



THE
POISON PEN
OF
JERSEY

FRANK DALTON O'SULLIVAN





THE POISON PEN *of* JERSEY

by

FRANK DALTON O'SULLIVAN

AUTHOR OF

"RACKETS," "ENEMIES OF INDUSTRY," "CRIME
DETECTION," "THE DEFENSE PLEADS INSANITY,"
"UNDER THE YOKE," "SUCCESSFUL TELEPHONE
SELLING," ETC., ETC.

7

PUBLISHED BY

THE O'SULLIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE

THE SOUTHERN PACIFIC BUILDING

35 WEST JACKSON BLVD.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Copyright, 1936, by

THE O'SULLIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE
Chicago

—

All Rights Reserved

PUBLISHERS' PREFACE

WHEN a group of radical agitators, affiliated with societies that are among the most persistent advocates of revolutionary principles in America, organize and incorporate themselves under a seemingly altruistic and high-sounding name like "Consumers' Research," the result is the delusive attirement of wolves in sheep's clothing.

The object of Communist groups in this country is the subversion of our form of government and our industrial system, by fostering public discontent with existing conditions, to be followed by a popular "uprising." Socialists become Communists by the adoption of the militant attitude of the latter, who favor the use of violence to gain their ends. And when we find that the men who head an apparently innocent business organization are Communists by profession or affiliation, it becomes a patriotic duty to strip them of their disguises and show that their pretensions to serve the American people are a mere cloak for their ulterior purpose.

In this book, "The Poison Pen of Jersey," the author, Frank Dalton O'Sullivan, a noted champion of legitimate business, has performed that public duty. He has torn aside the wooly disguises of Consumers' Research promoters, and exhibits to the public gaze the grinning vulpine features that have been too long concealed by the garb of innocence.

Men who profess admiration for the revolutionary principles and theories of Moscow, or cherish them in their hearts, have no license to pose as representatives of the American people, as consumers or otherwise; and the

THE POISON PEN OF JERSEY

contents of this book will make it clear to any intelligent and unprejudiced reader that the malevolent operations of "Consumers' Research, Inc.," should speedily be made the subject of official inquiry and condemnation, through the medium of a Congressional investigation or by drastic action of the courts in the interpretation and enforcement of the laws of libel.

CHAPTER TITLES

CHAPTER	PAGE
	Prologue 7
I	Who and What is "Consumers' Research, Inc."? 21
II	Radical Records of the Promoters 29
III	Objects and Aims of Communism 40
IV	Communism as a Threat to America 49
V	Self-Appointed Censors of Business 58
VI	"Consumers' Research" as a Business Racket 64
VII	Maligners of Manufacturers 71
VIII	Origin and Ostensible Objects of the "CR" 82
IX	The Piffle of "CR" Literature 89
X	A Strike Among Strike-Instigators 99
XI	A Book That Reeks of Radicalism 108
XII	The Nonsense of "CR" Food Criticism 120
XIII	Modern Foods and the "Grandmother" Slogan 129
XIV	Sensational Attacks on American Business 140
XV	More Attacks by the Poison Pen 163
XVI	The Boycott and the Blacklist 190
XVII	Reputation and Goodwill Wreckers 196
XVIII	Unfair Attacks on Drugs and Medicines 206
XIX	Beauty — Skin Deep or Otherwise 223
XX	A "CR" Prophet on the Profit System 239
XXI	The Truth About Advertising and Its Critics 254
XXII	Advertising Agencies an Invaluable Aid to Business 267
XXIII	Is "High-Pressure Salesmanship" Criminal? 281
XXIV	The Case of American Business vs. Consumers' Research 291

PROLOGUE

THE COMING OF THE PILGRIMS.—When a band of storm-tossed adventurers landed in 1620 upon the rock-bound coast of New England, it was to found a community destined to become the corner-stone of a mighty nation.

In that heroic band were the progenitors of American families that are proud today to recall, with utmost sympathy and understanding, the hardships and privations endured by their ancestors for conscience' sake; and the tale of the Pilgrims' sufferings and ultimate triumph over adverse conditions never fails to thrill the modern reader, and never grows old. It is an epic of group heroism, unsurpassed in the world's history.

Little was known of the American continent when the eyes of these adventurers turned from the Europe that offered them no hope of lasting peace or religious freedom to the distant shores of a new-found land. For them there shone no welcoming torch upheld by a Goddess of Liberty, such as would greet millions of their followers on the threshold of America in the years to come.

No relatives or friends beckoned them across the Atlantic, and there was none to greet them on their arrival. Cold, inhospitable shores awaited them; disease and death stared them in the face; savages were known to possess the land, a constant menace to newcomers; and they who resolutely faced all these and other dangers in an unknown land were but poorly supplied with the means of existence.

But the spirit of the Pilgrims rose above all obstacles; their faith rested on a sure foundation and never faltered. Like Columbus, they refused to turn back when once they had set their faces toward the West, and in due time their faith was rewarded.

Their pioneer efforts and sacrifices marked an era in the world's progress, not only in the history of religious liberty, but in that of constitutional government.

From that little band of serious-minded, conscience-driven emigrants, settling with little but faith and hope in a New World, the Old World has seen a mighty nation grow and prosper, establishing a new set of human traditions with the guarantee to every citizen of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, under a government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Well may the known descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers take pride in their ancestry, whose landing, purpose, and achievement have been so sympathetically and beautifully woven into song, verse and story the world over.

It was on September 6, 1620, that the Pilgrims set sail across the Atlantic. The little vessel *Speedwell*, which carried them from Holland to Southampton, was abandoned before the actual voyage began, ostensibly on account of unseaworthiness, although the reluctance of the crew to attempt the transatlantic voyage was a contributory cause. The *Mayflower* awaited the Pilgrims at Southampton and proceeded to old Plymouth, where some time was spent in refitting the vessel and shipping stores. Her captain was Christopher Jones, and having been engaged in the wine trade, she was known among the sailors as "a sweet ship."

For some reason unknown, Captain Jones made his landfall on the rocky New England coast instead of near the mouth of the Hudson, and in the evening of November 19 the *Mayflower* cast anchor in Cape Cod harbor. Before landing a compact was drawn up for the government of the new colony. This has been called "the first written constitution in the world." John Carver was chosen governor for the first year, and all the adult males, forty-one in number — the Pilgrim fathers — signed the compact. By this instrument they pledged themselves, "solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one another," to form a body politic, to frame such laws as might be needed, to which they promised "all due submission and obedience."

THE COMING OF THE PILGRIMS

Two days later, on November 21, the *Mayflower* entered a harbor in Cape Cod Bay, and sixteen of the men, "every one with musket, sword, and corslet," under command of Captain Miles Standish, went ashore to explore. They landed in the face of a wintry storm, on a boulder in Plymouth harbor, since known as Plymouth Rock, and now protected at its original site by a granite canopy supported on four pillars, to be preserved forever as part of the state park system.

The exploring party found the country bleak and uninviting. There was a fierce wind and snow lay deep upon the ground. It was an inhospitable coast, but the Pilgrims had to make the best of it, and falling upon their knees they blessed the "God of Heaven, who had brought them over the vast and furious ocean." Next day a praise service was held aboard the *Mayflower*. Plymouth harbor was finally selected as the landing-place, and on Monday, December 21, they "marched into the land."

Soon the men were busily engaged in building cabins, using the ship as sleeping quarters. But before there was shelter on land for the entire company disease began to spread among them. Ere spring arrived and there was an end of the harsh winter, more than forty of the colonists, including the wives of Bradford, Winslow, and Standish, had perished. But such was the great faith of the Pilgrims that when the *Mayflower* sailed on her return to England early in the spring, all the survivors remained to share the hardships of the new life, and most of these singularly enough, lived to a good old age.

Governor Carver was one of those who succumbed to the rigors of that first dreadful winter, and William Bradford was chosen to succeed him. He held the office for over thirty years. His interesting and picturesque chronicle of the events attending the formation and development of the colony is preserved among the archives of Plymouth, Mass.

When the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, the coast was

apparently free from Indians, due to a pestilence that had swept them away a few years before. During the first winter only a few red men were seen, though Indian signs abounded. Then, one day in the spring, the new colonists were surprised by the appearance of a lone Indian. This was a Wampanoag, or Maine, Indian, who had learned a little English from occasional fishermen on the coast of Maine. He was named Samoset and greeted the Pilgrims with the English word "Welcome." A few days later he returned with another Indian called Squanto, who became a useful friend to the colonists. He taught them methods of fishing and raising corn, and was instrumental in securing for them a treaty of peace and friendship with the great chief Massassoit. Later, when Massassoit desired the protection of the settlers against his enemy Canonicus, chief of the Narragansett Indians, Governor Bradford received from Canonicus a challenge consisting of a snake skin filled with arrows. The governor promptly sent it back filled with powder and shot. Then the hostile chief, aware of the power of the white man's weapons, decided that discretion was the better part of valor, and made friends with the colonists. For half a century thereafter the Plymouth colony was free from Indian troubles.

Under Governor Bradford, the government of Plymouth was a democracy pure and simple. For the first eighteen years laws were made in town meetings participated in by all freemen; and then, with the growth of the colony, a representative government was formed, — each settlement having two representatives in the law-making body. The referendum, or power to repeal any law their representatives might enact, was retained by the people until about 1648.

After ten years' existence the colony of the Pilgrim Fathers had increased to only about three hundred people. The severe conditions of life, with an unproductive soil and lack of means to procure necessaries, in the face of an unfavorable climate, militated against

the growth and prosperity of the settlers; and they were further handicapped by the necessity of paying off their debt to the merchant adventurers who had financed their migration.

A communistic mode of life was required at the outset, but after the settlement with the English merchants was effected in 1627, the communal system gradually disappeared and twenty acres of land was set apart for the individual use and profit of each family. Then the heroic settlers were free to make each his own way in the primitive life of the coast and the adjacent forest, setting an example of faith, courage, and devotion for the emulation of an admiring world. Finally the record of Plymouth Colony closed with its merger into the body politic that became the great state of Massachusetts. It is a record of which every lover of political and religious liberty, and especially every American citizen, is justly proud.

* * *

THE COVERED WAGON AND THE LOCOMOTIVE. — Three-quarters of a century ago, the populated and prosperous West of today was largely an untrodden wilderness. Great stretches of virgin forests were pierced only by trails, or roads hardly worthy of the name. To reach hamlets only a few miles apart consumed an entire day's travel.

The great expanse of the prairie was dotted with the white covered wagons of westbound emigrants. Freight transportation was confined to a few difficult and often dangerous routes, operated by teams of lumbering oxen.

All forms of transportation, summer and winter, were subject to suspension at the will of the elements; and not the least of the perils was that of hostile savages, who still roamed the plains and lurked in the forests.

Campfires of an evening were often interrupted by Indian prowlers and wild animals, but more frequently by storms which often sent the drivers into their wagons.

Here, it was pleasant to lie and listen to the rain as it pattered upon the cover, knowing that the heavy canvas would turn water as effectually as a shingled roof at home.

For several hundred miles the caravans followed the silent and unhurried Platte River, whose waters are tinged with the amber from the pines and fenlands of her upper reaches. Often a shaft of sunlight falling through the clouds, touched the river mists and gave them soft transition of color and light against the horizon. It was a picture to linger ever, holding as it did, all that life had brought to those venturesome pioneers. Few witnessing those gorgeous sights could give their thoughts expression in words.

The coming of the railroad changed all that!

As a western railway official recently put it, "Next after the Christian religion and schools, the railroad has been the largest contributing factor to the welfare and happiness of the public."

We cannot hold the pioneers in too high regard for their early efforts to cross the desolate prairie and penetrate the mountains on their way to the fertile slopes and the great mineral region of the Pacific.

They were hardy pioneers indeed, and not only those who risked their lives in the engineering feats involved, but also those who risked their money in the enterprise, are entitled to credit for the final achievement.

While the task of the engineer on the prairie was comparatively simple, from the technical standpoint, there were many difficulties to be overcome, even there. The forces of Nature, and human foes, fought the railroad builder. Then, when the foothills and the mountains were reached, these natural obstacles taxed the engineering skill of the pioneers, with no surcease of former troubles.

But the daring and skill of those early railroaders triumphed over every obstacle, and completed the conquest of the West, to make of the United States the greatest, richest, and most powerful nation on earth.

All honor, therefore, to the men whose foresight, skill, and endurance forged the great links of steel that bind that nation together, and especially to those who opened up the tremendous territory between the Mississippi River and the Golden Gate!

Modern writers have pointed out that when steam was adapted to transportation, and the railroads came, the wider markets thereby opened up hastened the movement toward larger units of industry. It is true that many of the characteristics of the pioneer settlement and the primitive little hamlet disappeared with the arrival of the locomotive; that many a small industry of the cottage home or village shop was rendered obsolete; that the individual miller of his neighbor's grain failed in competition with the mighty mills of Minneapolis, when their product was brought within easy reach of the rural consumer; and that the old days of family manufacture for family needs should depart, never to return, when all the products of distant factories and mills were brought close to every man's door.

As a well-informed writer on railway operation has justly said: "Without railroads, the United States today would, in all probability, not be radically different from the United States of a hundred years ago. All the large towns and cities would still be clustered upon the coast and waterways, and back of them would still rest many, many square miles of undeveloped country; the nation would have remained a sprawling, helpless thing, weakened by its very size, and subject both to internal conflict and to attack of foreign invaders. It has been repeatedly said that if there had been a through railroad developed in the South during the fifties, there would have been no Civil War."

The railroad reaches an arm into an unknown country, — and it is known! Great tracts of land that were untraversed before, become farms; hillsides yield up their mineral treasure; a busy town springs into life where there was no habitation of man a little time before, and

the town becomes a city. Commerce is born. The railroad bids death and stagnation begone. It creates. It reaches forth with its life and life is born.

“The railroad is life itself.”

* * *

COMBINES, AND “BIG BUSINESS.”—The story of the evolution of business is practically a history of the human race. Business began with barter, when the wants of the individual were few and far between. Industry, as such, began with individual manufacture of weapons and implements that could be exchanged for what the maker needed.

The industrial development of American communities is of special interest, because within a comparatively short period of time, practically all the stages of economic progress have been exhibited on this side of the Atlantic. Some of these stages, in fact, have been coexistent in the United States, while the industrial progress of the country has been so rapid as to present a kaleidoscopic view of business evolution.

At the outset, the American communities enjoyed the advantage of incoming settlers familiar with the conditions of advanced civilization and educated industrially. Hence the early settlers were not compelled to pass through the stages of evolution of primitive man. They brought with them improved tools and implements, a knowledge of the rights of property, and a deep sense of social obligations. Each man respected his neighbor and his neighbor's rights, so that the community organization was effected without trouble, and the benefits of organization soon began to appear.

It is one of the characteristics of progress in civilization that while increases in population are going on, with corresponding increase in productive power, manufactures, transportation and general trade increase in greater proportion than agriculture and mining.

The aggregate needs of the population for food and

other raw material increases, as a rule, little more rapidly than the number of inhabitants. Consequently, if the productive power of the people increases much more in proportion, a certain amount of labor is freed from the necessity of producing the raw materials which are the absolute necessities of life. This labor is then available for the elaboration of materials in such a manner as to supply higher needs and meet the requirements of more cultivated tastes.

Thus the field of employment is enlarged and its varieties become more numerous. In other words, there is direct encouragement of manufactures, and hence of commerce, in the course of natural progress, — especially noticeable in the case of growing and resourceful countries like the United States in the last half of the nineteenth century.

One reason for this economic result is seen in the fact that the wonderful improvement in the means of production has enabled the same amount of labor to accomplish vastly more than it could in the middle of the last century; and this improvement in productive means and methods has been steadily maintained. As a result, a great variety of new products and new services, unknown to past generations, have been introduced; and the masses generally have been enabled thus to enjoy products and conveniences, even comforts and luxuries, — which were formerly accessible only to the few. The quality of goods, even of those consumed by the poorer elements of the population, has also been greatly improved.

In a word, fewer people can now produce the actual necessities of life for the whole population, in proportion to the growth of the latter; and more and more are set free to produce the manufactures and perform the services that make for a higher standard of living for all.

This characteristic of human progress has been nowhere so generally illustrated as in the United States. Nowhere else has industrial progress been so rapid. Our economic history shows that the introduction and im-

provement of machinery, and the progress in methods of industrial organization and administration have resulted in making the individual more productive, and worth more per unit of his time; that he has therefore received continually a greater compensation; that his increased income has given him increased purchasing power, and that this gain in purchasing power has so increased the demand for manufactured articles as to much more than counterbalance the original displacement of labor by these improvements.

That was the conclusion drawn from the economic history of the United States during the last half of the century, by the Industrial Commission which reported on the state of our manufactures, and summed up the fundamental elements of efficiency in industrial production in the United States.

"When we find a people of constitutional vigor and intelligence," said the Commission, "with a talent for invention and construction, with political freedom, and without social caste control, with a good system of education of mind and of hand, with abundance of wholesome food and a working day of proper length, with vocation and general opportunity free to all, — they will soon acquire tools and machinery, and skill in their own elevation in maximum degree in minimum time."

During the half century period of expanding manufactures to which reference has been made also saw the beginning of an era of business combinations and consolidations, — the era of "big business."

In recent years the rapid growth of capital, with the known advantages of its use which follow combination, has made consolidation the order of the day. Despite the popular outcry against the so-called "trusts" when the present century began, capital continued to combine with capital to secure economy in production and distribution of commodities, and to increase the productive power of the individual through the introduction of improved machinery and methods.

When goods were in general demand over wide sections of the country, when these goods were of a certain standard uniform quality, and when the goods were bulky, so that the freight charges formed an essential part of the cost, — it was found, according to economic experts, that a combination in the production of such goods might readily secure so great an advantage over its smaller rivals that the tendency toward monopoly became strong. Combinations in the oil, sugar, salt, and similar industries were organized early, and they became powerful.

When large establishments were necessary in order to produce at the lowest cost, a combination had a decided advantage over an individual competitor of small financial strength. Experience further showed that when expensive advertising was necessary to popularize special brands or trademarks, combinations had an advantage over small concerns.

These three influences — a standard product, large capital, and popular trade-marks, seem to have been especially potent in the creation of the most successful combinations.

But, on the other hand, it appears to be difficult to form efficient combinations when the conditions require the producer to cater to individual tastes, instead of to consumers in the mass. In some cases it is feasible for the combination to buy up exclusive or exceptional talent, or genius, and thereby to secure some control of the business at stake; but such cases are rare, and entire control of such a business, demanding special talent, can never be secured by a combination.

There is therefore little reason to believe that the entire field of industry is in any immediate danger of falling under the control of capital combinations, beneficent or otherwise, even though it is probable that the movement toward concentration of many lines of industry will proceed at a steady pace. Abundant opportunity will always be left for the exercise of individual ownership and management, with the odds, as ever, in favor of

the man with integrity, courage, and the will to win.

At the turn of the century, as was stated, the period of combination and of the "trusts" which were the target of many a so-called "muckraker," who exerted a powerful influence upon public opinion, through newspaper and magazine articles that gradually brought about a suspicion, if not actual condemnation of every attempt to combine the various factors of an industry with a view to greater economy of production and operation.

Public opinion in this respect has undergone a decided change in the last twenty years, and the appellation of "trust" is no longer a term of obloquy. It has been replaced in part by the expression, "big business," and it is now quite generally recognized that big business may justly and naturally comprise trusts of various kinds that are beneficent in their effect upon the public weal, rather than otherwise. Mass production and low prices for many commodities has been the result, with a standard of living for the American people that is the highest in the world's history. Even the world-wide depression that followed in the wake of the World War after a period of wild speculation and over-expansion, with its direct and reflex effect upon American prosperity, brought forth no practical suggestion of a change in the economic system under which the whole United States has grown and prospered — and will continue to grow and prosper in the years to come.

* * *

NOW COME THE WRECKERS. — And now we come to the present stage of our country's economic history, and may well ask ourselves if it is to be a stage of wreckage — wreckage of all our aspirations and hopes and achievements! Are we to continue as a progressive people, or are we to be classed as a decadent nation?

After more than three hundred years of development and progress, our country now seems to be infested with the dregs of Europe, bound together with the halfwits and scum of our own soil in radical groups and organiza-

NOW COME THE WRECKERS

tions, all bent on nullifying and destroying our great achievement of centuries. Communist, Socialist, and dozens of other organizations, mostly with misleading names, have sprung up all over the country, with aims and purposes that include the destruction of industry, or organized society, religion, and our commerce. Most of these radicals would like to see our beloved country made over, socially, industrially, and politically, into another Russia.

Some of these organizations work from one angle, some from another, — but all seem to be striving for the same end — the overthrow of the present social and political systems and the downfall of the American Nation.

One of these vicious organizations that seems at the present time to be doing more harm than all the rest combined, is "Consumers' Research, Inc.," of Washington, N. J. True, the real object of the promoters is covered up under the guise of "protecting" the consumer from the wiles of the manufacturer, the advertiser, and the distributor; but in reality their whole purpose is to wreck our manufacturing industry, the labor-employing system of our country.

"Consumers' Research, Inc.," is officered, directed, and managed by men who are out-and-out enemies of our industrial system. For verification of this statement, we invite the reading of the following pages, after which you may agree with the author hereof, that a man's character is like white paper. If once blotted, it can never be made to appear as white as before. And never was there a country or a nation that deserved less, the slur that has been cast upon it by the heads and associates of "Consumers' Research," who seem to be possessed with foreign ideas of economic change and "reform" by violence; who seek the overthrow of the American system of government and industry as an affiliate of treacherous radical organizations dominated from Moscow, — and who are utterly disqualified to act as critics or judges of American business and American products.

CHAPTER I

WHO AND WHAT IS "CONSUMERS' RESEARCH, INC."?

WHEN an organization composed of a few private individuals sets itself up as a critic and censor of American business men, business methods, and business morality, it is pertinent to inquire who these individuals are, and what their ultimate aim and object may be.

If they succeed in establishing themselves to any extent, and become a menace to business by worming themselves into the confidence of even a small section of the purchasing public, the business world has a right to learn their true character, the precise nature of their activities, and the dangers to which business in general will be exposed if they are permitted to continue their malevolent operations.

The operation of such an organization is a step backward in our recognized plan of advancement. A step backward because it undoes in a few years what it has taken responsible and progressive producers and consumers a quarter of a century to build up, — a spirit of hearty co-operation and mutual benefit.

Consumers' Research, Inc., of Washington, New Jersey, is such an organization. It has established a headquarters in that small, insignificant town, and, without any official standing whatever, assumes to sit in judgment, to criticize, and to censor the whole vast range of American products and business services. It makes and publishes an arbitrary classification of manufactured products as (A) *Recommended*, (B) *Intermediate*, (C) *Not Recommended*, — loses no opportunity to attack advertisers and the advertising fraternity, and works into its garrulous and repetitious publications the radical economic views of its quartette of promoters, who, as we shall show shortly, are avowed Communists and propagandists of the Red theories of revolution.

It is high time to tear the mask from the faces of these organizers of the so-called Consumers' Research, Inc., and in this effort to give the business men and the purchasing public of America a clear idea of their character and of the possible effects of their thinly-veiled operations, the writer hereof believes that he is performing a public duty.

Aside from the fact that these men have no earthly right to assume the role of business censors, to condemn certain products and damn others with faint praise, and to cast doubt and suspicion upon the honesty and goodwill of advertisers, the radical political views of the promoters of Consumers' Research lay them open to the charge of having an ulterior objective, to wit, the creation of general discontent with the existing social and governmental system of our country. That is the present object of every Communist in the United States, — to create public dissatisfaction by "boring from within." Whatever their business disguise or their ostensible occupation, they all have the same ultimate purpose at heart.

If they can work toward their secret objective by operating some kind of business racket, with more or less profit to themselves, they are probably regarded by their Red fellows and associates as "smart," and there is more than a suspicion that Consumers' Research is more or less of a racket, despite its incorporation "not for profit." At any rate its financial statement indicates that the few individuals at the top receive salaries that enable them to maintain a high standard of living, while dissatisfaction among their underlings, who are confessedly overworked, found recent expression in a strike of the employees, of which we shall have more to say hereafter.

The name of the Stalin at the head of the Consumers' Research is F. J. Schlink, who styles himself an "engineer-physicist." He poses as President and Technical Director of the organization, and in his closely-guarded lair in Washington, N. J., he apparently wields, with astonishing fecundity, the offensive weapon which many an

American manufacturer, merchant, and advertiser may well call "the poison pen of Jersey."

That poison pen has placed the seal of "CR" condemnation upon many an honest American product, formerly esteemed by the consuming public, and the "Intermediate" or "Not Recommended" classification of such products have aroused much righteous indignation among manufacturers and distributors, and have caused many strong protests, which Messrs. Schlink & Co. receive and ignore, with a smile of self-satisfaction.

Fortunately the field covered by the emanations of the poison pen is as yet limited to some sixty thousand of the great consuming public, for people are not falling over one another in their haste to subscribe for the "general" and "special" (confidential) services of the Red-headed CR organization.

It may be noted, by the way, that the NRA and AAA of the United States government have been frequently alluded to, and sneered at, in the publications of Consumers' Research. But alphabetical designations for their activities are quite common among radical agitators and propagandists, — witness the GPU of Red Russia and the KKK of the nightriding, nightshirted brethren of the unlamented Ku-Klux-Klan, — and so Consumers' Research aggressively calls itself the "CR" — and we shall frequently use that abbreviation to save space, and because the full name of the officious organization is rather an abomination to our sight and in our ears.

* * *

Who constitute the Consumers' Research anyway? Whence do they derive their assumed powers of censorship, and by what authority do they dispute the right of others to criticize them? Consumers' Research is simply a minority group of radicals, a handful of Red agitators bent on creating trouble in the business world, among producers and consumers. Do the Red leaders of Russia,

who believe they have done away with "middle classes" and have made it difficult for the so-called proletariat to obtain the bare necessities of life, have any such regard as the CR promoters claim, for the ultimate consumer's interest?

Do they not whip the bulk of consumers, the masses, into line, by forced regimentation, in order to maintain themselves in power? Do they not breed public fear and mutual distrust, encourage espionage and eavesdropping, snooping and suspicion, — setting neighbor against neighbor, friend against friend, brother against brother?

Is not the method of the Consumers' Research, by its discriminatory bulletins of product criticism and impeachment of manufacturers' honesty, well calculated to set class against class, consumer against producer, and thereby do the underhanded work of Moscow? And is such a method of undermining the industrial system to be tolerated in free America? Have we not economic troubles enough of our own, without enduring the pernicious activities of men imbued with alien ideas of violence, operating under the guise of an altruistic concern for the public interest? Why should we suffer the dangerous existence of such snakes in the grass?

We do not assert without good foundation for our statements that the managers of the CR racket in the little Jersey town, with their "enormous correspondence" and multifarious leaflets and bulletins of business criticism, are tainted with the poisonous ideas of Communism. In a later chapter we shall show in detail, upon the best available authority, the personal Communistic records of the man Schlink and his leading associates, and leave it to the intelligent reader to judge whether the interests of the American consumer are really their chief consideration, or whether the CR organization is not a mere blind for an ulterior motive, as well as a present menace to American business. There is more than a suspicion in many minds that they are ever ready to act as tools of others in injuring American industry.

No authority was ever delegated to Schlink and his CR associates to regulate business, which is a doubtful function of even the central Government; the only authority they have is *assumed*; and they are open to criticism as legally as any other quasi-public body that exists on membership fees and represents only a small minority of the citizenry.

They do not like criticism, and in their own underhanded way they resent it. But why should this snoop-ing and slanderous organization be exempt from criticism, especially when its managers themselves are so critical? In this country we are still, thank God, permitted to enjoy the freedom of the press and the freedom of speech. And we would like to ask, is it wrong to point out to the uninformed public, or the susceptible "CR" member, to what a wide extent and how dangerously the deceptive wiles and foul methods of the organization are exercised?

Is it wrong to grab the managers of this mismanaged outfit by the collar and drag them from their places of hiding behind the banner of an allegedly legitimate business association, and prove to the world that they are attempting to crush the very life out of thousands of our leading business concerns?

Is it wrong to point the finger of publicity at an outfit that is constantly inviting favorable publicity, which its promoters do not deserve and which deludes the public as to their real character?

Is it wrong to expose a system of sham and deceit, avarice, and greed? Is it wrong to separate the real from the unreal, and to nail a publicity lie with the truth?

Confidentially we say NO, and we expect to continue voicing our opinions when and how we please, — always adhering strictly to the facts on which our opinions are soundly based. And right here we will say this:

If ever there was in America a business concern that needed impartial but thorough investigation by a governmental agency, such as the Federal Trade Commis-

sion, — that concern, that organization, is the pharisaical, hypocritical, business-destroying "Consumers' Research."

As a writer on the subject of rackets, I have, at times, been criticized by the cohorts of the racketeers for what they termed our "daring audacity." But the writer can take it! When a fight or a controversy is on, he does not expect to be the only one to deliver blows. But he has always fought fair. He does not hit below the belt or commit other fouls, which seems to be the favorite method of the business critics.

Digging up an industry's past, magnifying peccadilloes into crimes, and rehashing old, forgotten charges against an opponent or critic, — these are the tactics of a foul fighter, in business controversy as in the field of sport; and the sport-loving public has nothing but condemnation for a foul fighter.

The managers and members of the Consumers' Research, who resent criticism, are not good sports. *They cannot take it!* For several years they have been accustomed to having a monopoly of abuse and libel of manufacturers, distributors, and business men in general. In season and out of season they have attacked the products and business reputations of those who incur their displeasure, and they have "got away with it" so long that they seem to have acquired the notion that they alone, of all the business community, can indulge in scurrilous and defamatory statements about others with impunity.

But when they themselves are attacked or criticized for their methods and practices, when the limelight of publicity is turned upon their suspicious methods, when it is pointed out by what wiles and hypocrisy they have long continued to evade the condemnation of the public, — and when the charges against them are expressed publicly in language that cannot be misunderstood, — they cry out in pain and assume a mask of righteous indignation.

Against the more important charges with which it is confronted, the "Consumers' Research" has no real de-

fense. Its "engineers" have spent many thousands of dollars during the past few years in printing and distributing bulletins making charges against business; but the bulk of these bulletins were absolutely worthless, — first, because of their lack of authority; second, because of unjustified discrimination against competing products; third, because most of them dealt with products in which the subscribing member was not interested; fourth, because of the strong suspicion of bias and prejudice.

There are two kinds of racketeers, but both kinds are terrorists. The "Consumers' Research" employs the weapon of mental terrorism, fear of a loss of business, in its attitude toward manufacturers and distributors; while the racketeers more generally regarded as gangsters, use physical terrorism.

But there is no doubt that "Consumers' Research" is a racket of the modern type. It may be called a high-class racket, if by that we mean to signify one that is more insidious because more secret, and one that has the support of high-sounding names.

The common racketeer in business "muscles in" to obtain a share of the profits, through fear; the "Research" racketeers, by a peculiar use of "moral suasion," secure subscriptions and "contributions" from the gullible public, while dread of their misrepresentations causes some producers to sit quietly under their attacks, fearing the effects of denials and controversy.

As between the common or garden variety of racketeer, classed as public enemies and generally regarded as criminals of low type, and the racketeer who poses as an advocate of better goods and better merchandising, the latter is perhaps the more despicable.

The "engineers" and some members of Consumers' Research, Inc., will say: "Our methods are progressive, — we are following the car of progress." Following it where? The car of progress is propelled by reason, and reason never directed an unfair deal or the destruction of a business. This grand old globe is stored with everything

necessary to the health and happiness of the human race. The treasures have been poured forth with a hand so bounteous that though the population were doubled and trebled, it would go on forever, if guided by reason and justice, and no mortal son of man need suffer for life's necessities. God never intended that we should have an organization of busybodies of the "Consumers' Research" caliber. They are but the outgrowth of selfish minds, the result of greed and ignorance.

We were given all the faculties necessary to the perpetuation of progress, and sufficient reason to direct the machinery of our own affairs. Then we were left to work out our own salvation, aided by those silent forces that are pressing all animate and inanimate life onward to perfection.

The average business man, with sense enough and capital enough to establish a business, has reason enough to run it safely. Reason needs no celestial guide, no heavenly monitor, for it is the greatest attribute of God himself. Where reason sits enthroned, right always reigns. But reason is not found, nor does right reign, within the sanctum of the "Consumers' Research" — of Jersey.

CHAPTER II

RADICAL RECORDS OF THE PROMOTERS

WHEN any man or group of men assume to represent any considerable section of the American people, the personal character, political and economic beliefs, and the affiliations of such persons are a legitimate subject of inquiry and investigation.

This is especially important in the case of promoters of such an organization as Consumers' Research, Inc., which has coolly assumed the function of representing the whole body of American consumers, and undertakes to tell the public what products it should buy and what should be left alone, or boycotted.

The public is entitled to know just who and what the men at the head of such an organization really are, — and we propose to set forth this information plainly and unmistakably, so that both manufacturers and advertisers, as well as consumers, may know the incentive or animus behind Consumers' Research criticism and condemnation of the goods and services which we produce and use in our daily life.

The promoters of Consumers' Research have radical records that stamp them as enemies of the American industrial system and social order, — hence enemies of the public weal. Their true allegiance is not to the government of the United States, but to the rascally Reds who have seized the government of Russia and maintain themselves in power by force, while reducing the populace to a state of political and industrial slavery. We have not to seek far for proof of this allegation, — and here it is!

The character of the personnel of the CR directorate, which we have called Communistic, may be learned from an authoritative source by anyone who will take the pains to examine that enlightening book, "The Red Network," a "Who's Who" and handbook of Radicalism for Amer-

ican patriots, the responsible author being Mrs. Albert W. Dilling (Elizabeth Dilling).

The board of directors of Consumers' Research, Inc., is composed of the following individuals, according to a CR circular.

F. J. SCHLINK, Engineer-Physicist, President and Technical Director.

J. B. MATTHEWS, Author-Lecturer, Vice-President and Assistant Treasurer.

M. C. PHILLIPS (Mrs. F. J. Schlink), Author.

CLARK C. WILLEVER, Treasurer.

In Mrs. Dilling's "Who's Who in Radicalism," F. J. Schlink, the chief officer and promoter of Consumers' Research, is listed as follows:

"SCHLINK, F. J.: nat. com. Nat. R. & L. Found.; technical director of Consumers' Research (socialist); finan. contrib. I.L.D., 1928; lect. for L.I.D."

I.L.D. and L.I.D. are separate organizations.

The first part of this cabalistic description of F. J. Schlink indicates that he is a member of the national committee of the National Religion and Labor Foundation, with headquarters in New Haven, Conn., which, as later noted, is a Communistic subsidiary. Mr. Schlink's name appears on the letterheads of this Red organization, whose pro-soviet attitude is indicated by the following extract from a letter written February 16, 1933, by Francis A. Henson, economic advisor to the so-called Foundation:

"We believe that the primary job today is one of achieving economic justice. We believe that this will require revolutionary changes in our social and economic order. Therefore, instead of attacking Soviet Russia, we are anxious to appreciate the contributions which it has made, and, at the same time, build here in this section of the world an order that has all of the values of the one that is being created in the Soviet Union, without the sacrifice of other important values."

The official organ of the National Religion and Labor

Foundation, of which F. J. Schlink is such a prominent member, is called "Economic Justice," and carries plain Red revolutionary propaganda; its first issue, in November, 1932, included a highly offensive cartoon of Jesus by Art Young of the staff of the Communist-Atheist publication, "New Masses"; and the editors of "Economic Justice" — presumably well known to F. J. Schlink, — made special efforts to distribute copies of this revolutionary and blasphemous cartoon throughout the country, as part of their propaganda.

In a subsequent issue (January, 1933) of the N. R. & L. F. organ, the associates of Schlink printed another typical atheist Soviet cartoon ridiculing Christianity, representing Christ, unburdened, leading ahead workers with bowed backs crushed beneath the weight of a huge cross, while these workers are also harnessed to and pulling "Capitalism," represented, as always by the Soviets, as a fat man with a plug hat. The cartoon was a plea to throw off Capitalism, the Cross, and Christ's leadership.

In the same issue of the publication sponsored by the organization of which F. J. Schlink is a national committeeman, one of its Communist correspondents, writing from Los Angeles, said:

"It is no longer a question of the need of a revolution; the question is as to the method of bringing the revolution to pass . . . There is little hope of making any considerable change in the psychology of the masses except as the sequence of *radical social action outside of respectable ranks*; the work of revolt will have to be carried through in two sections, — the first of these the long-suffering and no longer quiescent disinherited and unemployed, who will respond to their desperation rather to any well-digested education; the second, a trained and disciplined group who will know how to function in a *Lenin-leadership* when the hour of opportunity comes. Consequently our concern is to build the understanding leadership for the crisis . . . from those who are ready to talk business and digest the strong meat of *direct revolutionary preparation.*"

We could multiply proof of the Communist and Mus-

covite character of the National Religion and Labor Foundation, which carries the name of F. J. Schlink on its letterheads, but enough has been said to stamp the "President and Technical Director" of Consumers' Research as a Communist agitator and revolutionary agent, not only in heart but in practice; and we believe there will be general agreement that when such a man assumes to represent the interests of the consumers of America, there is an ulterior revolutionary purpose and aim behind all his activities, including those of his so-called "CR" organization.

F. J. Schlink, "nat. com. N. R. & L. F.," is apparently one of that "trained and disciplined group" referred to by the Los Angeles Communist, "who will know how to function in a Lenin-leadership when the hour of opportunity comes." He is evidently accepted by his fellow-Communists as one of those "ready to talk business and digest the strong meat of direct revolutionary preparation."

But Schlink's leadership in the National Religion and Labor Foundation is not the only evidence of his anti-American radicalism. He is also listed in the "Who's Who" of Communists as a lecturer for the "L.I.D." or League for Industrial Democracy. This organization is described in Mrs. Dilling's authoritative work as "Militant Socialist." It was founded by the revolutionary Jack London in 1905 as the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, but changed its name in 1921, after Socialism acquired a bad odor owing to the jailing of many Socialists during the war, for seditious activities. Active Communist workers are at the head of the L.I.D. It spreads Socialist-Communist propaganda and literature in our colleges, and some of its activities are listed in "The Red Network" as follows:

It operates chapters of its Intercollegiate Student Council in about 140 colleges, many under the guise of Student Councils, Radical or Socialist Clubs, etc. The L.I.D. evidently believes with Stalin and other Muscovite leaders in "catching 'em young," and a strong public

sentiment has arisen against such radical activities in American colleges.

In 1933 the L.I.D. claimed that its speakers' corps (including F. J. Schlink, lecturer) had reached almost every State in the Union and spoke to some 175,000 people in 1932. Its speakers reached about 60,000 students in 160 colleges and universities in 40 States; likewise they spoke to about 100,000 people in non-college meetings. In addition to these speeches, there were innumerable general meetings, political meetings, and radio broadcastings at which L.I.D. speakers appeared.

The L.I.D. is "very closely interlocked by officership" with the A.C.L.U. or American Civil Liberties Union, and, says Elizabeth Dilling in "The Red Network," — "Anyone who has taken the trouble to investigate what the A.C.L.U. is and does, knows that it is directed by Communist and Socialist revolutionary leaders and their sympathizers, and that it works untiringly to further and legally protect the interests of the Red movement in all its branches — red strikes, Atheism, sex freedom, disarmament, and seditious 'academic freedom.' It opposes deportation and exclusion of Reds, encourages rioting, etc., and is constantly supporting and cooperating with Moscow's open legal defense agency, the I.L.D. (International Labor Defense), which is the American section of the Moscow-controlled International Red Aid, the Russian section being called the M.O.P.R.

F. J. Schlink, by the way, is listed in the Red "Who's Who" as a financial contributor to the I.L.D., with which the L.I.D. cooperates so closely. The I.L.D. aids and propagandizes in behalf of Communist criminals arrested for revolutionary activities, and loses no opportunity to foment race hatred.

The L.I.D. (F. J. Schlink, lecturer) publishes an organ called "Student Outlook," formerly called "Revolt." The first page of this publication for February, 1933, was headed "Wanted: Students with Guts," and the accompanying article said in part:

"It is questionable whether the student who hasn't guts enough to get out on his college campus and hawk the 'Student Outlook' will overcome his delicate scruples if the time comes to face tear-gas and machine-guns. The same sort of wellbred doubts and inertia that afflict one when saddled with the responsibility of escorting a petition or putting up posters will arise more urgently and subtly if the time should come to *refuse to go to war* or to picket the *Chicago Tribune*. . . If you have enlisted under the banners of Socialism, you've got to carry the job through."

A special announcement on the same page said: "With this issue 'Revolt' becomes the 'Student Outlook.' Students felt it was more important to sell our magazine and convince by its contents than to shout 'Revolution' and have no one listen. *Persons who give us more than a glance will not mistake our colors.*"

No, Mr. Schlink, no one will mistake the colors of the radical organizations to which you belong, the L.I.D. and the N. R. & L. F., and as you have assumed to criticize and condemn American business, it is a public duty to exhibit you in your true colors, as a Red of probably the deepest dye, vainly hiding behind the cloak of Consumers' Research.

In view of the facts of F. J. Schlink's Communist record, as set forth above, it is pertinent for manufacturers and business men affected by his present CR activities to inquire:

"How much Moscow money has found its way into your pocket, Mr. Schlink, while you have thus been engaged as national committeeman of the N. R. & L. F. and lecturer for the L.I.D., propagandizing in behalf of radical theories subversive of the American government and social order?"

"Your allies of the L.I.D., Mr. Schlink, want college students to show their 'guts' by avowing their Red sympathies. What about you? Have you the intestinal fortitude, Mr. Schlink, to make an open confession of your

faith to your dupes of Consumers' Research, and let them know that you are, primarily, not an economist actuated by sympathy for the consuming public of America, or a loyal supporter of the American government, but a teacher of revolutionary Communism?"

* * *

F. J. Schlink's associates in the direction of Consumers' Research are "tarred with the same brush." Take the case of J. B. Matthews, who is advertised as Vice-President of the CR. This character, presumably Schlink's righthand man, is listed in the 1934 edition of "Who's Who in Radicalism" about as follows (the space-saving abbreviations being extended for clarity):

"MATTHEWS, J. B.: executive secretary, Fellowship of Reconciliation; circulator of F.R. petition for recognition of bloody Soviet Russia 'in the interests of peace' (?); said to be sympathetically close to Moscow; has been annual visitor to Russia for past five years; presided at Student Congress Against War; chairman American League Against War and Fascism; Communist Anti-Imperialist League delegate to Cuba, 1933; associate editor 'Student Outlook' (formerly the 'Revolt'), organ of the L.I.D.; member N. R. & L. F. (see record of Schlink); speaker at Communist Mooney meeting, May 1, 1933, at Chicago, where he was applauded when he inferred he might soon change from the advanced Socialist to the Communist party; national committeeman Friends of the Soviet Union, a Communist subsidiary, 1934; ousted as secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1934, because of his too open support of 'Class Struggle.'"

Is not that a sufficiently damning exposition of J. B. Matthews, Vice-President of Consumers' Research, as a Communist developed from radical Socialism, and a fitting associate for the Communist Schlink, — but not by any means a fitting person, any more than Schlink is, in whom to entrust the interests of the people of America as consumers of manufactured products.

The more we examine the records of Schlink and Mat-

thews, the more it appears that neither is in the proper place, when they devote their undoubted talents for racketeering and publicity to the operations of Consumers' Research in the little town of Washington, N. J. The proper place for anti-Americans of their ilk is in the Soviet Union they admire so deeply; and it is suggested, in the interests of American business, that on his next annual trip to Moscow, J. B. Matthews take F. J. Schlink along with him — and stay there, to flourish (or be jailed as undesirable aliens) in the land of their dreams.

The contributions of J. B. Matthews to Consumers' Research publicity include the sensational book, "Partners in Plunder," of which he is the principal author, with "R. E. Shallcross" as co-author. That book, with which we deal at some length in a later chapter, is an ultra-radical attempt to show that Business and the Business-State (our present form of government) are in a conspiracy to "plunder" the public, and that we are fast developing a system of Fascism which will replace our national democracy. Now Fascism is abhorrent to all "collectivists" (Communists), and the work of Matthews and Shallcross has a decidedly Communistic flavor.

And who is "R. E. Shallcross," co-author of "Partners in Plunder"? We note that in a recent addendum to Elizabeth Dilling's "Who's Who in Radicalism," the name of "Ruth Shallcross" is coupled with the April, 1934, Bulletin of the *Revolutionary Policy Committee* of the Socialist Party; and the presumption is that the revolutionary Ruth and "R. E. Shallcross" are one and the same person. If Mrs. F. J. Schlink, author of "Skin Deep," uses the name "M. C. Phillips," it is of course natural in Consumers' Research circles for Miss or Mrs. Ruth Shallcross to pose on a title-page as "R. E. Shallcross."

But we are chiefly concerned with the revolutionary ideas of Ruth Shallcross, and we find that the Revolutionary Policy Committee with which she is closely connected, state that "they wish to make every effort to *promote the world revolution*," and to secure "governmental power

for the victorious revolution by *arming the workers*" (italics ours) and "by preparing the working class to turn imperialist war into class war," — which was Lenin's Communist slogan. The Bulletin to which Ruth Shallcross's name is attached further says that the Revolutionary Policy Committee are "seeking a united front" with other Red revolutionaries, and that they "*make no fetish of legality.*"

The careful attention of law-abiding American citizens, and especially those whose products or business methods have been assailed by Consumers' Research, is directed to that declaration of revolutionary objects by the person whom we logically assume to be co-author with J. B. Matthews of "Partners in Plunder." And among the signers of the Shallcross appeal for revolutionary action by the Socialist party we also find the name of J. B. Matthews.

* * *

Stuart Chase, a noted exponent of radical theories, was the chief author of the book, "Your Money's Worth," which, as we will show, gave an early impetus to the organization that developed into Consumers' Research. F. J. Schlink is proud, no doubt, of having been associated with Stuart Chase as co-author of that work. Let us see what the affiliations of this radical author (the first president of Consumers' Research) have been, and how he and Comrade Schlink can be justly classed as "birds of a feather."

"The Red Network," in its "Who's Who" department, records his activities about as follows:

"CHASE, STUART: treasurer, L.I.D. (League of Industrial Democracy); advisory counsel American Society for Cultural Relations with Russia, (a Communist subsidiary formed to break down antipathy toward the Soviet government); auditor Labor Defense Council; former associate of Berkman anarchist gang; was treasurer Russian Reconstruction Farms; on staff Rand School, a Socialist school for

labor agitators; speaker for communistic Labor Institute Forum; executive committeeman National Council for Protection of Foreign-Born Workers (Communist); author with Communist Robert W. Dunn, Rexford Guy Tugwell, Carleton Washburne, etc., of the communistic propaganda book, 'Soviet Russia in the Second Decade' of the First American Trade Union Delegation to Russia (which was repudiated and denied the sanction of the A. F. of L. because of its communistic character); writer of numerous articles in the radical press, and known as a Communist-recommended author."

It will be noted that Stuart Chase is described as on the staff — the teaching staff — of the notorious Rand School of Social Science, which has its headquarters in New York City. This school was established and owned by the American Socialist Society. It was convicted under the Espionage Act in 1919 and fined \$3,000 for "feloniously obstructing enlistment service of the United States," and for printing and publishing a pamphlet, "The Great Madness," by Scott Nearing, a regular instructor there. Evidence produced in a government report illustrates its teachings, namely: Class hatred; to "take over the State"; to fight government defense; work for class consciousness; Red agitation of all kinds. Such are the teachings in which Stuart Chase — the close associate of F. J. Schlink — participates as a member of "the staff" of the Rand School.

* * *

From the above it will be seen that of the four members of the Consumers' Research directorate, F. J. Schlink, President, and J. B. Matthews, Vice-President, have active Communistic records which should debar them from making any pretense to represent the consumers of America. The third director, whose name is given as "M. C. Phillips," is the wife of Schlink, about whom nothing further need be said; and the fourth member of the directorate, Clark C. Willever, has no particular record of which we are at present aware, but is probably

in full sympathy with the radical views of his associates; and as Treasurer of the CR organization and official holder of the pursestrings, he is doubtless completely under the thumb of Schlink.

CHAPTER III

OBJECTS AND AIMS OF COMMUNISM

THE profession of a belief in Communism is justly regarded as a reproach in this country of ours, because the tenets of Communism are subversive of almost everything that the good American citizen holds dear, including his government and his religion.

Communism has spread to some extent among us, and the so-called Communist Party has succeeded in forcing its name and candidates onto our ballots at election times, partly owing to the influence of "parlor pinks" and Reds among our college professors and of Communist writers and lecturers like Stuart Chase and J. B. Matthews of the Consumers' Research, whose radical records, with that of F. J. Schlink, president of the CR, we gave in the preceding chapter. These men and other agitators have succeeded in gaining a number of converts, especially among the manual labor element, by denunciation of the present industrial system and social order, and by painting a rose-colored picture of an economic paradise in which the so-called proletariat shall be supreme.

In view of the drastic treatment accorded to men of the professional class in Russia, under the dictatorship of men professing to represent the proletariat, — in view of the persecutions, killings, imprisonment, and banishment that have been visited upon priests and teachers and men of culture under victorious Communism, — it is remarkably strange that American educators and men like Schlink and Matthews should fall under the spell of Communistic theories, with their class hatreds, atheism, and denial of personal and industrial rights.

But the spirit of Communism exists among us, thanks to these propagandists, and only the common-sense of the people of America can withstand its influence.

We have clearly connected the promoters of Con-

sumers' Research with the Communist menace and its American propaganda, and in order to show the false and misguided character of "Consumers' Research" management it will be necessary for us to take a closer look at Communism and see just what it is, — what these radical agitators, operating under the guise of friends of the consumer, really have at heart.

What are the aims and objects, and the methods, of American Communists, and of the international organization, with headquarters in Moscow, to which they belong? What is the nature of the panaceas they recommend for our economic ills? What is their ultimate object in "bor-ing into" our trade and industry, in setting class against class, consumer against producer, and fomenting discontent among our people?

It was lack of freedom, lack of opportunity, that drove our ancestors to this country. Here, they found what they had lacked, and what they sought, and it is for us their descendants, to realize that we enjoy, with a far greater capacity and means for enjoyment, the independent mode of life, the personal rights, and the equal privileges which they traveled far and toiled early and late to secure for them and for us.

No nation on earth affords its people such a standard of living — such comforts, conveniences, and luxuries — as all sorts and conditions of men possess in this country. We have a form of government that has been a model for many other peoples who have freed themselves from autocracy. Those who sit in the seats of power are representatives of the people's will, chosen and changed by the voice of the people; and every man and woman has an equal voice in the conduct of our national and state affairs.

Under our free, constitutional form of government, a blessed heritage of the God-given wisdom of our forefathers, this nation has grown and prospered far beyond their early conception of its possibilities, — until it has

become the wonder and admiration of the world. Temporary clouds of economic depression cannot block its progress or break the spirit of freedom which, with individual enterprise, has made us what we are. America is still a land of opportunity.

