The Radical Right and Its Influence upon American Foreign Policy

David Stringer Roberts
THE RADICAL RIGHT
AND ITS INFLUENCE UPON
AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

by

David Stringer Roberts

A thesis presented to the
Faculty of the School of Graduate
Studies in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Master of Arts

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
July 1963
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the political science faculty of Western Michigan University for their assistance in providing source material and advice for the production of this thesis. A special thanks goes to Dr. Jack C. Plano, the author's graduate and thesis advisor, for his special attention to this project, and especially for his advice, criticism, and encouragement during the researching, the writing, and his reading of the final manuscript. Also a special thanks goes to Dr. Robert W. Kaufman, who allowed the author to develop part of his thesis in a course paper, and who gave him special advice, criticism, and encouragement.

Thanks is due many other groups and individuals, too numerous to mention here, for their efforts in behalf of this project. Special mention must be made of Senator Philip Hart and Representative August Jornsen for providing primary source material on the right-wing, much of which was material put out by radical right organizations. Senator Hart's fine letter of encouragement and of information on the author's subject was also appreciated. Dr. Wesley McCune of Group Research, Inc., must also be mentioned for providing material from his organization, free of charge.

David Stringer Roberts
Battle Creek, Michigan
July 6, 1963
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>THE DEFINING OF TERMS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>THE CAUSES UNDERLYING THE RADICAL RIGHT MOVEMENT</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociological Causes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political and Economic Causes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological Causes</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Causes</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>THE METHODS, THE STRENGTH AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE RADICAL RIGHT</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Typical Methods of the Right</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Strength of the Radical Right</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Effectiveness of the Radical Right</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>RADICAL RIGHT INFLUENCES UPON CONGRESS, AND ITS IMPLICATIONS UPON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politics Pulled to the Right</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical Right Internal Congressional Influences</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical Right External Influences Upon Congress, and Further Links with Congressional Supporters</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>RADICAL RIGHT INFLUENCE UPON THE NATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, AND ITS IMPLICATIONS UPON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>GENERAL CONCLUSIONS</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an exposition into the American radical right. It is the author's contention that expository writing has a role to play in thesis-writing, especially when dealing with broad political problems such as the radical right movement.

The major "thesis" of this paper is that the radical right has an inordinate influence on the formulation of American foreign policy, out of all proportion to its actual numbers. All efforts will be made to prove this proposition.

The radical right or the right-wing are phrases used to describe a rather heterogeneous group, which is not easily identifiable and which is certainly not susceptible to scientific classification. Thus, Chapter One is devoted to an attempt to define what the author means by radical right, and why he calls it "radical." Also, the chapter explores the nature of the right-wing movement, its ideology, its major components, and some of its personalities. The differences and similarities of the moderate right and the extreme right are also discussed. The terms "conservatism" and "liberalism" are considered in comparison to the radical right.

In Chapter Two, the author attempts to explain why there is a radical right, including the sociological, psychological, political, economic, and religious causes and undercurrents which lead to extremist politics. These undercurrents help to point to the depth of the right-wing phenomena. It is important to note how deep, underlying fears, frustrations, and intolerances in the American people, caused in part by the threat of the Soviet-
Sino Communist Bloc, by the threat of nuclear war, and by the threat of sociological status-insecurities, have allowed the radical right to play upon and increase these fears, frustrations, and intolerances to the point that "anti-communism" becomes the dominant passion of American life. Later chapters attempt to reveal how this dominant passion affects American policy-making, especially foreign policy-making.

Chapter Three is a compilation of the methods of the radical right, of its strength coming basically through its links with influential components of the "conservative norm," including the powerful military-industrial interests, and of its effectiveness on the American political scene. This chapter also gives an indication of the strong pressures the right-wing can bring upon the federal government, and of its resulting effects upon policy.

Chapter Four is an attempt by the author to come to grips with the basic thesis by examining the influence of the right-wing on the making of policy, particularly foreign policy, in the Congress. There appears to be no viable liberal pressures in the Congress to counter-balance the influences from the right; and Republicanism and conservatism seem to be increasingly identified with right-wingism, especially since the Republicans do not hold the presidency. The radical right also increases its influence on policy through its links with the "conservative coalition" in the Congress. (This is a coalition between Southern Democrats and Republicans.) Because the Congress is basically a conservative institution, with conservatives holding most of the positions of real power in its structure, the author has tried to show that this has resulted
in a sympathetic acceptance and support by key members of many of the positions taken by the right-wing. He has also identified the members who are rightists or who support the right-wing positions on significant policy questions.

A later section in Chapter Four attempts to reveal the external pressures and influences of the radical right upon the Congress. Such pressures include the use of lobbying and letter-writing campaigns, and the like. Such influences upon foreign policy include the effects upon the amount of foreign aid, and upon the Yugoslav and China questions.

The author, in Chapter Five, tries to reveal how radical right pressures and influences reach into the National Administration, and how they are especially potent when they are backed by congressional support. The Berlin and Cuban questions are used as examples.

Chapter Six is a reaching for general conclusions, and an attempt to interpret the future of the right-wing in the United States.

In summary, Chapter One explains the background and definitions of what the author is developing. Chapters Two and Three attempt to treat the radical right both as a grass-roots movement that affects people at the local level, and as a more national movement that is related to powerful conservative interests in this society, and both have effects on national policy. These effects are compounded because the United States has a grass-roots political system, where pressures and influences are able to come from below in the system, and it has an open system where points of access in the national government are open and expedited. Chapters Four and Five specifically reveal these direct and indirect pressures and
influences on the national government and the resulting effects upon American foreign policy.

It is not the author's intention to bolster up right-wing arguments, or to defend the radical right position, just as it is not his intention to attack the argument and position of the right merely for the sake of rhetorical controversy or for personal motives. That is not the purpose of the present work. It is rather to explain these arguments and position, in as objective a manner as possible, as well as anything else pertaining to the right, in a way that will help to explain the appeal, strength, effectiveness, and influence of the radical right upon foreign policy.

This thesis seeks the answers to the what and the why of the right-wing. What appeal, strength, effectiveness, and influence does it have on the contemporary American scene? And why does it have such appeal, strength, effectiveness, and influence? It must again be stressed that the major focus of the thesis is upon American foreign policy, but it must be admitted that domestic and foreign policy are interrelated, and are not manageable in isolation one from the other. If the radical right affects American domestic policy, it must be expected that it will also affect American foreign policy, and vice versa. While discussing the what and the why, the thesis will also include the beneficial and adverse conditions of the right's appeal, strength, effectiveness, and influence.

The author is a so-called balance-theorist who believes that democracy is a perilous balance between authority and freedom, and who sees a viable democratic political system as one with a balance between a radical right and left, and the liberal-conservative dominant consensus rejecting both extremes. The great majority of people would fall within the limits of the -
dominant consensus. Compromises between the consensus and the extremes would truly fall in the middle of the political spectrum: compromises with the right would be periods of conservatism, and compromises with the left would be periods of liberalism. But the conservatives would have the special responsibility of guarding against and rejecting extremists of the right, and liberals would guard against and reject extremists of the left, and, as a result, conservatives and liberals would unite against extremism of both right and left. The thesis tries to explain why extremism, whether of right or left, is undesirable. And the balance theory is also explained and evaluated in regard to the American political system, especially in Chapters Four through Six. It is the contention of this thesis that American politics are pulled inexorably to the right because of the strong right-wing, and because of the vacuum created by the lack of a viable liberal movement and of a significant radical left. Political compromises must be made between the dominant consensus and the radical right. This is because the latter is the only significant political force outside of the dominant consensus. These compromises push the final decisions, which are made, to the right on the political spectrum. The reasons for the lack of force and enthusiasm among liberals and leftists are also presented throughout the thesis.
If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face--forever. And remember that it is forever. The face will always be there to be stamped upon. The heretic, the enemy of society, will always be there, so that he can be defeated and humiliated over again. Everything that you have undergone since you have been in our hands--all that will continue, and worse. The espionage, the betrayals, the arrests, the tortures, the executions, the disappearances will never cease. It will be a world of terror as much as a world of triumph. The more the Party is powerful, the less it will be tolerant; the weaker the opposition, the tighter the despotism. Goldstein and his heresies will live forever. Every day, at every moment, they will be defeated, discredited, ridiculed, spat upon--and yet they will always survive.*

CHAPTER ONE--THE DEFINING OF TERMS

"Radical right" is a difficult term to define with clarity and objectivity. The author found no single definition by other authors which would suffice for the purposes of this thesis. He chooses to define it in the following manner, relying upon his own ideas, and upon a compilation of ideas of other authors.

The distinctiveness of all extremist movements in the United States is their inability to accommodate their goals to those of the dominant consensus, which may be defined as the moderate, majority opinion of thought in American society. The radical right is considered radical

*George Orwell, Nineteen-Eighty-Four (New York: The New American Library--a Signet Classic, 1962, first published, 1949, Afterword, 1961), pp. 220-221, italics added. It may be strongly suggested that Orwell's Nineteen-Eighty-Four is not limited to a picture of Soviet or Chinese communism, but it is a view of the world gone mad, with the isms, communism, Westernism, Americanism, etc., responding to and living off of the terror and hatred of the others. In Nineteen-Eighty-Four, as in the right-wing world which will be developed in this thesis, democracy has no role to play.
because of the extremism of its demands, which include the desire to eradicate from American political and social life all of the persons or institutions which threaten its economic interests or its social and political values; and it is also radical from the standpoint that it is opposed to all of the social and economic reforms of the last thirty years, and to the internationalist foreign policy of the Administrations of that period.¹

Some writers would quarrel with the use of the term "radical" in relation to rightists. Ralph E. Ellsworth and Sarah M. Harris favor calling them conservatives:

Historically, conservatives have always opposed change, and these conservatives oppose it no less. If they seem sometimes contrariwise to desire change instead, it is only temporarily, in order to remove that accretion of changes which have occurred in spite of them in the last twenty, fifty, or two hundred years, and which they have never accepted as legitimate.²

But this is not to deny that the changes which the right advocates are radical and extreme—in fact, as radical and extreme as the Communist demands for change. Both rightists and Communists reject society as it has evolved. Both advocate destroying it and starting over, the rightists with something old—a mythical nineteenth-century society—and the Communists with something new—a mythical classless society. Both claim

¹Seymour M. Lipset, "The Sources of the 'Radical Right,'" from Daniel Bell (ed.), The New American Right (New York: Criterion Books, 1955), p. 166. Also see this article in the revision and updating of the book, with Bell again as editor, under the title, The Radical Right—The New American Right Expanded and Updated (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1963), pp. 259-312. Unless otherwise stated all referrals to this article will be in reference to the 1955 edition.

that when their objective—the final change—is achieved, society will become perfect and change will stop. And to call the radical rightists conservatives, especially since they want to be designated with that title, is to allow them to push moderates of both major parties, such as Senators Clifford Case (R., N.J.), Jacob Javits (R., N.Y.), and Paul Douglas (D., Ill), into the socialist, pro-Communist wing of American politics. Indeed, many rightists are endeavoring to equate the Americans for Democratic Action, a small liberal group, as the John Birch Society of the left-wing.

The radical right is considered both rightist and authoritarian; rightist for it is opposed to government intervention to promote economic and social equality; authoritarian in that it desires to narrow the acceptable range of deviation from the community norms governing both ideas and behavior. The radical left, on the other hand, tends to be both leftist and liberal in that it promotes government intervention and supports the widening of an acceptable range of deviation. But as the above definition of "radicalism" implied, radicalism of the right and left is remarkably similar.

A person, organization, or movement may be described as engaging in

---


4 Ibid.

right-wing extremism when it stresses a distorted and inaccurate picture of the Communist danger to the United States. Such views might include: (1) a wild exaggeration of the number of Communists and Communist-sympathizers and of their influence in the United States; (2) a picture of the United States in danger of Communist internal seizure; (3) a linking of unpopular social philosophies and movements, such as socialism and liberalism, with the Communist threat; (4) and a using of the popular reaction against Communists to attack people, organizations, or movements not favored by the rightists.

The radical right appears to consist of two major parts—the moderate right and the extreme right. Both have certain characteristics in common. These characteristics might include: (1) viewing the Communist danger as primarily an internal one, with welfarism and the increase in federal power seen as steps toward socialism, which is equated with communism; (2) interpreting all anti-Americanism, neutrality, and independent nationalism as signs of victory for communism; (3) seeing all United States failures and setbacks as the result of an internal "conspiracy that is virtually omnipresent, omniscient, and omnipotent"; (4) and the promoting of hatred and distrust of everything foreign, especially governments, trade, literature and thought, and immigration. The single core of the entire rightist movement, which appears to hold many elements of the radical right together,

---

6Father John F. Cronin, *Communism: Threat to Freedom* (New York: Paulist Press, 1962), p. 36. This is an 80-page booklet put out by the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The above points are developed: pp. 36-44.

is the demand for prompt but undefined "total victory" over communism. There are significant differences between the moderates and the extremists. These differences might certainly include the following: the moderates generally do not see their opponents as part of the overt Communist conspiracy, as do the extremists, but rather as "misled individuals" or Communist-dupes; they also see the United States government officials, who, they charge, have made basic mistakes which have helped the Communists, as misled persons, who have been misused by the Communist conspiracy, rather than as active Communist-agents, which is often the extremist interpretation; and finally, the moderates are generally less extreme in their means, methods, and programs than the extremists, as will be shown below. But with all their differences, the moderates and extremists are linked informally and formally, as will be revealed throughout the thesis.

Although rightists regard themselves as conservatives, some observers disclaim this self-description, as the author has done above. Richard Hofstadter, for example, uses the term "pseudo-conservative" to denote

---

8Ibid., p. 37.

9William Buckley, a moderate rightist, recently said: "Our leaders are not Communists, or pro-Communists, and are not suspected of being so, notwithstanding the gleeful publicity that has been given to the aberrations of a single conspicuous member of the Right Wing [Robert Welch, head of the John Birch Society] who made a series of statements that I would put up alongside some of the political commentary of Herbert Matthews, Gore Vidal, and Norman Mailer, as qualifying for the most foolish political prose published during 1961...Our leaders are not Communists, but they have consistently failed to grasp the elementary logic of nuclear blackmail, with the result that we have found ourselves without any strategy to enforce a doctrine we felt capable of enforcing 140 years ago." William F. Buckley, Jr., "A Conservative's View—One of Two Articles Entitled 'Opposing Statements on the Role of the Right Wing in America Today.'" *Playboy*, vol. 10, no. 1 (January, 1962), p. 168.
that rightists are not the true conservatives which they claim to be. Pseudo-conservatives, he charges, are men who in the name of upholding traditional American values and institutions and defending them against more or less fictional dangers, consciously or unconsciously aim at their abolition. Hofstadter lists what he feels are the beliefs of the pseudo-conservative, which can be summarized as follows:

he believes he is living in a world in which he is spied upon, plotted against, betrayed, and destined for total ruin; he feels his liberties have been invaded arbitrarily and outrageously; he is against everything that has happened in the United States, especially in politics, in the last few decades, and he hates the very thought of Franklin Roosevelt; he is deeply disturbed by American participation in the United Nations, which he sees as a sinister, foreign organization; he sees the United States as so weak that it may easily fall prey to subversion, yet so powerful that any failure to have its way in the world is due to its betrayal from within; he is bitter about American involvement in past wars, but he is less concerned with avoiding the next one; he hates Soviet communism, but he is bitterly hostile to any measures that might strengthen the United States in relation to the Soviet Union; he is more concerned with the domestic scene where communism is weak, rather than with those areas of the world where it is strong and menacing; he is opposed to Western European democratic countries, and he is against any aid to help them; and he is opposed to all of the operations of the federal government, except congressional investigations into Communist activities, and to almost all federal expenditures.¹⁰

Summarizing, the term radical right is used in this thesis to denote all persons, organizations, or movements from the moderate right to the extreme right, who generally have more in common than differences. The radical right sees the danger of communism coming from within the United States, and it attributes government failures to a vast Communist conspiracy

¹⁰Richard Hofstadter, "The Pseudo-Conservative Revolt," from Bell, The New American Right, p. 35. Also see this article in Bell, The Radical Right, pp. 63-80. All references to this article will be from the 1955 edition, unless otherwise stated. Hofstadter borrowed from Theodore W. Adorno, et al., The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950), pp. 675-676.

which has infiltrated the government. The radical right is also opposed to the social welfare legislation which has been on the American scene since the 1930's. Welfarism is looked upon as a product of the Communist conspiracy. The right-wing demands that welfarism must be stopped, with a return to nineteenth-century laissez-faire liberalism and free enterprise, and to a limited federal government.

Moderate conservatives, as opposed to the radical rightists, generally do not wish to turn the clock back. They accept the New Deal-Fair Deal reforms and tolerate the labor movement, while tending toward isolationism in ideology. They believe in constitutional processes, civil liberties, and due process. The test of true conservatism is by deeds as well as words in the conservative's concern for civil liberties, and by his devotion to, what Peter Viereck has called the "law of compensatory balance" by exposing right-wing anti-Communist frauds, which is the special responsibility of conservatives. Many conservatives believe the United States must meet and overcome the Communist danger, stop aid to the Communist satellites, and stop growth of federal welfarism, and to these the radical rightist agrees. But the rightist goes a step further and identifies an internal Communist conspiracy which he feels is causing the country to fail to meet its real problems. The conservative generally upholds the status quo in the political, economic, and social organizations of society, and he

---

12 Lipset, "Sources of the 'Radical Right,'" p. 189.

13 Peter Viereck, "The Philosophical 'New Conservatism'--1962," from Bell, The Radical Right, pp. 164-165. The liberals, on the other hand, have the particular duty of exposing Communist fellow-travelers in their organizations.

feels that any change that must come has to be slow and moderate.  

Liberalism is a political view that desires to change the economic, political, or social status quo to allow the full development and well-being of the individual, which looks to the government to develop and carry out a concrete program against the shortcomings and abuses of society. Both conservatism and liberalism recognize communism as primarily an external danger to the United States.

The primary differences between conservatism and liberalism seem to involve differences over what government should do and how it should be done, with the conservative slow to have the central government undertake what he feels is best handled by the states or by private enterprise.

But more and more, reputable conservatives, such as Ronald Hamowy and Peter Viereck, are charging that conservatism is moving to the right and is joining forces with the radical right. Hamowy charges that American conservatism which was once pacifist, isolationist, and non-interventionist, is today mongering for war, calling for intervention everywhere, and is more concerned with the freedom of Moise Tshombe than Martin Luther King. Viereck charges that the shell of the "conservative" label has become at best the supporter of laissez-faire Manchester liberalism, and at worst thought-controlling nationalism which uproots traditional liberties.

16 Ibid., p. 9.
17 Viereck, "Philosophical 'New Conservatism,'" pp. 171-172.
Such charges, of conservatism moving toward the radical right, will be looked at carefully in a later chapter.

The radical right is made up of various components, who are generally the anti's of American society: anti-laborites, anti-liberals, rural people who are anti-urban, segregationists who are anti-Negro, conservatives who are anti-Administration, rightists who are anti-government, isolationists, anti-intellectuals, and opponents of government spending except for business grants and aids. Such components make up what is known as the "conservative coalition" in Congress, as will be developed in a later chapter.

For the purposes of this paper, the components of the radical right will be divided into four main groups, all inter-related:

1.) *The fanatics of the radical right who make up what are known as "hate groups"*—Hate groups, and the people who make them up, are almost completely anti, as they oppose some other group of people, not by democratic procedures or by the promotion of their own ideology, but by conducting political warfare through seeking to destroy the other group's views as well as the people who advocate them. There is no indication that these people, and the groups they run, are in conflict with the more moderate right-wingers but are rather an extreme caricature of them; and the fanatics say openly and concretely, if often hysterically,

---


21 David Wesley, "Hate Groups and the Un-American Activities Committee," *Emergency Civil Liberties Committee* (New York: 1962, rev.), p. 4. This is an 18-page pamphlet.
what the moderates only generalize or hint at. One author has said:

...the hate groups share an enthusiasm for the political and social causes of the extreme right. Thus, they believe that America is not a democracy but a republic; that income tax should be abolished, foreign aid ended, States' rights restored and the powers of the Supreme Court restricted. Inevitably, hate groups have an affinity for one another, based on a consciousness of kind, common emotional needs and interlocking prejudices.

White Citizens' Councils are a good example of a hate group, along with other racist groups in the South, and several authors have documented the links between the radical right and the racists. The John Birch Society chapter leadership, it has been charged, is interchangeable with the White Citizens' Councils' leadership, for example. The radical right and Southern racists have common goals and views which include the sharing of common rightist social and economic views of the world; the sharing of the love of the past and the equal hatred of the welfare state, the union movement, social planning, and political democracy; and the desiring for the destruction of centralized planning and welfarism in favor of State's rightism.

---

22. Dunham, Men of the Far Right, p. 141. See especially a complete chapter, pp. 134-141, for an excellent look at the fanatics.


2.) **The action groups**—These groups have a conspiracy theory that is typical of rightists, but generally their expressions and charges are more moderate, rational, and guarded than those of the fanatics.\(^{27}\)

They are made up of mostly reputable people, rather than purely fanatical elements which grace the hate groups. It is not the intention of the present work to develop a sketch of the various radical right action groups for that is not the purpose of it. Other works have treated such groups in that manner and have done an adequate job.\(^{28}\)

These groups, like the hate groups, are almost completely anti, spending little time developing what they are for, or developing a program to take the place of the status quo. The John Birch Society is typical of such groups and it is against: social security, reciprocal trade agreements, NATO, defense spending (communism to them is an internal danger), foreign aid, diplomatic relations with Communist countries, the National Labor Relations Act, the graduated income tax, the TVA, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Rural Electrical Administration, government wage and price controls, forced integration by the federal government, United States government bonds, the Federal Reserve system, urban renewal, fluoridation, the corporation tax, metro government, mental health, farm programs, federal aid to housing, U. S. support of the U. N., the International Labor

---

27 Dulman, *Men of the Far Right*, p. 142. An entire chapter is devoted to the action groups, pp. 142-150.

Organization, GATT, WHO, UNICEF, and the International Trade Organization.\textsuperscript{29} Such anti-ism is part of the radical right's efforts to secede from the twentieth-century. The radical right is notorious for borrowing from the past only those things which benefit its cause, and ignoring the rest. Robert Welch, the head of the Birch Society, is well-known for this as he has "a melancholic nostalgia for the good old days before the First World War, without ever remembering John D. Rockefeller, the Triangle Shirtwaist fire, the Pullman Strike, the 72-hour week, the county poor house, the flu epidemics, child labor, or any of the other quaint fruits of that by-gone Eden."\textsuperscript{30}

Dr. Fred Schwarz runs one of many so-called schools on communism, the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, and he tours the country setting up seminars and rallies, and making speeches to outside groups. Though his manner and organization is more moderate than the extremists, "some lecturers speaking under his auspices feel free to venture into questionable areas, sometimes implying treason in national institutions, sometimes plainly suggesting that one might well find Communist activity under almost any bush near home."\textsuperscript{31} Schwarz does nothing to disassociate himself from such views, claims sole responsibility for choosing the speakers, and states he gives them "academic freedom."\textsuperscript{32} Here is one more example of a

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{30} Grove, \textit{Inside Birch Society}, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
\end{flushleft}
link between the more moderate rightist and the more extreme fanatical rightist.

3. The intellectuals and anti-intellectuals of the radical right—

Intellectuals may be defined as those who create, distribute, and apply culture which includes art, religion, and science.33 The basis of the radical right appears to be anti-intellectualism, as it appeals to fear, hatred, superstition, resentment, and prejudice rather than rationality; and the intellectuals of the right, such as William Buckley and Ayn Rand,34 must accommodate themselves to the anti-intellectualism and tolerate the more extreme elements, or find themselves in danger of losing support from the rank and file.35 Some of the intellectuals are trying to eliminate the more foolish and fanatical parts of the radical right movement, as may be seen from Buckley’s attack on Welch for calling Eisenhower and other conservatives, “conscious Communist agents.” Buckley apparently has no quarrel with the premises of the Birch Society, or even its methods which will be looked at in a later chapter, if Welch will but eliminate his practice of equating all those who disagree with him with idiots, “Com-symps”, a term Welch uses to mean a Communist-supporter of various


35Dudman, Men of the Far Right, pp. 151-152.
shades, or Communists. This is a practice which, Buckley feels, makes
the rightist movement ridiculous. Irving Brant, in a 1962 article in The
New Republic, suggested that Buckley attacked Welch because the latter
attacked true conservatives, which diverted the public's attention from
and decreased the effectiveness of The National Review's campaign against
liberals. Indeed, Brant claimed that the real target of Buckley and his
National Review is the liberals, since both charge them with all that has
gone wrong in the world since 1945. Unlike the extremists, Buckley appears
to have a concrete program which entails holding the Soviets at bay with
nuclear weapons, and retaking Communist territory through a series of limit-
ed wars.

