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Preface

The purpose of this dissertation is to trace the history and explore the meaning of the idea of "Americanism" during the period from 1919 to 1929. As such it is part of the larger study of nationalism. I accept the view of those historians of nationalism, such as Hans Kohn, Carleton J. H. Hayes, and Boyd C. Shafer, that nationalism is a state of mind. It is an idea, an attitude, and an emotion. It is the idea that men's highest loyalty should be toward the nation. A nation is a group of people who are believed to be a nation by themselves and by others. Some historians have maintained that overemphasis on nationalism as an idea leads the historian to view nationality as an act of sheer will or belief and to ignore the solid fact of common interests in the creation of nations and nationality. Obviously, common interests have played an important role in the creation of nationalism. It must be remembered, however, that common national interests themselves are partly a matter of perception. The ideas, if any, that people have of their common interests are determined by the books and newspapers they read, the schools they attend, and the values they share, as well as by their common economic, political, or military interests. The idea of nationalism, as many scholars have pointed out, is often consciously taught.¹

¹The historical treatments of nationalism as an idea include such standard works as Hans Kohn, The Idea of Nationalism (New
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Nationalism is an idea. Ideas depend on perspective or point of view. It follows that different nations may have different concepts of their nationhood. Moreover, different groups within each nation may have different concepts of their nation. This dissertation is a part of the history of the national ideas of a particular nation, the United States. American nationalism, like most nationalisms, involves loyalty to what some consider to be the institutions, traditions, religion, and language of the nation.

The American nation, however, was founded before there were any "national" traditions. America has neither a common religion nor an exclusive language. American nationality, therefore, has probably come to involve identification with a particular ideology to a greater degree than most other nationalities. Although


Clinton Rossiter identified that ideology as conservatism, I have come to agree with Louis Hartz and Yehoshua Arieli that liberalism, in the sense of economic, or possessive individualism, has been one element at the heart of American national ideology. Inherent in liberalism was the idea that property was or should have been the result of the property owner's labor and his virtue. In this context, those who are usually called conservatives in America, and so called in this dissertation, were simply liberals who maintained that the distribution of wealth as it existed accurately reflected the distribution of hard work and virtue among individual Americans. All had had an equal opportunity to gain wealth, and those who had succeeded had demonstrated their superiority. Since equal opportunity already existed, the government should do nothing to redistribute wealth or to change the conditions under which wealth was gained. Those called liberals in America, and in this dissertation, believed that equality of opportunity was an ideal yet to be attained and that change was necessary in order to create it.  

Although the element of economic individualism is at the core of the ideology of most Americans, it is not the only one. I have found that the idea that America should be a well organized team, with all classes cooperating for their common economic good, was just as important in the 1920's. In this context, the differences between

---

liberal and conservative Americans are over how the various members of the team can be made to work together. Conservative Americans in the 1920's generally believed that cooperation between the classes could only be achieved when all classes recognized the leadership of America's natural leaders, the business executives. Liberals wanted to create cooperation by giving all classes an equal voice in decisions affecting them all. Both conservatives and liberals, however, usually remained firm in their common beliefs that economic goals were extremely important and that economic goods should be privately owned.

These two ideas, economic individualism and teamwork, do not exhaust the popular beliefs about the meaning of Americanism in the Twenties. For many Americans virility (or the willingness to fight) or racial purity were essential to the meaning of Americanism. Moreover, it is not the purpose of this dissertation to designate any one belief as "American" and treat all others as aberrations. To do so would be to create a piece of national ideology rather than a study of national ideology. Although some concepts of Americanism were more prevalent and thus more important in understanding American thought than others, any concept of American nationality expressed by any American ideally should be considered to be a part of the meaning of "Americanism." Obviously, it would be impossible to examine all of the expressions of nationality of any period, no matter how brief. I do not claim that even all the popular meanings of Americanism are examined in this dissertation. I have tried, however, to examine the meanings given to Americanism by groups who identified themselves
and were identified by many others as being peculiarly qualified to define Americanism.

Although many aspects of American national ideology seem to have great continuity, World War I formed the immediate background of American nationalism in the 1920's. Chapter One discusses that background. Chapter Two attempts to outline the causes and patterns of American intolerance toward people or ideas deemed "un-American" in the 1920's. Chapter Three discusses the attempt of several individuals and groups, such as those trying to "Americanize" the immigrant or influence the teaching of patriotism in the schools, to define Americanism. Chapters Four, Five, and Six discuss in detail the concepts of Americanism expressed by the American Legion. The Legion's concept of Americanism is used as a general archetype of conservative Americanism. Chapters Seven and Eight discuss conservative variations and enrichments of this conservative national ideology as expressed by the Chamber of Commerce and the anti-radicals. Chapter Nine attempts to balance the conservative concepts of Americanism with those of two well-published and articulate liberals, Norman Hapgood and Horace Kallen. In examining the Americanism of these groups and individuals, I have tried to discover and explain both their concepts of what American society should be and what that society's relation to the rest of the world should be.

I would like to express my appreciation for the aid given to me in preparing this dissertation by my adviser, Professor Burl Noggle, and by Professor Anne Loveland of Louisiana State University, and by Mrs. Mary J. Thurman, librarian at Eastern Kentucky University.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this dissertation is to trace the development and explore the meaning of the idea of Americanism during the period, 1919-1929. The ideas of the Americanization Movement, race theorists, literary nationalists and others are briefly examined. More attention is given to the ideas of the American Legion, the Chamber of Commerce, the anti-radicals, and two liberals, Norman Hapgood and Horace Kallen.

During the 1920's, Americanism was identified with such diverse things as virility, the "American" language, Protestantism, Aryanism, the open shop, cooperation, competition, fair play, toleration, and liberty. Despite this diversity some things united almost all of the groups and individuals whose ideas were examined. First, no matter what they thought Americanism was, they thought it was something good. Although American ideas were peculiarly American, they were good for all men.

Another thing which united the Americans whose ideas were examined was that they often used the same words to describe what Americanism was. Both Ku Klux Klan leader Hiram Evans and philosopher Horace Kallen stated that Americanism stood for toleration. They differed in the diversity of groups each was willing to tolerate. Hiram Evans believed that to be American, or good, a person had to be white and Protestant. He had to accept the institutions created by earlier generations of Americans without change. Since large numbers
of people could not or would not be Americans by this definition, Evans tolerated a relatively small number of people. Kallen believed that America stood for universal ideals which anybody could accept. He tolerated a much larger group than Evans. Like many Americans, Kallen identified Americanism with equality of economic opportunity. This implied great emphasis on economic development. Kallen could not conceive of, and in one sense was intolerant of, groups who did not put great stress on economic development.

Almost all Americans of the 1920's associated the idea of "fair play" with Americanism. Fair play was an economic concept. It meant equal opportunity for individuals to "get ahead." For conservatives it also meant that the losers in the competition to "get ahead" should be good sports and not try to change the rules of the game.

The individualism of the concept of "fair play" was balanced by the idea of "teamwork," which both conservatives and liberals believed to be the primary lesson of World War I. Liberals and conservatives differed in their interpretation of the idea of "teamwork." For Liberals "teamwork" meant that Americans should work together in cooperatives and labor unions in order to achieve "equality of opportunity" in a nation dominated by large corporations. Internationally "teamwork" meant that nations should cooperate to avoid war by instituting "fair play" for the whole world. Economically developed nations were to have an equal opportunity to gain markets and open up "backward" areas of the world.

For conservatives teamwork meant that workers and the govern-
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ment should cooperate with the natural leaders of the nation. These leaders had already proved themselves by rising through competition to their exalted positions. Competition was primarily good for those who had not proved themselves by becoming rich. For the Chamber of Commerce, international teamwork meant that other nations should cooperate with America, the natural leader among nations. For the American Legion and the anti-radicals, teamwork meant the cooperation of all Americans in war. America needed foreign markets. Foreign markets could only be protected by superior military forces. Superior military forces meant great national prestige. For these Americans virility, or the willingness to fight with no questions asked, was co-equal with fair play as an essential part of Americanism.
CHAPTER I

World War I and American Nationalism in the 1920's

The 1920's, some historians believe, was a period of heightened nationalism in the United States. This heightened nationalism inspired both an effort to define just what America was and an intolerance for people deemed to be "un-American."¹ The forms taken by nationalist intolerance and national ideology in the 1920's were determined by the conjunction of several factors including the cumulative history of American nationalism to 1914 and the impact of World War I on American society.

By 1914, Americans had developed most of the badges of national identity, such as a national flag, a national emblem, and a national motto, which have marked the rise of modern nationalism. Moreover, they had developed their own versions of many of the concepts of liberal, organic and militaristic nationalism found in many other nations.² World War I did not create any fundamentally new


² Among the important works covering the history of American nationalism to 1914 are: Merle Curti, The Roots of American Loyalty
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concepts of American nationality. It did, however, greatly intensify, at least for a time, outward show and presumably inward feelings, of nationalism. Moreover, along with the Bolshevik Revolution, World War I greatly influenced both the emphasis and the intensity of American nationalism in the 1920's. In fact, for the first year and a half following the War, during the period known as the "Red Scare," the patriotic emotions precipitated by the War continued unabated. They only gradually diminished thereafter.

During World War I, Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt enunciated and popularized concepts of American nationalism which

3 For example, John A. Garraty, The New Commonwealth, 1877-1890 (New York, Evanston, and London, 1968) 313, maintained that "the epithets 'un-American' and 'communist' were employed nearly as frequently in the 1870's and 1880's as in the decades following the Russian Revolution of 1917." According to Robert Moats Miller, "The Ku Klux Klan," in Change and Continuity in the Twentieth Century: The 1920's, John Braeman, et. al., eds. (Columbus, Ohio, 1968), 230, the Klan of the Twenties, begun in 1915, was not a unique phenomenon in American history but "the receptacle for nativist themes flowing from the distant American past."

were admired and used by both liberal and conservative definers of Americanism in the Twenties. The militantly conservative American Defense Society reprinted Roosevelt's "last words" on many of its pamphlets and supplied schools with his picture. Many were disillusioned over the results of Wilson's War idealism. Many other Americans in the Twenties, both liberal and conservative, still believed that World War I was a war for democracy. Moreover, as Christopher Lasch has pointed out, disillusioned liberals were not so much disillusioned with Wilsonian liberalism, as with what they thought was Wilson's "'betrayal' of it." An examination of the concepts of Americanism enunciated by these two men can serve as an introduction to the concepts of Americanism popular in the Twenties as well as during the World War.

In Woodrow Wilson, American liberal nationalism found one of its most persuasive spokesmen. Although a racist, insofar as Negroes were concerned, Wilson did not define nationality primarily

---

in terms of race. A nation, to him, was a group which represented a particular ideal.\footnote{I. A. Newby, Jim Crow’s Defense: Anti-Negro Thought in America, 1900–1930 (Baton Rouge, 1968), 67, 167; Arthur S. Link, Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era, 1910–1917 (New York, 1954), 63-67; Woodrow Wilson, The New Democracy: Presidential Messages, Addresses, and Other Papers (1913–1917), Ray Stannard Baker and William E. Dodd, eds. (2 vols., New York and London, 1926), 1, 378.} The United States could assimilate immigrants from all over Europe if they accepted American ideology. The United States, he maintained, had always been made up of men who came to the New World "with a single purpose, sharing some part of the passion for human liberty, which characterized the men who founded the Republic...."\footnote{Wilson, The New Democracy, II, 180, 252.} Each nation, Wilson believed, had the right to rule itself without outside interference. The freedom that the United States stood for was partly national and partly individual. It was freedom of economic opportunity, or as Wilson told the American Electric Railway Association in 1915, "'A free field and no favor.'"\footnote{Ibid., I, 108; II, 260; William Diamond, The Economic Thought of Woodrow Wilson (Baltimore, 1943), 122-124.} Competition between classes was bad, however, because all Americans should stand together.\footnote{Woodrow Wilson, The New Democracy, II, 347.} Private property was not in itself absolute, but it had been found, he said in Omaha in 1916, "to be the indispensable foundation of stable institutions" which provided for "the rights of humanity."

Woodrow Wilson believed that America stood for liberty, the rights of man, and their indispensable adjunct, private property, not just in the United States but everywhere in the world. The American
wanted to share human liberty and rights "with the whole world...."
The flag stood for the nation's right to "serve the other nations of the world."\textsuperscript{10} Since the United States stood for human rights all over the world, "America First" was an appropriate motto. America's transcendent mission meant that patriotic loyalty was "sacred" and "spiritual" and demanded "self-sacrifice."\textsuperscript{11} Moreover, if the world needed America, America needed the world, for American industries had "expanded to such a point that they will burst their jackets if they cannot find a free outlet to the markets of the world." The need of the world for America's ideals and America of the world's markets were complementary, not contradictory.\textsuperscript{12}

How would the United States promote the rights of men and American trade in the world? America was to be an example both to those who did not put America first and to the world by "thinking American thoughts and by entertaining American purposes, for they are intended for the betterment of mankind."\textsuperscript{13} These ideals included \textit{laissez faire}. America had to convince other nations to open the way for free movement of goods and capital throughout the world.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., I, 144, 134. It was, II, 68, the "'destiny of America' to declare and stand for the rights of men."

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., II, 193-94, 205, 213, 251-52.

\textsuperscript{12}Quoted in Diamond, \textit{The Economic Thought of Woodrow Wilson}, 132.

\textsuperscript{13}Wilson, \textit{The New Democracy}, II, 205.

Wilson tried to put his national ideals into practice in diplomacy. Before the United States entered World War I, he called for "a peace without victory" and "among equals" with a "League for Peace" to guarantee a peace in which each people would have the right of national self-determination and a democratic government guaranteeing the rights of man. Otherwise, peace would not last because men would revolt against their governments. Peace was only possible among democracies. The democracies would guarantee freedom of the seas, free trade, and a reduction of armaments. The American system would be extended to the world. American principles and policies were "the principles of mankind and must prevail." After America entered the war, Wilson drew up his "Fourteen Points" embodying these proposals.

During the war, in opposition to Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt preached a more militant brand of nationalism. Roosevelt's theory of American nationalism was based to a large degree on his belief in the ever present danger of war and the necessity to always

\[\text{\textsuperscript{15}}\text{For a discussion of Wilson's religious and national moralism in diplomacy see Arthur S. Link, "Wilson the Diplomatist," in The Philosophy and Politics of Woodrow Wilson, Earl Latham, ed. (Chicago, 1958), 147-64.}\]


\[\text{\textsuperscript{17}}\text{Frederic L. Paxson, American Democracy and the World War (2 vols., Boston, 1939), II, 179. Levin, Wilson and World Politics, 11-64.}\]
be prepared for it militarily, industrially, and emotionally. It sometimes appeared that for him the main purpose of the nation was fighting.18

Roosevelt believed that there were two kinds of nations—the righteous, powerful, and civilized ones and the criminal, uncivilized ones. Fear and suspicion of one another and minor blunders and misunderstandings caused wars among civilized nations. Disputes between the civilized and uncivilized nations were caused by criminal activity on the part of the latter combined with lack of preparedness for war on the part of the former.19 How, then, could war be avoided? A very gradual decreasing of fear and growth of confidence in one another would ultimately solve major disputes between the civilized states.20 Nevertheless, Roosevelt believed that the civilized nations should enter treaties of arbitration with one another and agree to back up the decisions with force. They would form a "League of Righteousness" which would be used to discipline the criminal nations of the world.21 No arbitration treaty, however, should be unlimited in scope. The United States should never agree to arbitrate away its vital national interests or national honor. To do so would be like

---


20Roosevelt, Works, XVIII, 39, 52-53.

21Ibid., XVIII, 44, 55, 73, 148-49, 155, 242.
arbitrating between a robber and his victim. The robber should be punished, not treated as an equal to his victim in arbitration. America should have always been on the side of God. America stood for democracy and liberty. Any state, whether previously defined as civilized or not, became a "criminal state" in disputes involving American vital interests and honor.\textsuperscript{22}

Since the development of the good will and confidence between civilized nations necessary for permanent peace between them would, of necessity, take a long time to develop, America always faced the possibility of war. Toward criminal states, America, either alone or in conjunction with a "League of Righteousness" of the civilized nations, needed to keep up her guard in order to enforce her rights and maintain her self-respect. America should actually be continually engaged in situations which might lead to military action because to be neutral in any dispute between any two nations was immoral. Neutrality ignored the fact that there was a right and wrong to every dispute. America's international duty was always to intervene on the side of right. Only by being intensively nationalistic could Americans do their duty to the world. If America failed to meet these challenges she would be conquered by a more virile nation. War was not necessarily bad, since it tested the virility and morality of the nation and its citizens. It

united Americans of all classes in a great national effort. It stimulated patriotism.  

The preparedness for war that Roosevelt advocated was not simply military. Ideally, it should encompass all aspects of American life. America should always be militarily, industrially, and emotionally prepared for war. For this America needed virile, tough, high-minded citizens continually ready and willing to be sacrificed for the good of the nation in war. Suffrage should be directly tied to military service. The most productive citizens were graduates of West Point. American citizens, always willing to fight for the nation, of necessity had to see the identity of their interests and those of the nation. This would be possible only if all good Americans were willing to give justice to all Americans on an equal basis. Good Americans realized that complete national unity necessitated one language, one set of values, and a high standard of living for all Americans. That was the essence of Americanism.

There was no room in America for either those who had divided national loyalties, i.e., hyphenated Americans and "professional

---

23 Roosevelt, Works, XVIII, 42, 46, 48, 53-54, 72, 185, 201, 206-08; 225, 231, 253, 262, 298-99; XIX, 243-47, 250-54; Roosevelt, Letters, VIII, 1000; Roosevelt, National Strength and International Duty, 31.


26 Roosevelt, Works, XVIII, 254, 331, 392, 396-97, 403, 443-44; XIX, xxv, 67-68, 70-95, 167-72, 301-07; Roosevelt, National Strength and International Duty, 92.
internationalists," or those who put self and individual desires and ideas above the good of America as Roosevelt saw it. Pacifists were criminal traitors and cowards, or, more colorfully, "sissies." If America was on the side of God, they were the Devil's agents. Willfully wealthy men who put their interests above that of the nation were un-American as well. Those radicals who refused to accept the nation essentially as it was and who preached class war and national disruption were by definition enemies of the nation. All of these groups were un-American because they put something above the nation as Roosevelt defined it. Although patriotic Americans should condemn the government when it led the nation along the wrong path as the Wilson administration did, traitorous, un-American pacifists, radicals, and hyphenated Americans should be silenced in the name of Americanism.

Although Roosevelt and Wilson were political opponents, their visions of America were similar in many essential ways. Both believed America to be the nation destined to lead the world to righteousness.

27Roosevelt, Works, XVIII, 201, 204-04, 207-08, 262, 278-84, 311-12, 324; XIX, 301-03; Roosevelt, National Strength and International Duty, 66, 85.

They both identified America with capitalism. They both, however, believed that Americans of all classes should stand together, united, and denied that economic individualism was divisive. By defining America as righteous and capitalistic, they helped open the way to defining those who questioned capitalism as both evil and un-American. Ultimately, they both sanctioned war as a means by which America could fulfill her world mission.

II

World War I united the economy of the United States to a greater degree than ever before. The Selective Service Act gave the federal government power to draw millions of men into national military service. Over two million men were sent overseas to participate in the war. President Wilson gained almost unlimited power to oversee and coordinate the economic system of the nation in order to supply these men. Many government agencies were created to direct the economy towards the single end of winning the war. The government became a huge consumer of goods and often used its power as a massive consumer to raise wages for workers in industries vital to the war effort thereby giving ordinary men a greater stake in the nation. In encouraging the conservation of food, the Food Administration, under Herbert Hoover, gave every man a chance to sacrifice for his country, to feel that he was adding to the war effort, to be conscious of his part in a great transcendent undertaking by observing wheatless days and meatless days, by saving a "pat of butter," and by cultivating a "liberty garden." As important as any of these activities in
encouraging men to see the American nation as the object of ultimate
loyalty was the effort to finance the war through Liberty Loan sales. The
government became a great source of investment for millions.

In order to get people in large numbers to buy bonds and to
save a pat of butter, a huge propaganda campaign was launched. Total
national military and economic mobilization involved total intellectual
and emotional mobilization. This was probably the most important
effect of the war on the development of extreme national consciousness
in the United States during World War I. The Committee on Public
Information (CPI) sent out thousands of speakers, hired specialists
in advertising, hired artists, made films and published over
75,000,000 pieces of printed matter in order to encourage support for
the war. According to the CPI, the war was a war for democracy, a war
to end all wars, against an autocratic, militaristic Germany who might
turn to conquest of America if she won in Europe. Although this pro­
paganda did win support for the war, it was considered to be danger­
ously weak by the more extreme patriots during World War I. The CPI,
it was charged, was soft on Germany. A more virulent propaganda of
patriotic hate for Germany and the Central Powers was sponsored by
private organizations such as the National Security League (NSL)
originally a preparedness organization. It propagandized a hatred
of Germany and a deep suspicion of liberals who seemed moderate in
their denunciations of Germany.30

As war propaganda increased national consciousness, fears grew that American teachers were not teaching in such a way as to promote uncritical patriotism and the war effort. Some states began to take action even before America entered the war, and others followed suit soon after. They passed various laws providing for such things as the teaching of subjects designated to promote patriotism, signing a loyalty oath for all teachers, singing the national anthem, and pledging allegiance to the flag in the schools. In a few states, New York being by far the most notorious, teachers were dismissed for not being strong enough in their advocacy of the allied cause or for being either too neutral toward or positively critical of America's entry into the war or some aspect of American life. Meanwhile, a rumor began to circulate that the Germans, through history text books, had been plotting to subvert American youth for several years before America's entry into the war. Some European texts were banned in Iowa, Montana, California, Washington, Arizona, Rhode Island, Ohio, and Oklahoma. Portland, Oregon and Evanston, Illinois, banned Muzzy's An American History on the grounds that it

did not praise America's heroes enough or was generally critical of some aspects of American history. In all, Bessie Pierce, after a study of the teaching of history in American schools, concluded in 1926 that "From 1917 to the present, the dominant note has been a dynamic patriotism growing out of the World War."^32

The efforts to create a unified nation for war succeeded in evoking an outburst of patriotism among the American people. Over 18,000,000 people subscribed over $4,000,000,000 in one Liberty Loan drive alone. Unfortunately, although the United States was in a war "to make the world safe for democracy" and for human rights, the patriotism precipitated by the war created a great deal of nationalistic intolerance. In Illinois a young man, Robert Paul Prager, was lynched on the basis of an unfounded rumor that he was somewhat disloyal. Other victims of patriotic hysteria were beaten, forced to kiss the flag in public, had their houses painted yellow, or were pressured into buying more Liberty Bonds than they felt


they could afford.33

President Wilson seems to have forseen intolerance as a result of American entry into the war. He was reported to have told newspaper man Frank Cobb, in an often quoted Statement, "Once lead this people into war and they'll forget there ever was such a thing as tolerance. To fight you must be brutal and ruthless, and the spirit of ruthless brutality will enter into the very fibre of our national life..."34 Yet when the intolerance that Wilson predicted came to pass, Wilson did little to check its full force. George Creel maintained that by the height of the war, Wilson was against free speech saying, "there could be no such thing-- that it was insanity, and that men could, by their actions in America, stab our soldiers in the back."35

Officially, governmental efforts to protect the nation from a broadly defined disloyalty were evident in the passage of the Espionage

33Paxson, American Democracy and the World War, II, 271; H. C. Peterson and Gilbert C. Fite, Opponents of War, 1917-1918 (Madison, 1957), 142-45, 194-205. Peterson and Fite catalogue a very large number of intolerant acts perpetrated during the World War. Ray H. Abrams, Preachers Present Arms (Scottdale, Pa., 1969), related the role of the clergy in creating war hysteria by spreading atrocity stories, equating the enemy with the devil, etc. Higham, Strangers in the Land, 204-22, makes explicit the connection between wartime intolerance and nationalism.


Act of June, 1917. Among other things, the act allowed the Postmaster General to deny use of the mails to publications with disloyal views. In addition, the Sedition Act of May, 1918, outlawed "disloyal, profane, scurrilous or abusive language" concerning the federal government, the flag, the uniform, the armed forces or the Constitution. Under the Espionage Act, over fifteen major publications were banned from the mail within a few months after the war began. Over 6,000 people were prosecuted under the provisions of the two acts.

More drastic and irresponsible acts of patriotic intolerance were promoted by two unofficial loyalty testing organizations of the federal government during World War I. The Loyal Legion of Loggers and Lumbermen (LLLL) was organized ostensibly to promote the production of timber for airplane production, but it actually functioned to suppress labor unrest and disloyalty and eventually to suppress the A.F. of L. and the I.W.W. among lumbermen. The American Protective League (APL), a private organization created before the war, gained the approval of the Justice department as a volunteer spy hunting group. By the end of the war, the APL had 1,400 local units with 350,000 members. Although this force sometimes functioned as the Justice Department intended, it often became an instrument for the suppression of minority groups, as its members interpreted loyalty to mean adherence to their own private opinions. One group helped plan

36Quoted in ibid., 69
37Ibid., 57; Hyman, To Try Men's Souls, 268; Higham, Strangers in the Land, 210-12.
and execute the rounding up of over 1,000 striking miners in Bisbee, Arizona, putting them on cattle cars, and sending them out into the desert without food or water. The Justice Department did little to check or punish these abuses.\(^{38}\)

The most obvious targets of nationalistic prejudice during World War I were immigrants, and, more particularly, German immigrants. Suspicion of immigrants because of the war predated actual American entry into the war. On January 30, 1915, representatives of various German-American organizations met to try to plan some way to influence American policy in the war. The result was a wave of anti-German sentiment, which turned into a movement for "unhyphenated Americanism," led by Theodore Roosevelt.\(^{39}\) Roosevelt launched a campaign for what he called "AMERICA FOR AMERICANS."\(^{40}\)

In part, this campaign was a peaceful attempt to assimilate immigrants more fully into American life. An Americanization movement for immigrants begun by private groups in the Progressive Period became very popular. July 4, 1915, was declared Americanization Day\(^{41}\) with the purpose of promoting a movement that would, according to Americanization leader Frances Keller, "forge the people in this country into

\(^{38}\)Hyman, To Try Men's Souls, 272-84, 292, 298-314; Johnson, The Challenge to American Freedoms, 89; Higham, Strangers in the Land, 210-12.

\(^{39}\)Higham, Strangers in the Land, 196-98; Edward George Hartman, The Movement to Americanize the Immigrant (New York, 1948), 105-07.

\(^{40}\)Quoted in Higham, Strangers in the Land, 198.

\(^{41}\)Hartman, The Movement to Americanize the Immigrant, 108-12.
an American race that will stand for America in times of peace or of war...."  

This was to be done through a program of education in the English language and American patriotism. After the United States entered the war, the Americanization effort was merged with the general war effort, and various state and private efforts were coordinated by such government agencies as the Bureau of Naturalization, the Bureau of Education, and the Committee on Public Information.

Unfortunately, all concern for national solidarity and fear of foreigners in the United States did not find an outlet in peaceful activities such as the Americanization movement. Gradually, demands for "Absolute and Unqualified Loyalty" in 1915 and 1916 by Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge, General Leonard Wood, and by such private patriotic, militaristic groups as the Navy League, the National Security League, and the American Defense Society prepared the way for popular action against those deemed dangerous to the country when the United States did enter the war.  

With American entry into the war, demands began

\[42\] Quoted in Ibid., 115.
\[43\] Ibid., 126, 149, 164, 170-215.
\[44\] Other leaders of the preparedness and 100 per cent Americanism movements included Jurists James M. Beck and Alton B. Parker, Congressman Augustus P. Gardner of Massachusetts, munitions manufacturer Hudson Maxim, former Assistant Secretary of War Henry Breckinridge, and former Attorney General George W. Wickersham. Militant preparedness organizations included the Army League, the Association for National Service, the Universal Military Service Workers, the Military Training Camps Association, and the American Legion (not to be confused with the post-war veterans organization.) More elaborate listings of individuals and organizations, both militant and otherwise, active in the preparedness movement can be found in Abrams, Preachers Present Arms, 13-48; Chase C. Mooney and Martha E. Layman, "Some Phases of the Compulsory Military Training
to be heard for what was called "100 per cent Americanism," or complete identification of the individual with the nation. Although traditional American doctrines such as individualism and the rights of men were not repudiated outright, it was felt that there could be no legitimate conflict between these values and absolute, unthinking national conformity. In general, the American nation was looked upon by 100 per centers as being complete and perfect so that any idea of change was interpreted as disloyalty. These 100 per centers often felt that the federal government was criminally negligent in failing to enforce a very narrow American patriotism. In this situation, traditional nativism in the United States took on a new form. Anti-Catholic and racist nativisms were not applicable to the situation. Of the three traditional nativistic movements, only anti-radicalism immediately benefited from the war. Radicals were suspect because they were dissenters rather than conformists and because they sometimes challenged the wisdom of the entry of the United States into the war. Suspicion of radicals was increased...
after the new Bolshevik government of Russia made peace with Germany, Rumors spread that the Bolshevik government was controlled by the Kaiser. This seemed to be confirmed by propaganda from the Committee on Public Information. The identification of radicalism with disloyalty seemed complete. When the war ended, there was no more Kaiser to fear and hate. But the anti-radicalism continued unabated. The war had seen much intolerance, but it had united the American people in a sense of national unity through transcendent purpose as they had never been united before. Insistence on conformity had actually increased a sense of community and comradeship among conformists. They were not ready to give up this sense of purposeful unity when the war ended. As a result, World War I dominated American thoughts and feeling about the nation and patriotism for years following its end.45

45Higham, Strangers in the Land, 199, 204-09, 213-20, 222-24; Johnson, The Challenge to American Freedom, 89-103; Preston, Aliens and Dissenters, 6-10, 85-91. Poet and scholar Conde B. Pallen, director of the anti-radical division of the National Civic Federation in the 1920's, rhapsodized in 1917: "Thank God there still are battles, that man has still a soul." See Pallen, "Dies Irae," Literary Digest, LIV (June 9, 1917), 1787.
CHAPTER II

American Nationalism in the Twenties:
Causes and Patterns

The end of World War I saw a continuation rather than an end of the hysterical nationalism created by what was considered to be a national emergency. The continuation of anxiety over the fate of the nation was caused, in part, by a fear of the social and economic changes, such as the growing urbanization of America and the achievement of political and economic power by a new ethnic groups in the previous decades—changes which had been accelerated by the War.¹

In some areas, such as in America's economic relations with the rest of the world or the effort to promote the teaching of patriotism in the public schools, the continuity of American nationalism from

¹Robert D. Warth, "The Palmer Raids," South Atlantic Quarterly (January, 1949), 20, characterized the American public as "nervous" during the Twenties. According to David B. Tyack, "The Perils of Pluralism: The Background of the Pierce Case," American Historical Review, LXXIV (October, 1968), 74, "fundamentalists of all stripes felt a peculiar sense of urgency, of anxiety, of displacement" in the Twenties. Roderick Nash, The Nervous Generation: American Thought, 1917-1930 (Chicago, 1970), characterizes Americans in general in the Twenties as "nervous!" Robert Moats Miller, "The Ku Klux Klan," in Change and Continuity in Twentieth Century America: The 1920's, John Braeman, et. al., eds. (Columbus, Ohio, 1968), 215, states that the "Ku Klux Klan of the 1920's is a study in anxiety rather than in abnormality" and that, 217, the Klan was "essentially a counter-revolutionary movement."
World War I to 1929 was pronounced. However, the emphasis and intensity of American nativism, or nationalist intolerance, in the Twenties falls into three fairly distinct periods. Fear that America was endangered by insidious and evil forces was probably greatest during 1919 and the first half of 1920 during what is known as the Red Scare. The anxiety (with its attendant intolerance) of many Americans over the safety of their nation diminished again with the Immigration Act of 1924. This Act assured Americans that large numbers of what they believed to be undesirable immigrants would never again come to America. Again, however, intolerance in the name of national patriotism survived. 2

The sense of National emergency immediately following the war was kept alive, in part, by the action of the federal government in its continued arrest and trial of persons under the wartime Espionage and Sedition Acts throughout 1919. 3 These cases involved mainly Socialists and members of the I.W.W. so that the identification of radicalism with treason was maintained and strengthened. Senator Lee Overman of North Carolina got Senate approval to turn his judiciary subcommittee, which had originally been organized to investigate German propaganda, to the investigation of "pacifists, socialists, radicals, radicals, ...


Bolsheviks, free-love college professors and their ilk. With members and former members of the Bureau of Investigation as star witnesses, the Committee was able to find what it was looking for. It found that the Nonpartisan League was trying to get a soft peace for Germany, that radicals advocating a change in the American economic and social system found their best audience among the foreign born in the industrial centers, and that twenty well-known American colleges and universities employed or had previously employed dangerous radicals on their faculties. Again governmental action linked radicalism and even liberalism with treason to American institutions.

Meantime, the American public was being made more susceptible to the lesson of the direct connection between ideological non-conformity and disloyalty by a whole host of problems stemming from postwar demobilization. A swift rise in prices had begun when the war started in Europe and prices continued to rise after it ended. Labor had gained ground during the war and was determined to keep these gains in the face of the rise in the cost of living. At the same time businessmen were determined to prevent any basic extension, such as the labor-supported Plumb plan to nationalize the railroads, of the regulatory legislation of the progressive era and to maintain


5Lowenthal, The Federal Bureau of Investigation, 50, 56, 60.
freedom to operate without restrictions by labor unions. The result was a series of strikes during 1919, beginning with the Seattle general strike in February and culminating in the Boston police and the steel strikes in September and the coal strike in November. American businessmen were able to convince many Americans, according to historians R. K. Murray and John Higham, that strikes and labor costs were the primary cause of the rise in prices. Both prominent individual businessmen and business dominated patriotic and trade groups such as the National Civic Federation, the National Security League, the American Defense Society, and the National Association of Manufacturers, joined with some prominent governmental officials in identifying the strikes as an evidence of the growth of dangerous and radical ideas in the United States. This attack on labor strikes was

---

6 Gabriel Kolko, *The Triumph of Conservatism: A Reinterpretation of American History, 1900-1916* (London, 1963) argues that businessmen designed the regulatory legislation passed during the progressive era in order to create economic stability and security by eliminating competition. Using Kolko as a starting point, James Weinstein, *The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State: 1900-1918* (Boston, 1968), maintains that corporate leaders in the progressive era created an ideology calling for cooperation of business leaders with other groups, including labor unions, and for government regulation of the economy. Businessmen in the Twenties also maintained that all classes should cooperate. They believed, however, that cooperation meant that the laborer was not to seek power over his own destiny through unions, but was to rely on business paternalism. On the lack of serious consideration given to the Plumb plan see George Soule, *Prosperity Decade, From War to Depression, 1917-1929* (New York, Evanston and London, 1968), 158-59, 196-97.

soon broadened into a full-scale attack on organized labor by business groups all over the country. The Employer's Association of Louisville, Kentucky ran advertisements in local newspapers proclaiming the "open shop" to be "the American Plan of fair play, of individual rights above class rights." By April, 1920, the Attorney General of the United States, A. Mitchell Palmer, was identifying striking railroad men with a world Communist conspiracy to overthrow the American government. Once again the lesson that change and disloyalty were one was reinforced.

Meanwhile, the charges that the nation was in danger of a Bolshevik take-over were made plausible for many Americans by a number of bombings and threatened bombings in 1919 and 1920. These bombings along with May Day riots and the Seattle general strike of 1919, produced hysterical editorials in American newspapers concerning the Bolshevik menace and calling for repression of "excessive" freedom of speech and strict laws curbing radicalism.

At the same time these alarming events were taking place, servicemen were being brought home and discharged from the Army. They discovered that many jobs they might have found had been taken

---

8Quoted in "The Log of Organized Business, Nation's Business, IX (February, 1921), 63. Businessmen of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Arkansas and New Mexico organized in the Southwestern Open Shop Association conducted an open shop trade school in Dallas, Texas. See "Log of Organized Business," Nation's Business, IX (May, 1921), 60. See also "Log of Organized Business," Nation's Business, XI (June, 1923), 95.


10Murray, Red Scare, 68-80.
by members of minority groups, particularly Negroes, during the war. On the other hand, Negroes who had fought in the nation's armed forces seemed determined to assert their rights and liberties. Soldiers, often unable to find jobs, resented the fact that the workers striking for more pay in 1919 and 1920 had made more money than ever before during the war while they, the soldiers, had been making sacrifices for their country. They sometimes concluded that their nation, the one they had gone to war to defend, was being attacked by subversive groups. Sometimes their reaction was to participate in mob action against radical groups like the I.W.W.¹¹

Yet all these things do not explain completely why many Americans were so receptive to the lesson of nationalistic intolerance toward minority groups and particularly toward those with unusual opinions during the war. After all, if some governmental officials and prominent organizations were willing to see a Foreign, radical conspiracy to overthrow the national government and institutions, there were always other prominent individuals and organizations which were ready to counter these claims.¹² True, they were often drowned out by the hysterics of the popular press and the headlines comman­deered by men like the Attorney General, but these voices continued

¹¹Ibid., 181-88

throughout the decade following the war. Although the most overt hysteria was beginning to die down in the face of growing criticism by the late Spring of 1920, nativism continued very strongly until the Immigration Act of 1924 was passed and even then only very gradually diminished. In general, Paul Murphy concludes that in the 1920's nationalistic intolerance tended to change form in face of criticism rather than to die.\(^{13}\) This suggests that some basic cultural force was operating which predisposed the popular acceptance of the lesson of nationalistic prejudice. Stanley Coben maintains that large segments of the population were always ready to take part in a nativistic reaction in which some groups in society were rejected. When social and economic changes are rapid, people sometimes respond by trying to revitalize what they consider to be the fundamental tenets of their culture. Many Americans in the Twenties were looking for cultural norms which all true Americans could rally around so that a more homogeneous, emotionally satisfying culture could be created, maintained, and protected.\(^{14}\)


\(^{14}\)Stanley Coben, "A Study in Nativism: The American Red Scare of 1919-1920," *Political Science Quarterly*, LXXIX (March, 1964), 53. The concepts of nativism and cultural revitalization were originally used to describe the efforts of primitive people who were trying to reassert old values in the face of anxieties created by the introduction of new ones by more technologically advanced societies. These concepts were applied to the reactions of dominant groups in technologically sophisticated societies to a threat, real or imagined, to their dominance as early as 1943 by Ralph Linton, "Nativistic Movements," *American Anthropologist*, XLV (April-June, 1943), 220-43.
If this is the case, what cultural norms could unite these Americans? Economic individualism had long been identified with the United States.\textsuperscript{15} This individualism had come increasingly under attack both during the progressive era and World War I. Paradoxically, many people looked to economic individualism to unify them and protect them from the frightening changes they saw all around them. They were ready to listen to business groups who identified the nation with the free enterprise system and the open shop and who warned that labor unions and radical ideas were dangerously un-American. Their idea of the social order was violated by the rapid rise of groups traditionally seen as either unworthy or incapable of exercising their liberties and individualism. These groups were not only rising rapidly but they often demanded immediate equality through labor unions or through radical activity. Many people were willing to believe the race theorists who were constantly warning of the menace of immigrants and Negroes who were multiplying "like rabbits" and endangering the life and character of the nation. Racists like Harry H. Laughlin, Lothrop Stoddard, and Clinton Stoddard Burr were

See also Antony F. C. Wallace, "Nativism and Revivalism," International Encyclopedia of Social Science, David L. Sills ed. (17 vols., 1968), IX, 75-80. Higham, Strangers in the Land, 268-70, suggests that disillusionment following the War tended to shatter liberal nationalism but strengthened one-hundred per cent nationalism because the one-hundred per centers believed evil to be external to themselves. They only had to assert themselves more to get rid of it.

recognized as "race experts" by many Americans.\textsuperscript{16} Many people were also able to agree with those who held that the Pope was a great threat to the nation and that restrictions should be placed on the Catholic minority. Increasingly during the Twenties, people saw their idea of the moral order being violated in the roadhouses, the automobiles, the short skirts, the loose talk, the sensual books, and what they saw as the loose sexuality of the nineteen-twenties.\textsuperscript{17}

Some people saw all these problems as a connected whole. Latin American expert Philip Ainsworth Means, although calling for toleration between the races, believed that radicalism and the popularity of "dirty books" was caused by the fact that "the tone of society in pre-war days was sounded by the newcomers, whose origin was in heaven

\textsuperscript{16}On the recognition of race theorists and their influence on the House Committee on Immigration, which, under the leadership of Chairman Albert Johnson, drew up the Immigration Act of 1924 see Higham, Strangers in the Land, 313-21. Burr, who in America's Race Heritage: An Account of the Diffusion of Ancestral Stocks in the United States During Three Centuries of National Expansion and A Discussion of Its Significance (New York, 1922), 155-57, suggested that Blacks either be placed in concentration camps or sent back to Africa, combined his racism with a belief in the desirability of American economic expansionism in the world and anti-Bolshevism. He believed, 156, that the Negroes settled in Africa or Latin America by the United States would develop the natural resources of these places and provide profitable foreign investments for American capital. Bolshevism, 234, was "fundamentally an Asiatic conception which is repugnant to the western mind."

