

MORE

BY REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN DIES
CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

READING TIME
25 MINUTES 25 SECONDS

PART ONE—WHY I MAKE THESE THINGS KNOWN

FOR more than a year I have listened to the testimony of hundreds of witnesses who have testified under oath with reference to subversive activities and groups in the United States. I have likewise read hundreds of letters and examined a mass of documentary evidence. All this is a matter of public record and may be found in the official reports of the hearings on un-American activities.

But what is not a matter of record is the information which I have gathered from confidential sources and conversations that I have had with numerous people who would not testify before the committee. During the year and one half that we have been investigating un-American activities, I have established many

BEHIND THE SCENES IN



SNAKES THAN I CAN KILL

confidential sources of information throughout the country. Some of my information comes from people who are now members of Communist and Fascist organizations. I have made it a point to listen patiently to people who had, or thought they had, information. I therefore feel qualified to present myself to the American people as an expert witness on this subject.

It is not my purpose nor my desire to open old wounds or to violate any confidences or to injure my party. In relating the conversation between the President and myself with reference to this investigation, and in making public the contents of letters from certain leaders of my party, I do so because I believe that a public service will be rendered thereby. I am not concerned with the partisan phase of this question. From the beginning I have made it clear that the task of preserving the institutions of this republic is not a partisan matter. Naturally I love the Democratic Party, to which I owe much. As far back as I can remember, my people have been Democrats, but they have always put their country before party politics.

Neither do I wish to injure the cause of true liberalism, which I desire to distinguish from so-called liberalism--the latter is composed of "crackpots," Socialists, Communists, and fellow travelers who masquerade under the name of liberalism. My activities have never been directed at legitimate labor unions. In fact, I have been endorsed many times by the American Federation of Labor and by some of the unions now affiliated with the C. I. O.

This investigation is in the interest of the Democratic Party, true liberalism, and legitimate trade-union movements. It is because I am firmly convinced that the people are entitled to know the truth, and that the best interest of the republic will be served thereby, that I have decided to make public this information.

It is equally clear to me that it is my duty to take advantage of every legitimate opportunity offered by the

Communists, Fascists, Nazis—Those enemies who are working subversively in this country to undermine the spirit of American democracy! Now, revealing things never told before, the head of the Dies Committee gives you his own inside story of a history-making investigation

radio, magazines, newspapers, and public forums to acquaint the people with all the facts with reference to subversive activities and propaganda in the United States. Where it is customary for magazines and forums to pay writers and speakers a fee, I shall accept it, but only for the purpose of using all such proceeds for

this, I question its propriety under the present circumstances, and I do not want to do anything that would tend to cheapen this great cause and cast a cloud upon the motives which prompt my utterances and activities. I shall consult with leaders of patriotic organizations with reference to the most effective use that these proceeds can be put to in order to promote Americanism in this country.

Another reason which impels me to make public the inside story of this investigation is that I am reliably informed that distorted accounts of different occurrences are likely to be published in the near future and that it is in the interest of truth and clarity that I give the people the correct information.

I shall not deal with purely personal matters, such as the threats that have been made against my life, threats to kidnap my children, or the reliable information which has come to me concerning a large sum of money which has been raised for the purpose of opposing me in the next election, or the aspirants in my district who have been approached with the suggestion that they should undertake to unseat me. These matters, as I have said, are purely personal, but the same cannot be said with reference to the various attempts which have been made to sabotage this investigation.

I have often been asked how I hap-

All statements made and opinions expressed by Mr. Dies in this series of articles are his own, and Liberty disclaims responsibility for any of them. For his statement of his case, it has allowed him the fullest latitude within the laws of libel. As always, it will be happy, in any instance, to present the other side too.

some patriotic cause and to inform the people with reference to the enemies within our country.

In other words, I do not propose that the proceeds from lectures and writings dealing with this investigation, and the facts brought to light by it, shall be used by me for my personal benefit. While many public officials accept honorariums and fees for their personal use and benefit, and while there is nothing illegal about

THE PROBE OF UN-AMERICANISM



pened to become interested in the matter of investigating un-American activities. My record in Congress will show that I have been active in immigration and naturalization matters. As a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I introduced a number of bills to stop undesirable immigration and to exclude alien Communists. The purpose of the bill which I introduced during the Hoover administration to exclude and deport alien Communists was to cure the defect in the existing law, under the terms of which Communists are not excludable or deportable as such. They may be excluded or deported upon some other ground but not simply because they are Communists.

