

*ALL-AMERICAN OR UN-AMERICAN:
ANTI-SEMITISM AND THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN
ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE, 1938 - 1945*

ROSALIE ASTON

History Honors Seminar
Seminar Director: Professor Albert Lindemann
Faculty Advisor: Laura Kalman
1993 - 1994

ALL-AMERICAN OR UN-AMERICAN:
ANTI-SEMITISM AND THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN
ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE, 1938 - 1945

INTRODUCTION.....	1
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW	
Historiography.....	7
Ordinary and Extra-Ordinary Anti-Semitism in America.....	15
THE ROOSEVELT ERA	
Jews and the New Deal.....	25
Organized Anti-Semitism and the "Jew Deal".....	32
THE CREATION OF THE SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES	
Samuel Dickstein and the Dickstein Resolution.....	39
Martin Dies and the Dies Committee.....	47
THE CREATION OF THE STANDING HOUSE COMMITTEE FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES	
Rankin's Coup: 1945-46.....	66
CONCLUSION.....	76
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	82

INTRODUCTION

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a special committee to be composed of seven members for the purpose of conducting an investigation of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by the Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.¹

Few investigating committees have had a more illustrious or controversial career than the Special House Committee for the Investigation of Un-American Activities. When Martin Dies (rhymes with lies) submitted House Resolution 282 on May 26, 1938, he asserted that the investigation was not directed at any one race. He assured the House that there would be no abridgment of "the undisputed right of every citizen in the United States to express his convictions and enjoy freedom of speech." Dies stated that he believed in every man's right to his own opinion, whether it be religious, economic, or political, and that the success of the committee would depend on how the investigation was conducted. Rather than a committee bent on gaining publicity "to arouse hatred against some race or creed, or to do things of that sort" which "might do more harm than good," he said the investigation would concentrate on the exposure of subversive activities, such

¹ CR-75-3, 10 MAY 1938, 6562. U.S.C., TITLE 2, SEC. 192

exposure of subversive activities, such exposure being one of the most effective means of waging battle in a democracy.²

The purpose of this study is an examination of the House Un-American Activities Committee from its inception as a Special Committee in 1938 to its creation as a permanent Standing Committee in 1945. Of primary concern is the role that anti-Semitism played in the creation of the Committee, on its investigations, and on its proceedings. Anti-Semitism had always existed in America, though not of the same intensity as its European counterpart. Until the Armistice of 1918, the United States had been considered the "exception," the "golden land" to which Europe's refugees swarmed in search of freedom from suspicion and persecution. Following the war, America witnessed a rise in anti-Semitism as the Jews were linked with Russian Communism, Bolshevism, and a radical, revolutionary element in the States. It dwindled as economic progress and prosperity surged in the twenties, only to resurface again in the aftermath of the Market Crash and onset of the Great Depression.

The thirties was a decade of anxiety and frustration for many Americans. The Depression wrought economic ruin and unemployment across the nation. There were industrialists who feared social upheaval as an outcome of the Depression, as politicians and churchmen, as well as less respectable agitators looked for a way back to the happy days of prosperity. They looked for a reason for the country's ills, and many found a

² William Gellerman Martin Dies (New York, 1944), 62.

scapegoat in the Jew, the perennial alien and outsider. At the same time, Adolf Hitler was on the march in Germany, and in the United States sympathizers were being won by his anti-Semitic propaganda. Evidence of this exists in the appearance of 121 pro-Nazi, anti-Semitic organizations in the United States between 1933 and 1940, openly rallying, goose-stepping, and reviling the Jews.

No man had worked harder or devoted more energy than Samuel Dickstein, a Jewish congressman from New York, for the creation of a committee to investigate Nazi activities and subversive propaganda in the United States. When Congressman Dies proposed his Resolution for the creation of a special House Committee for the investigation of Un-American activities, Dickstein rallied to his support. Opposition to the resolution was voiced by Representative Maury Maverick, who predicted that the word "un-American" would be defined as "simply something that somebody else does not agree to," and would be used "inquisitionally against the advocacy of such things as freedom of speech. . . ." Representative Boileau saw the likelihood of the committee as a warning to American citizens to be careful where they went and with whom they associated, because they were likely to be labeled "enemies of our great democracy." Representative Coffee called the resolution "a disguise for a smelling expedition aimed at liberal organizations in the United States."³

The Dies Resolution was approved by a vote of 191 to 41, and when the victorious Dickstein rose to request that he be

³ Ibid., 64.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Historiography

Contrary statements are often made by historians about the nature of anti-Semitism in the United States. The U. S. has generally been accepted by American historians as having been "exceptional," a less oppressive atmosphere for Jews than Europe as a whole. More than anywhere else, the United States is regarded by leading historians as a "happy Galut," the "golden land," a Jerusalem which represented a "history of good times, of expectations realized."¹ Prejudice against Jews is not ignored by these historians but is said to be a social reality of greatly reduced proportions when compared to that of Europe, a "distinctly minor feature of the nation's historical development."²

On the other hand, there are some who feel that anti-Semitism has not received due consideration by American historians simply because no political or social movement, no decisive event, no great individual has been associated primarily with anti-Semitism. Because of this, they feel there has been very little interest in, even neglect of, the study of anti-Semitism in the United States.³ These observers feel that anti-Semitism in America has always been prevalent. From this perspective, anti-Semitism is seen as a deeply

¹ Cf. Albert S. Lindemann, Through Esau's Eyes (U.C.S.B., Hist. Dept., 1993) 304; Arthur Hertzberg, The Jews in America (New York, 1989), 13; Lucy S. Dawidowicz, On Equal Terms (New York, 1982), 162.

² David Gerber, ed., Anti-Semitism in American History (Chicago, 1986), 7.

³ Michael N. Dobkowski, The Tarnished Dream (Westport, Conn., 1979), 3.

equality, abolition of inheritance, class, religious, and racial hatred and intolerance."⁴

Martin Dies was also an anti-Semite, a fact that became apparent early in his political career. In his mind the words "alien," "Jew," and "Communist" were synonymous; he was convinced that the economic problems of the country were caused by the "new seed" European immigration and could only be solved by the deportation of all "aliens," as well as the restriction of all future immigration. During the tenure of his service in the House he proposed countless bills to this end. As Chairman of the Special House Committee for the Investigation of Un-American Activities he ultimately diverted the attentions of the Committee from its original purpose (investigation of pro-Nazi, subversive activities and propaganda) to his own personal hatred of Communists (aliens and Jews).

In March of 1942 a debate began within the House on a resolution to continue the Dies Committee. A statement presented by one hundred prominent attorneys said: "That the Dies Committee, while giving lip service to impartiality and fair play and proclaiming its devotion to Americanism. . .used its hearings

. . .for the dissemination of irresponsible slanders...consisting of surmise, conjecture, unfounded opinion. . . ."⁵ Representative Coffee argued that the Dies Committee had demonstrated itself as a "platform from which Jew-baiters,

⁴ Quoted in Gellerman, 5.

⁵ Ibid., 239.

crackpots, and totalitarians identified with Fascist organizations spouted their nauseating nostra [sic]."⁶

Nevertheless, the House continued the Committee, and in 1944, following Dies's retirement, Representative John E. Rankin took up the cause. Although Rankin was never the chairman of the Committee, there was never any doubt who was in charge. It was also well known that Rankin was a bigot; he "despised Negroes, Jews, aliens, and liberals," and this was "to be sure, his foremost claim to Americanism."⁷

The confusion and violent change brought about by first economic depression and then war fostered extreme movements of both the right and the left. Many intelligent, well-meaning people considered any type of 'un-American activity' an inherent danger to the United States.

This study of the Special House Committee for the Investigation of Un-American Activities indicates that the Committee was neither an ideal nor a desired means of exposing subversive activities. In its failure to perform this suspect service to the country, it stands in history as an example of what an investigating committee should not be. The examination of that failure may well serve to point the way that should or should not be followed in the future.

⁶ Ibid., 240.

⁷ Walter Goodman, The Committee (New York, 1968), 167.

allowed to speak for a few moments, he was unceremoniously turned down. Dickstein had been the power behind the drive, and had fought hard for this day. But when the newly appointed Committee Chairman Martin Dies named the members of the Committee, San Dickstein was not among them.

In practice, the conduct of a Congressional investigation generally proceeds from the objectives of the committee chairman. The chairman's prerogatives set the agenda and, within limits, he sets his own rules and procedures as to witnesses, questioning, and testimony. Court rules do not prevail in House Committee investigations. When the question arose - "What is meant by un-American activities?" - the answer was usually found in the personal convictions of the chairman and those closest to him. Martin Dies was then a Republican congressman from Texas who had very definite and strong convictions as to what constituted an American. He sought to impose his own version of Americanism on the American people. His views demanded that all Americans accept the Christian religion of the Holy Bible, the capitalistic system under which all Americans should live, private property and the rights of inheritance, the American system of checks and balances and its three branches of government, and "individualism as contrasted with political, economic, or social regimentation based upon a planned economy." He also believed that the good American should reject, among other things, "absolute social and racial

embedded element in American culture that has "left a deep imprint on its victims, even if it did not otherwise affect the course of American history."⁴

How anti-Semitic is America? There is no simple way to answer this question, for anti-Semitism has many dimensions. Most people define it as entailing negative beliefs or stereotypes about Jews. According to this definition, an anti-Semitic viewpoint might be that Jews are more dishonest in business, more aggressive, and extremely money-oriented. The relationship between Jews and money dates back to the middle ages, when Christians were not allowed to engage in money-lending at interest, and so it fell to the Jews to carry on the business in an atmosphere of religious hostility.⁵ The existence of this "Shylock" image is apparently acknowledged among historians and Jews alike in America, though not necessarily accepted as important.

Another common stereotype of Jews is that they are clannish. Having been segregated for centuries in Europe and subjected to years of oppression and persecution, the Jews developed their own community and lived by their own strict codes. The Jewish religion also enforced its own separation by virtue of its codes and practices. Once they began to be freed, this separation became problematic. When they began to assimilate into society after arriving in America, any tendency to associate with other Jews made them once again

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Harold E. Quinley and Charles Y. Glock, Anti-Semitism in America (London, 1979), 3.

vulnerable to charges that "Jews stick together too much."⁶

Other negative traits that are often attributed to Jews are that they are prideful and conceited, power-hungry, pushy, and intrusive. Arthur Hertzberg summarizes the colonial Puritan's attitude toward the Jews: "The Jews were a 'scorn and reproach to the world;' it was best to keep them out, for only 'the happy day of their conversion could improve their condition.'"⁷ This was standard Christian doctrine. Jews remained outsiders; they could become a part of America only if they assimilated into the Christian community and ceased being Jewish.⁸ These may be negative beliefs and stereotypes, but are they indicative of a deeper, ideological anti-Semitism?

As America was founded by Europeans who brought with them Christian ideals that commanded conformity, Jews were immediately subjected to discrimination during the colonial period. Indeed, they were subjected to civil, political, and religious penalties as were non-Jews such as deists, atheists, and members of dissenting churches. While historians agree that Jews were not the only minority immigrant group that suffered, there are disagreements as to the extent of the discrimination. Albert Lindemann writes that Americans accepted the Jews because of the labor that was needed to build and populate the country. He makes the case that in America the Jews were freer from friction than

⁶ Ibid., 4.

⁷ Hertzberg, 34.

⁸ Ibid., 45.

anywhere else in the world, which he partially attributes to the tendency of some Europeans to "idealize the New World, to praise it as a place where the prejudices of the Old World had been left behind."⁹ Oscar Handlin asserts that Colonial America became a friendly place for the immigrant Jews: "Elsewhere, they [Jews] had boasted of greater cultural achievements. But nowhere in their past was there precedent for the total equality extended to them in the American colonies."¹⁰

Michael Dobkowski found negative views of the Jews to be more pervasive in colonial America. Because the Christian colonials had negative images of the Jews, he accuses them of possessing an intolerant, narrow, egotistical faith. Such negative images of Jews, he finds, were redolent in writings of the seventeenth century. Because of this he argues that many Americans associated Jews with adherence to foolish ritual, narrow racial identity, Christian hatred, and delusions of grandeur. The Jews were often portrayed negatively as being intolerant, insensitive, conceited, and aggressive. He identifies these negative traits as a "variety of invidious stereotypes [that] were nurtured once millions of Jews began to arrive on these shores." According to Dobkowski, the extent of these images probably heightened the manifestation of anti-Semitism in the New World. "Image and act, thought and deed, are not very far removed."¹¹

⁹ Lindemann, Esau's Eyes, 305.

¹⁰ Oscar Handlin, Adventure in Freedom (New York, 1954), 21.

¹¹ Dobkowski, 34.