\textsuperscript{17}Charles C. Alexander, The Ku Klux Klan in the Southwest (Lexington, Kentucky, 1965), vii, 19, 21, 30-36, 55-56, 256, emphasises the provincial "moral authoritarianism" of the Klan in the Twenties.
knows what gutter, and those newcomers, being essentially low themselves lowered the society which they rapidly dominated.\textsuperscript{18} Some people, alarmed for the safety of the nation, were ready to ride with the Ku Klux Klan and restore the natural, moral order of things and keep America Protestant, chaste, racially pure, and capitalistic.\textsuperscript{19}

II

During the nineteen twenties Americans often expressed intolerance toward the three groups identified by John Higham as the traditional victims of American nativism. This intolerance was expressed in the name of national solidarity, what was viewed as the natural hierarchical social order, and the natural moral order. During the Red Scare of 1919 and 1920, these intolerant acts were carried out on a national scale by private individuals and groups, local and state governments, and most spectacularly by the Federal government itself. Attention during this period centered on the Northeast and particularly on New York and on other industrial centers identified in the public mind as centers of sedition. Intolerance was exercised primarily toward radicals and liberals. Immigrants suffered as well, partly because they were seen as the main source of the radical threat and partly because of the growth of nationalistic racism

\textsuperscript{18}Philip Ainsworth Means, \textit{Racial Factors in Democracy} (Boston, 1919), 170.

immediately before and during World War I.\textsuperscript{20} Sometimes action to protect the nation from "un-American" influences was fairly peaceful, as in the Americanization movement, although intolerant of ways that diverged from what were considered to be the national norms. More dramatically, nationalistic intolerance following the war involved the refusal to seat a duly elected member of the United States House of Representatives and several members of the New York legislature. The most drastic governmental action was taken by the Justice Department headed by A. Mitchell Palmer and aided by William J. Flynn, head of the Bureau of Investigation, and by J. Edgar Hoover, the chief of the Bureau's new anti-radical division. In November, 1919, Justice Department agents rounded up hundreds of radical and suspected radical aliens in nation-wide raids. Two hundred forty-nine were deported on what became known as the "Soviet Ark." In January, 1920, raids were made on the Communist Party, and some of those seized then were deported as well. Meanwhile, thirty-five states had passed sedition and criminal syndicalist laws by 1921. Thirty-five states and many cities passed laws in order to prevent demonstrations with red flags. About three hundred people were ultimately convicted under these acts. Mean-while, private citizens acting individually or in mobs sometimes persecuted those suspected of holding dangerous opinions.\textsuperscript{21}


By late spring of 1920, the Red Scare was on the wane because of the growing effect of liberal criticism of its excesses, the beginning of criticism of a formerly friendly press at Palmer's insistence on a peacetime Sedition Law and lessening tensions with the deportation or detention of many radicals. Businessmen feared the anti-immigration feeling the Red Scare had fostered might dry up a source of cheap labor. A decline in the number of strikes and the onset of an economic depression were factors in ending this phase of nationalistic intolerance as well. Nationalistic intolerance continued very strongly, however. If Americans were not as interested in Americanizing the immigrant after 1920, it was partly because they, influenced by the "scientific" race theories of men like Henry Pratt Fairchild, Clinton Stoddard Burr, Lothrop Stoddard, E. A. Ross and William McDougall, had come to believe it was impossible to Americanize the immigrant because he was genetically incapable of being Americanized. If the persecution of radicals declined, it was because persecution was directed at Catholics, Negroes, and Jews, who were often seen as the source of radicalism in any case.

---


23 See Chapter VIII.
The end of the Red Scare marked the beginning of a new period of nationalistic intolerance. This period was characterized by a lessening of overt and spectacular action by the Federal government against radicals. Attention on the Federal level centered on a renewed drive for immigration restriction. Action by state and local governments to coerce those expressing "un-American" opinions continued, but less attention was given those areas where large numbers of immigrants, radicals, and minority religious groups actually lived. Although leadership in national race theory still centered in the Northeast, intolerance was most overt in the South, West, and Midwest. The most spectacular action was taken by private groups, particularly by the group most characteristic of the one hundred percent Americanism of this period, the Ku Klux Klan. If nativistic attention was more diffuse geographically during this period as compared to the Red Scare, it was also more diffuse in its targets. Those who were corrupting the nation through such actions as defying the Volstead Act, committing adultery, and failing to attend church were added to Roman Catholics, racial and national minorities, and radicals, the traditional victims of national intolerance in the United States.

The Ku Klux Klan of the 1920's had been founded in Georgia in 1915 by William J. Simmons. It remained a very small organization until 1920, when it began a spectacular growth, stimulated by frustrations created by the depression beginning that year and by its ability to appeal to a wide variety of prejudices in the name of
one hundred percent Americanism. A congressional investigation of the Klan in 1921 unwittingly provided the publicity necessary for its national growth. It grew from a few thousand in early 1920 to a peak membership of somewhere between three and four million in early 1924. Meantime, the Klan had acquired, through a coup d'etat overthrowing Simmons in 1922, its leader for most of the Twenties, Hiram Wesley Evans.24

The Klan was a patriotic organization of national scope in the 1920's. It was not, however, equally successful throughout the country. It was strong in the West and South, but its greatest strength was in the Midwest. About one quarter of its national membership by 1924 was concentrated in Ohio and Indiana. Although historians have sometimes pictured the Klan as a small town and rural phenomenon, Kenneth T. Jackson maintains that about fifty per cent of all Klan members in the Twenties lived in towns of over 50,000 persons. More Klan members were found in cities which had recently experienced rapid growth than in those with stable populations. In the cities, the Klan seems to have been popular mainly among the lower fringes of the middle class who felt their economic and social positions threatened by the new arrivals to the city. In small towns, however, the Klan made an effort to enlist the leading citizens, the clergy,

and the law enforcement officers first, so that it gained an aura of respectability.25

Although the Klan had an authoritarian, hierarchical organization on paper, each local Klan was beyond any effective control. Moreover, the anonymity of individual members often made the control of their violent actions by local Klan officials difficult. Nevertheless, there were national trends of strategy and tactics. In general, most of the night-riding of the Klan was done during the early period of growth. Evans and other Klan leaders tried to turn the Klan to political activity beginning in 1922 and 1923.26

The Klan did not have a coherent national political program to offer because it appealed to so many different prejudices. It supported efforts to curb immigration, demanded strict enforcement of laws protecting its view of public and private morality, and supported public, non-sectarian schools against private and parochial schools. The Klan tried to elect either its members or those it felt were sympathetic to its cause to political office and opposed candidates

25Rice, The Ku Klux Klan in Politics, 12-14, 58; Chalmers, Hooded Americanism, 126, 163, 175; John Moffatt Mecklin, The Ku Klux Klan: A Study of the American Mind (New York, 1963), 99-102; Jackson, The Ku Klux Klan in the City, 235-41. Robert Moats Miller, "The Ku Klux Klan." 234-35, and Charles Alexander, The Ku Klux Klan in the Southwest, 27-30, emphasize the rural mindedness rather than the rural residence of Klan members. If, however, Jackson, 241, is right in his contention that most urban Klan members were long time city dwellers, then it may be that the dichotomy between urban and rural mindedness made by such writers as Miller, Alexander, and Murphy, "Sources and Nature of Intolerance in the 1920's," 68-69, has been overdrawn.

26Rice, The Ku Klux Klan in Politics. ;2-14, 58; Chalmers, Hooded Americanism, 126, 163, 175; Mecklin, The Ku Klux Klan, 90; Alexander, The Ku Klux Klan in the Southwest, 79-82.
it felt were hostile toward one hundred per cent Protestant Anglo-Saxon Americanism. Many local politicians and state legislators were elected with Klan support. Several Klan candidates were elected Senators, Congressmen, and Governors as well. The Klan claimed to have defeated Davis and LaFollette and thus elected Coolidge in 1924. However, Klan support often stirred more opposition than support for candidates. As the Coolidge example shows, many candidates' support by the Klan probably was won because of factors other than Klan support. David Chalmers maintains that the Klan was more effective in defeating than electing candidates. Arnold Rice believes that the spirit of the Klan rather than the Klan as an organization was an important factor in the election of 1928.27

Although the Klan was not responsible in itself, its most successful national program was immigration restriction on a racial (national) basis. In the years during which the Klan was most active, various forces were making immigration restriction possible. World War I, according to John Higham, had the effect of turning the national immigration debate from whether to restrict immigration or not to a debate over how and by what formula to reduce the numbers of immigrants coming into the nation. Patriotic organizations such as the American Legion and the Klan began pushing for restriction soon

after the war ended. Organized labor, which had opposed unrestricted immigration before the war on economic grounds, now called for restriction on the grounds that continued immigration was undermining national unity, as well. The last major hurdle to restriction was removed when business leaders accepted the necessity for restrictive legislation partly because of fears of racial and ideological "contamination" of the nation and partly because automation had relieved some of the need for immigrant labor. Meanwhile, from race theorists such as Madison Grant, Lothrop Stoddard, and Kenneth Roberts, Congress sought and gained information concerning the menace of the immigrant to American character. Harry H. Laughlin of the Eugenics Research Association was made "eugenics expert" for the House Immigration Committee. The Johnson-Reed National Origins Act of 1924 ended the danger of America's being inundated by a flood of immigrants of "inferior stock." The act set quotas on the national origins of immigrants according to the proportion of foreign born from each nation in the United States in 1890, before the "new" immigration became very large.²⁸

The passage of the Johnson-Reed Immigration Act was a turning point both in American national ideology and in nationalist intolerance in the 1920's. The theory of the United States as an assimilative nation, one combining divergent traditions and thereby constantly changing and developing, was rejected. The United States

²⁸Higham, Strangers in the Land, 301-24.
was no longer, on any large scale, a refuge for the "oppressed" of the world. On the other hand, nationalistic intolerance both changed form and diminished after 1924. Although racial nationalists continued to agitate for further restrictions on immigration and to warn of the danger to the nation's lifeblood if the United States was not willing to adopt these restrictions, the vast majority of Americans were satisfied that the danger to the nation from this source had passed. With the danger passed, Americans could afford to listen to and learn from critics of national racism. This change was reflected in the decline of the Ku Klux Klan after 1924. After it had reached its peak membership of over three million in 1924, the Klan declined very rapidly, partly because of the ineptness and corruption of its leaders and bad publicity stemming from violent acts attributed to it, but primarily because it could not convince people of the reality of the danger to the nation from those it had defined as un-American. By 1928, it had only about one hundred thousand members left.29

IV

From the passage of the National Origins Act to the beginning of the Great Depression, strident American nationalism was dominated by the residue of private patriotic organizations left over from World War I, who after the war were still concerned with subversive

29Ibid., 329-30; Chalmers, Hooded Americanism, 4, 172-74, 191-95; Alexander, The Ku Klux Klan in the Southwest, 244-45.
elements on the left. Anti-radicalism was one of the keynotes, but they often seemed most concerned with maintaining American military might in face of what they considered to be traitorous pacifist organizations. The leading militantly patriotic organizations of this period included such veterans' organizations as the American Legion and the Order of the World War. They were aided by the American Defense Society and the National Security League, World War I preparedness organizations, and to the Daughters of the American Revolution. Information on "dangerous" and "traitorous" individuals and organizations such as Jane Addams, Sherwood Eddy, and the League of Women Voters was supplied to the "patriotic" groups by "watch dog" societies such as the Key Men of America. The patriotic societies often had connections with right wing military men such as General Pershing and the head of the Army's Chemical Warfare Service, General Amos Fries. Their tactics included accusations of disloyalty and communism against their opponents, black lists of individuals and organizations, propaganda, and purification of the schools of any "unpatriotic" influence.30

The Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), founded in 1890, had been a part of the progressive movement before World War I. After the War began in Europe, they became part of the preparedness movement and gradually turned against neutralism, pacifism, and reform. The DAR supported American entry into the League of Nations at the end of the World War, a stance far from that adopted later against internationalism. Another turning point occurred in 1923 when the DAR solidified its tendency to view a hierarchical society as just and natural and to identify those who held otherwise as traitors to the nation. The reactionary and intolerant nature of DAR patriotism was revealed in the late twenties when, after scrutiny by the press and some of its more liberal members, it was revealed that DAR officials were using blacklists supplied by Fred Marvin's Key Men and E. H. Hunter's Industrial Defense Association which condemned as un-American and communistic such individuals and organizations as the Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Consumers' League, and the National Child Labor League. The DAR continued to use the "Spider Web Chart" (purporting to list all "subversive" women's peace organizations) prepared by the librarian of the Chemical Warfare Service, Luci R. Maxwell, for several years after it had been repudiated by the War Department itself.31

The American Legion was a less extreme but much more effective agent for national solidarity and ideological conformity. Formed

by American army officers in France in 1919 in part to counteract any
tendency toward Bolshevism by American soldiers, the Legion became
one of the staunchest supporters of the Red Scare. Although the
national organization disclaimed responsibility, some local Legion
posts openly supplied strikebreakers in the coal strike of 1919.
Strikebreakers in the switchman's strike that year in New Jersey were
chartered as a Legion post. The Legion proposed to end the immigrant-
radical "menance" to Americanism by such measures as amending the
citizenship clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution so
that only those whose parents were eligible for citizenship could be­
come citizens, and by deporting Socialist leader Victor L. Berger. 32

Meantime the Legion developed practical means for putting its
program of one hundred per cent Americanism into effect. In 1919, it
decided to create a National Americanism Commission. Although not
completely organized until 1924, the Commission began functioning in
a limited way in 1920. It carried on a propaganda campaign against
radicalism and misuse of the flag. Education in Americanism was pushed.
In 1923, a committee to investigate history instruction was organized
to insure that the subject was taught in a properly patriotic fashion
in the schools. More completely organized, the Americanism Commission

32William Gellermann, The American Legion as Educator (New
York, 1938), 3, 10-16, 19-20; Roscoe Baker, The American Legion and
American Foreign Policy (New York, 1954), 11-14, 82; Rodney G.
Minott, Peerless Patriots: Organized Veterans and the Spirit of
Americanism (Washington, D.C., 1962), 38-41, 58. Minott, 29-36, tr
traces the idea, name and military spirit of the Legion back to a
preparedness organization began with the inspiration of General
Leonard Wood in 1915.
in 1924 broadened its campaign for one hundred per cent Americanism with get-out-the-vote campaigns, oratorical contests, baseball leagues for boys, pamphlets against radicalism and pacifism, a Legion sponsored American history text for the schools, and a drive for an expansion of the number of national holidays, monuments, and shrines.33

The American Legion was more thoroughly organized and effective than any other patriotic organization. Unlike some of the others, it was a truly national organization. People usually felt that it was motivated by patriotism rather than by selfishness. It realized the importance of publicity and of selling the Legion's version of patriotism to the public. The Legion was flexible in its methods and employed all media to the fullest extent possible, including films, newspapers, magazines, and the radio.34 Moreover,


34Proceedings, Seventh Convention, 139; Proceedings, Ninth Convention, 43; Reports, Tenth Convention, 48-54; Baker, The American Legion and American Foreign Policy, 20-21. The extensiveness of the Legions publicity efforts can be seen in that the News Service Division reported to the National Convention in 1927 that it had distributed 250,000 different stories concerning Legion activities. See American Legion, Reports to the Ninth Annual National Convention of the American Legion, 1927, 23.
the Legion was not content with publishing its views. It had a very effective Legislative Division which supported both state and congressional actions approved by the Legion. Its chief Congressional lobbyist, John Thomas Taylor, maintained that Congress merely ratified legislation pushed by various interests, and by 1946 claimed to have personally written between 1500 and 2000 bills.\textsuperscript{35}

American nationalism took new forms with the onset of the Great Depression. Some anti-radical, patriotic organizations simply lacked funds to continue their activities. Although some businesses continued or even increased their anti-radical campaigns, they discontinued their financial support to the National Civic Federation's anti-radical division. Even before the Depression began, in July, 1919, Fred R. Marvin's Key Men of America folded because of financial difficulties. The Depression also made the hysterical defense of the status quo emphasized by these organizations less popular. Although the first response of the DAR to the Depression was to blame the Communists, it had by 1933 begun a temporary retreat to

\textsuperscript{35}Baker, The American Legion and American Foreign Policy, 22.

Legislation supported in Congress by the Legion ranged from a universal draft bill to a bill allowing the selling of parts of the frigate Constitution as "relics." State bills passed of interest to the Legion were listed each year and ranged from tax benefits to veterans to laws protecting the flag and laws requiring the teaching of Americanism in the schools. An idea of the extensive-ness of this activity can be gained from the fact that forty-five pages were devoted to a mere listing of these state acts in the Reports, Ninth Convention, 143-88, and a similar amount of space was devoted to them in the Reports each year.
less controversial activities. The Legion also temporarily cut down its anti-radical campaign. This did not mean that Americans had changed their basic national beliefs. They simply began to look for new ways to apply these beliefs to a changed situation.36

CHAPTER III

The Effort to Create a Comprehensive Americanism

Many Americans were concerned over the safety and destiny of their nation in the 1920's. They sometimes expressed their concern by joining the movement to Americanize the immigrant, or the movement to exclude immigrants of "inferior" races, or the movement to insure that patriotism was properly taught in the schools. These movements created definitions of Americanism that revealed almost as many anxieties about American life as there were groups to define "American." If the immigrant should be Americanized, then Americanism must be something which could be taught. If, as the Klan maintained, the Roman Catholic Church and the new sexual morality were un-American, then Americanism must be something which included religious and personal moral beliefs as well as political ones. The drive for a more comprehensive Americanism, however, did not include only these prejudiced against immigrants or Roman Catholics. It ultimately included some Americans, such as literary scholars, who were not directly involved in nativistic movements at all.

One peaceful way many Americans expressed their concern for the safety of their nation during the early Twenties was to join the movement to Americanize the immigrants. This effort seemed urgent because of the "discovery" that many immigrants drafted during the war had not accepted American ways (i.e., they could neither read nor
speak English), because of the renewal of large-scale immigration following the War, and because of the specter of Bolshevik agitators stirring up trouble among the immigrants.¹

In 1919 and 1920 a bewildering variety of American organizations attempted to relate themselves to this great patriotic effort. Business and industrial leaders sometimes encouraged or even required immigrants to attend Americanization classes either on or off the job. American colleges and universities, encouraged to begin courses for Americanization teachers, sometimes did. American librarians were encouraged to make books that inculcated Americanism both more available and more appealing to immigrants.²

¹It was pointed out at the Americanization Conference of 1919 that 24.9 per cent of the 1,552,000 men drafted during the War could not "read an American newspaper" or "write a letter home." See Proceedings, Americanization Conference: Held Under the Auspices of the Americanization Division, Bureau of Education, Department of Interior (Washington, 1919), 22, 109, 156. See also Howard C. Hill, "The Americanization Movement," American Journal of Sociology, XXIV (May, 1919), 612; Ralph H. Bevan, "First Aid to Americanization," Forum, LXVII (March, 1922), 230, maintained that "the perils of unassimilated or ignorant populations, the world conflagration and Bolshevism have just thrown their lurid light" on the need for Americanization. According to Y.M.C.A. Industrial Department leader Fred H. Rindge, Proceedings, Americanization Conference, 168, lumbermen should help build "a real citizenship" among their workers who needed it in order to "counteract evil radical tendencies...."

If only because of its diversity, the Americanization movement imparted a wide variety of meanings to such key concepts as America, Americanism, and Americanization. To W. A. Wilson, Manager of the education department of the Columbia Gramaphone Company, the phonograph was "essentially American" and breathed the very "spirit of the land." Salesman H. E. Stone believed that the Americanization problem was simply to sell something at a profit. The immigrant could be sold on America in the same way he was sold commercial products. Mrs. Percy V. Pennybacker, past president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, however, believed Americanization was the giving of each child his right "to know the language of this land."

One thing all Americanizers seemed to agree upon was the goal of Americanization—to create a more highly integrated nation with an intensely loyal citizenry. Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane maintained that the Americanization movement should "reach... every man in the United States who does not sympathize with us in a


3Proceedings, Americanization Conference, 51.

4Ibid., 138-40.

5Ibid., 373.
supreme allegiance to our country." The ultimate test of the success of Americanization was the willingness of Americans to sacrifice themselves for their country, particularly in war.

According to Lane:

We can tell when a man is American in his spirit. There has been a test through which the men of this country—and the women, too—have recently passed—supposed to be the greatest of all tests—the test of war. When men go forth and sacrifice their lives, then we say they believe in something as beyond anything else; and so our men in this country, boys of foreign birth, boys of foreign parentage...all these boys have gone to France, fought their fight, given up their lives, and they have proved all Americans that they are, that there is a power in America by which this strange conglomeration of peoples can be melted into one...

If there was a great deal of agreement among Americanizers as to the goal of Americanization, there was very little agreement as to how to pursue that goal. For most Americanizers, Americanization— or what Frances Kellor called the "science of race assimilation"—consisted of the techniques of teaching English to the foreign-born.

Much of the Americanization Conference of 1919 was given over to the

---

6Ibid., 294. Frederic C. Howe, Commissioner of Immigration for the port of New York from 1914 to 1916, "Immigrant and America," in America and the New Era; A Symposium on Social Reconstruction, Elisha M. Friedman, ed. (New York, 1920), stated that the goal of Americanization was to so "adjust the immigrant to America that he will become as integral a part of our institutional life as the early immigration which came to America during the first two hundred and fifty years of her life." Langdon Mitchell, "The New Secession," Atlantic Monthly, CXXXXVIII (August, 1926), 182, believed that Americanization of the Immigrant was necessary because "a people flourish and becomes great only when its moral unity is intact; only, or most, when its citizens are in a high degree like-minded.

discussion of this problem. America, they believed, was a nation of one language; and in order to read American newspapers, American history, and understand American ideas, the immigrant had to understand that language. Americanizers who believed this often proposed that schools be required to teach all courses in English, wanted the licensing of private elementary schools, proposed that employers pay workers who spoke English a higher wage than those who did not or would require at least that immigrants be flatly required to learn English within a given period of time.\(^8\)

Some of the leaders of the Americanization Movement questioned the emphasis placed on the English language. While most of these critics believed that the English language was essential, they believed either that over emphasis upon it would offend the immigrant and make his assimilation all the more difficult or that the teaching of English should only be a small part of a more complete and thorough Americanization.\(^9\) As Mr. Ohlinger of Toledo pointed out at


\(^9\)Sociologist H. A. Miller of Oberlin College pointed out that many immigrants came to America to escape the oppression of international states such as the duel kingdom of Austria-Hungary or Russia. One of the signs of that oppression was the denial of the right of their language to live. They would inevitably resent the implication of the Americanizers that their language was somehow inferior to English. See Proceedings, Americanization Conference, 229-35. See also Ibid., 88, 285; M. E. Ravage, "The Task for the Americans," New Republic, XIX (July 16, 1919), 349.
the Americanization Conference, some of the most dangerous radical "agitators" spoke English only too well.10

If teaching the immigrant English was not enough to complete his Americanization, what else was needed? For some, national ceremonies and display of patriotic emotion at the sight or sound of national symbols needed to be taught. Native-born women should make sure that all national ceremonies were conducted with "solemnity and dignity and beauty...."11 Children of the foreign born should be invited into the homes of the native-born on national holidays in order to make sure that the immigrant understood the meaning of these days.12 Above all, immigrants must be made to honor "one flag above all flags, and only one allegiance to that flag."13

Another method of teaching the immigrants Americanism, some of the more liberal Americanizers believed, was by example. This could be done by Americans themselves living up to their ideals and granting the immigrant social, economic, and political justice and protecting him from those who would exploit him. Frances Kellor warned that "if America reverts to its former industrial brutality

11Ibid., 372.
12Ibid., 54-55. See also Bernice Knowlton, "Americanization Goes Home," Outlook, CXXIX (December 14, 1921), 608-09.
13Hill, "The Americanization Movement," 630. See also Proceedings, Americanization Conference, 84.
and indifference, Americanization will fail." Those who held this position were forced to maintain that somehow native-born Americans weren't really American enough and had to be Americanized. They put themselves in a position of saying that there were distinctively American ideals somehow different from what some Americans apparently believed and that what some Americans believed were not American ideals. They tried to solve this problem by maintaining that America had a history and traditions which stood for liberty, equality, toleration, and economic justice, or, as Frederick P. Woellner put it, everything "good, beautiful, true or virile...."

Ultimately the procedure for Americanizing the immigrant involved the definition of America and Americanism. Here again, there were some differences among Americanization workers. For most, however, America stood for freedom, equality, and democracy.

14 Kellor, "What is Americanization," 293. E. E. Bach, Pennsylvania Chief of Americanization work, Proceedings, Americanization Conference, 175, stated that American ideals had to be translated "into terms of good wages, decent working conditions, American standard of living...." and that, 177, exploitation was "un-American."

15 Ravage, "The Task for the Americans, 210-11; Proceedings, Americanization Conference, 87-293.

16 Frederic P. Woellner, "The Teaching of American History as a Factor in Americanization," School and Society, XIII (May, 1921), 587. M. E. Ravage, "The Immigrant's Burden," New Republic (June 14, 1919), 210, maintained that "a parvenu industrial middle class, with a stake in the game, had appropriated our national inheritance and branded it with its own seal...." However he also believed that his own view of American tradition was the only true one and that all problems would be solved if, "The Task for Americans" 351, Americans lifted "American institutions and American practice to the high plane of America's own traditions."
Franklin K. Lane wanted to make "America a synonym for liberty and generosity and knightliness.\textsuperscript{17} When spelled out these ideals meant the equal right of all Americans to participate in politics and society as individuals. Some saw this participation as one of organized groups, however. According to Allen T. Burns only that kind of participation would head off radical movements like the I.W.W.\textsuperscript{18}

Most of those interested in Americanization who discussed the problem believed that the ideals of liberty, equality, and democracy had an economic connotation. They believed that economic democracy was essential. Father O'Grady maintained that Americanization was "at least 50 per cent industrial democracy."\textsuperscript{19} The Kalamazoo Chamber of Commerce industrial director, Mrs. J. E. Owen Phillips, thought it necessary to teach the immigrant that there was "no class distinction" in America like that in Europe.\textsuperscript{20} Equality did not, however, mean an equal distribution of wealth. Although John J. Mahoney, principal of the Massachusetts State Normal School at Lowell, called for a more equitable distribution of wealth between capital, labor, and the entrepreneur, he maintained that "equality means not a leveling, but the right and the chance for every man to develop the

\textsuperscript{17}Lane, "How to Make Americans,"\textit{Forum}, LXI (April, 1919), 399. See also\textit{Proceedings, Americanization Conference}, 51, 61.

\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Proceedings, Americanization Conference}, 77-84, 90-91, 259, 286-90.

\textsuperscript{19}\textit{Ibid.}, 172.

\textsuperscript{20}\textit{Ibid.}, 104.
utmost that is in him for the common good." Mrs. Phillips developed this idea further, explaining that "the employer as well as the worker shall have equality of opportunity" and that radical schemes that "would raise the proletariat and keep capital and employer out of the scheme altogether" had no place in America. Another aspect to the meaning of Americanization for America's economy was explained by E. E. Bach. He stated that Americanization should mean good working relationships between capital and labor and good wages so that there would be a "maximum production and a minimum labor turnover." 

One thing all Americanization workers seemed to agree on was that America and Americanism stood for the best values possible. Franklin K. Lane, moved by this idea, explained to the Americanization Conference that if he had a conversation with an immigrant he would say to him, "Young fellow, I want you to understand that this:

---

21Ibid., 127.

22Ibid., 107. According to C. C. Keenan, 319, deputy appraiser of the port of New York, it was useless to complain about profiteers because there was an iron law of supply and demand.

23Ibid., 176. A. W. Coffin, 193-95, advocated a program of industrial recreation. This would, he believed, make the foreign-born worker more contented and efficient by developing in him "loyalty and team spirit...." It would also give the native-born an opportunity to become "the foreign-born workingman's hero or his honored general or corporal instead of his taskmaster or drill master." Lane, "How to Make Americans," 404, believed that any sentimental belief that a day would come when men would not have to work was wrong; when God drove man "out of the Garden of Eden, it was the finest, most helpful thing that could have happened to the race."
is God's country." It was obvious to some of the members of the Americanization movement that such a country had a duty not only to itself and the foreign-born living within its borders but also to the world. Lane believed that American soldiers in the World War were "filled with the spirit that has made America: a spirit that meets challenge; a spirit that wants to help." Americanization was not something concerning America alone. It was, H. C. Hill maintained, "a co-operative movement bigger than America." It was "a world wide movement that all peoples may be united in a world brotherhood." H. A. Miller added that the immigrant would never totally lose his involvement in the affairs of the country of his origin and become completely Americanized until justice reigned in Europe. America should heed the "object lesson in political science" afforded by the

---

24 Ibid., 296. Mrs. Margaret Long, 99, secretary of the Woman's Committee of the National Catholic War Council, wanted the immigrants not to forget "the allegiance and gratitude they owe to this Republic--God's own country--where they have found freedom and opportunity."

25 The only thing America was willing to fight for, United States Commissioner of Education, P. P. Claxton, Ibid., 30-31, declared, was "the extension of ...freedom."

26 Lane, "How to Make Americans," 405. Mrs. Phillips, Proceedings, Americanization Conference, 101, believed that "when America went into the World War she embarked on a world-wide scheme of "Americanization," and the League of Nations created by Wilson was "a concrete expression of this world-wide Americanization that we are trying to carry out."

27 Hill, "The Americanization Movement," 630. Mrs. Phillips, Proceedings, Americanization Conference, 102, believed Americanism was "the concrete expression of the brotherhood of man" and that America was "the object lesson, as it were, thrown upon the sheet for all the world to see, that here we can put into practice and reduce into concrete terms those beautiful theories that we have talked about and that all the world has talked about."
immigrant groups and "reform the world...."28

Although Americanizers affirmed the brotherhood of man and the universality of American ideas, this universality was often circumscribed by their racial views. They usually saw the various immigrant national groups as separate races.29 Although they sometimes claimed to be students of race developing a "new science...of race assimilation,"30 Americanization workers usually had a very hazy concept of race which included contradictory ideas. They believed both that cultural traits were linked to race and that these traits could be changed by a change in environment.31 They sometimes maintained that all races were equal. They just as often spoke of lower and higher races. In fact, some maintained that the blend of different races in America would produce an American super race. Still others believed that there should be no real merger of the races either because variety was good and should be maintained or because some race, usually the Black race, was assumed to be so


29Fred C. Butler, Proceedings, Americanization Movement, 23, divided Americanization work into four "phases—education, social, racial, and information." Hill, "The Americanization Movement," 637, wanted to give "the native born a sympathetic comprehension of the racial and historical background of the immigrant." Kellor, "What is Americanization," 282, believed that America contained "thirty-five different races speaking fifty-four languages...."


31Kellor, "What is Americanization, 285; Proceedings, Americanization Conference, 128-33, 162.
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inferior as to make their merger with the rest unthinkable. At any rate, the belief that immigrant groups were racial groups and cultural traits were racial traits undermined the intellectual foundations of the Americanization movement. Although the Americanization movement did not end in 1920 or 1921, its popular support diminished as more Americans came to believe that it was necessary to exclude undesirable races, not assimilate them. With the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924 limiting European immigration, the few Americanization workers left turned their attention to such groups as the Japanese in Hawaii and the French Canadians in New England.

Although the Americanization movement produced one of the more serious efforts to define Americanism, it was not the only effort to do so. A much more systematic racial definition of Americanism was created by the race theorists who provided a convenient rationalization for the Immigration Act of 1924. Hiram Evans, Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, rationalized the prejudices of Americans who

32 Kellor, "What is Americanization," 285; Bach, Proceedings, Americanization Conference, 175, believed that America's salvation was that it always had "infused into it new blood from the great races of the world," resulting in an American type that was "the result of the culture of all peoples in all ages...." Lane, Ibid., 298, maintained that Americans hoped to become "the supremely great race of the world." Burns, Ibid., 291, believed that the melting pot idea would reduce "to a pulp like, spineless, inert mass all that rich variegated cultural life that the immigrant brings with him...." See also Ibid., 96-99; Ravage, "The Immigrants Burden," 210.

saw a wide variety of threats to the nation and in doing so created
a very broad definition of those who were un-American, and thus a
narrow definition of Americanism.

Evans believed that America should remain what it had been as
created by its pioneer forefathers. This America was one of
patriotism, toleration, democracy, equality, truth, and Protestantism.
These characteristics were best represented by the descendants of
the pioneers who had a prior right to the country. More recent
immigrants could not expect to change the nation but should only help
preserve the American way. The preservation of America depended on
a "unity of mind and spirit which is possible only to an homogeneous
people...." Strife, bickering, and prejudice must end.

The enemies of Americanism were those who stood in the way of
America's destiny to stay what it was. They could be placed into
three categories. Some could never be assimilated into the American
way because of their biological make up. The most obvious of these
were the Blacks. Their inferiority was proved not by logical
argument but by the "race instinct, personal prejudices, and sentiment"
of native Americans. Many immigrant groups, although not
necessarily inferior, were racially incapable of becoming Americans

34Hiram Wesley Evans, The Public School Problem in America
(n.p., 1924), 6, 12, 18, 24; Hiram Wesley Evans, "The Klan: De­
defender of Americanism," Forum, LXXIV (December, 1925), 804-05, 811.
36Evans, The Public School Problem in America, 4-5, 25.
by accepting American ideas. The Roman Catholic hierarchy also stood in the way of the realization of "that united, understanding, homogeneous 'group mind' which is essential to nationhood...." It sought a political sovereignty which would create a "divided allegiance" rather than a one hundred percent Americanism. The Roman Catholic Church pursued its evil goal by supporting a parochial school system which taught lawlessness instead of law and order, propaganda instead of truth, class education and monarchy instead of democracy, and which created controversy instead of unity. It opposed the strengthening of the public schools which would teach unity, patriotism, democracy, economic justice, and how to think and dig out information. A strong public educational system would create a truth court made of the "electorate of the whole country" whose decisions would be "divinely just" for settling "religious and all other disruptive controversies on American soil."

Almost as dangerous to Americanism as racial minorities and the Roman Catholic Church, according to Evans, were the so-called "best" people, liberal intellectuals who excused the un-American

38Ibid., 810.
39Ibid., 806.
40Ibid., 812.
42Ibid., 25.
activities of others. They attacked "the Puritan conscience" and gave out "platitudinous confortings, and bally-hoo stuff about the beauties of alien things and ideas." Moreover, they accused good Americans trying to purify America of being "narrow, prejudiced, intolerant, bigoted, and anti-semitic." In becoming intellectuals, liberals had "lost contact with the deeper emotions and instincts" of man and had become "like a bird-dog that had lost the sense of smell." That these instincts were the best guide to truth was evidenced by the fact that intellectuals had opposed Christ, the American Revolution, and American entry into the World War, whereas "plain people" had supported these things. When the threat to Protestant, white, and democratic America by the racial minorities, the Roman Catholics, and the intellectuals was ended, then the Klan would display the American virtue of toleration.

Hiram Evans rationalized religious and intellectual as well as racial bigotry in terms of "Americanism." A much more thoroughgoing racial definition of Americanism was created by race theorists who provided a rational for immigration restriction along national lines.

---

44 Ibid., 802.
45 Ibid., 807-09.
46 The pervasiveness of the theories of the racists during the early twenties can scarcely be overstated. Lothrop Stoddard's *Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy* (New York, 1921) was a best seller. It was endorsed in glowing terms by such Americans as President Warren G. Harding and sociologist Edward Alsworth Ross. Stoddard's *Racial Realities in Europe* (New York, 1924) was serialized.
Although these race theorists claimed to be acting from patriotic American motives, their theories of Americanism actually violated the idea of nationalism insofar as it rested on the concept that each nation had characteristics separate and distinct from all others. Clinton Stoddard Burr claimed "wholly patriotic" motives for writing his America's Race Heritage, which warned against continued immigration of the "dregs of Southern and Eastern European nations" to America. Americanism, he believed, was "the racial thought of the Nordic race...." Yet neither Burr nor any of the other popular racists believed that only America was Nordic. They claimed that most of northern Europe as well as New Zealand and Australia were Nordic. The aristocratic classes in the rest of Europe were believed to be Nordic. Although the racists often inveighed against the "internationalism" which led some Americans to view all men as equals and allow almost anyone to enter the country, they sometimes decried the World War as a "civil war" weakening Nordics and paving the way


47Clinton Stoddard Burr, America's Race Heritage (New York, 1922), 1, 5, 208. Henry Fairfield Osborn in his first "Preface" to Madison Grant's The Passing of the Great Race or The Racial Basis of European History (Fourth Revised Edition, London, 1921), ix, maintained that the "conservation of that race which has given us the true spirit of Americanism...is a matter of love of country...."
for the rise of the inferior Alpine, Mediterranean, Mongoloid, and Negroid races. 48

What were the racial characteristics which separated the un-American Alpines, Mediterraneans, Mongoloids, and Negroids from Nordic Ameridans? Negroes were stupid. The Alpines were a peasant race and had become incapable of contributing to the advance of civilization. Mediterraneans sometimes showed flashes of brilliance but were basically unstable. Although all of the "inferior" races with the exception of the Negro were sometimes credited with helping to build the earliest civilizations, it was generally believed that they could not contribute to or even sustain modern civilization. They either had an insufficient sense of order, or were insufficiently intelligent, or had insufficiently developed social and sexual inhibitions. If the world were left to them, anarchy and chaos would ensue. This was a real danger because the lower races were characterized by a willingness to accept a low standard of living. This, along with their lack of inhibitions, created an extremely high fertility rate. Their

48 Burr, America's Race Heritage, 25-26; Charles W. Gould, America, A Family Affair (New York, 1922), 8, 20-22, 159-60; Madison Grant, The Passing of the Great Race, vii, 77, 79, 81, 188-212, 227, 230-31; Stoddard, Racial Realities in Europe, 31, 57, 76-77; Stoddard, Rising Tide of Color, vi-vii; Lothrop Stoddard, The Revolt Against Civilization: The Menace of the Under Man (New York, 1922), 120-22; Bachman, "Theodore Lothrop Stoddard," 15-16. Sometimes the racists tried to resolve the contradiction created by identifying patriotism with racism by differentiating between nationality and race. They then would proceed, however, to discount the importance of nationality or point out the weakness of a multi-racial nationality. See, for example, Stoddard, Racial Realities in Europe, 72-75; and Grant, The Passing of the Great Race, 56-68.
numbers were restrained only by natural forces such as famine, pesti-
ence, and war.49

Although the characteristics of Nordics, and presumably of true Americans, were seen as opposites of those of the inferior races, they were often contradictory. On the one hand the Nordic race was the one great race with the inhibitions, genius, unity, intelligence, and orderliness necessary to advance civilization. The "Whites" (Nordics), Charles Gould believed "throbbed with the same emotions" and had a race life "attuned to vibrate in harmony and unison throughout the mass...."50 Yet the Nordic characteristics most noted and admired by the racists were precisely ones likely to produce dis-
order and disunity. Nordics were "very individualistic and touchy" about their "personal rights."51 Much more important to the racists, Nordics were by far the most warlike of the races. Grant maintained that the wars of the last two thousand years in Europe had been Nordic civil wars. Nordics were the pioneers, explorers, and adventurers of the world. The marauding Spanish conquistadors had been the purest of Nordics.52

49Grant, The Passing of the Great Race, 47, 109, 138-39, 146-
47, 153, 165-66, 228-29; Stoddard, Racial Realities in Europe, 11-
13; Stoddard, The Revolt Against Civilization, 32-34, 62-63, 89-90;
Burr, America's Race Heritage, 20-21; Stoddard, Rising Tide of
Color, 7-10; Bachman, "Theodore Lothrop Stoddard," 67-68; Newby, Jim
Crow's Defense, 54-59.

50Gould, America, 20.

51Stoddard, Racial Realities of Europe, 17.

52Ibid., 17-18; Grant, The Passing of the Great Race, 192-93,
228-32; Gould, America, 160; Burr, America's Race Heritage, 24.
Nordics, the racists usually believed, were the aristocrats of the world. They were instinctively class conscious and dominated the other races. On the other hand, Nordics granted equality to their own kind. Recently, however, the Nordics had imbibed poisonous environmental theories of human society and succumbed to a false humanitarianism and false equalitarianism. They had forgotten, as Lothrop Stoddard put it, that there was an "iron law of inequality."

Democracy might be good for a racially homogenous country like England but it was sheer folly for a nation like the United States which, as a result of unrestricted immigration, was threatened with mongrelization and a resultant collapse of civilization.53

Actually, all Nordics were not equal themselves. The mass application of the I.Q. test to draftees in the Great War had proved, the racists maintained, not only that the Nordics were superior to other races but also that some Nordics were inferior as well. Civilization was continually advanced by a select few of the Nordic race, and some of the Nordics themselves were unable to keep up. The inferior races, along with these inferior Nordics, Lothrop Stoddard believed, instinctively hated civilization which, by necessity, had relegated them to the lower rungs of the social and economic ladder. They longed to destroy Nordic civilization and create a chaos in which their inferiority would not be so evident. Although inferior, these "under men" were dangerous because they were led by capable men who by some quirk had failed to succeed in civilized society and were bent

---
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on revenge. These frustrated geniuses, often Jews, created the ideology of Bolshevism to rally the under men in an assault upon civilization. Many racists agreed that America should cut off immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe, end the Americanization program which encouraged inferiors to become citizens, support strict segregation of Blacks with a possible view to their eventual colonization in the tropical areas of the world, and instigate an eugenics program designated to decrease the numbers of the inferiors and increase the racial purity and numbers of the superiors. A neo-aristocracy of ability then could be developed in order to lead the world in the creation of a still higher civilization. Meantime, fratricidal wars between Nordics should be avoided at all costs. The Nordics' warlike and organizational ability should be used to stem the rising tide of color and to save civilization.54

In the racists' theories can be seen many elements of American nationalism which were developed to a higher degree by other groups. Americanism had a racial as well as an ideological meaning. Americanism was identified with the war-like spirit. Americanism might mean democracy but it also meant rule by the best. Americanism meant cooperation with, not a challenge to, "the best people" in their efforts to lead the country. America, along with the other Nordic nations, had a mission to save civilization from the forces of darkness by securing the rule of the best.

The identification of Americanism with war and its heroes was not limited to the race theorists. Along with economic individualism, this identification was one of the most common ones made by those Americans who wanted to promote the teaching of patriotism in the schools. Patriotic societies, ethnic interest groups, business organizations and ambitious politicians engaged in such diverse activities as campaigns for R.O.T.C. programs, the teaching of civics, the teaching of proper respect for national symbols, the teaching of an aggressively militaristic version of history, and the teaching of an aggressively *laissez faire* version of economics. Patriotic efforts to control the schools had been stimulated by the interaction of two separate developments of the 1910's and 1920's. One was the highly patriotic emotionalism engendered by the World War. The second was the effort of some educators to present a more critical version of their subjects. This effort sometimes meant a less passionately patriotic American history or a questioning of some aspects of the American free enterprise system. Some patriots in the 1920's saw such efforts as nothing less than treason."

There were two separate but related versions of Americanism that private patriotic groups wished to see taught in the schools. One was pushed primarily by business-supported groups. They often

---

tried to ban from the schools any periodicals, texts, or subjects which contained "radical" or "socialistic" ideas. In Los Angeles the Nation and New Republic were banned from school libraries in 1921 because they were thought to be inimical to "the economic principles of America." At the same time business groups tried to get their own version of Americanism taught in the schools. The National Association of Manufacturers wanted a separate, privately-controlled but publically-financed system of industrial schools. Utility groups such as the National Electric Light Association and the American Gas Association pushed their own publications on the schools. The former, after asking for and getting changes, endorsed a text on public utilities by Martin G. Glaeser, and the AGA published 1,000,000 pamphlets in 1928 alone.

Some business-dominated groups, such as the Better America Federation, pushed the study of the Constitution in the schools. These groups maintained that Americanism, the economic status quo, and the political status quo were all one and the same. They believed that the Constitution was perfect as it was because it closed the door to both the "mob rule" of the majority and the imposition of the will of any individual or government upon the nation. Efforts to amend the Constitution or support direct democracy through initiative, referendum, or recall were, according to conservative business
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spokesman Randolph Leigh, attempts to make "raids in the dark" upon that "citadel of Freedom," the Constitution, and therefore un-American. Leigh believed that the greatest interpreter of the Constitution was Webster. Webster argued in the Supreme Court case *Dartmouth College v. Woodward* for the broadest interpretation of the clause in the Constitution forbidding states to impair contracts and thus regulate the activities of state-chartered corporations.

