

# The Real Dies Report

BY KENNETH G. CRAWFORD

Washington, January 8

HAVING run through one dragon, Martin Dies is charging another. As a result of his first gallant fight, he admits, communism in the United States lies prostrate, if not dead. The Russian invasion of Finland might have helped a little, but Dies takes most of the credit for the accomplishment. Since the Dies committee already has achieved its purpose, the virtual destruction of un-Americanism, why should it go on? This problem has been solved by the discovery of another, tougher, uglier dragon, parent of the first. It is atheism or paganism, and the campaign against it is to be a holy war led by Martin Dies.

The ideology of the crusade goes like this: The world is engaged in a fight between Marxist materialism on one side and Christian idealism on the other. The Russian invasion of Finland and the German invasion of Poland are products of Marxism, a term synonymous with atheism. That leaves the Italian invasion of Ethiopia unaccounted for, but it apparently was the exception proving the rule. In the United States the Marxian atheists, disguised as "so-called liberals," are engaged in the materialistic enterprise of supplying the unemployed with food and, in the process, transforming our system of government into a bureaucratic state capitalism.

Dies introduced the new line in the first article of his series in *Liberty*. He developed it in his radio sermon last Saturday night. But it was most fully and clearly set forth in the first draft of his report to Congress. This report, unfortunately, was rewritten by liberal members of the Dies committee and consequently never made public. I say unfortunately because the original document shows that Dies himself and, presumably, a majority of his committee are still determined to destroy the New Deal. The reasonable report that was finally made public was written by a minority of the committee and has created the wholly false impression that Dies and his majority have changed stripe. If their authority and their appropriation are renewed, their efforts to smear Roosevelt liberalism, this time in the name of Christianity itself, will also be renewed.

Consider this paragraph from the conclusions of the suppressed report submitted to the committee by Dies with the recommendation that it be adopted:

These Marxists who are not attached to the Communist Party or the German-American Bund are characterized, especially in these times, by their constant assaults upon the American economic system, which to them is a

pile of "folklore" [as in Thurman Arnold's "Folklore of Capitalism," apparently]. Some of them have received appointments to high government positions, from which vantage points they carry on an incessant attack upon our economic system. Most of them may properly be called milk-and-water Marxists. Nevertheless, by their contempt for the American economic system and

their unflagging efforts to discredit it, they serve the ends of those Marxists who feed on the stronger meat of violent revolution. Marxists of all hues and of all degrees of consciousness are seeking to sabotage by slow stages the political and economic system of America in favor of bureaucratic state capitalism.

And this, according to the rejected report, is how the sabotaging is done:



Jerry Voorhis

First, attacks upon one phase or another of our economic system [reform]. Second, the advocacy of the principle that the government has the duty to support the people [relief]. Third, subtle proposals to regiment agriculture [AAA], labor [NLRB], and industry [SEC and various other government agencies] under some system of planned economy. Fourth, the final abolition of private property in favor of public ownership of basic industries [TVA], and, finally, complete dictatorship [Roosevelt the Kerensky who precedes the dictator].

The report goes on to bolster the Kerensky approach with the flat statement that "we are now witnessing the first stages of this [Marxist-atheist-pagan] campaign."

Thus it becomes apparent that Dies himself and, presumably, the four conservatives who constitute the majority of the committee are still bent on a campaign of New Deal destruction. They permitted the minority members—Jerry Voorhis of California, Joe Casey of Massachusetts, and John Dempsey of New Mexico—to rewrite the report because they wanted something all members of the committee would sign. Dies was anxious to avoid the uncertainties about renewal of his authority that a minority report might entail. Even the House, tolerant as it has been with the antics of the committee, was disgusted with the report of J. B. Matthews, "re-

search director," that consumer organizations are Communist dominated—except Consumers' Research, the one in which he was long interested. Dies authorized publication of this report without consulting minority members of the committee. He also raised Matthews's pay without bothering to mention it. Matthews was probably the real author not only of the original Dies report but of the chairman's other recent literary productions.

The elaboration of Dies's anti-New Deal prejudices into a new testament of Christianity suggests the Matthews hall mark. Other features of the original report were similarly suggestive. For example, there was the announcement that "Communists have from the beginning of this labor organization [the C. I. O.] wielded the dominant influence in its policies and control." And there was the "shameful and alarming" finding that "563 employees of the federal government could belong to so obviously a Communist-controlled organization" as the League for Peace and Democracy. At one of the committee's meetings Matthews was forced to confess that he could not name a single Communist in the government service, although the original report said some of the shameful 563 were "self-admitted members of the Communist Party." The minority members of the committee eliminated this along with other fanciful "statements of fact."

As everyone now knows, the published report of the committee denounced communism and fascism in uncompromising terms. It was, in fact, considerably harder on the Communists than the original. But it affirmatively rejected the falsehood that liberalism and communism differ only in degree. It defended civil liberties and by implication accused the Dies committee of disrespect for them. It estimated that no more than 1,000,000 of 132,000,000 Americans have embraced subversive doctrines despite widespread suffering during ten depression years. "We owe them," it concluded, "a solution of the economic and social problem of unnecessary poverty in the midst of possible plenty."

The published report, like the unpublished original, recommended further investigation of "un-American activities," but it defined these, as the original did not, as operations in the interest of foreign governments. Such a recommendation seemed so reasonable that it was promptly underwritten by the liberal as well as the conservative press. The *New York Times* expressed the happy thought that the Dies investigation at last had educated Dies. But Dies was in Texas whetting his trusty dragon-lance when the report was written. It is plain that his new dragon is much the same as his old dragon and that it still bears a striking resemblance to the Roosevelt New Deal.

## *Soviet Russia Today*

### III. DEATH OF A REVOLUTION

BY LOUIS FISCHER

**T**HE drastic modification in Russia's attitude toward the outside world did not suddenly spring full-blown from the brain of Stalin. It is not the casual whim of one individual. Nor is it merely the product of a new world situation. It has its roots deep in Soviet domestic conditions. The Russo-German pact begins a new era. But it is also a stage in a striking development of the Soviet revolution which started several years ago.

The year 1936 represents a divide in the history of the Bolshevik Revolution. The roots of the rapprochement with the Nazis go back to that year. I trace the new pact with Germany to a divorce between the Soviet leadership and the Soviet people; it became noticeable in 1936.

Up to about 1933 the Soviet regime was laying the industrial foundation of a new Russia, for which the population paid in the form of reduced consumption and harder work. Some did so grumblingly, many patiently. In 1934 and 1935 and in the first half of 1936 life became a bit easier. More goods could be bought in shops. But then the rising curve of consumption began to flatten

out. The supply of consumers' commodities in the Soviet Union is today woefully inadequate, and while food is generally plentiful, butter and milk and even articles like cabbage, a staple of Russian diet, are often unobtainable. In this field little progress has been made in the last three years. The deficiency is in part due to military preparations. But it is more adequately explained by the purges and several inherent Soviet economic weaknesses.

Even when he has the money the Soviet citizen faces a knotty problem when he tries to purchase most articles of clothing, especially pants—and there is no socialism without pants—or writing paper, or kitchen utensils, or kerosene for cooking, or a thousand and one items of common daily use. The proof of scarcity is found in the Soviet press: speculators are regularly arrested and sentenced. Speculators flourish only in scarcity. Moreover, factory directors and managers of industries are discharged, purged, or imprisoned for failing to produce efficiently and sufficiently. This usually makes matters worse: less experienced men take the vacated posts. On December 2,