



HATTIE F KRUGER

Socialist, Suffragist, Grandmother

Terrence McGarty

Hattie F Kruger

DRAFT

Terrence P. McGarty

Contents

1	Introduction.....	5
2	Birth	5
3	Education	6
4	Politics.....	7
4.1	National Woman's Party	8
4.2	Dorothy Day: The Accidental Suffragist	8
4.3	Woodrow Wilson	11
4.4	November 1917.....	21
4.5	November 25 1917.....	25
4.6	September 1918	28
4.7	July 1919.....	28
4.8	July 1920.....	30
4.9	Martens and Communists	33
5	Marriage.....	35
6	WWII	36
7	Friends.....	37
8	Death.....	39
9	References.....	40
10	Appendix.....	43
10.1	Census 1940.....	43
10.2	Election Returns and Votes 1920.....	44
10.3	New York Women	45
10.3.1	Eunice Dana Brannan.....	45
10.3.2	Amy Juengling	46
10.3.3	Dorothy Day.....	47
10.3.4	Lucy Burns.....	47
10.3.5	Matilda Young	48
10.4	Woodrow Wilson: The New Freedom	49
10.5	Louise Despert	54
10.6	DOC Hart Island Burial Records	54
10.7	Russian Propaganda, Martrens and Socialists.	55
11	Index	69

1 INTRODUCTION

Family histories come in three packages. First is what we are told by family members without any reference to facts. This often is what people would have liked the family to be. Second, is what we find in public records. We find birth and death records, marriages and divorces. They often tell a different story. The third is what we find in our genetic history. Namely all those stories about being say Hungarian we find are not even close, we are all Scots, or whatever the genetic makeup tells us.

I approach this task with a little bit of all of the above. I try my best to gather facts but these facts are often hidden and obscured if not plain destroyed in the miasma of the past.

This tale is about my grandmother, one Hattie Frances Kruger. She was born in Buffalo New York in 1890 if the records are correct. She dies in 1976 at the ripe old age of 86. In between she did a great deal, and I was fortunate to have spent 33 years of that in her presence. In a sense she taught me what I know now, at least by method and intensity. For each Saturday when I visited her, I had to work a puzzle before being able to get my hands on some M&Ms or Kraft caramels. So I became a puzzle player. Puzzles are not linear. They are executed by clustering likes and then slowly disassembling the likes into connected parts, slowly assembling the entire picture. Puzzles are truly pattern matching systems and the rules are complex but executable.

This document was thus assembled as she taught me, as a puzzle. I had a pile of family lore, a pile of records, and a bunch of DNA. The assembly in the following is my best effort to put the pieces together. I have used memory, ancestry searching, searching of public records. I am certain that a more thorough search may be fruitful but this is a start.

The following is a brief chronology based upon what few facts are currently available.

1890 February, Born in Buffalo NY
1905 September Nurse in West Haverstraw NY
1917 November Arrested in Night of Terror Buffalo NY with Dorothy Day
1918 November Ran as US Congressperson in Socialist Party Buffalo NY
1920 November Ran as NY Treasurer in Socialist Party Buffalo NY
1922-1932(?) Works at Seaview Hospital Staten Island NY
1928 February Marries Thomas Maynard in Manhattan NY
1920-1940(?) Resides in Huguenot on Staten Island near Dorothy Day
1940 January Resides in 108 New Street Staten Island NY
1943 I arrive
1952 Lives in Westerleigh Staten Island NY
1976 September Dies at Seaview Hospital

2 BIRTH

As best as we can tell, she claims a birth in 1890 in Buffalo, NY on 6 February 1890. That makes her a US citizen by birth as well as being 27 at the time she was incarcerated. I have some doubts

on both counts since there was always a family lore regarding her direct German heritage as well as her date of birth. We have no birth certificate but we do have a Social Security start data in 1956 which would corroborate her birth records.

It appears that the family resided in Buffalo for a long period. She does not appear to have gotten to New York City until the early 1920s and marries my grandfather in early 1928. There are records that she is licensed by the State of New York as a Nurse and was educated in Buffalo. No specifics as to licenses are available. It is not at all certain as to her family history but she did have a brother whom I had met. He owned and operated a trucking business but that contact was in the early 1950s.

3 EDUCATION

It appears that she studied at Buffalo General Hospital School of Nursing sometime around 1905-1910¹. The paper by Diehl from around that period notes:

A number of graduates were employed. The hospital report of 1899 gives the daily average of patients as one hundred and forty-three, nurses and probationers forty-seven, graduate nurses four. In looking back to the early history of the school one cannot but be surprised at the great results achieved from such small beginnings. In the early part of 1900 the benefactor of the school, Mrs. Gates, passed to her reward. The total number of graduates of the school on July 1, 1900, was two hundred and thirty-one.

This did not include two graduates dropped from the rolls for cause. Nine of the graduates have chosen other occupations, as follows: three physicians, one dentist, one deaconess, one stenographer, two manicurists, and one lodging-house keeper. Sixty-four have married (twenty-seven per cent. of the total number of graduates), twelve have died, ninety-three have left Buffalo, and one hundred and twenty-six remain in the city.

However in the New York State records it notes that²:

¹ See http://libweb1.lib.buffalo.edu:8080/xtf/view?docId=ead/archives/ubar_ms0147.xml for the alumni association for possible records. Student records are in http://libweb1.lib.buffalo.edu:8080/xtf/view?docId=ead/archives/ubar_ms0147.xml&doc.view=content&brand=default&anchor.id=0#series1C

2

https://books.google.com/books?id=t_k2AQAAAJ&pg=PA715&lpg=PA715&dq=%22hattie+f.+kruger%22&source=bl&ots=BLzALZJWyS&sig=PI5-maprrqC1PLsIMzdrTv62y_Y&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi3lZiT-N7XAhVsIoMKHR9hA3kQ6AEILzAC#v=onepage&q=%22hattie%20f.%20kruger%22&f=false also New York State Service, Volume 23 By New York (State). Dept. of Civil Service

**Hospital for the Care of Crippled and Deformed Children, West
Haverstraw—Concluded**

Exempt class

Position	Name	Date of entrance into service	Compensation
First assistant surgeon.....	P. Henry Fitzhugh.....	Mar. 11, 1901
Assistant surgeon.....	F. D. Weisse.....	April 22, 1902

Competitive class

Surgeon-in-chief and superintendent.....	Newton M. Shaffer.....	Nov. 9, 1900
Book and storekeeper.....	Edwin T. Dunn.....	Nov. 15, 1905	\$600
Matron.....	Gertrude A. Hoxie.....	Dec. 1, 1900	600
Resident physician.....	Lee A. Whitney.....	May 1, 1904	900
Stenographer.....	Jessie L. Weller.....	Sept. 28, 1904	360
Teacher.....	Edith M. Rice.....	June 1, 1905	360
Chief nurse.....	Hattie F. Kruger.....	Oct. 1, 1905	420
Nurse.....	Helen V. Kelly.....	Dec. 22, 1905	420

Hospital for Incipient Tuberculosis, Ray Brook

Unclassified service

Board of trustees.....	Willis G. Macdonald.....	Feb. 11, 1903
	Elmer E. Larkin.....	April 14, 1904
	Martin E. McClary.....	Jan. 18, 1905
	John B. Devins.....	Mar. 8, 1905
	One vacancy		

The above would indicate she was fifteen at the time which sounds a bit too young. Yet this is a State institution in a rural area on the west side of the Hudson about 40 mile north of New York. This is West Haverstraw, across from Croton on Hudson in New York. She was a Head Nurse in this time period which belies her listed birth date. I believe she was born in 1895, not 1890 but again the record is complex.

There was, as indicated before, a family rumor that she was born in Germany, then came to the US. Her birth date was in 1885 from that rumor. However later records still record 1890 but there is always some hesitancy. There also is the issue that Nursing School may not have required a High School completion and may have been a direct move from Grammar School. All of this is open to conjecture.

4 POLITICS

Hattie became a major player in the Socialist Party during the 1912 through the 1920 period. It appears that she may have started in Buffalo and then continued as she progressed through her time in Philadelphia if that was correct. However there was and is a Lighthouse Medical Clinic and Mental Health Clinic in Buffalo and this may likely be where she was. Her business address was Jefferson Avenue in Buffalo and that address is close to the current Lighthouse Medical

Clinic³. However this Buffalo clinic is of recent establishment and unlike the Philadelphia is not nor ever was a settlement house.

4.1 NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

A focal point for the Women's movement to vote was the National Woman's Party. From the Library of Congress the following description:

Founded in 1913 as the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage (CU), the National Woman's Party (NWP) was instrumental in raising public awareness of the women's suffrage campaign. Using a variety of tactics, the party successfully pressured President Woodrow Wilson, members of Congress, and state legislators to support passage of a 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guaranteeing women nationwide the right to vote. In so doing, the NWP established a legacy defending the exercise of free speech, free assembly, and the right to dissent. NWP members picket outside the International Amphitheater in Chicago, where Woodrow Wilson delivers a speech. October 20, 1916.

The NWP effectively commanded the attention of politicians and the public through its aggressive agitation, relentless lobbying, clever publicity stunts, and creative examples of civil disobedience and nonviolent confrontation. Its tactics were versatile and imaginative, drawing inspiration from a variety of sources—including the British suffrage campaign, the American labor movement, and the temperance, antislavery, and early women's rights campaigns in the United States.

Traditional lobbying and petitioning were a mainstay of NWP members, but these activities were supplemented by other more public actions—including parades, pageants, street speaking, and demonstrations. The party eventually realized that it needed to escalate its pressure and adopt even more aggressive tactics. Most important among these was picketing the White House over many months, leading to the arrest and imprisonment of many suffragists.

The willingness of NWP pickets to be arrested, their campaign for recognition as political prisoners rather than as criminals, and their acts of civil disobedience in jail shocked the nation and brought attention and support to their cause. Through constant agitation, the NWP effectively compelled President Wilson to support a federal woman suffrage amendment. Similar pressure on national and state legislators led to the ratification of the 19th Amendment in 1920.

The NWP became an aggressive and assertive group of women across the country that used demonstrations and the media to press for the right of women to vote. This movement led to the November 1917 confrontation. It seems clear from the record that Hattie was a member of the NWP. In the records of her arrest she is assigned that attribution.

4.2 DOROTHY DAY: THE ACCIDENTAL SUFRAGIST

³ <https://www.lighthousefreemedicalclinic.com/> this is of recent creation so it is not like the one in Philadelphia.

She also was arrested in the group with Dorothy Day. Day would have been twenty at the time of the arrests. As is noted about Day⁴:



Day, who had thought herself sterile following her abortion, was elated to find she was pregnant in mid-1925, while Batterham dreaded fatherhood. While she visited her mother in Florida and separated from Batterham for several months, she intensified her exploration of Catholicism. When she returned to Staten Island, Batterham found her increasing devotion, attendance at Mass, and religious reading incomprehensible.

Soon after the birth of their daughter Tamar Teresa, on March 4, 1926, Day encountered a local Catholic Religious Sister, Sister Aloysia, S.C., and with her help educated herself in the Catholic faith and had her baby baptized in July 1927. Batterham refused to attend the ceremony, and his relationship with Day became increasingly unbearable, as her desire for marriage in the Church confronted his antipathy to organized religion, Catholicism most of all. After one last fight in late December, Day refused to allow him to return. On December 28 she had herself baptized with Sister Aloysia as her godparent.

What is interesting here is that Hattie knew and was friendly with Day. Hattie was when I knew her a-religious at best. Day's return to Staten Island seems to coincide with Hattie's move to Staten Island. The Sister belongs to the Order of the Sisters of Charity under whose tutelage I went to Grammar School. Thus one could reasonably speculate that the two of them remained close at that time. Day lived in what was called Spanish Camp⁵ in Annandale on Staten Island, which was just a short distance from where Hattie originally lived during the late 20s and early 30s. It is thus not unreasonable to conclude that they may have continued the relationship. Thomas attended the Dutch Reformed Church in Huguenot which was just a few blocks away. Again this is conjecture but reasonable. Hattie was as noted not the least bit religious and thus any nexus with Day's liberal view of Catholicism, which may very well have been her replacement for Socialism, is a guess.

⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dorothy_Day#cite_note-34

⁵ Spanish Camp was started in 1923 by emigrants from Spain, most of whom were anarchists, under the name Spanish Naturopath Association. The 18-acre property, located on New York Harbor and off Poillon Avenue on the southeastern shore of Staten Island, had its own streets and services, quite independent of anything having to do with the rest of Staten Island and New York City. A small pond and associated wetlands were included. A small beach faced New York Harbor, adjacent to an ornate picnic area and athletic field. Roman Catholic activist Dorothy Day lived for years in one of the cottages.

Ironically, my mother who converted to Catholicism, is buried near Day in the Cemetery of the Resurrection on Staten Island. Her daughter followed her path and died in 2008 in Lebanon, New Hampshire, just over the hill from my home in New Hampshire⁶.

I was writing a piece on my Grandmother and her time as a Suffragist. I especially was focused on her time being arrested under the direct orders of Woodrow Wilson, that misogynistic, racist, anti-Semite, anti-Catholic, all around good guy. And we worry about Robert E. Lee, but I digress. Wilson hated these women walking around with signs asking for the right to vote. After all, he was a Virginian, a man, and more importantly the President. So off with their heads, or the next best thing was to arrest them and ship them off to prison. Get them past a friendly judge, and then to Occoquan Prison, now Lorton. Throw them in cells, host then down, let them starve! Yes indeed a real nice fellow Wilson was. After all he had just gotten us into WW I, sent a few hundred thousand to France, no uniforms though, but what the heck, let them figure out how to deal with the French snobs.

Now my Grandmother was in the first batch put in the Black Marias, the police wagons, no Paddy Wagons in DC, not enough Irish. Along with her was a young lady called Dorothy Day. I had originally thought Day was there as a Suffragist. Nope! She was sent down to cover the protest from her New York newspaper. She just happened to "be on the corner when the bus went by". Now day recalls but one of the people with her and Day recalls that they discussed literature in the prison. Day seems more interested in the "adventure" and somewhat aloof from the underlying cause of the vote for women. That surprised me, at least until I discovered a bit more about Day.

You see, she had one lover by whom she got pregnant and then had the child aborted. That followed with another where she kept the child, but not the father. Sounds like a rather difficult beginning. One must jump to today where the Cardinal in New York and the Pope in Rome are pushing for her Sainthood. One could surmise it is a bit like Augustine of Hippo, who took his concubine to Italy to study, abandoned her, then let his child somewhat loose, and then die, before his return to Hippo and a career writing against the likes of the Donatists and Pelagians. I gather abandoning your child and their other parent may be a prerequisite for Sainthood, but then again I am no Canon lawyer.

Now how did this accidental Suffragist get to this lofty position. It seems that she founded the Catholic Worker, a rather left wing but "Catholic" weekly, somewhat in competition with the Daily Worker, the paper of the Communist Party. She then was accompanied by a French wanderer who convinced her to leverage this to a full blow mission, a mission to the poor and homeless, for which there were many in the 1930s. By the 1940s she had also become an avowed Pacifist and opposed the US entry into WW II, especially after Pearl Harbor, then in the 1950s, she opposed the use of nuclear weapons and the execution of the Rosenbergs. By the 1960s she

⁶ <http://gilberthouse.blogspot.com/2008/03/tamar-hennessy-dies-at-82-eternal-rest.html> Tamar Teresa Batterham Hennessy, the only child of Catholic Worker co-foundress Dorothy Day, died subsequent to a stroke on Tuesday, 25 March 2008, in Lebanon, New Hampshire at the age of 82. She attended the Academy of Saint Dorothy on Staten Island.

had a multiplicity of "farms" and similar places where people assembled and had what we called "Retreats", which were weeklong "spiritual" get-togethers where they contemplated and listened to religious lectures. She also strongly opposed Vietnam, was pro-integration, and supported the farm workers actions. By the 1970s, in her later years she saw a slow collapse of many of these ventures, especially as she aged and was in poor health.

In a recent book by a grandchild, which details many of these efforts, she also spent little time on her only child, and in turn that child seems to have suffered by what one could call abandonment syndrome.

One could ask if this is a Saint Francis, a Saint Augustine, or what Saint would this be. Francis started an Order which exists even today. It was an order that was teaching and helped the poor. Augustine spent his time managing his church affairs and writing extensively of theological issues, such as his work, *The City of God*. Day's writings seems to have been a multiplicity of autobiographies, at least as I have examined them

Day was there the day the bus went by which carried my Grandmother and others to prison. Was this an enlightening event, or was it a mere happenstance of being asked to report on a story.

Now one may wonder why the extent of words. It is that the proximity to Day was not a single event. You see my Grandmother lived three blocks from Days home on Staten Island, and my parents are buried just a few plots from Day's grave. I also knew a great deal of Day when in New York in the 50s and 60s. Thus the interest. As Day was a convert, so too was my mother. As Day was intrigued by Catholicism, so too was I, exploring even the possibility of being a Franciscan, studying on Staten Island.

But Sainthood is something I would leave to the Good Lord. I could see Elizabeth Seton founder of the Sisters of Charity, she managed to create something which lasted. I was even educated by the good Sisters. But political activism and a social organizer may open the floodgates for many of questionable credentials. Then again I am not in Rome, and have zero chance of ever going there. As an Ockhamist, individualism and a rejection of social justice as a mechanism for right acting do not seem to be in vogue.

4.3 WOODROW WILSON

To understand the complex issues that led to the Night of Terror, one must first understand Woodrow Wilson. Wilson is a son of the South, a Virginian. He is a racist, a misogynist, and anti-Semite and overall Southern gentleman. Wilson was one of those people who managed to attain positions as a result of the initial impression of those in power and then no sooner there manages to make himself totally disliked. He did this at Princeton and as Governor of New Jersey. Fortunately for him, Teddy Roosevelt ran against Taft in the 1912 election allowing Wilson to get the election due to the dissension in the Republican ranks.

Wilson had a great deal of difficulty understanding the twentieth century. He wanted a Government like England, so as Prime Minister has also controlled Parliament, and in his case Congress. Wilson had no persuasive powers and he was grossly ignorant of anything outside the

US. Thus the Treaties at the end of the War led to WW II. Wilson lost his first wife and soon thereafter obtained a second, a woman who was possessive, arrogant, fed his ego, and after Wilson's stroke took effective control of the Government.

Woodrow Wilson is a complex figure in the development of the progressive movement. Many of the books about Wilson are hagiographies, most worse than those on FDR. For example, the book, *Woodrow Wilson: A Biography*, by Cooper, is a somewhat biased addition to the wealth of biographies on Wilson. Cooper is one of the class of writers who approaches Wilson in the somewhat favorable light of a progressive, in fact one may call Cooper a neo-progressive historian in light of how he develops Wilson's biography.

In contrast to Cooper is Pestritto, who is anything but a neo-progressive. He has written extensively on Wilson and the Progressives and his writing is brilliantly clear and comprehensive in coverage. We will follow Pestritto in presenting Wilson.