Within the past few years the voices of radical agitators, especially such as call themselves Communists, have been heard with increasing loudness in our large cities and many industrial plants. Misguided men and women have paraded the streets, bearing red flags, singing with a Babel of tongues, foreign to American ears, a revolutionary song, the so-called "Internationale," and displaying crude banners with such inscriptions as "Down With the Government," — "Down With Capital," — and so on.

The insidious Communist agitator continues to "bore from within" wherever he can gain a foothold and hearing. It is common knowledge that agents of Communists have planted themselves in our factories and in some organizations of labor in various parts of the country; and it is openly charged that serious recent strikes and much unrest in the ranks of labor have been due to the influence of such agitators. Now we find Communist agents invading the field of business, as in the case of "Consumers' Research."

In a land like free America, with all its advantages for the workingman, advocacy of Communism, or belief in it as a panacea for economic ills, is practically a disease of the brain, dangerous to the community only when it becomes epidemic.

A little sober thought, based on accurate knowledge of the purpose, intent, and possibilities of Communism, should convince any patriotic American, no matter what his occupation or daily task may be, that there is nothing but disappointment, loss, and retrogression possible for him in the unlikely event — which God forbid — that the theory and practice of Communism should ever prevail in our government and social system.

Let us see just what Communism is, what it proposes

to do, and what its effect would be upon the welfare of the American workingman.

Both Socialism and Communism advocate, in brief, an equal distribution of the earnings of labor, with all resources and means of production owned or controlled by the State, — that is to say, by the leaders of the party or faction in possession of the reins of government. The chief difference, in fact, between the Socialist and the Communist of today is that the former would gain his ends by lawful and peaceful means, the gradual education and conversion of a majority of the people; while the Communist, being in a hurry to secure the rewards of power, would employ more drastic methods, — riots, strikes, the forcible seizure of government, the confiscation of property, arson, assassination, and murder. Recent occurrences in Europe, including upheavals of government, illustrate and emphasize this view of Communist warfare against society.

* * *

“Communism,” said a writer of recent times, “possesses a language every people can understand. Its elements are hunger, envy and death.”

“The Communist,” it has also been said, “is perfectly willing to divide his pennies with you, if you will divide your dollars with him.” It is the shiftless, the propertyless, who see in Communism a means of personal gain. But even they are laboring under a delusion.

Consider now what the effect of Communism would be upon the American workingman and his family.

Today he can obtain most of the comforts and conveniences of modern civilized life. He may, as thousands do, own his own home, and make it as comfortable as he chooses. He and his family live and dress well, and there is no distinction in their attire from that of the business man’s family or the banker’s.

He may, as many do, ride to and from his work in an automobile, in which he and his family can also take evening and Sunday trips into the surrounding country,

or journey in vacation time all over this broad land, for Florida and California are both within his reach. The telephone and the radio are at his command, and his family frequently visits the motion-picture theatres.

Public libraries, playgrounds, and bathing-beaches may be used without cost and without distinction. Public schools furnish free education for his children, with high schools and state universities open to them for their further training in the arts and sciences. He has a truly comfortable home life, with everything possible to him that his employer or rich neighbor enjoys.

He is the absolute owner of all that he possesses, be it real estate or personal; and no man, no officials, no party leaders, no government, can take it from him, save in the event of debt, by due process of law.

As a free agent, with both person and property protected by law, he can hold his head high and look every other man in the face, without bowing or cringing before any office-holder or petty tyrant.

American freedom and personal rights are too precious; American life is too full of sources of enjoyment; and American citizens are too proud of the heritage of liberty they have received from their forefathers, for Communistic ideas of government and economics ever to make much headway among thinking people — and the American workingman, whatever his occupation, be it of hand or brain, is usually a thoughtful, sensible person.

No matter what its proponents may claim and say, Communism, in its ultimate development, is simply a racket for the benefit of *the few at the expense of the many*. It is as far removed from being the ideal government of the people, by the people, for the people, as the earth is from the sun.

There are good, staunch, American leaders for us to follow, without seeking or tolerating leadership from abroad, or from those imbued with foreign ideas of the social order; and the interests of the American consumer need no "protection" from such Communist agitators as

the officers and directors of "Consumers' Research," who are in training for "Lenin-leadership" when the hour arrives for the "revolution" they are doing their best to bring about.

But the American people are not revolutionary-minded, — and therein lies their safeguard against the underhanded work of Comrade Schlink and his "Red" associates.

* * *

Soon after the Communist menace first appeared in this country, a forceful writer on the subject said:

"An ominous specter hovers over the heads and hearts of every inhabitant of the United States. Communism, with its Red torch of scorching fire and flame, is ready to thrust its poisonous dagger into the constitutional heart of this country, provided the people, all of its citizens who seemingly are asleep, do not awaken to stop and head off this dangerous monster.

This foreign foe is an international animal, clearly international in scope. Its head is in Moscow and its hindquarters as well as its roots, penetrate the entire world. Unfortunately, these quick, grass-like roots have been planted on American soil and seemingly are thriving and spreading at a rapid rate — so much so that the life and blood of this nation already are feeling some bad after-effects from this leech which constantly is sapping our energy.

Remember, — nations are not unlike the human body. A nation's health is dependent upon vitality and resistance, in order that it may live, grow, prosper, and progress. If one's body-resistance is lowered, it accordingly predisposes itself to external attack and suffers proportionately to the severity of the attack. This rule applies to the body of the nation and its general welfare.

Communism is bent on the destroying of our nation's living tissue. It is leaving no stone unturned in its quest of rapacious devastation of every living cell and fiber existing in our country, to accomplish its destructive ends.

Night and day, in factory, mine, and mill; in schools, colleges, and churches; on the high seas, over prairies, fields, and forest, — in fact, everywhere — arises the phantom head of Communism.

Its theoretical, practical, and philosophical ramifications in every direction are carefully and deliberately planned and ably executed. In its leftward tendencies, from top to bottom, and in its onward sweep, Communism endeavors with might and main to embroil every one in its path, in acts of vengeance, violence, and coercion, thus precipitating the accomplishment of its cherished desire and eventual goal of a bloody revolution. That is the program of the day, but its consequences would be the utter destruction and abolishment of the Stars and Stripes, as well as of our present existing democratic constitutional form of government and every vestige of it.

Communists would supplant our form of government with one of their own, a government of despotism, whose aim and function would be the ruthless extermination of all those who in the slightest degree should happen to differ with even an iota of its despotic rule, slogan, or law.

In view of the fact that Communistic principles are what they are, and because Communism has planted its root in American soil, it behooves the people of this country to realize that Communism is a problem, a serious problem, in the United States.

Communists are shrewd and adept in causing discontent of every description. Schooled in harangue, demagoguery, and intrigue of the vilest kind, which constantly ebbs and flows from the lips and the wagging of acid tongues and pens, in the form of Communistic propaganda, its followers constantly are gaining a greater foothold here. This is the condition Americans must rise against.

The obnoxious and disloyal propaganda goes on inces-

santly. There must be a remedy and it must not be delayed long. Every American citizen must get into the breach to aid and assist in the extermination of this poisonous weed from the soil of our land. Nothing short of this will do.

Down with Communism, and up with the Stars and Stripes, now and forever! As Americans we must and we shall preserve our heritage regardless of the cost or the sacrifice demanded. We must stand four-square to the enemy, all for one and one for all."

* * *

Wherever Communism raises its head, it presents an attitude of defiance to constitutional government and the established social and industrial systems. Its agents and propagandists in America seek not only to sow discontent in the ranks of American labor, but advocate violent methods to secure their ends.

"The lone shot and the isolated bomb are futile," declared "*The Daily Worker*," organ of the Communist party of the United States, in a hypocritical endeavor to show that the advocacy and use of violence is declining among Communists in this country. But that was before the great strikes on the Pacific Coast, commonly attributed to Communist influence and characterized by violence, stirred the American people to a sense of impending danger and transformed the city of San Francisco into an armed camp in the interests of law and order.

The Communist assertion of a change of heart regarding the use of violent methods was made before blood ran in the streets of the model and peaceful town of Kohler, Wisconsin, as a result of an unprecedented strike of mysterious origin in an industrial plant whose management has long been noted for its friendly, humane attitude toward all employees.

Violence is and will continue to be one of the chief weapons of Communists here and elsewhere, so long as their activities are directed by foreign leaders of their

“international” party who have seized power through violent revolution.

It is all very well for “*The Daily Worker*,” to claim that members of the Communist party will only resort to violence when the time arrives for the people to rise *en masse* and “go into the streets, prepared to fight.” That time will never come in America, but the Communists themselves persist in going into the streets, and are ever ready to combat the agents of law and order and thereby invite violence in return.

This brings about a condition in which Communists delight and upon which they thrive. They get the publicity they crave, and the news of street rioting and “violent police methods” reaches the Communist press in other lands in magnified and aggravated form, as evidence of activities of “the proletariat” in America.

Earl Browder, secretary of the Communist party in the United States, while rather pessimistic as to its chances of ultimate success, said much in a recent annual report about the use of the “nucleus,” or group, as a means of Communist propaganda and militant activity. There are “shop nuclei” in hundreds of industrial plants and factories, ever seeking recruits, to promote discontent among the workmen; and in every city and town of size there are “street nuclei,” with soapbox orators, ready to organize parades and flaunt red banners in the faces of the police, in the hope of provoking the latter to violence.

These Communist “nuclei,” wherever they exist, are a positive menace to the welfare of American industry, and should be so regarded by the patriotic American workingman.

CHAPTER IV

COMMUNISM AS A THREAT TO AMERICA

COMMUNISM having spread to our schools and to some branches of government and industry, presents a menacing threat to the continued existence of American principles. It is virulent and insidious, and its influence is becoming nationwide. Therefore, it becomes the duty of the American people to rise en masse and stifle it before it secures a permanent footing in our country.

When such an organization as the "Consumers' Research, Inc.," is found to be promoted and controlled by known Communist agitators, like "Comrades" Schlink and Matthews, with their potentialities for evil, the patriotic American citizen should positively refuse to countenance its existence, much less give it financial support by subscribing for its "confidential" and other services. Just as these workers-in-the-dark would undermine American industry, under the pretense of establishing a new and improved social order, so the public should squelch its efforts by ignoring its appeal for subscription fees.

The fact seems to be that support of "Consumers' Research, Inc.," is tantamount to support of Communist activity in America.

"It can't happen here!" is a favorite expression when foreign occurrences are discussed. It is a rather daring slogan to employ for any purpose, and especially where Communism is concerned. Yet, in their childlike faith that the future will take care of all Communistic disturbances within the borders of the United States, regardless of how Communism maltreats, starves, and curbs other portions of the world, hundreds of Americans use that identical expression rather than devote a serious thought to the menace of Red agitators.

An Illinois manufacturer said recently:

"A few years ago we laughed at the idea that Communism could even get a hearing in this country. But then, if you recall, we also scoffed at a number of other danger signals that, were they to be repeated today, would send us scurrying to cover in a panic.

"There are, however, a number of men who are no longer scoffing — level-headed men, not easily frightened. No matter what their ideas were a few years ago, they are now very much awake to the dangers of the present situation, and it should serve as a further warning to us that they are beginning to grow concerned over the changes actually taking place in our own government.

"Manufacturers with whom I do business reflect as much as anybody else this state of alarm. They are growing worried about the unrest and the threats to government and internal peace, and they say so. Some of them, a few years ago, never had time for politics either.

"The prospect that frightens these men is the one that should frighten every individual. When a State, turned Communistic, owns and controls business, competition naturally ceases, and there can be only one result: progress practically becomes nonexistent.

"This is partly the business man's fault; I am not trying to shield him. He has at times made competition so keen that it destroyed. But that is no reason why we should go to the other extreme.

"Yet I firmly believe that unless we stop refusing to see how many people are listening to the 'Red' agitators, we may some day have a disagreeable, hare-brained scheme thrust right under our noses.

"The whole purpose of Communism is to destroy organized government, society and property.

"People who are Communistic are mostly those who have never had anything. They want to get their hands on property. They feel that by bringing disorganization and chaos to the country they have everything to gain and nothing to lose. The occasional

person with intelligence and money behind the Communist activity is the person who is capitalizing on the ignorance and the violence of the extreme radicals for his own selfish purposes.

"Communism finds its best footing in the strongholds of the foreign element and the ignorant. While this Illinois city is almost 99 percent American in citizenship and recent ancestry, Communistic forces have been able to wreak mild destruction here.

"A campaign of false propaganda aimed to destroy confidence in our community's banks was started not long ago. It was traced to Communists, who already had weakened the banking in Rockford, Ill., but this community was too intelligent to become panicky.

"You will see Communists fomenting strikes as they did in the truck drivers' difficulty in Minneapolis; you will see them smashing windows, you will see them spreading dissatisfaction among the industrial workers. The strike is a perfect means for their use in destruction. It is their opportunity, and they are keen to take advantage of labor troubles everywhere. Where a strike occurs, there you will find Communists and their agencies of propaganda."

* * *

The Constitution of the United States was written by and for the American colonists because they were no longer able to endure the tyrannical attitude of the English government as it affected their personal liberty, and placed restrictions on their opportunities to improve their personal and collective welfare.

It hardly seems possible that any American citizen of this day and age would even consider accepting the rigorous restrictions which a Communist dictatorship would impose upon individual freedom of action.

Furthermore, a Communistic form of government would differ from our present form of representative democracy in that it would be an illegitimate govern-

ment, deriving its authority from no established principle of law whatever.

Our present form of government is a legitimate democracy, since it expressly implies and grants the right to oppose, and consequently recognizes the legal existence of opposition.

The authoritarian state of Communism denies the right of any opposition, and subdues it by force and illegal violence, which is contrary to all social, moral, and political justice. The very essence of an "authoritarian" government is to encourage and uphold authority against individual freedom. We see this condition in Russia, Germany, and Italy under dictatorships today.

Therefore it appears obvious that the citizens of the United States who live, thrive under, and support a constitutional, legitimate system of government based on clear principles of law accepted by the people themselves would not tolerate any illegitimate system such as Communism.

Communism under a dictatorship could only be set up by force of arms and maintained in power by such force. It is doubtful if such methods ever have been or ever will be sufficient to support, for any great length of time, an unconstitutional, illegitimate regime, — even though it might possibly gain control and power temporarily through the hysterical popularity of a blood-thirsty Communist dictator.

It is unthinkable that any citizen, having lived under our present system of representative government, would consider existing under the dominance of a Communist state dictatorship. That is, if he has any intelligent consideration for his own welfare and the welfare of future generations.

In the United States at the present time we have numerous alien agitators shouting for revolution. These shouters who are for the overthrow of our government and social system, have undoubtedly gained a small following among the rank and file of American

workers and have made tools of some of the so-called "intelligentsia," including such men as the "Consumers' Research" managers, — to their everlasting shame!

The chief ambition of every Communist group is to spatter the Constitution of this democracy with blood and tears, and then to trample it into the dirt and set up a "Red" system of government under "Lenin-leadership," on the wreckage.

It is doubtful if those Americans who profess Communist sympathies have ever stopped to think of what Communism would mean to them, their future, and the future of their children.

They would blindly sacrifice their personal liberty of the present for the slavery of collectivism, — a slavery that is not only un-American but uncivilized. They would make themselves slaves to the whims and wilfulness of a dictatorship composed of a few of the loudest, most mercenary leaders, who would bend the "proletariat" to their will by force of arms.

Under our present system of government we all have certain personal liberties which a dictator could not possibly allow us to retain. We now possess the liberty to think and speak whatever we choose, wherever we choose. We may even act as we like, as long as our actions do no damage to our neighbors and fellow-citizens.

But under a Communistic dictatorship our every act would be restricted. We would work when and where we were told, regardless of our personal desires, inclinations, or previous occupation.

We might still be able to think what we choose, but if our opinions did not agree with those of the dictator or his Communistic bureaucrats, it would be dangerous to give expression to our thoughts. For if we did so, we would immediately find ourselves in a jail or concentration camp, sentenced to hard labor and short rations, or would even be taken out and shot, with or without the semblance of a trial.

For a dictator assumes to himself the grace of being always right, regardless of whether he is or not. The Caesars of ancient Rome ruled in this same autocratic manner, but they ruled in a pre-Christian and pre-civilized era, and they ruled over a pagan people, a people who were accustomed to slavery and the lash of the tyrant.

Are the people who now clamor for Communism prepared to endure the pain and suffering they will be forced to accept under a dictatorship? Communism is a backward movement for Americans, — a return to the Dark Ages.

Support of Communism is an admission of defeat for Americans. It is the last resort of a nation of people who have no hope. A revolution resulting in a Communist dictatorship would be a return to the ways of pre-Christian slavery, whether it be beneath the yoke of an autocratic state or the whip of an emperor.

If the Americans of this generation accept blindly the slogans and quarter-truths of the Communist school of thought, they will merely be saddling on to the backs of their children and their children's children the violence and bloodshed of another revolution. For our descendants will be the ones who will in turn be forced to resort to revolution to overcome the tyrannical monster of Communist state slavery and rebuild another democracy of human rights, with the freedom of thought, speech, and action which we now enjoy.

* * *

Communism is nothing but paganism, — the worship of a false god. It is a throwback to an era in the history of the race when the pagans deified their rulers, and made gods of men who were little better than savage beasts.

Under Communism the deification of the state reduces the individual to unresisting subservience and is a step backward to that age of darkness in which the rights

and liberties of human beings received no consideration from their rulers.

Those who advocate Communism violate the Christian principle of freedom, and deny that human beings possess either personality or character. It has long been acknowledged that no man is good enough to rule his fellowmen. Yet the authoritarian state system of Communism would tread us under, like the enslaved peoples of old.

Our present system of representative government, with all its minor faults, still guarantees to everyone the opportunity to allow their personality and character to function freely and peacefully.

No thinking citizen of today objects to state measures which are aimed merely to deal with economic matters alone. But the Communist is intent on invading the innermost privacies of everyday life. It would make mechanical robots of us all.

If the arguments in favor of Communism are carefully analyzed, the same old ideas against which we fought in the Revolutionary War are found to be its foundation. In that war the present freedom and independence of this nation were won. To accept Communism now would be an admission that nothing had been learned or gained during the last one hundred and sixty years of free government in these United States.

* * *

Communism and Atheism go hand in hand. Let us not forget that.

An elderly minister of the Christian Church, in a communication to the author hereof, recently called attention to the baneful influence of Communistic and atheistic literature. He said:

"In a recent magazine article Prof. Neil Carothers of Lehigh University made the statement that the three books which more than any others have altered the course of history are the Bible, Charles Darwin's Origin

of Species, and 'Das Kapital,' written by the German Jew, Karl Marx.

"In its implied assertion that 'there is no God,' Darwin's book has worked immeasurable harm, and it may be credited with causing a great measure of the moral irresponsibility which has been the bane of modern life. In eliminating the sense of responsibility toward God, and fostering the thought that man is responsible to himself only, or certainly to no greater authority than man-made society, this book did much to prepare the way for general disrespect of law and for crime waves, as well as for much too general acceptance of the teachings of 'Das Kapital,' the 'bible' of Socialists, Communists, and other revolutionaries.

"Teachings of this other atheistic work, 'Das Kapital,' are responsible for the tremendous political and economic unrest which is evident in practically every country of the world, and which seems to threaten the very basis of modern civilization.

"Leaders of revolutions which are convulsing the world, terrorists guilty of the assassination of both kingly rulers and elected representatives of the people, and fomenters of class struggles manifested in strikes and riots, — all these point to Karl Marx as their teacher and justify their acts by his teachings and theories.

"The Bible, a wholesome influence since the beginnings of true civilization, with a social as well as a spiritual message for God's people, teaches the divine origin of man and the possibilities of divine leadership, — while 'Das Kapital' teaches the materialist conception of history, which implies that man, with the possible exception of the occasional superman, is a creature of environment only, without spiritual power to resist evil; that conscience is merely one form of physical unrest, and that impulses to do good spring from nothing more important than what a man ate for dinner or drank to quench his thirst.

“Brotherhood vs. class hatred; all-embracing love vs. all-consuming hate; freedom, liberty of thought and action vs. compulsory surrender of all that freemen hold dear,— these are just a few of the issues in the inevitable death struggle between the Bible and Christianity on the one hand and ‘Das Kapital’ and Communism on the other.”

Considering the fact that the managers of “Consumers’ Research, Inc.,” have records as active propagandists of Communism, what right have they to expect the liberty-loving people of America to support them in comfort, by subscriptions to their “CR” books and bulletins, when all their operations, including the “CR” racket, tend to destroy confidence in American business men and to sap the foundations of American industry?

CHAPTER V

SELF-APPOINTED CENSORS OF BUSINESS

ALL forms of censorship are repugnant to the American spirit. Every attempt to censor public habits or public morals offends the basic sense of freedom that is inherent in every true American, whether he be of native or of alien birth; and nothing should be permitted to interfere with the development of that sense among us as a people.

But censors, appointed or self-constituted, constantly arise in our midst, to strut awhile in the public eye, and then, usually, to disappear like chaff before the wind of an outraged public opinion. We have had censors of the public morals, of personal habits, and of our natural appetites. We have been loaded down with prohibitory laws as the result of censorious propaganda; laws like those that forbade the drinking of intoxicating liquor, with the result that the whole nation took to strong drink.

We have seen a well-meaning woman, in the white robe of a social censor, spend her days in agitation against the use of cigarettes; and then a war came along, with the cigarette as almost the sole comfort of the men in muddy trenches, — and now the whole world has the harmless and cheering cigarette habit.

We have had censors of the theater and of the movies; and the good they do may survive them, but it is hardly in evidence today. And so all through the gamut of human activities, there have always been censors, to criticize and condemn things and practices in which the majority could see no great harm, and certainly no reason for interference.

Of all censors, those that are self-appointed are the least desirable in any community upon which they intrude. Their object is to force themselves and their ideas upon their fellow-citizens, no matter how great

the majority against them may be. And of all such self-appointed critics, those that make a business of interfering with other people's business are by far the worst and the most strongly to be condemned.

The name adopted by the "Consumers' Research" is a delusion and a snare, because it conveys an impression, which is increased by consumer propaganda, that there is something official, something of authority, something that has to do with law enforcement — if not something sacred — about the character of the institution. This is a snare, into which, it is to be feared, many people, including some supposedly level-headed consumers, have fallen. But it is a snare baited with false pretenses.

There is nothing official about the pseudo-"Consumers' Research." It has no character of authority, no official powers of any sort or degree. It is an organization which flourishes more or less on contributions from misguided men and women. In its personnel, is a set of annoying and often anonymous busybodies, ever seeking to dig up some form of business scandal, no matter how trifling, that they can flaunt as evidence of their activity. Such evidence — often in the shape of charges of the most flimsy kind against manufacturers — is promptly converted into publicity, for which the "Consumers' Research" yearns, because it makes such excellent bait for the delusion and ensnarement of prospective members and contributors.

From the standpoint of merchants and business men, the outstanding objections to the "Consumers' Research" are, first, the suspicious secrecy of its methods, and, second, the one-sided manner in which it promulgates the results of its espionage and alleged "investigations." The manufacturer and distributor have had absolutely no chance to combat its findings and its scandalous reports — until such a chance was offered by the publication of this book.

There is subject-matter for dispute in every one-sided report made throughout the country; and it is incredible

that American business men should have to suffer much longer from such unofficial and unauthorized interference with their affairs as they have been subjected to in recent years.

Of all rackets, those which ostensibly operate for the "protection of the public" under a title that immediately misleads the unwary into believing that anything coming from it is absolute truth, — rackets that are promoted and maintained under the guise of protection of the public against fraud — when, as a matter of fact, the true purpose of the promoters is to promote their own personal interest by mulcting the consumer public of its dollars — are perhaps the most unsavory, the most despicable, and the most detestable.

These racketeers use the finest instincts of the human heart as capital to make for themselves a questionable living at the expense of the susceptible victim, and are a deterrent to the development of the natural resources of this great country. Such rackets should be blasted from the face of the earth.

The "Consumers' Research" is a cunningly organized corporation, "not for profit," and with individual liability limited under the laws governing educational, benevolent, and religious institutions. They are without one scintilla of legal authority to regulate, censor, police, or supervise the business of a single citizen or concern in the whole country; therefore any act of theirs contrary to vested rights is unlawful.

The "Consumers' Research" is not an arm of, an agency of, nor does it possess any official status with, either State or Federal Government, any more so than any private citizen.

Membership in this outfit is not exactly a matter of pride, but is rather somewhat mysterious and secret. Governor Roosevelt of New York, at one time said, "No honestly intentioned membership corporation should hide its roster; no group of men should be permitted to operate in the dark."

Perhaps the Governor — now President of the United States — had in mind the secret organization of the "Consumers' Research," and its hush-hush policy of operation.

Before the people can have any confidence in the "Consumers' Research" movement, they should be informed as to its legal rights and limitations, and its responsibility for its acts; also as to the number and identity of its members. Its methods of investigation should also be known, together with the name of the responsible "chemists" and "engineers," with their respective duties and remuneration. The functions of the organization should be clearly defined; and the reasons for an investigation, together with the names of those making charges against a business concern or institution, should be given, upon request, to those directly concerned.

As matters now stand, it must be said that individuals who establish agencies of persecution, investigation, and punishment usurp the natural functions of the State and are its legitimate enemies; for if not checked, they would ultimately displace the State and substitute the rule of the racket for the system of jurisprudence that is the product of man's slow development through the ages. * * *

From the nature of the charges freely made against the "Consumers' Research," which have been corroborated by independent investigation, the assertion that it has become a racket appears to have been fully justified, as the "CR" has all the earmarks by which a racket may be recognized, including the following:

1. A secret membership, based on selfish interests.
2. Secrecy in operation, without license or authority.
3. Autocratic management and control of funds.
4. Persecution of "outsiders,"— manufacturers, advertisers, and distributors.
5. Use of unfair and illegal methods and practices.
6. Promotion of selfish interests.

7. Disregard of the public welfare.

Such is the case against the "Consumers' Research," which is now at the bar of public opinion and the subject of investigation, which must confirm the findings of the private investigators who have spent time and money to uncover the facts that stamp "CR" as a racket.

In the industrial and commercial system, the manufacturer stands at one end of the line and the consumer at the other end; and between them stand the agencies of distribution — the middlemen, the jobber, and the retailers who serve the manufacturer and the public. The competitive system rules. The manufacturer who can give the greatest value for the lowest price gets the business. Standard goods at reasonable prices are the staples desired.

By tricky and questionable methods, the "Consumers' Research" has apparently succeeded in creating public sentiment against the advertiser and manufacturer. Every retail merchant and dealer is a local agent and salesman for the legitimate manufacturer, therefore, whenever a manufacturer is persecuted and forced out of business through the medium of these self-appointed agitators, the legitimate retailers are also affected.

Why does the independent business man stand idly by and permit a private organization like the "Consumers' Research" to boycott and blacklist him and his business, destroy his name, reputation, and business? Why doesn't he go into court and fight? Without a doubt, his faith in his business will stand the crucible test of controversy. It is the differences of opinion expressed that keep the world from going to the dogs. There must be independence of thought, individual rules of business, a spirit of pride in one's personal efforts, if one is to succeed. Why should a man conduct his business according to specific rules laid down by an organization officered and managed by fanatics? By men doing the scavenger work of Communists!

At a time when the President of the United States is calling upon our citizens, and more especially upon the men engaged in business, to banish fear from their minds, it is imperative that no such institution as the "Consumers' Research" should be permitted to instill fear and doubt in the minds of consumers and others engaged in legitimate business, or to interfere with the operations of any legitimate business under the guise of investigating it for the purpose of discovering something, no matter how little or insignificant, to criticize and condemn in maliciously broadcast reports.

The call to action against such a pernicious system should be heeded by every business man who breathes the free air of America and possesses any modicum of the spirit of independence.

CHAPTER VI

CONSUMERS' RESEARCH AS A BUSINESS RACKET

ONE of the misleading claims made by the managers of Consumers' Research, Inc., is that it is "not a business enterprise, not operated for a profit."

But the organization operates as a business racket nevertheless, and we are not the only ones to designate it publicly as a racket, under the management of Schlink, Matthews, et al. Many business men of standing have taken steps to combat its findings regarding the products they manufacture or sell, and in doing so have not hesitated to stigmatize the CR as clearly akin to the rackets. In recent years, notorious gangsters and others of evil reputation "muscled in" to get for themselves a lion's share of the profits of otherwise legitimate business concerns. This is a development against which every business man must be on guard.

We have too many so-called "national" organizations operating from backrooms or out-of-the-way places in the interests of this, that, and the other alleged public movement, but organized solely to relieve the susceptible public of its surplus change and thus provide salaries for the promoters. Funds subscribed to such rackets can often be traced to a single promoter's pocket.

Many business men appease their fears by saying that the CR organization is not formidable, — is of but little importance in the world of business; but experience teaches that the more ridiculous a racket, the more foolish a fad, the more readily it finds a following. Of course, the Consumers' Research should not be allowed to survive. It is a child of the economic darkness and should perish with the coming of dawn.

There is no valid reason for the existence of such an organization, sponsored and exploited by a few individuals, and the laws of business and of physical evolu-

tion make it inevitable that the useless and unfit should perish from the earth. So perished other self-appointed "reform" organizations, and so will pass this new avatar of business bigotry and consumer folly, which has found a temporary lodgment in a land boasting liberty of conscience beneath the flag of the free.

But though the days of the Consumers' Research be few and full of trouble, it may, like the cholera scourge or an epidemic of scarlet fever, do an infinite amount of harm before it is eradicated. Its tendency is to promote class hatred and deny the claims of business integrity, and thus check the mighty stride of business progress and turn back the hands on the dial of time a generation or two. Its avowed object, as we have seen, is the practical blacklisting or smearing with suspicion of nationally-known products of this country. Criticizing business houses in its customary manner is nothing more than stuffing the consumers' ears with false reports.

Our present objects therefore — the objects of this book — may be summarized as follows:

(a) To present in readable form some of the results of recent investigations of the pernicious activities of the concern known as the Consumers' Research, — which cannot be regarded as otherwise than a detriment to business.

(b) To emphasize the fact of the transition of several Socialistic, Communistic, and anti-capitalistic writers of radical literature, into an institution that has usurped the functions of both State and Government agencies.

By operating as secret agents and arrogating to themselves the right to make private "investigations," of industrial concerns and products of all kinds, and publishing the results broadcast, denying the right of manufacturers to be heard before decisions are rendered and reports made, the CR managers have set themselves up as an invincible government, with secret methods of management and operation.

The time has come to call a halt to this kind of defiance of the constituted rights of citizens, and to end the criticism and condemnation to which all business men are subject at the hands of this vicious and unauthorized organization. For Consumers' Research is without any legal authority whatsoever for its assumption of critical powers. It depends for support upon the contributions of the gullible housewife and the easily-influenced consumer,— among that great mass of ultimate consumers, the American public, whom, with astounding effrontery, it calls "One Hundred Million Guinea Pigs," — the title of one of its publications.

The methods of the Consumers' Research racketeers are designed simply to harass the advertiser, the manufacturer, and the distributor; and the general effect of its activities is to create doubt and suspicion in the public mind as to the value of all advertised goods. One of its favorite methods is to damn products with faint praise.

As appeals, couched in prejudicial language, are constantly being made to consumers in every community to support this vicious organization, it is timely and appropriate to call attention to the fact that such contributions should cease. No citizen or consumer should permit himself or herself to subscribe to the support of a concern that foists itself upon the public as a servant of its interests, in securing "better prices" or "better goods," when it can be so clearly shown that the efforts of the promoters redound only to their own advantage and profit, and are of no public benefit, but distinctly the reverse.

The business of this country has had enough of the persecution and harassment of "Consumers' Research, Inc.," of Washington, N. J. It has had enough of the pernicious operation of unofficial secret "bureaus," and of the mummery and flapdoodle of professional reformers. Hence no excuse need be offered by any business man for engaging in or supporting the present wide crusade against the evil results of such activities.

The best interests of the general public and of the business community demand a drastic change in these methods or the total suppression of such organizations.

"Consumers' Research, Inc.," strikes at the very foundation of our prosperity, — for how can a nation be prosperous if its citizens do not buy the things they need? By proclaiming, in effect, that manufacturers are frauds, crooks, and thieves, that advertisers are liars and cheats, it leaves the consumer in such a state of doubt and confusion that he does not know what to buy, — consequently he buys nothing. It is quite safe to assume that this is the only country in the world saddled with a "Consumers' Research" of this harmful type.

It has been said that "Consumers' Research" never speaks of any business house unless it can speak ill, and never investigates or "reports" until it has determined to find something disparaging. Yet such has been the power of its attractive and misleading title and the glamor that was thrown around its earlier operations, with the cooperation and support of radical publications, that many consumers were deluded into believing that the "Research" was an altruistic institution.

"Consumers' Research" states that "it is organized, supported, and managed entirely by consumers"; — that "it is intended to fill the gap resulting from the failure of Government to protect the consumer adequately against the advertising and selling of completely worthless and even dangerous commodities" and that "the Government affords practically no protection against fraudulent and misleading advertising and selling."

The promoters and contribution-seekers of "Consumers' Research" boast that theirs is the only organization of national scope which takes the risks of controversy with business interests.

The general nature of the CR's "controversy with business interests" may be judged by persons of intelligence from the fact that, in one of its appeals for

subscribers to its "service," at so much per annum, this "non-profit" organization characterizes the advertising of manufactured commodities as "*an uncharted jungle of conflicting claims, skillfully presented misinformation, flattery, sex-appeal, and exaggerations.*"

What is this but a direct attack upon the honesty and integrity and common-sense of American business as a whole, — a vicious onslaught against the character of our business men, by promoters whose names are recorded in the records of Communistic activities in America, as in a previous chapter we have made clear to every interested reader? Their "holier-than-thou" attitude is that of the men who have made such a sickening mess of individual rights and liberties of all classes in Russia.

The claim is made by promoters of Consumers' Research that the organization is officered and participated in by "consumers." This is a childish claim, for the same can be said of every business and manufacturing organization in the wide world. All are composed of consumers, and the CR as it calls itself — how these radicals do like alphabetical titles! — has probably fewer consumers in its ranks than the majority of the concerns it attacks with the poison pen.

The movement has already become "national" and "international," if we may credit the boasts of its leaders, — which proves that it was not begotten by American industrial patriots, as at first pretended, but born in Communistic dens of anti-capitalistic bigotry. Decent Americans should have much to say concerning the necessity of suppressing such a blatant organization, fostered and managed by radicals, whose present purpose seems to be a division of the American people into two hostile classes — the poor against the rich. It is generally recognized that an industrial republic, divided against itself, is soon brought to chaos and destruction.

As we have seen, the Consumers' Research, which is primarily a boycotting outfit, was spawned in New York City a few years ago as the result of a muckraking book

entitled: "Your Money's Worth," which maligned business and libeled business men, and was written by two of the promoters of the present organization. Later the promoters became possessed of the bright idea that their success would be greater if they were located in Washington, — any Washington, — as they figured the people they were allegedly serving were too ignorant to know the exact location of the seat of our National Government; hence, they moved their bag of tricks over to New Jersey, where they became a barnacle in the side of the quiet little town of Washington.

The promoters, none of whom had any business experience, had some grotesque idea of attaining the beautiful through the brutal, of going to heaven by way of hell. They no doubt had heard that the rose springs from rottenness, that the sweet perfumes are extracted from impurities, that the foul emanations of earth make the lightnings flash, and roll the thunder-drums in the heavenly skies. But the editors and writers of the Consumers' Research literature bedaub the nation with the slime of criticism, not because it nurtures beauty and fragrance, but because it breeds distrust between the manufacturer and the consumer. Their writings suggest some disappointed sybarite, in whom business misfortune has caused perversion instead of repentance, and whose soul is ever rioting in the nameless infamies of the past.

We have had government reform attempted through the NRA and the AAA, etc., and private reform through the creation and adoption of various commissions, business bureaus, associations, and trade organizations, — many of which were and are pure rackets, working for their own aggrandizement and personal profit — and to furnish big jobs for little men.

But the greatest racket yet to raise its head is the "Consumers' Research," now located on the banks of a sluggish little stream outside the small town of Washington, N. J. It is housed in an old building, the outside of which resembles a deserted pirate shack or the back

of some prehistoric monster. The inside is equipped with long-range poison-pen guns, that shoot fear, prejudice, distrust, and malicious mischief into the homes and hearts of gullible consumers throughout the land.

Even the water of the little brook which tumbles and babbles past this architectural monstrosity, it is said, is filled with a reddish fluid of a bloodlike tint, as it creeps day and night through the bruised countryside and empties ultimately into the cleaner waters of the great Atlantic.

For be it remembered that the place above described is the nest of some of America's most prolific "Red Birds," —active, blatant Communists and men who have graduated from the pink of Socialism to the Red of the "Internationale" revolutionary movement.

The little town of Washington once held its head high. It was proud to bear the name of the Father of our Country, — but now its head is bowed in shame and its heart is bruised and bleeding. Its good name is besmirched by the malicious outpourings of the so-called "Consumer's Research." The town is infected with a scourge as devastating to human decency and American pride as was the leprosy to the people of the Sandwich Islands, whose entire population was practically destroyed when that scourge appeared among them.

CHAPTER VII

MALIGNERS OF MANUFACTURERS

CONSUMERS' Research, Inc., is to American business like a malignant growth upon the body of an otherwise healthy and active individual. Such an excrescence can best be cured by the surgeon's knife, wielded in time, before the infection spreads. It must be cut out and eradicated promptly, if the sufferer is to find permanent relief.

This malignant organization, self-styled "the CR," has fastened itself upon American business for the ostensible purpose of benefiting the consumer, whom it assumes to represent. Although its membership includes only four persons out of every ten thousand of the total number of American consumers, the organization brays and boasts as loudly and boldly as if it had the indorsement and support of the whole body of the consuming public, the whole population of 130,000,000 souls.

But we have no present concern with the numbers of the gullible who have contributed to the CR coffers — we shall deal with that aspect of the situation later. What we are now concerned with is the threat to American business interests that has arisen through the early unchecked operations of the CR, with its open and veiled attacks upon, not only the products of manufacturers large and small, but upon the methods and motives of business men who act as distributors of every kind of product, the promoters of trade through publicity, and all those who render needed business services to the community.

The CR practically disclaims having any regard for the interests of commodity manufacturers and their essential allies, the distributors of commodity products; and it is from the standpoint of these great and essential interests that we direct public attention to the

malign influence of the New Jersey organization as an enemy of business, at a time when our country is struggling toward more complete business recovery.

Being thus aligned on the side of American business as against its traducers, we shall keep this book free from verbosity, and as brief as possible, while presenting the case against the CR with the utmost clarity and vividness. The author has no roundabout mode of expression; he hits out straight from the shoulder, for he has neither the time nor the inclination to "fiddle around in the ring." And he is decidedly of opinion that business men in general have neither time nor inclination to read page after page of generalities or cheap philosophy — such as the CR has put forth in its labored efforts at propaganda — in order to extract one fact of moment.

The CR managers and scribes have delved into ancient history for material to prove their assertion that present-day methods of manufacture are inferior to those of the past, and result in the production of goods that are inferior, — which is utter nonsense. They have gone back one and two thousand years in their wearisome attempts to slight or deny the march of industrial progress. They point to the past record of manufacture with as much pride as a political party convention takes in pointing to a doubtful and disputed record, and they seek to glorify the past at the expense of the present.

In doing so, they simply ignore facts that are undisputed, and assume that the public is ignorant of the steady, inevitable march of progress. They would have us believe that the world is standing still and would have continued to do so, with an all-prevailing ignorance of the fact, if they had not arrived to enlighten us with their ill-meaning and mercenary verbosity, demanding our attention by designating us as "One Hundred Million Guinea Pigs" and selling their absurd books under equally absurd and sensational titles — *ad captandum vulgus*, to catch the dollars of the credulous crowd.

But we are not as ignorant as they would paint us.

The American consumer, the purchasing public, is fully aware of the main facts of manufacturing progress and is proud of the advances that have been made, to lift us to the highest plane of living known on earth. We all recognize that the horse-and-buggy and the horsecar are things of the past, and that so too are the old methods of manufacture and distribution. And we are willing to let the dead past bury its dead.

Why, then, should the CR writers dwell for page after page on something that is obsolete, in the attempt to belittle American business methods in comparison with those of the past? We are dealing with a present situation, not with old, abandoned methods and formulae of manufacture. Who wants to return to the days of the stylus or the quill-pen, when we have the fountain-pen and typewriter? Who wants to carry the milkjug to the door, for a carelessly measured pint or quart, when we have the regular, systematic delivery of pasteurized milk in standardized bottles, sterilized and sealed, transported in rubber-tired motor-wagons? That being the case, we can surely realize that the present methods of doing business, while capable of improvement and bound to improve in the eternal process of human progress, are far in advance of all that have yet been tried or suggested.

In its efforts to cover the whole field of business, in the spirit of criticism and fault-finding, censoring every kind of product and every type of advertising service, the CR or any other organization with like aims, assumes a large responsibility as well as a gigantic task, — a task altogether beyond the capacity of men with limited means and facilities at their command.

“Business,” said Andrew Carnegie, “is a large word,” and the thing itself requires volumes to give it capable expression. It has many ramifications, for there are many types of business carried on in every civilized country; and one of the greatest of all is manufacturing. The manufacturers of a country need friends, and must

necessarily fight enemies. But in the past, American manufacturers, especially those included in the term "Big Business," have been singularly lax in fighting back when attacked, and there has always been a horde of small-fry agitators and disgruntled individuals barking at its heels, with radicals, would-be reformers, and troublemakers, including Communists like the managers of the CR, ever at work, inciting the public to discontent, envy, and abuse of the men who successfully manage the capital intrusted to them by the stockholders of our great manufacturing concerns. A little quiet thought should convince any intelligent person that no stigma should attach to the term "Big Business" or to those included in that term.

But now the worm shows signs of turning in its own defense. A recent newspaper spread sponsored by that well-known firm of advertising agents, N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., of Philadelphia and New York, with branches in Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, Detroit, London, Montreal, and South America, sounded the keynote of defense for Big Business with the following statement:

"Large-scale industry in America has a fascinating and inspiring story to tell, — and it is one of the major misfortunes of our time that that story so seldom has been told."

Then, with reference to the common, unthinking attack upon capital, the story was told in brief as follows:

"Leadership has its penalties as well as its rewards. That which is successful becomes conspicuous, — and by the same token it becomes the target of attack from the envious, the ambitious, and the professional fomenters of public discontent."

(What a striking, if accidental, characterization of the Consumers' Research that is! "Professional fomenters of public discontent." But on with the story:)

"From such quarters as these, the story *against* Big Business, the incomplete and misleading and in some

cases the totally false story, has been loudly and persistently retailed.

“But of the story *for* Big Business — of the epic of large-scale industry — little or nothing has been heard. The part which it has played in developing new comforts and conveniences within the reach of everyone, — in raising the general wage level — in research and the advancement of science — in enabling people to escape from the restraints of city life through low-cost transportation — in lightening the drudgery of the farmer, and in taking women out of the kitchen, — all these things and many others which have contributed toward increased human happiness and a higher standard of living in America, have remained largely untold.

“And they have remained untold simply because large-scale industry itself has not chosen to tell them.”

In other words, the American public has been told but one side of the story — the side of the agitators, the side of the Consumers' Research and kindred trouble-makers, the side of the Communists and other enemies of the common weal, — the side that asperses Big Business and would make it a term of reproach instead of one of honor.

(For if business is an honorable occupation, which it assuredly is, and every small business man would like to become a big business man and is justified in that ambition, what earthly reason is there for assailing and reproaching Big Business, or for regarding it as otherwise than honorable?)

But the great Philadelphia advertising firm has some pertinent comment to offer upon the fact that Big Business has hitherto been content to let its enemies rave on without reply, at least without telling its own side of the story. They point out that whereas Big Business — our largest manufacturers and producers — may have millions of impersonal customers among the 130,000,000 inhabitants of this country, altogether too few of those customers can be counted upon as friends.

"This is an unhealthy condition of affairs," say N. W. Ayer & Co., "not only for Big Business, but for the nation at large. Sound and enduring progress can be built only upon a basis of mutual respect and regard. The country needs Big Business for its vision and imagination, its efficiency, its courage and initiative and brains. But Big Business has an even greater need of the public. It needs its loyalty and friendship to compete against irresponsible competition, to protect itself against the attacks of the self-seeking and the misguided, to avert labor troubles and misunderstandings, — in short, to exist at all."

And then the way to win that friendship of the public is pointed out. There is only one way to win anybody's friendship, and that is "to let him see you as you are." One may have all the good qualities imaginable, but if they are hidden they cannot be appreciated. There is here a strong hint to our manufacturers, applicable to others besides those classed as Big Business, to come out into the open and show themselves in their true light, as public benefactors, assuming a fighting attitude if necessary to guard their interests against underhanded attacks. But it is the hand of friendship that is counseled in the concluding paragraph of the noted publicists' timely exhortation to business men:

"The time has come for America to turn its face against the forces of internal strife and dissension, — to seek new strength in the old solidarity of thought and feeling, — to recapture, and to restore to its rightful place in our life as a nation, the personal, human touch. And it would be worthy of the great tradition of American industry if its leaders should be the first to take a step in that direction, — if they were to stretch forth the hand of fellowship frankly and generously to those who should be their neighbors and their friends."

Yes, it is the restoration of that "personal human touch" which is all that is needed to counteract the efforts of men like the managers of Consumers' Research

to breed and encourage class hatred between manufacturer and consumer, which is doubtless the object of those Communistic individuals. For the old order of things has changed and we must accommodate ourselves to the new, which cannot be done if the consumer is infected with suspicion of the personally unknown manufacturer.

In former days, if our fathers and grandfathers needed a new pair of shoes, they called on the local shoemaker, who was well known to them personally, and he built shoes to their measure or upon a special "last" of their own. There was mutual confidence, even friendship, between the shoemaker and his customer. The latter knew he would get good shoes, and the former knew he would be paid his price cheerfully.

Today there is no such friendly or intimate contact between producer and consumer. It is not possible. The manufacturer may have a million consumers of his product, which is bought in retail stores; and we may not even know the name of the company that makes the shoes we buy. So that, in establishing friendly relations between producer and consumer, the utmost that can be done, as a rule, is to establish general confidence in the integrity and highmindedness of American manufacturers as a class. And whosoever tries deliberately to arouse suspicion of all manufacturing industry, instead of encouraging confidence, is a public enemy. That is what the Consumers' Research does — it breeds suspicion and distrust, and that is what the CR is — a public enemy.

We can safely assume and assert that American manufacturers, as a class — since we must refer to classes, — are both honest and highminded. They are men of integrity, honor, initiative, and business ability. They wish to give the public the benefit of their knowledge and experience, in the shape of good goods at reasonable prices, and of course, to reap a profit for their stockholders. Business sense teaches that profits can be most

surely made by cultivating the public taste and giving the consumer what he wants.

If the manufacturer creates new wants and is prepared to supply them, he is rendering a public service by increasing the standard of living. And it is to his own best interest to produce goods that are just what they are represented to be.

No intelligent manufacturer or distributor would dare to sell harmful goods knowingly. It would be suicidal to his business, to say the least about it. Let one customer die as a consequence of purchasing adulterated foodstuff or, say, cosmetics, or from handling a defective mechanical device, — and the manufacturer would soon succumb to a loss of goodwill, for such instances are always widely publicized, and perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars of financial investment would be lost. Business depends upon the goodwill of the public, the ultimate consumer, and anything that tends to destroy, like the efforts of the "CR" — is a positive detriment to business.

We shall show later how the Consumers' Research, by its unfair criticisms and classifications, has interfered with the business of foodstuff producers, drug houses and druggists, and manufacturers of various kinds of cosmetics and more staple articles of trade.

"Let the buyer beware" is a business axiom as obsolete as the dodo bird. The modern business man and the manufacturer know that their goods and services must be such as to beget buyer-confidence, and that honesty is the only successful policy. To class manufacturers as dishonest and crooks — as the CR would have the public believe — is as ridiculous as it would be to class the entire populace as criminals or gangsters. These are two cases in which exceptions do not prove the rule.

As the span of life has increased at least ten years in the last half-century, it goes to prove that our present method of living is far better than that enjoyed by our grandparents. How much of this is due to our manu-

facturers and their methods we cannot say, but the fact of life-extension under present conditions and with the present products is one that needs no special proof and cannot be gainsaid.

Consumers' Research, however, warns the consumer against paying the manufacturer a fee, in the shape of a reasonable profit, for his intelligence, investment and experience, when manufacturing industry has cooperated so well with other agencies in bringing about our higher standard of living, and thus aided in adding materially to the allotted span of human life and to human happiness in this favored land.

Consumers' Research agrees with its Communist friends and sponsors that universal standardization of things is a proper and desirable plan. The Communist organization, the Internationale, stands firmly for standardization and is encouraging the teaching of this doctrine everywhere. But the CR does not think much of the United States Bureau of Standards; in fact, it takes many a sly dig at the Bureau in its bulletins, with an implication of its own immense superiority to that useful government agency.

Consumers' Research reminds one of the oldtime actors who always played to the gallery. Its promoters lack the spirit of fair play. They do not want to give the producer and investor a "break." They do not always say that products are not good; but when they deal with products known to be good, they say the price is too high. In every case they act as both prosecutor, judge and jury, — without the slightest official standing or reason for their dictatorial attitude. They have in fact no *raison d'être*, — no reason for being!

The mystery of the whole disgusting racket, as conducted under the glamorous title of Consumers' Research, is this: Why have our manufacturers — broadminded, thinking business men — allowed a group of troublemakers with Communistic ideas and affiliations to malign their products and injure their business during the past

few years of CR activity, without making an effort to punish the offenders or to refute the charges made? Why have such men as the promoters of Consumers' Research, including a self-styled "physicist" and an unknown "accountant," been allowed to set themselves up as authorities on everything from a cake of laundry soap to the nether garments of New York's most fastidious courtesans and the automobiles in which they take the air?

Why, indeed? There is absolutely no reason for the existence of Consumers' Research or for such operations as theirs, which have but one purpose, the breaking-down of public confidence in our industrial system and the methods of manufacture and distribution of worthwhile products. We shall not see the genesis or rebirth of public confidence in industries, large and small, until the exodus of such malevolent organizations as Consumers' Research, Inc., becomes an accomplished fact.

Can the author of the following mean Washington, N. J.?

GOSSIP TOWN

Have you ever heard of Gossip Town,
On the shore of Falsehood Bay,
Where old Dame Rumor, with rustling gown,
Is going the livelong day?
It isn't far to Gossip Town,
For people who want to go.
The Idleness train will take you down,
In just an hour or so.
The Thoughtless road is a popular route,
And most folks start that way,
But it's steep down grade; if you don't look out,
You'll land in Falsehood Bay.
You glide through the valley of Vicious Folk,
And into the tunnel of Hate,
Then crossing the Add-To bridge, you walk
Right into the city gate.
The principal street is called They-Say,
And I've-Heard is the public well,
And the breezes that blow from Falsehood Bay

Are laden with Don't-You-Tell.
In the midst of the town is Telltale Park,
You're never quite safe while there,
For its owner is Madam Suspicious Remark,
Who lives on the street Don't Care,
Just back of the park is Slanders' Row,
'Twas there that Good Name died,
Pierced by a dart from Jealousy's bow,
In the hands of Envious Pride.
From Gossip Town Peace long since fled,
But Trouble, Grief, and Woe,
And Sorrow and Care you'll meet instead
If ever you chance to go.

