

Given at Arizona-California  
District Convention at Apache (East Fork)  
Mission in White River, Ariz. 1960

Communism In Its Effect Upon the American  
Way of Life

In the summer of the year 1887 a most unusual novel appeared in America and rapidly became a best seller. Written by Edward Bellamy and entitled "Looking Forward," it told the strange story of a man who had gone to sleep under the influence of hypnosis in a subterranean chamber on May 30, 1887, and slept straight through for 113 years until he awoke one fine morning in the year 2000.

This new Rip van Winkle hadn't aged at all and could still enjoy the wonderful things he saw around him. There was a stunning girl waiting for him, of course. But one thing impressed and pleased him above all: socialism had become an accomplished fact not only in our country but all over the civilized world. He later found out that our people had been converted to socialism in the 1940's and adopted it with great enthusiasm at that time.

In some respects Mr. Bellamy was a clever prophet. He foretold the radio, public laundries, ration cards such as we used during World War II, and sensible dresses for women--remember they were wearing hoop skirts and bustles in the 1880's. His picture of the socialistic state resembles present day Russia without its cruel dictatorship. It is a kind of military set-up using for its model of efficiency, of all things, the German army of von Moltke--the one that beat the French in 1870. Everyone had joined the system of his own free will and was very happy in it, for it "guaranteed to each citizen nurture, education, and com-

WISCONSIN LUTHERAN SEMINARY

Library

663 W. WARTBURG CIRCLE  
MELUON, WISCONSIN 53092

fortable maintenance from the cradle to the grave"---a real welfare state.

But Mr. Bellamy certainly was off the beam in his belief that Americans were converted to socialism or communism in the 1940's, even though there are a few old-fashioned people who believe that socialism did come in with the New Deal. We do have the beginnings of a welfare state---security from the cradle to the grave. But most people believe that our American way of life is at the opposite pole from communism or even socialism. A booklet authorized by the Congress in 1955 states that the Communist Party of the U. S. A. is a "Russian inspired, Moscow dominated, anti-American, quasi-military conspiracy against our government, our ideals and our freedoms." And Prof. Rehwinkel of Concordia Seminary in his book, "Communism and the Church," 1948, wrote: "Since the rise of victorious Mohammedanism in the 7th century there has been no great threat to the church quite equal to the spread of aggressive and atheistic Communism today."

How could a system that was praised as an ideal by Bellamy and some 50 other writers of Utopian novels around the turn of the century develop into the one which we today consider Public Enemy No. 1? The fact is that these writers represented what might be called Utopian or benevolent socialism, while the system which we dislike is known as scientific Marxian, Leninist socialism. The first variety goes back at least as far as Plato's masterpiece, the "Republic." It is worth noting that when the greatest thinker of the heathen age conceived a plan for a perfect state,

it was communistic in form.

Probably the first really serious attempt to put benevolent communism into practice was the church of apostles, as described in the 4th chapter of the Acts. The apostles had shared all things in common with their master, who had not where to lay his head, who carried neither scrip nor purse and who, when a likable rich young man wanted to join him, said: "Go and sell all thou hast and give it to the poor and then come and follow me." "We have forsaken all and followed thee. What shall we have therefore?" asked Peter of his Lord (Matthew 19:27). It seemed natural to the apostles that such a state of affairs should continue in the church. Even to this day the church offers its spiritual gifts freely and equally to all men regardless of race or social ~~status~~ status.

Benevolent communism also brings to mind that interesting work "Utopia" by Sir Thomas More, a Catholic martyr under Henry VIII of England. In 1516, the year before the beginning of the Reformation, this noble man, thinking about the evils of society in Europe and hoping that in the new world, discovered just then, a saner social structure might be reared, wrote his book, meaning literally "Nowhere," in which he described an imaginary island in the western hemisphere. Politically it was far ahead of Europe. It had no lawyers. Gold and silver were used for base utensils in order to discourage their use as money. But the chief point is <sup>that</sup> ~~is~~ Utopia was a communistic state. The Utopians, said More, were attracted to Christianity because Christ had urged his followers to have all things in common.