One should always remember that Wilson was the ultimate opportunist. He was offered the Governorship of New Jersey just as the Board at Princeton was tiring of his high handed, arrogant, and almost dictatorial style while its president. He ran for President just when the political machine that initially supported him in 1910 decides the same in 1912. Wilson was also a pragmatist. He did what was necessary at the time. Thus as he saw TR and the Progressive bent he assumed much of the TR Progressive mantle to himself. As the country tired of TR it accepted the aloofness of Wilson, not knowing what it had elected.

Wilson was a Virginian by birth and at heart. In 1912 that still meant a level of arrogance and self-importance as well as a strong racist bent. Milkis details the occasion when Trotter, a black leader and editor of the *Boston Guardian*, was thrown out of Wilson's office abruptly because he disagreed with the President's refusal to even discuss the separate but equal position of the Democrats⁷. Wilson also as a Virginian had strong ties to the south in many ways and the south was the core to his ongoing efforts. This truly was a sad day when the President so denigrated such a man as Trotter.

To understand Wilson one must understand the base of his world view, and that was Hegel. Strangely in the book by Cooper there is not a reference to Hegel in the index. Perhaps the reason is the nexus of Hegel and Hitler, the historicism of the Hegelian conflict of civilizations with a teleological view of a selected end point. For Hegel the process of history had a deliberate end point. It was not a process for the sake of process, but process with a conclusion. The winners of the thesis, antithesis, one the ones in the synthesis, were the better of both prior worlds, and as one reads Wilson one sees this Hegelian view flow out again and again.

One may ask, besides Wilson's world view, a Hegelian view, why did he become a progressive or was that part of his evolving character? Cooper states⁸:

⁷ See Milkis pp 274-275 places Wilson in the poorest of light as he deals with the civil rights of the blacks.

⁸ Cooper p 106.

"When, how, and why Woodrow Wilson became a progressive would become hotly debated question after he entered politics. Foes of both sides would denounce him for opportunism; erstwhile conservatives patrons would scorn him for ingratitude and for pandering to the passing popular fancies; skeptical progressives would suspect him of belated and halfhearted adherence to their side. Opportunism unquestionable played a part in swaying Wilson toward progressivism. The popularity of Roosevelt's anti-trust and regulatory policies, growing reformist insurgency in both parties, and repeated defeats of conservative Democrats, all pointed to the direction in which the political winds were blowing..."

Yet Wilson was both opportunist, some would say pragmatist, and at the same time driven by a vision, a philosophy of history as developed by Hegel.

The development of Wilson's historicism in the Hegelian context is provided by Petitto⁹. First historicism is the theory of history based upon Hegel that states that history is both organic and evolving and yet rational and a reflection and instrument of power. Hegel saw history as an evolving conflict of ideas, of ways of thinking and living, the thesis and antithesis, when meeting in a point of conflict, the synthesis, the best idea of the next step of history, evolving, yet the evolution has a purpose, a teleological drive to improvement. Superior tribes overcome inferior tribes and the result is a forward moving civilization.

I would briefly question Hegel and the historicism because in European history we have the Huns destroying Rome, the Vikings killing off Irish culture, and tales of this kind again and again. One could argue that history is Darwinian with no end just a process of survival of the fittest, the Spencerian way in which mankind evolves. Yet it is important to understand a person's world view, and Petitto presents this brilliantly.

As to the influence of historicism on Wilson, Petitto states¹⁰:

"Wilson also adopted the framework of historicism in describing how history bring progress. Advance in history comes out of conflict, a dialectical process where opposing conventions or customs meet, with the historically superior convention winning over and assimilating the inferior. Wilson traced this dialectic back to what he considered the early history of the state - the primitive family or tribe."

In many ways this is Spencerian history, with the Hegelian conflict. Yet one must add to this the end, the goal, the teleology that implies that this is all going somewhere. As such, one can see Wilson with a vision, a mission, driven to crash into the existing system with his views and seek the Darwinian survival of what he saw as the evolving United States. We will see that vision somewhat when we examine the New Freedom which was the basis of his campaigns.

Again from Petitto we have¹¹:

⁹ Petitto, Wilson, pp 14-19.

¹⁰ Petitto, Wilson p. 35.

¹¹ Petitto, Wilson p. 34.

"The principles that underlie Wilson's theory of the state reflect Hegel and the tradition of historicism. Throughout his writings, Wilson constantly referred to government as something that is a living and must adapt and grow in accord with the progress of history. This organic concept of government is most thoroughly explained in The State."

The principle that Wilson followed was a changing one but the change was around the laws, around the Constitution, reinterpreting what was there already with a strong role for the executive, especially when he became that entity.

Finally it is important to understand how Wilson saw the Constitution. It was well known in his writing in Congressional Government that he considered the three branches of government as cumbersome and that he thought the English Parliamentary system much more effective. Thus it is no wonder that he can totally dismiss the Declaration of Independence as well as the Constitution as outmoded elements of a process towards the organic development of the United States. As Petitto states¹²:

"In his New Freedom campaign, Wilson asked rhetorically what the attitude of progressives ought to be toward the symbols of the founding political order - especially toward the Constitution and the individualistic understanding of it that dominated the founding era. His answer was that the form and principles of the founding era were appropriate and necessary for their time.The founders primitive, individualistic liberalism - while outdated for the present circumstances - had been historically necessary....Wilson's argument that the ideas of the founding were outmoded for the modern times is why he and other progressives who wrote about the founding era tended to focus on biographical and historical accounts and avoid discussion of principles."

It is also why progressive historians like Beard try to denigrate and downplay the founding fathers and those who created the Constitution. It is essential for progressives to set the Constitution aside, to make it unnecessary, to make it something that we, society, has moved beyond, and to allow the central government to expand its powers over all. Wilson stepped further than TR and most progressives because he did so on the shoulder of Hegel, and in a strange way it was the same Hegelian shoulders that brought forth the Third Reich.

As Teddy Roosevelt had his New Nationalism, Wilson introduced during his campaign his New Freedom. In contrast to Roosevelt, Wilson has a much more refined and detailed presentation. Yet as Link states¹³¹⁴³:

"Wilson became more and more convinced that the struggle between the New Freedom and the New Nationalism was a struggle between the two concepts of government so radically different that he prophesied slavery and enchainment for the people if Roosevelt were elected. "This is the second struggle for emancipation" he (Wilson) declared in a supreme outburst at Denver on

¹² Petitto, Wilson, pp 103-104.

¹³ Link, Wilson, p 21.

October 7. " ... If America is not to have free enterprise, then she can have freedom of no sort whatever"

Links also discusses Wilson's health problems and this has been discussed by many since then. Wilson had atherosclerosis and as a result his moods would swing greatly. This of course was exaggerated by the time he tried to negotiate the 1919 Peace Treaty. Wilson was a vacillating thinker who sought out people who would praise him, thus the ever presence of Col. House, and thus the inability to seek the advice and guidance of others. Wilson saw Roosevelt's Progressive ideas of actual nationalization of certain industries as unacceptable. However the Wilson approach would be one of Government control, and as Rahe had stated this becomes the "Soft Despotism" that Montesquieu has foretold almost a hundred years earlier.

The document called *The New Freedom*, published after his election, was in effect a compilation of Wilson's speeches during his campaign in 1912. These speeches have inputs from many including Brandeis. The two men truly complimented each other and their intellects came through in what we see as *The New Freedom*. It became the corner stone of the Progressive movement during this period.

The first part of the structure of the *New Freedom* is Wilson's statements regarding the dynamic nature of the Constitution, the flexible bending ability of those responsible for its enforcement as to what indeed they were enforcing.

Wilson states:

"Now, it came to me, as this interesting man talked, that the Constitution of the United States had been made under the dominion of the Newtonian Theory. You have only to read the papers of The Federalist to see that fact written on every page. They speak of the "checks and balances" of the Constitution, and use to express their idea the simile of the organization of the universe, and particularly of the solar system,—how by the attraction of gravitation the various parts are held in their orbits; and then they proceed to represent Congress, the Judiciary, and the President as a sort of imitation of the solar system.

They were only following the English Whigs, who gave Great Britain its modern constitution. Not that those Englishmen analyzed the matter, or had any theory about it; Englishmen care little for theories. It was a Frenchman, Montesquieu, who pointed out to them how faithfully they had copied Newton's description of the mechanism of the heavens.

The makers of our Federal Constitution read Montesquieu with true scientific enthusiasm. They were scientists in their way,—the best way of their age,—those fathers of the nation. Jefferson wrote of "the laws of Nature,"—and then by way of afterthought,—"and of Nature's God." And they constructed a government as they would have constructed an orrery,—to display the laws of nature. Politics in their thought was a variety of mechanics. The Constitution was founded on the law of gravitation. The government was to exist and move by virtue of the efficacy of "checks and balances."

*The trouble with the theory is that government is not a machine, but a living thing. It falls, not under the theory of the universe, but under the theory of organic life. **It is accountable to Darwin, not to Newton. It is modified by its environment, necessitated by its tasks, shaped to its functions by the sheer pressure of life. No living thing can have its organs offset against each other, as checks, and live. On the contrary, its life is dependent upon their quick co-operation, their ready response to the commands of instinct or intelligence, their amicable community of purpose. Government is not a body of blind forces; it is a body of men, with highly differentiated functions, no doubt, in our modern day, of specialization, with a common task and purpose.***

Their co-operation is indispensable, their warfare fatal. There can be no successful government without the intimate, instinctive co-ordination of the organs of life and action. This is not theory, but fact, and displays its force as fact, whatever theories may be thrown across its track. Living political constitutions must be Darwinian in structure and in practice. Society is a living organism and must obey the laws of life, not of mechanics; it must develop.

All that progressives ask or desire is permission—in an era when "development," "evolution," is the scientific word—to interpret the Constitution according to the Darwinian principle; all they ask is recognition of the fact that a nation is a living thing and not a machine."

The above statement by Wilson set that framework, specifically the call to action in the last paragraph which states: *in an era when "development," "evolution," is the scientific word—to interpret the Constitution according to the Darwinian principle; all they ask is recognition of the fact that a nation is a living thing and not a machine.* The Constitution need not change the words just how the words are interpreted. The problem of course is twofold: first, who is the interpreter and second the Constitution had within it the means to change how it would be interpreted, and changed.

Wilson then goes on to address the opposition and his case the Republicans. He starts out below by disemboweling Hamilton, without any due process, just his belief that Hamilton was in favor of the landed gentry. Then he goes on to Lincoln, giving Lincoln a backhanded compliment and then taking his shots at Republicans. He states:

*"There are two theories of government that have been contending with each other ever since government began. **One of them is the theory which in America is associated with the name of a very great man, Alexander Hamilton. A great man, but, in my judgment, not a great American. He did not think in terms of American life. Hamilton believed that the only people who could understand government, and therefore the only people who were qualified to conduct it, were the men who had the biggest financial stake in the commercial and industrial enterprises of the country.***

That theory, though few have now the hardihood to profess it openly, has been the working theory upon which our government has lately been conducted. It is astonishing how persistent it is. It is amazing how quickly the political party which had Lincoln for its first leader,—Lincoln, who not only denied, but in his own person so completely disproved the aristocratic theory,—it is

amazing how quickly that party, founded on faith in the people, forgot the precepts of Lincoln and fell under the delusion that the "masses" needed the guardianship of "men of affairs.""

To Wilson, he believes that he and the Progressives are the men of the people and they have a vision, given solely to them, of what should be done and how people should be treated.

Wilson then goes on to address the major topic of the day, corporations and especially monopolies. Again as I had said regarding Roosevelt, the facts at the time do not support Wilson. Yes there were monopolies, railroads, telegraph, telephone, certain oil products, but at the same time there was competition. There was great competition. Wilson bemoans the monopolies as follows:

"The doctrine that monopoly is inevitable and that the only course open to the people of the United States is to submit to and regulate it found a champion during the campaign of 1912 in the new party, or branch of the Republican party, founded under the leadership of Mr. Roosevelt, with the conspicuous aid,—I mention him with no satirical intention, but merely to set the facts down accurately,—of Mr. George W. Perkins, organizer of the Steel Trust and the Harvester Trust, and with the support of more than three millions of citizens, many of them among the most patriotic, conscientious and high-minded men and women of the land.

The fact that its acceptance of monopoly was a feature of the new party platform from which the attention of the generous and just was diverted by the charm of a social program of great attractiveness to all concerned for the amelioration of the lot of those who suffer wrong and privation, and the further fact that, even so, the platform was repudiated by the majority of the nation, render it no less necessary to reflect on the significance of the confession made for the first time by any party in the country's history. It may be useful, in order to the relief of the minds of many from an error of no small magnitude, to consider now, the heat of a presidential contest being past, exactly what it was that Mr. Roosevelt proposed.

Mr. Roosevelt attached to his platform some very splendid suggestions as to noble enterprises which we ought to undertake for the uplift of the human race; but when I hear an ambitious platform put forth, I am very much more interested in the dynamics of it than in the rhetoric of it. I have a very practical mind, and I want to know who are going to do those things and how they are going to be done. If you have read the trust plank in that platform as often as I have read it, you have found it very long, but very tolerant. It did not anywhere condemn monopoly, except in words; its essential meaning was that the trusts have been bad and must be made to be good.

.... Mr. Roosevelt long ago classified trusts for us as good and bad, and he said that he was afraid only of the bad ones. Now he does not desire that there should be any more bad ones, but proposes that they should all be made good by discipline, directly applied by a commission of executive appointment. All he explicitly complains of is lack of publicity and lack of fairness; not the exercise of power, for throughout that plank the power of the great corporations is accepted as the inevitable consequence of the modern organization of industry. All that it is proposed to do is to take them under control and regulation. The national administration having for sixteen years been virtually under the regulation of the trusts, it would be merely a family matter were the parts reversed and were the other members of the family to exercise the regulation.

And the trusts, apparently, which might, in such circumstances, comfortably continue to administer our affairs under the mollifying influences of the federal government, would then, if you please, be the instrumentalities by which all the humanistic, benevolent program of the rest of that interesting platform would be carried out!

*I have read and reread that plank, so as to be sure that I get it right. All that it complains of is,—and the complaint is a just one, surely,—**that these gentlemen exercise their power in a way that is secret. Therefore, we must have publicity.** Sometimes they are arbitrary; **therefore they need regulation.** Sometimes they do not consult the general interests of the community; **therefore they need to be reminded of those general interests by an industrial commission.** But at every turn it is the trusts who are to do us good, and not we ourselves.*

Again, I absolutely protest against being put into the hands of trustees. Mr. Roosevelt's conception of government is Mr. Taft's conception, that the Presidency of the United States is the presidency of a board of directors. I am willing to admit that if the people of the United States cannot get justice for themselves, then it is high time that they should join the third party and get it from somebody else. The justice proposed is very beautiful; it is very attractive; there were planks in that platform which stir all the sympathies of the heart; they proposed things that we all want to do; but the question is, Who is going to do them? Through whose instrumentality? Are Americans ready to ask the trusts to give us in pity what we ought, in justice, to take?"

The last paragraph is an interesting one. For the Socialists, they wanted the Government to own all of the monopoly companies, for Roosevelt he want Government to control them, perhaps as Wilson suggested as their Board, and then what is Wilson saying, for the last sentence is almost terrifying, *Are Americans ready to ask the trusts to give us in pity what we ought, in justice, to take?*, indeed, is he saying that the Government should take over the trusts?

On the one hand Wilson sees the Spencerian Darwinian process, change being through a competitive market, yet Wilson and the Progressives in general see monopolies and trusts as immutable challenges to democracy. One should ask, how many are left? And how many trusts are left? We have had a century of regulation, and one can argue with some merit that in telecommunications it was the regulated company which made decisions to maximize its gain in a regulated environment that set that technology back decades. It was not until deregulation that all of what we see today happened.

Then Wilson praises the referendum. He does so as follows:

*When I was in Oregon, not many months ago, I had some very interesting conversations with Mr. U'Ren, who is the father of what is called the Oregon System, a system by which he has put bosses out of business. **He is a member of a group of public-spirited men who, whenever they cannot get what they want through the legislature, draw up a bill and submit it to the people, by means of the initiative, and generally get what they want.** The day I arrived in Portland, a morning paper happened to say, very ironically, that there were two legislatures in Oregon, one at Salem, the state capital, and the other going around under the hat of Mr. U'Ren. I could not*

resist the temptation of saying, when I spoke that evening, that, while I was the last man to suggest that power should be concentrated in any single individual or group of individuals, I would, nevertheless, after my experience in New Jersey, rather have a legislature that went around under the hat of somebody in particular whom I knew I could find than a legislature that went around under God knows who's hat; because then you could at least put your finger on your governing force; you would know where to find it.

Yet when we look at California, rant with referenda, one sees that people get lower real estate taxes, more services and exploding debt. When there is no fiscal responsibility then there will be evolving instability. That instability can be mitigated by a Legislature if and only if the Legislature has constraints. Handing change and legislation into the hands of the voters directly will take away the quid pro quo of who pays for the new service or what gets cut when you reduce taxes. Wilson and the Progressives seem never to have thought through the process.

We take a look finally at Wilson's view of liberty and freedom, or lack and control thereof. He states:

What is liberty?

I have long had an image in my mind of what constitutes liberty. Suppose that I were building a great piece of powerful machinery, and suppose that I should so awkwardly and unskillfully assemble the parts of it that every time one part tried to move it would be interfered with by the others, and the whole thing would buckle up and be checked. Liberty for the several parts would consist in the best possible assembling and adjustment of them all, would it not? If you want the great piston of the engine to run with absolute freedom, give it absolutely perfect alignment and adjustment with the other parts of the machine, so that it is free, not because it is let alone or isolated, but because it has been associated most skillfully and carefully with the other parts of the great structure.

What is liberty? You say of the locomotive that it runs free. What do you mean? You mean that its parts are so assembled and adjusted that friction is reduced to a minimum, and that it has perfect adjustment. We say of a boat skimming the water with light foot, "How free she runs," when we mean, how perfectly she is adjusted to the force of the wind, how perfectly she obeys the great breath out of the heavens that fills her sails. Throw her head up into the wind and see how she will halt and stagger, how every sheet will shiver and her whole frame be shaken, how instantly she is "in irons," in the expressive phrase of the sea. She is free only when you have let her fall off again and have recovered once more her nice adjustment to the forces she must obey and cannot defy.

Human freedom consists in perfect adjustments of human interests and human activities and human energies.

Now, the adjustments necessary between individuals, between individuals and the complex institutions amidst which they live, and between those institutions and the government, are infinitely more intricate to-day than ever before. No doubt this is a tiresome and roundabout way of saying the thing, yet perhaps it is worthwhile to get somewhat clearly in our mind what makes

all the trouble to-day. Life has become complex; there are many more elements, more parts, to it than ever before. And, therefore, it is harder to keep everything adjusted,—and harder to find out where the trouble lies when the machine gets out of order.

