



COMMUNISM

**ANSWERS
QUESTIONS
OF A**

COMMUNIST

BY

RT. REV. MSGR. FULTON J. SHEEN, O.D.

John Winton.

6216 Peter Ct
Smith Blvd, In 46614

Communism Answers Questions of A Communist

By

RT. REV. MSGR. FULTON J. SHEEN, PH.D., S.T.D., LL.D.



NEW YORK
THE PAULIST PRESS
401 WEST 59TH STREET

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED IN THE U. S. A.
BY THE PAULIST PRESS, NEW YORK, N. Y.

First Printing, 25,000 Copies
Second Printing, 10,000 Copies
Third Printing, 10,000 Copies
Fourth Printing, 5,000 Copies
Sixth Printing, 5,000 Copies

In a recent issue of the "Daily Worker," Communist newspaper, there appeared a lengthy article in the course of which eight questions were asked of Monsignor Sheen, Professor of Philosophy at the Catholic University of America and internationally known writer and orator. Monsignor Sheen has sent a reply to the author of the article in which he answers each question. Notably, every fact he mentions is taken from Communist sources. The reply thus has been made a brilliant refutation of the modern Communist propaganda, out of the mouth of Communism itself; as the author puts it, Communism answers the questions of a Communist.

Communism Answers Questions of A Communist

By

RT. REV. MSGR. FULTON J. SHEEN, PH.D., S.T.D., LL.D.

MR. LOUIS F. BUDENZ,
care of the *Daily Worker*:

Under date of December 25, 1936, the *Daily Worker* carried a three-column article under your name entitled "Communists hold out hand of fellowship to all enemies of war and oppression," in which a series of questions were proposed to me. I assume that the only reason the questions were asked, was that they might be answered, and I trust you will do me the courtesy of filling an equal space with the reply.

Question 1: "How can Monsignor Sheen speak against those people, the Communists, who are in the forefront ever of the battle for the downtrodden, for those starved out through lack of relief, for those who are seeking to keep a home together, for those who wish so deeply to be saved from the ravages of war?"

Communism and the Poor

Answer: I can speak against the Communists because I can make a distinction between the Communists' interest in the poor, and their method of helping them.

My opposition to Communism is not because it claims to be the friend of the downtrodden, but because of the way it treats them when it comes into power.

Communism and love of the poor are not identified, though this question assumes that if you love the poor, you must be a Communist. This is not true.

Our Blessed Lord loved the poor, but His Commandment "Thou shalt not steal" is opposed to violent confiscation advocated by the Official Program of the International Communist Party (pp. 34-38). Frederick Ozanam loved the poor and recommended and practiced the charity of Christ ten years before Marx wrote his revolutionary Manifesto, but Ozanam was not a Communist.

Not Facts, Exaggerated Claims

It is, therefore, one thing to protest against unjust conditions of the poor, and quite another to be their real friend. If I raised my voice daily against Jews and Christians for not reading the Old Testament in Hebrew, where there is the music and the rhythm of the original tongue, I might eventually get many to believe that I read the Old Testament in Hebrew. The fact is, I do not. So, too, the Communists, by constantly talking about the poor, may create the impression in some minds that the Communistic system really is best for the poor, but in reality it is not, as I shall show. I might call your attention to the fact that your article did not contain one single fact, but only exaggerated claims and promises. My answer would be equally empty if I did not appeal to facts, and every fact that I shall mention about Communism in action, will be taken from Communistic sources. In other

words, Communism will answer the questions of a Communist.

Let us take up the points one by one:

(a) Is Communism "in the forefront ever of the battle for the downtrodden and for those starved through lack of relief"? Yes, whenever it seeks to make converts to its cause; No, when it has established itself in power.

If Communism is the friend of the downtrodden, why, because of increased juvenile delinquency occasioned by the break-up of the family, does it bring children of twelve years of age and above, under the Penal Code which includes capital punishment? (*Pravda*, No. 97, April 8, 1935.)

Steal Grain, Peasants Executed

If Communism is the friend of the downtrodden, why did it publish an order that the starving peasants who, in order to live, stole grain from the fields they once owned and cultivated, "must be shot and all their goods confiscated"? (*Izvestia*, August 8, 1932.)

If Communism is the friend of the downtrodden, why, in order to protect State grain grown on confiscated lands, did it order that "children are to be put on guard even during the night, from the time they are eight years old"? (*Moldavia Gvardia*, August 17, 1935.)

If Communism is the friend of the downtrodden, why did the Kremlin issue on November 5, 1932, under the names of Kalinine, Molotov and Enoukidze, the following orders?: (a) for an absence of a day, the worker is deprived not only of his work, but also of his card without which he can have neither lodging nor bread,

and this punishment applies to all the members of his family (*Izvestia*, November 25, 1932).

If Communism is the friend of the downtrodden, why did it order that the directors of work must not be conciliatory to the workers? (*Pravda*, February 5, 1933, and *Za. Ind.*, December 2, 1932, and January 4, 1933.)

If Communism is the friend of the downtrodden, why does it refuse to increase fixed wages which is but only an increase of bonus for exceeding an ever-increasing quota (*Izvestia*, January 15, 1936), and why did it abolish a minimum wage law? (*Izvestia*, November 12, 1936.)

If Communism is the friend of the downtrodden, why, while professing equality, does it permit Red leaders a salary of 20,000 rubles a month and workmen only 184 rubles? (*Za. Ind.*, January 2, 1936.)

Profiteering in Bread

If Communism is the friend of those starved through lack of relief, why does Russia, in a country which boasts of no middlemen, sell bread to the peasants at a fee sometimes nineteen times more than is paid the peasants for wheat? (*Izvestia*, September 26, 1935.)

If Communism is a friend of those starved through lack of relief, why does it produce only one pair of shoes per year for every 2.5 persons, and shoes whose soles come off after ten to fifteen days? (*Izvestia*, June 24, 1934.)

If Communism is a friend of those starved through lack of relief, why did it give up the bread cards and force the poor to buy in commercial shops, at prices so

advanced that the State could profit on hungry stomachs to the tune of twenty-four billion rubles? (*Za. Ind.*, February 9, 1935.)

If Communism is a friend of those starved through lack of relief, why did M. Kalenine explain the shortage of crops by saying the people ate too much bread? (*Izvestia*, January 10, 1935.)

If Communism is a friend of those starved through lack of relief, why during 1932-34 did it allow between three and seven million people to starve, and why even during that famine did the *Pravda Severa*, the Archangel Soviet Organ, under date of February 1, 1933, state that the "first duty" of every peasant and worker was to "fight" for the fulfillment of the export program, and the non-fulfillment of this duty would be "direct sabotage"?

Now Communism cannot have it both ways: it cannot be in the "forefront of battle" for the starved and at the same time tell the starved their "first duty" is to export.