There were dozens of other great writers and thinkers who in the course of the centuries followed More's example and wrote books about an ideal, more or less communistic, set-up--people like the Ruskins, Carlyles, Bernard Shaws in England, the Henry Georges, Lincoln Steffenses, and Upton Sinclairs in this country. Among the most entertaining is Bernard Shaw, who even preached his socialistic creed from soapboxes. In fact he said: "I first caught the ear of the British public at the back of a cart in a corner of Hyde Park to the accompaniment of a brass band." In the 1920's he summed up his ideas in a book: "The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism." Among other things he pointed out that we already have more communism than most people realize. Every community shares its bridges, streets, lights. People buy their beer separately, but they get their water communistically."

Shaw was converted to socialism by an American named Henry George, whose book, "Progress and Poverty," came out in 1879. Henry George had somewhat of a prophet's strain. His stirring indictment of our civilization in the age of the robber barons is typical of virtually all those who proposed communism as a remedy. These people were not just idle dreamers or vicious schemers. They were deeply moved by man's inhumanities to man and wanted honestly to do something about them.

A brief survey of benevolent socialism would also have to include the practical attempts to create communistic communities. They range all the way from religious groups like the Mennonites, Dunkers, Amish and Hutterites, with their beards, black hats, long buttonless coats, their

horses and buggies, to the colorful communities inspired a little over a century ago by the French humanitarians Fourier and St. ~~Simon~~ Simon. Among the latter were Brook Farm, described by Hawthorne in "The Blithedale Romance" and Fruitlands, where Louisa Alcott spent a part of her youth. Wisconsin had half a dozen Utopian communities at one time.

Perhaps we could also include under benevolent socialism such political movements as the social democratic party of Germany in the pre-World war era or the socialist party in America, which never polled more than 900,000 votes in a presidential election--that of 1912--but produced two perennial presidential candidates, Eugene Debs in the early years of the century and Norman Thomas in the second quarter of the century. This party also elected a slate of candidates that ran Milwaukee from 1910 to 1912 and kept one of its men, Daniel Hoan, in the mayoral chair for 24 years. In fact the Milwaukee mayor, Zeidler, who ended his term of office only this spring still called himself a socialist. Norman Thomas has made the point that our whole country by adopting the bulk of the socialistic program in the New Deal managed to bypass both socialism and communism. In the 1880's Bismarck similarly countered the Social Democrats by stealing most of their thunder. There have thus been hundreds of books by famous men advocating socialism or communism. There have been small religious groups practicing it; there have been labor organizations and governments appropriating it bit by bit. Now if that were all there is to the movement, it would hardly offer a great challenge either to country or church today. But we all

know that this isn't the whole story of the communistic movement. Side by side with the older idea of sharing and benevolence has come the newer idea of violence and godlessness, and of this we must now speak. It began in the French Revolution when the various communes of the people instituted a bloodbath and outlawed the Christian religion for a time by setting up a goddess of reason in the church.

Perhaps a few words should be said about the distinction between socialism and communism. The words have often been interchangeably used. Even Russia's official name is the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the so-called USSR. Nevertheless today Communism is the word used for the Marxist or Russian kind of socialism. Marxists consider socialism a first or lower stage of communism, a transitory period between the seizure of power by the proletariat and the higher or final stage of communism. Communists have only the utmost contempt for socialists of the Norman Thomas variety. These are merely impractical allies of the bourgeoisie.

The father of modern militant Communism is Karl Marx, a partly Jewish German philosopher and publicist of encyclopedic learning and cantankerous temper. He could never support his family of seven children but depended on the gifts of friends, notably on help from his partner Friedrich Engels, a German business man living in England. Marx had a devoted wife and able sons-in-law and pupils, who later acted as his lieutenants in the Communist parties of different countries in Europe. He was exiled from Prussia twice, from Paris twice, from Brussels once, and spent the last

third of his life in London, where he visited the reading room of the British museum daily, gathering materials for his massive work, "Das Kapital," the bible of Communism.

His most important writing, however, was the "Communist Manifesto" which he published with his friend Engels in the year 1848, just in time to spark the European revolution of 1848. This little pamphlet, with its ringing final sentence "Workers of the world unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains," contains almost every doctrine of modern Communism. The ponderous "Kapital," the first volume of which was not published until 1865, adds comparatively little to the "Manifesto" except an endless number of case histories proving the evils of capitalism. There are gruesome details like these:

At a certain place children of 9, and 10 are dragged from their squalid beds at two, three or four o'clock in the morning to work for a bare subsistence at the lace trade until ten, eleven, or twelve at night, their limbs wearing away, their frames dwindling, their faces whitening and their humanity absolutely sinking into stonelike torpor, utterly horrible to contemplate.