There are various reasons for the radical right attacks on intellec-
tualism. These include: (1) the educated circles usually are the most
effective opponents of extremism; (2) there appears to be a correla-
tion between advanced education and liberalism, which makes liberal in-
tellectuals a target for rightists; (3) and through history, intellec-
tuals have tended toward the political left. Seymour Lipset has
claimed that there is an increased identification, among intellectuals,

36See William F. Buckley, Jr., "The Question of Robert Welch," The National Review, vol. 12, no. 6 (February 13, 1962), pp. 83-88. This is Buckley's written attack against Welch, but regardless of his efforts, Welch remains as the head of the Birch Society. Buckley is editor of The National Review.


38Irving Brant, "The Anti-Communist Hoax—Why Do They Get Away With It? (Part II of Two-Part Article), The New Republic, vol. 146, no. 23 (June 4, 1962), p. 18. Later chapters will allude to the fact that the entire radical right structure is geared to an attack against liberalism.

39Ibid., p. 17. This theory will be expounded on further in a later chapter.

40Lipset, "Egghead Looks at Himself." p. 22.
with conservatism and Republicanism. This may be due, at least in part, because of the threat of leftist communism which makes an identification with left unpopular and even dangerous. It is the contention of this thesis that the radical right is using the threat of communism to pull American politics to the right.

1.) Fundamentalism--The fundamentalist groups could be included as either hate groups or as action groups, but because of their special strength and importance, especially in the Midwest, South, and West, they will be considered separately. The fundamentalist is closely linked with the radical right and shares many of its characteristics, including: the belief in the theory of the internal Communist conspiracy, with the only way to break it through a new political party, secret organizations, front groups, and pressure campaigns; the rejection of the programs of both liberals and conservatives, and the rejection of the American political system, including the politicians, the major parties, and political compromises; and the refusal to believe in the patriotism and integrity of those who lead the dominant social groups like the government, churches, and labor unions. Generally fundamentalism is identified with various religious sects.

Thus developed are the major components of the radical right, which help explain the diversity, the prolificness, and some of the strength of the movement.

---

1Lipset, "Egghead Looks at Himself," p. 22.
3The next chapter will consider the fundamentalist religious sects in some depth.
CHAPTER TWO--THE CAUSES UNDERLYING THE RADICAL, RIGHT MOVEMENT

Radicalism is the product of deep underlying social, political, economic, psychological, and religious drives which cannot be fulfilled within the existing social and political structure. These drives or causes will now be looked at in relation to the radical right.

Section 1--Sociological Causes

Throughout American history, radicalism has appeared. During periods of relative prosperity, especially when inflation accompanies full employment and many people are able to improve their economic positions, status political movements or prosperity movements are formed. The term "status" is used because the groups which identify with such movements are receptive to status-oriented appeals. During periods of prosperity, society as a whole is not in economic or social crisis but many groups and people within it are in social crisis, and they feel hatred and fear for the social forces, which help determine their social position in society. Others are ambivalent in their feelings toward these forces. Such groups and people

---


2 The sociological causes of such movements will be discussed in more detail later in this section, at a time when the radical right is specifically looked at, as the radical right is a modern example of a prosperity movement.
include the "newly arrived" who fear their newly won status may be threatened by the same social forces through which they rose, those who have slid down in the social structure, and those who have suffered real defeat or deprivation through their failure to rise or failure to rise fast enough.

Such prosperity movements set up "scapegoats" who they look upon as a threat to their value system: the Know-Nothing's, prior to the Civil War, were anti-immigrant and anti-Catholic; the American Protective Association of the late 1880's was anti-Catholic; the progressive movement of 1900-1912 had immigrants and "plutocrat" millionaires as "scapegoats;" the Ku Klux Klan which arose in the 1920's attacked minorities, especially Jews, Negroes, and Catholics, and also the upper classes of the larger cities; and McCarthyism of the early 1950's found a "scapegoat" in the more liberal Eastern elite by equating it with communism. Early prosperity movements tended toward liberalism and leftism, but as basic social changes took place, rightist and authoritarian reactions sought to reverse the new economic trends, which worked in favor of centralized government at the expense of private enterprise, through political means. It is inevitable that every time a society is ready to move into a new period, reactionary forces come to the front to resist it.

During periods of depression and grave national emergency, liberal and leftist forces have become predominant, as may be seen from the 1930-1945 period when liberal and radical left organizations had a tremendous growth as a result of the Great Depression, the threat of fascism, and
World War II which was fought against the Fascists, who were identified with the right. The post-war period saw a resurgence of conservative and rightist forces as a result of a prolonged period of full-employment and prosperity, and the threat of communism which is identified with the left. Not even during World War II, extremist opposition to the Soviet Union on an American basis was fostered by a combination of nationalistic isolationism, anti-communism, and elements of fascism. As early as the 1930's, rightist elements were developed and increased by the Coughlinite movement. 3 The Coughlinites were followers of the radio-priest, Father Coughlin, who tried to build an anti-liberal, anti-New Deal, and nationalistic movement. The movement, though it never had great popular support, got its main support from the lower classes, Catholics, Republicans and anti-Roosevelts. It attracted anti-Semites for Coughlin worried with what he called the Jewish influence in politics and business, which was blamed for the bad times. Coughlinism also attracted some upper class people who were not part of the New Deal.

McCarthyism became the link between the 1930 rightist groups and the present radical right. 4 It is seen as a result of the strains caused by the


4 Ibid., pp. 326-348; Talcott Parsons, "Social Strains in America--1955," from Bell, The Radical Right, pp. 175-192 (This article is also in Bell, The New American Right); and Peter Viereck, "The Revolt Against the Elite--1955," from Bell, The Radical Right, pp. 135-154 (Also in Bell, The New American Right). The McCarthyite material is from these sources.
international situation, as the United States faced the Soviet bloc in
the cold war, and the internal strains caused by those who were resentful
because of status desires created by the prosperity period, and those
who were upset as a result of centralized government with its controls.
McCarthy's "enemy" became the upper-class, Eastern Protestant, especially
the Episcopalian Harvard graduate who was employed by the State Depart-
ment. 5 This group became McCarthy's "Communist" target: 6 the more liberal,
Eastern ruling classes. McCarthyism became both a Midwestern populist
revolt against the traditional and upper classes, and a movement supported
by vested-interest groups, like the new rich of the Midwest and Southwest,
who could identify with McCarthy against the old rich and established
classes of the East. However, the strength of McCarthyism must not be
overestimated. Seymour Lipset wrote:

...it may be worth noting...that the evidence indicates that
McCarthy did not have widespread support either in 1952 or in
1954. Only 10 per cent of those questioned by Roper in 1952
felt that most of those accused by McCarthy were actually Com-
munists. More significant, when asked in the same survey who
among a list of names had done the best job of handling the
Communist problem "here in America," only 7 per cent mentioned
McCarthy, while from the same list 19 per cent singled him out
for unsatisfactory handling of the problem...And in the 1954
pre-election I.N.R.A. survey, 32 per cent gave anti-McCarthy
responses on an index based on three questions about McCarthy,
while only 15 per cent gave favorable answers. It seems clear
from these and other surveys that the form-of-radical rightism
represented by McCarthy...aroused much more hostility than
support. 7

5In fact, it should be pointed out that Harvard graduates made up
the greatest percentage of the State Department employees at the
time of McCarthyism.

6McCarthyism could not be considered anti-Communist for it did not
discover a single spy in government.

The contemporary radical right is a response to the threat of international communism as was McCarthyism and it is not surprising that Americans who regard it as a great evil should form groups and associations to combat it. But, also as in the case of McCarthyism, it is difficult to maintain that the internal danger comes from the few discredited members of the American Communist party, so the radical right "has shifted the argument to a different and more nebulous ground--the identification of Communism with liberalism." The radical right, with its status-oriented appeals, attracts various persons from many different groups in the American society. These groups include:

1.) All those threatened by big-government, big-labor, and big-business; Especially included here are small businessmen who are squeezed by big-business, who see governmental reforms generally as increased complications of their business operation, and who generally adopt the image and values of the more powerful groups in society. This image and these values are often those of the radical right which is opposed to bigness.

2.) The dispossessed: This is a term used by Daniel Bell to denote groups of people who are displaced and threatened by the modern social forces. The managerial dispossessed are those managers of large industrial complexes who are threatened by large trade unions, which often act in concert with the federal government to restrict much of the independence and freedom from

---

It is interesting to note that the radical right generally never alludes to the real danger of Soviet-paid spies within the United States, that security programs are developed to prevent. It almost always sees the threat as domestic Communists.


Ibid., pp. 18-20. Bell includes the fundamentalists as dispossessed people, but they will be included later in the chapter.
outside restraint of the industry, and by the unstable, transitory position of the managerial power.\textsuperscript{11} President Kennedy's victory over the steel industry in the spring of 1962 has helped to increase these threats. The managers are trying to find an ideology to justify their position, and more and more it is the radical right position.\textsuperscript{12} The military dispossessed is that military personnel which finds itself pushed back by civilian controls.\textsuperscript{13} First came the clash with the scientists over the military control of atomic energy, and the result was the Atomic Energy Commission was put under civilian authority. Then came the clash over the control of space with space experiments placed under the civilian National Aeronautics and Space Administration. And finally came the strict civilian controls that Secretary of Defense McNamara has placed on the military. Increasing numbers of military men are identifying with the radical right.\textsuperscript{14} One of the reasons is:

...the main point is that the military community is no longer the only, or even the dominant, source from which the strategists are drawn, and the older military leaders particularly, with vested interests in military doctrines and weapons systems derived from their own by now parochial experiences, find themselves in danger of being ignored or shalved.\textsuperscript{15}

3. \textbf{Members of rising social and ethnic groups:} Such groups in their frustrations must seek sinister explanations for their unhappiness. Catholics, who were largely of low status until recently, are rising up the social ladder.

\textsuperscript{11}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 22-24.

\textsuperscript{12}The industrial link with the radical right will be considered in the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 24-30.

\textsuperscript{14}The next chapter will document the military-radical right links, and it will give further reasons for them.

\textsuperscript{15}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 29.
and are vulnerable to status-linked political appeals.16 Rising ethnic
groups also often shun their own ethnic culture, in order to become ac-
cepted, in favor of extreme Americanism. Old-family Americans also often
support the radical right for they are oriented toward a strong identifi-
cation with the past, and they see both economic reforms and international-
ism as a threat to their tradition. Groups that have the greatest degree of
status insecurity generally will oppose economic reforms and international-
ism as a threat to their status, and they tend to support the radical right
which is opposed to such policies.

4.) \textbf{The people of the lower-middle class:} They see the cost of living
increasing over wages, and they blame it on political corruption and foreign
and welfare handouts. This class is not a potential mass base for the
radical right because it is often in favor of liberal economic policy, but
it contributes votes and public opinion responses to the radical right.

5.) \textbf{The people of new wealth:} These people see the government not giving
them the same freedoms as were given to the wealthy of the last century,
while they are not accepted by the established rich. A return to the past,
advocated by the radical right, has appeal to this group.

6.) \textbf{The isolationists:} They have the same scapegoats as the radical right,
which include the Communists and the New Deal liberals who, they maintain,
got the United States into war.

7.) \textbf{Catalytic elements:} These include members of Fascist or proto-Fascist
groups, ex-Communists who so often go from one extreme to another, and indivi-
duals who maintain rightist sentiments while never becoming members of such

\footnote{16Catholic right-wingers will be considered in a later section of
this chapter.}
organizations. As the term "catalyst" implies, these elements often give the radical right much of its motivation, justification, and strength which helps to set off the radical right reaction. For instance, a former Communist turned rightist is living proof of the "internal conspiracy," and he helps to increase the entire movement's sense of justification and responsibility. Most radical right activities will include ex-Communist speakers and writers on their programs.

Thus presented is the major sociological explanation for the sources of the radical right support. It is seen as the result of frustrations caused by status discrepancies: those who rise economically find that their sociological position did not rise commensurately, or those whose economic position did not rise find their social status higher than their economic position.\(^\text{17}\) Such frustrations help to create deep resentments in these persons which will put the radical right in a favorable light with its attacks on government and liberalism. During the McCarthy-era, there were attempts to test this sociological hypothesis with survey data, which proved to be fruitless: only one study found a relationship between McCarthyism and status discrepancies, i. e., more strain, the greater the tendency to be pro-McCarthy.\(^\text{18}\) There was some evidence of a link or a relationship between the Birch Society and tensions caused by community integration and population growth, in a May, 1962, California poll.\(^\text{19}\) The poll suggested that the respondents whose occupational and educational attainments were not congruent, i. e., those who had a college education and lower

---

\(^{17}\) Lipset, "Three Decades of Radical Right," p. 333.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., pp. 333-334.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., p. 363.
jobs and manual work, or those with lower education and higher jobs, were more likely to support the Birch Society than those with similar or equal statuses on the two stratification dimensions measured. This one study lends credence, though it is too narrow to be reliable, to the theory that there is a relationship between extremist politics and social mobility and/or status discrepancies.  

Section 2—Political and Economic Causes

Political scientists, unlike sociologists and psychologists, have written very little on the political causes of the radical right, but some international and national factors of political and economic significance will be alluded to here. Certain international and national events have occurred, which have helped the growth of the radical right. Russian achievements in space, plus the threat of Soviet nuclear and rocket power, have produced a threat to the pre-eminence of the United States by a country not quite fifty years away from a primitive agricultural society. Nuclear deterrence has become the American policy, with the inherent dangers of nuclear war which have decreased its effectiveness, and it has not deterred limited Soviet advances. There has been a whole series of international defeats, culminating in the rise of a Communist Cuba and the failure of the United States to overthrow it. Various moves have been made in the United Nations to the point where the United States

---

20 Ibid.

could be consistently outvoted. And finally, the United States has various internal problems which include federal taxes at almost wartime levels, along with high state and local taxes, the increase of federal power to meet complex problems of a modern world, whether under Republican or Democratic Administrations, and the strains caused by racial tensions and increased youth and adult crime. The radical right's appeal comes from the simple explanations and solutions it presents to solve these complex problems: the American failures and shortcomings, and Soviet achievements, are caused by evil and treason in high places in the United States; and the answer to these problems is also simple—one must become active in anti-Communist organizations of the radical right type.

Other causes, which help to feed the fires of right-wing radicalism, are wealthy reactionaries who attempt to use radical right organizations to set out their own notions of policy, and some rightist organizers who find such activities as a profitable way of making a living.22

Section 3—Psychological Causes

The danger of international communism and the tensions and frustrations of a sociological nature have inspired feelings of fear and frustration in those people who have paranoid tendencies, and who cannot face

22See Chapter Three, Section 3, for a look at the finances of the radical right.
these dangers in a more rational way. The whole radical right movement has a paranoid syndrome since its leaders see the Communist threat close by and threatening. To the radical rightist, Khrushchev is not as dangerous as the person down the street for the paranoid needs his threat as immediate as his own neighbor. The paranoid individual is generally insecure, hostile, and suspicious but is unable to face his own problems so, as a defensive action, he projects his guilt upon others. The defensive action requires that all of his perceptions become distorted to stave off his own increasing anxieties. As he appears hostile and suspicious of others, they in turn become cautious and hostile toward him, and he becomes convinced that anyone who crosses him is part of the "enemy system." It is not hard to see how this type of person is appealed to by radical right organizations, with leaders who are unusually anxious and know how to use and appeal to anxieties of others like themselves.

So-called "normal" America is filled with psychological insecurities, tensions, hatreds, and intolerances. Americanism has become as much of a

23 Hofstadter, "Pseudo-Conservative Revolt," p. 40; Edward V. Stein, "Galloping Paranoia," Christian Century, vol. 79 (March 11, 1962), pp. 323-324. Members of the hate groups display the strongest paranoid tendencies though all right-wingers, to the extent that they see their "enemy" close by and threatening, have such tendencies.

Interestingly, the radical right sometimes sees paranoia on the other side, as witnessed by Fred Schwarz's testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities: "I believe paranoia is at the heart of communism." To believe that the United States can negotiate with the Soviet Union reveals "a failure to understand communism so completely that it approaches mental illness." Ralph E. Ellsworth and Sarah M. Harris, The American Right Wing: A Report to the Fund for the Republic (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1962, first published, 1960), pp. 52-55, footnote no. 55. This was quoted from Dan Smoot's Report (April 7, 1958), pp. 5-6.
compulsory ideology as communism, and Americans are pressured into conformity as one of the conditions for good citizenship. Such demands for conformity have reached abnormal psychological proportions in our persistent hunt for "un-Americans" in our midst. The real danger is that the radical right will continue and will increase its playing on public fear and hysteria to the point that liberties will be restricted, especially with no end in sight for the crisis-filled cold war.

Public opinion in the United States has had a real role to play in bringing psychological tensions and pressures to bear against governing bodies:

In the ill-defined, loosely articulated structure of American life, public opinion rather than law has been the more operative sanction against nonconformists and dissenters. Though Americans often respond to a problem with the phrase "there ought to be a law," their respect for law has been minimal, and during periods of extreme excitement, whether it be the vigilant action of a mob or the removal of a book from a school library, the punitive sanctions of opinion quickly supersede law.

It has always been easier to "mobilize" public opinion on legislation here than it is in England, and in the United States the masses of people have a more direct access to politics.

This public opinion pressure has been used for evil, at times, for Americans are generally intolerant people and are suspicious and hostile toward anything or anyone different. This is the result, at least in part, of the Protestant puritanical morality, which has always existed in this country, that sees everything as black or white, wrong or right.

---

24 Lipset, "Sources of the 'Radical Right,'" pp. 177-178.
25 Bell, "Dispossessed," pp. 31-32.
26 Lipset, "Sources of the 'Radical Right,'" pp. 174-175.
policy is carried out under this assumption which is based on the opinion that the United States and its allies are white and right, and that its enemies are fundamentally black and wrong.

Political intolerance is not just the belief of wartime vigilantes or extremists, but appears to be a significant factor among the general population of all periods. The 1919-1920 prosperity period, following World War I, is a good example. The U.S. Attorney General, Thomas Gregory, demanded that constitutional guarantees be suspended, and he told patriotic organizations to continue their work of amateur spying on groups and individuals who they thought were subversive. Seven justices of the Supreme Court, with Brandeis and Holmes dissenting, upheld a lower court's sedition convictions of people for distributing pamphlets objecting to American troops going to Siberia during the Russian Revolution. There were raids and arrests by federal agents of leftist suspects, states were passing sedition laws, and riots, beatings, and lynchings took place against "subversives." Public opinion polls got their start in the early 1930's, and from the beginning, they revealed that a great number of Americans, often a majority, oppose the rights of unpopular political minorities, and great numbers specifically oppose the rights of "atheists," "Socialists," and "Communists." Even in the 1930's surveys showed that the great mass of the population favored the outlawing of the Communist party, and approved the original House Committee on


Un-American Activities, headed by Martin Dies. And again in the 1950's, intolerance was predominant:

At the height of McCarthyism, the earlier trend point had established in January, 1954, when 81 per cent of the national sample declared they would not allow Communist Party members to speak on the radio, a steady rise from a figure of 40 per cent in 1943. Three years later, in December, 1956, the figure was 73 per cent, and in April, 1957, it was 75 per cent. Similarly, we had reported in 1954 that 45 per cent would not allow Socialists to publish newspapers in peacetime, a rise from a figure of 25 per cent in 1943. In December, 1956, 38 per cent still endorsed this policy and in April, 1957, the figure was 39 per cent. Such fragmentary data suggested that the sentiments of the American public continued to be intolerant, but simply had become latent in the absence of forces to activate, focus, or mobilize opinions.

Unfortunately, little research has been done on American intolerance during the 1960's.

---

29 Lipset, "Three Decades of Radical Right," pp. 327-328. In November, 1937, 54% of a national Gallup sample were in favor of a law allowing the police to close up places where Communist literature was printed, while 35% was opposed. In June, 1938, 53% of a national sample said they were against Communists holding meetings in their communities, with 35% for letting them. Again in November, 1939, 65% were against allowing Communist leaders to speak at student groups, and 24% would let them. Surveys in 1938-1939 revealed that three-fourths of the respondents were for the continuance of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. And finally in June, 1942, with the Soviet Union an ally of the United States, 50% favored a law to outlaw membership in the Communist party, with 36% opposed to such action. Ibid. Such responses, along with the Coughlinite movement, reveal that there are strong feelings against left-wing-Communist-liberal influences in a crisis period, even though the governing officials favor leftism-liberalism in the form of increased federal activity. But even so, the New Deal was predominately a moderate, conservative program to save the American economic system from more radical left influences.

It was Herbert Hyman who suggested that the political intolerances in the United States were not caused by complex historical, social, and psychological forces of the types presented earlier, for, as Mr. Hyman argued, England had the same type of forces and it was able to develop relatively free of intolerance.31 The reason was simply the results of the magnitude in the United States of official government investigations into the loyalty of people. He writes:

Those who know they are free of the danger of investigation have no reason to be afraid. When millions of individuals, located everywhere, are brought under official scrutiny as possible security risks, it validates the belief that everyone ought to be regarded with suspicion, and it legitimizes the idea of investigation itself, whether performed by professional officials or by amateurs. It thus encourages in the public at large a climate of intolerance toward those who may exhibit nonconformist opinions.32

31Ibid., pp. 240-249.

32Ibid., pp. 245-246. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who certainly cannot be mistaken for a left-winger said: "Our Government has kept us in a perpetual state of fear, kept us in a continual stampede of patriotic fervor with the cry of the grave national emergency. Always there has been some terrible evil at home or some monstrous foreign power that was going to gobble us up if we did not blindly rally behind it by furnishing the exorbitant funds demanded. Yet in retrospect, these disasters seem never to have happened, seem never to have been quite real." Quoted from the presentation of Norman Mailer: Norman Mailer and William F. Buckley, Jr., "The Role of the Right Wing, A Debate—A Head-on Clash Over American Politics and Policies Today," Playboy, vol. 10, no. 2 (February, 1963), p. 122.

J. Edgar Hoover, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has contributed to this aura of suspicion of an internal Communist conspiracy by his official and private statements and by the actions of his organisation which seems to recognize danger only from the left. The House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security have done their part also to increase the suspicion of a "conspiracy," as will be shown in Chapter Four.
Mr. Nyman points out two other differences in the American and English
situation: in England there is no political exploitation of the Commu-
nist issue that could increase intolerance, while in the United States there
has been and is great exploitation of it as both sides blame the other for
"softness towards communism;" and the British security program works in
quiet without fanfare and publicity, while publicity is an intrinsic part
of the investigation process, in the United States, and helps to inflame
public intolerance. Regardless of the causes, intolerance is an intri-
gal part of the American political scene.

Section 6—Religious Causes

An increasing number of Catholics are right-wingers. The reasons
are varied. To the Catholics as a religious group, communism is seen as
a real threat—many of the countries it has taken over are Catholic, and
others that are threatened are Catholic also. Added to the threat of

33 Ibid., pp. 247-249.

34 Edward T. Gargan, "Radical Catholics of the Right," Social
Order, vol. 11, no. 9 (November, 1961), pp. 409-419; and
Russell V. Gibbons, "Conflicts in Catholicism," The Nation,
vol. 195, no. 19 (December 8, 1962), pp. 389-390. The Catho-
lic material is from these sources. They offer a fine treat-
ment of the number of Catholic right-wingers. For instance,
Robert Walsh estimates that half of his members are Catholics.
Bishop John Wright of Pittsburgh said: "You can always get
more Catholics than Protestants to join an organization looking
for the impeachment of Earl Warren. Any super-super patriotic
organization that wants the United Nations kicked out of New
York will always find a large number of Catholic cranks going
around collecting signatures." Ironically, Bishop Wright is
the immediate administrative superior of Father Richard
Ginder of Pittsburgh, a rabid right-winger and a member of
the John Birch Society. Gibbons, "Conflicts in Catholicism,"
pp. 389-390.
international communism is the opinion of many Catholics who see the welfare state as a threat to their improving sociological and economic positions. An increasing number have the "conspiracy theory" of history, and they have a profound distrust of the ability of the present leaders and of the worth of the present form of government in the United States, especially with a more liberal, moderating Catholic in the White House. These same Catholics are deeply disturbed by the liberal moves of the papacy, led by the late Pope John XXIII and other Church leaders. Some right-wing priests are directing their congregations to ignore the directives of the papacy when they are slanted toward liberalism. As one priest said: "If you disagree with what he [The Pope] has said, ignore it, scratch it out. He is entitled to his opinion and you to yours, scratch it." The result of these causes and threats has been that many Catholic radical rightists have made informal working alliances with fundamentalists of American Protestantism, among other components of the radical right, in a furious attempt to strike back at the new moderating Catholic social-action movement started by Pope John. One such alliance has been with the anti-social, strongly anti-Catholic American Council of Christian Churches, which is presented by the rightists as the conservative counterpart of the moderate National Council of Churches of Christ.

The fundamentalists are those whose pattern of thinking have been attacked by the modernists and intellectuals with evidence based on science and rationality, and so they are strongly anti-intellectual. Fundamentalist thinking is basically local and regional in nature, and so it is

35Gargan, "Radical Catholics," p. 413.
generally isolated from liberal pressures, changes, and movements in
religion and politics. It believes in the inerrancy of the Bible, sal-
vation by faith alone, the return to earth of Christ, and it is against
any form of modernism, reform or revisionism. Its commitment to Biblical
prophecy allows it to set up an anti-historicist ideal that leads to the
support of the conspiracy theory of social change, which interprets all
change as atheistic and the work of the devil.