You know that one of the interesting things that Mr. Jefferson said in those early days of simplicity which marked the beginnings of our government was that the best government consisted in as little governing as possible. And there is still a sense in which that is true. It is still intolerable for the government to interfere with our individual activities except where it is necessary to interfere with them in order to free them. But I feel confident that if Jefferson were living in our day he would see what we see: that the individual is caught in a great confused nexus of all sorts of complicated circumstances, and that to let him alone is to leave him helpless as against the obstacles with which he has to contend; and that, therefore, law in our day must come to the assistance of the individual. It must come to his assistance to see that he gets fair play; that is all, but that is much.

Without the watchful interference, the resolute interference, of the government, there can be no fair play between individuals and such powerful institutions as the trusts. Freedom to-day is something more than being let alone. The program of a government of freedom must in these days be positive, not negative merely.

Here we will see Wilson pandering in a Jeffersonian way to the rural small town folks. He dismisses the vitality of New York and its contribution in favor of what the small town, whatever that is, brings to the country. Here too we see the Wilson of the Government controlling all. The last sentence is most telling. Namely as Wilson states: ***Without the watchful interference, the resolute interference, of the government***, yet it is that watchful eye, that controlling hand that we also fear.

You know what the vitality of America consists of. Its vitality does not lie in New York, nor in Chicago; it will not be sapped by anything that happens in St. Louis. The vitality of America lies in the brains, the energies, the enterprise of the people throughout the land; in the efficiency of their factories and in the richness of the fields that stretch beyond the borders of the town; in the wealth which they extract from nature and originate for themselves through the inventive genius characteristic of all free American communities.

That is the wealth of America, and if America discourages the locality, the community, the self-contained town, she will kill the nation. A nation is as rich as her free communities; she is not as rich as her capital city or her metropolis. The amount of money in Wall Street is no indication of the wealth of the American people. That indication can be found only in the fertility of the American mind and the productivity of American industry everywhere throughout the United States. If America were not rich and fertile, there would be no money in Wall Street. If Americans were not vital and able to take care of themselves, the great money exchanges would break down. The welfare, the very existence of the nation, rests at last upon the great mass of the people; its prosperity depends at last upon the spirit in which they go about their work in their several communities throughout the broad land. In proportion as her towns and her countryside are happy and hopeful will America realize the high ambitions which have marked her in the eyes of all the world.

As Wilson matured in the White House his need to control increased. After the death of his first wife he soon remarried and in his second term, after running on the platform to keep the US out of the European War, in April 1917 he reneged and the US went to War. At this point there was an explosion of War opposition but Congress passed a law making it illegal to oppose the War. The result was crushing on many who had integrated a variety of social programs as well as the right to vote. Wilson saw the demands by women as an opposition to his War strategy as well as a personal assault. Thus by November 1917 with War now full force in Europe, Wilson tolerated no opposition. This was especially true of the women walking outside the White House.

4.4 NOVEMBER 1917

By 1917 Hattie is back in Buffalo and as a nurse in some local facility in Buffalo as best we can ascertain. She is a licensed New York State nurse and Hattie is listed as being from Buffalo.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 10.—Forty-one Women suffragists from fifteen States were arrested this afternoon for picketing outside the White House. Their adventure was one of the quietest and at the same time most sedately spectacular of all the picketing affairs yet staged. Of the group of forty-one pickets, twelve were from New York City. The prisoners included Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, wife of the pure food expert; Mrs. William Kent, wife of former Representative Kent of California, now a member of the Tariff Commission, and Miss Lucy Burns, Vice Chairman of the Woman's Party. ' All of the forty-one pickets, after having a ride in Black Maria to the police station, were registered and then promptly released under \$25 bail each. Miss Mary Ingham of Philadelphia, who did not have herself arrested, furnished the bail, aggregating \$1,025, and the prisoners were allowed to go pending hearing on Monday in the Police Court.

The following is a continuation of that above:

List of Those Arrested, Seven of the militants are serving jail sentences here for picketing. Those arrested today were:

NEW YORK CITY.

*Miss M. T. Burritt, Miss Dorothy Day,
Mrs. Brannan, Mrs. H. Butterworth,
Miss B. Steinberg. Mrs. Cora Week.
Miss L. H. Hornesby. Mrs. P. B. Johns.
Miss Paula Jacobi. Miss, E. Hamilton,
Mrs. Cynthia Cohen, Mrs. Hila Guilford.*

NEW YORK STATE.

*Miss Amy Juenghing, Buffalo,
Miss Hattie Kruger, Buffalo.*

MASSACHUSETTS.

*Mrs. Agnes H. Morey, Brookline.
Mrs. William Bergen, Worcester.*

Miss L. Daniels, Boston.
Miss Ella Findeisen, Lawrence.
Miss Cornelia Whitcomb, Worcester,

NEW JERSEY.

Mrs. George Scott, Montclair.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Philadelphia.
Mrs. Elizabeth Methane, Philadelphia,
Miss Catharine Lincoln, Philadelphia.

CALIFORNIA.

Mrs. William Kent of Kentfield.

UTAH.

Mrs. R. D. Quay, Salt Lake City.
Mrs. C. T. Robertson, Salt Lake City.

OREGON.

Miss Alice Gram, Portland.
Miss Betty Gram, Portland.

COLORADO.

Mrs. Eva Decker, Colorado Springs,
Mrs. Genevieve Williams, Manitou.

INDIANA.

Mrs. Charles W. Barnes, Indianapolis.

MINNESOTA

Mrs. J. H. Short, Minneapolis.

OKKAHOHA.

Mrs. Kate Stafford, Oklahoma City.

IOWA

Mrs. A. N. Beim, Den Moines.
Mrs. Catherine Martinette, Eagle Grove.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mrs. Harvey Wiley.
Miss Lucy Burns.

MARYLAND.

Mrs. Mary Bartlett Dixon, Easton.

Miss Julia Emory, Baltimore.

LOUISIANA.

Mrs. Alice Cosu, New Orleans.

FLORIDA

Mrs. Mary A Nolan, Jacksonville

The article continues:

The suffragists carried their usual display of banners, one at the head of the line reading: " Mr. President, in your message to Congress urge the amendment enfranchising women.

" Various other banners conveyed the idea to the throng that the demonstration was intended to impress the President with the urgency of his advocacy of the suffrage amendment The marching pickets lengthened their line appreciably as the vanguard approached the east gate, so that the New York women advanced on it alone. Immediately the New York women reached the gate they were stopped by Captain Flather. The police officers quietly informed them that they must " move on."

Mrs. Brennan replied that they intended doing no such thing. The Captain gave them a moment to wait; then, motioning to half a dozen policemen standing at his elbow, he ordered the women escorted to the Black Maria. They went without protest, completely filling the conveyance. While the Black Maria was driving off to the police station the second group of suffragists had worked its way to the west gate of the White House, in this group were women from Massachusetts, headed by Mrs. Agnes H. Morey of Brookline, followed by Pennsylvania and New Jersey women.

Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, who marched in this group, was one of the sixteen pickets arrested last July and pardoned by President Wilson after being sentenced to Occoquan.

From the Library of Congress we have the following photo along with the names of those involved.

Some of the picket line of Nov. 10, 1917. Left to right: Mrs. Catherine Martinette, Eagle Grove, Iowa. Mrs. William Kent, Kentfield, California. Miss Mary Bartlett Dixon, Easton, Md. Mrs. C.T. Robertson, Salt Lake City, Utah. Miss Cora Week, New York City. Miss Amy Ju[e]ngling, Buffalo, N.Y. Miss Hattie Kruger, Buffalo, N.Y. Miss Belle Sheinberg, N.Y.C. Miss Julia Emory, Baltimore, Md.¹⁴

¹⁴ <http://www.letsrockthecradle.com/new-york-state-women-arrested-and-imprisoned-at-occoquan-in-november-1917/>



Hattie is the third from the right.

From Gillmore we have a description of the arrests:

Immediately a third group appeared, and after they had been arrested, a fourth; and, on their arrest, a fifth. For half an hour a continuous line of purple, white, and gold blazed its revolutionary path through the grayness of the November afternoon. Mary A. Nolan of Florida headed the fifth group of pickets. Little, frail, lame, seventy five year old, her gallantry elicited from the two lines of onlookers applause, cheers, calls of encouragement. "Keep right on!" one voice emerged from the noise. "You'll make them give it to you!"

The women of the first group were: Mrs. John Winters Brannan, Belle Sheinbcrg, L. H. Hornesby, Paula Jakobi, Cynthia Cohen, M. Tilden Burrirt, Dorothy Day, Mrs. Henry Butterworth, Cora Weeks, Peggy Baird Johns, Elizabeth Hamilton, Ella Guilford, Amy Juengling, Hattie Kruger.

The women of the second group were: Agnes H. Morey, Mrs. William Bergen, Camilla Whitcomb, Ella Findeisen, Lou Daniels, Mrs. George Scott, Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Elizabeth McShane, Kathryn Lincoln.

The women of the third group were: Mrs. William Kent, Alice Gram, Betty Gram, Mrs. R. B. Quay, Mrs. C. T. Robertson, Eva Decker, Genevieve Williams.

The women of the fourth group were: Mrs. Charles W. Barnes, Kate Stafford, Mrs. J. H. Short, Mrs. A. N. Beim, Catherine Martinette. ,The women of the fifth group were: Mrs. Harvey Wiley, Alice Cosu, Mary Bartlett Dixon, Julia Emory, Mary A. Nolan, Lucy Burns.

4.5 NOVEMBER 25 1917

From the NY Times of that day¹⁵:

At the beginning of the suffragist hearing here ;today Miss Lucy Burns, Vice Chairman :of the Woman's Party; Mrs. Lawrence Lewis of Philadelphia, and Miss Hattie Kruger of Buffalo, weak from hunger striking were assisted into the court-room to testify concerning their charges of brutal treatment. Judge Waddill held, however, that an inquiry into these charges was unnecessary in view of his decision that the prisoners were illegally held. Counsel for the militants gave notice that they would present a formal petition later for redress. The court indicated approval of the Judgment of the District Police Court In convicting the women on the charge of blocking traffic when they picketed White House.

From Stevens we have:

We are all taken to the District Jail, where we are put through the regular catechism: "Were you ever in prison before?-Age- birthplace-father-mother-religion and what not?" We are then locked up,-two to a cell. What will happen next? The sleek jailer, whose attempt to be cordial provokes a certain distrust, comes to our corridor to "turn us over" to our next keeper-the warden of Occoquan. We learn that the workhouse is not situated in the District of Columbia but in Virginia.

This is also called the Lorton Reformatory. and it has held a variety of major criminals from the District of Columbia although used by the Federal Government as well¹⁶.

Other locked wagons with tiny windows up near the driver now take us, side by side with drunks and disorderliness, prostitutes and thieves, to the Pennsylvania Station. Here we embark for the unknown terrors of the workhouse, filing through crowds at the station, driven on by our "keeper," who resembles Simon Legree, with his long stick and his pushing and shoving to hurry us along. The crowd is quick to realize that we are prisoners, because of our associates. Friends try to bid us a last farewell and slip us a sweet or fruit, as we are rushed through the iron station

¹⁵ <http://www.suffragistmemorial.org/suffragists-in-new-york/> This is a somewhat complete list of New York Suffragists.

¹⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lorton_Reformatory also see <http://www.latimes.com/travel/la-tr-woman-occoquan-20171112-htmlstory.html> which notes: A Virginia judge agreed, and they were returned to D.C. after their Nov. 23 trial. By month's end, all had been released, weakened and, in some cases, permanently worse for the wear. By early January 1918, Wilson expressed his support for the voting rights amendment, which passed the House but failed in the Senate. Some opponents argued that women already had the right to vote in some states, but proponents wanted an amendment to ensure that women had the right in every state. On June 4, 1919, the Senate passed the amendment, which the House had passed two weeks earlier. Tennessee became the 36th state to ratify the amendment on Aug. 18, 1920. Eight days later, it became part of the U.S. Constitution, more than seven decades after the first women's rights convention in Seneca Falls, N.Y.

gates to the train. Warden Whittaker is our keeper, thin and old, with a cruel mouth, brutal eyes and a sinister birthmark on his temple. He guards very anxiously his "dangerous criminals" lest they try to leap out of the train to freedom! We chat a little and attempt to relax from the strain that we have endured since Saturday. It is now late in the afternoon of Tuesday. The dusk is gathering. It is almost totally dark when we alight at a tiny station in what seems to us a wilderness. It is a deserted country. Even the gayest member of the party, I am sure, was struck with a little terror here. More locked wagons, blacker than the dusk, awaited us. The prison van jolted and bumped along the rocky and hilly road. A cluster of lights twinkled beyond the last hill, and we knew that we were coming to our temporary summer residence. I can still see the long thin line of black poplars against the smoldering afterglow. I did not know then what tragic things they concealed.

We entered a well-lighted office. A few guards of ugly demeanor stood about. Warden Whittaker consulted with the hard-faced matron, Mrs. Herndon, who began the prison routine. Names were called, and each prisoner stepped to the desk to get her number, to give up all jewelry, money, handbags, letters, eye-glasses, traveling bags containing toilet necessities, in fact everything except the clothes on her body. From there we were herded into the long bare dining room where we sat dumbly down to a bowl of dirty sour soup. I say dumbly-for now began the rule of silence. Prisoners are punished for speaking to one another at table. They cannot even whisper, much less smile or laugh. They must be conscious always of their "guilt." Every possible thing is done to make the inmates feel that they are and must continue to be antisocial creatures.

We taste our soup and crust of bread. We try so hard to eat it for we are tired and hungry, but no one of us is able to get it down. We leave the table hungry and slightly nauseated. Another long march in silence through various channels into a large dormitory and through a double line of cots! Then we stand, weary to the point of fainting, waiting the next ordeal. This seemed to be the juncture at which we lost all that is left us of contact with the outside world, -our clothes.

An assistant matron, attended by negress prisoners, relieves us of our clothes. Each prisoner is obliged to strip naked without even the protection of a sheet, and proceed across what seems endless space, to a shower bath. A large tin bucket stands on the floor and in this is a minute piece of dirty soap, which is offered to us and rejected. We dare not risk the soap used by so many prisoners. Naked, we return from the bath to receive our allotment of course, hideous prison clothes, the outer garments of which consist of a bulky mother-hubbard wrapper, of bluish gray ticking and a heavy apron of the same dismal stuff. It takes a dominant personality indeed to survive these clothes. The thick unbleached muslin undergarments are of designs never to be forgotten! And the thick stockings and forlorn shoes! What torture to put on shoes that are alike for each foot and made to fit just anybody who may happen along.

Why are we being ordered to dress? It is long past the bed-time hour. Our suspense is brief. All dressed in cloth of "guilt" we are led into what we later learn is the "recreation" room. Lined up against its wall, we might any other time have bantered about the possibility of being shot, but we are in no mood to jest. The door finally opens and in strides Warden Whittaker with a stranger beside him.

He reviews his latest criminal recruits, engaging the stranger meanwhile in whispered conversation. There are short, uncertain laughs. There are nods of the head and more whispers.

"Well, ladies, I hope you are all comfortable. Now make yourselves at home here. I think you will find it healthy here.

You'll weigh more when you go out than when you came in. You will be allowed to write one letter a month-to your family. Of course we open and read all letters coming in and going out. To-morrow you will be assigned your work. I hope you will sleep well. Good night!"

We did not answer. We looked at each other.

News leaked through in the morning that the stranger had been a newspaper reporter. The papers next morning were full of the "comfort" and "luxury" of our surroundings. The "delicious" food sounded most reassuring to the nation. In fact no word of the truth was allowed to appear.

The correspondent could not know that we went back to our cots to try to sleep side by side with negro prostitutes. Not that we shrank from these women on account of their color, but how terrible to know that, the institution had gone out of its way to

bring these prisoners from their own wing to the white wing in an attempt to humiliate us. There was plenty of room in the negro wing. But prison must be made so unbearable that no more women would face it. That was the policy attempted here.

We tried very hard to sleep and forget our hunger and weariness.

But all the night through our dusky comrades padded by to the lavatory, and in the streak of bright light which shot across the center of the room, startled heads could be seen bobbing up in the direction of a demented woman in the end cot. Her weird mutterings made us fearful. There was no sleep in this strange place.

Our thoughts turn to the outside world. Will the women care? Will enough women believe that through such humiliation all may win freedom? Will they believe that through our imprisonment their slavery will be lifted the sooner? Less philosophically, will the government be moved by public protest? Will such protest come?

The next morning brought us a visitor from suffrage headquarters. The institution hoped that the visitor would use her persuasion to make us pay our fines and leave and so she was admitted. We learned the cheering news, that immediately after sentence had been pronounced by the Court, Dudley Field Malone had gone direct to the White House to protest to the President. His protest was delivered with heat. The President said that he was "shocked" at the sixty day sentence, that he did not know it had been done, and made other evasions. Mr. Malone's report of his interview with the President is given in full in a subsequent chapter.

Following Mr. Malone, Mr. J. A. H. Hopkins went to the White House. "How would you like to have your wife sleep in a dirty workhouse next to prostitutes?" was his direct talk to the President. Again the President was "shocked." No wonder! Mr. and Mrs. Hopkins had been the President's dinner guests not very long before, celebrating his return to power. They had supported him politically and financially in New Jersey. Now Mrs. Hopkins had been arrested at his gate and thrown into prison.

4.6 SEPTEMBER 1918

Hattie appears to have run for Congress in the Fall of 1918. The War was winding down and the classic Socialists still had a strong presence. On June 16, 1918, Debs had made a speech in Canton, Ohio, urging resistance to the military draft of World War I. His words were interpreted as advocating that men oppose the Draft. He was then arrested on June 30 and charged with ten counts of sedition. He was convicted, sentenced to ten years in Federal Prison, and incarcerated in the Spring of 1919. Debs was not a well man at the time and in prison even got worse. It would not be till December 23 1921 that Harding released Debs. Wilson, one suspects it was Mrs. Wilson, refused any leniency.

Yet Hattie, amidst this set of events, appears to have made her one and only run for Congress during this trying time for Socialists. In Stevens book she states:

Hattie Kruger, Buffalo, N. Y. Trained nurse; ran for Congress on Socialist ticket in 1918. Worker in Lighthouse Settlement, Philadelphia, and for time probation officer of Juvenile Court of Buffalo. Nov. 10, 1917, sentenced to 30 days in Occoquan workhouse for picketing.

The Lighthouse was a settlement house in Philadelphia. As they note¹⁷:

Founded in 1893 as a settlement house, the mission of the Lighthouse is to provide educational, recreational and economic improvement programs to families and individuals to improve the quality of their lives. For more than 100 years the Kensington, Fairhill and North Philadelphia communities have relied on the Lighthouse to provide multi-cultural services that respond to the multi-dimensional needs of our communities' members.