Marxism did not come out of a clear sky. It was the result of half a dozen historic forces or conditions: the social maladjustments of the industrial revolution, the chaos brought on by the Napoleonic wars, the blind reaction under Prince Metternich, the equally reactionary position of the established state churches. In nearly all cases the churches were on the side of the ruling aristocracy. Their tyranny was also one of the reasons why the Communists induced many of our forefathers to leave Germany. The same tyranny was also one of the reasons why the Communists turned so drastically against religion.

WISCONSIN LUTHERAN SEMINARY

*Library*

6633 W. WARTBURG CIRCLE  
MEQUON, WISCONSIN 53092

Besides the four forces mentioned, there was the intellectual ferment produced by the 18th century of reason, by the new discoveries in science and by the higher criticism of the Bible. The age that produced Marx also produced Darwin, Feuerbach--- with his philosophy of materialism---Der Mensch ist was er isst--- and David Strauss, whose "Life of Jesus" spoke of the resurrection as "the world historic humbug." Marx also was a materialist, and his attitude toward religion is sufficiently characterized by his notorious saying that it is "the opiate of the masses." It was he who set the style for the atheism usual among Communists. William Z. Foster, former head of the Communist party of the U. S., testifying before a congressional committee, insisted that Communists did not forbid church membership, but he was quite frank in stating that no church member could be a party member. "Workers who would be so imbued with religious superstition as to be married in a church could be of no value to the Communist party," he said.

May I add here that it is a moot point whether the church and Communism could exist side by side. In their constitution of 1936 Russians did permit freedom of religion, though in the same breath they also gave freedom to those who combat religion. They resurrected a kind of Russian church, especially in order to curry favor with our country when we became their allies in 1941. It is also pointed out that there are 2 million Communists in Italy and half a million in France, most of whom are Catholics. It is possible that if the church would stick to preaching the gospel instead of doing as it did a century ago, allying itself with the rich and the rulers, it could thrive even in a Communist state. In this connection allow me to quote a devout



Swiss church leader, Leonard Ragaz. He said to a friend one day: "Do you know why Marx came? Marx came because Jesus was not allowed to come." A German theologian of the last century when asked: "What did the common people expect from the church?" replied, "Everything." "What did the common people receive from the church?" The answer was "Nothing, except the advice to bear their lot in patience in this vale of tears."

Marx's system has been called dialectical materialism. Dialectic means the process of argument (thesis) and counter-argument (antithesis) to reach a higher meaning (synthesis). The famous German philosopher G. W. Hegel applied that process to history, and his pupil Marx, distorting the master's meaning, argued something like this: "Call a certain economic class, capitalism, the thesis. This class is dominant, controlling means of production, setting styles in clothes and houses, and so on. An opposing class--the antithesis, in this case the proletariat--rises and seeks to overthrow the first group. A class struggle ensues, from which emerges a new order of society--a synthesis, which, said Marx, will incorporate the best of the old classes.

Marx was specific regarding this class struggle. Capitalists he said would become fewer and fewer and more powerful, while the proletariat increased and become more and more undifferentiated. Then would come a violent revolution in which the proletariat would seize power. An impure society would emerge. Such organs as state and police and army and such methods as party discipline, compromises and purges would still have to be used to crush the bourgeoisie. But finally would come the synthesis--perfect Communism, stateless, classless,

godless and propertyless. Each person then would work according to his abilities and receive according to his needs. Somewhat illogically he concluded that the thesis, antithesis and synthesis process would then terminate and the Utopian situation become permanent.

It is because of the doctrine of world revolution that Communists are the aggressive people we know and that our government will not tolerate them. Communists make no bones about the fact that they want to do away with our constitution. But I think that if we would one day accept Communism willingly and peacefully, the party members would be deeply disappointed. That wouldn't be right according to Marx. There must be a war, a revolution, to upset things completely. Robert Frost has written about the mentality of such men. It is entitled "A Case for Jefferson" from Out and Away.

