"New England: Indian Summer" reviewed by Samuel Sillen

*

★ ★ ★

★ ★

★

★

★

★



Outlook for Europe Will Britain's rulers capitulate to Hitler? by R. PALME DUTT

Patriotism a la Mode by Ruth McKenney

Hollywood Peace Crusade by Herbert Biberman

GROPPER, ISIDOR SCHNEIDER, SIDNEY HILL, ALVAH BESSIE

Between Ourselves

THE travel ads describe Cuba as a land of gayety, blue seas, casinos tinkling with jingling coins, long cool drinks at Sloppy Joe's ... and ah, those senoritas.

But Joseph North quit Havana last week for the seldom visited interior of Cuba. He found poverty, disease, death. "The best place to study the wretched handiwork of imperialism," he writes us, "is down here at the point of production, where almost every palm leaf belongs to Electric Bond & Share. . .." That's the way his story, to appear in next week's NM, begins . . . and we think it affords a better picture of Wall Street's devious ways in foreign lands than any you've read in many moons.

For instance—Manzanilla, in the far corner of the isle, has sixty thousand people, ravaged by typhoid this very minute . . . and Manzanilla is the dateline on Joe North's story.

"Responsibility for this epidemic," he tells us, "is Electric Bond & Share's. That company owns most, practically all, of Cuba's electric supply as well as waterworks. And in Manzanilla the water rates are so high that in the greater part of the city only one family on a street block can afford to pay for water. Neighbors come daily with jars and buckets, begging, borrowing, or stealing a precious drop to drink.

"Worse than that is the water's quality. There's a saying in Manzanilla: 'When the water runs brown, the priests will walk a lot.' In those days, typhoid is deadliest; twenty-five, perhaps thirty babies will be dead in a short time. It was the fight against this monopoly that helped the Communist Party win the mayoralty of Manzanilla for the first time in history." This you may read in detail in next week's NM.

Two weeks hence Joe North will write the story of how Cuba's vast Negro population elected a Negro mayor—Justus Sala of Santiago de Cuba, second largest city on the island. "This victory," North writes, "was won despite the combined opposition of the Bacardi rum interests, whose biggest plant is in Santiago; and that of the hierarchy, the corrupt politicians, and all others who tried to defeat Sala. But the people elected him, with the support of the Communist Party."

No other publication in America has covered this great advance of democracy in the island south of us." You may read about these victories, and what they portend, only in NM. Don't fail to order your copies now. **M**^{ARION} GREENSPAN, who was a war correspondent in loyalist Spain, next week writes on how that country defended its democracy. Mr. Greenspan discusses in detail the relationship of the Spanish army to the people, their organizations, and particularly their trade unions. But more important, Mr. Greenspan points to the differences between Washington's "defense" plans and a genuine people's defense program. Mr. Greenspan's piece is an important contribution to the controversy on how to defend America.

Our desk calendar notes that September 16 is the day when NM's subscription rates will rise somewhat. (There are details on the back cover.) Another big date to remember is September 6. On that day Chesters' Zunbarg, the happy hostelry in the mountains, will turn its facilities over to the friends of NM. From Friday evening to Sunday night, you will play tennis, boat, swim, dance, enjoy the entertainment program, eat and sleep, all for the small sum of \$5 per day or \$10 for the weekend. A chartered bus will take us, and you too, to the door. For other details see the advertisement on page 19. A share of the weekend proceeds goes to NM.

Who's Who

R. PALME DUTT is the author of *World Politics: 1918-1936* and *Fascism and Social Revolution.* Dutt has been editor of the British Labour Monthly since its inception in 1923. ... Herbert Biberman, noted movie director, is chairman of the American Peace Crusade and one of the founders of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. Among the movies Mr. Biberman has directed are *Roar China* and *Valley Forge.*... Alex Brooks is a college student who is spending the summer in California. ... Ed Falkowski, a former coal miner of Pennsylvania, contributes frequently to NM.

Flashbacks

FUNNY how things get changed around. Take those liberals who are shouting "fifth columnist" at all who oppose the fascist conscription bill and the whole drive toward war. When, on Aug. 19, 1936, in the peaceful socialist world, Zinoviev, Kamenev, and fourteen other fifth columnists of war and capitalism admitted their terroristic plans, the "liberals" were horrified not at the treachery but at the exposure. These "liberals" looked with mild alarm at omens of the stability of relations of Germany and the USSR when on Aug. 19, 1939; the two countries signed a trade treaty. . . . Knowing that disillusionment about the last war is complete, these same "liberals" whose record in the last war stinks-to borrow a word coined by Ruth McKenney-now pay homage to those who resisted the last war. This war, it seems, is "different"or would Big Bill Haywood say so? He, with a hundred other IWW's,was convicted Aug. 17, 1918, of conspiracy to block the war.

This Week
NEW MASSES, VOL. XXXVI, NO. 9
August 20, 1940
The Outlook for Europe by R. Palme Dutt 3
Hollywood Skips the Next War by Herbert Biberman . 7
Strictly Personal by Ruth McKenney 9
From Slums to Barracks by Sidney Hill 10
Mr. Yorty's Hunt for a Blacklist by Alex Brooks 12
Editorial Comment
Gropper's Cartoon
REVIEW AND COMMENT
The Withering of New England by Samuel Sillen 17
Modern Poetry by Isidor Schneider
Epic in Steel by Ed Falkowski
US Foreign Policy by J. S
SIGHTS AND SOUNDS
Out of Hollywood by Alvah Bessie
Art work by A. Jamison, Geoffrey David, Clinton, Charles Roundtree.
Two weeks' notice is required for change of address. Notification sent to NEW MASSES rather than to the post office will give the best results.
Published weekly by WEEKLY MASSES CO., INC., at 461 Fourth Ave., New York City. (West Coast Bureau, 6715 Hollywood Boulevard Boom 287, Hollywood, Calif.) Copyright 1940, WEEKLY MASSES CO., INC. Reg. U. S. Patent Office. Drawings and text may not be reprinted without permission. Entered as second-class matter, June 24, 1926, at the Post Office at New York. N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Single copies 15 cents. Subscriptions \$4:50 a year in U. S. and Colonies and Mexico. Six months \$2.50; three months \$1.25; Foreign \$5:50 a year; is months \$3; three months \$1:50. In Canada, \$5 a year, \$2.75 for six months. Subscribers are notified that no change in address can be effected in less than two weeks. New MASSES welcomes the work of new writers and artists. Manuscripts and dravings must be accompanied by stamped, addressed envelopes. New MASSES does not pay for contributions.

NEW MASSES

VOLUME XXXVI

AUGUST 20, 1940

NUMBER 9

The Outlook for Europe

Will Britain's rulers capitulate to Hitler? R. Palme Dutt's second article on the perspectives of the war. Washington's stakes in London's politics.

London, England.

HE collapse of French imperialismwhose effects are only beginning in its colonial empire and in the colonial empires of the world-has generated a new scramble and created a new world situation. Desperate and urgent as are the immediate issues of struggle of the working people in France and in this country consequent on the new situation, it is necessary for Marxists, in the interests of that struggle and its correct guidance, coolly and soberly to estimate the forces and relations and perspective of this new world situation. The laws of the concentration of capital operate remorselessly in the relations of states no less than in the relations of individual capitalists and firms. The dramatic moments of final crisis are familiar in the records of capitalist enterprise when some weaker firm, with a long history and traditions, goes to the wall, and its rivals close in to devour the victim. They are no less familiar in the history of states, as the monopolist empires extend and the weaker states lose their independence, either by direct annexation or becoming client, semi-colonial states. This process is familiar over the past three-quarters of a century in the undeveloped regions of the world, in Asia, Africa, and South America. But, as Lenin noted in his Imperialism, "it is not only in newly opened-up countries, but also in the old ones, that imperialism is leading to annexation, to increased national oppression." This development has gone forward at a lightning pace in the present war. The position of the formally independent smaller countries of Europe has become untenable. Only where the influence and direct armed strength of the socialist power has extended have their independence and national freedom been maintained under the protection of the socialist power. Beyond that region of influence the smaller countries have been in practice divided up between Britain and Germany (in the majority of cases Germany establishing territorial overlordship and Britain securing the gold, shipping, and colonies, together with the juridical claim of possession of the refugee legal governments).

LARGER REDIVISION

But this redivision of the world, which is the essence of imperialist war, is not necessarily confined to undeveloped or smaller countries, or to the colonies and possessions of the powers. The same process of concentration extends to the imperialist powers. If opportunity offers, one imperialist power will endeavor to absorb another. At the beginning of the last war, in 1914, there were eight imperialist great powers, six in Europe and two outside Europe. By the end of the war two had vanished, the two weakest and most unstable: Austria-Hungary and czarist Russia. Austria-Hungary crumbled into dissolution and gave way to a series of vassal states of the victor powers; the Russian empire was conquered by socialism. A third, Germany, was prostrated, robbed of its colonies, and placed under heavy burdens; but remained in being as a monopolist concentration of capital and was thus able to rise anew for the continuance of the struggle. In this war France was visibly the weakest link in the chain of imperialism. That link snapped; but owing to the depth of imperialist corruption in the working class movement (Socialist Party and reformist trade union leadership) the French working class was not yet united and ready to win and hold power. Therefore German imperialism has for the time being annexed France with the consent of the French ruling class.

In British official comment this annexation or virtual annexation (for the armistice terms in fact make France a vassal state with decisive controlling power in German hands) is treated as a temporary military domination which will be reversed by the final verdict of the war. The question is not so simple. Undoubtedly the French people, once they are able to advance in unity under the leadership of the working class, will throw off their national oppression together with the vassal fascist government-but not in order to go back to the old capitalist form of state or to fall into the claws of British imperialism. Until then, within the sphere of capitalist relations the question is not simply one of military domination; it is a question of a certain degree of fusion of French and German capital, that is, a real process of concentration. The conditions for this fusion of French and German capital were already more and more visibly preparing in the two decades since the last war (as shown in the European Steel Cartel, etc.). The same tendency continued to be shown also after the outbreak of war (the exchange of Lorraine iron ore and Ruhr coke between French and German capitalists alongside formal hostilities). The question at issue was under whose control this economically necessary fusion should take place. The first stage of the war has decided this issue in favor of Germany.

Lenin in his Imperialism, quoting a bourgeois economic writer (Richard Calwer, Introduction to World Economy, Berlin, 1906), notes the five "main economic regions" of the world there described: (1) central Europe (the whole of Europe with the exception of Russia and Great Britain); (2) Great Britain and her empire; (3) Russia; (4) eastern Asia; (5) America. The colonies are here included in the "regions" of the states to which they belong. Of these five, two are noted as regions of "poorly developed capitalism": Russia and eastern Asia. Since then Russia has passed out of the sphere of capitalist world economy and become the first sector of socialist world economy; in eastern Asia Japan has gained in strength, but the region still remains weaker in capitalist development relative to the other three. There are thus three decisive regions of capitalist world economy:

We observe three regions with highly developed capitalism (with a high development of means of communication, trade, and industry): the central European, the British, and the American. Among them are three states which dominate the world: Germany, Britain, the United States. Imperialist rivalry and the struggle between these countries have become very keen, because Germany has only an insignificant area and few colonies; the creation of "Central Europe" is still a matter for the future, and it is being born in the midst of desperate struggles.

This situation caused the last war and continues into the present war. There remain three contestants for world power: Germany, Britain, the United States (Japan, though advanced in strength, is still completely occupied within her region). But the situation of these three powers is markedly different, no less than the situation of the "regions" on which they are based.

RELATIVE STRENGTH

In respect of strength of capitalist development (iron and steel production, electricity, chemical industry, mechanical horsepower) the United States stands first, Germany second, and Britain third. In respect of the monopolist concentration of capital, Germany stands first, the United States second, and Britain third. In respect of extent of territorial possessions Britain stands first, the United States second, and Germany (up to

the outbreak of war) nowhere. In respect of military technique and equipment (land and air). Germany stands first. Britain second, and the United States third. In respect of naval power Britain stands first, the United States second, and Germany a weak third. The difference in respect of their "regions" is no less marked. The British empire is a political unity under a single sovereignty, though geographically dispersed and in danger of disintegrating tendencies. The United States is in process of integrating the American continent under her control, and has made marked progress in this direction. But "Central Europe" has remained, from the time that Lenin wrote up to the present war, a conception, not a unity. "The creation of 'Central Europe' is still a matter for the future, and it is being born in the midst of desperate struggles." The consolidation of "Central Europe" (i.e., all Europe except Britain and Russia) under German domination is thus the condition precedent for the challenge of Germany, corresponding to her strength of capitalist development, toward world power; and this consolidation itself involves "desperate struggles." The struggle over "Central Europe" is thus the first form of the struggle between Germany, Great Britain, and the United States for world power.