However there is no evidence that she worked there. It may be possible upon her trip back to New York that this may have happened.

I remember seeing her election posters from this time. They were standard name and full face posters when she ran for Congress in the Fall of 1918. At this point she had most likely moved back to Buffalo and ran up there. The record is sparse.

4.7 JULY 1919

By 1919 there was a growing separation amongst the various political elements. The classic Socialists, of which Hattie belonged, basically viewed the Government as the best controller of

¹⁷ <http://lighthouse1893.org/about-us/history/>

the essential elements of a society such as health, water, transportation, and utilities. The Marxists or new socialists had moved to full Communism which meant total abolition of any private property and a dictatorship of the proletariat. In contrast there were also anarchists who believed that Government had no function at all and that people should just do for themselves. Emma Goldman was a typical example of this group. Progressives were somewhere in between all of these players. In a strange sense none seemed to base their views on the Founders. Many views were generated in "discussion" groups and in speeches given at rallies.

To understand the disparate views of the new Socialists one need just read Kagan,

Nineteen-nineteen should have been a banner year for New York's socialists. In the months after the armistice, the economic gains which workers and unions had achieved during the war rapidly dissipated. Wage hikes lagged behind inflation; unemployment mounted steadily, employers laid plans for an open-shop drive. In response, New York's workers—released from their patriotic obligations and no-strike pledge—virtually exploded. Four days after the Armistice, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers called a general strike, involving 50,000 of the city's tailors. Not long after, other laborers joined the garment workers on New York's streets. Longshoremen, harbor workers, actors, printing pressmen, railway shopmen—all rebelled against their employers within a year of the war's end. It was the New York socialists' golden opportunity, the moment of worker discontent and rebellion they had long awaited. But in 1919, the socialists \ had other, more pressing matters on their minds. In that year, the intra-party dissension that had built up for almost two decades came to a climax. In' the wake of this battle, American communism was born.

*The Russian Revolution was, of course, a critical factor in the decline of the SP. As James Weinstein has shown, the Bolshevik leaders encouraged a left-wing rebellion in the American socialist movement.^ In the months after the Armistice, the Bolsheviks still anxiously awaited another revolution. Lenin had read enough of Marx's writings to believe that the survival of his own communist regime depended upon the creation of other, more industrially developed workers' states. Hence, he constantly reiterated to socialists around the world the need for a revolutionary program, conducted by revolutionary socialists, according to a revolutionary timetable. In his "Letter to American Workingmen," published in the December 1918 issue of *The Class Struggle--the New York left wing's bimonthly periodical*—Lenin stressed that the Bolsheviks would remain in a beleaguered fortress, so long as no other international socialist revolution comes to our assistance with its armies." Accordingly, Lenin scathingly attacked reform socialists, who claimed to believe in the class struggle but who "revert again and again to the middle-class utopia of 'class-harmony' and the mutual 'interdependence' of classes upon one another."*

The international socialist movement needed revolution rather than reform, action rather than words. The international socialist movement needed to rid itself of constructivists, American socialists took Lenin's words to heart. They would not have done so, however, had they not already believed Lenin preached. In New York, a vocal group of party members had fought reform socialism for almost two decades. They had protested the constructivists' election strategies, trade union policies, middle-class orientation. They had asserted the need for a revolutionary party, with its base in the working class. .

They had constantly challenged and defied Hillquitian leadership.

Hillquit was the New York City leader of the classic Socialists and a colleague of Debs. He became the target for many of the new Socialists who were in reality at least Marxists if not outright Communists. The final gasp of the old line Socialists would soon occur.

4.8 JULY 1920¹⁸

By 1920 Eugene V. Debs was still imprisoned by Wilson in a Federal Prison in Atlanta. His supporters were trying to get him released but Wilson was paralyzed by a stroke and his wife was basically in control and she did nothing. In fact his wife appeared more ruthless than he had been before his incapacitation.

Yet his supporters placed him again on the Presidential Ballot that year. The New York State Ballot included:

Here Is The Socialist Ticket;
For Governor—Joseph D. Cannon.
Lieutenant Governor — Miss Jessie Wallace Hughan.
Secretary' Of State—Charles W. Noonan.
Controller—Philip Randolph.
State Treasurer — Hattie F. Kruger.
Attorney General—Darwin J. Meserole
State Engineer—Vladimir Karapatoff.
United States Senator—Municipal Court Justice Jacob Panken.
Judges Of The Court Of Appeals—Leon A. Mahlkiel, Hezekiah Wilson.

Now at the same time there was a massive rift in the Socialist Party. The Eastern European Jews, especially those in the garment business in New York, took the Marxist Soviet position, whereas the older Socialists like Debs and Hattie, retained the general Social Democrat positions. The rift was growing more every day, especially in New York. Kagan presents an interesting overview of this period.

As Kagan notes:

Initially, the Russian Revolution seemed an unlikely event to shatter the Socialist Party. When Lenin assumed power in October, the entire spectrum of New York's socialist movement responded with enthusiasm. In a memoir of New York's Lower East Side at the time of the revolution's announcement, one Jewish socialist wrote:

"All the coffee houses in the Russian quarter were overflowing with people, with song, with bright eyes and bright gazes. It is the Russian Revolution! The Revolution has triumphed! . The truth has triumphed! The truth of the folk, the truth, the great truth of humankind —of Revolution!"

¹⁸ <https://www.ourcampaigns.com/RaceDetail.html?RaceID=552331>

The leadership of the party shared the popular excitement. Morris Hillquit wrote in the spring of 1918 that the Bolsheviks had

"rendered a tremendous service to the... cause of social progress by shaking up the old world and by their telling fight for a great and bold ideal."

The Jewish unions also hopped on the Bolshevik bandwagon. The ILGWU, for example, hailed the revolution as "the first time in the history of the world that the workers showed the determination not to allow themselves to be defrauded of 'the fruits of their victory by their master classes."

In these first months, Local New York organized meetings, demonstrations and parades in support of the Bolsheviks. Together, its members fought for the U.S. recognition of Russia and against a "U.S. invasion."

The Socialist Party was split between the old line Socialists, who had led and still controlled the Party and the now dominant Eastern European Jewish Socialists who had taken up the banner of Leninist Communism.

The NY Times reports on the Socialist Party platform and the candidates. This was in effect the last of the old line Socialists in action with what appears to be some concessions for the new Socialists. This is presented below:

All candidates of the Socialist Party, when elected to office, will vote and work for the adoption of such measures as the following, not only for the immediate relief of pressing evils, but also as preparatory to the full realization of the Socialist goal,

1. Legislation which will enable municipalities to acquire land, construct dwellings on public account, and lease them at rents calculated to cover cost of upkeep and replacement, but without profit, thus solving the now growingly acute housing problem.

2. Establishment of a comprehensive system by which the State in conjunction with municipalities and co-operative societies shall deal on a large scale in food and other necessities of life, buying directly from the producers and selling directly to the consumers at cost, thus eliminating the capitalist middlemen, stimulating production and diminishing the cost of living.

3. The rapid extension of State and municipal ownership and operation of transportation and storage plants, of lighting and other so-called public utilities and of industrial establishments beginning with those which, are already most largely monopolized and those which have to do with the production of the prime necessities of life. life.

4. The conservation by the State of the forests, mineral deposits and sources of water power which it still owns, the reclamation of such as have been voted away, and the exploitation of

these resources by the State, not for profit, but for the production of raw materials and power to be sold at cost.

5. Legislation which will clearly exempt labor unions and farmer associations from prosecution under the so-called anti-trust laws, and will assure them of the right of collective bargaining in the sale of their labor power and their farm produce respectively.

6. Legislation guaranteeing labor the right to organize and strike, free from interference by the courts through the power of injunctions.

7. Repeal of the war emergency laws concerning military service and military training in the schools, and repeal of the so-called criminal anarchy law, which has been demonstrated to be in practice a law for the suppression of free speech and for the promotion of spies and provocateurs.

8. Amendment of the State Constitution and of the laws governing municipalities in such manner as to introduce the principle of occupational as well as geographical representation in legislative bodies and administrative boards; to introduce the referendum and the power of recall, and to take away from the courts the power to declare laws unconstitutional. ...

Military training in the schools of the State was denounced. Other resolutions included a demand that the United States immediately recognize the "Republic of Ireland," and urged the release of James Larkin, Secretary of the Irish Transport Workers. The delegates pledged the moral and financial support of the party to the Jewish victims of pogroms in Poland, the Ukraine, Hungary and Rumania, calling upon the workers of America to do all in their power to prevent further persecution of Jews in those countries.

One of the resolutions expressed sympathy for the workers of Mexico and denounced the "attempts of American capitalists to force intervention." It was demanded that the President and Congress "take such action as may be necessary to effect by international conference the freedom and recognition of the independence of subject nations of the world, including Ireland, Haiti, Egypt and the Philippines.

The final resolution demanded the lifting of the blockade against Russia and the immediate recognition of L. C. A. K. Martens, as the accredited representative of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic.

The last statement regarding Martens is interesting. We have discussed him above. He was a Soviet representative and was to be expelled. Generally the old line Socialists would have deferred on making any such comment.

There is another statement in the Press regarding Hattie, namely from Olean Evening Herald (Olean, New York) 1920, October, 26 they list the slate and state:

*For President.....EUGENE VICTOR DEBS
For Vice President.... SEYMOUR STEDMAN*

Hattie F. Kruger, Treasurer, 116 Davey Street, Buffalo, NY (Residence). 352 Jefferson Street, Buffalo, NY (Business)

Thus it appears that by 1920 she is still in Buffalo and the address is as above.

Now it appears that after this election Hattie left the political scene. She apparently moved to New York City, and specifically Staten Island where she took up as Head Nurse at Seaview Hospital, the New York City Hospital for TB¹⁹. Seaview is atop Todt Hill on Staten Island. Todt Hill, or "Death Hill" from the Dutch, was the highest point on Staten Island and in fact on the Eastern US seaboard.

4.9 MARTENS AND COMMUNISTS

It is worth a brief side note on Martens. If one notes the NY Times position of the Socialist Party in 1920 one sees reference to Martens. Martens was a Russian close with the Bolsheviks. He was sent to the US to make certain purchases and was representing the Soviet government. Now given the Kagan assertion, as well as those of Salvatore and others, that the split between the Old line Socialists and Communists had occurred, perhaps this inclusion was a sop towards the Communist branch. Thus it is worth looking at the Senate record of the Martens hearing. It notes:

Whereas one Ludwig C. A. K. Martens claims to be an ambassador to United States from the Russian Soviet Government; and Whereas, according to newspaper reports, he refuses to answer certain questions before the Lusk investigating committee in the city of New York, committee appointed to investigate propaganda against this Government on the ground that he is such ambassador and entitled to diplomatic privilege.

Whereas said Martens has headquarters in the city of New York and is also to be directing propaganda against this Government; and

Whereas, according to his testimony before said Lusk committee, he came to this country as a German citizen and is a member of the Communist Party pledged to overthrow capitalistic systems of government the world over;

Whereas said Martens, according to his said testimony, regards this Government as a capitalistic government:

Now, therefore, be it Resolved,

That the Committee on Foreign Relations is hereby authorized as directed, through the full committee or through any subcommittee thereof to investigate as speedily as possible the status of said Martens; what allied government or power in Europe he represents; what, if any, recognition of any kind has been accorded him by this Government; whether or not he is an alien enemy; what propaganda, if any, he is carrying on for the overthrow of governments; and all facts and circumstances relating to his activities in this country and his alleged diplomatic

¹⁹ See Bynum, p 199

representation, and all facts relative to the activities of any other party, parties, or organization bearing upon or relating to Russian propaganda in this country, and make report to the Senate of such findings.

Martens life has been described in various documents²⁰:

Ludwig Martens was born on 1 January 1875 in Bachmut, Ukraine, then part of the Russian empire. Ludwig's father, a German-born industrialist named Karl Gustav Adolf Martens, was the owner of a steel mill in Kursk, Russia. There were five sons and two daughters in the family. Two of them, Ludwig and Olga, became professional revolutionaries. In 1893 Martens graduated from a Kursk Realschule and entered Saint Petersburg State Institute of Technology, from which he graduated to become a mechanical engineer. While at the State Institute of Technology, Martens became acquainted with Vladimir Lenin and Julius Martov. Soon he became a member of an illegal Marxist group League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class.

In 1896 he was arrested, and in 1899 as a German national was deported to Germany where he became a member of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. In 1902 he graduated from the Technical College of Charlottenburg. In 1906, following the failure of the 1905 Russian Revolution, Martens emigrated to Great Britain.

In emigration Martens worked as a procurement agent for the Demidov Iron and Steel Works, purchasing machinery for the large industrial works, one of the largest steel works in Russia. In 1915, with the onset of World War I, the Kursk steel mill owned by Martens' family was confiscated by the Russian government because the Martens family were considered German nationals. In 1916 Martens emigrated to the United States where he worked as a vice president of the engineering firm Weinberg & Posner (New York City).

In 1917, after the February Revolution, Martens – together with Leon Trotsky and 278 other Russian Social Democrats – returned from the United States to Russia on a steamship. In March 1919 Martens returned to the United States and founded the Russian Soviet Government Bureau, an informal embassy of Soviet Russia. He established commercial contacts (formally illegal as the USA boycotted Soviet Russia at the time) with more than one thousand American firms including such as Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of J. P. Morgan.

He negotiated a loan with the then Irish Emissary to the United States, T.D. Harry Boland, using Russian jewels as security. In June 1919 the Bureau was searched by police, and after hearings in the United States Senate and the United States Department of Labor, Martens was finally deported to Soviet Russia in January 1921. After returning to Russia, Martens became a member of the Supreme Soviet

Thus the question is; does the inclusion of Martens in the 1920 Socialist plank mean that the Party as a whole moved to the position of the Communists or that this was just a nod to the part of the Party moving there.

²⁰ see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ludwig_Martens

In later discussions with Hattie she said that her departure from the Socialist Party in 1921 was due to the infusion of Communists. Specifically the splitting into two factions, leaving the old Socialists as mere shadows of their former selves.

5 MARRIAGE

Hattie is married on 19 March 1928 in Manhattan to Thomas C Maynard. She was 38, he was 27²¹. Now as best I understand the tale, my grandfather had married quite young and his first wife died shortly after the marriage of TB. The hospital where she was treated was Seaview and that is where he met Hattie. The age difference was startling at the time and I suspect that his mother, who I gather was still living, was aghast. But Hattie is akin to a small tug, strong and powerful, and the two lived happily for 48 years until her death.

As I noted earlier, Hattie most likely was close to Dorothy Day, who was about seven years younger but the two were arrested together and sent to prison hand in hand. Day lived on Staten Island and Hattie comes to Staten Island about the same time Day returns. The two lived just a few blocks away.

Now my grandfather Thomas C Maynard was the youngest of a Brooklyn family which had a shipping business for a few generations. In WW I his two older brothers went to France and one was killed and the second shell shocked and hospitalized for life. Tom got himself in the Army at sixteen by forging papers but at boot camp he apparently slugged a Sergeant who was a Southerner and was beating a black soldier. You did not do things like that and up to a Court Martial. Since he was too young to be there in the first place they just discharged him, especially in light of the history of his two brothers.

Tom studied Marine Engineering and ultimately became the Harbor Master in New York during WWI. His ship was the Vigilant. Hattie was a strong support and companion for him and their marriage was to all appearances flawless. Unfortunately Tom had a severe case of bipolar disorder before there was any medication, and it only became more serious after WW II. Hattie and my parents, as well as myself, would spend many a time taking him off to Bellevue for calming down treatments. I gather Louise Despert was part of this.

After the collapse of the classic Socialist Party, and its being taken over by the Communists, Hattie settled in New York as noted . I believe she worked at Bellevue for a while and then went to Seaview, the New York City hospital for TB patients²². This was located on Staten Island. It is assumed that Tom may have met Hattie at Seaview. This assumption is based on two facts. Tom's first wife died very young of TB and as such she most likely was in Seaview and Hattie was in Seaview at about the same time. Hattie lived in Huguenot section near Dorothy Day and her compound. It is not at all clear if she even may have spent time there. Tom most likely befriended Hattie at the hospital when his wife was ill and died. That would have been the early

²¹ New York, New York, Marriage Index 1866-1937

²² See Oshinsky, pp 182-184

20s just after the 1920 election. Thus there may have been friends for quite a while before marrying.

6 WWII

Hattie and Tom lived at 108 New Street, a small two story house in the Port Richmond district of Staten Island²³. I was born early in WWII and my father was drafted just before my birth. My mother moved into the house on New Street and it was there I spent my early youth. My father would not return, except for a brief time before going to the Pacific, until 1946. He was part of the Japanese Occupation forces. My grandfather spent most of the time on his ship during the War, although in the New York harbor area, but it was an intense time with German subs always near the port. My mother was not around as much, she may have been working, and thus I spent most of my time with Hattie. She taught me to read, do puzzles, and be certain every night to ask my small statue of General MacArthur to take care of my father.

My grandmother went out and bought me a statue of General MacArthur, in soapstone, a small beige soft bust of the General. Each night, instead of praying, she had me speak to the General, he was alive she proclaimed, and he would bring my father back. Unlike my Italian friends in the neighborhood who had multiple religious statues of various Italian saints, I had the General beside my bed stand. Thank God my father never knew, it would have turned into World War III. He was a devout Catholic and to some degree my grandmother and I were practicing idol worship. In the end my father came safely home and I dutifully thanked the General.

But a bit of a word before moving on. There is that typical question that we all ask; what was our first memory? Psychologists say we must be at least three or older to have any memories. Somehow or another I remember April 1945. This I believe is due to a certain neural imprinting done in the limbic system. Marty Samuels explained it to me decades ago, limbic valence. It is the ability of the memory portion of the brain to get imprinted resulting from what could be a severe shock that excites the limbic system, the internal control portion of the brain. This would be my limbic valence example.

The day Roosevelt died, I was out in front of 108 New Street. It was a turn of the century gray clapboard house and on one side was a small deli candy store, Welch's was the name, on the right side looking at the house. On the other side was a house in which we lived was an Italian family. The son I was later told was a wrestler. In those days the wrestling business was not what it eventually became in the US. He wrestled Friday and Saturday nights at a local sports club and sometimes wrestled in some arena. Well, it was the day Roosevelt died, and there I was standing outside the house, and down the street he comes, all 300 pounds, shouting, "The bastards dead, the bastards dead, the bastards dead." By this time I has mastered momma, nana, papa, and probably even potty. I now learned a new word, "bastard". So in I went and spoke to momma, nana, and shout "bastards dead". Momma, that is my mother for those not following the narrative, immediately imbedded me and my limbic system me with a sharp slap across the cheek. There it was, a true limbic valence, an imbedded memory, never to be lost! Again remember that all this occurred before child abuse was even thought of. Thus, I have this early

²³ See US Census 1940.

memory of Roosevelt, or at least of his demise. I also am one of those who remember Roosevelt in a light somewhat different than current day historians.