Just as the various components of the radical right are interrelated,
so are the various causes of the movement as has been shown. They must
be dealt with separately for the sake of convenience.
CHAPTER THREE--THE METHODS, THE STRENGTH, AND THE EFFECTIVENESS
OF THE RADICAL RIGHT

This chapter is included in the total framework to give an indication
of the over-all strength and effectiveness of the radical right in this coun-
try, which will help reveal the strong pressures that this movement can bring
on the national government.

Section 1--The Typical Methods of the Right

It might be argued that the leaders of the radical right, who think
and act remarkably alike and whose leadership overlaps in various rightist
organizations, are really authoritarian individuals who favor government
by the few and collectivism under the control of the rightist elite at the
local level. Such individuals leave no indication but that they hate and

---

1See Seymour Lipset, "Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites,
McCarthyites, and Birchers--1962," from Daniel Bell (ed.), The Radical
Right--The New American Right Expanded and Updated (Garden City, N. Y.:
Doubleday & Co., 1963), pp. 341-343, for an analysis of the similarities
between right-wingism and the authoritarian personality. The surveys
that this analysis relies on often are linked with the findings of
Theodore Adorno et al., The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper &
Brothers, 1950). The radical rightists claim to be supporters of individu-
alism, which may be defined as any theory that places the individual,
not the society, as the primary focus of consideration and importance.
Some, like Ralph E. Ellsworth and Sarah M. Harris, argue that the right-
ists are supporters of individualism because of their opposition to
strong, centralized federal government, and because of their opposition
to all foreign entanglements. But it may be charged that the rightists
are individualists in name only, and that they are actually supporters
of collectivism at the local level. Collectivism may be viewed as a
system of central or collective government controls, whether at the
national, state, or local levels, with the individual seen only as a
means to a collective end with no inherent value. Norman Mailer has
said: "The Right Wing often speaks of freedom when what it desires is
iron law, when what it really desires is collectivism managed by it-
self." The rightists appear to have a profound distrust of man's
nature and his ability to govern himself in a democracy, especially his
fear democracy, and that they advocate adopting Communist methods to fight communism. Colonel Archibald Bulloch Roosevelt, the third son of President Theodore Roosevelt, in his pamphlet "Manual for American Action" put out by his New York organisation, The Alliance, gave a familiar exhortation of the far right:

Too many of us are imbued with the concept of fair play when fighting the enemy. We must remember this is political warfare. This is not a pure game or contest. Americans have always learned the hard way that the only way to fight an unscrupulous and immoral enemy is to throw the polite book of rules out the window and to fight fire with fire.

In order to survive, one side often has to learn from the methods of its enemies...

Some Americans extol and support the anti-communism of the radical right, while at the same time giving some type of confused support to democracy.


2 Robert Welch is famous for calling the U.S. a republic and not a democracy. To him a republic is "ruled according to the well-established laws—whether set forth by statutes, by precedents, or by written constitutions—and not simply by the whim of the monarch, or of the oligarchy, or of a temporary majority of the voters," while democracy, whether direct or indirect, is seen as majority vote which is a move to mobocracy and finally to complete lawsless-dictatorship. Welch charges that in the United States this move is well-advanced. Gene Grove, Inside the John Birch Society (Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications, Inc.—Gold Medal Books, 1961), pp. 98-101.

Such persons do not realize that they may be destroying the very thing they seek to protect through means that can only lead to violence, lawlessness, and the end of liberties and of democracy.

The radical right groups, like the John Birch Society, have remarkable similarities to the Communist party which they avowedly seek to destroy.¹

1.) Standard Communist procedure in a country that the Communists are trying to take-over is to sow seeds of doubt and distrust in the people of that country against the government and its leaders—the whole radical right organization is geared to revealing that the governing bodies of this country are staffed by traitors who are influenced by the liberalism-socialism-communism conspiracy.

2.) The radical right and the Communist party are opposed to the most effective defenses against communism, which include, the United States membership in and support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, United States foreign aid, the United Nations as an organization independent from the influence of both sides in the cold war, and the increased military spending by the United States. The Soviets appear to have recognized the contributions of the radical right toward world communism, as seen in the following excerpt from the Literary Gazette of Moscow of April 4, 1961:

The predictions of Lenin are materializing in...the United States... Lenin said that the most ardent foes of communism will eventually become frightened and suspicious of anybody who does not agree with them. In this manner these extremely nationalistic capitalists will actually work for the cause of communism by eliminating some of the...

largest obstacles on the road toward a world-wide Communist way of life.

Several years ago an American Senator by the name of McCarthy performed a great service to world communism...by throwing suspicion of Communist affiliation on some very important personalities of the capitalist world.

Now the Communist movement has gained unexpectedly a new supporter. His name is Robert Welch. This former candy-maker went one step further. He has published a book which compares with Hitler's Mein Kampf, in which he outlines his program....

3.) Many radical right groups, especially the Birch Society, have authoritarian organizations with a monolithic structure, and with policy dictation from above and no dissent allowed from below, as it is with the Communist party. As Robert Welch has written: "The John Birch Society will operate under completely authoritative control at all levels." Especially for the near future and in the fight against communism "it is imperative that all the strength we can muster be subject to smoothly functioning direction from the top."6

4.) The radical right uses the "mean and dirty" tactics which the Communists so often use under their theory that the "means are justified by the end."

Such tactics include the infiltration into the legislative processes of other bodies, and the disruption of their proceedings, as called for by the national leaders, like Robert Welch, in order to "fight fire with fire." A good example of such tactics took place in Southern California on April 22, 1961:

...four local clubs sponsored a meeting at a public school, at which a film and public discussion were planned. Seventy to eighty John Birch Society members invaded the meeting and broke into cheers and

---

5Ibid., p. 90.

6Grove, Inside Birch Society, p. 75.
boos on signal, shouting the word "republic" whenever a speaker referred to "democracy." The visitors interrupted and insulted the audience and speakers.

The following day, a similar group of invaders, seventy-two in all, disrupted a peaceful meeting of a club in Tucson at the local community center. The Birch members were so abusive in their interruptions that it became necessary to call police officers in order to prevent physical violence. 7

Another case may be given, this time involving members of the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation, a Catholic right-wing group: "On October 13, 1962 at the campus of Loyola University of Los Angeles, a group of pamphlet-toting people invaded the organizational meeting of a Southern California chapter of the Catholic Council on Civil Liberties. As Thomas Francis Ritt, the council's national president, later reported: 'The ultra-Rightists invaded our meeting. There were pickets. Standing on chairs, ranting and raving, they refused to allow an orderly session. The result was that we were unable to organize and the meeting broke up in confusion.' 8

More devious and underhanded methods of the radical right involve the use of the "big lie" by attributing fraudulent quotes to Communist leaders in order to strengthen the right-wing position. One such quote was alleged to Premier Khrushchev, which supported a major rightist tenet that any liberalism leads to communism: "We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism, until they suddenly awake to find they

7 Mosk and Jewel, "Birch Phenomenon Analyzed," p. 89.
have communism."\(^9\) Senator Lee Metcalf (D., Mont.) tried to trace the quote by sending inquiries to the Library of Congress, the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, J. Edgar Hoover, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department, and the United States Information Agency. None could verify that Khrushchev had said that, and John McCone, head of the CIA, said: "The quotation does not appear in any of Khrushchev's speeches, interviews, articles, or off-the-cuff remarks which have come to our attention. To the best of our knowledge, we believe the quotation to be spurious."\(^10\) Various radical right groups attribute a quote to Lenin who they say allegedly said: "First we will take Eastern Europe; then the masses of Asia. Then we will encircle the United States of America which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack it, it will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."\(^11\) The Library of Congress reported that no such quote by Lenin was found, according to Jack Mabley of the Chicago \underline{Daily News}.\(^12\)

Other radical right propaganda, including films, is as false as the alleged quotes. One film, "Communism on the Map," put out by the National

---


\(^10\)Ibid.


\(^12\)Ibid.
Education Program of Searcy, Arkansas, is the most notorious.\textsuperscript{13} The NEP is headed by George Benson who is also president of Harding College, a fundamentalist school that is associated with and houses the tax-free, "educational" organization. The film pictures a world that is dominated by the Communists except for the United States, Switzerland, Formosa, and a few other places, as it equates socialism with communism. The film depicts the United States as the pawn of the Communists with the major danger not from the Soviet military but from gradual infiltration into the government, press, and educational institutions. According to a New York Times article, "Communism on the Map" has been viewed by ten million persons in schools, service clubs, industrial plants, defense establishments, and political forums.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 45. Another film that is as distorted is "Operation Abolition" put out by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which tries to put the blame on the students for the "riots" that occurred at the San Francisco city hall in 1960, while the Committee was holding hearings there. The film depicted the students as being under Communist-control, and it was fond of showing the Communists present in the crowds, not pointing out that they were subpoenaed to be there. The film offered no documented proof that the students were Communist-controlled. No mention was made that they were protesting the "stacking" procedure by the Committee which would let most of the seats in the hearing room go to late-arriving, card-carrying DAR (Daughters of the American Revolution) members, while the students had stood in line for hours. A subsequent trial proved the students were not to blame for the disturbances, as the one student who came to trial was acquitted by a jury. Sixteen others had the charges against them dismissed. Ibid., p. 44. See also "Operation Abolition—Some Facts and Some Comments," National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. (New York: 1961), 32-page pamphlet.

\textsuperscript{14}Suall, "American Ultras," p. 45.
Section 2—The Strength of the Radical Right

The radical right obtains its strength, and its resulting effectiveness, from the links it has with what may be called the "military-industrial complex." The complex is made up of a minority of vociferous military men who move into the right-wing movement, industrial firms that support the right-wing through sponsorship or contributions, and special organizations which link certain military men with various industrial firms, primarily defense contractors.15

The American Security Council, founded in 1955 by former FBI agent, William Carroll, is an example of the latter type of organization, as it brings together radical right businessmen and military personnel.16 The ASC claims a membership of 2,941 organizations, primarily business or


16The Council's "National Strategy Committee" is made up mainly of military men, all of whom are retired: Admiral Arthur Radford, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who has strong Washington ties and influence; Admiral Ben Morell, Chairman of Board of the Jones and Laughlin Steel Company, and founder of the right-wing Americans for Constitutional Action (see ibid., pp. 58-61, 108, 112, 181-182); Lt. Gen. Edward Almond, a member of the Committee of Endorsers of the Birch Society (this is a group of men, who may or may not be members, who lend their prestige and support to the Society, and who have little other responsibility or power); Dr. Stefan Possony of the University of Pennsylvania's Institute dealing with foreign policy (this group, entitled the Foreign Policy Research Institute, will be looked at later in this section of this chapter); Admiral Felix Stemp, board member of another right-wing group, Freedom's Foundation (see in the next section of this chapter); Rear Admiral Chester Ward, supporter of several right-wing causes; and General Albert Wedemeyer, member of the Editorial Advisory Committee of Robert Welch's magazine, American Opinion.
industrial firms but also foundations and universities, with each paying $30 to $900 per year according to the number of employees. The Council provides a blacklist operation of the loyalty and security of persons, in which employers can check the left-leaning tendencies of employees and job applicants from a list of more than one million names, compiled from private lists that go back as far as World War II. The philosophy of the radical right generally seems to be "once a 'leftist' always a 'leftist'" unless the person can "cleanse" himself of the evil by joining some good, patriotic, anti-Communist group. The ASC has the typical right-wing position of "fighting anything that smacks of social legislation under the guise of combating communism.... It also has entered the foreign policy field and maintains a Washington Bureau to keep close liaison with the


17Dudman, Man of the Far Right, p. 127.

18Ibid., pp. 126-127. According to the New York Post of July 9, 1958, the nucleus of the ASC files was purchased from now deceased Harry Jung for $35,000. The Chicago Sun Times said of Jung: "Harry Jung (was) one of Chicago's most notorious purveyors of anti-Semitic propaganda during the 1930's and an old time labor foe." Swall, "American Ultras," p. 54. Again another link between the moderate right and the extreme right is added.

executive and legislative branches of government, and with the military services. 20 The ASC advocates the "hard line -- total victory" position involving the United States relations with the Communists, including: the United States withdrawal from the United Nations if Red China is admitted; opposition to nuclear test-ban talks and to a nuclear-free zone in Europe; the wide dissemination of nuclear weapons to our European allies; and strong military incursions against the Communists, including military force to oust Castro; and calling government officials, such as McGeorge Bundy, Walt Rostow, and George Kennan, defectors about communism. 21

George Benson and his Harding College have been blessed by industrial backing. Cabell Phillips of the New York Times, in the spring of 1961, found evidence of such backing. Harding, with an enrollment of about 1,000, had ten new buildings and an eleventh under construction, and an endowment fund of $6 million, almost all from industrial donors. 22 Irwin Suall documented the fact that high officials in many large industrial firms give support and are related to Benson's National Education Program, including: General Electric Co., U. S. Steel, Lone Star Cement, Olin Mathieson Chemical, the American Iron and Steel Institute, Monsanto Chemical

20 The Council claimed that in 1960, two Congressional committees and eight government agencies got information from its Research and Information Center on a regular basis. Suall, "American Ultras," p. 55.

21 Ibid., p. 54; Cook, "Ultras," pp. 593-594.

22 Cook, "Ultras," p. 590; Dudman, Men of the Far Right, p. 95.
Union Bag Camp Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel, and the American Petroleum Institute. 23

The Allen Bradley Co. of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and Cherokee Textile
Mills of Tennessee are open supporters of the John Birch Society. 24 Most
of the high officials of the Birch Society are industrialists, now mostly
retired, who ran what Floyd Hunter called the twenty top "national organi-
zations according to power and influence in affecting the formulation of
national power." 25

In total, Alan Westin made a cautious estimate that the business
community contributed about $10 million to the radical right during 1961. 26

The radical right has appeal to these industrial people, beyond the
personal reasons cited in the previous chapter, because of their vested
interests in the profits that come from the continuance of the cold war

23 Suall, "American Ultras," pp. 51-52. The support and relations of
the firms to NEP involve financial donations, participation in
the NEP activities like "freedom" forums and seminars, and active
propagating of the NEP-line by showing "Communism on the Map" to
employees and to the public, and by distributing other NEP propa-
ganda. One high O. E. Official, O. Roy Fugal, wrote in reply to
Suall: "It is a pleasure to endorse without reservation, the
National Education Program." He wrote this in his official capac-
ity as Manager of Employment Practices. Ibid., p. 51.

24 Ibid., p. 52.

25 Floyd Hunter, "Studying Associations and Organizational Struc-
tures," from Roland Young (ed.), Approaches to the Study of Politics
Quoted from Edward T. Gargan, "Radical Catholics of the Right,"
Society is now getting the vast experiences and talents of these
persons. The Society has three former presidents of the National
Association of Manufacturers, and Welch is also a former NAM offici-

26 Alan F. Westin, "The Deadly Parallels--Radical Right and Radical
section of this chapter will look more specifically at the
through defense contracts, and the like. These same profits would not occur either in an ameliorated world, through some form of coexistence and disarmament situation, or in an advanced social welfare state. Logic ally, these interests are drawn to the right with its cry of "total victory over communism--and no social welfarism that is the same as communism."28

The radical right has had links with the military since 1958, at which time the National Security Council issued a still unpublished financial resource of the radical right.

One more interesting business-radical right link is the Coast Federal Savings & Loan Association of Los Angeles, one of the largest loan associations in the country, which is active in right-wingism. It operates a "free enterprise" department on which it spends 4% of its income before taxes. In 1961, it mailed out two million pieces of right-wing literature to depositories, borrowers, and business concerns; 5,000 business concerns inquired about its program; and an estimated 2,000 American business firms have such programs. Fletcher Enebal, "Rightist Revival: Who's on the Far Right?--Their Money, Their Numbers, Their Motives," Look, vol. 26, no. 6 (March 13, 1962), p. 22. Other radical right-business links may be found in Edmund, Men of the Far Right, pp. 103-113 for an entire chapter on the subject.

27 See especially Fred J. Cook, "Juggernaut: The Warfare State," The Nation (Special Issue), vol. 193, no. 16 (October 26, 1961), pp. 277-286 for an excellent look at the cold war vested interest groups. This article has been expanded by Mr. Cook into a book entitled The Warfare State (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962).

28 Politics of the right create strange bed fellows. As with the links between Catholic right-wingers and anti-Catholic fundamentalists, the relationship between industrial interests and the radical right is equally interesting. The latter too often calls for strict controls on defense and related spending, and even calls for the decrease of such spending at times. But the right does not lack for business or military supporters. It is as though such interests realize that the radical right will never have its way, especially in regard to defense spending, but that it can be used to increase public hysteria and world tension to the point that there can be no changes in the status quo, i.e. in the predominance of welfarism over welfarism.
directive, which set up the policy of the United States government to use military personnel and facilities to bring to the attention of the American public, and to arouse them to the threat of communism.29

First came the links between the National War College, and the Institute for American Strategy in Chicago and the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia).30 The War College, as stated by its former Commandant, Lt. Gen. Thomas Harrold, has charge of "grooming already experienced and promising military and civilian leaders for positions of highest responsibility in the service of their country."31 The two Institutes are financed in part by the Richardson Foundation, which has supported various other right-wing causes.32 The IAS was founded in 1958 by Frank Barnett, and the FPRI is headed by Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé, Col. William Kintner, a retired army officer, and Dr. Stefan Possony. The two Institutes have inter-

29 Daniel Bell, "The Dispossessed--1962," from Bell, The Radical Right, p. 5.

30 Unless otherwise credited, the material relating the War College to the two Institutes is from: Suall, "American Ultras," pp. 24-26; Dudman, Men of the Far Right, pp. 129-131; and Gene M. Lyons and Louis Morton, "School for Strategy," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, vol. 27, no. 3 (March, 1961), pp. 103-106. For convenience the Chicago Institute will be called IAS, and the Pennsylvania group, FPRI.

31 Cook, "Ultras," p. 594. In the first fourteen years of its existence the War College has had 1,452 graduates, 79% still on active duty. The majority were officers of the Armed Forces, but 25% (over 360) were civilians in the CIA, the State and Defense Departments, the Information Agency, and the National Security Council. Ibid. These civilians, many of whom are responsible for United States foreign policy, are often presented only the "hard line--total victory" military point of view at the War College for their official training.

32 The Foundation has financed the American Enterprise Association, a rightist organisation, and in 1959, it contributed $25,000 to a South African leadership exchange program in Johannesburg to bring to the United States "white apologists for the racist apartheid system." Suall, "American Ultras," p. 25.
looking directorates, their purpose is to alert Americans to the danger of communism, and it appears that the IAS presents and "sells" to the public the ideas that are formulated by the FPRI. The philosophy of the two organizations include the concept of "protracted conflict" which allows for no changes in the Communist world that will make possible peaceful coexistence between the two sides in the cold war; an increased military budget; opposition to all negotiations toward nuclear test bans, disengagement, or disarmament which are seen as defeatism; the use of "fourth dimensional warfare" which means aggressive paramilitary methods on the enemy's territory, such as economic sanctions, strikes and riots, and guerrilla warfare, in order to start revolutions behind the Iron Curtain, and then moving in military troops if the Russians resist; and the familiar call for "total victory" over communism, even through the use of nuclear weapons if needed. To these organizations, anything short of total victory efforts is defeatism and appeasement. This is clearly seen by the statements of Admiral Chester Ward at an IAS Regional Strategy Seminar, on September, 1960, at Chicago, which brought together top military and business personnel:

So what is their [the Communists'] strategy of conquest? They sell us on idealistic over-optimistic escape solutions, each one of which cumulatively weakens our strength, our resolve, our will to resist. Disarmament. Nuclear test ban negotiations. The United Nations. World peace through world law. Each one at best a diversion; at worst a fatal trap.

***

...you know what our national objective is...? You wouldn't believe it. Its world peace through enforceable law. In other words, some of our leaders seem to have a surrender complex. 33

33Ibid., pp. 25-26. The co-sponsors of the rally were the 5th. U.S. Army, the 9th U.S. Naval District, the Naval Air Reserve Training Command, the 10th. U.S. Air Force, the 9th Marine Corps and Recruitment District, and various civilian groups such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the American Security Council, the Chicago Press Club, the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, and the Illinois Manufacturing Association. Ibid., p. 26.

The IAS also holds an annual National Military-Industrial Conference at Chicago, which is also a joint endeavor of business and military leaders.
In 1959 and again in 1960, Strausz-Hupe, Kintner, and Possony conducted a "national strategy seminar" at the War College, upon the invitation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The seminars were for reserve officers on active duty, and apparently the IAS co-sponsored them along with the FPRI. A book was developed from a series of lectures delivered by Strausz-Hupe, and others in the 1959 seminars, and it was used as a text in the 1960 seminars. The book was called *American Strategy for the Nuclear Age*, and it incorporated much of the IAS-FPRI philosophy, that was developed above, into it.34

Senator J. W. Fulbright (D., Ark.), in a August, 1961, memorandum to the Defense Department which he placed in the Congressional Record, charged that there was another linkage between the military and the radical right, this time in the form of seminars presented to civilians and held under the authority of the 1958 National Security Council directive.35 Senator Fulbright cited eleven instances when active military personnel joined with radical rightists to present seminars which all had the same theme of recognizing the Communist danger as internal, equating liberalism with socialism and socialism with communism, and claiming that foreign aid, cultural exchanges, disarmament, and all other international programs are dangerous, if not openly subversive.

The IAS in its seminars and publications never fails to allude to the internal Communist crisis.


The three FPRI leaders also collaborated on a second book, *A Forward Strategy for America*, which is much like the first. The exact number of FPRI seminars at the War College was not found, and writing to the federal government did not prove fruitful.


See also Smail, "American Ultras," pp. 20-24 for other instances of such seminars which occurred before and after the Fulbright memorandum.
In 1961, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara ended the relationship between the National War College and the Institute for American Strategy-Foreign Policy Research Institute combination, but Eintner and Poseno were retained as special consultants on McNamara's special advisory committee to improve troop political instruction. Some links were ended, others were added. And in recent testimony before the Senate, McNamara commended both the IAS and FPRI for their "responsible" seminars, and he also singled out Frank Barnett, since early 1963 the director of the National Strategy Information Center in New York City, for special credit.

Also in 1961, Secretary McNamara issued a Defense Department directive, with no indication as to whether the 1958 directive was superseded, which stated in part:

After the President has taken a position, has established a policy, or after appropriate officials in the Defense Department have established a policy, I expect that no member of the Department, either civilian or military, will discuss that policy other than in a way to support it before the public.

This new directive led to confusion with the 1958 directive as to how much or how little military personnel can say in public, by leaving a large area between right action and wrong action. General Edwin Walker evidently went too far with his pro-Birch Society troop indoctrination program because he was reprimanded and removed from his command in Germany, and as a result he resigned his commission to protest his reprimand and removal.

---


and to devote himself to radical right activities. Janson and Risse wrote recently:

While the new Defense Department directive...has had a restricting effect on the freedom of military officers to advocate Right-wing theories or support them at public functions, it is far from irrevocable. But the administration believes—that the restrictions, along with the example of the Walker case, will serve as guidance to those commanders who are inclined to interpret the 1958 directive as license to indulge in any form of superpatriotism.40

All in all, McNamara's moves against the military-radical right linkage has been extremely cautious, most certainly because he realizes the potential great strength of this combination.

The radical right has appeal to some military men, beyond those reasons stated in the previous chapter, as a result of what might be called the "military mind." This in part relates to the fact that many military men, as well as the radical rightists, are unable to comprehend that communism advances because of social discontent, but they rather see it as a matter of logistics and subversion.41 They believe that the United States is militarily stronger than the Soviet Union but the latter continues to gain victories, which must be caused by the United States betrayal at home, for if the Communists are not winning logistically they must be winning through internal subversion.42

41Small, "American Ultras," pp. 5-6. For a well-documented report of social revolution in developing nation-states, see: Sidney Lens, Revolution and the Cold War (Philadelphia: American Friends Service Committee, 1963), pp. 1-47. This is a 64-page booklet in the "Beyond Deterrence Series."
42Small, "American Ultras," p. 6. One can almost visualize General Walker using this line of reasoning, after he personally witnessed the United States-Red China military stalemate during the Korean War. (Walker fought in Korea.) This type reasoning has all the similarities to Hitler's "stabbed in the back" theory: the soldier is courageously defending the homeland, while devious individuals at home are selling her out.
This view of the militarists has a lot of appeal for it appears that most people see communism as a conspiracy for world domination by subversion and military means, and both military personnel and the radical rightists play on this theme. Thus, it follows that the only way to meet this threat of conspiracy is through extreme internal security measures, and increased military spending. Social upheavals continue in the world, which are blamed on the Communists, and cold war tensions continue to increase, with the result being an increase in security measures and in military spending, and so the snowball grows, tension met by tension, force met by force, and bomb added to bomb. Such strategy leads to the defense of the status quo at home and abroad. At home powerful vested interests are created that will brook no change or compromise in the status quo for militarism equals profits, and also there is strength added to a "military and garrison state mentality" by such strategy, which leads to a powerful radical right, increased conformity, increased loyalty oaths, and the decreased rights for unpopular minorities. Abroad military policy leads the United States to support right-wing dictators, who in return for our aid give us bases and join our anti-Communist military alliances, and the American vested interests allow for no change in this support for new liberal forces in the developing countries would probably withdraw the pro-Western military commitments in

\[\text{\textsuperscript{43}}\text{Lens, Revolution and the Cold War, p. 48.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{44}}\text{At the most, communism only plays upon and benefits from the world's injustices which lead to social upheavals. Even with the United States having a military predominance, or even with communism being non-existent, the social upheavals in the developing countries would continue. Ibid., pp. 49-50.}\]
favor of national development. This type of military strategy leads to militarism as a way of life, threatens the peace of the world by increasing the arms race with the real danger of nuclear war, and strengthens the "hard line" Communists in the Soviet-Sino Bloc.