—Anon.

CHAPTER VIII

ORIGIN AND OSTENSIBLE OBJECTS OF THE "CR"

LET us now look a little more closely into the origin and objects — at least the ostensible objects — of this Communist-controlled "Consumers' Research, Inc.," which has its temporary abode in Washington, N. J., and its Mecca in Moscow.

According to its own statement in one of its propaganda leaflets, the "CR" is "organized and incorporated under the laws of the State of New York as a membership corporation, to provide unbiased information and counsel on goods bought by the ultimate consumer; *not a business enterprise, not operated for profit.*"

Not a business enterprise? But it affords a good living to its voluntary promoters, sells its so-called services at good round figures, solicits contributions from the generous and receives them up to the confessed sum of \$10,000, and has a scale of special charges for answering questions and making so-called investigations. Not a business enterprise, — when it assumes to deal with the whole field of business as a self-constituted critic and censor, when it will tell the consumer what soaps to buy and what to leave alone; what brand of gasoline to put in his tank, while practically condemning other brands as "Intermediate" or "Not Recommended"; what dictionaries and encyclopedias to purchase and which to place on an "Index Expurgatorious"!

Not operated for profit? When every book, pamphlet, leaflet, and bulletin it publishes is put forth at a good profitable price, and the expenditures for alleged "research" are kept well within the income, so that the excess (profits) may go into the pockets of the promoters, presumably in the shape of salaries!

Not for profit, — when employees of the organization who were not getting what they considered their fair

share, recently went on strike, and on being ousted, organized a competing concern for "consumer research," — which they would be most unlikely to do if there were not "money in the racket."

In its propaganda, including a circular appealing for subscribers at \$3 a nine-month year for its "combined service" (confidential) and \$1 a year for four "general bulletins" only, — the CR asks such questions as these:

"What is a good and inexpensive brand of toilet soap?"

"What items should a home medicine chest contain?"

"What laxatives are safe, or least harmful?"

These are questions that any good housewife, any family physician, and any druggist can answer at a moment's notice; but we are told that "Consumers' Research was organized to give you the answers to these and hundreds of similar questions."

The individual who receives one of these subscription-selling leaflets is boldly told on the first page that the CR is taking over a function in which the United States government is lacking, and a thinly-veiled attack is made upon at least two of our government agencies, namely the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration, while the Bureau of Standards is sneered at on the following page. Thus we are told that —

"Consumers' Research . . . is intended to fill the gap resulting from the failure of government to protect the consumer adequately against the advertising and selling of completely worthless and even dangerous commodities . . . The government affords practically no protection against fraudulent and misleading advertising and selling. Consumers' Research is *the only organization of national scope* which takes the risks of controversy with business interests involved in discussing inferior products in terms which anyone can understand and apply in the selection and purchase of goods in the retail market."

So Consumers' Research, with its very limited list of subscribers, limited facilities for investigation, and veiled Communistic desire to subvert the government, claims to be, and deludes its subscribers into believing that it is, of national scope. Its corporate title and such claims as this have doubtless given the simple-minded the idea its promoters intended to convey, — that this destructive organization has some sort of official standing or influence, whereas the fact is, as we have already stated, that it is of a purely voluntary, unofficial character, but well calculated to set class against class, consumer against producer, in the well-known Communist manner.

The history of Consumers' Research, from its own showing, began in 1927, when F. J. Schlink, who now has the title of president and technical director of the CR, was co-author with Stuart Chase, another radical of the deep Red stripe, of a book entitled "Your Money's Worth," which purported to be "a study in the waste of the consumer's dollar. We have already shown the full extent of the Communistic tendencies and affiliations of both Schlink and Chase, the latter being advisory counsel of a Communist subsidiary, the American Society for Cultural Relations with Russia, while Schlink is a national committeeman of the National Religion and Labor Foundation, organized by radicals in 1932 to propagandize "the new social order" (Communism-Socialism) within Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant churches.

The book "Your Money's Worth," according to the CR leaflet referred to above, "described the predicament in which competitive advertising and sales pressure place the consumer who attempts to find his way to an intelligent purchase through an uncharted jungle of conflicting claims, skillfully presented misinformation, flattery, sex-appeal, and exaggerations." After a few months, alleged to have been "spent in answering questions by readers of the book," one of the authors, to-wit, F. J. Schlink, "decided that a local consumers' club which he had previously organized should be expanded to meet the problems

of such correspondents and to obtain more data on goods."

Within a year, the enlarged Schlink Consumers' Club attained the enormous membership of 565 persons, out of the 130,000,000 consumers in America, — which indicates the extent of the demand for its services.

Something had to be done to attract notice and give the public an exaggerated idea of its importance; and so in December, 1929, the Consumers' Club, owned, operated, and dominated by F. J. Schlink, became Consumers' Research, Inc., with Comrade Schlink as its head and front, as he is today. And by September, 1935, we are told, the subscribers to the "combined service" (confidential) of the CR numbered 55,000, — still a very small percentage of the consuming public, but one large enough to threaten some damage to industry, while the general idea of the organization is a positive and growing menace.

As already noted, the service furnished to subscribers by the CR is of two kinds, "combined service" and the "general bulletin." Each subscriber to the combined service is required to sign an agreement to keep the CR information in confidence, though just why is not clearly explained; and the question naturally arises, if Consumers' Research really has the interests of consumers at heart, why should not its allegedly valuable information be passed on to others by those who pay for and receive it?

To this there is but one answer: The CR claim to operate "not for profit" is unfounded in fact. It wants to get hold of as many of the public's dollars as it possibly can, — and the "confidential" factor in its plan has a certain money-making psychological value. Most persons have a streak of curiosity as to matters held "confidential" and are willing to pay money to learn things that are stamped as secrets, — especially business secrets.

Each subscriber to the CR combined service, we are told, receives the "Annual Handbook of Buying," and monthly Bulletins for a nine-month year (except July-August and September). From October to June, five confidential Bulletins and four non-confidential or General Bulletins are issued.

The "Annual Handbook of Buying," — to quote from the CR leaflet which is an essential part of its publicity literature, — summarizes previous findings regarding commodities and services. It lists several thousand products by brand name as Recommended, Intermediate, or Not Recommended. These listings are compiled under the direction of F. J. Schlink as technical director; and we are told and asked to believe that the information on which listings are based "comes from authoritative and impartial opinions of *governmental* and private experts, and from the testing and research work of CR's staff (about 50 persons in all) and over 200 scientific and technical consultants" — many of whom, especially those with Communistic leanings, "furnish most valuable services free of cost."

The combined service costs \$3 a year, Canada and abroad, \$3.50. It is open to anyone who signs the confidential agreement. The General Bulletin service consists of four of the monthly issues of the combined service, and is open to any individual, to libraries and other organizations, at the subscription price of \$1 a year; Canada and abroad, \$1.50.

Now notice this naive statement from CR's promotional circular:

"For the most part the General Bulletin is devoted to the discussion of economic and related questions of fundamental interest to consumers, such as the failure of the Bureau of Standards to release the results of its investigations to consumer-taxpayers, and the inadequate protection afforded by the Federal and State Food and Drug Administrations."

Here we have the Consumers' Research setting itself

up as teachers of its own brand of economics, with sly digs at the economic branches of a government which it is the ulterior purpose of Communists to subvert by every means within their power. When they cannot work in the open, they operate by boring from within and teach their disciples and dupes to adopt that plan. So we are not surprised, knowing the brush and color with which the CR is deeply tinted, to find that the CR bulletins, with their own particular theories of economics and government, are suggested for purchase by subscription by "teachers and students of the social sciences, who wish to keep abreast of the new knowledge of consumption-economics."

For the benefit of teachers and students who may be tempted by the CR propaganda to subscribe for its General Bulletin service — four pamphlets a year, — we may say that the Moscovite theories of economics expounded in the bulletins by the CR are several shades more radical and unsound than those condemned for their unsoundness and unconstitutionality by the United States Supreme Court in the cases of the defunct NRA and AAA, to which the CR often refers slightly.

There is one additional feature of Consumers' Research "service" to subscribers that is worth noting here, not because of its intrinsic value, which is highly problematical, but because it illustrates the fact that the CR, though organized "not for profit," refuses to give any extra service for nothing. Answers to inquiries for information must, as a rule, be paid for by the subscribers to the confidential "combined service." There is a special scale of fees for everything of the kind.

This point is made clear in the promotional circular as follows: "The answering of individual requests for information from subscribers to the confidential service is *not* a part of the service. Such requests may on occasion be answered at special fees listed in the 'Introduction to Consumers' Research' (free on request) when information is easily available and when it is of general

interest to consumers and not only to the individual requesting the information." And in the case of many ordinary business letters from subscribers, the latter are required to inclose return postage.

The CR is also at pains to explain to non-subscribers just what the term "confidential" means when applied to its handbook and monthly bulletins. The circular soliciting subscriptions says: "The term 'confidential' may be interpreted to include use of CR material by the members of the immediate family or household in which the subscriber lives, including servants who have no other home; but it does not include relatives or friends who reside at another address or who are visiting the subscriber's household temporarily. The use of CR material by any member of a household is subject to the same limitations as in the case of the subscriber who signed the application blank."

In other words, if a certain brand of toilet soap is listed by the CR as "Not Recommended," in one of the confidential bulletins, the subscriber may let his cook or chambermaid into the awful secret, but must not tell his daughter-in-law or niece about the soap, if she happens to reside in the next street.

What a farce the whole CR method and procedure would be if there were not an element of danger to business in its operations!

CHAPTER IX

THE PIFFLE OF "CR" LITERATURE

WE HAVE read all the books and pamphlets written and published by the Consumers' Research, Inc., and its promoters, and after doing so we felt as though we had waded through the Augean stables long before Hercules turned the River Alpheus through them. But publishers and critics are compelled to read whatever books or printed matter a foolish public makes a fad of reading, — and in this day of decadent literature and depraved taste the task is often an unpleasant one.

If a book is only bad enough, if it contains filth, a criticism of officials in power, of business, or of industry, it is sure to find a public demand. The books of the Consumers' Research authors sink below the usual level of insufferable stupidity. To the normal mind they are neither entertaining nor instructive. The printed lie is the work of the roundabout fool.

In Russia it is the Communists' policy to keep the masses in ignorance; but in America, where their followers can and do read, they are doing all in their power to poison people's minds through malicious books, — and there is no more poisonous thing than a bad book.

The books and bulletins issued by the propagandists of Consumers' Research, suggest that possibly they were ghost-written by the snake editor of the *Jungle Times*. There are about a half-dozen of the CR-sponsored books, bulking large in their verbosity and windiness, and each more economically unsound and containing more nauseating material than the previous effort. The man or woman who can read, pleasurably or profitably, two chapters at a time, without symptoms of nausea, must be of cast-iron constitution or have an inordinate appetite for erroneous philosophy and economics. Many of the passages in these books are too sickening in their

radicalism for even an intelligent tincan-eating billy-goat to devour.

"Comrade" F. J. Schlink himself, as presiding genius of Consumers' Research, is the chief perpetrator of the CR literature. He wields a tireless pen; and inasmuch as he is so free in charging the use of poisonous ingredients to the manufacturers or "processors" of food products, it is appropriate to describe his instrument of literary expression as a "poison pen."

But Schlink never forgets to be Communistic. He always has an eye on Russia and likes to furnish Moscow with material for exultation over the economic and government conditions in America. In the CR Bulletin for June, 1935, for instance, Editor-in-Chief Schlink included an article headed:

"AMERICAN CITY HAS ORDINANCE TO POISON INHABITANTS."

This absurd heading appeared prominently in the table of contents on the front page of the Bulletin. Its utter falsehood is of course, self-evident. No American city has or could have an ordinance for any such purpose. But consider for a moment how such a heading and a garbled translation of the article it captioned would cause delight when reproduced in Moscow, as an evidence of the utter degeneration of American municipal government under the "capitalistic" system! In this and other more or less insidious ways, Consumers' Research attests its allegiance to its Russian idols.

In his general condemnation of the foods on which the American people live and thrive and attain longevity, Schlink throws all discretion to the winds. He can see no good in anything we eat or drink, or take for a headache or to cure a cold. In this sense and in this sense alone he is perfectly impartial—he condemns everything, and would seemingly have us return to the diet and food habits of the "good old times" that our pioneer grandmothers recall with a shudder, when they recall the

discomforts and lack of domestic conveniences and cookery-aids from which they suffered.

But Comrade-Author Schlink is fond of talking about grandmother days and the products of grandmother cookery. He apotheosizes the family slaves of old, who spent most of their time in the kitchen, working up raw materials into edible dishes, with no convenient and wholesome canned or otherwise processed goods on their pantry shelves to lighten their labors. The delightful products of trained cooks and bakers that come to us today in such profusion, in convenient forms for immediate use, have no attraction for Schlink. Just as our grandmotherly forbears, in a nerve-wracking solitude of forest life, might fancy they saw an Indian lurking behind every tree, so "Comrade" Schlink, in his efforts to sow discontent and suspicion among American consumers, professes to see the threat of poison and other deleterious material in every can of food, every glass jar of preserves, every bottle of grape-juice or ketchup,—and a source of danger in every apple.

He is obsessed by but one idea—to make things appear worse than they are and to paint the good as evil. He goes to extremes and is continually overreaching himself, as when he warned consumers recently against the possible dangers of apple-eating. And for that ridiculous warning—one among innumerable instances of the kind, he was promptly called to account by an eminent authority.

Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the American Medical Association's *Journal*, speaking recently before the Women's Advertising Club of Chicago, referred to the need of defending the consumers against their own self-constituted defenders. He said:

"Much of the judgment passed by Consumers' Research is *absolutely without warrant*. For instance, it has had a great deal to say about the danger of eating apples, due to the lead and arsenic sprays used in their cultivation. Yet the fact is that there are few scientific records

indicating cases in which the doctor could definitely establish that a person had been poisoned by lead and arsenic on fruit.

“When this is pointed out to the Consumers’ Research, they reply that it is very ‘slow’ poison; that the day of reckoning will come in later years. How do they know this? What is the authority for their statements? The history of confirmed apple-eaters does not support this statement. The fact that not one instance is on record of the most inveterate apple-consumer being poisoned, would tend to indicate that the Consumers’ Research criticism is absolutely without foundation.”

The fact is that apple-eaters, as a rule, live to a ripe old age. It is rare indeed to find an octogenarian or nonogenarian who does not regard apples as a welcome part of his diet; and we all know that the proverb about an apple a day, known and followed the wide world over, has a sure basis in human experience all down through the ages, — ever since Eve was tempted and Adam fell at the sight of the delightful fruit, — forbidden solely as a test of human will-power and obedience to Divine command, with the result of advertising the delights of apple-eating to all future generations, without respect to right or wrong. Adam and Eve may indeed be regarded as the first advertisers of the fruit-growing industry which Schlink and his CR organization condemn in such wholesale, indiscriminate terms.

Like a true Communist, “Comrade” Schlink professes a poor opinion of the government and its scientists’ regard for the interests of the public. He stresses the importance of “the naive belief that a government run by business men temporarily turned into cabinet officers and bureau heads, selected by a business-minded and business-advised chief executive, with huge investments in big industries and no training or background in consumers’ rights or needs, will not conduct its scientific experiments and give its scientific advice in the interest of the general public rather than in the interest of more

profits and sales by food processors, brokers, and chain store merchants.

“With honest, consumer-minded government scientific bureaus, the harm of false ideas and misleading beliefs could have been confined, in their worst effects at least, to a limited group of illiterates or uneducable citizens, by the government’s issuing a continual stream of truthful and well-directed and forthrightly expressed counter-propaganda.”

There the Communist in Schlink crops out. He not only decries government efforts and suggests a new plan of bureaucratic management, but employs the favorite Communistic term, “counter-propaganda,” which is all right when the agitation is pro-Communist, but all wrong and immediately punishable when it is anti-Communist.

Then he goes on to impute base motives to the government, and to sneer at the “middle class,” as follows:

“With the government as well as private experts *sold out to business*, and quick to fall in line with its great need for pseudo-science in furtherance of the exploitation of consumers and the masses who toil for a subsistence or less than subsistence wage, the great middle class who get most of their intellectual fare from Good Housekeeping, the Cosmopolitan, Collier’s, and the Saturday Evening Post, the Chicago Tribune, the Philadelphia Bulletin, the Los Angeles Times, the Birmingham Press, and the rest of our commercial press, are snared in the trap of words and pictures that have directly and indirectly made for the substitution, on 20,000,000 home and restaurant tables, of baker’s bread chemically adulterated and even chemically flavored, for genuine homemade bread of fine flavor and savor; and canned corned beef with canned spinach, for a juicy steak with baked potatoes, baked squash, and fresh peas.”

So what must we do? What can we do about it? Suppose the family income does not run to “juicy steaks,” or the family equipment does not permit the preparation of such a meal as the racketeers of Consumers’ Research

seem to prefer, — what is the answer? Why, there are millions of consumers in America, Mr. Schlink, to whom a can of corned beef has furnished dinner for two successive days in recent years, and canned spinach on the side would have been a luxury with a dietary value of its own; and even when a family is in comfortable circumstances and well-equipped with kitchen facilities, the time and labor required for the preparation of the “genuine homemade bread” of which you prate cannot be devoted to that end. Besides which, a very slight acquaintance with farmers, Mr. Schlink, would show you that they prefer the baker’s bread which you condemn to the “homemade” product of their overworked wives. As a Chicago business man, brought up on an Eastern farm, said in discussing this question: “When I was a boy, baker’s bread used to taste to us like cake.”

* * *

F. J. Schlink’s latest book of captious criticism is devoted to the subject of food and allied products, under the title “Eat, Drink and Be Wary.” The well-known weekly magazine “Printer’s Ink,” of New York, published in December, 1935, a review of the book by T. Swann Harding, under the caption “Read and Be Weary,” while a subhead said: “In his new book, F. J. Schlink becomes excited about the food that we eat.”

Now “Printer’s Ink” is the able and influential representative of the publishers, advertisers, printing trades, and booksellers of America; and soon after Consumers’ Research began its career as a voluntary and unwanted critic of products and producers, including books of all kinds in its field of criticism, “Printer’s Ink” recognized the fallacy of its pretensions and the true character of its promoters, especially that of the man Schlink, who is the head and front of CR offending. And at various times, as we shall see, the editors of “Printer’s Ink” have severely castigated the management and methods of CR and exposed the weakness or worthlessness of its “literature.”

In his review, "Read and Be Weary," of Schlink's book, Mr. Harding shows that in 1820, Frederick Accum, a British chemist, published a work on the adulteration of food and "culinary poisons," to show that the common foods of the day were unclean and were killing the populace; and that previously, in the year 1770, Smollett, the English novelist who was also a surgeon, in one of his books ("Humphrey Clinker") described the drinking-water of his day in London as laden with all manner of deleterious matter and filth.

"In the year 1935," says the reviewer, "the engineer, Frederick J. Schlink has published his book, 'Eat, Drink and Be Wary,' designed to show that modern processed foods reek with filth, poison, and corruption, and are killing the populace of the United States. This he attributes to recent refinements in food manufacture, for he holds that the good old traditional diet of a century ago was above reproach.

"Schlink also writes of our drinking water as chlorinated, coppered, phenolized, and manganated, and otherwise contaminated with strange and poisonous chemicals, so that even the incomparably refreshing and palatable qualities of pure water from the well or spring are forgotten."

Similarly with bread: In 1770, Smollett described the bread of London as "a deleterious paste mixed up with chalk, alum, and bone-ashes, insipid to the taste and destructive to the constitution." It was white, said Smollett, because foolish folk demanded whiteness in flour, and thus paid others to ruin their health and "compelled bakers and millers to poison them."

"In 1935, F. J. Schlink writes of the white bread that is so inferior, but 'which glorifies the great American wheat-spoiling industry that mills chemically bleached white flour and sells it mainly to bakers, who chemicalize it still more with yeast foods, chemical flavor reinforcers, butter substitutes, nut substitutes, egg substitutes, milk

substitutes, and even, incredibly, yeast substitutes and flour substitutes.'

"Nevertheless," says Mr. Harding, "the human race has survived all these alimentary catastrophes. Things are never as bad as the Jeremiahs, calamity-howlers, and poison phobiacs believe and assert them to be. A little knowledge is a dangerous thing, though much learning may also make one mad."

In his book "Doctor" Schlink, as "Printer's Ink" sarcastically calls the president of CR, ruthlessly attacks advertisers, food processors, advocates of milk, home economists, scientific experts in nutrition, raw foods and their advocates, and the commercial bakers. All is wrong with these modern classes of the civilized community, while Schlink is in favor of the traditional diet of a century ago (ask Grandma and see what Accum and Smollett say) of raw milk, diets to prevent colds and tooth decay, diets eaten by primitive man, tomcats, and robins. Also, and enthusiastically, Schlink, of course, is in favor of his own Consumers' Research.

"Broadly speaking," says Mr. Harding, "Schlink impresses the reader as an almost pathologically frightened man of ill-assorted and poorly digested erudition, who lacks the specialized knowledge that could alone properly equip him to write intelligently on the subject of human nutrition. Schlink is violently agitated over too many things that simply are not so."

Incidentally, Schlink has shifted his attack from food and drug officials to home economists. He refers to "spoiled" salmon so reconditioned that it can later be foisted on the public. But he seems to understand the word "recondition" to mean sorting the good from the rotten salmon. However, he now has great animosity against the Bureau of Home Economics in general, and nutrition workers in particular.

In general, says the "Printer's Ink" reviewer, "Dr." Schlink displays an inadequate grasp of scientific procedures in nutrition investigation. His attack on raw

food, for example, is like so much else in the book, "a blanket, prejudiced indictment built up by quoting one set of authorities and ignoring another set that think differently." The consensus of scientific opinion is that we do need a certain amount of raw foods; and we may mention that when the present author was at the Mayo Brothers' clinic in Rochester, Minn., for observation and treatment not long ago, he learned that the eminent scientists of that institution advocate the use of a modicum of raw foods and roughage in the diet, — and they are recognized authorities whose dicta cannot easily or safely be gainsaid.

Yes, Schlink does indeed "deliberately turn his back on scientific nutrition investigation." He will have none of it, for as Mr. Harding says, he believes it, or professes to believe it, to be ignorant, or bought by the trade, or both. That obsession runs through all his censorious comments and reflections on food products. He quotes only the opinions of those with whom he agrees and ignores the other side. He follows the procedure of quoting, in support of his assertions, one scientist or one scientific school of thought, ignoring other work quite as respectable, and he frequently states a flat opinion where no such conclusion is justified.

This type of bias occurs on almost every page of the Schlink book, "Eat, Drink and Be Wary," and without it no such sensational case against our common foods could be made out.

In concluding his review, Mr. Harding asks a pertinent question, considering Schlink's wholesale condemnation of the popular present-day foods:

"If both white bread and bran are poison, what shall we eat? If we must have Vitamin D, fresh vegetables, and water free from dangerous bacteria — but all these come to us laden with dire poisons, what shall we do to be saved?"

"Dr." Schlink's answer appears in the foreword of his book and on a later page, where the dietary habits of

primitive man are recommended; on certain other pages where Grandma's laborious cookery in crude utensils and the good old traditional diet of former days are recommended; and on another page "where the tomcat appears, daintily picking just the right kind of food out of some garbage-can."

Which will be sufficient to say, for the present, about "Comrade" Schlink's latest book, which is typical of all his writings on American products, including the biased bulletins, handbooks, etc., of Consumers' Research. The spirit and motive of his authorship will be more clearly understood if his Communist affiliations are borne in mind.

CHAPTER X

A STRIKE AMONG STRIKE-INSTIGATORS

IN gangster rackets, dissensions soon occur as a rule, and dissension has usually in the past had more or less fatal results. The gang dissenter or trouble-maker is "taken for a ride," and mystery veils the manner of his end. Sometimes, however, when Communist racketeers quarrel, — in this country, at least, — the feud may result in the organization of another racket. That is what has already happened in the case of "Consumers' Research, Inc." For not all Communists are murderous, — some are merely mercenary!

While still but a young concern, with a few radical employees, the CR organization recently passed through the throes of a humiliating strike. It appears that some of the originators of the blacklisting scheme were being underpaid by the more powerful element, and responded by the only method known to the radical mind, namely, the strike, with the intention of either gaining control of the business or killing it.

But these minority leaders have yet to learn that the only way to kill a snake is to cut its head off. And President Schlink, co-author of "Your Money's Worth" and other spasms of anti-business literature, is still in control of the Washington, N. J., poison-pen headquarters.

We are advised, however, that the strikers against the mercenary rule of F. J. Schlink *et al.* have settled the trouble by organizing a new CR "Consumers' Racket" of their own, and are now competing with their former associates for the consumers' dollars.

It may be presumed, from these premises, that other strikes will occur, as it is charged that the leaders in this, as in other rackets, take the major part — the lion's share — of the income for themselves, leaving a minimum for their minor associates and the actual workers. Therefore,

in time, unless effectually stopped by public indignation, Consumers' Researches will be as plentiful throughout the land as gangster rackets were in the days of the Eighteenth Amendment.

* * *

"The 'Consumers' Racket" is the title of an article published March 4, 1936, in a weekly news-letter called "Items of Interest," which is the organ of the patriotic society, the American Vigilant Intelligence Federation. This Chicago society is the oldest continuous auto-subversive organization in the United States, operating under the slogan, "America for Americans," with strict Constitutionalism and a square deal for employer and employee, — a declaration of principles to which every true American can cheerfully subscribe.

The article, "The 'Consumers' Racket" furnishes some pertinent facts regarding the "Consumers' Research" of Washington, N. J., and the recent strike within its ranks. We learn from it that when the late Florence Kelley (Wischnewetsky) founded the National Consumers' League in 1916, she opened up a rich "lead" of financial support to her fellow-Socialists. Through her so-called "white lists," intended to blacklist firms not conforming to her program of labor-regimentation, "she wielded a powerful club that brought in juicy revenues while disseminating Marxian doctrines."

At the time of her death in 1932, we are told, Florence Kelley had among her active co-workers in the NCL several persons, men and women, of social prominence, among others of left-wing (red) complexion. The possibilities of the situation were recognized by other radicals, and in 1927, the "Consumers' Club," organized, as we have already said, by Stuart Chase and F. J. Schlink, enabled these authors of "Your Money's Worth" to "muscle in," and the Consumers' Club was expanded into Consumers' Research, Inc.

Chase was the first president and Schlink "technical director." On their Committee of Sponsors were to be

found the names of a wide range of subversive doctrinaires, "making Consumers' Research the clearing-house for many dubious activities."

For a \$2 fee, says the article in "Items of Interest," any consumer could become a member, and was entitled to advice on such subjects as "What toothpastes should be avoided because they are harmful to the teeth?" and "Do I need a sunlight lamp or 'ultra-violet' window-glass?"

It seemed as though the "Research" was destined to go on forever, raking in the two-case notes of the faithful and the curious, says the patriotic writer in "Items of Interest." And then an unparalleled thing occurred, — a strike among the instigators of strikes! Perhaps this might be called "poetic justice," but we may crudely attribute it to a desire by the "researchers" for a wider division of the spoils by the executives.

Then a new organization, formed by the strikers, sprang into the breach. In other words, instead of one Consumers' Research, we now have two rackets of the same type, with the selfsame object, the fooling of consumers at the expense of manufacturers. The new organization is called the "Consumers' Union of the United States, Inc.," and, according to our informant, has its headquarters in Room 1435, 22 E. 17th St., New York City. (Note that this headquarters is a single room on a side street. Where the necessary laboratories, if any, of these country-wide "researchers" are located, deponent knoweth not.)

The new Consumers' Union had a full-page advertisement in "The New Republic" of March 4 last (1936), which gives the following information:

"Originally formed to attempt a fair settlement of the strike at Consumers' Research, the Association (a body of Consumers' Research subscribers) turned its attention to a new organization when it became clear that there was no hope of bringing about its original purposes through appeal to the directors of Consumers' Research. . . The strike emphasized the need for a pro-labor consumer

organization, functioning on a broad social base, democratically controlled, and serving especially the worker, the low-salaried employee, and the housewife.

"For over a month" —the New Republic ad continues — "a staff of fourteen former CR strikers, experts in their fields, have been at work conducting and supervising technical research and preparing material for the first of Consumers' Union publications."

So now business is threatened with another flood of handbooks and bulletins on manufactured products and business services, coming fresh from the muddled mentalities of the fourteen Schlink-trained CR strikers, huddled in "Room 1425" under the high-sounding title of the Consumers' Union — of the United States, don't forget. What a spectacle for American business men to consider. Fourteen former CR strikers taking a leaf out of Comrade Schlink's book and setting themselves up as rival censors of the whole field of American manufacturing industry and business!

And the "CU," we are told, is just a little more Communistic in its makeup than the Red "CR." For the American Vigilant Intelligence Federation says it is of great importance to note "the personalities who are behind this Consumer *swing to the left*," — to a deeper-dyed radicalism. The president of the newborn body of censors is Colston E. Warne, a professor of economics who was released from the University of Pittsburgh for radicalism and was conductor of a Russian tour in 1933 under the auspices of the notorious L. I. D. (League for Industrial Democracy).

Among the directors of the CU are Heywood Broun, the radical writer and speaker who resigned from the Socialist party because it was too pink for him; Rose Schneidermann, known Communist sympathizer who has been called "the Red Rose of Anarchy," and A. Philip Randolph, negro agitator who is listed with the others mentioned above in the Who's Who of Radicalism. Arthur Kallet, one of Schlink's former authors of CR

literature (co-author of "One Hundred Million Guinea Pigs") and leader of the strikers, is the director of the Consumers' Union, with Dewey H. Palmer, former treasurer of the CR, as "technical supervisor" of the new and equally malodorous outfit.

* * *

"Printers' Ink," the veracious New York weekly, organ of the publishing and printing trades, has long been in controversy with F. J. Schlink and his CR enterprise, and naturally took a great deal of interest in the strike of CR employees, as did a few Radical publications that could not understand at all why such a great and altruistic concern as Consumers' Research should have a strike on its hands. From the pages of successive issues of "Printers' Ink" we learn the following additional and interesting particulars regarding the dispute.

It seems that the cause of this white-collar strike was the refusal of the CR board of directors to reinstate three men, — John Heasty, president of the CR employees union, John Kilpatrick, and Donald Rogers, — who say they were discharged on August 24, 1935, because they asked for recognition of the union, which was an auxiliary of the Bookkeepers', Stenographers', and Accountants' Union.

Forty-one employees of the CR went on strike on Wednesday morning, September 4. They insisted that the three men be reinstated, that the union be recognized, that an agreement be signed giving reasonable security to employees, that the existing six-months probationary period of employment be abandoned, that a minimum salary of \$15 a week for all CR workers be granted, and that Dewey H. Palmer, treasurer, and Arthur Kallet, secretary, be restored to office, — these two officers having been ousted for their sympathy with the strike. Mr. Kallet was a member of the board of directors until the fall of 1934 when he was removed, his place on the board going to M. C. Phillips, the wife of President F. J. Schlink.

There were seventy-two persons on the staff, including kitchen help, when the strike started. Schlink and his board refused to meet the terms of the strikers, and there was the usual picketing and some violence, which caused concern to the peaceful villagers of Washington, N. J., one mile and a half from the site of the CR plant. The first real excitement came one night when about 300 strike sympathizers rushed out from Washington village to the plant at "Beardstown," when they heard that an attempt was to be made to reopen it. Schlink was inside, but refused to see a committee of the strikers. Some windows were broken, but the crowd dispersed after learning that there were only two men inside, leaving pickets to watch the plant all night.

For some time after the strike started, President Schlink refused to make any statement of the Consumers' Research attitude; but finally he issued a printed statement in which he said: "The present board of directors will no more tolerate the surrender of the control of Consumers' Research, Inc., to *the political group which is now leading the union* than it would hand the organization over to a group of manufacturers and advertisers. It would be equally dangerous and destructive to the ideals and integrity of Consumers' Research to do either."

(Always, at every possible opportunity, the animus of Comrade Schlink toward "manufacturers and advertisers" crops out when he takes his poison pen in hand.)

But the strikers and their friends, according to a special correspondent of Printers' Ink, have also said some interesting things about the present management of Consumers' Research. For instance, a statement published in the Washington, N. J., Star ("America's greatest country weekly") said in part:

"The contracts of all employees of Consumers' Research contain the provision that the technical director (F. J. Schlink) is empowered to issue discharges at any time he wishes, inside six months' employment,

without giving either notice or reason. This privilege to discharge at will has been exercised so liberally by the director that the number of CR employees who have left during the last two years now exceeds the present staff of seventy. It was to reduce these unwarranted discharges and obtain a fairer labor policy that the union was formed.

"The lowest salary category at CR is now \$13.13 per week. The wages paid in the lowest brackets for the two days worked before the strike (September 2 and 3) did not exceed the regular minimum.

"CR describes itself as a non-profit organization, yet Mr. and Mrs. Schlink receive from it an income of over \$11,000 a year, while according to their own admission, a fifth of their employees receive less than \$15 a week. J. B. Matthews (vice-president and assistant treasurer) receives \$5,000 a year."

When the Printers' Ink correspondent drove down the little country road past the CR plant later in September, there was a group of guards outside the building; but they had not taken down a large sign which bore the words, "*Only Rats Work Here.*"

The forty-one striking CR employees held a meeting in New York when the strike had been in progress for two weeks, and the gathering was attended by several hundred people, including CR subscribers, former CR employees, representatives of various unions, and a sprinkling of the general public. The gist of the opinions expressed was that "the CR must be saved from Schlink" — while Schlink, on the other hand, was quoted by some of the speakers as saying that he would never yield to the newly-formed union; that before doing so he would close up shop and junk Consumers' Research, with all that it is and all that it hopes to be — which eventuality, by the way, would be a mighty good thing for American business, a consummation devoutly to be wished!

"Thus," said a report of the meeting, "there is unfolded the rather remarkable spectacle of an organization dedi-

cated to the high and holy purpose of saving the consumer from the evil consequences of what the meeting delicately termed 'the advertising racket' — and at the same time coming to death grips with organized labor, with no quarter offered or expected."

The principal addresses at the New York meeting were made by Arthur J. Kallet, former secretary of CR, and Dewey H. Palmer, former treasurer. Here is, in effect, what Kallet said of his former associate and co-author, — according to one present at the meeting:

"Schlink was my friend. We wrote a book together. He is my friend no longer, because of his attitude toward these employees."

Regarding the attitude of Consumers' Research (that is, Schlink's attitude, for the CR is Schlink and Schlink is the CR) Arthur Kallet said:

"Schlink goes to great extremes to learn the truth about the goods on which he reports to his subscribers. But the fine balance (?) he displays as to products is lacking in his dealing with human beings.

"I cannot understand this situation," continued the former CR secretary and director. "They seem to be in a *state of temporary aberration* out there in Washington, New Jersey. Maybe the success of Schlink and his wife has gone to their heads and they want to be dictators of America. Now he has police out there fighting workers!"

The spirit of the meeting, as summed up by an independent observer, seemed to be about as follows: "The CR is a fine thing (for the promoters), and as a consumer organization it has a mission (to pay salaries). And inasmuch as its leading officers seem to be doing their best to destroy it (killing the goose that lays the golden eggs), it is certainly worth something to us to try to save that situation."

Yes, it was a comparatively "easy" racket, with possibilities too alluring to surrender; and so in the end the strikers solved their problem by organizing a competing

concern, as we have seen, and Arthur Kallet and D. H. Palmer became the heads of the new "Consumers' Union, Inc." and proceeded to set up a new headquarters for poison pens in New York,—shaking the dust of Washington and Beardstown, N. J., from their feet. They were joined by a dozen of the CR strikers, including some of the \$15-a-week variety no doubt; and as "expert researchers" they are now prepared to compete with Schlink's CR in censoring the whole field of American business and telling consumers what they should and should not buy!

With reference to the Association of CR subscribers, mentioned in this chapter as in sympathy with the strikers against Schlink's rule, *Printers' Ink* said in its issue of September 26, 1935: "Last Sunday fifty subscribers of Consumers' Research, Inc., journeyed from New York to CR's home town in Jersey, determined to conciliate the strike of CR workers,— a strike that for a number of dogged, but not necessarily inarticulate days, has been crimping CR's consumer-saving.

"The peacemakers contacted one director, who said he was willing to arbitrate, but couldn't speak for the other directors, including F. J. Schlink, consumer-saver-in-chief, none of whom could be reached . . . Thwarted only temporarily, the visiting subscribers revealed that, to the end of settling the strike, by Jove, they'd organize a special league," as they did.

And so, the New York magazine commented, "the spectacle of consumers banding militantly to save their saviors, somehow brings to mind the question in an old song: Who takes care of the caretaker's daughter when the caretaker's busy taking care?"

That is a question that must be answered, each for himself, by the subscribers who have been misled into supporting the CR or any other "consumer" racket that impeaches the general honesty and integrity of American manufacturers and business men.

CHAPTER XI

A BOOK THAT REEKS OF RADICALISM

IN VIEW of the wholesale attacks by Consumers' Research, Inc., upon the business interests of America, especially upon the honest intent of manufacturers, the truthfulness of advertisers, and the integrity of the average business man, sporadic attempts have been made to controvert the claims and expose the fallacies of the CR writers, including F. J. Schlink, Arthur Kallet and Stuart Chase.

Only a few of these would-be defenders of the American system of manufacture and distribution have gone to the root of the matter; hardly any have had the clear-sightedness, factual knowledge, and courage of the New York magazine editors quoted in the previous chapter,—who stigmatized Schlink *et al.* as economic quacks, deep-dyed with offensive radicalism, and having the ulterior objects of the militant Communist at heart.

Some of the defenders of business have strayed from their subject in order to exploit economic theories and panaceas of their own, as in an instance to which we shall presently refer; and consequently their attempts to "set American business right with the people" have either fallen flat or failed utterly in their purpose.

Our belief is that the manufacturers and business men of this country have a good and valid defense against all their detractors; that they rank as high as any intellectual class in honesty, integrity and achievement for the common good; that they are, as a class, entitled to the confidence of the public and the loyal support of the consumer; and that there is no good end to be served by wholesale criticism and censorship of manufactured products and business services by unofficial individuals or organizations such as Consumers' Research and the

newborn Consumers' Union; while on the other hand, such criticism, when it runs riot in the operations of radical-minded individuals like Schlink and his disciples, is calculated to have a reactionary effect upon American progress and to retard the business recovery which is the present object of our government and people.

In 1935 a book was published which purported to be a defense of our manufacturers and business men against the diatribes of "Consumers' Research." The author of the book, Walter B. Pitkin, a university professor, has a reputation as a ready writer. But his facile pen ran away with him—or maybe it was his portable typewriter, and after getting started on the defense job, he seems to have forgotten what he was writing about, and soon lapsed into rather wild prophecies of what was going to happen in our midst "within two years," followed by a lot of extraordinary advice on the "sadly neglected art of getting what we want." In the end, the professor's book was just about as severe and radical a criticism of the business structure as any of the Consumers' Research books yet printed.

It is true that in spots, the professor made an effort to justify the ostensible object and advance advertising of his book,—that it was to be a scathing expose of the Consumers' Research racket,—but so many university professors have apparently gone Communistic, it seemed to be difficult for this educator to write anything but radical material, and we cannot but consider his book as akin to the "CR" literature in its propagandism of Communist ideas. As examples of the professor's thoughts, ideas, and expressions, we invite the attention of the reader to the following:

A radical can see a crisis coming whenever the economic sky is overcast, and so our professor-author prefaces his book with a warning that "the crisis draws near." Not merely *a* crisis, but *the* crisis! And we are told that it may "break like a hurricane," within two years at the

very outside. This crisis is to be in the nature of an "uprising" by the needy to get what they want — food, clothing, health, and shelter.

One year has already passed, of the two allotted by the professor for the uprising, and as no portent of any such thing has yet appeared upon the horizon, save in the radical mind, it may be that he is a false prophet of evil. It will not come, he assures us, as a Red campaign, not as a Socialist Party movement, but out of general discontent created by social and political agitators like Dr. Townsend, with his "old-age dream;" Father Coughlin, with his panaceas for social reform, and the Huey Longs of the political arena.

The professor speaks of the desperation of the "common folks," as the ordinary man "sinks deeper and deeper into slumdom, and visualizes the movement of a sound, solid wave of indignant men and women, organized to *force* a slow government to give them what they want." Then, in turbulent vein, he says:

"Two out of every three people are too weak, too vague, or too yellow to join such a movement. But the remaining third is more likely to go to the opposite extreme of violence, once it is aroused. It is, alas, the American habit to dilly-dally, to shirk, and to muddle along until things grow unbearable — and then to burn, slay, hang, and loot. The Goddess of Liberty marches at the head of a lynching mob."

Common sense gives the lie to the statements in the paragraphs just quoted. Whence does the professor derive the notion that it is the American habit to muddle along for a while and then to "burn, slay, hang, and loot"? Does he not understand the anti-revolutionary nature of his fellow-countrymen,— their genius for slow, steady, law-abiding progress and their pride in their traditions of industrial and political freedom? Or has radicalism blinded him to the true character and psychology of the American people, as the Germans were

blind to the psychology of the British and American nations when they started the Great War?

We repeat, Professor, that the spirit of the American people is anti-revolutionary, and that neither you nor the Consumers' Research can stir up a revolution against American manufacturers and business men by appeals to class prejudice, even in a time of widespread unemployment and distress. You are barking up the wrong tree when you advocate an "uprising" with violence, and charge even one-third of our people with a desire or disposition to "burn, slay, hang, and loot." And you are playing with dangerous weapons, Professor, when you use a poison-pen, like that of Consumers' Research, to foment class hatred and general discontent. The man who talks of violent uprising to the American people is a public enemy.

The professor has for the past several years been a well paid word-slinger. Perhaps his success, and his hurry, has developed in him a general disregard for facts, at least his book would tend to give that impression.

The professor raves about things of which he apparently knows nothing. Thus in the second chapter of his book he tells us that there are three distinct Americas, each a separate economic society with its own aims and methods. One of these he calls Anti-Capitalist America, and this, he says, is our *criminal* society, including "four or five million adults — perhaps more." Then he continues:

"Nobody can make more than a guess at the number of citizens who live by cheating, by chiseling in on legitimate business, by getting something for nothing through shady means or foul. Our criminal class is more highly organized than any other, more powerful, and about as prosperous as ever, despite bad business. Anti-Capitalist America nets its members billions yearly, and costs all Americans a cool twelve to fifteen billion dollars annually."

Did you ever read such rot?

There are hundreds of thousands of honest men in this country who are anti-capitalists; men who have never "cheated" or "chiseled" anyone out of a dollar in their lives. There are many radicals and Socialists in this country who are as honest as university professors. To brand as criminals all men who are opposed to capitalism is absurd. Capitalists themselves would quickly refute such an implication, for they realize as well as anybody that there are weaknesses in the capitalist system that are open to honest criticism and that many of their critics are honest and sincere in their convictions, though the fact is that America has prospered under that system as no country on earth ever prospered before.

We were under the impression that the Consumers' Research writers had reached the depths of degradation in describing the quality and condition of the foods that are served to us, without complaint, in public places. But if you wish to be nauseated more thoroughly with allegations about the manner in which food is handled, you will find sickening material in the professor's book, which is entitled "Let's Get What We Want." He says, for instance:

"Many a time I have made careful observations of soda fountain clerks, cooks in ordinary low-priced restaurants, and waiters in cheap hotels and boarding-houses: and I cannot bring myself to put on paper some of the things seen, though I could give affidavit as to their occurrence."

Then the professor throws reserve to the winds and goes on to say: "I can take you to expensive bakeries where flies crawl all over the high-priced pies and cakes. To seemingly swanky restaurants where food dropped on the nasty floor is picked up, swabbed off with a towel and replaced on the platter, which is then borne out to the innocent diner. I have seen meat scraps picked out of garbage-cans and tossed into soup kettles. I have

seen dead insects scooped off the top of milk which is promptly served to customers on the other side of a partition." And yet the professor professes to have a poor opinion of muckrakers!

On another page, turning like the Consumers' Research writers to denunciation of advertisers, the professor says: "The copy writer has done more harm to American producers than all the Communists and Socialists and Fascists who have ever invaded or ever will invade our shores. I despise liars and fools. All menace civilization and must be run to earth."

In view of the generally high-class character of business advertising today, especially the advertising of Big Business, such charges against the men who prepare advertising copy for our newspapers and magazines are absolutely uncalled-for and ridiculous in the extreme. The average copy writer seeks, of course, to make out a good case for the product whose sales he is promoting; but his aim is to tell the truth and to tell it simply and wisely. Thus, to call him or to imply that he is a liar and a fool simply recoils upon the head of the person who does so. The copy writer would be a fool if he did not tell the truth in advertising. The modern advertising agency has no use for either liars or fools; and there are university professors who would probably find it mighty hard to get a job with an agency.

Later in his book our professor-author takes a shot at the purveyors of building material, as follows:

"Of all the big industries, the retail building material makers get away with bigger and better murders than any others. Fraud is dangerously easy in lumber, brick, plaster, and plumbing, and so the industries swarm with crooks big and crooks little. One of the tricks of the lumber gang is to give estimates of lumber-costs without specifying the grades."

It would seem, however, that the professor rather encourages the purveyors of deleterious fruits and foods.

He says: "I prefer rotten bananas. The blacker and slimier, the better for me. I also prefer spoiled milk to sweet; not sour,—I mean milk which has undergone a chemical change from standing in a warm place. Call it sour if you like.

"I prefer spoiled cheese too, and few friends linger at my elbow as I eat Camembert that has turned tan through and through. I prefer cantaloup, one end of which has rotted past all eating. And of course honeydew melon is worthless unless decay has set in."

As a panacea for some of the ills he complains of, the professor suggests the appointment of a "Board of Consumer Inquiry," by whom we cannot say. Then he goes on: "One of the most important functions of your Board of Consumer Inquiry would be to drive out of business all the lying advertisers and sub-standard copy writers who injure consumers vastly more than almost any decent producers, though not so much as the sub-standard distributors. The common brand of advertising agent and copy writer is more of a menace than any of the products he ballyhoos. I would kick out every publicity-hound who was caught in even a white lie."

In answer to that wild and libelous attack upon advertisers, distributors, and the professor's favorite bogeyman, the advertising agency copy-writer, it need only be said that, as business men, American manufacturers, advertisers, and distributors must and do understand that it is necessary for their products and the goods they sell to "stand up" and bear the test of consumer-use. Goods that are widely advertised must be just as good value as they are represented to be, or the advertiser will soon have to take the inevitable consequences of misrepresentation, which the consumer is not slow to discover.

"Once bit, twice shy," applies to manufacturers and advertisers as well as to the novice in any enterprise and to the puppy who investigates a hot stove for the first

time. When a manufacturer finds that a product fails to come up to the standard of quality or service that he expects, the necessary changes in material or technology are made as promptly as possible, for the promotion of a poor product shows a lack of business sense.

In recent years we have seen a great automobile manufacturer immediately withdraw from the market thousands of cars of a new and widely-heralded model when technical defects of design were discovered — although a whole season's sales were lost and the manufacturer was seriously handicapped thereby in the competitive race for public favor. But he had a reputation to maintain,— a reputation for giving the public the best value possible for its money,— and so the costly sacrifice of an imperfect product was made to retain goodwill. Such sacrifices are not uncommon in the manufacturing industry, for no sensible manufacturer will knowingly or willingly sponsor a product that it not worth its price. One bad lot of goods, one misrepresented can or jar of food products, will go far to ruin the reputation of the producer; and this our manufacturers and advertisers know, although the professor does not give them credit for realization of the fact — or for ordinary common sense.

The business of the manufacturer depends upon public acceptance of his goods,— upon the good will of the consumer. That fact affords protection to the consumer in the case of goods carrying a definite name or brand. If the goods are not as advertised, the consumer need never buy that brand again. Who is the ultimate loser?

We have almost done with the professor and his 1935 book, but cannot ignore the following statement in one of his final chapters: "You cannot hope to conquer the million or more criminals who cheat the public in shelter, in health commodities, and in foods. They work in the dark. They have immense funds. They are cleverly organized. So the best you can do is to prevent them from cheating you and your kind"; but, he goes on, "be-

ware of approaching the national trade associations, for these swarm with underworld characters."

It is pitiable indeed to find a public educator, with university affiliations, so completely obsessed with the idea that the men and organizations that carry on the business of America must be regarded with suspicion as dishonest, lacking in principle and linked with "underworld characters." Such charges carry their own condemnation and refutation when considered by any intelligent person of unbiased mind.

Like many of the New Deal professors and "brain-trusters," the author of the 1935 book suggests, as one of his conclusions, that "consumer laboratories" be established in the various "progressive" universities, to test the fish, butter, stockings, and aspirin tablets brought to them by consumers. These laboratories would be under the strict control of scientists, he claims, and not like the "feeble and often hypocritical 'institutes' operated by newspapers and magazines in quest of fat advertising contracts." Thus in his wildly accusative fashion, suspecting everything and everybody concerned in supplying the people's wants, the professor laughs off the able and conscientious efforts of our great family magazines and other worthy agencies to educate the public as to the means and methods of right living and the successful pursuit of happiness.

The mental attitude of the professor may be judged from this final excerpt from his book: "If we lived in a decent country you wouldn't have to lift a finger in order to protect yourselves against the evils of clothing, food, and drugs, and schemers who sell trashy lumber, rotten bricks, fake silk, and spoiled fish. But *you live in a chaos*, not a civilization. Every street houses scores of criminals. Every trade is plagued with the vermin."

And the professor started out to defend American business against the wholesale criticism and condemnation of "Consumers' Research." As a wielder of the

poison-pen, he out-Schlinks "Comrade" F. J. Schlink; and as a breeder of dangerous discontent his book is merely another contribution to the ultra-radical literature that nauseates the patriotic American.

* * *

Another book of a very different type may be referred to briefly here. Soon after the appearance of the volume "Your Money's Worth," the introductory prayer book of the Consumers' Research racket (Schlink and Kallet co-authors), a Philadelphia business man, Charles E. Carpenter, wrote in reply a book which he called "Dollars and Sense," which had a wide circulation.

In the introduction to his work, Mr. Carpenter said that he had been at pains to learn something about the personalities and business experience of the authors of "Your Money's Worth," "which made a mild sensation by outrageously maligning business and grossly libelling business men." He discovered that neither Schlink nor Kallet "had ever faced a payroll." One was a physicist and the other an accountant.

Then, having himself all the necessary qualifications to write authoritatively of business and business men, after forty-six years' experience, Mr. Carpenter decided to reply to the radical writers, and made a good job of answering their criticisms of American manufacturers and advertisers. He hit the right nail on the head when he declared that "Your Money's Worth" was basically Communistic propaganda. He showed that in its advocacy of universal standardization, for instance, the authors of that book, intentionally or not, played into the hands of the Third Internationale, the governing body of Communism, which encourages the teaching of this doctrine everywhere.