The second version of Americanism the patriots wanted taught in the schools was a combination of xenophobia and militarism. Parts of this movement were support for laws forbidding foreigners from teaching in the schools and charges by patriotic organizations that opposition to R.O.T.C. programs were a communist plot. But the central effort was one to control the content of history courses in the schools. This effort began as early as 1915 when some patriots began to see a pro-German bias in European history textbooks. The patriotic attack on history teaching broadened in 1917 when the Sons of the American Revolution condemned an American history text written by David Muzzy. They were joined in the attack on the history texts by Anglophobes, organizations and politicians like

---


Charles Grant Miller, Mayor John F. Hylan of New York, and the Knights of Columbus. Their efforts had, by 1923, resulted in laws in three states requiring the American history texts used in the schools to do such things as teach "love of country and devotion to the American government," to refrain from falsifying the "facts" concerning the American Revolution, and to exclude "propaganda favorable to any foreign government." The movement to Americanize and militarize school history texts reached its peak in the 1920's with the publication of Charles F. Horne's text The Story of Our American People, a book sponsored by various patriotic organizations led by the American Legion, and with a series of spectacular attacks on "unpatriotic" history books in the schools and in the public library by Mayor "Big Bill" Thompson of Chicago in 1927 and 1928.

The patriotic critics of American history textbooks always claimed that they simply wanted the "truth" and not foreign propaganda taught in the schools. "Big Bill" Thompson complained that school history textbooks had been "falsified and denatured" in a plot to "denationalize" American children. The patriotic concept
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of truth, however, had little to do with "scientific" or "historic" truth of verifiable or documented facts. The leader of the Anti-Radical Division of the National Civic Federation, Conde B. Pallen, believed that tradition was "more venerable than documents," that it was more appropriate to determine the facts of history through the study of the character of great men than vice versa, and that history was "not always what was said or done in fact, but what was said and done in truth." On these grounds, he determined that schools should teach that George Washington, "the ideal and patriotic model for all true Americans," did, as a boy, chop down a cherry tree and tell his father the truth about it. These ideas were more directly expressed by Mayor Thompson. The "truth" was the American point of view. Just as Christianity rested on the "divinity of Christ," so American patriotism depended upon "the nobility of George Washington... and the righteousness of the cause of freedom and independence he led." Just as the church guarded its altars, patriots must protect national shrines and heroes. To do this, the patriots had to make sure that anything hinting at the human fallibility of national heroes be excluded from textbooks, and also must insure that such inspiring slogans as "Don't Give Up the Ship" and "I've not yet begun to fight" were included.

65 Conde B. Pallen, "Idealism in History," Catholic World CXX (November, 1925), 180-83.

66 Thompson, "Shall We Shatter the Nation's Idols in School Histories?" 620-25. This view of the religious nature and requirements of patriotism was by no means limited to Pallen and Thompson. Henry Litchfield West, "Teaching Patriotism through Books," Bookman, L (September, 1919), 70, maintained that a "Bible of Patriotism" based on the Constitution should be written in order to lay "down
The efforts such as those by Charles Grant Miller and Mayor Thompson to censor the teaching of history and the social sciences in the interest of patriotism did not go unchallenged. Individual historians and educators and professional organizations both investigated and protested the patriot attempt to control history teaching in the schools. The American Historical Association passed a resolution in 1923 demanding that history textbooks be judged "only upon grounds of faithfullness to fact as determined by specialists or tested by consideration of evidence..." However, more often than not what historians and educators objected to was not the teaching of patriotism in the schools but the efforts of "amateurs" to specify the kind of patriotism to be taught and the way it was to be taught. The School Review objected that the decision as to the best time and way to teach the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and other subjects should be determined by "the judgement and skill the golden rule of civic conduct and teaching political righteousness through parable and precept." In this book Lincoln's Gettysburg address "would be a parallel to the Sermon on the Mount." The "Bible of Patriotism" should be, West held, "frequently" expounded upon by the 180,000 ministers of America.

of technical experts" and not by politicians. Historian Albert Bushnell Hart attacked Mayor Thompson for "defending the heroes and patriots of the Revolution against people who have spent their lives in the effort to make them live in the minds of present day Americans." Bessie L. Pierce made a study of civic attitudes expressed in American textbooks in 1930 including those under attack by the American Legion, the D.A.R. and others. She found the textbooks to be "permeated with a national or patriotic spirit."
The history and civics texts often taught that Americans were superior to other peoples. The history, reading, singing, and civics textbooks often illustrated American superiority through tales of war and praised war makers more than peace makers. Why, 
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then, did the Legion, the D.A.R. and other one-hundred per cent Americans object to books which taught the kind of patriotism they thought textbooks should teach? This, Pierce believed, was the measure of how nationalistic and militaristic the pre-World War texts were. The pre-War texts which many one-hundred per cent Americans had used in school, for example, made no effort to portray America's enemies in any of her wars fairly. The new textbooks published in the 1910's and 1920's, although militaristic and patriotic, made some effort, even if superficial, at impartiality in treating America's wars. These efforts at impartiality were what the patriots objected to. 

IV

The drive for a more comprehensive American nationalism in the 1920's was by no means confined to militarists, nativists, and racists. It was a movement that affected all aspects of American life. During the 1920's literary nationalism completed its conquest of the literature departments of American colleges and universities,

71Ibid., 117, 120-25, 131, 169-71, 193, 207, 209, 212, 219-20, 254-55. Ruth Miller Elson, who examined over 1,000 nineteenth century textbooks, maintains that on the whole they taught a hierarchal theory of society with women inferior to men, the poor inferior to the rich, Negroes inferior to whites, etc. Americans were God's chosen people so American influence was destined to spread throughout the world. Although the United States was a peace loving nation and all of her wars had been defensive, history was largely a study of wars. Wars were natural and inevitable. They were almost always glorified. See her Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1964), 101, 114, 119, 166, 189, 208, 299, 312, 344, 339-40.
which had been the last bastions of non-national literary activity in the United States. The late date of this success, however, was due more to the general unprogressiveness of American higher education than to any dispute with nationalism among American College professors.

Until the mid-nineteenth century college curriculums in the United States were dominated by the study of classical literature and history. Beginning about 1850, philology began to appear in college curriculums. By the late nineteenth century the study of English literature had grown out of philological departments. Although the first formal course in American literature had been taught as early as 1875 by Moses Coit Tyler, separate American literature courses were rare until the twentieth century. In 1919 Pennsylvania State College professor Fred Louis Pattee called for the establishment of a Chair in American literature in every American college because the United States had become a distinct entity with a "soul unique among the nations" and with its own literature. The study of American literature separate from all others, Pattee asserted, would provide answers to such questions as: "What is this democracy that the world must be made safe for?...What is it that makes America unique among nations?...What is the American soul?" If what Pattee later called the "Monroe Doctrine" for American literature was to succeed, the holders of the chairs in American literature could not be ordinary

scholars. They had to be men of nationalistic vision because every "classic...has survived because it emanated from a human soul during a national era...."^73

In the 1920's, American literature began to be a subject for graduate study in American universities. Surveying seventeen leading American universities in 1922, Professor Arthur Hobson Quinn of the University of Pennsylvania found, much to his chagrin, that in only three could a student take a purely graduate course in American literature every year. Three others, John Hopkins, Brown, and Princeton, had no graduate courses in American literature. All, however, had plans to expand their graduate programs in American literature. According to Quinn, what was then needed was "our own standards" for American literary scholarship.^74

Meantime, American literary scholars were developing their own interpretations of the distinctiveness of American literature and its relationship with American patriotism. Arthur Quinn believed that drama was the most nationalistic of all literary forms. Although the new American playwrights probably would reflect the international ideas popularized by Woodrow Wilson, they would use these ideas with "a true national spirit" if they understood the "artistic patriotism" of the American people.^75 In order to combat such critics of
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literary nationalism as Brander Mathews and H. L. Mechen, Louisiana State University Professor Earl L. Bradsher felt compelled to list the characteristics that went into the make-up of Americanism in American literature. To deny the distinctiveness of American literature was, Bradsher stated, "to deny us both mind and soul." American literature was less assertive, less militaristic, less traditional, less scholarly, but more innovative, more individualistic, more humorous, and more optimistic than that of European nations. Ignoring such writers as Hawthorne, Melville, Crane, and Dreiser, Bradsher concluded that there was no spiritual doubt in American literature. Other American literature scholars, such as Jay B. Hubbell and Norman Foerster, simply began to trace the development of American literature incorporating the latest findings of the best American national historians, particularly Frederick Jackson Turner. Official recognition of the study of a separate national American literature came with the establishment of the American literature group as a part of the Modern Language Association in 1921, and the establishment of a separate scholarly journal, American Literature, in 1928.


American Nationalism in the 1920's was also expressed in America's economic relations with the rest of the world. Despite the fact that the United States had become a creditor nation as a result of the World War and could collect on the debts owed her only in goods and services, Congress in 1921 and 1922 raised tariffs on imported goods. At the same time Americans demanded that the European debts be paid. Moreover, Americans generally supported Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover's efforts to force down the prices of raw material imports and to expand American exports. The result, whether consciously designed or not, was a kind of economic Americanization of the world. The United States gained a larger and larger share of the world's gold reserves, and American investors owned a larger and larger share of the world's industries.79

Although Americans in the 1920's were generally very conscious of their nationality, they did not always agree as to the definition of their nation. Some defined America economically, others racially, and still others religiously. Americanism was identified variously as the free enterprise system, industrial democracy, the brotherhood of man, success in war, loyalty, liberty, law and order, chastity, truth, myth, equality, and rule by the best. In order to discover the relationship between these various meanings given to Americanism in the 1920's, it is necessary to examine the meanings of Americanism

for particular groups which emphasized particular points of view. At the end of World War I many Americans agreed that the soldiers returning from the battlefields of Europe would be one group able to spell out the precise meaning of Americanism. Many Americans, whether they called themselves liberal or conservative, agreed with Theodore Roosevelt when he wrote:

> When these men come home, or at least then those of them who escape death come home, I believe that they will demand, and I know that they ought to demand, a juster type of life, socially and industrially, in this country. I believe, and I hope, that they will demand a loftier idealism in both our public and private affairs, and better and more common-sense methods of reducing our ideals to practice and making them realizable.\(^80\)

---

CHAPTER IV

The American Legion and Americanism:
Youth and Community Programs

Many Americans, both liberal and conservative, believed that World War I had been a war to save liberty, democracy, and constitutional government from an arbitrary and autocratic Germany and to substitute international order and good will for the selfish nationalism that Germany seemed to exemplify. To such Americans nothing seemed more natural than that the men who had been willing to sacrifice their lives for these ideals should have been ennobled by their experience in the war. These returning soldiers would provide a better, less selfish, even spiritual definition of America.

According to clergymen, social worker, educator and moralist Graham Taylor, the returning soldiers had "attained a new and deeper experience in things fundamental and essential while in service to their country." When they returned from Europe the ex-soldiers would "set a higher standard of progress" and would never "submit either to the autocracy of individuals in industry or the equally despotic and dangerous autocracy" of class. After "fighting and fellowshipping with the brave men of other nations our returning soldier Citizens [would] not likely...defend that narrow
nationalism at home against which they fought abroad...."\(^1\) Taylor was one of the first but not the last to see the ex-soldier as the pre-eminent carrier of American ideals. Senator Hiram W. Johnson of California explained to the American Legion in 1923 that the older generation of Americans looked, in peace as well as in war, to the soldiers "who won your great laurels in blood and carnage beyond the seas." "We look to you," he told them, "in the problems that confront the nation in the days to come, to win fresh laurels for the American flag and the American people."\(^2\) Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis, addressing the American Legion national convention in 1924, confessed that a "mere civilian" like himself could not tell a collection of veterans anything about the constitution because if it had not been for them "there wouldn't be any constitution of the United States."\(^3\)

Although there is some disagreement as to the exact circumstances under which it was organized,\(^4\) the American Legion emerged at the
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\(^2\)American Legion, Summary of the Proceedings (Revised) of the Fifth National Convention of the American Legion, 1923, 5.

\(^3\)American Legion, Summary of the Proceedings (Revised) of the Sixth National Convention of the American Legion, 1924, 16.

of the War as what was to become the largest of all American veteran organizations. As such it saw itself as the authoritative interpreter and preserver of the American heritage. The preamble to the constitution of the American Legion declared that:

For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order, to foster and perpetuate one hundred per cent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our association in the Great War; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy, to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion and mutual helpfulness.5

American Legion leaders repeatedly declared that the Legion was the most eminently qualified and "the foremost agency within the country" to foster Americanism because it and it alone was completely American, a virtual "crosscut of the nation," including "all creeds, political parties, kinds and conditions of real Americans" in its membership.6 National Commander, Franklin D'Olier reported to the national convention of the Legion in 1920 that, "To the American Legion there is no East or West, no North or South, no Jew or Gentile, 
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6American Legion, Summary of the Proceedings of the Third National Convention of the American Legion, 1921, 18; American Legion News Service, Manual for American Legion Speakers (New York, 1921), 4. For similar statements concerning how American the American Legion was, in almost exactly these same phrases, see Proceedings of the Tenth National Convention of the American Legion, H.D. 338, 70th Cong, 2nd sess. (Washington, 1929), 63; Summary, Fifth Convention, 6; American Legion, National Americanism Commission, Americanism Handbook (Indianapolis, 1929), 14.
no protestant or Catholic, no Capital or Labor,—no employer or
employee, no Republican or Democrat. The American Legion is the
only organization in which is represented every good element in the
entire country." Such an organization, Commander John G. Emory
told the convention in 1921, had the duty "to make and keep America
truly American, to maintain in the hearts of our people allegiance
to their basically American institutions which have made the name
'America' the hope of the world...." With such an exalted purpose,
it seemed obvious to Commander Hanford MacNider in 1922 that American
leaders who were eligible for membership in the Legion must realize
"that if their best effort is not in the Legion— that its high ideals
may be carried on— they are just as much slackers, as poor American,
as those who hid when the country's life was at stake. To avoid that
duty is to betray our right to citizenship." After all, continued
MacNider, quoting "one of the greatest soldiers of modern times,"
the Legion was "the cradle for the whole future of America." This
point was emphasized again and expanded by David A. Reed, Legion­
naire and United States Senator from Pennsylvania, who declared in
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1927 that since the World War veterans "constitute at this time the larger part of the vitality of the United States," they "can and will rule this country for the next quarter of the century."10

In order to carry out the mandate of the Legion to safeguard and promote Americanism, the 1919 national convention of the American Legion passed a resolution creating an Americanism Commission. This commission was to "foster and perpetuate a 100% Americanism" by countering "all Anti-American tendencies, activities and propaganda," by teaching immigrants, citizens, and school children "the principles of Americanism," and by informing the public as "to the real nature and principles of American government."11 To accomplish these goals, the Americanism Commission either engaged in or encouraged others to engage in a bewildering variety of activities.

In order to promote a true understanding among citizens of Americanism and the principles of American government, the Americanism Commission, among other things, encouraged local American Legion Posts to conduct public forums and study groups on the Constitution of the United States and created a Speaker's Bureau to preach Americanism as well as to combat radicalism. To insure that school children were taught Americanism, the Commission promoted the patriotic teaching of American history and civics in primary, secondary and higher educational institutions, sponsored
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a national American Education Week, a National essay contest for high school students, and a Junior All-American Baseball program for teenaged boys. Moreover, it urged the local Posts to sponsor Boy Scout troops and loyalty parades for children, and schools to educate the young in "the meaning of the sacrifice of life for one's country, especially...in the Nation's wars." The Americanism Commission tried to Americanize the immigrants by such measures as fighting for the exclusive use of the English language as a medium of instruction in the schools, pushing for a more impressive naturalization ceremony, and urging Posts to meet immigrants at Ellis Island and to sponsor Adult education programs. It also tried to decrease the number of immigrants by urging deportation of "undesirables" and by immigration restriction. In order to combat un-American ideas, the Commission founded an anti-radical Speakers Bureau, challenged radical speakers in public forums, initiated an All-American Conference in order to coordinate the anti-radical activities of various patriotic organizations, and published pamphlets explaining the dangers of both Bolshevism and pacifism. The Legion promoted one hundred percent Americanism by creating, in cooperation with other patriotic societies, a flag code and urging its adoption by

---
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Congress; by urging Congress to officially recognize "The Star Spangled Banner" as the national anthem; and by sponsoring, with the National Association of Manufacturers, a get-out-the-vote campaign in 1924 and 1926. In addition Posts were encouraged to engage in a wide variety of community betterment programs such as planning community buildings, forming emergency relief councils, forming community national defense councils, joining community advertising campaigns, and joining safety campaigns.¹⁴

Just what the American Legion meant by Americanism was not always clear. The Legion, like all very large organizations, had members with many differing views. Direct official statements as to the meaning of Americanism were fairly rare, and they often were sufficiently vague as to allow a wide variety of interpretations. For example, National Commander James A. Drain, in 1925, defined Americanism as "better citizenship' with all that these words imply."¹⁵ Others identified Americanism with the constitution and the liberties it guaranteed. In 1919 Eric Fisher Wood, then secretary of the American Legion, stated that the Legion was for "America on the basis of the present constitution, which insures


¹⁵Proceedings, Seventh Convention, 6.
all the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."¹⁶

When asked to speak at the 1928 convention on the phrase in the preamble to the American Legion constitution, "Foster and Perpetuate a 100 per cent Americanism," Father Joseph Lonergan equated Americanism with "opportunity by which each individual shall freely speak, shall freely grow, shall freely worship and shall freely advance." It was, in addition, "opportunity for every man and woman in sympathy with human liberty and human rights to come here and to be welcome." Lonergan believed that a very fundamental American principle was that "'all men are created equal.'"¹⁷

A somewhat different view of Americanism was provided by the official agency charged with promoting Americanism, the Americanism Commission. National Commander D'Olier expressed the first official view of the Commission, stating that "100 per cent Americanism is fair play for all those who play fair."¹⁸ In 1923, the Commission stated that "Americanism is nationalism and patriotism. It is that spirit which has led us to victory in all our wars."¹⁹ In these statements emerge the phrases, "fair play," "nationalism," "patriotism," and the "spirit that leads to victory," which were to become constant themes in the Legion's Americanism work.
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The question now arises as to how (or if) these various themes fitted together and what their relationship was to the multitudinous activities of the Americanism Commission. That these activities were important, even central, to the Legion's concept of Americanism is shown by the fact that when the Legion published pamphlets on Americanism it gave almost no space to any formal discussion of the meaning of Americanism. Instead, the pamphlets were mostly made up of discussions of the flag code and descriptions of the Legion's youth and community betterment programs. For example, in 1924, the chairman of the Americanism Commission, Garland W. Powell, published a handbook of Americanism entitled "Service: For God and Country," in which the nearest thing to a direct discussion of Americanism was a three-page section on "What Constitutes American Citizenship?" By way of contrast there are nine pages on planning, building, and operating playgrounds and ten pages on planning and building a community building.20

Probably the connection between these various Legion and Americanism Commission activities and the concept of Americanism is most explicit in the Junior All-American Baseball program. The 1920's witnessed a great growth of spectator sports, including professional baseball, professional and collegiate football, and professional boxing. In the Twenties athletic stars such as "Babe" Ruth, Red Grange, and Jack Dempsey were worshipped as national heroes. American Legionnaires, like many other Americans, believed

20Garland W. Powell, "Service: For God and Country" (Indianapolis, 1924), 6-8, 80-99.
in what John R. Tunis, a contemporary critic of organized sports, called the "Great Sports Myth." They believed that sports heroes, tested and purified by competition, possessed only the highest virtues.21

What, the Legion asked, could be a greater service to the nation than to give thousands of boys the opportunity to compete in team sports—sports which would develop in them the highest of moral attributes? At the 1925 national convention of the Legion, the Americanism Commission recommended the Junior All-American Baseball program to the Legion in order to teach Americanism by teaching "fair play." It was also thought that this would provide good publicity for the Legion.22 This theme of teaching "fair play" was elaborated at the next convention of the Legion, when the Commission maintained that "true sportsmanship...is closely akin in principle to good citizenship" because the "true sportsman plays fairly, he smiles in defeat and is gracious in victory, and above all, he heeds the rules." 23
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all, he abides steadfastly by the rules and laws of the game."23

The next year the Commission listed the good citizenship qualities taught by the program: "respect for the rules," "fair play," "loyalty," "teamwork," "gameness," and "democracy."24 In 1928, the Commission listed seven rules in the "Code of Sportsmanship" which were "also a mighty good code for citizenship:"

Keep the rules
Keep faith in your comrades
Keep your temper
Keep yourself fit
Keep a stout heart in defeat
Keep your pride in victory
Keep a sound soul, a clear mind and a healthy body.25

By this time the Commission had become fairly precise as to how these rules and teaching of good sportsmanship were related to Americanism. A boy could see that respect for the rules was important because "without rules baseball wouldn't be a game at all but merely the senseless chasing around of the ball....[it] is the same thing in the game of life. Without rules, which we call laws, life would be just a meaningless chaos and anarchy in which no one would get anywhere." Fair play was important because the boy learned "that the only satisfaction from winning a game comes from winning fairly...that nothing in life is worth while winning unless it is won on the square." From learning to be loyal to his pitcher and captain, "no matter how the game is going," he would learn to

23Proceedings, Eighth Convention, 46, 79.
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"be loyal to his family, to his associates and to his country when he reaches manhood." Teamwork was very important because the boy must:

learn to play for the team and not for his individual glorification. He must learn to sacrifice when a sacrifice is the play, instead of trying to hit a home run. Teamwork is merely another name for co-operation and the ability to co-operate is necessary to every good citizen. It is necessary for success in personal, business and public life. A nation of individualists would pass swiftly into anarchy.26

According to the Legion it was important for the citizen to learn gameness because the good citizen "fights a good fight for his business aims and for his political beliefs, and if he is beaten he grins and tries again." Democracy, the Legion believed, was taught in baseball because each boy was judged by his accomplishments, not by "what position his family may hold in the community."27

The American Legion, it seems, saw life as a game and the nation as a team. Although this was not clearly stated until the Junior Baseball program was begun, it had been implied from the beginning. It makes sense out of many statements made and actions taken by the Legion about Americanism, nationalism, and loyalty. According to Eric Fisher Wood, the great lesson learned in the World War was "teamwork." The Legion was founded to continue this teamwork after the war.28 Garland Powell saw the development of the individual responsibilities of each member of a community as resulting in

---
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"Team Play." D'Olier believed in 1920 that it wouldn't be necessary for the national organization to exert its authority over the Legion because ex-servicemen had a "sense of team play." The veteran had the right to expect readjusted compensation from the government after the war because it should "simply play fair" with the man who "has played so fair." Americanism was the "spirit which has led us to victory in all our wars." That is, it was the team spirit.

What are the implications of such a view of the nation? First, a nation, like a game, is a thing in itself. It needs no external justification. The object is to win within the rules. Only acceptance of the rules, or fair play, makes the game meaningful at all. What the Legion wanted was a very high degree of national integration. Those who questioned the rules or purpose of the game, or the idea of winning, could only be unpatriotic.

It might be pointed out that this desire for a very high degree of national integration was inconsistent with traditional American economic individualism. Yet there were two reasons why the Legion could never admit this. First, any changing of the rules necessarily would involve questioning them and hence would disrupt national integration. Second, the Legion really did believe in one hundred per cent Americanism or total national loyalty. The logic of total loyalty called for an unquestioning acceptance of the status quo.

29 Powell, Service, 112
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because to question the nation as it existed was to compare it with some abstract higher ideal and thus to admit that the nation was not an end in itself and that patriotism was not the highest virtue. The Legion saw the nation as a team but also it saw the nation as composed of smaller teams, such as communities and individuals. If one lost in the competitive struggle of American life, he was to grin and bear it, be a good loser, and not question the rules.

Many of the programs of the Americanism Commission either reflected this desire for unity or were designed to draw Americans into a closer unity, creating an unquestioning acceptance of the nation as it was, or, as the Legion thought it was. The Legion's get-out-the-vote campaigns labeled those who failed to vote "shirkers." Shirkers were than compared to the "slackers" of the World War. Failure to vote signified either a questioning of, or at least an indifference toward, the rules of the nation. Study of the Constitution was also promoted by the Americanism Commission. It was necessary because the citizen who did not know the Constitution was "in as bad shape as the sentry who didn't know his general orders...." In Service, the study of the Constitution is urged and the Constitution itself is reproduced. However, instead of following this plea with a discussion of the checks and balances in the constitution, or the bill of rights, or the concept of dual sovereignty, or of the elastic clause, Powell simply listed the duties of the various executive
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officials beginning with the president and vice-president. Although
this does not give a very clear picture of the Legion's conception
of the constitution, in part, it seems, the Legion (or at least Powell)
saw the constitution as an assignment of duties or a table of organi-
zation for the national team rather than a charter of liberties or
a way of checking power or a system for controlling conflict.33

Community service projects was another Americanism activity
which reflected the Legion view of the nation as a unified, well-
functioning team. According to Garland W. Powell, "team play is
success for a community. Failure to acknowledge the value of a
single element in the development of civic life, disregard of any
force is a tendency to weaken the outcome of the effort for civic
betterment." For the team to work well, all citizens must be as
totally involved in the team effort as possible. Any program should
enable "the entire people to find expression of their leisure time in
as constructive a manner as possible." Once this has been attained,
"the channels of public intercourse flow smoothly along to an end,
appreciation of art, music, or efficiency—mental, moral and physical,
through organized play—the successful culmination of civic projects
becomes possible, because all elements are aligned in a common
purpose."34

Of course, if "all elements are aligned in a common purpose"
there is little room for questioning, doubt, or disagreement.
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According to Powell, "real Americanism work means action not words." Accordingly, the descriptions of community service projects in Service were not calculated to provoke discussion as to just what direction a community should take, or what values should be emphasized. These were taken for granted. To a large degree there was simply a minutely detailed description of the technical details of a project. For example, in proposing the creation of a playground, the depth, length, and width for a sand box was discussed thoroughly. This, along with similar detail on a teeter, slide, swing, climbing ropes, horizontal bars, jumping pits, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, football fields, bleachers, and swimming pools, seemed to preclude any discussion about the need for, the running of, or the purpose of any of these things, let alone of the playground itself.

Another important focus of Legion effort to create unquestioning national loyalty was in the area of national symbols. The Legion paid some attention to the creation of and proper observance of national holidays. At its second national convention the Legion approved a resolution designating November 11 a national holiday, Armistice Day. At the third convention, the Legion expressed willingness to "co-operate with other organizations in the observance of patriotic holidays" but proclaimed that "the American
Legion should be accorded the position of leadership in the observance of Armistice Day.\textsuperscript{38} At the sixth convention, in 1924, the song "Armistice Day Forever" was adopted as an official Legion march. In 1922 the national convention passed a resolution condemning the celebration of Memorial day as a day of pleasure; the Legion urged, instead, that it be observed in a more solemn manner.\textsuperscript{39} At the seventh convention the Legion offered its view of the function of a national holiday:

It serves to unite the citizenry of the Nation in a common interest, and thus serves to strengthen the group spirit. It creates a psychological atmosphere in which men and women are peculiarly susceptible to dominant ideas. It is the purpose and responsibility of the American Legion to foster dominant ideas which will serve to develop loyalty, industry, and generally better citizenship.\textsuperscript{40}

At the same convention, the Legion proposed to extend the number of national holidays to include Arbor Day, Americanism Day, Mother's Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Citizenship Day, Labor Day, Constitution Week, Columbus Day, Armistice Day, Christmas Day, Washington's Birthday, and Flag Day. Programs for all of these except Citizenship Day, Washington's Birthday, and Flag Day had already been proposed in 1924 in Powell's \textit{Service}.\textsuperscript{41} At the eighth convention, it was announced that "special booklets" had been prepared for Armistice Day, 
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Memorial Day and Independence Day." It was also mentioned that on Independence Day at the same time all over the country a roll call of the signers of the Declaration of Independence had been read, after which audiences faced the flag and repeated the American's Creed.\(^42\)

In addition to promoting the proper observance of national holidays, the Legion campaigned for reverent and frequent use of national symbols. For example, Congress was urged to officially recognize "The Star Spangled Banner" as the national anthem.\(^43\) The greatest effort, however, came in the Legion's flag campaign. Here, the Legion tried to promote a reverent attitude towards the flag, and a respectful but frequent displaying of it. The Legion proposed the creation of a flag code, promotion of laws protecting the flag, and education of the public in the history and proper use of the flag.

The campaign for the protection of the flag was really launched in the 1921 convention. There a resolution was passed which condemned misuse of the flag, especially for advertising purposes, and called for laws protecting the national symbols of friendly countries from abuse and the negotiation of reciprocal treaties with these countries for the protection of American Symbols, especially the flag.\(^44\) The next year a resolution was passed to change the words "my flag" in the flag pledge to "the flag of the United States of America."\(^45\) In 1925,
the Legion reiterated its opposition to the unlawful use of the flag for advertising. At the same convention the Legion's Americanism commission advocated purchase of only those flags manufactured within the United States and made of "material of good quality and fast colors."

The Americanism Handbook, published in 1929, suggested that a good community service project for a post would be to improve the appearance of a city by "providing uniform flag decorations for the streets" and by keeping flags and poles in good condition. Meantime, the Legion sponsored conferences of patriotic societies with representatives of the Army and Navy in 1923 and 1924 in order to draw up a flag code for civilians. At its sixth convention the Legion announced that this code had been endorsed by 140 organizations with 14,000,000 members. This code was published in many newspapers and in a special pamphlet of the Legion, "Respect the Flag of the United States," as well as in Powell's Service. The Legion now had only to launch a campaign to secure Congressional and state recognition of the flag code as the official flag code of the United States. At the same time it urged states to pass laws protecting the flag and requiring its use on public buildings, and especially on schools.

---
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The American Legion did not rely on laws alone, however, in its campaign to protect and promote the flag. It launched an extensive educational campaign, as well. The national headquarters of the Legion was directed to "prepare a motion picture film to illustrate the proper etiquette of the flag" in order to "secure a positive nationalism and a love and respect for the flag" at the 1922 convention. For the same reason the national headquarters was authorized to design and distribute at cost to the State Departments of the Legion a poster "illustrating methods of hanging the Flag and giving the proper salute of the colors when carried in parade and other functions...." More important than either of these probably was the Legion's effort to stimulate study of the history of the flag and the flag code in the schools. Garland Powell suggested that each Legion Post sponsor a contest in each classroom concerning knowledge of the flag. A questionnaire would be given to each child, including such questions as, "What did General Washington say relative to the colors and stars of the new flag?" or, "What is the correct manner of displaying the flag on Memorial Day?" or, "What ceremonial United States Flag event occurred during the World War which more closely united the two great Anglo-Saxon nations?" This questionnaire would draw the parents into the contest because the children would go home and ask them for the answers to these questions. Finally, flags would be given to those classes
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in which the children had answered a specified number of questions. By the 1927 national convention of the Legion the Americanism commission was able to report that twenty-four state departments had adopted a plan for flag knowledge contests for school children.

The Legion's flag campaign like its baseball program, reinforced the image of the nation as a unified team. It also provided other metaphors which give additional insight into the Legion's idea of the nation. The nation pictured in the flag campaign was a holy, organic union of sovereign states guaranteeing the natural rights of men. In his Service, Garland Powell explained the symbolism of the flag:

The red is for valor, zeal and fervency; the white for hope, purity, cleanliness of life and rectitude of conduct; the blue, the color of heaven, for reverence to God, loyalty, sincerity, justice and truth. The star...symbolizes dominion and sovereignty as well as lofty aspiration. The constellation of stars within the union, one star for each state, is emblematic of our Federal Constitution which reserves to the states their individual sovereignty except as to rights delegated by them to the Federal Government.

As his explanation of the color blue indicates, the flag was a religious as well as a political symbol:

The Flag of the United States of America needs no church banner above it, because it symbolizes Christianity in itself. It stands for God and Country, it means independence, liberty, justice, patriotism and idealism. It is the flag of one hundred and ten million people who have united and formed themselves into a nation, founded upon the principles of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Let all do reverence

---
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to the living symbol of our Great Republic.\textsuperscript{53}

Again, in complaining about the abuse of the flag which had resulted from the lack of a uniform civilian flag code before the Legion sponsored the flag conferences of 1923 and 1924, the Legion indicated the religious significance of the flag:

Yet the flag of the United States is a thing that men die for, and it is a sacred thing. Disrespect for the flag symbolizes disrespect of law and indifference and ill will toward our great national establishment of government and country.\textsuperscript{54}

Thus the flag symbolized not only the federal structure of the government of the United States, the rights of individuals, and law and order but also devotion to God and Christianity. It should never be dipped to anything.\textsuperscript{55} It symbolized those ultimate things which needed no external justification and as such it was a thing men died for. When men died for sacred things they were immortalized, their spirit continued to live in the nation. The Legion and the nation, then, were not only for the living but also for the dead. The Manual for American Legion Speakers equated the spirit of Americanism with the spirit of the American Legion. This spirit "is the greatest spirit of its kind that the world has ever known. It borders on the holy zeal of a religion." The Legion was not simply "a selfish organization of the living...." A "sacred day" was set aside as a
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national holiday to honor "those who gave their lives for God and Country...." The Legion defended the sacred nature of the flag and nation aggressively when it felt it necessary in 1928 to answer critics who had charged that nationalism had become a religion involving "worship of the flag." The Americanism Commission then maintained that the flag was "a symbol of the hopes and history, the fears and ambitions, the visions and dreams of generations of a free people." No other world banner had "offered men more of progress and opportunity. If to reverence and honor the Stars and Stripes is flag worship, then let it be." 

In formulating a general rule for displaying the flag, the Legion used still another metaphor to describe the flag. The nation and its flag were living organisms. It should always be remembered that "the flag represents the living country and is itself considered a living thing. The union of the flag is the honor point; the right arm is the sword arm and therefore the point of danger and hence the place of honor." Although the flag was to be displayed at half-staff from sunrise to noon on Memorial Day, in commeration of the war dead, it should be displayed at full staff in the afternoon, "for the Nation lives and the flag is the symbol of the living Nation."
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As evidenced by the junior baseball program and the flag campaign, the American Legion believed that patriotism, nationalism, and Americanism could be taught. The Legion seems to have felt that indirect lessons were better than direct ones. The junior baseball program, it was stated, "has solved the problems of approach to the red-blooded American boy who has no time for preachments or studious application to the doctrines of good citizenship." However, a more direct approach to teaching patriotism was by no means neglected. Garland Powell, lamenting the fact that the United States had slipped from fourth to ninth place among nations in literacy, declared ignorance to be a greater danger to the nation than "Prussian militarism." "Free popular government," he said, "is based on the literacy of the citizenship that maintains it; how can a citizen unable to read and write be expected to cast a well-considered vote?"

In fact, Powell maintained that the destiny of the nation depended upon education, more particularly an education in one language, teaching allegiance to one flag, and teaching one history "free of propaganda, inspirational and truthful." These sentiments were echoed in the Americanism Handbook which maintained that, "Education is the Legion's most trusted weapon against those who would destroy the ideals and institutions which have raised America to its present greatness." To make sure that education did its duty to the nation, each Legion post "should be particularly watchful of instruction in
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American history and civics. Patriotic observances and flag exercises in the schools should be encouraged."\(^{61}\) Patriotic history teaching should be encouraged, stated the *Manual for American Legion Speakers*, so that "the growing generation may carry on unbroken the traditions so gloriously handed down to them."\(^{62}\)

In order to strengthen education as the safeguard of national patriotism, the Legion pushed for the passage of state laws requiring loyalty oaths for teachers, discharging of teachers guilty of disloyalty, higher salaries for teachers to ensure their contentment, federal aid to American schools in the Orient to ensure the loyalty of American children there, adoption of Powell's *Service* as a text in Americanism, the elimination of foreign languages from schools where they obstructed Americanism,\(^{63}\) and the protection of history textbooks from any revisions which would "exclude certain facts about war...and subordinate military leaders and statesmen to lesser leaders."\(^{64}\) The Americanism Commission was to cooperate with educators in the development of a program of "patriotic citizenship training to the use in the schools of our country."\(^{65}\) In addition, the Legion, through
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the Americanism Commission, developed three national programs for the inculcation of patriotism in the schools—the American Legion award program, the Legion national essay contest, and the American Education week.

In 1923, the national convention of the Legion passed a resolution calling for posts to adopt an American Legion award program modeled after that of Pennsylvania to reward the qualities of "courage, honor, service, leadership and scholarship...." At the tenth national convention it was explained that "honesty, truthfulness, courage, honor, scholarship, service" were those traits which made for "high character" and "good citizenship." The awards, it was believed, were particularly effective in encouraging patriotism because they were given at an impressionable age when students were beginning to think seriously about future careers. At the same time it was reported that 1,046 awards had been given in 1926, 1,512 in 1927, and 1,804 in 1928. The effectiveness of the awards had been strengthened in many cities by the association of winners formed for various functions and by outings given in honor of winners in other towns.

At the same time that the Legion decided to encourage posts to adopt the school award program it passed a resolution calling for the promotion of a national essay contest, the first contest to be concluded in April, 1925. The national essay contest for 1925-26
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called for essays creating a "Patriot's Flag Creed," in 125 words or less, in order to "foster respect for the flag" through a creed "stated in concise, impressive phrases and in a style of sufficient vigor and literary merit to warrant its memorization and use in schools, in citizen assemblies and on all patriotic occasions." However, following this contest this program was dropped, at least temporarily, because of competition with other essay contests.69

The Legion's concept of Americanism became even clearer when it began to co-sponsor American Education week and urged local posts to participate beginning in 1924. The Legion hoped to inculcate "patriotic ideals in our nation's youth" through speeches to the children by servicemen on the "duties of patriotic citizenship," as well as in other ways.70 During American education week, each day was to be set aside for the study or celebration of some special aspect of citizenship or education. The names of these days varied from year to year. In the Twenties they included, at one time or another, Constitution Day, Patriotism Day, School and Teacher Day, Illiteracy Day, Physical Education Day, Community Day, For God and Country Day, Constitutional Rights Day, School Opportunity Day, Armistice Day, Citizenship Day, Health Day, Home and School Day, and Know your School Day.71
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On School and Teacher Day, citizens and parents should try to get to know their schools in order to assume the responsibility of seeing that "the schools are functioning" with efficiency in their greatest task, "the development of citizens." The school and the family, as two of three institutions influencing the growth of the child, should get to know each other.\textsuperscript{72} The theme of Home and School Day should be the role of the teacher in building up the community and the reinforcement of the teachings of the school in the home.\textsuperscript{73} "The Home" it was declared in 1928, was "the central institution by which civilization is advanced" so that the school should build upon the foundation laid by the home.\textsuperscript{74} In 1926, Know Your School Day was used to further the realization that although courses and methods of study were the teacher's business, "the ideals, aims, and particularly the needs of education [were] the business of every citizen."\textsuperscript{75} The next year it was explained that the schools, "the first and biggest enterprise in nation, state, country or city," helped the child to adapt himself to the difficult life of our time.\textsuperscript{76} In schools, it was reported in 1928, children learned "how to learn, how to think, to develop vision, to judge and to do,...an appreciation of accumulated knowledges....the mastery of the tools, technics and the spirit
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Illiteracy Day, Garland Powell maintained, should bring to mind the fact that the principle of popular government had helped to make the United States the "most powerful" country "in the world." Until recently the American people had always been competent to govern the country by using the ballot after "weighed and balanced thought...." Now, however, illiteracy threatened popular government, since an "ignorant citizenship" could not handle the management of public affairs. It was the duty of each citizen to see "that illiterates are afforded education." School Opportunity Day stressed the "opportunities" the school should offer a child. Each child should be aided in finding "his opportunity for service." Opportunity for all and a raising of the standard of living should be promoted through vocational courses in "agriculture, trades and industries, commerce, and home economics." The theme of Opportunity Day was to "Make democracy safe for the world through universal education." On this day it should be realized that education of youth was "one of the few paramount duties of an enlightened government," and that an illiterate adult was a disgrace "to his educated fellow citizens." In particular, immigrants should be Americanized through education in meeting "the problems of everyday American life."  
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The theme of physical fitness, particularly for military service, emerges in the Legion's discussion of Physical Education Day and Health Day. Garland Powell, describing Physical Education Day, stated that, "The sound mind in the sound body has been the educational ideal of the great races of mankind...." Physical Education Day should help solve the great national problem presented by the fact that "the draft records of the great war have shown that one in every four of our young men is physically unfit for military service." Health Day should emphasize the role of the schools in teaching "hygiene and health habits" and in providing for exercise. Citizens should realize that a "sanitary, spacious, cheerful" school plant "preserves the health of the school children and helps to improve individual and community life and to insure a better race." In 1928, it was declared that "health is the foundation of personal and social well-being. By helping children form high standards physical and mental fitness the school contributes to the betterment of the race."

The themes of Constitution Day, Constitutional Rights Day, and Citizenship Day stressed the duties and obligations of citizenship. Second only to literacy, according to Garland Powell, was the necessity of each citizen's knowing the history and constitution of the United States so that he might get some idea of the freedom and the duties of citizenship. Powell warned of a "certain

---
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drowsiness of spirit that spells death to democracy. It must be brought home to all oncoming citizens that the responsibility of the nation's welfare rests on them directly just as the strain of a strong pull tests every link of a chain."\textsuperscript{84} The eighth national convention of the Legion stressed that on Constitutional Rights Day it must be understood that every right carried with it a reciprocal duty, for "Liberty which does not consider the public welfare is license."

A demand for liberty "not prefaced by a pledge of service to the cause of liberty is selfish and unreasonable."\textsuperscript{85} On Citizenship Day it should be remembered that "the ultimate object" of education was "to train boys and girls to become good citizens." Schools, through their courses in civics, history, geography, and current events could "eliminate factional and national hatreds and develop that mutual sympathy, respect and understanding which are essential to good citizenship."\textsuperscript{86}

Garland Powell emphasized equality of opportunity as the theme of Community Day. "We must" he said "afford an even chance to all."\textsuperscript{87} However, the usual theme for Community Day was the spirit of civic unity. In 1926, it was declared that "Civic unity makes an efficient community."\textsuperscript{88} In 1927, Legionnaires were reminded that the opportunity
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for individual improvement was "influenced by the ideals and practices of the community as a whole." They were told that "Good roads unify a community." Schools should help "improve community standards" in "art, music, literature, and sports" as well as provide facilities for various activities, making the "school-house the community center."  

