 67.

p *Political Affairs*, December 1978, p. 7.

p *Homefront*, February 1976, p. 10. *Homefront*, December 1975, pp. 53, 54. *American Opinion*, July-August 1977, p. 176.

p Kirkpatrick Sale, op. cit., p. 91; *Homefront*, May 1973, p. 18; July

p 1973, p. 29; October 1973, p. 43; *Congressional Record*, 107(12),

p 1961, p. 15869:(13):17036.

p Gerald Schomp, op. cit., p. 40.

p Robert Welch, "More Stately Mansions," in: D. B. Davis, ed., *The*

p *Fear of Conspiracy* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press,

p 1974), pp. 327–334.

p *American Opinion*, February 1977, pp. 4–5.

p *American Opinion*, September 1970, pp. 4–11; October 1972, pp. 57,

p 73; January 1977, p. 39; June 1972, p. 49.

p *American Opinion*, March 1970, p. 23; January 1972, pp. 53, 55;

p October 1972, p. 1; October 1974, pp. 1–2; February 1977, pp.

p 103–104.

p ' *American Opinion*, January 1972, p. 20; April 1972, p. 34. ^1^ *American Opinion*,
January 1972, p. 20; November 1972, p. 69. ^1^ *American Opinion*, November 1976,
p. 38. ' Antony C. Sutton, *National Suicide: Military Aid to the Soviet Union*

p (New York: Arlington House, 1974), pp. 253–254. ' *American Opinion*, July–August
1976, pp. 15–25. ' *American Opinion*, January 1974, pp. 13–22.

p ^1^ Gary K. Clabaugh, *Thunder on the Right. The Protestant Fundamentalists*
(Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1974), p. 96. ' Gary K. Clabaugh, op. cit., pp. 75, 94–96. ' *Homefront*,
November 1975, p. 50. ^1^ Kirkpatrick Sale, op. cit., p. 94. ! Gary K.
Clabaugh, op. cit., p. 147. ^1^ Quoted *ibid.*, pp. 151, 152.

p Fred Schwarz, "Operation Blindfold," *Christian Anti-Communist Crusade*, 15 February
1976. ' *Ibid.* ' " *U.S. News and World Report* 2 August 1976, p. 48; *Homefront*,

p February 1975, pp. 6, 8.

p *Ibid.*

p Gary K. Clabaugh, op. cit., pp. 197, 198.

[p](#) *Time* 23 September 1974, pp. 33–34. ^{^^1^^} *National Review* 4 July 1975, p. 704. ['] *Congressional Record* 1966, 112(20): 27351. ^{^^1^^} Curtis B. Dall, "Internationa] Chain of Destruction," *The American*

328

[p](#) *Mercury*, Winter 1873, pp. 11–13; *The American Mercury*, Summer

[p](#) 1975, pp. 3–4, 10–12, 31–32.

[p](#) *Homefront*, May 1975, pp. 23–24; November 1975, p. 49.

[p](#) *Congressional Record* 1969, 115 (24): H782.

[p](#) M. Stanton Evans, *Clear and Present Danger: A Conservative View*

[p](#) of *America's Government* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Jovano-

[p](#) vich, 1975), pp. 107, 110, 113.

[p](#) Peggy Morley, "Where Your Tax Money Goes," *The American Mercury*, Winter 1975, pp. 53–56.

[p](#) *The American Mercury*, Spring 1974, p. 13.

[p](#) *Ibid.*, p. 60.

[p](#) *Homefront*, March 1973, p. 13; October 1973, p. 45.

[p](#) *The New York Times* 4 September 1971, pp. 1, 25.

[p](#) Robert Jewett, *The Captain America Complex: The Dilemma of*

[p](#) *Zealous Nationalism* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973), p. 90.

[p](#) *Homefront*, March 1973, p. 11. *American Opinion*, September 1972, p. 75.

[p](#) Gary K. Clabaugh, *op. cit.*, pp. 204–206.

[p](#) *National Review* 2 February 1973, p. 135; 2 August 1974, p. 884.

[p](#) Quoted in *Newsweek* 28 February 1972, p. 24.

[p](#) *American Opinion*, April 1972, p. 45.

[p](#) *Life Lines* 20 March 1974, p. 3.

[p](#) *National Review* 21 January 1972, p. 20.

[p](#) *National Review* 30 March 1973, p. 347.

[p](#) *Congressional Record* 1974, 120 (36): S3790.

[p](#) Patrick J. Buchanan, *Conservative Votes, Liberal Victories: Why the*

[p](#) *Right Has Failed* (New York: Quadrangle, 1975), p. 47. ¹¹ *National Review* 10 August 1971, p. 842. ¹¹ *National Review* 21 January 1972, pp. 18, 20.

[p](#) *The New York Times* 5 September 1971, p. 20. ' *U.S. News and World Report* 3 April 1972, p. 5- 9 August 1971,

[p](#) p. 47.

[p](#) ' *National Review* 21 January 1972, p. 65.

[p](#) ' *National Review* 4 August 1972, p. 825. *National Review* 16 March 1973, p. 306.

[p](#) Quoted in: Murry Rothbard, "Confession of a Right-Wing Liberal", in: Henry J. Silverman, ed., *American Radical Thought: The Libertarian Tradition* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1970), pp. 291, 295.

[p](#) Quoted in: John P. Diggins, *Up From Communism: American Intellectual History* (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), p. 410. *Homefront*, November-December 1973, p. 49; March 1973, p. 11; January 1975, p. 1.

[p](#) ¹¹ *Time* 8 July 1974, pp. 11–12.

[p](#) ⁵ Quoted in: *Newsweek* 4 November 1968, p. 18.

[p](#) ' David R. Berman, *State and Local Politics* (Boston: Holbrook Press, 1975), p. 18.

[p](#) ⁷ Quoted in: *Newsweek* 27 March 1972, pp. 25–26.

329

[p](#) *U. S. News and World Report* 10 April 1972, pp. 32, 34; *Time* 15 May 1972, p. 28.

[p](#) Quoted in: [7.5. *News and World Report* 6 November 1972, p. 31. *National Review* 12 April 1974, pp. 416–417. *Ibid.*, 30 August 1974, p. 954. *The Nation* 31 January 1976, p. 106. *National Review* 23 May 1975, pp. 533, 550.

[p](#) William A. Rusher, *The Making of the New Majority Party* (New York: Shed and Ward, 1975), pp. 107–108. *Homefront*, June 1976, pp. 25, 26; March 1975, p. 12. *U.S.*

News and World Report 6 September 1976, p. 15. *U.S. News and World Report* 1 November 1976, p. 28. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[p](#) *National Review* 20 December 1974, p. 1480. Quoted in: *Time* 25 March 1974, p. 33. *The New York Times* 7 January 1967, p. 20. *The New York Times* 2 January 1976, pp. 1L, 20L. *Daily World* 13 January 1976, p. 2. ¹¹⁵ M. Stanton Evans, *op cit.*, pp. 9-10.

[p](#) *Political Science Quarterly*, March 1953, No. 1, pp. 10–12. V. I. Lenin, "Reformism in the Russian Social-Democratic Movement," in: *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1977), p. 229.

[p](#) V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" in: *Collected Works*, Vol. 22 (Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1974), p. 205. Quoted in: Arthur M. Schlesinger and Morton White, eds., *Paths of American Thought* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963), p. 383. Harry K. Girvetz, *The Evolution of Liberalism* (New York: Collier Books, 1963), p. 300. *Ibid.*, pp. 301, 354.

[p](#) Neil H. Jacoby, ed., *The Business-government Relationship: A Reassessment* (Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, 1975), p. vi.

[p](#) Samuel Lubell, *Revolt of the Moderates* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956), pp. 249–250.

[p](#) Irwing Louis Horowitz, *Ideology and Utopia in the United States: 1956–1976* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 148. Richard Dudman, *op. cit.*, p. 152. John P. Diggins, *op. cit.*, p. 402. Quoted *ibid.*, p. 405. *American Opinion*, Fall 1973, p. 49. Quoted in: Mark Sherwin, *op. cit.*, pp. 20–21.

