

CIO Political Action Committee. Subsequent history has attested the meticulous accuracy of those reports, a fact in which I find some satisfaction because I wrote them. The CIO unions which I named as Communist-dominated in those reports were expelled from the CIO five years later, with the exception of two or three which threw off the Communist yoke. The Catholic weeklies, *Commonweal* and *America*, denounced the findings of those reports; and the *Daily Worker* of October 27, 1944, picked up their denunciations and reprinted them.

I must register my dissent from a widely held assumption that all Catholics are of one mind on the question and methods of resisting the encroachments of Communism. No such unanimity exists. There is no monolithic Catholic line on the subject of freedom based upon the free competitive market, commonly but inadequately known as Capitalism.

I have in my library a book entitled, *Catholicism, Capitalism or Communism*, written many years ago—but since the emergence of the Soviet slave state—by Father Jeremiah C. Harrington of the Saint Paul Seminary. It bears the imprimatur of the Archbishop of St. Paul. In this book, Father Harrington wrote: "Capitalism is a comparatively new economic system but we believe that the influence of the Church will be the gradual diminution and eventually the abandonment of Capitalism, because the spirit of the Catholic Church and the spirit of Capitalism cannot permanently coexist together."

Father Harrington said further: "We do think that the abuses of Capitalism are as dangerous as Socialism or Communism." The left-wing World Council of Churches echoed this plague-on-both-your-houses doctrine in its report at Amsterdam in 1948 which read as follows: "The Christian churches should reject the ideologies of both Communism and laissez-faire capitalism. . . ."

Father Harrington's error is a common one. It is predicated on the belief that an evil Capitalism replaced a lovely agrarian Utopia. He wrote of the transition from a predominantly agrarian economy to the free competitive economy, as follows: "Heart-rending it must have been indeed for the poor people

to tear themselves away from their native fields and cottages, where like their fathers gone before, they had enjoyed so many happy days." That is sheer sentimental twaddle and an unwitting falsification of history. But even conservatives—political and economic as well as religious—have accepted without question this left-wing folklore of the intellectuals, and have based their notions about Capitalism with its factory system and free market upon it. In a recent book entitled, *Capitalism and the Historians*, edited by Hayek, a serious effort has been made by responsible scholars to dispose of the myths which surround the advent of the factory system and the free market.

But, to get back to Father Harrington. In his conclusion, he wrote: "Capitalism is dying of dry rot." That is also the Marxist conclusion.

"AMERICAN MERCURY" ARTICLE

In that much-discussed *American Mercury* article, I wrote: "Some seven thousand Protestant clergymen have been drawn during the past seventeen years into the network of the Kremlin's conspiracy." Actually, my card file contains the names of 8,673 such clergymen, the greater number of whom naturally belong in the category of unwitting dupes of the Communist-front apparatus. The comparable number of rabbis is 353, which is approximately 14 percent of the total number of rabbis in the United States.

While I am on the subject of figures, I will say that 2,131 of the 8,673 clergymen were Methodists; 1,439 were Protestant Episcopal; and 626 were Presbyterian, U.S.A.

The opening sentence of my *American Mercury* article on "Reds and Our Churches" read as follows: "The largest single group supporting the Communist apparatus in the United States today is composed of Protestant clergymen." There was a myth circulated during the uproar which followed the publication of the article that I did not write that sentence. Let me say here and now that this myth was utterly without foundation. I wrote every word of the sentence, and did so after many hours of reflections on precisely how it should be worded. The rough drafts of the article leave no doubt that I