There then is no memory period until Spring of 1946 and then my father returns. He shows up and I of course have no idea as to who this stranger was. My life was carefully arranged by my grandmother and my mother from time to time ensured that all was well. I had the distinct impression that women ran the world and we men were meant to show up once in a while, eat, sleep, and then go play again, war being a child's view of adult play. The women were in control of the world and we men were some form of kept creatures. In my world at that time there were no other men, other than the wrestler, and my grandfather was on his ship most of the time as well.

Thus this man enters my house. He walks up with my mother, my mother, my sainted mother. I held onto my parachute which I carried everywhere. Actually it was a piece my mother's slip, an under garment, which I apparently like rubbing on my face, and to avoid any concerns my grandmother made it into a parachute to give it a manly appearance. So old dad arrives back from the war and he sees his son with a slip, he didn't get the parachute idea too well, and he went ballistic. I also went ballistic because he took my place in mother's attention. I tried a few times to get back in but he kept kicking me out. Inside I thought what right did he have. Outside I ended up sleeping in my now small lonely crib. I got to appreciate Dr Despert after this childhood crisis.

Grandmother saw ways to solve this. We went shopping. Any problem you solve by shopping. It was so easy, we went to the main street of Port Richmond, and went from store to store. She bought toys, candy, clothes, and books. Needless to say my father objected and the battle started. He was emphatic that I was his son and that she had no right to buy my affection. Not that he was around much to give affection but that was the end of my short term excursions into the good life. I guess the orphanage was too strong an influence. If it was good enough for him then it would be a good enough life style for me.

Then my father wanted to go back to work as an electrician. However, my mother was now certain that there would be another depression. To avoid abject poverty my father had to get a safe job, and the safest was like his father as a police officer in New York. He took the exam, passed, and this started the second generation of policemen in the McGarty family. There is a picture of me with him in June of 1946 on his first day on the police force. I am almost three and he is all decked out in his police uniform.

7 FRIENDS

I saw very few of Hattie's friends. On in particular was Louise Despert, a well-known Psychiatrist. Louise would come for Sunday dinner and have length political and social conversations. I always found this interesting since my father was very conservative and these older independent women dominated the conversation and frustrated him. I learned that one must have a factual and logical basis for such a debate. One must be better read than one's intellectual competitor and one must have been experienced in presenting ideas. These two women were first class in that category.

From Despert's book we have the following description of her bio:

In the course of over twenty years of medical experience Dr. Despert has examined more than a thousand children in difficulties. In addition she has had the opportunity, virtually unique among psychiatrists, of conducting a ten-year project with normal children.

Dr. Despert was born and received her early education in France, taking her undergraduate degree at the University of Paris. Her professional studies were interrupted by the beginning of World War I, when she plunged at once into war work as a nurse with the French Red Cross, and soon became chief nurse in charge of a refuge for evacuated children. After the war she came to New York, where she received her premedical degree at Barnard College and her medical degree at the New York University College of Medicine. In 1936 she became head of the Children's Service of the New York State Psychiatric Institute. In 1937 she began her ten-year research on the personality development of young children at the Payne Whitney Nursery School. She now practices in Manhattan and also sees her young patients on weekends at her country home in Chatham, N. Y.

Dr. Despert is convinced that in order to make successful contact with young children you have to enter into the child's world— especially in the matter of language—and she has devised a system when working with young children in which she deliberately limits her vocabulary to what she calls her “fifty-seven words.” For young children of two or under she uses even fewer. By communicating the way a child does—through tone of voice, facial expression, gesture, and body movement—she has had outstanding success with very young children and very disturbed older children from whom it's usually difficult to draw a response.

The NY Times reported on Louise's death:

A memorial service will be held tomorrow at 4 P.M. at the First Presbyterian Church in Southampton, L.I., for Dr. J. Louise Despert, a child psychiatrist and author of "Children of Divorce," considered by many an authoritative work on the subject. Dr. Despert died June 14 (1982) at the Todd Nursing Home in Southampton at the age of 90.

Louise was also a painter and had several shows in New York. I do not know if they were shown because of their quality or because the Gallery owners may have been former patients. Her painting of my grandmother is shown below. It hangs on the wall in front of my desk in my office, aside the thousands of books I have collected thanks to Grandmother!



8 DEATH

By the 1970s I was now out of Graduate School, and initially teaching at MIT and then down to Washington, in 1975. Hattie died on September 15, 1976. She had been hospitalized at Seaview which was then an old age hospital for the city of New York. It is ironic that she died where she had worked some fifty years earlier.

9 REFERENCES

1. Boisvert, R., John Dewey, New York (Albany) 1998.
2. Boucher, D., P. Kelly, The Social Contract from Hobbes to Rawls, Routledge (New York) 1994.
3. Brown, D., Richard Hofstadter , An Intellectual Biography. The University of Chicago Press (Chicago) 2006.
4. Bynum, H., Spitting Blood, (New York) 2015
5. Chalberg, J., Emma Goldman, Pearson (New York) 2008
6. Cooper, J., Woodrow Wilson, Knopf (New York) 2009.
7. Cooper. J., The Warrior and the Priest, Harvard (Cambridge) 1983.
8. Croly, H., Progressive Democracy, Transaction (New Brunswick, NJ) 1998.
9. Croly, H., The Promise of American Life, The MacMillan Co (New York) 1909.
10. Despert, J., L., Children of Divorce, Doubleday (New York) 1953
11. Diehl, L., A History of the Buffalo General Hospital Training-School for Nurses, The American Journal of Nursing, Vol. 1, No. 11 (Aug., 1901), pp. 790-795
12. Freud, S., W. Bullitt, Thomas Woodrow Wilson, A Psychological Study, Houghton (Boston) 1967.
13. Fried, A., Socialism in America, Columbia Univ Press (New York) 1970
14. Gillmore, I. H., The Story of the Woman's Party,
https://books.google.com/books?id=HRdgL0Or2vYC&pg=PA251&lpg=PA251&dq=%22Belle+Sheinberg%22&source=bl&ots=yCbg4CKZ5W&sig=xv-5XCF4EK8XXHBlsDXH0bRWKdl&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi2oK6lod_XAhXM6oMKHXZLDMMQ6AEIUTAK#v=onepage&q=%22Belle%20Sheinberg%22&f=false
15. Goldman, E., Living My Life, Penguin (New York) 2006
16. Goodwin, L., The Populist Moment, Oxford (New York) 1978.
17. Heilbroner, R., Between Capitalism and Socialism, Vintage (New York) 1970.
18. Heilbroner, R., The Limits of American Capitalism, Harper (New York) 1965.
19. Hofstadter, R., Anti- Intellectualism in America, Knopf (New York) 1963.
20. Hofstadter, R., Social Darwinism in American Thought, Beacon (Boston) 1992.
21. Hofstadter, R., The Age of Reform, Vintage (New York) 1955.
22. Hofstadter, R., The Idea of a Party System, California (Berkeley) 1969.
23. Hofstadter, R., The Paranoid Style in American Politics, Vintage (New York) 2008.
24. Hofstadter, R., The Progressive Historians, U Chicago (Chicago) 1968.

25. Hofstadter, R., *The Progressive Movement*, Prentice Hall (Englewood Cliffs, NJ) 1968.
26. Howe, I., *Socialism and America*, Harcourt Brace (New York) 1977
27. Hyman, J., *Columbia Law Review* Vol. 53, No. 8 (Dec., 1953), pp. 1175-1179
28. Kagan, E., *To The Final Conflict: Socialism In New York City, 1900-1933*, Princeton BA Thesis 1981.
29. Kukathas, C., *P. Pettit, Rawls*, Stanford Press (Stanford) 1990.
30. Laidler, H., *History of Socialism*, Crowell (New York) 1968
31. Latham, E., *The Philosophy and Politics of Woodrow Wilson*, Chicago (Chicago) 1958.
32. Levy, D., *Herbert Croly of the New Republic*, Princeton (Princeton) 1985.
33. Lewenson, S., *Taking Charge*, Natl League for Nursing Press (New York) 1996
34. Library of Congress <https://www.loc.gov/item/mnwp000296/>
35. Library of Congress, *Tactics And Techniques Of The National Woman's*
36. Link, A., *Woodrow Wilson*, Harper (New York) 1954.
37. McGarty, T., DD 649, USS Albert W Grant, 2008,
<http://www.telmarc.com/Documents/Books/DD%20649%2010.pdf>
38. Milkis, S., *Theodore Roosevelt, the Progressive Party, and the Transformation of American Democracy*, U Kansas (Lawrence) 2009.
39. Miller, N., *Theodore Roosevelt*, Quill (New York) 1992.
40. Moore, J., *Herbert Croly's The Promise of American Life at Its Centenary*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing 12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK, 2009.
41. Morris, E., *The Rise of Theodore Roosevelt*, Ballentine (New York) 1979.
42. New York, New York, *Marriage Index 1866-1937*
43. Nugent, W., *Progressivism*, Oxford (New York) 2010.
44. NY Times July 10 1982 <http://www.nytimes.com/1982/07/10/nyregion/despert-memorial-service.html>
45. NY Times Nov 25 1917.
46. NY Times Published Nov 11, 1917
47. NY Times, Published: July 5, 1920
48. *Olean Evening Herald* (Olean, New York) 1920, October, 26
49. Oshinsky, D., *Bellevue*, Doubleday (New York) 2016
50. *Party Suffrage Campaign*, <https://www.loc.gov/collections/women-of-protest/articles-and-essays/tactics-and-techniques-of-the-national-womans-party-suffrage-campaign/>
51. Pestritto, R., W., *Atto, American Progressivism*, Lexington (Lanham, MD) 2008.
52. Pestritto, R., *Woodrow Wilson*, Rohman and Littlefield (Lanham, MD) 2005.

53. Riis, J., Theodore Roosevelt the Citizen, Outlook (New York) 1904.
54. Salvatore, N., Eugene V. Debs, Univ Illinois Press (Champaign) 1982
55. Stevens, D., Jailed for Freedom, New Sage Press (Troudale OR) 1996.
56. Thayer, W., Theodore Roosevelt, MacMillan (Boston) 1919.
57. US Census 1940
58. US Senate, April 1920, RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA. April 14, 1920.—Ordered to be printed. Mr. Moses, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submit the following REPORT I [Pursuant to S. Res. 263.] By resolution of the Senate adopted December 20 1919, the Committee on Foreign Relations, through the Judicial Committee or b; subcommittee, was authorized to make inquiry into the status i | activities of Ludwig C. A. K. Martens, the representative in the country of the Soviet regime in Russia.
59. Weinstein, J., The Decline of Socialism in Amera, 1912-1925, Rutgers Univ Press (New Brunswick) 1984

10.2 ELECTION RETURNS AND VOTES 1920

VOTE FOR TREASURER IN 1920

COUNTIES	John F. Healy, Dem.	N. Monroe Marshall, Rep.	Hattie F. Kruger, Sec.	John McKee, Proh.	John A. Withers, Sec. Lab.	Joseph E. Cronk, Farmer-Lab.	Blank	Void	Scattering	Whole number of votes
Albany.....	28,237	45,903	1,300	454	95	248	4,231	522	...	80,990
Allegany.....	2,529	10,078	491	651	32	25	1,343	36	...	15,185
Bronx.....	69,069	68,830	35,276	472	598	3,227	12,599	1,289	1	191,361
Broome.....	8,236	22,276	1,017	719	70	106	4,510	109	...	37,043
Cattaraugus...	6,032	14,703	612	624	46	90	2,908	80	...	25,101
Cayuga.....	6,158	14,549	613	273	52	41	21,686
Chautauqua...	6,054	25,061	2,890	1,002	131	101	4,998	40,207
Chemung.....	7,349	15,522	452	1,031	44	78	1,941	162	...	26,579
Chemungo.....	3,170	9,680	64	477	3	52	1,871	86	...	14,403
Clinton.....	3,658	7,907	30	343	5	22	1,814	103	...	13,782
Columbia.....	4,950	8,803	187	178	13	36	14,107
Cortland.....	2,309	8,313	126	402	6	25	1,400	74	...	12,655
Delaware.....	4,013	10,131	141	403	9	70	2,055	135	...	16,957
Dutchess.....	9,650	19,667	831	297	36	72	2,708	109	...	33,370
Essex.....	42,008	92,587	13,545	1,577	531	313	19,227	21	...	169,809
Franklin.....	1,979	6,941	42	112	5	9,092
Fulton.....	3,017	9,325	60	214	7	14	1,538	195	...	14,370
Genesee.....	3,167	10,245	844	578	48	27	531	30	...	15,470
Hamilton.....	2,435	9,109	487	225	20	18	1,084	2	...	13,380
Hamilton.....	3,448	5,524	250	216	11	24	587	42	...	10,405
Hamilton.....	1,072	717	2	10	1,203
Herkimer.....	6,208	12,979	738	343	25	31	20,327
Jefferson.....	7,154	20,075	214	667	34	623	2,787	348	2	31,904
Kings.....	168,596	224,079	45,116	1,762	972	6,600	36,505	2,382	...	476,012
Lewis.....	2,512	5,184	18	109	6	12	980	92	...	8,913
Livingston.....	3,451	9,149	440	282	11	17	268	11	...	15,629
Madison.....	3,418	9,952	216	314	18	33	13,951
Monroe.....	27,383	73,320	10,800	1,974	330	818	1	114,626
Montgomery...	5,856	11,880	416	224	45	36	1,902	82	...	20,441
Nassau.....	9,400	29,615	1,108	267	45	318	1,575	208	...	42,536
New York.....	179,474	197,556	46,641	1,081	805	9,371	...	7	...	434,935
Niagara.....	7,502	20,002	1,671	628	70	89	3,717	5	...	33,684
Onesida.....	15,829	34,357	2,178	617	126	82	4,488	57,677
Onondaga.....	23,376	53,816	4,395	935	249	160	7,697	170	...	90,707
Ontario.....	5,494	13,231	888	290	20	33	270	20,226
Orange.....	10,084	22,515	1,467	462	46	146	1,602	82	...	36,404
Orleans.....	2,136	7,714	606	202	14	30	528	53	...	11,289
Oswego.....	7,636	16,394	495	741	16	58	2,394	88	...	27,822
Otsego.....	5,689	10,881	108	538	18	82	1,870	109	...	19,295
Pitnham.....	1,294	2,965	34	37	8	24	4,399
Queens.....	54,313	65,053	6,159	444	291	2,961	10,497	457	...	140,175
Rensselaer.....	20,769	27,399	1,688	359	86	143	50,444
Richmond.....	12,023	12,763	663	206	46	294	2,765	125	...	28,885
Rockland.....	5,155	9,854	472	167	23	145	1,447	85	...	17,348
St. Lawrence...	6,386	22,176	333	401	25	61	3,731	318	...	33,431
Saratoga.....	6,577	14,046	319	477	29	123	2,667	277	1	24,516
Schenectady...	8,599	18,159	4,790	795	128	48	104	6	...	32,629
Schoharie.....	3,444	4,803	42	385	8	23	1,059	50	...	9,814
Schuyler.....	916	3,500	131	152	15	12	357	22	...	5,105
Seneca.....	3,070	6,031	231	230	9	10	632	28	...	10,241
Steuben.....	6,966	17,030	1,111	1,075	79	49	2,538	25	...	28,873
Suffolk.....	9,034	23,646	586	439	50	263	3,616	270	1	37,905
Sullivan.....	3,736	6,945	560	171	14	63	1,277	50	...	12,816
Tioga.....	2,081	6,116	72	313	20	20	1,024	76	...	9,722
Tompkins.....	3,238	8,612	266	418	18	32	1,636	46	...	14,266
Ulster.....	8,214	16,584	281	744	22	147	1	25,993
Warren.....	3,312	7,330	158	203	9	32	1,567	158	...	12,769
Washington...	3,902	11,840	124	181	8	30	2,223	104	5	18,423
Wayne.....	3,950	12,416	283	345	11	32	17,037
Westchester...	31,848	68,348	5,465	547	240	598	7,019	105	...	114,980
Wyoming.....	2,317	8,337	286	236	8	30	1,184	52	...	12,450
Yates.....	1,329	5,167	37	173	22	16	694	61	...	7,499
Total.....	901,611	1,666,989	200,836	30,095	5,784	28,227	178,866	8,977	18	2,921,403

10.3 NEW YORK WOMEN

New York women sentenced on November 14, 1917²⁴

1. Amy Juengling, Buffalo, NY; unlawful assembly
2. Hattie Kruger, Buffalo, NY; unlawful assembly
3. Paula Jacobi, NYC; unlawful assembly
4. Eunice Brannan, NYC; unlawful assembly (bio available on TPSM web site)
5. Lucy Burns, NYC; unlawful assembly (bio available on TPSM web site)
6. Emily Dubois Butterworth, NYC; unlawful assembly
7. Dorothy Day, NYC; unlawful assembly (bio available on TPSM web site)
8. Elizabeth Hamilton, NYC; unlawful assembly
9. Louise Hornsby, NYC; unlawful assembly
10. Peggy Johns, NYC; unlawful assembly)
11. Kathryn Lincoln, NYC; unlawful assembly
12. Belle Sheinberg, NYC; unlawful assembly
13. Cora Week, NYC; unlawful assembly
14. Matilda Young, NYC; unlawful assembly (bio available on TPSM web site)

10.3.1 Eunice Dana Brannan²⁵

Eunice Dana Brannan was a prominent suffragist, being the daughter of Charles A. Dana, who was the founder and editor of the “New York Sun” and a trusted counselor of President Lincoln. She was also the wife of prominent physician Dr. John Winters Brannan, president of Board of Trustees of Bellevue Hospital. She was an advisor to Harriot Stanton Blatch, suffragist leader in New York, and later held prominent roles with the National Women’s Party including as a member of the Executive Committee and state chairman of the New York Branch. She gained attention for her brilliant state suffrage work as an officer of the Woman’s Political Union in NY. She was elected to the Executive Committee at the first National Convention of the Congressional Union in DC, on December 6-13, 1915. She was in the delegation of women who met with President Woodrow Wilson after the death of noted suffragist, Inez Milholland. It was President Wilson’s refusal at that meeting to act in support of an amendment allowing women’s suffrage that triggered the White House picketing. When the National Woman’s Party was formed and the Congressional Union for Women Suffrage dissolved in March of 1917, Brannan was elected to serve on the NWP board. Her first arrest for picketing the White House was on July 14, 1917, for which she was sentenced to 60 days in Occoquan. After three days she and the others were pardoned by President Wilson after one high ranking husband complained to the President. She also led the first group of 41 pickets that protested the treatment of Alice Paul on November 10, 1917. At their trial on November 12, 1917, Brannan said: “The responsibility for an agitation like ours against injustice rests with those who deny justice, not those who demand

²⁴ <http://www.truth-out.org/speakout/item/27182-night-of-terror-for-white-house-pic>

²⁵ From <http://www.suffragistmemorial.org/suffragist-of-the-month/>

it. Whatever may be the verdict of this Court, we shall continue our agitation until the grievance of American women is redressed.”