Harrison loves my country too  
But wants it all made over new.  
He's Freudian Viennese by night  
By day he's Marxian Muscovite.  
It isn't because he's Russian Jew.  
He's Puritan Yankee through and through.  
He dotes on Saturday pork and beans  
But his mind is hardly out of his teens:  
With him the love of country means  
Blowing it all to smithereens  
And saving it all made over, new.

It makes no difference to Communists that many of Marx's prophecies have proved wrong. In our country, for instance, capital, instead of being concentrated, has become more widely diffused. Most of us are both haves and have-nots. Yet we do have a proletariat, and in a depression it becomes more numerous. At such a time conditions approach the Marxian prophecy close enough to seem like a fulfillment, and if we ever adopt communism, you may be sure that it will be in a terrible depression or after a crushing military defeat, both of which, let us hope, may never occur.

Marx's prophecies were erroneous in other respects. He said that the revolution would lead to the abolition of private property. That was tried for a decade in Russia but abandoned in the constitution of 1936. The Chinese seemed to be going through that phase a while ago. He also hinted at the possible modification of the family, and for a while the Russians were supposed to be trying that too. However, they backtracked here long ago; it would seem that a divorce is harder to obtain in Russia today than in many parts of America. Again ~~the~~ the Chinese with their communes were recently passing through that phase. In an interview with Senator Humphrey about two years ago, Kruschchev shook his head and said that the Chinese experiment wouldn't work.

Marx predicted that the revolution would be directed against capitalism, that it would lead to the ultimate abolition of the state, and the removal of national boundaries. It did none of these things in Russia. The revolution was aimed against the old aristocracy, the landowners, not against capitalists, and, far from abolishing nationalism, has made it rampant in the worst sense in Russia and China. Much of what we dislike in Russia is old fashioned power politics, pan-Slavism, czarist absolutism under a new name, all of which supposedly have nothing to do with the essence of Communism. Finally in his interpretation of history Marx was completely blind to the rise of such a thing as Fascism, which can be worse than Communism.

Yet the fact remains that the revolution did succeed in Russia, and that is fulfillment enough. That it did is largely the work of a third man--Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, later known as Lenin. Without him Communism might have been drowned in an ocean of angry manifestoes, quarrels and personal feuds. The

first language into which Das Kapital was translated was Russian. A Marxist group was founded in Russia in 1883. Lenin joined it in 1893. Much of his life thereafter was spent in exile in Siberia and in Switzerland, where he resided in 1917 when the Germans, desperately wanting Russia out of the war, allowed him to travel in a sealed train to the Russian border. During his 20 years as a Communist Lenin had worked hard to make the party a picked group of dedicated, fanatic men. There had been agitation to open party membership to all sympathizers, but Lenin and his Bolsheviks, meaning the majority, said no. "The class war is bitter. The enemy is powerful," he argued. Only a picked group, a highly skilled, trained General Staff can combat capitalism. Each party member must be a trained revolutionary, a ruthless conspirator, ready to go whenever and wherever the party sends him. If the class struggle demands it he will leave his family for months, even for years.

The result of this intensive training was that Lenin and his men were ready when their great chance came in October, 1917. In ten days that shook the world the Bolsheviks overthrew the mild, republican, pro-ally regime of Kerensky and made themselves rulers of Russia. They withdrew from the war and in March 1918 signed the treaty of Brest Litovsk with Germany. The allies did not forgive this defection and made war upon them. If William Foster, one time head of the party in America, speaks truly, the Bolsheviks had to fight 14 different nations at the time. But they triumphed over them all.

Their stunning success inspired Communist sympathizers all over the world and led directly to the formation of the Communist party of the U. S. in Chicago in September, 1919. Almost at that same time Attorney General Mitchell Palmer

tried to round up all Communists, undesirable aliens and radicals in what Morison and Commager, in their history, "Growth of the American Republic" call the "deportation delirium of 1919-20." "Using spies and agents provocateurs, the attorney general conducted a series of lawless raids on private houses and labor headquarters, rounded up several thousand aliens, held them incommunicado and subjected them to drumhead trials. In the end only a few hundred were deported; the vast majority of those arrested were found to be harmless." As usual in such cases, the witch hunt hadn't harmed the party, but rather provided an argument for joining it among those who were so inclined. A steel and coal strike terminated by force under wartime acts in 1919 and two others, a railway and coal strike broken by force in 1921, offered further talking points for joining.