The entire American society appears to have the status quo view of the world, including the liberals who will be considered in the next chapter. No viable group is demanding internal progressive changes, and most Ameri-

\[\text{Ibid., pp. 50-51. There appears to be real fear in the United States, and in the military-industrial vested interests, that this country would be unable to control the new forces in the developing countries, and it is undoubtedly correct. But Americans are deceiving themselves if they think they are controlling the old forces. William Lederer documented cases of where right-wing dictators have used the United States to get their way by shouting of a fabricated "Communist danger." William J. Lederer, A Nation of Sheep (Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications—A Crest Reprint, 1962, first printed by Norton, 1961). See especially his chapter on Laos, pp. 11-26; on Formosa, pp. 32-52; and on Korea, pp. 53-71. Examples of the United States support of rightist dictators abound: Batista in Cuba, Salazar in Portugal, Franco in Spain, Phoumi Nosavan in Laos, Ngo Dinh Diem in South Vietnam, Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa, and Syngman Rhee in Korea to name but a few. The American rightists give full support to such foreign right-wing dictators, as seen by the writings of their entire movement: Freedom's Foundation, a right-wing group that will be looked at in the next section, gave "freedom" awards to Chiang, Rhee, and Diem (Lederer, Nation of Sheep, p. 62); the Committee of One Million, which will be presented in the next chapter, is organized to provide a pro-Chiang Kai-shek lobby in Washington; and the writings and other propaganda of most rightists, from the moderates to extreme hate groups, reveal a real support for the dictators. The pro-right argument is that such dictators are anti-Communist. But they stand for the same things that the Communists do: a secret police, a controlled press, one party that brooks no opponents, and enforced concentration and political execution of "enemies" of the state.}

\[\text{Lenz, Revolution and the Cold War, pp. 52-53.}\]
cans view the external social changes, which are occurring around the world, as a threat to our position in the world. And our position is permeated by the military point of view. This recalls to mind the recent, February, 1963, statements of a State Department official before a Congressional committee. When asked what the Department of State was doing to prevent the spread of communism from Castro Cuba to the rest of Latin America, he replied that a strict military blockade of Cuba had been set up (as though a blockade could prevent the spread of ideas), and that the United States had increased military aid to the pro-American countries of Latin America.47

The military position is provided for and listened to by the American public on an unprecedented scale.

Defense officials, civilian and in uniform, make several times as many speeches and write several times as many articles bearing on foreign policy as officials of the Department of State. And through its links with a battalion of national organizations, the Defense Department has a built-in system of communication with the American people unequaled in scale by anything available to other Federal agencies.48

Radical right organizations, linked to the military-industrial complex in the manner presented in this chapter, bring strong pressures on the federal government to prevent changes in the status quo, as will be shown in the next chapter.

Section 3—The Effectiveness of the Radical Right

The radical right's link to the military-industrial elements in the American society, which gives it its main strength, provides it with

---


respectability and financial support which helps to give it effectiveness.

The John Birch Society enjoys quite wide popularity among Americans, without a doubt caused at least in part by the respectable positions of many of its members. In April of 1961, a national Gallup poll asked how many had heard of the Birch Society, and it found that 39 million people had either read or heard of the Birchers.49 The responses were as follows: 47% had an unfavorable estimate, 22% had a favorable one, and 43% had no judgment. This meant that 3 million people thought the Birch Society was an acceptable organization at the time it was getting great amounts of unfavorable publicity by the American press, and at the time Welch was calling former President Eisenhower "a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy." Another 2½ million people with favorable responses would be added if the 43% with no opinion were divided in the same way, and by this method one could estimate that 5½ million of the almost 40 million adult population who had heard of it felt the Birch Society was a favorable patriotic body.50

In February, 1962, a Gallup poll again asked a national sample about the Birch Society, and 6% of the now 56 million who had heard of it were still favorably impressed, with 43% unfavorable and 43% with no opinion.51 Four and one-half million Americans had a favorable opinion, with a potential among the undecided of 5 million, and an estimate of 9.5 million who see the Birch Society as a useful organization in fighting communism.

50 Ibid.
Alan F. Westin estimated that the John Birch Society in 1962 had a membership of 60,000, with a working fund of $1,600,000 per year ($1,300,000 from the membership in annual dues and $300,000 from lifetime memberships, the sale of Society literature, and special donations), and a staff payroll of $625,000 per year ($12,000 per week). This is big business, and the favorable responses and the huge finances of the Birch Society help to increase its effectiveness.

But the Birch Society is but one example of an affluent radical right organization. Fred Schwarz's Christian Anti-Communist Crusade grossed $63,000 in 1957, $115,000 in 1958, $380,000 in 1960, and by Schwarz's prediction would gross over $1,000,000 in 1961.53 California Attorney General Stanley Mosk revealed that in Los Angeles alone in ninety days following June 30, 1961, the Crusade took in $311,253 with a net profit of $214,737.54 Mosk also said in a televised speech:

This is indeed big business—nearly a quarter of a million dollars net in ninety days! At that rate there would be a million dollars a year—in just one city. No one is told, except in generalities, what is happening to the Oakland profits—or to the $100,000 taken out of Philadelphia, the $40,000 out of Phoenix, and so on in city after city. No wonder this whole movement has been called "Patriotism for Profit."55

All across the radical right, huge profits are seen. In 1961, more than 100,000 Americans gave nearly a million dollars to the tax-exempt, "non-profit" Christian Crusade of Billy James Hargis;56 and press reports of the recent "Operation Midnight Ride" of Hargis and Edwin Walker reported that they

---

52Ibid.
55Ibid. See pp. 573-576 for Schwarz's backing among millionaire right-wingers and the businesses they control.
drew 2,200 people at St. Louis and 800 at Kansas City, with admission of a dollar and collections taken after the performance. Kent and Phoebe Courtney’s Conservative Society of America found "a recent appeal for funds brought so many checks ranging in size from $100 to $2,500 that they crammed a large box...." Human Events, a right-wing newsletter, increased its circulation to 90,000, and it grossed an estimated one million dollars in 1962 at $12.50 per year for a subscription. At the Dallas and Washington, D. C. meetings of the National Indignation Convention, which was founded to stop the training of Yugoslav military personnel in this country, paper buckets were passed around the audience to hold contributions, and $3,500 was taken from 2,500 people in Dallas.

The radical right fundamentalists are another affluent case in point. No longer are they made up of just poorly educated sharecroppers and villagers, but of prosperous Texas oilmen and rich farmers who provide them with wealthy and influential lay leaders and huge finances. The results of such backing are startling as the fundamentalist sects have large publishing houses, a vast network of colleges and training schools, and a

57 "Report," Group Research, Inc., vol. 2, no. 6 (March 29, 1963), p. 24. Hargis’ emotional appeals for money as the only way to fight communism, always succeeds in bringing in huge contributions from grateful admirers.


59 Ibid.

60 "National Indignation Convention," Group Research, Inc. (April 23, 1962), p. 1. The next chapter will document the results of this group’s efforts to bring pressure on the national government.

The fundamentalists remain in control in many rural-dominated states through rural-controlled state legislatures, the failure to reapportion, and through gerrymandering, but they also are strong in some urban areas as in Houston. 63

The immense radical right financial resources allow the movement to bring strong pressures on the American society. The next chapter will document its pressures on the national level. The radical right also pays special attention to local areas where so often a minimum of pressure may obtain a maximum of results, and it is on the local level that many of its most spectacular successes have taken place.

The radical right maintains a huge propaganda organization in all means of communication, and the right-wing view is brought to the American public on an unprecedented scale. 64

Right-wing efforts have often been concentrated on education, striving to gain the support of children and young people by molding their minds to conform with the rightist position, and striving to rid the schools of liberal and moderate teachers. These efforts may be the most devious and dangerous of the radical right's efforts. In 1961, the American Bar Association made a study of 278 communities and found very few schools teaching about

62 Ibid.


64 See Sull, "American Ultras," pp. 48-50 for a special view of the "ultra publications;" also Janson and Eismann, The Far Right, pp. 147-157. The efforts of the radical right in other means of communication, like radio, television, and films, are scattered among all the prime sources on right-wing organizations. See Chapter One, Footnote No. 27 for a list of such prime sources.

The bulk of the right-wing orders for printed material goes to several mail-order distributors, with the biggest being Bookmailer in New York City. In 1961, it sold over two million pieces of printed matter. Janson and Eismann, The Far Right, p. 148.
communism, and also very few courses on it at the college undergraduate level; and at least part of the reason was the desire of school officials to avoid controversy, and the increased harassment of teachers by right-wing groups.\(^{65}\) All too often, liberal and moderate forces fail to teach a sound and rational study of communism, and this leaves such teaching, in monopoly form, to radical right groups. This allows the rightists to press their efforts that there are but two points of view—the rightist view and the Communist view. Joseph Stocker of the Arizona Education Association recently revealed a survey he conducted on the impact of the radical right upon education: in some areas teachers were forced to resign or were fired because of the actions of rightists; many groups were striving to impose textbook censorship; and Birch members were trying to take over PTA organizations.\(^{66}\)

The radical right has brought pressure on persons, schools, and districts on a school by school approach.\(^{67}\) Other efforts have been by the wholesale approach: in Louisiana, the legislature passed a law requiring high school and junior high school students in the state to see "Communism on the Map," the radical right film by George Benson; and in Florida, the legislature passed a law requiring all Florida high school students to study *The Naked Communist*, a right-wing book by Cleon Skousen, a close associate of and lecturer for Fred Schwarz.\(^{68}\) The radical right was instrumental in getting these laws passed.


\(^{66}\)Ibid., p. 170. Also see Suall, "American Ultras," pp. 34-37 for the right-wing impact on schools.

\(^{67}\)Suall, "American Ultras," pp. 34-35.

\(^{68}\)Ibid., p. 35.
One radical right organization that carries on an increased operation in the schools is Freedom's Foundation, which boasts of former Presidents Hoover and Eisenhower as honorary officers. These two men give the organization respectability, and allow it to function so effectively in the schools. It works in the schools through essay contests, guest speakers, and the like. It also gives out awards to patriotic organizations and individuals: the National Education Program of Benson's leads the field in the number of awards, and others include Benson, Glenn Green, and other NEP officers, Thomas Anderson, Southern racist and John Birch leader, Frank Barnett of the Institute for American Strategy, and Senator Barry Goldwater. The president of the Foundation is Kenneth Wells, a frequent speaker at NEP Freedom Forums around the country, and who shares the platform with Fred Schuurs, Benson, and Green, and others of that stripe.

The impact of the radical right upon school children is hard to measure, but the influence is serious and seems to be increasing. Even Boston's school system has a unit on communism which teaches that socialism is as evil and as much a threat to freedom and democracy as communism. In fact, this whole rightist attempt to equate socialism and communism does not appear to be seriously questioned anywhere in American society.

Two more successes of the radical right, outside of the field of education, may be included to give more indication of the effectiveness of this movement. The second example has wide national implications. One was the efforts of Thomas Sullivan, an official of the Coast Federal Savings & Loan

---

69 Ibid., pp. 36-37.

70 Ibid., p. 37. Also see Cook, "Ultras," pp. 598-601 for other examples of rightist influences on schools.
Association "free enterprise department," whose efforts were to lead the fight against the use of the Westchester, California, city facilities by a volunteer mental-health clinic, which he charged was backed by Communists. 71 He got 2,000 names on a petition, while the supporters could muster only 800, and the clinic was denied facilities by the city council and was forced to get private facilities. This is a limited, local victory but one which is repeated in area after area.

The second was Life magazine's capitulation to Fred Schwarz. 72 Life magazine made an unkind reference to Schwarz's "revival meetings" in Southern California: "Schwarz preaches doomsday by communism by 1973 unless every American starts distrusting his neighbor as a possible Communist or 'comsymp' (Communist sympathizer)." Pressure was put on owner Henry Luce by Schwarz and his supporters and followers, which led to Life's admitting its error. At Schwarz's gala Hollywood Bowl extravaganza of October 16, 1961, G. D. Jackson, publisher of Life, stated:

It is a great privilege to be with you tonight because it affords me an opportunity to align Life magazine in a very personal way with a number of stalwart fighters...against the first implacable foe our country has ever had--imperial, aggressive communism. 

***

You have with you a man who has dedicated his life to helping disseminate that knowledge and therefore to helping endow our nation with that power. That man is Dr. Fred Schwarz and, like all dedicated men, he will be subject to over-simplified misinterpretations. Regretfully, my own magazine recently published such an over-simplified misinterpretation. I know that you are not interested in how that happened, but I hope you will be interested in my statement that I believe we were wrong and that I am profoundly sorry. 73

---

73 Ibid., p. 576.
Chalmers Roberts of the Washington Post reported that politicians of both parties told him that Jackson's public retraction was the greatest success of the radical right. "The apology served to swell the sense of increasing power for the rightists," wrote Roberts.74

Next to be considered is the radical right influence upon Congress and the National Administration.
CHAPTER FOUR--RADICAL RIGHT INFLUENCE UPON CONGRESS, AND ITS IMPLICATIONS UPON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Congress, as an American institution, is affected by the sociological, political, economic, and psychological factors which were looked at in Chapter Two, and by the strengths and effectiveness of the radical right, which were presented in Chapter Three, especially as it is the closest branch of the federal government to the people. An example may be presented to illustrate this point. When voters feel insecure in a time of relative prosperity, and in a time of acute international crisis, as at the present, an economic appeal will not arouse them for it is not goods or jobs which worry them; and in such a situation, the political candidate must rely upon ideology and fall back on half-dreamlike allegiances and prejudices which serve most people for an ideology. The radical right contributes its part toward keeping politics in a cloud of irrationality, divorced from reality, by convincing political candidates, through letter-writing campaigns and the like, that federal bigness and anti-communism are the main issues in the election, discreetly pulling everyone's attention from our real problems. Also, because Congress is the closest to the people, it represents the peak of strength of the radical right for it is a sounding-board of mood as much as

---


a group for pork-processing and bill-passing. 3

Section 1--Politics Pulled to the Right

The great pressures that the radical right places on the American political system in general, and on Congress in particular, are the result of its functional relationship to the present order of things, which include varfarism, anti-welfarism, and status-quoism, as emphasized in the last chapter. The radical right is often used as a handy instrument for preventing any type of welfarism, by equating it with socialism and communism, and it is also often used as a means to prosecute the cold war and maintain an armsaments economy and stifle opposition to such policies. In the rightist's demands for a return to the past, along with powerful status quo powers like the military-industrial complex, powerful pressures are built up which resist progressive change.

The differences between the conservative and liberal positions in Congress on foreign affairs have disappeared to a large degree because the hatreds, fears, and frustrations of the cold war have made anti-communism the dominant passion of our lives. 4 Both conservatives and liberals campaign on it, and vote together on it. This anti-Communist passion is mainly developed and increased by the radical right which plays upon these hatreds, fears, and frustrations. All Congressmen unite on the exclusion of China from the United Nations; only Representative Frank Kowalski opposed our invasion of Cuba; and increased defense expenditures whip through Congress without dissent. 5 Republicans and Democrats alike tend to support the

3 Riesman and Glazer, "Intellectuals and Discontented Classes," p. 86.


5 Ibid.
status quo view of the world, and the real issues of the cold war are not
even debated. The crisis over Berlin, our Cuban policy, the struggle for
Laos, the military intervention in South Viet Nam generally do not have a
liberal voice of protest or dissent, while such issues are hotly debated
in the other democracies of the world.6

The liberals in Congress, and the liberal-intellectuals throughout
our society, are generally without force and enthusiasm today, as seem
partly by their acceptance of status quoism through their voting in Con-
gress. The lack of force and enthusiasm among liberals is caused at least
in part because: they have been tainted by their identification with Com-
munists at an earlier period; they have been deserted by the discontented
classes of people who often have turned to the radical right, which gives
them a reason for their discontent; and their unity is broken because of
their increasing debates over what their present policy should be.7 The
liberals are forced to seek allies among the upper-classes and well-to-do,
and this tends to make them conservative.8 They tend to be voted into
office only when they can prove that they are more anti-Communist than their
opponents. When elected to Congress, they are faced with a conservative
coalition of Southern Democrats and Old Guard Republicans which organizes
from strength and holds control of Congress.9 This coalition holds control

6Ibid., p. 130.

7Frisman and Glazer, "Intellectuals and Discontented Classes," pp. 85-86.

8Ibid., p. 78. There tends to be no popular demand for liberal policies
during prosperity periods like at present. Generally it is only during
economic crises that such policies are demanded. Thus the liberals lose
their natural allies, like the lower-middle and lower classes. They must
then turn to so-called "enemies" like the upper-classes, for support.

9Gar Alperovitz and Kim Wilenson, "Failure in Congress: The Leaderless
Liberals," The Nation, vol. 195, no. 6 (September 8, 1962), p. 103. The
voting strength of this coalition will be considered later in this section.
of the key leadership roles, and the liberals curry favor with the leaders
so they can rise in influence in their Congressional committees. The liberals
have enough strength in the House so that with a bloc vote they could prevent
the conservatives from organizing it alone. But it is not surprising that
they do not act as a bloc with so many pressures and forces acting upon them.
Today, the force and enthusiasm are with the radical right.

The liberals in Congress are a special target for radical right letter-
writers. On July 24, 1961, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch reported the results
of its survey of fifteen liberal or moderate Senators and Representatives from
the East, Midwest, and West of both parties. All of them reported marked in-
creases in the volume of conservative mail, and at times the radical right

---

10 Ibid., p. 105.

11 Riesman and Glaser, "Intellectuals and Discontented Classes," p. 85. A
good example of the lack of force and enthusiasm on the part of the
liberals is their repudiation of The Liberal Papers, which is a com-
position of lectures of intellectuals, including Riesman, on the state
of the United States, on the failures of our foreign and domestic policy,
and on possible new approaches, made to a group of liberal Democratic
Congressmen. Senator Everett Dirksen (R., Ill.) and Representative
Charles Halleck (R., Ind.) charged that this was clear and present proof of
a subversive plot to indoctrinate the White House. There was nothing
in the book that was subversive for those who cared enough to read it,
but a rightist uproar took place, even to the extent of calling it the
left-wing equivalent of Robert Welch's John Birch Blue Book. The result
was that all liberals who listened to the lectures, except Representative
James Roosevelt (Calif.) who wrote a forward in the book, and two or
three others, repudiated the book and divorced themselves from any con-
nection with it. The Kennedy Administration gave no support to the liberals,
as it also repudiated it. Fred J. Cook, "The Ultras: Aims, Affiliations
and Finances of the Radical Right," The Nation (Special Issue), vol. 194,
no. 26 (June 30, 1962), p. 602. See also David Riesman, "The Intellectu-
als and the Discontented Classes: Some Further Reflections--1962," from
Bell, The Radical Right, pp. 132-133, footnote no. 4.

12 Fred J. Cook, "Juggernaut: The Warfare State," The Nation (Special
section of this chapter will document letter-writing as one of the
methods of the radical right.
view constituted a majority. The same ideas were repeated in various parts of the country, and among the more popular ones were: impeach Chief Justice Warren; cut back foreign aid; curb the role of the federal government; prevent federal aid to education; support the House Committee on Un-American Activities; keep Red China out of the United Nations; and support and strengthen the Communist-control measures.

The United States does not lack just a viable liberal sector in and out of Congress, but it also lacks a viable left to balance the radical right.

The pacifist and Socialist elements have been unable to make the peace issue salient. The radicals have been unable to develop a comprehensive critique of the social disparities in American life—the urban mess, the patchwork educational system, the lack of amenities in our culture. Among the liberals, only the exhaustion of the "received ideas," such as they were, of the New Deal remains. It is a token of the emptiness of contemporary intellectual debate that from the viewpoint of the radical right, the Americans for Democratic Action constitutes the "extreme left" of the American political spectrum, and that Life, in order to set up a fictitious balance, counterposes the tiny Councils of Correspondence, a loosely organized peace group led by Erich Fromm and David Riesman, as the "extreme left," to the "extreme right" of the John Birch Society.

It may be argued that a radical right has a role to play in a dynamic democratic political system, as does a radical left. It gives the system a broad spectrum in which the political environment can develop and prosper, and by which the political consensus can shun radicalism of the right and left in

---

13 Senator Philip Hart of Michigan, who could be classified as a liberal Democrat, wrote to the author: "As far as this office is concerned, most of the so-called lobbying by these radical right groups is done by mail. One observation that may have some validity is that the same group of people write me each month much concerned over the same subject—and the subject changes each time. Thus, we have had 'Cuba Free in 63,' one month; a campaign against imports from Iron Curtain countries another month; against water fluoridation another, and so on."

favor of periods of moderate progressive liberalism, and of more status quo conservatism, as seen in Britain. But without a dynamic left and with a dynamic right, the political system is inexorably and unavoidably pulled to the right. This is because the right can identify the radical left as it chooses, and its choice is generally well to the right of the left-wing extremism, especially since there is no radical left. As the members of the political system accept and recognize this sector as the "radical left," the middle or moderate position falls considerably more to the right than it normally would in a dynamic political system. With no extreme left to present counter-pressures, the dominate consensus must take into consideration and make compromises with the viable right, and such appeasements pull the political system further to the right.  

It was alluded to earlier that conservatives are identifying with the radical rightists on an increasing scale. Seymour Lipset, in 1955, wrote that with the Republican party in opposition and with the radical right increasing in strength, the Republicans tend to give it covert support, or at least the more moderates in the party tend toward neutrality; and he added, "Even when they viewed the methods of the radical right with disaste, the party leadership saw the group as potential vote gainers. The frustration of twenty years in opposition reduced the scruples of many Republicans, especially those who were involved in party politics."  

This was written about political affairs before 1953 and the Eisenhower victory. Now once

---

15 These ideas will be developed further in the next chapter, using the Berlin and Cuban questions as examples.

16 Seymour Lipset, 'The Sources of the 'Radical Right'--1955," from Bell, The Radical Right, p. 296.
again the Republicans are in opposition, and they will welcome any embarrassment which can be made against the Kennedy Administration, including trying to link it with a Socialist-Communist conspiracy, especially with the 1964 elections drawing near. Earlier, the Republicans had turned against Senator McCarthy only when he attacked the conservative Eisenhower Administration, and especially the conservative Department of the Army. At present, many Republicans are only attacking the radical right, mainly the John Birch Society, because of Robert Welch's attacks on Eisenhower and other conservatives, like Allen and John Foster Dulles. So it is a real danger, at present, that moderate Republicans will adopt some of the issues of the radical right to appease and hold its members and allies from rightist encroachments, especially as the issues increase in popularity, while during the Eisenhower Administration, the Republicans tried to destroy the influence of the radical right leaders who had challenged them while they were in power. 17 But now that they are in opposition, the danger is great that they will not only adopt right-wing issues, but that they will remain neutral about the increasing political influence of radical right leaders and about radical right methods.

It was noted in Chapter One that the moderate conservative, who is Republican-oriented generally, has views similar to the radical rightist, in a common dislike for federal powers, for federal spending, for an unbalanced budget, and for the increasing assumption of federal responsibility for the formulation of public policies. 18 The radical right often links

17 Ibid., p. 297.

18 J. R. Pole, "Forward From McCarthyism--The Radical Right and the Conservative Norm," The Political Quarterly, vol. 33, no. 2 (April, June, 1962), p. 199. Other common views between Republicans and radical rightists were listed in Chapter One.
Republican party losses to the Republicans attempt at being better Democrats than the Democrats by pushing centralized government and welfare programs. The right claims they need to push anti-federalism and true conservative programs to gain victory, which it claims has appeal. One can visualize the disconcertion of the radical rightists who witnessed the continued trend toward centralized government under the conservative Eisenhower Administration, and it appears some rightists, like Robert Welch, could interpret such a trend only as the result of the Communist-conspiracy which they believe has seized even the Republican party. In reality, the Republicans support a diminished role for the federal government only when out of power, but when in power they must seek, realistically, centralized programs which will meet the threat of international communism and pressing national problems. In other words, the Republicans have not accepted the radical right notion that communism is completely an internal danger, and to meet it all that is needed is a skeleton central government stripped of all but its investigatory powers.