It must be understood, however, that conflict and hostility toward Jews is not necessarily anti-Semitic. David Gerber gives two examples often cited by historians to demonstrate this point. The first he refers to as *conversionism*, or the Christians' attempts to convert Jews, which are often regarded as anti-Semitic acts. Proselytizing and evangelizing, however, are part of the Christian doctrine. Gerber notes that some missionaries considered it anti-Semitic not to proselytize the Jews, implying that the Jews, alone, were unworthy of becoming spiritual equals with Jesus. Many missionaries felt it was Christian error and hatred that caused the lamentable condition of the Jews, and that only by converting them could they make up for their guilt.¹² Certainly, this concept cannot be linked with the overt and violent acts of bigotry often connected with anti-Semitism.

The second example given by Gerber is *ethnocultural competition* between religious and ethnic groups in America. In the pluralistic, predominantly Christian atmosphere of the United States, there was often latent competition for recognition of their particular doctrine or ritual. Despite the fact that separation of church and state was written into the Constitution, the nation continued to sanction the observance of the Christian Sabbath by closing its businesses on Sunday, and the celebration of Christian holidays in the schools through hymn singing, gift exchanges, and legal

¹² Gerber, 6.

holidays. Though Jews often criticized these acts as being insensitive towards their rights and feelings, and pushed to gain public legitimacy of their own creedal rites, Gerber does not see this as being motivated by any latent hostility or anti-Semitic sentiment. On the contrary, he feels it is a "continuing process of accommodation by which a pluralistic society develops...."¹³ It is, therefore, necessary to look at these incidents with a critical eye towards their motives and beliefs before applying them under the umbrella of anti-Semitism.

Historians of the Jewish experience in America have concerned themselves with anti-Semitism, but only as it related to other issues: immigration, settlement and assimilation, Jewish life, Jewish leaders, and the many contributions that Jews have made to the nation. When anti-Semitism began to take on larger proportions in the late nineteenth century, it was generally attributed to the massive new immigration from Eastern Europe. Restrictionists attempted to block this immigration in the 1890s, and eventually succeeded with the restrictive immigration laws of the 1920s.

Historian John Higham sees part of the explanation for the upturn in discrimination at this time in the swift ascendance of the new Jewish immigrants. Like many of the German Jewish immigrants who had preceded them, the refugees from the persecutions of Eastern Europe possessed a certain

¹³ Ibid., 6-7.

dynamism not usually associated with foreign groups. They rose quickly from the slums and produced a generation of investors, clothing manufacturers, pawn brokers, film magnates, and real estate speculators. According to Higham, they, alone among the recent immigrants, managed to send many of their children to college. This aroused suspicion and economic competitiveness, and gave rise to increasing social discrimination against the Jews in clubs and resorts, private schools, college fraternities, and restrictive covenants in many exclusive residential areas. More significantly, job opportunities for Jews were tightening and many found it difficult to find white collar employment.¹⁴

Because of their exceptional mobility, however, Higham found that the Jews were able to rise above most of the economic discrimination, while other groups were at a greater disadvantage. Italians were often obliged to deny their national origins in order to secure employment. He cites the non-discriminatory nature of the enacted prohibitions on the entry of aliens into certain areas of employment as evidence of the intention to exclude the immigrant in general, not necessarily the Jew. Despite isolated incidents of violence, such as the Leo Frank case of 1913-15 in Georgia, Higham feels that anti-Jewish sentiment "probably did not exceed in degree the general level of feeling against other European nationalities."¹⁵ Albert Lindemann also feels that in America

¹⁴ John Higham, Strangers in the Land (New Brunswick, 1988), 161.

¹⁵ Ibid., 278.

Jews found an exception to European hostility: "Jews faced fewer obstacles to gaining social acceptance in the United States." He also states that "Jews who showed a taste for commercial gain and individual success were less likely to encounter hostility. . . than in Europe. They were more likely to be admired, if grudgingly."¹⁶

Historians Louis Harap and Michael Dobkowski find negative views and imagery of Jews to be pervasive in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Dobkowski contends that "this negative imagery, although present before on a smaller scale, began essentially in the 1870s and continued through the Henry Ford crusade of the 1920s."¹⁷ It is his view that this discrimination has not been adequately recognized or studied by historians of the Jewish experience in America, and is generally a neglected aspect in the interpretation of American anti-Semitism.

The growth of anti-radical nativism that emerged during World War I, and became a vehicle for anti-Semitic feelings that broadened enormously following the Armistice, will be discussed later in this paper. Most historians minimize the ultimate importance of anti-Semitism on the eve of the war contending that Jewish survival in America had never been threatened by it up to this time.

Ordinary and Extra-Ordinary Anti-Semitism in America

Before undertaking any interpretation of American Jewish

¹⁶ Lindemann, 312.

¹⁷ Dobkowski, 7.

status, it is important to note the difference between what is called ordinary anti-Semitism and extra-ordinary anti-Semitism. Both types can be manifest at the same time and may be seen as the same, but there are essential differences between the two.

Ordinary anti-Semitism encompasses the common experiences of preconceptions, prejudices, and hostilities towards Jews which have existed since the first European immigrants landed in the New World. These phenomena might include negative imagery and stereotyping of the Jew in literature, art, theater, cartoons, comedy, and motion pictures. Discrimination in residence, employment, education, fraternal orders, social clubs, hotels, as well as "quasi-public" boards such as civic boards, trade boards, museum and symphony boards, are also evidence of ordinary anti-Semitism. Random verbal and/or physical harassment can also be included in this category.¹⁸

Ordinary anti-Semitism is quite often taken for granted by Jews and non-Jews alike, and is perceived as part of the normal relations between the two groups. In their acceptance of what is regarded as a deeply institutionalized "natural order," Jews often will call attention to it themselves through satirical jokes and comedy routines, or circumvent it altogether by congregating in specific neighborhoods, jobs, businesses, and clubs, rather than confronting it head-on.

Extra-ordinary anti-Semitism is not necessarily an

¹⁸ David A. Gerber, Anti-Semitism in American History (Chicago, 1986), 20.

increase in the extent and measure of ordinary anti-Semitism. Although the American Civil War produced a rise in anti-Jewish sentiment which resulted in accusations of war profiteering and treason, there is little evidence that there was any significant increase in the aforementioned common forms of public prejudice and discrimination.

Extra-ordinary anti-Semitism can be defined as exaggerated fear that is transformed into a core for the creation of a political ideology which seeks to blame the Jews collectively for the problems of society. It becomes the motivating factor for the establishment of anti-Semitic movements and organizations which seek to enter the political mainstream. Extra-ordinary anti-Semitism is also accompanied by an increased respectability of anti-Semitism by public officials, as well as influential persons in the arts and economy, who "are willing to articulate publicly prejudicial views and sanction discrimination against Jews on the basis of ideological conviction. . . ."19

Anti-Semitism in this political form first appeared in the United States at the end of World War I as a part of the post-war Red Scare. Large quantities of anti-Semitic literature entered into circulation at this time, which indicated the first large-scale effort in the United States to identify the Jew with revolutionary ideology. Again, in the 1930s, during a time of world-wide depression and crisis, anti-Semitism of an extra-ordinary nature reappeared on the

19 Ibid, 21.

American scene. It was at this time that organized efforts by the two major Jewish defense organizations, the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League, became engaged in an active effort to combat the rising tide of blatant anti-Semitism in America.

For purposes of this study, it is important to identify and recognize the differences between ordinary and extraordinary anti-Semitism. Ordinary anti-Semitism in the United States also may be considered as a phase of the anti-alien sentiment that has periodically manifested itself. The Jew is the perpetual outsider. Since the Jew is frequently identified as a member of a separate group, he is invariably a victim of any anti-alien movement.

The first anti-alien movement in the United States occurred during the administration of John Adams, and resulted in the passage of the Alien and Sedition Acts. Another such movement was sustained in the 1850s in the form of the Know-Nothing or American Party, that was directed primarily against the Irish Catholic immigrants who had become supporters of the Democratic Party. Prior to the mass immigration of millions of eastern European Jews between the 1880s and 1920, the Jewish population in America was small, and was scattered about the nation. Because they were industrious and generally avoided indigence, they were able to ward off most of the prejudice, discrimination, and harassment associated with this American nativism.

A third wave of anti-alien sentiment was the result of

the economic crisis of the 1890s, which the Populist Party used to its advantage during the national elections of 1892 and 1896. According to an Associated Press dispatch article covering the 1892 Populist convention in St. Louis, "One of the striking things about the Populist Convention ... is the extraordinary hatred for the Jewish race. It is not possible to go into any hotel in the city without hearing the most bitter denunciations of the Jews as a class and of the particular Jews who happen to have prospered in the world."²⁰ This movement was primarily a southern-based pseudo-agrarian phenomenon, however, and died out along with the Populist Party. Historians continue to debate the role of anti-Semitism in the Populist platform, as opposed to the role of bigotry, racism, and xenophobia in general in the movement.²¹ While the Populists sought to understand the decline of the American family farm in economic terms, the xenophobic anti-Semites railed against monied, urban Jewish middlemen, bankers, and financiers.

A fourth anti-alien movement manifested itself in the restrictive immigration laws of 1921 and 1924. Writers such as Madison Grant (*The Passing of the Great Race*, 1916), and Lothrop Stoddard (*Revolt Against Civilization*, 1922), warned against the "debilitating influence of Semitic stock on Anglo-Saxon civilization."²² Restrictive immigration legislation aimed at this new wave of immigrants was

²⁰ Howard M. Sachar, A History of the Jews in America (New York, 1993), 278.

²¹ Albert S. Lindemann, The Jew Accused (Cambridge, 1991), 220.

²² Sachar, 321.

introduced in Congress in the years 1891 through 1913, when the Dillingham-Burnett Bill containing a literacy test and tighter means test passed both houses. In one of his last acts as President, however, William Howard Taft vetoed the measure. The new Wilson administration was also ill-disposed to the restrictive legislation.

Although anti-alien sentiment was not always specifically anti-Jewish, the Jew was invariably marked, along with Southern and Eastern Europeans, as a less desirable type of immigrant. Previously, ordinary anti-Semitism had expressed itself primarily in terms of social discrimination. Prior to 1880 there were not enough Jews in the United States to attract serious attention. Between 1881 and 1917, however, approximately 2,000,000 European Jews entered the country. By the end of World War I the Jewish population was large enough to make a sizable target.

The introduction of immigration quotas and the vaunting of WASP racial superiority were not the only expressions of anti-Semitism. It was already perceived in the American mind that Bolsheviks were overwhelming Jewish. The Bolshevik Revolution and the pursuant American Red Scare provided restrictionists with another weapon and laid the groundwork for the first strands of ideological anti-Semitism to take root. Most of the prejudice of this period may be explained by the effects of the post-war depression, the rise of labor, and heightened nationalism, but the power of the Bolsheviks in Russia made the bogey of revolution seem highly realistic.

Since the war had made minority groups suspect, it was not difficult to generate anti-Jewish public feelings. Although the Russian Anti-Communist Information Bureau, an organization founded by the American Jewish Committee, asserted in a letter to the New York Times in 1918 that "Everything that real Bolshevism stands for is to the Jew detestable," this sentiment was not universally shared.²³ Much of the immigrant community tended to greet the new Communist regime in Russia with initial enthusiasm; Jews were a large proportion of the immigrant community, and indeed, they made up as much as fifteen percent of the American Communist Party membership in 1922, and forty-five percent of its leadership.²⁴ As the nation slid from wartime anti-German fanaticism to post-war anti-Red hysteria, it was inevitable that the onus would fall on the Russian-American Jew who, for years, had been identified with socialism and radicalism, both in Europe and in the United States.

This generalization found a basis in reality in the radical figures of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman. Goldman, the Lithuanian-born daughter of an Orthodox Jewish father, immigrated to the United States in 1886 at the age of seventeen. Although the execution of the Haymarket Square radicals moved Goldman to the radical left, her political radicalism was fixed when she fell under the spell of German born Alexander Berkman, a dedicated anarchist, and moved in with him. The 1892 workers' strike against Carnegie Steel's

²³ Sachar, 294.

²⁴ Ibid, 295.

Homestead plant, near Pittsburgh, evoked the kind of direct commitment that was typical of Goldman and Berkman. They set to work plotting the assassination of Henry Clay Frick, Carnegie's managing partner. Leaving for Pittsburgh, Berkman purchased a revolver, forced his way into Frick's office at Carnegie Steel, and shot him twice. Frick survived, and Berkman was sentenced to a twenty-two year prison term, Goldman to a one-year term as his accessory before the fact.