THE Committee on Immigration, which reported my bill favorably, was convinced, after extended hearings, that some adequate definition of a Communist should be placed in the bill. The bill was approved by the Department of State and the Department of Labor. Both departments, as well as the Committee on Immigration, believed that the enactment of the bill was necessary to relieve the government of difficulties in enforcing the law.

My bill passed the House. If it had passed the Senate, the courts would have relieved the government of the necessity to prove that the Communist Party, and its affiliated or subsidiary organizations and others of a similar nature, in their various programs or platforms believe in, advise, advocate, or teach the various things specified in Section 6 of the existing law; and, as a matter of administration, the Secretary of Labor could have held that certain organizations were Communist organizations within the meaning of this act, with the necessary conclusion that members of such organizations came within the meaning of this act and, as such, would be excludable or deportable.

A representative of the State Department helped me prepare the bill. When the bill came before the House for consideration, it was opposed by Congressman LaGuardia and the so-called liberal bloc in the House of Representatives at that time. Notwithstanding this opposition, the bill was passed by a large vote and, of course, went to the Senate for consideration. Because of the opposition of Senator Robert M. La Follette and the so-called liberal group in the Senate at that time, the bill did not pass the Senate and did not become a law.

As a result of conferences which I had with representatives of the State and Labor departments while this bill was pending before Congress, I learned that both departments had considerable information with regard to the presence in this country of a number of alien Communists whose deportation was difficult under existing law. The fact that my bill, which only clarified the existing law so as

to carry out the plain intent of Congress, was so vigorously opposed by so-called liberals in Congress caused me to wonder what it was that the self-styled liberals or progressives in Congress had in common with the Communists, but I did not attempt to pursue the matter any further at that time.

This was not the only immigration bill which I introduced and which was defeated or stymied by self-styled liberals in Congress. Another bill of mine, to prevent illegal entries and to strengthen existing laws, met with a similar fate at the hands of the same men.

In fact, every effort that was made in Congress by any one to exclude and expel undesirable aliens was successfully blocked by this same group.

In March, 1937, the sit-down strike had reached a critical stage in American industry. Our industrial system was paralyzed with fear, and no one in authority had denounced this illegal and dangerous technique. On March 21, 1937, when Vice-President Garner talked to me about my proposed speech against the sit-down strike, he said that William Green opposed the sit-down strike and that, upon the return of the President from Warm Springs, a statement would be issued by the Chief Executive in denunciation of the sit-down-strike method.

WHEN the President returned from Warm Springs, it is my understanding that he conferred with Secretary Perkins, Senator La Follette, and Senator Wagner before conferring with Democratic leaders of the House and Senate. He did not issue any statement condemning the sit-down strike and, later, administration forces opposed my resolution to investigate and condemn sit-down strikes.

Mr. Garner told me that he considered the sit-down strike a most dangerous situation. I told him that I was going to deliver such a speech, and on March 23, 1937, I denounced the sit-down strike as lawless and indefensible. Among other things, I said:

"To remain discreetly silent in the presence of such a menace, or to condone by inaction this threat to the very foundations upon which our government is erected, cannot be justified from any point of view."

I also said:

"Those who have been so loud in the past in denouncing the abuses and lawlessness of Wall Street are for some reason strangely silent about this other species of lawlessness which is equally indefensible and dangerous."

This speech was deeply resented by so-called liberals in the House, who had become very numerous and powerful. But notwithstanding the unfavorable reception my speech met with in the House from this group, I introduced a resolution to investigate and condemn sit-down strikes. The leadership of the House warned me

not to insist upon a vote, but, over their opposition, I called the resolution up for a vote. It was overwhelmingly defeated on a record vote.

Again I was surprised to find the so-called liberal group in Congress opposing an investigation and condemnation of something which was so clearly wrong and illegal as the sit-down strike. This episode made me more curious than ever to determine, at least for myself, what the tie-up was between the self-styled liberals and the Communistic influences and groups in the country.