"We know," said Mr. Carpenter, "that it is the policy of the Third Internationale to teach its doctrines and carry on its propaganda surreptitiously in America; and

its identity is seldom disclosed when it is back of any book or movement." As we have clearly shown that at least one of the authors of "Your Money's Worth" is closely allied with the Communist activities in America, our allegation of the ulterior object of Consumers' Research literature is confirmed by the findings of Mr. Carpenter.

"Dollars and Sense" brings a mass of evidence to disprove the charges of Schlink and Kallet that all advertising is made up largely of false and misleading statements, that commodity brands are for the most part swindles, and that the consuming public is made up of "nincompoops" or "100,000,000 Guinea Pigs," who buy merely because of advertising and high-powered salesmanship.

Disproving the Consumers' Research claims and charges by facts rather than theories, Mr. Carpenter shows the consumer that the policies advocated in "Your Money's Worth" are impractical, and that the very practices condemned by the CR authors may be followed, for the most part, by the purchasing public with the assurance of profit on its purchases of manufactured goods and business services.

"The very title of 'Your Money's Worth' indicates an erroneous idea of economic purchasing," says Mr. Carpenter. "All purchases should be advantageous to the buyer and the seller alike, and therefore mutually profitable." The Consumers' Research writers seem saturated with the theory that when a purchase is made the seller reaps a profit, but the buyer takes a loss. But that, says the author of "Dollars and Sense," is not the principle upon which modern commerce is conducted, and no real student of business would make any such claim. Whenever you make a purchase, you want to receive that which is worth to you personally more than the amount which you pay, and unless it is, you should make no

purchase. No one is compelled to buy any commodity unless he needs that commodity."

As a defense of American business and the business man, Mr. Carpenter's book is worth a hundred such effusions as that of the university professor referred to earlier in this chapter. As an exposition of sound business principles and economic sense, it shows the utter fallacy of Consumers' Research theories and pretensions, and the misleading nature of Schlink and Kallet's attempts to align the American consumer behind the Communist banner of "standardization" and slavery.

CHAPTER XII

THE NONSENSE OF "CR" FOOD CRITICISM

“CONSUMERS' Research” is particularly unhappy about the foods we buy and eat, and is never so hypercritical as when its writers describe the sins of food-producers and the ills that follow purchase of their products. If we were to believe all, or even part, of what Schlink and his associates, including some of those who went on strike recently, tell us about the common things we eat and drink, we should never be able to sit down at table without a shudder of apprehension, much less enjoy our meals in comfort, as we generally do.

Among the reports, “confidential” and otherwise, given out to “CR” subscribers in books and bulletins, are many which would indicate that we are poisoned to death by the hundreds, through partaking unconsciously of “poisoned” foods. This, if true, is a serious matter, sufficiently serious to rivet public attention and demand official inquiry,—but what are the facts?

The most pertinent fact is that of 100,000 people who pass away in this country of ours in a year, at least 999 out of every 1,000 die of causes that have no connection whatever with foodstuffs. This clearly refutes the CR claim that we are being poisoned; but these professional food-critics make a further claim—that human life in America is shortened by at least five years by reason of the poisonous content of our common foods. It is inconceivable, in view of the facts, how they can possibly reach such a conclusion, which is not merely unsupported by the vital statistics, but directly opposite to the fact of life prolongation in recent decades.

When the CR claim that the public health is shattered and life shortened by “poisoned” foods was laid before the director of New York City's health department, he

answered emphatically, "No, it is not so! There is no evidence to support any such statement," — and he cited statistics to prove his contention. The officers and statisticians of two of our largest life insurance companies say that possibly the mortality from food poisoning in cities of 200,000, might be one a year out of the entire population.

There are no available figures as to the number of persons made ill by poisoned foods or drugs. Thus it must be assumed that Consumers' Research made a rough guess at the facts, and let it go at that. If such a report scares the susceptible consumer,—fine! If not, they will advance a new theory in the hope that they may be successful in frightening people.

We are referring of course to commercially canned and packaged goods. But it may not be amiss to state that there have been several outbreaks of illness attributed to individual or home-canned foods. The American Medical Journal reports such a case in its February, 1934, issue, which says: "What was at first thought to be an outbreak of food poisoning in November (1933) at Grace hospital, New Haven, is believed to have been an outbreak of grip with abdominal symptoms. Following investigations of the health board, it was found that 120 people had partaken of a certain meal, November 8, and that the only article of food that had been consumed by them all was freshly-cooked steak. . . . It was concluded that there was not a single fact that could not be adequately explained on the basis of an outbreak of influenza, whereas there were many features that could not be explained by a diagnosis of food poisoning."

Where one or more persons has actually been made sick by food, it is invariably the result of someone making a mistake, blundering, by using the wrong materials or ingredients. How do fires occur, or a mishap at sea or an accident along the paved highway? Some human being has failed in his duty. When this occurs, some

publicity-seeking official demands an investigation, or a law to prevent such accidents in the future, knowing all the while that no law can ever be passed which will keep human behavior accurate. When the human factor enters into any method or procedure, it is always a source of weakness.

Man's sense of taste and smell usually prevents him from being cheated. No one is rash enough to buy or eat nauseating or unfit food,— and it can be said with equal positiveness that no manufacturer or distributor is rash enough to offer in the market any foods that are unfit for human consumption. For a manufacturer to do so, as we have already pointed out, would be business suicide. But the Consumers' Research writers would have us believe that manufacturers and distributors are blind to their own interests and are all Borgias at heart, willing to indulge in wholesale poisoning of consumers for the sake of a few cents of extra profit.

Happily, there is no such class of manufacturers in America; no such class of advertisers as the CR people condemn; no such class of distributors or advertising copy-writers; no such vile situation as is painted by the poison-pen of Washington, Warren County, New Jersey, wielded by F. J. Schlink, Arthur Kallet, and others of their tribe. If our manufacturers were in the habit of placing on the market such goods as these people describe, they would simply be cutting their own throats.

No one claims that all the food products, processed, packaged, or canned, that are to be found on the grocers' shelves are of the finest quality, any more than they are all one-priced; but there is a legitimate demand, usefully and profitably supplied, for goods of the cheaper grades, available to persons of limited means,— and the Consumers' Research to the contrary notwithstanding, millions of our people have had good reason to be grateful in recent years to the manufacturers and distributors of the cheap and wholesome soups, the life-saving little

cans of beans, the canned corned-beef, and the delicious and inexpensive preserved fruits and jams, that have supported whole families in health when there was little or no employment and the family savings were exhausted. The consumer who practically lived on a diet of canned pork-and-beans during the years of depression, and found himself in even better health than before, by reason of a limited but wholesome diet, will find it hard to believe the dictum of Consumers' Research that he has been poisoned. The hard times taught many Americans to live better and cheaper than ever before — thanks to the manufacturer or processor who supplied the necessities of life cheaply and in fair quantity and quality.

More harm comes to us from the excessive or prolonged use of certain aggravating foods than from any possible poisons in our foodstuffs; as, for instance, from the inordinate use of bran, which, while it has its value in occasional use as roughage, tends to irritate the intestinal tract if used constantly. But that is a matter for the family doctor to decide in each individual case, and not one for the know-it-all pundits of Washington, New Jersey.

As the claims of Consumers' Research regarding the effects of poisoned food on the population are totally at variance with the vital statistics, and all the evidence goes to show that human life in America has acquired an average extension of several years, instead of being shortened five years by the use of canned and packaged foods and drugs, we must conclude that the CR claims and charges may be disregarded as the vaporings of radicals with little regard for the truth, but with an intent purpose to injure our manufacturing industry and create discontent among our people, thereby bringing nearer the coming of the day of revolution to which all Communists, including those of the CR, look forward with eager anticipation.

In this connection we are tempted to quote Bernarr

Macfadden, the publisher of *Liberty*, who is one of the leading exponents of forthright Americanism and a consistent opponent of alien-born radicalism and Communist propaganda. He can see the snake in the grass, for he knows the insidious methods of the Reds and their American imitators and dupes; and he is never ambiguous in expressing his opinions on the editorial page of his popular magazine.

Commenting on the joy with which all Communists await some major social-economic disaster in America, Mr. Macfadden said recently: "It has been stated that the Communistic horde which has come here from Russia is waiting and praying for that particular calamity to happen to this country; that they are already prepared for this situation; that they are perfectly organized with a view to taking over our government in such an emergency."

But Mr. Macfadden does not believe (nor do we) that this will ever happen to us because, as he says: "The freedom that made us a great people, the fundamental principles that were developed, that began to take substantial form in July, 1776, founded a democracy that stands without an equal throughout the entire history of the civilized world; and if there is any manhood left in us, we will fight for the principles that it has maintained, bitterly and grimly, with a rigid determination that will be unyielding, to the very end of life itself."

* * *

We can find neither reason nor sense in "Comrade" F. J. Schlink's sweeping denunciation of our common foods as poisonous and life-shortening, as expressed, for example, in his book "Eat, Drink and Be Wary," which Consumers' Research continues to vend at a profitable price.

This man Schlink is not a doctor, a scientist, dietitian, or health expert. What, then, is his authority for dog-

matic, condemnatory statements regarding the things we have always used and liked,—national and standard goods in the form of food and drink and medicine? This would-be pundit and censor voices his alleged knowledge of the “horror” and “filth” and “unsanitary methods” of making and processing foodstuffs, and of the ingredients of everything one ever heard of. Bread and meat and vegetables and milk and orange juice, cheese and fish and candy, herb tea and aspirin tablets,—all are alike terrible to his mind!

After wading through the disgusting array of what Schlink calls “nothing but the truth,” we are conscious merely of a deep sense of nausea,—not at the standard brands we use, always have used, and always expect to use, but nausea at having actually read a book that makes one so truly sick. That’s the inevitable effect upon the intelligent reader — “Eat, Drink and Be Wary” is sickening, and nothing else!

As a sample of Schlink’s wide and wild criticism, we may cite part of his diatribe against the women’s magazines, including “Good Housekeeping,” its advertising policy and personnel, and the foods advertised in that publication. He says: “Read such magazines if you must, but don’t feed your family on the foods or methods of cookery they recommend. They are in a very serious sense responsible for most of the things and most of the kinds of things that are wrong with the American dietary. The literacy of American housewives fed upon this kind of kitchen and pantry pabulum has left them much less qualified to deal with the problem of their families’ food supply, in fact, than the illiteracy of a Mexican or Indian or South Sea mother of a numerous brood of half-savage children who thrive on a diet at a small fraction of the American diet’s cost and without benefit of frequent consultation with a pediatist! And where the women’s magazines have failed completely to deliver the American housewife into the hands of General Mills and Gen-

eral Foods and Standard Brands, the home-economist has stepped energetically into the breach to give the right business-like slant to the advice available to the oncoming generation."

Now these sweeping assertions by Schlink are based on the idea that the advertisements of such food-products as those of Borden, Kraft-Phenix, and General Mills, in the women's magazines are false and misleading,—when every housewife knows the value and economy of such products. And Schlink would also have the women of America believe that the valuable articles on home economics in *Good Housekeeping*, *The Ladies' Home Journal*, *The Delineator*, *McCall's*, and the *Woman's Home Companion* are "written with an eye to the advertisements or upon the advertisers who may yet be landed."

One may well ask Author Schlink why he writes as he does, if it is not to secure purchasers of his books by sensational statements; why his Consumers' Research attacks so many products and business men in its periodical *Bulletins*, if it is not for the mercenary purpose of securing subscribers? As a matter of fact, Schlink and his pals descend to the very depths of business degradation, exploiting non-existent "poisons" and horrendous, mostly imaginary, "filth" in order to capture the dollars of the unwary.

With regard to his charge that magazine articles are always written "with an eye to the advertisers," we may state for the enlightenment of Comrade Schlink, who shuts his eyes to all commendable business conditions, that our great magazines such as those mentioned above, and all our really great newspapers, make a strenuous effort to "divorce" their editorial and advertising departments;—but not even a Schlink would expect any business concern to oppose the interests of its customers; and if our great family magazines *are* largely supported by their advertisers, that is nothing for any critic to cavil

at, for these publications are thereby enabled to give the reading public much more than their money's worth.

When advertising enables the American consumer to purchase, for a nickel or a dime, a magazine that will furnish the family a whole week's reading, including interesting short stories, political and social essays and reviews, autobiographies of famous men and women, expert health advice, clean humor, and serials worthy of subsequent publication in book form, together with beautifully illustrated announcements, in color and otherwise, of useful products that pertain to a higher standard of living,— the carping criticism of Schlink and Consumers' Research seems childish and absurd. But *it is not dictated by any real regard for the consumer*. It is merely designed to create dissatisfaction with things as they are, and to aid in bringing about that "major economic-social disaster" which is so much desired by all Communistic agitators.

* * *

"Comrade" Schlink indulges in much criticism of the class of scientists who specialize in the investigation of foods and drugs. He does not think much of their ability, but never tires of lauding his own "scientists" and "researchers" to the skies. These allies of Consumers' Research are, of course, able, honest and above reproach, while all others are classed as "bought and paid for" by Big Business. The CR consultants are in a class by themselves, according to CR propaganda. Many of them, it is claimed, furnish reports of their investigations of food and other products without charge, and the CR boasts of this fact—if indeed it be a fact. For our part, we are inclined to doubt whether any expert "researchers" work for the CR for nothing. Men whose opinions are worth "thousands of dollars to any business concern," as the CR claims, are not likely to furnish valuable reports gratis—to Schlink or anybody else,—

unless they are Reds of his own type, doing the work of Moscow in America.

When the CR refers to Science as the ally of American business, it prints the word Science with the dollar sign as an initial, thus — \$cience. From this we are supposed to infer that American scientists — all but the CR variety — have gone money-mad; this would be very distressing news to our scientific food-experts if any of them ever took the pains, which we doubt, to read Schlink's book.

\$cience, with the dollar sign, being thus prostituted to business, and allied with Big Education in our colleges and with Big Business, is responsible, we are told, for "the well-exploited idea that food in cans and bottles, from canned chicken-a-la-king to frankfurters bottled in glass jars, is nearly or quite as good for one as savory foods prepared fresh from raw materials for the meal at which they are eaten. For this delusion," Schlink says, "the American public has to thank the Canners' Association, the larger can companies, the women's magazines, and the endless nonsense of the newspapers' women's pages."

It is quite evident that the food of which Comrade Schlink is accustomed to partake does not entirely agree with him, or he would not give way to such incessant dyspeptic thinking; and unless he is too terribly "set in his ways" to take a cheerful and common-sense view of anything, we hereby recommend him to include in his diet some of the delicious canned foods that are relished by the rest of us, but which he so viciously condemns.

CHAPTER XIII

MODERN FOODS AND THE "GRANDMOTHER" SLOGAN

THE American housewife of today, typical representative of the consuming public, needs no lecturer on home economics or cookery to inform her that the food products at her command are infinitely larger in number, better in quality, and more convenient in use, than the foods and food accessories available to her grandmother.

She knows this to be a fact, from her own experience and family traditions, just as she knows that her kitchen facilities are far superior to those of a half-century ago; that her housekeeping labors are lightened thereby, and that she would not think of exchanging the comfort and convenience of her modern stove and utensils for the cruder and more cumbersome kitchen equipment of the so-called "good old days."

American manufacturers and distributors, aided by the scientific research of recent times, have contributed immeasurably to the comfort of family life and the higher standard of living which we enjoy. And it requires but a little reflection on the part of the average consumer to realize what immense strides of progress have been made in the supply and quality of our foodstuffs and the methods whereby they are prepared for the table.

Yet Consumers' Research writers and critics never tire of working their "Grandmother" slogan, and they have succeeded only in working it to death. For their persistent advocacy of a return to the foods and methods of our grandmothers' days is made supremely ridiculous by the logic of facts, the knowledge of and experience of the housewife, and an intelligent comparison of the things we use today with those of the unregretted past.

For many of the improvements in food products and

methods of preparation we are indebted to the scientific experts of the manufacturers and processors, and to other scientists who labor, independently of business considerations, to increase our knowledge of foods, of the essential factors of health, and of everything that has to do with our mode of life and the well being of the community.

But Consumers' Research takes no stock in the efforts and achievements of food and health experts, other than those attached to its own limited staff. And F. J. Schlink, the dictator of CR policy, vents his spleen upon them by the assertion that no scientist, "whose own eating may be done at a college restaurant or boarding-house, is qualified to tell any grandmother with all the traditional skills and latent underlying science of a well-managed home and kitchen, how to choose the diet of young and old."

In reply to which we may remind Comrade Schlink that in grandmother's days the frying pan was the chief utensil of the kitchen; that fried foods three times a day constituted a staple diet, and its victims died young; that there are many men old at fifty-five today, who talk of the "good old days" on the farm, and say they have been "meat-and-potatoes men" from childhood,—until their digestive organs rebel against protein-stuffing and they suffer from dyspepsia and dangerous underweight.

Cast back in your memory, Mr. or Mrs. Average Consumer who may be inclined to believe the dicta of Consumers' Research, and think of the meals grandmother prepared with her limited materials and facilities. Don't think so much of her pies and doughnuts, which you devoured so voraciously with your child's appetite, but which you would partake of so sparingly today. Think of the fat-fried, tough meats that appeared so regularly on her table, and of the constant succession of stomachic ailments that followed with almost equal regularity.

Think of the raw foods in the grocery, kept in bins

open to the dust and flies and daily handling by customers. Then think of the superior cleanliness and convenience of modern canned and packaged goods; think of the baked and broiled, steamed and boiled, meats and other foods that come out of the modern kitchen,— and then ask yourself if you would like to go back to the foods and cookery of grandmother's days !

(Most of what Schlink and his dupes say about the "poisons" and "filth" in foods may have been applicable to the things in use in those days, but are certainly not true to any considerable extent of the things we eat and drink today. The bulk of "CR" criticism of present-day foodstuffs and drugs is grossly exaggerated — for a purpose !)

Blinded by prejudice, Consumers' Research can see no value in the work done by food and health researchers under the auspices of great concerns such as the California Fruit Growers' Exchange, General Mills, Corn Products, the makers of Kellogg's Cereals, the Doughnut Machine Corporation, or the United Fruit Company,— because, forsooth, these researchers are "business-paid."

The CR takes the stand that these scientific experts, including college professors, who are engaged in making our products better or cheaper, more attractive or more palatable, deviate from sound science in order to please their employers. Exactly the same charge can be laid at the door of the CR "experts," who are also "business-paid," since Consumers' Research, Inc., is manifestly a business concern and operated for profit, if it only pays large salaries to Schlink and its other officers, while bestowing a minimum of the intake upon its minor employees,— and such a decided minimum, indeed, that the latter had to strike for more pay and better working conditions in September, 1935, and ended by organizing a so-called Consumers' Union, as we have seen, in competition with Schlink's "CR."

There is hardly a sane American man or woman who does not appreciate the dietary value of oranges and grapefruit and lemons, all of which add greatly to the enjoyment of our meals and aid the preservation of health. But Consumers' Research, through its mouth-piece, Schlink, deprecates the vogue of these valuable items of diet,—“as though the human race in America and other lands of similar climate did not live and prosper until citrus fruits came into its collective lives.”

It is really too bad that there is no such vogue in Russia, for if there were, “Comrade” Schlink and his Communistic associates would no doubt recognize its value, of which, he says sneeringly, there was “a tremendous outpouring of the most convincing evidence from a dozen colleges and universities.” All of this evidence of the dietary value of citrus fruits Schlink calls “sensational and misleading hokum,” — but American consumers are convinced to the contrary by their experience of the beneficial effects of orange juice, etc., in their diet, and so the CR can rave as it pleases about our favorite fruits without changing a single vote.

* * *

Consumers' Research is so strongly addicted to the grandmother slogan that it loses no opportunity to recommend, directly or indirectly, a return to the foods and methods of olden times. Here is a paragraph from one of F. J. Schlink's wordy lectures on our diet, which illustrates the frequent use of “grandmother” in the ridiculous CR propaganda:

“How can Americans who invented mass-production of canned ‘baked’ beans and soup, hot-dog sandwiches, and doughnuts, and the only nation successfully to turn oranges, apples, cheese, wine and fruit cake into factory products with belt-line production techniques, be expected to believe that one might learn more about foods and drinks from one's grandmother than from realtors

gone into the Sweet Shoppe and Wayside Inne business, or New York stockbrokers turned into California vintners?"

There is a simple answer to that query of "Comrade" Schlink's. Americans have too much common sense, in spite of Schlink's opinion of them, to turn their backs on the progress in matters of diet and health and the techniques of production, to revert to the questionable food fads of the past. Thus this question, like so many of the statements made by Schlink and the CR, answers itself.

Consumers' Research would have us adopt a method by which consumers would not exercise any judgment or initiative in making purchases of foodstuffs or any other goods in the market. They would have us merely do as they say, not as our knowledge and experience dictate; buy only the products they recommend, and boycott all others. This CR method would encourage laziness; it might suit thoughtless people and those who prefer to have their minds made up for them. And it goes along with the Socialist-Communist idea that the government should do everything for the people, even to providing the necessities of life and telling people what else they should buy — if they have left any means of making purchases. But such an idea is utterly repugnant to the American spirit and will not get far, in spite of the most strenuous efforts of its CR advocates.

* * *

"Doctor Schlink has made many attacks upon our restaurants and other places in which food and drink are served to the public. Both the foods served and the methods of preparation and service being condemned in the wholesale manner that is characteristic of CR writers.

Now, it is stated on good authority (not Schlink's) that approximately one-sixth of all the food used for human consumption in the United States is served in public eating-places. In Chicago, for instance, more than \$750,000

is spent daily in restaurants and other places serving food; and over 1,000,000 persons eat 1,500,000 meals daily in the restaurants of this city.

According to Schlink, we are being slowly but surely "poisoned" by the foods we eat, and our lives are being shortened at least five years. If he were correct in these wild statements, Chicago would surely be a city of the sick, with a high death-rate and many short-lived inhabitants. But the vital statistics show that the death-rate of this city is one of the lowest in the world, if not the lowest, for a city of its size, and the records of our health department prove it to be as healthy a place to live in as can be found if we search the wide world over. Hence, with health conditions in this typical large city as evidence of the falsity of Schlink's contentions, we may dismiss them as samples of "sensational and misleading hokum," such as he condemns in others.

* * *

Let us glance briefly at a few more of the things "Comrade" Schlink says about the common foods we use and the "poisons" that lurk in them. Bread that is "unspeakably bad" is denounced time and time again in his writings, but few persons will agree with him that the varieties of bread they buy and eat have ever affected either their appetite or their health. Much of the bread offered to city consumers is made by large bakery companies in buildings erected for the purpose, with every consideration for sanitation and cleanliness, and from flour and other materials of a perfectly safe and wholesome nature. That there has been room for improvement in the past goes without saying; but in all modern production plants, the interests of the ultimate consumer are far better taken care of than the CR critics, who see no good in anything, are willing to admit. And bread, despite the horrific criticism of Schlink and others, will continue to be the staff of life.

Cabbage, cauliflower, celery, and broccoli fall under the ban of the CR because they are alleged to have been "dosed heavily with terrible insect poisons." One of these poisons, the one most commonly used, we are told, is so virulent that one-45,000th of a pound daily "will bring on symptoms of poisoning within a short time," and one-4,000,000th of a pound is said to be a dangerous amount for a daily intake over a period of years. The first reaction of the reader to such a statement is the thought that no one need continue to absorb the poison "over a period of years," and then one may reason that such infinitesimal doses cannot do anyone much, if any, harm. And as a matter of fact the medical records show no cases of poisoning caused by eating fruit or vegetables from plants that were sprayed with arsenic or lead or any other material used by the market gardener or fruit-rancher. More sensational and misleading hokum"!

Next we find sugar linked (or Schlinked) with "strange chemicals" in various common foods as dangerous to our welfare, and we are supposed to be duly shocked and terrified by statements like the following:

"Hams and beef and bacon are cured (with the aid of injections by a syringe!) with strange chemicals more suitable as disinfectants for use on the bathroom floor than for food preservation. Perhaps as serious as anything mentioned is the fact that all sorts of vegetables, fruits, breads, cakes, and even meats are 'enriched' and preserved and cured and canned and pickled with suicidal amounts of sugar and glucose and refined starches (the latter may become nearly as bad a food as sugar). Such artificial and over-sweet and over-pasty substances never were a part of the diet of man in his natural environment."

So we learn that one of Schlink's food-fads is in antipathy to sugar, and that we are everlastingly partaking of "suicidal amounts" of it. (Does "Savior" Schlink suffer from diabetes?) When we reflect how little sugar

is used by the women of today, even in the form of candy, compared with what many of them consumed before it became the fashion to wear but little flesh on the bones, we can feel reasonably sure that the fairer sex, at least, is not in much danger of sugar-poisoning today, even from the pastries and meats listed and condemned by Schlink. And if he thinks he can persuade twentieth-century Americans to return to "the diet of man in his natural environment," — the caveman and primitive savage, we hope the CR dictator is greatly mistaken.

After taking a shot at candy, as a food that "keeps well and easily sells for 30, 40, or 50 cents or more a pound to the person who forgets the price of sugar" — and the manufacturing and distributing costs, he might have added, — Schlink quotes with approval a statement by Dr. A. Gault regarding the food of the Fijians, which appeared in the Journal of the American Dental Association for May 1934, as follows:

"The food of these people (the Fijians) consisted of fruit, vegetables, and fish, and has done so since their arrival in Fiji; and where this diet is still maintained, there is little doubt that the dental conditions are much better than that of those nearer to the towns, who follow the diet adopted by the average white person."

From this we are to infer that we should boycott all canned and packaged food-products of American manufacture and subsist on the kinds of food that suit the erstwhile cannibal inhabitants of the Fiji Islands, or those commonly eaten by "men who are close to nature." And again the American consumer will reply to "Comrade" Schlink: "No, thank you! We are doing quite well on our present diet and with our present mode of living, and are thankful for the progress we have made from the crude foods and habits of the past."

With the Fijians still in mind, Schlink turns abruptly to the subject of milk as an article of diet. Here again he sees Red. Referring to books "written to prove that

the human race simply cannot get along without milk," he says the Fijians evidently could (which must make life something of a problem for Fiji babies). Then he turns his gun upon a book by Dr. P. H. Tobey, entitled "Milk, the Indispensable Food," and charges the author with being a paid employee of the Borden Company,—which is not even important if true. The fact remains that milk is and always has been and always will be an invaluable article of human diet,—and a hundred thousand Schlinks cannot disprove nor gainsay that fact. Milk is indeed "the nearly perfect food," and deserves all that has ever been written in its favor by nutritional experts and physicians. No doubt F. J. Schlink lived and thrived on milk in the earliest period of his life, although he does not seem to have included the milk of human kindness in his later diet. The American housewife, mother, and grandmother will know what to think of and say about his unfavorable attitude toward milk and milk products.

* * *

We referred in a previous chapter to a word-ridden professor who, in a book published last year (1935), essayed to tell "the people" how to get what they want. This writer, noting the frequent laments of Consumers' Research over the passing of grandmother's days and methods of family food supply, also bewails the fact that "homemade pies," like Grandma used to make, are now turned out by great baking companies, operating costly pie-making machines and distributing their product "in special insulated trucks" to every kitchen in America whose owner has the price of a fine homemade pie.

In this lamentation the professor joins in a duet with Consumers' Research, and the strident voices of both these Jeremiahs proclaim their belief that mass production of pies and many other articles of food is a step backward, instead of being a decided stride forward with the seven-league boots of modern progress.

The professor tells a little story to support his argument. He pictures Grandma So-and-so, first, as making pies that are the delight of her immediate family and the envy of neighbors; then, as helping out the family income by selling her pies to a limited number of customers; then widening her field of custom, with the aid of a live advertising man, and a staff of assistants, but still supervising the making of her product, advertised as Grandma's Homemade Pies. She makes money with the aid of the up-to-date advertiser as manager,—and then he buys her out and she is able to retire to California to end her days in comfort. Along comes Capital, with its enterprise, initiative, and ability to devise and supply pie-making machines,—and pies made from Grandma's recipes are soon available to the public from coast to coast at a reasonable price.

Is there any reason to pity the public for this development,—any reason for the fears and tears of Consumers' Research and our at-least-pink professor? If they do not find Grandma's pies just as wholesome and delicious when turned out by machines that are almost human, they do not have to buy them. They can still condemn their womenfolk (if they can!) to hard labor in hot kitchens; they can still, if they wish, split the wood or carry in the coal for the same kind of stove over which Grandma used to toil, with floury hands and arms and an eternal sense of haste and worry. But the average American, man or housewife, boy or girl, will rejoice in the knowledge that women have been delivered from their bondage to old-fashioned ideas of pie-making (and cooking in general).

But, the critics contend, the machine product of the great bakeries seldom equals in crust or flavor the pies that Grandma used to make with her own devoted and enslaved hands. This may or may not be so, but the public finds the modern product sufficiently delicious to demand it with the daily meals. The fruit and spices

used in mass production are the same as Grandma included in her recipes, and as for the crust, the professor admits that "a committee of scientists sit daily in a quiet laboratory toiling over the super-chemistry of pie-crust."

The modern pie comes to us fresh from the bakery, and in its making neither materials nor pies are touched by human hands. The materials are the best that the seasonal market affords, and the whole process of pie-making is cleanly conducted in buildings designed for the purpose, with every regard for the satisfaction, health, and gustatory delight of the consumer. If the product did not please the consumer's taste, the pie-baker would not prosper. So he *has* to make his pies equal or superior to the much-vaunted homemade pies of Grandma — and he does!

It will take more, therefore, than the periodic jeremiads of Consumers' Research and radical professors to drive the American housewife back to the drudgery of Grandma's days in the kitchen.

CHAPTER XIV

SENSATIONAL ATTACKS ON AMERICAN BUSINESS

AS we pore over the rantings and ravings of the Consumers' Research writers, we become more and more imbued with the thought that this gang of traducers and haters of American industry and American principles should be driven out of the country, as St. Patrick drove the snakes out of Ireland. They are a disgrace and a menace to any country, and if driven into the sea and headed toward Russia, it is doubtful if their unwashed comrades on the other side would be waiting on shore to cheer their coming.

In their anxiety to vilify American manhood, the authors of that supposedly "economic" work, "Partners in Plunder," dragged in by the heels a case of a negro lynching in Florida. The writers of such vile matter should be accorded the same treatment as was meted out to the colored rapist whose actions they attempted to defend. Even Russia, with its ill-treated and half-starved people, would have difficulty in producing a man who has sunk to the moral level of the authors of "Partners in Plunder."

The story of the Florida crime, as printed in the CR book, is the filthiest piece of literature that this writer has ever been obliged to read. It sounds like the drunken ravings of the inmates of an old levee dive; and this is the kind of trashy "literature" that the "great" Consumers' Research is sending into the homes of American families, to be read by our wives and children. Shame on the unclean authors — and on the thoughtless men and women who permit such nasty books to contaminate their homes. How our government permits such a vile book in the mails, why librarians should buy such a book or merchants sell such a book, is beyond comprehension.

To show in a measure the animosity, ill-will, and utter contempt in which CR holds American enterprise, we will devote space in this and the following chapter to some of the scurrilous attacks made on American business by the "protectors" of American consumers.

* * *

One of the important industries selected for attack by Consumers' Research is the Lighting industry, including such prominent concerns as the General Electric Company, the Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company, with such useful scientific allies as the Edison Electric Institute and the Better Vision Institute, the latter being an auxiliary of the National Association of the Optical Industry.

If ever the civilized world owed a debt of gratitude to any individual, it was to Thomas Alva Edison for his invention of the electric light, which brought us out of the semi-darkness of coal-gas and oil-lamp days and placed the incandescent lamp in very office, store, and factory, and the vast majority of homes, to conserve eyesight and promote the general health.

But the efforts of the lighting companies to bring better light into our homes and to give us better sight — efforts to increase our comfort and promote human welfare — are attacked by Consumers' Research as if they were wrongful, if not criminal, attempts to force something upon us that we do not need. Thus a CR bulletin says that skilled salesmen, with the aid of a sight-meter, "tricked housewives into increasing their connected wattage, the average increase per home being 220 watts."

This, we are told, was done, in one case, through the activities of representatives of the Niagara Hudson Power Corporation, Utica, N. Y., and the method of increasing sales of electric current was so successful that it was called by salesmen "the New Approach."

Then came the Better Light-Better Sight campaigns, "put over," according to the CR, "by graduates of the four-day course on the New Approach, which the General Electric Company has been giving all over the country;" and Consumers' Research would have us believe that there is something wrong in the training of salesmen,— which is the legitimate and essential duty of every sales manager.

Then, skipping to the westward, the Detroit Edison Company is inferentially charged with "putting something over" on the consumer by employing and training women as "light specialists," to visit homes and suggest desirable changes in the lighting system, so as to give the residents better vision. Is there anything wrong or criminal in that? Is it not to the ultimate benefit of the consumer?

Another development of lighting service which is attacked by the CR as dictated solely by the pursuit of profit is sneeringly referred to as follows: "The light-selling activities of the electric utilities had not progressed very far before it became evident that an advantage was to be gained by seeking the cooperation of other business groups. It seems at first a rather far cry from the selling of light to the selling of spectacles and the selling of paint."

But it is not such a far cry as the CR writers seem to think. It is a natural sequence of better light — and of better knowledge, through education. Is there anything wrong or criminal, we ask again, in suggesting that children's eyes be examined by an optometrist, or that the drab or gaudy walls of a home be treated with a sight-preserving coat of a different color; — that the soothing shades of green, for example, be substituted for the nerve-racking reds, as any good oculist would recommend, especially in nervous cases? Is there anything wrong or criminal in a perfectly natural "community of interests" that tends to promote health and vision?

But it was just this community of interests, says a CR critic, "which led to the formation of the Better Light-Better Sight Bureau in August, 1934, when the better-lighting campaign was just over a year old." This Bureau the critic calls "a promotional octopus." According to the *Electrical World*, the Bureau is backed by eleven trade associations, and links a total of twenty-one groups interested in eyesight conservation and lighting sales; and it constitutes a voluntary, non-profit enterprise, underwritten as to necessary finances by the Edison Electric Institute and the General Electric and Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing companies. The Bureau has the indorsement of the Illuminating Engineering Society, the Better Vision Institute, and the National Bureau of Casualty and Surety Underwriters.

With the establishment of this Bureau, the Better Light-Better Sight campaign "rapidly gained momentum," says the CR critic, and by the end of 1934 the manager of the Bureau was able to report that "more than 5000 persons on utility staffs are now devoting their full time to selling better (seeing) in homes, stores, and factories," and "in the combined electrical, paint, and optical industries it is estimated that over 250,000 persons are active or indirectly doing their bit in promoting eyesight conservation and Better Light for Better Sight."

Once more we ask: is there anything wrong, harmful, or criminal in that? Can any intelligent person see anything but cause for congratulating the public that so active a body as the Better Light-Better Sight Bureau is taking an interest in the conservation of light-consumers' vision and the proper illumination of American homes?

Then it is further charged by the CR that "optometrists lend a hand." They actually have the audacity to "cooperate" in the better-lighting campaign. And why, in the name of ordinary business sense and good citizenship, should they not cooperate? The Consumers'

Research bulletin (confidential) says: "Throughout the country meetings of the State optometric societies have been held jointly with groups commercially interested in the sale of electricity, lamps, and paint," etc., etc. What if, as a consequence of such trade conferences, optometrists learn to advise their patients that eyesight can be conserved under proper lighting conditions? Is there anything wrong or criminal in that?

The attack of Consumers' Research upon the lighting industry appears to be a part of its ridiculous campaign against advertising and salesmanship—everything, in fact, that serves for the promotion of American business. And none but enemies of the common weal would advocate the abandonment of advertising and salesmanship as aids to business, the prosperity of industry, and the progress of civilized society.

The eyes convert light into sight, and most people are aware of the effects of "poor seeing," though some of these effects are indirect and obscure. Eye-defects are the most obvious costs of poor seeing. Headaches are commonly due to poor lighting and prolonged close visual work. Dizziness, nervousness, and even indigestion are common results. Nervous muscular tension, as from driving an automobile in fog or rain or on poorly lighted roads and streets, drains human energy.

The problem of seeing is closely related to the problem of lighting. If the eyes need correcting glasses, they should be obtained; and if the lighting system of the home, office, or store is not adapted to the needs of the worker, a "lighting specialist" employed by your electric-light company will suggest desirable changes,—and is there anything wrong about that?

If there are children or old people in the home, they need more light for reading or sewing than the average adult gifted with perfect sight. There is a mistaken belief that the intensity of illumination can be too high; but lighting experts assure us that no visual task indoors

will probably ever be over-lighted. The average general illumination in the American home is about 2 or 3 foot-candles, as compared with outdoor daytime intensities up to 10,000 foot-candles.

The question of the cost of adequate illumination in the home is often raised; but even Consumers' Research knows that electric light is supplied to the home at an extremely low cost. Housewives who go about turning off lights when visitors have gone should remember that the cost of illuminating the average apartment brilliantly for a bridge-party of two tables is only about half the cost of an ordinary package of cigarettes. Regardless of this fact of low cost, the average home is generally under-lighted; and if the lighting utilities use modern methods to persuade modern people to improve the lighting of their homes and thereby protect their children's eyesight and their own,—can anybody but the captious critics of Consumers' Research find anything wrong or criminal in that?

* * *

Coffee, the favorite daily drink of the American household, is also a favorite with Consumers' Research; that is, it is a favorite subject of attack! In a bulletin issued as recently as January, 1936, the credulous subscribers of the CR "confidential" service were warned that roasted coffee is apt to lose some of its flavor after awhile, and that the packaged coffee now used so generally loses much of its "flavor-strength" by the time it is brewed for the breakfast table. Hence coffee packers "take advantage of lack of realization of these facts."

In the eyes of Consumers' Research writers, manufacturers are always "taking advantage" of somebody or something. But in this case they are opposed by the findings of the American Medical Association, which states that investigation shows that "freshly-roasted coffee immediately sealed in vacuum tins does not

become stale in the unopened packages." And the scientists of the Medical Association assure the public that it is thus "*possible to obtain fresh coffee from the grocer at any time.*"

If this is not sufficient to nullify the criticism of Consumers' Research, let us examine for a moment the coffee procedure which the CR bulletin suggests for adoption in the American home. As in the case of other food-products, the consumer is advised to return to the old pioneer methods of roasting—that is *baking*—and grinding your own coffee. The CR writers advise that several neighbors join in buying coffee beans in their natural state, then delegating one of their number to "roast" the coffee in her oven and distribute the "fresh" roasted coffee to be ground in each home in the old-fashioned coffee-mill—and enjoy "good coffee." Of course the neighborly prowess would have to be repeated every day or two,—but how would this CR suggestion work?

It wouldn't work at all in the country, where neighbors are sometimes a mile apart, and the farm-wife usually has enough work on her hands as it is without baking coffee for her own use and her neighbors'. And it wouldn't work in cities, where one does not even know his next-door neighbor, even after living side by side with him for years. Of course it is a good communist idea, but Americans are still individualists, thank the Lord, and every family chooses to attend to its own affairs, especially in matters of its household economy and its food.

But suppose the Consumers' Research suggestion was tried by a group of neighbors in a small town or village like Washington, N. J., where the CR critics live their Arcadian life and revel in the foods and customs of their grandmothers — if they practice what they preach! Suppose John Smith and his neighbors decide to bake and grind their own. When the first attempt is made to "roast" coffee beans in the family oven, does it take

much imagination to visualize the result—the black, charred mass that will emerge from the oven, to be distributed among the subscribing neighbors for individual grinding and use?

The whole suggestion reminds one of the famous recipe for cooking catfish: Skin and disembowel the fish, then carefully wash and “plank” it—that is, nail it to a board; put it in the oven and bake for an hour at a temperature of 300 degrees; remove it gently, holding your nose, carry it into the backyard,—and pitch it over the fence into the alley!

Can't you see what will happen as soon as John Smith tastes the first cup of coffee, home-baked and ground and brewed according to the CR recipe? Why, it will spur him to immediate action. In a jiffy he will be out of doors and on his way to the grocer's, to follow Major Bowes's advice and buy a pound of Chase & Sanborn's coffee or some other equally reliable, scientifically ground, and carefully packaged brand,—as the American farmer and the American housewife do today.

When the CR writers set themselves up as experts on coffee, as they do on every other conceivable thing under the sun, they make themselves supremely ridiculous; and when they advise a return to the crude methods of pioneer days, they will convince none but the subscribers to their disservice—and mighty few of them!

* * *

Life Insurance.—Like the banker of whom it was said that, with equal grace and facility, he could “lead a prayer meeting, refuse a loan, or foreclose a mortgage on a widow,” Consumers' Research writers have a marked facility for jumping from one subject to another, regardless of their relevance; and it is often difficult to follow their meanderings, except on the understanding that they are equally opposed to everything that is a source of profit and advantage to the American people. So one acquainted with their vagaries is not surprised

when they turn from discussion of foods, coffee, washing-machines, and lighting apparatus and take a running jump at an entirely different line of business, namely, Life Insurance. Of course they do not approve of insurance by any other than the "collectivist" (Communist) plan, which refers everything to "the State" — that is, to a highly centralized national government of the proletariat by a few favored leaders — headed by a single autocrat or dictator. No business of any kind, not even insurance must be allowed to escape the greedy clutches of the collectivist State.

Endowment Insurance seems to be especially disliked by the managers of Consumers' Research, those "informed intellectuals" who are in training for what the Communist groups call "Lenin-leadership." The CR writers say that the agent selling endowment insurance invariably uses the old, time-worn slogan, "You don't have to die in order to have the insurance company pay out the money under this contract," — but that is a fact that appeals to many investors in insurance.

Then they go on to criticize as follows: "First, the endowment policy is too expensive. Second, the endowment policy is not flexible enough. Third, the endowment policy does not adequately safeguard the savings accumulated thereunder." Column after column of criticism follows, with citations of supposititious cases involving a Mr. Jones and a Mr. Robinson, who are apparently blamed for taking out \$10,000 twenty-year endowment policies, — and yet we are continually assured that the object of Consumers' Research is to protect the poor consumer, especially the consumer of the laboring class. As comparatively few, if any, laborers take out \$10,000 policies of any kind, the Jones and Robinson illustration of the enormity of the endowment-policy offense hardly supports the CR argument against that class of insurance, and common sense and public experience are also against it.

With regard to endowment insurance, let us quote in answer to Consumers' Research, the sensible view of a popular writer and experienced business man. In a pamphlet published in 1934, entitled "What I Have Learned About Life Insurance," Bruce Barton says:

"I began to learn about life insurance on my fifteenth birthday. My father, a clergyman on a small salary, called me into his study and said: 'I want to start you in the habit of saving money, and life insurance is the best way for a young man to do it. I shall have three \$1,000 endowment policies written on your life, and I shall carry them until you graduate from college. Then you can take them over. With this good beginning, I hope you will increase your insurance as fast as your income increases . . .'

"His advice to me made a lasting impression. I now own various policies payable to my wife; other policies which would provide a modest monthly income to my daughters; still other policies on the lives of my boys, to start them off as my own father started me; and, finally, certain policies payable to educational and charitable institutions in which I am interested."

Bruce Barton's faith in insurance is fully justified by American experience, and as he pointed out in his timely pamphlet, "the American people have held fast to their faith in life insurance straight through the depression." Ordinary life insurance safeguards the family against want on the death of the insured; endowment insurance effects all the good results suggested by Mr. Barton, and more — it furnishes needed funds at times in a man's life when he may sorely need them; and the purchase of annuities — a practical form of insurance — enables many a man and his wife to live in comfort when earning days are over.

Verily the weight of evidence against the critical contentions of Consumers' Research is overwhelmingly in favor of the practice and business of life insurance. That

business, at least, should not suffer from the silly attacks of the CR so long as the American people keep their minds free from the poison of Russian collectivism.

* * *

Refrigerators. — Among the “gadgets,” as Consumers’ Research calls them, with which inventors and manufacturers, aided by advertising and salesmanship, have blessed the American public, such invaluable household appliances as refrigerators and washing-machines are included. Both have been assailed by the poison pens of Jersey.

Time and space forbid quotation of the text of CR attacks on both electric and gas refrigerators. It is only a few years since these types of refrigeration were introduced, and at first, as with all new things, there were difficulties of construction and operation to be overcome; but these difficulties have been for the most part removed and the refrigerators now on the market are entirely safe and reliable.

The merits and value of the Frigidaire (General Motors) and of the General Electric refrigerators are well known and thousands of well-satisfied users attest their efficiency and the truth of advertising claims made for them. These and other reliable makes now form part of the regular equipment of apartment hotels and houses; and the home without a mechanical refrigerator of some kind is not regarded as completely equipped. The added convenience and comfort of this modern system are beyond dispute, and even the matter of price has been satisfactorily adjusted to meet the public needs. The CR criticism is therefore perforce largely confined to its usual cry, that expert salesmanship is employed to “force” these “gadgets” into the homes of the people, — and the fact that the public only required to be *shown* the advantages of mechanical refrigeration, in order to get rid of the peripatetic iceman, in order to create a

popular demand for it, is ignored by Consumers' Research in its eagerness to put the poison pen to work and damage business of every kind.

A typical electric refrigerator requires no attention; it is quiet in operation, and gives dependable performance at low cost. The mechanical refrigerator has, in fact, revolutionized household refrigeration costs, and its efficiency is constantly on the increase.

It is claimed that the sale of improved gas refrigerators, typified by Electrolux (Servel) has also received a great impetus in the recent past. There are approximately 16,000,000 homes in this country where gas service is used, and a gas refrigerator is to be found in a large proportion of these homes, giving perfectly satisfactory results. It is of course the object of gas companies to increase the use of their product, just as it is the object of electric light and power companies to enlarge the numbers of users of electric current; but Consumers' Research attacks both for their efforts to promote their business.

Such attacks by the CR, however, are worse than futile, for as long as business is business, so long will it continue to be perfectly natural and legitimate for business men to strive for the success of their concerns, and the keen competition of modern business will redound to the advantage of the public — in better products, lower prices, the constant supplying of new wants, and the transformation of luxuries into necessities in the homes of rich and poor alike.

In the year 1935, over a million automatic refrigerators were sold in the United States, and an even greater sales is confidently expected in 1936. That fact, of itself, is a practical answer to the criticism of Consumers' Research, and shows the foolishness of its opposition to the march of progress in the equipment of the American home.

Washing-Machines. — The “gadgetry” that had lightened the labors of the housewife, through the education of the public by advertising and expert salesmanship, includes washing-machines; and of course the methods of sale of these useful appliances, if not the machines themselves, are condemned by Consumers’ Research. Most of the “research” done by the CR seems to consist of finding things that have been successfully sold by newspaper and magazine publicity and the efforts of salesmen. And so washing-machines are listed by the Washington, N. J., writers as akin to products of the devil. But the CR does not go so far as to suggest that housewives throw their newly-acquired washers into the alley with the burnt coffee of amateur roasting; and if it did, the American housewife would be more critical of Consumers’ Research than the CR is of washing-machine salesmen, — and that is saying a good deal!

In the September, 1935, issue of its “handbook of buying,” the CR admitted that a certain Maytag Washer model was “comparatively easy on clothes” and had other merits, including washing effectiveness, but the poison pen had to get in its work, and so a certain detail of construction was “judged unsatisfactory.” Then the effect of such criticism was entirely lost by the further remark, “This model reported discontinued.” So would George Stephenson’s original locomotive, the “Rocket,” and Edison’s first phonograph have been adjudged unsatisfactory, no doubt, if Consumers’ Research had had an opportunity to criticize those great inventions in their early stages of development.

Now, back in 1922, the appearance of the Maytag Aluminum Gyrotator Washer introduced a new principle of washing to the American washer industry and the public. This new principle, upon which Maytag obtained a United States patent in 1932, has now been adopted generally in washer manufacture, and the Maytag and other washing-machines have attained a high state of

perfection. Today there are nearly three million Maytags in use; and as the majority of these have been demonstrated in the home of the ultimate purchaser — thanks to what Consumers' Research condemns as "high-pressure salesmanship," — the buying public's questions as to durability, quality, efficiency, and long life of the machines have been completely answered.

In 1914, Maytag produced the first washer powered by a simple, gasoline engine, the Maytag Multi-Motor, of their own manufacture, for use in homes without electricity. Today, nearly a million engine-powered Maytag washers are in use. Maytag is said to be the world's largest manufacturer of single-cylinder and two-cylinder engines.

This is a record of which any manufacturer may well be proud, and when one considers the immense labor-saving qualities of washing-machines, and what they have meant to the city and country housewife, one cannot but feel that the attacks of Consumers' Research upon the selling methods that have introduced them into American homes are unworthy of serious consideration.

There are other good washers in the market, including the Thor products, the new Westinghouse Washer of exceptional beauty and value, and other Westinghouse laundry machines to suit every purse. Is it not perfectly absurd for the CR writers to attack these and many other labor-saving appliances of the modern household as having been "forced upon the people," and to condemn the explanatory advertising of such articles as "gadgetsry nonsense." We are very much inclined to doubt that "Comrade" Schlink, president and "technical director" of Consumers' Research, permits M. C. Phillips (Mrs. Schlink), the author of "Skin Deep," to do the family washing by hand on Mondays, or to do the ironing with an old-fashioned flatiron on Tuesdays, or to return to any of the hard labor of grandmother's days, in spite of the CR attacks on household "gadgetsry." Indeed, we

suspect that there are as many mechanical labor-saving gadgets in use in the Schlink home as in the average American household.

Air-conditioning is among the "gadgets" condemned by the CR either directly or by inference. R. M. Hellmund, chief engineer of the Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co., is quoted as saying that "air-conditioning has unlimited possibilities." CR sneers at the statement, and says: "Of course; there are 20,000,000 homes to be air-conditioned, also restaurants, barber-shops, stores, and mortuaries; and why omit jails and penitentiaries?" To which crude sarcasm we will only reply that millions of people today appreciate to the full the air-conditioning systems that make crowded places of amusement comfortable in summer and winter alike, and with the lapse of time the statement of Chief Engineer Hellmund will be fully justified, when some such system is part of the regular equipment of apartment houses, hotels, stores, and homes.

* * *

Aspirin. — If you have ever used aspirin, as of course you have, to combat a cold (colitis) in its early stages, or to relieve a headache, or to gargle a sore throat, you will be inclined to smile with incredulity if you should happen to read one of the Consumers' Research attacks on that useful and successful family remedy, which is found in the medicine cabinets of so many American homes.

In a non-confidential bulletin of October, 1935, Consumers' Research began a lengthy criticism of aspirin by damning it with faint praise: "Aspirin is probably the least dangerous of the widely-sold pain-killers." Then it went on to condemn "continued use" as a pain-killer, especially by certain "sensitive persons," for fear of dire effects, of which there are extremely few instances known to the medical profession; but the bulk of the attack was directed at the advertising methods of

The Bayer Company, one of the leading manufacturers of aspirin.