[p](#) William F. Buckley, Jr., *God and Man at Yale: The Superstitions of "Academic Freedom"* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1951), pp. XV-XVII, 11, 14, 16, 17, 46, 47, 50, 54, 190, 197. Quoted in: Mark Sherwin, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

[p](#) W. M. F. Buckley, Jr., and L. Brent Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1954), p. 335.

330

[p](#) *Ibid.*, p. 329. *Ibid.*, p. 250.

[p](#) William F. Buckley, Jr., *Up From Liberalism* (New York: McDowell and Obolensky, 1959), pp. 115, 119, 141. *The American Mercury*, Fall 1973, p. 49.

[p](#) William F. Buckley, Jr., and the Editors of the *National Review*, *The Committee and Its Critics: A Calm Review of the House Committee on Un-American Activities* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1962), pp. 23, 33.

[p](#) Mitchell S. Ross, *The Literary Politicians* (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1978), pp. 23–24.

[p](#) *The Blue Book of the John Birch Society*, p. 67. Richard Dudman, op. cit., pp. 155–156.

[p](#) Russell Kirk, *A Program for Conservatives* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1962), pp. 3, 6. Ibid., pp. 22, 23, 35.

[p](#) B. W. Hill, ed., *Edmund Burke On Government, Politics and Society* (London: The Harvester Press, 1975), pp. 277, 289, 295. Russell Kirk, op. cit., p. 24. B. W. Hill, ed., op. cit., p. 285. Russell Kirk, op. cit., pp. 167, 170. Ibid., p. 117. Ibid., p. 80. Ibid., p. 12. Ibid., pp. 41–42. Ibid., p. 40. Ibid., p. 140. Ibid., pp. 159, 160. Ibid., p. 158. Ibid., p. 159. Ibid., pp. 227–228. Ibid., pp. 150, 151. Ibid., p. 262.

[p](#) Jeffrey Hart, *The American Dissident* (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1966), pp. 202–204. Ibid., pp. 192, 199, 214. George P. Loweke, op. cit., p. 470.

[p](#) Richard Hofstadter, William Miller, and Daniel Aaron, *The American Republic*, Vol 2 (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1959), pp. 245–246.

[p](#) : Quoted in: Eric F. Goldman, *The Crucial Decade—And After: America, 1945–1960* (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), p. 127. *Congressional Record* 1950, 96 (2): 1954.

[p](#) Joseph R. McCarthy, *America's Retreat from Victory: The Story of George Catlett Marshall* (New York: Devin-Adair, 1954), p. 166.

[p](#) Seymour Martin Lipset "The Sources of the 'Radical Right'—1955: in *The Radical Right*, p. 267.

331

[p](#) ' Samuel Lubell, op. cit., pp. 85, 268. *Harper's Magazine*, December 1952, p. 22.

[p](#) Quoted in: Angelo del Boca and Mario Giovanna, *Fascism Today: A World Survey*, trans by R. H. Boothroyd (New York: Pantheon Books, 1969), p. 338.

[p](#) ' *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Convention of the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America*, pp. 63, 73–77, 105, 171, 195, 283, 289.

[p](#) ¹ *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Convention of the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America*, pp. 193, 146, 153, 154, 199.

[p](#) *Jobs, Freedom, Opportunity in the Postwar Years: Preliminary Observations by the Postwar Committee of the National Association of Manufactures* (New York: 1942), pp. 12, 13, 22, 23, 24, 26, 35. *Billionaire Corporations: Their Growth and Power* (New York: International Publishers, 1954), pp. 25, 31.

[p](#) Leonard Freedman, *Power and Politics in America* (Belmont, California, Duxbury Press, 1971), p. 190.

[p](#) *Socialism in America: A Study by the Committee on Economic Policy, Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.* (Washington: 1950), pp. 7, 16. R. Joseph Mosen, Jr., and Mark W. Cannon, *The Makers of Public Policy: American Power Groups and Their Ideologies* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965), pp. 28–29, 32. *Communism: Where Do We Stand Today? A Report of the Committee on Communism, Chamber of Commerce of the United States* (Washington: 1952), Introduction.

[p](#) Chamber of Commerce of the United States, *Communists Within the Labor Movement* (Washington: 1947), pp. 8, 9, 23–27. Karl Schriftgiesser, *Business Comes of Age* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1960), pp. 135–136.

[p](#) Glen W. Miller, *Government Policy Toward Labor: An Introduction to Labor Law* (Wichita: Grid, Inc., 1975), pp. 67, 69, 337.

[p](#) Daniel Bell, "Interpretations of American Politics," *The Radical Right*, p. 47.

[p](#) *Monthly Review*, January 1954, p. 423. C. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite*, p. 35. *Fortune*, April 1954, p. 182. *Fortune*, May 1954, p. 100.

[p](#) Robert Engler, *The Politics of Oil* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961), pp. 360, 362–363.

[p](#) *Fortune*, May 1954, p. 212; *Monthly Review*, January 1954, p. 424.

[p](#) *The Nation*, 30 June 1962, p. 571.

[p](#) *The Progressive*, November 1964, p. 5.

[p](#) *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[p](#) Kirkpatrick Sale. *op. cit.*, p. 100.

[p](#) *The Progressive*, July 1966, p. 7.

[p](#) Irwin Snail, *op. cit.* pp. 51–53; Richard Dudman, *op. cit.*, pp. 99–100.

[p](#) Francis X. Button, Seymour E. Harris, Carl Kaysen, and James Tobin, 332

[p](#) *The American Business Creed* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 293, 294.

TM ⁵ *Congressional Record* 1961, 107 (12): 15869. ⁴⁹⁰ Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, op., cit., pp. 295–297,

^p 309–310.

^p ⁴⁹⁷ Ibid., pp. 295–297.

^p ⁴⁹⁸ Ibid., pp. 296–297.

^p ^{''''} Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics* (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), p. 74. ⁸⁰⁰ C. Wright Mills, op. cit., p. 101.

^p ⁵⁰¹ S. Bernard Rosenblatt, Robert L. Bonnington, and Belverd E. Needles Jr., *Modern Business: A Systems Approach* (Boston: Houghton– Mufflin Company, 1977), pp. 363, 367, 370.

^p ⁵⁰² U.S. Congress. House. *Final Report of the Select Committee on Small Business* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952), p. 58.

^p ⁶⁰³ C. Wright Mills, op. cit., p. 36.

^p ^{***} *Final Report of the Select Committee on small Business*, pp. 6, 37.

^p ⁵⁰⁵ Quoted in: Martin Trow, "Small Businessmen, Political Tolerance, and Support for McCarthy," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. LXIV,

^p No. 3, 1958, p. 279.

^p ^{''} *Congressional Record* 1966, 112 (3): 2967. ⁶⁰⁷ Gerald Schomp, op. cit., pp. 12–16. TM *Labor-Management Relations*, pp. 3375, 3376, 3378, 3381, 3453, 3459,

^p 3555–3558, 3625, 3627, 3629.

^p ⁵⁰⁹ *Lobbying, Direct and Indirect*, Part 4, p. 471. ⁶¹⁰ *Political Science Quarterly*, March 1955, p. 100.

^p ⁰¹¹ *Final Report of the Select Committee on Small Business*, pp. 261–262.

^p ⁵¹² Willard W. Cochrane and Mary E. Ryan, *American Farm Policy, 1948-*

^p *1973* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1976), pp. 7, 68.

^p ⁵¹³ Ibid., pp. 8, 9. K1 Ibid., p. 86.

^p ⁵¹⁵ *American Agriculturist*, 3 December 1949, pp. 20, 33.

[p⁵¹⁰](#) Ibid., pp. 20, 25.

[p⁵¹⁷](#) *Congressional Record* 1969, 115, (24): H779-H782.

[p⁵¹⁸](#) *Congressional Record* 1958, 104 (6): 8355.

[p⁵¹⁰](#) John G. Tower, *A Program for Conservatives* (New York: MacFadden, 1962), pp. 8, 12.

[p⁵²⁰](#) David M. Oshinsky, *Senator Joe McCarthy*, p. 40.

[p⁵²¹](#) Ibid., p. 148.