NEW STAGE

This struggle underlay the last war, the politics of the intervening period, and the first ten months of the present war. It has now been settled, for the first time in the history of capitalist Europe, in favor of Germany. That is why the whole world situation now moves forward to a new stage, and the United States awakens to full world political activity. In the last war Germany strove to create "Central Europe"; Britain set herself the task to prevent it. In order to prevent it Britain gave her backing to the weaker capitalist power in the region, France, and drew in the support of Russia, as well as, finally, when the issue grew precarious. of the United States. This superior combination defeated Germany, and thus appeared to reverse the natural course of economic development. The weaker capitalist power, France, sought to organize "Central Europe" in the following period, while Britain worked to prevent the creation of "Central Europe" by playing off France and Germany. The artificial ascendancy of France could not last; but the British maneuvers to maintain the disunity of "Central Europe" broke down through the emergence of the new factorthe overmastering fear of the socialist revolution. Britain's plans required for their success close collaboration with Russia; but British conservatism, as the leader of world capitalism and counter-revolution, was the leader of hostility to the Soviet Union. On this antagonism German capitalism continuously played to build up its strength anew, from the Rapallo Treaty of 1922 through Hitler's anti-Bolshevik crusade to the final quick followup of Britain's refusal of the



"How our boy has grown, Henry."

Anglo-Soviet pact by the non-aggression treaty. Thus the inner contradiction of British policy has led to the creation of the very specter it strove for a quarter of a century to prevent—the creation of "Central Europe" under German domination with far greater completeness than was ever dreamed of in 1914-18.

The preliminary phase of the war, which reached no solution in the four years of the war of 1914-18, is thus completed in the first ten months of the present war. The war moves toward world war. The British empire and the new German empire now confront one another in the final conflict for world power, while the United States speeds up her preparations at a feverish tempo in order to dominate the final outcome. The press pathos about the "little island" facing "alone" the embattled Nazi power over all Europe must not blind us to the real, titanic dimensions of this world imperialist conflict. British imperialism is not yet so weak or so bankrupt as is sometimes suggested, nor so completely unprepared and planless as it is sometimes willing to see suggested in order to whip up the war enthusiasm of its people in the belief that they are conducting a "people's war" in spite of and against the will of their reluctant rulers.

POWERFULLY MATCHED

The two contestants are powerfully matched. The new German empire holds Europe in its grip from the Atlantic coast to the borders of the Soviet Union, from Norway and Denmark to Italy and Spain. It has thus largely broken or weakened the blockade, save in respect of the vital question of oil. It holds powerful military forces and air superiority. It controls the European coasts facing Britain on the north, the east, and the south. The British empire holds in its domination one-third of the world and some six hundred millions of people, if we add to the former colonial empire the Belgian and Dutch colonial empires, together with the hope, now less certain, of securing the French colonial empire. It holds naval supremacy. It possesses superior economic and financial resources. It can count on the resources of the United States. The outcome of the conflict is by no means a foregone conclusion for either side.

The role and strategy of the United States in this lineup is relatively the clearest and

4

least complicated. In the most general terms it has been plain from the outset that, as in the last war, but still more decisively in this war, the United States regards it as her destiny to emerge as the ultimate victor, while postponing direct military participation until the final stage. Since the success of the German imperialist domination of central Europe, the United States has unhesitatingly placed her resources on the side of the British empire, and openly prepares the way toward eventual participation on its side. The reasons for this are manifest. The United States regards herself as the destined "heir of the British empire"; and the heir has no wish to see his patrimony seized from under his expectant eyes by a new upstart gangster. The United States holds \$4,000,000,000 of investments in the British empire, which she does not wish to lose. She shares the anti-Soviet aims of the British imperialists. She fears the effects of a violent breakup of the British empire in liberating the struggle of the colonial peoples for freedom all over the world. For all these reasons the United States financial oligarchy "supports" the British empire. But it "supports" the British empire in something of the same fashion as the British imperialists sought to "support" Nazi Germany against the Soviet Union. By this "support" it intensifies and foments the conflict, both increasing its immediate war profits and at the same time weakening and exhausting both its rivals in a prolonged and deadly struggle into which it can the more easily at the end enter as the ultimate victor. The adoption of the interventionist multimillionaire corporation chief Willkie as the Republican presidential candidate, with the elimination of even the semi-isolationists, is proof of the essential unity of policy of the American financial oligarchy, independently of whether Roosevelt remains or is replaced by a Republican.

RULING CLASS PROBLEMS

For the British bourgeoisie, on the other hand, the situation is not an easy one, and raises acute dilemmas, which are reflected in the inner political tension and controversies. Now that the first phase of the war has ended with Hitler in possession of most of the continent of Europe up to the borders of the Soviet Union, the British ruling class has to make the final decision whether to go forward in a heavy, protracted, and incalculable war, which, even in the event of victory, may bring immeasurable results of social breakup, or to explore first the possibilities of a solution on the basis of the relative gains and partial redivision of the world already achieved by either side, and thus to seek to rebuild the unity of the world reactionary front against the menace of the working class and democratic forces and against the already enormously increased strength of the Soviet Union.

These problems are reflected in the tension and signs of developing crisis in the British political situation, both in the ranks of the

ruling class, and still more in the rising mass discontent. The critical character of the present turning point makes it necessary to endeavor to estimate with care the present policy of British imperialism and the relation of forces within the ruling class, in order to determine the immediate tasks and line of advance of the working class movement. Any such estimate needs to be based on a Marxist analysis of the objective forces. It would be a mistake to transfer the conditions which existed in France to the different situation of Britain. Undoubtedly there exist important analogies in the presence of powerful reactionary pro-fascist forces which fear sharply the menace of imperialist war to the existing class structure. Lenin already noted this 'pacifism of the millionaires": "The enlightened millionaires wish to hasten peace because they are afraid of revolution." (Lenin, Bourgeois Philanthropists and Revolutionary Social Democracy, 1915.) This tendency has been powerfully reinforced in the fascist period, and is associated with the whole character of the "fifth column."

UNLIKE FRANCE

But the differences are even more important. The French bourgeoisie, as we have seen, had already lost its independence. Its choice lay between dependence on British capital and dependence on German capital. This issue was expressed in a sharp conflict between opposing sections of French capital, between those sections more closely associated with the City of London and those sections more closely associated with German monopoly capital and the Continental cartels. British finance capital, on the other hand, is a fully independent world power, with still consid-erable room to maneuver. The British financial oligarchy is very closely interlocked and unified; the divisions are mainly between the representatives of different methods of realizing the same basic aims, so far as the imperialist policy of the most powerful sections of finance capital is concerned. The issue which has presented itself to the British financial oligarchy is not that of "capitulation" in the French sense, but the choice between an attempted compromise or deal, or the continuation of the fight to the bitter end.

Is there a basis for a deal between British and German capital? The objective grounds which can be presented as providing the basis for such a deal are manifest. Germany has already won considerable spoils and is now established in dominion over western and central Europe, with the hope of reversion of some African booty in the event of a settlement. Britain has also won considerable spoils and is established in dominion over her vast overseas empire. Why continue the conflict? Why should not these two giant powers recognize each other's sphere of dominion and reach a mutually advantageous settlement over the bodies of the victims of the war, over the bodies of the former Belgian, Dutch, and French empires? Would not such an alternative be preferable, from

the standpoint of capitalist interests, to carrying forward a protracted and suicidally destructive conflict, which can only unloose the menace of revolution on both sides, while the Soviet Union daily grows in strength and extends her power?

BRITISH-GERMAN CAPITAL

Economically, such a deal would represent a resumption of the tendencies to fusion of British and German monopoly capital, which were already developing at a considerable rate in the preceding Munich period. Indeed, some of the agreements between some of the biggest British and German trusts, which had established a system of interlocking shares and directorates, contained special clauses providing for temporary suspension of the arrangements "in the event of hostilities," and thus leaving the door open for resumption after the little interruption. Politically, such a deal would represent the alliance of the reactionary and fascist forces of European capitalism, not for peace, but for suspension of their own hostilities in order to concentrate on war against the working class and democracy, against the colonial peoples, and eventually against the Soviet Union. No doubt such a settlement would involve a certain temporary shock to the ideologists, to the liberal illusionists, whose fantasies accompany the *Realpolitik* of every imperialist war and are a necessary ingredient to stir up the requisite moral fervor; but the ideologists of imperialism are used to shocks and would find the way to adapt themselves and pass, as the French millionaire press was able to pass in a single day, from gory proclamations of war to the death to hymning the praises of the victory of "peace" and the salvation of 'civilization.'

It is thus clear that the possibility of a deal cannot be ruled out. Nevertheless, there are powerful considerations which militate against it. The redivision which has so far been reached is still only partial. The real issue is the redivision of the world. For the British ruling class a settlement at the present stage and under the present conditions, without a single military victory having been won, would represent a defeat, especially in contrast with the presumptions with which the war was launched. Such a defeat would inevitably have far-reaching repercussions in the disintegration of the empire, the scramble of other powers to drive home their attack, the encouragement to the colonial peoples to strike a blow for freedom, the discrediting of the ruling class in the eyes of the home population. The cautious rulers who thought to save their vast possessions by a quick settlement might find they had lost them by that incautious act. On the other hand, from the point of view of German imperialism, the domination of central Europe is, as we have seen, the necessary basis for the challenge for world power; and if the moment of advantage thus won and the present relation of forces appear the most favorable for pressing home that challenge without delay, then that opportunity is not likely to be foregone for the sake of abstract pleas about the general interests of capitalist civilization, unless the internal German situation compels a change of front. Finally, the United States is most actively concerned to prevent an Anglo-German deal and to ensure the continuance of the conflict.

The factors driving to a continuance and extension of the conflict are thus very strong. Certainly from the standpoint of capitalism as a whole it is a suicidal course. But so was the launching of the war. There is no unity corresponding to capitalism as a whole, but only the warring blocks of monopoly capital, which are only capable of drawing together, and that very irregularly and incompletely, in the moment of highest revolutionary danger. The capitalists are caught in the network of their own contradictions. They can solve their problems neither in war nor in peace. Having launched the war, they are drawn deeper and deeper into the war, until the so-called "phony war" of the early months has become already a vast and murderous conflict. The issue of the redivision of the world cannot be so easily evaded. It is more and more obvious that any attempt at a settlement could only be a temporary truce in a protracted struggle; and even such a truce is less likely than the most colossal extension of yet more terrible and extending world war, sweeping over people after people of the earth. This is the outlook which capitalism presents, and against which the people, with the working class at their head, need to gather their forces to save humanity.

CONSOLIDATION

Is there a division of the British ruling class? Undoubtedly the present situation raises the sharpest dilemmas and controversial problems for the British rulers. Any consequent signs of differentiation are of the greatest importance in the development of the crisis. But we have already had occasion to note the high degree of interlocking, unification, and centralization of the British financial oligarchy, which shows itself in especially marked form in moments of crisis. All the signs indicate that the previous differences, which reached an acute form in the period preceding the war, have been to a great extent liquidated or placed on one side. What is going forward at present is a process of closer consolidation of the leading ranks of the ruling class in face of the growing dangers to their imperialist rule, and especially in face of the growing mass awakening. Churchill and Chamberlain unite in common defense of their identical imperialist and class interests. As the division between the people and the rulers grows, so the rulers draw closer together. Against the growing awakening and discontent of the people is ranged the counter-revolutionary solidarity of the ruling class.

This analysis of the perspective of the war, and of the relation of forces in the British political situation, throws into sharp relief the responsibility that falls on the working

class, and on the militant leadership of the working class, which can alone mobilize, lead, and save the people in this hour of increasingly serious menace and in this whole period of sharp and sudden turns. After the experiences of the past months the anger of the people is undoubtedly rising against the rulers who have brought these disasters upon them and who have led them into this catastrophic situation. This anger is directed in the first place against those who are seen and recognized by the overwhelming majority of people as the architects of disaster, the men of Munich, the friends of fascism and enemies of the people, the Chamberlains, Simons, Halifaxes, and Hoares. This anger is the first step in the awakening of the people to the deep divergence of their interests from the interests of the ruling class. The responsibility falls on the class-conscious workers to respond to and lead this awakening, to lead it in struggle against the reactionary rulers, and to lead it forward to full consciousness of the struggle against the ruling class for their own aims, their own government, and their own way to peace.

The ruling class of this country, who have brought the people to the present disastrous situation, can now offer them only two alternatives. Either the policy of the fascist deal, the counter-revolutionary alliance, which is not a policy of peace, but of war on the working class, on democracy, and on socialism. Or the policy of imperialist war, which presents itself in the guise of the defense of the nation, but in reality utilizes the sacrifices, the lives, and the resources of the people for the maintenance and extension of the world power of the bourgeoisie, for the aims of their domination in the Middle East, in India. in Africa, and in all parts of the world. Either alternative spells limitless misfortunes, burdens, and slavery for the people. The final outcome, if the policy and leadership of the ruling class is accepted, may even see a combination of both; first, a phase of the unlimited all-destructive extension of imperialist war, and then, when the most extreme

catastrophe has been reached, when the rising anger of the people menaces the basis of class rule, the sudden turn to the alternative line of the attempted counter-revolutionary settlement and alliance, followed by new horrors of the most decaying reactionary capitalism in control. Against these vistas of ruin the working people must fight for their own third alternative, by which they take their fate into their own hands for the protection of their own interests and to find their way to peace in unity with the working people of the world.

