Where Capitalist Parties Get Their Money

By BERTRAM D. WOLFE.

The national committee of the republican party admitted and swore to an expenditure of over eight millions dollars to elect Harding president of the United States. The democratic party admitted an expenditure of $2,237,777. In 1924, the republicans confessed to an expenditure of $6,627,000.

If we put the expenditures of the two capitalist parties in the sham battle between them, and in the interests of the capitalist system and of Wall Street, at 30 million, we will be making an extremely conservative estimate.

Where Do They Get the Money?

The newspapers of the last few days have revealed some very interesting answers to the question as to where the capitalist political parties get their funds. There is an old American proverb to the effect that "he who pays the fiddler calls the tune." Who is it that pays the fiddler?

Certainly no corporation gives a penny to the election of a candidate for president! The law takes care of that. In order to fool the voters as to the source of funds, a bill was passed in 1907, making it unlawful for any national corporation or national bank to contribute money for purposes of election. This smart law is not to prevent Wall Street from contributing, but rather to cover up the contributions by the thinnest of fig-leaves. Thus Doheny and Sinclair contributed money, of course as "individuals," while their corporations gave not a cent. Roosevelt was able to denounce a supposed offer of a hundred thousand dollars from the Standard Oil Company while the treasurer of his party's campaign fund could take one hundred thousand dollars from H. H. Rogers, of course as an "individual," who was one of the officers of the Standard Oil Company. Another convenient element in this, is that a corporation can contribute to both parties through two chief officers.

The "Virtuous" Democrats.

However, they are often careless. Doheny and Sinclair contributed to both parties, and while the democratic party is working itself into a frenzy of indignation about Sinclair's republican contribution, they keep very quiet about their own receipts from the same source.

Some people imagine that the democratic party is much better than the republican in this respect, because it does not raise such big campaign funds and does not receive as much from the corporations. The correct answer to this is that as far as the democratic party is concerned, "the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak." If they get less from the Wall Street bankers and corporation owners, it is not because they do not try as hard, but rather because it is generally safe for Wall Street to give a smaller share to the democrats, because it is betting on the republicans to win the presidential election. However, it plays safe and buys both candidates and both party machines, lest it should be surprised by an upset in the presidential returns.

We have this little confession by a prominent democrat, published by Arthur W. Dunn in his book "From Harrison to Harding." This confession was made after the nomination of Judge Alton B. Parker, thoroughly acceptable to Wall Street, by the democratic party in 1904, and the ditching of the less acceptable William Jennings Bryan, who made himself **persona non grata** with Wall Street by his espousal of the free silver issue in his first presidential campaign.

"We had been promised a campaign fund of four million dollars," reads the confession—and the promise was made to them because Wall Street was carrying on a little mock battle with Roosevelt and had not yet made him come to terms. The promise was made through Jim Hill, of Minnesota and who understood it came from J. Pierpont Morgan, who was backed up by big business men here in New York, with whom he is in close relations. We were told if we would nominate a safe and sane man on a sane platform that that amount of money and probably more would be forthcoming as soon as the convention was over. Now, here we are (at the national committee meeting in New York) and we are told that the arrangement has failed. Morgan says he has made his deal with Roosevelt and that it is not likely that Parker can be elected and they prefer republicans in power anyway if they can get along with them."

Where Democrats Get Money.

A casual examination of the letter of Mr. Jesse H. Jones of Houston, director of finance of the national committee of the democratic party sent by him on February 29 of this year to the democratic national committee, reveals that plenty of good Wall Street gold is received by them. Yet his letter deals only with contributions to make up the deficit from the 1924 campaign. It includes a contribution from Owen D. Young, vice-president of the General Electric Company, who is an old backer of Governor Smith, and who is very much interested in the disposition of the source of water-power in the United States and in super-power control and mergers. There is Cyrus H. McCormick of the International Harvester Trust on the list. John W. Davis, former candidate for president and lawyer of the House of Morgan, was "shaken down" for ten thousand.

Thomas Fortune Ryan hands out $50,000 at one clip to make up a little deficit.

Several members of the Strauss family are on the list. Henry Morgenthau is there. So is Silas H. Strawn. This was just a small honor roll of those who contributed to wipe out a little deficit of less than a million, left over from the last electoral campaign, and gives no real notion of where the big pickings come from.

The democratic party has never complained that Wall Street gave them too much. The only official complaint we have on record is that of Wilbur R. Marsh, former treasurer of the democratic national committee, who declared in 1920 before the senate committee: "We have lost continuously because we did not have money enough to present the issues. There is no question about that." And indeed, Mr. Marsh is in a large measure correct. In all electoral campaigns since the Civil War, with one exception, the victory always went to the party with the biggest campaign fund.

Among the big business elements that contribute to campaign funds are certain gentlemen who like to play safe. They are sporting gentlemen all right, but they take no chances.

The Boys Who Play Safe.

Among these gentlemen is Edward Doheny. In 1920 he was a democratic national committeeman for the state of California. He was vice-presidential timber and actually nominated as the favorite son of his state for the vice-presidency. Edward Doheny is a good democrat—no one doubts that. Yet an examination of the campaign lists of the republican party for the year in question reveals that Doheny contributed to them as well as to the democrats. Sinclair did the same, although he is reputed to be a republican. Their plan was simple. If the democrats had carried the election, some good friend, possibly Doheny himself, would have been made a cabinet member. Another good friend would have been made secretary of the interior. However it would have been managed, the net result would have been Teapot Dome going to the hands of Doheny and Sinclair. It turned out the other way, but they were just as well prepared.