Upon her release from prison in 1893, "Red Emma" lived from hand-to-mouth, subsisting on contributions as a popular speaker for anarchist and other radical causes. She traveled from town to town, lecturing in English, Russian, and Yiddish, appearing before Chicago factory workers and Montana miners, suffering jail terms occasionally for advocating abortion. And so she lived, the incarnation of the radical Jew in American eyes, alone until Berkman's release in 1907 and the resumption of their lives together. Under the Espionage Statute of 1917, Goldman and Berkman were eventually deported in June of 1920, along with 1,119 other aliens. The great majority of them were Jews.²⁵

Altogether, during the postwar years, Jewish radicals became catalysts for a Red scare that evolved rapidly from anti-alienism to overt anti-Semitism. In United States government, as in most governments of Europe and America, it was accepted that Russian Bolshevism was Jewish-inspired and Jewish-led. Hugh Gibson, minister to the newly created

²⁵ Ibid, 297.

Poland in 1922, assured the State Department that "the Soviet regime is in the hands of the Jews and [Russian] oppression is Jewish oppression."²⁶ Lewis L. Strauss, an aide to Herbert Hoover, was alerted to the "excessive" role of Jews in the Bolshevik movement by American officials at the Paris Peace Conference, and William C. Huntington, attaché at the United States embassy in St. Petersburg, insisted that "the leaders of the [Bolshevik] movement ... are about two-thirds Russian Jews."²⁷

Though the high point of prejudice was reached during 1920-1922, anti-Semitic sentiment continued for several years thereafter. It was during this time that the pseudo-agrarian campaigns of the 1890s joined with the openly anti-Semitic Ku Klux Klan and the anti-Bolsheviks in the form of the popular industrialist, Henry Ford, who was also the publisher of a Michigan newspaper, the *Dearborn Independent*. In 1920 Ford began an anti-Semitic campaign in the *Independent*, with the publication of an article entitled "The International Jews: The World's Problem." The article soon developed into a weekly series which contained, among other things, a many times doctored, fictional account of a worldwide Jewish conspiracy to take control of the world's financial and political spheres. This alleged international plot, originating as far back as 1864 in a French satirical novel, had been plagiarized many times. By this time the plot was being referred to as *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*;

²⁶ Ibid, 298.

²⁷ Ibid.

Ford printed *The Protocols* in the *Dearborn* as further indication of a Jewish international conspiracy. Ford's campaign died down following the American Jewish Committee and Anti-Defamation League's endorsement of a boycott of Ford automobiles and individual lawsuits against Ford.

In 1924 Ford revived his anti-Semitic campaign in the *Dearborn Independent*, and kept it going for a year. By 1927, following a well-publicized suit brought against him, and numerous boycotts by non-Jewish and Jewish firms, Ford had enough. He was forced to retract his anti-Semitic charges in a statement which he printed in the *Independent*. Stating that he had been too busy to follow the series of articles in the *Independent* personally, he had been "shocked" and "mortified" by their content. He continued,

I deem it to be my duty as an honorable man to make amends for the wrong done to the Jews as fellow-men and brothers, by asking their forgiveness for the harm that I have unintentionally committed, by retracting so far as lies within my power the offensive charges laid at their door by these publications, and by giving them the unqualified assurance that henceforth they may look to me for friendship and good will.

The American Jewish Committee distributed fifty thousand copies of Ford's statement, stating that Mr. Ford had regained the confidence of his fellow Americans through his "superb moral courage in his wholehearted recantation."²⁸ With the Klan's decline into insignificance by 1927, organized anti-Semitism virtually disappeared from the American arena.

²⁸ Ibid, 318-319,

Many factors contributed to an atmosphere of fear and hostility in America by 1933 when anti-Semitism began to reappear, this time boldly and blatantly. Historian David Gerber has identified the 1930s as "the high point of organized, ideological anti-Semitism in the nation's history."²⁹ What anti-Semitic individuals and pro-Nazi organizations had in common, Gerber contends, was "an ideology linking Franklin Roosevelt, the New Deal, the Depression, and international crises and threats of war to international Jewish conspiracies, whether capitalist or communist or both."³⁰ What they represented was overt, and extra-ordinary anti-Semitism.

²⁹ Gerber, 31.

³⁰ Ibid, 32.

The Roosevelt Era: Jews and the New Deal

Beginning in the 1930s, the Jews in the United States found themselves in a position to achieve power and prominence as members of a governing coalition that emerged in the course of the Great Depression. During the New Deal era, Jews were to provide Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration with a vitally important pool of talent and expertise and overwhelming electoral support.

When Roosevelt and the Democratic party came to power in 1933 they were opposed by much of the nation's established elite. As a result, Jewish attorneys, economists, statisticians, and other talented professionals provided the expertise for the Roosevelt administration. Although Jews constituted barely three percent of the national population, more than fifteen percent of Roosevelt's top level appointees were Jewish. Most of these were given administrative positions in New Deal programs. In fact, it is said to have been one of Roosevelt's Jewish aides, Samuel Rosenman, who coined the term "New Deal."³¹

A number of Jews rose to positions of importance and influence during Roosevelt's administration. One of these men, Bernard Baruch, was referred to by Herbert Hoover as the "most powerful Democrat in the capital." Although Roosevelt personally disliked Baruch, he believed in that reputation, often exclaiming of Baruch that "He's got lots of influence on the Congress still. . . . He helps out tremendously in

³¹ Benjamin Ginsberg, The Fatal Embrace (Chicago, 1993), 104

keeping. . . the Southern members of Congress kind of down and reconciled." At Baruch's suggestion the President appointed George Peek as the director of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and General Hugh Johnson the director of the National Recovery Administration.³²

Another key Roosevelt advisor and consultant was Harvard law professor, Felix Frankfurter. Prior to Frankfurter's appointment by Roosevelt to the Supreme Court in 1939, he had a central role in formulating New Deal programs, and in enticing many young and talented Jewish lawyers to Washington to work in the New Deal agencies. These men came to be known as "Frankfurter's happy hot dogs."³³

Benjamin Cohen, one of Frankfurter's hot dogs, was prominently involved in writing New Deal legislation, including the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, the Public Utility Holding Act of 1935, the Federal Communications Act, the TVA Act, the Wagner Act, and the Minimum Wage Act. Other individuals who held high positions in the Roosevelt administration included Jerome Frank of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, first chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, David Lilienthal, Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Abe Fortas in the Securities Exchange Commission, head of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the President's chief economic advisor, Isador Lubin, Charles Wyzanski in the Labor Department, and White House special assistant, David Niles. These are only a fe

³² Sachar, 446.

³³ Ginsberg, 105.

of the better known Jewish political personalities of the New Deal era. Four or five thousand Jews operated at various echelons of government during the 1930s. If their numerical presence was less than spectacular, their influence was more than noteworthy; so was their visibility.

Government service became an important source of employment and a vital route to successful careers and social status, especially for young attorneys, during a time when there was significant discrimination in the private sectors of American business and society. Although Jews were able to excel in college, graduate school, and professional school, they often found their way barred to jobs and high-status careers in the anti-Semitic climate of the 1930s. Major law firms refused to hire Jews, and law school faculty positions also were not offered to Jews. Service in the Roosevelt administration was often the only option open to these bright Jewish professionals. It gave them status and power, while Roosevelt was understandably willing to take advantage of this pool of under-employed talent.

The Jews were also strong supporters of Roosevelt's administrative reforms and his efforts to expand the power of the national government. Jews favored institutions that would link the administration to a mass constituency and played an important role in instigating these aims. The National Labor Relations Act established under the New Deal brought blue-collar union workers into the Democratic fold; the Social Security Act, which provided benefits to Americans

in time of need, strengthened that bond and added the aged and disabled to the list of Roosevelt supporters. Amendments to the Social Security Act in 1939 also established merit systems at the state and local levels of government, which led to the first civil service systems in the nation. This was imperative to assure that control of the program would not fall to whatever political forces dominated locally.

Jews welcomed the adoption of merit systems, which insured employment based upon competitive examinations and educational requirements. They saw in it the likelihood of the recruitment of civil servants with a higher degree of education and technical proficiency, which would, they felt, skew the distribution of these jobs to the advantage of Jewish professionals.³⁴

At the state and local levels, Jews also played an important part in Roosevelt's efforts to oust incumbent Democratic leaders who were hostile to his reform efforts. In New York, for instance, Jews formed third-party organizations and reform clubs such as the American Labor party and the Democratic reform movement, through which they attacked the patronage system in an effort to dry up the resources upon which the party leaders depended. They also challenged local bossism and party organizations that their opponents led in an effort to undermine incumbent party leaders who opposed the administration. These endeavors worked in two ways: Not only did they enable the Jewish

³⁴ Ibid, 107.

liberals to gain power at the local levels for themselves, but to the extent that they could effectively destroy the traditional local patronage machines, they also hoped to enhance their importance in the process of new policy formulation in their favor.

In the late 1930s, Jews became important in yet another way as vital allies in the Roosevelt administration's struggle against isolationism and pro-Axis sentiment in the years preceding the United States' entry into World War II. Roosevelt and the American Jew had a common enemy - the right-wing, pro-German, and isolationist organizations that had sprung up in opposition to American aid to the British and in support of Nazi Germany's cause. Roosevelt and America's Jews became close partners in the struggle against these forces, as the Jews came to see Roosevelt as a powerful defense against Nazism at home and abroad.³⁵ They were joined in this alliance by the "Eastern establishment," a fact that Benjamin Ginsberg finds curious in that it [the Eastern establishment] had made itself *judenrein* only a few decades earlier."³⁶ Although most Eastern Protestants disdained Jews, on the basis of education, family connections, and economic interests, they found the Jewish community to be the only stable and reliable allies for the British cause. In fact, a large segment of the American public, including Americans of Italian, German, Irish, and Scandinavian descent, either supported Nazi Germany, were against England, or opposed

³⁵ Sachar, 451.

³⁶ Ginsberg, 109.

American intervention in European affairs.

Jews and members of the Eastern establishment (mostly upper-class) united to create the *Century Club*, which included such well-known Jews as financier James Warburg, film producer Walter Wanger, and the president of the Viking Press, Harold Guinzburg. Eastern establishment representatives of the *Club* included a prominent manufacturer, Ward Cheney, journalist Joseph Alsop, diplomat Frank Polk, and prominent attorneys and public servants Dean Acheson and Allen W. Dulles.³⁷ Another organization was the *Fight for Freedom Committee*, chaired by Bishop Henry Hobson, whose members organized a nationwide effort to mobilize public opinion against Germany and in support of England.

A pattern of close cooperation also developed between the Jewish organizations and the State Department. The Anti-Defamation League conducted surveillance against pro-German groups and prominent individuals, and monitored the activities of many of the 121 anti-Semitic organizations that sprang up between the years 1933-1940, such as the German-American Bund, the National Economic Council, and prominent isolationists like Charles Lindbergh, General Robert Wood, Senator Burton Wheeler, Senator Gerald Nye, Senator Theodore Bilbo, Senator Robert Reynolds, Representative Hamilton Fish, and many others. The list also included such overtly pro-Nazi or anti-Semitic politicians as Gerald L. K. Smith,

³⁷ Ibid.

Gerald Winrod, Laurence Dennis, and Father Charles Coughlin.³⁸

The Anti-Defamation League employed secret agents who collected damaging and incriminating information that was turned over to the FBI and/or the Immigration Bureau for possible criminal action. The American Jewish Committee conducted its own surveillance activities, and, over a period of five years, compiled a list of fifty thousand individuals who had some connection with these organizations. This index was often used by the FBI and army and intelligence offices.³⁹

Jewish filmmakers, columnists, and radio announcers seemed anxious to cooperate with the administration in its anti-Nazi, pro-interventionist campaign. In 1938, for example, Warner Brothers produced the film *Confessions of a Nazi Spy*, starring Edward G. Robinson, which represented Germany as a "clear and present danger to the United States."⁴⁰ By 1940, a number of Hollywood producers were making feature and short films, some of them free of charge, which contained a public message at the end warning of the dire consequences of anti-interventionist policy. These activities did not win many friends among America's anti-Semitic population; the importance of the New Deal regime, in part, made Jews the objects of severe anti-Semitic attacks during the 1930s.

Organized Anti-Semitism and the "Jew Deal"

³⁸ Donald S. Strong, Organized Anti-Semitism in America: the Rise of Group Prejudice During the Decade 1930-40 (Washington, D.C., 1941), 14.

³⁹ Ginsberg, 111.

⁴⁰ Ibid, 112.

When Adolf Hitler set out to become dictator of Germany, and ultimately all of Europe, he had a definite plan in mind. His immediate purpose was the unification of Germany, and the destruction of Western democracies. He began by utilizing a system of psychological processes and propaganda techniques.

The Germans were frustrated, an understandable state due to the loss of a war, inflation, and the impact of a devastating depression. Hitler provided the German people with new goals and a way in which they could pitch in and help themselves out of their troubles. He built up their hope and aspirations, and gave them an outlet for their frustrated aggressiveness: destroy the Jews.