The masses of the people of this country are not concerned with fighting for world power or maintaining domination over other nations. The people want peace with freedom—the right to determine their own mode of life and government: not a peace of subjection to fascism, home or foreign; nor war for world domination; but peace with freedom, in which they neither dominate others nor are dominated. They can only realize these aims, not by following the leadership of the ruling class, not in unity with the ruling class, but by their own struggle, by their own strength and unity.

The campaign of the Communist Party of Great Britain has shown the way forward to the realization of these aims. The Communist Party has shown the necessity for the establishment of a new government, in which there shall be no representative of imperialism or friend of fascism; a government which will be supported and controlled by the mass movement and which will have behind it the myriad network of working class and democratic organizations and the Workers Control Committees in the factories; a government, not of imperialist war or of the sellout to fascism, but one which will protect the interests of the people against all enemies at home and abroad, establish friendship with the socialist Soviet Union and with the working people of all countries, and lead the way to peace with freedom, opening the way to the rapid advance to socialism.

R. PALME DUTT.



"I heard him myself, Officer. . . . He yelled, 'Shut the door and stop that damned draft!""

Hollywood Skips the Next War

Herbert Biberman, noted film director, tells how the movie capital's great anti-war crusade began. Four started it, now thousands belong. They march "On to Chicago."

HEN the Emergency Mobilization for Peace is called to order in Chicago on August 31, Los Angeles will answer "present" with a delegation of two hundred to three hundred representatives of the American Peace Crusade. Of this number about fifty will make up the Hollywood contingent.

Several facts are in order, explaining why all these people will make a two thousand mile trek—why, how, by whom, and how come. These facts concern the American Peace Crusade and the Hollywood Peace Forum.

Only a history of the past eight months of fierce struggle will explain the gathering determination of this community for the preservation of peace and democracy. Only this history will tell you all about the people. It's a history that begins last December with broken ranks in every organization. It tells of the sharp reformation of these ranks, the fusing of youth, working, and professional people, the first steps in the direction of a new kind of organization.

Behind and through all the steps was a single great impelling force—the people, all the people, demanding their own continued development and organization. Having been deserted by one kind of leadership, discarding another form of organization, they refused to disperse. They insisted upon newer and better organization and they issued a challenge. "We are the people," they said to those who would hear them, "and in us, those of you who have the courage to lead will find endless strength."

The weakness of the existing organizations made most of them static. With their boards divided on new situations, they were unable to move. Weeks and even months of debate loomed. In many instances the membership was actually permitted to drift while executives tried to find common ground or compromise, while some of them attempted to bludgeon organizations into blind acceptance of Roosevelt and any program he would espouse. Those who had fought for collective security, who had built the anti-Nazi movement, were asked to become pro-imperialist anti-Nazis, to abandon the central point of their position, the fight against war and domestic fascism. Those who had criticized the anti-Nazi movement for kicking young Mussolini and Leni Riefenstahl out of Hollywood suddenly became loud anti-Nazis via defense of the British empire. The Union Jack replaced the Stars and Stripes on many a Hollywood breast.

HOW IT STARTED

That was the situation; and one evening at a party seven Hollywood craftsmen found themselves in a living room corner talking about these things. All were burning to go out to the people with the issues. They believed in the people and they believed in the issues. Someone said, "Hire a hall!" They hired a hall. Guy Endore, Sam Ornitz, and I, we decided, would speak. We invited Prof. Herbert Alexander of Los Angeles City College to join us. We had no organization. We did not attempt to set one up. We were feeling our way and we hoped that our work would help existing organizations by demonstrating that the people were ready to support all those who were one with history, one with facts.

We grew. Three hundred people were hearing us regularly. Then we were invited to get out of the hall. Apparently we (and the people) were growing too much. We found another hall. We grew. Five hundred people. Again we were asked to find "another place." We were still growing. No matter how fast we traveled from place to place, we could not lose our audience, the people. Then, seven hundred. This time we lasted in the hall for one meeting.

There was only one hall left. To us, it was enormous. We were afraid of it. We feared we might lose a certain intimacy that we, audience and speakers, felt. But there was no choice. We took it. We grew to one thousand. A thousand people each week. This was the "mass base" of the Hollywood Peace Forum. Admission, 25 cents. Unemployed free.

We sold twenty thousand of our two pamphlets, Chamberlain, Count U's Out by Douglas Greenwood and Let's Skip the Next War by Guy Endore. We mimeographed our more effective addresses and distributed them by the thousand. Pay what you can-take them free if you can't afford to pay. Still, we felt, we were not scratching the surface. The demand for facts, for instruction in reading the papers and understanding history in the making, was growing all around us. From four speakers we became the four factsmen of peace. We clipped the papers, the journals, the foreign news bulletins. We began to quote from the Wall Street Journal and from the financial pages of the Hearst press. We insisted on factual analysis. Mere opinion was scorned. What is your proof? Trot it out. We began to teach people-and ourselveshow to read a newspaper. "Bring your newspaper. We'll read it for you."

We got into a sort of routine of work. Guy Endore became moderator. Dr. Alexander summarized the week's happenings in twenty minutes. Then I went into the national scene. Sam followed with the international picture. One hour was given to questions from the audience. We stuck to the time allotted.

There was nothing to do but grow. We developed another forum team. It was to travel. Then we organized another; it was also to travel. Travel with the *facts*. The facts will make you free. More than that, they will make a man of you because they will place you beyond panic. Still we weren't doing enough. Demands for speakers came from all over town. The first team began to look worn and haggard. That wasn't important except that we weren't keeping up with the growing needs. We decided we must organize a school.

SPEAKERS' CLASS

To this first speakers' class came some twenty people. They got a rude shock. They had imagined they would sit back and be given the kernels of wisdom uncovered by the forum team. They were told they would get nothing that way, they had to dig for the roots themselves. Come and tell each other what you have unearthed. Sam was teacher. He just sat and listened, guided.

Kids who had been frightened of their shadows, men and women who "were not speakers," gray-haired workers from near the oil fields, writers and actors and secretaries became speakers. They stood up and delivered their personally packed dynamite-in such quantity that a research bureau had to be organized to take care of the facts. The Hollywood Peace Forum subsidized it, as it had subsidized so many similar activities, out of the profits of the Friday evening weekly forum. The class grew to fifty. From this class came the forum teams. Four young men, the handsomest foursome even Hollywood's eves had ever seen, two actors and two writers, became the Motion Picture Democratic Committee's weekly forum with a permanent location in Hollywood. Two young girls and two young boys became the Youth Forum and trekked all over town bringing their facts to youth.

A half dozen forum teams and forty speakers began to bob up all over southern California from San Diego to Bakersfield. Want a veteran? Want a youth? A writer? Trade unionist? Forum? Call Hillside 7391. Want research on national, international, or local issues? Call Granite 5136. This is what emerged from the coming together of a few men who wanted to give the people the truth.

But that's not even half the story. Things were happening at the same time in other directions. In March the American Youth Congress and the Congress of Industrial Organizations named April 6 National Peace Day. This was a challenge to us, to all of us who had by this time finished the great debate. History had hurried that debate. No more argument. Peace had been clearly established by the facts as central in everything from breakfast to hitting the hay, through work and thought and hope of survival. Our tories, reverting to the '76 tempo, donned their red coats, Red-baited, and got out of organizations. The Americans stayed in. For the Americans in Hollywood, National Peace Day was a challenge.

It wasn't our day. Two great national organizations had conceived it. The natural thing was to consult with them. The eight Hollywood progressive organizations sent representatives to a meeting at which the Hollywood Peace Council was formed. The Hollywood Peace Council sent a committee to meet with the CIO and the California Youth Legislature. It was determined we would hold a great demonstration on April 6.

"We" went to work. But the "we" was no longer just Hollywood. The CIO, the California Youth Legislature, the Hollywood Peace Council: that was "we." We issued a newspaper-a quarter of a million copies, four pages-advertising the great meeting. It was an interesting meeting because there was only one speech-it was ten minutes long-at the very end of the meeting. There was a living newspaper with a cast of 125, called "Once Is Enough." For almost two hours we dramatized the last war, the events leading up to this one, and then finally the struggle for peace. We dramatized the organizations of the people, of youth, unions, intellectuals, women, Negroes, Mexicans, all the myriad associations of citizens devoted to a better life. "Peace," they said, "isn't merely not war. It is the fullest flowering of life out of the conscious self-organization of the people to that end."

Nine thousand people jammed the Olympic Auditorium, cheering. Terrific. Yet when it was all over we asked ourselves what we had accomplished and we were forced to admit it was less than we had first believed. Why? We had entertained and instructed the people, but we had not organized them. But why organize them for peace? Why not work through their own organizations? The answers were not long in coming.

In many of their organizations the executive bodies were hopelessly divided. Somehow we got the full sense of the situation. We were in a different period. Affiliation of organizations was necessary for any successful work for peace. But something more was necessary. We had to get to the people to get to the organization. We felt people were reaching out for association of a kind which would ultimately strengthen the established organization.

The idea of a new membership organization with occasional meetings and a bulletin each month seemed too formal and too remote. People must be got together, in a new way. A thousand people gathered every week at the Hollywood Peace Forum. This had never happened before. Nor had we ever had nine thousand people in a single meeting before. The people were in motion. They were feeling for better organization. If we were worth our salt we had to help them find it. We talked to the people. We talked to them; but mostly we listened, listened, listened. Through them we examined our California tradition. And in it we found the key. Utopians, Epics, Hamand-Eggs. Large movements which came very near to carrying majorities in California had organized on the basis of small clubs. Clubs?

Peace Clubs! Thousands of them! Functional bodies of five or more persons. In shops, in neighborhoods, in apartment houses, even in families. This was a veritable crusade of the people rising from breakfast tables, lunch rooms, markets, factories, churches, and, as we discovered later, even bowling alleys. The American Peace Crusade! The people had our answer. And they suggested an organization of dual form. Have your individual clubs, they said, but don't stop there. Affiliate with all possible organizations, trade unions, fraternal, cultural organizations. Know the facts. This is where you'll find the people. The American Peace Crusade listened.

On June 8 the new triumvirate—the CIO, the California Youth Legislature, the Hollywood Peace Council—called a giant demonstration against war. It was on the steps of City Hall, Los Angeles. Again a quartermillion leaflets were distributed through the city. The meeting was called with only ten days for preparation. It was called for one o'clock Saturday. And the people came, eighteen thousand of them. They came with banners and signs. Never had such a visually colorful assemblage of citizens been seen in our city. But never before had three such great sections of our city worked in such harmony.

The demonstration lasted only a half hour. The people were asked to march twenty blocks to the Olympic Stadium where a peace convention would be held and, if they approved, the American Peace Crusade organized. Through the center of town marched four thousand men and women. Thousands lined the streets cheering as the marchers passed. An hour later the great convention got under way. Peace kits were distributed. They contained instructions for the organization of clubs, membership cards, songs, peace petitions.

The people there examined the material, discussed the plan, voted their approval. Hundreds of individuals signed cards signifying their desire to organize clubs. A meeting of these Crusade organizers was called for ten days later. Almost a thousand came. Out of these, in each of the city's twenty-nine assembly districts, captains were selected. Each of the captains in turn organized an assembly district organizing committee. Every effort was made to take the work out of the central office. The "AD" captains were the focal



"She's a Rhode Island Red!"

points around which the movement would grow. The thousand club leaders were the next points of emphasis. Finally, the ten thousand people in the individual clubs themselves.

The individual clubs met once a week. They discussed the newsletter of the week. They read the pamphlets. They discussed the petitions. They organized letter writing campaigns. And they sent a representative to the weekly general assembly of the Crusade. At the general assembly each club leader received his material for that week's distribution, he turned in the dues from his club, 10 cents per member per month, he learned of the progress of the organization and heard analyses of the week's events, he heard songs written for the Crusade, saw skits acted by Crusade members dramatizing the work of the Crusade.

In our membership work emphasis was placed upon the need for keeping the clubs from growing too large. "Break up into more clubs and build those to twelve-break up again and build to twelve or fifteen." More clubs, more representatives, more small groups going out into their neighborhoods to talk for organization to preserve our democracy, the defense of our peace. And this method, of course, brought more representatives to the weekly meetings. On the fifth week we began to alternate the meetings. Every other week each of the assembly districts held a meeting in its district. Thirty meetings on a given night all over the city. The people began to catch on, to feel their strength.

A cry rose from the clubs: what about national organization? As we began to discuss this, the call for the Emergency Peace Mobilization in Chicago reached us. An "On to Chicago" button was designed. An "On to Chicago" song was written. The clubs began to give parties, run raffles, organize pot luck suppers, give dances, musicales. Everywhere the question arose of sending delegates to Chicago.

All this has been built in six weeks. Not by a super-executive, but by the people. Who runs it? The people. Who performs? Who makes the reports? Who goes to Chicago? The people.

