THE ORIGINS OF WALTER LIPPMANN

by

Samuel L. Blumenfeld

The "prestige" of Walter Lippmann is one of the unquestioned and unchanging phenomenon of our time. He is not only considered our number one journalistic pundit, despite his constant "errors of judgment," but he is also considered a sage of incalculable wisdom. Presidents consult him; Khrushchev granted him private interviews; and a major TV network devotes a precious hour each year to a privileged "visit" with Mr. Lippmann at his fireside. There seems to be no limit to his connections and influence. And yet, when you stop and think of it, all Mr. Lippmann is is a columnist, that is, to the younger generation. Indeed, one has to go back to the very beginning of Mr. Lippmann's career to understand why he has the prestige he has as well as his famous influence in political affairs.

Walter Lippmann was born in New York in 1889 of wealthy parents of German-Jewish origin. He was educated at a private school for boys where he astounded his teachers with his brilliance and precocity. During his youth, Lippmann's family often went to Europe, permitting the budding intellectual to experience the luxury of foreign travel and cultures. In 1906, at the age of 17, he entered Harvard. His principle influences at Harvard were the philosopher George Santayana, the psychologist William James, and the Fabian Socialist Graham Wallas. Wallas, who was one of the original founders of the Fabian

Society, had come to Harvard as a visiting professor during Lippmann's last undergraduate year. His influence on Lipomann was to be deep and enduring. In a short time Lippmann gained the reputation for being the most brilliant and articulate young Socialist intellectual on the campus, and all his teachers knew that he was destined for great things.

Lippmann didn't even have to leave the campus to seek his destiny. It came looking for him in the guise of the American Fabian Socialist Lincoln Steffens, who had been looking for an assistant. Steffens describes how he found Lippmann in his famous Autobiography:

> It was late summer when I went to Cambridge. The graduated class of Harvard was scattered. There were a few of them left around Boston, and some professors. I described the man I was after, not the job I had to offer. If you mention a job, people think of a "friend who needs a job." I asked for the ablest mind that could express itself in writing. Three names were offered, only three, and after a little conversation everybody agreed on one--Walter Lippmann. I found Lippmann, saw right away what his classmates saw in him. He asked me intelligent, not practical, questions about my proposition and when they were answered, gave up the job he had and came home to New York to work with me on my Wall Street series of articles. It was reporting. I was writing in my house in Connecticut. He went to Wall Street for facts, which he reported to me. He "caught on" right away. Keen, quiet, industrious, he understood the meaning of all that he learned; and he asked the men he met far more than I asked him for. He searched them; I know it because he searched me, too, for my ideas and theories.

From then on, Lippmann had it made. The summer assignment was followed by a year of postgraduate work, during which time Lippmann, at the request of Steffens, organized the Harvard chapter of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, structured along Fabian lines, for the purpose of stimulating an interest in socialism among college men. By the end of 1910, Lippmann had done such a fine job at Harvard that 300 students successfully petitioned for an introduction into the curriculum of a course in socialism.

From Harvard, Lippmann went to work briefly for Steffens on the staff of Everybody's Magazine. Then, in 1912, he was appointed executive secretary to Rev. George R. Lunn, the newly elected Socialist mayor of Schenectady, New York. Lippmann found the job challenging, but in a short time realized that one Socialist victory in Schenectady was not going to revolutionize that city, let alone the nation. And so, on May 1, 1912, Lippmann resigned his position. Ernest Sutherland Bates, writing in the Modern Monthly of June, 1933, described what followed:

> On June 1, 1912, there appeared in The Call, Socialist organ of New York, an article entitled "Schenectady the Unripe" in which the executive secretary (Lippmann) justified his resignation. He spoke with affection of the Socialist Party, begging that though its members might consider him a fool they would at least call him "Comrade Fool," but he pointed out that, while Mayor Lunn was giving Schenectady a better government than it had had before, it was a strictly reformist government, characterized by "timidity of action, the lack of a bold plan, a kind of aimlessness behind the revolutionary speeches." "When the Socialists become reformers," he wrote trenchantly, "there ceases to be an organized party

of genuine radicals to keep the reformers alive."