The Republican party is rapidly becoming a parrot of the "no-negotiation, no-compromise, inevitable world conflict which must only and in our total victory" doctrine which is espoused so strongly by such rightists as Fred C. Schwarz and Senator Barry Goldwater. The 1962 Joint Committee on Republican Principles issued "A Declaration of Republican Principles and Policy" in Washington on June 7, 1962, a statement which only Senator John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky refused to sign: "The world cannot permanently endure part Communist and part free," and our "overriding national goal must be victory over communism...." It affirmed that "An active strategy aimed at victory does not
increase the risk of nuclear war."\textsuperscript{19} This last statement conforms with Senator Goldwater's belief that the United States should fight limited wars with the Communists to turn back their "empire," without fear that they will resort to nuclear weapons because they would rather give up their empire than die fighting for their ideology. The Soviet action of pulling out the bombers and missiles from Cuba recently can only lend credence to this theory, which is similar to the one expounded by William Buckley as presented in Chapter One.

The radical right is getting normal Republican funds, especially from business interests which would normally support the Republican party; and in some localities the party is almost identical with the radical right, as in Texas with Representative Bruce Alger and Senator John Tower, and in Arizona with Senator Goldwater.\textsuperscript{20} In other areas, the radical right has captured the Republican party, especially the Young Republicans. The Los Angeles Young Republicans is a case in point, as Robert Gaston, of the Richfield Oil Co. legal staff, captured the organization in the name of "Goldwater-Taft-Tower conservatism."\textsuperscript{21} Gaston advocates the United States pulling out of the United Nations, which he calls a Communist-front, abandoning aid to Communist countries, stopping welfarism, and supporting the House Committee on Un-American Activities.\textsuperscript{22} It cannot be stressed too

\textsuperscript{19}Fleming, "Broken Dialogue on Foreign Affairs," p. 135.


\textsuperscript{22}Ibid.
strongly that the radical right is a long ways from taking over the Republican party, especially if and when the latter retakes the presidency and is forced to moderate its out-of-power views regarding centralized government powers. But the radical right is a power in the party which must be reckoned with.

The Michigan Republican State Central Committee, on January 27, 1962, became the first official Republican organization to repudiate the rightists, and it denounced the political action organizations of the far right as well as the far left. And even governor-hopeful George Romney, on January 24, had described the Birch Society "of a reprehensible character and an unfortunate thing", and he added, "I want nothing to do with them." 23 But at the Republican Convention in Detroit in the fall of 1962, gubernatorial-candidate George Romney, possibly more aware than before of the influences of the Birch Society within the Republican party of Michigan, said to reporters: "Their extremist group is the Communist Party elements. Their problem is in the form of Communism, not in the form of Birchism. That has been historically true. In the last 30 to 35 years, they have worked themselves into positions of importance not only in Government, but into the ranks of the party. I think that Communism is still a problem in the Democratic Party." 25 When asked by reporters if he was implying that Michigan's Democratic party was presently infiltrated with Communists, Romney said, "It's difficult to say...." 26

---

24 Ibid., p. 223.
26 Ibid.
The pressures within the Republican party which forced him to make the above charges are hard to pin down, and very possibly they were completely politically motivated, in an attempt to discredit the Democratic party. But here we have a so-called moderate Republican implying an internal Communist conspiracy in the opposition party, and waving the Red-flag of distortion, innuendo, and half-truth, which helps to create hysteria, violence, and unreason. One is reminded of Peter Viereck's "law of compensatory balance," mentioned in Chapter One, which postulates that conservatives have the special duty of exposing right-wing elements in their own sector. Romney's charges brought a blast from the Democratic Convention in Grand Rapids, which passed a resolution calling Romney a "political slanderer." He then tried to "clarify" what he had said: he claimed he had never said "there are Communists at the present time inside the Democratic Party."; he did "not believe that the Democratic Party would knowingly harbor a Communist within the party."; and he believed both parties must be aware and alert to the dangers from both right and left.27

The "conservative coalition" was introduced in Chapter One. The Congressional Quarterly identifies it as a voting alliance of Republicans and Southern Democrats against Northern Democrats in Congress; a conservative coalition roll call is any roll call which a majority of voting Southern Democrats and a majority of voting Republicans oppose a stand by a majority of voting Northern Democrats; the Southern states are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, and the Northern

27 Ibid.
states are all the rest; a conservative coalition support score is the percentage of the coalition roll calls that a member of Congress votes with the conservative coalition; and the conservative coalition opposition score is the percentage of coalition roll calls that a member votes against the coalition.  

The following table, originally in the Congressional Quarterly, gives an indication of the sectional power of this coalition.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Periods, and Parties</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Economy, 1957-1958, and Conservative Coalition, 1959-1961</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of President's Foreign Policy, 1955-1961</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Unity, 1955-1960</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The East is the least conservative section of the country as far as the attitudes on federal economy and foreign policy are concerned, in the voting.


in Congress by both Eastern Democrats and Republicans. In 1955-1961,
Eastern Republicans cast a higher proportion of their votes for the
President's foreign policy than other Republicans; and in 1961, Eastern
Republicans cast 64% of their votes for President Kennedy's foreign-
aid bill, as opposed to 48% of Western Republicans, 49% of Southern Re-
publicans, and 39% of Midwestern Republicans.30 Also in 1959-1961,
Eastern Democrats cast higher percentages of their votes in support of
the President's foreign-aid proposals than Democrats of other sections.31
The East is regarded as the "home of those who rule" who are in the main-
stream of American political and economic life, and as a result there is
no struggle against the main-current.32 Radical right groups have made
few inroads in the East.33 Easterners appear to be truer conservatives
and liberals, as defined in Chapter One, than those of any other sector.
The West is second to the East in liberalism, but it is a sector that
also has pockets of strong radical rightism, especially in Southern
California.34 The Democratic South is the conservative bastion of the
country, with the Republican Midwest as the second bastion. Southern
Democrats and Midwestern Republicans reflect, to a large degree, the

30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
32 Ibid., p. 124.
33 Ibid.
34 The peak strength of the John Birch Society apparently shifted from
the Midwest, the main strength of McCarthyism, to Southern California
(and Texas). The sociological explanation presented in Chapter Two may
give some explanation of why--the "new rich" and middle sectors of Calif-}
ornia feel less secure than the "traditional classes" of the East, and
are thus more open to "status appeals."
But the West is somewhat in the mainstream of American life like the
East, and as such is better able to resist extremism.
economic and psychological distresses of their constituents, especially in small towns that are fighting the flowing of real power to large corporations and labor unions in bigger cities, and to Washington. Such sectors in the South and Midwest are outside the American mainstream, and as a result encourage localized fundamentalist thinking. Even in the larger cities of the South, the growing population, especially the working classes, receive little guidance from liberal or labor groups, but most of the influence comes from conservative sources like the newspapers, the business community, and the politicians who serve them.\textsuperscript{35} Also the working class of the South and Midwest is more psychologically and physically close to the business community, and it is, thus, influenced by its conservative opinion.\textsuperscript{36}

In the large metropolitan areas of the East and West, cleavage between groups is great, the psychological and physical distance between employers and employees is also great, and the competition between the political parties is more issue oriented.\textsuperscript{37} In terms of political structure and levels of state and local government expenditures, the East and West rank highest; and they also are the most competitive sections politically, the most urban, and the highest in terms of income.\textsuperscript{38}

Thus, we see the "conservative coalition" coming primarily from Midwestern (rural) Republicans and Southern Democrats (both rural and urban). The conservatives in this coalition are not all radical rightists, but there is

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., p. 127.

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 126. Often this opinion is radical right oriented.

\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., pp. 126-127. Midwestern communities, like Detroit, have these characteristics and are islands in a sea of rural conservatism, as seen by the votes of Midwestern Democrats.

\textsuperscript{38}Ibid., p. 126
the danger, as pointed out earlier in this section, that the conservatives will identify and borrow from the extreme right. Others in this coalition are by definition radical rightists, and they will be identified in the next section of this chapter.

The "conservative coalition" has a potent voting strength as seen by its record, 1957-1962. The coalition appeared on 65 (22%) of the 1960's session of 300 roll calls; 17% in 1959; and 18% in 1958 (the number would be greater except many issues were non-controversial). In the Senate, it won 67% of the time in 1960, 65% in 1959, 86% in 1958, and 100% in 1957; while in the House it won 91% in 1959, but dropped to 35% in 1960, due mainly to its defeat ten times on the Area Redevelopment Act, which had the appeal of federal funds for congressional districts of normal coalition supporters. In 1961, the conservative coalition appeared on 88 (28%) of the session's 320 roll calls, winning 48% in the Senate and 70% in the House. The coalition supporters during 1961 were primarily Southern Democrats and Midwestern Republicans. In the Senate: Southern Democrats all scoring over 92% on the conservative coalition support score were Thurmond (S.C.), Stennis (Miss.), Jordan and Ervin (N.C.), Russell and Talmadge (Ga.), and Holland (Fla.); and the Republicans were Dworshak (Idaho), Mundt (S.D.), Bennett (Utah), Williams (Del.), Case (S.D.), and Hruska (Neb.), all scoring over 85%. Lausche, a Democrat from Ohio, scored

---

40 Ibid. On the other nine coalition votes, it won 7 or 78%.
42 Ibid., p. 1798.
63%. In the House: Southern Democrats scoring over 91% were Haley and Mathews (Fla.), Kitchin, Alexander, and Fountain (N.C.), Ashmore (S.C.), Selden (Ala.), Gathings (Ark.), Whitten (Miss.), Forrester (Ga.), Dowdy and Fisher (Tex.), and Abbitt, Gary, Tuck, Downing, and Smith (Va.); Republicans scoring 96% or better were Bruce and Wilson (Ind.), Dole and Shriver (Kan.), Langen (Minn.), Neermann (Neb.), Ray, Ming, and Pillion (N.Y.), Jonas (N.C.), Ashbrook, Betts, Brown, Latte, and McCulloch (Ohio), Welch (Okla.), Levid, Schadberg, and Thomson (Wis.), Gross (Iowa), Johansen and Meader (Mich.), and Poff (Va.).

In 1962, the "conservative coalition" appeared on 50 (14%) of the session's 348 roll calls, winning 71% of the time in the Senate (24 victories), and 44% in the House (7 victories). President Kennedy and the coalition were at odds on 25 of 50 coalition votes, 13 in the Senate, and 12 in the House: the President's position won 12 times, 6 in each chamber, and the coalition won 13 times, 7 in the Senate and 6 in the House. The conservative coalition scores were as follows:

---

43"Conservative Coalition' Appeared on 14% of Roll Calls," Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, vol. 20, no. 44 (November 2, 1962), p. 2065. Several reasons were given for the drop to 14% from 28% in 1961. It was suggested that President Kennedy had success in stopping the coalition from appearing by wooing individuals from it, for at significant times it failed to appear. Also many bills were killed with one blow and not in a series of blows, as were the urban affairs program and medicare, while there were a whole series of votes on housing in 1961. Ibid., pp. 2065-2066.

44Ibid., p. 2066.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this it can be seen that the coalition got less support from Southern Democratic House members than from Republicans and Southern Democratic Senators. The individual support scores include: Southern Democratic Senators Thurmond (S.C.) 91%, Jordan (N.C.) 91%, Ervin (N.C.) 91%, Robertson (Va.) 86%, Eastman (La.) 86%, and Talmadge (Ga.) 88%. Senator Bible, a Democrat (N.C.) 71%; Republican Senators Murdock (S.D.), Hruska (Neb.),, Curtis (Neb.), and Williams (Del.), all 91%; House Southern Democrats, Wagonenar (La.), Abernathy (Miss.), Fisher (Tex.), and Abbott (Va.), all 100%; and House Republicans had 15 with 100%, including Johansen of Michigan.

During the period studied, 1957-1962, the "conservative coalition" position won out generally over internal welfare programs like Medicare, while it tended to be defeated on foreign policy programs. Part of the reason may be that with the progressive internal policies, there does not appear to be any strong public demand for such programs, thus, allowing the coalition to win out by default, but the threat of communism and the

---


46 Ibid., p. 2068

cold war causes the foreign-aid programs to win, generally without dis-
sent. When dissent does come, it comes generally from the right by
those who argue that the foreign policy programs are pro-Communist.

Section 2--Radical Right Internal Congressional Influences

Congress reveals a real penchant for accepting the radical right's
views, and this includes the ideology of Americanism, enforced conformity
and the hunt for un-Americans, and the belief that communism is basically
an internal threat. Thus, the Communist-control measures passed by Congress
set up criminal punishment for those who fail to conform to Americanism, and

48 It will be argued in the next chapter that the radical right puts
pressures on the Administration, which influences the type of program
that is presented to Congress. Dynamic programs are born in the
State Department by the President's foreign policy advisers, and
action by Congress is merely anti-climatic.

49 This recalls the 1962 session's debates on United States trade
with Communist countries, like Poland and Yugoslavia that then in
turn trade with Castro Cuba. The House put into the foreign aid
appropriations bill a mandate that the United States not trade with
such countries, but the Senate Appropriations Committee amended the
bill leaving out the stipulation against such trade, leaving it to
the President's judgment whether the United States should or not.
Many Senators spoke against this amendment on the Senate floor from
the rightist position. Senator Olin B. Johnston (D., S. C.) was one
who said in part: "Our former ambassador to Cuba, Earl L. T. Smith,
reveals dramatically in the current issue of U.S. Navy & World Report
the kind of distorted misguided government philosophy or policy that
existed under the Eisenhower administration that led to our woes in
Cuba.

"Former Ambassador Smith reveals how the so-called career of men of
the lower echelon of the State Department developed and put into ef-
fec the program which embraced pro-Communist Castro and isolated us
from pro-American Batista.

"...the philosophy which tolerated such an asinine foreign policy
as to help Communist Castro rise to power in Cuba is the same asinine
philosophy which now wants to continue to send foreign aid to Com-

... of the State Department--The Senate (October 1, 1962), p. 20324.

The House and Senate ultimately allowed such trade to Communist
countries as the President deemed proper and under certain-circumstances,
as will be seen further in the third section of this chapter, over the
opposition of the "conservative coalition." "Conservative Coalition,"
the various Congressional committees, as the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, are busy seeking subversives and un-Americans among us. Very few voices of protest are raised in Congress against such activities, and those who do are dubbed "Communist dupes" who would weaken us at a time of grave internal danger. The huge annual appropriation to the House Committee on Un-American Activities breezes through Congress with barely a dissenting vote, and though it is rumored that many Congressmen would like to oppose it, only six did in 1961 when the vote came up.50

The two internal security committees give the radical right a forum in Congress. The House Committee on Un-American Activities is a "hate group" as defined in Chapter One, and it is linked to the "hate underworld." It has according to David Wesley, all the characteristics of a hate group: it is primarily an anti-group, as it is anti-radical left, anti-liberal, anti-Negro, anti-alien, anti-labor, anti-Semitic, and anti-democracy, and the "anti-ism" often reaches fanatical, even paranoid proportions; it has a fanatical devotion to the status quo, especially to the corporate power interests; and it has a common language and an interlocking system of information and ideas, and a familiar relationship with people engaged in the hate field.51 Over the years, HUAC has developed into "a solid establishment: an acre of files, a thoroughly indoctrinated staff, a firm tradition, a network of contacts and sources of information, a conditioned pattern of behavior, a

50Cook, "Ultras," p. 602; Fleming, "Broken Dialogue on Foreign Affairs," p. 129. For convenience the Committee will be called HUAC.

51David Wesley, "Hate Groups and the Un-American Activities Committee," Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (New York: 1962, rev.), pp. 5-9. These ideas are developed further in these pages.
methodology—all intricately interwoven into the whole fabric of the underworld of hate, with its interlocking directorships and its broad, cross-pollinating system of propaganda organs." Frank Donner writes:

The Committee is not merely functionally linked to hate groups. Its own operations reflect the hate-group syndrome. It is itself a hate group. HUAC's extremism, its exaggerations, deceptions, and distortions, its willful oversimplification of the complex, its division of the world into black and white, its response to all forms of criticism with the Red smear, its overheated, fear-mongering rhetoric, and its rivers of antidemocratic propaganda, are the techniques and practices which have been made familiar to us by the operations of the hate groups.

As was pointed out, any attack on HUAC is seen as a Red plot, and the function of private organizations and persons in the HUAC-system is to help expose and punish the Committee's enemies by bringing pressure against them at the local level, by way of the communication media. Frank J. Alpin of Ann Arbor, Michigan, wrote to the Battle Creek Enquirer and News in response

52 Ibid., p. 8.


54 Ibid., p. 30. The primary function of the HUAC machinery is exposure (see ibid., pp. 54-98 for an excellent look at this function), and the target is liberals and non-conformists who can be discredited by linking them to communism. This is the same method of the radical right of which HUAC is a part and to which it is linked. (HUAC has relationships and support from all the radical right components, and not just the hate groups.) With HUAC, as with the radical right, communism is viewed as primarily an internal threat.

This Committee is not anti-Communist for it has failed to turn up any solid knowledge or concrete evidence of an internal Communist conspiracy, and to find a Communist it has to go back before 1945 (especially to the 1930's) in a person's past in order to establish any link at all with the Communist party or its front-groups. To HUAC, once a Communist always a Communist unless one can purge himself of the sin by exposing others. The Committee is more interested in who you know, rather than what you might know about Communist internal activities, which helps to prove it is only out to destroy its enemies. HUAC has made exposure and the search for internal "subversives" part of the American way-of-life.
to a letter the author had written to the newspaper, challenging the HUAC contribution to the American internal security. Mr. Alpin wrote: "In a letter to the *Enquirer and News* of August 22, 1961, David S. Roberts wrote: 'Many, like Mr. Coager, are quick to defend the House Committee on Un-American Activities. What contribution does the Committee present to our internal security?' Many terms of communism, their fellow travelers, or suckers fooled by them, have asked the same question." So, with one stroke of the pen, the argument has been reduced to part of the Communist conspiracy, for, as Mr. Alpin might reason, only Communists and their dupes..."
and fellow-travelers would ask such a question by casting doubt on HUAC. The Committee, as all hate groups, exaggerates the power of its enemies out of all proportion, and points to new proofs of their evil influence, and it has been so successful in this regard because it can define its enemies in the nebulous term of "subversive," who is anyone that HUAC wants it to be. HUAC's most desperate and urgent charge is that the Communists are ready to take over the United States, and only it and a few patriotic persons and groups stand in the way. It has an ever-increasing political propaganda machine that allows it to increase its fear of a Communist plot, to continue its ties with various hate groups, and to continue its preventive war-total victory line; and HUAC issues more publications and circulates more copies of them than all other House committees combined. Such publications include "consultations" with "experts" like Fred Schwarz, whose _The Communist Mind_ is claimed to be the most widely circulated document printed by the Government Printing Office. The Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, like HUAC, leaves no doubt that it recognizes internal danger only from the left, as brought out in the following official statement, which was prompted by a person inquiring about

those who refuse to inform on others in committee hearings, in the form of efforts to get them fired from their jobs and expelled from their communities, by bringing pressure on their employers and neighbors, and the like.

56 Donner, _The Un-Americans_, p. 37.

57 Ibid., p. 50.

58 Ibid., p. 49.

59 Ibid., pp. 49-50. The claim is made by Schwarz and HUAC.
the Birth Society:

The John Birch Society, which you asked about is known to be a conservative anti-Communist organization. However, the subcommittee cannot endorse any organization officially. We are happy to state that it seems to be, from our records, a patriotic organization.

The radical right has other accesses to Congress beside the two internal security committees, and this includes access to individual Congressmen whose sympathies either lie with the right or who are actual right-wingers.

Gordon Scherer, an influential member of HUAC and a Republican from Ohio, said he was not a member of the John Birch Society but that he looked with favor on it; and he is on the Committee of Endorsers of the Society, and he works hard to prevent any harassment of it by HUAC.61 He was also an "instructor" at the Christian Crusade "national anti-Communist leadership school," led by Billy Barger, at Tulsa, Oklahoma, January 29 to February 2, 1962.62 Senator James Eastland (D., Miss.), who heads the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and who led the above endorsement of the Birch Society by the subcommittee, gets a large part of his political support from White Citizens' Councils whose members are on the Committee of Endorsers of the Birch Society, and he is instrumental in preventing the subcommittee from attacking the Society.63 Both Eastland and the late

60Philip Abbot Luce, "From Candy Bars to Anti-Communism," Mainstream, vol. 14 (June, 1961), p. 43.


63Luce, "Candy Bars to Anti-Communism," pp. 43-44; and Suall, "American Ultras," p. 58.
Francis Walter, who headed HUAC, were linked to Wycliffe Draper, a wealthy New Englander who is a fanatical racist and eugenicist who believes in the inferiority of Negroes and Jews. Both sat on two Draper-financed committees, which investigated the inferiority question, though they denied it to Ronald Ney, a Washington correspondent for the Madison (Wisconsin) Capital-Times. 64 The Washington Post confirmed that the denials were lies, and that Draper was the largest contributor to Walter's political campaigns. 65 Again it must be stressed, with the two internal security committees, and the people who make them up, linked to the right and part of the right, it is little wonder that they see the internal danger only coming from the left. They are themselves dangerous to the American internal security because they divert our attention from the very real danger of the radical right. Regardless of what it might have been, the internal Communist threat is less of a danger to this country than it has ever been. 66

Senator Barry Goldwater (R., Ariz.) is the best known rightist. The Senator's foreign views were in part given above, with his belief that the

64 Wesley, "Hate Groups and Un-American Activities Committee," p. 13.
65 Ibid. Another link between the moderate and extreme right is added.
66 See Father John F. Cronin, Communism: Threat to Freedom (New York: Paulist Press, 1962), pp. 21-33 for one source that holds to this theory, by a man who supposedly was the one who tipped off Richard Nixon and his HUAC-staff about Alger Hiss in 1947. Earl Mazo, Richard Nixon--A Political and Personal Portrait (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), p. 51. Father Cronin sees the internal Communist danger at its peak between 1935 and 1950, and over by 1950 before McCarthyism, and of little consequence today, at a time when many groups continually preach on its overpowering potency. It is this author's contention that Father Cronin exaggerates the earlier dangers, as a result of the research the author has done, but it is beyond the interests of the present work.
United States should get tough with the Soviet Union. As Gilbert A. Harrison commented: "He wants little government at home. Abroad, he wants that government to wield a big stick." The same writer said of Goldwater, he "is neither a Constitutional lawyer, nor a historian, nor even a clear thinker." Such is the case when one views his ideas on domestic affairs: when he speaks of freedom he means only the freedom of businessmen; he desires to turn back the clock to some form of laissez-faire capitalism by abolishing all domestic central government programs, and turning them over to state and local governments for action (or inaction?); and by the strict interpretation of the constitution, and by the application of eighteenth and nineteenth century conservatism to the present situation without taking into consideration the differences in time; he cloaks his reasoning with God's will that only Goldwater alone can interpret; and he holds fast to the premise—more government, less freedom, which he treats as fact. As seen by the definition of conservative and radical right given in Chapter One, Goldwater is a rightist and not a conservative. And the Senator has the typical radical right interpretation of a devious left-wing conspiracy in this country, as he said:

68 Ibid., p. 17. Goldwater had only one unsuccessful year of college at an Eastern military school.
69 Ibid., pp. 13-17. An example of his lack of clarity is witnessed when Mr. Goldwater sees no threat to freedom from the type of federal government that would be needed to fight limited wars of conquest of the type the world has never seen.
70 Goldwater though wants to be known as a conservative, thus, he calls his book The Conscience of a Conservative. One more example of American politics pulled to the right, for if Goldwater is a conservative, moderates like the Americans for Democratic Action (the Adlai Stevenson group) become radical leftists in comparison. Extreme efforts are made by the rightists and their supporters to
"I believe the great threat, the real danger to our nation, to our way of life and to the cause of freedom throughout the world comes from the leftists in our midst who even today counsel a soft attitude toward Communism, both at home and abroad."71 In a speech before the District of Columbia Young Republicans recently, he avoided denouncing the Birches Society by saying he was more worried about the Americans for Democratic Action.72 In fact, Goldwater holds that in general the Birches are patriotic and the kind needed in American politics.73 But he feels that Welch has gone too far, and he told Gore Vidal in an interview: "Well, I've known Bob Welch five, maybe six years. But I didn't really get to know him until that summit business, you know, when we tried to keep Eisenhower from meeting Khrushchev. Welch and I worked together then. Of course all that stuff of his about Eisenhower being a Communist and so on was silly. Fact, I told him when he gave me that book of his [The Politician] to read, I said: 'Unless you can prove every one of those statements about people being Communists is true, you better go destroy every single copy of that book.'"74 Goldwater felt that Welch should resign from the Birches Society.75

---


75: Ibid.
It appears that Senator Goldwater has wide appeal to more moderate people, not so much for his ideas, but because he is not afraid to speak out and he has charm and an ability to simplify his ideas in a period of crisis and complexity; and such assets gain him many supporters, especially among people of college age who look for reasons for their problems in a hypocritical society which speaks one way and acts another.76 Some observers feel that Goldwater is a potential Caesar, who has the attributes for such a position, in that he has attracted a following of extremists, true believers, and people with "The Truth," he oversimplifies vital issues, putting himself on the side of the majority (for example, he advocates limited wars with and "total victory" over the Communists, and at the same time he believes the income tax should be abolished, but modern war and "victory" cost money and he gives no indication of where it will come from), and he is exactly the type that one would expect of being a Caesar because of his "nice guy" appearance.77 Others argue that if Goldwater becomes

76 Ibid., p. 108, 118; Harrison, "Carry Me Back," pp. 17-18. Many of his more moderate supporters fail to see that his ideas are in a flux and lack clarity, and that his political position is as obscure as most politicians. Goldwater's stand on racial integration is but one more example. Formally, he stood strongly for keeping the federal government out of the integration movement, and letting the states act (or fail to act?) on their own racial problems. Just recently he has made a stronger stand for efforts to end the racial crisis, which might entail the use of federal power. His stand on federal aid to education is another case in point. He says the lack of educational funds is not a problem, but if it is, he proposes a federal tax rebate to tax-payers on the money they spend for schools. How such a rebate will help the schools, Mr. Goldwater never clears up.