Aspirin is a pharmacal compound known to the chemist as acetylsalicylic acid, and the Bayer Company was granted a United States patent for both the product and the process of making it. The patent expired in 1917, since which time other manufacturers have entered the field of production, but Bayer aspirin has continued to be sold on its reputation. It had created goodwill, and the public had confidence in its efficacy as a deadener of pain. Of course its excessive or improper use is not advisable and in some extreme cases may be harmful; but a similar criticism can be made of many, if not all, of the things we use in our diet or home treatment of common ailments. The consensus of medical opinion and lay experience appears to be that the prescribed and occasional use of aspirin, in the doses and for the purposes recommended by the manufacturers, is not only harmless but helpful. Of course, we repeat, *when used indiscriminately*, acetylsalicylic acid may be potentially harmful, as the American Medical Association Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry is alleged by the CR to have stated; but the same medical group also said:

“Practically all American brands of acetylsalicylic acid (aspirin) are of pharmacopeial standard. The only impurity likely to occur in any reputable brand is salicylic acid (in mere traces only) *which is of no practical significance whatever as a contaminant.*”

After quoting the medical council's report, and outlining the history of the Bayer Company from its establishment in Germany, whence it removed to the United States, (New York City) upon the issuance of its patent, the CR bulletin lists Bayer Aspirin and five other brands in its classification of products, as “B-Intermediate.” That is to say, these brands of aspirin, while they fail to receive the supreme CR honor of being “Recommended,” are not visited with the condign pun-

ishment of being classified as "Not Recommended." No, they are consigned to the Intermediate column as something neither worthy of praise nor deserving of condemnation. And so the public can continue to buy and use Bayer's aspirin or any other brand it chooses, regardless of CR criticism or the "Intermediate" classification, in which Consumers' Research has placed so many other useful and valuable American products.

* * *

Yeast. — Anything that has been "put over" on the public by the legitimate methods of modern advertising is a source of much worry to the propagandists of the Consumers' Research humbug, and a subject for the vituperation of the poison pen. And so we find the current popular use of yeast — "three cakes a day" and so forth — attacked as a valueless fad, promoted by newspaper, magazine and radio publicity, with special CR emphasis on the advertising claims and medical support of Fleischmann's Yeast.

But in the book "Eat, Drink and Be Wary," the individual effort of F. J. Schlink, the president of Consumers' Research says that yeast is "the one substance that has been commonly used in baker's bread that has notable nutritional value, as distinguished from food or caloric value." Hence the casual reader of the Schlink book may be surprised to find the CR author saying, on a later page: "By all means eschew added vitamin substances, especially Vitamin D, which is now being incorporated medicinally into all sorts of common foods, including yeast." The first admission by Schlink of the nutritional value of yeast is a sufficient answer to the command to "eschew" its use because it contains Vitamin D, since Vitamin D is scientifically regarded as an essential in the diet of man.

Schlink also asserts that Fleischmann's Yeast "has to go abroad for medical testimonials to the value of its

product," which is simply untrue. Many American physicians and scientists of repute have testified to the medical and dietary value of yeast in general and Fleischmann's Yeast in particular, and their testimonials have appeared in the pages of numerous newspapers and magazines of large circulation. It is true that European scientists and medical men have also borne testimony to the value of yeast in the diet; but the yeast manufacturers have not "had to go abroad" for such testimony.

Investigations by physicians of the Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, reported in the Journal of the American Medical Association, proved the value of yeast in cases of malnutrition and allied conditions, and also demonstrated its importance in the treatment of common skin diseases. It was also found that yeast, while not in any sense a cathartic, aids in the elimination of body wastes and is an effective remedy in many cases of constipation, also, a very definite result of the addition of yeast to the diet was a marked increase of the appetite, accompanied by a more complete utilization of the food.

As to the therapeutic value of yeast cakes, Dr. W. H. Eddy of Columbia University, author of "The Manual of Vitamins," says: "The claim made for their use rests on a perfectly firm basis. They are rich in the "B" vitamin, the proteins of the yeast cake are of good quality, and the cake contains no ingredients poisonous to man. Many people are reporting beneficial effects from their use."

As a final answer to Schlink and his Consumers' Research twaddle on the subject of yeast, here is the opinion of Drs. Osborne and Fishbein, editors of the "Handbook of Therapy," published by the American Medical Association: "As to general treatment (of boils, etc.), anything that makes for appetite, good digestion, proper movement of the bowels and nutrition, works for a successful fight against furunculosis. One of the recom-

mended treatments is yeast. The ordinary compressed yeast cake is easily obtained and administered . . . Yeast may have a beneficial action in gastro-intestinal sluggishness and apparently has power to change the flora of the intestine."

All of which proves that The Fleischmann Company did not have to go abroad for medical approval of efforts to promote the public health by increasing the use of yeast in the diet. Much more medical testimony to the same effect can be adduced to refute the malicious attacks of Consumers' Research.

* * *

Old Dutch Cleanser, a popular by-product of the Cudahy Packing Company, has escaped fairly well from CR criticism, by the New Jersey organization of consumer "protectors," which says that this household necessity, "although it appears to contain hard and gritty scouring abrasives, may, nevertheless, be taken as pretty safe for any but the most valuable porcelain and enamel surfaces."

In our opinion, the average American housewife is more than intelligent enough to know that the scouring material which she finds so useful in cleaning the kitchen sink and the bathtub must necessarily contain some abrasives in the form of "hard and gritty" material, without which it could not do its efficient and time-saving work. And we also believe the American housewife has intelligence enough to ignore the CR criticism of many more of the common things she is accustomed to purchase.

* * *

Fountain pens, an indispensable convenience of modern business and social life, fall within the category of CR "gadgets," and those who have marketed them by means of liberal advertising are assailed by the CR writers, chiefly for their use of the testimonials that are

so abhorrent when viewed from the standpoint of "Comrade" Schlink and his group of hypercritical disciples. The author of "Partners in Plunder," for instance, derides the fact that a popular clergyman lent the indorsement of his name to the Waterman fountain pen, twisting the inference to be drawn from the advertisement to be that "if Dr. S. Parkes Cadman writes his sermons with a Waterman, so must you — and thereby emulate his verbal wizardry." This is an illustration of the constant sneers of Consumers' Research writers at testimonial advertising of useful commodities. It would be a safe bet, however, that those writers all use fountain pens and many other modern conveniences which they condemn either directly or by inference.

Standard Oil, of course, did not escape altogether when Consumers' Research aimed its popguns at Big Business. J. B. Matthews, vice-president of the CR links Standard Oil with the United States Steel Corporation, the Mellons, and the Du Ponts, in his accustomed radical phraseology, as "private expropriators of property," which may mean anything or nothing, — and denounces Standard Oil and its subsidiaries as "highwaymen *de luxe* and employers of strike-breakers."

Since "Partners in Plunder" was penned by Mr. Matthews, he and his chief, F. J. Schlink, secreted themselves behind locked doors in Washington, N. J., to avoid contact with their own strikers, and were guarded by "big, burly policemen" while a strike of CR employees against their parsimony was in progress. They, too, probably employed strike-breakers; at least they must have filled the places of the strikers, who never went back to their jobs, but formed an organization in New York to compete with the Schlink-Matthews concern.

If Standard Oil interests are "highwaymen *de luxe*," how comes it that the American motor-car owner gets gasoline and oil cheaper than in any other country on earth? How is it that the highways have convenient

Standard Oil filling-stations all over the country? And how is it that those who still use kerosene for illuminating purposes in their homes are able to get it at one-fifth the price their grandfathers paid? And did you ever hear of a highwayman endowing schools and universities, or promoting scientific research and the general welfare as the Rockefeller Foundation does?

There was a time, perhaps, when the muckrakers could cast mud at the founders of our greatest industries and mold public opinion against them; but the public services, blameless lives and munificent benefactions of such men as the Rockefellers, father and son, have made a deep impression upon the American people and their names will live in the public memory long after those of their traducers are lost in oblivion.

Chewing gum, among other objects of habitual use in this country, has excited various CR writers to sarcastic criticism. Recently, we are told by one of the critics, the University of California received a donation of \$5,000 from the Wrigley company for a study of the effects of chewing gum on dental health. The statement is made as if there were something suspicious about this donation; but we will simply ask if any just criticism can possibly be leveled at it. Is there anything wrong about it? Is it not a perfectly natural thing for a manufacturer of chewing gum to do? And are not the favorable results of such a study completely reassuring to the public?

But we are also told by the CR that "the craze over Vitamin D has no limit," and we are supposed to sneer with the critic at the announcement that one of the Wrigley companies "has achieved Vitamin D in chewing gum." Well, suppose it has! Is it not a good thing for the gum-chewer to get a little of the essential Vitamin D into his system by indulgence in a pleasant habit which aids digestion?

Breakfast Foods, Etc. — The bread we eat is a peren-

nial object of attack by Consumers' Research writers, their books and bulletins containing many diatribes about the minor ingredients used by bakers and most of the criticism being aimed at advertising aids in bread-making, such as modern substitutes for yeast. Our conveniently packaged breakfast foods also come in for attack, especially those manufactured and marketed by General Mills and General Foods. When we consider the advances made in the character and supply of these commodities, we must be inclined to laugh at the CR suggestion that "A hand-grinder and some washed wheat make a better breakfast food, and cannot be compared to any ready-made by General Mills." Of course such a home-made food cannot be compared with our delicious packaged cereals, of which the manufacturers offer such an infinite variety. We are told, for instance, that instead of the Cream of Wheat which children and adults alike enjoy, we should go to some Italian macaroni factory and get our wheat cereal in the form of "semolina," which is said to be used by "many thrifty families in two Connecticut cities where large Italian populations exist." While noting this suggestion, we may reply to Consumers' Research that American people prefer to *live*, and not merely to *exist*; and so we shall continue to purchase and enjoy the breakfast foods that we and our families prefer.

Incidentally we may mention that F. J. Schlink, author of "Eat, Drink and Be Wary," says the big, single factor that caused that product of the poison pen to be written was the fact that a certain domestic economist, a woman "with excellent hips but no knowledge of the correct basis of eating, came out boldly for bread, in behalf of General Mills." And we mention this simply to point out that "excellent hips" appear to be the only things American of which Schlink seems to approve.

Coca-Cola, the popular drug-store beverage of all classes and all ages, is classed by Consumers' Research as

a "stimulant," and the critic is horrified to learn — and wishes us to be horrified to read — that "Coca-Cola and a dissolved aspirin tablet is often taken." What can the G-men have been doing during Prohibition days, when they overlooked the immense sale of this beverage, which is classed by the CR with "corn liquor, apple-jack, and cognac, all taken to relieve distraction from the pangs of hunger, caused by bad cooking in restaurants and kitchenette meals."

Now the Jersey writer should know all about apple-jack, at least, since it is a peculiar product of New Jersey; and if he has ever experienced, as maybe he has, the effects of that insidious and potent liquor, he should know better than to place Coca-Cola in the same class. The fact is that Coca-Cola is a refreshing and pleasant beverage, without a caffeine content that gives the ordinary glassful about the same stimulating effect as an innocuous cup of coffee. The stenographers and clerks of Atlanta, Ga., where Coca-Cola is made, drink it by the pitcherful in hot weather, and find it better for them than ice-water.

Among other manufacturers and business concerns that have been criticized by Consumers' Research, either for their products or for their business methods, especially advertising, are the great mail-order houses, Sears, Roebuck & Co. and Montgomery Ward & Co., whose products and merchandise are designed to meet the financial conditions of all classes in city and country; also the Corn Products Refining Co., manufacturers of Crisco and Cerelose, etc., excellent products for household use, and the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., a great distributive agency whose service to the American housewife is familiar to all. All of these concerns exercise important functions in the business world, and the Consumers' Research criticisms of them are too insignificant or too far-fetched to merit further notice.

CHAPTER XV

MORE ATTACKS BY THE POISON PEN

AS already noted, there is no branch of American business, large or small, that escapes criticism of the peculiar kind in which Consumers' Research indulges with keen delight and disregard of every consideration but sensational publicity for its spurious efforts to "protect" the consumer of domestic products.

The automotive industry is one of those that have been attacked in the books with alarming titles and contents that have been the chief means of publicity for the CR organization, whose den of scurrility is located in a small New Jersey town. There, far from the busy haunts of men, the authors of CR books and bulletins cut themselves loose from all restrictions of truth and decency, and give free rein to their false ideas of economics and to the imagination of "vain things" regarding the products and methods of our manufacturers, public utilities, and business in general.

Although Henry Ford has been a leader in raising the wages and improving the working conditions in the automotive industry, the Ford Motor Company is assailed by a CR writer who fondly hopes that the "class struggle" will ultimately lead to an "uprising" against the "profit system" in America. He says: "Those who have any doubt about results of the class struggle should follow closely the costly paraphernalia in manufacturing plants to keep wages extremely low and working conditions intolerable." The inference of this charge, so far as the Ford Motor Company is concerned, is so false that the allegation will deceive nobody; and it recoils upon the heads of the managers of Consumers' Research, whose employees went on strike in September, 1935, to secure more reasonable pay and better working condi-

tions. Their demands being refused by Schlink and his partners in the CR racket, the strikers, as we have previously noted, organized a "Consumers' Union" of their own to compete with Consumers' Research, and the CR has not recovered from that knockout blow.

In pursuance of the attack upon the Ford Motor Company, the same CR writer mentions that the personnel director of the company ordered the employment of 500 war veterans, selected on the basis of their "war records." It was stated at the time that these men were to be hired because of expansion of one of the Ford factories in Detroit; but the CR writer knows better, and says: "It is known that Ford is against any union in his plants, and thinks veterans are anti-radical and therefore ideal workers."

To understand the animus behind that assertion, it must be remembered that the promoters of Consumers' Research are ultra-radicals; in fact, they are closely affiliated with "collectivist" (Communist) groups and active in the Communist cause. Was it not to the credit of the Ford Company that it offered employment to unemployed Americans who had demonstrated their patriotism by their war service, and were likely to prove "ideal workers," not because they are anti-radicals, but because they would appreciate employment at the comparatively high rate of wages customary in the Ford plants?

The Consumers' Research writers do not want to see American factories filled with "ideal workers," but with ideal strikers and trouble-makers, who will engage militantly in the alleged "class struggle" and advance the day of revolution. Fortunately our war veterans are not of that type, and the CR attack is really a compliment to them.

Taking another big target for attack, Consumers' Research makes frequent derogatory references to General Motors, which employs legions of American workmen and contributes to the income of many, many thousands

of stockholders among all classes of our people. The ideal management and distinguished success of General Motors have given that great corporation such a high reputation in the world's industry, that any attack by Consumers' Research is like that of a gnat upon an elephant; and the roundabout way in which the CR assails General Motors is as ridiculous as it is futile.

For instance, a CR writer quotes Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., president of General Motors, as saying in the *Atlantic Monthly* that the home of tomorrow will have all modern housework-reducing conveniences, as well as air-conditioning, the teletype for news, television, and improved radio, with provisions for motion pictures, operas, etc.—surely a pleasing and perfectly possible preview of the future, all the conveniences and comforts mentioned being already well on their way to the average American home, if not already there.

But the captious CR critic and pessimist retorts: "One thing is wrong with Mr. Sloan's picture of this paradisaical domestic gadgetry. That is, the lack of assurance that the air-filtering system of the air-conditioning plant will keep out the putrid, toxic, and rancid sales-stuff that now enters in culturally lethal quantities."

This CR criticism, if one can call it that, is not at all relevant to the subject, but it shows how obsessed the critic is with the idea that all advertising of products is wrong and all advertisers and salesmen blameworthy. This idea is advanced by all Consumers' Research writers, in season and out of season, in connection with any other subject, regardless of relevancy or sense; and any reader who notes that such clean, modern, interesting, informative, and beautifully illustrated advertising as that of General Motors, for example, is inferentially called "putrid, toxic, and rancid" by the CR writer quoted above, will know what to think of the type of unsound mind from which such criticism emanates.

We may add that when Consumers' Research employs

such language in its comments on the business methods and business men of today, its managers have no reason to object if language similarly strong is used to denounce their own methods of scandalous attack and their own un-American ideas and affiliations. It is necessary at times to fight the devil with fire.

Earnings of General Motors, distributed largely in dividends to thousands of small stockholders, are a constant source of worry to Consumers' Research; but, quite inadvertently, it quotes the following reassuring statement from *The Advertising Age*: "As long as the small business has access to the public ear and as long as any enterprising business man with courage, a good product, and a little money is free to advertise his wares to millions of eager consumers at a small cost, *there is no reason to fear that American industrial democracy is in danger.*"

The popular and efficient "Cadillac" is one of the General Motors auto products that, back in 1930, was classified by Consumers' Research as "B. Intermediate," along with other leading makes of automobiles. At the same time, the statement was made that "if one can buy a secondhand Cadillac at a low price after two or three years' service, it is a good buy." Most auto-owners would call this recommendation of the used car quite contradictory of the "Intermediate" classification,—and the public will continue to regard the Cadillac as a perfectly good car, and *always* a good buy, either as a new or used automobile.

As recently as February, 1936, a "confidential" CR bulletin attacked the advertising claims of General Motors for its products, the Oldsmobile, Pontiac, Chevrolet, and Buick automobiles. "An Engineer Subscriber" was the medium of attack; he wrote a letter to the CR after visiting the 1936 auto show in New York and the General Motors exhibit at the Waldorf. The burden of this man's complaints was that the money expended by General Motors in advertising—in giving the public

necessary information regarding its various products — might be better spent in laboratory research for the improvement of reliability and safety in motor-cars.

The engineer should have known that the research laboratories of both General Motors and the Ford Motor Company are everlastingly at work devising the improvements in design and detail of construction, of which the public gets the benefit with each recurring season's new models; and that these laboratories are among the most important and interesting departments of every large automotive manufacturing plant.

It is needless to add that such laboratories, *plus advertising*, have placed the modern, low-priced motor-car within the reach of the great majority of American families. And nobody but Consumers' Research would recall the days before the motor-car became generally available for family and business use.

With regard to the Packard type of automobile, Consumers' Research said at one time that "the main ground for unfavorable recommendation" of Packard was that it required considerable servicing of a costly nature. Later the CR said the Packard 8 is believed to be one of the fastest stock cars made, but the servicing required was still costly. To which the natural answer is that the Packard, like all other makes of motor-car, is constantly in process of improvement, and that purchasers and owners of Packards are as a rule of the moneyed type that can well afford the servicing charges, and do not complain of them, being perfectly satisfied with the performance, reliability, and durability of this fine product of American manufacture. "Ask the man who owns one!"

For some reason or other, Consumers' Research saw fit some time ago to criticize the internationally-famous Rolls-Royce, on the ground that it was "a very complicated piece of mechanism" and that the chauffeur should have special training. Such training is offered free by the makers, but whether it is or not, the operation of

a Rolls-Royce would seem to be a matter of as little concern as its cost to the class of consumers who pay Consumers' Research \$3.00 a year *and up* for the kind of "protection" it assumes to provide.

About the time (1930) when Consumers' Research, in its early years, began to criticize and classify automobiles without knowing much, if anything, about them; among the makes listed unfavorably were the Nash, Hudson, Oldsmobile, LaSalle, and Overland. Most, if not all, of the cars thus criticized have since developed rapidly in popular favor, and are today carrying thousands of American families into the country at week ends and on tour in the vacation season, with immense benefits to health and happiness.

It may be that the earlier criticism of cars was for the purpose of making manufacturers "come across." We do not say that it was intended for that purpose, but the suspicion must have been aroused in many minds, especially as Consumers' Research at that time was fishing for "contributions" as well as for subscribers who would pay only a dollar or two a year. Thus, a CR bulletin of April, 1931, carried an announcement to this effect: "Contributions up to \$50,000 would help, but of course those of \$1 will not be spurned. It is suggested, however, that membership be \$2.00, *plus 1 per cent of the subscriber's income*. Five thousand dollars would be a big lift for the coming year. Certainly, given three or four years to develop a staff, and an income of \$1,000,000, we could do big things, testing every commodity (consumer goods)."

At that time (April, 1931) Consumers' Research had about 15,000 subscribers and they were reported to be coming in at the rate of 85 a day, but this rate of increase was not kept up. And here was this concern, incorporated "not for profit," suggesting contributions "up to \$50,000" and visualizing a growth of income to \$1,000,000 a year! It speaks well for the good sense of

the consuming public that no such results have ever been, or are ever likely to be realized.

Consumers' Research was founded on the circulation of a sensational book. It has been kept alive by subsequent issues of sensational volumes, which formed no part of its subscription service, but were sold largely to its subscribers, in sufficient number to arouse public interest, through newspaper notices and reviews. The effect of sensationalism soon dies away, and it will be found that the house of Consumers' Research, builded upon sand, will totter and fall when the storms gather, and the winds blow, and the lightning of the law strikes the fragile structure — and great will be the fall thereof!

* * *

There were several reasons for the selection of Du Pont de Nemours & Co. for Consumers' Research attack when the products and policies of General Motors had been duly dealt with by the poison pen. One reason was that the Du Pont company and "G. M." are closely associated financially; but another and more compelling reason was that the Collectivist writers are avowed pacifists when war threatens, although militant enough in their desire for economic and social and governmental revolutions,— while the Du Pont Company stands in their minds for everything that is war-like and war-promoting, because of the fact that some of the munitions of war are among the products of that company. With the Du Ponts they link other manufacturers of war material.

And so we find a CR propagandist saying that "All the highway robberies of history have done less violence to the social values of property, or indeed to the 'rights' of private property, than the legalized work of the private expropriators of property, of concerns like Standard Oil, the Mellon and Du Pont interests, and the United States Steel Corporation." This statement, while rather obscure

in its meaning to the average reader, refers no doubt to the patriotic services of the great business concerns named during the World War; for all kinds of munition-makers are condemned by pacifists for their activities in wartime.

Now the great bulk of Du Pont products are designed for the peaceful service of industry. The high explosives they include serve the miner and the quarryman, the excavator and the tunnel-builder; they give us our coal and iron and, in a lesser degree, our oil; they serve as firemen in the limitation of spreading fires, they remove ice-gorges and help to build Boulder Dams. They are, in fact, indispensable for many peacetime purposes, and in wartime the manufacturing facilities of these concerns are at the command of the government,—which is fortunate for a country that is always lacking in preparedness for self-defense.

But the pacifists of Consumers' Research object to a typical peacetime product of the Du Ponts. They fear that advertising may extend the use of Cellophane, that useful material of recent invention which now serves to keep so many food products and other merchandise free from dust and dirt and contamination. And so the CR says: "We may next expect the *sliced crustless loaf of bread*, packaged in cellophane. Then Du Pont will have a new cellophane market until the next war opens up opportunities for more billions. Already it is on the way, for the Northwestern Miller pictures a Brooklyn baker offering a sliced and crustless loaf."

Well, why not a crustless loaf, sliced and wrapped cleanly in cellophane? There are many persons who do not care for the crusts of bread; many more probably who cannot eat them for lack of molars and incisors; and a crustless loaf would no doubt find a ready demand, as the sliced loaf promptly did when it was placed on the market. And is the Du Pont Company to be blamed for providing, after much costly experimentation, a re-

markably effective and valuable transparent wrapping material for so many products that are the better for such a covering?

The Du Ponts are a notably philanthropic family. Consumers' Research says they donate to colleges and universities with an ulterior object in view, namely, the utilization of college professors, especially those of small means, in the interests of the war-munition industries and other profit-making projects. And the CR would have us believe that that is the reason why members of the Du Pont family have made donations to the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, Leland Stanford University and Princeton College, and endowed thirty-seven fellowships in the Polytechnic Institute of Virginia!

Incidentally we may say that Consumers' Research should know a good deal about ulterior motives, since it has one of its own, as we think we have shown.

It is a curious quirk of human nature, however, that men of the mental type of CR writers condemn the rich for the possession of wealth, and condemn them also for their benefactions to educational, religious and charitable institutions, either before or after their death, although they themselves may underpay their help, run a profiteering racket, and were never known to give a dime to a worthy old mendicant.

Raving in its usual style on the subject of Cellophane, Consumers' Research says: "Not long ago the New England Bakers' Association held a convention in Boston, where it was announced that 'today the biggest emphasis of all salesmanship is on the *appearance* of the products.' This is in line with the emphasis of all salesmanship in the New Age of Cellophane. Appearance is not only served through modern packaging, but it is equally well served by chemicalized 'freshness.'"

There the CR writer goes off at a tangent again, jumping from the undoubted value of cellophane as a protec-

tive wrapping to the technique of production, and ignoring the fact that the cellophane wrapper is added when the product is absolutely new and fresh, and the further fact that the Du Pont covering material does preserve the freshness of practically every article which it enwraps.

We are informed that in one of its bulletins Consumers' Research asserted with a sneer that a well-known brand of bacon, widely marketed by Swift & Company has a *perfumed* wrapping of cellophane, and that Du Pont, very kindly and appropriately, obliges the Chicago packers by perfuming the cellophane with *bacon*, thus giving both package and wrapper a similar scent. This may or may not be true,— we will not waste the time of the packers by calling them up to inquire, but inasmuch as the bacon is plainly visible through the wrapper and its quality tells its own tale, we prefer to believe that people with sensitive olfactory nerves will not be offended by the "perfume" thereof. The CR writers have little or no sense of humor, and this was probably the best joke of which their imaginations were capable.

* * *

Radio.— We come now to a subject of Consumers' Research criticism in which every American who owns a radio set is more or less interested. That is the subject of Radio and the great business conducted by the Radio Corporation of America (RCA), with which Consumers' Research links the names of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Western Electric Co., the General Electric Co., the Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co., the United Fruit Co., General Motors, the General Electric Institute (Nela Park, Cleveland), and Owen D. Young.

The nature of CR criticism of the great combination that carries the voice of the President of the United States, the Pope, and King Edward into every American home, and gives us the music of the Metropolitan Opera House and the symphony orchestras of our large cities,

and furnishes daily and nightly entertainment for listening millions,— may be judged by the statement in a recent CR publication that Radio is “a cesspool of shady advertising.” We will let the extreme violence and filthiness of that charge answer itself, for it gives rise to unpleasant thought of the general character of CR criticism and critics.

It is far more pleasant to reflect upon the fact that Radio has brought entertainment and happiness to the aged and infirm, to chronic invalids, the blind, and the bedridden, and has enabled them to join in the devotional exercises of their faith and to hear uplifting sermons, as well as the voices of the great, in every community of the land.

At the outset of a characteristic attack upon the Radio Corporation of America, Consumers' Research quotes Walter S. Gifford, president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., as saying before a Senate committee: “The Bell system now has patents and patent rights to the number of 15,000, and has 1,300 patent applications pending. These are not for exploitation, but to give us a clear field.” What of it? Has not the result been to give us the best telephone system in the world? We can remember, many of us, when much confusion was caused in business and social affairs because there were two or more competing telephone systems in the same community; and a single system, country-wide, makes for the greatest public convenience.

But the CR writers refer to what they call the “patent racket” as a basis of their attack on Radio. They recite the history of the Radio Corporation in part and recall that, under Owen D. Young leadership, the RCA held, within eleven years from its birth in 1919, about 4,000 patents or “alleged patents” on radio apparatus. A few years later, “it brought in a six-billion dollar combine dominating the field, including broadcasting, electrical appliances, communications, motors, and accessories.

Beginning with General Electric, it then took in American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Western Electric, United Fruit Co., Westinghouse, and General Motors." The result, deprecated by Consumers' Research, was that the Radio Corporation of America "destroyed competitors or brought them to terms;" and having gained possession, through legitimate purchase, of the fundamental patents upon which all later patents are based, the RCA had a clear field to give the American people the best radio service possible, under one unified management.

In England, radio broadcasting is under the sole control of the government,—and the owners of radio sets pay a good round tax for their entertainment. Here we have the major control in the hands of a large private corporation, with funds and facilities sufficient to provide the best possible forms of entertainment, and we pay no tax at all for our evening's enjoyment of broadcasting programs. But Consumers' Research thinks it is all wrong, because *advertising* pays the bills, and the CR is terribly opposed to advertising. Why? Because it sells American products, and the CR thinks our *products* are all wrong—at least they find something wrong with every product they sample,—and anyway, they are opposed to American business methods and the awful "profit system" under which our growth as a nation and our manufacturing progress have developed.

So Consumers' Research does not approve of General Electric "giving brooms away" to New York radio listeners who will "drop a postcard" and ask for them; the sight of a new broom might make the recipient want a General Electric vacuum-cleaner. It does not approve of Westinghouse "giving away" 5,000 "food-savers" for old-fashioned ice-boxes,—it might make the icebox owners desire a modern refrigerator. And if this awful advertising by radio goes on, the lecturers of the General Electric Institute may persuade listeners to make their bathroom a "health room," by installing a modern lighting

system that will make shaving and powdering-the-nose more easy and pleasant.

The CR tells us that there is one house in America that has an average of seven electric gadgets to the room ("Gadgets" in the CR vocabulary means domestic and other conveniences.) The house referred to is in Schenectady, N. Y., and the gadgets, we are told, "*are almost all General Electric products.*" This fact is emphasized by italics as if General Electric products were of evil origin,—but to our mind the comfort-loving owner of the Schenectady dwelling, with its 80-odd useful electric appliances is to be congratulated.

Consumers' Research objects because radio "fans" are warned by advertising and radio announcers against keeping their serviceable tubes in use too long. This is good advice, whoever gives it; for no radio fan wants his reception of a President's address or a ball-game broadcast interrupted by tube-failure,—and an occasional inspection of your radio set by a service-man is as advisable as an occasional overhauling of your motor-car by an expert repair man. But, says Consumers' Research, "junking tubes means health and happiness for the RCA and a richer life for Gerard Swope and Owen D. Young"—which, whatever it means, is pure nonsense.

Reluctant to leave the subject of the Radio Corporation and Owen D. Young's successful connection with its management, Consumers' Research takes a farewell fling at Mr. Young, in conjunction with other leading business men, in the following statement and prediction:

"The Art Smiths, the Pelleys, the Guldens, the George W. Christians, the Townsends, and the Huey Longs, are the political 'deformities' to which the business systems of the Du Ponts, Owen D. Youngs, the Sloans, and the Morgans gave birth . . . From these demagogues, who are self-appointed 'deliverers,' the *de facto* rulers of America may yet have to pick a Hitler for their own purposes."

That is just another typical CR slap at Big Business, with the veiled warning that we are on our way to the Fascism which "collectivists" like Schlink & Co. detest for fear of the same fate as that which befell the Communists of Italy, when Mussolini's Black Shirts gave them castor-oil in large doses.

* * *

Cheese, a leading article of the diet of many people in this country and Canada, has been the subject of many a sneering allusion by Consumers' Research writers, and they have laid especial emphasis on an alleged lack of quality in the food-products which they group under the name of "process cheese."

Thus in his wearisome volume of food-criticism, "Eat, Drink and Be Wary," F. J. Schlink, dictator of Consumers' Research and would-be dictator of American food-consumption and business in general, says: "One of the major atrocities of this age is the disappearance of cheese and the substitution for it on a national scale of what is called process cheese, made by grinding cheese of very low quality, or any quality that happens to be available, and mixing in chemicals as emulsifiers, and sometimes other substances such as dried milk, milk sugar, or low-grade butter."

The Kraft-Phenix Cheese Corporation, Chicago, a division of the National Dairy Products Corporation, is the largest producer of the so-called process cheese in the United States; and its products, packaged conveniently to suit every requirement of the household and every family purse, are known and appreciated by millions of our people. These consumers need little assurance that the processing methods of the Kraft Company and the ingredients used in Kraft products are beyond criticism, — for all these products are found eminently satisfactory in use. But let us see what the producers say about the process of making Cream cheese, for example, which

is the most popular of all packaged cheeses. We quote from a Kraft booklet, "The Romance of Cheese," as follows:

"The smooth, creamy richness of Cream cheese, as its name implies, comes from the fresh, sweet milk and cream from which it is made. Cream cheese plants are located in the heart of dairy sections, where farmers deliver their daily milk production early each morning. The milk is then enriched by the addition of freshly pasteurized sweet cream, and the mixture is pasteurized in large, specially constructed vats. When pasteurization is complete, the rich milk and cream mixture is cooled, and laboratory-cultured 'starter' is added to assure uniform 'curding' and to produce perfect smoothness and easy digestibility. After eighteen hours of curding and setting, the curd is poured onto sterilized, closely-woven cheesecloth, to drain the whey from the curd. After a few hours the cloths are drawn together and tied at the top, forming a sack in which the curd is held while pressed between cracked ice overnight. In the morning the chilled curd is pressed and salted. Then a machine works the cheese to perfect smoothness . . . After packaging, Cream cheese is rushed to grocers by fast express, and protected by refrigeration at every stage of distribution."

There are many Kraft varieties of soft cheese, made and "ripened" with similar care and regard for sanitation. In hard or soft cheese manufacture, the "starter" used to make the curd is either rennet or lactic acid; and the "poor ingredients" and "chemical emulsifiers" mentioned by Schlink are creatures of a distorted imagination.

Carnation Milk advertising of "contented cows" peacefully feeding in an ideal pasturage is ridiculed by Consumers' Research, which asserts that Carnation cows are "stall-fed" because of a larger production of milk and a saving of overhead. The evaporated milk industry having been attacked by the CR in some of its publications,

Mr. Wilbur Slemmons, chemist of the Carnation Milk Company, Oconomowoc, Wis., went to New Jersey to ascertain the cause of the criticism. He tells of his trip as follows:

"Owing to some fault found with Carnation Milk by Consumers' Research, I made a trip to the plant of the CR in Washington, N. J. It was a place out in the country, hard to locate, as no one seemed to know anything about where it was. I finally asked a roughly-dressed man on the road (a CCC worker) where this Company was located, and he directed me to an isolated spot, where I found what seemed to be an old, deserted building. But sure enough it was occupied, and how!?!"

"Five big, burly policemen met me at the door, and questioned me,—asked me who I was and why I was there, etc. After explaining myself, I was shown to a young lady secretary of Mr. Schlink, the manager, who informed me that Mr. Schlink made no appointments except by mail, and I would have to follow that rule.

"I stayed about an hour trying to see him, and left for New York where I remained for several days and finally made an appointment by phone to see Schlink. I laid before him our side of the matter, after which Schlink agreed to correct his report that Carnation Milk was 'not recommended'; and this he did in a bulletin issued shortly thereafter,—but in a later bulletin he again placed Carnation Milk in the 'Not Recommended' classification."

The experience of the Carnation Milk Company's chemist at the CR village headquarters affords a certain index to the business character of F. J. Schlink. It shows what sort of business man he is. When even an unknown visitor from a distant city or state was announced to the late Chauncey M. Depew, he would have him admitted without delay, saying to his secretary, "That man has come a long way to see me!"

But Schlink could keep a visitor from Wisconsin waiting in vain at his door for hours, and then have him sent away, to wait for days for an appointment. And the

object of the visitor was to get simple justice done to a worthy and popular product. What followed? Shilly-shallying, contradictory reports, and a final unfair, unjustified criticism of the product! And Schlink meanwhile was securely guarded by "five big, burly policemen," to keep the "proletariat" from approaching his august presence.

Milk — Butter. What the CR calls "factory-made butter," such as the fine butters made by the Blue Valley Creamery Co., is among the dairy products that arouse the ire of Consumers' Research, probably because of its large sale. The CR does not approve of any American product having a large sale. The well-known Borden milk products are subjected to criticism for much the same reason. Because, forsooth, the concern is a large advertiser of its useful products, we are told that "the Milk Trust, like Tobacco, must yield dividends to the limit of traffic."

Consumers' Research is always inclined to scoff at the use of milk in the diet and loses no opportunity to denounce "the milk fad," in spite of the agreement of medical men and all other scientists that milk is "the almost perfect food for man." But American mothers will continue to feed milk freely to their children and the average adult will not be prevented by CR criticism from making milk a part of the daily diet.

The value of milk as a food, either as a principal or an accessory article of the daily diet, continues from birth to old age. It is Nature's own food, marvelously and plentifully provided for the sustenance of mankind, and as a potent factor in the upbuilding of the human body and the preservation of health.

Modern methods of sanitation, treatment and distribution of this invaluable product of the farm,—such as the methods of the Borden Company,—bring this life-giving and life-preserving fluid to your doorstep in the purest, most desirable, and most convenient form. In this respect the American people, especially those living

in large communities, are the most fortunate on earth, for in no other country is milk brought to the city or town consumer so promptly, regularly, and with such an efficiency and low cost of service.

While the pseudo-scientists of Consumers' Research may term the daily use of milk "a fad," real scientists who have made a special study of milk, like Professor Sherman of Columbia University and Professor McCollum of Johns Hopkins University tell us that a quart of milk a day for each adult, and a quart or more for each adolescent is the very minimum quota that should be ingested for the ideal preservation of health. And to say the least, milk is a food that should never be absent from one's daily diet, regardless of age or physical, mental, or social conditions.

The Food and Drug Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture has received inquiries from consumers regarding the CR charges of danger to health occasioned by the presence of arsenic and lead in foods and from lead arsenate sprays, etc. A portion of the government report on the subject is as follows:

"Some 12,000 foods from all the different classes and localities have been examined by the Food and Drug Administration for arsenic, and some 200 for lead. Special emphasis was placed upon foods such as milk, candy, chocolate products, and jams, which are consumed extensively by children. *In no case has any alarming situation been uncovered.* We have not found, in fluid or evaporated milk, for instance, quantities of lead or arsenic which can, by any stretch of the imagination, be regarded as harmful."

We prefer to accept the reports of government experts with regard to such subjects as food contamination or the lack of it, rather than the "vain imaginings" of Consumers' Research.

Pets. — Even our domestic pets would be deprived of their favorite manufactured and cleanly-packaged foods, if Consumers' Research had its way, for the meaty rations

made and packaged by Chappell Bros., of Rockford, Ill., are distasteful to "Comrade" Schlink. But "man's greatest friend" and other household pets will continue to enjoy them.

Glass. — Special window-glass for the transmission of the ultra-violet rays of sunlight is deemed by these critics to be over-advertised, and although Consumers' Research denounces the Du Ponts for their business success, it suggests that cellophane, one of the Du Pont products, be substituted for glass in our windows; then it tells the consumer where cellophane can be obtained in sheets large enough for the purpose. But it will probably be a long time before the American householder adopts the suggestion, or any other of the dictates of the Jersey village czar.

Soaps. — Toilet soaps of the popular kind have been so frequently criticized in Consumers' Research book and bulletins that, if the public did not know better than to be influenced by such criticisms against their better judgment, the sale of well-known brands like Palmolive might be seriously affected. But this soap has proved so generally satisfactory in family use that the sneers of the CR at the value of palm and olive oils in soap manufacture have about the same effect on the consumer as water on a duck's back,—and the low-priced, agreeable Palmolive will continue to be a family favorite.

* * *

Chocolate and Cocoa are among the food substances that fall under the ban of the CR. If Consumers' Research writers had their way, in fact, the American people would abandon many of their most popular foods and beverages. The soothing "hot chocolate" of the corner drug-store or the home fireside after the theater or picture-show on a cold night would become a thing of the past; the children's cup of cocoa for breakfast or supper would be denied them, and even the use of cocoa by adults as a substitute for coffee and tea, though advised

by physicians, would be abandoned. And why? Because, in its terroristic campaign against the things we commonly eat and drink, Consumers' Research warns us that there are certain poisons lurking in chocolate and cocoa,—that lead and arsenic may be found in these apparently harmless substances.

This is the same old cry — that we are being slowly poisoned by the things we consume, which the CR has raised against so many innocuous food-products, in the general attack on consumer-goods. If there are lead and arsenic in chocolate, they exist in such infinitesimal quantities, as many minerals exist in the human body, that they are not only non-poisonous, but in fact beneficial,—because the human system *needs* them.

The CR objections to chocolate and cocoa, we learn, “apply of course to the numerous products in which they are extensively used, particularly chocolated drinks, soda and sundaes, cakes and candy.” There is no day in the year, perhaps,—not even Christmas day, when more chocolate candy, chocolated drinks, and confections containing chocolate are consumed than on Easter Sunday; and on the morning of Easter Monday when these lines are being written, we do not find in the papers any news of deaths or illness from chocolate eating or drinking, and the children and grandchildren of our family and our neighbors have suffered no ill effects, in spite of their consumption of chocolate eggs and chocolate rabbits and all manner of chocolate drinks.

And as for chocolate candy bars, especially condemned by the CR, and other “monstrosities,” as the CR calls them, such as the baker's “chocolate center rolls,” the chances are a thousand to one that the sale and consumption of such confections will continue as great, if not greater than ever, because the consumer knows from personal and family experience that those commodities are harmless.

* * *

Tobacco.— In cases of longevity, it is common to learn

that the aged individual has been accustomed to use tobacco all his life, in some form or other. Thus, when an old gentleman celebrated his 100th birthday by swimming thirty-five yards under water near Miami, Florida, recently, he assured reporters that he attributed his health and longevity, in part, to his habit of smoking tobacco in a pipe. He certainly had not been "poisoned" by the habit, but Consumers' Research would have smokers believe that they inhale "lead or arsenic" with their cigars or cigarettes.

Tobacco companies, the CR asserts, keep right along ignoring the danger to smokers, although .01 (one-hundredth) of a grain of arsenous oxide may be taken into the system while smoking 3½ ounces of pipe tobacco, or a dozen packages of cigarettes, or 23 cigars (7 ounces). Pipe smoke is most likely to be poisonous, the CR says, and cigar smoke the least. But the active old Florida gentleman noted above smoked a pipe, and if there were any symptoms of poisoning in his case, the wide-eyed reporters who saw him perform his under-water feat in January, 1935, could see no trace of it. And millions of American smokers who attain a ripe old age and enjoy the comfort of pipe, cigar, or cigarette are no more "poisoned" by their habit than they are by the carbonic-acid gas they expel from their lungs with every breath.

If the ill-informed writers of Consumers' Research would cease their use of the poison pen for a moment or two of calm thought, they might decide to ask a few of the majority of doctors who smoke, why they indulge in the habit, especially when they have infectious or contagious cases to deal with. The CR critics might then learn something of the antiseptic, germ-killing properties of tobacco,—and revise their opinions of it. But we are inclined to think that when they pen their criticisms of tobacco, they probably have either a pipe or a good cigar in their mouths,—and their criticism is merely for the purpose of creating a sensation, like so much more of their work when they attack American products.

They say, for instance, that lead is more serious in tobacco than the arsenic they allege to be present, and that the lead is derived from the lead arsenate with which the tobacco plants may have been sprayed while still in the ground. The same allegation has been frequently made by them with regard to some of our common fruits and vegetables; and the possibility of "poisoning" therefrom has been as frequently denied by medical experts, as we showed in an earlier chapter, in which the opinion of Dr. Fishbein, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association was quoted to the contrary.

Camel cigarettes are attacked by the CR, largely on account of the manufacturers' advertising. "What possible relevancy can there be," one CR writer asks, "in the publicized fact that certain famous men and women smoke Camels?" Well, there may be no relevancy in the opinion of the CR, but it would be interesting to hear Franklin D. Roosevelt's opinion of CR's "poisonous" criticism of the cigarettes he carries in his pocket, or the opinion of the hundreds of thousands of business men who are equally addicted to the cigarette habit.

Criticism of the use of tobacco in cigarette form was quite general in the prewar days of Lucy Page Gaston; but the World War changed all that, and made the American people a cigarette-smoking nation, as well as a nation of cigar-smokers; and on the streets of downtown New York today one will see almost as many pipe-smokers as on similar business streets in London.

Old Gold, Chesterfields, and Spuds are among the brands of cigarettes mentioned with Camels in CR publications as objects of derision, with special emphasis on the fact that the claims of these cigarettes to public patronage and use are supported by many scientists,—which is a fact that the CR can only meet with sarcasm. If ever Consumers' Research attacks on a particular commodity or branch of manufacture were unsound and uncalled for, their assaults on the tobacco industry and the smoking

habit are of that character. And when the whole of their criticism is boiled down, it is the use of testimonials from well-known people that most distinctly arouses their ire. In other words, they cannot refrain from denouncing the success of modern advertising and selling methods.

* * *

The Consumers' Research attacks the perfectly legitimate custom of using "testimonials" in advertising. Testimonials are a valuable form of currency in business, as in social life. The introduction of one person to another is, in effect, a testimonial, whether it be written or oral. A testimonial is a formal token of regard; when it is written, it is a certificate of regard for the object thereof. Is there anything possibly wrong in expressing the regard one feels for either a person or a product? The answer is emphatically No!

But Consumers' Research would have the public join in regarding testimonial advertising with suspicion,—that is, suspicion of the product recommended, and suspicion of the motives of the testimonial-giver. The answer to that is, that most of the products that are advertised by testimonials from prominent people are already as well and favorably known to the public as the persons who recommend them; and readers are naturally pleased to find that men and women of prominence use and like the same things they themselves buy.

It is a natural trait of humanity to find one's judgment of things, from a motor-car to a specific brand of soap, cigarettes, or face-creams, corroborated by an advertised testimonial from anybody who enjoys public respect, whether it be a famous politician, a leading society woman, a Queen of Rumania, or anyone else who is prominent in the public eye.

Why do American families flock to Florida or to California to spend vacations or to escape climatic rigors in their home towns? Many go for the first time every year. Why? Because of testimonials written or spoken

by their neighbors and friends who have enjoyed the pleasures of the southern climes and willingly recommend them.

Why does an intending depositor or borrower seek a letter of introduction or some other recommendation from business acquaintances when he approaches a banker? Because the attitude of the banker is likely to be influenced by such testimonials. A man's credit often depends upon such evidences of reputation.

Many types of business require the use of "references," and what is the useful reference but a testimonial? House-owners generally require references from would-be tenants; employers require them from seekers for jobs, and the groceryman feels more assured in extending credit when the customer can present satisfactory credentials in the form of testimonials!

Even Consumers' Research itself seeks testimonials for itself with avidity, though it condemns their use by other advertisers. When one of its sensational books first sees the light of publication, how eagerly the CR authors and officers of the Jersey organization look for newspaper and magazine reviews, for every such review is a testimonial and helps them to sell their products.

And that is just the reason why manufacturers, advertisers, and distributors use testimonials of *their* products, — because such recommendations *help to sell goods*. What if a society woman does lend her name to the promotion of a cosmetic which she has found to be an aid to the cultivation or preservation of beauty? As a consumer she has the right to advise other consumers, — just as much right, and more, than the so-called Consumers' Research. If she should happen to receive a check for the use of her name or portrait, the proceeds of the check are just as likely as not to be devoted to some favorite charity, such as a hospital or an orphans' home. And that denotes the possession of a personal trait — *charity* — the cultivation of which is strongly

recommended to the CR writers who do not approve of testimonials for any products but their own.

* * *

Razor Blades of Gillette and other makes have been attacked for various alleged reasons by the CR. In one case, that of the "Doublekeen (General Blade Corporation, New York) the blades of that brand were placed on the "Recommended" list, but after the manufacturer used the fact of CR recommendation in advertising, the CR subscribers were told that they might refuse to buy the blades, "in order to express their disapproval," and it was also suggested that such disapproval would "notify dealers" — and so, of course injure the sale.

With regard to the excellent quality of the blades now being offered to the public, and the general satisfaction they give in use, we may quote the following from "Fortune," the magazine of business: "The mechanism for the manufacture of Gillette blades seems to be endowed with superhuman faculties of precision. They cost millions of dollars — years of thought and research." And the American public uses millions of these blades a year, with a shaving comfort that our grandfathers never knew. For, as Joe Cook said after a trip through the Boston plant of the Gillette Safety Razor Company: "The machines put so fine an edge on each blade that you can't even see 'em."

Everything American being all wrong, according to the CR, it is not surprising to find Consumers' Research taking a fling at our correspondence schools, which have done such a mighty work in promoting self-education. CR subscribers are warned against "long-distance education," which is accused of furnishing "sketchy and un-scholarly text to students," and it is charged that the "money-back guarantee is usually useless, because a time limit is established." But the fact remains that business and professional circles are full of men, young and old, who have benefited vastly by enrollment for correspon-

dence courses, and the greatest colleges and universities now recognize the value of home study, of which the late Dr. William R. Harper, president of the University of Chicago, said: "That which a young man learns by conscientious study in the privacy of his home is of infinitely greater value to him, and is longer retained, than most of the things he learns in the classroom." And the correspondence schools of America will continue to flourish as an important feature of our general education system.

* * *

Funerals — Consumers' Research not only tells you how to live, and how to be "poisoned," but also tells you how to die and how your family should bury you after you are dead. The CR writers say: "There is a barbarous lack of taste in our burial customs that is almost incredible . . . There was a time when last rites in this country had an uncommon homeliness that gave them dignity. Friends cared for the body and carried it on their shoulders to a grave near the home. Today, with veins pumped full of chemicals and a rouged and painted face plumped out with wax or cotton, the deceased is placed on display in a hired hall and then carried off to some high-pressure real estate development, with hucksters of many varieties snatching and pawing to grab as great a share of profit as possible from the performance."

And then these CR experts on everything on top of the earth, give a man who intends to die explicit instructions how to do it, and how to arrange for his funeral afterward. They say that if you pay more than \$360 for your funeral, you're gypped. Their final remarks are as follows: "The family should take final leave of the body in the room where death has occurred. It can then be sent directly to the crematory. A member of the family can accompany the body to the incinerator chamber, which is rather like a crypt of a mausoleum, without its clammy suggestiveness."

Cremation is a means of disposal which is repugnant to the feelings, religious and otherwise, of the great majority of our people, though there is a considerable minority who favor it, especially for others than themselves. Of course the managers and writers of the CR organization can order the manner of their own disposal after death, and if they prefer to go up — or down — in flames and smoke, that is their own affair. Most of their subscribers, doubtless, would just as soon see them cremated as buried; and for our part, in the interests of American business, we do not care how soon either course is adopted; but the overwhelming majority of Americans will continue to prefer that among the last words spoken over their remains shall be the significant phrases of committal, "Dust to dust, ashes to ashes, earth to earth!"

CHAPTER XVI

THE BOYCOTT AND THE BLACKLIST

UNTIL the formation of the "Consumers' Research" organization, the Chinese held the record as the champion boycotters of the world; but they really only boycotted the goods of nations against which they were aggrieved, while the "Consumers' Research" managers have effectively employed the boycott against manufacturers and business concerns generally; — it is a business with them — a racket!

Boycotting is a weapon of this organization, devised to injure business houses or individuals by criticizing their products, checking their sales, and lessening their profits. "Consumers' Research" endeavors to prevent the public from dealing with such business men as come under its ban, working unceasingly to that end through the means of "bulletins," "reports," annual handbooks, etc. This is similar to the tactics often employed by organized labor against department stores and other business houses, when "pickets" are placed in front of their places of business, wearing large signs bearing the words "Unfair to Organized Labor."

The methods and practices of the alleged "Consumers' Research" have resulted in hardship and financial loss to hundreds and thousands of manufacturers and business men. Many states have legislated against boycotting methods and have provided laws that make them illegal, especially where there are malicious attempts to injure another's business. But for some reason business men have failed to take advantage of these laws against their persecutors. It is quite possible that they feel that the same fate will finally befall the "CR" management that befell the greedy, avaricious and oppressive Irish landlord, Captain Boycott, from whose name the term "boycott" is derived. He just escaped with his life when his angry tenants turned against him.