But the party grew slowly. The vast majority of Americans never did warm up to socialism or communism. In 1922 the party membership numbered 12,400. By 1930 it had dropped to 7,500. It did not grow phenomenally during the depression, reaching only 30,000 members in 1935. Its peak of 80,000 came in the year 1944, more as the result of our alliance with Russia than for any other reason. By 1955 it had dropped to 22,600 and

today it is much lower still. The party today has in fact gone underground. It does not issue membership cards any more. In its 16th and most recent convention in New York, Feb. 9-12, 1957, it loudly asseverated its loyalties to our country and its democratic ideals. But shrewd students of its resolutions--reporters were not allowed--believe that the language is still Aesopian doubletalk (the expression will be explained later), deliberately used to mask the party's real loyalty to Russian Communism.

Five times from 1924 to 1940 the party ran a candidate for president, achieving its highest percentage of the total votes in 1932, with 102,991 votes out of 40 million. In 1948 it supported Henry Wallace and the Communist infiltrated Progressive party. Wallace later confessed that he had been taken in by the Communists. He had incorrectly interpreted Communism and its counterpart, Russian imperialism

Library  
6633 W. WARTBURG CIRCLE  
MEQUON, WISCONSIN 53092

because the Russians had pulled the wool over his eyes during his visit there in 1944.

Back in 1919, soon after the Communist party was formed, a young man named J. Edgar Hoover was asked by the attorney general to submit his opinion on the new party. Hoover concluded his report with the following words:

These doctrines threaten the happiness of the community, the safety of every individual, and the continuance of every home and fireside. They would destroy the peace of the country and thrust it into a condition of anarchy and lawlessness and immorality that passes imagination.

Forty years later this man and his efficient organization, the FBI, may still be considered the most militant and effective opponents of the party in our country. The FBI has been gathering evidence for four decades and the gist of it is presented in Edgar Hoover's book Masters of Deceit, which came out two years ago. Evidence of the same kind and almost as plentiful is contained in "A Handbook for Americans" on "The Communist Party of the USA," authorized by the 84th congress in 1955

for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary. It can be obtained from the Government Printing Office. *Besides this book the U.S. Govt. Printing Office lists about 60 publications relating to Un-American activities, mostly Com. in.* Senator Wiley of Wisconsin, by the way, was a member of that committee. To these revelations must be added those of the famous trials of Alger Hiss and of the 12 communists ten years ago, to say nothing ~~of everything~~ *about what* we heard during the half decade in which McCarthyism was dominant. I believe that we know just about everything there is to be known about the nature and the activities of the Communistic party in the U.S., though we cannot of course be sure about what new tricks or treasonable acts they may try next. Both Hoover and the Senate Committee agree in their findings. It <sup>is</sup> quite clear that our Communist party is a replica

of the one in Moscow, that it follows the party line and even takes its orders from Moscow. In its small way it is just as hard-boiled, hard-hitting, well-organized, self-denying, conspiratory, secretive and fanatic. It uses the same doubletalk, or Aesopian language--the word refers to the Aesop fables, which also have a double meaning. Thus "democracy" means the Russian system, not ours. "Restore academic freedom" means "Permit official teaching of the Communist party;" "Restore the bill of rights" means "Stop persecuting Communists."

The party is extremely clever in infiltrating organizations like labor unions, or even young people's societies in a few churches. The more liberal Protestant churches have often been accused of sympathizing with Communism, most recently this year in an army air force booklet, which brazenly listed the National Council of Churches as Communist inspired. Charges like that are invariably made by reactionaries who see red in the double sense of the word every time they come in contact with a progressive new idea.

Another party technique is to set up fronts--organizations that operate under harmless and high-sounding names like American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, American Russian Institute, American Soviet Music Society, American Youth for Democracy, Institute of Pacific Relations, Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. In past years, though not recently, Communists were successful in lining up famous people behind such fronts, people who foolishly thought they were serving noble humanitarian causes instead of furthering Communist schemes. Frederick G. Schwarz, Sydney, Australia, surgeon, psychiatrist and Christian Executive Director of the Christian Communism Crusade with headquarters in Long Beach, California, <sup>wrote</sup> in Chris-

tianity Today, April 13, 1959:

Communists become all things to all men that they may enslave all. A Christian missionary working in a Moslem country could not embrace the Moslem faith, live a life of apparent matchless devotion to all Moslem causes for the sole purpose of opening a door for the Christian gospel. To the Communist this is normal conduct, righteous and honorable. They assume the mantle of Christian, Moslem or Jew, worker or business man, traitor or patriot, libertine or puritan, with equal facility.