[p⁵²²](#) Ibid., pp. 124, 140.

[p⁵²³](#) *The New York Times* 23 September 1964, p. 27.

[p⁵²⁴](#) Glen W. Miller, op. cit., p. 67.

* * *

Notes

[[307](#)*] In 1944 Americans had some \$35 billion in personal savings; in 1945–46, 1.5 million new commercial and industrial concerns came into being.[p⁵⁰²](#)

NAME INDEX

[p](#) Acheson, Dean—62, 76, 79

[p](#) Adams, John—279

[p](#) Adler, Selig—78

[p](#) Agnew, Spiro—240

[p](#) Anderson, Thomas J.—196, 203,

[p](#) 273, 275

[p](#) **B**

[p](#) Baldwin, Roger—23

Barnett, Frank Rockwell—175,

179

[p](#) Barsky, Edward K.—37, 38 Benson, George Stuart—157, 158,

[p](#) 200, 201

[p](#) Benton, William—81 Birch, John—146 Block, Herbert—73 Bohlen, Charles E.—111
Brannan, Charles—79 Brewer, Roy—40 Bricker—100 Bridges, Harry R.—93 Brownell,
Herbert—88, 90, 114,

[p](#) 115, 126

[p](#) Buckley, James—240, 270, 274 Buckley, William F.—195, 196,

[p](#) 206, 213, 223, 260, 261, 268,

[p](#) 274, 287–92, 294, 295 Bundy, Edgar—152, 154, 190 Burke, Edmund—292, 293, 295
Burnham, James—195

[p](#) Byrd, Harry F.—160

Carter, Edward K.—78 Chafee, Zecharian, Jr.—96 Chaplin, Charles—40 Chiang
Kaishek—78 Churchill, Winston—61, 77 Clark, Tom C.—30, 94, 114, 115 Cohen,
Morris R.—43 Commager, Henry Steell—131,

[p](#) Coors, Joseph—245, 261 Coughlin, Charles E.—52, 144 Courtney, Kent—161, 162, 221,

[p](#) 229 Cox, E. E.—99

[p](#) **D**

[p](#) De Pugh, Robert Bolivar—167,

[p](#) 168–70.

[p](#) Dennis, Eugene—22 Dies, Martin—35, 148, 303 Du Bois, William—44 Dulles, Allen—148 Dulles, John Foster—113, 148

[p](#) Eastland, James O.—79, 128, 131

[p](#) Einstein, Albert—44

[p](#) Eisenhower, Dwight David

[p](#) —uses anticommunist rhetoric— 115

[p](#) —refuses to dissociate himself from McCarthy—106

[p](#) —resolution against any "secret understandings"—109

[p](#) —agreement with Robert Taft to fight against "creeping socialism"—105

334

[p](#) Cain, Harry P.—126 Canwell, Albert F.—46 Carey, James B.—25, 26

[p](#) —passim—31, 80, 88, 90, 102, 106, 111–15, 148, 172, 195, 226, 236

[p](#) Emerson, Thomas I.—95, 131

[p](#) Evans, Medford Stanton—204, 205, 278, 292

[p](#) Evers, Medgar—144

[p](#) —platform—20

[p](#) —"Operation Dixie"—215

[p](#) —attitude toward the John Birch Society—211, 212, 215 —support from monopolies—210,

[p](#) 212, 213

—victory at the convention—20 —defeat of, November—221 —demagogic use of the "little guy"—217, 218, 313, 314 —"progressive conservatism"—

219

[p](#) —allies—209, 212–17 —financing by monopolies—213,

[p](#) 214 —passim—160, 178, 191, 192,

[p](#) 222–24, 228, 229, 231, 236,

[p](#) 239–42, 260, 261, 269–71, 274,

[p](#) 287, 292, 295, 314–16 Gonzales, Henry—168 Goodwin, William J.—78

[p](#) **J**

[p](#) Lodge, Henry Cabot—105 Long, Huey—144, 228

[p](#) **M**

[p](#) MacArthur, Douglas—76, 149, 212

[p](#) McCarthy, Joseph

[p](#) —demagogic use of the "little guy"—313

[p](#) —supports ultras—119–22

[p](#) —"Twenty Years of Treason" by the Democrats—115

[p](#) —financial machinations—80, 81

[p](#) —elected to Senate—75

[p](#) —lobbyist of the Lustron and Pepsi-Cola Corporations—81

[p](#) —attacks:

[p](#) —the Truman administration— 72, 76, 77

[p](#) —the Eisenhower administration —110–13, 115, 116, 118

[p](#) —Charles E. Bohlen—111

[p](#) —Owen Lattimore—77

[p](#) —liberal press—98

[p](#) —decline in popularity—118–20

[p](#) —negotiations about an economic blockade of the socialist countries—112

[p](#) —family of—313

[p](#) —investigations:

[p](#) —of the army—112, 113

[p](#) —of the Voice of America—111

[p](#) —of State Department’s overseas information services—111

[p](#) —of trade unions—26

[p](#) —Flauders demands the censure of—118, 119

[p](#) —speech in Wheeling—72, 297

[p](#) —allies—75, 76, 100, 101, 113, 114, 119–21, 302–04, 313

[p](#) —passim—62, 75, 76, 79, 82–96, 100, 102, 104, 106, 107, 114–16, 119, 122, 125, 126, 128, 174, 194, 195, 222, 289, 297, 298, 306, 308, 315

[p](#) McCarren, Pat—62, 77, 78, 100

[p](#) McCormic, Robert R.—75

335

[p](#) Jackson, Henry Martin—269,

[p](#) 270, 276

[p](#) Jefferson, Thomas—279, 314 Jenner, William—43, 79, 90, 100,

[p](#) 108, 128, 303 Jessup, Philip—76 Johnson, Eric—39 Johnson, Lyndon—160, 213 Judd, Walter—162

[p](#) Ferguson, Homer—43 Fish, Hamilton—112 Flanders, Ralph—118–20 Foster, William Z.—73 Frawley, Patrick J.—175 Friedman, Milton—200, 206

279 Fulbright, William—84, 168, 178,

180

[p](#) **K**

[p](#) Kamp, Joseph P.—79, 144

[p](#) Kasper, John—185

[p](#) Kendall, Willmoore—195, 295

[p](#) Kennedy, Edward—257, 276, 277

[p](#) Kennedy, John F.

[p](#) —civil rights bill—143

[p](#) —attempted invasion of Cuba—

143 —promises of social reforms—

143

[p](#) —opposes ultras—143, 219 —murder of—143, 168, 219 —passim 160, 182, 211, 237 Kennedy, Robert—169, 190, 231 Kennen, George F.—61, 119 King, Martin Luther—190, 231 Kintner, William—176, 179 Kirk, Russell—162, 195, 213,

[p](#) 278, 292–95 Kohlberg, Alferd—78

[p](#) Galvin, Robert—175

[p](#) Goldwater, Barry

[p](#) —begins his political career—209

[p](#) —elected to Senate—209

[p](#) —supports:

[p](#) —Nixon's election campaign, 1968—239, 240

[p](#) —McCarthy—209

[p](#) —policy of the Nixon administration toward China—266

[p](#) —political views—209, 210

[p](#) —presidential election campaign, 1964:

[p](#) —Arizona Mafia—219, 221

[p](#) —foreign policy program—210, 211, 219, 220

[p](#) —nominated for president—212, 213

[p](#) —demagogically criticizes liberals—217,218

[p](#) —demagogically criticizes monopolies—314

[p](#) —group of Clifton White—213, 214, 216, 217

[p](#) —leadership in the Republican party gained by his backers— 216

[p](#) **H**

[p](#) Hall, Leonard W.—107, 118, 211 Halleck, Charles—162 Hamilton, John Adams—279
Hargis, Billy James—154–56, 170,

179, 189, 254, 255 Harris, Roy—185 Hart, Harnell—72 Hart, Merwin K.—16, 144, 189
Hayek, F. A.—206, 279, 287 Hennings, Thomas C.—81, 82,