I was equally puzzled to observe the manner in which certain Nazi and Fascist agents in the United States were active in certain so-called patriotic societies and organizations. For instance, the German-American Bund was working with other groups, such as the Silver Shirts, who claim to be 100-per-cent Americans. Efforts had been made to unite all of these so-called patriotic organizations under some capable leader and, in fact, conventions had been called and held at which a number of self-styled patriots were present. On account of the mutual jealousy and rival ambitions of the leaders, the delegates could not agree upon the Führer of the movement.

While all of these organizations, such as the Silver Shirts, the American Nationalists, the Italian Fascists, the Ukrainian Fascists, and many others, profess to be patriotic, when I examined the statements of their leaders and the real activities of the organizations, I reached the very definite conclusion that in these organizations, in their attempt to unite, we had the beginning of an American Fascist movement which would prove to be as serious as the Communist movement unless it was checked in time.

MANY leaders of these organizations had gone on record as being admirers of Hitler and Mussolini, and in some of their official publications were found propaganda written in Germany.

There were some other so-called patriotic organizations and groups who, while they would have nothing to do with the German-American Bund, nevertheless preached the same racial doctrines.

I had made many patriotic speeches throughout the country and had come into contact with many patriotic organizations. While the majority of these organizations were sincere, there was a growing minority whose idea of patriotism was racism, characterized by secret admiration for strong-arm methods and the suppression of civil liberties, under the pretext of emergencies. I had observed that among some of these groups the veiled but well understood attacks made by some speakers upon certain races and religions always brought greater response from the audience than any tribute to or defense of tolerance and the Bill of Rights.

I also noticed that there was a well

planned but carefully concealed campaign to use these groups to spread the propaganda that Roosevelt was a Jew and that the New Deal is a Jew Deal.

I was convinced that certain selfish interests were silly and unpatriotic enough to undertake to use this un-American method to oppose objectionable policies of the New Deal. I was convinced that some Republicans were secretly encouraging this damnable program and that it was well financed.

The facts, which will be later brought in, of the Gilbert-Campbell-McWhirter affair confirmed my suspicions.

In these hearings it was definitely shown that several extremely prominent Republicans were actively promoting a campaign of racial and religious hatred, upon the mistaken and corrupt belief that that was a way to fight the President.

Unfortunately, we have never been able to prove the full facts with regard to this campaign, because the contributions were made in cash and covered up to avoid exposure. But some day the Fascists in America are going to talk as freely as the disillusioned Communists, and when they do, the country will find out the names of the men who financed this contemptible campaign.

LET me say, in justice to business men and industrialists, that, like the laboring people, the great majority of them are loyal Americans. It was only a small minority of scoundrels who were guilty, and they deserved the condemnation of every honest citizen. The Republican Party should have expelled any official who was shown to have been implicated in this campaign of hate.

The majority of the Republicans and Democrats in this country are loyal, patriotic Americans who have no sympathy for Communism or Fascism. But should not the Republican Party have investigated to determine whether or not McWhirter was an asset to the party, and should not the Democratic Party have investigated to determine whether or not Scott Ferris, National Committeeman from Oklahoma, was an asset to the party after accepting an alleged legal fee from Sam Carp, brother-in-law of Premier Molotov of Russia—as I shall hereinafter relate?

Long before this investigation began, and down to the present moment, I have been as deeply alarmed over this Fascist movement in this country as I have over the Communist. The two movements are, in fact, closely interrelated, because both are cults of the pagan religion of Marxism, and each furnished a pretext for the growth and activities of the other.

Many people have overlooked the fundamental and important fact that Nazism, Fascism, and Communism are offshoots of Marxism. Hitler, Lenin, and Mussolini borrowed the fundamentals of their cults from Karl Marx, the greatest expounder of the

philosophy of materialism the world has yet produced.

Marxism, as applied in Germany, is disguised under the name of Nazism; in Italy it masquerades as Fascism; and in Russia it is Communism. But Fascism, Nazism, and Communism are merely different cults of the same pagan religion of materialism and godlessness as enunciated by its chief and most illustrious apostle, Karl Marx.

As Christ symbolized the noblest and highest conceptions of spiritual perfection, so does Karl Marx represent the lowest form of materialism. The two, therefore, stand at opposite poles, and their teachings are as far apart as the sky and the earth. To Marx, man at his best was merely an intelligent animal, of no more importance than the beasts of the field. To Christ, man was the noblest handiwork of God.