Bates further wrote:

> During the ensuing year, Comrade Lippmann was an active member of Branch 1, which was considered the most radical of the Socialist groups in New York City. When Charles Edward Russell was nominated for mayor by the Socialists in the spring of 1913 eleven members of Branch 1, including Lippmann, were dissatisfied with the party platform and submitted what was currently called a "revolutionary left-wing platform" of their own, presumably written by Lippmann as the literary genius of the group. It made a clear distinction between, on the one hand, "Non-Socialist Reforms Indorsed by Socialists," and on the other, "Distinctively Socialist Policies," and it contained a ringing declaration in favor of the latter: "We do not pretend to represent the economic interest of all. We hold that where irreconcilable conflicts of interest exist, it is either ignorance or hypocrisy to pretend to represent all of them. We therefore do not expect, or ask for, the votes of any but those genuinely interested in the abolition of the profit system."

The Socialist candidate was badly beaten, but the year was by no means wasted for Lippmann. During the previous months he had been developing his own arguments for Socialism in his first book, A Preface to Politics, which was published in 1913. This book should perhaps be entitled "A Preface to Walter Lippmann," for one must read it in order to fully understand how thoroughly committed Lippmann was to the Fabian proposition that our Constitutional republic

had to be destroyed. What did he hope to replace it with? A Socialist state--loosely called a "democracy"--which could be attained through the "creative statesmanship" of an Executive with a strong will to remake America. Did the end justify the means? Of course, said Lippmann, but not quite so crudely:

> Instead of trying to crush badness we must turn the power behind it to good account. . . . Behind evil there is power, and it is folly,--wasting and disappointing folly,--to ignore this power because it had found an evil issue. All that is dynamic in human character is in these rooted lusts. (p. 50)

This twisted view of evil was certainly in line with Fabian morality, which was nothing more than a modern adaptation of Machiavelli, fittingly symbolized in the Fabian coat-of-arms depicting a political wolf in sheep's clothing. Concerning the Machiavellian tactics of Fabian Socialism, Philip M. Crane wrote in <u>The Democrat's Dilemma</u>:

> (Sidney) Webb was fully prepared to employ any means--fair or foul--to achieve his end. As Anne Fremantle put it: "There was also in Sidney an almost terrifying disregard for the means to achieve the single goal he had set himself."

In other words, the Fabians were practicing Marxism-Leninism before Lenin had even emerged, and what Miss Fremantle had said of Sidney Webb could be also said for Walter Lippmann. In fact, his book was a primer for those who would willfully and deliberately transform the United States into a socialist state. He provided the philosophical and practical guidelines for a vast plan of action. Lippmann wrote:

> Nobody needs waste his time debating whether or not there are to be great changes. That is settled for us whether we like it or not. What is worth debating is the method by which change is to come about. (p. 285)

Naturally, such change could only take place after the masses had been sufficiently "educated":

> The real preparation for a creative statesmanship lies deeper than parties and legislatures. It is the work of publicists and educators, scientists, preachers and artists. Through all the agents that make and popularize thought must come a bent of mind interested in invention and freed from the authority of ideas. (p. 307)

Lippmann's book made quite an impression among his fellow radicals. It led Lippmann directly into his association with "liberal" Herbert Croly in the founding of The New Republic magazine in 1914. The magazine, financed by Willard Straight of the J. P. Morgan company, was billed as a "Journal of Opinion which seeks to Meet the Challenge of a New Time." H. L. Mencken, not at all taken in by such high-sounding advertisement, referred to Lippmann and his colleagues as the "kept idealists" of the New Republic. Its first issue, published on November 7, 1914, characteristically featured an article entitled "The End of American Isolation," thus serving notice that the magazine would promote a new internationalist foreign policy for the United States. Although the magazine was promoted as "Liberal," it was clearly a mouthpiece for socialist ideas and world government. This was the time, incidentally, when the Fabian totalitarians began expropriating liberal terminology as a cover for their own illiberalism.

During this same fateful year, Lippmann's Fabian professor, Graham Wallas, also published an important book of his own entitled The Great Society. The Preface, written in the form of a dedicatory letter to his star pupil, read as follows:

Dear Walter Lippmann,

This book develops the material of that discussion-course ("Government 31") which you joined during my stay at Harvard in the spring of 1910.