Paid Starvation Wages

If Communism is the friend of the starved why does it not pay a living wage to its workers? The figures given herewith are, as usual, taken from Communist sources. The *Commission of State Planning* (Gosplan), published in 1936, a booklet showing the "increase" in wages, namely, in 1934 the average monthly salary was 150 rubles a month, and in 1935 189 rubles a month. This, of course, is not the real average, which is much lower, but only the average for 24,741,000 workers and State employees. Of the 145,000,000 other workers they quote no figures. But let us take their figures, which represents the highest aver-

age, and proceed to inquire how much a Communist worker can buy with 189 rubles a month or about 6.3 rubles a day. The food prices we here quote from the *Izvestia* of September 26, 1935. Butter is 7.5 rubles a pound and sugar 2 rubles a pound. This means that one of the better paid *Russian workmen does not earn enough to buy one pound of butter a day!* Those on relief in America receive more than that per day!

If Communism is the friend of the starved, why does it take back in taxes from 25 to 31 per cent of the already meager salary of the worker? Why does it charge him 200 to 240 rubles for a pair of shoes, and 220 to 300 rubles for a suit? It is sheer nonsense to say that Communism helps the worker when after nineteen years of it, a worker cannot earn enough in a month to buy a pair of shoes. Under our capitalist system with all of its defects a worker earning \$90.00 a month could buy at least 18 pairs of shoes. If Communistic prices prevailed here, he would pay \$100.00 for a pair. Before the war in Russia, the average salary of the day laborer was 18 to 24 rubles, with which he could buy between 792 and 1,056 pounds of bread. Now, after nineteen years of Communism when the day laborer receives 90 to 110 rubles he can buy only 308 pounds of bread. And what is worse, a Communist worker cannot always be sure the State will have the necessities of life to sell. According to *Soviet Commerce*, April 8, 1936, "in the city of Marioupol, 20 stores had no sugar, 28 no tea, 40 no cereal, and 10 no macaroni." But Stalin says: "Life is becoming better"!

If Communism is the friend of the starved, why does it allow in the city population only twenty-two pounds of meat per person, per year (*Izvestia*, December 10, 1935), a decline of fifty pounds a year per per-

son since 1929? (*Sovietskaia Torgovlia*, January 10, 1930.) This figure represents less than two pounds of meat per month, or about eight ounces of meat per week, or a little over an ounce a day.

(b) Is Communism battling for "those who are seeking to keep a home together"? Yes, when it talks to Americans; No, when it talks to those who are under the Dictatorship of Communism. If Communism is trying "to keep a home together," why did it confiscate property and disrupt the family life by Article 144 of the Family Code, which stipulated that if a woman could not tell who, among several men, was the father of her child, that all the men should share the expense?

If Communism is "trying to keep a home together," why did Chevtssov hand down a decision that "there is no such thing as a woman being violated by a man; he who says that a violation is wrong denies the October Communist Revolution. To defend a violated woman is to reveal oneself as a bourgeois and a partisan of private property"? (*Outchit Gazeta*, October 10, 1929.)

If Communism is interested in "keeping the home together," why does it allow seven million Bezprizornye (homeless, abandoned children) to roam the streets? And the testimony for this statement is no less than Madame Kroupskaia, the widow of Lenin (*Izvestia*, No. 51), who added, "Let us not make ourselves stupid and say: 'Go to your parents, or to the children's homes.' There are no more parents! And the children's homes no longer exist."

Russia Is Eager for War

(c) Is Communism in the forefront of battle for those "who wish so deeply to be saved from the ravages of war"? Yes, whenever anyone wages war against Communist dictatorship; No, whenever Communism seeks an opportunity to impose Communist dictatorship on other nations.

If Communism is "in the forefront ever" in the battle against war, why does Russia have such a tremendous Army and Navy? And why does it speak of "world revolution," and "being victorious throughout the world"?

If Communism expected to establish itself through peaceful means, it would not seek to be a world conqueror through revolution? The answer, of course, to the riddle is that Communism makes this equation: Peace equals Communist dictatorship under Stalin. Therefore, they say, they are justified in waging war "to establish peace."

If Communism seeks to save us "from the ravages of war," why, when M. Paul Boncour said in the French Senate "If Russia continues to organize her revolutions at home, she has nevertheless become more conservative abroad" (*Journal Officiel*, January 17, 1934), did Russia immediately disclaim conservatism and love of peace in these words: "With Lenin's standard we conquered in the struggle of the October Revolution. . . . With the same standard we shall be victors in the proletarian revolution throughout the world"? (*Izvestia*, January 21, 1934.)

If Communism is seeking to save us "from the ravages of war," why did Manuilsky at the Third International Congress, August, 1935, say: "Our

Party, our people and our country, educated by Stalin . . . will be true to the ideals of proletarian internationalism . . . until the last drop of blood”?

Planned Revolution in Spain

If Communism wishes to save us “from the ravages of war,” why did the *Pravda* under date of May 10 and 11, 1931 (5 years before the present Civil War in Spain), speak of the necessity of starting a revolution in Spain and “driving soldiers into the Soviets” and “getting hold of the soldier masses as one of the means of arming the revolution”? Is not a civil war a war, and the worst of all wars? If Communism seeks to prevent “the ravages of war,” why did the *Izvestia* of October 20 and 22, 1934, state that the Spanish civil war was “a struggle for Soviet power” and “the Soviets have directed the fight”? (Note the date: 1934.)

If Communism seeks to prevent “the ravages of war,” why does the Communist Party state “there does not exist for the proletariat any peaceful means toward power”? (*Int. Press Corr.*, November 5, 1934.) If Communism never wrote another line, that line would be enough to condemn it.

In America we believe that there are peaceful means to power. And to argue there is no “peaceful means to power” and at the same time say that Communism is for peace, is nothing short of nonsense.

If Communism seeks to prevent the “ravages of war,” why did Ercoli, in his August speech before the Third International Congress (1935), state that the reasons the Communists failed in the Spanish revolution of 1934 was because the Communists in Spain “were not up to the level of the teachings of Marx and Engels in the art of insurrection”?

Seeks Destruction of Capitalism

If Communism is such a lover of peace, why does it permit its American secretary, in his work *What Is Communism?* to advocate a revolution on the part of the soldiers and sailors against the government, on the ground that "all revolutions have been made with weapons which the overthrown rulers have relied on for their protection" (p. 165)?

If Communism is such a lover of peace, why does the official daily of Moscow, the *Izvestia*, state that "under the direction of Stalin, the U. S. S. R. is today not only a State organized by a party of the World Proletariat, but a State whose power accelerates the destruction of capitalism"? (No. 31, February 5, 1935.)

Is destruction of property the way to peace? And why does your "Official Program" speak of "continuing class struggle after the civil war" (p. 48), and why do the *International Press Correspondence* and the *Daily Worker* both advocate: "Down with the non-intervention pacts" and "Stop the murderous policy of neutrality"? (*Int. Press Corr.*, October 24, 1936, Vol. 16, No. 48, p. 1288.) Are class-struggle, revolution and destruction the paths to peace? And if it be answered in the language of Dimitrov, that it is a "war for peace," may I ask what kind of peace the world will have after a world revolution?

The Wreck of Spain

It will take Spain at least a century to restore itself, and it would take the world longer than that. In any case, since when is world revolution the path to world peace? You might just as well say that wholesale

robbery is the way to world justice. The Communist solution of peace through war, violence and revolution makes me suspect Communism, much in the same way I suspect the love of the husband who immediately after the marriage ceremony began beating his wife, saying, "You may not know it now, dear, but this is just the beginning of our honeymoon."