Therefore I perceived some years ago that the irreconcilable conflict

REPRESENTATIVE DIES

was born in Colorado, Texas, on November 5, 1901, to Martin and Olive M. (Cline) Dies. His education included student days at Wesley College (Greenville) and the University of Texas, and he took his LL. B. degree at the National University in Washington, D. C. He began the practice of law in 1920, and in the same year married Miss Myrtle M. Adams. They have two sons. In 1922 they settled in Orange, Texas, which is their present home. Mr. Dies is a member of the Christian (Disciples) Church and is, of course, a Democrat. He has represented the Second Texas District in Congress since 1931.

between the teachings of Christ and Marx constitutes the most serious and far-reaching issue before the world today. The followers of Marx in America are not to be underestimated from the standpoint of numbers or influence. Some of them are card-holding members of the Communist Party; some of them belong to Nazi and Fascist organizations; some of them belong to the Socialist Party; but the majority of the followers and disciples of Marx do not belong to either the Communist Party or the Socialist Party. They masquerade under some more attractive title, and they deny they are Communists or Socialists, which is technically correct, but the truth is they worship at the shrine of Marx and derive their political views from his writings.

It is for this reason that the Marxist breeds in America flock together, and that the most militant fringe of the Marxists, namely, the Communists, exert the greatest influence.

This is the explanation of the fact

that many known Marxists were used by the Communists to further the interests and aims of Moscow in America.

The Communist cult of Marxism used the bait of class hatred and anti-capitalism to draw within the sphere of their leadership and influence many people who would never accept the teachings and principles of Marxism under the label of Communism. The Fascist cult of Marxism employed the same strategy to attract the support and assistance of certain so-called patriotic groups. The only difference was that the Fascist and Nazi dangle the bait of intolerance and bigotry, disguised as nationalism and patriotism, before the distorted visions and prejudiced minds of self-styled patriots.

Many of those who followed Fascist leadership in this country did so because they secretly admired Hitler and Mussolini; others were attracted to Fascist leadership, disguised as patriotism, by racial and religious hatred.

By this strategy the high priests of Marxism—namely, Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini—were able to use thousands of gullible Americans to promote their interests in America, to support their foreign policy, to divide our people into hostile camps, and to secure the prized industrial and military secrets of the United States.

THESE observations and convictions led me to introduce, on July 21, 1937, a resolution authorizing the Speaker to appoint a special committee of seven members for the purpose of conducting an investigation of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or is of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution; and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

It was not until May, 1938, that I succeeded in getting my resolution reported favorably. When it reached the House for consideration, the extreme liberal group opposed it on the floor, but they did not get enough support to defeat the measure which was so obviously patriotic. Many moderate liberals who voted for the resolution did so with some misgiving and without any enthusiasm. The resolution was amended, however, so that the committee would expire on January 3, 1939.

This gave us only a few months to attempt one of the most difficult tasks ever assigned to a Congressional committee. But even the time limit would not have been so serious if we could have secured adequate funds with which to conduct the investigation. As it was, however, we were given the sum of \$25,000, which everybody

knew was wholly inadequate to do anything like a thorough job. As the author of the resolution, I was automatically entitled to the appointment as chairman of the committee, which I received from the Speaker.

When the other members of the committee were named, we met to discuss our plans. The prospect of a successful investigation was dismal. In fact, all of the members of the committee agreed that we were starting with two strikes already called on us. None of us had had any experience in conducting investigations, and we knew little or nothing with reference to the clever strategy of subversive groups in America. The responsibility for organizing and conducting the investigation fell upon the shoulders of the chairman, as is usual in the case of Congressional investigations.

SOME of my best friends advised me strongly against attempting the investigation under these great handicaps. Some of those who had for years undertaken to expose the machinations of the Communist Party in America, only to be held up to scorn and ridicule, warned me against pitting the feeble resources of our inexperienced committee against the clever strategy of individuals and organizations trained in the art of ridicule and deceit.

But while I did not fully appreciate the seriousness of the obstacles which confronted us, I was deeply impressed with the necessity of making an attempt to expose the termites which were gnawing at the pillars of the Republic and using well intentioned liberals in America to promote the interests of the Soviet Union.

One of the excuses given for the small sum placed at the committee's disposal was the provision in the resolution which requested the head of each department to detail to the committee such legal and expert assistants and investigators as the committee needed. It was argued that since the committee could secure this outside aid from the various executive departments, we would not need more than \$25,000.