Now that the book is finished, I can see, more clearly than I could while writing it, what it is about; and in particular what its relation is to my Human Nature in Politics (1908). I may, therefore, say briefly that the earlier book was an analysis of representative government, which turned into an argument against nineteenth-century intellectualism; and that this book is an analysis of the general social organization of a large modern state, which has turned, at times, into an argument against certain forms of twentieth-century anti-intellectualism.

I send it to you in the hope that it may be of some help when you write that sequel to your Preface to Politics for which all your friends are looking.--

Sincerely yours,

Graham Wallas

Wallas's thesis was that our great industrial civilization was drifting, and that in order for it to be channeled in the proper socialistic direction, it had to be controlled from top to bottom. Individual freedom had to be curtailed "democratically." For example, on the subject of thought control, he wrote:

> If non-official Thought is to become effective it must also use the oral interchange of ideas. And since, in our urban communities, nothing can be done effectively which is not done deliberately, we must provide at least as carefully for the Organized Thought of the ordinary citizen as we are now beginning to provide for his Individual Thought. (p. 283)

Lippmann's second book, Drift and Mastery, which was published in late 1914, echoed his teacher's ideas. He too was concerned about how we could reach The Great Society. But, as Lippmann discovered, it wasn't the plutocrats who were standing in the way of socialist planning, but the people themselves. He writes:

> . . . We have to face the fact in America that what thwarts the growth of our civilization is not the uncanny, malicious contrivance of the plutocracy, but the faltering method, the distracted soul, and the mushy vision of what we call grandiloquently the will of the people. (p. xvi)

For Lippmann it wasn't tyranny which blocked the way to socialism, but freedom which had reached new heights as the old authorities crumbled under the advance of science. To Lippmann and Wallas, this freedom was really chaos. Lippmann writes:

> The battle for us, in short, does not lie against crusted prejudice, but against the chaos of the new freedom. This chaos is our real problem. (p. xvi)

Lippmann's book called for a conscious plan to be imposed upon America by the radicals so that their great collectivist society could be attained. Lippmann, of course, had to convince his fellow "liberals" that the people with their mushy vision--for whom he had typical Fabian-intellectual contempt--would not really object to being controlled:

> Men will do almost anything but govern themselves. They don't want the responsibility. In the main, they are looking for some benevolent guardian, be it a "good man in office" or a perfect constitution, or the evolution of nature. They want to be taken in charge. (p. 189, our emphasis)

As for our traditions of freedom which look with disfavor upon those who would impose their plans over others, Lippmann argued:

> There can be no real cohesion for America in following scrupulously the inherited ideals of our people. . . . The only possible cohesion now is a loyalty that looks forward. . . . To do this men have to substitute purpose for tradition. . . . We can no longer treat life as something that has trickled down to us. We have to deal with it deliberately, devise its social organization, alter its tools, formulate its methods, educate and control it. (p. 266)

Of course, any kind of master plan demands that those who carry it out work under a central discipline, giving up their individual independence. But Lippmann finds great compensations in accepting this discipline:

> There is a terrible loneliness that comes to men when they realize their feebleness before a brutally uninterested universe. . . . He [man] seeks assurance in a communion with something outside himself, at the most perhaps, in a common purpose, at least, in a fellowship of effort.

"This is the true joy in life," says Bernard Shaw, "the being used for a purpose recognized by yourself as a mighty one." (p. 278)

Shaw, of all the Fabians, gloated most over the use of Machiavellian methods. Lippmann further rationalized the need for collective discipline in several of the most interesting passages in his book:

> What men need in their specialties in order to enable them to cooperate is not alone a binding passion, but a common discipline.
>
> Science, I believe, implies such a discipline. . . . The scientific world is the best example we have today of how specialists can cooperate. . . . There are undoubtedly beginnings of such a common method in public affairs. . . . Instruments of a cooperative mind are being forged. . . .
>
> This work has aroused in many men the old sense of cosmic wonder, and called forth devotion to impersonal ends. (p. 261)