Question 2: "Monsignor Sheen now admits (in the report in the *New York Herald-Tribune* of December 14, 1936) that 'there is something very good about Communism. That good is its protest against low wages, accumulation of wealth, the conditions of the poor, imperialism and the condition of the working man. That is its appeal.' If this be true then why wage war upon this 'something very good'?"

Answer: Because it is good only in its protests, and it is wrong, as I said in the same speech, in its methods and in its reforms. The very fact that the above question should be asked proves that the questioner identified the revolutionary overthrow of the existing order with the love of the poor. I repeat, the two are not identified. I can protest against drunkenness without being a Prohibitionist. I can protest against throwing eggs at Communist lecturers, without forever raising my clenched fist as a symbol of destruction, and I can protest against social injustice without being a Communist, for the simple reason that none of these solutions is the only way out of the difficulties.

Right in Its Protests

Communism is right then in its protests, but so is every man who protests against social injustice. This means that Communism has no monopoly on protests.

But though Communism is right in its protests it is wrong in its (a) *methods* and its (b) *reforms*.

(a) It is wrong in its *method* which is violence. The official Communist Program in speaking of the method of establishing Communist Dictatorship always uses words associated with violence: a "period of civil war" . . . "national wars and colonial rebellions" . . . "armed conflict" . . . "world revolution" . . . "forcible invasion" . . . "conquest of power" . . . "ruthless suppression" . . . "stern violence" . . . "instrument of suppression" . . . "mercilessly suppress the slightest opposition" . . . "systematically and unswervingly combatting" . . . (pp. 34, 35, 48, 49 and 53).

Communists may justify this on their Philosophy of Dialectical Materialism, but suppose some one else justifies violence on his philosophy as do the Syndicalists in Spain? Any argument which justifies a Communist Revolution, must necessarily justify an anti-Communist Revolution, and then it becomes a free for all.

Furthermore, the Communistic theory of violence implies restraint and control of the very forces which violence releases. But this is impossible. You cannot blow up boilers and expect them to limit their pressure to 100 pounds a square inch when they come down. It is like resorting to explosives to move your house. Spain proves this, for there Communism has already discovered that it cannot control the Anarchist groups which it invited into its Revolution (*Int. Press Corr.*, October 24, 1936, Vol. 46, No. 48, p. 1287ff; November 21, 1936, Vol. 16, No. 52, p. 1293).

And again, violence must not be the first principle of social reform as it is with the Communists (Program of the Communist International, p. 34). No **man**

and no nation has a right to use it until the resources of reason are exhausted.

And if it be answered that the dictatorship of the proletariat endures only until the Paradise of Communism is established, it might be interesting to know how long that will be? Russia still has its dictatorship over the proletariat under Stalin, even after nineteen years, and there is no indication that he is ready to surrender his dictatorship. Rather, through the execution of his rivals, he seems to be bearing out the truth of Lenin's warning: "Stalin is bent on concentrating power in his hands and I am not sure that he always knows how to use it . . . Stalin is too rude, and becomes insupportable. . . . Therefore, I propose to the comrades to find a way to remove Stalin." (Lenin's Will of January 4, 1923.)

It is not at all unlikely that if Stalin continues in power another five years, either Dimitrov, Litvinoff, or Radek,¹ and possibly all three, will be executed by Stalin the same as Kamenev and Zinoviev, both of whom stood in the way of Stalin's passion for power.

There is absolutely no justification for Communist violence; not even a distortion of historical facts can justify it, as Earl Browder attempted to do in his reference to the Revolutionary War on page 16 of his book, *What Is Communism?*: "Our American giants of 1776 were the 'international incendiaries' of their day." Without further delay, let it be said that this is a perversion of an historical truth. If Communism is entitled to be revolutionary because we had a Revolutionary War, then we might just as well become logically

¹ Since this line was written Radek was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment.

absurd, and say that every American should take a sea trip because our soldiers in 1917 crossed the Atlantic. Furthermore, why does it follow that the Communists have the unique right to be revolutionary? Why has not every fool and his party an equal right? Why should it be the privilege of the Communists? If it is the privilege of one group, it is the privilege of all, for that is the meaning of revolution.

Case of Bad Logic

By the same bad logic an automobile driver could argue that the Revolutionary War gave him the privilege of being revolutionary against traffic laws and driving through red lights, especially because they are the Communists color. To return to the point, the Revolutionary War is the one thing that tells against Communism instead of for it. The reason of the Revolutionary War was to throw off a foreign yoke. *The real heirs of the revolution therefore are those who in 1937 seek to throw off the yoke of Russia as the Fathers of 1776 fought to throw off the yoke of England.* If they want to be real Americans then let them be revolutionists against Moscow. That is the way to love America and not by seeking to overthrow its government by making Communists out of the Army and the Navy.

If it be objected that the Christian believes in violence for the Kingdom of Heaven "suffereth violence" it must be answered that the violence of the Christians is poles apart from Communistic violence. The Communist believes in violence against his neighbor; the Christian believes in violence against himself, *i. e.*, against his pride, his selfishness, his sinfulness, his

hate, in a word, against those lower passions which would make of him a Communist.

(b) Not only is Communism wrong in its *methods*; it is also wrong in its *reforms*, for it cures overpossession by dispossession and transforms the individual selfishness of the worst forms of Capitalism into the collective selfishness of Communism. The Communistic Official Program in treating the "tasks of the proletarian dictatorship" uses the word "confiscation" five times in speaking of "Industry, Transport, and Communication" (p. 40) and once in reference to "Housing" (p. 43). Now, it is well to remember that because the State "confiscates Industry, Transport, Communication and Housing" it does not become any less dishonest than if another nation did it, or a Capitalist did it.

Stealing does not become right when done by a Big State any more than when it is done by Big Business or even by Communists. And quite apart from its ethical aspects, the Communist remedy for Capitalistic excesses is to make the State Capitalistic. The Christian also admits that Capital has been able to "claim all the products and profits and leave the laborer the barest minimum to repair his strength" (*Quadragesimo Anno* of Pius XI) but he seeks to correct the injustice not by dispossession but by distribution. "Each class must receive its due share, and the distribution of created goods must be brought into conformity with the demands of the common good and social justice" (*Quadragesimo Anno*). In other words, because there are rats in the barn, do not burn the barn; drive out the rats.

Just what other reforms are wrong is evident from the facts given in answer to Question 1. But further defects in reform will be mentioned when we

come to the question concerning democratic rights. For the present, suffice it to say that the very fact that Communism should have made two Five-Year Plans concerning *things*, before it made a Plan for *persons*, is the strongest proof that it is not "something very good" in its reforms. Walter Lippmann suggests that the reason Russia reformed industry rather than social conditions is because she was preparing for war—Aye! even that "lover of peace."

"This brings us to the question of whether in its subsequent development Russian collectivism has continued to be predominantly military in its aims and methods. To prove that it has been, the argument must go deeper and must show that the purpose which has dominated the fundamental decisions of those who have planned Russian economy is a military purpose, that the economy is organized not to improve the popular standard of life as rapidly as possible but to make Russia a formidable military power.

"The proof is to be found in the fact that the two Five-Year Plans have had as their primary objective the creation of heavy industries in the strategically invulnerable parts of Russia, and that to finance this industrial development the Russian people have been subjected to years of forced privation.