The theft of a man's good name is a crime punishable by law, provided the thief can be caught and convicted. When it is malicious, the law calls it libel, and provides for damages; but many a business reputation has been wrecked by secret or "confidential" reports, filled mainly with insinuations, that emanate from such organizations as the "Consumers' Research" and poison the business atmosphere of America.

Almost every week our attention is called to some report or secret bulletin, issued by one of these dangerous organizations and purporting to "expose" some flaw in the product or formula of some company in the territory it foully serves as a prattler, while posing as a custodian (self-appointed) of business conduct. When analyzed, these reports are frequently found to be altogether unfair and unjust to those at whom they are aimed. But the damage is done, and it is impossible for the business man to secure retraction from their source, even though their effect may be to wreck the reputation of his product for all time.

It is a melancholy fact that "Consumers' Research" reports directly or indirectly affecting the reputations and integrity of the products of manufacturers or processors, are sometimes adopted as gospel truth by local women's clubs, and even by organizations of parent-teacher associations. At any rate, they find their way into the files of other organizations besides the pestiferous "Consumers' Research" that originates them,—and attacks on business character seem to be accepted as justifiable by many persons who would not accept any other kind of business statement without independent investigation.

The slanderer is about the lowest type of humanity; and why should an official or quasi-official slanderer be tolerated in the community any more than a vicious purveyor of backdoor gossip? An officer of a woman's association was asked the other day to show a visitor the report in her files against the goods of a certain business concern. She refused, saying that the report was

confidential, intended for perusal only by members of her organization,—and that it would be “dangerous” to make it public. Why would it be dangerous? Simply because it was libelous; and if it was libelous, by what right was it made available to members of the association? What right has anyone to make even a limited publication of libelous matter?

We come now to a case in point which was recently “investigated” by the “Consumers’ Research,” and also received publicity in its blacklisting book, “100,000,000 Guinea Pigs.” We refer to the case of *Pebeco* Toothpaste. The “CR” critics say:

“Many of the advertised toothpastes in the druggist’s window are actually harmful, or involve risk to the user. For instance, *Pebeco*, because its principal ingredient is a poison. Two-fifths of each tube of *Pebeco* is potassium chlorate, a poison that has been responsible for dozens of deaths. In 1910 a German army officer committed suicide by eating a tube of *Pebeco*. There are nearly 30 grams of potassium chlorate in each 2½-ounce tube of *Pebeco*.”

The “Consumers’ Research” published this boycotting statement broadcast, even though they had in their possession, at the time, the approved statement of the Council on Dental Therapeutics of the American Dental Association. The Council’s approval states:

“Reports are frequently found showing toxicity (poisoning) following the ingestion of large amounts of potassium chlorate, but no reports are found on the toxic action following its action in a dentifricial manner.”

This is but one of many such cases of deplorable “Consumers’ Research” methods and persecution, of which the details and proof are in the writer’s possession, and under the “Consumers’ Research” such things are happening today; after more than two years of strenuous effort at Washington to put an end to “unfair competition” in trade. Such efforts become a ghastly farce so long as the “CR” system is permitted to exist.

The facts in the case of the Pebeco Company furnish a valuable object-lesson for business men the whole country over. They show that in seeking to end the menace of the "Consumers' Research," legitimate business has a hydra-headed monster to deal with, and that the task is indeed a herculean one. But just as Hercules found a way to put an end to the many-headed monster whose extermination was one of his allotted "labors," so this modern menace to business can be ended if its victims and prospective victims will only "fight back" courageously, and let the light of publicity show up the nefarious, underhanded methods of this concern's managers — who are all "tarred with the same brush."

In every field of manufacture the Consumers' Research picks out more or less popular products for its harsh and unfounded criticism. When "Pebeco" was attacked in the book that insultingly informed the American people that they are "100,000,000 Guinea Pigs," other well and favorably known tooth preparations received similar uncalled-for attention.

Thus the cleansing agent of "Pepsodent" came in for some carping criticism, and the opinion of a professor of *Materia Medica* at the University of Pennsylvania — a gentleman with a distinctly foreign name — was quoted to the effect that the materials commonly used by American adults and children to keep their teeth clean are rather bad for the tooth-tissues if used continuously. Inasmuch as Americans may be credited with greater care of the teeth than the inhabitants of any European country, and as a rule their teeth are the envy of foreigners, such statements will not cause us to abandon our practice of brushing our dental equipment daily, even if our tooth powders and pastes do contain the requisite percentage of "abrasive substances."

And we shall probably continue to instruct our school-children to brush their teeth daily, if not after each meal, regardless of the hypercritical findings of Consumers' Research and a lone university professor here and there

who can be found to approve the censorious attitude of the CR toward everything manufactured in America.

"Kolynos" toothpaste also came in for criticism by the inventor of the "Guinea Pig" appellation for Americans. And what do you suppose was the point of his objection to Kolynos? Why, simply that it may contain, as one of its ingredients, a little too much of the best quality of Castile soap! Considering the value every mother sets upon Castile soap for use on the tender body of a baby, who needs fear to brush his teeth with a preparation, skillfully designed for the purpose and compounded by competent chemists, just because it contains a very natural ingredient in the form of a modicum of Castile. Why, we have known dentists who recommend Castile soap, as a daily dentifrice, and with none but good results; and for the benefit of "Guinea Pigs" who may be inclined to heed Consumers' Research criticism of tooth preparations or any other products, we may remind them that the "CR" critics can see no good in anything American, for it does not accord with their Communistic mission to approve any of our products. All they desire is to create consumer-discontent, and injure American business as much as possible.

The lesson of the "Pebeco" case and others, is that no business concern, in any part of the country, is safe from the operations of this monstrous, self-styled consumer-protector, with its hotbed of unfair competition, greed, and malice. The "Consumer's Research" office is a lair of a Hydra as dangerous to American business as the monster which Hercules slew was to mankind. It took fire to end the mythical beast, and the fire of an aroused public opinion should end the sneaking "CR" system.

For hundreds of years, men have been toiling and striving toward business and mechanical perfection, impelled by that mysterious law that causes the pine to spring toward the sun; sometimes the advance has been by leaps and bounds, when men of giant intellect, like

Edison or Ford, especially gifted with the attributes of genius, brush aside the obstructions to surmount which lesser men have toiled in vain. Sometimes the car of progress stands still for a century— or else moves slowly back toward primitiveness,— there being none of sufficient strength to advance the standards up the rugged mountainside of progress.

But we *have* progressed; we have made matter so far subject unto mind that Nature's mighty forces have become our obedient bond-slaves. We have built societies and nations; weighed the world and measured the stars. We have not only acquired knowledge and power, but wealth and freedom, and with such marvelous resources as this country boasts, touched by the magic hand of genius, the Golden Age of which poets have dreamed and for which philanthropists have prayed, should be ever at our door,— and would be, were it not for such business destroying organizations as the "Consumers' Research."

CHAPTER XVII

REPUTATION AND GOODWILL WRECKERS

THE "Consumers' Research" idea has been looked upon rather favorably by the general run of consumers, who did not foresee its inevitable trend and general depressive effect on business. It appears that the greater the fake reform, the greater the endorsement from the people of the community.

However, this concern is so cleverly camouflaged that some of its members and most of its subscribers are unaware of the real menace that underlies its existence. But this fact we shall bring to their attention in such a forceful manner that they will not be apt to neglect or forget their responsibility in the future.

It is suggested that business men call upon the Courts to decide whether a number of racketeers can band themselves together for the purpose of wrecking the reputation and business of manufacturers and advertisers, without the support of law or any license for their acts.

Actions in tort, with malice counts which carry an ultimate jail penalty, should be employed in every instance against the responsible "Consumers' Research" members and directors; and where judgments are obtained, the offenders ought to be clapped into jail until the judgments are satisfied. This prospect should make every director, every member of the outfit consider his responsibility for the acts of that nefarious organization,—an unlicensed, unbonded menace to the business community.

A tort, in the eyes of the law, is a private wrong, committed by one man or group of men against another, — as distinguished from a public wrong, or crime. The Law of Torts is based upon the common law; it is an ancient and righteous law, designed for the protection of the weak against the encroachments and persecution of the strong.

No matter how strongly entrenched in wealth and position a group of men may believe themselves to be, they cannot with impunity wrong their fellowmen, either by personal acts or by proxy. Directors and members of the "Consumers' Research" cannot plead ignorance of the acts of those with whom they are associated. Thus, a man may be convicted, under the Law of Torts, for failure to restrain certain dangerous agencies or enterprises with which he is connected.

"Consumers' Research, Inc.," obtained a charter as an educational institution for the purpose of camouflaging its real reason for existence, and hasn't any capital stock for the reason that there would then be something tangible, for any injured person to recover damages resulting from illegal acts of this vicious concern.

Not being chartered under the ordinary commercial business statutes, which require capital stock and tangible assets, an officer or a member of the "Consumers' Research" cannot claim the same legal protection that a stockholder in a domestic corporation could claim for the illegal acts of officers and directors of such domestic corporation.

It is well settled that where the corporate form is used by individuals for the purpose of evading the law, and, we may add, for the purpose of libeling, blacklisting, or harassing others, eliminating competition, and defeating justice, as is done daily by this organization, our courts will not permit these frauds and wrongs to go unpunished. A recent decision says:

"Whereas the corporate form is used by individuals for the purpose of evading the law, or for the perpetration of fraud, the Courts will not permit the legal entity to be interposed so as to defeat justice." (1) See citation of cases at end of this chapter.

It is our purpose now to discuss the "Consumers' Research" corporation from a legal standpoint, and we expect to show that its directors are strictly limited in their power, and that the only power they have is that power

specifically granted to them under their charter,— that is, the power to adopt by-laws and regulations governing their own members and to enforce those powers against their own members alone; and that they are without one single vestige of power to control, to regulate the conduct of any person not a member of their association. We intend to show that the very nature of their existence is but a cloak to cover up their libels, malice, and wrongdoings, and that each officer, agent, and member is individually liable for the torts committed by the corporate entity, through the neglect of the members and officers to properly supervise the activities of their corporate agents.

The charter of a corporation read in connection with the general laws applicable to it, is the measures of the powers of the corporation, and the general doctrine in this country is that the powers of a corporation organized under legislative statutes are such, and such only, as those statutes confer. It follows that a charter containing specific powers implies the exclusion of all others. Authority for these statements can be found in many cases.

In order that a corporation may employ and derive power by implication, it must appear that such power is necessary to the enjoyment of the specially granted power, without which the latter would, to a substantial degree, fail.

A corporation is an artificial being, invisible, intangible, and existing only in contemplation of law. Being a mere creature of law, it possesses only those properties which the charter of its creation confers upon it, either expressly or as incidental to its very existence. (2).

It follows that since the "Consumers' Research" stipulate in their charter the power only to "provide unbiased information and counsel on goods bought by the ultimate consumer," the usurpation by it of any power or pretended authority to regulate the conduct of any business, to cause injury to any business man, or to

otherwise assume the function of judge and jury, however justified that may be from a supposed "public welfare" interest, is entirely without their charter rights and is proper ground for quo-warranto proceedings to oust it from the State.

The powers of a board of directors are, in an important sense, original and undelegated. They are derivative only in the sense of being received from the State in the act of incorporation. (3)

The affairs of a corporation are in the hands of its board of directors; the board consists of individuals, each of whom is part of an elected body of officers constituting the executive agents of the corporation. (4)

The difference in nomenclature, i. e., *trustees* of charitable and educational institutions and *directors* of business enterprises, is not supported by either factual or legal differentiation. (5)

Where the board of directors commits acts in violation of its duties, participating members are jointly and severally liable for their misdeeds.

And this is so without regard to the degree of dereliction of which each director may be guilty.

It has been said that wrongdoing directors are joint tortfeasors. (6)

Upon accepting a directorship, the director gives an implied promise that he will attend to his duties with that degree of care which the situation demands, and that he has a competent knowledge of the nature of their functions.

A director's inattention to his duties is not excused by the fact that he receives no compensation for his work.

A director is not obliged to assume office in the first place, and he has an unqualified right to resign at any time; and his continuance as a director is evidence of the fact that he is willing to serve without compensation, and clearly it would be unfair to permit him to avoid liability created by his own neglect of self-imposed duties, where that neglect has caused damage to others.

A director is chargeable, not only with knowledge actually acquired by him in the course of his work, but he is presumed to know everything concerning the corporation that he might have learned by exercising reasonable care and diligence and the making of proper inquiry consistent with the performance of his official functions. He may not urge ignorance of facts that he should have known, as a defense to an action against him.

A director is bound and presumed to know any event of unusual importance either at the time or soon thereafter. (7)

A director cannot blindly shut his eyes to what is transpiring about him, and shelter himself behind the claim of ignorance. As a director he was chargeable with such knowledge as he gained or as he might have learned by the exercise of reasonable care. (8)

The common-law liability for negligence is not excluded by statutory liabilities.

It is no defense for a director, to such an action, that he acted in good faith.

The duty of a director is to direct. He cannot sit idly by and leave the affairs of the corporation to others, and later seek to avoid liability upon the ground of lack of knowledge.

The position of director is not to be regarded as a nominal honor, permitting the choosing of a director for the mere use of his name.

Gross inattention to the affairs of the corporation is, in and of itself, actual negligence.

Delegation of authority to others by the board does not relieve the board of the duty of proper supervision and the possibility of inconvenience is something that the individual director should have considered before accepting office. (9)

Failure on the part of a director to attend meetings and give attention to the matters there considered is to be regarded as actionable negligence.

Directors are not excused from liability because they

committed their duties to an executive committee, for if they saw fit to rely on the executive committee it was their own reliance and at their own risk; they may delegate the work but not the responsibility. (10)

Mere reliance upon the statement of an officer is not the exercise of proper diligence.

Directors are, in general, liable for all damages that are the natural and proximate result of their negligence. (11)

Directors must use the same degree of care that is properly employed by an ordinary prudent business man under the same or similar circumstances in his own business.

Where a director knowingly permits a violation of a statutory or charter provision of the corporation, he is liable.

He is liable where he knows of and consents to the commission of an improper act.

A director is liable for negligent supervision of the acts of the officers and agents of the corporation.

A director is liable, in general, for failing to prevent illegal acts of the officers and agents of the corporation, where the exercise of reasonable diligence would have resulted in such prevention.

The fault is particularly gross negligence where directors have granted officers full control of the business and thus practically created the opportunity for improper acts. (12)

Figurehead directors are chiefly elected so that their names will give credit to the corporation, but take no really active part in its affairs.

They are held responsible for neglect of duty; that they are directors only in a nominal sense will often be of importance in determining the real character of acts performed under cover of their names. (13-14-15)

* * *

When our forefathers fled from England to escape

from political and religious tyranny, from Charles and James; to escape the persecution and the restrictions which were imposed upon individual liberty by combinations and by threats of one kind and another, they came to this country and subsequently adopted the Constitution of these United States for a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; and there has been no interruption of that governmental authority. It does not make any difference whether a man is rich or poor, whether he is classed as a capitalist or as an employee, we are all equal before the law, and you cannot put any construction upon our Constitution that will grant its protection in one case and withhold it in another; no such construction on it that will give the so-called "Consumers' Research" the right to obtain money from so-called "membership dues" and use that money to exterminate, control, or regulate business to the point of approval of its contributing members, for that is a heritage no corporation can have; it is the police power of our government, and cannot be conveyed to private enterprises.

That the "Consumers' Research," individually and collectively, is a conspiracy in restraint of trade and in violation of the Sherman and Clayton Acts and the anti-trust acts of many States, is now fully supported by evidence. The most forceful analogy of the liability of directors and members of organizations is shown in the "Danbury Hatters' Case," because it was carried to the U. S. Supreme Court and hence is affirmed by our highest authority.

We are going to give you the full record of the Danbury Hatters' Case, from its legal beginning until the \$240,000.00 judgment in favor D. E. Loewe & Company against Martin Lawlor and 250 others, as individual members of the Hatters' Union, was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States. (16)

The necessary facts to be stated for your benefit about that case, are these: The suit was instituted, not

against the Hatters' Union as an organization, but against Lawlor and 250 other individual members who paid dues to the organization. On demurrer to the complaint, a writ of error was taken to the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals, which in turn certified to the United States Supreme Court the question, "Whether such a case, if proven, would come under the clause of the Sherman Anti-Trust act?" The unanimous decision of the Court, delivered by Chief Justice Fuller, held that such cases came under the statute as conspiracies in restraint of trade. (208 U.S.274) The suit was then tried in the United States Circuit Court and lasted from August 26 to October 11, the verdict awarding plaintiff Loewe \$80,000.00, which, when trebled, as provided under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, amounted to \$240,000.00. An appeal to the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals, Second District, was taken and the judgment of the lower court affirmed (17). It was then taken to the United States Supreme Court, which also affirmed the judgment.

Hon. Walter G. Merritt, of counsel for Loewe, made these points:

"When a man joins an organization and pays dues to it, he is bound by its constitution . . . the members are responsible . . . even though under the constitution of an organization, their officers were forbidden to do anything but lawful acts . . . They were paying their dues and they could be and were informed as to what was going on, for their officers published journals monthly . . . telling what they had done, although they say they were campaign documents."

Stop and study those words! They fit the "Consumers' Research" like a glove, even to the publication of their Reports and Bulletins, which inform all members of what is being done by the corporate entity.

And Attorney Merritt continued:

"You may not like me; you need not speak to me. You may not like my store; you need not trade in it. You may not like my factory; you need not work in it.

BUT YOU SHALL NOT organize men against me to RUIN MY BUSINESS. I have a right to conduct that business and you have no right to destroy it.

“Men have certain rights of life, liberty, reputation, property, and business. You can take my life — that is murder; you may say evil things about me — that is slander; you can put me in a room and chain me there — that deprives me of my liberty; and when you organize men against my business — that is boycott. To do these things is not only to turn against the laws of this country, but to turn against the eternal laws, and the laws of Moses.”

We say that the unlawful acts of the “Consumers’ Research” come directly under the Sherman Anti-Trust Law, and that it flagrantly violates the law and our Constitution in its daily activities, and that the decision of the United States Supreme Court means what it says in the Danbury Hatters’ Case. Every contributor to the “Consumers’ Research” is liable to the same extent as were the contributors of the Hatters’ Union to Loewe, and it is a matter of history that this \$240,000.00 judgment was collected by attachments on property and on the bank accounts of those defendants who contributed, and that these attachments extended from the New England States to California.

* * *

Cases cited in the foregoing chapter.

- (1) First National Bank of Chicago vs. Trevin.
- (2) Trustees of Dartmouth College vs. Woodward, 17 M.S. 518-636.
- (3) Burrill vs. Nahant Bank, 43 Mass. 163-167.
- (4) Manson vs. Curtis, 223 N. Y. 313-322.
- (5) Matter of Mt. Sinai Hospital, 250 N. Y. 103-107.
- (6) Braswell vs. Morrow, (1928) 195 N. S. 127-130.
- (7) Savings Bank vs. Wulfekikler, 19 Kan. 60-64.
- (8) McClure vs. Wilson, 70 App. (N. Y.) 149-153.
- (9) Densmore vs. Jackson, (1928) 242 Mich. 192.
- (10) Kavanaugh vs. Commonwealth T. Co., 118 N. Y. Supp. 758-767.
- (11) Bloom vs. Nat. L. & Sav. Co., 152 N. Y. 114-120-121.
- (12) Bank of Des Ark. vs. Moody, 110 Ark. 39-41.
Gores vs. Day, 99 Wis. 276-279-280.

Bates vs. Dresser, 229 Federal 772-797.

- (13) Martin vs. Webb, 110 U. S. 7, 3 Sup. Ct. 428.
- (14) Old Dominion vs. Lewiston, 210 U. S. 206, 28 Sup. Ct. 634.
- (15) McEwen vs. Kelley, 140 Ga. 720, 79 S. E. 777.
- (16) 235 U. S. 522.
- (17) 209 Fed. 721.

CHAPTER XVIII

UNFAIR ATTACKS ON DRUGS AND MEDICINES

THE druggist and the doctor are among the numerous classes of business and professional men who have been subjected to criticism — much of it unfair or unwarranted — in the books and bulletins issued by Consumers' Research, Inc. The subject of drugs, in fact, seems to have about the same effect upon CR writers that a red flag has upon a bull; and when they take the poison pen in hand to discuss the common drugs and remedies used by the American people, they act just as an enraged bull might be expected to act in a china shop; that is to say, they fairly run riot.

Nothing seems to stir them up to such rabid heights as the thought of some popular remedy that has relieved headache for a generation past, or some laxative that has effected its purpose satisfactorily in many a home. They condemn our familiar family remedies so freely indeed, that they may perhaps be contemplating the idea of placing on the market a "Consumers' Research Headache Powder" of their own concoction, or a Consumers' Research laxative under their own trade-name.

If that be the case, they show poor salesmanship in criticizing possible competitors before they start in the proprietary medicine business. But then one does not expect any of the sterling principles of salesmanship to be observed by the CR people, who consider selling power and other valuable factors of business to be derived from old satan himself, to bewilder and confuse the poor consumer.

We do not intend to quote at any length from the sensational books in which CR writers, including F. J. Schlink himself, and J. B. Matthews, and M. C. Phillips (Mrs. Schlink) have concentrated their attacks upon the drug industry and the whole field of proprietary remedies; but we propose to show that in many, if not most, of the cases they cite, the general experience of the public does not coincide with their conclusions, and that no such dangers as they allege are actually present or

to be feared in the things we are accustomed to purchase in the drugstore for personal or family use.

That there are drug substances and medicines in the market the *misuse* of which is likely to endanger the health, nobody will deny, for even a child might make that statement without fear of contradiction, and the most chemically ignorant person knows it to be true. But that is no reason for a wholesale attack upon the drug industry or the men who prescribe and sell drugs. Nor is it any reason whatever why anyone should abandon the *proper use* of remedies that may prove deleterious if *misused*.

Strychnine is a powerful poison, and nitro-glycerine a high explosive. In large quantities, the former will certainly kill, and the latter will blow the unwary sky-high. But in the infinitesimal doses prescribed by the doctor, both strychnine and nitro-glycerine are invaluable as heart stimulants and palliatives of disease.

Many poisonous substances have their uses in chemistry and medicine, and the mere fact that a compound contains a poisonous ingredient should not and does not necessarily condemn that compound for use in relieving human suffering. But we are asked to believe, on the authority of J. B. Matthews in his book "Partners in Plunder," that poisonous and misrepresented medicines are prepared and marketed solely for profit, and that this condition forms an essential part and aspect of the entire business system,— which is flagrantly absurd on the face of it.

When medicine contains any poisonous ingredient in sufficiently large quantity to render the whole amount contained in the package dangerous, it is plainly marked "Poison," under the law, the warning being given in large red letters that he who runs may read. The scope of medicine would be weakened, and its achievements would have been impossible without the use of poisonous substances, skillfully compounded with other and harm-

less ingredients to constitute remedies for a host of active and chronic diseases of the human body.

Consumers' Research criticism of drugs and proprietary medicines as poison-containers and thereby dangerous to the public health, loses much of its force, when it has any force at all, in view of the fact that the CR writers, like nervous old women, are accustomed to see poison in everything that is a product of American industry and manufacture as well as in the advertising pages of newspapers and magazines, on the billboards, and in the handbills that a local merchant uses to bring customers to his store. They find poison in everything we eat and drink; poison sprayed on our apples and pears and strawberries, our grapefruit and asparagus; poison in the powders wherewith women increase their charm and the lotions whereby they gain bodily comfort; and to them even the form of government under which we live is poison.

But singular to relate, nobody seems yet to have been poisoned by the food and drug and cosmetic poisons that affright the staff of Consumers' Research; instead of being sickened and killed off at a terribly high rate, we live longer than ever before; instead of eating less fruit because the CR says it is sprayed with arsenic and lead, we eat more; instead of ceasing to employ salesmanship and advertising, we sell more goods and advertise more freely than ever,—and in spite of criticism from Washington, N. J., the Government at Washington, D. C., still lives.

* * *

When a whole industry is attacked by generalized criticism and condemnation of its products, it is necessarily placed on the defensive; but who will come to the defense if those most directly concerned do not take the initiative? Three years of valuable time were lost, after the first attacks of Consumers' Research upon the drug industry were launched, before the manufacturers of packaged medicines, through their trade journals, began

to refute the CR charges; and then it was done in only a half-hearted manner. The reason alleged for the delay in defensive measures was that the manufacturers were of the opinion that any court case — such as a suit for damages against Consumers' Research would merely serve to give its sensational books more publicity. And so, instead of killing the "snake-in-the-grass" when it first appeared as an enemy of American business, it was permitted to spread its venom among consumers for a considerable length of time without let or hindrance.

Even the newspapers and magazines whose advertising interests were assailed along with those of their drug advertisers failed adequately to acquaint the public with the fact that the attacks of Consumers' Research were absolutely unjustified in their wholesale character; and that failure of the advertising media to protect both their advertisers and themselves is one of the most surprising features of the situation created by the radical propagandists of Consumers' Research.

A notable exception, however, to the general nonchalant attitude of the advertising media was the New York publication "Printers' Ink," which took an early hand in defending advertisers and the advertising fraternity, by enlightening articles on the unsubstantial basis of Consumers' Research charges, and produced testimony from doctors and scientists in refutation of various statements in CR publications regarding the "poisoning" of food and drug products.

Finally, in July, 1935, the Drug Trade News came to the defense of its advertisers in an editorial which was accompanied by a cartoon headed "Snapping at His Heels Long Enough." The packaged medicine industry was represented by a powerful-looking but indifferent lion, while snapping at his heels was a pack of wolves, representing the "sensational book and magazine attacks" of Consumers' Research. In a second panel of the cartoon, the lion was shown turning on his pestiferous attackers and putting them to ignominious flight with their

tails between their legs. That cartoon illustrates the situation as it is and as it should be. The wolves of Consumers' Research must be routed!

In its editorial the Drug Trade News said: "The American public is so susceptible to publicity and to propaganda that there is only one way to counteract this susceptibility, and that is by transmitting to the public the real facts, based on the findings of scientists of unquestioned ability and integrity. But these truths must be conveyed at least as vigorously and as frequently as the untruths have been conveyed."

Now that Consumers' Research propaganda includes books attacking manufacturers, not only of drug products, but of foods, cosmetics, dental goods, and all manner of nationally advertised merchandise,—“each of which further develops the assertion that many advertised brands are unreliable,”—the Drug Trade News advocated action to counteract the effect of the “half-truths” that make up the bulk of Consumers' Research charges.

“A half-truth is often as misleading as an untruth,” says the New York organ of the drug trade. “When Consumers' Research reports that a German army officer killed himself by swallowing an entire tube of a certain toothpaste, that is a half-truth only. The fact that he killed himself is borne out by the records. The fact that he swallowed a tube of toothpaste may also be true. But that his death was due to the toothpaste or to ingredients alleged to be dangerous is *untrue*. Millions of people use this toothpaste every day, and not one has suffered any ill effects from it. They use it simply for cleaning and whitening teeth, and not for swallowing,”—and the evidence of scientists is all against the possibility of encompassing death by the eating of this particular toothpaste or any other. As an argument against the use of this American product, the case of the German officer, frequently harped upon by Consumers' Research falls extremely flat.

The Proprietary Association, an organization of packaged-medicine manufacturers, now operates in Washington, D. C., a Scientific Research Section, especially organized to combat the attacks of radical writers and pseudo-scientists against products that have proved themselves over the years to be thoroughly reliable. In a statement to members of the Association recently, the president, Mr. Frank A. Blair, said:

"In a great number of instances the attacks to which our industry has been subjected were made by calling attention to the alleged fact that a number of deaths or permanent disabilities had resulted from the use of a certain type of packaged medicine.

"A careful study of these cases has revealed that, in nearly every instance, the medicine was not responsible for any death or any injury that may have been suffered by the individual. This information rests in the files of the manufacturers. In a few instances it may have been used in court cases by the manufacturer.

"More recently the attacks on packaged medicines have been made by a group of pseudo-scientists (referring to Consumers' Research) under the guise of being benevolent protectors of the consuming public. The so-called scientific data upon which they base their attacks in most instances will not stand careful scrutiny.

"Manufacturers in the past have been acting more or less on the defensive, not making any real attempt to show, through scientific information, the absurdities of the charges made against their products, or the value to be derived from the use of properly packaged medicines.

"We have available, through the membership in this organization, laboratory facilities and technical advisers that stand at the top of the list in the United States; and through these we should be able not only to combat the attacks that are made upon packaged medicines, but also, through our publicity bureau, to disseminate information to the general public that will be of material benefit to the readers."

Thus the Proprietary Association is beginning — and only just beginning — to turn like a lion upon the attackers snapping at its heels. But in repelling such attacks upon industry, something more is needed than the analysis and refutation of individual charges,— and it has remained for this book, "The Poison Pen of Jersey," to cast light upon the real character of the ultra-radical attackers, and to show up the real impelling motive of Consumers' Research by uncovering the Communistic affiliations of Stuart Chase, first president of the CR; F. J. Schlink, the present president; J. B. Matthews, vice-president, and other authors of the sensational books and bulletins that have appeared as the first line of attack upon the American system of business and government.

* * *

Consumers' Research writers have frequently advised their readers to buy the separate ingredients of certain medicines and cosmetics and make up the compounds themselves, which is a silly idea on the face of it. The object of such separate purchases being to decrease the cost of the compound, one of the first tasks undertaken by the Scientific Section of the Proprietary Association was to prove — as it did — that packaged medicines are no more expensive, if as expensive, as the separate U. S. P. or N. F. ingredients purchased separately. This study effectually disproved the allegation frequently made by Consumers' Research writers that packaged medicines utilize a brand name to gouge the public on price.

Consumers' Research professes to have the services (free) of a number of university men and others who "Investigate" products of all kinds and report on them. Why alleged scientists should donate their services to the wielders of the poison pen in Washington, N. J., is "something no fellow can understand," especially as the CR asserts that some of their reports of tests made "would be worth thousands of dollars to a manufacturer." But we can make a shrewd guess that the "scientists" and uni-

versity professors who serve Consumers' Research "free," are imbued with the same "collectivist" ideas as Messrs. Schlink and Matthews.

The names of the scientists alleged to test products for the CR are not made public. Probably they do not wish to be known as associated in any way with the CR attacks upon industry and business. But the consuming public can have confidence in the men who constitute the Scientific Section of the Proprietary Association, with laboratories at the nation's capital. They include: Dr. George F. Reddish, chief bacteriologist of the Lambert Pharmacal Co., St. Louis, Mo., chairman; Dr. Frederick J. Cullen, former Chief of Drug Control of the United States Food and Drug Administration, and now general representative of the Proprietary Association in Washington; Dr. Samuel T. Helms, Medical Director and superintendent of laboratories, Emerson Drug Co., Baltimore, Md.; Dr. John Paul Snyder, director of research and chief chemist for the Norwich Pharmacal Co., Norwich, N. Y., and John R. McClelland, vice-president and director of research, Kolynos Co., New Haven, Conn.

Men like those are surely a guarantee that the public is not being either "poisoned" or gouged in price by the manufacturers of proprietaries.

* * *

At every possible opportunity, Consumers' Research links its criticism of drug and other products with denunciation of advertising and advertisers, with sideswipes at "high-pressure" salesmanship, the government, and the laws devised for the protection of consumers. On the subject of Antiseptics and Germicides, for instance, in the CR bulletin for April, 1935, we find the following:

"Misleading claims and deceptive advertising by manufacturers, notably the 'ethical' drug and pharmacal houses, have led the public to purchase dangerously ineffective antiseptics and germicides, and have created many erroneous impressions regarding the potency and

limitation of antiseptics and germicides in general. No advertising, not even that in reputable medical journals, can be relied on in this respect. The characterless and ineffective food and drug laws have no control whatever over advertising of antiseptics, consequently the manufacturers can make all sorts of wild and misleading claims through advertisements in newspapers and magazines, billboards and car-cards, and over the radio."

Now these assertions, if true, might cause genuine alarm. But the facts do not bear them out. The use of Listerine, for example, is practically universal, extending over the entire civilized world, ever since it was named after the great English surgeon, Joseph Lister, who was the father of antiseptic surgery. And what a piece of effrontery it is for the pseudo-scientists of Consumers' Research to sneer at this famous and effective antiseptic as the author of "Partners in Plunder" does, when he refers to Listerine as a product of "the great mouthwash bottlers, the meretricious *advertisers-de-luxe* of American big-time advertising."

When we are told that no advertising, "not even that in reputable medical journals," can be relied on where antiseptics and germicides are concerned, the reaction of the reader against such stupid stuff should be immediate and positive,—for it is absurd! Are medical journals likely to deceive their medical subscribers regarding the potency and limitations of such products? If they did, how long would they continue to have a circulation? How long would the medical fraternity stand for misinformation on a subject involving the success of surgery and the life of the patient? The very idea is absurd,—and the newspapers and magazines of today that accept drug advertising are no less careful than the medical journals to guard their columns against misrepresentation of products. This, however, is a principle of journalistic management and policy that Consumers' Research writers seem totally unable to grasp. They all indeed seem to need medical attention, for there are surely evi-

dences of mental aberration, especially when they rave on the subject of advertising.

The charge that manufacturers make "all sorts of wild and misleading claims through advertisements" in all kinds of media, including the radio, is answered sufficiently by knowledge of the fact that all broadcasts are prepared with great care for truthfulness, because the public is quick to detect and report error or misstatement, and manufacturers are not likely to risk the success of an expensive broadcast by misrepresentation of their products. That truthful presentation of products is the only successful business policy is beyond the comprehension of Consumers' Research. If the CR writers understood that one recognized business fact, much of their criticism of advertising might remain unwritten. As it stands, it is as "wild and misleading" as the verbal vapors of the soapbox orators with whom they affiliate in Communist groups.

As antiseptics for personal and household use are usually selected on the advice of a physician, or from common knowledge of their properties and efficiency for a given purpose, what does it matter if "the label on the bottle is useless in aiding one to choose an effective antiseptic," as the CR complains. When the use of carbolic acid, for instance, is "indicated," as the doctors say, what would it profit the purchaser to have its chemical formula printed on the label, or an encyclopedic statement of its composition and properties? The word "Poison" should of course be prominently displayed on the bottle, when the useful antiseptic is intended for household use.

"The antiseptic gentry," we are told by a CR writer, "have been much more successful than other patent-medicine magnates in keeping out of trouble with the weak and ineffective drug control laws — city, state, and national." Here is another slap at the food and drug laws, and incidentally at the government bureau which administers them; and the whole argument of Consum-

ers' Research in this regard seems to bear the interpretation: "Your government and its laws being old-fashioned and inefficient in the judgment of 'informed intellectuals' like us, why not turn over the regulation of industry and all commercial business to us, and see what we will do with your newspapers and magazines, your radio broadcasters, and advertisers, and high-pressure salesmen? And while you are about it, why not turn over the entire government to us of Consumers' Research and our associate collectivists, who have been in training for Lenin-leadership, and see what a proletarian paradise, like Russia, we will make of this benighted country, with 'the State' owning all means of production — and we owning the State."

If ever there was a concern that ballyhooed itself into public notice, it was Consumers' Research, through the publication of its sensational attacks on everything and everybody connected with American business, including manufacturers and distributors, advertising men and expert salesmen. Some of the magazines — women's magazines in particular — are their pet objects of attack. Thus in the book from which we have quoted briefly above, the CR writer goes on to speak about the "ballyhoo" of the "Good Housekeeping Institute" and "Hearst's Good Housekeeping Magazine" in advocacy of certain antiseptics, "the proceeds from the advertising of which go to enrich the mansion of the Commissar of Yellow Journalism at San Simeon, California." This attack upon the owner of many of America's widely-circulated publications can safely be left for reply to the redoubtable Californian himself, who is usually neither slow nor soft-handed in repelling inimical assaults.

* * *

The subject of cod liver oil appears to be about as distasteful to the propagandists of Consumers' Research as castor oil was to their fellow-Communists in Italy when Mussolini's minions administered it to them in

large doses after the Fascist occupation of Rome and seizure of the Italian government.

The CR writers lay particular stress upon the advertising of Cod Liver Oil, Halibut Liver Oil, and Viosterol as containing artificial Vitamin D. They are strongly opposed to the general scientific view of the value of vitamins in diet, just as they are opposed to many other things that are generally accepted by scientists as valuable or even essential to the preservation or promotion of bodily health. They assert that there is no scientific proof that Vitamin D is necessary or desirable for active, healthy adults, other than pregnant women or nursing mothers, even in winter,—and as we said before, they don't think much of cod liver oil anyhow. Here is a sample of what they say on this subject:

“It should be noted here that cod liver oil has been added to the diet of cows and resulted in a marked decrease of the fat content of milk. Vitamin D medication may, if universally used, be of harm rather than of help, by seriously disturbing the body's utilization of calcium and phosphorus. Vitamin D products, including cod liver oil, are frequently poisonous, in that even moderate over-use (or unnecessary use) may bring about serious harm or illness.”

This is the first time we have known cod liver oil to be called “a product of Vitamin D.” We have always been under the impression, and belief, ever since cod liver oil served to transform us from an anemic into a sound and healthy child, that it is the product of the cod, and we believe that every native of Gloucester, Mass., who ever sailed to the Banks on a cod-fishing schooner will rise in support of our belief. But let that pass — Consumers' Research writers have so many weird ideas that a misstatement like that is just characteristic.

But it should be noted, that they give no instances and adduce no proof of cases wherein anyone has been “poisoned” by using cod liver oil or any other product containing Vitamin D. They only say that such things

may bring about serious harm or illness, if *misued*. So *may* every other thing we ingest or imbibe, every medicine we use to keep us in health or cure us in sickness, every single thing we use about the house, office, store, or factory for cleansing and sanitary purposes, and everything of which we may form a habit — such as reading Consumers' Research books and bulletins, which, if persisted in, will surely make one ill.

With the present scientific knowledge of the functions and value of vitamins, Consumers' Research writers show poor educational judgment in sneering at them, in the spirit of the man who spoke disrespectfully of the Equator. If the CR really wished to perform a public service, it would at least try to educate food consumers on the subject of substances which men of science regard as of great importance.

Why should any of the several vitamins discovered by modern science be sneered at or its presence in food-stuffs and medicines be belittled, when a vitamin is defined in standard dictionaries as "a nitrogenous substance, *minute quantities of which are essential to the diet of men, birds, and other animals, as a nutritive force and for stimulating growth*"? Valuable vitamins are present in beans, peas, whole wheat, fresh vegetables and fruits, etc., and if these vitamins are segregated and incorporated by manufacturers in their food-products and medicinal preparations, so much the better for the public.

A recent Associated Press dispatch from Cambridge, Mass., gives the latest scientific view of the importance of Vitamin D, which the manufacturers, in all sincerity, claim to be present in Cod Liver Oil and the similar products criticized by Consumers' Research. The dispatch, dated April 5, 1936, says:

"Experiments which suggest an unexpected human value to be derived from Vitamin D were made public today at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

"The findings were derived from 1,000 X-ray photographs of experimental animals which had been fed diets

containing more or less Vitamin D, comparable to the diets of human beings. The pictures were taken after a buttermilk-barium drink, like that given human subjects previous to X-ray examination.

"Investigators found that food residues were retained twice as long in the intestinal tract after a previous diet deficient in Vitamin D, as compared with retention from a diet in which this vitamin is plentiful.

"The nutritional reactions of the rodents used for the experiments are so often similar to those of man that it can be assumed the results of this feeding experiment may be applied to human beings.

"The work at Massachusetts Institute of Technology was done by Prof. Robert S. Harris and Prof. John W. M. Bunker in the biological research laboratories, with the use of the massive lead-shielded X-ray room of the department of mining.

" 'A diet lacking in vitamin D,' they state, 'produces a definite hypomotility (sluggishness) of all parts of the gastrointestinal tract of albino rodents. This is in agreement with the constipation which generally is expected in the conditions of rickets in these animals or in children.'

"Lack of the vitamin delayed emptying of the stomach and intestines by as much as fifteen hours. Addition of Vitamin D to diets which had been so lacking as to cause rickets not only cured this condition, but markedly relieved the intestinal sluggishness."

That is surely good news for the millions of people who suffer chronically from "sluggishness of the liver," and can obtain foods and medicines containing this useful Vitamin D,— but it is not the kind of information propagated by Consumers' Research, which deals only in jibes at the things we eat and drink and use to promote health, when it does not condemn them outright.

The pseudo-scientists of the CR are not to be relied upon as advisers on any of the subjects with which they deal; and they are false prophets of evil when

they assert that danger lies in wait in so many of the proprietary medicines that have stood the test of family use for many years and are in ever-increasing demand. Every intelligent person will note the remoteness of the danger when they say, in effect: "You *may* suffer serious harm or illness if you misuse this-or-that." So it will be well not to swallow the whole bottleful at once when the doctor prescribes a teaspoonful at a time; when you brush your teeth with Pebecco or any other tooth paste, please resist the temptation to eat the entire contents of the tube; and when you cleanse your mouth and deal a body-blow to germs with Listerine, kindly refrain from imbibing it by the quart; for if you do any of these things, or other equally absurd and unlikely, you can take it from Consumers' Research that you *may* suffer harm. Don't be like the German officer so gleefully — and ghoulishly — quoted by the CR,— who mistook a dental preparation for a sausage, and got a stomach-ache, which he was weak enough to relieve by suicide.

On the strength of an alleged report by a "Swedish investigator," a CR writer claims that cod liver oil contains "a toxic substance capable of producing heart lesions." Now there is no more healthy and sturdy group of men in North America than the cod-fishers who spend several months of every year on the Banks of Newfoundland,— and among the tidbits of fish which they prefer are the cod-livers, regularly served to them for dinner or supper by the ship's cook. Few, if any, of these fishermen or their "captains courageous" have ever been known to develop heart lesions; and the testimony of millions of American fathers and mothers is directly opposed to the charges of the CR, so far as any bad effects from the use of cod liver oil in prescribed doses is concerned. Innumerable children are alive today who would have succumbed to anemia, malnutrition, and rickets, if it had not been for the beneficent effects of cod liver oil in building up their juvenile systems.

It is *possible*, says the cod-liver editor of Consumers'

Research,— that is, it *may be*,— that there is some connection between reported cases of heart trouble among school-children in New York City and the ingestion of cod liver oil by them under “common medical advice.” But we have not heard that such cases are prevalent, and we doubt very much if they are, in spite of the inference of Consumers’ Research. Anyway, the assertion that cod liver oil even *may* be responsible for any such trouble is totally lacking in proof. In this case, as in so many others, Consumers’ Research fails to prove its point, and the universal experience of American families is entirely opposed to CR contentions regarding cod liver oil, and similar products.

If there were more cod liver oil in the diet of big-city tenements, and fewer fried pork chops, more vegetables and fruit and less protein, the mortality rate among school-children would be greatly reduced.

* * *

A correspondent of the Drug Trade News made a practical and valuable suggestion to the manufacturers of drugs and proprietary medicines recently, when he advocated “mass action” to combat the allegations of Consumers’ Research against their industry and its products. He said: “Many of the manufacturers who have had their products attacked in recent books have done nothing about it because they believed that the publicity which would result from a court case would do more harm than good, even if they won the case. However, I believe that *a large group of manufacturers, acting together, could do a great deal for themselves and for the industry by bringing suit all at the same time.*”

“It would certainly be a terrifically dramatic thing if 100 manufacturers, whose products are attacked in recent books, would bring suit for libel and damages against the authors and Consumers’ Research, Inc., all at once. Obviously the defendants could not fight that many suits at the same time, and they would be forced in many

cases to admit errors in their statements. Furthermore, the situation would be given wide publicity, and be of real help to the proprietary field."

And, the correspondent might have added, some such action by leaders of industry is demanded by the present situation, which, if continued, may further weaken the confidence of the consuming public in many standard American products besides those of leading drug houses and proprietary manufacturers.

You cannot successfully repel the attacks of such a concern as Consumers' Research with kid gloves or mealy-mouthed "statements in reply." But when the reputations of products and producers are assailed by libelous assertions, malicious half-truths, and downright falsehoods, suits for damages are quite likely to furnish an effective remedy. And the fact that Consumers' Research is incorporated allegedly "not for profit," does not free the corporation from responsibility for the acts and statements of its officers and writers.

CHAPTER XIX

BEAUTY — SKIN DEEP OR OTHERWISE

A KEEN-EYED philosopher once said that a beautiful woman dies twice,— the first time being when her beauty disappears.

From time immemorial women have used cosmetics for two purposes,— to enhance the charm of youth and to repair or conceal the ravages of time. At no time in the history of the civilized world were these aids to beauty so much used by the young as they are today; and at no time were they in so much demand by women of an older growth, for when age begins to show its first telltale signs in the female face, tragedy begins to stalk in many a home.

Certainly, no one can blame a woman for wishing to appear as beautiful as she can make herself. But our CR friends do not approve. Quite the contrary. So we find among its publications a book entitled "Skin Deep," by M. C. Phillips, a director the "CR" and, incidentally, the wife of "Comrade" F. J. Schlink, the president and technical director. Mrs. Schlink, apparently in the Communistic fashion, does not use the name of her husband, in the conventional American style, but prefers to retain a name of her own in business and in authorship — for which, under the circumstances, we do not blame her, for Phillips strikes our ear as a much more pleasing surname than Schlink!

* * *

History of Cosmetics. — The use of methods and preparations for decorating, correcting, or improving nature's endowments of personal beauty and seductiveness is a practice of the human race that dates from the very earliest beginnings of tribal or communal life and civilization.

The word *cosmetic* is derived from the Greek *kosmos*,

meaning ornament. As an adjective, it pertains chiefly to the beautifying of the complexion; as a noun, it signifies any compound applied to the skin to improve its appearance. But in modern use any preparation for improving the personal appearance of the skin, hair, nails, etc., is called a cosmetic.

There have been, apparently, three periods in the progress of cosmetics down through the ages. In *the first period*, we learn from an authority, the ministrations of religion, medicine and beautification were combined. In the primitive community, the priest was also medicine-man and beauty specialist. Offerings to the gods included burning aromatics, and that gave the world *perfumery*. Evil spirits that caused deformities were cast out by the priest, by rites, potions, and crude surgery. As a tattooer, the priest decorated the body, and used dyes to increase personal charm or indicate rank and prowess. The cosmetic dyes were also used to terrify enemies in battle, as in the case of the *woad*, or blue wood-dye, used by the Ancient Britons on their bodies.

The second period in the use of cosmetics appeared when certain peoples advanced from the civilization of the tribe to that of the state, kingdom, or empire. By that time the priests confined themselves more and more to spiritual matters; the rudiments of the medical profession appeared, and the practice of using cosmetics fell under the jurisdiction of the early physicians. Many, if not most, of the ideas that form the basis of modern cosmetics developed during this period. Massage was practised in China by blind masseurs, and the Chinese were the first to use goose-grease as a basis for ointments. They esteemed long fingernails as a sign of rank, or leisure, and this probably gave rise to the manicure.

Excavations in Egypt have furnished evidence that cosmetics of all kinds were in use as early as 4,000 B. C. The ancient Egyptians seem to have had everything "from perfumes to wax depilatories." A scroll called the *Papyrus Ebers*, dating back to about 1500 B. C., indicates

the use of hair tonics, cow's blood for dye, and the oils of lions, hippopotami, and even snake-oil as unguents.

Cleopatra was noted for the cosmetics she used, and the equipment of her dressing-table is historic. "She used green paint under her eyes, black *Kohl* (antimony) under the lids and lashes." When the tomb of King Tutankhamen was opened in recent years, phials of perfume found therein still emitted fragrance after more than 3,000 years. The "myrrh and frankincense" (aromatic gums) of the Bible were used with herbs to make a perfume popular with the Egyptians of "King Tut's" day. In that period the cosmetic industry became of international importance, the Persians and Phoenicians being the chief manufacturers and exporters. From Egypt the cosmetic fashions spread to the Greeks, the Hebrews, and other peoples of the Eastern Mediterranean. Biblical references show that the Hebrews used cosmetics freely, while the Greeks used perfumes so liberally that restrictions were enacted, for fear the supply would not be sufficient for religious ritual purposes.

From Greece, Rome got its fondness for cosmetics with its culture; and Rome spread their use to the extreme limits of its vast empire, even to the Celts of Britain. Rouge, hair-dye, face and body powder, and aromatics were as freely used by the Romans as by the Greeks, and the demand for cosmetics was at times greater than the supply.

After the Roman Empire fell, the use of cosmetics declined for a while in Western Europe, which was largely in the hands of "barbarians"; but when the Crusaders returned from the East, the cosmetic cult became firmly established. Then began *the third period* in the progress of cosmetics,—about the end of the 13th century, A. D. Henceforth we find the manufacture and sale of cosmetics with a technology of their own, apart altogether from the practice of religion or medicine. And in this latest period, the field and practice of cosmetics have

been continually enriched by the contributions of chemistry, physics, surgery, and the other sciences.

The divorce of cosmetics from medicine, and its independence as both a science and an art, came with the assertion of a French physician that the treatment of skin diseases must be considered as a quite separate matter from the practice of beautification. Then advances came quickly. The inventions of the Frangipanni founded the modern perfume industry; eau-de-Cologne was invented by Farina; chemistry gave the world dyes and lotions; physics contributed electrolysis and the X-ray,—and the march of progress still goes on.

During the Victorian age, in America, the free use of cosmetics was rather frowned upon in social circles as not altogether "nice," but after the World War there was a complete change of attitude among all classes of society; and today a woman is often considered old-fashioned if she does not make use of the beauty aids at her command in the market. The change has even affected rural districts, and compacts are found in the countrywoman's pocket or purse, as well as in the outdoor equipment of her sisters in the city.

The rapid expansion of the American cosmetic industry is seen in the figures of manufacture—the products of which increased in value from \$34,206,000 in 1914 to \$201,689,000 in 1929. The latter figures include "perfumes, cosmetics and toilet preparations," according to the U. S. Census of Manufactures, but does not include patent or proprietary medicines or compounds and druggists' preparations, among which are many remedies used for beautifying purposes.

The preparations in greatest demand or of highest manufactured value in the United States, according to the Department of Commerce, rank as follows: Face creams, dentifrices, perfumes and toilet waters, face powders, rouges, hair tonics, talcum and toilet powders, shampoos, hair dyes, depilatories, and a host of other

preparations that amount in value to nearly \$50,000,000 of the total.

The extent and importance of the toilet goods industry is indicated also by its advertising expenditures. Thus in 1913 less than \$5,000,000 was spent in advertising the various kinds of cosmetic preparations and remedies, or less than was expended in the interests of automobiles, food and clothing. But in 1929 drugs and toilet preparations stood at the top of the list of advertised products, the manufacturers having spent about \$25,000,000 in magazines alone, to maintain the demand for standard articles and acquaint the public with new and useful preparations.

Modern culture is practically unanimous in its approval of the practice of beauty aids and the expert use of cosmetics. It may almost be said that every modern woman is a trained cosmetician, although of course there are many features of cosmetic practice in which the aid of a professional is required. But every woman is familiar with the proper use of the essential aids to beauty, and can safely select her own creams and powders with the knowledge born of experience.