Garland Powell saw Patriotism Day as one devoted to the "Flag of America" since the flag was "the symbol of all the endeavors and sacrifices that have come to make the nation great." It was a "constant reminder of the nation" that afforded all citizens their "privileges and opportunities." According to Powell the two unifying forces in America were the flag and "our language," each of which were "the expression of the spirit of America." Therefore, one language and one flag "must be the American Ideal." In 1926, Patriotism was defined as "a fulfillment of individual obligations to the community, State, and Nation in peace or in war; a wholesome respect for the symbols of the commonwealth; and a will to defend the principles of liberty, equality, justice, and tolerance which actuated our forefathers to found it." Very closely related to the teaching of patriotism during American Education Week in the Legion's mind was Armistice Day, which provided for "a program of the highest patriotic
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quality," since it was the day when war duties were exchanged for "the
peaceful pursuits of life and...the duties of citizenship." It should
also be remembered "that the men who conquered by the use of arms in
the World War [were] the ones to lead in the movement to avoid future
wars" through their program of education, one that laid down "the
foundation of understanding and co-operation." Armistice Day was
"a good time to point out that one of the best ways to honor those
who have held the nation's battle lines in behalf of independence,
national integrity and world justice is to make the nation greater
still through the power of education." Armistice Day in 1928 fell on
a Sunday. Ministers that year were urged to visit the schools fre­
quently so that they might gather "first-hand information" for use in
Armistice Day sermons.  

For God and Country Day emphasized that the "three pillars of
the temple of the American Republic...are the HOME, the SCHOOL, and
the Church." The future of the country rested on these three, and
"failure of any one of them" placed the nation in danger. "The home,
the school and the church comprise the great trinity of democracy." The church was "the place for taking council and for high spiritual
endeavor." It was the church that supplied "that spiritual current
that brings light out of darkness." Since For God and Country Day
fell on Sunday in 1923 and in 1927, ministers were urged to preach
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that day on the subject of education. In 1927, every citizen was urged to attend both the morning and evening services. It was declared that "Ethical character--simple, positive, harmonious--is the supreme objective of the school and of life....By emphasizing ideals of right conduct the schools seek to maintain the moral and spiritual fiber of our people."96

The picture of the nation which emerges from American Education Week is clear: a unified community, with one flag and one language, providing equality of opportunity for service to the nation through universal education. In such a community, rights meant primarily obligations and duty to the nation. Popular government by an enlightened citizenship capable of "weighed and balanced thought" had made America the most powerful nation in the world, one well worth fighting for. However, this nation was not a warlike nation, and the very men who fought for the nation in war would lead her to peace. Such a unified democratic nation was possible only if the three cornerstones of home, school, and church united to teach those qualities which supported patriotism and citizenship. These institutions were basic to the nation, but they really all did the same thing. The home began the child's education in citizenship, the school continued and broadened it, and the church gave it spiritual authority. These institutions existed primarily to support the nation and not for some other reason. Every citizen had an obligation to make sure that these institutions did their duty.
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On the whole, then, as seen in its civic and educational activities, the Legion's view of the nation was that of a unified team, a thing in itself, a holy, organic, racial, language community ruled democratically by citizens who were enlightened, putting the nation above selfish advantage. These citizens had rights such as free speech, but to the Legion the most important thing about these rights was the obligations and duties to the nation they implied.

In the Legion's definition of Americanism, any particular ideology was secondary to total loyalty to a highly unified nation. However, total national loyalty itself demanded acceptance of the status quo, and, as such, supported conservative thinking. To criticize any fundamental existing American attitude or institution would be to question the rules of the game, and, as such, would be disloyal. Even here, however, there was room for considerable differences of opinion, for "the status quo and "fundamental values" were not always clear, particularly in a nation as large as the United States. In order to discover a more particular meaning of Americanism for the Legion, it is necessary to examine the Legion's perception of the status quo, as revealed by its attitudes toward those it considered to be un-American and toward that institution which provided the occasion for the creation of the Legion, war.
CHAPTER V

The American Legion and Americanism:
Slackers, Immigrants, and Radicals

In 1922, American Legion National Commander Hanford MacNider declared that the Legion "must not forget our great and basic purpose--that this country shall stay as we fought that it should stay--American."¹ The conservative implications of this statement and similar statements made by other Legion officials were freely admitted by the Legion, which saw itself as exercising a kind of extra-constitutional check on the possible evils of democratic government. The national historian of the Legion, in his report to the ninth national convention in 1927, stated that the conservatism and patriotism of the Legion "cannot but serve as a balance wheel or a gyroscope until the people have time to take account of the situation."² Like other conservative organizations of the Twenties, the Legion believed that the Constitution was a finished product which, except for the Fourteenth Amendment, could not be improved upon. The Supreme Court, its interpreter, was likewise a conservative force in society, and every effort to compromise its independence

¹American Legion, Summary of the Proceedings (Revised) of the Fourth National Convention of the American Legion, 1922, 10.

²American Legion, Reports to the Ninth Annual Convention of the American Legion, 1927, 56.
had to be defeated. Garland W. Powell, head of the Americanism Division of the Legion, stated that there was no room in the United States for immigrants "who came here with the idea that they can mold our customs, our ideals, our principles and government to suit any ideal the unwelcome individual or group may have."

The American Legion, as shown in the preceding chapter, considered itself to be a non-political organization including all respectable segments of society fighting for patriotism. The Legion's definition of "non-political" was such, however, that the claim of being non-political became meaningless. The Legion sometimes became involved in supporting or opposing particular candidates. In 1920, the Manual for American Legion Speakers stated that in the last election Legion posts and departments had thrown "in the full weight of their influence to defeat [two] candidates whose personal records on patriotic issues were deemed to place them beyond the protection of the Legion's non-political clause." One of these candidates had displayed a "defeatist" attitude during the war, and the other had been a newspaper editor who had said the wrong things in the war. How, then, did the Legion interpret "non-political?" The Legion, it was explained, was interested in certain principles and policies, such as veterans' benefits, the military policy of the United States,

---


4Garland W. Powell, "Service:" For God and Country (Indianapolis, 1924), 8.
and Americanization work, and not in particular candidates. Every man had the right to participate in politics without Legion opposition, but all candidates were expected to express the right views.\textsuperscript{5}

In view of the Legion's admitted conservatism and its peculiar interpretation of non-political, its claim to be non-political and impartial in social, economic, and political matters and to represent all legitimate factions of American opinion would seem to be less than candid. For example, the stress on nationalism and acceptance of the traditional American way without change meant that the Legion was for the traditional American interpretation of American economic individualism and against state-operated enterprises. The Legion felt that it would be "an unspeakable humiliation" and "positively perilous from the point of view of national defense" for the United States to be dependent upon foreign sources of nitrates. Yet when it passed a resolution at its national convention in 1922 to establish a nitrates plant at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, it was careful to add that the federal government should not operate this plant.\textsuperscript{6}

The American Legion's desire for a very high degree of national integration and acceptance of the status quo almost of necessity meant that it saw as un-American those persons and groups who threatened paramount loyalty to the nation or promoted extensive or rapid change. Frank Miles spoke to the tenth national convention of the Legion on

\textsuperscript{5}American Legion, News Service Division, Manual for American Legion Speakers (New York, 1921), 39-41.

\textsuperscript{6}Summary, Fourth Convention, 38.
the meaning of the phrase in the Legion's constitution, "To safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy." He identified "un-American" groups as the "despoilers of our traditions, defilers of the Constitution, violators of the law, boring bigots, pan-pounding politicians, bellowing Bolsheviks, howling hyphenates, peace-at-any-price pacifists, and insidious internationalists."\(^7\) To these were often added war profiteers and slackers.\(^8\)

Some knowledge of the Legion's ideas about Americanism may be gained through an examination of its concept of the threat some of these groups presented to America and how it was possible to combat them. The most obvious un-American group, given the Legion's origin, were those who had refused to fight for their country in the war, the slackers. At its first convention the Legion passed resolutions demanding punishment or control of alien "slackers" through the contradictory policies of keeping up-to-date records of their names and addresses, excluding them from citizenship, and deporting them. The next year the Legion added a resolution against any hindrance to completion of citizenship by aliens who had entered the armed forces


\(^8\)For example, see "Commander Owsley, of the Legion, and his Four Points," Literary Digest, LXXV (November, 1922), 50, 52.
of an allied country during the World War. In 1921, the Legion called for publication of lists of slackers and for wide publicity by the press. Moreover, the Legion urged the Federal government to take "drastic measures in the prosecution of service evaders and deserters...." The Legion campaign against the slackers reached fruition in 1921 when the Congressional Record published the names of all alien slackers. By that time, as Rodney Minott has pointed out, the slacker had become a negative symbol of Americanism, and those negligent of patriotic duty in peace as well as in war were sometimes branded as "slackers."

In 1921, in the Manual for American Legion Speakers, the Legion contrasted the position of the soldier and the slacker in World War I: "Doughboys, drenched to the skin dodging shells and machine gun bullets in the shell holes of the Argonne, had no kindly thoughts for the slackers who remained at home, sleeping on soft beds and skimming the cream off the war budget in juicy profits and wages." According to the Manual, the Legion had never forgiven this "spineless element" of "detestable cowards" and wanted to expose their cowardice to "their

---


10 American Legion, Summary of the Proceedings of the Third National Convention of the American Legion, 1921, 26, 30.

fellow citizens" through publication of their names. However, the
Legion had been frustrated in its efforts to get at the "yellow
streakers" by politicians who protected these "weak links in the chain
of the nation: for political purposes. Particularly objectionable
was the freeing of conscientious objectors by Secretary of War
Newton D. Baker. Quoting national Commander F. W. Galbraith, Jr.,
the Manual explained that these objectors had refused "'the first
duty of citizenship'" and "'outlawed themselves forever in the es­
timation of all American patriots.'" The Legion stood ready to use
all its machinery to aid those who would be in charge of punishing
them when publication of their names was forced. The Legion be­
lieved it was only justice to those who fought that these cowards,
"who accumulated gold instead of honor, be held up to the scorn of
the world."12

In his discussion of "What Constitutes American Citizenship?"
in Service, Garland W. Powell described the person who would sign a
pledge not to aid his country in time of war as:

a slacker in time of war, the most despicable person to
civilization, ridiculously misguided, childless women who
gave no support to the war and who had contributed nothing
to civilization, men who are afraid to fight even in defense
of their families, children who know no better and in a few
instances those who misunderstand the whole situation.
These people are internationalists and would not be termed
Americans, because they have no faith in their country nor
will they serve it, both of which are the first requisites
of good citizenship.13

To Powell, American citizenship was the "undying devotion to, faith
in and service to the United States of America." The will to serve would create a greater America in the future. Without it, life would be dull and meaningless. It was "the greatest contribution of American Civilization to the advancement of mankind." The Legion must protect that civilization from its enemies, the internationalists.\(^\text{14}\)

The slacker was the opposite of the good American, according to the Legion. By implication the traits of the good American were the reverse of those of the slacker. While the slacker was a "yellow streaker," "afraid to fight" and a man who slept on a soft bed and got rich on wartime wages and profits while others fought, a good American must be brave, willing to fight and to forgo soft living and wealth for his country in wartime. While the slacker put gold above honor, the good American must prefer honor to gold. While the slacker avoided service and was an internationalist enemy of civilization, the good American must be ready to serve America, and "through America, the World."\(^\text{15}\) He must be a nationalist. While the conscientious objector was a bad American, the good American must never question the justness or wisdom of any war the United States became involved in. If he did, he must not act on his doubts because service to maintain America was service to the world. If a woman were worthless to her nation and to civilization if she had no children, the good American woman, by implication, had children who

\(^{14}\text{Ibid., 7.}\)

\(^{15}\text{Ibid., 7.}\)
rendered the first and most important duty to the nation, service in war. They became strong "links in the chain of the nation."16

Recent immigrants were one group often identified with the slacker by the Legion, and as such they were deemed un-American. This was not the only objection the Legion had to many immigrants, however. Sometimes the Legion spoke as though it believed that all America's problems could be traced to undesirable immigrants. At its first national convention, the Legion declared that if its immigrant programs were adopted America would be "rid of the undesirable element now present in its citizenship, foreign colonies [would be] a thing of the past, the spirit of true Americanism [would be] prevailing throughout the length and breadth of our country, and our ideals of Government [would be] secure."17 In general, the Legion had four answers to what it saw as the immigrant problem: deportation, exclusion, selection, and Americanization. An examination of all of these programs, as proposed by the Legion, reveals what the Legion found objectionable and un-American about at least some immigrants and thus what the Legion thought America and Americanism stood for.

The first step in the Legion's program was to deport undesirable immigrants who were already in the United States as well as any that might come in the future. At its first national convention, the Legion called for the deportation of aliens who had been convicted as "enemies of our Government," and asked that any additional laws

16Summary, First Convention, 42.

17Ibid., 42.
needed be passed to "rid our country of this scum who hate our God, our country, our flag, and who prate of their privileges and refuse to perform their duties." Naturalized Americans who aided such aliens should be stripped of citizenship and deported as well.\(^\text{18}\) In 1921, the Legion added those immigrants who did not try to become citizens within a reasonable period of time to the list of those who should be deported. In 1924, the Legion began a campaign for the deportation of aliens who had violated laws. In order to assure that the nation of the deported immigrant's origin would accept his return, the Legion recommended in 1927 that the natives of countries refusing to accept deportees from the United States be refused admittance to the United States in the future. Meantime, the Legion had grown concerned over the problem of aliens (estimated by the Legion to number 1,300,000) who had illegally entered the country and recommended a publicity campaign demanding their deportation.\(^\text{19}\)

In 1927, the Legion made clear at least one of its objections to immigrants in America when it demanded the deportation of certain groups of aliens. The United States, the Legion maintained, had offered a haven for foreign citizens who wanted freedom or opportunity to rise socially. Many of these aliens, however, abused their privileges by condemning or undermining, both "through seditious propoganda and acts of violence, the Government of this country and its

\(^{18}\)Ibid., 41-42.

\(^{19}\)Summary, Third Convention, 24; Summary, Sixth Convention, 35; Proceedings, Seventh Convention, 149; Proceedings, Eighth Convention, 47; Proceedings, Ninth Convention, 42.
social and judicial institutions...." They had ridiculed the govern­ments of both the United States and of individual states. They had "forstalled and befogged" the "judgement of certain courts...." To remedy this situation, the Legion recommended that radical elements be brought to justice and called for the "immediate deportation of undesirable aliens."20

The aliens who the Legion conceived to be so un-American as to warrant deportation were those who made no effort to become citizens, those who broke the laws of the country, and those who were enemies of the Government, the God, the flag, the social institutions, and the judicial institutions of the United States. They showed them­selves to be enemies of American institutions by refusing their duties, by acts of violence, and by seditious propaganda. By implication, a good American was eager to become a citizen, obeyed the laws, and loved the government, the God, the flag, and the social and judicial institutions of the United States. He performed his duties and did not attack American institutions. It should be noted that even naturalized Americans were to be eligible for deportation. This would imply that in the Legion's mind an immigrant, citizen or not, was always on trial. Immigrant citizens were not exactly the equal of native-born Americans.

20Proceedings, Ninth Convention, 44. Many members of the United States Justice Department openly shared the Legion's desire to continue to deport alien radicals for several years after the Red Scare. They simply lacked the legal means to do so. See William Preston, Jr. Aliens and Dissenters, Federal Suppression of Radicals, 1903-1933 (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), 238-46.
The second step in the Legion's immigration program was to exclude undesirable immigrants. At its first national convention, the Legion maintained that American citizenship should be granted only to those who were fit for it in their "adaptability to American ideals, social and political, American civilization, form of Government and standard of living." The Legion believed that this type of fitness was at least partly determined by race. The relative adaptability of the various races to American ideals and institutions had been revealed by the War. Those who had proved themselves to be less fit should be excluded. Since "this nation" had the right "to determine its own citizenship," alien races had no cause for grievance if they were excluded from "unrestricted immigration." Like very many Americans in the Twenties, the Legion felt the Oriental races were particularly unfit for American citizenship. Specifically, the Legion called for "the abrogation of the so-called 'gentlemen's agreement' with Japan," laws "forever excluding foreign born Japanese from American citizenship," an addition to the Fourteenth Amendment that would exclude from citizenship all children born in the United States to foreign-born parents, unless both parents were eligible for citizenship, and a congressional investigation of alien penetration of the Pacific coast of the United States, the Territory of Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands.21 In 1925, the Legion explained

21American Legion, Summary, First Convention, 37-38. The Legion passed additional resolutions at later conventions concerning the "threat" of Oriental immigration calling for such things as rigorous exclusion of Japanese "picture brides" and hiring only people of "distinctly American origin" for governmental posts in Hawaii. See Summary, Second Convention, 53-54, 56; Summary, Fourth Convention
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that its stand for the "absolute exclusion of races ineligible to
citizenship by naturalization," which had by then been made law by
Congress, was not an "offensive" but a "defensive action," one adopted
"not... with intention to cast any aspersion on any race or creed, but
solely with the sincere and justifiable purpose of preserving our in­
stitutions of society and Government and keeping them American...."22

The 1921 national convention of the American Legion passed
resolutions calling for the exclusion of all new immigration for five
years, with the exception of the wives, mothers, fathers, sisters, and
husbands of American citizens. This was to give the various private
and public Americanization agencies a chance to Americanize the
immigrants already in the United States before any more came.23 The
next year the Legion urged Congress to suspend immigration until a
plan could be worked out to protect the nation and the American people

Proceedings, Eighth Convention, 45; Manual for Speakers, 50-51. Al­
though the State Department did not officially condone anti-Oriental
racism, Kell F. Mitchell, Jr., "Diplomacy and Prejudice: The Morris­
Shidehara Negotiations, 1920-1921," Pacific Historical Review, XXXIX
(February, 1970), 85-104, maintains that first Wilson as President
and then Charles Evans Hughes as Secretary of State put more emphasis
on using American anti-Japanese prejudice as a bargaining chip in
negotiations with Japan than on any effort to diminish American anti­
Japanese discrimination. On popular and Congressional prejudice
against Japan see Foster Rhea Dulles, Forty Years of American-Japanese
Relations (New York and London, 1937), 185-92; L. Ethan Ellis, Re­
publican Foreign Policy, 1921-1933 (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1968),
16-18; Thomas H. Buckley, The United States and the Washington Con­
ference, 1921-22 (Knoxville, Tennessee, 1970), 75-79; Fred H. Matthew,
"White Community and 'yellow Peril;" Mississippi Valley Historical

22 Proceedings, Seventh Convention, 40.

23 Summary, Third Convention, 25. See also, Summary, Fifth Con­
tvention, 26.
from the "dangerous influx" of immigrants which menaced American institutions and ideals. According to the Legion, unrestricted immigration was a menace because it would "eventually undermine and destroy respect for law, orderly government, every patriotic impulse, and the loyal character of American citizenship, as well as disorganize our industrial and economic structure... ." It is readily apparent from the Legion's stand on immigration, particularly on Orientals, that the Legion believed it was impossible for members of some races to become good Americans. To Legionnaires, race determined a person's social, economic, and political attitudes and even his ability to change these attitudes. Some races were more "American" than others. Desirable races could adapt to American social, political, and governmental systems that were already in existence. Moreover, there was an ideal but ever increasing "American" standard of living, and the ability of a person to accept or achieve this standard of living was determined in part by race.

The third step in the Legion's immigration program was selection of the proper kind of immigrant in the future. In 1921, in order to facilitate this selection, the Legion proposed that all immigrants be examined to determine their physical, mental, and "general desirability" as future American citizens. This was to occur before the immigrant embarked for the United States. By 1922, as mentioned above, the Legion favored excluding all new immigrants for five years. In the meantime,

24Summary, Fourth Convention, 30.
however, it declared support for a strict enforcement of laws in effect limiting immigration to three per cent of the foreign-born nationals residing in the United States in 1910. When a final immigration plan was worked out by Congress, the Legion believed preference should be given to relatives of veterans and to American citizens. The next year the Legion recommended that in any new immigration law, immigration should be restricted to citizens of "nations having ideals kindred to those of the American people" and that the "mental, moral and physical qualifications" for immigrants be raised. In 1927, the Legion went on record as approving the principle of the Immigration Act of 1924. Any change in this act, the Legion believed, should be aimed at "tightening rather than loosening its protective measures against admission of immigration difficult of assimilation...."

In 1929, the chief of the Legion's Legislative Division, John Thomas Taylor, explained to the eleventh national convention why the Legion favored immigration restriction in general and the national origins provision of the Immigration Act of 1924 in particular. There were three parts to Taylor's argument. First, immigration restriction was justified because those already in America had the

25Summary, Third Convention, 24; Summary Fourth Convention, 30. In 1925, the Legion added that the preference for families of veterans was to include alien veterans of the American armed forces provided they were of a race or nationality eligible for citizenship and not otherwise undesirable as future citizens. See Proceedings, Seventh Convention, 40.

26Summary, Fifth Convention, 26.

27Proceedings, Ninth Convention, 42.
right to determine who and how many others would migrate. He stated "this is our country, and...we are entitled to be the judge of whether we shall allow people to come here from foreign countries to make their home with us or to say to them, 'We have sufficient persons of other races within our shores.'"  

Second, selection of immigrants should be by national origin and not by foreign born residing in the country because many foreign-born had been wartime slackers. Two million immigrants had claimed exemption from the draft, he maintained, and yet they would be counted among the foreign-born residents in America in determining immigration quotas. Or, if the date set for measuring the national origins of foreign-born residents in America was before the war, say 1890, then people of the same national origin as the draft evaders would be counted in determining immigration quotas. Thus, Taylor maintained, the "issue can be brought squarely between patriotism and slackerism—shall slackerism be represented in selecting our immigrants over patriotism?" Immigration quotas should be based on the same system used for the draft in the war.


29 Ibid., 188. On the same page it is stated that aliens who claimed and got exemption from the draft numbered 914,952, or fifty-three per cent of those aliens registered for the draft.

30 Ibid., 188. Taylor, Ibid., 189, maintained that in drawing the line between patriotism and slackerism he was not, as some critics charged, saying there were "slacker races or nationalities" which should be excluded. The Legion realized that persons of all races or national origins had served in the war. However, of the 5,000,000 men who served during the war, over 4,000,000 were native-
Taylor's third argument was racial. Although all races had their virtues, to Taylor some were more suited to live in the "wonder of the ages," America. Quotas should not be set according to the number of applicants in each nation, or according to the population of the source nation but according to the national origin of those already in the United States. The purpose of immigration restriction was to retain "the blend of population and racial mixtures as they exist in America to-day." The national origins system was simply "fair play," representative of all Americans, not just the foreign born. It should be noted that only the "white races" were to be counted in determining national origin. Other races heavily represented in the population of the United States were completely excluded. The "fair play" of this was so obvious to Taylor that he was able to mention it without comment. As a nationalist, Taylor considered the country to be already made. What he perceived to be the status quo was perfect. Nothing should be done to endanger it.

The final step in the Legion's immigration program was Americanization. The Legion saw Americanization primarily as an elaborate program of education for both immigrants and newly naturalized citizens. Like many others involved in the Americanization movement, the Legion believed that the first thing the immigrant had to learn was the "American" language because the "American

31 Ibid., 190-95.

32 Ibid., 190.
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language is essential to the proper conception of our Government and American institutions...."\(^{33}\) An English literacy test should be a requirement for citizenship. To make sure the immigrant did not pick up un-American ideas before he learned English, laws should be passed requiring the publication of all foreign language publications in English with penalties for misleading translations.\(^{34}\)

The second phase of Americanization, the Legion believed, was teaching the immigrant good citizenship through courses in civics, American history, and patriotism. The immigrant had to be made to "adopt American ideals and customs and to Respect our form of government." They should be instructed in the "rudiments of civil government and the meaning of patriotism" and should be made to realize especially the duties and responsibilities of citizenship as well as its privileges."\(^{35}\) The naturalization laws should be revised in order to provide annual examinations to prepare immigrants for citizenship. When the immigrant's education was complete, naturalization ceremonies were to be dignified and conducted to "impress on new citizens the dignity, responsibilities and privileges of American citizenship...."\(^{36}\)

\(^{33}\)Summary, First Convention, 46.

\(^{34}\)Summary, Fourth Convention, 38; Summary, Sixth Convention, 34-35.

\(^{35}\)Summary, First Convention, 40-41; Summary, Third Convention, 34-35; American Legion, Americanism Commission, Americanism Handbook (Indianapolis, 1929), 4.

\(^{36}\)Summary, Third Convention, 24-25; Americanism Handbook, 4.
The Americanism Commission gave the 1927 national convention a report on its Americanization activities. These had taken two directions. First, legislation was sought in the states which would provide for education of both aliens and illiterate adults. The laws of two states, Delaware and Connecticut, were chosen as desirable, and copies of these laws were sent to the Department Commanders who were to try to have the laws of their states revised accordingly. Second, the Commission wrote to the directors of alien education in sixty-three cities to obtain the details of programs there. This information, plus knowledge derived from past programs worked out by the various departments of the Legion, would, it was thought, enable the Americanism Commission to devise "a plan for the entire nation." The Commission wanted to standardize the various Americanization programs in the country, bringing them all closer in line with Legion ideals.

Rodney Minott, in his Peerless Patriots, sees a shift beginning about 1924 in the Legion's stand on Americanization. Before that date, according to Minott, the immigrant was expected to appreciate his own cultural heritage. He was urged to learn the English language "only as an economic and expeditious tool to aid him." By 1924, Minott maintains, the national organization of the had become more militant in its attitude toward the immigrant and expected him "to embrace all American cultural values and completely

37Reports, Ninth Convention, 44.
discard those of his native country." The evidence cited above does not lead to any such conclusion. There seems to have been merely a more complete elaboration of an attitude which existed from the beginning. At its first national convention the Legion maintained that the "American language is essential to the proper conception of the principles of our Government and American institutions...." The Americanization policy of the Legion, like its other policies, assumed from the beginning that there was one American language, one American form of government, one American social system, one American God; in short one American race and culture that the immigrant had to conform to if he were to be an American. Secretary of Labor James J. Davis was not speaking to an unfriendly audience when he told the national convention of the Legion in 1923 that the United States was not "a country of all races and all languages" but one of "one language and one flag and one people."  

If the Legion condemned the immigrants as slackers, it also condemned them as carriers of subversive, radical ideals which could destroy America. Radicals, however, were seen as un-American whether they were immigrants or not. One reason for the very effort to form the American Legion was to combat radicalism among newly

39 Summary, Fifth Convention, 24.
discharged soldiers. At its first national convention, the Legion "condemned all forms of anarchy and Bolshevism" and promised to "attack the red flag wherever it may be raised, as the symbol of disorder, riot and anarchy." In 1925, the Legion's Americanism Commission declared itself to be "unalterably opposed to the purposes of the Third (Communist) International" and proceeded to "denounce as traitorous any person or organization aiding or abetting the aims or action of the same...."

The Legion developed several tactics in its battle against the radicals. One of the most prominent was simply to warn the American people of the menace they faced. A fairly clear picture of what the Legion considered un-American about the radicals emerged from its warnings of the radical menace. According to the Legion, the radicals were egotistical, notoriety-seeking free thinkers who thought that they knew more than everyone else. Garland W. Powell believed many radical agitators were idealists. There were two kinds of idealists, "the honest and the dishonest idealist."

The first sincerely believes in his work of fostering political upheaval, believes in it as we believe in our God. The other is a hypocritical nondescript of our society, a notoriety lover who opposes everything and

---


41 Summary, First Convention, 56.

42 Summary, Fifth Convention, 26. The Manual for American Legion Speakers, 45, asserted that the Legion, composed of men who saved the nation "from the possibility of German domination" will "guarantee that the teaching of Lenin and Trotsky should never destroy the balance of reason in this country."
everybody and joins in every movement that every decent element is against. He isn't sincere but if he gets to be thought of as a free-thinker and gathers unto himself a group of the great unwashed, he is happy, in his own mind an intellectual giant, in the minds of the patriotic a fool. He is egotistical to an unbelievable degree and sticks a stiletto into the breast of society by talking that which he knows to be a lie but which seems cold, clear logic to the unfertile minds he chooses as an audience.43

The radicals, according to the Legion, were against the things decent people supported. The Communists were opposed to the capitalists. Who were the capitalists? The Legion contended that the Communists, as shown by the Communist Manifesto, believed that a man who:

owns his little home is a capitalist; if one owns the tools of his trade, or an automobile, or a cow, or has any money in the savings bank, he is a "capitalist." Persons who believe in God are "capitalists." Those who hold sacred the sanctity of the married relation are capitalists."44

Partly by misquoting the Communist Manifesto and partly by misinterpreting Marx's idea of the establishment of a "community of women," the Legion contended that Communist theory called for destruction of the home, nationalization of women, and making children "wards of the state...."45 Just as alarming for right thinking

43Powell, Service, 144.

44American Legion, Americanism Commission, The Threat of Communism and the Answer: With Questions and Answers on Preparedness vs. Pacifism (Indianapolis, 1928?), 3-5. Compare this interpretation of Marx's view of what constituted the private property that was to be abolished with Karl Marx and Fredrich Engels, The Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx and Fredrich Engels, E. Ryazanoff, ed. (New York, 1963), 43-44, 144-49.

45The Threat of Communism and the Answer, 8. Compare p. 4 with Marx and Engels, The Communist Manifesto, 47-49. The Legion actually seems to have done just what Marx (49) maintained the bourgeoisie would do. That is, since they regarded their wives
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Americans was Garland Powell's warning that if the Communists
managed to set up a Soviet in the United States, playgrounds,
athletics, happiness, contentment, and ambition would be abolished.46

The next attribute assigned to radicals by the Legion followed
naturally from the belief that the radicals were egotistical free-
thinkers who rejected values of good Americans. That is, the radi-
cals were dreamers, totally out of touch with reality. They refused
to recognize that there was "no short-cut to a better America" and
that the "path is confused by many difficult, many sided problems."
These dreamers would endanger the results of the wisdom of America's
forefathers with their schemes. They would "blast away the fruits
of the labor, toil and sacrifices of generations which have gone
before. Upon the wreckage and ruin, they would attempt to create a
Fairyland or Utopia."47

Although the radicals, according to the Legion, were
idealistic dreamers, they were also hypocritical cynics who actually
enjoyed seeing others go to jail on their behalf.48 Hypocritical,
the radicals liked to appear to be martyrs but actually considered

as private property, they interpreted the idea of a "community of
women" to mean that women would become the common property of all
men.

46Powell, Service, 145.

47Reports, Ninth Convention, 42; The Threat of Communism and
the Answer, 10. Powell, Service, 145, maintained that the establish-
ment of a Soviet would mean "total ruin [to] the things that have
been building in America since 1776." If a Soviet were set up in
the United States, its money would be worth only "its weight as old
paper...."

48Powell, Service, 144.
communism to be a "racket" from which they derived a "soft living" by "exchanging...governmental cure-alls for cash...." Moreover, the radical hypocrites tried to use the right of free speech to produce a situation in which free speech would not be allowed.50

The radicals, the Legion maintained, tried to achieve their goals by preaching internationalism and pacifism. They circulated "the slacker's oath" and "[clamored] for a revision of history text books. They wanted to exclude "certain facts about war from histories, and subordinate military leaders and statesmen to lesser leaders." During the early Twenties, the Legion saw the immigrant as the main target of radical propaganda. In the Late Twenties, however, they believed the radicals began "working feverishly through the intelligent, wealthy women who are giving considerable time to club work." Communists appealed to these women to refuse to give any kind of aid in wartime. They argued that just as clans superseded families, the nation had been superseded by the world so that "We should now be concerned with international relations rather than with national problems." Finally, the radicals supported pacifist attacks on the American military establishment because they knew


50 The Threat of Communism and The Answer, 5. In Ibid., 8, the Legion maintained that the radicals "would use the right of free speech as a screen to pollute the minds of our young, incite to crime, corrupt public morals and overthrow our government."

51 Ibid., 9.

52 Reports, Tenth Convention, 53.
that "Their ambition to overthrow the American Government cannot be accomplished so long as there is a loyal Army and Navy."53

Although the radicals supported pacifism, they were actually militarists. According to Garland W. Powell, they knew that in the society they would set, it would be necessary to put soldiers with fixed bayonets on every street corner to enforce the edicts of twelve self-appointed dictators.54

The Legion maintained that radical organizations, supported by "so-called liberal thinkers, so-called freedom of speech advocates, and I.W.W. defenders," in addition to club women and pacifists, were wealthy and powerful.55 Despite this great wealth and power, radical organizations moved "in the dark," and usually operated from headquarters located "in side streets and up several flights of rickety stairs or deep down in a basement." These dark, evil, and disreputable organizations were hypocritical like their members. They had "innocent sounding names" and pretended to be on the side of "brotherly love and sunshine" but actually they promoted hate and criminal activity. They would set up a world order in which the Bible would be ignored, where:

the ignorant, the lawless and the animal would take the place of the civilized, the religious and of liberty. They would take the world back to the Stone Age where each self confessed radical hopes to become ruler under the rule that "might is the master of right."56
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There was often in the Legion's warnings of the radical menace either a direct or an implied contrast between the characteristics of the radicals and the ideals of the good American or of the Legion itself. The good American was not so egotistical as to think that he could judge the worth of things supported by the decent elements in America. He knew that there were things wrong with America, but he also knew that the most important thing was to preserve the heritage of the past which had been made holy by the blood of thousands of soldiers. He knew that there were many difficulties and problems in the way of any project to improve America so that it was necessary to proceed carefully and slowly. He was suspicious of governmental schemes to cure America's problems.57

The good American, in the Legion's view, knew that he and other Americans had more privileges and rights than citizens of any other country, including the rights of free speech and free press. He also knew that the Constitutional principle of freedom of speech did not give immunity for all uses of language; in fact, it permitted punishment of those who abused the privilege of free speech. Freedom of speech did not deny to a state its "primary and essential right of self-preservation...."58
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The good American was not a pacifist and supported a strong military establishment because he knew that without it, violence, anarchy, and finally international Communism would emerge victorious in the world. He preferred to keep America's military and political leaders in the top position in the admiration of America's school children. The good American was not an internationalist. Although the Communist threat was, as National Commander Alvin M. Owsley warned in 1922, to "world" civilization, the best defense against it was not internationalism but patriotic nationalism. America had to "make sure of her own existence" before she could combat this evil. Her role would be to give the peoples of the world an example and to give them "sustaining strength necessary for their good."60

Organizations that the good American supported might not be much more powerful than those of the radical's but they were out in the open and did not try to fool people with talk of brotherly love and sunshine. They supported the Bible, America's God, the traditional American home and family life, private property, and "adequate national defense...." Good American organizations supported law and order, the honor of the nation, playgrounds, athletics, ambition, initiative, and right over might.61 Good Americans were against
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"the red flag with the black vulture of disloyalty and international unrest perched upon its staff" and for the red, white, and blue of the American flag with the eagle on top.62

The Legion did not rest with just warning the nation of the radical menace. It also advocated positive steps to fight the radicals, such as keeping a close watch over them, combating their propaganda, and preaching the values of Americanism. At its first national convention the Legion encouraged its posts to "organize immediately" in order to meet "the insidious propaganda of Bolshevism, I.W.W.-ism, radicalism and all other anti-Americanisms...." Specifically, posts were to detect "anti-American activities everywhere" and come out plainly for 100% Americanism and for nothing less." They were to urge legal authorities to "correct local conditions everywhere," and try to get each member to create a "vital knowledge" of the Constitution and of "law and order...." Posts were to try to convince persons "contaminated by un-American Prejudice" that the government must be for all the people and not just for a few.63 Individual legionnaires were to help the legal authorities maintain law and order and suppress "mob violence" which the Legion believed to be incited by "un-American groups in the United States...."64 Finally, foreign language newspapers and pamphlets should be forced to print English translations so that
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they could not be used by radicals to incite the "destruction of American institutions." By 1920, the Legion felt that its "greatest single service" had been its "virile stand for the maintenance of law and order." As the Legion recalled:

We quickly served notice in no uncertain terms upon those wild radicals who would by force attempt to injure those very institutions we had risked our lives to protect. We stated plainly that we were ready for them and could meet their force with far greater force sufficient to stop them instantly.

In order to combat radical's "prostitution of free speech," the Legion at its third national convention recommended that Politics be taken out of the schools, that instructors be judged only by their ability and their "Americanism," that laws be passed punishing teachers for disloyalty in the schools by "fine or imprisonment or both," and that the Legion help school officials by reporting all cases of disloyalty to them. Foreigners should be given instruction in the American system of government and their opportunities under that system. Finally, the Legion was to "discourage the distribution, the purchase and sale of all radical literature." At its fourth national convention the Legion revealed a new tactic in its stand against radicalism. The Legion declared itself to be against all propaganda or movements for the "recognition and endorsement" of the government of the Soviet Union by the United
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States on the grounds that that government had committed "crimes... against the civilization of the world." Such a recognition of the government of the Soviet Union would be not only a "condonation" of these crimes but "unthinkable to a people that fought and sacrificed to save the world from these very things." It would be a "blow" at the patriotism of Russians who had suffered at the hands of the Soviet government. Recognition should be extended to the Soviets only when the government had "completely purged itself" and "worthy honest persons [were] installed as the rulers of the Russian Government."68

The Legion in 1922 was just as anxious to combat the internal as the international threat of radicalism. It recommended "immediate vigorous prosecution" of the Communist Party of America and pledged itself to be ready to aid officers of the law in any effort to eliminate "these enemies of our institutions and our government."
The Legion, at its 1922 convention, passed a resolution making the Friday before each May Day, Americanism Day in order to minimize the effect of the radical celebration of May Day. Churches would be asked to have sermons on Americanism on the Sunday before Americanism Day and patriotic exercises would be held on Americanism Day.69

Beginning in 1927, the national Americanism Commission of the Legion felt it necessary to add a note of warning to its usual encouragement of posts and individual Legionnaires to act as watchdogs
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over radical activities. Communist propaganda efforts among American youth, the Legion believed, made continued vigilance necessary. The first impulse of Legionnaires was "to take these disciples of sovietism, line them up on the border of the sea, and give the command 'Forward, March!'" However, the Legion supported law and order and the Constitution. The Legion's "policy in dealing with any sort of an animal, even a skunk," was to follow the law. Furthermore, Legionnaires should realize that "irascible and unreasoning tactics" which led to "violence" did more harm than good. The Communists thrived "on the negative energy expended by patriotic groups or individuals." They benefited every time "a martyr" was made of their speakers.

Radicals, according to the Legion, made sure that all patriotic groups knew about their speaking engagements:

[Patriots would] publically denounce the speaker, condemn his impending meeting and take public means to stop him from speaking....Generally when there had been a lot of ballyhoo, the communist speaker makes a mild sort of speech in which he says nothing which will make him criminally liable. This maneuver puts the patriotic organizations in the position of appearing to have made a ridiculous ado about nothing. And the communist speaker slyly capitalizes the incident as an excuse to pose as a martyr to the cause of maintaining the right of free, lawful speech.

This did not mean that Legionnaires should not keep "an eagle eye on the promoters of radical movements." However, they had to move
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"sanely and sensibly." The Supreme Court had rightly set limits to the right of free speech and it was "the duty of every honest-to-God American citizen" to see that individuals who overstepped the constitutional limits of free speech were prosecuted. Instead of publicly opposing a radical speaker, the Legionnaire should follow other tactics:

Go quietly to the office of your district attorney. Tell him what you know of this character and the sort of unlawful, revolutionary doctrines he is spreading. Ask the district attorney to place his representatives there, quietly and without public notice, to listen in. When the speaker oversteps his rights and abuses the privileges of free speech, as defined by the Supreme Court of the United States, arrest can be made. Prosecute the culprit! When he commits the overt act—and he will do it if he thinks the authorities are not looking—nail him to the mast! Strip him of his robes of martyrdom!  

Even vigilance and prosecution of lawbreaking radicals would not be enough to end the radical menace, the Legion believed. Education was the best way to combat Communism "and its kindred diseases," particularly among immigrants. Children should be "given a thorough understanding of the slowly developed and soundly tested principles on which the American Government is founded so that they may be able to judge rightly between these and the airy ideas of the radicals." Another way to combat Communism through education was to teach boys "leadership and loyalty through such media as the school, Boy Scouting, C.M.T.C. (Civilian Military Training Camps)," and clean sports. If boys were taught through these agencies there could be "no doubt as to their reaction to the approach of the economic
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fiction from the Communist tongue and pen.\textsuperscript{75}

In summary, the Legion's campaigns against the slacker, the immigrant, and the radical provide a picture of what the Legion considered un-American. Those who were either enemies of America or simply did not fit into the American scheme were variously described as animal-like, lawless, anarchistic, violent, egotistical, free-thinking, idealistic, pacifistic, internationalist, and socialist beings. They often were described as having no respect for American institutions and culture, since they attacked the family, the American form of government, private property, the American language, the American social system, and the American God. They attacked civilization itself because America was the hope of the world. Those pictured as un-American often were seen as hypocritical tricksters because they abused the American right of free speech to end that right, and because they used humanitarian-sounding slogans to advocate criminal activity. Persons said to be un-American were often described as lazy cowards who preferred gold and soft living to the duty of serving their nation, particularly in war. Persons were seen as un-American simply because they were of a race difficult to assimilate, particularly those of a non-white race. Finally, those who could not achieve the American standard of living were not quite legitimate Americans.

By implication, the good American supported law and order and the Constitution. He realized the superiority of American

\textsuperscript{75}Reports, Ninth Convention, 42; The Threat of Communism, 10.
institutions, the American language, and American Culture. He also worshiped the American God. He was virile, sports-loving, and willing to fight for his country with no questions asked. He supported a strong military establishment to protect America from external and internal threats and as the best support for the civilization of the world. He supported the family, ambition, private enterprise and the Bible. He was white and able to achieve an ever increasing American standard of living.

In its civic programs, the Legion visualized America as a holy, well integrated, organic team. In its campaign against those it considered un-American, the Legion, if in a negative way, gave its view of the characteristics of the good team member. If the nation were a team what game did it play? How would it win the game? In order to understand the purpose of the national team it will be necessary to examine the attitude of the Legion toward the institution that created its reason for being, war.
CHAPTER VI

The American Legion and America's Mission: War and Peace

The American Legion, organized "to preserve to America and the world all the benefits to be derived from a war of world size and abnormal rightfulness,...can translate the wartime spirit of unselfish devotion into peace-time service." Thus did National Commander James A. Drain, depicted by his interviewer as a one-time intimate of Theodore Roosevelt and a man whose "aggressive, emphatic mannerisms" suggested those "of the late exponent of strenuosity," describe the origins of the Legion in 1924.1 Drain told the seventh convention of the Legion in 1925 that the Legion was "born in battle to make good in peace the awful price paid for being at war" and that the "fraternal feeling" between Legion members was the "issue of hardship" and that the "joys and dangers shared in a national crisis is deeper than that grown from any other human experience."2 The Legion's Constitution had declared that one of its purposes was "to preserve the memories and incidents of our association in the Great War." If the Legion was born in war and wanted to preserve

---
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the memories of war, was it then a war-like, militaristic organization which would interpret Americanism in a war-like manner?