77 Vidal, "Liberal Meets Mr. Conservative," p. 108. It must be stressed that Mr. Vidal and others are arguing that Goldwater only has the attributes of a modern Caesar, and not that he is actively trying to become one. A Caesar-type President would possibly advocate a strong government on the international front, to gain predominance over new territory and to get the people to pull together against a common external enemy, as Goldwater has; and such a President would probably use welfarism only as a gimmick to win public support, and he would certainly
President or Vice President, or even received the nomination, the pull of the moderates would probably be too strong, and he would move from the dom-
inating influence of the right. 78

Goldwater's main strength lies outside the Senate for he is not highly influental in that body because he lacks the legislative skills of the late Senator Taft, not because of his extreme beliefs. 79 Goldwater's mail never runs below 2,000 pieces per week, 75% from outside Arizona, and following a national televised appearance a single day may bring from 1,500 to 2,000 pieces. 80 His book, The Conscience of a Conservative, has sold 105,000 copies in hardback and 575,000 in paperback; and he writes a three-times-a-week column, "How Do You Stand, Sir?", that is carried in 63 newspapers around the country, in which he extols his extremist views. 81 There also is a great demand for Goldwater in person with no fewer than 25 formal written requests for appearances per day, and eight to ten telephoned re-
quests; and in the first three months of 1961, 835 refusals had to be sent out, and from January 19 to November 3, 1960, Goldwater made 180 such speeches,

allow some local autonomy by local officials in such matters, as Goldwater advocates the reduction of federal power in the welfare areas.

78 Dudman, Man of the Far Right, p. 32. Some political observers seem to feel that to get the presidential nomination, Goldwater will have to move to a more moderate position, and they might interpret his more moderating stand on the racial problem as a move in that direction. But it should not be denied that Goldwater's extreme image appears to have great popularity as will be presently shown.


80 Tmd.

81 Ibid.
and in 1961, he made or contracted to make 404 speeches.82

The Phoenix (Arizona) Gazette conducted a poll of the 1960 Republican convention delegates, and found that 48% of those who responded to the poll favored Senator Goldwater for President.83 Ballots were sent to 1,331 delegates in mid-April, 1963, and 707 replies were received. The delegates were asked to name the candidate they would support in 1964: 179 (48%) were for Goldwater, 244 (34.5%) for Governor Rockefeller, 24 (3.4%) for Governor Romney of Michigan, 83 (1.3%) for Governor Scranton of Pennsylvania, 12 (1%) for Nixon, 77 (20.2%) for Senator Morton of Kentucky, 15 (4.8%) for Governor Hatfield of Oregon, and one vote each for former President Eisenhower, Henry Ford II, Robert Hthing, and former Senator Knowland. Forty-four had no preference, and 27 marked the "don't know" box.

Senator John Tower (R., Tex.) is a supporter of General Walker, and he acknowledges that he has the support of the Birch Society, and he does not discourage its support.84 Tower has made a remarkable rise in the Senate and in his party, almost an impossible one for a liberal, since his entrance in 1960. He was placed on two influential committees, Banking and Currency and Labor, and Public Welfare; he was the only first-term Senator on the Senate Republican Policy Committee; and he was one of six Senators on the

82 Ibid.

83 "Goldwater Favored in Paper's Polls," Battle Creek Enquirer & News (Monday, May 27, 1963), p. 2. The ballots were sent out weeks before Governor Rockefeller's remarriage, but about 100 were returned well after it.

On February 16, 1961, the Indianapolis News polled the delegates on their present choice for party nominee, and found of the 60% who responded 55.9% were still loyal to Nixon (before his 1962 California defeat), but significantly Goldwater got 27.9% to Rockefellers 10.9%. Sheehan, "Arizona Fundamentalist," p. 140. It is startling to find such widespread support of a rightist for President.

84 Dudman, Men of the Far Right, p. 58. See an entire chapter on Tower, pp. 172-178.
Senate-House committee to draft a statement of Republican principles, with
the leading principle, as stated in the last section of this chapter, being
a demand for victory over communism. 85 Tower has introduced bills and reso-
lutions that are dear to the radical right. He introduced "by request" a
resolution by the National Indignation Convention, a radical right group
which will be considered further in the next section, calling for a halt
to the training of military personnel from Communist countries, to the sale
of weapons to Communist countries, and the removal of all American offici-
als involved in such programs. 86 Tower also introduced a series of eight
bills and resolutions, none of which were expected to get out of committee,
including a call for victory over communism as the objective of American
foreign policy, and a mandatory balanced budget except in case of war or
other national emergency. 87

Senator Strom Thurmond (D., S.C.), long a supporter of right-wing
causes, said recently that he thought both major parties had gone too far
toward socialism, welfare statism, and centralized government, and he
suggested a third party of a "conservative" type. 88 Thurmond and Goldwater
protested Senator Fulbright's attacks on the military links with radical
right organizations in speaking to civilian groups under the 1958 National
Security Council directive. They also protested his resulting memorandum
to the Defense Department. When the Department started to stop or censor

85 Ibid., pp. 172-173.
86 Ibid., p. 175. The National Indignation Convention was set up to

protest the training of Yugoslav pilots in the United States at a

Texas Air Force base. The resolution was pigeonholed in the Foreign

Relations Committee.

87 Ibid., p. 177. The bills and resolutions were introduced March, 1962.


was the Dixiecrat-candidate for President in 1948.
parts of the speeches of military personnel, the right-wing became stirred up around the country, and a flood of letters to Thurmond and to the Armed Services Committee convinced them to have formal hearings. Thurmond made great efforts to persuade the Senate to hold the hearings, and authorization was made with $30,000 given for the purpose. A special subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee was set up with Senator John Stennis (D., Miss.) as chairman and Thurmond as a member. The hearings were held September 6, 7, 1961, and from them, a huge book was compiled, from the records of the State and Defense Departments, of the examples of speech censorship, and it shows not only the extent of censorship, but the great amount of speech-making by the military. Senator Thurmond revealed what he felt was the responsibility of the military when he said: "If the military teaches the true nature of communism, it must necessarily teach that communism is fundamentally socialism. When socialism, in turn, is understood, one cannot help but realize that many of the domestic programs advocated in the United States, and many of those adopted, fall clearly within the category of socialism." The hearings never had the wide right-wing attraction of the McCarthy-hearings because of the firm, judicial attitude of Stennis who disallowed badgering and sharpshooting of government witnesses, and who banned television from the hearing-room; and because President Kennedy invoked executive privilege and refused to let the subcommittee

89Dudman, Men of the Far Right, p. 40. The hearings were also the result of General Walker's reprimand and removal from his command of a United States Army division in Germany. See an entire chapter on Thurmond, ibid., pp. 33-51.

90Ibid., p. 34.

91Ibid., pp. 181-182. Those like Goldwater and Thurmond reveal that they are opposed to civilian-control of the military, a principle on which this country was founded. Such opposition is truly dangerous when it is realized what vast support it has.
question individual censors about specific censorships, and this prevented Thumond from turning up a censor whose background could be made to sound subversive.92

Senator Everett Dirksen (R., Ill.), the minority leader in the Senate, also is linked to the right-wing. His name was one of 69 sponsoring a Katanga ad taken out by Marvin Lieberman, who will be discussed further in the next section, attacking American foreign policy and calling Katanga the "Hungary of 1961."93 Pressure was brought on Dirksen by President Kennedy, and Dirksen's office announced that his name had been used without his authorization, but Lieberman produced a telegram from Dirksen supporting the ad, and supporting a more radical Lieberman statement that called for private American contributions to the Katanga forces in conflict with the United Nation troops.94

Senator Thomas Dodd (D., Conn.) said on the Senate floor on March 30, 1961: The "smears" by ultra-conservatives "against a host of the nation's respected leaders" was similar to the "naive softheaded approach of ultra-liberals" who refused to believe that communism could be evil.95 But Senator Dodd, though he is quite often liberal on domestic issues, reveals a willingness to work with the radical right and to share their views, as witnessed by his regular speaking at Fred Schwarz's "anti-Communist" schools and rallies.96 Dodd also endorsed the right-wing Citizens Alert Committee as "another impressive evidence of the remarkable grassroots anti-Communist

92Ibid., pp. li0-li1.
93Ibid., p. li6.
94Ibid.
96Dudman, Men of the Far Right, p. 58.
movement that has sprung up in this country...(which) signifies that our people are tired of defeats and retreats under Communist pressures."

Senator John McClellan (D., Ark.) has worked closely with George Benson and his Harding College people. Congresswoman James Utt (R., Calif.) is a member of the Brich Society; and Representative L. Mendel Rivers (D., S.C.), long identified with racism, said on the floor of the House on March 21, 1961: The John Birch Society is a "nationwide organization of patriotic Americans whose dedication to their country is epitomized in their aim to bring about 'less government, more responsibility and a better world to live in.'"

Representative James Davis (D., Ga.) is a member of the National Advisory Committee of Billy Hargis' Christian Crusade, and Representatives Noah Mason (R., Ill.) and Dale Alford (D., Ark.) are close workers with Hargis.

The Young Americans for Freedom, a Goldwater group, has Goldwater and Tower as members, besides Senator Spessard Holland (D., Fla.) and Representative John J. Rhodes (R., Ariz.). The Americans for Constitutional Action, based in Washington to assist in the election and re-election of men who by their voting records show a "dedication to the principles of Constitutional conservatism," and a group against "collective morality and a socialized economy through centralization of power," has the endorsements of Goldwater,

98Dudman, Men of the Far Right, p. 58.
99Ibid.
101Dudman, Men of the Far Right, p. 58.
Senator Karl Mundt (R., S.D.), Senator A. Willis Robertson (D., Va.), and Representative: Ralph Beverns (R., Neb.), Durward Hall (R., Mo.), and Bruce Alger (R., Tex.).

The members of Congress, who are members of the radical right or who are linked to it, give strength and respectability to its position. They increasingly parrot the right-wing views to the American public, and they give access to the right-wing groups to the Congressional decision-making processes. But it is a two-way street, as the radical right uses their supporters and members in Congress, it is in turn used by them as a political tool in order to increase popular support for the Congressmen among their constituents and among Americans at large.

Section 3—Radical Right External Influences Upon Congress, And Further Links With Congressional Supporters

Peter Edson, a Scripps-Howard columnist, found 50 right-wing organizations which have "national headquarters or active lobbying and public relations offices in Washington," and most appear to be well financed. The lobbyist for Billy James Harris is General C. A. Willoughby (ret.), the former

103 Ibid., p. 22h. In the listing of conservative thought-leaders in "The First National Directory of Rightist Groups, Publications and Some Individuals in the U.S.," put out by the Liberty Lobby, a right-wing group, 162 Representatives (37% of the House) and 25 Senators (25% of the Senate) were placed in the right-wing. Cook, "Ultras," p. 571.

104 Cook, "Ultras," p. 571. These organizations are fluent in presenting their positions and programs to official Washington. Such positions and programs were introduced in Chapter One. They will be summarized and developed for present purposes at this time. They include on the domestic scene: (1) opposition to all government programs which contribute to a strong, central government, starting with the federal income tax; (2) opposition to centralised labor unions; (3) opposition to welfare or social religion as practiced by the National Council of Churches of Christ, and opposition to what Congressman August Jahnson (R., Mich.) calls "salvation by appropriation"; (4) opposition to public health programs including "socialized" medicine, fluoridation of public water, and Salk polio vaccine, which they are convinced are part of the Communist plot to destroy America's young people, but
intelligence chief for General MacArthur; the American Security Council's Washington office is headed by Admiral Chester Ward (ret.), who has close connections with quite a few active-duty military men; and the Institute for American Strategy has a headquarters in Washington.  

they are absolutely convinced that the effects of nuclear fallout are minimal; (5) opposition to all mental health programs; (6) opposition to federal aid to education, John Dewey, progressive education, and the National Education Association; (7) opposition to school integration in the North as well as the South, as they see it as a Communist plot to stir up racial problems, and as a threat to state's rights; (8) and they have a special opposition to the United States Supreme Court which they see as an active Communist organization, while they champion the FBI cause and see no danger from it, probably because J. Edgar Hoover has identified his position with the right. Senator James Eastland said: "The greatest single threat to our Constitution is the presently constituted Supreme Court of the United States. In fact, the Court, by its decisions, has aided the cause of Communism." He then reviewed the court decisions since the 1954 Brown School Desegregation Case, and stated: "There are now pending before my judiciary committee more than 100 bills designed to cure or alleviate the effect of one decision or another that has been rendered by the Supreme Court." The Jenner Bill to Limit the Court's appellate jurisdiction in certain cases, amended by Senator John Butler (R., Md.) is possibly the best known. During the 1930's, the Supreme Court was the champion of the rightists as it struck down New Deal measures, but today, it is their foe as it is concerned with individual freedoms, and supports Big Government programs. See summary in Ralph E. Ellsworth and Sarah M. Harris, The American Right Wing: A Report to the Fund for the Republic (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1962, first published, 1960), pp. 12-25, Eastland quotes, p. 23.

In foreign policy, the rightists reveal a basic distrust and hatred of foreigners, including first and second generation Americans, and of the United Nations which is made up of foreigners, to which, they feel, much American sovereignty is being surrendered. They are opposed to foreign aid, especially that part which is not linked to military aid to pro-American rightist dictators, who they feel give inferior foreign people the best government that could be expected, and to all cooperation with foreigners through NATO and other international organizations. And they have a special opposition to all relations and negotiations with Communist countries. Basically, the American right-wing tends to be a super-patriotic, America First-America Only movement which cannot trust its own neighbors, let alone foreigners. Ellsworth and Harris, The American Right Wing, pp. 25-42.

The John Birch Society’s operations in Washington are more indirect. A Washington dispatch to the New York Times dealing with President Kennedy’s foreign aid bill reported: "The principal lobbying effort against the bill is being waged... by an ultra-conservative businessmen’s organization known as the Citizen’s Foreign Aid Committee... Army Brigadier General Bonner Fellers, Ret. is national director and operating head of the organization’s Washington headquarters... while such groups as the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Farm Bureau Federation will also be heard in opposition to the aid program, much of the material they use will have originated in General Feller’s office." As just seen, despite its name, the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee is opposed to foreign aid, which, it says, has not prevented the Communists from overrunning the non-Communist world, but "rather it has been the U.S. strategic nuclear striking forces." And it states that "The grand design of U.S. foreign policy contemplates world disarmament and world government supported by an international police force. Our huge foreign hand-outs are to further the transition." CFAC was formed in 1959 in Washington by Walter Harnischfeger, board chairman of the Harnischfeger Corporation of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, who is also a director of racist-Fascist-Bircher Merwin K. Hart’s National Economic Council, and, at present, he is honorary chairman of the Foreign Aid Committee. It is the direct descendant of the pre-World War II isolationist American...
First Committee; and it is related by leadership links to several other radical right groups, including For America in which it shares offices, office forces, and officers (Fellers also heads For America), and the John Birch Society, in which at least one-third of the 67 on CFAC's national committee are Birchers.\textsuperscript{110} The CFAC's membership list includes the names of many industrialists, but the organization keeps no public record of financial contributions.\textsuperscript{111} It appears to have made some impact on the amount of foreign aid, as related by Harnischfeger on September 6, 1961: "During the three years our Committee has opposed foreign aid, we have: in 1959, made 12 appearances before the appropriate Congressional Committees. Foreign aid was cut 27%. In 1960, made 16 appearances.... Foreign aid was cut 11%....In 1961, made 15 appearances....Foreign aid as of this date has been cut 22%."\textsuperscript{112} In 1962, Ronner Feller testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and he recommended that the aid be cut from a proposed $1.9 million to $1 million.\textsuperscript{113} Both Harnischfeger and Feller made statements before the Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World, known as the Clay Committee, and they recommended that foreign aid be drastically cut to gain a balanced budget and a favorable balance of payments, and that the United States rely only on

\textsuperscript{110}Ibid.; Dudman, Men of the Far Right, pp. 217-218. Fellers is on the Birch Society Committee of Endorsers, and seven members of the CFAC's national committee are also on the national council of the Birch Society, including Clarence Manion, T. Coleman Andrews, E. T. Phelps, F. Gene Chance, Spruille Braden, A. O. Heinsohn, Jr., and William J. Grebe. The council aids Welch in running the Birch Society, and is supposed to pick his successor. "Facts About CFAC," p. 2.


\textsuperscript{112}Ibid., p. 5.

\textsuperscript{113}Ibid.; Dudman, Men of the Far Right, p. 118.
its superiority of nuclear striking force.\textsuperscript{111}

Liberty Lobby is another right-wing organization that lobbies Congress for other rightist groups.\textsuperscript{115} It advocates the repeal of the income tax amendment, the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations, the end of foreign aid and federal aid to education, no world government, and no United States recognition of Red China. It puts out various publications, including a brochure on "How to Write Your Congressman" by Billy James Hargis, and a Liberty Letter to alert members on the action of Congress, with a circulation of from 12,000 to 25,000 in 1961, according to the reports filed with the Clerk of the House. Liberty Lobby has many connections with other groups:

Liberty Lobby is at times authorized to represent other organizations on specific measures. For example, a letter was sent to the Senate Finance Committee stating that the Inter-Post Council on Americanism and Un-American Activities of the American Legion posts, Flint and Genesee County, Michigan, had authorized Liberty Lobby to testify on their behalf against the Foreign Trade Bill.
At the hearing, Curtis Dall, as Chairman of the Board of Policy, stated that Liberty Lobby was authorized to represent 253 groups in opposition to the Trade Expansion Act (H.R. 11970). The groups, listed in the appendix of Dall's statement, ranged from the National Indignation Committee, claiming 7,000 members, and the Congress of Freedom, claiming 2,000, to the Galveston Chapter of the John Birch Society, with 15 members, the Indiana University Young Americans For Freedom, with fifty members, and the Holy Name Society--Park Ridge, Ill.\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{114}See Walter Harnischfeger and Bonner Fellers, "Statements Before the Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World," Citizens Foreign Aid Committee (To Aid American Taxpayers) (Monday, February 25, 1963). Harnischfeger's statement is 10-pages and Fellers', 8-pages.
\textsuperscript{115}See "Liberty Lobby," Group Research, Inc. (August 17, 1962), 6-pages. The very purpose of the organization is to lobby for other rightist groups, and as a result, to increase the effectiveness of such groups before Congress.
\textsuperscript{116}Ibid., pp. 2-3. The statement was made before the Senate Finance Committee, August 10, 1962.
The Committee for the Monroe Doctrine is another organization which has links with Congress. It was organized by Captain Edward Rickenbacker, a right-wing speaker, Admiral Ben Moreell (ret.) of the Americans for Constitutional Action, Charles Edison of ACA and the Birch Society, William Buckley, Jr., and Marvin Liebman whose office is the headquarters of the Committee. It was set up to protest President Kennedy's concessions offered to Premier Khrushchev in regard to Cuba, especially the alleged concession of non-invasion of Cuba by the United States if the Soviets pull out the missiles and missile bases. On October 31, 1962, the Committee put out a statement that Kennedy's stand guarantees "Khrushchev's control over Cuba," and it is a "renunciation of the Monroe Doctrine." The statement called on all Congressmen and candidates to pledge debate on Kennedy's stand when Congress reconvened in January of 1963. A Committee Memorandum of November 15, 1962, stated that 34 members of Congress, 30 Republicans and 4 Southern Democrats, had supported the Committee statement before the November, 1962, elections.

Another one-issue organization is the National Indignation Convention set up to protest the training of Yugoslav pilots in the United States, which was used as a rallying point against all aid to and trade with Communist countries. During Convention rallies telephone contacts were made with supporters who gave "encouraging" statements. Representative

---


Bruce Alger, a Republican from Dallas where the organization got its start, who wanted "to be your NIC's voice in Washington"; Representative Glenn Cunningham (R., Neb.) who told of his legislation to stop the Communist use of the mails; and Representative Thor Tollefson (R., Wash.) who wanted everyone to know his main concern was the Communist danger and how to stop it. The sale of planes to Yugoslavia and the training of Yugoslav pilots ended quickly and quietly by Administration decision, at least in part the result of the great fervor caused by the NIC. Also Congress passed a foreign aid bill, looked at in a footnote in the last section of this chapter, which prohibited aid to Communist countries unless the President deemed it vital to American security, and in the appropriations bills, the President's discretionary action was limited to economic aid, with military aid banned. The NIC faded in power with the successful completion of the Yugoslav affair. It is characteristic of many radical right groups which are created, burn bright, and then fade out of power, mainly because they are a one-issue organization.

Often two organizations will work closely together, as does For America and the Federation for Constitutional Government.\textsuperscript{119} The latter is a coordinating body for White Citizens' Councils in eleven Southern states which is active in advocating the restriction of the federal courts, the continuation of segregation, and preserving the sovereign rights of the states.\textsuperscript{120} On the advisory board has sat many Southern Congressmen including Senators Thurmond, Eastland, and Talmadge, and Representative L. Mendel Rivers.\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., p. 4.
The Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations was first set up in 1953 with a statement signed by 212 politicians, businessmen, scientists, and religious leaders to influence President Eisenhower against any recognition of Red China; and in 1954 it was claimed that 1,037,000 signatures were signed against United States recognition of Red China, or any trade with the Peiping government, or its entrance into the United Nations. In the autumn of 1954, an informal group was set up. The organization is run by a handful of men, with the real power being Marvin Liebman, the Executive Secretary, whose office is the center of the radical right lobby that has been largely responsible for dis-orienting the American China-policy, and the center of a well-organized and well-financed plan to destroy the United Nations. In fact, Liebman's two professed activities for the future are the Goldwater student movement, the Young Americans for Freedom, and the Committee Against U. S. Participation in the United Nations, which he hopes to organize as a successor of the Committee of One Million.

The million signatures have lain unused, and there have been no attempts to contact the people behind them for it would be too expensive. There are not more than 6,000 out of the million who contribute money to the Committee, and there are not more than 25,000 people on its mailing list. The Committee is fond of pointing out that its annual budget is

123 Ibid.
just under $66,000, while the American Association for the United Nations, which supports Red China's admission to the United Nations, has an annual budget of over $300,000. But the weighty support of the signatures is used to silence every politician who might support the recognition of Red China, its entrance into the United Nations, or United States trade with it. Committee propaganda kits are sent out to all candidates for federal office, and they are polled as to their stand.

On November 4, 1959, the Committee of One Million put out a press release attacking Colon Associates, Ltd. of San Francisco, hired by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to study the Chinese question, whose report came out for United States recognition and trade with Red China, and its entrance into the United Nations. Liebman wrote:

To the best of my knowledge, Colon Associates conducted no serious investigation of either the sentiment of the American people or their leaders....We doubt very seriously whether Colon Associates consulted with either the people or the governments of Korea, Free China, Hong Kong....

Again the implication that the mysterious million signatures and the governments of Far Eastern countries should determine American foreign policy on this vital question, instead of basing the decision on rationality and reality of what actually exists.

The Committee of One Million has a status quo view of the world which refuses to recognize or accept the Chinese Revolution of 1949. (1) The Committee attacks the idea that the Communists are in firm and permanent

126 O'Kearney, "Lobby of a Million Ghosts," p. 76.
127 Ibid.
128 Ibid., p. 78.
control of Mainland China, but sees the mainland in unrest and paints a picture of Formosa as the Bastion of Freedom with Chiang Kai-shek ready to lead his forces for a take-over of Red China.\textsuperscript{129} It holds that the Red Chinese government is rotting within, but if the United States recognizes it, or opens trade with it, or lets it into the United Nations, it will mean that Red China will have its way with the world. (2) The Committee answers the belief that United States aid or recognition of Red China would allow a wedge to be driven between the Soviet Union and China, by stating that China is but a puppet of the Soviets which would fall without Russian aid.\textsuperscript{130} This is a complete denial of the fact that China's Communist Revolution was purely a nationalistic development which had occurred because of internal chaotic conditions caused by World War II, and not because of any international Communist plot.\textsuperscript{131} (3) The Committee states that Red China's entrance into the United Nations would destroy it.\textsuperscript{132} Since the destruction of the U.N. is also a tenet of Liebman and other radical rightists, it has always appeared to this author that they should support Red China's entrance into the world organization if they believe it would destroy it. But realistically, it would not destroy the U.N. One more veto in the Security Council of the U.N. would not really matter.