There is a large body of literature today that debates the significance of Hitler's anti-Semitism upon his popularity among Germans. Claiming that Hitler intentionally downplayed the anti-Semitic aspects of his campaign in order to gain support, the so-called "functionalist" argument is that the Final Solution actually arose piece by piece through Nazi initiatives, rather than by direct order of the Führer. Lucy Dawidowicz and other "intentionalist" historians argue that Hitler set the stage for the ultimate annihilation of the Jews when he invaded Poland in 1939. The orders given in 1941 to begin the mass murder of European Jews is believed to flow directly from Hitler's attitudes about the Jews, expressed by him as early as 1920 and repeated in Mein Kampf. Extensive psychological studies indicate that, once set on an ideological position, Hitler was not likely to stray. He had

long-range plans, and the destruction of Europe's Jews was at the center of them.⁴¹

In his analysis of Hitler's propaganda techniques, Clyde Miller⁴² contended that the process of displacement had left the Germans eager to shift the blame for their defeat and the country's economic woes. The Jews were made to order. For many centuries the Jews had been the "other," different from the majority, which prompted fear and suspicion among the German Christians. Consequently, Hitler had a ready-made scapegoat at his disposal. Hitler could have selected any minority group - indeed he would go on to malign all non-Aryan peoples - but the centuries of previous conditioning allowed him to achieve mass hatred most effectively by utilizing the Jews.

Not all Germans hated the Jews, however. Many upper and middle class Germans had satisfying business and social relationships with them. In order to win over the upper classes, Hitler needed another scapegoat: the Communists. The businessmen, financiers, statesmen, manufacturers, and the newspapers feared and hated Communism as an instigator of labor unrest and revolution. Hitler united the masses and the bourgeoisie by shrewdly associating the Jew with Communism, and ultimately with the word democracy, which he called "the foul and filthy avenue to Communism."⁴³ Once in

⁴¹ For a discussion of the Functionalist - Intentionalist debate, see Michael R. Marrus, The Holocaust in History (New York, 1989).

⁴² Clyde Miller was an Associate Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, and the Secretary of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis.

⁴³ Qtd. in Strong, ii.

power, using his leadership principles, Hitler destroyed labor unions and put an end to all public criticism of his acts by threat of death and/or concentration camps. To some industrialists, journalists, and churchmen, what he was doing was good, a necessary evil in defense of the dreaded Communism.

The secret to Hitler's effectiveness seems to be his astute utilization of the German people's fears and frustrations, as well as the anxieties of the business and religious leaders that there would be social upheaval. Once he had united the classes by giving them the Jews, Communism, and democracy as scapegoats, he got them to all work with missionary zeal to further the Führer's plan to become dictator of Europe.

The thirties was also a time of frustration and anxiety in America. Many industrialists and political leaders feared social upheaval as a result of the Depression and widespread unemployment. There were churchmen and politicians who feared that the masses, led on by the New Deal, would go "socialistic." This common fear and anxiety united many of America's upper classes in support of Hitler's program. Using many of Hitler's techniques; they would keep the unemployed in their place, prevent labor strikes, and emphasize authoritarianism in religion to control education and labor.

The importance of Jews in Roosevelt's New Deal made them objects of severe anti-Semitic attacks during the 1930s; most

historians consent that the 30s were America's most anti-Semitic decade. The economic hardships of the Depression had already generated a growth in nativism, and enemies of the Roosevelt administration quickly saw anti-Semitism as a useful tool to unite FDR's opponents and undermine confidence in the government. Foes of the New Deal often charged that Roosevelt was being used by Jewish Communists and/or Jewish financiers.

In fact, the New Deal was often referred to as the "Jew Deal" in upper-class circles, and Roosevelt described as "the descendent of a Dutch Jewish family, the Rosenvelts."⁴⁴ According to Frank Buxton, editor of the *Boston Herald*, "Substantial men sympathized with the anti-Semitism. I was amazed at the intensity with which highly intelligent men argued that the Jews were controlling the President."⁴⁵ This sentiment was echoed by editors of *Fortune Magazine*, who wrote that "Jew-baiting hysteria in anti-New Deal circles was common."⁴⁶

Although many upper-class opponents of the New Deal were reluctant to be associated with anti-Semitic activities, others were quite willing to condone anti-Semitic attacks, and even to contribute to political groups such as the *Liberty League* and Robert Edward Edmondson's *Edmondson's Economic Service*. Edmondson's *Economic Bulletin*, a weekly publication, described the New Deal as "the Communist Jew

⁴⁴ Ginsberg, 113.

⁴⁵ Myron Scholnick, *The New Deal and Anti-Semitism in America* (New York, 1990), 66.

⁴⁶ Quoted in Scholnick, 66

Deal," and claimed it was "directed by the Frankfurter-Brandeis-Baruch-Morgenthau Monopoly."⁴⁷ In the late 1930s Edmondson used the *Bulletin* to support his argument that Roosevelt was seeking to push the United States into a foreign war on behalf of Jewish financial interests. He further claimed that the radio, press, and motion pictures, all controlled by Jews were flooding the country with propaganda aimed at involving America in the war. "The only people who want war," he wrote, were "the Jews."⁴⁸ A popular tune of the late 30s was:

O haven't you heard the news?
We're at war to save the Jews
For a hundred years they pressed our pants
Now we must die for them in France
So we sing the Doughboy Blues.⁴⁹

Others were not at all hesitant to use anti-Semitic propaganda to appeal to the working and lower-middle-classes. The most well-known of these radical opponents of the New Deal were Father Charles Coughlin, William Pelley, and Gerald Winrod. During the 1930s, Father Coughlin, religious leader of the *National Union for Social Justice* and the *Christian Front*, told millions of listeners over his radio broadcasts that the New Deal was controlled by Jews. Coughlin was especially important in the 30s because he brought a large Catholic contingent into the anti-Semitic movement that, up to this time, has been primarily Protestant.⁵⁰ William Dudley Pelley was the founder of the Silver Shirts, a new-Nazi

⁴⁷ Ginsberg, 113.

⁴⁸ Ibid, 114.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Strong, 57.

organization that sought to mobilize anti-Semitic sentiment. Pelley charged that "Roosevelt and his top aides were Jews who had now taken almost complete control of the nation."⁵¹ Gerald Winrod, founder of Defenders of the Christian Faith and publisher of *The Defender*, a monthly magazine with a circulation of more than 100,000 copies,⁵² made various charges that the Roosevelt administration was "dominated by Felix Frankfurter and his staff of Jewish lawyers and every other evil in the materialistic world was Jewish Bolshevism."⁵³

Anti-Semitic groups such as the widely-publicized German-American Bund were also vigilant in their attacks on America's Jews. Originally known as the Friends of the New Germany, the Bund was the subject of numerous newspaper and magazine exposés. Its activities were investigated by both the McCormack and Dies Congressional Committees. Founded in 1933 by active leaders of the Nazi locals, former Nazi Party members constituted much of the charter membership of the Friends. At a convention in Buffalo in 1936 it changed its name to the German-American Bund. Among its many activities were public meetings and the publication of weekly newspapers, pamphlets, which acted as major channels of its anti-Semitic propaganda. The group was also responsible for rallying, goose-stepping, and reviling Jews at every

⁵¹ Ginsberg, 113.

⁵² It should be noted that circulation does not indicate number of subscribers. These statistics were often used by the organizations as an indication of the popularity of their movement.

⁵³ Strong, 71.

opportunity.

In all, the appearance of over a hundred anti-revolutionary, anti-Semitic organizations were documented during the years 1933-40.⁵⁴ These assaults made American Jews even more dependent upon, and supportive of the Roosevelt Administration. The government, however, was very leery of being identified too closely with the Jews. The administration distanced itself from Jewish causes, especially from the plight of the Jews in Europe. Regardless of how important the Jews were to Roosevelt's New Deal, they continued to be plagued with extra-ordinary anti-Semitism during the 1930s, allowing opponents of the New Deal to mobilize forces against the president and his policies.

⁵⁴ Ibid, 14

THE CREATION OF THE HOUSE SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR THE
INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Samuel Dickstein and the Dickstein Resolution

No one is more deserving of the title of Father of the House Un-American Activities Committee than Samuel Dickstein. Dickstein served in the House from 1923 to 1944, and during that entire time, devoted himself relentlessly to the establishment of a committee for the investigation of subversive activities.

It is not surprising that Dickstein should be so passionate over what he, and many others, regarded as "seditious" behavior in the 1930s. Hitler was on the march in Europe, Nazi sympathizers were openly rallying and goose-stepping in the streets, and anti-Semitic oratory was clogging the airwaves and mailboxes of America. Congressman Dickstein's New York City district was the home of immigrants, mostly Jews from Eastern Europe like his parents, who had run away from the pogroms of the Old World, only to find continued persecution in the New World. The persistence of the taunting and heckling (ordinary anti-Semitism) they could tolerate; but now they began to feel the heat emanating from the torment of the Jew in Germany, transmuting itself into a political ideology of the many anti-Semitic organizations in America.

Dickstein perceived a danger, and he attempted to strike at it not with the legislative arm of Congress but through its investigative arm. There was no law in America against German individuals joining in fellowship to drink beer and rail at the

Jews, but nothing in the Constitution prevented Congress from investigating them. In demanding an investigation of the German-American Bund, Dickstein was merely availing himself of a weapon that Congress had used previously. Legislators often found it necessary to peer into the activities of established organizations, and there was no legislative requirement that they produce a law to justify the time and money spent. Public enlightenment was purpose enough, and the possibility that a future law might result was justification enough. Unrestricted as they were by legal restraints, without the necessity of tangible results, each committee chairman's inclinations were given a wide berth.

Congressional investigations were numerous following World War I, as they often are following a war. For instance, in the 1920s there were investigations into the conduct of the war, banks, lobbies, railroads, union activities and strike breakers, the stock exchange, and the Teapot Dome scandal. The country's monied interests were the targets in nearly all the cases, and so the hearings were attacked by conservatives, and defended by liberals as legitimate expressions of people's right to know. At the same time Andrew W. Mellon was protesting to President Coolidge that "government by investigation is not government," Felix Frankfurter was countering with "The procedure of Congressional investigations should remain as it is. No limitations should be imposed by Congressional legislation or

standing rules. The power of investigation should be left untrammelled."¹

Investigations into subversive activities had occupied Congressional investigators off and on since the Armistice. Following two pro-Soviet rallies in Washington in February 1919, an investigation was launched into "any efforts being made to propagate in this country the principles of any party exercising or claiming to exercise authority in Russia ...[and] any effort to incite the overthrow of the Government of this country, or all governments, by force or by the destruction of life or property or the general cessation of industry."² Hearings were held by an informal committee on the brewing industry and German propaganda and a report issued; the following month the New York Legislature set up the Lusk Committee to investigate seditious activities. But even the Red Scare of 1919-20, strikes, bombings, Attorney General Palmer's raids on radicals and the deportation of 246 men and 3 women did not produce hysteria in the land, and passed into the general euphoria of the "Roaring Twenties."

Following the stock market crash, the House of Representatives decided it was time to begin a formal study into the "domestic menace of Bolshevism," based upon documents that alleged the Soviet Amtorg Trading Corporation was connected with the dissemination of Communist propaganda. It was later revealed that the documents were forgeries but not before a

¹ Quoted in the *New Republic*, May 21, 1924, 329.

² Walter Goodman, *The Committee* (New York, 1968), 5.

resolution was approved that provided for an investigation of the Communist propaganda, the Communist Party and all affiliated organizations, the Communist International, and "all entities, groups or individuals who are alleged to advise, teach or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or attempt to undermine our republican form of government by inciting riots, sabotage or revolutionary disorders."³

Hamilton Fish, the original sponsor of the resolution, stated that the purpose of the resolution was not to interfere with anyone other than Communists in the United States. He further advocated the deportation of all alien Communists who were not American citizens. When it was suggested that Congress should do something about unemployment, Fish replied that "after deporting every single alien Communist, one could give those jobs to honest, loyal American citizens who are unemployed."⁴ Thus began a media frenzy that referred to Ham Fish as a "throwback to the Salem witch hunters" (often punned as the "Fish-ing expedition."

The hearings lasted from July to December of 1930, when the committee produced a report. It had tracked the dues-paying membership of the Communist Party in the United States, attacked the Civil Liberties Union, and made numerous recommendations, including declaring the Communist Party illegal, deporting all alien Communists, enacting restrictive laws on the Communists, putting an embargo on items imported from Russia, and requiring

³ Ibid., 7.

⁴ Ibid., 8.

the State Department to get permission for their treasury agents to go to Russia to study the use of forced labor (This came at a time before the U. S. had recognized the government of Russia).