126

Hiss, Alger—60, 106 Hofstadter, Richard—124, 152,

306

[p](#) Holmes, Oliver Wendell—94 Hoover, Edgar J.—88, 94, 103,

[p](#) 205, 236

[p](#) Humphrey, Hubert H.—88 Hunt, H. L.—100, 112, 160, 194,

[p](#) 195, 199, 209, 236, 244, 252,

253, 262, 303 Hutchins, Robert M.—48, 98,

131 336

[p](#) Lamont, Corliss—93 Lane, Thomas A.—161 Lattimore, Owen—77 Lawson, John Howard—39, 40 Lehman, Herbert H.—83, 93 Le May, Curtis Emerson—237 Lemnitzer, Lyman L.—175, 177 Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich—281 Lewis, Fulton—72, 194 Lincoln, Abraham—279 Lipset, Seymour Martin—297

[p](#) McGrath, Howard J.—30, 94 McIntire, Carl—153, 199, 254,

[p](#) 255, 262

[p](#) Maclver, Robert M.—54 McNamara, Robert—179 Manion, Clarence—195, 203 Marcantonio, Vito—85

80, 148 Marshall, George—76, 77, 79,

148

[p](#) Marx, Karl—6, 160 Matthews, Joseph Brown—40,

[p](#) 102, 148, 154, 155 Meyer, Frank S.—195, 205, 213,

[p](#) 295, 296

[p](#) Mills, Wright C.—83, 302, 307 Mises, Ludwig von—200, 205,

[p](#) 206, 279, 287, 295 Moreel, Ben—159, 160 Mundt, Karl—85, 117

[p](#) N

[p](#) Nixon, Richard M.

[p](#) —impeachment—274

[p](#) —support from ultras—105

[p](#) —wins at the polls in 1968—

[p](#) 240 —role in the Alger Hiss affairs—

[p](#) 60 —role in creating anticommunist hysteria—24 —passim—84, 85, 106, 108, 114,

[p](#) 115, 212, 216, 223, 239–41,

[p](#) 261, 275

[p](#) —member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities

[p](#) (HUAC)—27, 60

[p](#) **o**

[p](#) Oliver, Revio P.—189 Oppenheimer, Julius Robert—32,

[p](#) 33 Oxnam, Bromley G.—103

[p](#) Pegler, Westbrook—72, 148, 194 Pew, Howard I.—194, 305 Possony, Stefan—176, 205

[p](#) **R**

[p](#) Rankin, John E.—35, 36,38, 60 Reece, Carrol B.—99 Reuther, Walter—26, 27 Richardson, Seth W.—29, 35 Robeson, Paul—93 Rockwell, George Lincoln—169-

[p](#) 71, 190–92, 230 Rogge, John O.—62 Roosevelt, Franklin D.—11, 12,

[p](#) 58, 61, 78, 80, 83, 99, 111,

112, 147, 164, 186 Rousselot, John H.—189, 224 Rovere, Richard H.—75, 110 Rusher, William A.—213, 274,

275 337

[p](#) Thomas, Parnell J.—22, 38, 41 Thurmond, Strom—57, 160, 178,

[p](#) 179, 181, 215, 239, 266, 270,

[p](#) 271 Tower, John G.—179, 240, 266,

[p](#) 269, 270, 314 Truman, Harry S.—28, 34, 35,

80, 85, 87, 99, 114, 115, 148

164

[p](#) —in 1968—229–39 —in 1972—271–73 —in 1976—276–78 passim—161, 169, 208, 222, 227,

239–41, 253, 275, 315, 316 Walter, Francis—162 Ward, Chester—175 Warren, Earl—183, 184, 195 Watkins, Arthur V.—118, 120,

[p](#) Wedemeyer, A. G.—195 Welch, Robert Henry Winborne —leader and founder of the John Birch Society—145, 146 —attacks prominent political figures—147, 148 —opposes: —business contacts with socialist countries—253 —detente—253 —social reforms—150 —attitude toward bourgeois democracy—146 —calls on his followers to work with young people—200, 201 —conspiracy theory—149, 150,

[p](#) 252, 253

[p](#) —passim—147–51, 165, 170, 177, 183, 189, 195, 201, 212, 241, 258, 287, 291, 305, 310 Wood, Robert E.—76, 144, 303

[p](#) **Z**

[p](#) Zoll, Allen A.—52, 144, 189

[p](#) Velde, Harold M.—43, 103, 110,

[p](#) 114 Viereck, Peter—123

[p](#) **W**

[p](#) Walker, Edwin A.—156, 177-8C Wallace, Henry—13, 122, 125 Wallace, George Corley —start of political career—227,

[p](#) 228 —becomes governor of Alabama,

[p](#) 1962—227

—assassination attempt—273 —"Segregation now—segregation tomorrow, and segregation forever"—227 —relies on strong-arm tactics—

228

[p](#) —demagogic use of the "little guy"—228, 229, 233, 234, 272 —allies among ultras—227–30 —runs for president:

[p](#) Salvatori, Henry—173 Schmitz, John G.—253, 273 Schwarz, Frederick C.—156, 157,

189, 201, 255, 256 Shelton, Robert—187, 188, 229,

235

Sloan, Alfred—158 Smith, Gerald L. K.—44, 184,

[p](#) Smoot, Dan—100, 196 Sokolsky, George—72 Spellman, Francis—101 Stassen, Harold—112 Stevenson, Adlai—106 Stone, I. F.—11, 217 Stone, Willis E.—163 Stratemeyer, George—121 Strausz-Hupe, Robert—176 Sutton, Antony C.—253

[p](#) Taft, Robert A.—76, 78, 104,

[p](#) 105, 107, 110, 145, 298 Taylor, Telford—89 Teller, Edward—175 Tenny, Jack B.—46, 47

Parsons, Talcott—124 Pauling, Linus Carl—44, 93

SUBJECT INDEX

[p](#) —criticizes the policy of “containment”.—182

[p](#) —criticizes the Nixon administration—268

[p](#) —propaganda campaigns—175

[p](#) —contacts with Congress—182

[p](#) —contacts with the administration—182

[p](#) —passim—174, 181, 207, 261

[p](#) —finances—175

[p](#) —blacklist—174

[p](#) Americans for Constitutional Action (ACA)

[p](#) —struggles for a conservative majority in Congress—159, 160

[p](#) —ACA Index—160, 177

[p](#) —supports "law and order"—161

[p](#) —passim—166

[p](#) Americans for Democratic Action

[p](#) (ADA)—13, 83, 130

[p](#) Anticommunism

[p](#) —leading factor in the politics of US ruling cliques after the Second World War—74

[p](#) —*Communism in Action*—14

[p](#) —factors in its development—12– 15

[p](#) Anticommunist hysteria

[p](#) —anticommunist laws and acts passed by federal and local government bodies—17–24, 26, 29, 48–50, 54, 55, 75, 84–93

[p](#) —persecution of the Communist Party—12, 22–24, 86–88

[p](#) —loyalty tests of government employees—27–35

[p](#) —investigation of philanthropic foundations—99

[p](#) —anticommunist offensive in the realm of the arts—38–43

[p](#) —investigation of educational institutions—43, 44, 46–48, 51– 54

[p](#) —attacks on the liberal press—

[p](#) 96–98, 111, 112 —represses the peace movement

[p](#) —44, 45

[p](#) 22*

[p](#) —persecution of progressive trade unions—24–27 —investigation of churches—101-

[p](#) 03 —system of paid informers—95,

[p](#) 96 —buildup of police forces—246-

[p](#) 50 —blacklist—36, 37, 40–42, 129,

[p](#) 154, 174 Anti-democratic legislation—11,

[p](#) 19–21, 23–25, 29, 48, 50–52,

[p](#) 55, 75, 84–93

[p](#) —certain provisions declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court—127, 128 —
attempts to restore provisions stricken done—250 Anti-Semitism—184, 189–94, 196,