\textsuperscript{129} "Relations Between the United States and Communist China," The Committee of One Million (New York: May, 1957), pp. 6-7.

\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., pp. 7-8.


\textsuperscript{132} "Relations Between U.S. and Communist China," p. 10.
The most amazing thing is that such liberals as Senators Hubert Humphrey (D., Minn.), Paul Douglas (D., Ill.), Clifford Case (R., N.J.), and Jacob Javits (R., N.Y.) continue to lend their names and at least tacit support to the Committee of One Million. It has been presented in this thesis why liberals have been losing force and enthusiasm, but one would not expect them to go to the extent of contributing to radical right organizations. But they have!

A recent Committee mimeographed handout, addressed to "city editors, editorial writers, columnists, and commentators," described the Committee as being supported by a majority of Congress, 55 Senators and 295 Representatives of both parties. The message of the handout was: "In an open letter to Adlai Stevenson, U. S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Committee of One Million warned that 'continued American support of the U. N. would not be justified if its Charter is weakened and ultimately destroyed through the admission of representatives of the so-called People's Republic of China.'"

Publisher W. E. Chilton, III, of the Charleston (West Virginia) Gazette wondered if the Congressional liberals and moderates, whose names were among the 349, really supported the Committee's attempt at threatening the United Nations with loss of American support if Red China was admitted to membership; and so he wrote to 50 endorsers of both parties who have reputations as liberals or moderates. Twenty-five of the 50 replied: only 3 believed the United States should withdraw if China was admitted; 7 would wait-and-see until the United States faced such a situation; 8 opposed United States withdrawal, including Senator Douglas who is on the Steering Committee of the Committee.

of One Million; 3 dodged the question; House Speaker John McCormack (D., Mass.) announced he was resigning from the Committee; and 3 others said they were not members of the Committee. Of the 25, only Senators Douglas and Kenneth Keating (R., N. Y.) said they were consulted in advance about the Committee's policy statement, and Douglas refused to sign the open letter to Stevenson though his name appeared on the back of the handout. The other 23 said they were seldom if ever consulted by the Committee staff.

But Douglas wrote an article in *The New Leader* magazine supporting the Committee position, after the Americans for Democratic Action adopted a resolution favoring American recognition of the Peiping government, and its entrance into the United Nations.

The Committee of One Million has placed strong pressure on Congress and both political parties so that Congress has annually passed a resolution opposing a seat for China in the United Nations, and the parties have made such resolutions part of their formal platforms. Kennedy, a moderate, went into the presidency on a platform of "more armaments and no seat for China." Any isolated Congressman cannot withstand such pressures from his leaders, and so he must follow such status quo thought or risk political destruction.

The radical right specializes in constitutional revision as a speculative enterprise, and it supports revisions which would destroy the effectiveness of the United States on the international level by constitutionally reducing its power. The radical right has five amendments which

---

134 Ibid., pp. 236-237.
it introduces into Congress periodically through its supporters who sit in Congress. All radical right organizations tend to demand these amendments in order to return us to a "constitutional government." They include:

1. Mundt-Coudert Amendment—this is an attempt to limit the power of the big city vote for President by giving each state the number of electors equal to its delegation in Congress, and the electors would be chosen in the same way that Senators and Representatives are chosen. The Presidential nominee who gets a state-wide plurality would be given two electors to correspond to the two Senators, and would get an elector in each Congressional district where he polled a plurality.

2. Reed-Dirksen Amendment—this would limit the taxing power of the federal government by setting a maximum rate for the income tax, and would deprive Congress of its power to impose gift or death taxes.

3. Byrd-Bridges Amendment—this requires Congress to impose federal taxes sufficient to provide revenues equal to appropriations, except in time of war declared by Congress or when the United States is engaged in open hostility against an external enemy.

4. The Bricker Amendment—this would prevent treaties or other international agreements from having any force or effect if they conflict with any provision of the Federal Constitution; and a treaty would not become law unless it was implemented by appropriate legislation.

5. Reed-Walter Amendment—this would permit the Constitution to be amended by action of three-fourths of the state legislatures, completely by-passing Congress. Senator Dirksen went on record in support of such amendments.

---

a change, whereby Congress would only pass on amendments to the states and have their legislatures make the final judgment. Richard Rovere warned that there would be great changes in our constitutional system if Dirkson's policy prevailed, for if an amendment backed by a minority, which did not offend the majority, with a program exalting Americanism, the church, strict economic spending, or fighting communism or socialism, ever passed Congress, it would certainly have an open path in the state legislatures where there is less independent thinking and more openings for mobocracy than in Congress. As Rovere said, no state legislature would want to go on record as being in favor of coddling traitors or favoring the increased and reckless federal spending.

Over the years, hundreds of amendments have been introduced in Congress and referred to committees, and some have called for: the repeal of the income tax, formulas to limit non-military expenditures to a fixed proportion of the national income, barring all federal expenditures for "general welfare," and the redefining of treason to include persons not only trying to overthrow the government through force and violence, but also those trying to "weaken" it through peaceful means.

The unusual thing has been the readiness the Senate has shown in giving such amendments respectful consideration, and the arguments presented to justify referring them to the state legislatures. This reveals the

137 Richard Rovere, "Letter from Washington," New Yorker, vol. 30, no. 18 (June 19, 1954), p. 68. A similar amendment is presently circulating in the state legislatures and in Congress, as will be shown below.

138 Ibid., pp. 69-70.
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pressure that Senators feel for some kind of change along radical right
tlines.  

At present, there are three amendments circulating among various
state legislatures that would curtail the federal government powers.  
The three are: (1) An amendment, similar to the Reed-Walter Amendment
and the Dirksen philosophy mentioned above, that would allow the states
to propose and ratify constitutional amendments without the approval of
Congress or of a national convention. The same arguments that Foree
used, as cited above, would apply against this amendment. And one severe
critic, Professor Charles L. Black of Yale University Law School, charged
that under such an amendment, 15% of the people could change the Constitu-
tion if they were represented by state legislators who desired such a
result, because 38 of the least populated states would have the power to
propose and ratify an amendment, while they would have only 40% of the
population, and even the 38 are weighted in favor of rural areas. Twelve
states have passed the amendment--Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kan-
sas, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas,
and Wyoming. (2) An amendment that would wipe out federal jurisdiction
over the apportionment of seats in state legislatures. Such an amendment

1142 Ibid., p. 39.

1143 See a three-part newspaper article by Stanley Neisler, Battle
Creek Enquire & News: (1) "Warren Warns of Moves to Revamp
Constitution (Monday, May 27, 1963), p. 1A; (2) "See Rough Road
Ahead for Amendment Pushers" (Tuesday, May 28, 1963), p. 16; and
(3) "Supreme Court Target of Constitution Changes" (Wednesday, May
29, 1963), p. 1A. The Constitution amendment-pushers are using
a seldom used constitutional procedure of proposing an amendment
by submitting the three amendments to the state legislatures, need-
ing 34 states to approve any one of them. The three amendments
have also been introduced into Congress for adoption but are ex-
pected to get nowhere. The danger is that if enough states pass
the amendments, or any one of them, Congress may bow to such pres-
sure and pass them.
would prevent the federal government from guaranteeing liberty, justice, or equality for federal citizens through the "equal protection of the law" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and it would guarantee that most states would remain dominated by rural interests who would control state legislatures. Thirteen states have passed this amendment—Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.\textsuperscript{110} (3) The "Court of the Union" amendment which would make it possible for certain decisions of the United States Supreme Court to be overruled by a "court of the union" made up of the chief justices of the 50 states. The court would be convened upon the request of any five states without a common boundary. Its one function would be to decide if a particular decision of the Supreme Court was constitutional, in matters involving the powers of the states or of the people, and 26 justices would overrule the Supreme Court. Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, South Carolina, and Wyoming have approved this amendment to decrease the powers of the Supreme Court.

These amendments are not of radical right creation, and the author has not been able to link them with it because of the lack of time to research such a topic, for the amendment-push only came to his attention in late May with the Meisler articles, and because the amendment-pushers have carried on a "silent campaign" to push them through state legislatures with as little fanfare as possible. In fact, the first two amendments went through the Texas legislature with little discussion, and with no one

\textsuperscript{110} Nebraska passed both this and the first amendment, but Democratic Governor Frank Morrison vetoed both. It is not hard to see that most of the states which desire these amendments are part of the "conservative coalition" of Southern Democrats-Midwest Republicans, who control their rural-dominated state legislatures and desire to keep it that way. Some of their links with the radical right have been pointed out earlier in this chapter. They are also most of the least influential-least populated states that favor such amendments.
explaining their purpose. Opposition to them has built up after Chief Justice Warren, whose court the last two amendments are aimed against, called national attention to them, and he castigated the American Bar Association for remaining silent on the matter. Since then the Bar Association has gone on record in opposition to all but the reapportionment amendment, and influential people, including Governor George Romney of Michigan, have come out against all three. No, the radical right has not been linked with the amendment-push as of yet, but it might be assumed that they will bring their vast resources behind the push for all three of the amendment proposals are dear to the philosophy and program of the right. This includes attempts to stop increased federal government and Supreme Court controls and power, and attempts to keep state governments under rural-minority control where the radical right can often bring maximum pressure, and attempts to amend the Constitution with all sorts of right-wing amendments without federal interference.

The amendment proposals were the result of angered Southerners over the Supreme Court desegregation cases, and angered Northerners over the 1962 Supreme Court case which stated that federal courts would have the power and jurisdiction to step into reapportionment disputes involving state legislatures, especially those rural legislators from both North and South who face possible abolition of their districts.145 The amendments were created at the general assembly of the Council of State Governments, and pushed in the states by another organization manned by state

legislators, and headed by Speaker W. Stuart Helsi of the Pennsylvania house.

At least 30 legislatures have acted upon one or more of the proposed amendments, or they have them under consideration, including Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.\textsuperscript{116} The Maryland legislature turned down all three, and Massachusetts and Nebraska turned down one. If \textsuperscript{116} states approve at least one amendment, Congress must call a constitutional convention to consider it. The convention powers are not known for such a procedure has never been done, but some legal experts think it would have wide powers, even including the right to make-over the Constitution.\textsuperscript{117} If the amendment was approved by the convention it would be submitted to the states for ratification, and it would pass if three-fourths (38) of the state legislatures or conventions approved it. The people do have the right to change the Constitution, but they must beware of attempts by a vocal minority to change the very basis of our constitutional form of government to meet their own personal desires.


\textsuperscript{117} Neisler, "See Rough Road Ahead for Amendment Pushers," p. 16.
Congressional Record is filled with right-wing speeches by Congressional supporters, and with right-wing material placed there by the supporters. Letter-writing campaigns are directed at Congress by radical right groups, especially at the House where conservatism appears to be the strongest, and the letters have the most influence when they reinforce established conservative, status quo positions.\textsuperscript{148} The mail impresses the uncommitted members of Congress, as seen by their cautious replies to the writers. Special organizations, like the Network of Patriotic Letter Writers in Pasadena, California, and Public Action, Inc. of New York City, are set up to get the letters out.\textsuperscript{149} The supporters of the Birch Society, for example, appear to be of a higher class and educational level, as reflected in the differences in style and tone of the letters, than the McCarthy-supporters. Survey data reveals that only 15\% of the McCarthyite mail could be described as reasonable in substance, tone, or literacy, while the Birch mail is more moderate in tone than the McCarthyite mail though as extremist in objective, and it is better written and reasoned.\textsuperscript{150} There is no equivalent action on the part of liberals:

The liberal organizations and publications, with a few honorable exceptions, show little sense of the urgency of the problem. None, for example, have yet come forward with a call for a united democratic alliance to strike back at the ultras, to resoundingly affirm the American rule of civilian control of the military, to bring pressure on Congress and the Administration to carry out the promises of the 1960 Democratic Platform.\textsuperscript{151}

\textsuperscript{148}Janson and Eismann, \textit{The Far Right}, pp. 203-204.

\textsuperscript{149}Suall, "American Ultras," pp. 59-60.


\textsuperscript{151}Suall, "American Ultras," p. 60.
The radical right has made strenuous efforts to get their pro-right candidates elected to Congress. In California, Representatives John Rousselot and Edgar Hiestrand, both public-acknowledged John Birch members, lost in their efforts at re-election in 1962, but the districts of both were gerrymandered by a Democratic-controlled state legislature, and yet both polled over 50,000 votes. The Republican party in California, with former Vice President Richard Nixon at the head in the gubernatorial election, repudiated the right-wing, but after Nixon gained the nomination he tried to woo the rightists by introducing communism into the campaign, by calling Governor Pat Brown "soft on Communists" through the use of innuendo. In the primary, Nixon beat a rightist candidate, Joseph Shell, by a two-to-one margin, but almost a half-a-million voters voted for Shell.

Elsewhere, in 1962, W. G. Synder in Louisville, Kentucky, who welcomed the support of the Americans for Constitutional Action and the Birch Society, won over liberal Democrat, Representative Frank Burke; Peter Dominick, a staunch rightist, won over liberal Democrat John Carroll in the Senate race in Colorado; and E. W. Stinson, a conservative Republican who was associated with the Puget Sound Anti-Communism School of Fred Schwarz and who was endorsed by ACA, won over liberal Don Magnuson in a Washington State House...
race. The author came across two items in The New Guard, the magazine for the Young Americans for Freedom. In a note from Astoria (Long Island), New York, it read: "YAF was instrumental in backing the campaign of GOP candidate Charles Cohen in New York's Ninth District. The Republicans requested YAF to assume complete responsibility for the Fourth Assembly District. YAF estimates that over 25,000 pieces of campaign literature were distributed."

Sadly, YAF had to report that Cohen lost, but it was not a total loss "because the work which the chapter did has given Astoria YAF a tremendous boost in the eyes of the Republican leaders, and the Democrats, too, realize that YAF is here." Better results came from Aberdeen, North Carolina, where "The Thomas Jefferson Chapter of YAF participated in the fall elections by endorsing and working for Congressman Charles Erskine Jones (R). The Congressman, whose AGA rating is 90 percent, was gerrymandered out of his district and pitted against a conservative Democrat, A. Paul Kitchin. Nonetheless, thanks in part to YAF efforts, Representative Jones was reelected by over 6,000 votes."

This chapter has tried to reveal that the radical right has power and influence above and beyond its mere numbers because it is the only segment of the American society which has been able to identify itself with anti-communism, that appears to be the dominate passion of Americans, and it so often has a monopoly in its teachings about and its stand against communism. Today, also, there is no viable radical left in American politics to balance

156 Ibid., p. 218.
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the radical right, in fact there is no viable liberal movement, and so
the political scene is inexorably shifting to the right. Increasingly,
Americans are accepting the philosophy of the right, in and out of Congress,
which equates democratic socialism and liberalism with communism, and which
sees any negotiation and compromise with the Soviets as appeasement, and
which recognizes only "total victory" in the cold war, and which identifies
an all-pervasive Communist conspiracy that is ready and able to seize the
United States. Any debate, any dissent (including this thesis) is charged
as part of that conspiracy. The radical right finds fulfillment in Congress
through large parts of the Republican party, through the "conservative co-
alition", and through the two internal security committees, and through
their members and supporters in Congress.
CHAPTER FIVE—RADICAL RIGHT INFLUENCE UPON THE NATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, AND ITS IMPLICATIONS UPON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The paragraph that Albert Einstein was writing when he died is a warning to humanity:

In essence, the conflict that exists today is no more than the old-style struggle for power, once again presented to mankind in semi-religious trappings. The difference is that, this time, the development of atomic power has imbued the struggle with a ghostly character; for both parties know and admit that, should the quarrel deteriorate into actual war mankind is doomed. Despite this knowledge, statesmen in responsible positions on both sides continue to employ the well-known technique of seeking to intimidate and demoralize the opponents by marshaling superior military strength. They do so even though such a policy entails the risk of war and doom. Not one statesman in a position of responsibility has dared to pursue the only course that holds out any promise of peace, the course of supra-national security, since for a statesman to follow such a course would be tantamount to political suicide. Political passions, once they have been fanned into flames exact their victims."

In the cold war, on both sides powerful vested interests have been created which have made waratism a way of life in today's nuclear age. These interests help to increase the influence of their opposite numbers in the opposing state, and this, in turn, is used as justification for increasing the program of foreign and domestic militancy. In the United States, these interests include the military-industrial groups that link their ascendancy and profits to waratism, the politicians who support them, and the radical right which gets its influence and strength from supporting and reinforcing waratism and anti-welfarism. Increasingly, the men who formulate and carry

out the United States foreign policy are forced to operate within the framework created by the vested interests. Foreign policy is the result of the environment from where it comes, and it is also the result of the challenges of the times. But the challenges will not make up for the lack of a dynamic, progressive environment. The United States cannot have a dynamic, progressive, and positive foreign policy if its domestic life is dominated by conservative interests, status quoism, and radical rightism through strong links between the military-industrial-radical right components. The radical right also has its greatest influence, besides working with the military-industrial interests, from supporting and reinforcing the "conservative coalition" that dominates the American society from its power-position in Congress, and in most state legislatures. Esmond Wright, a Professor of Modern History at the University of Glasgow (Scotland), wrote with the astuteness of a foreign observer:

...the United States, whatever its revolutionary origins, is now one of the most conservative of societies. Its conservatism is rooted in private enterprise and in a free economy that has been admirable suited to the development of a vast, underpopulated, but rich continent. There is still available in the United States abundant wealth, privately owned, for investment there or elsewhere. Congress will defend very jealously all efforts at direction or persuasion from above....And on broad foreign and defense issues the policies of any administration in Washington must be largely determined by its social system, its past inheritance and its geographical and ideological position.3

American foreign policy has been dominated by status quoism and the support of the status quo abroad, as witnessed by the United States support

---


of right-wing dictators. William O. Douglas, the Supreme Court Justice, has made serious charges against the United States foreign policy, especially its tendency to be of a military nature, and the way foreign aid goes to the support of governments of the privileged few as opposed to the masses. Justice Douglas wrote:

From 1946 to 1961 we thought in terms of dollars rather than of people. We thought in terms of gross national product rather than in terms of village conditions. The theory was the one that Herbert Hoover employed in 1930. By pouring in money at the top we hoped that some would reach the bottom. But in feudal societies the few at the top kept practically all of it. Millions were stolen and banked abroad. What was not stolen was used to entrench those who already owned and controlled the nation.

***

While the push on all continents is and has been for change, the weight of American influence has been on the side of the status quo. That was and is an untenable position. Not all the bombs in the world, not all the wealth of America can maintain that status quo.

***

Every effort on our part to maintain the status quo is certain to bring smiles of satisfaction to Khrushchev's face. Maintenance of the status quo is the one and only way to make communism the wave of the future. Our efforts to shore up the old feudal societies make Khrushchev confident that communism will win.... Khrushchev is warranted in having that confidence. For if conditions of social injustice continue to fester in the world's villages and all the rewards of modern life are syphoned off at the top, his creed, known in one area as Castroism and in another by a different name, will become the revolutionary phenomenon on all continents.

Conditions worsen with the mere passage of time. Twenty-five percent of the world's population has 75 percent of the income. Two-thirds of the people of the world live on or below a subsistence level. And the world's population is doubling every forty-two years.  

---

Status quo American foreign policy is also seen by our refusal to recognize the Chinese and Cuban revolutions, as well as by our support of status quoism abroad. Dynamic foreign policy must recognize and accept and work with the revisionistic revolutions which occur abroad, as they did in the United States and Europe in the past, but the dominant conservative consensus in this country looks upon these revolutions as a threat to its position, as was pointed out in Chapter Three. American foreign policy inevitably tends to take this conservative position in regard to the social revolutions in the world, as they are seen as a basic threat to the United States position. Justice Douglas continued:

We have a fixation about the Cold War. Nations that are not with us are against us...Nations that do not view the Berlin crisis, or the Congo, or Algeria as we do are suspect. Their political views on matters of this kind often jeopardize our grant of foreign aid. Our effort has been to develop pro-Western or pro-American nations. That cannot be successfully achieved in the underdeveloped areas without embroiling those fragile societies in a tug-of-war between Russia or China on the one side and the West on the other.5

Thus, American foreign policy has so often adopted the black and white thinking of seeing countries either for or against us, which predominates radical right thinking.

5Ibid., pp. 24-25. Chapter Three attempted to point out how American foreign policy so often takes the military position of trying to prevent the spread of communism through the use of armaments. This is also the position of many radical rightists. However, the radical right and its military supporters go a step further than the State Department, and interpret American defeats as a sign of an internal Communist conspiracy. Actually the military position creates tension and unrest in the developing countries, especially as the American armaments are generally used, not to fight Communists, but to further subjugate the people. See Ernest Gruening, "Exporting Trouble," The Nation, vol. 195, no. 10 (October 6, 1962), pp. 194-195.
McCarthyism during the 1950's had a definite adverse effect upon the State Department, and, thus, upon American foreign policy. It drove out the best qualified men, especially in the Foreign Service when McCarthy attacked it as "subversive," and it certainly kept others from entering State Department career work. Those who remained in federal service learned the crucial lesson of playing it safe; and former Secretaries of State Dean Acheson and John Foster Dulles offered McCarthy little or no resistance, and Dulles did nothing to build up individual initiative among State Department employees. Under Dulles, the foreign policy decisions and problems were worked out by himself, possibly with the use of a few top advisors, which helped to decrease the initiative further in the ranks of the Department. One of the Department officials recalled: "We went to the Secretary's press conference to find out what was going on." Government officials were forced to defend themselves against fantastic charges, instead of giving full attention to their important and pressing duties; and even Sherman Adams, one of President Eisenhower's advisors, remarked about "the strong aversion among foreign-service career men to anything imaginative and original." Especially after Dulles' death, foreign policy decisions


7Kraft, "Comeback of the State Department," p. 45.

8Irving Brant, "The Anti-Communist Hoax—Why Do They Get Away With It? (Part II of Two-Part Article)," The New Republic, vol. 146, no. 23 (June 4, 1962), p. 18. McCarthyism also affected the President who was forced to take into consideration a deliberate distorted public opinion. Brant is quick to point out that the distorted public opinion that affects the President, and the effects of the charges against government officials, which divert them from their main responsibilities, still remain in the 1960's with the present radical right. Adams' quote from Kraft, "Comeback of the State Department," p. 45.
were mainly handled by the Defense Department, with its military, status quo orientation, and the State Department was by-passed.9

The effects of McCarthyism upon federal officers can be measured by a study by Marie Jahoda and S. Cook, in 1951 among a small sample of Washington civil servants. The study found that the loyalty and security issue had become of such great concern to the civil servants that, in response to informal pressures and the total climate of formal government procedures, it revealed much cautionary activity and fear on their part.10

An example of the climate of fear among civil servants at the state level, during the early 1950's, was reported by Chief Justice Earl Warren:

A few days ago I read in the newspaper that a group of state employees...charged with responsibility for determining what announcements could be posted on the employees' bulletin board refused to permit the Bill of Rights to be posted on the ground that it was a controversial document. It was reported that the altercation became intense, and that only after the Governor, in writing, vouched for its non-controversial character was the Bill of Rights permitted to occupy a place along with routine items of interest to state employees. And this happened in the United States of America on the 15th day of December, 1954, the 163rd anniversary of our Bill of Rights, declared by proclamation of President Eisenhower to be Bill of Rights Day.11

With the advent of the Kennedy Administration in 1961, there has been a concerted effort to vest greater responsibility in the State Department, and to create a climate of confidence; and the Department has made efforts

---

9Kraft, "Comeback of the State Department," p. 45.


to gain control of the foreign policy field. For the very first time, the United States began to put its foreign aid on the level of the needs of the common people of a country when the Peace Corps was set up under Sargent Shriver, when George McGovern headed the Food for Peace, when Fowler Hamilton took over the control of foreign aid, and when Teodoro Moscoso was appointed Director for Latin American Aid. And precedence was set on March 15, 1961, when the United States first voted in the United Nations on the side of a colonial country, and against a colonial power. Thus, it was not until 1961, that the United States started to use its aid to actively set up democratic countries abroad. But it is not to be assumed that radical right influences upon foreign policy are negligible at the present time.

On December 19, 1961, two labor leaders, Walter and Victor Reuther, submitted a 24-page memorandum on the extreme right danger. The memorandum stated that the radical right influences in the military need immediate attention; and it called for a government investigation of extremist groups. It charged that the Attorney General's subversive list, which only recognizes internal dangers from the left, lends strength and justification to the radical right's cause, though the radical right is more of

---

12 See Kraft, "Comeback of the State Department," pp. 47-50. President Kennedy also has made efforts to protect the State Department employees, as witnessed by his recent rebuke of a newspaper reporter who questioned the loyalty of two Department employees. Hyman, "England and America," p. 253, footnote no. 28.