"Actually the Legion often saw itself as a non-militaristic organization working to promote peace and good will on earth."

The Legion's Constitution declared it to be a civilian organization in which no member could be addressed by his military or naval title at its meetings. This commitment to maintain the non-military character of the Legion was often renewed. In an explanation which became standard with the Legion, Commander Drain told Samuel Taylor Moore of the organization's purpose:

[The Legion is] not a martial mailed fist organization as its enemies would have the public believe. Men who have experienced the miseries of war abhor it because they have suffered more than the theorist can conjure up. American veterans will go the limit to prevent another war.

At its fifth national convention, the Legion declared that "war is an outlaw and its horrors constitute an indictment upon our civilization...."

---

3 American Legion, Unofficial Summary of the Committee Reports and Resolutions Adopted at the First National Convention of the American Legion, 1919, 14; American Legion, News Service Division, Manual for American Legion Speakers (New York, 1921), 37.


5 American Legion, Summary of Proceedings, (Revised), Fifth National Convention of the American Legion, 1923, 31. Garland W. Powell, "Service: For God and Country" (Indianapolis, 1924), 147, declared: "We all hate war. The Mother who gave her son, the son who fought and the father who labored that the son might have the best in the way of war equipment, detest it." Patrick J. Hurley explained the meaning of the phrase in the Legion's constitution.
The Legion was not content simply to declare itself against war and for peace. It also developed positions and lobbied in Congress for measures which it believed would promote peace. At its first national convention, the Legion declared that "a large standing army is uneconomical and un-American." It believed that both safety and "freedom from militarism" was "best assured by a National Citizen Army and Navy based on democratic and American principles of quality [sic] of obligation and opportunity all." The Legion declared itself to be "strongly opposed to compulsory military service in time of peace." Any military system created in the future, the Legion believed, "should be subject to civil authority." Finally, the Legion condemned any "legislation tending towards an enlarged and stronger military and naval caste...."6

Like many Americans, the Legion in the early Twenties supported arms limitation agreements in order to promote peace. In 1921, the Legion endorsed "the idea of an international armament "promote peace and good will," to the Legion's tenth national convention. Hurley maintained that the Legion stood for the "strict application of the golden rule to the individual, inter-racial, and international relations." See American Legion, Proceedings of the Tenth National Convention of the American Legion, H.D. 388, 70th Cong., 2nd sess. (Washington, 1929), 64. The Manual for American Legion Speakers, 37, declared that "the Legion is not a military organization" and that the "views of its members on military affairs are only those that other patriotic citizens are entitled to hold."

limitation agreement. At its fourth national convention, the Legion supported the report of the international veterans' organization, Federation Interalliee des Anciens Combattants (FIDAC), calling for an international disarmament on land, on sea, and in the air. At its fifth convention, the Legion clarified its policy on arms limitation by explaining that its policy was one "of intelligent limitation of all types of armament as opposed to either militarism or complete pacifism."

At its fifth convention, the Legion developed two more plans to promote peace. First, the Legion approved of an American Peace Award to encourage serious thinking concerning a practical plan for cooperation between the United States and other nations wanting to prevent war and obtain lasting peace. Second, since the Legion thought that the maintenance of good will among World War allies, and particularly among English-speaking peoples, would aid the quest
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9Summary, Fifth Convention, 44. Commander Owsley's report to this convention announced, 8, "the Legion's advocacy of an international conference for the limitation of air armaments" on the grounds that "America must either work for peace or prepare for war...."
for peace and make sure that those who died in the War would not have died in vain, it established a liaison committee between the Legion and the British Empire Service League.\textsuperscript{10}

Legion plans for peace through international cooperation culminated in 1924 when it created a World Peace Committee to study the international situation in order to report on the most practical plan for permanent world peace to the national convention.\textsuperscript{11}
According to National Commander Drain, the resolution creating this Committee "embodied the soul of the Legion, a spirit that has been tempered in the fiery forge of bloody conflict." It was "the direct answer to those who would accuse the Legion of Prussianism."\textsuperscript{12}

In 1925, the Legion World Peace Committee gave a report to the national convention which constituted the most complete statement of the Legion's stand for world peace in the 1920's. In addition to sufficient forces for both internal and external defense and a universal draft in time of war, the report called for American adherence "to a permanent court of international justice" as long as this did not interfere with American sovereignty; advocated cooperation with, but not necessarily entry into, the League of Nations; proposed international meetings to further "world security, disarmament, [and] codification of international law; and called for

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., 31.

\textsuperscript{11}American Legion, \textit{Summary of the Proceedings (Revised) of the Sixth National Convention of the American Legion, 1924}, 41.

\textsuperscript{12}Moore, "The Legion and the Nation," 444.
arbitration of disputes and consideration of the question of effective outlawry of wars of aggression. Other Committee suggestions included teaching the youth of the country to appreciate the virtues, glory, and ideals of other nations and races. In order to facilitate this proposal, the Committee advocated exchange of students between nations, international sports, and candid writing of history so that the causes of war could be determined, and an examination by teachers of ways to teach men international good will. The Committee also urged newspapers to try not to inflame public opinion against foreign nations by publishing misleading material.  

The acceptance of the Peace Committee's report in 1925 represented the high water mark in the Legion's program for world peace through international cooperation, international judication of dispute, and disarmanent. Although careful to guard American sovereignty, it visualized America as an equal member of a family of nations and recognized that war had to be dealt with on an international level. Most important, this program recognized that there were forces within many nations, including the United States, which made wars likely.

Although the Peace Committee, which merged with the Legion Commission on Foreign Relations after 1925, continued to push for its program, it commanded less and less attention in Legion circles
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after 1925. At the 1926 convention of the Legion, a resolution reaffirming support for the world court and international arbitration failed 618 to 298 with 120 abstentions. As if to underline still further the change in the Legion's stand, a resolution was passed opposing ratification by the United States Senate of the Geneva Gas Protocol against the use of gas in warfare.

Actually the Legion had another plan to preserve world peace, one that tended to take precedence over plans for international cooperation. After 1926, it became the only real Legion plan to preserve peace. The spirit of this plan was captured by James T. Williams, Jr., editor of the Boston Transcript, who gave the response to the addresses of welcome at the Legion's sixth national convention. Williams asserted the truth of "the Christian Text that 'when a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace!'" He quoted George Washington, stating that "'one of the most effectual means of preserving peace is to be prepared for war.'" The idea expressed by Williams, that America could best preserve peace by remaining strong militarily, was continually re
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reaffirmed by Legion officials in the nineteen-twenties. According to National Commander Drain, "peace-time preparedness for war which may be thrust upon the Nation will on the one hand reduce the probabilities of war, and on the other better prepare us to defend ourselves if forced into war." National Commander Paul V. McNutt told the eleventh national convention of the Legion that until all nations had accepted methods for settling international disputes, "this Nation must provide a complete defense in any contingency." The Legion eventually developed two basic plans for preparedness for war in order to promote peace. One of these was what the Legion called the universal draft, which was essentially a plan to allow the President to mobilize the nation's manpower and material resources for war in time of emergency but before war had actually been declared. Legion thinking along these lines had begun as early as the first national convention when it accepted the report of its Committee on Military Policy which called for universal military training based upon universal military obligations. The next year the Legion urged Congress to adopt a compulsory system of physical education, military and Americanization training. It was not until 1922, however, that the Military Affairs Committee presented the
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universal draft plan to the Legion's national convention.\textsuperscript{21}

According to the Legion, the universal draft would reduce the probability of war in two ways. First, it would "lessen the enthusiasm for war" by equalizing the burdens of war. All capital and all labor would be conscripted, taking the profit out of war. Both slackers and profiteers would be eliminated.\textsuperscript{22} Second, it would restrain other nations who might affront the United States because it would create a "united front" which "would make us a formidable adversary...."\textsuperscript{23} At first sight it would seem that this plan recognized domestic sources of war, putting the United States in the same category as other nations insofar as the causes of war are concerned. Moreover, this plan mitigated the Legion's stand for the national status quo by making preparedness and prevention of war higher goals than the maintenance of the free enterprise system. However, inspection of both the universal draft bill, drawn up by the Legion and introduced in Congress as early as 1923 by Representative Royal C. Johnson, Legionnaire from South Dakota and Senator Arthur Capper of Kansas, and the Legion's defense of this bill show this not to be the case.\textsuperscript{24}
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The bill called for a draft into military service of all persons, age limit not yet specified, without occupational exemption, along with the unorganized reserve in case of national emergency. The President of the United States would be given the power to control all material resources necessary and to set prices for essential services and commodities.\textsuperscript{25} In a question and answer defense of the bill, the Legislative Division of the Legion said it would be "impossible to" equalize rewards in war. Soldiers, but not profits or workers, would be conscripted. War would be financed, as before, by Liberty bond sales.\textsuperscript{26} Businessmen supported the bill, the Legion explained, because they had "no inherent desire to profiteer." They just wanted a fair profit guaranteed. Because a fair profit was not guaranteed them in the World War, they often tried to protect themselves against losses by contracting for great profits so that they "would come out with...whole" skins. If some businessmen made excessive profits in the war, it was not their fault but the fault of "our unpreparedness...." The universal draft would remove the uncertainty businessmen faced and thus "remove the incentive for profiteering."\textsuperscript{27}

As can readily be seen, the universal draft would not take the profit out but would actually guarantee profits in war. As one critic of the plan pointed out at the time, prices could be fixed

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid., 194.
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high in order to stimulate production, as was sometimes done in World War I, thereby guaranteeing high rather than low profits.\textsuperscript{28} The universal draft reinforced the Legion version of Americanism as the economic \textit{status quo} and did not envision any real restraint on possible internal pro-war forces in America. Despite this the Legion continued to picture it as a plan to take the profits out of war as well as eliminate slackers.\textsuperscript{29}

The ideas of the second Legion plan for peace through preparedness began to be discussed as early as the first national convention. At that convention the Legion called for the encouragement of "military training" in high schools and colleges, training camps for officers, a separate United States Air Force, and a "National Citizen Army and Navy...trained, equipped, officered and assigned to definite units before...the commencement of hostilities."\textsuperscript{30} On June 4, 1920, the President signed the National Defense Act, putting some of these recommendations into effect. This act became part of the second Legion preparedness plan. In addition to the Act's authorization of over 290,000 men for the regular army, the Legion wanted a National Guard of about 500,000 men, large reserves of trained men and war supplies, and a navy "second to none." However,
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Congress did not provide nearly enough funds for such a large force. The Legion spent the rest of the decade lobbying for at least some effort to put this plan into effect. In order to do this, the Legion eventually created separate committees on Naval, Military and Aeronautic Affairs. These committees recommended to the nation such measures as the development of a naval building program that would maintain a 5-5-3 ratio with Great Britain and Japan in all categories of ships, not merely capital ships as envisioned by the Washington Naval Conference; bring merchant marine vessels up to naval standards so that they would be used as a navy if arms agreements eliminated navies; maintenance of a strong naval air force; the extension of the time for which men would be considered for medals for action in the World War; air protection for cities and industry; and better planes and equipment for reserve squadron training.

The Legion's concern for keeping American military forces at a minimal level of preparedness in a world with no enforceable system for adjudication of international disputes does not necessarily indicate militarism or a militaristic interpretation of America and
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her world mission. As Peter Brady, American Federation of Labor representative to the Legion's eleventh national convention, pointed out, it seemed ridiculous to accuse those who wanted to expand America's armed forces of militarism when European powers kept military forces several times as large, in number of men, as those of the United States. However, in pushing for preparedness the Legion revealed its views not only on the necessity of preparedness but also on such things as the causes of war, the relation of the United States to war, the nature of America's enemies in war, and the relationship between war and citizenship. These in turn, revealed much about the Legion's idea of what America was and what its relationship with the rest of the world should be.

Basically, the Legion revealed two theories, sometimes contradictory, as to the causes of war. One of these theories was expounded along with a view of the nation's international mission by the Legion's Naval Affairs and Aeronautics Committees in their explanation of the necessity of naval and aeronautic preparedness. These two committees wanted a strong air force and a navy "second to none" because only with such a navy and air force could the United States maintain its prestige as a world power. In 1921, the Legion's Naval Affairs Committee reminded the nation that it needed an "adequate navy for the maintenance of our country as a world

The next year this committee expressed its concern that if the United States did not keep the navy up to the 5-5-3 ratio her position at future arms conferences might be jeopardized, and she might be "rated as an inferior power." The Aeronautics Committee stated in 1923 that the nation must "develop a merchant air marine" so that it could "maintain its leadership among the world powers...." 

The maintenance of world power was necessary, the Naval Affairs Committee believed, because control of trade routes gave a nation markets for its surplus produce and thus underwrote prosperity at home. It wanted to make people realize that the Navy "stands as a concrete expression of the power and authority which protects our seaborne commerce and their business ventures in foreign lands, by which our surplus products, our exports, are marketed." Domestic prosperity, the Committee reasoned, depended upon overseas commerce. In 1928, the Committee stated that "a navy is of the utmost importance to our uninterrupted economic expansion and prosperity...." The same year, it explained its position to the Legion's national convention:

Our defenses must be equal and on par with those of other nations, to defend and protect this country— the richest
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and most productive of all the world—envied and coveted by the nations who always have, and always will seek a place for their overcrowded population and for conquest.39

If naval and air power were considered by the Legion to be necessary for maintenance of trade routes and national prosperity, then national prosperity and maintenance of America's trade routes were necessary because they were the source of her power. According to the Naval Affairs Committee:

Since the earliest days of history, the control of the trade routes has been the secret of growth and greatness of all world power, and this country, because of the paltry sum necessary to carry out the requirements of the Ship Subsidy Bill, must not take the place of a decadent nation.40

The Aeronautics Committee, fearful that the nation would not develop an air merchant marine for purely defensive purposes, believed that it was "fortunate that history gives us another line of appeal." Nations, it claimed, "rate as world powers largely as they rate commercially—and standing in commerce is dependent upon transportation to an important degree."41

The Naval Affairs Committee concluded this circular argument with its theory on war: the "actual cause of all wars has been, and always will be, trade conquest, so we must be prepared for any emergency that may arise from within or without."42 Although wars were caused by trade rivalry, this did not mean that the United
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States should avoid such rivalry. Like the molders of American foreign policy in the Twenties, the Naval Affairs Committee believed that America had to maintain an "uninterrupted economic expansion." This, the Committee believed, would not endanger the peace because the United States was "one of the world's foremost nations as to population, political influence, wealth and works of righteousness...." Her navy was used in the "furtherance of international righteousness...." Therefore, the Committee contended:

A strong America does not imperil peace, but a weak America surely will in due course. Unless America is adequately prepared to insist on peace there will be no peace. If adequately prepared for our own defense, no combination of powers will have the hardihood to force us into war.

As can readily be seen, to the Legion's Naval Affairs and Aeronautics Committees there was little difference between power, prestige, prosperity, trade, and righteousness. All of these words described America's mission in the world.

In expressing its theory that war was caused by trade rivalry, the Naval Affairs Committee sometimes also expressed the second Legion theory as to the cause of war, one that underlay most Legion thinking about war and America's mission in the world. Wars, the Legion believed, were caused by "foreign aggression...." This idea

44Reports, Tenth Convention, 286-87
45summary, Sixth Convention, 17.
was continually voiced at Legion conventions and in Legion literature. Judge Thomas C. O'Brien, giving the Constitution Day address to the Legion convention in 1924, stated that the United States was "the only great nation which has never waged a war of aggression, the only nation which never coveted its neighbor's land...." Commander Drain wanted preparedness for a "war which may be thrust upon the Nation...." The Burton resolution to prohibit the exportation of the "implements of war to certain foreign nations" was opposed in Congress by Legion lobbyists in 1928 because it would tie America's hands in the type of war in which she might be involved, one of "aggression upon the part of some powerful nation...."

The Legion pamphlet, The Threat of Communism and the Answer, answered what it believed to be the most important arguments of the pacifists. The pamphlet answered the pacifist charge that the National Defense Act of 1920 was militaristic by giving its definition of militarism, which it stated was responsible for war. According to the Legion, militarism "means a desire for conquest; a desire to dominate." It meant maintaining large armies not just for defense but also for the "purposes of aggression." The Legion asserted that the designers of the National Defense Act and American army officers were just as

---
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opposed to militarism, or the desire to conquer, as were the pacifists. 49

In war resulted from aggression and the United States was never the aggressor, then the United States must have some special relationship to the world and to war. Judge O'Brien believed that the United States was the "only nation whose flag, the glorious stars and stripes, has never been unfurled save in the cause of human liberty, but once unfurled has never been defeated."50 If the United States stood for liberty in the world, this had been especially true in World War I, the Legion believed. The United States did not fight in that war just for her own rights. She fought for "the freedom of the world...."51 Since America fought for the freedom of the world, the Manual for American Legion Speakers maintained that the founders of the Legion had felt America to be "the new child of the nations destined to lead in this great hour; that new ideas should be woven into the minds and hearts of the people until we shall have a new manhood, a new nation and a new world."52 Garland Powell believed that the United States had saved the "civilization of the world" in the great War. America was now not only "the safeguard of civilization" but also "the greatest and most constant power in the world for the maintenance of human rights and liberties, and for the ordering of the lives of men in justice and security." It followed that

49 The Threat of Communism and the Answer, 12.
50 Summary, Sixth Convention, 15.
51 Summary, Third Convention, 31.
52 Manual for American Legion Speakers, 63.
"the boyhood of America is the hope of the world." World War veteran, Alvin M. Owlsey, Director of the Americanism Commission and later National Commander, told the national convention of the National Education Association that World War veterans were crusaders "for all mankind!"

If the United States was always right in war and was the savior of world civilization, then the enemies of the United States, it would seem, must always have been wrong. In fact, in its pamphlet, The Threat of Communism and the Answer the Legion consistently compared the enemies of the United States with criminals and the American forces with police. This pamphlet maintained that disarming or discharging the army would be like discharging or disarming the police, who were engaged "in constant warfare against murderers, vandals, thugs and burglars." To the pacifist argument that the police were a neutral force "to preserve law and order" while the army represented "only one side in a dispute," the Legion answered that the police were not neutral but always represented "the public." The Legion again drew a parallel between American forces and the police and between enemy nations and criminals in answer to the

53Powell, Service, 9, 64-65, 119.

54Alvin M. Owlsey, "The Peace-Time Program of the American Legion," National Education Association, Addresses and Proceedings, LX (1922), 220. Past National Vice-Commander F. Ryan Duffy, explaining the phrase in the Legion's constitution "to make right the master of might," stated that the Legion was a great help to the government of the United States in "its efforts to guard the liberties of the world." See Proceedings, Tenth Convention, 64.

55The Threat of Communism and the Answer, 13.

56Ibid., 14.
pacifist argument that civilized nations should be able to settle their disputes without recourse to war. "Individuals," the Legion maintained, "should be able to settle disputes without recourse to force." However, "police records revealed annually thousands of instances where men have entered personal conflicts as a result of disputes." In answering the pacifist assertion that preparedness did not eliminate crime, the Legion compared preparedness to laws against "murder and thieving and seduction." The pacifist, it was contended, did not argue that laws against these crimes should be abolished simply because they failed to end them.\(^57\)

This view of America's war-time enemies was carried to its ultimate conclusion by the Manual for American Legion Speakers. Here Americanism was equated with the Legion spirit which was:

the same spirit that swept over the top and out into the open when men were waging a war against war. It is the spirit that broke the Hindenburg line and made the devil himself tremble in his boots as the armistice was signed, for it was a body blow to his kingdom.\(^58\)

If the United States represented the forces of civilization, liberty and God, in its wars, while its enemies represented the criminal and evil forces in the world, then American wars could only reflect glory upon the nation. In fact, the Legion sometimes maintained that the nation achieved its greatness through war. At the request of the National Commander, Douglas I. McKay of New York spoke to the tenth national convention on the phrase "preserve memories of our association in war." According to McKay, Legion

\(^57\)Ibid., 15.

\(^58\)Ibid., 16.
members believed that "no nation can become great, no flag glorious except as that nation is sanctified and hallowed by the sacrifices of her children." Transported by the vision of "the glorious undertakings and heoric deeds of the World War" which helped glorify, ennoble, and raise a nation to greatness, McKay continued:

Who does not thrill with pride when he hears or reads the record of renowned experts of the World War? Who does not respond to the story of patriotic sacrifice with newborn resolve to give for himself a finer and fuller devotion to God and country? Treasured stores of national traditions coming to us from the earlier years were [sic.] the inspiration for the youth of '17-'18 to go forth and perform seemingly impossible tasks to the honor and glory of our Nation.59

Garland Powell saw the history of the United States as a series of battles, wars, and other military events. In a section on American history in his Service, he listed what he considered to be the most memorable events for each day of the year. The great majority of them had to do with war. For example, thirty-two events were listed for January. Of these, fifteen were battles, two were birthdays of men known almost exclusively for their military careers, and one was the ratification of a treaty ending a war. Many of the rest, such as the Emancipation Proclamation, were in one way or another connected with war. For April, thirty-five events were listed. Twenty-two of these were battles or occupations or retreats from strategic points or preparations for battles, two were declarations of war, one was the birthday of Ulysses S. Grant (among other things, a military hero), and one was the death of

59Proceedings, Tenth Convention, 61.
Abraham Lincoln (among other things, a war leader). All in all, twenty-four of the thirty-five events strictly concerned war and two partially concerned it. Thirty-four notable, national historic events were noted for the month of September. Twenty-seven were battles, plans for battles, or occupations by armed forces of strategic points in war, one was a peace treaty, and two were birthdays of men (Zachary Taylor and Lafayette) who were, among other things, military heroes. Altogether, thirty-one of the thirty-four in one way or another concerned war.60

If the glory of the nation's history was created by war, then war must accomplish great things. Alvin M. Owlsley, answering the question "What is war?" stated that it was "the means of making a just peace, nothing more or less."61 The Threat of Communism and the Answer replied to the pacifist charge that war was mankind's greatest enemy by saying that the Civil War was not the enemy of the slave, nor was the Spanish-American War the "enemy of the unfortunate Cubans...."62 The Legion sometimes seemed reluctant to give up this great instrument for good in the world. It complained that the Geneva Gas Protocol was supported by pacifists "who have as their ultimate object the elimination of war entirely." Legionnaires knew that this was "an ideal that is only for the future."63

60Powell, Service, 57-59, 61-62.
62The Threat of Communism and the Answer, 16.
63Proceedings, Eighth Convention, 144.
Only a short step separated the view that great deeds were accomplished by glorious wars and the view that war itself was good, a thing of glory. The Legion sometimes took that step. For example, the Legion constantly praised the effect of war on men and society and glorified the objects of war. At its first convention, the Legion was concerned about "the collection of war photographs, equipment and such other paraphernalia of war as would preserve our knowledge of the Great war for all time." The Legion's Military Affairs Committee wanted war trophies to be distributed to the states and not destroyed. The love of the soldier for his uniform, the Committee on Resolutions believed, was "conducive to true patriotism and Americanism." Father Lonegan believed that "the best test of a man's sympathy for his fellow humans is the comradeship of war." The Military Affairs Committee stated that service in war "inspired youth to useful and militant citizenship. That those who follow us may likewise be benefited, we strongly endorse the civilian military training camps...." The Emblem-Film Division of the Legion explained at the ninth convention of the Legion that money could be made by Posts "through the exhibition of appropriate patriotic and war films." It distributed three feature films, "Flashes of Action,"

---
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66 Summary, Fifth Convention, 30.
67 Proceedings, Tenth Convention, 60.
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"Man Without a Country," and "The World War."69

The Legion, sometimes seeing war as glorious and having been made conscious of the problem of going to war unprepared in 1917, often envisioned the ideal American society as one organized for an emergency, particularly the emergency of war. The universal draft would allow the President to organize the nation for war before war was declared. The Manual for American Legion Speakers maintained the Legion wanted to preserve "that exalted spirit of sacrifice that pervaded all citizens when the call to arms went forth, in April of 1917" and to "instill a little more Argonne stuff in the government...."70 The Military Affairs Committee supported military training in high schools, colleges, and universities because "teaching of national defense to the youth of the nation is the highest patriotism...."71

The heights of Legion rhetoric calling for the organization of the nation for war were reached by J. Monroe Johnson, president of the Rainbow Division, and Alvin M. Owley. Johnson, responding to the addresses of welcome at the fifth national convention of the Legion, believed that:

Every second of our lives, every moment, every day we are on trial. [I]t is our ambition that this nation be actuated at all times by that patriotic fervor that made us one from Canada to Mexico, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and

69 Reports, Ninth Convention, 23. "The Sly Raider" was added to the film collection the next year. See Reports, Tenth Convention, 21.

70 Manual for American Legion Speakers, 13, 54.

71 Proceedings, Eighth Convention, 45.
carried us on a transport of patriotic fervor of the
nations, actuating this greatest of all nations for war. 72

Owlsley, comparing the work of the American with that of the ancient
Roman Legions, captured the spirit of many aspects of the Legion's
concepts of Americanism:

'...Wild peoples of the North
Stood fronting in the gloam,
And heard and knew each in his mind
A third great sound upon the wind,
The living walls that hedge mankind,
The walking walls of Rome.'

The cities still stand that they builded in time of peace,
those legions of the Pax Romana that stood guard from Edin­
burgh to the deserts of Arabia....
But the cities abide and prosper not unforgetful of that day
long past that saw their birth—the armored soldiers carrying
stone, and tents of the generals, the crested centuries, the
engineers, and the cavalry. Those were the legions of Rome;
they built cities and defended them.
And we likewise of this Legion of America are building
no small town today, but rather a high and holy city for the
generations yet to come.... 73

Legion ideas about the organization of society for emergency,
and particularly for war, were put into concrete form by two programs
for local organization. First, each community was to have a National
Defense Council including representatives of all patriotic and civic
organizations. It would help obtain a quota of boys for the local
R.O.T.C., support the local National Guard and Reserve units and
organize public opinion for preparedness and against pacifism. 74
Each community, the Legion believed, should have an emergency organi­

72 Summary, Fifth Convention, 5.
73 Owlsley, "The Peace-Time Program of the American Legion," 221.
74 American Legion, Americanism Commission, Americanism Hand­
for preservation of the nation and its citizenry." This organization would be headed by the constituted authority in the community who would, in an emergency, assume "the position of practical, if not actual dictatorship." He would be aided by organized citizens like Legionnaires and the Boy Scouts. If the community organization was working well, it would begin operating automatically and smoothly in times of emergency, resembling "one of those motion pictures which unfolds in a few moments the growth of a flower."75

Warriors were the most valuable members of a nation which gained glory through war against evil. The World War had given men "a vision of citizenship and patriotism...."76 R.O.T.C. units in high schools and colleges were supported because military training made boys better citizens.77 Rifle matches were encouraged and sponsored because they made citizens better warriors.78 Sports and Civilian Military Training Camps were valued because they promoted physical health and emphasized values such as teamwork, obedience, and pride in aggressive, action-oriented virility, all of which were useful to the soldier. The Americanism Handbook explained that the Citizen's Military Training Camps not only included "priceless training and rip-roaring sports," built health and muscle but also taught men about camp life and "habits of accuracy, obedience to

75Powell, Service, 118-19.
76Manual for American Legion Speakers, 67.
77Americanism Handbook, 23.
78Proceedings, Eighth Convention, 44, 53-54; Proceedings, Tenth Convention, 48-49; Reports, Tenth Convention, 290.
constituted authority, snap, thoroughness and promptness." Young men learned sex morality, leadership, teamwork, democracy, and church attendance at these camps, as well.\textsuperscript{79}

The Legion, believing itself to be an ideal American group, often emphasized that these martial values, especially aggressive virility and obedience, were or should have been prominent in Legionnaires. In 1921, the Legion saw itself as standing for "virile Patriotism."\textsuperscript{80} Legion membership showed that a man belonged to the "most virile element in the population of this country...."\textsuperscript{81} The Publicity Division of the Legion even sent "virile, convincing information to the right target...."\textsuperscript{82} The martial obedience expected of the Legionnaire was made clear by Commander McNutt in his report to the 1929 convention of the Legion:

The American Legion must present a united front. There must be no gaps in the Legion ranks. The voice of the Legion must be as one. The spirit of the Legion must be that of the American soldier. He sought no personal reward. He faltered at no sacrifice. He feared no odds. He recognized no defeat. He did not turn his back but fought at the side of his comrades to achieve victory for the common cause. Discipline is the life of an army. It is also the life of a militant, living organization such as ours. Of course all of our members will not agree as to the solution of any question of vital importance. Such a thing is not possible in an organization the size of ours. However, we have our

\textsuperscript{79}Americanism Handbook, 6.

\textsuperscript{80}Summary, Third Convention, 3-4

\textsuperscript{81}Manual for American Legion Speakers, 57.

\textsuperscript{82}Reports, Tenth Convention, 15. See also Summary, Second Convention, 6; Summary, Sixth Convention, 9; Proceedings, Seventh Convention, 19; Reports, Tenth Convention, 286-87.
forum for discussing all questions and our properly authorized body for deciding them. Once a decision is made by a properly authorized body of the American Legion it is the duty of every loyal legionnaire to support that decision.83

The Legion, then, saw America as a nation complete and perfect, or nearly so, in its government, language, religion, race, and economic system. This nation was a holy, living team working to win the game of nations, a thing in itself. Sometimes the game the nation played was international peace, but more often, especially after 1925, it was the game of power, expanding trade, and national prestige. Even so, the American team was not to be compared with other national teams playing this game because the American team always fought for liberty, civilization, and God, whereas the others sometimes were lawless criminals fighting, it seemed, for the Devil himself. Since the nation fought for right in the world and was sanctified by the blood of its children, its ideal citizens were those who were good warriors. They were strong, virile, and disciplined.

The American Legion was a large organization containing many diverse elements. It created a broad and fairly consistent ideology which contained most of the elements found in the ideologies of many other conservative American organizations. However, differences of emphasis existed among the ideologies of these organizations. In order to explore some of these variations, the ideologies of two other conservative groups, the Chamber of Commerce and the anti-radicals, will be examined.

83Proceedings, Eleventh Convention, 12.
CHAPTER VII

Americanism and the Economic Status Quo:

The Chamber of Commerce and Charles Norman Fay

Like the veteran, the businessman was told in the nineteen-twenties that he represented the essence of Americanism. If the veteran had fought to "make the world safe for democracy," the businessman was engaged in what President Harding called the "business of America."¹ The largest organization of businessmen in America, the Chamber of Commerce, was not as unequivocal as the American Legion in claiming to represent every "decent element" in America, but the Chamber did develop a theory of Americanism closely identified with the interests and attitudes of businessmen.²


²Retiring president of the Chamber of Commerce Joseph Defrees, "Story of the National Chamber," Nation's Business, X (June 5, 1922), 30, maintained that business was but one of the "tripod" of interest groups in the country, the other two being labor and agriculture. He concluded that "business alone cannot be the final judge of what is
In many respects the Americanism of the Chamber of Commerce closely resembled that of the American Legion. For example, both considered radical criticism of the status quo to be the opposite of Americanism, and both believed the Soviet Union was a living example of the folly of putting radical ideas into practice. On the other hand, the Chamber of Commerce, because of its business orientation, developed positions on some issues which often kept the two organizations at odds. Because of its advocacy of lower taxes, the Chamber of Commerce opposed some veterans' legislation sponsored by for the public good." Resolution number five of the Chamber of Commerce's 1920 national convention, however, maintained that agriculture was not a separate interest and should have been represented in the Chamber of Commerce. See "Laying a Course for Business," Nation's Business, VIII (June, 1920), 36. Elliot H. Goodwin, Resident Vice President of the Chamber, "The Voice of Business," Nation's Business, IX (July, 1921), 28, believed that not only did business have the right to present its views to congress but that "right-minded Senators and Representatives, as well as members of the executive branch, want not only to receive them, but to weigh them." John Ihlder, head of the Chamber's Civic Development Department, "The Business Man's Responsibility," Nation's Business, XIII (November, 1925) 52-54, forthrightly declared that businessmen were the nation's leaders. Merle Thorpe, "Business Rallies to Action," Nation's Business, XI (May, 1923), 45, stated that America was the national "genuis for business organization...."

the Legion. More to the point, as far as the concept of Americanism was concerned, a distinct difference between the two organizations developed on the issue of immigration. At the height of the Red Scare, Merle Thorpe, editor of the Chamber of Commerce periodical, *Nation's Business*, announced with pride that Uncle Sam at last had begun to kick out presumptuous, radical aliens. With recovery from the depression of 1921-1922, though advocating selection of immigrants in order to produce a more homogeneous America, the Chamber called for a more flexible immigration policy in order to provide an adequate supply of immigrant labor in times of prosperity. In 1929, the Chamber asked for the repeal of the national origins provision of the Immigration Act of 1924 in order to avoid antagonizing the various racial groups in America. With these stands, the Chamber avoided the Legion's overt identification of America with a particular race.

One thing the Legion and the Chamber of Commerce agreed upon completely was that America was the greatest nation in the world. To Julius H. Barnes, one of the Chamber's more outspoken presidents, America was a "miracle land" which had made the world's highest marks in human progress in its "short national history." America's


5Merle Thorpe, "But 'the American' Got Mad," *Nation's Business*, VIII (February, 1920), 31; "Resolutions of the Convention," *Nation's Business*, IX (June 5, 1923), 42; Business Goes on Record," *Nation's
superiority was evident in her material wealth. It rested on the fact that in "three hundred years of national history" she had "created three hundred billion of national wealth...." Although the external evidence of this American superiority was material, it did not end there. Barnes and Thorpe thought that the fact that America had the highest standard of living in the world indicated "high ideals and righteous impulse" as evidenced by the establishment of art museums and the growth of education and philanthropic

Business, XVIII (May, 25, 1929), 74. The Chamber also opposed both a head tax on immigrants and extension of the quota system to Mexico. See "American Business Goes on Recors," Nation's Business, XV (May 20, 1927), 27. Compare Legionnaire John Thomas Taylor's militant stand (Chapter Five) on immigration restriction with the questioning attitudes in "The Immigration Question Up to Date," Nation's Business, XII (April, 1924), 54, 56; and "New Viewpoint on Immigration," Nation's Business, X (December, 1922), 29. The influence of business thought in the nineteen-twenties can be seen, in part, in the way social worker and Americanization leader Frances Kellor was able to treat the immigrant almost exclusively as a market, a factor in production, and a source of capital for American industry in the last half of Immigration and the Future (New York, 1920), 131-268. On this and the general business stand on immigration restriction from 1919 to 1923, see John Higham, Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925 (New York, 1968), 257-58, 310, 315-19.

6Julius H. Barnes, "The Mystery of the Sur-Tax," Nation's Business, XII (April, 1924), 51; Julius H. Barnes, "America May Abolish Poverty," Nation's Business, XI (November, 1923), 31; Julius H. Barnes, "The Road we have Come," Nation's Business, XI (August, 1923), 25. In "Government, Business and Good Sense," Nation's Business, XII (June 5, 1924), 9-11, Barnes illustrated America's superiority by stating that America, with six percent of the world's population, used ninety percent of the world's automobiles, fifty-seven percent of the world's coal, etc. William Feather, "A Fourth of July Speech--New Style," Nation's Business, XIV (July, 1926), 14, asserted simply that Americans "are rich, fat, arrogant, superior." See also "Log of Organized Business," Nation's Business, XI (January, 1923), 71. The materialistic nature of "ultra-conservative" thought in general and of business thought in particular has been commented on extensively by George Smith May, "Ultra-Conservative Thought in the United States in the 1920's and 1930's" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1954), 106-16, and Prothro, Dollar Decade, 60-76, respectively.
gifts in the United States. In short, Barnes felt that it was
evident that the belief that "America has established a world
leadership in material progress, in living standards, and an ad-
vance as well in those indefinable qualities that denote character"
was not based on "narrow provincialism or national self-conceit...."7
Thorpe went one step further, saying that business itself was the
"soul of America," supplying modern man's need for romance.8

What caused this American material superiority? It was not
simply an abundance of natural resources. Russia had many natural
resources and yet had not made any great contribution of world
service. Both Barnes and Thorpe believed that America's enviable
position could be attributed to a peculiarly American political and
industrial or productive philosophy.9 What was this "peculiarly
American" political and industrial philosophy? Individualism, which

7Barnes, "The Road We Have Come," 27; Merle Thorpe, "Dividends
of the Spirit," Nation's Business, XVII (January, 1929), 9. The
argument from material to spiritual superiority was repeated with
less emphasis on Americanism by Chamber President Richard F. Grant in
See also Merle Thorpe, "Lest Clear Up the Fog!" Nation's Business,
XVI (January, 1928), 9. Interestingly enough, historian Morrell
American Quarterly, XII (Summer, 1961), 126-39, parallels these argu-
ments by asserting that the growth of philanthropy in the 1920's
showed that businessmen were growing more conscious of their social
responsibilities.

8Merle Thorpe, "Business, The Soul of America?" Nation's
Business, XV (March, 1927), 13; Merle Thorpe, "The Romance of

9Barnes, "The Road We Have Come," 27; Julius H. Barnes, "Busi-
ness Needs No 'Stop' Signal," Nation's Business, XI (June, 1923), 27;
Barnes, "Government, Business and Good Sense," 9; Merle Thorpe, "Lest
We Forget," Nation's Business, XI (September, 1923), 38; Merle Thorpe,
"Don't Fumble the Torch," Nation's Business, XVI (February, 1928), 9.
Thorpe called "the heart and soul of America," was its prime characteristic.\textsuperscript{10} Clyde Dawson, a member of the Board of Directors of the United States Chamber of Commerce, believed that America was great because of individual opportunity.\textsuperscript{11} Barnes saw national achievement as simply "the sum of individual effort and accomplishment." Like Alexander Hamilton, Barnes believed that national wealth could be equated with private property. It was the aggregate of individual wealth.\textsuperscript{12}

Since national achievement was the sum of individual achievement, America rejected the "old fallacious" European philosophy that a limitation should be placed upon individual effort because there was only so much work to be done. According to Barnes, America had created her own economic laws. The first American law for prosperity was that no limitation would be placed on individual initiative and production.\textsuperscript{13} In 1920, a Chamber referendum on labor declared that


\textsuperscript{11}Clyde Dawson, "For the Freedom of Business," \textit{Nation's Business}, IX (March, 1921), 14.


\textsuperscript{13}Julius H. Barnes, "The World of Business at Rome," \textit{Nation's Business}, XI (May, 1923), 53; Barnes, "Business Needs No 'Stop' Signal," 27; Barnes, "The Road We Have Come," 25.
those who tried to limit worker's hours simply to create more leisure time should remember the effect this would have on the interests of the nation. Barnes believed that business leaders were being patriotic and protecting the American standard of living in insisting upon the open shop, since unions often tried to restrict output per worker. Similarly, the graduated income tax was un-American because it penalized success and "superior ability."  

Chamber leaders believed that a corollary to the first American law of economics was that human labor was extraordinarily valuable. Ignoring the differing ratios in the United States and Europe between the size of the labor force and the amount of land available for agriculture, Barnes felt confident in asserting that American agriculture proved the superiority of the American way because although European agriculture was more productive per acre, American agriculture was more productive per farmer. Realizing the value of human labor, Americans had developed their technology in order to increase the output of the individual workman. Much credit for technological advance, national Chamber President Richard F. Grant believed, was due the inventor. The businessman, however, was even more important in this respect. The businessman applied new inventions to satisfy

practical needs. Then the businessman himself was an inventor, discovering new ways to reduce production costs and new ways to market the invention. Most important, the businessman often provided the large-scale expenditure necessary to make a particular invention or series of inventions.\textsuperscript{15}

Only a short step was needed from the view that the businessman was the main reason for technological advance and the American standard of living to the second American law of economics. According to Barnes, America knew that prosperity depended upon production exceeding consumption so that capital could be accumulated for technological advance. Although Americans realized that it was necessary to have mass consumption in order to have mass production, they, and, Barnes believed, they alone realized that consumption was dependent upon production so that mass production and increasing efficiency of production necessarily meant mass consumption.\textsuperscript{16} Europeans or fuzzy minded radicals might worry about the distribution of wealth in the American system and thus the stability of the ever increasing American standard of living. Chamber leaders,


however, knew that America led the world in the wide and equitable
distribution of wealth through the automatic workings of the Ameri­
can free enterprise system. That it was widely distributed was proven
by the fact of mass production itself. If it were not, marketing the
cornucopia of goods—produced by what Chamber President John W.O'Leary
called "the genius of American business"—would be impossible.17

Three interrelated arguments proved that the distribution of
wealth in the United States was "accurate" and just. First, everyone
had an equal opportunity to make money. Merle Thorpe believed that
this was guaranteed by America's political and industrial philosophy
of "Individual Reward for Individual Merit."18 In order that this
be universally understood, Chamber President Joseph H. Defrees
advocated teaching equal opportunity and "sound economics" in the
public schools.19 That it was truly possible for those of humble
origin to become wealthy was demonstrated to the satisfaction of
Thorpe and Grant by the many rags-to-riches stories in American
business history. Thorpe maintained that United States Representa­
tive Underhill of Massachusetts had a "typical American career" since
he rose from the position of office boy to head of the Underhill

17Barnes, "One Lesson Learned from Europe," 16; Barnes,
"Business Needs No 'Stop' Signal," 25; Thorpe, "Lest We Forget," 38;
John Ihlder, "The Business Man's Responsibility," 52; Grant, "The
Case for the Investor," 40; John W. O'Leary, "What's Around the 1927

18Thorpe, "Forward! But Hold the Course," National Business,
XVI (June, 1928), 9.

National Business, IX (June, 1921), 30.
Finally, Presidents Grant and Barnes argued that the division of wealth was fair in America because of the automatic workings of the laws of the market. If anything, President Grant believed that the businessman's profits were only a "small fraction" of the "benefit he had conferred." If his profits were large, the services performed by his business were larger.

An economic system as perfect as that developed by America could, some Chamber leaders felt, be expected to achieve man's fondest dreams. President Barnes led the way in predicting paradise on earth with this system. Anticipating Herbert Hoover by several years, he declared in 1923 that it was "America's manifest social and industrial destiny" to utterly "defeat poverty and destitution...." President O'Leary in 1927 predicted that permanent prosperity could be established in America, thus ending the business cycle. Yet all of these hopes for America's future might be dashed

20 Merle Thorpe, "Through the Editor's Spectacles," Nation's Business, XI (April, 1923), 10. See also Merle Thorpe, "Through the Editor's Spectacles," Nation's Business, XI (February, 1923), 5; Merle Thorpe, "Through the Editor's Spectacles," Nation's Business, XII (January, 1924), 5-6; Grant, "Then There's the Case for Management," 46.


22 Barnes, "America May Abolish Poverty," 31. In 1929, Barnes, "Growing Responsibilities of Business," 16, maintained that America had "Found the key to universal individual welfare."