A great mass meeting is already being prepared to welcome the delegates back from Chicago and to receive their reports and to discuss the plans from there on. All that has been done to this point is a natural preparation for Chicago. From there we can go to work in common action with the people from North, South, East, and West, go to work with the facts.

A tough job? Naturally. A real fight? sure. The people know that. They know they are fighting for their right to fight. Defense? You bet. Defense of the people, by the people, and for the people. And that kind of defense no one will build for them. If they can only defend themselves, they'll defend the country, for they are the country. Foreign trade isn't the country. Investment abroad isn't the country. Bigger profit for Wall Street isn't the country. The fight for the right to fight for the people—that's the country. That's the American Peace Crusade.

HERBERT BIBERMAN.



Patriotism a la Mode

The ladies who attended the jolly little brawl up in Westchester last week, for the benefit of the Allied Relief Fund, came dressed to the teeth, I note via the New York Post, in a simply too amusing collection of jeweled American flags, flying starboard over the bosom, snazzy red belts amidships embroidered with "God Bless America" in rhinestone sparklers, and other equally quaint mementos of La Patrie. Mrs. Brock Pemberton also wore red, white, and blue combs in her hair.

I know very well that now if ever I ought to keep a cool head and the old powder horn reasonably dry. The times are distinctly out of joint and I should have better things to do than to worry about what Mrs. Brock Pemberton wore to a garden party in Westchester. But I can't help it. Those red, white, and blue combs, those elegantly embroidered belts, those sparkling flags snuggling on the gentry's chests make me want to jump up and down and bite my knuckles with just plain sheer rage. I'm not a great stickler for Flag Day rules and it never hurt my feelings to see the bunting draped hind side up or with the stars backward, but the good ladies of Westchester have gone just a smidgeon too far. They have, to put it crudely, a nerve to annex the American flag for an accessory a la mode, and for my part, that star spangled banner looks mighty queer stretched across a real leather pocketbook housing numerous crisp ten dollar bills by way of mad money.

Shakespeare had the good ladies at this party all summed up in the convenient nutshell for the ages: "Methinks they do protest too much!" Patriotism, I learned in my grammar school history book, was never like this in the old days. Patriotism formerly consisted of going out and dying in Valley Forge of frozen and gangrened feet and hands; or screaming out your life on a Civil War military operating table, without benefit of anesthetics. And neither George Washington and his little band, his ragged crew (to use John La Touche's poetic words), nor old Abe Lincoln and his gaunt frontiersmen up from the Wilderness needed to wear jeweled American flags conspicuously placed on their chests to demonstrate they loved their country.

And, you must admit, it does seem rather an odd fate for the American flag, born in hunger and agony and revolution; carried through the blazing hells of Appomattox and Shiloh and Gettysburg, to end up bejeweled, heaving gently on the perfumed bosoms of ladies who ken patriotism through the dividends of United States Steel, preferred. To my jaundiced way of thinking, by their deeds, not their lapel pins, shall ye know them.

Forgive me if I speak thus bitterly of Mrs. Brock Pemberton and her flag-wearing cronies. It happens that this patriotic motif in the latest fashions flicks a nerve still raw, after all these years, in my memory. I can't remember ever telling this story to anybody before, because I am still bitterly ashamed of it. But it may serve to point a moral.

My sister Eileen and I were five and six when the hysteria of that other war reached its greatest heights. We were fat, sassy little girls, and we lived in a big old white house in Mishawaka, Ind. Kitty-cornered across the street were the two people we loved best in the world, after our mother and father, two ancient, fat, jolly old Dutch people, Mr. and Mrs. Van Spechten. Old Mr. Van Spechten had a cuckoo clock and an immense globe. He was so old he had real patience with children; he never tired of demonstrating his two treasures and we paid him a regular afternoon call, to inspect the revolving globe and listen to the cuckoo crow or sing or whatever cuckoos do. Mrs. Van Spechten was built like a quivering barrel. She laughed most of the time and labored under the delusion that children would not eat cookies unless they were shaped like snowmen or giraffes, or other interesting natural phenomena.

As I say, my sister and I loved old Mr. and Mrs. Van Spechten, and they loved us in return. They were lonely people, and sometimes they borrowed us from our mother and took us to the movies.

On the Fourth of July, 1918, Mr. and Mrs. Van Spechten went away. This was very rare; they almost never stirred from their rambling old house. It was a hot day. And we were bored. About three o'clock four or five big boys from up the block appeared at the Van Spechten house.

"Come on !" the biggest one bellowed.

I trotted over. Eileen bore up the rear, her fat legs being slow transportation.

"Spies!" said the big boy. "Dirty Germans!" Eileen and I goggled.

"Von Spechten!" said one of the kids. "Get it?"

I gaped with horror. Fancy knowing spies,

real spies! And Eileen and I never said one word in defense of the people we loved, not even a murmur. The boys were much bigger than we were, but even so, our mother was within hailing distance, and we never raised the slightest howl. Instead we spent the rest of that hot summer afternoon pasting hundreds of tinv little American flags, the kind that have mucilage on the back of them, all over Mrs. Van Spechten's gleaming plate glass windows. The big boys climbed to the porch to do the upstairs windows; we stayed downstairs, giggling as we covered the glass. By five o'clock our tongues were rasped and swollen, but we glowed with satisfaction. The Van Spechtens appeared at the top of the street, walking home from the streetcar.

"Dirty spies!" the big boys bellowed, as they climbed down and ran.

"Dirty spies!" we echoed, Eileen in her bad lisp.

Mother heard the racket. We ran across the street, and suddenly, as we reached our porch, we began to lose the fine, patriotic fervor, the rich glow of the afternoon. Mother saw the whole thing in a glance. We dodged behind her. We didn't want to see the Van Spechtens come home.

But Mother grabbed us. "Watch," she said. And we watched. In my life, I have never felt such terrible, such corroding shame. We tried to break away, we begged to go upstairs to our rooms, "without our supper," we volunteered. But Mother just stood there, holding us fast, and repeated, "Watch."

So we saw the little old couple come up to their house, we saw them examine the windows, we saw Mrs. Van Spechten almost double up with grief, we heard her say, "But papa, papa, why have they done this, how could they do this, the little ones!" And Mother stood there, silent as death, and made us watch Mrs. Van Spechten, still sobbing in her old, hoarse voice, begin to clean those windows. Then she nodded. We knew what we had to do. We went across the street and asked if we could help take off the flags. But Mrs. Van Spechten said no. We began to cry. But Mr. Van Spechten came out and asked us to go away.

We almost hoped that Mother would invent some dreadful punishment, anything, so that we could wipe out that crime forever. But she had nothing to say. And that night, when we went to bed, she told us, "For the first time in my life, I am ashamed. Ashamed of you, and ashamed of myself, for not teaching you better."

And the next day she kept us in our backyard the whole morning and the whole afternoon while she told us the story of George Washington and Liberty and Tolerance and Free Speech.

My mother was a very great woman. Not the kind to wear jeweled American flags in her lapel. Not the sort to feed the hysteria which engulfs everything rich and good in our history. She never wore red, white, and blue combs in her hair, but she loved her country and what it really stands for.

From Slums to Barracks

The administration okays the brass-hat blitzkrieg on the housing program. The Republicans don't care and the Democrats perform neat feats of platform magic.

The low rent public housing program is being abandoned by the administration along with many other federal social services. Official reason: the armaments program. But it is almost election time and the voters are overwhelmingly in favor of the slum clearance and public housing which the New Deal promised in 1932 and 1936. It is not surprising, therefore, that the platforms of the two major political parties seek to obscure their records and hide their intentions on this important question.

Republicans have consistently opposed the low rent public housing movement. They have no record of either accomplishment or promise. Since they apparently do not intend to change their minds, even if elected in the fall, they have left housing out of the platform altogether. After all, the problem of providing decent housing at low rents concerns only "one-third of the nation." And what is that to the Republican Party?

The Democrats, on the other hand, have fashioned a very fine-sounding housing plank in their election platform. Actually, they are quite fed up with Senator Wagner's (New York) housing program but they can't afford to let the public know this just now. And so the Democratic platform points with pride to the record. "We have launched a soundly conceived program to rid America of overcrowded slum dwellings . . . and to replace them with low cost housing projects within the means of low income families." They promise to "extend and accelerate this plan . . . and make it a powerful arm of national defense." But the administration's actual housing record proves that this plank is so much platform magic. That record is worth examining in terms of Democratic Party promises this year.

NEW DEAL EFFORTS

The New Deal housing program began in 1933. At that time housing was considered primarily as an item in the emergency public works scheme. A Housing Division of the PWA was established with a fund of \$100,-000,000, which is just about enough to build an aircraft carrier with its complement of planes. After four years the Housing Division succeeded in building homes for only 21,000 families in the whole country.

Not until 1937, when the United States Housing Authority was created, was a real step taken in the direction of slum clearance and low rent construction. The USHA was based on two essential facts uncovered by extensive government surveys. First, at least onethird of the homes of the nation are definitely below any acceptable standard of decency. This information was a result of the nationwide Real Property Inventory of the Department of Commerce. It led the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which had been holding hearings on this question for three years, to declare in 1937. "It is now a matter of general agreement that even before the depression commenced over 10,000,000 families in America, or more than 40,000,000 people, were subjected to housing conditions that did not adequately protect their health and safety." Second, more than one-third of the families of the nation cannot afford enough rent to induce private enterprise to provide them with decent housing. When Congress was considering the Wagner-Steagall bill to establish the USHA, studies were made bringing the famous Brookings Institution figures on the nation's income in 1929 up to date. It was revealed that about 10,000,000 families, or one-third of the population, had annual incomes below \$1,000. Many of these families paid between \$20 and \$30 per month for their dwellings. Most of them (80 percent) paid less than \$20. On the basis of even a minimum living standard, none of these families could afford to pay more than \$16 per month for rent. This amount is too low to obtain decent housing in the open real estate market.

It became obvious—and was so stated by New Deal agencies, congressional committees, and experts—that private enterprise had been unable to provide safe, sanitary, and decent homes for the 10,000,000 families of the lowest income third. Only the government could possibly do so.

With the establishment of USHA in 1937 public low rent housing became a permanent responsibility of government instead of an emergency relief measure. Profiting from the pioneering experience of the PWA Housing Division, USHA does no building: it merely sets standards and lends money to local housing agencies which initiate, construct, and manage the projects. It operates by making loans up to 90 percent of the total cost of a project to the local authority. Every penny of these 90 percent loans is to be paid back by the localities with interest over a period of 60 years. The federal agency contracts for an annual subsidy grant designed to bridge the gap between the "economic rent" (i. e., the rent which would have to be charged to meet all costs including construction and maintenance) and the rent the tenants of the project can afford to pay. The maximum total of this annual grant or contribution by USHA is fixed in the present law at \$28,000,000the cost of a squadron or so of superbombers. And this relatively small sum (reactionary propaganda notwithstanding) is the only actual cost to the government of the low rent housing program.

Shelter rentals in USHA public housing projects range from a low of \$6.59 per dwelling per month in Austin, Tex., to a high of \$17 in New York City. The average in the South is \$10 per dwelling per month and in the North \$15. That this new housing is made available only to the low income groups is proved by the fact that the average family income in a public project is about \$900.

USHA enforces adequate standards of construction and requires the payment of prevailing wages to building and technical workers on the projects. It has progressively reduced construction costs. It has stimulated the clearance of slums and the planning of projects large enough to constitute entirely new neighborhoods and communities, blazing the trail for the advance planning of the growth of our urban centers and the organized reconstruction of the slums.

Admittedly, the USHA has great potential value. Unfortunately it has been crippled by lack of funds. The USHA was provided with \$800,000,000 in 1937. This sum will result by the end of 1941 in the construction of dwelling units for about 160,000 families over the whole country, a building rate of only forty thousand dwelling units per year! This is less than the rate at which shelter now available to slum dwellers is actually eliminated each year through new bridge approaches. street widenings, etc., and simply through old age. Moreover, the total population, as well as the number of families, is increasing; many of our industrial centers are growing more congested each year. At the present rate the federal housing program is filling perhaps 1 percent of the housing needs of that third of the population which is now completely neglected by the private builder.

THE ATTACK ON HOUSING

Despite its limited achievement, the USHA has been under constant fire by reactionary interests. Real estate and banking groups have attacked the program on the ground that it has threatened private enterprise. Actually, they fear that a successful public housing movement will become a permanent service of government like road construction and elementary education. Only last spring the National Association of Building Owners and Managers passed a resolution calling for the "cessation of the activities of the USHA." Just to be consistent they also demanded the elimination of building maintenance and service employees from the provisions of the Federal Wage and Hour Law."

Another example of housing sabotage is the decision of the Philadelphia Council several weeks ago to reject USHA funds allocated to that city. The Council refused to build another low rent housing project and voted to cut the city's \$35,000,000 program to \$16,-000,000. Local building trades, fifteen thousand strong, demonstrated against this deci-

sion by a work stoppage, but thus far the Council stands pat.