The judge responded by sentencing her to 60 days at the Occoquan Workhouse, making her among those who endured the “night of terror” at the DC prison in Lorton, Va. Again in late 1918, she was in attendance at the initial speech-burning demonstration at Lafayette Park and was the one who burned the President’s speech in which he justified the women’s protests by saying: “We have been told is the unpatriotic to criticise public action. If it is, there is a deep disgrace resting upon the origin of this nation. We have forgotten the history of our country if we have

10.3.2 Amy Juengling

Amy Juengling, born and raised in Buffalo, NY, was active in the National Woman’s Party and participated in the NWP’s picketing of the Woodrow Wilson White House. On November 10, 1917, Juengling set out with forty other NWP members to protest the imprisonment of Alice Paul at the D-C Jail. More specifically, they were protesting a denial of Paul’s status as a political prisoner (Cooney, 357). Juengling marched in the first group of picketers who descended on the White House. They carried banners of purple, gold, and white – the colors of the suffrage campaign. The protesters were arrested as soon as they took their positions at the east and west gates of the White House (Cooney, 358). They were not sentenced and were ordered released (Irwin, 258). Just four days later, on November 14th, Juengling and other picketers set out again to protest Paul’s treatment. Juengling was arrested as soon as she arrived at the White House, tried the same day, charged with unlawful assembly, and was sentenced to thirty days in prison or a fine of fifty dollars (Irwin, 260). Juengling and the other women refused to pay their fines and were taken to Occoquan Workhouse in Lorton, Virginia, to serve their sentences. Once there, the women fought to be recognized as political prisoners which guaranteed them certain rights, but the authorities refused.

During what would later be called the Night of Terror, in the early hours of November 15th, the women, including Juengling, faced brutality at the hands of the Workhouse guards (Walton, 199). She and the other women were placed in small cells and were beaten. In protest of their treatment, the women began hunger strikes and were subjected to forced feedings by the guards (Irwin, 288). Kept from communicating with those outside the prison, the women wrote notes which were secretly smuggled out of the facility. Once word of their abuse was reported in the press, the public became outraged and called for the release of the suffragists. On November 27th, Juengling and the other suffragists were released from the Occoquan Workhouse.

Juengling stayed involved with the National Woman’s Party after her arrest and imprisonment in Occoquan. On New Year’s Day in 1919, the National Woman’s Party began a new campaign called “watchfires of freedom.” She and other protesters burned the speeches of President Woodrow Wilson to call attention to his lack of involvement in the woman suffrage campaign (Cooney, 398). Wilson had verbally given his support to the passage of a woman’s suffrage amendment, but many members of the National Woman’s Party felt that Wilson should be more involved in the campaign (Cooney, 398).

10.3.3 Dorothy Day

*Dorothy Day (1897 – 1980) was born in Brooklyn, NY, and lived in San Francisco with her parents until the 1906 earthquake, and then in Chicago. Her father was a Journalist, and she was an avid reader. She moved to New York City as a young adult. From NYC, she went to Washington DC to work with the National Woman’s Party on women’s right to vote. She participated in the NWP group that protested the treatment of their leader Alice Paul, then imprisoned in DC. With the others, she was sent to prison in the Occoquan Workhouse on November 14, 1917, and experienced the “night of terror.” On that night “. . . two men brought in Dorothy Day, –a very slight, delicate girl; her captors were twisting her arms above her head. Suddenly they lifted her, brought her body down twice over the back of an iron bench. One of the men called: ‘The damned Suffrager! . . . I will put you through hell!’” [Irwin]. Her arm was cut. [Stevens] She became a famous leader as a pacifist, a social activist, and for her work to improve the lives of the poor. She wrote for *The Call* and *The Masses*, and co-founded *The Catholic Worker*.*

10.3.4 Lucy Burns

Lucy Burns was a versatile and pivotal figure within the National Woman’s Party (NWP). With distinctive flame-red hair that matched her personality and convictions, she was often characterized as a charmer and a firebrand—and the crucial support behind her friend Alice Paul’s higher-profile leadership.

Born in Brooklyn, New York, to an Irish Catholic family, Burns was a brilliant student of language and linguistics. She studied at Vassar College and Yale University in the United States and at the University of Berlin in Germany (1906-8). While a student at Oxford College in Cambridge, England, Burns witnessed the militancy of the British suffrage movement.

Burns set her academic goals aside and in 1909 became an activist with Emmeline and Christabel Pankhurst’s Women’s Social and Political Union (WSPU). She perfected the art of street speaking, was arrested repeatedly, and was imprisoned four times. From 1910 to 1912 she worked as a suffrage organizer in Scotland.

*Burns met Alice Paul in a London police station after both were arrested during a suffrage demonstration outside Parliament. Their alliance was powerful and long-lasting. Returning to the United States (Paul in 1910, Burns in 1912), the two women worked first with the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) as leaders of its Congressional Committee. In April 1913 they founded the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage (CU), which evolved into the NWP. Burns organized campaigns in the West (1914, 1916), served as NWP legislative chairman in Washington, D.C., and, beginning in April 1914, edited the organization’s weekly journal, *The Suffragist*.*

Burns was a driving force behind the picketing of President Woodrow Wilson’s administration in Washington, D.C., beginning in January 1917. Six months later, she and Dora Lewis—targeting the attention of visiting Russian envoys—attracted controversy by prominently displaying a banner outside the White House declaring that America was not a free democracy as long as

women were denied the vote. When Burns participated in a similar action with Katharine Morey later the same month, they were arrested for obstructing traffic. The banners displeased President Wilson and escalated the administration's response to the picketing.

Burns was arrested and imprisoned six times. Declaring that suffragists were political prisoners, she was among those in the Occoquan Workhouse who instigated hunger strikes in October 1917 and were subsequently placed in solitary confinement. Jailed again when protesting the treatment of the imprisoned Alice Paul, Burns joined Paul and others in another round of Occoquan hunger strikes. Burns was in Occoquan for what became known as the "Night of Terror" on November 15, 1917, during which she was beaten and her arms were handcuffed above her head in her cell. Particularly brutal force-feeding soon followed. After her release, Burns commenced nationwide speaking tours. Unlike Paul, who remained active in the NWP until her death, Burns retired from public campaigns with the success of the 19th Amendment. She spent the rest of her life working with the Catholic Church.

10.3.5 Matilda Young

Matilda Young of Washington, D.C., was the sister of NWP activist Joy Young. She worked full-time for suffrage for several years. She was the youngest NWP picket arrested, only 19 years old when she served her first prison term. She was arrested for picketing Nov. 10, 1917, sentenced to 15 days in District Jail, and served two terms in jail in January 1919; five days for watchfire demonstrations and three days for applauding suffrage prisoners in court. While burning one of the president's speeches in Lafayette Square, she said, "The women of the country will keep the flame of liberty ablaze until complete victory is assured."

10.4 WOODROW WILSON: THE NEW FREEDOM²⁶

Now, it came to me, as this interesting man talked, that the Constitution of the United States had been made under the dominion of the Newtonian Theory. You have only to read the papers of The Federalist to see that fact written on every page. They speak of the "checks and balances" of the Constitution, and use to express their idea the simile of the organization of the universe, and particularly of the solar system,—how by the attraction of gravitation the various parts are held in their orbits; and then they proceed to represent Congress, the Judiciary, and the President as a sort of imitation of the solar system.

They were only following the English Whigs, who gave Great Britain its modern constitution. Not that those Englishmen analyzed the matter, or had any theory about it; Englishmen care little for theories. It was a Frenchman, Montesquieu, who pointed out to them how faithfully they had copied Newton's description of the mechanism of the heavens.

The makers of our Federal Constitution read Montesquieu with true scientific enthusiasm. They were scientists in their way,—the best way of their age,—those fathers of the nation. Jefferson wrote of "the laws of Nature,"—and then by way of afterthought,—"and of Nature's God." And they constructed a government as they would have constructed an orrery,—to display the laws of nature. Politics in their thought was a variety of mechanics. The Constitution was founded on the law of gravitation. The government was to exist and move by virtue of the efficacy of "checks and balances."

The trouble with the theory is that government is not a machine, but a living thing. It falls, not under the theory of the universe, but under the theory of organic life. It is accountable to Darwin, not to Newton. It is modified by its environment, necessitated by its tasks, shaped to its functions by the sheer pressure of life. No living thing can have its organs offset against each other, as checks, and live. On the contrary, its life is dependent upon their quick co-operation, their ready response to the commands of instinct or intelligence, their amicable community of purpose. Government is not a body of blind forces; it is a body of men, with highly differentiated functions, no doubt, in our modern day, of specialization, with a common task and purpose.

Their co-operation is indispensable, their warfare fatal. There can be no successful government without the intimate, instinctive co-ordination of the organs of life and action. This is not theory, but fact, and displays its force as fact, whatever theories may be thrown across its track. Living political constitutions must be Darwinian in structure and in practice. Society is a living organism and must obey the laws of life, not of mechanics; it must develop.

All that progressives ask or desire is permission—in an era when "development," "evolution," is the scientific word—to interpret the Constitution according to the Darwinian principle; all they ask is recognition of the fact that a nation is a living thing and not a machine.

²⁶ <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/14811/14811-h/14811-h.htm>

There are two theories of government that have been contending with each other ever since government began. One of them is the theory which in America is associated with the name of a very great man, Alexander Hamilton. A great man, but, in my judgment, not a great American. He did not think in terms of American life. Hamilton believed that the only people who could understand government, and therefore the only people who were qualified to conduct it, were the men who had the biggest financial stake in the commercial and industrial enterprises of the country.

That theory, though few have now the hardihood to profess it openly, has been the working theory upon which our government has lately been conducted. It is astonishing how persistent it is. It is amazing how quickly the political party which had Lincoln for its first leader,—Lincoln, who not only denied, but in his own person so completely disproved the aristocratic theory,—it is amazing how quickly that party, founded on faith in the people, forgot the precepts of Lincoln and fell under the delusion that the "masses" needed the guardianship of "men of affairs."

The doctrine that monopoly is inevitable and that the only course open to the people of the United States is to submit to and regulate it found a champion during the campaign of 1912 in the new party, or branch of the Republican party, founded under the leadership of Mr. Roosevelt, with the conspicuous aid,—I mention him with no satirical intention, but merely to set the facts down accurately,—of Mr. George W. Perkins, organizer of the Steel Trust and the Harvester Trust, and with the support of more than three millions of citizens, many of them among the most patriotic, conscientious and high-minded men and women of the land. The fact that its acceptance of monopoly was a feature of the new party platform from which the attention of the generous and just was diverted by the charm of a social program of great attractiveness to all concerned for the amelioration of the lot of those who suffer wrong and privation, and the further fact that, even so, the platform was repudiated by the majority of the nation, render it no less necessary to reflect on the significance of the confession made for the first time by any party in the country's history. It may be useful, in order to the relief of the minds of many from an error of no small magnitude, to consider now, the heat of a presidential contest being past, exactly what it was that Mr. Roosevelt proposed.

Mr. Roosevelt attached to his platform some very splendid suggestions as to noble enterprises which we ought to undertake for the uplift of the human race; but when I hear an ambitious platform put forth, I am very much more interested in the dynamics of it than in the rhetoric of it. I have a very practical mind, and I want to know who are going to do those things and how they are going to be done. If you have read the trust plank in that platform as often as I have read it, you have found it very long, but very tolerant. It did not anywhere condemn monopoly, except in words; its essential meaning was that the trusts have been bad and must be made to be good. You know that Mr. Roosevelt long ago classified trusts for us as good and bad, and he said that he was afraid only of the bad ones. Now he does not desire that there should be any more bad ones, but proposes that they should all be made good by discipline, directly applied by a commission of executive appointment. All he explicitly complains of is lack of publicity and lack of fairness; not the exercise of power, for throughout that plank the power of the great corporations is accepted as the inevitable consequence of the modern organization of industry. All that it is proposed to do is to take them under control and regulation. The national administration having for sixteen years been virtually under the regulation of the trusts, it would

be merely a family matter were the parts reversed and were the other members of the family to exercise the regulation. And the trusts, apparently, which might, in such circumstances, comfortably continue to administer our affairs under the mollifying influences of the federal government, would then, if you please, be the instrumentalities by which all the humanistic, benevolent program of the rest of that interesting platform would be carried out!

I have read and reread that plank, so as to be sure that I get it right. All that it complains of is,—and the complaint is a just one, surely,—that these gentlemen exercise their power in a way that is secret. Therefore, we must have publicity. Sometimes they are arbitrary; therefore they need regulation. Sometimes they do not consult the general interests of the community; therefore they need to be reminded of those general interests by an industrial commission. But at every turn it is the trusts who are to do us good, and not we ourselves.

Again, I absolutely protest against being put into the hands of trustees. Mr. Roosevelt's conception of government is Mr. Taft's conception, that the Presidency of the United States is the presidency of a board of directors. I am willing to admit that if the people of the United States cannot get justice for themselves, then it is high time that they should join the third party and get it from somebody else. The justice proposed is very beautiful; it is very attractive; there were planks in that platform which stir all the sympathies of the heart; they proposed things that we all want to do; but the question is, Who is going to do them? Through whose instrumentality? Are Americans ready to ask the trusts to give us in pity what we ought, in justice, to take?

When I was in Oregon, not many months ago, I had some very interesting conversations with Mr. U'Ren, who is the father of what is called the Oregon System, a system by which he has put bosses out of business. He is a member of a group of public-spirited men who, whenever they cannot get what they want through the legislature, draw up a bill and submit it to the people, by means of the initiative, and generally get what they want. The day I arrived in Portland, a morning paper happened to say, very ironically, that there were two legislatures in Oregon, one at Salem, the state capital, and the other going around under the hat of Mr. U'Ren. I could not resist the temptation of saying, when I spoke that evening, that, while I was the last man to suggest that power should be concentrated in any single individual or group of individuals, I would, nevertheless, after my experience in New Jersey, rather have a legislature that went around under the hat of somebody in particular whom I knew I could find than a legislature that went around under God knows who's hat; because then you could at least put your finger on your governing force; you would know where to find it.

What is liberty?

I have long had an image in my mind of what constitutes liberty. Suppose that I were building a great piece of powerful machinery, and suppose that I should so awkwardly and unskilfully assemble the parts of it that every time one part tried to move it would be interfered with by the others, and the whole thing would buckle up and be checked. Liberty for the several parts would consist in the best possible assembling and adjustment of them all, would it not? If you want the great piston of the engine to run with absolute freedom, give it absolutely perfect alignment and adjustment with the other parts of the machine, so that it is free, not because it is let alone or isolated, but because it has been associated most skilfully and carefully with the other parts of the great structure.

What is liberty? You say of the locomotive that it runs free. What do you mean? You mean that its parts are so assembled and adjusted that friction is reduced to a minimum, and that it has perfect adjustment. We say of a boat skimming the water with light foot, "How free she runs," when we mean, how perfectly she is adjusted to the force of the wind, how perfectly she obeys the great breath out of the heavens that fills her sails. Throw her head up into the wind and see how she will halt and stagger, how every sheet will shiver and her whole frame be shaken, how instantly she is "in irons," in the expressive phrase of the sea. She is free only when you have let her fall off again and have recovered once more her nice adjustment to the forces she must obey and cannot defy.

Human freedom consists in perfect adjustments of human interests and human activities and human energies.

Now, the adjustments necessary between individuals, between individuals and the complex institutions amidst which they live, and between those institutions and the government, are infinitely more intricate to-day than ever before. No doubt this is a tiresome and roundabout way of saying the thing, yet perhaps it is worthwhile to get somewhat clearly in our mind what makes all the trouble to-day. Life has become complex; there are many more elements, more parts, to it than ever before. And, therefore, it is harder to keep everything adjusted,—and harder to find out where the trouble lies when the machine gets out of order.

You know that one of the interesting things that Mr. Jefferson said in those early days of simplicity which marked the beginnings of our government was that the best government consisted in as little governing as possible. And there is still a sense in which that is true. It is still intolerable for the government to interfere with our individual activities except where it is necessary to interfere with them in order to free them. But I feel confident that if Jefferson were living in our day he would see what we see: that the individual is caught in a great confused nexus of all sorts of complicated circumstances, and that to let him alone is to leave him helpless as against the obstacles with which he has to contend; and that, therefore, law in our day must come to the assistance of the individual. It must come to his assistance to see that he gets fair play; that is all, but that is much.

Without the watchful interference, the resolute interference, of the government, there can be no fair play between individuals and such powerful institutions as the trusts. Freedom to-day is something more than being let alone. The program of a government of freedom must in these days be positive, not negative merely.

You know what the vitality of America consists of. Its vitality does not lie in New York, nor in Chicago; it will not be sapped by anything that happens in St. Louis. The vitality of America lies in the brains, the energies, the enterprise of the people throughout the land; in the efficiency of their factories and in the richness of the fields that stretch beyond the borders of the town; in the wealth which they extract from nature and originate for themselves through the inventive genius characteristic of all free American communities.

That is the wealth of America, and if America discourages the locality, the community, the self-contained town, she will kill the nation. A nation is as rich as her free communities; she is not as rich as her capital city or her metropolis. The amount of money in Wall Street is no indication of the wealth of the American people. That indication can be found only in the fertility of the American mind and the productivity of American industry everywhere throughout the United States. If America were not rich and fertile, there would be no money in Wall Street. If Americans were not vital and able to take care of themselves, the great money exchanges would break down. The welfare, the very existence of the nation, rests at last upon the great mass of the people; its prosperity depends at last upon the spirit in which they go about their work in their several communities throughout the broad land. In proportion as her towns and her countryside are happy and hopeful will America realize the high ambitions which have marked her in the eyes of all the world.

10.5 LOUISE DESPERT

J Autism Dev Disord. 2015 Jul;45(7):2274-6. doi: 10.1007/s10803-015-2371-3.

Did Kanner Actually Describe the First Account of Autism? The Mystery of 1938.

Fellowes S1.

Kanner opens his pioneering 1943 paper on autism by making a mysterious mention of the year 1938. Recent letters to the editor of this journal have disagreed over a particular interpretation- does 1938 refer to an early paper by Asperger, effectively meaning Kanner plagiarised Asperger? I argue 1938 refers to a paper by Louise Despert. This was not plagiarism but a case of building on Despert's ideas. Additionally, I suggest his motives for not mentioning her by name were not dishonourable.

Dr Juliette Louise Despert

Birth 9 Jun 1892

France

Death 14 Jun 1982 (aged 90)

Southampton, Suffolk County, New York, USA

Burial

Potter's Field

Hart Island, Bronx County, New York, USA

Memorial ID 70087030 · View Source

<https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/70087030/juliette-louise-despert>

<https://data.cityofnewyork.us/City-Government/DOC-Hart-Island-Burial-Records/c39ues35/data>

Graduate of University and Bellevue Hospital Medical College, Class of 1932. The college is now named NYU School of Medicine. Practiced Psychiatry and a published author under the name J. Louise Despert.