For the comfort and assurance of American women in purchasing and using the beauty preparations now on the market, we will quote a significant statement from the pages of "The National Encyclopedia" (P. F. Collier & Son Company, 1932), to which we are indebted for some of the historical facts mentioned in this chapter. The editor of that modern and well-considered work, we may note, is Henry Suzzallo, Ph.D., Sc.D., LL. D., President of the University of Washington from 1915 to 1926, and now President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. "The National Encyclopedia" says on the subject of the medical aspects of cosmetics:

"Practically all cosmetics on the American market, sold by manufacturers of national repute, *are wholly free from harmful ingredients*. This includes such preparations as face creams and powders, rouge, compacts,

eyebrow pencils, lipsticks, hair lotions, and skin deodorants."

This is certainly a reassuring statement considering the persistent efforts made to create prejudice in the minds of American women against so many of the articles they are accustomed to use as beauty aids and otherwise, and to cast discredit upon their manufacturers, distributors, and the men who, as publicity agents, have done so much to help women in their modern quest for beauty.

* * *

But, despite the record of history and countless centuries of the general use of beautifying agents by the women of the world, Consumers' Research, through the author of the book "Skin Deep," sets itself up as an authority for the sweeping condemnation of the cosmetics manufactured and used in America.

Like so many amateur authors, Mrs. Schlink — beg pardon, M. C. Phillips — is awfully afraid lest somebody should steal her thunder by copying a part of her book, save by way of advertising it; and so we find this notice prominently displayed on the copyright page of "Skin Deep":

"All Rights Reserved. — No part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in a magazine or newspaper."

Thanks for the implied permission to quote briefly in this book review; but the permission was entirely unnecessary, as professional writers are fully aware of their rights of reproduction in a critical review of the works of others. These rights have been clearly defined by the courts in many cases; and all the Consumers' Research literature, including its so-called "confidential" bulletins and reports, are open to reasonable quotation for purposes of review, just as soon as they are published by distribution.

A captious critic of the CR type might well ridicule

the idea of a young woman amateur writer, living in a small Jersey town, without any special qualifications or experience in the cosmetic and beauty-culture field, setting herself up as an authority on the subject of the innumerable beauty preparations used by all classes of women in America. But the cool assumption of authority on every conceivable subject is characteristic of all Consumers' Research writers and publications,— and the less qualified they are to discuss a subject, the more positive they are in dogmatizing about it.

"Skin Deep" asserts that most cosmetics and beauty aids are poisonous; in fact, everything dealt with by the CR outfit is poison in their minds. But "M. C. Phillips" writes mostly in generalities, and fails to give instances of women being poisoned by using any of the creams or specifics mentioned in her tirade against the manufacturers and advertisers of these products.

It may be true that there are female amazons with hard, wrinkled faces who do not need face creams and other beauty remedies, and occasionally a woman may be found whose face is too tender or too sensitive for the use of creams, etc. But because there are a few such women in the world, must all the rest be content to look like frights and use only the CR formula, "soap and water"?

The book "Skin Deep" insults the intelligence of the average woman of this country. In one sweeping effort, this silly book rejects and discards all of the work and experimentation of the many chemists and scientific beauty experts who have devoted their entire lives to the improvement of the cosmetic preparations and remedies used by the world's most beautiful women, without an iota of "poisoning" or other deleterious effects.

If these beautifying or remedial products were frauds and fakes, and contained only the cheapest trash — "one cent's worth of some drug and the rest water," as claimed by the author of "Skin Deep," why and how have they been so effective in the past? Why has the business of

some well-known manufacturers existed and thrived for decade after decade, and the names of their products become household words?

The Phillips book ignores the fact that a product without value cannot long survive in the market,—and nobody realizes that fact better than the American manufacturer, distributor, or advertiser of cosmetic aids to beauty!

Miss Phillips ignores the fact that there is such a thing as allergy — or the fact that the skins and tissues of certain persons are irritated by some chemicals and vegetable and protein compounds. Hay fever is an example of allergy. The irritating cause, scientists tell us may come from some 800 sources. One sufferer may attribute his difficulty to ragweed, another to dust from parrots feathers, while still another may go back to our old stand-by, the golden rod.

But ragweed does not cause discomfort to all human-kind — it selects the few as its victims — the same is true of zinc stearate, as it only irritates the skin of very few users. Even oil may irritate the faces of a limited number of women. Fortunately victims of allergy are few, and if those who are subject to distress would but follow the advice of their physician they may lead comfortable lives. Careful cosmetic manufacturers try to eliminate the substances which are most likely to cause allergic reactions.

Before proceeding to look rather closely into the contents of "Skin Deep," we may note that this book is printed and published by The Vanguard Press, New York. Authors usually seek a sympathetic publisher, and by their publishers shall ye know them. Now this New York publishing concern is called "the Communistic Vanguard Press" in the Handbook of Radicalism for Patriots, entitled, "The Red Network," and we learn from that source that The Vanguard Press was started by the notorious Garland Fund and was a big favorite with the officers and distributors of the Fund, receiving, ac-

ording to one annual report alone, the sum of \$139,453 for capital, for books on Negro labor, and for a series of "studies on Russia," for which other large sums were also appropriated by the Fund.

Thus we find M. C. Phillips (Mrs. Schlink) and the book "Skin Deep" linked with the Communist movement and propaganda in America, through her publisher, as well as through her husband, whose Communist tendencies and affiliations we have so clearly demonstrated in a previous chapter. And we may repeat that the whole Consumers' Research movement and enterprise is of Communist origin and purpose; that its ostensible regard for the interests of the consumers of America, whom it flippantly called "100,000,000 Guinea Pigs," is a mere cloak for Communist activity, directed toward the creation of discontent and unrest among the masses of this country, in pursuance of the designs of Moscow and its "Internationale" organization of Communism.

The Garland Fund, we may explain for the benefit of those who are unfamiliar with its origin and purpose, was founded by a Radical, Charles Garland of Massachusetts, who served a term in the penitentiary for running a "Free Love Farm." Hence the Fund was also popularly known as the "Free Love Fund." Being an opponent of the private ownership of property, Garland turned over a large inheritance to form this Fund to further the radical cause.

The Fund's official report states that between 1922, when it was founded, and 1930, the sum of \$1,378,000 was given away and \$780,000 loaned. The loans, probably, were never paid back by the Communist individuals and organizations that received them, and so, by 1934, the Fund was practically exhausted.

The directors of the Garland Fund, according to "The Red Network," have been members of the I. W. W. ("I Won't Work"), Communist, and Socialist parties, "which are all basically aiming for the same ends — the abolition of the property right and the undermining and

eventual overthrow of our present form of government, — the differences between them being largely those of stress on certain tactics, such as use of violence or of parliamentary action, to gain control.”

Let us now return to our review of Miss Phillips' book, as it came from the Communist-founded and Communist-supported Vanguard Press.

* * *

In a preliminary “Acknowledgment,” the author of “Skin Deep” says she has “acted in an editorial capacity, bringing together information that has appeared in Trade Magazines, Medical Journals, Government and State Publications, and a number of books on cosmetics and dermatology. The major part of the information, however, appears in extensive files of the Consumers' Research.” Then she goes on to thank various professors for their help, *and* she is especially indebted to Mr. F. J. Schlink “for his careful and critical reading of the manuscript and for his suggestions and comments.” That was certainly very nice of Mr. Schlink, considering that the author is Mrs. Schlink, a director of the “CR,” and doing pretty well as a participator in the Schlink racket.

In her introduction, the wifely author-editor eulogizes the “CR,” Schlink, and the book “Your Money's Worth” (Schlink co-author) published in 1927. We are told that readers were so anxious for information on buying that, with the aid of a philanthropist (possibly the Garland Communist Fund,) Consumers' Research was organized and in December, 1929, had a subscription or membership list of 5,000; while by July, 1934, in spite of the depression, the “CR” confidential service had 48,000 subscribers and 20,000 had subscribed for the quarterly General Bulletins. (There must have been a falling-off in the following year, for in September, 1935, the number of subscribers to the combined services is said to have

been 55,000.) These results were reached by word-of-mouth propaganda and some "sporadic" circularizing.

"Consumers' Research" is then described by the wife of its dictator as "an organization to provide a clearing-house where information for consumers may be assembled, edited, and promulgated, by the use of which the ultimate consumers may defend themselves against the aggressions of advertising and salesmanship." All of this information is for the most part confidential and solely for the guidance of the particular consumer who subscribes and "pays for protection" at a modest *annual* fee.

The CR handbooks and bulletins provide him, she says, with unbiased (?) critical, practical advice in order that he may select from the numerous brands on the market, the particular type, make or brand which is best suited to his needs and, to his purse; and "Skin Deep," we are told, has followed the practice of "CR" in indicating the possible dangers which may arise from the use of certain cosmetics.

The author does not take into consideration, apparently, that certain cosmetics, no matter how carefully made, will not agree with everyone, just as certain types of food, drink and wearing apparel will not be satisfactory to each and every person or purse. The fact that a certain cosmetic does not agree with Mary's skin, does not necessarily mean that the cosmetic is at fault or that it is "poisonous." Again, a type of skin food that might be perfect for Mary would be dangerous for some others to use. This being the case, how can the "CR" — or rather, M. C. Phillips (Mrs. Schlink) — act as judge and jury on what is and what is not a good cosmetic? They simply can't!

But the "CR" and M. C. Phillips *do not claim infallibility* in the material which they present; "errors of fact and errors of judgment sometimes do unavoidably creep in," but they are always ready to make *corrections in listing if a manufacturer whose product is listed by*

the CR will approach them, and make the proper arrangements.

The files of Consumers' Research, we are told, contain such "a wealth of data of vital interest and importance to consumers" that the annual handbooks and monthly bulletins issued by the organization cannot contain it all; and so Miss Phillips thinks that a whole encyclopedia on consumers' goods might and should be prepared from those files, without exhausting their resources. She suggests that some philanthropist—some "dope" like the one who helped the CR to organize in 1929—may some day donate a million dollars for the purpose. Philanthropists, please take notice! Consumers' Research—"not for profit," of course—can always use a liberal contributor, and would dote on a sizable bequest.

Miss Phillips bewails the passing of the days, apparently, when women of 25 years ago used as cosmetics a can of talcum, a small piece of chamois "with a hand-crocheted border," and a bottle of glycerine for a hand-softener. However, in numerous other parts of her book she states that glycerine is drying and not "softening" for the hands—when criticizing hand-lotions made of glycerine. Perhaps it was different in the old days of 25 years ago.

Sad to relate, she says the selfish manufacturers and advertising agencies have found it very profitable to encourage women to emulate Cleopatra, and she claims that the former reluctance to use cosmetics was broken down by a heavy barrage of advertising. She derides and ridicules the beauty ads in women's magazines, and the use of face cream, rouge, and lipstick. She speaks scornfully of those poor, misguided, credulous women who persist in pursuing the Fountain of Youth in drugstores and beauty parlors.

The woman of today shudders to think of a world without beauty parlors and drugstore cosmetic counters. What a sad place it would be if all the women of the world were to follow the advice of the CR. Imagine

women without the spirit of beauty — without imagination — without the hope of making themselves more attractive by the aid of cosmetics! Can't you see them going about forlornly, — with a can of talcum powder in one hand and a crochet-chamois in the other? Oh, shades of our departed grandmothers help us all and keep us forever from the baleful and unhappy influence of the CR files and the suspicious pessimism of "Skin Deep."

"Remove confidence — and the most powerful advertising campaign, the best system of merchandising becomes useless." That is the object of the CR. It is the aim and purpose of Consumers' Research to *remove confidence* in our nationally advertised commodities, — just as M. C. Phillips (Mrs. Schlink) endeavors, in her book, to remove the confidence that women everywhere have in face creams, lotions, and all of the other fine cosmetics which are so essential to the women of today, — not available to the women of some generations back.

Advertising and merchandising efforts which will help to keep women on their toes, looking their best and feeling their best, are a boon to the nation and an asset to the world. The Fountain of Youth and modern miracles of beautifying, which are so scornfully referred to in "Skin Deep," are facts, and are easily made possible through the use of cosmetics, the fine creams, lotions, powders, and rouges, made under the modern regulation of manufacture, for the beauty-seeking women of today.

Placing an intrinsic value on cosmetics or any other manufactured commodity is somewhat ridiculous reasoning. After all, the metal in an expensive automobile may not actually cost more than \$60 or \$70, but the engineering knowledge, the dies and molds and presses required in manufacturing certainly demand that the car manufacturer receive more in return for his finished product than the mere cost of raw materials used.

Miss Phillips (Mrs. Schlink) decries the "rhapsodies," as she calls them, of the beauty editor or copywriter of

a certain brand of cosmetics (Elizabeth Arden), who likens a woman's beauty to a garden: — "Tended, it sings with glory; neglected, weeds creep in, and not only is a garden no longer a delight, but one grieves over it."

Surely that is an appropriate simile for a woman who neglects herself and shows the signs of neglect very much as a garden does,— so that you hear people say: "Too bad she doesn't take better care of herself; — she used to be so pretty, but now her complexion and her hair are so neglected." Yes, the garden simile is appropriate, but because it is used by one of those terrible old advertisers, the cultured author of "Skin Deep" calls this sort of reasoning "tripe" and "hooey,"— and says, "The face is best washed with soap and water and left alone." We wonder if, by any chance, Miss Phillips herself adheres to that formula.

In some respects, "Skin Deep" seems to have been written from a man's standpoint, rather than from that of a woman addressing herself to women; as when, in this instance, the use of cosmetics is deprecated in favor of "soap and water." If they follow this man-like advice, we fear a good many of the Consumers' Research women members must be soap-and-water beauties — faded, drooping flowers, like old-country women who are more familiar with farm drudgery than with the charm and beauty that adorn our homes, business offices, our retail stores, and many of our manufacturing plants, where women and girls take a just pride in their personal appearance. Soap-and-water beauties may be all right for the Jersey hamlet where the CR has its headquarters,— the den of the poison pen,— but something more in the way of charm is a modern necessity in the business life of urban centers.

A young lady office-worker was asked for her opinion of the soap-and-water formula, and promptly replied: "I tried it once, but never again! I was caught out in the country one day without face cream or makeup of any kind. I had plenty of soap and water, but somehow they

didn't work so well; and I don't think much of the formula. I know whereof I speak, and I would rather go without my supper than without face cream."

* * *

The author of "Skin Deep" asserts that the manufacturers constantly block any attempts to control manufacture which would keep dangerous preparations off the market; and that the consumers' best defense is to refuse to purchase any cosmetics of which the ingredients are unknown; — in other words,— ask the permission of Consumers' Research before buying. She suggests that women limit their purchases to the small selection of brands "recommended" in the handbooks and bulletins of the CR. "Do not be the first to try out any new experiments," she says, and might have added: "Subscribe for the CR confidential service, pay the annual dues, and abide by its advice."

Many of the suggestions made in "Skin Deep" are just as puerile. For instance, women are advised to use a *clean* powder-puff on their faces, and on no account to use another person's puff. What modern woman, either in city or country, needs such advice? The author might just as well advise against the use of another person's toothbrush!

Explaining some of the formulas of face creams, Miss Phillips asserts that they cost too much — a favorite charge of the CR against most manufactured products, — and that cold cream is the only one required for face treatment; and cold cream, she says, can be bought for 80c a pound. In advising women to buy the plain ingredients and compound their own cosmetics, she seems to forget that the ingredients of anything are much easier to get than the ability to compound them. Any woman can buy flour and sugar and eggs, but every woman cannot make a satisfactory birthday cake. And it takes an artist properly to blend the common ingredients into a perfect salad dressing. It also takes an

expert chemist to compound cosmetics to suit the discriminating taste of women.

Testimonials from cosmetic-users, according to "Skin Deep," are useless as recommendations. Thus the book echoes former statements by CR writers, who can never see any beauty or skill or attractiveness in modern advertising or any of its methods. Do you suppose any woman of rank or wealth or influence, or even a movie star of the highest order, would lend her physiognomy and name to the advertising of a product she knew to be dangerous or worthless? Is it not a fact that when testimonials are given for this or that by "society women" or stars of the first magnitude, it is for products that are already well and favorably known to the public? And when the reader of a testimonial advertisement learns that Miss or Mrs. So-and-So uses the same product she does, and approves of it, the effect is about the same as that of shaking hands with the President in the East Room of the White House. Is there any harm in that?

Time, space, and inclination forbid our going into further detailed review of the contents of "Skin Deep." The task is not a pleasant one, for we feel that the amateur efforts of Miss Phillips as a writer might have been directed into a much more worthy channel. We are rather inclined to pity her for having to share in the wholesale attacks of the Consumers' Research racket on American manufacturers and their products. Such wholesale and general charges as are made in "Skin Deep" against the makers of cosmetics are but an extension of the same kind of charges made in previous CR books and bulletins against other branches of manufacture; and the growing resentment of the business world against this kind of unofficial and unwarranted criticism will sooner or later be reflected in the minds of the readers of "Skin Deep" and the great majority of the intelligent women of America.

CHAPTER XX

A "CR" PROPHET ON THE PROFIT SYSTEM

THE latest volume in the Library of Discontent that is an important part of Consumers' Research propaganda was published in 1935, under the sensational title, "Partners in Plunder," with J. B. Matthews, vice-president of the "CR" organization, and R. E. Shallcross as co-authors.

All CR writers profess to be shocked by the sensation-seeking methods of business advertisers, but their own advertising agents describe this volume in lurid terms as "Another Consumers' Research book that names names and *explodes dynamite in high places*," — the same being a natural occupation for the principal author, J. B. Matthews, whose record as a radical agitator was presented in a previous chapter.

"Partners in Plunder" is further described as dealing with "the cost of business dictatorship" in the United States; and the partners in the nefarious work of plundering the American people are alleged to be (1) Business and (2) the Business-State, the latter being our present form of government, which, we are told, is entirely under the control of Big Business, to the extent of ignoring the interests of the consumers who constitute the mass of the population.

Most Americans will deny this premise of the authors, especially in view of the recent efforts of our government to "soak the rich" and to penalize business by heavy taxation. But the book was written when the now defunct NRA was still uppermost as a government agency for the control of business and a means toward business recovery; and as the NRA and the Blue Eagle are now dead,—outlawed by our Supreme Court,—the labored efforts of Messrs. Matthews and Shallcross to show that the government was business-controlled, in-

stead of being in control of business, fall quite flat, for they deal with an obsolete condition.

Before examining this book, "Partners in Plunder," we said that Consumers' Research is a business racket, in its very nature and essence; and on the principle of the pot calling the kettle black, we find the advertisers of the Matthews book asserting that "the ordinary commercial methods of American business are essentially indistinguishable from the gangster methods of racketeering." This will be news indeed to the vast majority of American business men, manufacturers and distributors, who conduct their enterprises with the honesty and integrity that, in the long run, are the only principles that pay.

Next we learn from the "CR" book that the government becomes a partner in "the plundered billions annually extorted from the American people," because it is the defender and upholder of the rights of private property — rights that are guaranteed to us by the Constitution and will never be surrendered, Messrs. Matthews and Shallcross and Schlink and the whole CR outfit to the contrary notwithstanding. It is because we enjoy those rights of private property, defended and upheld by our government, that we have become a great people and the envy of the nations of the earth.

Much space is taken up by the CR authors to support their charges against the profit system, which is the bugaboo of all radicals, no matter what they call themselves; and in the sensational vein of the entire book, profit is called "the pirate king." The very word "profit" seems to have an alarming and vexing effect on writers of the Matthews type, and they eject a perfect Niagara of words to relieve their feelings on the subject,—the effect in this case being minimized by the fact that J. B. Matthews is said to draw a salary of \$5,000 a year from the profits of Consumers' Research, in addition to profits in the shape of royalties on this book and his other radical writings.

You cannot frighten the American people with the

bugbear of Profit, for every man knows that business of every kind can only be carried on successfully at a profit; that without profits to reward enterprise and manufacture, the whole business system would collapse,—and that, no doubt, is the ultimate end and aim of the CR writers, whose ideal is the communistic state, with the government — or “the state” — running every industry and form of business, and the people mere human robots with no more freedom or independence of action than so many dummies, deprived of will-power, courage, and initiative.

We learn without surprise from the advertising of “Partners in Plunder” that the materials for the book are drawn chiefly from those inexhaustible “files” of Consumers’ Research, which also furnished the materials for “100,000,000 Guinea Pigs” (a title which insulted the whole body of American consumers) and for “Skin Deep,” the work by M. C. Phillips (Mrs. F. J. Schlink) to which we have previously referred. These files furnish the “evidence” for the charges against business and the government made by Messrs. Matthews and Shallcross, and this evidence is modestly claimed to be “overwhelming,” although the greater part of it will be found, upon examination, to be prejudiced and dogmatic statements regarding manufacturers’ products and business services, easily refuted by facts generally known to the public.

Of course, the name of F. J. Schlink, the radical czar of Consumers’ Research, is dragged into the Introduction of “Partners in Plunder,” as it was in the case of “Skin Deep,” and the authors say they are “specially indebted” to him for his help with their manuscript. A careful perusal of the book will show that much of it is a rehash of the critical material in the “Guinea Pig” effusion (Kallet and Schlink co-authors) and the virulent attack on all kinds of cosmetics which filled the pages of “Skin Deep.” The more these books are examined and considered, the more thoroughly one will be convinced that their sensationalism is designed for the purpose of breed-

ing class-discontent among consumers and profit for the authors, who condemn profit-making by everyone but themselves.

As extreme radical thinkers, the authors of "Partners in Plunder" attack all of the classes they call "liberals," including Socialists and especially Fascists, while all through the book we are told that the American government and people are rapidly tending to Fascism. We can easily understand the animus which men with Communist tendencies and affiliations have against Fascism, the kind of system that exists in Italy and in Germany, under Mussolini and Hitler. The Fascisti of Italy were organized in 1919 by Benito Mussolini as a society for the express purpose of opposing Bolshevism, which is the essence of Communism, and the Nazi movement in Germany is equally opposed to the system that prevails in Russia today, which is the ideal social and governmental system of the American Communist.

Let us here glance back for a moment at the radical record of J. B. Matthews, vice-president of Consumers' Research and principal author of the book we are placing under the microscope of review. In "The Red Network" and Who's Who of Radicalism, Matthews, who was a regular visitor to Russia for several years, is listed as former executive secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a radical "pacifist" organization of about 10,000 members employing Christian terms to spread Communistic propaganda. In 1934, we learn, Matthews was ousted as secretary of the Fellowship "because of too open support of the 'Class Struggle.'" He took an active part, either as chairman, speaker, or organizer, in the Communist-called Congresses Against War; and, says Elizabeth Dilling, author of "The Red Network": "I heard him cheered at the huge communist Mooney meeting, May 1, 1933, when he expressed his friendship and solidarity with the Reds, and said he wished Mooney's chances of getting out of jail were as good as his were of leaving the Socialist for the Communist party."

At the Student Congress Against War (pacifist-Communist) held at the University of Chicago, December 27-29, 1932, a stenographic report quotes J. B. Matthews as saying: "The pacifists have always been a failure because they were one war behind; in the next war they must be organized in a united front *to march on the seat of authority* where war is declared, and in order to do this we must be organized and *prepared to overthrow* any government that attempts to plunge us into war for any cause whatever." He said further that "even if Capitalism could outlaw war, pacifists would still have a second duty to perform, as there can be no peace in the world for the workers as long as *this parasitical, bloodsucking system* has the world in its grip."

That is the kind of propaganda the managers of Consumers' Research preach to their affiliates in the Red movement; and that is the kind of man who attacks the business and industrial system of the United States and seeks to promote his revolutionary ideas through the sensationalism of "Partners in Plunder" and other "CR" methods of agitation, under the cloak of a professed regard for consumers' interests. In his advocacy of the "class struggle," he would set the class which he calls "consumer-workers" against those who now furnish the means of production and every other class that does not conform to the Communist idea of "the proletariat." And yet, despite all this propaganda going on in our midst — even in our universities and colleges, through Communist "Student Unions," and many other organizations, the American business man remains cold to the threat of danger, serene in an over-confident belief that "it can't happen here," — when it is happening all the time, in the form of precipitated strikes, revolutionary mass-meetings and parades, and open defiance of law and order.

But Author Matthews says in his book that the "Red network" of revolution in the United States is purely mythical, — because the revolutionary groups squabble with one another, — which does not make them any the

less dangerous. It is "the black network of reaction," he says, which is the prime force in a threatened business society. And, by way of showing the solidarity of business, he continues:

"Ignorance of the existence of this force is the nullifying factor in the philosophy of liberalism. In the presence of any formidable opposition to the reign of property and profits, General Motors and Henry Ford could easily discover their transcendent mutuality; *Super-Suds* and *Rinso* (once pitted against each other in litigation) could dissolve amicably in the same dishwater; William Green and Owen D. Young could fraternize with brotherly deference; Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Herbert Clark Hoover could find their identity of interests greatly outweighing the tweedledee-tweedledum of their political parties' slogans."

Thus it appears to the Matthews mind that there is something altogether wrong for business men to organize in their "class interest" when the exigencies of business seem to require it; but it is altogether right and proper for other "classes," like his fellow-pacifists, Socialists, and Communists, to organize for revolutionary purposes, as he urged them to do when speaking in Chicago in 1932,—and "form a united front, to march on the seat of authority, prepared to overthrow any government," etc.

In his own opinion, Author Matthews is an "informed intellectual," and he classes the "liberalism" of such men as Professor Rexford Guy Tugwell as an archaic philosophy which deflects more radical and "informed" opinion into "channels of futility or outright reaction." Hence, he tells us, business in its direst hour of need will have cause to thank leaders of liberal thought like Tugwell for softening or misdirecting the attack upon it.

Present in America today, says J. B. Matthews, are all the elements necessary for a first-rate regime of Fascism. For while Mr. Roosevelt "continues to speak of a richer, more abundant life for all, his policies and those of the business world which he serves effectuate a poorer life for

all but the small group of property-owners at the top." This is another way of saying that the rich grow richer and the poor poorer, — a cheap demagogic assertion which is open to grave doubt.

Thus our Communist author would make Mr. Roosevelt out to be a sort of Fascist leader, while he (Matthews) and Schlink are preparing themselves for Lenin-leadership when "the day" of revolution comes and the consumer-worker enters into his own, — that is to say, his own state of Communistic industrial slavery.

After comparing the profit system with the head-hunting habit of certain jungle tribes of Borneo, Author Matthews opines that "Profit is still the pirate king of the Western world, and it is the underlying generative force of Fascism or any other form of business dictatorship."

Considering the strenuous and finally successful efforts made by American business to escape from the toils of dictatorship forged by the NRA and its alphabetical bureaus and divisions, the continual claim that such a dictatorship exists or can exist in this country falls to the ground of its own weight. Anyone who claims that business has more than its relative share in the management of our national concerns, or that our government is controlled by any social class is simply dallying with the truth or falsifying intentionally.

But business, and therefore government, is a wholesale racket, according to the author whom we can hardly refrain from calling "Comrade" Matthews, since he is of the same Red stripe as "Comrade" Schlink. "Business," he says — and we are taking it for granted that he wrote all the politics and economics and philosophy in the book, while Co-author Shallcross probably did the rehashing of the CR files, — "Business is a highly complex and well-integrated series of frauds, utilizing methods, both in its production and distribution, which are indistinguishable in spirit and effects from the practices of gangsterism, except that the effects of business are far more socially

devastating than are those of the racketeers outside the pale of the law."

That is one of the conclusions of the Matthews "study" of business conditions, fulfilling the promise of the sensational advertising copywriters who penned the advance notices of his book; and we may repeat what we have previously asserted in reply, that Matthews and Schlink and their associates ought to know a whole lot about racketeering, for Consumers' Research, which is their meal-ticket, is certainly a racket if there ever was one.

And as to the wholesale indictment of Business as "a series of frauds," we can safely leave the verdict to a jury of the public in any American community, where the business men form the most progressive, most civic-minded, most liberal, and most respected class, and are relied on to maintain the standards of American life and American honesty and credit.

Just one more brief quotation and we are done for the present with the politico-economic side of the Matthews book. He says on its last page, written in 1935: "During the two years of the New Deal, there have been major increases in the following things: Dividends, deterioration of goods, social insecurity, emergency relief, criminal illogic, pettifoggery and chicane by responsible officials of state and nation, militarism, and war perils. . . . New and unparalleled crises are in preparation, as the vacuum center of the whirlpool sucks its witless victim downwards."

To which pessimistic philippic we may reply that few Americans will agree with the author of "Partners in Plunder" that the things in which there were "major increases" are all evils. We certainly cannot agree that "dividends" are an evil, since they contribute to the incomes of so many hundreds of thousands of American families; nor that "emergency relief" is an evil, or what he calls "militarism" and which we prefer to call "preparedness."

In further reply, we can assure the pessimistic "col-

lectivist" that general conditions in the United States are slowly but surely improving; that the resilient spirit of business is asserting itself in natural recovery, and that so far from Fascism developing strongly in our midst, either politically or socially, the trend of the times is distinctly away from the conditions prophesied by the Consumers' Research agitators, in the direction of a revival of the American spirit (which they condemn) and American independence in manufacture, distribution, advertising, and consumption.

The American manufacturer will continue to produce what the people want, in honest quantity and quality, and will maintain his right to advertise his goods cleverly, attractively, and conscientiously; while the American consumer will continue to buy what and where he pleases, without regard to the advice, forebodings, and threats of Consumers' Research. And the "witless victims," being well able to keep themselves afloat, will surely escape from the whirlpool which exists only in the fevered imagination of the CR writer.

* * *

In its literary character, the book "Partners in Plunder" is simply a deluge of words, typical of the radical mind and the professional agitator. There are all the earmarks of its Red origin in the use of phrases coined to denote various classes and conditions, such as "the business-state," "idea-control," the "informed intellectual," and "the consumer-worker," the latter being the class, otherwise "the proletariat," whose special interests the authors profess to have at heart.

The person of average understanding who attempted to wade through this Consumers' Research book would soon find himself lost in a maze of language intended apparently to confuse the reader and give an impression of deep thought on the subjects considered. But most of the statements are dogmatic and open to refutation by facts. Politically and economically, the ideas advanced

are unsound and untenable. There is no such plundering or predatory alliance between business and the state as is not merely suggested, but insisted upon, by the authors — or the one, J. B. Matthews, who probably wrote the more serious part of the book.

The general idea of the book may be judged from the following choice gems of radical thought which we cull from its earlier pages:

“In business plunder is of the essence. The springs of thought as well as the source of physical life for the masses are poisoned when poisoning is profitable, adulterated when adulteration is profitable, and otherwise exploited in ways that blight and despoil.” . . . (“Guinea Pigs” slowly dying of poison, please take notice!)

“At every stage in the making and distributing of goods, there is a clash of classes. . .” (Always preaching the “class struggle!”)

“The present administration at Washington, like its predecessors, is completely under the control of . . . those who work for profits (not for wages and salaries) against the interests of consumer-workers . . . It is the interest of all those who are really consumer-workers to know about this danger in order that they may combat it. . .”

“These business practitioners have a desperate grip on the whole of our social life, through government, newspapers and magazines, schools, and the radio. That grip must be broken before it becomes tighter, or nothing can spare us the gruesome excesses of an out-and-out Fascist regime.”

“A people susceptible to the multitude of tricks now employed by business is already half-sold into the slavery of Fascism.”

Reading between the lines of those last three paragraphs, we can see the call of the Bolshevist spirit of the author, which in its determined opposition to anything even remotely resembling Fascism, sees a Fascist condition approaching or existent among a united people going about their daily business calmly and fearlessly,

under leaders of their own type and their own choosing. The Fascism discovered by J. B. Matthews and his ilk in this country is the baseless fabric of a dream.

In his antagonism to the profit system, Matthews asserts that business and the state are ruled by considerations of profit because, in this machine age, manufacturers — “those who gained control over production” — turned away from the idea of making goods “as a way of life and as a response to the needs of consumers,” and turned more and more “to the idea of goods as a means for their own private pecuniary enrichment.” In spite of the fact that the living standards of the vast majority have been raised immensely, by leaps and bounds, under the profit system — or what Adam Smith more accurately called the mercantile system, — the authors of “Partners in Plunder” would have us believe that the quest for profit in business has resulted in “the beating down of these living standards” — which no intelligent American will accept as true.

And J. B. Matthews, rather surprisingly, admits that if loyalty to the aims of Private Enterprise in business “were all that is needful for recovery, there should never have been a depression, for the active foes of the profit system (including Socialists, Communists, and other radical groups) have not at any time in recent American history numbered more than two and one-half per cent of the electorate.”

Yet he opposes that system and says “Profit is pirate king” and is leading us fast to Fascism, and the government and business are allied as partners in plunder, — thereby setting himself up as a prophet of evil, against the views and the experience of the 97½ per cent of the American electorate who stand firmly behind the business system under which they have grown strong and thrived and prospered ever since the infancy of the Republic.

At the height of the recent depression, Walter Lippmann, the noted columnist of the New York Herald

Tribune and the Chicago Daily News, wrote that the way to revivify private industry is to "raise prices above costs and thus restore profits." And oh, how J. B. Matthews excoriates Mr. Lippmann for that assertion of his belief in profits, — calling him an "ex-Socialist, ex-liberal, and ex-editor of the *New Republic*." And he quotes the distinguished writer rather sarcastically, for Lippmann rightly says: "In the American economy it is under the stimulus of profit that enterprise brings idle men and idle money together, permits them to create wealth and improve the national income."

The testimony of this "acknowledged spokesman for the business world" far outweighs the radical views of Consumers' Research writers, and all patriotic Americans will echo Mr. Lippmann's statement that "We are entitled to feel confidence in our own power of recovery" under the time-tried profit system.

In the opinion of Messrs. Matthews and Shallcross, the law, as an instrument of government, "is of necessity a tool of the ruling interests in society," and they assert that "it is one of the illusions of a thoroughly discredited social philosophy that the law is an impartial arbiter between all conflicting interests in society." Then they go on to say: "When we use the words 'pirates,' 'racketeers,' and 'plunderers,' we are not speaking of the Capones, the Insulls, the Foshays, and the Harrimans, who have run afoul of existing laws, but rather of that eminently respectable and numerous group that . . . dominates business and government . . . and whose chief enterprise, the quest for profit, *will be declared the major crime in the consumer-workers' society of tomorrow.*"

So we see that, in this radical view of things, the business men of America are to be accounted the chief criminals after the "uprising" that is to bring about a new proletarian government, with Schlink and Matthews and others who are being prepared for "Lenin-leadership" in control.

Under the heading, "The Rococo Front of Business,"

the authors of the Matthews-Shallcross book make one of the usual CR attacks on the business of advertising. With regard to this, we shall reserve our reply for a later chapter, in which we purpose to show the essential value of advertising to the modern business world and the important part it has played in elevating the standard of American living.

Advertising cannot be sneered at as merely "a billion-dollar adjunct to business"; and if it be true that it is "not a noble art," it must be credited at least with being an invaluable aid to the convenience, comfort, and happiness of the great consuming public.

"Partners in Plunder," as we have already said, contains much that is merely rehashed from former Consumers' Research publications. We find that the subject of "high-pressure salesmanship" is treated in much the same way as in a former book; that testimonial advertising is made the topic of a chapter, and the scientists employed by manufacturers to stabilize or improve the quality of their products are duly sneered at; that adulterations are condemned in much the same language as of yore; that "fancy brands" and trade-names are regarded with CR disfavor; that our foods are full of poisons, so that it is a wonder any of us live to learn the extent of the CR racket; that doctors and druggists would be sent to a region worse than Siberia if the CR had its way; and that it is the "junking" policy of automotive manufacturers that makes you want a new and up-to-date car when you have driven the old one 25,000 miles or more. All these subjects are treated in the same old way, with which the misguided persons who subscribe to Consumers' Research "confidential" service and readers of previous CR books are familiar.

All this stuff is thrown in for good measure in "Partners in Plunder," but the main purpose of the book is to air the Communistic views of J. B. Matthews, vice-president of Consumers' Research, Inc., — views which are shared by F. J. Schlink, the president, who collaborated

in the work to the extent of making many suggestions and approving the manuscript.

Now, the main purpose of Consumers' Research, as announced, being to inform consumers what goods are worth buying and what are not — to be a "clearing-house of information" on material products, and not a school of Russian philosophy and economics, — by what right, may we ask, do Matthews and other CR writers who are avowed radicals assume to counsel Americans as to their form and methods of government, to advise those who think with them to "organize" and prepare for more or less violent action against our constituted authorities, to seek to "overthrow" the profit system, and to make the wholesale charge that the American people are being "plundered" by their business interests and the state?

The fact is that Schlink, Matthews, and other ultra-radicals rely upon the tolerance of the American people when they spout forth their mouthings and the products of their poison-pens. They take advantage of the right of free speech and free publication which they enjoy under the government and business system which they accuse of being partners in plunder.

They take advantage of their American citizenship.

They know they could not say and do similar things in the Russia they admire so much and extol in their radical group meetings. They know that there, if they attacked the existing government, or the economic system of the country, or the conduct of a government bureau, or a single official or agent of the Soviet Union, they would be promptly jailed or exiled or sent to the Siberian mines to join the ranks of lost and forgotten souls who were "reactionaries" or "counter-revolutionists."

But they are Americans, and as such we strongly advise them to stick to their job of food-criticism — at least, until such time as public tolerance of the Consumers' Research racket ceases to be a virtue, — and to stop their thinly-veiled attempts to Russianize the Amer-

ican people, for fear of the inevitable consequences to themselves when the Federal authorities awake to the true nature of their outpourings.

CHAPTER XXI

THE TRUTH ABOUT ADVERTISING AND ITS CRITICS

ADVERTISERS of American products and their representatives in the field of commercial publicity have been the objects of continual attack by "the poison pen of Jersey" wielded by F. J. Schlink, J. B. Matthews, and their associates in the ultra-radical organization mis-called Consumers' Research, of Washington, N. J.

Ignoring the truth about advertising and its achievements in the interests of American industry and the American people, the writers of "CR" books and bulletins lose no opportunity to decry the value of advertising and traduce the advertiser and his advertising agent or copy-writer. Nothing is too harsh or too unfair or even too false for them to say about the manufacturer who seeks publicity for his products through the medium of newspapers, magazines, radio or billboards.

These attacks have been going on for several years, and while sporadic attempts have been made by individual members of the profession and by several of the great advertising agencies to make an effective answer, it has remained for us to show, as we have done in previous chapters of this book, the real purpose behind the efforts of Consumers' Research to belittle the value of advertising and cast discredit upon those who advertise.

That purpose is *an un-American, foreign-born radicalism* that seeks to promote "class struggle" in the United States, by setting consumers against producers and their allies in the promotion of American business, — always with a view to the "uprising" or "revolution" against capitalism and the profit system which "Comrade" Schlink and his associates in the poison-pen enterprise visualize as a desideratum of the future, with themselves as "Lenin-leaders" of a new order. If any reader doubts that they have this in mind, let him read the radical

records of these Consumers' Research managers, as given elsewhere in this book. (See Chapter 2.)

The first Consumers' Research book, "Your Money's Worth" (1927), Chase and Schlink, co-authors, was devoted largely to a series of attacks on advertising and advertised goods, with implications of falsity and deceit on the part of advertisers and copywriters. In a summary of the contents, the consumer was instructed "never to believe advertisements of competitive goods"; and if the "supersalesman" was inclined to smile at this instruction, he was told that "*some day* he may smile out of the other side of his mouth."

In 1932 Consumers' Research was responsible for another book, sensationally entitled "100,000,000 Guinea Pigs," with Arthur Kallet and F. J. Schlink as co-authors, and when the intelligent reader got over his indignation at finding the American people insultingly described as so many guinea pigs, he found a large part of the contents devoted to an attack on the techniques of food and drug advertising, based on the text that "almost no advertising intended to influence the general public is honest."

Then, in 1934, came "Skin Deep," by M. C. Phillips (Mrs. F. J. Schlink), with a tirade against cosmetic advertising in women's magazines, and advice to women to read the stories and admire the pictures, if they must, but on no account to rely on their advertisements as a guide to the purchase of cosmetics "or any other product that is of the slightest importance."

F. J. Schlink's "Eat, Drink and Be Wary" followed in 1935 from the radical presses employed by Consumers' Research. This was described as "a book about eating," and Schlink outdid himself in attacks upon advertisers as "misinformers of the public," rambling on page after page with his prejudiced criticism of newspapers and magazines and the character of the food advertising they carry to millions of readers.

Another book effort of Consumers' Research published in 1935 was the 444-page essay in politico-economics

entitled "Partners in Plunder," by J. B. Matthews and R. E. Shallcross. This book, which was reviewed in a previous chapter, attacked advertising even more strenuously than its predecessors and assumed that the body-blows delivered by the other Consumers' Research writers had made the advertising fraternity "groggy," so that it is now "on the defensive." The answer to that is that advertisers and advertising can put up such a stout defense against all their detractors as to make the charges of such critics as those of Consumers' Research appear supremely ridiculous.

* * *

Now what is the truth about advertising as an art and as an aid to both the manufacturer and the consumer?

As a recognized form of business enterprise, Advertising is of comparatively recent development, but in a general sense it is as old as Business itself.

Some sort of advertising is and ever has been a necessary feature of every kind of business. Men who suddenly awake to the importance of advertising are fond of asserting that it is "the lifeblood of modern business." This is true, but exceedingly trite, for advertising has been the lifeblood of business in all its stages since business first began.

There was advertising of many kinds long before the invention of movable types gave an impetus to printing and opened a new era of advertising by means of printer's ink. The pioneer advertiser is unknown, but must have been contemporary with the pioneer business man, centuries before printing was known.

Whenever in the world's history one individual announced in any way that he possessed something which another might possibly need, or be induced to buy, — he advertised. But the history of what we of the twentieth century call Advertising runs coevally with the history of the art of printing, — and more especially with the history of the periodical press.

Within the last twenty-five years advertising in the

United States has grown to immense proportions, and more and more attention yearly is being paid to the subject by business men. Advertising was always a feature of business activity, but compared with modern methods, those of former years were unquestionably crude. The average advertisement of even so recent a period as thirty years ago would present a decidedly antiquated appearance if published in the pages of a modern magazine.

Few people realize in how many different directions human progress has been evinced in a remarkable degree in recent years. The closing years of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth have been crowded with a bewildering sequence of important discoveries in the arts and sciences. These have been accompanied by many changes in the methods of doing business, among which the decided progress made in advertising has passed comparatively unnoticed, except by those engaged in the advertising profession and business men of the wideawake sort.

Advertising is the great selling force of the modern business world. It is the method by which a producer or distributor of commodities disseminates information regarding them; and it includes the principles and practice of profitable publicity.

Advertising makes it possible to reach thousands of people through printed words, whereas formerly the seller was limited to the scope of his vocal organs in making his commodities known. To the consumer, it has the value of a system of education, since it keeps him or her in touch with the invention of new commodities, the improvement of old, and the constant advance in industry. It helps to make known the wants of the people as well as to supply them, and is remarkably effective in creating new wants.

There is no question but that advertising stimulates the consuming power of men; it creates desires that raise the standard of living, — it is the incentive that makes one want a better home, better clothing, better food for

the family. Advertising, when it teaches the individual that to have these better things one must work for them, is truly good advertising.

Advertising both creates and fixes new staples, and it *improves the standard of living in every civilized community*. Where advertising prevails in its highest development, the consumer can buy better and cheaper than in other markets less favored by modern progress. Thus advertising is a better friend of the consumer than its critics, Consumers' Research, who would destroy the confidence of the public in advertised products, from the most popular common foods and drugs and cosmetics to vacuum cleaners and automobiles, and would rob women of the priceless heritage they have in the great magazines that are made available by advertising.

When one considers, even briefly, the wholesale onslaughts made by the Consumers' Research writers on advertisers and advertising agencies, and realizes to what extent these critics would deprive the people of the conveniences and comforts they enjoy, one is apt to see as red as these radicals think, and to wish that they would betake themselves, quickly and *en masse*, to the Russia whose dirty work they are doing in this country.

* * *

We live today nationally and internationally. To live internationally, we must accept Big Business as an accomplished fact and a step in modern progress, with international advertising as one of its factors. Let us not forget that in our search for necessary foreign markets for our products, American goods are advertised and sold throughout the British Empire, the countries of Europe, South America, and the Far East; while, on the other hand, many products of those countries are advertised and sold in the United States. Thus advertising promotes the interchange of goods for mutual benefit among the nations of the earth.

Our present civilization is the result of the interchange of ideas, goods, and money.

How is this brought about?

Simply because advertising plants the seed of desire in millions of hearts. Thus advertisers are forced to produce on such a scale that automatically lowered prices bring the good things of life within the reach of still other millions.

Criticism of advertising's contribution to the general welfare comes largely from two sources: — First, from those who would have you believe all advertising is fraudulent; second, from a certain class who believe that advertising is an economic waste, a drain upon the purses of the people, and an added tax on the consumer by the advertiser.

It is claimed by "CR" who are disposed to complain, that ingredients in certain advertised products can be bought more cheaply — perhaps in bulk. That may be true, but the difference between advertised products and others is not always in the commercial worth of ingredients, but in intangible qualities like convenience, style, service, or a guarantee of purity, reliability, and uniformity.

Consumers' Research critics, strangely, have little to say of one of advertising's greatest contributions to public welfare. Advertising alone has insured to America an economically independent press, responsible to no one but its own readers and its own conscience. No press in the world approaches it.

In no other country will you find publishers so relieved of the necessity of catering to economic or political power.

In no civilization that history records have the good things of life spread as quickly as in America. Advertising has given wings to our culture, our civilization. Remove its influence, or dilute it, and you will reduce the masses of our people to a lower class of ordinary ability.

Advertising is attracting attention to a certain product or service. It is not a wholesale swindle, as Consumers' Research would have us believe.

If business men were content to drag along until the merits of their product became known through the slow process of natural evolution, worthwhile inventions and labor-saving devices would be of little use for the first half-century after their development and manufacture.

To be of public benefit, advertising must be both timely and honest. And to the credit of the American manufacturer and business man be it said that despite the animadversions of Consumers' Research and its sensation-mongers, the great bulk of advertising is honest and truthful and beyond reproach. The business sense that dictates the advertisement is the consumer's best protection. To be profitable, advertising *must be true*.

Anyone with any sense knows that poor products or defective commodities of any kind cannot long survive in the face of legitimate advertising. Goods manufactured on a tremendous scale in a modern, scientific plant succeed with advertising and build up goodwill because of the sound merit of the product. Can anything be better or more palatable than a bowl of canned vegetable soup put up by one of the large companies? Made of the finest quality of ingredients, in an immaculately clean plant, where each employee must pass a daily physical examination and wear fresh, clean gloves in handling the vegetables, and where the entire plant is open to public inspection, — honest, truthful advertising has made possible a sale of 9,000,000 cans a day, by one of these concerns. If the product was inferior, would that be possible?

Advertising — not Consumers' Research — has taken the water out of syrup, the defective kernels out of coffee, the adulterations out of liquids, and in every way contributed more to the purification of food products than all the racketeering Research outfits, laboratories, standardization bureaus, and other self-appointed organizations of reformers between the Goddess of Liberty and the Golden Gate.

There may still remain a few who regard advertising

expenditure as a waste of money, but the scientific advertising man replies to this objection that advertising is worth what it costs, because it conveys information and creates business. It is in fact a great scientific business force, besides being the modern manufacturer's principal weapon of independence.

The modern era of advertising began with the appreciation on the part of great manufacturers that advertising was the most important selling force they could employ. This has been shown unmistakably by the results of recent advertising by the manufacturers of staple products and even such commodities as building materials, etc.

Most of the goods bought in this country reach the ultimate consumer through retail stores, and the object of the manufacturer is to make his product known to the public who purchase at these stores, by means of a trademark or name, or both. The particular merits of his goods are fully described in his advertisements in newspapers, magazines and through other media, and as a result his goods will be selected as against others which lie unidentified on the shelves of the dealer.

Herein lies the greatest field for advertising. It is so great that its possibilities have not even yet been fully realized. And while it has been suggested that great combinations of capital might do away with advertising, as they have often done away with competition, the fact remains that some of the largest users of advertising space today are the combinations that used to be called "trusts."

It is now realized, however, that without advertising business cannot be carried on to any large extent, for advertising has been well described as "the force which vitalizes all the other work which may be put into a business." After the merchandise is purchased by the distributor and the service hired, the steam that is generated to make the machine move is the advertising.

That, briefly stated, is *the function of advertising* in

the modern industrial world. It is the dynamic power which drives forward a business concern to success. It is the fundamental thing — the cornerstone of any business which would win for itself success or prosperity amidst the keen competition which is characteristic of modern civilization.

Advertising in fact occupies much the same relation to business that steam does to the locomotive. It is the driving power without which progress is impossible. The engine may be complete in every detail, but that fact does not move the cars attached to it. Until the steam is generated in the boiler, the locomotive might as well never have been invented, for all the help it is in moving the freight from one place to another. So it is with a business unless it advertises, — it remains stationary and does not prosper.

Modern methods of advertising have been developed as a direct result of increased competition in the business world. Competition in industry and commerce has become so severe that a manufacturer is obliged to keep his goods continually before the public. If he does not, they will be pushed aside by more enterprising firms, who not only appeal to the general public, but also try to encroach upon the ground which the old-established firm has hitherto regarded as within its "sphere of influence."

Any new business endeavoring to get a foothold in the industrial world is equally compelled to advertise. It is of the most vital importance to the success of the concern to attract public attention to its existence. If it cannot do so, the excellence of the commodity manufactured will benefit neither the manufacturer nor the consumer. Neither will have the knowledge necessary to enable them to become mutually helpful. *Advertising is the most efficient method of putting manufacturer or retailer into direct touch with the consumer.* It is the connecting link which binds the one to the other; and as long as manufacturers continue to advertise their products honestly and attractively, the utmost efforts of Consumers'

Research and other more or less malicious critics of advertisers will never be able to break that link of friendship and goodwill — “the tie that binds.”

* * *

Advertising makes new wants, and while Consumers' Research writers and pundits may deprecate the beneficence of this result, it means a “more abundant life” and a better way of living. “Advertising brings Opportunity to the door of Doubt,” says a great business man. “It hammers on the door until opportunity becomes Impor-tunity and the doubting one finds himself possessed with a new want and a new desire.”

This new desire, multiplied in potency and pulling power thousands of times through all the changing moods of human fancy, is the thing that pulls business and piles up industrial wealth to colossal heights. This is the thing that builds cities, factories, and railroads, and all the instrumentalities that contribute to human happiness and human progress. It makes the luxuries of today the necessities of tomorrow. By multiplying human desires, it brings about the establishment of agencies for gratifying those desires, until the earth is filled with the creative forces liberated by man's genius and industry.

Yet Consumers' Research, by implication of the “arguments” contained in all its sensational books, would have us return to the crude methods of life in primitive times, or, at least, to the mode of living of our grandparents.

Within a few years, advertising has filled the city and country highways of this and other lands with flying chariots of cushioned comfort and luxury, which rich and poor alike enjoy. It has taken thousands from the city out into the byways of rural loveliness, along sunlit meadows and singing brooks into quiet lanes of blossoming beauty. The automobile has rushed onward into popular favor, riding roughshod over almost-forgotten prejudice and opposition, and is no longer a luxury, but a necessity.