By using the phrase "cosmic wonder," was Lippmann cryptically referring to something much more concrete, such as the Illuminati order? In any case, we cannot help but suspect that when Lippmann wrote of the "instruments of a cooperative mind" which were in the process of being "forged," he was referring in a cryptic manner to the great political conspiracy which was then being organized around that master conspirator of all time, Col. Edward M. House. Col. House, who was Wilson's advisor and alter ego, had already formulated his own plan for a socialist dictatorship in America through a book which he had published anonymously in 1912 entitled Philip Dru: Administrator. It is not only likely that Lippmann read Philip Dru and was thereby influenced by it,

but it is also likely that Col. House read A Preface to Politics and found in Lippmann a first-class recruit for his cooperative mind, which was a fancy phrase for conspiracy. We do not know when Lippmann met House for the first time--perhaps as early as 1912 through the good offices of Lincoln Steffens--but we do know that by 1916, Lippmann, as an associate editor of The New Republic, was in constant touch with House. Discussing The New Republic's pro-Wilson bias, Lippmann wrote in the July 16, 1930 issue of the magazine:

> Our relations with Wilson were never personal. I don't think Croly ever saw Wilson when he was President; in the winter of 1916 I had two or three interviews, such as any journalist has with the President. Croly and I did begin to see something of Colonel House. It was a curious relationship. Wilson was preparing to run for his second term; his main problem was the management of American neutrality. We discussed the problem perhaps once a fortnight with Colonel House. He never told us what the President was going to do. . . . Partly by coincidence, partly by a certain parallelism of reasoning, certainly by no direct inspiration either from the President or Colonel House, The New Republic often advocated policies which Wilson pursued.

One must, of course, take the word of a Fabian Socialist with a large grain of salt. Whatever the circumstances may have been of how the "kept idealists" served their masters, it is a fact that Lippmann was one of Col. House's favorite pets, if not the favorite pet. Lippmann's third book, Stakes of Diplomacy, published in 1915, was a blatant blueprint for the World Government which Col. House had planned to create through his concept of a

post-war League of Nations. It is not inconceivable that Lippmann wrote the book specifically at Col. House's behest in order to prepare the "intellectuals" for the new internationalism and to set the guidelines for post-war diplomatic action. At the tender age of 26, Lippmann was so firmly committed to World Government and the abolition of the United States, that he could write with the following with complete equanimity:

> The difference . . . between the true internationalist and the unreasoning patriot lies in the supremacy of his conscious purpose. He holds his local patriotism with a sense that it is temporary, knowing that he must be ready to merge it in a larger devotion. He remains a nationalist in practice because that is the only effective way he can work for internationalism. He preserves his country in trust for that greater state which will embrace civilization. He regards his allegiance as a stewardship. It is true that he may forget. He may sink into a dangerous patriotism. That is one of the risks of an active life. It is always possible that men will lose sight of the end and become fanatic about the means. There is no guarantee against this insidious danger. Only constant criticism and candid discussion can guard against it. (p. 227)

It is somewhat stunning to realize that in this short period of one year--1914-1915--American foreign policy had undergone so drastic a change that we were now not only discarding "Isolation," but also the very sovereignty and freedom of the United States itself. But, of course, none of these plans, so painstakingly developed by Lippmann, could be implemented so long as the United

States stayed out of the War. Col. House, however, had full charge of that department, and through his tireless connivance managed to get us into the War by 1917. Of course, Wilson had run for re-election the year before with the campaign slogan "He kept us out of war." But that was just another decention contrived for the suckers with the "mushy vision."

The war found Lippmann ready to serve his country, although, as he had plainly admitted, his local patriotism was of a temporary nature only. Nevertheless, he was "invited" to become an assistant to Newton D. Baker, Wilson's Secretary of War. Lippmann remained in that position for only a few months until Col. House was ready to put him in a much more important job, that of making plans for the post-war League of Nations.

As soon as we had entered the war, the Colonel had decided to organize a secret study committee which would draw up proposals to be submitted at the Paris Peace Conference. House chose his brother-in-law, Sidney Mezes, President of the City College of New York, to head the Committee and then appointed Lippmann to serve as Mezes' secretary and as a direct liaison between himself (House) and the Committee. Mezes and Lippmann then proceeded to comb the academic world for all the Fabians, liberals, and do-gooder humanitarians they could find. Among the recruits were: James T. Shotwell of Columbia, Charles H. Haskins of Harvard, Charles Seymour of Yale, Stanley Hornbeck of Wisconsin, Archibald Coolidge of Harvard, Isaiah Bowman of Johns Hopkins, and others.