Like their prototypes in Moscow our Communists are also experts at fishing in troubled waters, making their appeal to unpopular minorities like Jews and Negroes and using mass agitation whenever the chance arises. And even though the party seems very small, Hoover's word of warning is that "when the Communist party was at its peak in the U.S., that is, when it had 80,000 members, it was stronger in numbers than the Soviet party was at the time it seized power in Russia;" of course, the situations are vastly different. In considering the menace of the Communist party in America we must also remember that it derives additional strength from so-called fellow travelers and other radical sympathizers who by spying and handing over state secrets often do us more harm than actual members. But I suppose even these would be not too dangerous if the party were not so closely allied with the second most powerful nation on earth, a nation that is not friendly to us and that is now made stronger by winning China to the side of Communism. That massive fact means that we can never for a minute relax our vigilance.

A question naturally arises. If Communism is the terrible thing we say it is, if Russia is a country in which the people have no freedom to speak of, if our American way of life, on the contrary, is so wonderful, why is it that so many people even in our country join Communism or sympathize with it.



What makes a Communist tick? In the following I take my material from the congressional handbook. A trite explanation offered by the ill-informed is that Communism is a product of inequalities under our social system. This, the so-called misery theory of Communism, is the ~~one~~<sup>one</sup> Communists perhaps use most in their propaganda. Only Communism, they say, can remove this misery of inequalities.

A corollary to this theory is that workers are attracted to the Communist party in the hope of improving their lot economically. However, there are few of the proletariat in the party. Rather it would seem that a large percentage of the party consists of mission minded intellectuals who have constituted themselves the exponents of the interests of labor, which wants no part of them. In this group would belong many Hollywood stars, such rich men as Frederick Vanderbilt Field and the rather numerous professional people who are attracted to Communism.

In a number of cases it is found that the party is a refuge for certain psychologically maladjusted individuals. Foster in his book on Communism makes much of the fact that there are few neurotics in Russia but many in ~~the~~ capitalist U.S. Maladjusted individuals feel themselves isolated. They are baffled by the complexities of modern society. Communism has a simple answer for all ills and it does have a certain warmth and camaraderie among its members. That feature may appeal to a person who belongs to a minority group and feels himself isolated. Dr. Rehwinkel in his book quotes a Negro named Doxy Wilkerson, who gives the reasons why he joined Communism.

My decision to join and work for the party has been fully justified by my experience.... In the first place I found in the party a warmth of fellowship which is unparalleled in any national organization of comparable size. Negro and white, Jew and ~~Catholic~~ Gentile, youth and age, man and woman, professional and worker--all are bound together by close and personal ties which make of them genuine comrades.

Second, I found in the party a group of citizens who are more alert to the social, economic, and political problems of the day--and more eager to do something about them--than any other group with which I have been associated. Nowhere have I found a more conscientious and zealous group of fighters for social progress.

This statement also illustrates the fact that many serious and idealistic people join the party, sincerely but mistakenly believing that the fine words used by Communists are really as honest as they sound. Some of these people, even William Foster himself, can write very persuasively and heart-warmingly. The favorite poem of Ella Reeves Bloor, the old mother of American Communism, who died in 1951, was Whitman's "The Mystic Trumpeter." I am inclined to be charitable to anyone who loves that poem, though I suppose that Mother Bloor was a fanatic like the rest.

Now trumpeter for thy close,  
Vouchsafe a higher strain than any yet,  
Sing to my soul, renew its languishing faith and hope,  
Rouse up my slow belief, give me some vision of the future,  
Give me for once its prophecy and joy.

Joining the party, furthermore, appeals to certain types of young people; to those who like the excitement of picket lines, strikes, mass meetings, demonstrations, tiffs with police; to those adventurous spirits who thrive in a conspirational atmosphere; to Bohemians and nonconformists, and to timid souls with an inferiority complex who are inspired to boldness when they become part of an aggressive group. Finally the party appeals to the disgruntled and embittered--second rate artists, lawyers without clients, doctors without patients, writers with-

out outlets and even to persons with a guilt complex, like the rich man who has not really earned his money and throws in his lot with the party to salve his conscience.