[p](#) 197, 258, 259

—"Memorandum on Anti- Semitism"—14 Association of Nation Pictures—

39

[p](#) **B**

[p](#) Bill of Rights—34, 73, 85, 89, 90, 126, 279, 280

[p](#) *Blue Book* of the John Birch Society—149, 159, 165, 177

[p](#) Bricker Amendment—112

[p](#) Busing

[p](#) —one of the central issues in election campaigns—258, 273

[p](#) —racists' resistance to—257, 258

[p](#) Air Force Association—176

[p](#) American Association of Physicians and Surgeons—165

[p](#) American Business Consultants— 41, 42

[p](#) American Civil Liberties Union— 23, 50, 130, 131

[p](#) American Conservative Union

[p](#) —attacks George Wallace—240

[p](#) —criticizes the Nixon administration—263, 264

[p](#) —refuses to cooperate with the Birchers—223

[p](#) —supports Nixon's election campaign—239, 240

[p](#) —breaks with the Republicans over Nixon's impeachment— 274

[p](#) American Council of Christian Churches—153

[p](#) American Economic Foundation —198

[p](#) American Farm Bureau Federation

[p](#) —common ground with the ultras—158, 200, 312

[p](#) —propaganda campaigns—166, 197, 198, 312

[p](#) American Federation of Labor (AFL)—23, 27, 116, 315

[p](#) American Independent Party— 230, 235, 237, 239, 240, 271, 275 Americanism—297

[p](#) American Institute of Marxist Studies—129

[p](#) American League for the Peace and Democracy/American League
339

[p](#) —league against War and Fascism/ —30, 103

[p](#) American Legion —supports Major-General Edwin A. Walker—178

[p](#) —alliance with the ultras—176, 177

[p](#) —statements in the spirit of the ultras—165, 166

[p](#) —supports anti-democratic legislation—87, 92

[p](#) —Joseph McCarthy—I 20, 121

[p](#) —investigation of liberal churches—102–03

[p](#) —efforts against progressive cinema—40, 41

[p](#) —passim—35, 48, 163, 165, 197

[p](#) —blacklist—41, 42

[p](#) American Medical Association (AMA)—59, 164, 165

[p](#) *American Mercury*—196, 288

[p](#) American Nazi Party (National Socialist White People’s Party)

[p](#) —isolation from the right—190– 92

[p](#) —attacks on Barry Goldwater— 191, 192

[p](#) —platform—191

[p](#) —ties with the Minutemen—170

[p](#) —passim—169, 183, 190, 194

[p](#) *American Opinion*

[p](#) —attacks large philanthropic foundations, liberal newspapers, and liberal religious organizations—105

[p](#) —on a "communist plot" on Wall Street—253

[p](#) —passim—149, 254, 305

[p](#) American Party—271, 273, 275

[p](#) American Security Council /ASC/

Campaign against academic freedom—43, 44, 46–49, 51–54
Camps for preventive detention—

86

Captive Nations Week—109
Carnegie fund—78, 98, 99
Central Intelligence Agency

[p](#) (CIA)

[p](#) —plots against democratic governments in other countries— 247, 248

340

[p](#) —operation Hoodwink—246, 247

[p](#) —passim—9, 111, 197, 198, 248, 256, 276

[p](#) Chamber of Commerce of the United States

[p](#) —tries to foster anti-union sentiment—18

[p](#) —alliance with ultra-rightist organizations—166, 176, 177, 200

[p](#) —declarations in the spirit of ultras—165, 166

[p](#) —*Communists Within the Government*—27, 301

[p](#) —*Communists Within the Labor Movement*—25, 301

[p](#) —role in the McCarthy hysteria —119, 300–02

[p](#) —passim—29, 31, 51, 210, 263, 299

[p](#) —contribution to “right-to-work” laws—20

[p](#) China lobby—78

[p](#) Christian Anti-Communist Crusade—156, 157, 201

[p](#) Christian Crusade

[p](#) —anticommunist schools—155, 156

[p](#) —propaganda effort—155, 156, 255

[p](#) —tries to win over youth—200

[p](#) —allies—155

[p](#) —financial backing—155, 254

[p](#) Christian Nationalist Crusade—

[p](#) 184, 185

[p](#) Church League of America—154

[p](#) Citizens’ Councils of America

[p](#) (White Citizens’ Councils)—

[p](#) 185, 186, 197

[p](#) —propaganda campaigns—186

[p](#) —attempts to prevent school integration—186

[p](#) —social base—186

[p](#) Civil rights movement—224, 227, 231, 256

[p](#) Civil Service Commission—28, 29, 31, 248

[p](#) Cold war—125, 130, 152, 153, 181, 242, 267, 270

341

[p](#) Commission for an investigation of “communism” in Michigan —48, 49

[p](#) Committee for a New Majority— 274

[p](#) Committee for Constitutional Government—15, 16, 18, 59

[p](#) Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress—245, 246, 275

[p](#) Committee to Impeach Earl Warren—150

[p](#) Communist Control Act—75, 88, 89

[p](#) Communist Party of the United States of America

[p](#) —struggle against registration with the Justice Department— 87

[p](#) —on the military-industrial complex as an irrationality in the American system—172

[p](#) —on the rightist threat in USA— 184, 238, 239

[p](#) —proceedings against American Communists under the Smith Act—22, 23

[p](#) —anticommunist provisions of the McCarran Act overruled by the Supreme Court—128

[p](#) “Communist plot”—12, 44, 145, 164, 183, 184, 232, 251, 252, 258, 284, 285, 295

[p](#) Conference of Small Business Organizations—59, 310, 311

[p](#) Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO)

[p](#) —break with the World Federation of Trade Unions—25

[p](#) —ten unions excluded—26

[p](#) —opposition to McCarthyism— 115

[p](#) —purge of progressive elements from union organizations—23, 25–27

[p](#) Conservative Society of America

[p](#) —attempt to create a third party—223

[p](#) —resources—161

—supports George Wallace—

229

[p](#) —program of action—161, 162

[p](#) —propaganda campaigns—162, 163

[p](#) —passim—196

[p](#) Conservative Victory Fund— 275

[p](#) Constitution of the United States of America—79, 157

[p](#) Constitutional Educational League—79

[p](#) Council on Foreign Relations— 252

[p](#) Cox committee—99, 100

[p](#) —Geneva agreements on Indochina—110

[p](#) —Executive Order 10450—31–33, 126

[p](#) —execution of the Rosenbergs— 33

[p](#) —foreign policy attacked by the ultras—108–13

[p](#) —loyalty tests of government employees—31–33

[p](#) —differences with the right Republicans over domestic issues—107, 108

[p](#) —investigations launched by McCarthyism into "subversive activity" in—110–14

[p](#) —main gains of the New Deal preserved—107

[p](#) —social and economic measures— 107, 108

[p](#) —dismissals for national security reasons—31

[p](#) —"moderate Republicanism"— 108

[p](#) —concessions to McCarthy—113, 114

[p](#) —passim—34, 73, 93, 303

[p](#) Dan Smoot Report—196, 199

[p](#) Daughters of the American Revolution—35, 120, 197

[p](#) Declaration of Independence— 34, 73, 157

[p](#) Detente

[p](#) —ultras’ struggle against—268– 72, 274

[p](#) —influence on the right—241–42, 271

[p](#) —Soviet-American summit meetings—267

[p](#) Dies committee—35, 102

[p](#) Dixiecrats—183

[p](#) Du Bois Club—130

[p](#) Eastern establishment—124, 229, 243, 258

[p](#) Fair Deal—58, 79, 104, 307

[p](#) False Witnesses—78, 79, 96, 97, 126, 130

[p](#) Fascism in the USA

[p](#) —advocates of German fascism— 14

[p](#) —organizations—190–94

[p](#) —potential threat to democracy—121, 122

[p](#) —*Fascism in Action*—14

[p](#) Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)

[p](#) —struggle against the Communist Party—22, 23, 247

[p](#) —struggle against youth and civil rights movements—246, 247

[p](#) —budget—95, 246

[p](#) —dossiers—246

[p](#) —Security Index—247

342

General crises of capitalism—121,

122

[p](#) General Motors—305 —financial support of the ultras

[p](#) —158, 198 Geneva agreement on Indochina

[p](#) —110

[p](#) Gillette subcommittee—81, 118 Group Research, Inc.—199

[p](#) **H**

Harding College—157, 158, 201,

255

[p](#) Hatch Act, 1939—11, 28 Hennings subcommittee—82, 118 "Hollywood ten"—39–41, 103 House Committee on Un– American Activities—HUAC (House Internal Security Committee) —allocations for its work—35,