23 O'Leary, "What's Around the 1927 Corner?" 15-16. Feather, "A Fourth of July Speech—New Style," 13, maintained in 1926 that the one-hundred per cent American knew that America would "Achieve universal prosperity exceeding the dream of the most moony Bolshevist."
by a foolish move on the part of the government. Despite their
great faith in the results of America's industrial philosophy,
Chamber leaders considered the American industrial system to be
extremely fragile, or as Barnes put it, "peculiarly sensitive to
shocks." Two things that the government might do to disrupt
industry were to go to war or to inhibit individual initiative.
The latter, Barnes believed, was the greatest menace.24

The government could easily inhibit individual initiative
by entering into competition with its own citizens. Chamber
officials compared the position of the government to that of an
umpire in a game. It was supposed to guarantee a fair field and
fair play for the participants in the game, not play the game
itself.25 Merle Thorpe warned in 1928 that if the Jones Shipping
Bill, the McNary-Haugen Farm Relief Bill, and the Muscle Shoals
Resolutions were passed by Congress, the Preamble of the Consti-
tution should be changed to read:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a
more perfect union... and secure the blessings of liberty
to ourselves and our posterity and engage in the
manufacture of fertilizer and in the business of ocean

24Julius H. Barnes, "Team Play for Prosperity," Nation's
Business, XI (December, 1923), 13; Julius H. Barnes, "The
Philosophy of Fair Play," Nation's Business, XIV (June, 1926),
36; Grant, "The Case for Business," 20.

25Merle Thorpe, "Forward! But Hold the Course," 9;
Grant, "The Case for Management," 46; Barnes, "The Road We Have
Come," 25. The first resolution of the 1921 national convention
of the Chamber of Commerce declared that "Laws and administrative
acts should touch business enterprise with great care and only
to preserve a fair field to all." See "Business Declares Its
shipping and fix the price of farm products, do 
ordain and establish this constitution.26

Some Chamber leaders believed that the fallacy of government ownership had been demonstrated in Europe. Government ownership of utilities and railways had been the cause of slow economic recovery from the effects of the Great War there. In the United States, by way of contrast, a new and peculiarly American system of governmental regulation of privately owned monopolies was found to be the best way to insure fair play for the consumer.27

If the government regulation rather than government ownership of business was the American way, Chamber leaders also believed that too much regulation could impede individual initiative and the American economic system. Richard F. Grant compared government officials who tried to regulate business with boys who liked to "throw things into a fly wheel or touch off a can of powder just to see what will happen."28 The stock market should not be regulated by the government, Thorpe maintained, because speculation was "an American characteristic" and because we "must speculate if we go


Governmental paternalism, which he called "The rape of individual opportunity," Thorpe opposed with equal fervor. He believed that the government should not subsidize farm prices because the British experience in subsidizing the coal interests proved how difficult it was to remove a subsidy once granted. Barnes believed that the farmer had forgotten that America had "achieved the highest standard of living in the world" not through paternalism but through a political philosophy which dictated that the primary function of government was simply to "preserve fair play."

Chamber leaders believed that they were not acting selfishly in asking the government not to impede their progress toward the millennium by over-regulation or paternalism or taxes that would rob investors of the capital with which to expand America's

29 Merle Thorpe, "We Must Speculate," Nation's Business, XVII (April, 1929), 9. In 1921 Thorpe, "At the Cross-Roads," Nation's Business, IX (April, 1921), 28, had warned that any governmental effort to regulate meat packing or coal mining would threaten "the structure of American business built on individual enterprise."

30 Merle Thorpe, "The Lesson to U.S."

31 Barnes, "Is There a National Farm Problem," 19. See also Thorpe, "Business Rallies to Action," 45. Businessmen were often encouraged by politicians themselves in seeing any governmental economic activity as tyrannical. See, for example, William E. Borah, "The Cancer of Too Much Government," Nation's Business, XV (February, 1927), 15-16 and David A. Reed, "If I Were Dictator," Nation's Business, XIV (August, 1926), 16-18.
economy. In fact, according to the 1928-1929 President of the Chamber of Commerce, William Butterworth, businessmen sought freedom from the government "only where it is for national advantage" and only if governmental impediments were "contrary to the letter and spirit of the fundamental policies which give the United States its national character." In seeking freedom from governmental interference in business, however, Chamber leaders sometimes developed doctrines which seemed to contradict the idea of America as a unified nation. They maintained that there were two independent spheres of activity in America, government and business. Clyde Dawson believed that the government of the United States was founded on the idea that "government should keep out of business, and that business should keep out of government—that each should confine itself to its own proper sphere of endeavor." If this were the case, then the American concept of freedom included the freedom of business from governmental restraint, and this meant constitutional rights were primarily economic rights. According to Dawson, if the government ran even one great industry in competition with its citizens, the nation would:


33 William Butterworth, "In the Public Interest," Nation's Business, XVII (February, 1929), 123.

go down in a welter of communism and the Constitution of the United States, which for more than one hundred and thirty years has stood as the most wonderful document the world has ever seen, will be but a scrap of paper forgotten by you and me, the people who have lived and prospered under it all these years.

Even in fighting governmental regulation, Dawson believed business was fighting to "preserve those liberties which were given to us by that Constitution." 35

The Logical conclusion of this line of thought was that business should form an entirely separate entity from political government, coequal and self-governing. It must be remembered that Chamber leaders often spoke as though business enterprise formed a total culture, creating art, literature, a system of social welfare, spiritual values, and a common history and destiny. 36 In 1926, the national convention of the Chamber was dedicated to the idea of the independence and self-government of business. 37 Ex-President Barnes made the critical connections uniting the ideas

35 Ibid., 13-14. Resolution number three of the Chamber's national convention in 1920 declared that individual initiative, which was "the essence of civilization," was guaranteed by the American form of government and would be violated if government entered "any phase of business" which could be carried out by private enterprise. See "Laying a Course for Business," 36. Merle Thorpe, "The Flight of Reason," declared that if economic freedom fell, it would "carry with it political freedom." See also Barnes, "Government, Business and Good Sense," Nation's Business, XVI (June 5, 1928), 19; Merle Thorpe, "That Man Mussolini," Nation's Business, XV (December, 1927), 21-22.

36 See p. 4-5.

of business rights, business culture, and business self-government:

"Self-government is the ultimate aspiration of all free people. Won by effort, maintained by sacrifice, self-government must be justified by record and achievement."^38

This idea that businessmen were a separate people, something very much like a nation, with the right of self-determination, obviously violated the idea of an American nationalism including all groups in the United States. Even so, Chamber leaders did not go much beyond President Calvin Coolidge who, in an address before the New York Chamber of Commerce, said of government and business, that each "ought to be sovereign in its own sphere."^39

Businessmen, then, encouraged by government officials themselves, believed that they could only be free if they governed themselves independently of political government. On the other hand, they maintained that individualism was both "the soul of America" and the "essence of Civilization." How could self-government among such individualists be achieved without dissolving into anarchy? The Chamber of Commerce tried to solve this problem by the use of the sports or game metaphor, which, in turn, created a new image of business Americanism.

One aspect of the sports analogy, the stress on competition, strengthened the centrifugal effects of the Chamber's emphasis on individualism. At the same time, however, it was used in an attempt to nullify this disintegrating tendency by encouraging the losers

---
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to "be good sports" and be satisfied with their defeat. Answering the complaint that the strong brutalized the weak in football and business competition, Merle Thorpe argued first that laws protecting "inertia, ignorance and immobility" would discourage "the brilliant plays that give zest to sport and to business." In addition, Thorpe added, not only did the public want good, clean competition but also without the risks of competition "there would have been no Columbus, no Washington, no Lincoln--there would be no American Republic." Thorpe clinched his argument with the contention that "the American spirit of business is still expressed in the sportsman's creed: a fair field and no favors--and may the best man win."^40

A more potent device to make the sports metaphor a national integrating rather than a disintegrating factor in business Americanism was the emphasis on teamwork and the team spirit. That is, the nation was not only the scene of internal competition but also was itself like a baseball or football team working together for the common good. Thorpe believed that Americans began "as kids on a baseball lot" and had a "distinct flair for team work" which was "born and bred in our bones."^41 Since the American industrial team included both labor and business there really should not be any

^40Merle Thorpe, "For the Game's Ache," Nation's Business, XVII (December, 1929), 9. See also Thorpe, "Don't Fumble the Torch!" 9.

^41Merle Thorpe, "To Any Maverick or Throwback," Nation's Business, XV (October, 1927), 13. Retiring Chairman of the Chamber's Board, Edwin B. Parker, "Teamplay for Prosperity," Nation's Business, XVI (June 5, 1928), 71, pledged business "to团队play with every element of the community of which we are a part." See also Merle Thorpe, "The Sins of Bureaucracy," Nation's Business, XV (November, 1927), 13.
competition between the two because their interests were identical. The worker, explained Richard F. Grant, was a consumer, often an investor who hoped to become a businessman. He and his employer knew that "we prosper or we suffer together..." The Chamber's president for 1927-1928, Lewis E. Pierson, added that team play ought to be and often was a reality between business and labor because the employers knew that high wages were necessary for prosperity and the worker knew that his wages had to be tied to productivity.

Equally important to teamwork between business and labor was teamwork among businesses. According to Thorpe, individualistic competitors who did not realize the necessity of teamwork and the fact that competition was not between whole industries and communities and not between the various firms in one industry were "unwitting economic 'throwbacks,' freaks who have sloughed off generations of development and reverted to form." Even competition

42Richard F. Grant, "And Now For the Case for the Employee," Nation's Business, XIII (April, 1925), 44.

43Pierson, "Looking Ahead for Business," 13. See also Defrees, "Some Social Problems for Business," 30. Calvin Coolidge, a businessman's president, supported the view that the interests of business and labor were identical. See Jules Abels, In the Time of Silent Cal (New York, 1969), 42-43; Donald R. McCoy, Calvin Coolidge: The Quiet President (New York and London, 1967), 54-55, 155-56. This idea, along with an assumption that business should assume a paternalistic attitude toward labor, has been presented recently by historian Wakstein, "The National Association of Manufacturers and Labor Relations in the 1920's," 175. He argued in 1960 that if the N.A.M. had only worked harder it could have developed "a more meaningful industrial relations system" instead of failing "to provide adequately for workers' economic, psychological and political health."

44Thorpe, "To Any Maverick or Throwback," 13.
between industries was sometimes seen as disruptive to national teamwork. Lewis E. Pierson, declaring the theme of the 1928 convention of the Chamber of Commerce to be "cooperation," stated that "we definitely abandoned the outworn notions of unrestrained competition...." President Butterworth, described by his interviewer as a battler for "patriotic teamwork," declared that business had to play as a team to avoid government regulation.

Chamber protests against governmental involvement in economic affairs were completely dissolved by the teamwork metaphor. Government, like labor, was to join the American industrial team, realizing that it was not an entity within itself with interests separate from those of business. Julius H. Barnes believed that the Chamber of Commerce building in Washington, D.C., was "a symbol of effective cooperative teamplay between business and Government." In part, Barnes and other Chamber leaders conceived the governmental role on the national team to be giving up any restraints on business such as taxation or regulation. If congress would make the tax cuts recommended by Secretary of Treasury Andrew Mellon, that, Barnes maintained, would be "intelligent team play, indeed." More important,

46 E. C. Hill, "Butterworth—Crusader for Cooperation," Nation's Business, XVI (July, 1928), 36-37, 38. Merle Thorpe, "Through the Editor's Spectacles," Nation's Business, XIII (October, 1925), 6, defined one of the purposes of the Chamber to be "teamwork in business."
47 Barnes, "One Lesson Learned from Europe," 15.
48 Barnes, "Team Play for Prosperity," 14. See also "A Business Call on Mr. Coolidge," 46.
however, the government, despite Chamber protests against "paternalism" toward non-business groups like farmers, was to contribute to the national team effort by positive governmental assistance to business. The Chamber repeatedly called for an end to governmental operation of the merchant fleet created with tax dollars during the World War; it proposed turning these ships over to private operators and then paying these operators various types of subsidies so that they might compete successfully with the merchant marines of other nations. 49 Heavy governmental expenditures on highways and harbors and subsidies at all levels of government for the development of private commercial aviation were called for in order to aid the growth of commerce. 50 Government subsidies were to be given for


50 "Log of Organized Business," 69. Other things the Chamber wanted the government to do for business included aid in getting paper supplies from Canada for the publishing business, collecting data for business marketing purposes, and establishment of good communications with foreign countries for commercial use. See "Laying a Course for Business," 38; "Business Declares Its Principles," 50. Evidence of business success in getting governmental aid was the fact that Nation's Business carried a monthly section entitled "Government Aids to Business," usually three to six pages long listing the various new services to business performed by government. For example see "Government Aids to Business, Nation's Business, XII (May, 1924), 112-14; 116-18; XIV (January, 1926), 76, 78, 90.
physical education in the schools, not simply so that the children might enjoy good health and a long life as things in themselves but because national "health is the basis of national efficiency" and the "nation needs to conserve life for the development of its enterprises." Even governmental regulation of business was wanted when it would help most businessmen. In 1927, the national convention of the Chamber of Commerce declared that insurance was a "proper subject of state legislation and regulation."

Chamber emphasis on national teamwork and governmental aid to business obviously contradicted the idea that individualism was the "heart and soul of America" as well as the "essence of civilization." Despite Herbert Hoover's reassurance that business could "cooperate yet compete," this contradiction occasionally bothered men like Merle Thorpe who preached both doctrines simultaneously. One way Chamber leaders answered this question was to simply extend


53Herbert Hoover, "We Can Cooperate and Yet Compete," Nation's Business, (June 5, 1926), 11-14.

54Although, on the whole, articles in Nation's Business reflected the views of Thorpe and other Chamber leaders, it often asked men with differing views to contribute, and they sometimes commented on these contradictions. This was sometimes effective in raising doubts in Thorp's mind. For example, Samuel O. Donn, editor of Railway Age, "The 'Practical' Socialist," Nation's Business, XVI (November, 1928), 15-17, 178, 180, maintained that businessmen were the cause of the growth of government and taxation through their "clamor" for government contacts and regulation of businesses other than their own.
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the national game metaphor one more step. Who could better advise those who saw the nation as a team than a great football coach? In 1928, Knute Rockne was interviewed by Nation's Business editorial staff member Chester Leasure. Rockne maintained that organization and teamwork in football, rather than crushing individualism, fused "eleven individuals into a group individualism—if you will stand for the paradox—a co-ordinated initiative." The editorial blurb which preceded the article agreed with Rockne that this principle applied to the wider scale of business and the nation.55

If American individualism consisted of group or team individualism, then, as many Chamber leaders knew all along, the captain of the team was of the greatest importance. Before Rockne had given his interview Thorpe believed that businessmen were better diplomats than politicians and if allowed to take over the nation's foreign relations "would succeed where the diplomacy of statesmen found itself utterly blocked."56 More to the point, Chamber President Lewis E. Pierson maintained in 1928 that business management represented all segments of the nation—capital, which provides the equipment of production, labor, which depends on the wisdom of management for jobs, and the public, which "must rely upon industrial leadership for the maintenance of national prosperity."


56 Thorpe, "Business Rallies to Action," 47.
Unfortunately, Pierson lamented, the public, unlike the business executive, did not realize the necessity of intelligent cooperation and teamplay.\(^57\)

If business management was the captain of the national team which was necessary to insure the national mission of material wealth and an ever increasing standard of living, then individualism was necessarily meant for the captain of the team, not the team members whose duty was simply to cooperate with the leaders. Strangely enough one of the things one editorial in *Nation's Business* accused the Bolshevists of was individualism. It was explained that an army of 600 French army officers routed the Red Army before Warsaw because the French officers were "experts" who "were schooled and experienced in fighting," whereas the Reds elected their officers and were "individualistic." A similar fate was predicted for Russian industry because of the loss of upper management.\(^58\)

The Chamber of Commerce, then, saw Americanism as fair play and, perhaps even more significantly as team play with business

\(^57\)Pierson, "Looking Ahead for Business," 14. See also Grant, "The Case for Business," 20; Hill, "Butterworth—Crusader for Cooperation," 37. In his "The Case for Management," 46, Grant, after identifying business management as the men who were responsible for the "great achievement of our country," maintained that any "system which would give the reward of leadership to other than those who by demonstrated ability and work earn it and are entitled to it would be destructive of the principles upon which our development and greatness are founded."

management acting as the captain of the team. As captain of the national team, Chamber leaders believed business should take a leading role not only in America's internal mission of universal prosperity but also in its relations with other national teams. Merle Thorpe believed that business had "its diplomacy no less than government." This business diplomacy was "able to rise above the dollar; to put above mere money-making the best interests of the country."\(^5^9\) Harry A. Wheeler declared as false the belief that "statesmen would have a wider knowledge and clearer conception of workable measures [in international policy] than the man of business."\(^6^0\)

As the attitudes of Barnes and Thorpe show, the Chamber of Commerce did not fit the traditional mold of isolationism which many historians have drawn for the 1920's.\(^6^1\) As a matter of fact, the


\(^6^0\)Wheeler, "Don't Desert the Lawmaker!" 15.

Chamber showed itself to be very much aware of the fact that America
could not ignore the rest of the world. At its 1921 convention, the
Chamber declared that the American declaration of policy on the
"establishment and maintenance of world peace, and of order and under­
standing in the commercial intercourse of nations, is of greater
importance than any other problem now confronting our country and
the world." The Chamber repeatedly called for American adherence
to the International Court of Justice. In its belief that the
United States could not ignore the rest of the world, the Chamber
occasionally saw America's role in military terms. More often,
however, the Chamber, unlike the Legion, opposed any great reliance
on military power in its world role because it opposed expensive
military armaments and because it feared war would disrupt trade.

The interest in international cooperation expressed by the
Chamber was based on the idea that America's future was bound up
with that of the other nations of the world. Nation's Business
declared in 1925 that in "our world each nation is inextricably a
part of the whole and no nation can prosper long if it attempts to


63 "Resolutions of the Convention," Nation's Business, X
(June 5, 1922), 33; "Resolutions of the Convention," Nation's
Business, XI (June 5, 1923), 42; "Resolutions of the Meeting," 269-
271; "A Business Call on Mr. Coolidge," 46.

64 "Laying A Course for Business," 36, 38; "Resolutions of
the Convention," Nation's Business, X (June 5, 1922), 34; "Guide­
posts of Business," 74; Business Goes on Record," Nation's Busi­
ness, XVII (May 25, 1929), 31.
prosper alone." This sentiment was repeated by various Chamber leaders from time to time.66

The greatest international obstacle to world prosperity, Chamber leaders believed, was in the slow recovery of Europe from the effects of the Great War. It was in America's interest to do everything possible to speed European recovery. One way to do this would be for Americans to help European nations with their war debts to the United States, releasing capital for recovery of Europe. Outright cancellation of the war debts might be in the interest of the United States as well as Europe, Barnes believed. This, however, would never be accepted by the American people, because they knew that the European nations were engaging in economic measures which were themselves retarding European recovery. More to the point, Europeans, through such measures as government ownership of railroads or government old age or unemployment insurance systems, were violating the idea of economic individualism which Chamber leaders identified not only with "Americanism" but also as the "essence of civilization." European nations also had to realize that a basic tenet of Americanism was the sanctity of contracts. Europe, by paying these debts in full, would actually receive valuable moral experience in the American philosophy which, in turn, would lead to


66See, for example, John W. O'Leary, "'Forward March' to Business," *Nation's Business*, XIV (June 5, 1926), 15; Merle Thorpe, "As the Business World Wags," *Nation's Business*, XVI (August, 1928), 12.
recovery. The most the United States could do was to reduce or eliminate the interest on the debt. The principal, in any case, had to be paid in full. 67

Although America could only help in problems like international debts by devising long, easy-payment terms, she did have a more important role to play overall in the recovery of economic health by Europe and in the economic growth of the world. Although the industrial and political philosophy which would lead to universal prosperity was peculiarly American, it contained universal truths which could be applied by all men. America, then, could best accomplish her world mission by teaching, primarily through example and exhortation, this philosophy, first to the nations of Europe and then to the rest of the world. Barnes believed that "America's open record" of economic achievement was its "great contribution to human progress" because the other peoples of the world could see how to follow America into greater individual production. 68 Thorpe specified industrial "teamwork" as the lesson to be learned by the Europeans. 69 Both Barnes and Thorpe believed America was an effective teacher and that Europeans were learning the lesson. Barnes stated in 1924 that Europeans were beginning to accept the American


69Thorpe, "To Any Maverick or Throwback," 13.
lesson of teamplay between business and government that would lead to European economic recovery. By 1927, Merle Thorpe felt confident in stating that Europeans, under the tutelage of American example, were beginning to "Americanize" their industry.  

In part, American desire for European recovery was prompted by the idea that only with a large European market for American goods could American prosperity be assured. This, in turn, led to the idea that the American world mission was to assume a dominating role in the world through an endlessly expanding economy based on world trade. According to Harry A. Wheeler, one purpose of government-business cooperation was to meet "world competition and the trade conflicts sure to accrue in the struggle for commercial supremacy." This could be accomplished through the creation of a flexible tariff policy. Although Barnes deplored the creation of tariffs for bargaining purposes by European countries, most Chamber leaders were against rigidly high American tariffs as a danger to world trade. They believed the tariff, if flexible, could be used

---


71 Sometimes Russian Bolshevik expansion was deplored because it cut off whole areas of the world from American economic expansion. See Vernon Kellog, "The Peril of Poland," Nation's Business, IX (January, 1920), 36; William C. Redfield, "Lenine and Your Table Linen," Nation's Business, VIII (June, 1920), 34.

72 Wheeler, "Don't Desert the Lawmaker!" 15. The Chamber also saw America's role in the expansion of the world's economy as one involving the creation of new opportunities for the investment of American capital abroad. See, "Our Business and World Affairs," 21.
to bargain for an end to foreign discrimination against American goods, to protect the American market from "dumping" by foreign nations, and to equalize the effects of differences in wage levels among the nations of the world. The ship subsidy was sometimes justified by the Chamber as a preparedness measure, but it was primarily seen as a necessity for the great commercial expansion envisioned by the Chamber. The Chamber's Marine Conference pointed out in 1926 that the value of American cargoes increased with the percentage of those cargoes carried in American ships between 1914 and 1925.

If the Chamber's conception of America's world mission included competition with the other nations for an ever growing world market, President Barnes included the idea of America as the captain of a world team of nations combined for the purpose of insuring commercial growth, partly by ending competition between nations, or, at least, eliminating competition between America and other nations. Barnes told the 1925 meeting of the International Chamber of Commerce that European debtor nations should not concentrate on goods for


immediate consumption but should try to expand their means of production. For example, Germany should not flood the American market with cotton goods undermining "American factories and American workmen...." Instead, she should concentrate on expanding her textile industry so as to be able to process cotton goods all the way from raw cotton to the finished product.75

In summary, the Chamber of Commerce identified Americanism with what it considered to be the economic status quo. Sometimes the Chamber identified Americanism with economic individualism and competition to the point of demanding a dual sovereignty between business government and political government. This intense individualism was controlled by the idea that the nation was a team made up of business, labor and government. Individualism really meant group individualism, or at least individualism of the captain of the team. Business management was often seen as the captain of the team representing the interests of government and labor as well as those of capital. Domestically the game the team played was the creation of universal prosperity. In the international arena the American team served as an instructor to other nations in the American lessons of individualism and teamwork. In addition the American team was competing with other national teams for dominance in an ever-growing world commerce. At the same time, the individualism of the various national teams was submerged, at least for Barnes, through the creation of a world team captained by America

which was to provide prosperity for all. Many Chamber leaders identified the nation's interests and the nation itself with business management.

Although the Chamber of Commerce identified business interests with the national interests and saw the businessman as the leader of the national team, it did not make many concrete proposals to guarantee business leadership of the national team. Charles Norman Fay, a retired business executive, did. Fay began his business career with the First National Bank of Marquette, Michigan, in 1869. He became, at one time or another, manager of the Bell Telephone Company, and president of the following companies: the Chicago Gas Trust Company, the Chicago Arc Light and Power Company, the Remington Sholes Typewriter Company, and the Indiana Natural Gas and Oil Company. Meantime, he had been vice-president for Illinois of the National Association of Manufacturers and a member of the committee on western litigation of the Anti-Boycott Association. During the 1920's he was a member of the Boston Chamber of Commerce and for a short period (1922-1923) industrial editor of the New York Commercial. During the decade he produced five books and a pamphlet pertaining to his ideas on organized labor, government, and business and his plans for a reconstruction of American government and society.76

Fay called himself a strong defender of the status quo against what he believed to be a radical attack by organized labor, progressives, liberals, socialists, and Bolsheviks, all of whom, in his view, stood for essentially the same things. However, his views amounted to a radical attack upon many fundamental American institutions and attitudes.77

Like Chamber of Commerce leaders, Fay professed to believe in an American philosophy of individualism. To Fay this meant, in part, that it was wrong for labor to organize on a national basis and engage in a "criminal attempt" to "hold up" the nation for higher wages. He maintained that any effort of organized labor to influence the politics of the nation was un-American because it put the welfare of one class over the national welfare. For these reasons Fay argued that the only patriotic thing to do was to outlaw what he called the "wholesale" or "national" organization of labor.78

77 Charles Norman Fay, Social Justice: The Moral of the Henry Ford Fortune (Cambridge, Mass., 1926), viii-xiv, 183, 262; Charles Norman Fay, Too Much Government, Too Much Taxation (New York, 1923), viii, xi-xii, 1, 5, 7-8, 10, 19, 23, 36-37, 39-40, 50, 92-94; Fay, Business in Politics, 29, 32. The full extent to which Fay was willing to go in attacking established beliefs in order to defend the position of the wealthy was shown in his attack on the teachings of Jesus Christ in Business in Politics, 110-11. In Social Justice, 245-51, he softened this attack by trying to reconcile Christ's teachings with his own philosophy.

Although Fay believed labor should not be allowed to organize on a national scale, he thought that anti-monopoly laws directed against business corporations were both unnecessary and un-American. In the first place, the laws of nature governing human affairs made it impossible for a true business monopoly to be formed. Moreover, it was impossible for a business corporation to become large unless it performed a great social service, and any effort to break up the corporation would end this service. It was not "putting class above country" for business organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce to enter politics because they were the nation's natural leaders. The real interests of labor, business, and the nation were identical. Labor leaders were mere hucksters taking the laborer for his union dues.79

One of the reasons Fay objected to government regulations of business was the inefficiency and ineffectiveness of government. In part, he believed this was because the universal laws of nature dictated a limit to the growth of the number and kind of things any organization could do. The government had enough to do with its primary duties of protecting life and property from criminal activity within the nation and from other nations without.

79Fay, Too Much Government, xii, xiii, 23-28, 76-77, 258-63; Fay, Social Justice, 54, 212-13; Fay, Business in Politics, 12, 20-21, 23-26, 29-46, 64, 103-08, 116-18, 136-38, 157-58, 164, 168-69, 171-72; Fay, Where Do the Union Men Get Off? 5-16, 21, 23-24, 31. Fay maintained that unions did not raise wages for the worker because there was a "natural balance between work and wages, service and reward" that unions were powerless to change. See Social Justice, vii.
Another reason for the ineffectiveness of government was the mediocrity and corruption of governmental officials. 80

The corruption of politics meant that despite its limitations, government would do more and more things more and more ineffectively, raising taxes higher and higher. American politics were based on political machines. In order to satisfy the desires of a multitude of political workers, these machines tried to multiply the number of minor political posts by creating more governmental functions and laying on new taxes. This prevented the voter from being able to make wise decisions about whom to vote for, a difficult task in any case, because of the multitude of elections of minor officials. The public was further prevented from realizing the destructiveness of this large scale, high tax form of government by a system of indirect, hidden taxes. The small taxpayer did not realize that he was being taxed at all for governmental services. Corrupt politicians provided still more jobs and money for their machines by extorting bribes from businessmen with the threat of regulation or the promise of government contracts. 81

Why was all of this possible under the American system of government? Fay believed that the root of the problem was what he called the old Puritan, New England town-meeting theory of government. The Founding Fathers were suspicious of governmental power


81 Fay, Business in Politics, 1-8, 14-19, 51-54; Fay, Too Much Government, 238.
and, unlike the modern corporation executive, were inexperienced in the conduct of large-scale affairs. The Founding Fathers believed that the powers of government should be dispersed as widely as possible. The power of one agency of government should, they thought, be checked and balanced by the power of another agency of government. This theory of government made possible the corruption of American politics by creating a bewildering multitude of levels and agencies of government as well as obscuring lines of responsibility within the government. Not bold enough to carry this critique of American political ideas and institutions to the national level and reject the Federal Constitution, Fay lamely concluded that, although the American system on the national level produced high taxes, corruption, and a multiplication of governmental functions, it at least limited the evil done by the openness of the confusing and inefficient debate in Congress. On the state and local levels, however, Fay applied his critique fully.82

With what would Fay replace the American political theory which produced inefficient, costly, and disruptive government? He answered this question by pointing out the efficiency of the business corporation. It had a board of directors elected by the stockholders who had a reputation for integrity and good business sense. They, in turn, met a few hours once a month and laid out broad guidelines of corporate policy. They selected a capable, efficient president to run the corporation within the guidelines set. He


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
was paid a high salary and given a free hand to do this. Fay con-
tended that this was the model government should set for itself. All
units of government should be eliminated except the national govern-
ment, state governments and local units twenty-five to thirty miles
in diameter. The people should only elect nine to fifteen members
of a "board of directors" for the local and state governments. This
board of directors then would lay down a broad outline of activity,
appoint a chief executive with a high salary, and give him a free
hand.83

Although this scheme might make state and local government
more efficient, Fay realized that it would not necessarily mean a
government controlled by the business elite. Therefore, integral
to his proposal for an overhaul of the American system of govern-
ment was a scheme for the election of these government boards of
directors. Each candidate for office would through a public
announcement in the newspapers at his own expense have to declare
his intention to run for office. The candidate would bear all his
campaign expenses himself, pay to have his name put on the ballot,
and support himself while in office. All candidates would be
elected "at large" to insure that a man, such as a wealthy business
executive well-known throughout the county or state, could be
elected.84

As a concession to those who had become prominent in a field

83 Fay, Business in Politics, 9-16, 55-61; Fay, Too Much
Government, 210-12, 221-22, 282-83.

84 Fay, Too Much Government, 283-85; Fay, Business in Politic,
62-68.
other than business, Fay, in his utopia, would allow organizations such as labor unions or medical associations or political parties to nominate a man and pay his expenses. However, they would not be allowed to nominate more than one candidate for the nine to fifteen offices to be filled because that one segment of society might come to dominate the government. This, of course, would eliminate the American political party system. Fay believed that there was nothing unfair about the scheme because he would prevent more than one businessman in one line of business from running. For example, one railroad executive, one steel executive, one meat packing executive, and one telephone company executive could run, but two railroad executives could not. The rich, per se, were not a class, not an interest group. They were simply those who had demonstrated that they deserved to rule. Since the interests of the laborer who worked in a factory and those of the businessman who owned it were identical, the steel executive did not represent the wealthy. He represented all those working or profiting in the steel business.85

According to Fay this scheme of government would not only be simpler than the "old Puritan" scheme, but also it would be less expensive. The businessmen-rulers would realize that governmental expense was pure overhead to be reduced to a minimum. They would

85 Fay, Too Much Government, 283-93, 298-99. In Business in Politics, 74-75, Fay maintained that there should not be more than one member of one racial group on this government legislature-board of directors. Presumably, just as the businessman did not represent a class but the whole people, the Anglo-Saxons did not represent one race but the whole people and could be represented by more than one member.
eliminate all taxes except a national sales tax which would be collected by the business-controlled local governments and apportioned among the three levels of government according to their needs. This would teach the voter the cost of government and make him desirous of the least amount of government possible. The corporate form of government would also be efficient because the business statesmen would be scrupulously honest, despite Fay's acknowledgment that the most successful businessmen gave bribes to politicians under the actual American political system. This would be so because they were already wealthy and needed no more money and because they were men of integrity and could not afford to have their honor besmirched.86

Although Fay maintained that he was a believer in American democracy, his radical plan for preserving what he believed to be the status quo showed his belief that the people had the right to elect only the right men, that is, the rich. The rich were the most capable, and no one wanted to be ruled by anyone no more capable than himself, except, presumably, the rich themselves. Although Fay condemned what he termed "too much government," he did not object to the government's having a great deal of power. It should be able to outlaw national labor unions, restrict the sale of alcohol to neighborhood clubs (which themselves would be restricted from political activity), create and maintain the Federal Reserve System, and maintain a national system of voter registration which

which would, among other things, keep a file card on all citizens for any number of purposes. 87

Insofar as their thinking was accurately represented in that of Fay and the leaders of the Chamber of Commerce, businessmen really wanted to be subject only to a government in which they held all the power. This explains the contradictory desires for individualism, business government independent of political government, and a strong government creating highways, improved harbors, a strong merchant marine, a commercial aviation system, and international trade agreements. This desire was expressed indirectly by the Chamber through the sports or game theory of Americanism and more directly by Fay in his elaborate corporate schemes to eliminate, in the name of Americanism and democracy, all but the wealthy from power in government.

This desire for a purely businessman's government indicated a Hamiltonian and early nineteenth-century stake-in-society concept limiting the nation to the wealthy. The wealthy were not just the best Americans, they were the nation, representing in themselves all legitimate interests of the nation. In challenging the dominance of businessmen in society and the government, liberals, progressives, labor leaders and socialists were being un-patriotic and un-American. 88 Insofar as they did not accept effective


88 Fay, Social Justice, 144, 146-47, maintained that "to be a good union man" was to be "a bad citizen." Morrell Heald, in
participation by any groups other than business groups in theory as well as practice, Chamber leaders were both reactionary and radical. Insofar as the Coolidge administration was almost purely a businessman's government, they were merely conservative.

As has been shown, both the American Legion and the Chamber of Commerce saw the nation as a highly integrated team competing, either violently or through trade, with other national teams. Both, although not entirely for the same reasons, believed that the national team should be integrated by adherence to the status

contradiction to Prothro, who in Dollar Decade saw the businessman as a reactionary elitist, hostile to government, maintains that businessmen in the 1920's and 1930's were becoming aware of their social responsibilities. The thought of E. A. Filene, Heald's example of progressive business thought, as represented by Heald, however, was not strikingly different from that of most Chamber leaders or of Fay. In "Business Thought in the Twenties," 137, Heald quotes Filene as believing that businessmen could eliminate poverty "by advancing their own self-interest." In "Management's Responsibility to Society: the Growth of an Idea," Business History Review, XXXI (Winter, 1957), 381-82, Heald maintained that Filene's idea of corporate business service through low prices resulting from mass production represented a progressive business attitude. However, there is no difference between this idea and those of Fay, Thorpe, and Barnes which were used to justify the open shop, business dominated government, etc. Another version of Heald's arguments, presented in an early form in Richard Hofstadter's review of Prothro's Dollar Decade, Political Science Quarterly, LXXI (March, 1956), 130-31, is the assertion that business thought was elitist and irresponsible in the twenties but had been transformed by business experience in the thirties. Francis X. Sutton, et. al., however, in The American Business Creed (Cambridge, Mass., 1956), the most thorough analysis of business thought since the twenties, found no substantial change in business thought as presented by Prothro and argued, 385-91, that the business creed has been very stable. These various arguments are summarized with appropriate bibliographical references in Thomas B. DiBacco, "The Political Ideas of American Business: Recent Interpretations," Review of Politics, XXX (January, 1968), 51-58. Political Science Quarterly LXXI (March, 1956), 130-31.
quo. Although this led them to believe that radicals were the antithesis of Americanism, neither organization concentrated exclusively on anti-radicalism in their presentation of Americanism. However, others who claimed to be one hundred per cent Americans did. An examination of their thought should give a more complete picture of the meaning of Americanism, at least in the minds of those who claimed to be the most patriotic.
CHAPTER VIII

The Anti-Radical and Americanism

It has been commonplace to note that there was a widespread and intensive anti-radical movement in the nineteen-twenties which was closely connected with the movement for one-hundred per cent Americanism. The anti-radical movement was most visible and received the most public support before the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924, and particularly during the "Red Scare" of 1919-1920, but it received some official support and popular acclaim throughout the twenties. Although anti-radical thought was widespread in the twenties, some organizations and individuals stood out in their vigilance against the radical menace. Among them were individuals like real estate man Ole Hanson, who, as mayor of

1See, for example, Sidney Howard, "Our Professional Patriots," New Republic, XL (September 3, 1924), 12-15: Norman Hapgood, Professional Patriots: An Exposure of the Personalities, Methods and Objectives Involved in the Organized Effort to Exploit Patriotic Impulses in these United States During and After the Late War (New York, 1927), 13; George Smith May, "Ultra Conservative Thought in the United States in the 1920's and 1930's" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1954), 50.

Seattle, became an early hero of the anit-radicals because of his stand against strikers in 1919. Lucia R. Maxwell, librarian of the Army's Chemical Warfare Service, Chairman of the Americanism Committee of the League of American Penwomen, and member of the Advisory Council of the Key Men of America, produced a "Spider Web Chart," purporting to show radical infiltration of women's organizations. Institutional leadership for the movement was provided by the American Defense Society (A.D.S.), originally a World War preparedness organization, and the National Civic Federation (N.C.F.), which began as an organization for the settlement of disputes between management and labor. Led by Ralph M. Easley, the National Civic Federation received support in the 1920's from a broad range of Americans such as the distinguished Catholic scholar and editor, Conde Benoist Pallen, 1904 Democratic Presidential candidate Alton B. Parker, and labor leaders Mathew Wohl and Samuel Gompers.  


In general, the anti-radical version of Americanism followed very closely that of the American Legion and the Chamber of Commerce. America was the greatest nation in all human history. It stood for law and order, freedom, democracy and progress. Freedom, however, did not always mean the guarantees of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution as they appeared on the surface. More central to the meaning of freedom and the American way was individualism, which was equated with "capitalism." Capitalism meant continuous material

---

Patriots, 14-36; May, "Ultra Conservative Thought in the United States in the 1920's and 1930's," 59-101; and the various articles in Sidney Howard's series in the New Republic in 1924, "Our Professional Patriots." See the New Republic, XXXIX (August 20, 1924), 346-52; XL (September 17), 71-77; XL (September 24), 93-95; XL (October 1), 119-23; XL (October 8), 143-45; and (October 15), 171-73.

Ole Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 13, for example, believed that America had the "best government yet conceived by man." The American Defense Society, Miscellaneous Publications Relating to Socialism in the United States (Washington, 1923-7) "September 7, 1923," 1, maintained that America had the greatest institutions in the world and that these had produced the greatest material progress.

Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 13, believed that America stood for "onward and upward" and, 284, that America equaled "God and Good." Member of the Board of Trustees of the American Defense Society, William T. Hornaday, The Lying Lure of Bolshevism (New York, 1919), 23, warned that the "fatal fetish-worship" of the "free-speech idol" could result in Bolshevik inspired civil war in America. Bonnie Busch and Lucia Ramsey Maxwell, The Red Fog, (2nd ed., Washington, 1929), 76, believed that it was a great departure for Bertram Russell to be "allowed to travel through our country" advocating "moral degeneracy, a change of system in our government - pointing out the way to build the so-called 'New Civilization.'"

United States Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer, "The Case Against the Reds," Forum, LXIII (February, 1920), 75, believed that America stood for "personal liberty and free speech" but also maintained, 74, that the government could make "no fine distinctions between the theoretical ideas of the radicals and their actual violations of our national laws" in its effort to "prevent crime." See also, Edwin Marshall Hadley, Sinister Shadows (Chicago, 1929), vii.
progress, economic justice, and eventually utopia on earth. All good patriotic Americans should stand together, follow their natural leaders, and not divide along "class" lines. The anti-radicals were against "traitorous" internationalism but were not isolationists. America was a beacon to all the nations of the world. She was destined to endless international economic expansion and needed to beware of internationalists who would disarm America and prepare the way for either a Bolshevik takeover in America or the seizures of foreign markets by the Bolsheviks or both.

---

7 Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 205, believed that capitalism was the "best and most scientific method yet devised or tried for human happiness," and that, 203, "men taken as a whole earn what they get regardless of their position in life." Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the American Defense Society, Elton Huntington Hooker, An Address (New York, 1920), 7, believed that businessmen would have more influence in politics, and that the "way to happiness in this country lies on the road to higher production." Samuel Crowther, "On the Trail of the Reds," World's Work, XXXIX (February, 1920), 344, stated, "I firmly believe that in the capitalistic system the greatest good for the greatest number will eventually be attained." See also Hornaday, The Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 21-24; Busch and Maxwell, The Red Fog, 3, 40-41, 59, 62, 79; Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 354-55; American Defense Society, American Defense Society, A Brief Report of Some of its Activities During the Year 1919 (n.p., n.d.), 5; William B. Shearer, Pacificso: A Novel Based on Truth, Fiction and Possibilities (New York, 1926), 224-25.

8 According to Hornaday, The Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 25, the "real American worker" knew that "Capital is just as necessary to Labor as Labor is to Capital...." See also: Busch and Maxwell, Red Fog, 62; Hooker, An Address, 7; Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 203, 282; "A cure for American Bolshevism," World's Work, XXXIX (December, 1919), 116.

9 Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 109, maintained that internationalism was a conspiracy to "disarm the world and abolish all authority and all means of self-defense in order to bring about a successful revolution." Americanization leader Frances A. Kellor, The Inside of Bolshevism (New York, 1920), n.p., who showed exceptional sensitivity to business needs for plentiful immigrant labor, saw a more complicated Bolshevik plot. She maintained that the Bolsheviks
Like other conservative, one-hundred per cent Americans, the 
anti-radicals emphasized the contrast between the virile, sports-
manlike nature of the American and the corrupt nature of the un-
American radical. The contrast, however, was developed to a much 
greater degree than by the Chamber of Commerce and even to a greater 
degree than by the vigorously anti-radical Legion. In describing 
the contrast between the American and the radical, the anti-radicals 
enriched the meaning of conservative Americanism and made the appeal 
of its glorification of war and capitalism clearer.