"If the primary purpose of these plans was the improvement of the standard of life, can it be seriously argued that the erection of steel plants would have been put ahead of the manufacture of clothes, that food would have been exported while the people went hungry in order to buy machinery to make goods which could have been bought direct at cheaper prices? No doubt the idealists believe that in giving the people steel instead of bread they are creating for the future a self-sufficient industrial system on the Socialist pat-

tern. But why is it necessary to make Soviet Russia self-sufficient?

“Why was it necessary to aim at self-sufficiency even in the years when Germany and most of central Europe were ruled by social democrats? Because, as the Communists have repeatedly insisted, they live in dread of an ‘imperialist war.’ In other words, they did not choose steel rather than bread in order to prove that Communism could do anything that Capitalism could do, they chose steel because they wished to be self-sufficient against a military blockade.

Preparing for War

“I do not mean to argue that Russian Communists have not done many incidental things which are not military in purpose. But I think it evident that the fundamental decision as to the form of the political state, the plan of the economy, the determining policies of the régime, are what they are because Russia has been preparing for war on her European and her Asiatic frontiers.” (Walter Lippmann, *Atlantic Monthly*, December, 1936, p. 740, paragraph 9.)

Communism, then, in answer to the question is right in its protests but wrong in its method and in its reform. That is why I can praise it for its protests, just as I can praise the Socialist, the Republican, the Democrat, the Protestant, the Jew or the Catholic for exactly the same protest. But protests do not make a program. I am even willing to protest with you Communists against the treatments accorded Earl Browder in Terre Haute, but that does not mean that I believe with Earl Browder in “making a revolution” in America (*What Is Communism?*, p. 162). *There is absolutely no ex-*

cuse for being violent to those who, if they were in power, would be violent to us.

Question 3: "Why not coöperate with the Communists against that slimy movement which breeds off imperialism and war, shouting its war cries to the world—Fascism?"

Answer: Because Communism can be just as "slimy" as Fascism and sometimes more "slimy." Because I am not a Communist, it does not follow that I am a Fascist, any more than because I am not an ardent hockey fan, therefore I am a fanatic about bridge. Communism and Fascism are not mutually exclusive systems as your propaganda would have simple souls believe. Communism and Fascism are fruits of the same tree of the Totalitarian State, and agree in these two important errors: (1) Dictatorship by the absorption of the individual into the Omnipotent State; (2) suppression of minorities, denial of freedom of the press, radio and rival parties.

There are, it is true, some important differences between Communism and Fascism and Nazism and they are that the latter two do not necessarily believe in confiscation of property, nor in atheism. This is an extremely important point and I am very glad you asked the question, because it gives an opportunity to clarify the atmosphere. Since the Seventh Annual Congress, when Dimitrov and others decided to launch a campaign against Fascism, Communism and its press have attempted to create the impression that unless the world becomes Communist it will become Fascist. In one part of your article you even go so far as to suggest that "unless" we become Communists we will be the victims of the Black Legion. Well, if suffer we must, then God grant that the Black Legion inflict the suffering, for their atrocities pale into insignificance.

compared to what humanity has suffered at the hands of Communists.

False Propaganda

But to return to the point. We do not become Fascists if we do not become Communists. We might become a dozen or more different types of peoples, none of which are Fascists or Nazis or Communists. Many American people have been fooled by this false propaganda, that is why those who favor one form of dictatorship ignore the dictatorship of another, quite forgetful that Hitler and Stalin, for example, are both dictators. The sympathizers with Italy are outraged by German persecutions; the sympathizers with Hitler are scandalized at Stalin's deportations and Communist sympathizers are horrified at both. The Catholic Church always comes in between the fire of both. The Communists accuse the Pope of being "the spearhead of Fascism" and the Nazis, on the other hand, in their official organ *Der Angriff*, say the purpose of Cardinal Pacelli's visit to the United States was part of a scheme to prevent the spread of Nazism.

Albert Joy Nock put this position rather strongly: "When we talk about Communism, Fascism and Nazism as if they stood for three different things—which most of us do—we are talking nonsense. They are three kinds of hooey, standing for the same thing—absolutism. So if we want to know what is really taking place in Europe, it is not a conflict of creeds or ideas. Not even in Spain is there any such conflict; the conflict there is between two sets of prehensile shysters, one of which has control of the Spanish taxing machine, and the other is trying to get control of it." (*American Mercury*, January, 1937, p. 103.) This is true to some extent, for the Spanish conflict has long

ceased to be one among the Spanish people themselves; it is a war in which France and Russia help one side, and Germany and Italy help the other, with the disadvantage of destroying their own property by fighting on their "home grounds." As Senator Borah so well put it: "It is a fight between groups of nations fighting out their battle on Spanish soil. And it is certainly to be regretted that any American citizen would want to do anything to indicate the attitude of the American people." (*Washington Post*, December 30, 1936.)

This claptrap of saying that if we do not take sides in the Spanish civil war we are "enemies of democracy" must be stopped. As Raymond Clapper, the Scripps-Howard correspondent put it: "It is one thing to have our opinion about the conduct of Germany and Italy, in assisting this Fascist attempt to destroy the Spanish Republic. It is something else again for our citizens to undertake to buy supplies for one side or the other. We in this country would resent any attempt to use America as a recruiting ground for Fascist troops. It would seem equally undesirable to attempt here to munition the loyalist side unless we are prepared to become the world's policeman. . . . The question for the United States to decide is whether we want to make another attempt to play the big policeman with the world for our beat, and make Europe take democracy and like it, or whether we can do more good by tending to our own business and demonstrating that in one corner of the world, at least, people have not gone completely crazy." (*Washington News*, December 18, 1936.)

Murder of Children

Instead of allowing me to answer the above question, you put an answer into my mouth which I must repudiate: "No, Monsignor Sheen must turn his attack upon the Communists remaining largely silent about the Fascist foe that threatens the homes, the liberties and the little children of the Catholic people."

The Fascists again! That word is waved in front of us in just the same way the bullfighters wave a Communist flag before the bull to enrage him. It may work with bulls, but not with men. Why do you assume that because a Fascist threatens "home, liberties and the little children of Catholic people" that I must therefore remain silent?

Since when do "children of Catholic people" become less precious because a German bomb drops on them in Madrid, rather than a Russian bomb? Does murder become less murder because a soldier with an outstretched arm does it, any less than a soldier with a clenched fist? As a matter of fact, one is just as vicious as the other, and if I have spoken less about Fascist murders it is because they are insignificant when compared to Communist murders and terrors. And if you challenge me to prove this statement, I will give some facts from Communistic sources which will positively make your hair stand on end. But I will not accept the challenge of a writer of the *Daily Worker* unless he prints my answer in the *Daily Worker*. Suffice it to say, presently, that the speech of Molotov at the Sixth Congress of Soviets in March, 1931, has some sorry tales about the prisoners in the labor camps in the north. And how could cruelty be any other consequence of Communism, when its "dead god" Lenin justifies it, not as an accident, nor as a prelude to Com-

munism, but as its basic principle? I refer to the letter Lenin wrote on May 17, 1921, to Comrade Kursky which appeared in the *Bolshevik*, October 31, 1930:

“The legal trial is not intended to replace terrorism; to make such a profession would be deception of others or oneself; *but to base terrorism firmly on a fundamental principle and give it legal form . . .*”²

This terrorism the Communists would inflict upon the rest of the world under the deceitful “front”: “Preserve democratic rights.” Since when does “terrorism” as a fundamental principle equal democracy? We refuse to have the issue clouded by throwing the dust of “Fascism” into our eyes. If Fascism means destruction of democratic liberties; if Fascism means dictatorship; if Fascism means suppression of minorities and denial of freedom of the press and radio; if Fascism means the exaltation of the State as supreme and the submergence of the individual into collectivity, then Communism is Fascism gone mad. Then the only difference between Hitler and Stalin is that Stalin is more skilled in the art of terrorism and as the Seventh Annual Congress put it, “the art of insurrection.”