10.6 DOC HART ISLAND BURIAL RECORDS

Based on [DOC Hart Island Burial Records](#)

Individuals buried on Hart Island with date and place of death when available

DESPERT J. LOUISE 90 06/14/1982 SO. HAMPTON NY

10.7 RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA, MARTRENS AND SOCIALISTS.

April 14, 1920.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. Moses, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submits the following R E P O R T;
[Pursuant to S. Res. 263.]

By resolution of the Senate adopted December 20 1919, the Committee on Foreign Relations, through the Full committee or the subcommittee, was authorized to make inquiry into the status of the activities of Ludwig C. A. K. Martens, the representative in the country of the Soviet regime in Russia.

On the 23d of December a subcommittee was designated to with the subject, and its membership comprised Messrs. Messrs. Borah, Knox, Pomerene, and Shields. Messrs. Knox and Pomer found it impossible to render the necessary service, and they were replaced by the appointment of Messrs. Brandegee and Pittman respectively.

Subsequently, the Senate, by resolution, authorized the subcommittee to employ counsel, and the Hon. Wade H. Ellis, of Ohio was retained in this capacity. Mr. Ellis was assisted by John Trevor, Esq., of New York City, who served the committee whose knowledge gained through service with the committee was of great value.

The resolution under which the committee acted is as follows

[Senate resolution 263, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session.]

Whereas one Ludwig C. A. K. Martens claims to be an ambassador to United States from the Russian Soviet Government; and

Whereas, according to newspaper reports, he refuses to answer certain questions before the Lusk investigating committee in the city of New York, committee appointed to investigate propaganda against this Government on the ground that he is such ambassador and entitled to diplomatic privilege and

Whereas said Martens has headquarters in the city of New York and is alleged to be directing propaganda against this Government; and

Whereas, according to his testimony before said Lusk committee, he came to this country as a German citizen and is a member of the Communist Party pledged to overthrow capitalistic systems of government the world over;

...

In consequence, it is unnecessary to go beyond the record to sustains the findings of the committee further than to point out certain evitable and wholly warrant-able deductions.

Following seriatim the items of inquiry enumerated in the resolution of the Senate, the status of Martens is disclosed by the testimony under several heads:

(1) What alleged Government or power in Europe does he represent ?

His credentials (p. 14) were issued by the "People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs" of the "Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic," from Moscow, under date of January 2, 1918. They were signed by G. Chichearin, "People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs," and were sealed with the official seal of the commissariat. This Government, as was brought out in the course of testimony (p. 23), was set up in November, 1917, by a communist revolution to the movements of March in that year, which accomplished the overthrow of the dynasty and government of Romanoff Czars. This republic operates under a constitution, the terms of which (p. 160) "all property rights in the treasures of the earth, water, forest, and fundamental natural sources within its boundaries are abolished"; which confirms "transfer of all banks into the ownership" of the Government; which there "pass over without indemnification to the disposition of the county, provincial, regional, and Federal Soviets," all private livestock and inventoried property of homesteads; and under which "private merchants, trade and commercial brokers" (p. 162); "monks and clergy of all denominations" (p. 194), and in general all persons who do not "perform useful, social functions" (p. 163), have no right either to vote or to be voted for.

For instance (p. 39) Martens explained that a man who own farm in Russia and who leases it to another may not vote or be voted for. Under this constitution all banks were converted into a state monopoly (p. 168), and holdings of bonds in excess of 10,000 rubles were confiscated (p. 169); these confiscations having taken place prior to the adoption of the constitution and were confirmed by the instrument. Under this constitution no Russian is permitted to vest his capital or to ship it out of the country or to receive interest upon it (p. 173). This constitution also provides for the disarming of the property classes, the arming of "all toilers" and the organization of "a Socialist red army" (p. 164). Under this constitution; in an election, the records are received by a Soviet (p. 200) who appoints a commission of verification; which in turn reports to the Soviet and the Soviet "decides the question when there is doubt as to which candidate is elected." By this means deputies; elected to "the All-Russian Congress of Soviets" and by this process the prime minister is chosen, to hold office during the pleasure of his electorates (p. 200).

From this government Martens took his letters of credence above stated; and there were later supplemented, under date of March.

Whereas said Martens, according to his said testimony, regards this Government as a capitalistic government: Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is hereby authorized and directed, through the full committee or through any subcommittee thereof to investigate as speedily as possible the status of said Martens; what allied government or power in Europe he represents; what, if any, recognition of any kind has been accorded him by this Government; whether or not is an alien enemy; what propaganda, if any, he is carrying on for the overthrow of governments; and all facts and circumstances relating to his activities in this country and his alleged diplomatic representation, and all facts relative to the activities of any other party, parties, or organization

bearing upon or relating to Russian propoganda in this country, and make report to the Senate of such findings.

The said committee is hereby empowered to sit and act at such time and place as it may deem necessary; to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses, the production of books, papers, and documents; to employ stenographers at a cost not exceeding \$1' per printed page. The chairman of the committee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses. Subpoenas for witnesses shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee thereof. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The expense thereof shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, on vouchers ordered by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

The subcommittee held its first meeting January 12, and continued its sessions from time to time until March 29-, when the hearings were formally declared closed. It was the constant purpose of the subcommittee to restrict the inquiry to the narrow lines set for it by the resolution above cited, and this effort was measurably successful, although, as is natural in cases where counsel appear—Martens being represented by former Senator Thomas W. Hardwick, of Georgia—much matter of a controversial or argumentative nature will be found in the record. Inasmuch as the major line of inquiry under the resolution dealt with the subject of Martens's activities in this country, the committee deemed Martens himself to be the most competent source of information. 'Accordingly, he was the chief and almost the only witness to be heard, and his examination was developed naturally along the lines of his own admissions and from documentary assistance, which in substantially every case was fully authenticated before being made use of..

The rights of Martens were fully protected not only through the presence of his counsel, who sat with him from the beginning of the inquiry to the end, whereas four sessions of the committee were held before suitable counsel could be obtained for it; and he was permitted at the outset to state his case from prepared manuscript with the utmost vigor of expression and with only slight interruption or interrogatory. The committee deems this statement essential by reason of Martens's protest in the closing days of the inquiry that he had not been permitted to make suitable explanatory replies to the inquiry to which he had been subjected. On this point the record will speak for itself.

The committee finds itself unable to reconcile the self-evident contradiction in much of Martens's testimony. He is a thorough by further Certificate signed by Chichearin and - addressed "to whom it may concern" in which Martens was given certain authorization to take over and administer all property in America belonging to the Russian Federative Socialist Soviet 99 and to exercise further functions cognate to those of a diplomatic or consular representative.

Aside from his own declarations the committee found no means to ascertain Martens's real mission in the United States. His letters of credence and documents supplementary thereto were not in a form to warrant his assumption of diplomatic privilege. They were not indeed even in the form attaching to the commission upon which a consular officer receives his exequatur. The policy which he adopted in pursuance of his authorization as he interpreted it was equally unique and nebulous. For example, he protested throughout the entire course of his examination that his sole purpose in this country was to establish and develop cordial relations between Soviet Russia and the United States, especially through the building up of commercial intercourse. In support of this purpose he declared that he had attempted to enter into contractual relations with many American enterprises to whom he offered contracts for tools, machinery, clothing, etc., to be sent to Russia. These proffers, however, proved to be wholly tentative; and the form of contract which he employed in the few instances where such engagements were executed was wholly unilateral and the burden not only of supplying the wares in question, but of securing their shipment to Soviet Russia, was placed entirely upon the producer and no earnest money was ever deposited in a single instance; while the American contractor by one means or another was led to bring pressure upon the Government of the United States for the purpose of forcing either a modus vivendi with or an actual recognition of the Russian Soviet Government. To the committee, therefore, the conclusion is inescapable that the entire fabric of trade negotiations which Martens unrolled was part of an ingenious scheme of propaganda to create sympathy, based upon cupidity, for the Russian Soviets and to produce by indirect means the admission of Soviet Russia into the companionship of international relations which other means had failed to secure.

The next inquiry suggested by the resolution of the Senate:

"What if any recognition of any kind has been accorded him by this Government?"

It has been observed that neither Martens's original letter of credence nor the supplementary certificate was in the usual form of diplomatic credentials; and in fact he testified (p. 36) that he is not familiar with the ordinary manner of diplomatic procedure, but that he knows of no reason why the usual form of such communications should have been departed from in his case. He testified that he filed his letter of credence with the Department of State on the 19th of March, 1919, accompanying it with a memorandum (p. 23) dealing with the intentions of the Government of Russia, as well as with the internal affairs of that country." He had other communications with the State Department (p. 27); but to none of them was any reply vouchsafed. He never presented himself in person at the State Department (p. 89) or sought the usual audience with the Secretary of State, which is customary for diplomatic representatives; and he "totally abandoned all efforts to secure personal recognition" (p. 81) after having sent his letter of credence to the department by mail.

He testified (p. 89) that "he was still trying to get recognition: but that no official representatives had ever been sent by him to the State Department (p. 90). Unofficial representatives had conversations with officials at the State Department, including the Under Secretary of State, and from these Martens received oral reports.

Protesting constantly that his sole purpose in the United States was to develop trade relations between this country and Soviet Russia, and testifying (p. 91) that he had never communicated in any manner with the War Trade Board or with any other department of the Government, he asserted, however, that certain American industrial companies with whom he sought to make contracts had communicated with the President (p. 135), and with the Attorney General (p. 75), with a view to securing a change in the policy of the Government toward the Soviet Government to the end of opening up trade relations.

He made no effort to claim for himself or for any member of his staff, any of the usual privileges accorded a diplomatic officer (p. 43) such as to bring any household effects without payment of custom etc.; and he never asserted his diplomatic quality (p. 43) until he was summoned for examination before the so-called Lusk committee of the Assembly of the State of New York. In fact, his appointment as representative of the Soviet Government appears to have been shrouded in some mystery. He testified (p. 100) that he had had no knowledge concerning his designation prior to receiving his appointment and that his credentials were brought to him by a courier. It appeared from documentary evidence, however (p. 308), that a bureau had been organized in the city of New York for the purpose of establishing communication with Russia, the membership of this bureau embracing eight persons, among whom were Martens himself, Santeri Nuorteva, who was secretary of the Martens bureau, Gregory Weinstein, who was Martens's personal secretary, and a Prof. Lomonosoff, who, having been earlier connected with the regularly accredited Russian era Embassy in this country, later cast in his allegiance with the Soviet government and with Martens's bureau. According to this evidence (p. 309), it was at first proposed that Weinstein should become the Soviet representative in the United States; but a question regarding Weinstein's integrity having arisen and two weeks' time being allotted to him to clear himself, at the expiration of this, Weinstein came before the committee with the information that Martens had received the appointment. The discrepancy between this evidence and Martens's assertion that the first intimation of his appointment had come when the courier handed him his credential is apparent. But in whatever manner his appointment was brought about, it is wholly clear that he received no recognition, even personally, from the Government of the United States.

His communications to and from his Government, or its representatives, were almost invariably carried by couriers—whose names were withheld from the committee and whose travels, it is fair to assume, were facilitated by spurious passports or otherwise in direct violation of the statutes covering foreign intercourse during the period of Martens's supposed representation here. These couriers brought to him not only letters, instructions, and other written communications, but also brought in large sums of money in the aggregate at least \$150,000 in violation of the trading with the enemy act, and of other statutory and regulatory restrictions. These couriers, in the number of about 20, he testified, comprised both American citizens and foreign subjects.

The inquiry whether or not Martens is an alien enemy, which the resolution of the Senate directs, brought out that Martens was born at Bachmut, in the Province of Ekaterinoslav, in Russia, in 1874, and that his parents were German subjects. His birth was registered in Russia as of German parentage and he was educated in Russia as an engineer, following that profession until 1899, when, after having spent three years in prison for revolutionary activities (pp. 7 and 8), he

was deported by the Russian authorities to Germany, where he was held as a German subject to the military service which the German Government required. In 1906, Martens took up residence in England, where he remained for 10 years (p. 10). Until the beginning of the war in 1914, no occasion arose in England for the determination of his citizenship; but in October of that year (p. 11) a registration, in most cases accompanied by internment, of German subjects, was set on foot. Martens then registered as a German subject, “ as a purely technical matter,” according to this testimony (p. 11), alleging that to be the reason why he was not interned. Following his decision to come to America, permission to make the journey was accorded by the British inspector under the alien act, and Martens and his wife came to the United States on the 2d of January, 1916 (p. 11), and, upon landing at New York, he declared himself to be a German subject (p. 11), making the regular declaration under oath. He contended before the committee, however, that he did this solely because of the British permit which he carried and which identified him as a German subject.

Upon the issuance, December 31, 1917, of the rules and regulations for the registration of German enemy aliens in the United States, Martens did not so register; basing his claim (pp. 18-19) upon the assertion that he had been made a Russian citizen by virtue of a decree of the provisional government of Prince Lvov. This, citizenship, he testified (p. 19), was procured for him by an application made by his relatives in Russia without special authority from him and with no formal paper from him in any manner. He was unable to furnish any copy of this decree (p. 20), though he declared (p. 20) that a document to this effect was issued to him, given into the possession of his sister in Russia and that she dispatched it to him by mail. This information, he declared (p. 20), came to him in a letter from his sister, but die was unable to produce the letter in question. He expressed the belief (p. 17) that the letter containing his certificate of citizenship' had been seized by the British censor of mails, but from the America^ embassy in London came information that no such letter had ever come into the possession of the British censor.

Martens's citizenship has been called in question more than once. By his own testimony (p. 15) he applied for Russian citizenship, which was refused on the ground (p. 16) that he had not performed his military duty in Germany. He insisted throughout that his German citizenship was merely “ technical ”; but he further test: (p. 17) that his German citizenship sufficed to bar him from amnesty proclaimed against political offenders in Russia upon overthrow of the Czar's Government, and it became necessary him to obtain Russian citizenship by other means. He was in a privileged class in this respect for he testified (p. 19) there were exceptional circumstances applying to his case and another, not as well-known as he, could not be given citizens without formal application. In this connection it may be well knowing that the letter from Martens's sister, which constitutes only written evidence he ever received touching the application decree involved in his assumption of Russian citizenship, was deemed of sufficient importance to have been kept by him with official papers, and in consequence it could not be produced in evidence (p. 31).

In view of the fact that Martens refused to disclose the names of any of his couriers it is impossible to say whether those who he described as American citizens also owed allegiance to At the Asian Soviet Government, where citizenship is procured in so shady a manner that it might be possible for one, either native born naturalized in America and in consequence exercising suffrage other functions of citizenship here, to be at the same time a citizen of Soviet

Russia, whose only prerequisite for citizenship as shown by the testimony is an application, which may be made in absentia accompanied by a declaration that the applicant is an honest n In any event these couriers, whether American citizens or not, share with Martens the responsibility for the repeated violation of Am can statutes which their actions involved.

It is perhaps questionable whether those who have associated v Martens in this country, and who have been paid by him for services, have also been guilty of violation of the law; although this connection reference may be had to those sections of the penal code which will be found in the record.

In the absence of evidence other than that of Martens's own assertion, unsupported except by his presumed letter of credence—which it may be observed, issued from a government which the Uni States does not recognize—the normal international relations which the United States has constantly adhered would continue place him as a German subject and hence as an enemy alien.

In seeking to determine what propaganda, if any, he is carry on for the overthrow of governments, as directed by the resolution of the Senate, the testimony is somewhat complicated. It is evident from the constitution of the Government which he affects to ref sent (p. 165) that the “fundamental problem” of Soviet Russia to bring about a the victory of socialism in all lands.” In this Martens admitted (p. 166) the United States is “absolutely included. There were also adduced in evidence two letters, copies which were furnished by Martens himself, purporting to have b addressed by Nicholas Lenin, prime minister of Soviet Russia, American workingmen. The first of these letters (p. Ill), da August 20, 1918, counted “ on the inevitability of the international revolution” (p. 116), while the second, dated January 21, 1919, 1 emphasis (p, 117) on the tremendous rapidity with which “workers in various countries have gone over to communism and bolshevism,” and boasted (p. 120) “ that the soviet power is great and spreading, growing and establishing itself all over the world.”

These documents, the authenticity of which Martens admitted (p. 121), were justified by him—the earlier appeal on the ground that this was necessary counter-propaganda against the activities which, as he asserted, the so-called Creel committee had carried on in Soviet Russia (p. 122). He pointed out that this letter was written prior to his appointment as Soviet representative in this country. But the second letter, dated January 21, 1919, and also offered by himself in evidence (p. 117), was written some three weeks after Martens's appointment, and he justified it (p. 179) upon the ground that American troops were in Russia opposing Bolsheviks, though he qualified this justification by declaring (p. 180) that propaganda of this character a few months later would have no justification.

It appeared, however, that even at this time when, as he contended, propaganda of this character would be unjustifiable there met in Moscow the so-called Third Internationale, which is the parent body of all Communist organizations and, in fact, its international court of last resort. From this body issued a manifesto, signed, among others, by Nicholas Lenin, the soviet prime minister, and by Leon Trotsky, the soviet minister of war, who are the ruling spirits in the Soviet Government. It is addressed “ to the proletariat of all lands,” and purports to contain (p. 182) “the authentic direct message from the conquering proletariat of great Russia to the toiling masses of the world”; it pictures “alongside the dethroned dynasties of the Romanoffs, Hohenstaufen, and

Hapsburgs and the capitalistic cliques of these lands the rulers of France, England, Italy, and the United States revealed in the light of unfolding events and diplomatic disclosures in their immeasurable vileness.”

With these sentiments (p. 183) Martens said that he agreed; and (p. 185) in an article signed by him and published in the New York Call on Thursday, May 1; 1919, he declared that “ the attitude of the workers of the world' toward the Russian workers' revolution has proved that the spirit of international solidarity of the workers is not dead. It is resurrecting in the Third Internationale a new glory,” and he concluded his article with the exclamation, “Long live the Third Internationale!” He later (p. 185) testified that he approved of the Third Internationale and its principles. It also appeared (p. 187) that the Russian Soviet Government by a decree issued in December, 1917, appropriated 2,000,000 rubles “ for the needs of the revolutionary international movement for the disposition of the foreign representatives of the commissariat for foreign affairs.” Martens himself, by the prima facie evidence of his own letter of credence, is such a representative; and this appropriation of money for the purpose of propaganda in foreign lands he justified (p. 189) on the ground that at this time “Russia was in the throes of a revolution and civil war and was attacked by all governments.”