Often the anti-radicals described the radical as being 
effeminate, flabby, weak, foolishly idealistic, and overly 
intellectual. Conde B. Pallen, Chairman of the Department on 
Revolutionary Movements of the National Civic Federation, in 
replying to college president Albert E. Kirk's praise of what 
Pallen considered to be the radical Youth and Peace Movements, 
maintained that "we must guard ourselves against the follies of 

wanted to raise the costs of American goods and thus make America 
lose markets abroad and thus "imperil the rule of American capital." 
Hornaday, The Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 21, pointed out that "The 
Marx-Lenin socialist has no country, and knows no such sentiment 
as patriotism. He is an 'internationalist.'" Naval Commander 
Truxton Rogers, the hero of militarist anti-pacifist William B. 
Shearer's novel, Pacifico, 89, complained that Congress could not 
"see that sea power is a necessary ally of our capitalists and 
merchants who may wish to have their money work for them outside 
the boundaries of our own country." In The Cloak of Benedict 
Arnold (Washington, 1928), 28, Shearer maintained that "Foreign 
powers, including their champions in this country, may just as well 
accept the inevitable, that the United States will remain on the 
seas regardless, and demand its share of world's trade, its ex-
ports, and mail subsidy." See also, ADS, Miscellaneous Publi-
cations, "For Immediate Release, Washington, July 25," 1; "Release 
for Sunday, July 25," 1-2, "Frederick J. Libby," 1, 3: Hooker, 
An Address, 2-3.
irresponsible dreamers and the pitfalls of reckless visionaries."

Radicals described in this manner, however, were usually the "yellow" pacifistic and "pink" socialistic "dupes" of the "red" communist "adepts." The anti-radical description of radicals in general and of the "red, adepts" in particular usually emphasized their national, racial, and physical characteristics.

Although the "dupes" were sometimes misguided "intellectuals," they were just as often pictured as ignorant and dim-witted Eastern European immigrants or Negroes. The "adepts" were more often Jews. Chicago businessman and writer Edwin Marshall Hadley published a novel, Sinister Shadows, in 1929 warning against the radical menace in the nation's colleges. The villain of the novel, Benedict Covet, alias Izzy Zug, was an immigrant Russian Jew; the hero, William Conover, was a "Nordic" businessman. Zoologist and ADS activist William T. Hornaday felt it necessary to warn American Blacks of a Bolshevik plot to win their support, and he advised them not to "touch Bolshevism with anything shorter than a ten-foot pole. If you do, you will see a tremendous revival of the old

---

10 Ralph Montgomery Easley, The Youth Movement, Do We Want It here? (complete ed., New York, 1923), 25. The ADS, Miscellaneous Publications, "Washington, D.C., September 7, 1923," warned against "vain theorizing, flirting, and coqueting with the very propaganda that would foredoom the nation." Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, vii, maintained that he was "nauseated by the sickly sentimentality of those who would conciliate, pander and encourage all who would destroy our government...." See also Busch and Maxwell, Red Fog, 3, 45, 50; Hornaday, Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 19, 26-27.
Ku Klux Klan; and you will get the worst of it.\textsuperscript{11}

The characteristics of the races and radicals which disturbed the anti-radicals were shown by the various other ways in which the anti-radicals described the radicals. Often the radical was pictured as an uninhibited savage or a primitive cave man. Hadley compared the laughter of the radicals at a joke by "Number One," the arch-Bolshevik conspirator, with that of Neanderthal men. The leading female radical in his novel was described as "the throwback to the time of club and fang, the unregenerated barbarian who ran with the pack, hating the restraints that civilization had attempted to impose."\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11} Hadley, Sinister Shadows; Hornaday, Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 20. Conde Pallen in Easley, Youth Movement, 6, maintained that the radicals defended a victory of "Turkish over the White civilization...." "A Measure of Radicalism," Outlook, CVII (November 12, 1924), 392, maintained that the failure of the LaFollette movement in the election of 1924 proved that "practically all so-called radicalism in this country, is almost entirely alien and hyphenated." Crother, "On the Trail of the Reds," 345, maintained the radicals were "everywhere stirring up the Negroes." A more complete racism was found in Shearer, Pacifico, 25, 58, 91, 138, 167, 175, 268, 303, 307, 312. See also, Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 98; Busch and Maxwell, Red Fog, 34, 43-44, 72; Easley, Youth Movement, 27; ADS, Miscellaneous Publications, "Release for September 7, 1923," 3; "The Plot to Make Our Blacks Red," Literary Digest, LXXVII (November 21, 1925), 13-14; "Bolshevising the American Negro," Independent, CXV (December, 1925), 631; "To Turn the Negroes Into 'Reds!'" Literary Digest, XCIV (July 30, 1927), 13. See Filene, Americans and the Soviet Experiment, 46-47, 67-68; "Hadley, Edwin Marshall," Who Was Who in America, III (Chicago, 1960), 356; "Hornaday, William Temple," Who's Who in America, XIII (1924-1925), 16 26.

\textsuperscript{12} Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 65, 66, 82, 86, 335. Hornaday, Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 15, maintained that the aim of the Bolshevik was to bring "all mankind down to the simple level of cave men." Busch and Maxwell, Red Fog, 74, called the radicals the "modern savages, the modern Attilas of destruction...." Conde Pallen, in Easley, Youth Movement, 27, stated that all radicalism was "in reality trend toward the degradation of primitive savagery." See also, Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 283.
Another common device the anti-radicals used in describing the radicals was to compare them with animals in their brutishness and physicality. One of Hadley's villains, Professor Wise, had wolf eyes, while another, Professor Covet, threw off the veneer of civilization at radical meetings and "ran with the pack." Hornaday constantly compared the radicals with gorillas, chimpanzees and baboons, lustful, destructive and dangerous. Radical doctrines were to be likened to a serpent, according to Hadley, the ADS, and Busch and Maxwell. Going further down a hierarchy of offensive metaphors, Busch and Maxwell compared radicals to poisonous scorpions. Lenin was, according to Hadley, like a "huge, hairy spider, his web being spun, sitting in a dark corner with eyes gleaming with hate and intrigue...." Finally the level of radicalism and its promoters could only be described by comparing

13Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 305, 87. Hadley, 79, also compares Number One with a "panther" and, 200, the Bolsheviks in general with a bucking horse.

14Hornaday, Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 8, 9, 15, 21. Hornaday also compares the Bolshevik, 6, with a hound and, 15, "a wild boar." Ralph Easley in NCF Youth Movement, 55, adds "carrion crow" to the list of anti-radical epithets. See also Busch and Maxwell, Red Fog, 79.

15American Defense Society, A Brief Report of Some of Its Activities During the Year 1919, 6; Busch and Maxwell, Red Fog, 51, 73; Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 365.

16Bush and Maxwell, Red Fog, 79; Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 58. Hadley, 167, also described Marxism as a "maggot...eating its way into our schools with deliberate planning." Easley, Youth Movement, 20, compared the socialists to "mosquitoes" and the NCF to "The committee of Public Health Education out to exterminate the 'pests.'"
them with a disgusting, inert "fog," "slime" or "filth."\(^17\)

What was there about the radicals that convinced the anti-radicals they were so low? Often the anti-radicals charged that the radicals were vile because they advocated "overt acts of violence" or "Brute Force." Yet this does not fully explain the horror the anti-radicals felt for the radicals, since they also ridiculed them because they were not good in a fight or because they were pacifists. The anti-radicals glorified violence themselves, as we shall see.\(^18\) More to the point was the charge that the radicals were "robbers." In its Brief Report...1919, the ADS defined the Bolshevist doctrine as "'Get something for nothing, live without working, steal the product of other men's labor....'"\(^19\) Of even greater importance to some of the anti-radicals was what they considered to be a radical attack on normal sexual morality and

\(^{17}\)Busch and Maxwell, Red Fog, 8, 73, 74; Palmer, "The Case Against the Reds," 176. Radicalism was also compared to a deadly "virus," "disease," or "germ." See Busch and Maxwell, 69, Palmer, 185; Hooker, An Address, 5; Easley, Youth Movement, 3; "The Bolshevik Virus in China," Literary Digest, LXXXVIII (February 13, 1926), 17; "A Cure for Bolshevism," 116-17.

\(^{18}\)Hooker, An Address, 7; Hornaday, Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 4, 8-9; Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 34. See also Busch and Maxwell, Red Fog, 3, 7, 23, 44, 47, 63, 85; Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 213. Crowther, "On the Trail of the Reds," 341-43, maintained that the radicals were dangerous precisely because they were pacifists and tricked men like A. Mitchell Palmer into making them martyrs by attacking them physically instead of intellectually.

\(^{19}\)ADS, Brief Report...1919, 5. Hornaday, Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 4, called the Bolshevists a "Robber Horde." Palmer, "The Case Against the 'Reds,'" 182, labeled the radicals a "gang of thieves" and, 174, maintained that "Robbery, not war, was the ideal of communism." See also Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 39-40.
religion, and thus upon society and the government. Wealthy philanthropist and writer Bonnie Busch, along with Lucia Maxwell, maintained that the radicals wanted to banish "God from the skies and government from the earth" by teaching atheism and doubt in the schools. The ADS maintained that by denying that God created the world and man, the radical "academic master tells me I am a dog, or evolved from one...and then he prescribes for me a canine code of ethics to build my character and evolve me into a superman." 

The radical rejection of religion the anti-radicals believed, created immorality. This immorality was sometimes expressed in violence or robbery. More often the immorality the anti-radicals complained of was sexual. This, in turn, explained the primary meaning of the bestiality and filth of the radical as pictured by the anti-radical. Hadley's Professor Covet gives his mistress "the rough caresses of a mating wolf." According to Busch and Maxwell, marriage meant no more to men in Bolshevist Russia than going to the movies, and there was no stigma on an illegitimate child. They concluded: "IT IS DEGRADING!" Furthermore, the radicals meant to subvert America by sponsoring courses in "Socialism, Communism

---


21 ADS, Miscellaneous Publications, "Release for September 7, 1923," 2. See also, Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 293.

22 Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 341. According to Hadley, 39-40, the children of Russia under the Bolsheviks ran "in packs like animals," exhibiting "sensuality and bestiality..."
and Sexology" and through such propaganda as novels which "fairly reek with sex filth." At stake was not only the nation but also civilization itself, for "THE PERMANENCY OF THE HOME DEPENDS ON THE SACREDNESS OF MARRIAGE, AND THE PERMANENCY OF CIVILIZATION DEPENDS ON THE PERMANENCY OF THE HOME." Even more to the point, so far as the anti-radical concept of the nation is concerned, was Ole Hanson's belief that Bolsheviks stood for "free love and no country," whereas good Americans stood for "one wife and one country."24

23 Busch and Maxwell, Red Fog, 66, 86, 88. They, 79, revealed with horror that the radical Alexandra Kollontay had eight husbands - the last "many years her junior." Hornaday, Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 15, maintained that in "some parts of Russia today it also is 'help yourself' to your young neighbor's young wife and daughters, and CHANGE them once a month, if you like!" The leaders of the National Civic Federation, Easley, Youth Movement, 15-16, 32-33, 45, maintained that the fact that some of the leaders of the Youth Movement of Europe developed a "cult of nakedness" with "promiscuous mixing of the sexes," proved that it was a subversive, radical movement. Palmer, "The Case Against the 'Reds,'" 183, called the radicals "moral perverts" and compared, 174, radicalism to a "prairie-fire" which was "crawling into the sacred corners of American homes, seeking to replace marriage vows with libertine laws, burning up the foundations of society." Filene, Americans and the Soviet Experiment, 46, traces American myths of free love in Bolshevik Russia to a New York Times article of October, 1918, and maintained that they were still being repeated as late as 1922. As can be seen, they never ceased to be repeated by the anti-radicals in the 1920's.

24 Busch and Maxwell, Red Fog, 72; Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 283-84. Ralph Easley, quoted in Sidney Howard's "Our Professional Patriots: II. Patriotic Perils," New Republic, XL (September 3, 1924), 13, regarded the doctrines of economic determinism as "an abomination leading straight to atheism and the destruction of the family." National Security League President S. Stanwood Menken, quoted by Sidney Howard, "Our Professional Patriots, III Sweeping up the Crumbs," New Republic, XL (September 10, 1924), 39, maintained that people read what he considered to be the radical Nation and New Republic, "with the same perverted sense as those of another time peeked into obscene literature." See also, Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 367.
Although the radicals were often compared to primitive men or animals, the anti-radicals did not believe that the leading radical conspirators were unintelligent. Hadley described the villain Covet as brilliant and called Lenin a "master mind." The radicals were intelligent, but it had to be remembered that theirs was a diseased, insane intelligence. One of Hadley's speakers ranted "with veins of his forehead standing out like whipcords, with eyes flashing, with the light of insanity and with saliva dripping from purple lips...." Radical intellectuals of the past, like Rousseau, Weiskaupt, Marx, and Nietzsche, had "unbalanced brains." Sometimes the anti-radicals depicted the characteristics of this insane intelligence while warning the nation of its danger. In general, as the anti-radical described it, the unbalanced, radical mind was rationalistic, given to doubt, skepticism and questioning of all the assumptions of society. It was an impractical, theoretical mind, one which knows all about the egg but can't lay one.

---

25 Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 58. Anti-radical race theorist Lothrop Stoddard, "1917 – Red Russia Turns Pink – 1927," World's Work, IV (November, 1927), 17, maintained that the Communist Party in Russia was led by "masterminds." Busch and Maxwell, Red Fog, 54-55, maintained that the conspiracy of what they believed to be the "radical" League for Industrial Democracy was "so complete, so comprehensive, so broad that it seems that the devil himself could not have arranged a better one...."

26 Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 6-7, 61-62. See also ADS Miscellaneous Publications, "Frederick J. Libby," 3; Hornaday, Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 8; Palmer, "Case Against the 'Reds,'" 175; Easley, Youth Movement. 45.

caused the radical mind to become unhinged? Their minds were too large for small things and too small for large things. They were not satisfied to become common laborers or clerks, yet they didn't have the ability to start a great enterprise as Henry Ford had done. As a result, the radical hated "the game at which he lost on account of insufficient skill" and was driven insane by his envy of those "with a better equipment for supremacy." In his insane envy, the radical sought "to change the rules of the game" and achieve "a cheap victory."  

If the cause of the radical's insanity and of his radicalism was failure at the game of private enterprise competition, then a change in the radical's fortune would cure his insane questioning of the status quo. The plots of two or Hugh MacNair Kahler's anti-radical stories in the Saturday Evening Post were designed to demonstrate this point. In them, a radical who had lost in the capitalistic game of life suddenly achieved some small-scale success as an entrepreneur. He then became an anti-radical. In keeping

that Karl Marx, "the high priest of jealousy...had no talent or wish for useful industry. Apparently he never in his life made a thing, or did a service, that people wanted, or would pay for...." Stoddard, "1917 - Red Russia Turns Pink - 1927," however, believed that Lenin "combined the theoretical dogmatism of a fanatic with the cold insight of an arch-realist."

28Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 168. Radical turned anti-radical Charles T. Kelly, "Are Radicals Insane?" Current History, XX (May, 1924), 205-10, maintained that the radicals had three-quarters ripened brains as opposed to the completely ripened brains of truly great men.

29Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 181, 199.
with this, the radicalism of college professors was explained by their low pay.30

In sum, the radical, according to the anti-radical patriot, was a violent, thieving animal, glorying in "sex filth" and driven insane by his envy of able, successful Americans. Theoretically, the good American, being his opposite, should have been gentle, generous, spiritual, successful and chaste. The anti-radical picture of the good American, however, only followed this portrait in part. The good American, as it turned out, was just as physical as the radical. In fact, his prime characteristic was his maleness, his virility. The ADS was afraid that the "virility of our faith and manhood" was being destroyed by the radicals and advocated a "united virile stand" against pacifist propaganda.31 This virility, however, was divorced from sex. Glorification of sex was what made the radicals so filthy. Instead, the true American expressed his virility

30Hugh MacNair Kahler, "The Commune Limited," Saturday Evening Post, CXCIII (April 30, 1921), 16-17, 40, 42, 45-46, 48; Hugh MacNair Kahler, "The Oppressor," Saturday Evening Post, CXCIII (June 25, 1921), 14-15, 47, 50, 53. Kelley, "Are Radicals Insane?" 209, maintained that "financial success will often dissipate his [the radical's] radicalism," for radicalism was not "the product of a well-balanced mine, a full stomach and pleasant surroundings." See also Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 244-52.

31ADS, Miscellaneous Publications, "Washington, D.C., September 7, 1923," 1-2. Ralph Easley, Youth Movement, 21-22, complained that the radicals and pacifists would "destroy the virility of the nation." According to Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 333, who had been a college athlete himself, football players, the essence of good Americanism, were "magnificent specimens of manhood" with "clean bodies" and rippling muscles. See also, 182, his description of the physical delight of his heroes, Conover and Morrow, when camping.
in other ways. He took his whiskey straight. Of much greater importance, he participated in sports. Hadley's heroes, Conover and Morrow, were "brilliant quarterbacks" when in college, idealized by the crowd and models for later generations of football players. The good American's athletic aptitude and good sportsmanship was paralleled by his expression of his virility through the acceptance and success within the American competitive free enterprise system. Conover became a business magnate whose "word was law to over three thousand employees." If men could not rise to great heights, they were, according to Hanson, still good Americans who did their jobs and did not become "inefficient, complaining fault finders" as the Bolsheviks would like.

Even more important to many anti-radicals in expressing their American virility was their willingness to fight and take violent action. Hornaday warned the radicals that American soldiers home from the war would stop them. One of Kahler's heroes gives rotten

32Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 199.

33Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 94. The Committee of '76 which was formed to deal with the radical, Covert, 349, was headed by a college football center. When, 347, Conover's son, Jack, a patriotic one hundred per cent American like his father, made a touchdown, "ten thousand throats roared the age old cry - the cry that has come down through the ages and swells a thousandfold in recognition of deeds of daring." Moreover, "As long as red blood flows there will always be something Homeric in games."

34Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 16; Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism," 287. In Kahler's "The Commune Unlimited" and "The Oppressor," one of the rewards the heroes got when they went into business and repudiated radicalism was the hand of the heroine. See also, Easley, Youth Movement, 55; Hornaday, Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 30.
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vegetables to a crowd to throw at radical speakers. Ultimately, the patriotic American showed his virility by his willingness and even eagerness to fight in war. Good Americans, according to Hansoij, were for "preparedness and universal training" and were thus "willing to die for America." Ralph Easley warned that the pacifist "War Against War" would "destroy the virility of the nation" if it succeeded. World's Work advocated universal military training as a way to Americanize the immigrant and thus destroy Bolshevism.

The equation of Americanism with a virile, war-like spirit achieved its purest form in William B. Shearer's anti-pacifist novel, Pacifico. In this novel, the United States saved the peace in the Pacific by frustrating a Japanese Monroe Doctrine for the Far East. In order to do this, the United States secretly supplied the Philippines with large numbers of airplanes, bombs and possibly poisonous gas. Shearer's theory was that threats and force preserved peace by not allowing any potential enemy to be tempted by weakness. Although force was necessary to preserve peace, and force was therefore good, this did not mean that war was bad, for Shearer believed that national honor, "the only shield to the immortality of a

35 Hornaday, Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 28-29; Kahler, "The Oppressor," 53. One of Shearer's heroes in Pacifico, 305, Captain Nelson, responded to a possible Philippine independence movement with this advice to Truxton, "Try 'em first on kindness...then if they don't listen; knock their heads together...."

36 Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 284-85; Easley, Youth Movement, 21-22; "A Cure for Bolshevism, 116. See also Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 202-17.
nation," was "only an empty boast" without the sacrifice of war. Force and war were good by Shearer's lights not only because they preserved national honor, but also because they were expressions of what Shearer ultimately valued most of all, power. The novel's hero, Commander Truxton Rodgers of the United States Navy, is eager to shake hands with the Chief of Naval Operations, who is "all powerful." Shearer believed that it was against human nature for people to give up wars on expansion "once they have tasted the sweetness of conquest."\(^{37}\)

Thus to the anti-radical the radical, in attacking a war-like nationalism and the free enterprise system, was attacking the good American's sense of manhood and worth. The Bolsheviks wanted, in Hanson's words, to soften the people "into a pulp without wrinkles, but also without a backbone."\(^{38}\) Moreover, in advocating freer sexuality the anti-radical believed the radical to be ripping away the veneer of civilization which separated good Americans from the cave men and the beasts from which they sprang.

The anti-radicals saw the civilizing process in a paradoxical way. They thought Christianity elevated man to civilization by repressing hidden desires and by maintaining the state and society. For Busch and Maxwell, "God and Government" were almost one. Without Christianity "the whole structure crumbles and

\(^{37}\)Shearer, Pacifico, 11, 33, 35, 129, 135, 195. See also Shearer, The Cloak of Benedict Arnold, 45.

\(^{38}\)Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 285.
civilization will perish."³⁹ A God-created and sanctioned state had, almost of necessity, a static social order. A challenge to this social order was a challenge to both God and nation. The American Defense Society maintained that "loose" radical theories were appealing "amongst the negroes (sic), amongst races, amongst laborers and feminine altruists" because they promised to create an impossible "mathematical equality" among men.⁴⁰

The anti-radical's Christian God who created and sustained the social order was not the God of brotherly love and peace that some men believed him to be. Fred R. Marvin, whose "Searchlight" column in the New York Commercial kept his "Keymen" up to date on

³⁹ Busch and Maxwell, Red Fog, 91. See also American Defense Society, Miscellaneous Publications, "Washington, D.C., September 7, 1923," 3. According to Shearer, Pacifico, 259, "It had been said that there are three great civilizing influences: force, railroads, and Christianity." Calvin Coolidge, Foundations of the Republic: Speeches and Addresses (New York and London, 1926), 149, maintained that "Our government rests upon religion. It is from that source that we derive our reverence for truth and justice, for equality and liberty, and for the rights of mankind." He further explained, 153, that "The government of a country never gets ahead of the religion of a country."

⁴⁰ American Defense Society, Miscellaneous Publications, "Washington, D.C., September 7, 1923," 3. Hornaday, Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 22, charged that the Bolsheviks wanted to "drag the hated 'capitalistic classes' and the educated 'bourgeoise' to the lowest intellectual of the peasant and workman." According to Harry F. Atwood, whose theories many anti-radicals found attractive, a republic, as opposed to an autocracy or democracy, monogamy, as opposed to polygamy or promiscuity, private property, as opposed to feudalism or socialism, and reverence, as opposed to skepticism or fanaticism were universal, divinely created standard forms of behavior for human beings just as "a sphere" was the divine standard form of a planet or "four wheels" was the divine standard form of transportation, and the corporation was the divine standard form of business. See Back to the Republic: The Golden Mean: The Standard Form of Government (7th ed., Chicago, 1920), 37-38, 44-45, 82, 85, 118. See also Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 19, 21, 32.
the identity and activities of radical individuals and organizations and their "dupes," explained:

"Brotherly Love," "Internationalism," "No More War," "Peace and Freedom," "Industrial Democracy," are beautiful expressions in the abstract, but not one of those slogans originated in the mind of an American. All of them were manufactured in other lands and sent across the water to this country to destroy the morals of the American people that we, in the end, might, as a nation be destroyed. 41

Although the Peace Movement of the 1920's was to a large extent inspired by religious motives, the anti-radicals considered it to be closely connected with atheistic Bolshevism. 42

The anti-radicals professed to believe that many theories of modern science in general and of biological evolution in particular were radical plots designed to destroy men's faith in God and thus in the established order. Paradoxically, they also believed that civilization was created and maintained through an extremely slow, painful and fragile biological and social evolutionary process. Hadley believed civilization was "formed like the birth of granite; it does not grow like a mushroom." Yet it was always possible for a race to plunge "into the abyss." 43 Conde Pallen believed there

41Quoted in Howard, "Our Professional Patriots II. Patriotic Perils," 14. The ADS, Miscellaneous Publications, "Washington, D.C., September 7, 1923," 2. was shocked at the fact that the Federation of Churches of Christ, instead of "rocking with righteous indignation" at evolutionary theories, "endorces (sic.) a feminist pamphlet on "Law - No More War for the World."


43Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 116-17.
were races in existence which were "decadent descendents of peoples who once possessed and enjoyed a high state of civilization." He suggested that "what we call 'jazz' is nothing more than the African jungle creeping over into our civilization."  

In its evolutionary growth, society was built up by suppressing the dark and forbidden desires in each man, and even more important, by putting the advanced, civilized men on the top of the class structure and suppressing the sensual, lustful, bestial lower class and non-white men. Radicalism threatened the nation, and, indeed, all of civilization:

[it would] plunge the world into a quagmire of anarchy, in which individualism, genius and leadership would be obliterated by the leveling process that mediocrity has sought through the ages to impose on those whose shoulders rests by natural attainments, the task of leading humanity from the miasmic swamps of mobocracy.  

Any further advance of civilization depended on extending the social hierarchy upward through the rights of private property and through competition between nations and men, rather than leveling it.

Those good Americans at the top of the hierarchy were materially successful. Their success proved them to have sound minds. They were intelligent in the way that counted - in practical business affairs. They were the "brains that made her [America] commercially great." 

---

44Gasley, Youth Movement, 27.
45Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 93.
46Ibid., 169. See also Hornaday, Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 5.
un-American radicals, were orderly and methodical. They believed their practical minds wanted "facts" and "solid meat," not "fancies" and "froth." They knew that there was only one way of thinking. Their minds were not cluttered by doubts. They were thus enabled to enjoy the simple, child-like pleasures of the game. As Busch and Maxwell put it, good, old-fashioned Americans before the advent of radicalism had minds that:

were clear; there was no confusion or controversy. There was no bemuddling of the brains with casuities and vain philosophies. They went forth to fight in the great arena of life, splendidly equipped for the battle, panoplied with the helmet of faith and the shield and buckler of truth - "God's word is truth."

If the best Americans - Anglo-Saxon, virile and chaste - were at the top of the social hierarchy as a result of competition between men as individuals, America was at the peak of civilization as a result of struggle among nations. America, being at the top, represented the very truths that made civilization possible: private property, Christianity, and sexual morality. The bottom represented ideas such as putting the job of food production and distribution in to the hands of the "ignorant 'proletariat mass' of rough-necks," which, if successful, would spell the end of civilization. It was

---

47 Conover "methodically" arranged a conversation with Morrow in his mind, "pigeon holing the data in sequence." See Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 198.

48 Easley, Youth Movement, 40.

49 Busch and Maxwell, Red Fog, 72. See also, ADS, Miscellaneous Pamphlets, "Washington, D.C., September 7, 1923, 2, "Frederick J. Libby," 4; Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 19.

50 Hornaday, Lying Lure of Bolshevism, 5. See also, Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 184.
obvious, therefore, to most anti-radicals that one great mission America had in the world was to protect it from the "virus" of Bolshevik ideas. Hadley maintained that, "If Russia will not voluntarily submit to the isolation of a contagion hospital (the confines of her own borders) until a cure is effected, she must be forced to remain therein."^51

Although America's mission in the world was mainly directed at the Soviet Union, other civilizations and nations were to be guarded against as well. Chief among these were the Moslems, who, in league with the Bolsheviks and American pacifists, were plotting an end to white, Christian civilization. According to the ADS, the Young Turk movement was simply "a branch of the World Communistic movement, masquerading as usual under the guise of constitutionalism" which, along with the Red Army, planned to make "a clean sweep of Christianity from all of Asia." Along with the Moslem-Bolshevik plot went a more insidious one led by Ghandi to remove the Christian British from India under the "guise of a nationalistic movement...."^52

Sometimes anti-radicals saw the mission of America to include not only the combating of Islam and Bolshevik Russia but also all of the rest of Asia as well. The ultimate in suspicion of foreign countries came in the writings of William B. Shearer.

^51 Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 162-63.


^53 Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 275.
Shearer believed that America lived in a world which was universally hostile, in which she could trust no one. The Washington Naval Conference of 1922 was simply a plot hatched by the British, along with other nations, to disarm America, seize world trade, and deprive America of her rightful position as the dominant world power. America's only salvation, as well as the salvation of peace and everything right in the world, rested upon continued readiness to fight all comers.\(^5^4\)

The anti-radicals accused the radicals of being cunning, sneaky conspirators, unwilling to come out into the open like men and fight. According to Hanson, "the Bolshevist (the I.W.W.) is a sneak and a coward per se...advocates sabotage in the darkness, always, everywhere...."\(^5^5\) The Society of the Illuminati, which anti-radicals sometimes identified as the forerunner of Marxism, was, according to Hadley, filled with "the insatiable spirit of intrigue."\(^5^6\) Yet, some of the anti-radicals believed Americans should have used intrigue and violence in order to combat the radical menace and promote patriotic causes. When asked in 1919 to speak at the Labor Temple in order to reach some agreement with

\(^{5^4}\)Shearer, The Cloak of Benedict Arnold.

\(^{5^5}\)Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, ix.

\(^{5^6}\)Hadley, Sinister Shadows, 192. The villainous "Senator Bull" who pushed for recognition of the Soviet Union was, Hadley maintained, 96, a "master of intrigue, demagogue." See also, Hanson, Americanism versus Bolshevism, 65; Hanson, "fighting Reds in Their Home Town, III Seattle's Red Revolution," World's Work, XXXIX (February, 1920), 401; Shearer, The Cloak of Benedict Arnold, 3.
Seattle strikers, Hanson refused because he was too busy "on plans for defense, including securing cartridges, shotguns, machine guns...." Although the hero of Shearer's *Pacifico* maintains that open diplomacy would make war less frequent, he praises secret planning by the U.S. and complains about the lack of money for the secret service and lack of Congressional appreciation for the necessity for secret planning. It is easy to see, then, that what was right and wrong, to some degree, depended upon who did it. The Bolsheviks were bad, in part, because they were violent conspirators. Yet conspiracy and violence were good if done by good Americans fighting evil.

Patriotic Americans of the one-hundred per cent variety, insofar as their thinking was represented by the American Legion, the Chamber of Commerce, and the anti-radicals, saw America as God's chosen nation representing certain universal truths. Some of the most important of these were the universal laws of free-enterprise economics which, if allowed to operate unhindered, would lead to paradise on earth. These laws dictated that individualistic economic competition resulted in rule by the best people. The best people were of Anglo-Saxon origin. Since these natural leaders were best, it was unpatriotic for others to compete with them for national leadership. The ordinary person's relationship with the leaders was analogous to that of the relationship of a football team to its coach.

---

57 Hanson, *Americanism versus Bolshevism*, 80.

58 Shearer, *Pacifico*, 32, 36, 54, 82.
If they lacked either the brains or the virility to engage and succeed in this competition, they should accept their inferiority and whatever life had to offer them. If they did not, they might go mad, become radicals, and reject the God-given rules of the free enterprise system. In this state, they would slough off centuries of progress and become like wild animals, thieving, violent, treacherous, rejecting all of God's laws. The proof of this state was their glorification of sex filth. Since the radicals were usually recent immigrants from Southern or Eastern Europe, Jews or Negroes, the veneer of civilization was very thin in any case. The only way to prevent these bestial groups from attempting to destroy the nation would be to exclude them when possible and to maintain the rule of the best through a rigid hierarchy of groups. Rule by the best groups was not class rule, however; it was simply rule by those who had proved that they were capable of running large-scale operations.

Since the radicals were violent, covetous, and sex-obsessed animals, the patriotic American could prove his virility and protect the nation, the home, and civilization itself by combating these beasts in every way possible. He could also prove his manly Americanism by his willingness to aid his country in its competition with other nations of the world. Just as the best individuals emerge from economic competition, the best nation was chosen by competition among nations for the markets and resources of the world. America had won this competition. She had won because she stood for God's laws of economic competition and teamwork. Since America was
superior, other nations should cooperate with her, emulate her and accept her leadership. If they did not, they were rejecting what was right in the world and could only be considered as uncivilized criminals. These criminal nations could only be kept in check by a strong, well-armed America with virile, manly, and militant citizens.

The anti-radicals had in common with other conservative Americans the belief that those who had managed to achieve wealth were more virtuous than others. The wealthy were the nation's natural leaders but liberal definers of Americanism rejected the idea that the wealthy had always achieved their wealth by superior virtue. They believed equality of opportunity had not yet been achieved. An examination of the views of some of these liberal Americans is necessary in order to get a more balanced picture of the meaning of Americanism in the nineteen-twenties.
CHAPTER IX

Liberal Americanism:
Norman Hapgood and Horace Kallen

The conservative national views of the American Legion, the Chamber of Commerce, and the anti-radicals did not go unchallenged in the 1920's. What were the national ideas of the critics of conservative or one-hundred per cent Americanism? Were their concepts of Americanism almost totally different from those of conservative Americans, or were there substantial areas of agreement between the two? A very few critics of one-hundred per cent Americanism, such as Thorstein Veblen, rejected patriotism altogether. More often critics simply protested the excesses of patriotism. The views of all of the critics of conservative Americanism cannot be examined here. Rather the national ideas of two liberal critics, journalist Norman Hapgood and philosopher Horace Kallen, will be examined. These two published their views extensively enough that a good picture of their concepts of Americanism can be drawn. Moreover, their concepts of Americanism seem to be typical of many other liberal critics of one-hundred per cent Americanism, such as social worker Jane Addams or former Assistant Secretary of Labor

---
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Lewis F. Post. As editor of a mass circulation periodical for two years in the Twenties, Norman Hapgood's views were well-known. Through the idea of cultural pluralism Horace Kallen developed a rationale for the views of liberals who wanted America to be a more cosmopolitan nation than the one-hundred per cent Americans envisioned.

Norman Hapgood and Horace Kallen believed themselves to be and were believed by others to be enemies of one-hundred per cent Americanism. Hapgood, who wrote a book exposing the activities of those he called professional patriots, stated flatly in 1926: "I myself am not a patriot." Although he admitted that patriotism sometimes was used to include constructive and valuable ideals, he maintained in 1925 that no word or idea in the world was "doing more harm in the world today" than the word patriotism. In reviewing Kallen's major work setting forth his ideas of the meaning of America, Brander Matthews, literary scholar and one-hundred per cent American (but enemy of literary nationalism) called Kallen an "unassimilated alien" who was "lacking in native sympathy which

---


4Norman Hapgood, "Psychology of Education in Outlawing War." Annual Academy of Political and Social Science, CXX (July, 1925), 158. See also Norman Hapgood, "The Usefulness of Legends," Independent, CIII (July 17, 1920), 76.
makes it easy for native Americans to understand one another."

Norman Hapgood was born in Chicago, Illinois on March 28, 1868. In 1875, his family settled in Alton, Illinois. The greatest intellectual influence on the youthful Hapgood were his father, a morally earnest agnostic, and his mother, who taught him a love for drama. At the age of eighteen Hapgood entered Harvard where he received his A.B. in 1890 and his LL.B. in 1893. As an undergraduate Hapgood came to admire the character of Charles W. Eliot and the pluralism of William James. By his own account, the greatest contribution of law school to his development was the study of the relationship between evidence and truth. The greatest lesson to be learned from such a study, he believed, was the relativity of evidence. Evidence never meant complete certainty, "even in the laboratory." One had to hold a high standard for truth, but one must be willing to work for something in the knowledge that his chances of being right were only sixty per cent.

After practicing law in Chicago for one year, Hapgood held various reporting and editorial positions for the Chicago Evening


7Hapgood, The Changing Years, 96-97.
Post, the Milwaukee Sentinel, the New York Evening Post, the New York Commercial Advertiser, and Bookman between 1894 and 1902. During these years he also published biographies of Daniel Webster, Abraham Lincoln, and George Washington as well as two literary works, Literary Statesmen and Others and The Stage in America, 1897-1900. Hapgood was editor of Collier's Weekly from 1903 to 1912 where he became involved in crusades against patent medicines, journalistic blackmail, Speaker of the House Joseph C. Cannon, and the conservation practices of Interior Secretary Richard A. Ballinger. In 1911, he published Industry and Progress. From 1913 to 1916, Hapgood was editor of Harper's Weekly.8

During the Ballinger affair of 1910-1911, Hapgood became acquainted with Louis D. Brandeis. Not long after that he became a partisan of Woodrow Wilson. These two men became his heroes and important sources of his ideas concerning Zionism, the domestic structure of the United States, and international relations. Hapgood supported Wilson's foreign policy through World War I and became the first chairman of the League of Free Nations Association following the war. Hapgood was the United States minister to Denmark during most of 1919. In 1920, he published The Advancing Hour, an important source for his ideas concerning Americanism. From 1923 to 1925, he was editor of Hearst's International, a magazine which opposed the Ku Klux Klan and anti-Semitism. In 1927, Hapgood published Professional Patriots, a critique of the one-hundred per

---

cent Americanism movement. Meantime, he had become an ardent admirer of New York governor Alfred E. Smith, whose biography, Up From City Streets, he co-authored with Henry Moskowitz. His last general work on drama, Why Janet Should Read Shakespeare, was published in 1929. In the 1920's and 1930's, Hapgood helped to turn his family's Columbia Conserve Company of Indianapolis into a worker's cooperative. In 1930, Hapgood published his memoirs, The Changing Years. He died on April 29, 1937.9

Although Norman Hapgood condemned the patriotism of those he called "professional patriots, he actually believed that "true" patriotism was good. True patriotism was the willingness of an individual to sacrifice "for the general good."10 A true patriot did not flatter his country but tried to remove its faults. Hapgood believed that true patriotism included the idea of change because America was not yet perfect or complete. America stood for justice, economic as well as political, yet capital often received more than its just share of wealth and wielded an inordinate amount of political power. America stood for freedom, particularly freedom of expression. Yet, to Hapgood, the Red Scare proved that most American leaders were not willing to stand up for freedom of expression.11


10Hapgood, Professional Patriots, 1-2.

Hapgood believed that there was a close connection between freedom of expression and the need for change. Intelligent change to improve America required knowledge about social conditions. Yet truth was complex and there were often many different truths concerning the same thing. Because of the nature of truth, it could be best discovered if open discussion and clash of ideas were allowed. Therefore, freedom and toleration were as necessary to truth as truth was to the perfection of the American ideals of freedom, toleration, and justice.\(^\text{12}\)

Several things stood in the way of creating the freedom of expression necessary to the discovery of truth and the promotion of progress. One of these was what Hapgood called the "war-and-power mind...." This was shown in the World War by the fact that the Allied governments had suppressed liberal correspondents trying to report the truth about Soviet Russia and about alleged German atrocities.\(^\text{13}\) Hapgood, however, supported both British and American...
entry into World War I in order to combat the "German enterprise of domination."\textsuperscript{14} Although he wavered from this position in the mid-Twenties, in 1930 he stated that in the United States the end result of the activities of both intellectual pacifists and the patriotic isolationists who opposed American entry into the War was a self-righteous "unwillingness to play with the wicked foreigner."\textsuperscript{15}

The "war-and-power mind" was exemplified in the United States after the War by the American Legion. Wealthy and conservative businessmen who sometimes tried to make the "noble word and emotion" patriotism a "handmaid of greed and cowardice" constituted a second

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., 15, 17-18.

\textsuperscript{15}Hapgood, The Changing Years, 262. With the failure of the United States to join the League of Nations, the development of Fascism in Italy, the French occupation of the Rhur, and other events of the Twenties, Hapgood began to condemn all wars, even those fought for liberty and democracy as enemies of Liberty, justice, and democracy. See Norman Hapgood, "How Europe Looked to Me." Hearst's International, XLVI (September, 1924), 20-21, 149; Norman Hapgood, "War," Hearst's International, XLV (February, 1924), 8; Norman Hapgood, "Then and Now," Hearst's International, XLV (April, 1924), 8. In 1923, Hapgood wrote an article, heavily influenced by British historian G. P. Gooch, incorporating the view that Germany was not the most responsible nation for the beginnings of the World War. See Norman Hapgood, "Treat Germany Decently," Hearst's International, XLIV (November, 1923), 84, 112, 114-16. Selig Adler, "The War-Guilt Question and American Disillusionment, 1918-1928," Journal of Modern History, XXIII (March, 1951), 1-28, surveys the growth of the idea that Germany was not the only nation responsible for the outbreak of World War I. His conclusion that this idea made American isolationists does not hold in Hapgood's case, however. On American revisionism in the 1920's see also Warren Cohan, The American Revisionists: The Lessons of Intervention in World War I (Chicago and London, 1967), 27-119.
source of danger to American freedom. In their efforts to "restrain the present feudal system in industry and property" they were quite willing to attack freedom of speech. Hapgood's attack on these conservative businessmen revealed some of the economic and social content of his concept of American freedom.

Hapgood, like the leaders of the American Legion and the Chamber of Commerce, believed that one of the great lessons of the World War was the value of teamwork. Unlike the Legion and the Chamber, Hapgood did not believe that teamwork could be achieved through unquestioning acceptance of the leadership of the corporate elite. The war had demonstrated the hollowness of the "truths" propagated by that elite. The corporate elite had justified such socially destructive practices as keeping their workers idle one-third of the time by maintaining that it was impossible to do "business without a profit." The state socialism created by the necessities of war proved that business could be done on three better principles. They were:

1. To produce primarily things that are needed.
2. To produce them uninterruptedly.
3. To distribute them equitably.

---


This did not mean that socialism was the answer to the problem of maintaining freedom. The centralized control under war socialism made life seem "like slavery." Marx had made two fundamental errors. He had assumed men would tend to become divided into opposing classes of proletarians and capitalists. Like his conservative critics, Hapgood believed economic individualism to be fundamental in America. Marxism would endanger the "established individual stake" of the vast majority of Americans since "every man who own[ed] a house, a farm, a bond, or a bank deposit" was a capitalist. In Hapgood's view, the second problem with Marxism, and thus socialism was that Marx misunderstood human nature. Like conservative Americans, Hapgood believed that the human mind was incapable of planning a "world-life." It was, he maintained, easier to "wreck a locomotive or a watch" than it was "to invent or improve it." One had to go slowly and adopt an experimental approach to improving the world.  

19Hapgood, The Advancing Hour, X, 149, 159-60. See also Hapgood, "The Sabotage of Capitalism," 249; Hapgood, The Changing Years, 255, 294; Hapgood and Moskowitz, Up From City Streets, 107, 112; Norman Hapgood, "Fresh," Hearst's International, XLIII (June, 1923), 7; Norman Hapgood, "Will There Be A Third Party," Hearst's International, XLV (January, 1924), 17. Hapgood's view that both radicals and conservatives were enemies of American liberty was mitigated by his statement that conservatives were needed to balance the power of the liberals and that if he lived in Europe he would be a socialist. However, when he made these statements he assumed that the conservative useful to the democratic process and the socialists who made searching criticisms of the status quo were really just conservative liberals and progressive liberals, respectively. The good conservatives and good socialists had the same vision of a good society the liberal had. The conservative simply wanted to go slowly and make sure each step was the right one. The socialists wanted to proceed more quickly. Hapgood did not concede the
Hapgood's attack on radicals and conservatives revealed a combination of lack of concern for profits, economic individualism and a desire for slow, experimental change. His praise of those he believed to be the friends of freedom, the liberals, combined these values with a desire for competition, economic variety, industrial democracy, and small economic units. What were the principles of the liberal? The liberal, unlike the socialist, wanted to purify and supplement "the system of private property," not destroy it. In doing this the liberal had to remember that "Variety is freedom. If the time comes when everything is the same it will be slavery...." Moreover, variety created the possibility of experimentation which, in turn, made possible the change necessary for the perfection of America and the world.