14 Ibid.


16 It included the Army's refusal to accept General Edwin Walker's resignation in 1959 when he charged that a "fifth column" was working in the United States Army, and the recall to active duty
an internal danger to the American democratic process than is communism. The memorandum also called for an investigation of the financial resources of radical right organizations, including an investigation of their tax exemptions, and a damming up of these resources as much as possible; and it called for putting the domestic Communist danger in its proper position as an exaggerated, tired issue. The memorandum was circulated in Congress as well as in the Administration, but no formal action was taken on any of the issues posed: the Defense Department opposed any probes into its activities; and attempts to start Congressional investigations into rightist activities were rejected.18

The present radical right puts much of its emphasis at the state and local levels where a minimum of pressure can often bring about a maximum of results, unlike McCarthyism which worked primarily at the national level.19 It has the advantage of being an out-of-power faction and of being able to work through the "conservative norm" in order to set up undercover cells, to increase doctrinaire conformity and to reduce the freedom of debate, and to conduct national programs with wild charges of "internal subversion," all in the name of anti-communism.20 Such a situation decreases the flexibility of the government to meet delicate foreign policy problems, like

---

17 Prior to the memorandum, the Internal Revenue Service began to review organizations claiming to be tax-exempt religious and educational organizations. It wanted to see if they were distributing political propaganda. No other action was taken. Ibid., p. 229.

18 Ibid., p. 230.


20 Ibid.
Berlin and Cuba, because of the increased rigidity of the democratic processes through a reduction of the freedoms of nonconformity and debate, and because any deviation from the "no compromise-total victory" line is so often looked upon as pro-Communist by an influential portion of the American public. The radical right also makes it hard for the United States to disassociate itself from the imperialism and white supremacy charges of the emerging countries.21

The whole American political system is weakened, as developed in the last chapter, because of the lack of a radical left to balance off the radical right, for in a viable system, extremism of both the left and right would be disregarded by the voters in favor of a moderate liberal or conservative program. Also in Chapter Four, it was shown that there is no viable American liberal force. The bi-partisan consensus with regard to foreign policy, the increased restraints on open and free discussion of alternatives to major policy directives in the Administration as well as in Congress, and the great emphasis placed on the cold war and on the military position by the Administration, all help to still liberal dissent.22 As a result, in the United States, "The effect of this pressure from the radical right, in the absence of anything like comparable pressures from the left, is to shift the whole climate of political contest and discussion toward the right...."23 There becomes only the moderate position and the radical right position, and the dominant consensus must take compromises with and appeasements to the right, as the only other strong

---

21Ibid. Part of this includes the radical right efforts for and links with the racist-hatist influences, the activities of which so often over-shadow positive racial steps, and radical right-federal government support for pro-American, right-wing dictators.


23Ibid., p. 124.
political force. As a result of such a situation, the Kennedy Administration has a major lack of flexibility in meeting the world's problems, because on one hand is the threat of nuclear war if the policies are too hard toward the Soviets, and on the other is the threat of losing the support of a significant number of Americans if the policies are considered too soft toward communism. The bind the President finds himself in is clearly seen by the perpetual Berlin crisis. Ralph Ellsworth and Sarah Harris point out his lack of flexibility:

They [many people] may wonder why, in the summer and fall of 1961, when the Berlin crisis was building up to a climax, President Kennedy found himself walking a very fine and unstable tight rope, with little chance to maneuver. Should he call the Russians' hand and force the re-opening of East Berlin, he would run the risk of starting an all-out nuclear war. Should he, on the other hand, come forward with compromises that in his, and his staff's, judgment might lead to long range settlement of the issues, he would run the risk of widespread and perhaps overwhelming criticism of being an appeaser and of lacking sufficient courage to stand up to Russia, as well as the risk of rebellion in the Congress.24

And Walter Lippmann wrote of the results of such inflexibility in his column:

The Soviet government has notified us that it will guarantee access to West Berlin on condition that West Berlin becomes a demilitarized free city, as they define these words.

***

We have never had and we do not now have a positive American and Western proposal for giving West Berlin a more durable and a more secure status than it now has. The policy of standing pat firmly means that Berlin is in a condition of perpetual crisis, which can never be resolved, where the choices are always to go to the brink of war or to incur the odium of appeasement.

***

President Kennedy is in a very difficult position... He is being squeezed by his adversary in Moscow, by his Allies in Bonn and Paris, and by the Right Wing here at home. The net result of these multiple conflicting pressures could be to immobilize him on the brink of thermonuclear war.25


The inflexible American foreign policy is also seen through the perpetual Cuban crisis. President Kennedy, during his 1960 campaign, borrowed from the right-wing position of seeing the United States as the hapless victim of the machinations of Castro and Khrushchev, which is helpless before them and suffering cold war defeat after defeat. He also denounced communism in Cuba, and attacked the Eisenhower Administration's Cuban policy as too pro-Communist, also familiar radical right exhortations. After his election victory, Kennedy continued the status quo Eisenhower policy of non-recognition of Cuba and of the Cuban nationalist revolution. But most dangerous of all, Kennedy continued the Eisenhower efforts to overthrow Castro, which led to the abortive April, 1961, invasion. His defense of such action again borrowed from the right-wing, especially from its love of the past when the United States actively and openly intervened in the affairs of Latin America. A British observer, J. R. Pole, wrote:

When President Kennedy made his public vindication of the United States' abortive action in aid of the overthrow of Castro, he made a point of protection of the New World against the alien and subversive doctrines of the old World. In the contemporary context, this observation was so anachronistic as to be merely quaint. But in the context of American ideology and its connection with the Monroe Doctrine, it must have seemed to many of his hearers to be perfectly sound and natural. It was what they expected—what they were entitled—to hear.

26 Riesman, "Some Further Reflections," pp. 120-121. The strength of the radical right is increased as such a view is given credence by President Kennedy, and the view may be used to interpret any new political alignment, in the world, as a defeat for the United States and a victory for the Soviet Union. Ibid., p. 121.

27 Ibid., p. 122.

28 J. R. Pole, "Forward From McCarthyism—The Radical Right and the Conservative Norm," The Political Quarterly, vol. 33, no. 2 (April, June, 1962), p. 202, Italics in original. President Kennedy's statement was shades of President Theodore Roosevelt and his "big stick." Few Americans would admit that the Monroe Doctrine is a dead issue, as much from United States action through its involvement in European
With the discovery of Russian missiles and missile sites in Cuba, President Kennedy, unlike in Berlin, decided to take more active action and the naval blockade was the result. Following the Russian missile withdrawal, the Kennedy Administration again seemed to be using mainly military means to defeat and isolate Castro and Castroism, as was alluded to in Chapter Three. Throughout the Cuban crisis, the radical right position was clear. It followed the dictates of Senator Barry Goldwater that an active and concerted United States military action was needed to oust Castro. In a word, invade Cuba. At no time were there viable liberal or radical left forces challenging our Cuban policy as being the wrong approach. No active forces in the Administration, in Congress, or in the American public were saying the way to end Castroism was through political, economic, and social means to end the suffering of people, which would help to end their appeal for extremism. The Kennedy Administration certainly had to take into consideration the active radical right, and the distorted public opinion it had created, because it was the only viable force outside of the dominant consensus. During the missile crisis, President Kennedy

affairs as from European involvement in Latin American affairs. Generally, most Americans are as poor historians as the radical right, and both conveniently forget what they want to about history. It cannot be denied that the Monroe Doctrine was geared to the nineteenth-century, and it was an agreement that the United States would stay out of European affairs if Europe would make no new incursions into Latin American affairs. Today, the Monroe Doctrine is, as Dr. Pole said, an anachronism. The United States can no longer logically justify its actions by a nineteenth-century document, or by a mystical notion that Latin American countries need its "protection." Such actions are interpreted by the world only as selfish U.S. national interests to bring its will on others for its own ends.

29 Berlin was considered to be in the Soviets' "sphere of influence," and as such it was assumed they would tolerate no strong action in regard to it. Cuba was considered out of their "sphere," and it was thought that they would not risk nuclear war over it, so stronger action was thought possible. The Cuban situation, by the time of the missile crisis, had deteriorated to the point that, with or without radical right influences, the United States might very well have taken the same type action in justification of its own national interests.
had to most certainly appease the right with its call for invasion, and so a military blockade was a logical compromise. Every such compromise with the right pulls the political system more to the right, and increases the right's sense of justification. In a progressive political system, under the same circumstances, a radical right position would probably call for invasion, a radical left position might advocate a policy of appeasement towards Castro communism, including the refusal to recognize any danger from it or from the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba, and a moderate compromise policy would fall in the middle, possibly with both sides trading missile bases on the other's borders. But under the American system, such a compromise would probably be impossible because of the "no compromise-total victory" right-wing position which has so much appeal in the United States.

The Kennedy Administration has made unique improvements in American foreign aid, as cited earlier in this chapter, even though they have been generally modest in scope, and much more needs to be done. Especially needed is for the United States to give full support to the nationalist movements around the world, and to give them political, economic, and social aid to support their democratic development. But to allow progressive internal and international programs which support democracy, liberal forces would have to unite as never before to balance off the radical

But most certainly, President Kennedy had to weigh most carefully radical right demands for more extreme action.

30 It was only after the installation of the naval blockade, which brought the world perilously close to nuclear war, that President Kennedy suggested his alleged no-invasion of Cuba pledge in return for the Soviet missile pullout. Even this pledge was held by the radical right to be appeasement.
right and the "conservative coalition." The chances of this happening are exceedingly dim, as the liberal elements lack force and enthusiasm for the reasons cited in the last chapter and in this chapter. For the present, the Kennedy Administration must resist the forces within the United States which claim that measures for social change must dry up to better fight communism, for such a policy will most certainly destroy the flow of democratic creativity in the United States, will stop all movement toward peace and freedom, and will ensure the status quo dominance of American foreign policy.\footnote{Suall, "American Ultras," p. 64.}

McCarthyism was a direct attack upon the national government, especially the State Department, as well as a grass-roots movement, and its adverse effects upon the Department lasted all during the Eisenhower Administration and into the Kennedy Administration. Its effects upon American foreign policy were direct. The present radical right, on the other hand, is mainly a grass-roots movement which brings pressure on foreign policy through indirect means. These means include efforts to work through the "conservative coalition" and its components like the military-industrial interest, and through the development of public opinion which refuses to tolerate a progressive foreign policy in favor of a status quo policy. And most importantly, a moderate policy must appease and make a compromise with the radical right, as the only viable political force outside of the dominant consensus. This pulls the foreign policy inexorably to the right.
CHAPTER SIX—GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Walter Lippmann has defined what he felt was a "truly civilised and enlightened man," who has to face the challenges of the nuclear age. Mr. Lippmann wrote that such a man must be a conservative, a liberal, and a progressive individual. He must be a conservative who defends constitutional doctrine, with a deep loyalty to the Western heritage of ideas. The right-winger is no conservative for he wishes to change constitutional doctrine to fit his particular glorification of the past, and he is loyal only to those ideas of past heritage which fit his ideology, while ignoring the rest. The civilized and enlightened man, Lippmann wrote, must be a liberal whose writing, speaking, and execution of the law must be done with enlightenment, affection, tolerance, and compassion.

The right-winger is no liberal for his whole being is reflected in a lack of enlightenment and compassion, and in disaffection and intolerance, as he interprets all ideas that are opposed to him as part of the "enemy apparatus," and he seeks to destroy such ideas as well as the people who hold them. His lack of respect for the law is seen in his use of extreme methods to reach his ends, and in his refusal to allow the protection of the law for unpopular minorities. The civilized and enlightened man, Lippmann continues, must be progressive, as he must be ready to adapt to the changes in the world, especially in the social order. The right-winger is not progressive for he refuses to recognize change except in

---

terms of a "conspiracy" that threatens his position, and he refuses to adapt to progressive change. His interpretation of change is to return to the past. Thus, it can be shown that the right-winger is not a "truly civilized and enlightened man," as Walter Lippmann defined the term, for he lacks true conservatism of borrowing from the past to live in the present, true liberalism of living in the present to plan for the future, and true progressiveness of adapting to change in a complex world.

In reality, radical rightism is linked to communism, especially to the neo-Stalinist group. Both set up an image in which all intellectuals and progressive reformers are seen as agents of the other side. Both need each other, feed on each other, and use each other to serve as "bogeymen" in order to force all deviants into conformity with the majority-ideology, whether it is Americanism, Fascism, communism, or the like. Freedom is the danger which both see, and freedom is the common target of both. Freedom is seen by the author as being in the position outside of the dominating influence of both right and left. The danger to freedom comes when both the radical right and radical left attack at the same time, and when a political system lacks viability it breaks apart in favor of either the right or left. In Germany, during the 1930's the Fascists of the right gained control; and in Russia, during 1917, the Communists of the left seized power. In a viable political system, the extremes balance each other off, as the dominant consensus of liberalism and conservatism rejects extremism. It must be stressed that the American system is not

---

truly viable for it lacks a radical left, but the radical right has created one to better serve its purposes of attacking freedom. But, as will be reviewed and as stressed in this thesis, because there is no actual left to balance off the right, the American political system is being moved to the right, which is as dangerous as if there were an active left and right attacking a system that lacks viability.

The United States has the appearance of stagnancy, politically, socially, spiritually, and economically, while the rest of the world marches forward. Americanism has become an ideology which increasingly looks to the glories and victories of the past, rather than to the challenges of the future. F. B. Schnick, professor of political science at the University of Utah, writes that

...an Americanism which, during many years of alleged economic prosperity, has left more than 6 per cent of the entire labor force without employment, has kept millions of its most industrious citizens in abject fear of illness and old age, has not provided a sizable percentage of its most talented high school graduates the opportunity to attend universities, an Americanism which has not tackled adequately, in the midst of an economy of plenty, its problems of malnutrition, of slums, of rapidly increasing crime rates, of an ill-supported public school system, or of an approach to life which, as a rule, bestows the highest societal standing on the successful money-maker rather than on the poverty-stricken schoolteacher, public servant, or scholar devoted to an ideal rather than the accumulation of riches, an Americanism of this type, indeed, will have to recognize and fulfill without delay the real needs of society if it is to remain worthy of defense. A stagnant Americanism looking to the golden age of past decades rather than the challenging opportunities of the future cannot be defended successfully in spite of its apparent support by today's American patriots.3

This condition of stagnancy has resulted in a large part from the paralyzing potency of right-wing propaganda, myths, and emotions which take Americans' minds off our collective problems, and which help to contribute to a slow withering of our open society at the grass-roots.\(^1\) The United States has a grass-roots political system, and any diverse effects at the local level would certainly affect the national level. The limitations we place on our thoughts and expressions, and our growing disinclination against speaking out, all caused by our belief, which is developed by the radical right, that they are necessary for our national survival, help to increase the stagnant condition.\(^5\) The radical right also has been successful, in several communities, in spreading hatred, fear, and suspicion; and it is learning to use political techniques that the liberals started, including door-bell-ringing, the organizing of election districts, and the compiling of voting records.\(^6\)

Americans cannot commend themselves by saying that at the present time the radical right has little prospect of winning the presidency, of capturing a national party, or of getting its policy enacted into law because the stagnation which it helps to cause internally affects the ability of the United States to meet its problems of domestic and foreign policy. The radical right threatens the freedom of action of the National Administration and of Congress in their efforts to formulate realistic anti-Communist programs, and to demonstrate the maturity of American democracy.

---


\(^5\) Ibid.

to the world. It also threatens to muddy the terms of debate on sensitive central issues from Berlin to Cuba. The radical right has exerted steady pressure on the President and the State Department, reinforced by public opinion and by the "conservative coalition" in Congress, against changes in the status quo, like the United States recognition of Red China or its membership in the United Nations, a general disarmament and arms control program, and a permanent settlement of the Berlin and Cuban problems that endanger world peace. The radical right also has brought steady pressure on Congress on the above issues, and to restrict United States support of the United Nations, and to prohibit foreign aid to Communist and neutral countries.

The influence of the radical right comes from its molding of public opinion. For the federal government to put into effect certain policies, especially in regard to basic and controversial changes in the status quo, it must have the support of public opinion in a sizeable majority, and such opinion is not "natural" so it must be formed and molded by the leaders. The Departments of State and Defense and the military-industrial-radical right complex have developed public opinion along the lines that the only salvation for this country is along military lines, and this has been done on a precedent-setting scale through the communication media, including public speeches, conferences, press releases, and advertising. Time is needed to give public opinion its desired form and direction, and,


Once accomplished, it tends to be quite rigid. Foreign policy issues are complex and remote from the average citizen, and emotions are easily aroused when the country and personal security are involved. Foreign aid especially is unpopular at a time when Americans recognize problems at home. In international conflict when negotiators need to be quite flexible in meeting new problems and challenges, they are tied to a rigid body of public opinion. For government leaders to have the continued support of the public, they must take action (or inaction?) in accord with the public opinion, which they have helped create, and not in accord with the needs of the time.

The radical right also gets much of its influence, more than just in its number of members or in its finances or in its links with military-industrial interests, from the fact that it is the only active and visible political force outside the dominant consensus, and that it alone is working actively for anti-communism. Thus, it has a monopoly in its anti-Communist methods. Many people will agree that at times it is too extreme, but, they claim, it is anti-Communist! And most important of all, its ideals are so abstract and so extreme, that the dominant consensus must go more than halfway to make a balanced compromise with it on any policy matter, and this moves the American political system continually to the right.

There are nothing like comparable pressures on the left. The labor force has lost much of its dynamism of the 1930's, and it is, today, quite a conservative movement. This is caused in part by its weakened position by technical automation and internal jurisdictional fights. The Negro civil

---

rights movement has too narrow interests to balance off the broader radical right. And there is no radical left, especially a viable American Communist party, to balance the extremism of the right.

In summary, the radical right resists change through its demands to return to the past, and the conservative interests, which also resist change, are increasingly being linked to the radical right, and both prevent progressive change.

The leadership of the radical right generally agrees upon domestic and foreign policy, as seen by its common exhortations, and its links with various right-wing groups, including its interchangeable and overlapping members of the leadership group, but the mass base is far from united on various issues. This latter point is not hard to explain when it is repeated that the radical right draws support from conflicting areas of the country, as anti-Catholic bigots from the South and Catholics from the North, and from conflicting classes of people, as members from the lower, middle, and upper classes. But there is the possibility of linking Catholic and Protestant-fundamentalist right-wingers, during the 1960's, in the memory of Catholic rightist, Senator Joseph McCarthy, and aided by a "liberal" Catholic President, John F. Kennedy, and helped along by the promise of a continued liberal trend in the Catholic Church by Pope John's successor, Pope Paul VI. There is also the possibility of the segregation question unifying the other components of the radical right, in the North as well as the South. It certainly seems to have the emotional attraction, and

---


the ability to unite the extremists and moderates of the right. The John Birch Society and other rightist groups have a definite appeal to many people in their advocacy against "forced integration" by the federal government, and by their idea that the Negro movement against segregation is a Communist plot to stir up trouble in this country.

The radical right is offering a better life to many people in the American society, especially the sociologically discontented people who see the radical right offering them both an explanation for their discontent, and a crutch, which is the shiny example of the past, for support in a disturbed world. Such discontent is both reflected and espoused in Congress.

It appears that the radical right has many of the basic principles of European totalitarianism, especially fascism:

...many of the cardinal features of European totalitarianism are plain to be seen in the American Ultra movement of 1962. The Radical Right criers of eternal suspicion and discord are backed by the millions of the Respectables, members of the moderate right and conservative groups, especially the industrial interests, as happened in Europe. Here, as there, all liberal legislation is equated with communism; any opponent of the self-designated patriot is branded as a "Consymp" or a traitor. As abroad, so here, the Radical Right wraps itself in the folds of the flag as if it alone possesses the attributes of patriotism. It shouts about its "freedom" programs, its dedication to Constitutional rights, its Americanism; it whips up a blind and passionate nationalism that demands "total victory" without stopping to assess the meaning or the cost. In its disregard of truth as exemplified in its written and film propaganda, in its adoption of the technique of slander and threat and intimidation, it employs all the tactics of totalitarian ideology; and in its wedding to the Military, its cries

12 The conspiracy theory of the radical right has a lot of appeal because it is a simple cause of all the problems that the United States has to face. The federal government lends credence to this theory through its perpetual hunt for subversives and un-Americans, and its recognition of the danger from within coming only from the left.
for the pre-emptive strike and the blowing up of Moscow, it is as hellbent on the most inconceivable war in history as were those who started the last war.\textsuperscript{13}

The radical right appears to lack two important necessities of fascism. One, it lacks a single scapegoat of the type that Hitler found in the Jews, "one really visible and real enough to steam up the hate of the fanatics and have it spill over into the public consciousness.\textsuperscript{14} It has tried to create communism into a scapegoat, but such a scapegoat lacks the visibility, closeness, and reality to the people. The real target of the right, the liberals, also lacks the emotional appeal of a readily identifiable group of people. And here the Negro might serve the purposes of the radical right as a scapegoat, for he is close, real, and easily recognizable. The racial problem has all the hatred, prejudice, intolerance, and fear that the radical right needs to play upon. The situation is perfect when the Negro civil rights movement is linked to communism, and the radical right has made efforts along these lines. And second, the radical right lacks a dynamic leader. Robert Welch is an excellent organiser of right-wing groups, but he lacks wide emotional appeal, and he has discredited himself by his wild attacks on conservatives like President Eisenhower. Senator Barry Goldwater has wide emotional appeal, especially among young people who are always the active political force to be reckoned with in any country. Goldwater could mold the right-wing into an active, cohesive group if he loses

\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Fred J. Cook, "The Ultras: Aims, Affiliations and Finances of the Radical Right," The Nation (Special Issue), vol. 191, no. 26 (June 30, 1962), p. 596. An earlier chapter and this chapter revealed the similarities between the radical right and communism. Thus, it is apparent that the right is similar to both fascism and communism. This is not hard to understand when it is realized that both are basically alike--a totalitarian-police state-dictatorship.}

\textsuperscript{14}\textit{Tbid., p. 596. The radical right weakens itself by being an "against-everything" movement with no single focus of its attention.}
the 1960 Republican nomination to a moderate, or if he decides there is no future for him in Republican politics. He could use the racial problem to his advantage as he has, to mold together rightists and conservatives of both North and South. With a single scapegoat and a dynamic leader, the appeal and the effectiveness of the radical right would certainly be increased in extreme proportion.

The future of the right is assuredly linked to the international situation. If it should ever become stable, the radical right would probably decrease in importance, for the appeal of its domestic issues lies to a large degree in the international dangers. If the international situation suddenly took a turn for the worse:

...if Laos and all of Vietnam were to fall to the Communists; if, within the Western Hemisphere, the moderate regimes of Bolivia and Venezuela were to topple and the Communists take over — then the radical right could begin to rally support around a drive for "immediate action," for a declaration of war in these areas, for a preemptive strike, or similar axioms of a "hard line." And since such conservatives as Nixon and Goldwater are committed, at least rhetorically, to a tough anti-Communist position, they would either be forced to go along with such an extreme policy or go under.

The basic problem is that the radical right is not isolated by businessmen, conservatives, and the Republican party who must rise up to defend American democracy as labor, liberals, and the Democratic party did in the late 1940s against the radical left. But it is easy to repudiate and isolate something that does not belong to you, and the American radical left was

---

15Westin, "Birch Society—Fundamentalism on the Right," p. 12. It is assumed that Goldwater would move more to a moderate position if he gained the nomination.


17Westin, "Deadly Parallels," p. 32.
generally considered to be Russian and not American, while the radical right is all ours and "belongs" to no foreign power.

Henry S. Reuss believes that if a large and important sector of the American people can ally themselves with their federal government against our vast and common problems, that this will isolate radicalism. But that is a tremendous "if" to overcome when one considers the historical and traditional belief of the American people that government and the "public sector" are generally bad and necessary evils, and "free enterprise" and the "private sector" are generally all good. One does not need to read J. Kenneth Galbraith too carefully to discover this.

The best and most complete way to isolate and balance off the radical right is through the development of a liberal counter-force, which is a difficult feat at this time in American history as this thesis has attempted to show. The United States is a conservative country, and even the liberal movement has been more moderate than liberal, as seen by the New Deal-era in which it had tried to appease and compromise the more conservative elements in the society. Where there are liberal pockets, they are usually marginal districts which can go either liberal or conservative in an election. But the growth of metropolitanism and the pushing back of fundamentalism by the modern age, and especially by the wresting of the state legislatures from the control of the rural-fundamentalist minority, will aid the cause of liberal, democratic politics. Modern education may also be a key to push back fundamentalist thinking. Education

---

can teach rational men to seek the facts that help point to truths, and not rely on emotion, prejudice, and half-truths which is one of the greatest weapons of the radical right. There are no simple answers to the threat of the radical right, but moderate Americans, including officials in high government positions, must start to consider the seriousness of the problem.
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