He added that he supposed the amount thus allocated was much more than 2,000,000 rubles. He declared that the bureau through which this money was to be expended has now passed out of existence, but admitted that his information on this point was gained through the Russian newspapers (p. 190). In this connection it developed that a report alleged to have been sent by Marten Frederick Strom (p. 191), the soviet representative at Stockholm spoke of Martens's agents being u busy in the western States and Canada where they are creating secret committees propaganda and becoming acquainted with professional organizations and local press,” and that “ American workers' association' passionately interested in the state of Russia and they are becoming more and more firm in the creed that nothing but bolshevism c advance the proletariat.” Martens admitted to have sent many communications by courier to Strom; but he denied that any character was among them.

In line with the foregoing it may be significant that Marten his closing words of testimony before the committee, testified u it would be an improvement to have the Soviet Government h€ and that he u would call that revolution.”

It further appeared (p. 208) that a newspaper published in the interest of the trade-unions of that city, and know the Truth, on November 10, 1919, published an article declaring soon “ the victory of the proletarian dictatorship in the whole w will be guaranteed,” that “ with the proletarians of all countries agreement would be reached without any diplomats. But with Messrs. Imperialists, we shall carry on conversations just as you with us—behind every word force; behind every condition force hind every demand force.” In commenting upon this Martens testified that he did not believe “ in force as such,” but that he did be] in it “ if necessary.”

Martens admitted (p. 239) that he has been a revolutionist fc years, and in every country where he has ever lived; that he w revolutionist when he came to the United States; and that he revolutionist now.

In his revolutionary character Martens was evidently well known. In the issue of the Class Struggle for May, 1919, in a comment on his appointment as soviet representative in this country, Mai was thus described:

Comrade Martens is a well-known figure among Russian socialists. * While a student he became interested in the revolutionary socialist move and became allied with a group of revolutionists among whom Lenin was of the most active members. Shortly after his matriculation he was imprisoned for revolutionary propaganda and spent three years in the prisons. Later he was banished and carried on his activities in the various countries in Europe. About three years ago he came to this country. Here he was employed as the American representative of the great Demidov steel world Russia. He combines, therefore, a knowledge of business affairs with an impeccable record as a socialist and revolutionist, a combination that will in him an ideal representative of revolutionary Russia during the trying difficult time of international economic reconstruction that lies before us.

From this background Martens emerged into his diplomatic quality; and it is fair to remark that if his conduct in that capacity has been as simple as he asserts, it is a reversal of form equally complete and gratifying. But it is difficult to believe that a man like Martens's previous record, involving a lifetime of revolutionary activities and with his declared quality of a revolutionist, no[^] always, could have suddenly changed his entire method of thought through the simple talismanic influence of an appointment as diplomatic representative; and while, on the face of the record, his utterances and his personal activities—shaped doubtless by competent advice, as well as by his own previous experience—bore superficial evidence of a determination to act correctly, the whole collateral deduction must be that his concealed course was in line with that which he had hitherto pursued, namely, of hostility to the existing order wherever he has found himself.

Even, however, if it should be conceded that his constant association with organizations of foreign origin and of a purpose hostile to the Government of the United States had been thrust upon him by the nature of his mission here, there is no justification for the detached and indifferent attitude which he manifested toward revolutionary, inflammatory, and even anarchistic utterances of his associates on the public platform and elsewhere. His constant asseveration that these episodes had nothing to do with him, were none of his business, and that he was too busy to allow them to find judgment in his mind contrasts strangely with the solicitous haste manifested by his letter to Emma Goldman; and it is wholly proper to conclude that his knowledge of events was equally complete in all cases and that his action, or non-action, in each was gauged by his own sense or sentiment as to how a given course of conduct would affect either his personal standing here, or his ultimate purpose in this country.

As indicating the difficulty of separating Martens and his activities from propaganda carried on for the purpose of replacing the existing Government of the United States with Sovietism, it is instructive to note (p. 52) his emphatic testimony that he never attempted in any way to have the people of this country advocate a soviet form of government”; that he was not connected directly or indirectly with any organization or association which advocated Sovietism in this country; and that he had never given support, either moral or financial, to such an organization. This testimony, however, was followed immediately by an admission (p. 52) that he was “very often in touch with these organizations” and that “on several occasions” he accepted their

invitations and spoke about Russia, but never in regard to the internal affairs of the United States.” These speeches, he testified (p. 53) were fully reported in the New York Call, yet in connection with speeches made by others, and likewise reported in the New York Call, he protested vehemently that they were incorrectly reported (p. 24). This leads to the suggestion that Martens possibly occupied a privileged position in the columns of the New York Call such as he testified attended him when he sought to obtain Russian citizenship.

Referring to the secret activities of Martens it will be noted from the testimony (pp. 212, 220, and elsewhere) that he denied all knowledge or relationship with the Russian Socialist Federation, except in so far as the evidence presented by counsel for the committee compelled qualifications in reply to interrogations. For example, the telegram addressed to the convention of the Russian Socialist Federation in Detroit (p. 284) is documentary refutation of the witness’s statement that he never gave, directly or indirectly, moral support to an organization which advocated a soviet form of government in the United States. The record shows (p. 251) that in spite of repeated denials on the part of the witness he was regarded by his most important assistant, Mr. Nuorteva, and his friend, Dr. Mislig, treasurer of the Russian federation, as an actual member of the association. This association, be it noted, not only advocates a soviet form of government but is organizing for the purpose of overthrowing the present form of government under which we live by force a violence. Martens denied explicitly (p. 281) that he had engaged secret political activity, yet when confronted with the minutes of the secret convention held by the Russian Socialist Federation in Detroit in August, 1919, he was compelled to admit making a speech before the delegates. On at least two other occasions also he had tried reach a basis of cooperation in conference with the executive committee of the association. In this connection attention should be directed to the unusual admission by the witness (p. 318) that not one of the 10 or 12 men who attended the executive committee’s meetings arose at the convention to substantiate his account of the proceedings before the committee, and nobody denied the statement of Gurin regarding the affair except himself. In other words, Martens by his own testimony admits that all the testimony as to these occurrences is direct against his sole contention.

Reports of the public meetings he testified (p. 58) were sent to him to his Government; and he testified further that he had knowledge of the “parties or organizations interested in this kind of pro] agenda,” and that his reports to his Government dealt with “the sympathies expressed by the different political parties.” He informed his Government as to the character of speeches made by him at these meetings, and as to the character of speeches made by other speakers (p. 58), accompanying his report by newspaper clipping containing printed accounts of the meetings. Yet when questioned* regarding some of the speeches which were made in his presence these meetings and which are readily classified as inflammatory revolutionary, and anarchistic, he declared that he paid no attention to them and did not know what they contained—though he was equally positive in his assertions that these speeches had been incorrectly reported.

In pursuing the inquiry, directed by the resolution of the Senate into his activities in this country, the testimony developed that, without waiting for recognition on the part of the Government to which he assumed to be accredited, Martens established himself and his bureau in offices in the city of New York (p. 40); and that he made a demand upon Boris Bakhmeteff, Russian ambassador in this country, for the delivery to him of all property, moneys, credits, furniture, archives, papers, etc., in his possession (p. 32). This demand was not complied with; and

Martens proceeded to the organization of his general offices, where he employed a staff of some 35 people among whom were 13 American citizens—two of whom, Rennet Durant and Wilfred R. Humphreys, had been connected with the so-called Creel bureau, officially known as the Committee on Public Information of the American Government (pp. 41-43). Martens bureau was maintained at an expense of about \$2,500 a week (p. 45 which was met by funds transmitted “ mainly by couriers from Russia ” (p. 44) for whom no diplomatic immunity was asked, whose names were refused by Martens when they were demanded by the committee, and who traveled clandestinely so far as any evidence permits a deduction. The carefully planned innocuousness of Martens’s public activities here do not extend, however, to some of the more intimate and necessary procedure growing out of his position. It is evident that he regarded customary and legitimate means of communication as un- suited to his purposes. So far as can be learned, it is only within the past few weeks that he made use of the cable to communicate with his Government or its representatives on neutral European soil; and the ordinary course of the mail was apparently never utilized by him.

In connection with his bureau Martens published a weekly newspaper known as Soviet Russia, which has a circulation of from 15,000 to 30,000, about one-half of this number going to subscribers, some 2,000 being “ sent without charge to public men in the country,” and the balance distributed by news agencies (p. 57). He also contemplated opening a technical school for Russians purposing to return to their country (p. 57), but this plan was never consummated. He proposed “ to call a technical conference of those who desired to help Soviet Russia ” and for this purpose registered over 20,000 people. This registration took place not only at the office of the soviet bureau in West Fortieth Street, in New York City, but also at the Rand School, where some form of branch office was maintained (p. 345). A questionnaire was furnished to each registrant, and in its original form a registrant was asked if he preferred “ to remain in America to work with the Soviet Government” (p. 347). Martens adduced no adequate explanation of what this “ work with the Soviet Government ” in this country would comprise.

Martens himself appeared to have had very little to do with the practical management of his bureau. He seems to have been something on the order of a show figure, and he frequently responded in tactful terms of gratitude to letters and resolutions of greeting which were sent to him by numerous organizations of a socialist nature, both American and Russian in their membership. One of these letters of greeting presented in evidence (p. 279) came from the Socialist Party of the eighth assembly district of New York, in which the members of this organization pledged themselves “ to work unceasingly for the propagation of those principles and policies and tactics that will aid directly in the establishment of a socialistic federated soviet republic in America.” Against such sentiments Martens testified (p. 280) he did not protest, saying that he regarded this as none of his concern, and adding that he did not regard it as a crime “ to propagate the soviet idea in the United States” (p. 281).

Prominent among Martens’s activities was his attendance upon public meetings generally held under the auspices of some of the numerous branches of the Socialist Party. One such (p. 215) was addressed by Gregory Weinstein, who was reported in the newspapers to have said “we have come here to tell Comrade Martens that we intend to prepare to take over this great country just as the working class has taken over Russia.” Another held April 1, 1919, presided over by Nicholas Hourwich, a near relative of whom later became the head of a department in the

Martens Soviet Bureau, and who was quoted in the New York Call as having said in his opening address that “ the left wing proposed to bring Bolshevism to America” (p. 218). Martens declared that he did not remember having heard either of these declarations, that he made no protest about it at any rate, that he is a Bolshevik, that he would be very glad to : America Bolshevistic ” and that “ any means which would provide this condition would be justified” (p. 218). At this same meeting one Louis Baske, editor of a Hungarian newspaper published in New York, also spoke and declared that there is only one way to help the Hungarian and Russian Soviet Governments. That is to revolutionize America ” (p. 219). Martens testified that he did not remember hearing this statement and that he would not have felt him called upon to disavow it if he had heard it (p. 219). Numerous other meetings of like nature were held, and the list of the speakers who participated in them bristles with the names of men who were (under either indictment or sentence for violation of the laws of the United States or who have since enjoyed such notoriety or who has become fugitives from justice. Two of these gentlemen, it is probably worth noting, were harbored by Martens following their trial and sentence for sedition in New Jersey, and were given a place upon the pay roll of his bureau (p. 245).

The Weinstein meeting above referred to was a subject of controversy in the testimony which the committee brought out. Martens himself asserted (p. 269) that Weinstein—and also Hourwich—were “ reported wrongly,” although, as above cited, he had at first denied having any recollection of what they said. A reporter for the New York Sun, who was present at the Weinstein meeting, testified (p. 394) that he saw both Weinstein and Martens sitting close together on the stage at this meeting, and that he heard Weinstein make declaration of their intention to take over America as the work: class has taken over Russia; that Martens made no reference or protest to these statements though he spoke after Weinstein had uttered them; and it was testified further (p. 395) that the audience applauded wildly, stamped, and cheered whenever the Soviet Government of Russia was mentioned ” and that “ they always his; when reference was made to the United States Government.” It is proper to state, however, that Martens, though he had previously testified that he remembered nothing about Weinstein’s speech, he asserted that Weinstein had spoken at this meeting in the Russian language.

Martens testified (p. 269) that he paid no attention to the application in the press of inflammatory speeches which were published wrong! as he declared, in reports of meetings which he attended, explaining that “ it was absolutely physically impossible ” for him to do. But he appears (p. 269)—possibly because he was then in hiding from the process of the Lusk committee—to have had leisure to observe reports which were published to the effect that he had “utterly insulted” Emma Goldman when she was undergoing trial and sentence for deportation; and, on December 15, 1919 (p. 271), wrote to Emma Goldman, then at Ellis Island under sentence of deportation, saying that he had not the pleasure of her acquaintance, that he sympathized with her for the “ insults ” to which she had been subjected in this country and, on behalf of Soviet Russia: offered her asylum as a political refugee.

The impropriety of Martens’s persistent public appearance at meetings held under the auspices of organized partisan groups, where his speaking companions were so frequently selected from men under surveillance, indictment, or sentence for their seditious and anarchistic activities, is plainly manifest. Had he been regularly accredited in the ambassadorial quality which he affects, such conduct would have secured for him the speedy severance of his personal relations with this

Government, the immediate tendering of his passports, and his prompt departure from the country. That he has greatly impaired, if not wholly destroyed, his diplomatic usefulness by such a course seems wholly clear; and even if the recognition which he has sought to bring about for his Government could now be obtained, it is wholly improbable that Martens would be held by the executive department to be a suitable representative.

The resolution of the Senate further directed the committee to investigate “ all facts relative to the activities of any party, parties, or organizations bearing upon or relating to Russian propaganda in this country.

The natural source of inquiry under this head is the diplomatic establishment maintained here under the title of the Russian embassy, whose head is Boris Bakhmeteff, and who has been recognized under such quality since his accrediting to this Government, and who, by a certificate of the State Department, still enjoys the privileges and immunities which accompany such recognition.

In consequence, both he and his staff were not subject to the process of the committee; and recourse was had to the Department of State, which furnished full documentary evidence dealing With the disposition of moneys which had been advanced to earlier Russian Governments from the Treasury of the United States, and with which purchases of war and industrial materials had been made in this country. In this connection Martens, in his testimony, had given the committee to understand that a misappropriation of American money had taken place. His testimony on this point, however, was of a most cursory and hearsay nature; and the documents furnished by the State Department and contained in the record provide a complete accounting for all these moneys and materials purchased therewith. From these documents it appears, also, that the maintenance of the recognized Russian Embassy in this country and the carrying on of its related activities are provided for by funds accruing from a loan privately negotiated in this country and in England.

Other organizations more or less sentimental in character were also found to exist in this country for the carrying on of activities in opposition to the soviet regime in Russia; but in most cases they were discovered to have only nominal or “ paper ” existence, and the committee deemed it unprofitable to pursue this line of inquiry.

In sum the committee finds in obedience to the instructions of the resolution of the Senate that—

(1) Martens has no status whatever in this country in any diplomatic or other governmental representative quality.

(2) Martens assumes to represent the Russian Federated Soviet Republic—a regime established in Russia by revolution and functioning under a constitution which has been above summarized; a regime which has never been recognized by the Government of the United States and which in international law has no standing as a constituted authority.

(3) Martens has received no recognition officially or even personally by the Government of the United States.

(4) Martens, by the accepted practice of this Government or its treaty or other international obligations and usages, is a (man subject, and in consequence an alien enemy.

(5) Martens's propaganda in this country for the overthrow governments is established by his own testimony, as shown in body of the report, that he has publicly associated and sympathy with those advocating such a course. He admitted to the committee his persistent revolutionary character, his desire to see the establishment of the " dictatorship of the proletariat " in all lands, his opinion that it would be better for this country if the such government were established here. It was also proved that he tinned to employ in the staff of his embassy persons who have publicly and in his presence advocated the bringing of Bolshevism America and he admitted to the committee that by any means would produce this condition would be justified."

All this leads the committee to the conclusion that Martens activities here have been of a nature to render him more suitable investigation and action by the Department of Justice than by committee of the Senate.

11 INDEX

- American, 17, 21
Batterham, 9, 10
Bolshevik, 30, 32
Brandeis, 16
British, 8, 49
Buffalo, 5, 6, 8, 22, 24, 26, 29, 34, 42, 47, 48
Cardinal, 11
Catholic, 9, 10, 11, 37, 49, 50
Cemetery of the Resurrection, 10
Chicago, 21, 42, 43
Communism, 30, 32
Congress, 8, 12, 16, 21, 24, 29, 33, 43, 51
Congressperson, 5
Constitution, 14, 15, 16, 17
Cooper, 12, 13, 42
Croly, 42, 43
Darwin, 16
Darwinian, 14, 17, 19
Day, 9, 10, 11, 36, 48
Debs, 29, 31, 44
Despert, 3, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 56
Dewey, 42
District of Columbia, 26
Dorothy Day, 5, 9, 10, 22, 25, 36, 37, 47, 49
Emma Goldman, 30, 42
Federal, 16
Freud, 42
General Hospital School of Nursing, 6
General MacArthur, 37
Harvard, 42
Hattie, 2, 5, 8, 9, 22, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 37, 39, 41, 47
Hegel, 13, 14, 15
Hegelian, 13, 14, 15
Heilbroner, 42
Hobbes, 42
Hofstadter, 42, 43
Kagan, 30, 31, 34, 43
Kruger, 2, 5, 22, 24, 25, 26, 29, 31, 34, 47
Lenin, 30, 31, 35
liberty, 20
Liberty, 20
Lighthouse Medical Clinic, 8
limbic system, 38
Link, 15, 43
Lorton Reformatory, 26
Martens, 33, 34, 35, 36, 44
Marx, 30
Marxists, 30, 31
Milkis, 13
Montesquieu, 15, 16
Nationalism, 15
New Street, 5, 37, 38
New York, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 21, 22, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 49, 54, 56
New York City, 6, 10, 22, 24, 31, 34, 35, 37, 43, 49
New York State, 6, 7, 22, 31, 39
Night of Terror, 5, 12, 48, 50
NWP, 8, 9, 47, 48, 49, 50
NY Times, 26, 32, 34, 40, 44
Pestritto, 12
Philadelphia, 8, 22, 23, 26, 29
Populist, 42
Port Richmond, 37, 39
Progressive, 12, 15, 16, 42, 43
Progressives, 12, 17, 19, 20
Progressivism, 44
Rahe, 15
Roosevelt, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 38, 43, 44, 52, 53
Russian Revolution, 30, 31, 32, 35
Saint Augustine, 11
Saint Francis, 11
Seaview, 5, 6, 34, 36, 37, 41
Seaview Hospital, 5, 6, 34
Socialist Party, 5, 8, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37
Staten Island, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 34, 36, 37
Sufragist, 9, 10, 11
Teddy Roosevelt, 12

The City of God, 11
The New Freedom, 16
TR, 12, 15
Trust, 18
United States, 8, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 31,
33, 34, 35, 36, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55
Wall Street, 21
Welch, 38
West Haverstraw, 5, 7
White House, 8, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 47,
48, 50
Wilson, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21,
42, 43, 44
Woodrow Wilson, 8, 10, 12, 47, 48, 50, 51
world view, 13, 14
World War I, 29, 35, 39
WWII, 3, 37