[p](#) 36, 130

[p](#) —struggle against the Communist Party—22–24

[p](#) Industrial College of the Armed Forces—174

[p](#) Institute for American Strategy— 174–76, 268

[p](#) Institute of Pacific Relations— 77–79

[p](#) International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators (IATSE)—40, 41

[p](#) International Studies Institute (ISI)—204–06

343

[p](#) Economic boom as a factor favoring the spread of conservative ideas—8, 122, 123, 306–08 Eisenhower administration —foreign policy doctrines—109 —meeting of Soviet and American leaders—110 —"spirit of Geneva"—110 —offensive against McCarthy—117–19

[p](#) —passim—9, 28, 31, 37, 50, 78, 91, 94, 128, 174, 181, 186, 195, 196, 205, 248, 256, 276

[p](#) —staff—95, 96, 246

[p](#) Federal Reserve System—149, 191, 253, 258

[p](#) Feinberg Law—51, 128

[p](#) Fifth Amendment to the Constitution—89, 90, 127

[p](#) For America—163

[p](#) Ford administration—275

[p](#) Ford Foundation—98, 100

[p](#) Foreign policy doctrines:

[p](#) —"containment of communism"

[p](#) —61, 109 —"brinkmanship"—109

[p](#) —"massive retaliation"—109

[p](#) —"liberation"—109

[p](#) Foundation for Economic Education—198, 204

[p](#) Free Europe—109

[p](#) Fund for the Republic—100, 125

[p](#) —influence on state legislatures—

[p](#) 45–55

[p](#) —Alger Hiss affair—60 —dossiers—37 —name changed—131 —gets permanent status as a Congressional committee—35 —program of action—36 —publications—36, 37, 129 —role in creating anticommunist hysteria—75 —investigations:

——of the Ku Klux Klan—131,

188

[p](#) ——of liberal churches—101–03

[p](#) of progressive trade unions— 26, 27

[p](#) ——of groups working for peace in Vietnam—131

[p](#) ——of educational institutions—

[p](#) 43, 44

——of the peace movement—44,

45

[p](#) ——of cultural institutions—38-

[p](#) 43 —bills and resolutions to abolish

[p](#) —35, 131

[p](#) —passim-9, 11, 12, 17, 28, 35, 41, 43, 84, 95, 114, 130, 131, 174, 181, 204, 205, 207, 290, 301

[p](#) —disbandment—249, 256 —blacklist—36, 40, 129 *Human Events*—194, 264, 288

[p](#) Investigations of "subversive activities" —in states:

[p](#) Washington—46 California—46, 47 Illinois—47, 48 Michigan—48, 49 —attempt to coordinate activities of investigative bodies—50 —in cities—49

[p](#) Investigations of "subversive activities" by Congress —Alger Hiss affair—60 — investigations:

[p](#) ——of philanthropis foundations

[p](#) —99

[p](#) ——of the Eisenhower administration—110–14

[p](#) ——of the Institute of Pacific Relations—77–79

[p](#) ——of the Barsky Committee—

p 37, 38

—of the Ku Klux Klan—131,

188

p —of trade unions—20, 21, 26

—of the peace movement—44,

45

of cultural institutions—38-

43

p —of churches—101-03

p Isolationism—296-98

—paid staff—148, 224, 251, 252 —periodical publications—148,

149

p —support of Nixon in 1968—241 —support of George Wallace—

p 230 —*The Politician* (“Black Book”)

p —147

p —attempts to clear itself of charges of anti-Semitism and racism—188, 189, 224 —
principles of operation—146 —attempt to infiltrate ParentTeacher Associations—201 —
attempts to gain control over associations in the field of education—201, 202 —
propagandizes its ideas in the army—177 —attempts to win over youth—

p 200-03

—in strongholds of Protestant fundamentalism—147, 225, 226 —closer contacts with
police—

225

p —ties with racists—189, 225 —“conspiracy” theory—149, 200 —passim—156. 157,
159, 161, 163-65, 179, 195-97, 199, 206, 207, 211, 215, 219, 222- 26, 228, 241, 251,
252, 255, 258, 261, 262, 275, 291, 292, 298, 305, 306, 309 —affiliates—150, 244, 245 —
finances—148, 224, 252 —number of sympathizers—225.

[p](#) 251, 252

—membership—148 Johnson administration—181, 182 Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (“Barsky Committee”) —37, 38 Joint Chiefs of Staff—174, 175,

177

[p](#) Joint Legislative Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities (Canwell Committee)—46, 47

344

[p](#) “Law and order”—161

[p](#) Liberals

[p](#) —attitude toward Communists— 13, 14

[p](#) —anticommunism—9, 83, 84

[p](#) —struggle against McCarthyism —80–84

[p](#) —lessened influence of the bourgeois press—199

345

[p](#) John Birch Society (JBS)

[p](#) —attempts to build a more acceptable public image—224

[p](#) —Western Islands—149

[p](#) —demands in the realm of foreign policy—150

[p](#) —*Blue* Boot—149, 159, 165, 177

[p](#) —Catholics—147

[p](#) —book stores—149, 197, 198

[p](#) —mass base—148, 209

[p](#) —attacks the Nixon administration—254, 262

[p](#) —attacks Wall Street—254

[p](#) —structure—146, 147, 251, 252

[p](#) Justice Department blacklists—9, 30, 34, 41, 45, 95, 100, 127, 128, 250

[p](#) **K**

[p](#) Kennedy administration

[p](#) —civil rights bill—143, 216

[p](#) —prohibits rightist propaganda in the armed forces—179 —attempted invasion of Cuba—

[p](#) 143 —Moscow Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—143, 219 —passim—214, 228, 237 —speeches by certain military commanders screened in advance—179

[p](#) Kersten Committee—109 Kilgore Bill—85 Knights of Columbus—48 Ku Klux Klan —statements in support of peace

[p](#) —187, 257

—new vitality—186–88 —associations within—187 —supports George Wallace—227-

30

[p](#) —investigation of—188 —sympathizers—187 —violence—257 —difficulties—257 —passim—156, 167, 183, 185,

[p](#) 186, 192 —membership—187, 257

[p](#) —contribution to anticommunist legislation—83, 85, 88 Liberty Amendment Committee

[p](#) —163

[p](#) Liberty Lobby —anti-Semitism—258, 259 —"communist plot" theory—258 —attack on tax policies—259,

[p](#) 260 —attempts to win backing among the middle classes—259 —supports George Wallace—230 —propaganda campaigns—258,

[p](#) 259 —Hitler sympathizers among the leaders—258 —passim—190, 222, 313 —financial backers—258 —annual budget—268 —membership—258 Library Bill of Right—53 *Life Lines*—160, 199, 262 Loyalty tests of government employees

[p](#) —staff for—28, 31 —appropriations for—29, 33 —influence on state legislatures—

[p](#) 46–55 —pressure from the right for—

[p](#) 27–29, 31 —Executive Order 9835—28, 31,

[p](#) 32, 45, 50

[p](#) —Executive Order 10450—31,

[p](#) 33, 126

[p](#) —sources of information—28 —criteria for “disloyalty”—28,

[p](#) 29–32 —violation of the Bill of Rights

—34

[p](#)

[p](#) —constitutionality upheld by the Supreme Court—30

[p](#) —security checks conducted on an increased number of persons—30–33, 54, 55

[p](#) —dismissal of Robert Oppenheimer—32, 33

[p](#) —blacklists—30, 32

Lynchings—57

[p](#) M

Manion Forum—156, 161, 199,

225

[p](#) Marshal Plan—61 McCarran-Walter Act, 1952 (Immigration and Nationality Act) —
75, 92, 93

[p](#) McCarran-Wood Act, 1950 (Internal Security Act)

[p](#) —definitions:

[p](#) —of the communist movement

[p](#) —85

[p](#) —of the Communist Party—85

[p](#) —of democratic organizations

[p](#) —85, 86

[p](#) —persecution of democratic organizations and the Communist Party under—87, 88