Advertising has sent the evangel of good health and

the simple life into thousands of homes. A few years ago a Nebraska lawyer whose stomach had gone out of business was trying a lawsuit in a small town in that State. At the hotel where he stopped he observed a man at the table each day eating a dish of boiled whole wheat. Being a dietetic crank, his curiosity was aroused. On inquiry he learned that the stranger, too, had a stomach that had refused to do the work for which Nature had intended it; but he was waxing strong and fat on boiled whole wheat, which he macerated in a bowl and ate with cream and sugar. The lawyer began eating it, and when he found that he could digest it and maintain his mental and physical powers, he began a series of experiments to make it a commercial proposition.

That is the story of Shredded Wheat, briefly told. Advertising has built this business into a mammoth industry, housed in a palace of light on the banks of the Niagara River and sending out each day of the year a million and a quarter Shredded Wheat Biscuits. The annual expenditures of this company for all kinds of advertising aggregate several hundred thousand dollars at one time; and the two-million-dollar plant in which these biscuits are made is visited annually by about 100,000 persons from all parts of the habitable globe. The Shredded Wheat Company for many years conducted an educational campaign which not only led to a world-wide recognition of the nutritive value of whole wheat foods, when properly prepared, but created a national sentiment in favor of pure foods and clean foods. Shredded Wheat is now a subsidiary of The National Biscuit Company.

Advertising, among its other achievements, has largely emancipated busy bearded men from the slavery of the barber-shop. It has made every man his own barber, so far as the daily shave is concerned. Advertising that inoculates a man with a desire to shave himself with a safety razor is a boon to the race. The average man who doesn't shave himself and who has reached the age of

seventy has wasted about three years of his precious waking life in barber shops. Advertising adds all these wasted hours to the productive energies of the race, besides promoting its peace and tranquility and lessening its profanity. The large manufacturers of safety razors now spend immense sums in advertising every year, and for personal use the old-fashioned straight razor is practically a thing of the past.

Advertising has put a fountain pen into nearly every business man's pocket, and the student is equally well equipped. The old-fashioned pen may have been mightier than the sword, but it was of no account when there was no ink handy. The first Waterman fountain pen was put on the market in 1884. The advertising appropriation for the first year was \$62.50, while the total sales were 200 pens. When the appropriations for publicity were increased, the sales mounted, until the value of the total annual output amounted to several million dollars.

In promoting the sale of toilet articles, the same being anathema to Consumers' Research and especially to the author of "Skin Deep," — advertising has "smoothed the wrinkles of Worry from the brow of Care. It has brought the roses of June to the fading cheek of December. It has covered crow's-feet and freckles with velvety smoothness and whiteness, transforming old maids into poems of pulchritude." Pompeian Massage Cream was first put on the market in 1902. The advertising appropriation for the first year was \$3,000. A circular issued in 1903 spoke of the company's "tremendous" advertising campaign of \$8,000 in ten publications. This circular announced that The Delineator would carry Pompeian copy to the extent of three inches. Four years later the company was announcing to the dealers a double-page spread in the Saturday Evening Post.

Advertising created and originated the dollar watch, putting a reliable timekeeper within the reach of hundreds of thousands who could not afford the more expensive timepieces. The story of the Ingersoll watch is the

story of one of the most wonderful advertising successes of the present age. The first watch was put on the market in 1893, and for the first year the sales averaged 300 watches per day. By 1910 the annual output was approximately 3,000,000 watches, or between 11,000 and 12,000 per day. At that time the manufacturer's advertising covered a very wide range of publicity and the annual expenditure was several hundred thousand dollars.

The attention of business men may well be directed to the following trustworthy maxims of advertising:

(a) "The man who cannot use advertising in his business has no business to be in business, and generally isn't.

(b) "The man who doesn't find advertising profitable in his business, finds business unprofitable.

(c) "An intelligent knowledge of advertising, and of all that pertains to it, is as essential to the success of a well-regulated business as is familiarity with debit and credit.

(d) "The day passed into history, half a century ago, when any brainy man dared to say that advertising did not pay.

(e) "Advertising, like everything else, must be made to pay."

And the honest advertising of honest goods, by competent advertising men, *does* pay, largely because it is an appreciated public service.

So we say, in answer to Consumers' Research critics, that the great bulk of the advertising of products today is done by worthy and qualified men, in an honest and worthy way, for honest and worthy products; and that advertising, in spite of its lack of perfection and in spite of all allegations of untruthfulness, is worthy, as a rule, of the confidence of the consuming public and assists materially in promoting the public welfare as well as the interests of American business.

CHAPTER XXII

ADVERTISING AGENCIES AN INVALUABLE AID TO BUSINESS

THE voluntary, unofficial, and unwarranted criticism and condemnation of advertising which characterizes the outpourings of Consumers' Research, extends to individual advertising men, managers, agents, and copywriters, and all concerned in the promotion of manufacture and distribution of American commodities, including the advertising agencies that handle the business of manufacturers large and small.

In doing so, Consumers' Research shuts its jaundiced eyes to the fact that you cannot hide your product under a bushel and expect to sell it. The truth about it must be told, the public must be informed as to its merits and usefulness, or there will be no business. Our manufacturing industries would languish and die without advertising, and unless that is the aim and object of the wholesale criticism of Consumers' Research, its condemnation is wholly unwarranted.

As a matter of fact, the advertising manager and individual advertising agent, as well as the great agencies that promote production and sales, are invaluable aids to business, with functions and services that are essential factors of a successful industrial and business system.

The essence of advertising is that it takes the place of a personal introduction. By truth and truth alone it creates confidence; and that repetition of the good points of an article is necessary to the greatest success of advertising does not condemn the practice; it merely recognizes the psychological effect of repeated statements.

To be profitable, as we have said, advertising *must be true*. That the modern advertising of American products is a collection of lies, ingeniously told for the purpose of flimflaming the consumer or charging him or her an exorbitant price for an inferior article, — as Consumers'

Research would have the public believe, — is a charge so absurd on its face as to deceive none but the gullible who credit everything they see in print, especially such absurdities as appear under the sponsorship of Consumers' Research in sensational volumes like "Your Money's Worth" and "100,000,000 Guinea Pigs," "Eat, Drink and Be Wary" and "Skin Deep."

The less attention and credence one gives to the contents of these books and the ultra-radical nonsense of their companion-volume, "Partners in Plunder," the more one may be credited with intelligence, common sense, and knowledge of the facts.

Advertising may be described as "telling the truth for profit," and it will take greater economic authorities than the radical writers of Consumers' Research to convince Americans that the quest for profit is a crime.

The charges made by the writers of Consumers' Research should recoil upon their own heads, for they are the most sensational and untruthful advertisers in America today, and all their productions are calculated to deceive the public, as well as to harass the manufacturer and his publicity agents.

* * *

What, exactly, is the functions of the advertising agent? He may be properly described as "an expert in advertising." His field of knowledge and action includes the whole field of advertising. He must know intimately the mediums of publicity. He must know the history of advertising and everything that has happened in the advertising world since advertising became such a vital force in business. He must be a live business man and know the conditions of business. He must be able to plan and execute a campaign. He must know a thousand-and-one things about the work of a bookkeeper, a writer, an artist, an engraver, a printer; and like the mythical gentleman who maintained a difficult and anxious position between the devil and the deep sea, he

must stand tactfully "twixt the advertiser and the publisher." Good agencies won't accept advertising for questionable products — publications won't print those ads. Double censorship.

The advertiser has goods to sell, and the moment his market widens beyond the local field to the extent that the selection of media becomes a problem in itself, the advertiser at once feels the need for skilled assistance. And when that problem becomes so complex that special study and continuous attention are required to master it, that is the time when the advertising agent becomes an indispensable aid and ally.

There can be no question as to the value of the agent's services to the advertiser. They save him money that would be lost in experiments with media and territories and circulations. The agent is a skillful pilot who guides the advertiser's vessel through the shoals of fallacious circulation figures, among the rocks of unprofitable media, out into the deep ocean where the breeze of publicity may fill his sails. As "one star differeth from another star in glory," so one publication differs from another in "pulling" power. The relative value in media — that is for the expert to decide. And by the exercise of this important knowledge, he serves both the advertiser and the publisher, while the advertiser gets the added benefit of the agent's planning, advising, and writing.

The fact is that "experts" — authorities on advertising — are a necessity.

In many respects the interests of the advertiser and his agent or agency are identical. Both must remember that the advertising word is their bond. It is important to win new trade, but it is equally important to hold old trade, and *fair dealing* is the only thing that will hold it, as the modern advertiser knows. The public memory is short for benefits, but long for injuries. Deceive or disappoint a customer once, and you will have no second opportunity to do it. That fact alone is a guarantee of fair

dealing with the public in advertising, although Consumers' Research seems to be ignorant of it.

Shrewd advertisers are well aware that for future results advertising copy must be truthful; that no sacrifice is too great in the effort to acquire a reputation for fair dealing and truth-telling; that dissatisfied customers work like a creeping frost on a seemingly flourishing business.

The only force that will draw trade continuously and increasingly is the public conviction that when an advertiser says that a thing is so, it is so. And Consumers' Research has devoted its efforts to the ignoble task of destroying that conviction, for the apparent purpose of creating strife in America. Hence, we repeat, it is high time for business men to fight back and show up the real character of this New Jersey organization of radical snoopers as a menace to advertisers and destructive of the goodwill they have created among consumers of their products.

* * *

The modern advertising agency is the direct outcome of the increased attention paid to advertising by business men generally. Advertising being now regarded as a business necessity, and a knowledge of fundamental principles being recognized as essential to successful expenditure of money in this direction, the advertiser has come to realize that a professional advertising man or a properly conducted advertising agency can give his advertising more business like treatment and make it more effective than if he were to devote his personal attention to it in the limited time at his command for the purpose.

As early as 1850 there existed in New York agencies whose function it was to arrange rates with newspapers, to gather information as to the extent and character of newspaper circulation, etc., for the guidance of the advertiser. At that time advertisements consisted usually of plain statements of the character of the things offered

for sale. With the enormous development of the patent-medicine industry after the Civil War, advertising assumed a more complicated technique. Illustrations were required and a nice adjustment of the character of advertisements to the territory covered.

Between 1880 and 1890 there was a great development of advertising through illustrated catalogs. Examples of business built up through such advertising are the mail-order houses and the garden-seed concerns. After 1890 there was a vast increase in the production of trade-marked articles for personal and household use, which were wholly dependent upon advertising for a market. Then the "advertising campaign" became a characteristic feature of American business. The management of such campaigns made necessary the development of a new type of advertising agency, well supplied with capital, having at its command a corps of highly trained writers and illustrators, and possessing a competent technical apparatus in the form of records of advertising experience, etc. Thus the modern agency may be described as an organization of "experts in advertising," capable of dealing with the publicity problems of the largest national advertisers and the technique of the most widespread advertising campaigns.

The enormous extent of the advertising field, as opened up by the developments of the last few decades, brought into existence, not merely one new profession, but practically three. Under the general head of "advertising men" — a title now proudly borne by thousands of excellent business men, scientifically trained for their vocation,— we find three distinct and specialized types; namely, the advertising agent, the advertising manager, and the advertising salesman.

The advertising agent is the professional man, in his own office, who acts as adviser to advertisers. His relations to the man who has a product to sell by advertising are similar to those of a lawyer, doctor, or architect

to clients. His experience in managing advertising and merchandising campaigns is purchased by the advertiser.

The larger magazines and the better sort of newspapers usually require that an advertising agent shall be engaged as a go-between, and as a rule decline to recognize a regular employee of the house. This makes it necessary for much of the business of a house which has an advertising manager to be placed through an agency.

The third profession we may note is that of the advertising salesman. He is the man who secures advertising for one or more publications; that is, he sells advertising space. He, of course, represents his own employers, but at the same time he creates new business for other publications by discovering new business that can be advertised. This work is also performed by the better class of advertising agents, and in ideal conditions the solicitors of the leading publications and the managers of the agencies which develop advertising, work in entire harmony.

* * *

The results of the successful early advertising campaigns were truly remarkable. The nature of the "copy" used in those days was very different from that of successful copy in the twentieth century. It was perhaps easier then than now to obtain results, and there was an absence of the painstaking care and study in the construction and use of advertising matter that is necessary for success in the present day. But the advertisers who secured results and made fortunes were those who displayed courage and enterprise in their methods, and who advertised persistently,—just as successful advertisers do today.

In the pioneer days of advertising, the advertiser usually had to "go it alone." The modern advertising agency, with its scientific methods of procedure and careful planning of advertising campaigns, was as yet undeveloped. The art of illustration for advertising purposes was in its infancy. The effect of various kinds of advertising

upon the reading public was an unknown quantity. Modern methods of securing attention and arousing interest in the reader were undreamed of. There were advertising agents, it is true, but their services were comparatively unskilled, though their commissions were high. The whole subject of advertising was partially shrouded in mystery. There was little in common between the advertiser and the publisher. They had not really found each other or "got together," as they did later on.

Among the earliest advertising agencies, the fame of George P. Rowell & Company stands out prominently. This agency was the first to offer to advertisers the kind of service that they may enjoy today from many large and reputable concerns. They secured rates from publishers, made up lists of newspapers by which a given territory might be covered, and in other ways began the work that is now so important a factor of the advertising business.

One of the earliest of the middlemen in the advertising world, standing between the advertiser and the publisher, and gradually bringing the two together, was Mr. V. B. Palmer, who as early as 1850 published a card in the New York Tribune announcing himself as "authorized agent for receiving advertisements for all the leading newspapers of the country," with offices in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

One of Mr. Palmer's clerks and solicitors was S. M. Pettingill, who left him to establish an agency business of his own in Boston, and gained fame and fortune as an advertising man. In 1852 Mr. Pettingill moved to New York, and founded the firm of S. M. Pettingill & Company, which became one of the most conspicuous and most favorably known advertising agencies in America.

Mr. Pettingill started a monthly publication called "Pettingill's Reporter" which contained a list of the newspapers published in the United States and Canada. One of his plans was to establish an American agency in Lon-

don which should "represent the American press, file newspapers from every State in the Union and Canada, furnish advertising and correspondence, attend to the wants and promote the interests of publishers, and make it the home of all Americans visiting abroad." P. T. Barnum, who was then in London, approved of the plan and agreed to take the management of the agency if Mr. Pettingill would guarantee him a salary of \$1,000 a year; but the enterprise was abandoned before the agency saw light. Today many American newspapers find it pays to maintain offices and representatives in London.

Many interesting stories are told of those old days. One of the best, according to the authors of "Modern Advertising," relates to Robert Bonner, publisher of the New York Ledger. When James Gordon Bennett, the elder, was editor of the New York Herald, Mr. Bonner was struggling to build up The Ledger, and decided to try a little advertising. He wrote an announcement consisting of eight words, "Read Mrs. Southworth's New Story in The Ledger," and sent it to the Herald office marked for "one line." His handwriting was so bad that the words were read in the Herald office as "one page." Accordingly the line was set up and repeated so as to occupy an entire page. Next morning, when he saw the Herald, Mr. Bonner was thunderstruck. He had not money enough in the bank to pay the bill. He rushed excitedly over to the Herald office, but was too late to do any good. But the error had a curious sequel.

In a short time the results of the page advertisement began to be felt. Orders for The Ledger poured in until the entire edition was exhausted and another one was printed. The success of The Ledger was then established,—and ever after that Mr. Bonner was an ardent believer in advertising and a liberal purchaser of space.

From this incident Robert Bonner has been regarded as "the founder of the sensational style of advertising in New York," although it was already old in England and

had been the subject of ridicule by Richard Brinsley Sheridan in "The Critic."

* * *

In the early days of advertising agencies, the magazine was of little consequence. Today the magazine is the strongest of all advertising media, or at least is as strong and important as the newspapers. We read of the advertising done in behalf of the New York Ledger, but nothing at all about the advertising in it. Yet some of the magazines that were important in 1850 are still alive and important today, and are now valuable advertising media. The Saturday Evening Post, for example, has been published continuously since 1728, but in all its history it never became a serious advertising medium until it was bought by Cyrus H. K. Curtis, who founded the Curtis Publishing Company in 1883, and was its president until 1932. The growth and development of the popular magazines are coincident with a large part of the history of advertising in the last fifty years.

Many commodities have been successfully advertised in newspapers and magazines by persistent use of phrases that have become household words in America since the days of Sapolio's "Spotless Town" and the evanescent "Sunny Jim" of a breakfast food. Thus a certain phonograph is still associated with the use of the catch phrase, "His Master's Voice," in connection with the picture of a terrier listening at the end of a small phonograph horn, or loud speaker. "It floats" has long been recognized by the public as referring to a certain brand of soap which the public approves and will continue to approve whether Consumers' Research does or does not. Everyone knows the "57 Varieties" of food products. The trade name "Uneda" still stares us in the face from magazine pages, as it used to from every billboard, and has fully accomplished its object. We know the brand of flour referred to when we see the phrase "Eventually — Why Not Now?" And many other catch-words and phrases used

in advertising call up mental images of articles brought into popular demand by persistent advertising in which these words and phrases invariably appear.

New wants are constantly being created by the art of the advertiser. It is indeed in America an age of advertising, and advertising will still be serving the consumer and raising his standard of living long after the last breath of defamatory criticism has been expended by Consumers' Research and the spirit that animated that evil organization has flown to a communistic purgatory in Russia — or an equally comfortable haven in Hades.

* * *

The great advertising agencies exemplified their American patriotism during the years of our participation in the World War, when their services to the government earned the lasting gratitude of all our people; and it is fitting here to quote the head of one of the greatest agencies of the present day — Albert D. Lasker, president of Lord & Thomas — on the contributions of advertising to the general welfare of "our incomparable American civilization." In *The Chicago Tribune* of a recent date, Mr. Lasker said:

"The settling of the country, the machine age, the coming of the automobile, telephone, movies, radio, the advances in fine arts and all the sciences, demanded that our capacity to accept and use new ideas be developed to a point never before seen on the pages of history.

"There and there only is the key to 'the more abundant life.' And in America it has come about largely, in my opinion, through advertising that fired the imaginations of millions with the glory of desires to be fulfilled. Fired them with iron determination to make their own dreams come true. This has been advertising's great destiny in our national life.

"And so, if you will measure the forces, psychological as well as material, which labored to build our incomparable American civilization, you will find that adver-

tising has made five major contributions to the general welfare. Contributions without which the writer believes we could never have come so far along the road. They are:

- "1. Advertising has developed the urge among Americans for better ways of living. And fired their determination to seek fulfilment.
- "2. Because of advertising, American people get better quality in what they buy, and more of it for their money, than any other people in the world.
- "3. Advertising has brought to the average American home an education in health, diet, hygiene, and sanitation unparalleled among all the nations of history.
- "4. It has educated people that leisure is an indispensable part of life, and, more than any other influence, has taught them how to use it.
- "5. It has guaranteed the sanctity of a free press, without which there can be no freedom.

"No better example exists than the automobile industry of that debt we owe to advertising for arousing in people the desire to lift themselves to a higher standard of living.

"A giant industry has grown before our eyes. Billions in sales. Billions in pay rolls. Millions of men in jobs. And an easier, more livable life for every one of the 20,000,000 car owners in America — in large part because automobile manufacturers had the courage and vision to educate you and me.

"But not alone has advertising spread desire for greater material comforts — the automobile, the radio, better housing. Count, if you will, the amazing contribution advertising has made to people's knowledge of how to live. How many of the enlightened daily habits that enrich our living owe their original stimulus to advertising!

'Contrast the emancipated condition of American women in matters of feminine hygiene to the oppressed status of women in many other lands. Advertising has

played its part in almost every single important hygienic precaution practised by American women today!

"Americans are known to have the healthiest mouths, the soundest teeth of any civilized people on earth. Why? Witness, Dr. Charles H. Mayo, one of the two great Doctors Mayo, said in an address made in San Francisco: 'The modern dentist is doing a great work in pointing out that more than twenty ailments show themselves in the mouth. Amos 'n' Andy are doing more than any one else in the world to get people to care for their teeth.'"

That remark of Mr. Lasker's about the famous black-face comedians brings us to the subject of the latest development in advertising media — the radio,— with all its present power of reaching into the homes of the consuming public, and the enormous possibilities of its future development as an agency for the promotion of business interests.

The use of radio for advertising purposes is now universal, though it is still in its infancy, and at a stage wherein there are daily and hourly opportunities for misuse of such a marvelous facility. We did not require Consumers' Research to discover and inform us that the statements broadcast by some of the small advertisers who avail themselves for a minute or two of this means of reaching consumers and telling of special sales of this and that, are frequently exaggerated and deceptive. But radio advertising by manufacturers and business houses of repute must be as truthful as their printed advertisements in order to be effective, for the public will soon find them out if the things they recommend in their broadcasts are not as represented.

The managers and writers of Consumers' Research, lacking in business experience, do not seem to realize that untruthful advertising will kill the sale of an article and sooner or later bankrupt the advertiser. That fact, as we have said before, is the consumer's best guarantee of the reliability of advertising, whether the medium be a

magazine, a newspaper, a billboard, "skywriting" from an airplane, or the voice of an announcer in a radio program.

The radio advertising of large companies is usually managed by an advertising agency of the first class, and the modern advertising agent may be relied upon to observe the rule of truthfulness and honesty in the announcements he prepares to be orally transmitted through the microphone and over the air into thousands, perhaps millions, of homes, as part of a musical or dramatic program, broadcast periodically,—or injected into a popular "amateur hour." Even Consumers' Research will not deny, though it shuts its eyes to the fact, that the public owes a large part of its daily and nightly entertainment to commercial advertising, for it is advertising that pays the cost of great broadcasting stations and the technical equipment that enables them to operate.

Advertising has filled the world with music twice within the memory of living man. Into palace and cottage, after the invention of the phonograph, it took the wonderful voice of Caruso, leading the lover of grand opera to the mountain tops of wonder and delight, while simple folk who love the music that never dies were stirred by the strains of "Dixie" or moved by the mellow melody of "My Old Kentucky Home."

Then came radio, which did all and more than the phonograph could do in the transmission of music into the home, giving rich and poor alike the opportunity to hear clearly and instantaneously, though hundreds or thousands of miles away, the splendid voices of Galli-Curci and Lily Pons and Lucrezia Bori and Lawrence Tibbetts, and all the other great singers of the world, as well as the mighty music of the United States Marine and Army bands and the classical programs of famous symphony orchestras;—and the voices of the world's greatest rulers and statesmen, the voice of the Vatican upraised for humanity in tones that are heard to the ends of the earth; while from the far Antarctic come the oral

messages of a famous explorer marooned amid the polar ice in "Little America."

Through radio, advertising has immensely increased the enjoyment of home life for millions of people. Do the young or their elders wish to dance? The turn of a knob will bring within your walls the strains of a popular orchestra, and you can dance to its music until the wee small hours. Do you want entertainment of a more serious kind? A glance at the daily programs printed in the newspapers will give you your choice of an infinity of broadcasts available to your ear at every hour of the day or evening. You can hear lectures, travel talks, political speeches, sermons, debates, and plays,—and advertising is at the bottom of it all, the impelling force that makes your entertainment possible, for it supports the broadcasting stations. And when you are inclined to thank a station for a good or exceptional program, you should not forget also to be thankful for Advertising and the advertiser that lighten and brighten your life.

Then you will know what to think and what to do when you read one of the Consumers' Research tirades against advertising. They simply ignore public knowledge of the facts, and insult your intelligence!

CHAPTER XXIII

IS "HIGH-PRESSURE SALESMANSHIP" CRIMINAL?

IN the biased view of Consumers' Research writers, the form of sales promotion which they call "high-pressure salesmanship" is linked with Advertising in terms of condemnation which might lead the gullible to regard such salesmanship as a crime, or at the very least, an offense against the common weal.

That such is not the case, and never was or will be, is capable of easy proof, for the charges of Consumers' Research in this respect are as malicious and baseless as those against advertising. In both cases, Consumers' Research is animated by a desire to injure American business as much as possible by defamation; and when the poison pen of Jersey inaugurates an attack on anything or anybody connected with business promotion, it casts discretion to the winds and goes far beyond the bounds of truth and decency.

What, if anything, is a "high-pressure salesman?"

He is a scientific salesman of the expert type, regarded by his fellows, perhaps, as a sort of super-salesman,— a man successful in selling and unusually adept in "closing sales." He ranks in business above the common run of salesmen, and his services are always in demand, because of his ability to produce results. No stigma should be attached to him or to his efforts because of this ability to make sales; and yet Consumers' Research would stamp his efforts and achievements as those of a crook, especially when the sales he makes are of manufactured products that have been subjected to the lash of "CR" criticism.

Scientific salesmanship distinguishes between real salesmen — men of forceful character and distinct personality, capable of commanding success in their calling — and those who are mere order-takers. "I can hire any

number of clerks who call themselves salesmen," said a great Chicago merchant, "but the real salesman is rare and a valuable asset when found."

"High-pressure salesmanship," therefore, being nothing but good and efficient salesmanship, practised by an expert in the art of selling, it is absurd to allege, as Consumers' Research frequently and persistently does, that goods sold by such means are open to suspicion, and that manufacturers and distributors who employ expert salesmen are "putting something over on the public."

Many of the references made to "high-pressure selling" are utter nonsense. What is high-pressure but a legitimate force, in business as it is in mechanics? As applied to salesmen, the term is rapidly falling into desuetude, for the high-pressure salesmanship of a few years ago is the ideal salesmanship of today.

The accountants and physicists who run Consumers' Research know little or nothing about business. Partly for that reason they mistake modern sales methods for "high-pressure salesmanship" and criticize those who are successful in the wide distribution of commodities. People who know nothing of business do not realize that there is a point of absorption — a limit to sales in any given community or territory. This applies to all lines of commodity products and to every type of business, even to places of amusement and religious service.

The faculty of initiative is indeed a valuable asset. Its exercise betokens courage and self-confidence. Among the men who succeed in salesmanship in the present day there are many whose strongest characteristic is their originality and power of initiative. These men become super-salesmen and sales managers. It is no discredit to them to be called high-pressure salesmen, especially when the epithet is conferred upon them by such prejudiced minds as those of the Consumers' Research critics of business, for such salesmen are mainstays of American business.

Having built up a strong character and having

confidence in themselves, they are not afraid to act upon their own judgment and responsibility. They are willing to do things first, without waiting to see what the effect of similar action is in other cases. They stand ready to seize every opportunity. They are ready to inaugurate things without waiting for others to lead; they become leaders of men, and as promoters of business they are entitled to the respect of the producer and the consumer alike.

* * *

The creation of new wants is one of the functions of salesmanship allied with advertising. Advertising is, in fact, a form of salesmanship, and in the distribution of manufactured products the two work hand in hand. In most cases both are indispensable to success. Surely it is no crime, but rather a privilege, to participate in supplying what the people want and increasing their convenience and comfort by the offer of new products.

Even door-to-door salesmanship has its uses in the business economy, and many a household would be without the convenient carpet-sweeper, the vacuum-cleaner, the washing machine, and improved brushes for domestic use, if it were not for the peripatetic door-to-door salesman. Such manufactured conveniences of modern American life are classed as "gadgets" by Consumers' Research, with an implication that they are unnecessary and have been forced upon consumers by "high-pressure salesmanship." But the American people have reason to thank heaven for such "gadgets," which has lightened the household labors of countless women and made home life more tolerable in thousands of dwellings large and small.

Viewed from any standpoint except that of Consumers' Research, the services of salesmen are required in marketing products and maintaining industry. When the selling policy and methods of a manufacturer or wholesaler are determined, some form of sales organization becomes necessary. The principles underlying such an

organization are essentially the same whether the concern be large or small. Whatever form it takes, the sales organization or sales department is the instrumentality by which the product of the concern is disposed of,— and the primary object of the department is to dispose of the product at a profit. The department may consist of one man or a thousand. Whatever its size, its function is always the same.

The skillful, tactful sales manager, capable of transforming an "average salesman" into an expert closer of sales, that is, a "high-pressure" salesman — if we must use the old-fashioned Consumers' Research term,— knows that a sullen, listless, or disloyal member of a selling force will affect the company's profits immediately. If there are many such on a selling force, the department is costly and inefficient; and the effect of thousands spent in advertising may be nullified by such conditions.

We have already noted that the expert salesman is a man of initiative. Someone has said that the world gives its big prizes for just one thing, and that is Initiative, which is doing the right thing without being told; and that next to doing the right thing without being told is doing the right thing when you are told — once. But there are really four things, instead of one, that secure the big prizes this world has to offer. They are: Initiative, Decision, Dispatch, and Perseverance. The salesman who will cultivate these four qualities in his dealings with "the house" and customers, his success will be assured,— and he will fall into the honorable class of "high-pressure salesmen" and be esteemed far beyond the power of Consumers' Research to injure his reputation no matter how much it maligns him!

* * *

The great problem of manufacturers and other business men is Distribution. To this end all selling efforts are directed, and advertising is a form of salesmanship. In advertising and salesmanship alike, the object is to

convince and to create desire. Both arts may be regarded as forms of teaching, because both seek to teach others to have confidence in the producer or seller and in his products.

Advertising may be said to conduct a public school, by means of printed matter talking to a thousand people, while salesmanship conducts a private school, or gives individual lessons, appealing to one or two persons at a time. One reaches the people in the mass, the other a few at a time. Advertising is salesmanship on paper, and just as there is good and bad salesmanship, so there is good and bad advertising; one is successful in effecting its purpose, the other fails to do so.

Every advertisement is a salesman, and every salesman is an ad. Advertising is salesmanship plus publicity; salesmanship is publicity plus getting the order signed. Each is a power alone, but when they are combined you have the greatest business-producing power known. It takes brains to create and combine them, and it takes nerve to touch them off; but the results are worth while.

This we say, regardless of Consumers' Research condemnation of both advertising and salesmanship. And we say it knowingly and positively, in the interests of American business; whereas the statements of Consumers' Research reflect only the ultra-radical views of its managers.

In both selling and advertising, the prime requisite is honesty. Success in either form of selling is based upon confidence, and where there is not absolute honesty there cannot be perfect confidence. Hence it is gratifying to know that the great bulk of American advertising in the present day is both truthful and honest, and that the men who sell the products of our manufacturers are as a rule worthy representatives of a great and important calling. They do *not* misrepresent the products they sell; and if their salesmanship is high-powered, that is, effec-

tive, the fact is evidence of their superior skill in an essential art.

* * *

In order that the domestic market for our products may be cultivated, so that our national business will expand and prosper, the public must be educated to an appreciation of the utility, importance, and value of new products, and must be reminded continually of the existence of many other commodities that have been long in demand. Hardly any manufactured product can maintain its popularity over the years without some form of salesmanship — either the personal contacts of salesmen or the use of advertising.

Perhaps the most striking fact about the great mass of consumers is their lack of knowledge of the many useful things available for their use. The ordinary man who has to earn his living, and the woman who has to look after the home, have little or no time to find out the best article of its kind in the market. They need to be educated, and it is as much a part of the manufacturer's or merchant's business to educate his public as it is to make or supply goods for their use.

Wholesale criticism of products and methods of selling, such as Consumers' Research indulges in, is not the kind of education that the public needs, but a positive detriment to business in general. Consumers' Research admittedly has no regard for the interests of the American manufacturer or for the welfare of business as a whole. The only object it seeks to promote is the so-called "class struggle" ignoring the fact that all classes of the community are consumers, and that in this country the interests of all are closely intertwined.

Why should Consumers' Research condemn the successful methods of modern salesmanship and advertising, unless it be for the purpose of doing as much damage as it can to the business of the nation?

Salesmanship and advertising are closely bound together with the expansion of trade, and both forms

of business promotion are becoming more and more powerful as business forces. Consumers' Research can no more stop their progress — and hence the progress of American industry — than it can stem the flow of Niagara or prevent the Ohio from overflowing its banks after the exceptional snows of a hard winter.

Scientific salesmanship and systematic advertising have been adopted by all the more enterprising members of the commercial world. Why? Because both forms of selling are universally recognized as necessary adjuncts to all business concerns.

Consumers' Research itself seeks publicity wherever it can be obtained without cost. The organization does some advertising for subscribers, but its methods are crude, chiefly circularizing, and its subscription list remains practically stationary. It does not employ salesmen, because salesmen and subscription solicitors require the payment of commissions, and the managers of Consumers' Research, who draw large salaries themselves, do not believe in parting with much of their profit to employees. Witness the strike of half their underpaid staff in September, 1935, as described in a previous chapter of this book,— which resulted in the strikers organizing another "research" concern to compete with the New Jersey organization headed by F. J. Schlink and J. B. Matthews.

In a circular appeal for subscriptions repeatedly sent to uninterested business men, Consumers' Research says it "does no personal selling of its service and has no subscription agents . . . It does not believe that such solicitors can be prevented from resorting to misrepresentation and 'high-pressure' methods in their eagerness to win commissions, and by its very nature it cannot risk its good reputation by permitting in its service the practices which it criticizes in others."

After the disclosures of its character made in this book, the less the managers of Consumers' Research say about its "good reputation" the better; and as for its criticisms

of "high-pressure" methods of salesmanship, the employment of a few expert salesmen might result in a large increase of business for Schlink, Matthews & Co.,— if such salesmen could possibly be induced to associate themselves with the "CR" racket.

But the knowledge of expert salesmen that honesty of purpose is essential to the success of any business would effectually prevent them from entering the employ of Consumers' Research, to say nothing of the parsimony of its managers, as proven by the recent strike in Washington, New Jersey.

There is plenty of demand, however, for "high-pressure" (expert) salesmen in the legitimate selling of American products, and they do not have to engage in the exploitation of the foreign ideas of collectivists like those who direct the fortunes of Consumers' Research. (The reader will please note that when we use the term "collectivists," it is merely the more euphonious and less startling term by which the Communist groups in America prefer to describe themselves.)

* * *

In every avenue of business which they explore, the writers for Consumers' Research see only the fakirs and frauds that are to be found here and there in all forms of human endeavor. Then they proceed to condemn the whole line of business, in scathing terms, on the basis of the exceptions, ignoring the rule, which is that of truthfulness and honesty in all forms of business promotion. They might just as well condemn all religion because there are Pharisees and hypocrites to be found here and there in church pews. And of course, in doing so, they would simply be following the course of the Bolsheviki they admire so much, who have destroyed the religious faith of the masses in Russia, substituting the worship of the State, or Stalin, for the worship of God, and taking away from millions of human beings the only comfort they had in life — the comfort of their faith.

An example of the acceptance by Consumers' Research of "exceptional" as characteristic of the whole is seen in its assertion that the consumer erroneously assumes the highest-priced product to be the best. Is that not true in 99 cases out of 100? The consumer may not be so well informed as he should be, but he has discovered by experience that quality and low price seldom go hand in hand. To assert that the buyer is robbed, or harmed in any way, because he is charged a higher price for a Packard than for a Ford, is simply the height of absurdity. And it is equally absurd to criticize a salesman for using "high-pressure" methods if he succeeds in convincing a retailer or a consumer that a new product is worthwhile, or succeeds in "taking a customer up the line" by inducing him to buy something more expensive than he had contemplated or something much more suited to his needs.

Invention and manufacture, aided by super-salesmanship and advertising, have accomplished much for humanity that even Consumers' Research cannot deny or belittle. Sewing-machines deprived many a poor toiling seamstress of her means of livelihood, but gave employment on machines to many more women at far better wages.

The coming of the steam locomotive threw many stage-coach drivers and guards out of work, but the railroads furnished jobs for hundreds where a dozen had been employed before, besides creating employment in shops and factories, as well as in train and track service, for many times the number of men that were required to operate the stage-coach lines. And several of the great bus lines of today employ more men than were ever engaged in stage-coach transportation and fighting off the masked bandits of the western highways.

When typesetting machines were invented, there was a loud outcry of protest from printers, but today there are many more men employed in setting type on machines than ever worked at the case.

The automobile arrived and the business of the buggy-maker collapsed within a few short years; but the mass production of motor-cars employs, in a single factory at much higher wages, more men than were ever employed in the whole country in the slow work of building buggies for Dobbin to draw.

If we were to revert to the conditions before the machine age, and abandon mass production under the profit system which Consumers' Research professes to despise, we should have to pay \$10,000 for an automobile that can now be bought for \$700 or less, and the car would probably run badly and be expensive to repair.

And if such conditions still prevailed, we should probably have forty millions of our population idle, instead of only ten millions in an exceptional period of world-wide depression.

Those who deprecate the existing conditions of life, and would return to the methods and customs of the past, should inquire of the American farmer if he would wish to abandon his mowing and seeding machines, his motor-car and his "combination" harvester and thresher. His answer should be a sufficient reply to the reactionaries of Consumers' Research, who would turn back the wheels of progress in all things American, in favor of an "advance" in the direction of Russia.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE CASE OF AMERICAN BUSINESS VS. CONSUMERS' RESEARCH

“CONSUMERS' Research” is organized as a non-profit membership corporation. The preference for this type of organization is obviously an attempt to avoid liability for damages resulting from libeling, black-listing, and boycotting of manufacturers and advertisers, with the full knowledge of subscribers or members, in violation of the Sherman anti-trust laws and the Clayton Act. Under these acts, the directors, members, and subscribers are liable for triple damages and subject to injunctive proceedings by the Attorney General of the United States, according to the opinion of eminent counsel.

The divers methods, scope, and subtlety of CR activities in boycotting manufacturers and advertisers are cleverly set up and involved in numerous books, bulletins and confidential reports.

Proceeding under the guise of public protectors of consumers from fraudulent charlatans, the officers and members have adopted the constructive title of “Consumers' Research,” concealing its membership and the fact that its boycotts are perpetrated against manufacturers and others without giving them a chance of defending their products or presenting their side of the case. Thus the managers of the CR, by extensive publicity through the medium of books, bulletins, booklets, press releases, and otherwise, publicize themselves as “maintained for public protection” and “to protect the consumer's dollars,” as “disinterested and impartial arbiters and advisers on trade practices, products, and dealers therein,” and make other statements implying altruistic and benevolent purposes. All charges and scandalous information broadcast against manufacturers, adver-

tisers, and distributors are so framed as to destroy the business of the concerns so boycotted.

In order to instill confidence and trust in their boycott activities, Consumers' Research promoters publicize themselves as disinterested investigators of individuals, firms, and corporations engaged in fraudulent advertising and distribution of inferior merchandise.

The remedy would be to bring the officers, directors, and subscriber-members of Consumers' Research, and their sources of revenue, out into the open, as a matter of public record; also the records and qualifications of their alleged chemists, who pass judgment, offhand, on some of the most intricate and perplexing problems of manufacture in this country. In fact, some of those \$13-a-week employees of CR can condemn or approve in a few minutes an article that may have taken a quarter of a century for recognized authority to perfect.

If the business of this country is to come back to normal, the conditions described in this book must be remedied, and Congressional investigation of the activities of Consumers' Research, its sponsors, officers, and members, is most certainly needed and requested.

What aspects of the serious case against the CR would such an official investigation disclose?

1. The first and perhaps the most significant would be the fact that the organizers of Consumers' Research, including the present president and vice-president, are men of the ultra-radical, un-American type, closely affiliated with Communist groups and societies that seek the subversion of our system of government and our social and business systems; that they are not merely passive members of such societies, but take an active part in their operations, which tend to promote the so-called "class struggle" and to bring about a political, social, and industrial revolution in America.

The radical records of these men are set forth in one of the first chapters of this book, and cannot be denied. They are not mere "parlor pinks," professing radicalism

for the sake of social sensation, or for the purpose of distinguishing themselves as different from the ordinary man of sense. No, they are deeply imbued with Muscovite ideas of government, of economics, and social relations;—in short, they are Reds!

Hence it can be logically inferred, and the facts support the inference, that such men as F. J. Schlink and J. B. Matthews are more deeply concerned in setting class against class, consumer against manufacturer, than they are with the ostensible object of their CR organization, the "protection" of the public from exaggeration in advertising and the wiles of "high-pressure salesmen." Their real and ulterior object is *the promotion of general discontent* among the "proletariat," or the great mass of the consuming public. They have already gone to great lengths in their attacks upon manufacturers and the agencies of distribution, and they will go to even greater lengths in attacking that "class" unless they are soon brought up with a sharp jerk.

2. Investigation by a Congressional committee or other official body will also bring out the fact that the determined assaults of Consumers' Research on the advertising and selling methods whereby our manufacturers find a domestic market for their products, place an obstacle in the path of returning prosperity. They tend to keep prosperity from continuing on its way around the corner. This may be a good time for radicals to sow discontent among our people, but it is no time for any American citizen to hinder progress by wholesale attacks on the honesty and integrity of business men.

In this connection we desire to repeat and to emphasize a statement made in an early announcement of this book, which said: "Consumers' Research strikes at the very foundation of our prosperity,— for how can a people be prosperous if they do not buy the things they need? By proclaiming, in effect, that manufacturers are frauds, crooks, and thieves, that advertisers are liars and cheats, the CR leaves the consumer in such a state of doubt and

confusion that he does not know what to buy,— and consequently he buys nothing.”

That statement “got under the skin” of certain CR supporters, who wrote us in harsh terms that it was untrue, that CR criticism of products and producers would not keep consumers from buying— only make them more careful. But we repeat and shall continue to reiterate the statement, as a fact, that undue and persistent criticism of manufacturers and their products does tend to keep consumers out of the market, and does damage the country’s business.

3. What else would official investigators find out about Consumers’ Research? They would find that the constant allegation of “poisons” in our food-products, in our drugs and cosmetics, in our fruits and candies, and in the very bread we eat, is made in many cases out of whole cloth, and in other cases is so grossly exaggerated as to be patently malicious and intentionally libelous. The charge against manufacturers of using harmful quantities of poisonous ingredients in our foods is clearly met by reports of the government Food and Drug Administration, and by many physicians and other men of science who have written forcibly on the subject. The investigations upon which such official and scientific reports are based, result almost without exception in finding that the poisonous allegations of Consumers’ Research are no more substantial than “the baseless fabric of a dream,” and are born in the imaginations of individuals whom we may call “the arsenic boys of Jersey.”

4. Congressional investigation of Consumers’ Research would also disclose the fact that the frequent and outrageous attacks in CR books and bulletins upon advertisers and the business of advertising are an important feature of the plan to do as much damage as possible to American business, in the promotion of the “class struggle.” If the CR can destroy the people’s confidence in advertising, which might be the effect of these attacks, business is bound to suffer; and what rejoicing there

would be in official Communist circles in Moscow if their allies in this country were able to report that American business continues in the slough of depression and despond, and found it impossible to recover, through the insidious attacks of revolutionary agencies!

When the CR "protects" consumers by inciting their suspicion of the honesty of advertisers and the earnestness of salesmen, it is dealing all business a blow below the belt; and the sooner business men awake to a realization of this fact, the better for all the important interests concerned.

5. An official probe will also show that while the managers of Consumers' Research continue to denounce advertising and selling methods, they themselves are inveterate seekers after publicity for their sensational publications; that they themselves are high-pressure salesmen who have stumped up and down the country, energetically and intensively selling their false economic doctrine to those who would listen; that the very titles of their books, "100,000,000 Guinea Pigs," "Skin Deep," "Eat, Drink and Be Wary," "Partners in Plunder," etc., are designed to secure free advertising for them, while they know that the average reviewer will be blind to the foulness of their attacks on American business. They condemn other advertisers for making false claims for their products, but their own claim to "protect" the consumer is as false and misleading as any advertisement of a quack that has ever been permitted to creep into an American newspaper or magazine.

What possible "protection" does it afford a *housewife* to be told that the food-products she buys and has bought for years *may* be harmful to health if misused or over-eaten, when her children have lived and thrived, grown strong and healthy and happy on such products; when all her experience of family life and motherhood denies the truth of so many of the antagonistic allegations of the self-appointed CR critics and the pestiferous works of the poison pen!

6. Under official inquiry, the true character of the men who direct the operations of Consumers' Research would come to light, and it would appear that these "collectivists" who cloak themselves with an assumption of superior knowledge and wisdom and pretend to be competent judges of every type of manufactured products, every kind of business service, and every feature of our governmental and economic systems, are merely malicious maligners of manufacturers, traducers of the honesty and integrity of business men, wreckers of reputation and goodwill, boycotters and blacklisters (also blather-skites), authors and publishers of foul attacks on practically everything American, economic quacks and cranks, and, in general, a menace to the national business and prosperity, that should be speedily stamped out.

7. Independent investigators would also discover that Consumers' Research publications are being used to spread Communistic ideas among the young in our schools and colleges. The CR "general" bulletins which contain articles derogatory of our government institutions or condemnatory of our industrial system and methods, especially of what Communists call "the profit system," are among the texts used in some cases in teaching economics. We know, for instance, of a Chicago college in which such bulletins are to be found in the department of economics (political economy); but, said a student, "Only one member of the class takes much stock in the CR bulletins, and he is an avowed Communist!"

One of the leaflets appealing for subscribers to the so-called "confidential and general services" of Consumers' Research recommends its bulletins and other publications to "economists, teachers, and students of the social sciences, who wish to keep abreast of the new knowledge of consumption-economics." Thus are teachers and students deluded into paying the CR an annual fee to get the poison of "collectivist" theories. This "new knowledge" of which the "informed intellectuals," Schlink and Matthews, boast, is dangerous doctrine for American

youth, and intelligent parents and teachers should be warned against it, for the discussion of "consumer-economics" in CR bulletins is apt to be, and frequently is, transformed into propaganda for subversive, Communist theories of government and social organization.

8. Official investigators of the Consumers' Research racket would doubtless wish to know why some of their bulletins are held to be "confidential," while others are called "general" and cost less. And the investigators would come to the conclusion, no doubt, after hearing sufficient evidence, that the "confidential" imprint on certain bulletins and reports is utilized to get more money for them. There are people who become quite anxious to learn the contents of any letter, document, or bulletin that is marked "confidential," and they are willing to pay for the privilege of perusing anything which wears an air of mystery.

There is nothing mysterious or really secret about the CR confidential bulletins, however, except the fact that they are so called. The general bulletins are of much the same character as the "confidential," although the latter may be a little more positive (or rabid) in condemnation of consumer-goods. But the criticisms and classifications of manufactured products and merchandise that appear in the confidential bulletins find their way ultimately into the pages of the annual CR Handbook of Buying; and in neither case is there anything really *confidential* or secret about them.

Once a bulletin criticizing a product or its maker is printed and published,—that is, circulated among the CR subscribers,—it loses any confidential character it ever had, and may be accounted libelous. To claim immunity from damages for libel simply because the libelous statement was marked "confidential," when it was mailed to some thousands of subscribers, would be legally the same as claiming immunity for a book filled with scandalous stories of a person's life and habits, on the ground that it was "printed for private circulation

only." A libelous attack is rendered even more subject to the recovery of damages when it is given the added weight and importance of being labeled "confidential," as the managers and members of Consumers' Research will probably learn to their cost one of these days, when they are swamped with suits for damages.

* * *

Far from being a "partner in plunder" with the government as its ally in victimizing the public, as J. B. Matthews, vice-president of Consumers' Research, charges in his latest sensational work, business "has been whipping-boy of politics," according to President Harper Sibley of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, who made the statement in a recent radio address. Having in mind the recent attacks on business, including those of Consumers' Research, he declared that "prejudices and antagonisms have harvested dragons' teeth in the form of hasty and unwise laws, cumbersome restriction of legitimate enterprises, agitation of needless industrial strife, dislocation of goods and crops, and the heaping of still further burdens of taxes and public debt upon the backs of those already straining to make ends meet." Justly indignant at these attacks when the nation is seeking industrial recovery, the Chamber of Commerce president concluded that "Business should serve notice that the misrepresentations and pillorying of business *must be stopped forthwith.*"

Radical agitators, inside and outside the ranks of labor, will doubtless continue to harass business on various grounds of political expediency, and will continue to seek the aid of the law-making powers and what the author of "Partners in Plunder" miscalls "the business-state." But the den of scurrility in Washington, N. J., operating under the hypocritical title of Consumers' Research, has been suffered to exist long enough. Business has not yet undergone irreparable damage, but many American products have been damaged in the eyes of

a considerable section of the public through the circulation of the scurrilous books on which, as well as on its subscribing members, Consumers' Research lives and Schlink and a few high-salaried associates thrive. But a day of reckoning is probably at hand. The American people are long-suffering, and the American manufacturer can "take it" as well as the next man; but there are definite limits to patience, and the people will soon get tired of being told that they are being poisoned, when they are in perfect health; that the foods they enjoy *may* do them an injury; that the medicines the doctor prescribes are either worthless or harmful; that the fine cosmetics a woman uses and the soothing powder with which a man comforts his skin after shaving are all replete with danger; that they must believe everything Consumers' Research says about buying or methods of living and dying, and nothing that real, recognized authorities say,—especially what advertisers say about their products!

The CR "experts" scoff at the idea of manufacturers expecting them to take unsupported assertions or promises regarding products,—but the CR bulletins are filled with wild and unsupported assertions of which no proof is offered. Apparently they consider their word to be law, while that of other interested persons is unreliable or intentionally deceptive. They do not hesitate to make damaging statements, for which they present no proof, but they will not hear others in rebuttal. And when they assert that they *at all times* give manufacturers and distributors all proper opportunity to present evidence, the assertion is as false as many of their charges against familiar products. Witness the treatment accorded the chief chemist of an important milk company, who was barred by police from entering the Jersey den of Schlink and Co. in September, 1935, and gained access to the sacred precincts only after waiting in New York for several days for an opportunity to set the CR "experts" right, with scientific evidence of the purity and value of

his company's famous milk-product. That experience of the chemist, a real scientific expert, beside whom the pseudo-scientists of Consumers' Research are pygmies and quacks, shows plainly and unmistakably the inimical attitude of the CR toward manufacturers and the research agencies which they maintain at large expense for the protection of the consumer and the service of the public.

The consensus of opinion regarding Consumers' Research, after investigation, seems to be that they are not designed to project ideals or elevate standards. The characteristic policy of CR managers seems to be to strike its victims, not in the open with the methods of the crusader, but with the underhanded methods of the secret Klan.

The high-handed manner in which they have been carrying on their so-called "investigations" in every branch of business, followed by the issuance of defamatory reports on the manufactured products of such individuals, firms, and corporations as fall under their displeasure, is hereby branded as unfair, unethical, and un-American.

As constituted and operated at present, the CR serves no good or useful purpose, but is detrimental to the business community. At best it serves only the credulous and susceptible contributing members of their organization, for the personal advantage of their managers and directors. In this respect they would surely be adjudged guilty of restraint of trade, if their operations were called to the attention of the proper department of the national government.

There are certain features of CR management which are truly contemptible and dastardly. Scandalous reports affecting the honor and integrity of long-standing and respected business firms are sedulously gathered by CR agents, and no matter how slight or baseless these reports may be, they gain publicity and are broadcast to the injury of the victim, and then lodged in the CR "files"

to be revamped and reissued later by one of their vicious writers as an "interesting" paragraph in one of their malicious books. There is no time limit to CR persecution of this character, and no business man is safe from this Damocletian menace. CR acts on suspicion and wears a hideous robe of secrecy.

It is indeed high time for the poison pen to be snatched from the hands of Schlink and his associates by the strong arm of the law.

THE END