A few years ago Lady Astor asked Stalin in an unguarded moment: “How long will you continue murdering people?” and Stalin answered: “As long as it is necessary.”

Reaction to Communism

If the Communists are so interested in keeping Fascism out of America there is one sure way to do it, and that is to keep out Communism. And why? Because Fascism has always arisen as a reaction against

² The *Daily Worker* never published a single word of this reply to their question.

Communism. It did so in Germany, in Italy, in Spain; it is doing so presently in England and in France and it will arise here if we allow Communism to grow. When a group which starts abolishing private property of a productive character, and identifying party and government, and suppressing all opposition by murder and by exile, there is bound to be a reaction, and the reaction generally produced is Fascism.

Just suppose a small village of five hundred souls had no burglar in it. That means that there would not be a single lock upon any door. Now imagine one burglar bent on violence entering that town. That would mean that five hundred locks would have to be put on the five hundred homes. Suppose that twelve burglars bent on violence entered the little town. Then police would have to be organized as a protection against their violence. Now suppose that the Communists enter, not a town of five hundred, but into a nation. Some kind of lock has to be made to keep them out, and the lock which is presently made in most countries of the world is Fascism. If you want to keep locks off your doors, keep out the burglars; and if you want to keep Fascism out of your country, keep out the Communists.

Departments of health always have to organize where there is an epidemic. Police patrols must increase when there are robberies, and nations must intensify their authority when there is Communism. If then we do not want Fascism in America, we must not permit that thing to exist which calls it into being—namely, Communism. If we wish to keep away one, we must necessarily keep away the other. We cannot breed rats in abundance without being obliged to use rat poison, and so neither can we breed Communism without being obliged to use the poison of Fascism.

Question 4: "Monsignor Sheen says 'The Commu-

nists' protest against Fascism is not a just one. When a Communist uses the word "Fascist" he means anti-Communist. To every Communist, every priest is a Fascist and all who oppose Communism are Fascists.' Come, come, Monsignor Sheen. When have Communists declared that every priest is a Fascist? It has never been done, and we challenge you to give proof of such an assertion."

Answer: Come, come and I will show you! First turn to Kuusinen's pamphlet, *The Youth Movement and Fight Against Fascism*. On page 31 he explicitly states that "Catholic priests" are the force which is preventing Communism from organizing the youth against Fascism. Turn next to your official *International Press Correspondence*, Vol. 16, No. 25, November 21, 1936, p. 1293, and read: "With Fascist leaders . . . march the Bishops." Next turn to the same official organ of November 21, 1936, Vol. 16, No. 52, p. 1376, and read: "The Fascists are the priests' beloved sons in whom they are well pleased." Now look up the *Communist*, December, 1936, p. 1169, and read where Ercoli identifies "the clergy and the Jesuits" with the Fascists in no complimentary terms. Now back to the *International Press Correspondence*, September 19, 1936, p. 1182: "The Vatican is officially taking sides with Fascist generals. . . . The Pope is the spearhead of international Fascism." . . . "It is clear that he is advocating the introduction of Fascism into every country."

Counter Challenge

I am rather surprised that a Communist is not more familiar with Communistic literature and should have asked for texts. But there they are. And now let us issue a challenge: We challenge you to prove the state-

ment that "the Vatican is taking sides with Fascist generals," and that the Holy Father "is advocating the introduction of Fascism into every country."

Question 5: "Is it not the Communists who are fighting in Germany for the freedom of worship for Catholic priests, hunted and hounded by the madman Hitler?"

Answer: It is true that Hitler is hindering freedom of worship in Germany, but the *Daily Worker* must know at least one Communist dictator who closed the churches of Russia, and is probably familiar with Clause 121 of the Criminal Code of Russia penalizing all religious teaching. It is true, as stated in your article, that "Hitler foamed at the mouth at Nuremburg about his desire for Soviet soil," but we must not forget that the Soviets foam at the mouth in Moscow in their desire for the conquest of the world.

But it is not true that the Communists "are fighting in Germany for the Catholic priests," because the Bishops of Germany at the Fulda Conference last summer said the Communists were fighting the Church in Germany. It is also worth noting that on Sunday, January 3rd, the Bishops of Germany published a pastoral letter which stated: "We Catholics know that if Moscow's armies should—which God forbid—carry the red flag victoriously through central and western Europe, everything would be transformed into ruin and churchly life also would be plunged into chaos and destruction." There is the official attitude of the German Catholics about Communism despite the handicaps under which they must live under Hitler. Furthermore, is it not true that before Hitler's decree of 1932 the Communist Party in Germany boasted of 5,000,000 affiliates of the militant atheists of Moscow? Do

friends of religion spread irreligion? Do lovers of cleanliness spread dirt?

And at this moment, if the Communists in Germany are defending religion and the Church, why do they publish clandestinely the *Proletarische Freidenkerstimme* which is avowedly anti-religious, and why in their atheistic sheet for the German youth do they publish *Das Proletarische Kind*, the tenth issue of which states: "Organize atheist evenings in opposition to that out-of-date thing, Christmas." The answer to the above question then can be given by leaving out the word "for" in the question; thus making it: "The Communists in Germany are fighting freedom of worship for the Catholic priests."

Black Legion and Klan

Question 6: "Is it not the Communists who have opposed to the very limit the Black Legion and the Ku Klux Klan in America?"

Answer: I was under the impression that it was the legally constituted courts of the State of Michigan which broke up the Black Legion and that it was (a) the depression and (b) the innate good sense of the American people which broke up the Klan. After all, why are all decent Americans opposed to the Black Legion and the Klan? Is it not because both take law into their own hands, and thus are subversive of legal justice administered by the courts? Despite the Communistic opposition then to the Black Legion and the Klan, why do the Communists stand in principle for the same subversion of legal justice, the same taking of law into their own hands, for the Official Program of the Communist Party, on page 36 advocates "the violent overthrow of the judiciary"?

Question 7: "Is it not the Communists who have stood with the Basque priests not only for democracy in Spain, but also for the right of those priests to freedom of worship?"