[p](#) —passim—24, 75, 84, 85, 89, 91, 92, 103, 256

[p](#) —ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court—128, 129

[p](#) McCarthyism

[p](#) —campaign against the Supreme Court—127, 128

[p](#) —influence among workers—315

[p](#) —as a reflection of antagonisms within the ruling class due to different attitude of its various groups toward working people—124

[p](#) —“godfather” of the reactionary right in America—121, 122

[p](#) —as a factor favoring the development of the right-extremist movement—142

[p](#) —mass base—299–304, 301–13

[p](#) —"new rich" as a factor favoring the spread of—123, 302–04

[p](#) —opposition to—80–84, 115–17

[p](#) —identification with the Populist movement and fascism— 122

[p](#) —role of the National Association of Manufactures and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in creating the social climate—119

[p](#) —press as a powerful tool for— 98

[p](#) —defeat of—125–30

[p](#) —bourgeois theories on the social character of—121, 123, 124

[p](#) —passim—9, 72–125, 130, 289, 298, 302–04, 310

[p](#) McCormac Act, 1938—11, 85

[p](#) Methodist Church Federation for Social Action—101, 152

[p](#) Military-industrial complex

[p](#) —struggle against detente—268, 269

[p](#) —pressure on the government— 172

[p](#) —Walker affair—117–80

[p](#) —spread of Birch Society ideas— 177

[p](#) —propaganda campaigns—173– 77

[p](#) —demands for "victory over communism"—173, 176, 179

[p](#) Military spending—173, 179, 180

[p](#) Minutemen

[p](#) —military training—168

[p](#) —lack of contacts with other extremist groups—170

[p](#) —platform—166, 167

[p](#) —stores of weapons—169

[p](#) —threats of violence—168

[p](#) —membership—167

[p](#) —passim—156, 170, 171, 229

[p](#) Monopolies and corporations

[p](#) —connections with Nazi Germany—14

[p](#) —expenditures for anti-worker legislation—21

[p](#) —financial backers of rightist organizations—15, 16, 176, 194, 198, 199, 206, 213, 214, 235, 236, 243–45, 258, 303–05

[p](#) Mood of violence—144

[p](#) Motorola, Inc.^175

[p](#) Movement against the war in Vietnam—231, 264, 265

[p](#) Mundt-Nixon Bill—50, 84, 85

[p](#) Murray Bill—59

346

[p](#) N

[p](#) National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)—37, 227

[p](#) National Association of Manufacturers

[p](#) —campaign against the Wagner Act—18

[p](#) —negative attitude towards any social or economic concessions to working people—59, 299–301

[p](#) —role in McCarthy hysteria—119, 300–02

[p](#) —passim—146, 148, 158, 210, 299, 300

[p](#) —contribution for "right-to-work" laws—20

[p](#) National Conservative Political Action Committee—275

[p](#) National Council for Civil Responsibility—226

[p](#) National Council of Churches of Christ—101, 102, 152, 153, 155

[p](#) National Economic Council

[p](#) —struggle against the New Deal—16

[p](#) —struggle against the Fair Deal—16

[p](#) —means of winning over public opinion—16, 17

[p](#) —connections with monopolies—16

[p](#) —financial help—16

[p](#) National Education Program (NEP)—158, 159, 166, 200–02, .305

[p](#) National Farm Labour Union—20

[p](#) National Federation of Independent Business—310

[p](#) National Labor Relations Board —19, 21, 25, 26, 310

[p](#) National Layman's Council—154

[p](#) National Renaissance Party—193, 197

[p](#) *National Review*

347

[p](#) —struggle against the liberal establishment—195, 196

[p](#) —criticizes the policies of the Nixon administration—262–64. 267, 268

[p](#) —plans to annihilate the Soviet Union—268

[p](#) —acclaims the birth of the John Birch Society—195

[p](#) —decision to distance itself from the Birch Society—223

[p](#) —break with Nixon after his impeachment—274

[p](#) —passim—195, 260, 274, 276

[p](#) National Security Council—178

[p](#) National States Rights Party— 170, 192, 193

[p](#) National War College—174, 179

[p](#) Navy League—176

[p](#) New Deal

[p](#) —attacked by the right—11, 15, 123, 307

[p](#) —passim—59, 79, 98, 99, 104, 107, 108, 279, 282, 302, 308

[p](#) “New rich” as a factor favoring the development of McCarthyism and the ultra-rightist movement—9, 123, 243–46 Nixon administration

[p](#) —wage and price controls—262, 263

[p](#) —“guaranteed income policy”— 262

[p](#) —differences with the ultras— 262–69

[p](#) —represses democratic forces— 249

[p](#) —closer contacts with the Peking leaders—265

[p](#) —ties with the ultra-rightist movement—182, 183, 260–62, 268

[p](#) —Soviet-American agreement, 1972—267

[p](#) —strengthens the police apparatus—248, 249

[p](#) North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)—61, 112, 219, 252

[p](#) **O**

[p](#) Ober Law—50, 51 Oppenheimer case—33

[p](#) —Ku Klux Klaii—156, 167, 183, 185–88, 192, 227–30, 256, 257

[p](#) —publications—162, 184–86, 189, 190, 196, 197, 208, 288

[p](#) —all varieties collaborate in the Wallace movement—235

[p](#) —White Citizens' Councils—183, 185, 186, 230

[p](#) —an integral part of the ultrarightist movement—183

[p](#) —social base—186, 306

[p](#) —harassment of Martin Luther King—190

[p](#) —Christian Nationalist Crusade—184

[p](#) Rankin Bill—24

[p](#) “Red Channels”—41, 42

[p](#) “Red menace”—11, 246, 265

[p](#) Reece committee—99

[p](#) Republican Party

[p](#) —uses McCarthyism to discredit the Democratic administration —105, 114

[p](#) —role in the McCarthy hysteria —120

[p](#) Reserve Officers Association— 174, 176

[p](#) Revolution in Cuba—142

[p](#) Richardson Foundation—176

[p](#) Rightist youth organizations— 203–08, 214

[p](#) “Right-to-work” laws—20, 21, 166, 288, 290, 302, 305, 312, 316

[p](#) Right-wing fundamentalists

[p](#) —drive against the national liberation movement in Africa and South America—255

[p](#) —as an ultra-rightist group— 151–59, 306, 307

[p](#) —supports McCarthyism’s attacks on liberal clergymen—105

[p](#) Rockefeller Foundation—78, 98, 99

[p](#) Roosevelt administration—30, 58,

[p](#) 123, 194, 215, 282 Rosenberg case—83

348

[p](#) Taft-Hartley Act, 1948

[p](#) —impact on trade unions—21, 26

[p](#) —influence on relations between labor and capital—21 —main provisions—19, 20 —passim—21, 25, 58, 86, 105,

[p](#) 108, 294, 301, 310 —certain provisions ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court—128

[p](#) Ten Million Americans Mobilizing for Justice—120, 161 Trials at Nuremberg—14 Trials of eleven Communists in New York—22, 23 Truman administration —ultras attack the foreign policy of—76–79 —opposes the domestic policy—

[p](#) 56, 57, 79, 80 —offensive against McCarthyism

[p](#) —80

[p](#) —role in the McCarthy hysteria—119, 300–02 —and Congress—58 —altitude toward the Alger Hiss affair—60

—message on civil rights—57 —Loyalty tests of government employees—27–31 —
differences with racists—57,

215

[p](#) —charges against American fascists dropped—30 —suggestions in social and
economic fields—56, 57 —passim—34, 73, 104, 105, 107,

[p](#) 215, 216

[p](#) Twentieth Century Reformation —119, 254

[p](#) American employees—79

[p](#) —role in creating anticommunist hysteria—75

[p](#) —passim—43, 204

[p](#) Senate Investigative Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee

[p](#) —investigations:

[p](#) —of the army—112, 113

[p](#) —of the State Department’s overseas information services—111

[p](#) —of the United Electrical Workers—26

—of the Voice of America—

111

[p](#) —role in creating anticommunist hysteria—72

[p](#) —attempted inquiry into CIA— 111

349

[p](#) Pentagon

[p](#) —influences the economy—171, 172

[p](#) —military bureaucracy—171

[p](#) —political views—173

[p](#) —takes over certain police functions—247, 248

[p](#) —propaganda effort—180

[p](#) —expenditures—171, 180

[p](#) —passim—9, 117, 177, 178, 247

[p](#) —punitive operations against the radical and democratic movement—248

[p](#) Persecutions in the educational world—43, 44, 47, 48, 52–54

[p](#) Petty bourgeoisie

[p](#) —mass base of McCarthyism and the right-extremist movement— 144, 306, 313–15

[p](#) —attitude toward workers and trade unions—310, 311

[p](#) —attitude toward social and economic programs—59, 307

[p](#) —position under state-monopoly capitalism—306–11, 314, 315

[p](#) Policy of denying passports for political reasons—93

[p](#) *The Politician*—147

[p](#) Potsdam agreements—60, 61, 109

[p](#) Progressive Citizens of America— 13

[p](#) **R**

[p](#) Racism

[p](#) —struggle against the Supreme Court's decision to desegregate public schools—127, 185, 186

[p](#) —resistance to busing—257, 271

[p](#) —Wallace movement—227—41

[p](#) —Dixiecrats—183

[p](#) *Salt of the Earth*—41

[p](#) Schick Safety Razor Company—

181 Second World War—172, 306,

308

[p](#) —Second front—77 Security Act—29 Seditious Activities Investigation Commission, Illinois—47, 48 Seminars of military men—173,

[p](#) 174, 175

[p](#) Senate Internal Security Subcommittee

[p](#) —report on “communist” infiltration into the Democratic administration—80

[p](#) —“communist” infiltration into the Republican administration —112 —investigations:

[p](#) —of educational institutions—

[p](#) 43, 44

[p](#) —of radio and television—42

[p](#) —of the Institute of Pacific Relations—77, 78 —of the activities of UN’s Sheppard Bill—24

[p](#) Shift to the right in the political life of the USA—12, 13 Smith Act, 1940 —similar laws adopted by states

[p](#) —86, 87

[p](#) —conviction of Communists under—22, 23 —fingerprinting—91 —passim—11, 12, 50, 89–91, 125 —ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court—127 Subcommittee headed by Milliard E. Tydings—80, 81 Subversive Activities Control Board—9, 86–88, 126, 129, 249, 256, 261, 310 Social reform

[p](#) —as a “red menace”—11 —as a means to strengthen bourgeois domination—143 Soviet Union launches the first artificial Earth satellite—142 States’ Rights Party—57, 215 “Status politics”—122, 124 Stockholm Appeal of the World Peace Council—44, 45, 87, 102

[p](#) Students for a Democratic Society—130 Supreme Court of the United States of America —subject to ultras’ criticism—

[p](#) 127, 128

[p](#) —rules Executive Order 10450 a violation of the law passed by Congress—126

[p](#) —decision to convict Communists upheld:

[p](#) ——under the Smith Act of

[p](#) 1940—23

[p](#) ——under Articles 9 and 14(6)

[p](#) of the Taft-Hartley Act— 20, 26

[p](#) —rules racial discrimination in public schools unconstitutional, 1954—127, 183, 185, 257 —passim—33, 38–40, 115, 185, 18G, 251

[p](#) —rules certain provisions of anti-democratic legislation unconstitutional—127–29

[p](#) System of undercover informers— 28, 29, 32, 95, 96

[p](#) **U**

[p](#) Ultra-rightist movement

[p](#) —anti-Semitism as an integral part of ideology—184 —factors in its development—8, 11, 122, 142–45, 242–51, 282– 87, 306–09 —democratic forces struggle against—226 —influence:

[p](#) on educational institutions— 202, 203

[p](#) ——on government policies—11,

[p](#) 12/54, 55

——of detente on—241–42, 270-

74

[p](#) ——among workers—316, 317

[p](#) —ideology—278–98

[p](#) —first steps—300

[p](#) —historical roots of ideology—5,

[p](#) 6, 279, 280 —candidates for president:

[p](#) ——Tom Anderson—275

[p](#) —John Ashbrook—266, 271

[p](#) —Barry Goldwater—209–21

[p](#) —Richard Nixon—239–41

[p](#) —George Wallace—229–39,

[p](#) 271–74, 276–78 —criticism:

[p](#) —of the Nixon administration—262–69

[p](#) of the “containment” doctrine—61, 182 —McCarthy as the “godfather”

[p](#) of—122, 142

—mass base—8, 306, 307 —youth organizations—203–08 —attacks Wall Street—253, 254 —rejects peaceful coexistence—

253

[p](#) —identifies liberalism with socialism and communism—11, 55, 158, 159, 183 —“victory over communism”—

[p](#) 173, 176, 182, 210, 242 —supports the American policy in Vietnam—261, 262

350

[p](#) Yalta agreements—60, 61, 109

[p](#) Young Americans for Freedom (YAF)

[p](#) —influence among Congressmen—260

[p](#) —criticizes the Nixon administration—264–66

[p](#) —supports:

——the war in Vietnam—261,

262

——Barry Goldwater—206, 207,

214

[p](#) —Nixon in 1968—239, 240

[p](#) —political activity—207, 208, 240

[p](#) Veterans of Foreign Wars—35 —common ground with the ultras—181

[p](#) —supports McCarthy—120–21 Voorhis Law—11, 39, 85

[p](#) **w**

[p](#) Wagner Act, 1935—18 Waldorf Declaration—39 Walker affair—177–81

351

[p](#) —supports McCarthy and McCarthyism—120–22

[p](#) —attempts to form a third party—274, 275

[p](#) —link between the right extremism of the 30s and that of the 60s—144

[p](#) —ultra-rightist propaganda—194– 99

[p](#) —propaganda centers—255

[p](#) —split following the 1964 elections—222, 223

[p](#) —ranks grow—142, 208, 209, 226, 251, 252

[p](#) —ties with big corporations—15, 16, 176, 194, 206, 209, 210, 213, 214, 235, 236, 243–46, 258, 303–05

[p](#) —social and economic programs —6, 7

[p](#) —allies in Congress—209

[p](#) —financing—15, 16, 155, 158, 167, 194, 206, 207, 213, 214, 226, 229, 235, 243–46, 258, 303–05

[p](#) United Automobile Workers— 26

[p](#) United Electrical Workers—25, 26

[p](#) United States of America

[p](#) —world’s policeman—15, 171

[p](#) —ally of reactionary regimes—61

[p](#) —citadel of international imperialism—171

[p](#) Executive orders of US presidents—28, 31–33, 45, 95, 126

[p](#) Wallace movement

[p](#) —struggle of democratic forces against—239

[p](#) —"law and order"—231–33, 23S

[p](#) —1968 campaign platform—237, 238

[p](#) —sources of income—288, 229, 235, 236

[p](#) —tries to camouflage its racism— 234, 235

[p](#) —difference within the movement—236, 237

[p](#) —contacts with police—234

[p](#) —allies—208, 227–31

[p](#) —demagogic use of the "little guy"—228, 229, 233, 234, 279

[p](#) —participation in the 1972 election campaign—271–73

[p](#) —participation in the 1976 election campaign—276–78

[p](#) War in Korea—45, 104, 110, 172

[p](#) War in Vietnam—172, 180, 181, 193, 237, 245, 261, 267, 316

[p](#) Watergate scandal—8, 246, 274, 275

[p](#) Watkins Committee—118, 120

[p](#) "Welfare state"—157, 183, 194

[p](#) We, the People—164

[p](#) Wiretapping—94

[p](#) World economic crisis of 1929– 1933—122

[p](#) —platform—206, 260 —ties with the Nixon administration—261, 268 —passim—204, 206, 226, 240,

[p](#) 245, 276

[p](#) —financial support—207, 260 —membership—207, 260 —Sharon Statement—206, 207, 260

[p](#) Young Republican National Federation—214

[p](#) Young Workers Liberation League—131

[p](#) Youth for Wallace (the National Youth Alliance)—208

Youth movement—200