The demand for more public housing is tremendous. Enough applications from local authorities are now in Washington to require over \$1,000,000,000 of additional funds. In answer to this accumulating demand Senator Wagner introduced a bill last year calling for another \$800,000,000. The Senate agreed but, lacking active administration support, the bill was allowed to stay in a House pigeonhole. This year real estate interests and allied opponents of public housing have made a vigorous, and so far dangerously successful effort to throttle the bill and thus kill the housing program entirely.

The latest news is that at least \$150,000,000 of the original and still unexpended \$800,-000,000 appropriation has been diverted to housing in connection with the armaments program. It is reliably reported that for this military housing the USHA will relax many of its high standards, particularly with regard to restriction of tenants, by income level, which was designed to ensure the use of the projects by slum dwellers.

What can the people of this country expect from the two great political parties? The Republicans are silent. The Democrats make fine promises. But their actions right now belie their own words and their own past achievement.

REAL HOUSING PROGRAM

A realistic housing program would insist first on no lowering of USHA standards. If there must be emergency housing at army and navy air bases and at new armaments centers, this should not be done at the expense of the already inadequate USHA program. Second, government slum clearance and low rent housing must be expanded to meet the increasing need. In its 1940 legislative program the CIO suggests that the USHA program be enlarged to provide at least 300,000 dwelling units a year for the lowest income groups. For those workers whose incomes are above the USHA level, the CIO calls for an increase in the present rate of private residential construction from 400,000 to 700,000 units a year. This is to be accomplished by government stimulation of the construction industry. The total CIO housing program involves the construction of a million new dwellings a year. As in so many other phases of American life, it is the labor movement alone which visualizes "national defense" as something more than tanks and guns and conscripts. It is the labor movement which fights to fulfill those promises which the New Dealers have forgotten, to enlarge upon the achievements which the New Dealers themselves have surrendered.

SIDNEY HILL.



Mr. Yorty's Hunt for a Blacklist

California's grand inquisitor sends trade unionists to jail for refusing to turn over union records. The attack on state relief. "This silly blather about constitutional rights."

ALIFORNIA continues to afford the rest of the country an object lesson on the growth of American fascism. In a typical California town, Stockton, not very long ago, a Black Maria backed up to the State Relief Administration offices and into the wagon were hustled twelve SRA workers. They were handcuffed, taken to the county jail, and held on the maximum bail allowed by law. The three women in this group were bundled into a cell originally intended for twelve, but which already housed nineteen other women, mostly prostitutes and drunks.

Added to these twelve were seven more, arrested later. Altogether nineteen social workers were sent to jail. Why? Because they were law-abiding citizens who worked for the state government and had organized a union, the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America. These nineteen had refused to turn over their union records to California's Red-baiting "little Dies" legislative committee headed by Assemblyman Sam Yorty. They also refused to answer personal questions asked for political reasons. They refused to comply with a host of unconstitutional demands. And for that these men and women were jailed.

Yorty and his committee purport to be investigating "subversive activities" within the State Relief Administration of California. The committee's work is symptomatic of that flourishing hysteria which the defense program has engendered in this country. It is fascism wrapped in an American flag, profaning the symbol of democracy. The committee's support comes from California's industrialiststhe great and powerful growers whose organization, the Associated Farmers, controls the state's farm industry. There are also the robust anti-labor groups who cheer Yorty's committee on-the Neutral Thousands, the Chamber of Commerce, the American Legion, the Women of the Pacific-in its work of smearing the red herring across the SRA, and the SRA workers' union, the SCMWA.

CHAMELEON

Assemblyman Yorty was once known as a "liberal" when it was politically profitable to be one. He was dealt out in a California political shuffle, and his liberalism quickly faded. Once lauded by progressives, Yorty is now supported and applauded by every reactionary in the state. Yorty's committee burst out on the California legislature with startling *a priori* charges of "Communism" in the SRA. The state legislature, alert to the publicity possibilities of an investigating committee, listened attentively to Yorty's allegations. The press carried lurid and startling stories. California reactionaries hastened to the Yorty standard, and Yorty's "investigation" was broadened by the legislature, which was on the point of considering special appropriations for the SRA.

Yorty's first "fact-finding" hearings, in Oakland, were inconspicuous. Immediately following the hearings, however, the Oakland SRA office was "reorganized." Twenty-nine social workers were fired. By a peculiar coincidence these workers were all members of the SCMWA. Yorty's committee proceeded to Visalia, where Joseph Zukas, financial secretary of the SCMWA local, refused to supply Yorty with a "complete record of all . . . dues or contributions from all persons whatsoever during the year 1939 and months of January and February, 1940, including a complete list of all persons paying such." (Italics mine-A. B.) Because of his determination not to give up the union records, Zukas was tried and convicted of "contempt of committee," and sentenced to sixty days in jail. On top of that, he was fined \$100. He later lost a civil service job for which he had been accepted by the federal government, because Yorty took pains to notify Washington that "he was a Red." Banner headlines in a Visalia paper proclaimed: KKK RIDES AGAIN. Fiery crosses studded the Visalia countryside.

INQUISITION IN STOCKTON

From Visalia the Yorty committee marched on Stockton, where SCMWA members were indiscriminately accused of being Communists. The Yorty committee, incidentally, had been authorized by the state legislature only to "investigate and report the extent to which activities of groups and organizations . . . affect the costs of administration of unemployment relief" in California. Yet of the questions asked the SCMWA workers in Stockton less than 1 percent were directly on the administration of relief, a problem which has been studiously ignored by Yorty and his committeemen. The entire line of questioning was inflammatory, directed not at the truth of the matter, but at marking workers with a label. Yorty's method has been to label first and attempt to prove the accusations later. In no cases has Yorty been borne out; vet his accusations are flaunted by the press and perpetuate themselves in the public mind.

Why has the Yorty committee investigated the SRA? What has it actually accomplished? The Yorty committee is trying to discredit liberal elements in the California Democratic administration and break the growing power of the SCMWA, which has opposed the administration's retrenchments. But, most important, the committee is trying to return the administration of relief to the counties, where relief would be a tool in the hands of the local politicians controlled by the Associated Farmers. Yorty hopes that by spreading distrust of the SRA he can put the voters in a frame of mind to demand a revision in the state relief administration. This would mean disaster for all workers, but particularly the migrant workers who very largely depend on relief to keep alive. If the Associated Farmers controlled relief, the migrant workers would be even more at the mercy of the large growers.

"ECONOMY" BOYS

The Yorty committee's sentiments are shared by the present "Economy Bloc" in the California legislature. The bloc has already slashed relief appropriations over 40 percent. It has added a stringent rider to a recent appropriation which stipulated that no relief funds were to be spent on wages for social workers who would refuse, or had refused, to testify before a legislative committee. Automatically, all workers who protested against the unconstitutionality of the Yorty committee —and there were scores—were fired.

Yorty- went further. All union members who refused to yield to his questioning were cited for "contempt of committee." In Stockton seventeen workers have already been tried and convicted on this charge. They have been fined \$500 apiece, and have been sentenced to one year in prison, the maximum penalty fixed by law.

During the trials every form of pressure was exerted on jurors and defendants; the judge acted in obvious collusion with the prosecution in the interests of a summary conviction. Stockton's prosecutor, H. C. Stanley, told the jury that "whenever anyone speaks of his constitutional rights it comes under the constitution of the state of California and independent of the national Constitution. . . . There is practically no limit to which a legislative committee may go, provided it does not violate the state constitution." The Klan played an open and coercive role. At first apparently innocuous, the Yorty committee has revealed itself as a vicious mechanism embracing all the ugliest aspects of fascism. If the extraordinary powers of the committee are found to be legal, as may easily happen, labor must expect that future employer-controlled legislative committees will have the power to (1) furnish blacklists to special interests whenever desired, (2) break up any organizing drive that gets under way, and (3) inspect any union activity, whether it be social, religious, or political. The Yorty committee is setting a precedent for restrictions of all civil rights. A Mr. Buck recently declared, "I don't know what all this silly blather about constitutional rights is for!" Mr. Buck is none other than the assistant city attorney of Stockton.

ALEX BROOKS.



Editors A. B. MAGIL, RUTH MCKENNEY, JOSEPH NORTH.

> Associate Editors JAMES DUGAN, BARBARA GILES.

Business Manager CARL BRISTEL.

West Coast Representative

GEORGE WILLNER

Offer to India

BRITAIN'S latest proposals for India are advertised as magnanimous concessions. Actually, they are nothing of the sort. The British viceroy has simply repeated the offer of last October: he is prepared to enlarge his executive council and form a war advisory committee, in both cases including prominent Indian leaders. The only thing new is that Britain specifies the convocation of a representative assembly-part of the promise of dominion status-but after the war is over. Obviously, the enlargement of the viceroy's councils will satisfy merely that handful of native interests who would profit by India's participation in the war. The average man looks askance at British pledges: witness the violation of the Nine Power Treaty of 1922 last month when Churchill closed the Burma road to supplies which are crucial for China's integrity and independence.

The British offer is so meager as to be almost contemptuous. Nevertheless, it can be interpreted as a sign of worry in London. After all, in the last war, Britain got a million and a third men from India plus over a billion dollars in gifts and loans; today, all this could be used to imperial advantage as Germany prepares to strike and Italy moves to sever the empire's jugular vein at the gulf of Aden. On the other hand, these proposals also reflect the rising temper within India itself, the increasing popular pressure for more vigorous measures to achieve independence. The most important Indian leaders greeted the new proposals with reserve. No leader who cherishes his position among the masses could possibly accept them.

USA-USSR

R EADERS who have been following NEW MASSES' discussion on "Defending America" will be impressed with the fact that while many people disagree with us emphatically on many matters, the idea of Soviet-American collaboration is generally endorsed. For example, Lewis Gannett, the literary critic of the New York Herald Tribune, differed violently with NEW MASSES on most things but did "believe that Russia and America have common interests in foreign policy and should explore channels of cooperation."

People who have thought seriously about the debacle of French democracy will admit that fascism wedged the threshold of France with the nullification of the Franco-Soviet mutual assistance pact-the betraval of Spain and Czechoslovakia. People who view soberly Britain's impasse will recognize that it is the historic tory antagonism to the USSR which has brought the British people to the point where every power on earth mistrusts Britain's rulers. The American people may be placed in an analogous position: big business support to Japan and the President's commitments to Downing Street may shortly result in the extension of Japanese power in the Pacific and Germany's power in the Atlantic. As we see it, neither appeasement of the fascist alliance nor war with it will solve America's problem. There is a third course, a course which the USSR itself has followed: neither appeasing nor fighting the fascist axis. This is a course of absolute neutrality. It is a course which challenges the power of monopoly capital in Washington. It is a course which socialism in America would guarantee; but short of socialism, it is a course which a true people's government would stand the chance of enforcing.

Even short of a people's government, there is some slight sign that certain circles in Washington have been tacking to new winds. Last week's renewal of the Soviet-American trade treaty was, of course, only an elementary and wholly normal continuation of Soviet-American relations. The fact that Washington refrains from interfering with oil shipments to Vladivostok may also be considered a token of sobriety. Some reports last week, perhaps exaggerated, said that discussions between Sumner Welles and the Soviet ambassador indicated a drawing together of American and Soviet policy toward Far Eastern problems. Experience shows that the USSR can be expected to reciprocate friendly overtures, only if they are genuinely motivated by respect for mutual interest. The burden of proof still rests with Washington.

Suez Grapple

BRITISH SOMALILAND is a strip of soil facing east along the Gulf of Aden (where the Indian Ocean meets the Red Sea). North of it lies French Somaliland, from whose major city, Jibuti, Italian troops have thrust southward. Surrounding it lies the Ethiopian empire which only five years ago the British tories and Pierre Laval handed over to Mussolini. Now all the feathered friends have come to roost: Italian troops are breaking through the 120-degree heat and the deserts where British outposts hold the oases. They stand an excellent chance of taking

Somaliland's chief city, Berbera. Simultaneously, the Italians are moving down into British Kenva, farther south along the east African shore, while in the north they have announced an offensive against Egypt.

Mussolini evidently intends to force Suez, first by severing communications with India at the gulf of Aden, second by threatening British naval bases at Alexandria and Haifa. Related objectives are: the subjugation of Egypt's rich cotton fields, the seizure of Britain's Near Eastern oil supplies at Mosul, the complete control of the route to India. Problems of terrain are enormous; so long as British naval bases are undamaged, all supplies must come overland from Libya or by airplane; moreover, Egypt will certainly give battle, relying on the extensive British forces in her capital. While it is far too early to estimate the outcome for either side, at least two factors influence Italian chances: first, the attitude of the Arab world and especially the state of Yemen which borders on Aden in the Arabian peninsula; second, the attitude of Turkey, which has a pact of friendship with Egypt, and is traditionally opposed to Italian encroachments in the eastern Mediterranean

Buzzard over Europe

HE buzzard of Palo Alto is soaring L over the scene again. When that Great Humanitarian begins to bumble about "famine" the reader may well be wary. He got front page consideration in the press last week, repeating the warnings of hunger uttered some days ago by John Cudahy, recalled ambassador to Belgium (Mr. Cudahy, of Beef and Hogs). "Somebody," Mr. Hoover said, according to the New York Herald Tribune, "must raise a voice for food supply during the coming winter to the 27,000,000 innocent civilians, mostly women and children, in Norway, Holland, Belgium, and Poland. Possibly, France also will be in difficulties." Of course hunger menaces the people of Europe. And they should be fed. But Mr. Hoover is not concerned with their hunger, whereas Mr. Cudahy really may be. (After all, what are you going to do with that beef stacked sky-high and without markets?) Mr. Hoover has motives somewhat different from the ambassador's; the experiences of 1918 showed that. The Sage of Palo Alto proved to be one of the finest organizers of counter-revolution anywhere. The key to Mr. Hoover's solicitude can always be found by reading the word 'revolution" for the word "famine.'