Do people ever quit Communism? The answer is, "Yes, they do." There is a very large turnover in the party. For one thing, a healthy American with an inborn sense of rugged individualism just can't take the severe discipline, which may force him to leave his family more or less permanently, to change his name and even his identity by a facial operation, ~~to~~ to take tongue lashings from party leaders for being incompetent.

Many members suffer from intense qualms about the correctness of the party line and about its practices behind the iron curtain, such as the maintenance of slave labor camps, Soviet imperialism, anti-Semitism, and the suppression of civil rights. They are offended or at least confused by sudden switches in party policy in Moscow. The quarrel between Stalin and Trotsky and the condemnation of the latter, the pact with Hitler in 1939, the unfriendly attitude toward America after the war, the break with Tito and the debunking of Stalin after his death caused defections from the party. Members also finally tire of the opposition to religion, the guilt feeling that they are spies, stool pigeons, bringing a bad name upon themselves and their families.

Just how dangerous are the American Communists today? My own opinion is that they are well under control. Perhaps the following anecdote will illustrate. Ten years ago when I was preparing a paper to be delivered on a similar subject to a group of teachers in St. Paul, I looked up the Milwaukee address for party headquarters given in Dr. Rehwinkel's book.

It was a small place on the 9th floor of an older downtown building. I found two young ladies there who showed me every courtesy. I told them frankly who I was and that I was preparing a paper to be given before a highly important group of Lutheran teachers. The word Lutheran didn't even seem to register. They gave me plenty of free material and sold me W. Foster's book on "The Twilight of Capitalism," for 35 cents. I had the impression, however, that they were ardent party members who believed that Russia could do no wrong and that the U.S. was deliberately trying to misrepresent her. Also they were very much excited about the New York trial of 11 communists which was going on just then. They kept speaking of the trial as we might speak of the Reformation.

Somewhat later I told this incident to a Watertown lawyer. He knew all about the place and the people that go there. "If you had gone there more than once or twice," he said, "You'd probably ~~be~~ have been watched too." In the war this lawyer worked with the army intelligence. He told me how they had shadowed union members who were suspected of being Communists. That is how they found out that a Milwaukee man named Christoffel, the Allis Chalmers union leader, was a party member. They had rigged up a broken down laundry truck right across from the office and equipped it with a telescopic movie camera. The Communist union members would gather nonchalantly and at intervals, carefully looking around to see whether they were being followed, and enter the building furtively. Well, even that long ago--this was during the war--the FBI had a line on these people. Of course the FBI didn't know everything. Revelations of disloyalty in high places since then have shocked us. But we did

find out about them and have taken effective measures to guard against such treasonable actions in the future. I rather think that the class struggle is some distance off in our country, to say the least. The laboring man is not a friend of Communism. Last fall (1959) when Khrushchev visited America, it was noted that he got along best with government officials, rich men, and movie actors but that he quarreled violently with representatives of labor and never hobnobbed with working men.

ca 1959<sup>2</sup>  
I have now spoken about benevolent communism, about Marxism, and about the Communist party in our country. I come at last to the challenge of Communism--meaning how are we to judge it, what are to do about it, both as citizens and as members of the Lutheran church.

In judging a vast movement like this, it seems to me that a thoughtful person should raise himself above the passions of the moment and view it from the perspective of history. We have seen that Communism, regarded in the light of 2000 years, does have a benevolent side, that its heart or core is in fact a noble ideal once tried out by the apostles--the ideal furthermore that is expressed in our own Declaration of Independence in these words: "We believe that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These ideals have been obscured by the wickedness of men in Russia and in China, and at various times in a somewhat different way in our own country. Yet I have a great faith in the power of ideals.

What may happen in Russia or China or anywhere in 50 or 100 years, however, doesn't change the fact that Communism is

very much with us in the world right now. And this is a second thing to consider. No matter how much we dislike it, it has achieved the seemingly impossible in two great countries. It overthrew a despotism in Russia and made that country the most powerful in the eastern hemisphere. It toppled an inefficient, corrupt government in China and made that country, which had been the doormat of nations, a world power. Nations all over the world have been vastly impressed, and there is no use in yielding to wishful thinking that they will just naturally choose American democracy in preference to Communism because they love our way of life so much. And even if in a world war we should overthrow the Russian and Chinese systems, we might as well accept the fact that we are still going to have some form of socialism among us. The common man all over the world has tasted personal freedom and equality and he won't relinquish it. Do you think for instance, that Negroes will cease demanding full rights and equality? Or that labor would say to its employers: We have been wrong in asking increases in wages and shorter working hours. Let's turn back the clock to the last century when we worked hard and long for small wages while you were raking in all the cash? Fifty years from now the New Deal, the Fair Deal and the Eisenhower deal may look like tame deals in this respect. The welfare state announced in our constitution is here to stay, because there is no other agency to which the people can turn for the things they are going to demand.