Immediately after the committee was appointed, and before we had selected any investigators, I wrote to the heads of the appropriate departments and requested aid in accordance with the resolution. I particularly asked J. Edgar Hoover and the Department of Justice to assign to our committee investigators to assist us in conducting the investigation.

Much to my surprise, the heads of the departments refused to comply with my request and with the resolution of the House of Representatives. They did not even take the pains to assign a good reason for refusing to carry out the wish of the House of Representatives. As a matter of fact, the same departments had been very liberal in extending aid to the La Follette Committee, as the record will show.

It was while I was struggling to secure assistance from the departments that Mr. Wohlforth, secretary for the La Follette Committee, telephoned me that he could secure some investigators from the executive branch of the government. The fact that he knew that I was asking this help and volunteered to get it for me naturally aroused my curiosity. In order to ascertain whether or not Wohlforth could really deliver the goods, I told him that I would like to see him get me some assistance from the departments. Soon thereafter he sent to me a man by the name of McDonald, who advised me that arrangements had been made to have him assist our committee and to place him on the pay roll of the Works Progress Administration.

Mr. Wohlforth sent another man to me who was on the pay roll of some government agency.

I had both men appear before the committee in executive session and testify to these facts, and then I notified them that the committee did not desire their services.

IT was beginning to dawn upon me what the committee was up against. The executive branch of the government refused to carry out the expressed wish of the House of Representatives contained in the resolution authorizing the investigation when the chairman of the committee requested it to do so, but the secretary of the La Follette Committee was able to secure for our committee what we ourselves could not get, namely, assistance from the executive departments.

I cannot say that I was not thoroughly discouraged and to some extent frightened by the dismal prospect ahead of me. No member of Congress can truthfully say that he does not attach great significance to the good will of the President of his country and the leader of his party. Especially is this true in the case of a Southern member who comes from a district where Democratic Presidents are almost idolized.

I knew then, as I know now, that the great majority of the people in my district are strong supporters of the President, and that in any contest between the President and me, growing out of disagreement as to the method of conducting the investigation, all of the advantage is on his side.

I also knew that in the important matter of patronage and project approval and the expenditure of public funds in my district, the President's word was and is final.

My district has a serious problem of unemployment, aggravated by the exhaustion of our timber resources. Many of my counties were clamoring for public money, and while I was certain then, as I am now, that Roosevelt is too honorable to permit an honest difference of opinion between him and me to damage the interests of my people, I also knew that my enemies would claim that the

reason we did not get more projects was because the President disapproved of my investigation.

Then, too, I was a great admirer of the President. He has one of the most winning personalities with which I ever came in contact. It had been my pleasure upon several occasions to talk with him about public bills and District matters, and, regardless of what congressmen may tell you, they are easily influenced and swayed by the smile and the pat on the back from the President of their party, who, incidentally, has control over the purse strings that may mean a new post office at some politically important town in your district, or who can appoint your friends and would-be friends with large family connections and influence to public office, or who can appoint the congressman to a judgeship for life in the event of defeat or anticipated defeat.

Therefore candor compels me to confess that I approached this difficult job with some fear and misgiving. But I saw no alternative. I knew that the situation was very serious and that it was in the interest of the country that I do my best, without fear or partisanship.

I had a duty to perform, and something kept telling me that I had to see it through, regardless of what happened to me.

OF course the President is the responsible head of the Democratic Party as well as the President of the United States, and, naturally, he considered it his duty to look after the interests of the party. I could understand why the leaders of my party did not want to antagonize the C. I. O., which had contributed heavily to our national campaign at a time when money was badly needed, and other so-called liberal organizations whose support in doubtful states was regarded as necessary to success by some Democrats.

But my situation was wholly different, as I saw it. I was chairman of an investigating committee charged with the exposure of un-American activities. The matters under investigation were not partisan. I had promised to be honest and fearless in the discharge of my duty.

No matter how I looked at the matter, I could come to but one conclusion: I must do my duty and not shield any one.

Is it true that in his endeavors to do his duty thus, Mr. Dies has had the Roosevelt administration to contend with? That the President personally opposed his undertaking an investigation of Communism within the C. I. O.? Mr. Dies' own answers to these questions, with his grounds for them, will appear in Liberty next week, and he will present the facts that have been derisively misinterpreted as a charge by his committee that Shirley Temple was a Communist.