As Palme Dutt said in his brilliant article last week, "The fear of revolution begins



Presidential Campaign





NM August 20, 1940

to become the overmastering fear of the bourgeoisie." There's the rub.

The fear is growing that Hitler will not be able to handle the "social situation" resulting from the hunger following in the wake of the panzerdivisionen. But at the same time "food is war," the Herald Tribune thundered editorially in commenting on Mr. Hoover's proposals. And the British warlords are far from satisfied with the terms offered them by the Third Reich. They are not at all eager to forego their greatest weapon, the economic blockade of Germany, and the countries that have fallen in its path.

As Mr. Edwin L. James, of the New York Times sighed, "It is a tough problem . . . a sad problem . . . a real problem. . . ." But the problem he talked about was not the problem of millions starving. It was this, in effect: "If you feed them, you may stop revolution but you may help Hitler. If you don't, then revolution may come and you won't be able to help Hitler." There is a solution, but the masses won't consult Messrs. Hoover, Cudahy, and James when they come to it.

Memo to Mr. Cowley

THE "liberal program" today seems to be The "liberal program tool, to try to win control of an organization; if successful, to throw out the Communists; if unsuccessful, to stage group resignations, issue public statements claiming or insinuating that the organization is under Communist control or following the Communist line, that its work has been hampered by factional dissension and that the organization is no longer what it set out to be.

The latter course has been taken by a continually outvoted group in the League of American Writers. Malcolm Cowley becomes the spokesman for this group in his New Republic review last week of the book Fighting Words, edited by Donald Ogden Stewart. After praising the book as an effective summing up of the Third American Writers Congress which he considers the greatest achievement of the League, Mr. Cowley accuses the League of reverting "to purely political discussion" which has cost it "a whole section of its membership."

Mr. Cowley might have added that the reversion "to purely political discussion" came from his group, and the reader of his review may note that his statement is a sample since it is mainly a statement of his political differences with the majority. Mr. Cowley does not say that the compromise anti-war statement issued by the League was signed by over 350 writers as against under thirty opposed; that a counter-statement proposed by his group was defeated in the executive board; that a test meeting of the New York chapter with about 65 members present was unanimously anti-war except for one member who declared himself neutral. Finally, Mr. Cowley does not mention that his group has developed such tenderness toward the war advocates and such callousness toward literature that it had sought to block a resolution condemning MacLeish's invitation to book burners, his speech attacking great anti-war books as "factors for spiritual demoralization.'

Mr. Cowley captions his review "In Memoriam." It is a more appropriate title than he thinks. His review is a memorial to those liberals who are succumbing to the bullying, hysteria, or opportunism that characterize these days of the reactionary offensive.

The Case of Oscar Wheeler

WHEN the Communist Party of West Virginia filed nine thousand signatures on nominating petitions, Martin Dies and the state's judicial machine got busy. Soon an indictment was found against Oscar O. Wheeler, the Communist Party's candidate for governor. He was arrested, held in jail on high bail, and refused a habeas corpus writ. Finally, Wheeler was sentenced by Judge Harlem M. Kilgore, himself a candidate for senator on the Democratic ticket, to a prison term of six to fifteen years. Conviction was obtained on an obviously concocted charge of misrepresenting the nominating petition. Evidence was given by witnesses who were threatened with jail themselves if they did not testify for the state.

Similar prosecutions are pending in West Virginia and other states where the Communist Party has filed more than the legal number of signatures necessary to a nomination. Earl Browder, candidate for President, issued a statement last week in which he declared that these persecutions originate in circles close to the White House. These circles fear that the Democratic ticket, lacking support, will be defeated in several states. The drive to keep the Communist Party off the ballot is due to that party's determination to run its own ticket and to support neither Roosevelt nor Willkie. "In any case," said Browder, "the violation of electoral rights of Communists, and such highhanded outrages as that against Oscar O. Wheeler in West Virginia, if allowed to go without effective challenge, marks the beginning of the end of free elections in the United States." An appeal has been filed on Wheeler's behalf and the case will be carried, if necessary, to the Supreme Court.

Defense for Profits

S OME weeks back a few voices timidly suggested that if American men were to be drafted, conscription of American wealth would only be fair. So President Roosevelt cautiously mentioned an excess profits tax. An "excess profits bill" is now before Congress, but it has become something else again. In June, Congress authorized the War Department to contract for four thousand planes. Last week Secretary of War Stimson said, "We have been able to sign contracts for the construction of but thirty-three . . ." The reason for this is blackmail on the part of industrialists in aviation and navy shipbuilding. As the price of signing contracts they demand tax concessions, particularly removal of the profit ceiling from government awards, and permission to deduct costs of plant construction during a five-year period of amortization. These concessions are now embodied in the "excess profits" measure-which will raise no more than \$190,000,000, to meet a defense bill of nearly \$15,000,000,000.

Aviation shows high profit increases over 1939-from 20 to 125 percent. Yet the RFC is planning to lend \$200,000,000 for more airplane factories, while billions of private funds are still withheld. Big corporations, such as du Pont, General Electric, and General Motors, are associated in international cartels with German business, which is holding up the use of patents necessary to American defense. Thurman Arnold is making gestures of investigating this situation while with the other hand he is canceling anti-trust investigations of oil and rubber. Greater monopolies, sky-high profits are the Washington rule for wealth.

Meanwhile Washington regards with disapproval any defense of labor's rights. Secretary of Labor Perkins dropped a hint that workers in the defense industries might be prevented from striking. And lo, a few days later, Dr. Gallup providentially discovered that public opinion harmonized with Miss Perkins' attitude. Mr. Roosevelt was busy last week urging state governments to copy the FBI's industrial espionage policy. He found time to suggest that leaders of veterans' organizations, who have created vigilante gangs for use in many labor-disputes, might be asked soon to form a home defense corps. Mr. Stimson also decreed the end of the forty hour week in government arsenals.

Labor, however, is alert to any infringement of its rights. It stands united against the draft. It has compelled the government to pay arsenal workers time and a half for overtime. Boeing aircraft workers forced their profitswollen wage-cutting company to accept arbitration of the union's wage and hour demands. Bendix airplane carburetor workers are this week approving a contract won by their own efforts.

In the political field, Labor's Non-Partisan League and the CIO are actively combating the administration's concessions to capital, and attacks on labor. The resistance to a war for profits and against democracy is growing.

Roundup

"THRILLER" touch in Red-baiting was A "THRILLER touch in a straight provided by a Grand Jury investigation of "Communist activities" in Los Angeles with the charge that Britt Webster, militant member of the Longshoremen's Union, was responsible for the death of an anti-union man five years ago. The alleged murder was investigated at that time and no evidence found against Webster. District Attorney Fitts, directing the investigation, made headlines with the announcement that he will summon movie notables, including Herbert Biberman, director, Gale Sondergaard, and Lionel Stander, for questioning on "Communist connections." . . . Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau has a plan for killing two birds for

US imperialism with one stone: the administration having "frozen" in this country assets of nations invaded by Hitler (thereby keeping them from Germany), Morgenthau now proposes to use those assets (about \$2,000,000,-000) to pay World War debts to us. . . Anniversaries: Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, great fighter in US labor struggles, on August 7 rounded a half-century of life; August 9 marked fourth anniversary of death of Lincoln Steffens. . . . The mass picket lines of Local 65, CIO United Wholesale & Warehouse Workers, parading before a struck New York firm, held steady despite blackjacking police attack and wholesale arrests of July 18. The first group of twenty-eight pickets arrested were given jail sentences of ten and five days. The Union signed ten new contracts during the past week. . . . Philatelists and green ink manufacturers suffered a blow when "Dear Jim" resigned postmaster-generalship and chairmanship of Democratic National Committee to become defender of Coca-Cola in South America. Tammanyites, particularly Bronx section, were elated by the appointment of their boy, J. Edward Flynn, to the Democratic chairmanship. . . . Otto Abetz, Nazi agent expelled from France on eve of present war, may soon be able to resume his cordial relations with the "two hundred families" without the embarrassment of secrecy: Herr Abetz is expected to return to Paris as ambassador from Germany. . . . Henchmen of George Scalise, deposed president of Building Service Employees who is now on trial on an extortion charge, used the war scare and Redhunt to oust twenty-one progressive members of Bronx Local 32E as "Communists." A detective for the Bureau of Immigration attended the expulsion meeting, recorded names and addresses of those asking questions or speaking about the expulsion. . . . David Lasser, whose pro-Rooseveltism led to his resignation as head of the Workers Alliance, made his writing debut with a series of articles in the New York Post "exposing Communist control" of the Alliance and announcing plans for a new unemployed organization composed of Lasser and a handful of other generals. Frank Ingram, national secretary of the Workers Alliance, warned the Post that it will be held legally responsible for false statements by Lasser. . . . The progressives in the American Labor Party announced their slate for the September primaries; included are: Rep. Vito Marcantonio, for reelection; Shaemas O'Sheel for congressman from the 18th Manhattan District, against incumbent Kennedy and Christian Mobilizer candidate Joe McWilliams; Morris Watson, to oppose Rep. Bruce Barton; Alfred K. Stern, vice chairman of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, for congressman from 21st District. Old guard ALP leaders Rose, Dubinsky, et al. refuse to answer the progressive leaders' query regarding their stand on conscription. ... The New York Herald Tribune prints a three-line item: "A Negro in Robeson County, N. C., offered himself for sale for \$325 in a newspaper advertisement."

Defeat the Draft!

THE debate on conscription now taking place in Congress is one of the most crucial in the history of our country. Not the fate of one bill is being decided, but in large measure the fate of American democracy. Millions are beginning to realize this; their voices must be heard in Congress, their vote cast.

Three recent collateral developments serve to point up the danger. On August 5 President Roosevelt sent a letter to a conference of governors and law enforcement officials of forty-two states urging the passage by Congress and state legislatures of sedition acts and laws against so-called subversive activities. The following day the President announced at his press conference that he was considering plans to mobilize World War veterans as home defense corps should the National Guard be called into active service—an augury of legalized vigilantism. On August 8 the Senate passed a bill to permit President Roosevelt to mobilize the 360,000 members of the National Guard and Army Reserve for a year of intensive training and to send them outside the United States for service in any part of the western hemisphere.

These three steps are part of a growing pattern of which conscription forms the dominant motif. The drive for conscription was organized in blitzkrieg style. Leading the *panzerdivisionen* were his majesty's New York *Times* and the rich men's club known as the Citizens Military Training Camp Association. They did not disdain to use the methods of ballyhoo, bluff, suppression, and chicanery in order to stun the American public and thus railroad through the conscription bill before the opposition could awake to the danger. In fact, a deliberate effort was made to create the impression that the Burke-Wadsworth bill was either already enacted or on the verge of being passed. Headlines such as "Army Command Poised to Call Giant Lottery—With Compulsory Service Held Sure, Marshall Has All in Readiness to Register 42,000,000 Americans" (New York *Times*, July 28) were used to gull the public. As a result, the US Army Information Service in New York reported that it had been receiving inquiries from men who thought the bill had been passed and wanted to know where they were supposed to register.

Who are the people behind this sinister campaign? On May 22 a group of business men met at the Harvard Club to make plans for launching the conscription drive. Present were Henry L. Stimson and Robert P. Patterson, who shortly after became secretary and assistant secretary of war, respectively. Among the others were:

Grenville Clark of the Wall Street law firm of Root, Clark, Buckner & Ballantine, who was cited by a congressional committee in 1937 for evading \$90,000 in taxes; Maj. Gen. John F. O'Ryan, Japanese agent, who recently told a Shanghai newspaper that China was to blame for the Far Eastern war, and who has advocated America's entrance into the European war; Col. Julius Ochs Adler, general manager and part owner of the New York Times; Kenneth P. Budd, director of the North British and Mercantile Insurance Co. (London) and executive vice-president of William Iselin & Co., a subsidiary of the Commercial Investment Trust Corp., which is connected with the Canadian Acceptance Corp., Ltd.; Lewis W. Douglas, tory Democrat, former director of the budget, now president of the Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Duncan G. Harris, president of Brown, Wheelock, Harris, Stevens, Inc., director of the Continental Insurance Co. and of various other insurance and real estate companies; Elihu Root Jr. of the law firm of Root, Clark, Buckner & Ballantine, director of the Fiduciary Trust Co., Mutual Life Insurance Co., and American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Archibald G. Thacher, director of American and Foreign Insurance Co., controlled by British and Foreign Marine Insurance Co., Ltd., Liverpool, director of five other firms controlled by British insurance companies; Francis M. Weld, director of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, director of the Canadian-owned International Agricultural Corp., which has 1,600,000 marks invested in a German potash company; Brig. Gen. Benedict Crowell, assistant secretary of war and director of munitions under Wilson, now president of the Central National Bank, Cleveland.