Lippmann stayed with The Inquiry, as the Committee was later called, until he completed his work, which included drafting the famous Fourteen Points, which were to be the basis of Wilson's Paris Peace negotiations. It is hard to believe that a 29-year-old Fabian Socialist could have reached such heights

of power as to be in charge of formulating the foreign policy of one hundred million Americans who hadn't the faintest idea what was going on behind their backs.

Lippmann left The Inquiry in mid-1918, was commissioned a Captain in the Military Intelligence division of the American Expeditionary Force and, in August, 1918, found himself in Europe writing propaganda leaflets to be dropped behind enemy lines. Before reaching the front, however, Lippmann and his fellow officers, Capt. Heber Blankenhorn and Lt. Charles Merz--the future editor of The New York Times--spent several days in England where they conferred with Graham Wallas, H. G. Wells and other Fabians. The remaining months of the war were spent at the unit's headquarters in France, which was under the command of Major Willard Straight, the Morgan partner who had financed The New Republic. This was quite in keeping with the needs of the situation, since German propaganda leaflets were informing the American troops to what extent they were the tools of "Morganism" which, according to the Germans, had driven Wilson and America to the betrayal of humanity.

The Armistice brought Lippmann's short military career to a close and he was sped to Paris where he became secretary of the Paris Peace [redacted] organization set up by Col. House. David Weingast, in his short biography of Lippmann, describes Lippmann's key role at the time:

> The Germans having agreed to surrender on the basis of the Fourteen Points, House had to obtain the approval of Lloyd George and Orlando to a capitulation on those terms. The British and Italian leaders wanted to know what Wilson's declaration meant. To Lippmann went the task of preparing an explanation. Writing all night, he completed thirteen

memoranda, Frank Cobb of the World supplying the fourteenth. The memoranda were cabled to Wilson, who gave them his approval.

Lippmann, however, soon found himself at odds with Wilson, whose coming to Paris he strongly disapproved of. As a good Fabian, he was also greatly distressed by the Allies intervention against the new Communist regime in Russia. Anything that threatened the new Soviet experiment had to be fought. Weingast quotes Lippmann as follows:

> "I tried in vain," he said, "to remind Wilson of the incongruity of the situation. I pointed out that by participating in the war during the era of pacification we were bound to cancel out the effectiveness of the peace treaty we were drafting."

But Wilson remained adamant. Apparently he took seriously the slogan that we had gone to war to save the world for democracy. Lippmann knew, however, that the slogan had merely been coined* to induce the American suckers, with their "mushy vision," to perform bigger and better sacrifices. But the disagreement forced Lippmann to resign from the Peace Conference and return to the United States. In the meanwhile, Col. House had sent Lincoln Steffens on a personal mission to Lenin to reassure the Communist butcher that his friends in America would not let him down. Lippmann, in the meanwhile, did his best to sell the American people the League of Nations and a new line of co-existence with the Soviet Union.

The end of the Wilson Administration marked the end of the first phase of Lippmann's fantastic career. By the age of 30 this Harvard intellectual

* Not "coined," but lifted directly from the writings of one of the most important Illuminati, Albert Pike, of some fifty years before. Just as the name, The Great Society, was taken today from Graham Wallas' book of fifty years ago.

had written three books, innumerable articles, had become a skilled literary agitator and a moulder of our destiny as a nation. He had become part and parcel of the invisible government which was shaping the socialist future of of America without the approval or knowledge of its people.

It would be too easy to underestimate the role played by Walter Lippmann in those early days when the political conspiracy to abolish the United States was being formed. Lippmann was clearly the most persuasive intellectual spokesman for that disembodied "cooperative mind." He had indeed subordinated his great intellectual talents to serve in that sinister "fellowship of effort" dedicated to the destruction of a free America. Therein, of course, lies the key to Walter Lippmann's unending "prestige," a prestige sustained by that "cooperative mind" of which Lippmann has been a part ever since he left Harvard.

# # #