Of the numerous bills resulting from the Committee's recommendations to deport alien Communists - most Communist Party members were aliens at the time, with East European Jews noticeably present - only one (introduced by Rep. Martin Dies, Texas) managed to get through the House, but was never voted on in the Senate. Sam Dickstein was active in all these events, backing Hamilton Fish in his relentless pursuit of alien Communists. It was he who moved to consider Dies's anti-Communist bill in the House on June 6, 1931; in 1933, after an assassination attempt on F.D.R., he called for an investigation of anarchists.⁵

Then in 1934, House Resolution 198 was offered by Dickstein providing for an investigation of Nazi and other propaganda activities. Much of the discussion of this Resolution centered on the Jewish question; Dickstein assured members of Congress that the investigation would have nothing to do with a boycott of German goods because of the persecution of Jews.

The Resolution was opposed by Gerald J. Boileau (Wisconsin); Rep. Carpenter (Nebraska) injected his objections also, claiming that proponents of the measure were Jewish like Sabath and Dickstein. In fact, he stated, most Germans felt that Hitler was doing a good job and that they would resent the

⁵ August Raymond Ogden, The Dies Committee (Washington, D.C., 1945), 30-33.

investigation.⁶ Martin Sweeney (Ohio) and Thomas O'Malley (Wisconsin) also took issue with the Resolution, expressing surprise that members [representatives] were actually talking about representing Jewish or German groups.⁷ The Resolution passed, 168 to 31.⁸

John W. McCormack was appointed as chairman; committee members were Dickstein, Weidemann, Kramer, Jenkins, Taylor, and Guyer. Most witnesses were examined in executive session, and only if it was deemed necessary were public hearings held.⁹ A. Ogden remarks that, though McCormack attempted to keep the proceedings on a "high plane," when Dickstein was questioning witnesses he often resorted to "calling witnesses names, threatening them with a jail sentence for contempt, and then ordering them to answer the questions."¹⁰

The Committee Report, submitted on 15 February 1935, had sections in it on Nazism, Fascism, Communism, and other organizations such as Pelley's Silver Shirts, the Order of '76, and the American Vigilante Intelligence Federation. It concluded that all these movements were founded on racial and religious intolerance and presented a danger to the country. The report also alluded to efforts being made from abroad to influence and organize alien residents in America and prevent assimilation. The constitutional rights of American citizens

⁶ Congressional Record 73-2, March 20, 1934, 4943.

⁷ Ibid., 4944-45.

⁸ Ibid., 4946.

⁹ Ogden, 34. There were only 7 public hearings held. The record of the executive sessions has been sealed and can only be opened by an Act of Congress.

¹⁰ Ibid., 35.

must be protected from these "isms." "All were equally dangerous and unacceptable to American interests."¹¹

Of the many recommendations of the Committee to solve the problem, only two were enacted into law. One relating to the registration of foreign agents came later during the Dies Committee; and one covering the Committee's recommendation on subpoena procedures was approved by the House in July 1935, amended in the Senate and passed in June 1936. It was signed by the President July 13, 1936. From this time forward, Martin Dies would play an important role as the agitation continued on the subject of un-American and subversive activities.

Dickstein was upset and felt that he had been "muzzled" in the McCormack Committee. He was also frustrated that his bill providing for the expulsion and exclusion of alien Fascists and Communists still sat in committee. On January 26, 1937 Dickstein asked for another investigation of un-American activities. It was debated in the House and, for the most part, denounced as a source of "no possible good and of much possible harm."¹² The bill was ultimately tabled. Thus, Dickstein was thwarted once more in his attempt to revive a committee on un-American activities.

Sam Dickstein was his own worst enemy. In arguing for his bill, with its provocative term "un-American," he promised that it would permit investigation not just of Nazis but of "Everybody!"¹³ The question that arose in debate, "What is

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ogden, 42.

¹³ Congressional Record 75-1, January 21, 1937, 331.

meant by un-American activities?", was to echo down through the decades. Civil libertarians opposed the concept as a witch Hunt, and Representative Maverick cautioned Dickstein that it could "start a wave of anti-Semitic propaganda all over this country."¹⁴ Dickstein suspected that it was not so much the language of his bill but the sponsor who offended men in the House. For years he had railed incessantly of fascist plots, "Nazi rats, spies and agents . . . recruiting and drilling uniformed and armed groups . . . I will name you one hundred spies . . ."¹⁵ There was no pretense of rationality in his obsession, and he was accused of grandstanding for self-glorification and publicity in the national papers. When the resolution was tabled by a vote of 184 to 38, Dickstein told the House "It is a vote which gave aid and comfort to all the enemies of America and all subversive organizations plotting to destroy our form of government."¹⁶

Samuel Dickstein had fought obsessively for a resolution providing for a special investigating committee of subversive activities, specifically for the investigation of anti-Semitic, pro-Nazi Fascists in America. Yet just three months after the defeat of his final resolution, Representative Dies of Texas introduced Resolution 282 for the same purpose, which would ultimately see its way through committee and House debate. The resolution finally passed by a vote of 191 to 41,¹⁷ and a Committee to investigate subversive activities had again been

¹⁴ Goodman, 14.

¹⁵ Ibid., 15.

¹⁶ Congressional Record 75-1, April 8, 1937, 3289.

¹⁷ Congressional Record 75-3, May 26, 1938, 7583-86.

created by the House of Representatives. Dickstein, anxious to revive the Nazi-hunting committee he sat on in 1936, was angry that when the committee was picked, he was left off.¹⁸

Martin Dies and the Dies Committee

On the day after he entered Congress in 1931, Dies introduced his first bill, which provided for the suspension of general immigration into the United States for a period of five years. Such suspension of immigration, Dies declared, would contribute to the solution of the unemployment problem. Immigration would continue to be a major theme throughout Dies' tenure in Congress. Writing in the *Saturday Evening Post* in 1935, Dies urged that we "relieve the unemployment in our midst" by deporting the 3,500,000 foreigners who, he asserted, were in America unlawfully. He wanted "relentless war without quarter and without cessation ... waged upon them until the last one is driven from our shores." In his eyes there was "no middle ground or compromise" in the matter. "Either we are for or against our country."¹⁹ On many other occasions Dies was known to argue that, although there were many secondary causes of unemployment, the primary cause was immigration. Speaking over the radio he quoted statistics claiming that the United States contained 16,500,000 foreign-born, 7,500,000 aliens, and approximately 10,000,000 unemployed. "If we had refused admission to the 16,500,000 foreign born who are living in this country today, we would have no unemployment problem to distress

¹⁸ Staff writer, "National Affairs", *Time*, June 20, 1938, 12

¹⁹ Martin Dies, *Saturday Evening Post*, April 20, 1935, 37.

refusing to vote for legislation to investigate un-American activities."³⁰

Only one amendment was offered, that of Warren calling for a report on or before January 3, 1939. The Resolution was finally passed by a vote of 191 to 41. Thus, the House Special Committee for the Investigation of Un-American Activities was created. When the victorious Representative Dickstein rose to request permission to speak for three minutes, he was unceremoniously turned down.³¹ A week and a half later, the Chair appointed the members of the new Committee. Sam Dickstein, who had labored with all his heart for this day, was not among them. The Chair appointed the members of HUAC on June 6, 1938. They were:

Martin Dies (Texas), Chairman
 Arthur D. Healey (Massachusetts)
 John J. Dempsey (New Mexico)
 Joe Starnes (Alabama)
 Harold G. Mosier (Ohio)
 Noah M. Mason (Illinois)
 J. Parnell Thomas (New Jersey)

The formation of the Committee received little more attention than that usually accorded Congressional investigating committees. Most political analysts assumed that the emphasis would be placed on Nazi activities. Father Charles Coughlin's weekly newspaper, *Social Justice*, destined to become one of the most ardent supporters of the Committee, noted that though Dies's particular peeve of the moment seemed to be the Nazis, many Congressman who were wary of the communist element had

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Congressional Record 75-3, May 26, 1938, 7583-86.

are for America, we must be for the exclusion of new-seed immigrants." Keeping European immigrants out of America Dies associated with keeping European ideas out of America: "I am appealing to my fellow countrymen to adopt the American slogan: America for Americans."²⁴

When Dies' original anti-immigration bill proved too harsh to be enacted into law, Dies introduced a measure for the "deportation of criminals and certain other aliens." Opponents countered that a bill of this sort was "un-American," would engender race hatred, and was nothing more than Jew-baiting rhetoric.²⁵ In a letter written to Secretary of State Cordell Hull on March 26, 1938, Dies discussed the relief of political refugees from Europe. The solution to this problem, he wrote, was "the colonization of unemployed and persecuted aliens in Paraguay."²⁶

Throughout 1937 and 1938 Dies presented a series of bills and resolutions calling for various governmental investigations - "to define conspiracy and combinations under section 1, act of July 2, 1890, dealing with monopolies and combinations in restraint of trade, so as to include employees who refuse to vacate the plant, mill, business, or industry of their employer;" "to investigation the motion-picture industry;" to investigate monopolies; "to investigate un-American [Communist] propaganda;" and others.²⁷ He also produced a resolution providing for a House investigation of the sit-down strikes.

²⁴ Martin Dies, "Minority Views," *Congressional Digest*, November 1935, 271-2.

²⁵ Gellermann, 52

²⁶ Gellerman, 53.

²⁷ Gellermann, 56-57.

to me this strategy of frightening critics of Communism by crying red-baiting or Fascist is duplicated to a great extent by the New Deal; that whenever anyone criticizes that, they are economic royalists or reactionists or other such names."³⁹

Congressman Starnes, who once read a part of Voltaire's *Candide* into testimony,⁴⁰ was also no lover of the New Deal programs. During the investigation of the Federal Theatre Project, when Mrs. Ellen Woodward⁴¹ was testifying, she brought up the fact that a previous witness appearing before the Committee had been in a hospital because of his "physical and mental condition." This led to the following choice passage of testimony:

Mr. Starnes: And Mr. Harry Hopkins⁴² has been in the hospital, too, hasn't he?

Mrs. Woodward: Yes. But it was for no mental difficulty.

Mr. Starnes: That might be a matter of opinion.⁴³

J. Parnell Thomas could not "see very much difference between a person ... sympathetic to the communist [sic] cause, and a member of the Communist Party." Again, later in the Federal Theatre Project hearings, he stated that "it seems as though the New Deal was hand in glove with the Communist

³⁹ Hearings Before a special Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 898-899.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 817.

⁴¹ Ellen S. Woodward, assistant administrator of the W.P.A., and Hallie Flanagan, director of the Federal Theatre Project, were the first persons to testify before the Dies Committee.

⁴² Harry Hopkins was the W.P.A. Administrator, of which the Federal Theatre Project was a part. He was later blamed for not rising to the defense when the Theatre Project was chucked, and for allowing Mrs. Flanagan even to testify before the Dies Committee.

⁴³ Gellermann, 68.

Although it lost in a test vote, the relationship between this resolution and the adoption a year later of the Dies resolution directing an investigation of un-American activities is interesting to note. As soon as Dies was appointed chairman of the newly formed House Committee on Un-American Activities, a portion of his attention was immediately directed to the sit-down strikes. On the basis of the evidence, it might seem that Martin Dies considered that anyone who fundamentally disagreed with him ought to be investigated. Yet he objected to editorials imputing improper motives to his resolutions. In defending his actions in the House to members who classified themselves as "liberals" and "the rest of us as reactionaries," Dies stated "No man can arrogate to himself the label of liberalism who is so intolerant and so bigoted in his views and his conduct that he questions the sincerity of the motives which actuate others, who have minds of their own and have the same right to reach their own conclusions." Moreover, he hoped the day would never come when he would "become so intolerant and so illiberal that he would "cast insinuations upon the motives and conduct of [his] colleagues because [he happened] to disagree with them"²⁸ These words would come back to haunt him less than a year later.

Dies's denials of any anti-Semitism are contradictory to the anti-Semitic content of his comments. All of his arguments against European immigration had been used copiously by the known anti-Semitic organizations in America during the 1930s.

²⁸ Congressional Record 75-2, November 19, 1937, 196-99.

The linkage of "new seed" immigration and "alien political, economic, and social ideas" to East European Jews in America was well established in the United States by the mid-thirties. For Martin Dies, the terms "alien" and "Jew" were interchangeable. The Jews also had a major interest in the motion-picture industry, composed a large contingent of the labor class, had been linked with Communism and the Bolshevik Revolution, and were naturally opposed to Hitler's persecution of the Jews in Europe, anxiously hoping for U. S. intervention in Europe. His pleas for tolerance and for the right of individuals (himself) to have differences of opinion without being labeled reactionary and un-American are of great interest in light of subsequent developments.