So great has popular opposition grown that the conscriptioneers have been compelled to shrink a bit their design for American fascism, limiting its application to men between twenty-one and thirty-one. The danger now is that the administration and its Republican accomplices may try to put through some phony "compromise" such as the Maloney amendment. This provides that voluntary enlistment be tried until Jan. 1, 1941, but if not enough men have responded by that time, compulsory service would go into effect. This is an obvious device to demobilize the opposition and keep conscription from being an issue in the election campaign. Let no one be taken in by these stratagems. The labor movement stands united against conscription —John L. Lewis, William Green, and the presidents of the five non-AFL railroad brotherhoods have spoken. Hundreds of other organizations have taken a similar stand. It is up to the people to let Congress know that every man who votes for conscription will be turned out of office.

NM	Augus	t 20, 19	40												17
R	E	V	Ι	E	W	A	N	D	С	0	М	М	E	N	T

The Withering of New England

Van Wyck Brooks' new book continues his study of the rise and decline of the Yankee golden age. A review by Samuel Sillen.

NEW ENGLAND: INDIAN SUMMER, by Van Wyck Brooks. Dutton. \$3.75.

'N HIS sequel to The Flowering of New England, Van Wyck Brooks portrays the autumnal spirit of Yankee letters during the decades following the Civil War. Both volumes are keyed to the seasonal metaphor. The spring days of the ante-bellum period, so colorfully revived in the earlier book, witnessed the great creative effort of Emerson, Thoreau, and Hawthorne, of Whittier, Lowell, and Holmes. The literature of the golden age, efflorescent, abundant, confident, was rooted in the traditions of the American Revolution. It was nourished by high moral and intellectual purposes, by a passion for social justice which found its finest expression in the Abolitionist movement, by a youthful faith in the unlimited promise of American life. In religion, Unitarianism had displaced the orthodox creed; in philosophy Transcendentalism had released fresh and rebellious energies; in social reform Fourierism, Women's Rights, and Abolitionism had been signs of the times. But the younger generation of 1870 found that this vigorous culture had already broken down; there was no new ideal around which they could rally their talents. Most of the older writers, with such outstanding exceptions as Wendell Phillips and Samuel Gridley Howe, lived in a tranquil afterglow, incapable of directing their reforming zeal to problems generated by new conditions. By the end of the century a visitor like H. G. Wells could say with justice that an immense effect of finality brooded over Boston: "One feels in Boston, as one feels in no other part of the States, that the intellectual movement has ceased." Howells, who had come from Ohio to the American Athens in 1866, left Boston for New York after twenty years, thirsting for a more vigorous intellectual milieu. With Henry Adams. as Mr. Brooks notes, the New England mind had apparently come full circle. "It had passed through its springtime, its summer and Indian summer, and Edwin Arlington Robinson was not the only Yankee who saw

A dreary, cold, unwholesome day, Racked overhead, As if the world were turning the wrong way, And the sun dead.

The evidences of this sea change were abundant, and Mr. Brooks, with his characteristic genius for evoking the literary mood of a period, recalls them in a gently ironical vein. One may note, for one thing, the appalling gulf between William Ellery Channing and Mary Baker Eddy. Only a time

of declining vitality, as Mr. Brooks says, 'only a region at ebb tide could have given birth to the cult of Christian Science." Mrs. Eddy's hysterical denial of evil was as characteristic a distortion of Emerson's teachings as was Horatio Alger's vulgarization of the essay on self-reliance. If Henry Adams was more sophisticated, his interest in the Orient was no less an amusingly naive version of Emerson's and Thoreau's response to the thinkers of the East. One can hardly imagine Emerson sitting, like Adams, for half an hour under the shoot of Buddha's bo-tree. The vogue of antique collecting, the malady described by one of the women novelists as "grandfather on the brain," was equally a parody of the more genuine historical pursuits in the earlier period. Prescott, Motley, and Parkman, who had combined great history and great literature, were giving way to Edward Channing, correct but humdrum, and James Ford Rhodes, the business man who wrote history like a business man. The solid note of cultural independence which Emerson had struck in the thirties was being mocked in the thin appeals for a new colonialism by the later Lowell, Charles Eliot Norton, and Henry James. The flourishing homesteads of the earlier period were now being described by Sarah Orne Jewett, Mary E. Wilkins, and other realists as part of "a world of empty houses and abandoned farms, of shattered windows, relics, ghosts and silence." At Harvard, Charles Eliot was replacing classical studies with the more handy five-foot shelf. The Brahmins were bankers who left culture to the womenfolks.

What was behind this phenomenal change in the cultural weather? Mr. Brooks is less at ease in dealing with this question than he is in dealing with individual figures or with the literary tone of an epoch. Readers of The Flowering of New England will recall the amazing passage toward the end where the author referred briefly to Spengler's cycle theory in order to characterize the historical epoch with which he had dealt. The explanation was entirely unsatisfactory. However useful a season or a cycle may be as metaphor, it is evasive as analysis. The Spenglerian patterns are mental constructions, not reflections of reality. In the present volume Mr. Brooks cites the historical views of Croce in support of a notion concerning the time spirit. It is disappointing to find a critic like Van Wyck Brooks, who for years has been associated with socialist principles, relying on the nonscientific theories of Spengler and Croce while ignoring the tremendous work of Marx, Engels, and their followers in the field of historical materialism.

Yet the elements of a materialist explanation are clearly present in the facts described by Mr. Brooks. "The commercialization of life," he writes, "had thinned the emotional atmosphere." The rise of the factory system, the exploitation of immigrant labor, the evils of absentee ownership had their effect on New England culture:

More and more, as the factories spread, the owners abandoned the region, loving it less the less they labored for it, and ruled their slaves from Boston through the whips of agents. The whips were no less real because nobody saw them, and the lords in no way owned the Boston State House less because they ruled by legal methods.

The fundamental fact behind the seasonal change was the distinction between pre-monopoly and monopoly capitalism. Pre-monopoly capitalism, as Lenin once reminded Kautsky,

which reached its zenith in the seventies of the nineteenth century, was, by virtue of its fundamental *economic* traits (which were most typical in England and America) distinguished by its relative attachment to peace and freedom. Imperialism, i.e., monopoly capitalism, which finally matured only in the twentieth century, is, by virtue of its fundamental *economic* traits, distinguished by the least attachment to peace and freedom, and by the greatest and most universal development of militarism everywhere.

And what was true of peace and freedom was certainly true of culture, which goes hand in hand with them. The plain fact was that the class with which literature had traditionally been associated in New England had no use for culture any longer; no creative use, that is, for it could use it on occasion as ornament or as an instrument in the hands of a Harvard reactionary like Barrett Wendell or Irving Babbitt. The chief issue for literature, the question of its survival, was rapidly becoming that of identification with the producing, the truly creative masses.

It is because William Dean Howells sensed this issue and, before it was too late, sided with the proletariat, that he becomes the only positive major figure in Mr. Brooks' study. It is significant that, like Whitman, Clemens, Norris, Dreiser, and Sandburg, he was not a stem of Boston's oligarchical family tree. When the Chicago anarchists were convicted after Haymarket, he was aware that "the historical perspective is that this free republic has killed five men for their opinions." Following the downfall of the Brazilian empire, lamented by the press, he wrote to Mark Twain that the American republic had been supplanted by an aristocracy-loving oligarchy:



Why should our moneybags rejoice in the explosion of a windbag? They know at the bottom of the hole where their souls ought to be that if such an event finally means anything it means their ruin next; and so they don't rejoice; and as they mostly inspire the people's voice, the press, the voice is dumb.

And Howells understood the really important fact that the artist was "anomalous" in the social and business world: "Perhaps he will never be at home anywhere in the world as long as there are masses whom he ought to consort with, and classes whom he cannot consort with."

The two other major figures who emerge most distinctly from this volume are Henry Adams and Henry James. Adams despised the politics of the Gilded Age and he could not respect its business chicanery. But, as Mr. Brooks reminds us, Adams was not consumed by a passion to reform his world so much as he was with a burning desire to manipulate the controls. He wanted power, and he felt that as an Adams it was his due. Nobody could exercise it more intelligently than he. And as for disillusion with the Credit Mobilier and the robber barons, Adams was perhaps more worried about the effect of strikes on his investments. Mr. Brooks quotes from Adams' letters: "I am not so easy about the coal strike and labor troubles in Europe because they may bother me. I keep my eye fixed on the stock exchange." "After all, I do like luxury as a steady business. . . . As a man of sense I am a gold bug and support a gold bug government and a gold bug society." Actually, as a man of sense, Adams was perhaps aware that this was not the kind of philosophy which could enable him to lead an undivided and truly creative life as a citizen of his epoch.

The case of Henry James had been an-alyzed by Van Wyck Brooks in a previous book, and nothing materially new is added here to the thesis that the clue to James' work is his precarious existence as a novelist without a native land. Mr. Brooks takes issue with those who praise James' later novels at the expense of his earlier work. He was at his best when celebrating his nostalgia for Europe: "All his great novels had dealt with Americans at a time when he had understood them. . . ." The later novels were applauded by "cosmopolitan esthetes who saw themselves dimly reflected in James' people, functionless people, like themselves, without objective interests, who spun webs of thought about one another, who analyzed themselves, for want of other occupation, while they collected brica-brac, material and human." Recognizing James' magnificent artistry, Mr. Brooks deplores his shift of interest from character to predicaments. The "crooked corridors" and 'antechambers" in which he eluded his readers were smokescreens behind which he vanished, fleeing from the American self that he sought to lose in Europe. Again, as with Adams, the sense of a mutilated career, the sense of being thoroughly disenchanted with one order of things and yet utterly incapable

of becoming truly a part of another order.

Carrying his narrative down to the years before the first World War, Mr. Brooks describes the "Second March" of New England letters. In the questioning mind, "the austere integrity and tragic feeling," of Edwin Arlington Robinson, he sees the ground cleared for new growths. In the boldness of Amy Lowell, the lyric strain of Edna Millay, and the earthiness of Robert Frost, in the work of E. E. Cummings and Eugene O'Neill he notes the stirrings of a new birth in the New England spirit. But it is in these later portions of the book that one realizes most sharply the limitations of the method which Mr. Brooks uses and to which he refers quite frankly in his preface, where he says that any sectional treatment of our literary history is bound to be arbitrary. The truth is that a sectional study is bound to become almost intolerably arbitrary if carried too close to our own day. For the national forces which were beginning to put Boston in its place during the seventies were more and more inexorably obliterating regional lines. The lines of class interest and class identification were emerging plainly, until there was far more connection between a Vermont writer like Thomas Boyd and a California writer like Lincoln Steffens than there could ever be between Boyd and, say, Mary Ellen Chase.

New England: Indian Summer, like its popular predecessor (which has gone into fifty-two printings!), is a work incredibly rich in literary reference; it is a beautifully written book. Free from the pedantry and conservatism of so many of the neo-Barrett Wendells who have entrenched themselves in Chairs of American Literature in our universities, Van Wyck Brooks is weaving into a work of literary art the literary achievement of America. Yet one must regret his failure to contribute a new historical insight into our literature. The contemporary issues of American life have thrust into our vision problems of life and death, for culture, for humanity, and on our ability to comprehend the historical roots of these problems depends our fate, in no small part. Mr. Brooks is the critic on whom we might have counted most to carry on social criticism where Parrington left off. Remarkable and solid as his work is on one level, we cannot pretend that it presses on the frontiers of critical analysis in America.

SAMUEL SILLEN.

Modern Poetry

DIRECTIONS IN MODERN POETRY, by Elizabeth Drew, in collaboration with John L. Sweeney. W. W. Norton & Co. \$2.75.

O^{NE} cannot withhold respect for the per-ception and thorough thinking that form even those judgments of the authors with which one disagrees. It is a pleasure and a gain to read their book.

I think they undervalue Hart Crane and overvalue Laura Riding; I cannot understand their silence about a number of contemporary

American writers; for instance, I feel that Maxwell Bodenheim and Alfred Kreymborg, both for the quality of their work and their influence during an important period, better deserve the authors' attention than others to whom it is given. More seriously, they have left unexplored an important direction of modern poetry along which some of the strongest young talents on the left have gone -the ballad and song lyric.

The authors face the fact that the poet is in an abnormal situation. Disintegrating traditions and economic and social patterns have made unusable to the poet former thematic sources and closed off former areas of contact with the people: As a result, although poets have been neglected in other periods, never before has the neglect been so painfully thorough and the validity of poetry itself so sharply questioned. The authors face this situation and draw from it penetrating explanations of the special character of poetry in our time, its tensions and peculiarities. On the other hand, they have not, like some shallower critics, dismissed modern poetry as the gibberish of frustrated talents. Apart from special values it may have as historical and sociological evidence, there is notable achievement in modern poetry, and it is good that the authors make this emphatic.