A Sure Way to Win.

Samuel Insull is another gentleman of the same species. He bet on all horses in order to be sure of winning the race. He gave money to the successful candidate in the republican primaries, Mr. Smith; money to his unsuccessful opponent in the republican primaries, and money to the democrat who was to run against whoever carried the republican primary election. If there had been two democratic candidates in the primaries, Insull would have thought of both of them. His stakes were not Teapot Dome, but such little tidbits as Muscle Shoals and super-power.

Harvey Havermeyer, of the sugar trust, who is specially interested in sugar tariffs, was once called before the senate and asked to explain his campaign contributions. In response to questions he replied: "In republican states we contribute to the republican party and in democratic states to the democratic party." And when a senator asked: "But Mr. Havermeyer, what do you do in the doubtful states?" he said calmly: "Why, in that case we contribute to both parties."

Where the Money Goes.

In the presidential election of 1924, the republican national committee confessed to spending, without counting local funds, secret funds, etc., 22 cents apiece for every one of the 29 million votes cast in that election. They spent it on buying newspaper space, on supplying publicity material, on touring speakers, on printing pamphlets, leaflets, etc., and on many other things that they are not so anxious to make public. However, on these things, which they have made public, it is interesting to note that they are precisely the things that the Workers (Communist) Party needs to spend money on—with the exception of buying of newspaper space in the sense that they buy it. We have to spend money on spreading our press to new readers, on touring speakers, on printing leaflets and pamphlets, and from one-quarter to a half of the fund of $100,000 that we intend to raise, on a job that the republican and democratic parties do not have at all—namely, the task of getting the Party on the ballot in the various states.

Where the Money Comes From.

It is also interesting to note that in spite of appearances, the republican and democratic parties, in the last analysis, really get their money from the same sources as the Workers Party campaign fund—namely, from the American workers. The only difference is that the Workers Party pursues the method of "direct taxation" and the republican and democratic parties the method of "indirect taxation." It is true that the Morgans and Mellons, the Guggenheimers and Youngs, the Ryans and Rockefellers, and the like, give the funds that the republicans and democrats use in the electoral campaign. But these funds are only part of the tremendous profits that they wring out of the American workers by the system of capitalist exploitation. Thus the workers are forced to make up these many millions of dollars of campaign funds by their sweat and toil as a small part of what they give to their masters in Wall Street. It is not surprising, therefore, that the awakened workers prefer to give their funds, insofar as it is in their power, to the Communists, for a struggle against Wall Street and the whole exploitation system.

In the next article, we will take up the question of what the bankers and corporations of Wall Street get from the republican and democratic parties that makes it worth their while to contribute these huge sums, and in passing we will have a few words to say on what the workers of America will get in return for the $100,000 that they are preparing to raise for the campaign of the Workers Party.

Harding Walsh Sinclair Hays

Besmirched with oil! Ex-president Harding is one of the "prominent" figures whom Senator Thomas Walsh's investigating commitee could no longer keep out of the limelight. Walsh, expert concealer, is shown next to Harding. Harry F. Sinclair, oil magnate, paid Will Hays, then treasurer of the republican national committee, the cash for which the Teapot Dome oil reserve was turned over to Sinclair.

Women's Party Lobbies Against Labor

By CARRIE LYONS.

When the idea of women voting and participating in politics was still shocking many people the argument that women would act as a purifying force was very popular. Who even dares recall this argument now, in view of the disgraceful careers of Ma Ferguson and Mrs. Knapp?

Another bourgeois illusion thrown overboard.

Bourgeois Women.

Now the National Woman's Party is hard at work lobbying in Albany and Washington. These rich women who have nothing else to do,—who no doubt enjoy this form of activity as a relief from ennui—are profoundly shocked and incensed at the idea that special measures should be introduced for the protection of women. Such bills can be interpreted in only one way, they say, that is, that women are weaker than men, for it is only the weak who need special protective legislation. We will show them, they say, that we can stand on our own feet. Woman suffrage is one thing and special protection is another. The first was insistence upon equality; the second a confession of weakness—a virtual retraction of the previous demand. The horror of it—to be classed with children! It is enough to make these ladies cry with mortification. But then crying is something the "new" woman must not indulge in—so she orders her chauffeur to drive her to Albany and from there to Washington.

Workingclass Women.

In spite of the fact that one mill after another is closing down the New England mill owners are asking for a repeal of the special measures limiting the hours of work for women and children. (News item.) The reason given for this is that production costs must go down in order to meet competition. The mill owners therefore reduced the wages of their workers by several 10% cuts. Since all the mill owners have done the same thing they are now looking for another remedy. Low wages and long hours are quite a happy combination for mill owners. Since wages were already very low they had only one alternative—and that was to lengthen the hours of work. Because textile mills employ women for the most part the repeal of the act limiting hours of labor for women is very essential to further the mill owners' interests.

What Equality Means.

The working woman has nothing in common with her bourgeois sister's notion of equality.

Equality for the working woman means fighting side by side with her fellow workers, male or female, on the picket line, in the Union, in political organizations, and in co-operatives.

The exploited working woman can only know equality in the actual class struggle.

At the present time what she needs is an active organization thru which she can express the needs peculiar to her sex and class. She must fight for special measures to meet these needs.

Let the bourgeois women fight for **perfect equality!** Working women **must fight to better their conditions and in doing so fight for equality.**