On July 21, 1937, Dies introduced in the House of Representatives his resolution providing for a special committee to investigate un-American propaganda. The fact that Dies was a member of the Rules Committee that submitted the resolution as a report of that committee was no doubt an advantage. When Dies called for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 282 ten months later, it read in part as follows:

Resolved, that the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a special committee to be composed of seven members for the purpose of conducting an investigation of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

Dies opened the debate on May 26, 1938 by remarking that the investigation was not directed at any one race, particularly not at the German-Americans. He further asserted that he had no intention to abridge the individual right of every citizen of the United States to express his honest convictions and to enjoy freedom of speech. The opposition, led by Maury Maverick, warned that the Resolution gave "blanket powers to investigate, humiliate, meddle with anything and everything ... from the German Saengerfest to B'nai Brith...." When Patrick of Alabama asked yet again, "But what is un-Americanism?" Maverick bellowed: "Un-American! Un-American is simply something that somebody else does not agree to."²⁹ Several Congressmen made the point that the nation's real problem was its millions of unemployed. "Whenever a parliamentary body in any country of the world has found itself unable to deal with the economic problems that face the people," said O'Malley of Wisconsin, "they go on a witch hunt."

But Martin Dies, whose hatred of Communists was his political stock-in-trade, had enlisted the support of Samuel Dickstein, whose hatred of Nazis was his political stock-in-trade, and their strategy had been well-conceived. There was anxiety in the country over the parading Nazis and the incendiary radicals, and an investigation that promised to expose subversives on the left as well as the right was bound to command popular support. As Representative Cochran observed and many congressmen repeated: "I do not want to be accused of

²⁹ Goodman, 22.

and harass us From any angle of approach it must be evident to every thinking American citizen that the unemployment problem was transferred to America from foreign lands." Further, he added that America would "continue to struggle with unemployment as long as it permitted itself to be the dumping ground for Europe."²⁰

In Congressional discussion Dies expressed the belief that 1,500,000 aliens were on relief in the United States while 6,000,000 other aliens were holding jobs that could be held by American citizens. "I submit that if we are going to undertake to put 3,500,000 people to work, we should deport the 3,500,000 aliens unlawfully in our midst, who are either holding jobs or are on relief. He emphasized that, while he had "no prejudice against" Americans of "foreign stock," nor were his remarks "in prejudice to the Jew or the Italian or anyone else," he considered it in the best interest of the naturalized citizens of the United States to stop all "new-seed immigration."²¹

In accord with Dies' opinion that a large part of the aliens in the United States were here illegally, his study of the alien problem was not finished. He seemed determined to get the facts regardless of what they showed. In further discussion Dies stated that "I am not actuated by racial and religious prejudice but I do believe that charity begins at home and that self-preservation is the first law of nature."²² Consequently, he introduced a bill including the following provisions:

²⁰ Quoted in William Gellermann, Martin Dies, (New York, 1944), 50.

²¹ Congressional Record 74-1, May 20, 1935, 7883-85.

²² Ibid., May 31, 1935, 8458-61.

1. Permanently stop all new-seed immigration from every country.
2. Deport all aliens unlawfully in the United States, including alien communists, dope peddlers, gangsters, racketeers, criminals, and other undesirables.
3. Deport all aliens legally here who fail to become American citizens within a reasonable time.
4. Gradually reunite families where the admitted relative is not likely to become a public charge or to take some job away from an American citizen.
5. Register and fingerprint all aliens in the United States.
6. Require every alien to secure from the Department of Labor a permit to work before he can hold any job, with the provision that permits to work will be denied to any alien so long as there is an American citizen able and willing to do the work.²³

Many of Dies' attacks on aliens in the United States were also published in newspapers and magazines, as well as introduced into the *Congressional Record* by Dies himself. He attacked aliens in the United States for sending money to their various homelands, as well as for holding jobs which "rightfully belonged" to American citizens. Other charges that he leveled against aliens were that their crime rate was double of any other race; that they introduced "pauper labor conditions," thereby lowering labor's standard of living; and that they brought alien standards and ideas to America, and tried to get American involved in European affairs. In a minority view article written in the November, 1935 issue of *Congressional Digest*, Dies contended that "We introduced into our midst alien political, economic, and social ideas." He argues that "If we

²³ Ibid., June 26, 1935, 10232.

industrial stagnation and business morality, the very stuff on which the Communists fattened."⁴⁶

The next witness was interrupted to allow Tom Davis to take the stand. Speaking of Spolansky's testimony of the previous day, he stated that it "was given at a time when it can be done and is being used for political effect only." Further, he damned the often repeated assertion that all would be given a chance at rebuttal: "It is true that this committee has tendered the privilege to Governor Benson ... but this committee fully realizes that in the closing hours of a bitter and hard-fought campaign these men cannot leave the field of battle and come here and denounce a most vicious kind of political propaganda."⁴⁷

Though most of the testimony over the three days of October 18-20 dealt with the activities of the Communists in the unions and their part in the sit-down strikes, the damage to Governor Murphy had been done; his name had been brought up and linked with Communist backing. Another witness refused to commit himself with respect to Governor Murphy, but did say that the Governor had been present at one of the sit-downs. In questioning the witness, Dies asked: Did the State make some determined effort to save itself when they knew that these Communists were active in creating those conditions there? Was no effort made by the State to stop them?"⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Ogden, 75.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 76.

and was a senior partner in the law firm Dies, Stephenson and Dies, in Orange, Texas. He was a member of the Christian (Disciples) Church.³⁵

Joe Starnes was born in Alabama in 1895, graduated from the University of Alabama, and was elected to Congress in 1936. He was a second lieutenant in World War I and was a lieutenant colonel in the National Guard in the while serving in Congress. Starnes was a Methodist, and a member of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Masonic and Shrine Lodges.³⁶

John Parnell Thomas was born in New Jersey in 1895 and attended the University of Pennsylvania. He was also elected to Congress in 1936. Prior to his entry into politics Thomas was a bond salesman and bond department manager in New York City. He was a Mason; no religious denomination is given.³⁷

Noah Morgan Mason was born in Wales in 1882 and graduated from the Southern Illinois Normal University in 1925. He served as a superintendent of schools until 1936 when he was elected to Congress. He was a Mason, a member of the Rotary Club and the Union Church of Oglesby.³⁸

None of the men could resist using the Committee as a dais for their own particular social philosophy. Mr. Mason used the hearings as a sounding board for his own opposition to the New Deal. At a hearing on August 22, 1938, Mason remarked: "I want to interject this thought before you go any further. It seems

³⁵ Ogden, 66.

³⁶ Ibid., 67.

³⁷ Ibid., 67-68

³⁸ Ibid., 68.

also chimed in with an 'aye' vote.³² The *New Republic* classified Dies as the Democratic equivalent of Fish, as "physically a giant, very young, ambitious, and cocksure," and characterized him as a man in a great hurry to make a national reputation. The editorial sounded a note of doubt by concluding that, "If the powerful energies of Mr. Dies are not given over to hounding Communists, it will be a miracle."³³

Who were the men who made up a majority of the Dies committee from 1938 to 1943? Dies of Texas and Starnes of Alabama were both Democrats, and Mason of Illinois and Thomas of New Jersey were Republicans. Other Committee members came and went, but these four served continuously, and comprised a majority of the Committee until the number of members was increased from 7 to 8 in 1943. The Committee was under the control of two Republicans and two Democrats, therefore technically bi-partisan from the standpoint of party membership. However, all four men were in alignment as far as major matters of social policy were concerned; they were definitely anti-Roosevelt and anti-New Deal in orientation.³⁴ As long as that was true, it was a pretty good bet that Dies could count on majority support.

Short biographies of the four men find that Martin Dies was born in Texas in 1901, graduated from the University of Texas, and later attended National (Catholic) University in Washington, D.C. He began service in Congress at the age of twenty-nine,

³² Ogden, 47.

³³ Editorial, *New Republic*, June 15, 1938, 158.

³⁴ See Gellerman, 65, and Ogden, 51.

Party."⁴⁴ Mrs. Woodward and Hallie Flanagan managed to maintain their composure, even during what seems like heckling from the Committee:

Mrs. Woodward: You know, it seems to me the capitalistic press would certainly say so if we were doing that [spreading Communist propaganda].

Thomas: What press did you say?

Starnes: She said the capitalistic press.

Thomas: What do you mean by capitalistic press?

Dies: That is a Communist term.⁴⁵

It was Martin Dies, however, who enraged journalists, politicians, analysts, and President Roosevelt with his manipulative use of the Committee preceding the general elections of 1938. In a move which many came to believe was timed and calculated to coincide with the elections in an attempt to discredit New Deal supporters running for re-election, Dies reiterated his desire to get the bead on Communism. On October 18 the first witness, Steve Gadler, presented evidence to prove that the Communists had made inroads into the Farmer-Labor Party. The testimony was then linked to the sit-down strikes by Jacob Spolansky, who claimed he was a former FBI man engaged in the study of subversive activities. After relating the attempts that had been made to intimidate him, he attempted a definition of Communism, something the Committee had never touched upon. In the same context he spoke of Governor Murphy, who, he said, was not a Communist, but a liberal and a very honest man. The Communists, he said, backed the Governor because he "represented a policy which perpetuated

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Goodman, 44.

The media picked up the story, and one reporter for the *Chicago Tribune* declared that a binding link had been made between the CIO and the Communists. The smear continued unrelentingly over the course of the next week. The attack on Murphy affected President Roosevelt deeply and he vented his pain by issuing the first formal criticism of a committee of Congress ever made by a President. In a lengthy statement he called the hearings "a flagrantly unfair and un-American attempt to influence an election."⁴⁹ *Congressional Digest* writer, Paul Y. Anderson, reported on the incident that President Roosevelt had "soundly boxed" the ears of Dies for his "crude attempt to smear Governor Frank Murphy as a Communist Tool."⁵⁰ In the same article he calls for an investigation of Mr. Dies, stating that there is one question they should not fail to ask, as follows: "After the resolution authorizing the Dies investigation was adopted, but before the personnel of the committee was announced, did Dies seek to persuade another member of the House to serve, telling him, 'This is going to be a swell committee - there won't be a Jew on it'?"⁵¹ The following week, after doing his homework, Anderson's article further revealed troublesome activities of the Associated Farmers, and a relationship that existed between that organization and Fascist and Nazi propagandists. He suggests that if and when the La Follette Civil Liberties Union chooses to expose these activities, "then, and not before, we may learn about the un-American activities

⁴⁹ Qtd. in Goodman, 50.

⁵⁰ Paul Y. Anderson, "Investigate Mr. Dies!", *Congressional Digest*, November 5, 1938, 471.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 472.

which constitute a real threat to this country's institutions. How illuminating it would be to discover that persons engaged in those activities have been using the Dies committee as a loudspeaker for their propaganda!"⁵²

Despite the uproar, and subsequent House debate on Dies' conduct in the investigations, the House overwhelmingly supported the continuation of the Special Committee in February, 1939. In the middle of February, Dickstein pushed the Committee once again on the necessity of an investigation of Nazi activities. Dies took the initial step and requested the FBI's report on the Bund made the year previous. The FBI had no objection but pointed out the danger of divided efforts; central control, they insisted, should remain with the FBI. Dies expressed his appreciation, and said the Committee would learn from its mistakes and in the future hold hearings that would be "dignified and judicial."⁵³

On May 18, 1939, Dies announced that the Committee had evidence to show that a well-organized plot had developed in the United States that would be investigated. He said that a dastardly plot had been uncovered that alleged that rich Jews were planning to seize the Government that August with the aid of 150,000 Spanish mercenaries from Mexico. At the same time, these Jews intended to manipulate the stock market, sending it crashing and triggering a wave of strikes. How did he know this? He had it on the good authority of General George Van

⁵² Paul Y. Anderson, "Behind the Dies Intrigue" *Congressional Digest*, November 12, 1938, 499.

⁵³ Ogden, 116.

Horn Mosely and George E. Deatherage, two outspoken anti-Semites.⁵⁴

In an aura of mystery, six witnesses (whose identities were carefully guarded) were heard. In his summary, Dies stressed only the anti-Semitic character of the reports.⁵⁵ The following day more information was available. A source present the previous day remarked that the alleged reports could not be made public since they had a strong anti-Semitic tinge and charged unbelievably seditious activities on the part of well-known men. He added that the Committee was not so concerned with the plot as it was with the motivations behind the reports. The anti-Semitic nature of the accusations were potentially very damaging to the Jews. But when a transcript of the testimony was released two days later, the plot took first place, the anti-Semitic aspects received barely a notice.⁵⁶

Testimony in the succeeding days sometimes bordered on the fantastic but was nevertheless carefully examined. The alleged plot to overthrow the country was rendered in some detail although it did not include names of the plotters. One witness, proving most belligerent and demanding to know if the oath he had taken was Christian, admitted quite frankly his opposition to Jewish leadership. He was quite insolent in his testimony, speaking of the publicity he had received for being called before the Committee, stated "...that is the best publicity I can get."⁵⁷ He ended with an offer to give the Committee all

⁵⁴ Gabler, 352, Ogden, 116, and Sachar, 482.