A third consideration: I think we should all be aware of the risks involved in sweeping condemnations or witch hunts and in all attempts to suppress Communism by force. Several years

ago, Raymond Maynard Hutchins, then president of the U. of Chicago and certainly anything but a Communist, wrote: "To persecute people into conformity by non-legal methods popular today is little better than doing it by purges and pogroms. We are busily engaged in adopting the most stupid and unjust of the ideas prevalent in Russia and are doing so in the name of Americanism. Every day in this country men and women are being deprived of their livelihood or at least of their reputation by unsubstantiated charges." This was said before Senator McCarthy appeared on the scene. While he was in his heyday, President Alfred W. Grizwold of Yale University declared: "Books won't stay banned. They won't burn. Ideas won't go to jail. In the long run of history, the censor and the inquisitor have always lost. The only sure weapon against bad ideas is better ideas."

Insert  
from p 25 →

Again I quote Thomas Jefferson who put it thus in 1808:

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

I am glad that our leaders have been on the trail of Communism and are guarding against its evil devices. But ~~also glad that unstanding Americans have shaken out to keep us firm~~ I am losing our sense of judgment and justice in meeting this danger.

But how are we as Christians and workers in the Lutheran church to judge Communism. Let us remember, first of all, that it is a secular, worldly movement and that our work is concerned chiefly with eternal things. Let us remember also that it is an affair of state and that we believe in the separation of church and state. We have no call to play politics, to throw our weight around as a huge organization or to put pressure on

governments, even in a good political cause.

We have only one direct call--one great commission--to preach the gospel of salvation in Jesus Christ to every human being. This call certainly involves taking a stand against every kind of evil, including the crimes and godlessness of Communists.

Yet our chief weapon against the evils of Communism--as well as the evils in our own country and in our own hearts--is that very same gospel which it is our privilege to preach and teach and live. With this great weapon in mind, I confess that I am unafraid even of Communism. I do not believe that the immortal human soul can be satisfied for long with the husks of materialism. I do not believe that faith in the God of Love can ever be destroyed by atheism.

If then you would ask me point direct what I should advise the church to do in the face of even the worst type of Communism, I should say. Follow the command of your Lord with a new consecration. Preach the gospel in season and out of season, to the submerged and the downtrodden as well as ~~the~~<sup>to</sup> the high and mighty and respectable. Teach it to the young and trust in it as a power that is mightier than sin and evil. And don't worry too much about the kind of government under which you must labor. The church has lived through every conceivable type of government from the despotisms of Nero and Hitler to the benevolent systems in English speaking countries. If Communism with all its excesses should ever come to this country, that would be all the more reason to preach the gospel, to oppose the fury of men with love and if need be to prove our faith with our lives. Persecution has more often tested and



strengthened the church than destroyed it. But I see no reason for such a gloomy possibility.

If on the other hand Communism comes in its milder benevolent form, let us say of the welfare state, which is partly here already, it would not hinder us in our work and we would be truly thankful. Whatever does come, men will remain sinners, lost without the mercy of God. To bring the word of that mercy to them is our calling--the timeless challenge to the church.

insert  
p. 23

Someone recently wrote a poem about the list of unAmericans published by the American Legion : It was printed in the Nation:

If you find that you're unable to determine who is pure  
They've got a little list, they've got a little list  
Of eleven dozen characters of varying allure  
Who may be Communist.  
Democracy is ~~the~~ <sup>threatened</sup> by a host that runs the gamut  
From Marshal Joseph Stalin to subversive Dashiell Hammett  
We can't avoid submission to collectivizing wives  
If people pay admission to a concert by Paul Ives  
You mustn't say that Perelman's your favorite humorist.  
They've got him on the list.

ELMER  
RIESSLING