Answer: No. And in order to answer this question with facts we have gone to the two men who should know—namely, the Bishops of the two dioceses in the Basque country: the Most Rev. Marcellino Claechea of Loizago, Bishop of Pamplona, and the Most Rev. Matteo Mugica y Urrestarazu, Bishop of Vitoria. On August 6th they published a joint pastoral letter describing the conditions in their dioceses. They open their letter with the words: "By virtue of this paternity which forces us, like the Apostle, to multiply efforts to make you in the Image of Christ, we speak to you today when our sacred land is drenched with blood generously shed by the children of this land." Then they pass on to fix the blame for this bloodshed, and where do they place it? At the doors of "the modern monster:—Communism . . . which wants all, and because at the end of the struggle, when we find ourselves reduced to a minority, face to face with an enemy irreconcilable as to its principles and its social objective, we would behold ourselves in the lamentable situation which is that of minorities in autocratic régime."

Bogey of Fascism

Question 8: "We invite you and the Catholic people to join in a united fight for the preservation of democratic rights and against the black danger of Fascism. Coöperating with those who have ever been in the front ranks in this fight for democracy."

Answer: (a) There is that bogey "Fascism" again.

Let us stick to the facts. Thanks for the invitation, but we Catholics and all Americans must decline the invitation to the "United Front" and why? Simply because it is a front. A front is a camouflage and deceit to be removed when it has served its purpose. Communism has two faces: one it shows in Russia where it is established, the other it shows to the rest of the world where it hopes to be established. "United Front," "Popular Front" merely mean new tactics are used to present or to disguise the same revolutionary philosophy which has enslaved Russia. The proofs are these: The Seventh Annual Congress of the Third International which was held in Moscow, July and August, 1935, was described by Dimitrov as a new tactical approach. As Kuusinen put it: "Whom the gods would destroy, they must first make blind." (*The Youth Movement*, p. 30.) We refuse to be blinded and that is why we shall not be destroyed.

(b) The change contemplated by the Congress was the use of non-revolutionary methods to attain revolutionary ends. "Comrades, we intentionally expunged from the reports as well as from the decision of the Congress high-sounding phrases on the revolutionary perspective. We did this not because we have any ground for appraising the tempo of revolutionary developments less optimistically than before."

The new procedure, he continues, "is to fulfill at every stage of the movement the tasks that are in the interests of revolution, the tasks that correspond to the specific conditions of a given stage, we accelerate, more than in any other way, the creation of the subjective pre-conditions necessary for the victory of the proletarian revolution." (Dimitrov, *The Working Class Against Fascism*, p. 165.) In other words, "suppress the language of revolution, but not revolutionary intentions,"

or "give the people only as much Communism as they will absorb any given moment."

In order to better disguise the revolutionary intentions, Dimitrov recommended the drawing of a red herring across the path of the people—namely, Fascism, which he characterized as "the bestial hatred of other nations." (*The Working Class Against Fascism*, p. 9.) It was only natural for Communists at the Congress to notice the new line of approach. Manuilsky stated the difficulty and met it this way: "But, say our opponents, the new tactics of the Communist International contradict the old tactics. Well, even if they do, what's wrong with that?" (*The Work of the Seventh Congress*, p. 54.) Nothing is wrong with it except dishonesty and untruthfulness. Accordingly, Dimitrov recommended for America the two "fronts" of "a League Against War and Fascism" and "a Farmer-Labor Party" (*op. cit.*), both of which Browder on his return from Moscow recommended in his book (*op. cit.*, pp. 112, 179) despite the fact that on page 205 he says: "No, the Communist Party does not take orders from Moscow."

Principles Camouflaged

(c) The new disguises of the United and Popular Fronts do not mean that Communism has given up any of its revolutionary or atheistic principles—it only means it has camouflaged them. "Tactics, generally, may change, but the general line of the Communist International, the course it is steering for the proletarian revolution . . . remains unchanged." (Manuilsky, *op. cit.*, p. 65.) And lest anyone live under an illusion that Communism has ceased to be Communistic because of its new "front," Manuilsky warns: "Only downright scoundrels . . . and hopeless idiots can think that by

means of the United Front tactics that Communism is capitulating to social democracy." (*Op cit.*, p. 59.)

Ercoli quotes Lenin in defense of such a "front": "It is possible to conquer the most powerful enemy only . . . by taking advantage of every opportunity, however small, of gaining an ally among the masses, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional. Those who do not understand this do not understand even a grain of Marxism." (*Int. Press Corr.*, October 1, 1935, Vol. 15, No. 49, p. 1238.) There is then not the slightest doubt that the United Front is only the burrowing from within, or the "attack on the rear" as Kuusinen puts it, and the starting point of revolution. As the Official Program states: "The task of the party is to utilize these minor everyday needs as a starting point from which to lead the working class to the revolutionary struggle for power. (p. 80.) When there is no revolutionary upsurge the Communistic party must advance partial slogans." (p. 81.) That is why in America Communism presents only partial slogans; it talks about the rights of the poor, about the dangers of Fascism, but it says nothing about its full program, which is abolition of private ownership, overthrow of the government, suppression of religion and the disruption of democratic rights.

Not only does Communism attempt to disguise its real purpose by partial slogans, but it even warns those who do join in the United Front that they dare not use Communism to attain their ends. That is another reason why Americans must decline the invitation to join the United Front. Lest we should have any illusions concerning the real character of Communism, it might be well to recall the words of Dimitrov: "Whoever attempts to damage the iron unity of our party by any sort of factionalism will soon learn, to his cost,

what Bolshevik discipline, as taught to us by Lenin and Stalin, really means. Let this be a warning to those isolated elements in individual parties, who hope to exploit the difficulties of their parties, the bitterness of defeat, or the blows of a furious enemy, to carry out their factional plans or to pursue clique interests. The party must be above everything.

“Guard the Bolshevik unity of your party like the apple of your eye—that is the first and supreme law of Bolshevism.” (*Int. Press Corr.*, January 22, 1936, Vol. 16, No. 5, p. 137.) This means, in plain, simple language, that the workers, the unemployed, the victims of social injustice who join the Communist United Front eventually find themselves under Communist dictatorship. A policy of that kind is just as vicious as offering gifts to a person in order to effect the ruination of that person.

Dictatorship Their Aim

Still more important is the fact that Communists admit among themselves that the purpose of the United Front is not the preservation of democracy nor religion nor the rights of the workers, but only the establishment of Communistic dictatorship: “The final aim of the United Front is the building of the Communist or Collectivist Society.” (*The Communist*, April, 1936, p. 365.) Now, is that fair? Communism asks Americans to join the United Front to “preserve democratic rights” and then, when we do join, we find that we dare not “violate Bolshevik discipline” nor hope for anything else than a “Communist Society.” This is not honest. You tell us you stand for the defense of religion, and then your secretary, Earl Browder, tells us:

"We Communists stand without any reservation for education that will root out all beliefs in the supernatural." (*What Is Communism?*, p. 191.) We only hope that this line of Mr. Browder will always have as little effect on the American people as his speech in Moscow had on Stalin, who said: "I do not recall the speech of Browder. . . . I do not even recall what he talked about." (*Int. Press Corr.*, March 14, 1936, Vol. 16, No. 14.)

No! We Catholics cannot join your United Front because we have found you out. We know the Front is only a front, and we think the less of Communism for insulting our intelligence. We even do not like book agents who gain admittance to our office by the "United Front tactics," *e. g.*, of telling us they want to discuss religion. How much more, then, we must reject the proposal of those who would betray our liberties with the kiss of Judas?