⁵⁵ *New York Times*, May 19, 1939, 11.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, May 21, 1939, 9.

⁵⁷ Ogden, 118.

the information he had; the Committee thanked him and he was dismissed.

General George Van Horn Moseley, U.S.A., retired, was the next witness. His testimony indicated a strong acquaintance with the literature of the American Fascists, advocacy of violent army action to purge the Government of Communists, and approval of a recent Bund rally as an impressive patriotic meeting. Despite his denials, a strong strain of anti-Semitism ran through his testimony.⁵⁸ He was allowed to make a statement in which he exposed the alleged Jewish inspiration of the Bolshevik movement. He continued with the usual retinue of Jewish hegemony seeking to impose its will. At the end, the Committee ordered the statement stricken, declaring it had nothing to do with subversive activities. Moseley later gave copies of the statement to the reporters.⁵⁹

Reactions to the testimony were varied. The *Times* sarcastically reported that even Orson Wells could not have told a more lurid story.⁶⁰ The *New Republic* complained that the Jewish conspiracy had received the greatest amount of publicity while the anti-Semitic plot had really been the subject of the inquiry.⁶¹ Due to the fact that the reports themselves were never made public, and only vaguely identified as relating to a Jewish Communist plot to overthrow America, subsequent publicity was accused of providing false and misleading headlines and misplaced emphasis.

⁵⁸ Ibid, 119.

⁵⁹ Ibid, 120.

⁶⁰ *New York Times*, May 29, 1939, 17.

⁶¹ Ogden, 121.

In subsequent sessions Dies went on record that the Committee was not so much interested in the anti-Semitic aspects of the movements under investigation as the fact that the leaders of the organizations were in favor of Hitler. Dies finally terminated the discussions by declaring that he was not particularly interested in anti-Semitism, but rather in the evidence that the groups advocating such doctrines were in favor of Fascism or Nazism.⁶²

The final witness, Henry Allen, was a former member of the Silver Shirts and frankly admitted his anti-Semitic bias. His ties to other anti-Jewish organizations were well documented. Allen was given a chance to explain and expound his views on the Jews in America. His solution to the "problem" was the suppression and segregation of all Jews in the United States.⁶³ His testimony provided the anti-Semitic Allen a platform to reach the press and the entire nation. He did, however, establish a link between anti-Semitic organizations and subversive groups.

No further testimony was heard. Thomas had demanded that William Pelley be called to testify, but Dies evaded the issue by remarking that witnesses like Pelley did not want to tell the truth and revealed nothing on the stand.⁶⁴ In reaching its conclusions, the Committee declared that the groups investigated were engaged in a form of racketeering as well as in subversive activities. "Their prostitution of such words as 'patriotism'

⁶² Ibid., 127.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 129.

and 'Christian' was deplored and their tactics were likened to those of Hitler's.⁶⁵ Interestingly enough, there was no mention of the un-Americanism of their anti-Semitic propaganda. The greater part of the subsequent hearings in 1939 was taken up with Communism, following the German-Soviet non-aggression pact of August 23, 1939.

So ended the investigation of "Nazi" and "native Fascist" activities for the year. An alleged Jewish plot had been investigated; labor unions and sit-down strikes had been investigated; there were no investigations of pro-Nazi or anti-Semitic activities. The evidence before the Committee would seem to have justified a more detailed study, and it is not clear why this was not done. Martin Dies had been present at all but one of the sessions and conducted most of the questioning himself.

The Committee was renewed at the beginning of each Congress, and Dies continued his attacks on Communist Front Organizations, the C.I.O, and labor unions for another six years until, on May 12, 1944, he announced that he would not seek reelection. He was in ill health and was weary after fourteen years in the House. He had been labeled, among other things, a demagogue and a fanatical anti-Semite. His retirement was greeted by the United Steel Workers as "the most outstanding contribution made by Dies to our national welfare."⁶⁶

⁶⁵ Ibid., 130.

⁶⁶ New York Times, May 13, 1944, 10.

THE CREATION OF THE STANDING HOUSE COMMITTEE FOR THE
INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Rankin's Coup: 1945-46

The creation of a standing Committee on Un-American Activities was engineered almost single-handedly by Representative John Rankin, Mississippi. Rankin was a shrewd student of parliamentary procedure and a canny politician who often used his talents to harass his enemies and thwart proposals that he opposed. That he was also classed with other haters down south as a rude and ignorant fellow who despised Negroes, Jews, aliens, and liberals was probably his foremost claim to fame at the time. But the clever way in which he caught the House of Representatives by surprise and forced it to establish a permanent Un-American Activities Committee remains the crowning achievement of his career.

That anything out of the ordinary would occur on the first day of the first session of the 79th Congress must have been the furthest thing from anyone's mind, as there is no evidence that Rankin gave any forewarning of his intentions. The old HUAC, always a temporary committee created for a special purpose, had been dying a slow death since the United States had entered the War in 1941, and in 1944 it held only a few, brief hearings. Dies' announcement in 1944 that he did not plan to seek reelection looked like the deathblow to the Committee so long identified with his name.

As the members of the House took their seats on January 3, 1945, the Chaplain called on God for assistance in building "a future altogether worthy of our traditions." While Minority leader Martin introduced Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn, who spoke about national unity, Rankin bided his time. When Chairman Sabath of the Rules Committee made the customary proposal that the rules of the previous Congress be adopted, Rankin rose and proposed an amendment to the rules: to make the Special Committee for the investigation of Un-American Activities a standing committee of the House, with great latitude as to how it would conduct itself and what it might investigate.⁶⁷

The cleverness of Rankin's move was in the fact that the Sabath proposal had to be voted on first, since technically no committee existed until the resolution was adopted. The normal procedure is that rules changes and resolutions for new committees are offered after the session gets under way, and they are then referred to the Rules Committee for consideration. Rankin was attempting an end run. His main argument, besides the fact that the Dies Committee had performed an invaluable service to the country, was that if Congress didn't act fast there were those who intended to destroy the files and records that had been collected over the previous eight years by the Dies Committee. He also reminded his colleagues that the American Legion, whose political potential might be very great

⁶⁷ Robert K. Carr, The House Committee on Un-American Activities 1945-1950 (New York, 1952), 19-20; Goodman, 167-68

as the War was ending, had asked Congress to continue the Committee.⁶⁸

The members of the house did not want to affront America's patriots by an insult to Martin Dies, nor did they wish to adopt as their own his offspring. Representative McCormack spoke for the leaders when he said that, while he was in favor of continuing the Special Committee, he wanted the matter to be handled via the normal procedures, through the Rules Committee. Therefore, he urged a vote against a procedure that had no precedent; in "150 years of Constitutional history, no Congress ... has ever followed to establish a permanent committee of this kind."⁶⁹ When the vote was taken, the amendment lost by a narrow margin of 134 to 146. The clever Mississippian then asked for a roll call, and now the vote was 207 to 186 in favor of the Committee. Forty members, including the young Lyndon B. Johnson from Texas, did not vote. "I caught 'em flat-footed and flat-headed,"⁷⁰ Rankin rejoiced. A few minutes later the first session of the 79th Congress adjourned having created a permanent Committee on Un-American Activities.

Despite his efforts, Rankin was not named chairman of the new standing Committee (he may not have wanted to relinquish his position as chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, which was likely soon to be an influential position). Edward Hart, a democrat from New Jersey, was named chairman, but Rankin was still HUAC's voice and conscience; it was he who set its tone

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Goodman, 169.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

and agenda. A decorated veteran of World War I, Rankin had begun his career as a prosecutor before entering Congress in 1921. He quickly established his reputation by insisting there was a link between Communism and Judaism: "If I am any judge they [Jews] are Communists, pure and simpleThey looked like foreigners to me. I never saw such a wilderness of noses in my life." He referred to Walter Winchell as a "slime mongering kike" for attacking him in his column, and labeled another Jewish writer "that little Communist kike...a scavenger who stooped to as base a level as that of the loathsome ghoul at night who invades the sacred precinct of the tomb." He did not feel inclined to confine his anti-Semitic remarks to the outside world. On the floor of the House, in addressing Congressman Emmanuel Celler as a "Jewish gentleman," he stated "I have no quarrel with any man about his religion. Any man who believes in the fundamental principles of Christianity and lives up to the, whether he is Catholic or Protestant, certainly deserves the respect and confidence of mankind."⁷¹

With its comingling of Communists and Jews, Hollywood was an ideal target for Rankin,⁷² and also had been on the agenda of Martin Dies; what Rankin needed was an opening. He got his chance when Edward Hart became ill and resigned the chairmanship in June 1945. Rankin was appointed acting chairman. Though only fourteen days passed before a permanent chairman was appointed, Rankin made good use of the time. At his first

⁷¹ Neal Gabler, An Empire of Their Own (New York, 1988), 355.

⁷² Neal Gabler, An Empire of Their Own, and Howard M. Sachar, A History of the Jews in America, provide discussions of Communism in Hollywood.

session he proposed to send investigators to Hollywood. "We don't know what information he has," said one member, "but the motion was agreed to on the theory that we ought to find out whether our acting chairman is having nightmares or whether there really is something that ought to be investigated."⁷³ Rankin had no doubts at all. The very next day he announced that he was about to expose "one of the most dangerous plots ever instigated for the overthrow of the government...[Hollywood] is the greatest hotbed of subversive activities in the United States." In replying to charges of a witch hunt by Walter Winchell and Drew Pearson, he repeated his determination "to expose those elements that are insidiously trying to spread subversive propaganda, poison the minds of your children, distort the history of our country and discredit Christianity...."⁷⁴

Rankin made no secret of the source of his animus towards Hollywood - the large number of Jews in the motion picture industry. Several Jews and liberals, recognizing what he was up to, strenuously objected. "Are they planning to follow up a previous investigation of Hollywood which resulted in the assertion that Shirley Temple was a Communist?" asked Sam Dickstein. "Do they feel that her growing up has resulted in her being a stronger Communist?"⁷⁵ Several members from California even met with John Wood, the newly appointed

⁷³ Gabler, 356.

⁷⁴ Goodman, 173.

⁷⁵ Gabler, 357

chairman, to brief him on how little Dies' previous investigation of Hollywood had uncovered.

Enraged, Rankin accused them of trying to thwart the Committee, and delivered a seething condemnation against what he called anti-Christian heathens. "Communism is the most dangerous influence in the world today." He delivered a diatribe on the Communism of Leon Trotsky, stating it was his brand of Communism that had persecuted the Savior, crucified him, gambled for his garments, then spent 1900 years destroying Christianity. Now, he continued, these "alien-minded communistic enemies of Christianity, and their stooges, are trying to get control of the press of this country....the radio....their lying broadcasts in broken English." But it was Hollywood that really rankled him. "They are now trying to take over the motion-picture industry, and howl to high heaven when our Committee on un-American Activities propose [sic] to investigate them. They want to spread their un-American propaganda, as well as their loathsome, lying [sic], immortal [sic], anti-Christian filth before the eyes of your children in every community in America."⁷⁶

The rhetoric was pure Rankin, but it was also almost verbatim of what another extremist, right-wing Nazi-sympathizer had been saying about Hollywood for months. The Reverend Gerald L. K. Smith was one of the self-styled saviors who had emerged during the Depression. He was often described as a rabble-rouser from Wisconsin with a feverish stump style who had

⁷⁶ William Z. Foster, The Rankin Witch Hunt (New York, 1945), 37-38.

assisted Huey Long in the thirties. Then, after Long's assassination, he had tried to round up the remnants of Long's supporters into a coalition of other disaffected populists. The effort failed when he proved so overbearing, egocentric, and unpredictable (he was once jailed for using obscenities and disturbing the peace) that not even other political crackpots wanted much to do with him.⁷⁷

By the later thirties, what finally emerged from under his Southern rancor was a distinct appeal to neofascism and Jew-baiting. Like many Americans, Smith had opposed America's entry into the war, but unlike most of them, he failed to recant following Pearl Harbor. He regrouped along with other extreme isolationists and formed a new America First Party, which gave vent to all his hatreds. Along with a negotiated peace with Germany, his 1944 platform called for a Congressional investigation to find out who had been responsible for getting this country into the war, an end to immigration, and a solution to the "Jewish Problem."⁷⁸

Smith was clearly a kindred spirit with Rankin, and may even have been an inspiration as well. For months Smith had been berating Hollywood for undermining the influence and teachings of the Church, the Christian home, and the Sunday School. Also, at the same time Rankin was urging HUAC to investigate Jews in Hollywood, Smith's party publication, *The Cross and the Flag*, had started a six-part series titled "The

⁷⁷ Glen Jeansonne, Gerald L. K. Smith, Minister of Hate (New York, 1988), 12.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 18-19.