Like his liberal hero, Louis Brandeis, Hapgood believed that the economic variety which was supportive of change and freedom
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was threatened by large corporations. Large corporations were a threat to individual freedom because some degree of individual economic independence was necessary for freedom. Large corporations by their extent and power threatened the ability of the people to control their affairs through their local governments. Since big corporations had the ability to overpower local governments, their extent called for a formidable federal bureaucracy which was itself a threat to freedom.22

Because of the threat to economic efficiency and political freedom posed by large corporations, regulated competition should be the basic principle of the American economy, not regulated monopoly. Small economic units should be encouraged. Size itself should be taxed. This did not mean that every large corporation should be broken into smaller units. Occasionally the genius of a single individual such as Henry Ford would create a legitimately efficient, large business. The variety necessary for freedom demanded a few large corporations as well as many small competing units.23


23Norman Hapgood, "Tax as Weapon," Hearst's International, XLIII (June, 1923), 7; Hapgood, "Worrying About My Vote," 10-11; Norman Hapgood, "Socialism," Hearst's International, XLVII (January, 1925), 8; Hapgood, The Advancing Hour, 72; Hapgood, The Changing Years, 220, 300. In The Changing Years, Hapgood expressed, 267-68, doubts about the practicality of taxing large corporations because the wealthy always seemed to be able to evade any tax. Like Senator George W. Norris, Hapgood believed that public utilities should be owned by the government in order to protect the freedom
Variety and small units, however, were not the only necessities for the preservation of liberty. The liberal had to realize that freedom could never be safe and democracy would be a failure unless the masses were led by trained, far-sighted, and sympathetic leaders and unless the masses had "a happy life...." Since the stability of business was threatened by the proletariat, which had "no stake in the community," the "only remedy" was "to abolish the proletariat" through "Industrial Democracy." The proletariat should be given a "stake" in society through such measures as continuous employment, increased production so that society could "level up," and an equal voice for workers with management in the running of businesses. The business leader who did these things would be able to produce "enthusiastic teamplay" through the removal of "distruptive tendencies...." of the people from a rule by "the concentrated wealth of the country."

This was not socialistic, he explained, because it was not government ownership for its own sake. See Norman Hapgood, "For Government Monopoly," Forum, LXXIX (March, 1928), 344-48; Norman Hapgood, "Bunk," Hearst's International, XLV (June, 1924), 8; Richard Lewitt, George W. Norris: The Persistance of a Progressive, 1913-1933 (Urbana, Illinois, Chicago and London, 1971), 307-09.


25 Ibid., 291, 295-96, 300-01; Hapgood, The Advancing Hour, 208-09, 215-16, 232; Hapgood, "Justice Brandeis: Apostle of Freedom," 330; Norman Hapgood, "Fear," Hearst's International, XLIII (June, 1923), 6; Hapgood, "Worrying About My Vote," 10. Hapgood believed that one of the best ways to introduce industrial democracy was through the development of cooperatives. Cooperatives were good because they allowed ordinary people to battle against the powers of big business without calling on the aid of an equally dangerous big government. They did not try to elevate one class over another. Cooperatives were not socialistic because they contained an element of economic inequality. See The Advancing Hour, 168, 172, 178, 191, 204; The Changing Years, 290-305.
Hapgood believed that small units and variety were conducive to freedom not only in the area of economics but in cultural and political matters as well. People should, he stated, be able to use their freedom to make decisions through small cultural and political units as well as in the nation as a whole. He complained in 1924 that:

Every year we throw more burdens on the central government at Washington and inevitably it handles them worse and worse. The predicament would give Jefferson cramps. The time must come when Washington does less and the localities more.26

Hapgood refused, however, to recognize that local, small units as well as large ones might threaten individual freedom. In part, this attitude was reinforced by Hapgood's unconscious acceptance of some of the arguments of the racists. Although a champion of the rights of Jews to enter Harvard, or of immigrant groups to retain their cultural heritages, Hapgood was oblivious to the violation of the freedom of Blacks in the South. In the 1920 presidential campaign, when Hapgood and Talcott Williams debated the issues, Williams, arguing for Harding, goaded Hapgood with the idea that Cox's election depended on the suppression of the Negro. Hapgood responded by asking Williams if he was "reviving an old sectional bitterness" in order "to get negro votes in northern cities?"

Hapgood managed to put the South in the same category as a foreign country, violating the idea of the United States as one nation, by comparing Williams' effort with those of politicians who were

interested in supporting Italian imperialism, entangling the United States in controversies with Great Britain, or upsetting the League of Nations in order to get the Irish, Italian, and German vote in the United States.27

Hapgood's combined prejudices against war and big units and for Liberalism, national self-determination, international cooperation, England, and Zionism led him into a morass of contradictory beliefs concerning the proper relationship between America and the rest of the world. In The Advancing Hour, he began by contrasting the positions of the friends of liberty, the liberals, with those of its enemies, the radicals and conservatives. The radicals were for complete internationalism or for complete lack of international government. The conservatives were parochial and wanted to "impose our ideals by force on others." Liberals wanted to respect "national differences and feelings" and join with other countries in the League of Nations in an effort to end war, one of

27Talcott Williams, "The Real Issue," Independent, CIII (July 24 and 31, 1920), 109; Talcott Williams, "The Path to the Best for All," Independent, CIII (August 21, 1920), 209; Talcott Williams, "How Big is Cox?" Independent, CIII (September 4, 1920), 271; Talcott Williams, "Training the Elephant," Independent, CIII (September 11, 1920), 302; Talcott Williams, "What Does Cox Say?" Independent, CIII (September 4, 1920), 274; Norman Hapgood, "Cox and His Record," Independent, CIII (September 4, 1920), 271; Norman Hapgood, "The Senate Despotism." Independent, CIII (September 18, 1920), 335. In his "The New Threat of the Ku Klux Klan," Hearst's International, XLIII (January, 1923), 8, Hapgood was careful to state that the Klan of the 1920's was not the one of the Reconstruction days. The new Klan was bad because it tried to use a secret organization to dominate the Nation's government, whereas the old Klan "may have been a wise move. The South settled its negro problem in its own way, and the Klan went out of existence." See also Norman Hapgood, "Juggling Consciences," Forum, LXXVII (February, 1927), 186-87.
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the great enemies of freedom and democracy. Despite Hapgood's rejection of what he believed to be a conservative effort to impose American ideals on other nations, he argued in favor of the League of Nations on the grounds that it was to the world what the Constitution was to the United States in 1787. Moreover, throughout the Twenties he equated democracy with the desire for peace. The League could function properly to preserve peace only if the leading nations in and out of the League were democracies. It was not enough for the mere outward forms of democracy to be observed. In order to insure peace the democratic nations had to elect the true friends of democracy, peace and freedom to office, the liberals.

In 1919 and 1920 Hapgood believed that despite wrongheaded policies toward Russia, the United States, as a leading democracy, was a force for good in the world. He admitted that the charter of the League of Nations had many defects. Because of the conservative, "capitalistic origins of modern war" the League might become a

28Hapgood, The Advancing Hour, 40.

29Ibid., 58; Norman Hapgood, "Is Wilson's Dream Coming True," 151-52. In "How Europe Looked to Me," 148, Hapgood stated that "Germany, if treated well, would be as likely as any country in Europe to adopt democratic ideas and make for peace, even in spite of great provocation." He concluded the editorial "Hot Air," Hearst's International, XLVI (October, 1924), 8, with the statement that "as governments become more genuinely people's governments, therefore, morals in relations between nations will cease to be only hot air, and will become calm and sound." Compare these beliefs with those of E. H. Carr, Nationalism and After (New York, 1945), 18-35, who believed that international lawlessness and large-scale wars grew with the expansion of the concept of the nation to include all classes. See also William Appleman Williams, The Tragedy of American Diplomacy (Cleveland and New York, 1959), 55-60.
"league of conservatives and imperialism, like the Holy Alliance."\textsuperscript{30}

Despite the fact that the United States was one of the leading capitalist as well as democratic nations, Hapgood maintained that these problems would be corrected if "this vast and fresh nation, generously and with determination, assumed its place, month in and month out, at the council board.\textsuperscript{31}

By the mid-twenties, Hapgood had become very critical of the role the United States was playing in the world. He had a habit of comparing the United States unfavorably with other nations, especially England. These unfavorable comparisons became more frequent. In 1924, he maintained that the United States should "purify" herself before she became too involved with Europe, least she harm Europe's "purification" with her "imperial money...." He did not, however, seriously suggest that the United States isolate herself from the rest of the world. American prosperity, he believed, was dependent upon the prosperity of Europe. European prosperity was dependent upon peace.\textsuperscript{32}

In 1926, Hapgood wrote that the United

\textsuperscript{30}Hapgood, The Advancing Hour, 58.

\textsuperscript{31}Norman Hapgood, "Wilsonism as an Issue," Independent, CII (June 5, 1920), 319. See also Norman Hapgood, "Yes the Democratic Platform," Independent, CIII (August 21, 1920), 207-08; Norman Hapgood, "Concerning the League," Independent, CIII (September 25, 1920), 371. Hapgood, like the conservatives, believed that the American form of government was nearly perfect. Revolution was inexcusable "under a constitution like ours." See Norman Hapgood, "Evolution," Hearst's International, XLIV (July, 1923), 10.

States should join the League and take up her share of world re-
sponsibility, not for Europe's sake but for her own.33

The failure of the United States to join the League of Nations and her relations with the Soviet Union and Mexico were the issues which led Hapgood to question the wholesomeness of American involvement in the world as it developed in the 1920's. His stands on the latter two issues revealed a highly critical attitude toward American foreign policy combined with a tendency to apply American standards to the world. The American military intervention in the Soviet Union in 1919 followed by a propaganda campaign against her, an embargo against trade with her, and a refusal to recognize her government constituted, Hapgood believed, "a cohesive capitalist war against Russia...." This undeclared war against Russia was wrong because it violated the principle of national self-determination, it violated the rights of merchants to free trade, it hindered the development of world prosperity and because it forced Russia to keep a large army which was a threat to world peace.34 Moreover, American Soviet policy ended any chance America had to encourage reasonable Soviet leaders like Lenin to see the hopelessness of any effort to organize society along socialist lines. A friendly attitude toward the Soviet Union, Hapgood believed, would lead her to grant "greater

33 Norman Hapgood, "Is Wilson's Dream Coming True?" 153.
concessions to private independence." She would then evolve toward the same liberal economic variety which was Hapgood's goal for America. That is, a friendly attitude toward the Soviet Union was desirable both because international toleration was good and because it would make it possible to Americanize her.35

Hapgood believed that in Mexico, the United States was playing the role Germany played in the World War. Just as Germany had wanted to carry her "Kulture" to the rest of the world, the United States talked about giving the benefits of "American business, of American standards of living, of American efficiency" to the backward people of Mexico.36 Behind the nationalistic appeals to "the flag, law and order, and American rights" Hapgood saw a desire to take oil lands from Mexico.37

35Hapgood, The Advancing Hour, 152; Norman Hapgood, "Russia and the Nation's Business," 289; Norman Hapgood, "More Acid Test," New Republic, XXIII (July 14, 1920), 200-01; Norman Hapgood, "Individuality," Hearst's International, XLIII (May, 1923), 7; Norman Hapgood, "Why Lie About Russia?" Hearst's International, XLIV (October, 1923), 59, 123, 132. George Norris argued in favor of recognition of Russia both because the Russians had a right to have a Soviet government if they wanted one and because recognition would lead to trade and thus jobs for Americans. See Lowitt, George W. Norris, 143, 381-82. For the views of another leading liberal for recognition of the Soviet Union in the 1920's see Robert James Maddox, William E. Borah and American Foreign Policy (Baton Rouge, 1969), 183-214.


Although Hapgood condemned the American national egotism in its interference in the affairs of Russia and Mexico, he did not condemn nationalism in world affairs altogether. Hapgood maintained that all nations were potentially equal because national traits were not immutable, but in actuality he gave those nations whose traits he approved superior rights to those whose traits he was indifferent to or disapproved of. He said he believed that democracy was furthered by encouraging the special traits of nations and races as well as of individuals. His defense of any particular nation's right to develop its special traits, however, seemed to depend on its acceptance of democracy and modern technology as well as its relationship with those nationalities he favored.38

Through the influence of Brandeis, Hapgood became a fervent Zionist. The Jews, he believed, were one of the two notable historic races, the other being the ancient Greeks. In order for the Jews to achieve a flowering of their peculiar and important culture, they needed a homeland where they could congregate free from oppression. This would not be a violation of the rights of the Arabs because the Palestinian Arabs were nomads who would be little affected by the establishment of a Jewish nation in their midst. Moreover, the Jewish Palestine would be democratic, with "equal opportunity for all." Finally, the Jews would bring the Arabs, and indeed all of the Moslems of the Middle East the benefits of their business,

cultural, and technological genius. Israel would become highly industrialized. It would be enlarged to include the Sinai Penninsula, which would be watered by the Nile to create a virtual Eden. The net effect would be a thriving Near East centering around Palestine. When critics pointed out that Zionism was simply another form of the nationalism Hapgood had deplored in the Americans, He replied that nationalism had done much good. Its dangerous excesses were to be found in large nations, not small ones. It seems that Hapgood believed it to be wrong for Americans to spread the benefits of American civilization to Mexico but all right for Jews to give the Arabs the benefits of Jewish civilization.

The second nation Hapgood favored at the expense of others was England. England, he believed, led the world in industrial as well as political democracy. One had to remember that England had "conservatives, but no reactionaries." Although Hapgood stated in one editorial that Great Britain would have to satisfy India's demands in order to keep her, he never criticized British imperialism harshly and sometimes indicated that it might be a good thing.
It would seem that although Hapgood believed in a vague equality for nations and individuals in general, in practice he advocated a hierarchical arrangement of national groups not too dissimilar from that of the conservatives. At the top of this hierarchy were the Jews, Englishmen, and White Southerners. At the bottom were Negroes, Arabs, and subjects of the British Empire. The right of nationalities, even small or well-led ones, and local groups to develop their own cultures and run their own affairs often meant the sacrifice of the rights of other groups and individuals. Then personal prejudice and circumstance decided who had rights and equality and who did not.

II

Horace Meyer Kallen was born on August 11, 1882, in Berenstadt, Germany. His family moved to the United States in 1887. Kallen obtained his A.B. (1903) and Ph.D. (1908) at Harvard, where, like Norman Hapgood, he was greatly influenced by the pluralism of William James. Kallen was an instructor in English at Princeton from 1903 to 1905. From 1908 to 1918 he was successively a member of the faculties of philosophy and psychology at Harvard University and the University of Wisconsin. In 1919, he became a member of the faculty at the New School for Social Research where he was closely stated that Ramsey MacDonald headed a "great free empire...." One difference between Hapgood and Kallen, who supported American entry into the League of Nations, and liberals like Senators Norris and Borah, who opposed it, was that Norris and Borah did not believe the British Empire was "democratic" or "free." See Lowitt, George W. Norris, 117-21, 142-43; Mattox, William E. Borah, 62.
associated with John Dewey. Like Hapgood, Kallen considered himself to be a spokesman for liberal values, industrial democracy, and the internationalism represented by the League of Nations. As a Jew and an immigrant, Kallen tried to apply the pluralism of James to the problems of the immigrant in America. In doing so, he produced views on Americanism related to but much more systematic than those of Hapgood. Kallen has been an active writer since 1908 and has expressed his views in numerous books, articles, and pamphlets. Some of his most prominent works include: William James and Henry Bergson (1914); The League of Nations Today and Tomorrow (1919); Culture and Democracy in the United States (1924); Education, the Machine and the Worker (1925); Why Religion (1927); Individualism: An American Way of Life (1933); Art and Freedom (1942); Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea (1956); and Liberty, Laughter and Tears (1968). He edited, among other works, The Philosophy of William James in 1925 and Freedom in the Modern World in 1928. Kallen now lives in New York City.

Kallen's concept of American nationality was closely connected with his explicitly developed theories of the nature of the universe, truth, man, national groups, democracy, freedom, and culture. According to Kallen, man lived in a world which was not made for him, which did not "care any more than a dead donkey whether we live or die, are happy or unhappy or bond or free...." The world was pluralistic with no absolute universal laws that men could rely on. Men were in a constant struggle to survive, to create certainty and freedom through understanding and control of natural forces. Since the world was pluralistic, containing related but semi-independent and uncertain sequences of cause and effect, truth was multiple and had to be closely related to particulars. The measure of truth was man's ability to use it to control nature. Therefore truth would triumph over falsehood in the end if free investigation of it were encouraged. In his effort to understand and control the world, man faced human as well as inanimate obstacles. He came into conflict with and was limited by the efforts of other men seeking security and freedom through the control of their environment, natural and human.


43Kallen, "What is Real and What is Illusory in Human Freedom," 278-302; Horace M. Kallen, "Fear, Freedom, and Massachusetts,"
Kallen believed that the universe was complex, pluralistic, and uncertain, and he applied this belief to man as well. In an effort to avoid both biological and environmental determinism, Kallen developed an ambiguous and dialectical theory of the nature of man. On the one hand, he maintained that the immigrant who came to America could cut himself off from his race externally, but he could never change the internal fact of his race or nationality. Similarity "of nationality" was "inevitably intrinsic." Even inter-marriage could not erase the old nationality. The new was simply added to the old. Racial traits, however, could not be measured in any way, especially by the crude I.Q. tests developed for the use of the army in the World War. Pavlow had proved that intelligence was closely related to conditioned reflexes. Human nature was "variable and viable...." There were "no inevitabilities in it, whether of "intelligence," feeling or habit." "Jewishness," for example, was "an acquired and secondary quality." On the other hand, acquired characteristics of a close knit group could become, for the


45 Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, 24-26, 31.
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individual, "practically ineradicable."\(^{46}\) What, then, was the relationship between race, heredity, and environment in the determination of human characteristics? Kallen often answered this question by comparing a human being to a musical instrument and human habits, customs, and desires to pitch. Just as any number of musical instruments could play the same notes, so human individuals of all races can acquire the same behavior patterns. Just as musical instruments differed in timbre and tonality, so biological inheritance affected something about the way human attitudes and customs actually operated for any given human being or group of human beings.\(^{47}\)

In man's effort to free himself from the restrictions of his environment, he operated in conjunction with other men. The group he became associated with in this effort established his identity. In a complex society an individual became associated with many different groups and assumed many identities. He was at once a father, a brother, a Democrat, a railroad worker, a Presbyterian, a friend, and an American. Although these relationships were in continual flux, creating uncertainty in society, the most important of them were those of family, and along with family, race or nation. This tie was most fundamental because it expressed most fully what the individual was, or at least what he had become. It defined his


\(^{47}\)Kallen, "Democracy versus the Melting Pot," 194; Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, 180-82.
his style, the force and character he gave to any undertaking.48

Man's effort to control his environment was an effort to be free. Since other men were part of that environment, this effort historically consisted of an effort to control other men as well as nature. The men who were controlled had lost their freedom to those who controlled them. The free men in control defined their liberties as crimes when exercised by the unfree men. Thus the hunting of foxes was a liberty for noblemen in the past. It was poaching if done by others. Sometimes the free controlling group constituted one nationality which exploited another nationality. The effort of the exploited group to end the restrictions on their activity and claim their liberties was called democracy or nationalism according to the nature of the exploiting and exploited groups. Kallen used the term liberalism to describe all such efforts.49

The struggle for liberty took various forms at various times. For example, the struggle for laissez faire was at one time a
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genuine struggle by a submerged group, the middle class, to end exploitation by the aristocracy. The middle class simply, and rightly, wanted the state to stop interfering in the economy to benefit the upper class at their expense. The development of the factory system dependent upon automatic machinery and an elaborate division of labor changed the nature of *laissez faire*. The working man began to be considered as a commodity to be manipulated like any other commodity. He was regimented. He ceased to be a free individual. The freedom of the middle class factory owners (now a privileged class) from the demands of their environment was at the worker's expense. *Laissez faire* was then used to protect the factory owner's ability to manipulate his workers without any interference. Thus *laissez faire*, originally a liberal doctrine, had become "anathema among the lovers of liberty...." Industrial democracy, or the worker's right to share in management decisions, had become a libertarian cry. This did not mean that there was no liberal doctrine. Liberalism stood for "equality of opportunity." "fair play," a "free field," and "no favor" in each man's effort to make himself free by mastering his environment.


Kallen believed that America's peculiar historical development made her the leading spokesman for liberalism in the world. The American pioneer had had an unexploited natural environment to exploit. The pioneer realized intuitively that any effort to master the environment and make himself free was piecemeal. He tried to free himself of a restrictive environment by mastering the land and its resources, not other men. He had subconsciously learned from practical experience the pragmatic and pluralistic truths that philosophers like William James had laboriously discovered through thought. America had discovered universal truth. This truth was for all men, not just for Americans.\textsuperscript{52}

America's realization of the truth of liberal pluralism did not come all at once. In separating from England, the thirteen colonies asserted corporate liberty from England. Government was to be a tool for the creation of liberty, not an end in itself. What was really asserted, however, was the independence and liberty of each state, not the liberty of individuals. In the nineteenth century, however, industrialism created the need for greater power and autonomy by the central government. The Civil War established a new ideal, that of union. Liberty was then reinterpreted to mean individual liberty. How were liberty and union to be reconciled? This was done through the third and last great American ideal,

\begin{flushright}
\textit{Freedom in the Modern World, Horace Kallen, ed. (Freeport, New York, 1969), viii-xii; Kallen, Education, the Machine, and the Worker, 37, 102-09, 184-94.}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textit{52}Kallen, "Introduction," \textit{The Philosophy of William James,} 32-42.
\end{flushright}
democracy. Government was still a tool but no longer the tool of the state. It was the tool of and responsible to the people. This put a tremendous responsibility on each individual citizen. Each had to be Plato's philosopher king. At the same time each had his individual rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As this individualism implies, Americans were not one people as, say, the French were. They were varied in race, background, and outlook. American citizenship was not something a person was born into. It was something he chose. Government was a tool and citizenship was voluntary. This meant that the United States was not a nation.53

What, then, was the relationship between the individual, nationality, and America? Americanism stood for liberalism, or equal opportunity of individuals to make themselves free and pursue happiness to the best of their ability and in their own way. The individuality of any particular person, however, was determined to a large extent by the groups he was associated with, particularly his family and national groups. True Americanism, or liberalism, was the freedom of national groups to express their individuality and strive for perfection of their national cultures. There should be no effort to "Americanize" different national groups in the United States in the sense of standardizing their customs or forcing them to use the English language. In fact, an immigrant group achieved "Americanization" in the fullest meaning of the word when it became conscious and proud of its national heritage. When the

53Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States, 44-46, 92.
"wop" became an "Italian-American" he had internalized the American idea of the equality and dignity of the individual and his equal opportunity to "make good." All Americans were hyphenated Americans, including Anglo-Americans. The hyphen connected the individual with America; it did not separate him from her.54

Kallen usually maintained that all national and racial groups were equal. He was one of the few whites in the 1920's who really seemed to believe in equality for Negroes. Kallen usually maintained that all nationalities should maintain their individuality indefinitely in America. This would lead to cross-cultural stimulation which was a prerequisite for the creation of culture and which would aid in the perfection of the various national cultures. That is, democracy, in the sense of national cultural freedom, was necessary for the creation of culture. Not only was the United States not a nation, but also it would never be a nation. It followed that nationalities had the right to develop their own cultures but not necessarily the right of political sovereignty. In one case, however, Kallen departed from these views. As a leading Zionist he maintained that in order for Jews to develop and perfect their culture, they had to have a home land. They couldn't perfect their culture in the United States because any culture

54 Ibid., 99-102, 107-08, 114-16, 121, 131-32, 182, 199-202; Kallen, "Political Science as Psychology," 193. In part, Kallen believed that the Americanization movement was simply an expression of the desire of the corporate leaders of America to label any group which did not agree with their hopes for unlimited profits during the War as "un-American." It was a movement aimed at organized labor and industrial democracy as much as at immigrants as such. See Kallen, Education, the Machine, and the Worker, 16-17.
created there would become a part of an emerging American national culture, not a part of Jewish culture. Ignoring the fact that Palestine was small, already occupied by thousands of Arabs, and could never support a very large national group, Kallen maintained that the Jews should create a national state there, although he had maintained in 1919 that the nationalities contained within the old Austro-Hungarian Empire could not reasonably expect national sovereignty because they were too small, intertwined, and economically interdependent.\(^5^5\)

Unfortunately, Kallen believed, there were powerful groups in America which did not behave as though they believed in the American idea. Some wanted to suppress individual freedom by insistence upon *laissez faire*, or the right of employers to manipulate their workers as things. Others wanted to impose the culture of the largest national group in America, the Anglo-Saxons, on all the others. These groups often used the public schools and the Arts to inculcate ideals favorable to the privileges of the dominant classes in America. That is, like the conservative interpreters of America in the 1920's, Kallen believed that there were large numbers of un-American Americans. In part, the motives of these enemies of the American idea were simply economic, hence rational.

However, Kallen, like the anti-radicals, believed that those opposed the American idea had sick minds.\textsuperscript{56}

When the vast majority of Americans were Anglo-Saxon Protestants, this group was self-confident and progressive. In the late nineteenth century they began bringing immigrants to America in order to use them to achieve wealth. As the number of immigrants grew they began to demand equality in the American system. As the number in the laboring class grew they demanded power to protect their interests. By that time the privileged classes had fallen victim to "a pathological state of the social mind," or "a sort of group arterio-sclerosis...." The challenge to their cultural values and privileged position in Massachusetts by the Irish Catholics, for example, produced an "inward feeling of insecurity, of fear and anxiety, ungrounded in social or economic realities" which could be described as "paranoic." In such a state the privileged could use pure passion to weld together any set of events or data, no matter how diverse, in order to prove mysterious plots to overthrow the nation, or to prove the innate superiority or inferiority of particular races.\textsuperscript{57}


Kallen's view of the proper relationship between the United States and the rest of the world was conditioned by two interrelated sets of ideas. They were his concept of the cause and the cure of war and his concept of Americanism. According to Kallen, the causes of war were basically economic. An economically interdependent world, as existed in the twentieth century, was one in which it became increasingly difficult for any nation to remain neutral in any war. Wars between any two nations were more and more likely to become worldwide in scope. Moreover, an economically interdependent world was an insecure world. Each nation tried to secure markets and sources of raw materials through force. This led to the development of a large international armaments industry. It was in the interest of this industry to identify patriotism with military preparedness and to produce preparedness scares. An increase in armaments produced more insecurity and anxiety, increasing the likelihood of numerous and widely destructive wars.58

Although the development of a powerful economic group with a vested interest in competitive armament and war was one of the causes of war in the twentieth century, disarmament agreements alone could not guarantee peace. A modern, industrial nation could rearm itself in a short time and would do so if it felt its interests were threatened. A balance of power was no guarantee of peace either.

Balance of power politics had always involved numerous wars. Like the American Legion and the anti-radicals, Kallen believed that peace was possible only if one power was so great that it overshadowed all others. This situation could develop in one of two ways. One was for one nation to dominate the world, creating a world empire. Unlike the anti-radicals, Kallen rejected this solution to the problem of war. The second way was for the various nations to join together to create the preponderance of power necessary for peace. All of these nations should not have an equal voice in such an association. In the *League of Nations*, written primarily in 1918 but published in 1919, Kallen recommended that power in a future League of Nations be distributed on the basis of the power of the various nations "to wage effective and victorious war." Although such a League would carry with it a danger of oppression of minorities within each nation or the oppression of some of the states within the League, it would be less oppressive than either a preponderance of power by one nation or a continuation of international anarchy. Anarchy, Kallen believed, always ended in tyranny. The League, on the other hand, would provide economic as well as military security by establishing international "justice and right" which were simply "equality of opportunity for advantage."

---
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If a League of Nations was the answer for world peace, the United States had a special responsibility to bring this answer to the world, for to Kallen the American idea was genuinely universal. The United States was itself the model for the world. What Kallen proposed in *The League of Nations* was to extend the American system to the world in almost all of its particulars. The covenant of the League should be drawn up by delegates elected by the people of each state and ratified by a two-thirds vote of the people in each state or by the legislative body of each state. Although power in the League would be distributed according to the potential military power of each state, the prime determinants of that power were, Kallen believed, the degree of democracy, economic development, and literacy in each nation, as well as its population. Once in power, the League should establish for the world all of the regulatory agencies established in the United States during the Progressive Era and during the World War, as well as others Kallen thought desirable. There would be an "International Commerce Commission," which would include an "International Commission on Shipping" to end "differential freight discriminations and other forms of discriminations...." The operations of an International Commission on Highways "could obviously be modeled to best advantage on some American Public Utilities Board...." It would, among other things, "prevent discrimination in restraint of trade." An International Finance Commission would establish an agency like the American Federal Reserve Board. These and other international regulatory commissions would establish for the whole world such American ideals.
as "fair play" and the "open door" which meant "equality of economic opportunity." This framework of ideals would provide a "new freedom" in international competition which would lead to "excellence," not war. The policy of the "open door" toward what Kallen considered to be backward areas, like Africa and the Middle East, would allow them to become economically developed like Europe and the United States. Kallen assumed that these societies wanted to be "opened up" because they, like Americans, placed a very high value on economic growth.62

Kallen realized that some Americans did not agree with his interpretation of American mission. Some saw the United States as a nation and believed that nations had absolute sovereign rights. Others believed that the United States had traditionally been an isolationist state and therefore should simply be an example to the world, not a leader in the re-organization of the world. In order to answer these critics, Kallen tried to show that the League of Nations was the logical outcome of American diplomatic history. According to Kallen, George Washington and Thomas Jefferson were not really isolationists. They simply wanted to stay out of local European disputes "so that the United States might be free to intervene in matters of world interest and general justice to humanity."

62Ibid., vi, xvii-xviii, xx, 7, 15-16, 18-21, 35, 41, 48-49, 64-65, 68, 71, 78, 86-87, 95-96, 109, 125-27, 150. See also Kallen, "The Covenant of the League of Nations, American Foreign Policy and the Washington Conference," 266-67. Kallen, Ibid., 34, gave the British Empire as a whole eight of ten possible points for "democracy" in figuring the number of representatives from each state in the League, altogether the United States would have 46 votes, The British Empire 45, France 36, Germany 34, Italy 21, and China only 12.
The Monroe Doctrine was designed to make the "American hemi-
sphere 'safe for democracy.'" This, along with such actions as
support for Mexican independence against the French in the
1860's and the declaration for an "open door" for China at the end
of the nineteenth century, constituted a "hundred years' warfare
between monarchism and republicanism...." The culmination of this
"hundred years" war was the World War to make "the world safe for
democracy" which resulted in a "decisive victory" for republicanism.
Those who blocked American entry into the League of Nations, there­
fore, had made the United States "a hypocritical slacker" in world
opinion.63

Liberals Norman Hapgood and Horace Kallen and conservative
interpreters of Americanism such as the American Legion, the Chamber
of Commerce, or the anti-radicals saw each other as ideological
enemies. The similarities between their concepts of Americanism,
however, were at least as important as the differences. Both be­
lieved that America stood for liberty. Liberty for both had an
economic meaning. Among other things it meant equality of opportu­
nity. For Kallen and Hapgood this did not mean, as it did for many
conservatives, the right of natural leaders, the businessmen, to
lead without competition or interference and to accumulate unlimited
fortunes. Kallen and Hapgood believed that because of the

63Kallen, "The Covenant of the League of Nations, American
Foreign Policy and the Washington Conference," 270-77. See also,
Kallen, The League of Nations, 92-93. Kallen stated in The League
of Nations, 125-27, that the victory of allied propaganda over
German propaganda was based on the fact that truth was stronger than
falsehood and allied propaganda was based on truth.
development of large-scale economic operations, equality of opportunity in the twentieth century had to be pursued through "industrial democracy" or cooperative efforts of workers to gain a voice in management decisions. They put more emphasis on local government and variety than did the conservative groups examined here. Hapgood put emphasis on economic variety and territorial government of states, whereas Kallen emphasized the cultural autonomy of ethnic groups in America. Kallen and Hapgood as well as the conservatives maintained that the American values of "equal economic opportunity" through "fair play" were universals, good for all mankind. They agreed that the extension of these values to the world would provide a basis for world peace. Although conservatives were more likely to emphasize American superiority, the equality of groups implied in such universal values was mitigated by personal prejudices for or against various groups by Kallen and Hapgood as well. Conservatives placed a much higher value on direct military measures in order to secure American economic interests in the world than did Kallen and Hapgood. Kallen and Hapgood, however, assumed that an economic development similar to that of the United States was desirable for all men, and desired by all men. They assumed that no group would want to be left alone to maintain or develop values which might preclude a great emphasis on economic development.
CHAPTER X

Conclusion

The "American" language, race, spirit, optimism, literature, history, economics, chastity, virility, teamwork, mission, liberty and countless other things were deemed essential as aspects of "Americanism" by various groups and individuals in the nineteen twenties. The question arises: does anything unite the ideas of those who tried to define "Americanism" at that time? Can any order be brought out of this diversity? From the analysis of the ideas of the various Americans described above, it would seem that they did have some things in common.

First, all of these groups and individuals used the terms America and Americanism as value terms. They did not simply study the characteristics and beliefs of the people living in the United States and then apply the term Americanism to describe them, good or bad. Rather, they described their own ideals and then found in American history evidence that those ideals were peculiarly American. Things "American" were good and things "un-American" were bad. In this sense, all of the individuals from Red-baiter Bonnie Busch to National Commander of the Legion Alvin Owlsy to philosopher Horace Kallen were American nationalists.

Second, all of the individuals used comparable if not similar words to describe what Americanism was. Hiram Evans of the Ku Klux
Klan, Eric Fisher Wood of the American Legion, and journalist Norman Hapgood agreed that America stood for democracy, freedom, and toleration. Secretary of Interior Franklin K. Lane, Chamber of Commerce President Julius H. Barnes, and Horace Kallen defined Americanism in terms of "equality of opportunity" and "fair play."

More important than the fact that all of these individuals used words like equality, fair play, and teamwork to define Americanism was their agreement, to some extent, on what those words meant. Equality meant equal opportunity for individual development, and more particularly individual economic development. "Fair play," a "free field," and the "open door" were used to describe the principle of equality of economic opportunity in differing circumstance. Teamwork meant that people of all occupations, and particularly labor, management, and capital, should stand together and work together for the common good. Conservative Charles Norman Fay and liberal Norman Hapgood believed that although there should be different income levels in America, these income differentials should not divide Americans into antagonistic classes. The idea of toleration was not given as specific a content by those Americans as was "fair play" or "teamwork." Even here, however, there was a minimal agreement, explicit or implied, that toleration did not mean that all groups should be allowed absolutely anything they pleased, even if they did not interfere with the rights of others. All of these Americans, that is, were intolerent of some groups and considered them to be outgroups. All believed that some groups were "un-American" in some way. At a minimum, they all agreed that those
who did not value economic and technological progress, who did not want to 'get ahead,' or who on an international scale, did not wish to be "opened up," were in some way inferior to those who did.\(^1\)

At a minimum, then, the Americans described above believed that America stood for something good. It stood for freedom, toleration, equality of economic opportunity, and economic and technological progress. These things were American, but since this meant they were "good," they were also universal. All men wanted them, or at least should want them. It was America's duty to see that they got them.

Just as important as the similarities among the versions of Americanism expressed in the Twenties were the differences. The various groups differed by what they all added to these ideas. Norman Hapgood and Horace Kallen believed that almost absolute freedom of speech was a part of the American idea. The American Legion and the anti-radicals said they believed in free speech, but they were more interested in making sure that no one said anything they considered to be improper. On the other hand, the Legion, the Ku Klux Klan, the anti-radicals, the race theorists, and many members of the Americanization movement believed that there was an "American" race, and "American" language, as well as an "American" idea of fair

\(^1\)Even Senator George W. Norris, a champion of the right of self-determination of nations like China and the Philippines, made a distinction between "civilized" people, who had this right of self-determination, and "uncivilized" or "barbaric" people, who might have to be subdued by force in order to "civilize" them. See Richard Lowitt, *George W. Norris: The Persistence of a Progressive, 1913-1933* (Urbana, Illinois, Chicago and London, 1971), 42-43, 147.
play. The Klan and the anti-radicals added that there was an "American" idea of sexual chastity. The more qualities the term American included, the smaller the number of people who could be classed as American or good. For the Ku Klux Klan, therefore, the American virtue of toleration could only be practiced toward a few people. Horace Kallen, who had a shorter list of qualities deemed necessary to be a good American and thus a good person, could tolerate a larger number of groups and individuals. Since all the things he believed to be American were cultural rather than biological attributes, all people were at least potentially good Americans. There were, however, for Kallen, as well as for the Legion or the Klan, some people deemed to be "un-American."

Another way the definers of Americanism in the Twenties differed was in the way they interpreted or proposed to put into practice ideals such as "fair play" or "teamwork." To most conservative Americans "fair play" and a "free field" already existed in America. Anyone who had the right qualities could get ahead. Those who lost at the game of life should not complain or try to change the rules of the game. They should take their loss like a good sport. People should try to get ahead only as individuals, not as groups. Labor unions, therefore, which tried to advance the interest of workers as a group were un-American. They were trying to put class above country. On the other hand, it was acceptable for management and capital to cooperate and advance their interests as a group because they had already played the game and won. Moreover, they represented the interests of the workers as well as themselves.
The government should at least let them manage their businesses and their workers as they pleased. Better, government should play on the business team by giving business aids and subsidies. Rugged individualism was good, however. It was especially good for the laborer who had yet to prove himself.

Liberal Americans, insofar as they were represented by Hapgood and Kallen, believed that in an increasingly technological and interdependent world it was impossible for men to improve themselves wholly as individuals. It was necessary that they organize in groups in order to achieve their best. Moreover, fair play was an ideal not yet completely realized. Those at the top had not for all time proven themselves. They would have to continue to compete and prove themselves. Those at the bottom might be there because they had not really had "equality of opportunity." However, Kallen and Hapgood, like the Chamber of Commerce, believed that the main ideal for America was for individuals to be able to get economic goods to the best of their ability.

Almost all of the Americans examined above used the idea of teamwork to integrate America into a community, or as a counterbalance to the idea of individual equality of opportunity. They believed that Americans should work together for common goals. They believed that Americans should not divide along class lines simply because some were more successful in the struggle for material goods than others. Kallen and Hapgood on the one hand and the Chamber of Commerce on the American Legion on the other differed as to how this teamwork was to be achieved. For the Chamber of Commerce teamwork
was achieved by all Americans cooperating with those who had proved themselves to be the natural leaders by winning the struggle for more wealth. Kallen and Hapgood believed a more highly integrated industrial team would be achieved when the workers had some of the advantages enjoyed by management, including a voice in management decisions. Ultimately Hapgood, at least in his own family's business, would erase the distinction between labor and management almost completely.

Conservative Americans believed that the American ideal had already been achieved and that the thing to do now was to "keep America what it was" or "Keep America American." If America had already achieved perfection she could not be judged by ideals external to her. The liberals believed that America was not yet perfect. To do so they had to judge America by values to some extent external to her. In that sense they really weren't as nationalistic or as patriotic as one-hundred per cent Americans. They balanced the theme of glorification of the real America with the theme of the ideal, or liberal, America to come. Yet the one-hundred per cent Americans wanted technological progress just as the liberals did. They believed, evidently, that technological and economic change could be isolated from other factors in American society so that no social adjustments had to be made. Although Hapgood and Kallen preached technological and economic change, they seemed to realize that this would require continual social adjustment if a minimum level of national integration were to be maintained. In that sense they wanted to preserve America just as much as the conservatives.
Definers of Americanism also differed in their concepts of an American mission. Those who included the most qualities in the concept of Americanism of necessity made American ideals the least universalistic. Since Americanism was defined as good, those people who could not possibly achieve this ideal were bad. Thus the American Legion, the anti-radicals, and the race theorists tended to see other nations as criminals who had to be dealt with by force. Kallen and Hapgood, as well as the Chamber of Commerce, on the other hand, believed that most peoples could adopt the American ideals of toleration, freedom, and equality of opportunity and become good. They could be dealt with peacefully. In making the American ideal limited and more universal, the liberals and the Chamber of Commerce were at once more and less nationalistic than the Legion or the Klan. America could become the world. On the other hand, if it became the world, it would cease to be a nation in any meaningful sense.

Both liberal and conservative groups believed that the American ideal of equality of economic opportunity was universal and that America should give this ideal to the world by example. Moreover, American prosperity, it was believed, was dependent on world trade. The achievement of an increasing foreign trade by the United States was dependent on international equality of opportunity, or the "open door." The Chamber, however, sometimes believed that just as the wealthy had already proven themselves the natural leaders of the nation, so America had proved herself the leader of nations.
Other nations should cooperate with her and compete only among themselves. The Legion and the anti-radicals offered another variation on the theme of world trade. They believed that an ever increasing American world trade depended on an ever increasing American military power. America was to compete militarily as well as economically. Since other nations had criminal tendencies, America had to police the world for her own benefit. Since good Americans were virile and prided themselves on their willingness to fight, this was not only necessary, but also good.

If the Legion, the anti-radicals, and the racists had a more war-like theory of Americanism than other Americans, it must also be remembered that most of these other Americans believed that American values could be pursued in the world through war as well. The great majority had enthusiastically supported American entry into the World War. Moreover, Kallen, Hapgood, and the Chamber of Commerce believed, just as the Legion did, that the war had taught valuable lessons. They all believed it had taught teamwork. For the Legion, teamwork was the coordination of all aspects of American life for a future war through the leadership of her natural leaders, the military and industrial elite. For Hapgood and Kallen the teamwork taught by the war was teamwork between labor and management within America for a more economically just society, and teamwork among nations to achieve world equality of economic opportunity and avoid war.

What, then is the significance of the agreement by many Americans of the 1920's on the ideals of equality of economic
opportunity and teamwork as the meaning of Americanism? Equality of opportunity implied competition and competition produces both losers and winners. When the stakes were material this meant that equality of opportunity was a condition that could not exist long without a continual redistribution of property, which would have made the game meaningless. Moreover, the fact that competition for material goods produced both winners and losers also meant that diverse classes in a competitive society had differing material interests. In order to solve the dilemma created by these implications of the ideal of fair play, the individuals and organizations examined here offered what today seems an increasingly impossible panacea, continuous economic growth. Only such growth made the ideals of equality of opportunity and teamwork seem compatible. Moreover, liberals Kallen and Hapgood never really addressed themselves to the possibility that America might lose in the world competition for economic goods, even if the "open door" were universally applied. Chamber president Julius Barnes was only a little more imaginative in suggesting world teamwork with America acting as captain of the team for a solution of the problem of the insecurity created by world economic competition. The Legion and anti-radicals faced the problem more forthrightly. They suggested the use of threat and military power to assure America of her share of an ever expanding world trade. Thus the question remains of whether the ideals of equality of opportunity and teamwork are adequate for an America and a world increasingly threatened as well as benefited by technological advance and economic growth.
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