May we make a suggestion to the Communists? Now that we know your "new front" is only a front, why not give it up? After all, every disguise becomes ineffective as soon as it is known to be a disguise. Masquerades always fail when one knows who is behind the mask. Why not be honest and assert Communism as it is? We would think the more of Communism for doing so, because at least it would be honest. *Under the "tactics" plan, however, you will neither assert what Communism really stands for, because America will not stand for it; nor will you deny what it really stands for, because the International Communist Party would not stand for it.* Tell us openly about the final aims of Communism and spare America the sad task of discovering its real purpose when it is too late, *i. e.*, after Communists have started, as their Program states, "a civil war."

Now, to pass on to the second half of your question: You invite Catholics to join in Communism to "fight for the preservation of democratic rights and against the black danger of Fascism." Fascism may be the black danger, but Communism is the red one. Incidentally, that is why we will not join your "front," the "League Against War and Fascism," namely, because you leave Communism out of the title. If Communism is such a lover of democracy, let it start a league against subversive organizations, entitled: "League Against War, Fascism and Communism" *and we will join.*

Preservation of Rights

Now to get down to the problem of the preservation of democratic rights. What are they? The most important ones are these:

1. The right to own one's own business as the extension of human personality and to buy and sell articles in that business.

2. The right not only to agree with a government policy, but also the right to disagree or dissent either publicly or by secret ballot.

3. The right of workingmen to unite in unions to protect their interests and to strike, if need be, to attain legitimate wages and working conditions.

4. The right to practice religion and to propagandize it.

5. The right to freedom of the press and freedom of speech.

These are democratic rights, but the new Soviet Constitution, which the *Daily Worker* said "manifested a genuine care for human beings for the first

time in history" (November 5, 1936), *does not grant a single one of these rights*: It not only abstains from granting these democratic rights, it even prohibits them.

1. The right to own property as the extension of personality is denied, for Articles 5-9 of the New Constitution state that all the property which is confiscated is either State property or Collectivist property. Article 9 explicitly outlaws property of the above-mentioned kind on the ground that it "exploits others." Even commenting on this same Article 9, which "allows" small plots the *Pravda* of June 14, 1936, stated that this article did not allow automobiles, except in the rare cases of "workers who distinguished themselves in an exceptional manner."

2. The democratic right to decide government policies is also denied by the Soviet Constitution. There is only one party allowed in Russia and that is the Communist Party. (Article 141.) The citizen has the right to vote (Article 134) but he may only choose between candidates offered and approved by the party. The citizens have absolutely no right to put forward candidates. In this Communism is like Nazism, where the German citizen can "rubber stamp" only the candidates offered by the Nazi Party. Would we consider America democratic if the President outlawed all rival parties and permitted us at the next election to vote only for Democrats? Instead of democracy it would be a trick to uphold the autocratic tyranny of a few leaders. It is just that in Russia, and that is why in Russia the citizen has lost his right to disagree, which is important in any régime, but in particular against a régime such as in Russia, where Molotov, the President of the Council of the People's Commissariat, said: "In the course of elections no one will dare show his nose, for the dictator-

ship of the proletariat will strike without pity" (*Izvestia*, October 23, 1934). The Official Organ of Communist Labor in Russia unwittingly told the truth when it said: "The sole possibility with Communism is: One party is in power and all the others are in jail" (*Troud.*, November 13, 1927).

Rights of Workers

3. The democratic right of workers to unite in unions to protect their interests and to strike if need be to attain legitimate wages and working conditions is also denied by the new Soviet Constitution. It is true that Article 118 gives the citizen the "right to work," but that is not enough. He also wants the right not to work or the right to strike. But if a citizen went on a strike in Russia he would run up against Article 131, which makes him guilty of "infringing upon public socialist property as—an enemy of the people," and that last phrase brings him under the Criminal Code. There is one of the great mysteries about Communism. Here in America Communism encourages strikes and violence, and in Russia, where conditions are worse, it exiles or shoots a man for striking. I say "shoot" because that is what the Official Daily of Moscow recommended be done to the workers of Don and Kouban: "They must be shot, and shot, and shot" (*Pravda*, December 9, 1932). Communism also denies the democratic right of the workers to "unite in unions to protect their interests." They may unite in unions (Article 126), but only "to strengthen and develop the socialist system." Which comes first: the "right of a man to a decent wage and freedom" or the "socialist system"?

How the *Daily Worker* would protest if unions were

established only to "develop the capitalist system," but what is Communism but a super-capitalist State where the State is boss? At least the workingman in America can leave one employer for another, but in Russia there is only one employer—the State—and if he refuses to work for the State the Communist Party writes across his passport "disorganizer of labor." And conditions are so bad in some factories that citizens prefer to be among the floating population (the Soviet word for "unemployed") rather than submit to the hardships imposed on them by the Red bureaucrats.

For example, in the Communist factory at Magnitogorsk, which Soviet propaganda calls "one of the greatest triumphs of Socialist structure," laborers are leaving constantly, despite the penalties, rather than submit to conditions. "The twelve locomotives employed in mineral transport have, in the space of two years, changed their mechanics 460 times. In the repair shop during the same period 200,000 workmen have been employed successively on seventy machines. Only a small proportion of the population live in the stone houses, which are scandalously built. Hardly have the tenants settled in, but they must proceed to repairs. The main portion of the operatives live in sheds. In most of these hovels, bugs, dust and refuse rule the roost. Most of the time the cooking is repulsive; there are practically no clean or well-lighted places in which to eat" (*The Bolshevik*, April 15, 1934). Imagine being declared "an enemy of the people" for striking against such conditions!

4. The democratic right to practice religion and to propagandize it is also denied by the new Soviet Constitution. It is true that Article 124 "recognizes freedom of religious worship" [it does not use the word "right"], but it immediately adds "and freedom of

anti-religious propaganda." Notice the clever distinction; the Communists distinguish between "worship" and "propaganda." "Freedom of worship" is recognized if (a) you can find a church. There were 70,000 open when Communism came to Russia; only a few of that number open now; (b) if you can find a priest, or a minister or a rabbi. But most of these have been "liquidated" (the Communist word for murder. See the *Izvestia* of December 11, 1932). But despite these difficulties could citizens build a school to teach religion? No! That is propaganda! Could they circularize or use the radio? No! That is propaganda! Citizens have freedom to practice religion if they can, but the government reserves the right to propagandize against them if they do. It even denies a church in Russia any juridical rights and privileges which are essential for freedom (Criminal Code No. 125—1935 edition). Furthermore, the Commissariat of Education, during the past year, wrote a letter to the directors of the District Boards of Education complaining that "the anti-religious education has considerably weakened." The order then proceeds to enumerate five recommendations all to this effect, which is taken from the fourth recommendation: "To take measures in guaranteeing that schools issue methodical assistance in anti-religious education and bring into force expedient graphic descriptive help according to the dictates of the Public Board of Education and the *Central Committee of the Association of Militant Atheists.*" To talk of "freedom of worship" under these conditions is to rob words of their meaning. Would the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Jews, the Christian Scientists, the Episcopalians or the Catholics believe they had "freedom of worship" if the United States put all *their schools* under the control of an atheist organization? If Communism

is really sincere about freedom of worship, why did it summon on February 7, 1937, "A World Congress of Atheists and Freethinkers," including 1,600 delegates from 46 nations the program of which is: (1) To establish an office for anti-religious propaganda in the entire world; (2) to exchange international experience of the anti-religious war and different methods of combat; (3) to give financial aid to those carrying on anti-religious work.