Rape of America by Hollywood." Contained in the paper was an open letter to Rankin recommending that he "not waste too much time on the 'small fry' Reds with which Hollywood is overrun" but concentrate on the major traitors, many of whom "wrap themselves in Stars and Stripes" pretending to be 'All-American' Americans.⁷⁹ This was obviously a reference to many of Hollywood's studio owners who went out of their way to produce films for the war effort.

Up to this point, there really had been no investigation of Hollywood; there had been only Rankin's campaign for one. It is quite possible that Smith's bombardment had its effect. By year's end Chairman Wood and investigator Ernie Adamson⁸⁰ conducted a one-day closed-door hearing in Hollywood. They emerged convinced that, indeed, there was a Communist plot to take over Hollywood, and they would soon smoke it out. The Committee went forward with its Hollywood investigation, but except for periodic hints by Rankin and Adamson of findings "so hot" they could not even be released, it bore no fruit. One of the first witnesses in Washington in January 1946 was none other than Gerald L. K. Smith. He ranted and raved about the Jews who controlled the press, the radio, and the movies. "There is a general belief that Russian Jews control too much of Hollywood propaganda," he said, "and they are trying to popularize Russian Communism in America through that instrumentality."⁸¹

⁷⁹ Gabler, 359.

⁸⁰ Ernie Adamson once stood idly by while one of his underlings warned of the Hitlerian consequences for left-wing Jews

⁸¹ Gabler, 360.

Within the Committee, there was dissension over Smith's wild charges. Other congressmen objected that they had not been able to question Smith themselves, since he was undoubtedly "America's most raucous purveyor of anti-Semitism and of racial and religious bigotry."⁸² The Jewish community was appalled that Smith could gain so much legitimacy. "Although Congressman Wood is the nominal chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities," wrote one member of the American Jewish Committee in a report on Smith's testimony, "it was apparent throughout the hearing that Congressman Rankin was the actual head of the committee and spearheaded its activities. Ernie Adamson, the committee's counsel, was obviously friendly to Smith."⁸³

The movie industry was not fated to undergo its test by fire quite yet; Hollywood was not the only media of communication under investigation. The hearings stalled throughout 1946, or until the Congressional elections in November. Under the newly elected Republican majority in the House and Senate, a simmering battle against the New Deal took over center stage. The leader of that battle, the new Committee Chairman Parnell Thomas, would lead the way into the post-war investigations.

Measured against the standards set by Martin Dies, the Rankin Committee did not do very well. Even Dies' man, Stripling, was dissatisfied. Referring to an underling who had

⁸² Robert K. Carr, The House Committee on Un-American Activities (New York, 1952), 26.

⁸³ Gabler, 366

detected a similarity between the words *Kreml* (a hair tonic) and *Kremlin*, he called it "an all-time low in investigations."⁸⁴ The antic viciousness and over-riding bigotry of Rankin and Adamson had negated any sort of accomplishment by the Committee. The new Committee was no blessing, either. Rankin remained, and Thomas had been a loyal backer of Martin Dies for six years. With the Republican majority in the House and Senate, it was with exhilarating prospects that the House Un-American Activities Committee would enter its most infamous period.

⁸⁴ Goodman, 189.

CONCLUSION

True love of country is not mere blind partisanship. It is regard for the people of one's country and all of them; it is a feeling of fellowship and brotherhood for all of them; it is a desire for the prosperity and happiness of all of them; it is kindly and considerate judgment toward all of them. The essential condition of true progress is that it shall be based upon grounds of reason, and not of prejudice. (Elihu Root)

In 1919-20 the Red Scare succeeded in that it firmly associated the notion of radical worker insurgency with the abiding American dread of the alien. It intrinsically linked the Communists with the Bolshevik Revolution and with the Jew, the perennial alien on American shores. To many of America's fanatic patriots, as well as its upper classes, to hate and fear Communists and Jews was the sure way of proving one's American identity.

Then in the 1930s, millions of ordinary Americans found themselves in desperate circumstances and were willing to listen to reactionary politicians and fanatic churchmen who claimed both to understand their problems and to have a ready cure - a cure that, to some, seemed to have worked quite well in Germany. In addition, enemies of the Roosevelt administration sought to make use of the relationship between the White House and the Jews to energize and unite upper and lower-class opponents of the New Deal. This resulted in a surge of anti-Semitism in a country where nearly one out of every four American adults was out of work. At both the top and bottom of the social scale, there were audiences receptive to anti-Semitic appeals. Though these audiences were always a minute minority of the American

populace, their rhetoric was heard loud enough to create concern among some politicians, specifically Samuel Dickstein. This was not ordinary anti-Semitism, but extra-ordinary anti-Semitism that transformed fear and anxiety into a core for the creation of a political ideology which sought to blame the Jew for the problems of society.

Thus, when notorious anti-Semite and rabble-rouser Gerald L. K. Smith organized his *Committee of One Million* in 1936 to save the nation from Jews, Communists, and the New Deal, his largest financial contributors were presidents of some of America's biggest companies. To win their support, Smith emphasized his opposition to Jewish New Deal programs that, in his view, would result in the nationalization of business.¹ Similarly, when a group called the *Sentinels of the Republic* was organized to battle the "Jewish threat" to America, it received funding to fight against Social Security and other New Deal programs from the Liberty League, an organization that included such captains of American industry as General Motors President Alfred Sloan.²

At the same time, a sizable popular audience was ready to respond favorably to anti-Semitic propaganda. Evidence of this is seen in the registration of over 100 anti-Semitic, pro-Nazi organizations active in the United States during the 1930s. Nativism had been a factor in the politics of the rural South and Midwest since the turn of the century. The rural Midwest and South had provided a large audience for Henry Ford's anti-

¹ Jeansonne, 65.

² Ginsberg, 116.

Semitic editorials in the *Dearborn Independent* in the 1920s. During the 1930s, leaders of agrarian protest movements such as the Farmer's Holiday Association, became disenchanted with New Deal farm policies, and voiced the charge that Roosevelt was a traitor and the New Deal a "Jew Deal."

Throughout the country, Americans of German descent were a credulous audience for the anti-Semitic propaganda of the German-American Bund. Americans of Irish descent, who had reason to be anti-British and, thus, pro-German and against the Jews, were the core of Father Coughlin's enormous audience and formed the core of support for his Christian Front. And, in a similar vein, many of the country's politicians, unwilling to risk their political futures by being accused of "un-Americanism," were willing to support a committee that was based upon traditionally un-American concepts. The Dies and Rankin Committees usurped the authority of Congress, the executive, and the judiciary; it refused witnesses the right of examination by their own counsel; it accepted as evidence material that would be thrown out of any court in the land; and it precipitated a witch hunt that hampered the free expression of ideas so necessary to a democracy. But perhaps the most serious shortcoming of the Committee's record was the way in which it *personalized* its undertakings by following the anti-Semitic agendas of its chairmen and leaders. In this respect it completely failed to uncover the really "un-American" forces that robbed mankind of their reason and encouraged the persecution of those with "foreign" ideas and "alien" beliefs.

The Dies Committee was designed to do a job which would not be done legally but which had to be done under the cloak of legality for fear of offending public sensibilities. In 1938 the Depression had lasted for almost a decade and the great masses of the American people were becoming restless. The leaders of American business wanted to put an end to sit-down strikes, and the anti-New Deal forces were anxious to cripple the New Deal. For whatever the reason, Dies was the man for the part. He had been authorized by law "to investigate," but instead he had acted outside the law insofar as his victims were concerned. He was able to classify organizations and individuals as "subversive," "un-American," or "Communist," according to his own personal whims, without fear of legal reprisal. The Committee, whose original concept it was to investigate anti-Semitism and pro-Nazi, subversive elements wound up a platform for Dies's personal anti-Semitic vitriol. This pattern continued with Rankin committee and through the 1940s. Although this paper does not deal with the Committee beyond 1946, further investigation would probably bear out its anti-Semitic proclivities through the infamous McCarthy era.

Whatever the political or personal agenda of the Committee, however, anti-Semitism was decisively defeated in America during the New Deal era. Despite the efforts of men like Father Coughlin, Gerald L. K. Smith, Martin Dies, and John Rankin, a European-style, anti-Semitic coalition did not emerge in the United States either during or after the 1930s. One of the reasons for this was that the economy slowly started to revive,

removing much of the economic motivations of anti-Semitism. Persons of substance and property generally will consider allying themselves with rabble-rousers and reactionary politics only if they are desperate.

Second, no viable candidate existed who could become the national leader of an anti-Semitic movement. Father Coughlin, the most brilliant orator and possibly the ablest leader, was Catholic in a predominantly Protestant country. The reaction, in the vernacular of an emphatic anti-Semitic Protestant, might have been "We don't want a damn Catholic leading our movement against the damn Jews."

And finally, the majority of upper-class Americans in the 1930s were Anglophilic, while the anti-Semitic contingent was almost always pro-German. As the German threat to Great Britain increased during the 1930s, the Eastern establishment was compelled to align itself with the Jews in opposing the anti-Semitic forces. Thus Jews and non-Jews were united in groups such as the pro-British Fight for Freedom Committee, which sought to undermine pro-German forces by attacking anti-Semitic groups.

Today the Jews in America are freer, bolder, and more powerful than any community of Jews has ever been in the Diaspora. They can be bolder now because America is different; there is no longer a self-confident, stable religious majority. Across the country, minorities are busy emphasizing rather than camouflaging their differentness: Some blacks have taken to wearing their ancestral dashikis; women are holding candlelight

rallies and marching to "take back the night"; Orthodox Jews in colleges are insisting on wearing yarmulkes; and millions of people across the country are thronging to see a movie by a young Jewish film director about persecution of the Jews in Nazi Germany and the one man who was able to save a few. America has become less Western and Judeo-Christian; Jews are no longer the only non-Christian minority, and are now becoming an accepted part of the political landscape.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

Congressional Digest

Congressional Record

Dies, Martin. Martin Dies Story New York, Bookmailer, 1944

- - -. Dies Exposes Winchell!!!. Detroit: G.L.K. Smith, 1944

New York Times

Time Magazine

U. S. Congress, House Special Committee on Un-American Activities Hearings

Secondary Sources:

Bentley, Eric, editor. Thirty Years of Treason. New York: Viking Press, 1971.

Brinkley, Alan. Voices of Protest. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982.

Carlson, John Roy. The Plotters. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1946

Carr, Robert K. The House Committee on Un-American Activities. New York: Cornell University Press, 1952.

Dawidowicz, Lucy S. "On Equal Terms: Jews in America 1881 - 1981". New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982.

Foster, William Z. The Rankin Witch Hunt: New York: New Century Publishers, 1945.

Gabler, Neal. An Empire of Their Own. New York: Doubleday, 1988.

Gellermann, William. Martin Dies. New York: John Day Co., 1944

Ginsberg, Benjamin. The Fatal Embrace. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1993.

Goodman, Walter. The Committee. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1968

- Handlin, Oscar. Adventure in Freedom: Three Hundred Years of Jewish Life in America. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.
- Hertsberg, Arthur. The Jews in America: Four Centuries of an Uneasy Encounter. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1989.
- Higham, John. Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism 1860-1925. New Brunswick: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1988.
- Jeanstone, Glen. Gerald L. K. Smith, Minister of Hate. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Lindemann, Albert. The Jew Accused: Three Anti-Semitic Affairs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- - -. Through Esau's Eyes: Jews and Non-Jews in Modern History. A Reinterpretation of the "Jewish Question". Santa Barbara: Unpublished Manuscript, 1993.
- Marcus, Sheldon. Father Coughlin: The Tumultuous Life of the Priest of the Little Flower. Boston: Little, Brown, 1973.
- Marrus, Michael R. The Holocaust in History. New York: Penguin Group, 1989.
- McWilliams, Carey. A Mask for Privilege: Anti-Semitism in America. [1st ed.]. Boston: Little, Brown, 1948.
- Ogden, August Raymond. The Dies Committee: A Study of the Special House Committee for the Investigation of Un-American Activities. Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1945.
- Sachar, Howard M. A History of the Jews in America. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.
- Smith, Gerald L. K. Besieged Patriot: Autobiographical Episodes Exposing Communism, Traitorism, and Zionism from the Life of Gerald L. K. Smith. Ark.: Elna M. Smith Foundation, c1978.
- Strong, Donald Stuart. Organized Anti-Semitism in America; The Rise of Group Prejudice During the Decade 1930-40. Washington D.C.: American Council, [?]
- Wesley, David. Hate Groups and the Un-American Activities Committee. New York: Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, 1962.
- Wistrich, Robert S. Antisemitism: The Longest Hatred. New York: Pantheon Books, 1991.