5. The democratic right of freedom of the press and freedom of speech is also denied by Communism. Article 125 of the New Constitution says that both are "guaranteed," but read on and discover that both are guaranteed "*in order to strengthen the socialist system.*" Is that freedom? Would our press be free if it could print only propaganda for the party in power? Would it be free if all the printing presses were owned by the Government (Article 125)? Is speech free when it means speaking only for the purpose of "strengthening the socialist system"? Communistic freedom then means agreement with Communism, thinking what its leaders think, believing what they tell you to believe, and saying only what they want you to say like an In-tourist Guide. One hundred and fifty-seven pupils in the Commercial Institute of Novosibirsk took Communistic freedom of speech seriously and we know what happened to them (*The Truth of the Comsomol*, May 8, 1935). Professor Levit of Russia just a short time ago at the Congress of "Neurologists and Psychiatrists" also learned what his party means by "freedom of speech," for the Communists expelled him from the party for "dragging in a Fascist conception" (there's Fascism again!!) which was merely a theory on genetics. Suppose our Government refused to permit Communists to lecture in America on the ground that they were in favor

of establishing Communistic Dictatorship by revolution and "violent overthrow of the judiciary," etc., as the Communist Program states? What a terrible protest would go up from the Communist Party! They would say that they were denied the "democratic right of freedom of speech." Very well, then, *why, when they deny that same right to citizens of the Communistic régime, do they call it "freedom of speech"?* Furthermore, in Russia the members of the Communist Party number less than one and one-half per cent of the population. That means that 98½ per cent of the people are "free" to do what 1½ per cent dictates. Forty-three thousand amendments to the New Constitution were submitted by the people's 2,500 delegates, and when Stalin addressed them he said: "In the U. S. S. R. there is no soil for several parties. *There is soil for only one Party which can only be the Communist Party,*" and that means 1½ per cent of the population of Russia. Truly indeed Communism is "dictatorship over the proletariat." This fact alone disproves the Communistic propaganda about the social order being divided into two groups: "The exploiting class" and the "exploited class." First of all, there are not just these two classes in American life as Communists would have us believe. Furthermore, what does Communism do but substitute two worse forms of oppression: the tyranny and the tyrannized, the Red Leaders and the led, the powerful and the powerless. As Walter Lippmann puts it: "The commissars replace the capitalists, exercising the same powers or greater ones, enjoying the same social privileges or greater ones, and though their money incomes may be smaller, their luxuries less florid, they have everything that could tempt the less favored to envy them. . . . The only difference is that whereas under capitalism social ad-

vantages give political power, under Communism political power gives social advantages. The struggle for wealth is simply transmuted into a struggle for power" (*Atlantic Monthly*, December, 1936, p. 738).

The above, my dear Sir, are the reasons why Catholics and all Americans must refuse to join with Communists, namely, because: (a) Your "United Front" tactics are only a disguise for revolution, confiscation and violence; (b) because Communism is destructive of all democratic rights which America holds dear. We are just now beginning to find out that when Communists use words, they mean only what they attribute to them. When they use the word "democracy" they mean "dictatorship of the proletariat" and when they use the word "liberty" they mean belly-crawling subserviance to the Red Leaders.

No, thanks! We want no dictatorship of the proletariat, for *dictatorship* and democracy are irreconcilable. We are not opposed to Communism just because it is anti-religious, but because it is primarily anti-human; we are opposed to Communism not just because it preaches the gospel of hate and class-struggle, but because we can never make this world a fit place to live in, until we dwell in peace and concord. Any disagreements then between those who preach the revolutionary philosophy of Moscow and Americans who still believe in democracy, must be settled by facts and not by fists. The more I read about Communism, the more I am convinced that its *greatest propagandists know practically nothing factual about it*. They talk of Russia either in general terms or in the stereotyped language of its propaganda. That is why I believe many Communists are in good faith, and here I include you Mr. Budenz.

Of course, it is extremely difficult to know much

about the Soviet Union. Its boundaries are closed. Those who go in have their passports taken from them, and are permitted to see only what Intourists Guides permit them to see, and practically none of the common people are permitted to cross its borders, but only its propagandists. Those who do so bring us frightful tales of its conditions. Even those with whom visitors in Russia speak, are afraid to voice their true opinions. This much is certain, if Russia were a Paradise, the Red dictators would let some of its inmates out to tell the rest of the world about its glories.

And so, I conclude with this reflection: You have done Americans a great service by asking me these questions, and I have done Communism a great service by answering them with *facts*. Why, you ask, do I do Communism a service? Because Communism has said: "Play your part in helping to spread the *Truth* about the Soviet Union" (*Int. Press Corr.*, November 2, 1935, Vol. XV, No. 58, p. 1443). *That is just what I have done.*

You conclude your questions with this suggestion: "We suggest to the Catholic working people this thought today: Do you wish to be dragged into the rôle of fighters for Fascism?" Our answer is categorically no! Neither do we wish to be dragged into the rôle of dupes for Communism. We know your tactics from your documents; we know your purpose from your writings; we know your failures through Mexico, Spain and Russia. No! We will not join with you. *We prefer to be loyal to our God and to our Country.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
5708 SOUTH CAMPUS DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637

RESEARCH REPORT
NO. 1000

BY
J. H. GOLDSTEIN

1955

Study these excellent pamphlets and watch for new ones which we will publish shortly on Communism! . . .

SPAIN AND THE CHRISTIAN FRONT

ARNOLD LUNN

THE WAR IN SPAIN

PASTORAL OF SPANISH BISHOPS

COMMUNISM AND UNION LABOR

REV. RAYMOND T. FEELY, S.J.

ENCYCLICAL ON ATHEISTIC COMMUNISM

POPE PIUS XI

CATHOLICISM, AMERICANISM AND COMMUNISM

REV. FABIAN FLYNN, C.P.

**A CATECHISM OF COMMUNISM FOR
CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS**

REV. FABIAN FLYNN, C.P.

JUST WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

REV. RAYMOND T. FEELY, S.J.

COMMUNISM AND MORALS

(formerly titled "Morals and Moscow")

REV. RAYMOND T. FEELY, S.J.

FASCISM, COMMUNISM, THE U. S. A.

REV. RAYMOND T. FEELY, S.J.

THE TACTICS OF COMMUNISM

RT. REV. MSGR. FULTON J. SHEEN, D.D.

LIBERTY UNDER COMMUNISM

RT. REV. MSGR. FULTON J. SHEEN, D.D.

**COMMUNISM ANSWERS QUESTIONS
OF A COMMUNIST**

RT. REV. MSGR. FULTON J. SHEEN, D.D.

COMMUNISM AND RELIGION

RT. REV. MSGR. FULTON J. SHEEN, D.D.

**SPAIN'S STRUGGLE AGAINST ANARCHISM
AND COMMUNISM**

REV. GENADIUS DIEZ, O.S.B.

5 cents each, \$3.50 the 100, \$30.00 the 1,000, carriage extra

THE PAULIST PRESS - 401 West 59th Street - New York, N. Y.