Their analysis, however, is sometimes incomplete, and suffers from misunderstandings of Marxist thinking. For example, they speak of "the Marxist emphasis that the quality of man's manhood depends not upon himself but on his economic environment." This is an example of what the Soviet critics call "vulgar sociology." The Marxist emphasis is rather upon the fact that a man's manhood has the power creatively to change environment, including those elements in it, material culture and social institutions, which are his own contributions or mistakes.

Because the Marxist perspective is a social system freed of the race, class, and economic discords which rack and hold up our society today-briefly a more "congenial" systemthe authors say, "Poetry can spring as strongly from resistance as from acceptance, and the doctrine of the congenial period will not bear examination." And they point to the "great poets, Marlowe, Donne, Blake, Wordsworth, Baudelaire, Rimbaud, Hardy, Yeats." To assume a society where poets or any men will meet with no resistance is as much a fantasy as the frictionless plane on which all still things never move and all moving things never stop. But the discords in a social system may multiply frustrations and deformations, until this condition becomes destructive to poets as to all men. If we examine the author's examples we find that Marlowe was cut off at the height of his powers by what modern research suggests was a political assassination to end his "resistance"; that Donne secluded himself in his church post; that Blake went mad; that Wordsworth in his rural retreat wrote piffle; that Baudelaire was driven to psychopathy, and Rimbaud to artistic suicide; that Hardy could voice only resignation; and that Yeats emigrated to

ghostland. In every one of these we see destruction or sidetracking or deformation. Hardly an argument for what the authors call "resistance." Resistance is not in itself a condition for creativeness, but in an "uncongenial" society the social system may have to be "resisted" to make creation of any sincere kind possible.

And in not understanding this, in making the "resistance" of some of the leading poets appear to be involuntary, like a reaction to an irritant, we find the missing link in the authors' analysis. They scarcely mention the "poetry renaissance" which cannot be understood apart from the great progressive movements of 1912. Without the poetry renaissance American poetry might have atrophied into a hobby or a drawing room accomplishment. But poets reacted to the widespread progressivism of 1912 by a heightened consciousness of their role as poets. It was then that they developed "resistance." Some, for traceable reasons, conceived the poet's role to be an autonomy within society; others, like Vachel Lindsay and Edgar Lee Masters, sought close contact with people and with life, that they might make poetry a valid expression of life. Such, along with influences from abroad, were the elements of the poetry renaissance whose impulse is not altogether spent, and whose most visible hope of renewal is to be seen in the culturally ambitious labor movement.

There are other points where issue may be taken with Miss Drew and Mr. Sweeney. They ignore American folk poetry and new genres that are arising from its influences; they give little consideration to the effects of a journalism where the advertiser, not the reader, determines content and tone; they think of social themes in literature in terms of their limitations-and usually imaginary limitations-rather than in terms of their opportunities. I make no polite pretense that these things are unimportant. But, in spite of such lacks and misemphases, the book is so sensitively percipient that it remains a valuable book on modern poetry.

ISIDOR SCHNEIDER.

Epic in Steel

AS STEEL GOES, by Robert R. R. Brooks. Yale University Press. \$3.

• HE author of two excellent studies of I labor, When Labor Organizes and Unions of Their Own Choosing, now gives us the story of labor organization in American steel. Mr. Brooks traces the rise of that organization from the beginnings of the Sons of Vulcan in 1858. During the post-Civil War years the Associated Brotherhood of Iron and Steel Heaters, Rollers, and Roughers appeared and made strong headway. It received oblique encouragement from ironmasters who regarded the union as a handy device for crippling less able competitors in the struggle for markets. The author continues his chronicle through the Homestead debacle and its aftermath of



A DELIGHTFUL POST-LABOR DAY WEEK-END

NEW MASSES invites you to a luxurious mountain lodge in the lofty Rip Van Winkle country.

Limited Reservations

A FULL SCHEDULE of sports and social events

PLUS

A SPECIAL NEW MASSES WEEK-END PROGRAM

CHESTERS' ZUNBARG

Woodbourne, New York

September 6th-8th **TWO FULL DAYS**

Special transportation arrangements for those without cars at minimum rates.

Cost of Week-End Minus Transportation, \$10.00

RESERVE THIS WEEK-END NOW

Swimming, Tennis, Boating, Ping-pong, etc., at your leisure.

Fill out the blank below and return.

I wish to make reservations for people at \$10.00 per person for NEW MASSES week-end Sept. 6th to 8th.

REMITTANCE ENCLOSED \$... REMITTANCE TO BE SENT TO NEW MASSES NO

LATER THAN SEPT. 2nd $\overline{\checkmark}$ check

I WILL NEED TRANSPORTATION -

Name	
Address	

Telephone number..

Na



Please mention NEW MASSES when patronising advertisers

defeatism, bringing his story to date with a detailed account of the rise of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee under the CIO. Mr. Brooks adheres to the role of an impersonal narrator with a concern for cold facts. Available documents are combed for pertinent material. The importance of the principal actors is not overlooked and their first-person stories make up some of the most absorbing chapters of a book full of human drama.

The history of steel is a violent one—conspiracy and terror, murder and massacre, often with the full connivance of local authorities. The steel corporations have had at their disposal the most elaborate machinery of socialand economic repression in America. Such conditions have often evoked public protest from social-minded members of the middle class. But it remained for the workers in the industry to break through the employers' resistance with a bona fide labor movement. Mr. Brooks tells, in a chapter that reveals some little known data, of the revolt within the steel company unions—a revolt from which the SWOC drive got much of its initial impetus.

The author appraises the prospects of steel workers today and expresses his apprehension for the future. Organization throughout the industry is not yet complete. In some areas the old feudal regimes still dominate the scene unchallenged. The arrival of the hot-strip mill threatens tens of thousands of steel workers with loss of jobs in the near future. Only a union powerful enough to bargain with the huge corporations for shorter hours and improved wages can hope to avert the full consequences of this impending technological change. An even greater threat to the workers is war. Says Brooks:

The officers and many of the members of the SWOC are fully aware that if the United States becomes involved in war in Europe, much if nor all of the gains won by steel workers during the past four years will be sacrificed to military gods. They fully expect real wages to be slashed by the rising cost of living . . . and clearly see the threat to trade unionism involved in a period of superpatriotism. "M-Day," the first day of war, carries with it a danger to an independent labor movement, especially in steel, fully comparable with the danger involved in a totalitarian form of government.

As Steel Goes is a valuable book for everyone who feels a vital concern about the trends in American labor and the perspectives of its future.

ED FALKOWSKI.

US Foreign Policy

THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD AFFAIRS: 1939, by Whitney H. Shepardson and William O. Scroggs. Harper. \$3.

THIS is the latest of a series of annual volumes on American foreign policy published in cooperation with the Council on Foreign Relations. It is a summary of events, names, dates, figures—evidently a rewrite of

the New York Times Sunday news review. The year 1939 was so crucial a turning point in world affairs-the climax of the Versailles era in an open, armed struggle among the major powers for a redivision of the imperialist world-that serious people would demand analysis of information in any such volume. Instead we have surface information, but little analysis. How the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact came about is fully misrepresented; the authors have apparently failed to examine even the partial evidence of the French Yellow Book. Just why the war malingered for eight months is never made clear. And the furor of chagrin and rage over Finland last winter are explained on the painfully superficial basis that "the character of [Finland's] people . . . her faithfulness in maintaining payments on her debt . . . while all other nations were in default . . . had won the respect of the entire nation." In a postscript to the volume proper, the authors abandon themselves to an appeal for the earliest possible war with Germany, which expresses for them the entire content of the future of American policy. Meantime, they want Britain to man the guns for the United States until both guns and men have been prepared in this country, to the end that the American dream becomes the world's nightmare. Such is the substance and promise of historical science in the year 1940!

I. S.



Out of Hollywood

"The Boys from Syracuse," "The Man I Married." Other movies.

B^Y THREE screenwriters, from George Abbott, Rodgers and Hart, out of Shakespeare's *A Comedy of Errors, The Boys from Syracuse* comes to the screen. Hollywood and Hays have cleaned it up considerably, and if you see one reel you've seen it all. For the comedy that can be derived from historical anachronism is distinctly limited and was worked effectively and for all time many and many years ago, in the film version of John Erskine's *Private Life of Helen of Troy*.

The mixed-up story of the twin Antipholi of Ephesus and Syracuse and their twin slaves, Dromio, affords a chance for a little double-meaning innuendo: their respective wives, unaware of the other set of twins, naturally cannot tell them apart. You get the point. And the point is worked to a farethee-well. Add this to Grecian maidens suddenly moving out of terpsichore into swing, Periclean Good Humor salesmen, chariots with taximeters, Golden Age bars and grills, Ephesian radio announcers, Greeks bearing wisecracks that were ancient history when Solon was a shyster lawyer, and you have

NM August 20, 1940

the sum total of *The Boys from Syracuse*, both of whom were Allan Jones (a toothy tenor with a marcel wave), and Joe Penner, without a duck. Martha Raye as an Ephesian matron is occasionally funny, Charles Butterworth as the duke who cannot stand trumpeters will make you smile.

But Shakespeare, even though still an apprentice when he wrote the script, was funnier.

"THE MAN I MARRIED"

Hollywood has ditched a number of its scheduled anti-Nazi films, for one reason or another not too hard to guess at, but here is one that got through the blockade. The Man I Married (originally titled I Married a Nazi) stems from a serial in Liberty magazine; it is a fairly intelligent picture that shows what might have happened in a similar situation in life.

Joan Bennett (in a black wig) is married to the about-to-be-naturalized Francis Lederer. They return to his *Vaterland* for a three-month vacation with their child. Joan, who is a good individualistic American, cannot stand the suffocating atmosphere of the Third Reich, with its stage-managed mass meetings, its goose-stepping, heiling multitudes, its manifest brutality to Jews, Czechs, other minorities. Lederer, more German than American, is soon infected by the "reborn" life of Germany, ably assisted by an attractive young Nazi *Maedchen*, Anna Sten. He changes visibly, decides to remain in Germany, and the inevitable family breakup occurs.

In the resolution of this somewhat artificially contrived situation Miss Bennett also has the good luck to run into a male propagandist for Americanism. He is Lloyd Nolan, American correspondent in Berlin, and his idea of Americanism finds symbolic expression in innumerable references to hamburgers and coffee. So while Lederer rapidly becomes more German (in this context, more Nazi), Miss Bennett, under the charming cynicism of the newspaperman's attentions, becomes too American for words.

The husband demands his son, wants a divorce. But his anti-Nazi father acts as the god-from-the-machine. Meeting his son's refusal to allow the boy to return to America, he says that he will denounce his son to his newfound party as a half-Jew. Miss Bennett and her child are permitted to depart; Miss Sten, in horror, whispers "Du bist ein Jude1" and exits, and Mr. Lederer is left alone, head in hands, to contemplate his father's statement: "You will suffer much, my son; but you will learn from it what you would have done to others."

As usual in the Hollywood interpretation of history, the real significance and nature of fascism are scrupulously omitted. Hitler is a maniac with a power complex, who is indigenous to Germany and could not flourish in the clean, individualistic air of America. Surprisingly enough, an occasional reference to the forced labor, the suppression of civil liberties in Germany, the racial persecution, gets into the film. But the American audience will not learn from this story that fascism

FOR THE RIGHT TO VOTE

(Advertisement)

An Appeal to New Masses Readers

You may or may not agree with us on political issues, but we all cherish the right to choose our public officials and the right of political parties to a place on the ballot. We want to tell you in this limited space of an important chapter being written today in the life of America. (Finances do not permit the space required.) We are facing the 1940 election campaign with the right to vote as an issue, the right of a minority party to a place on the ballot. That right is being challenged today by the bourbon forces throughout the country. You know the pattern of reaction in the modern world. Remember 1933 when the Nazis came to power? In West Virginia, 9,000 American citizens signed the Communist Party nominating petitions placing its Presidential electors on the ballot. 141 of the signers were jailed. The American Legion printed and distributed a brochure with the names and addresses of the 9,000 signers. (You can guess the rest of the story.) In Pennsylvania, 60,000 signed Communist nominating petitions. 43 were arrested and placed under bail totaling \$350,000. Reactionary newspapers printed the names of these signers. Steel workers lost their jobs. (You can fill in the rest of the story.) In Kansas and Georgia, public officials have issued statements to the press, wherein they declared that they will break statutes which made mandatory the placing of the Communist Party on the ballot. . . . And this is only part of the chapter this space will permit us to write. We are fighting this terror with all the resources at our command. We are defending the rights of these petitioners. We are fighting for the right of a minority party to a place on the ballot. Will you help in checking these reactionary forces before it is too late? We are asking you for a contribution, no matter how small or big.

NATIONAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE COMMUNIST PARTY

35 East 12th Street

New York, N. Y.



is also flourishing here right now. It will learn, through the bitter lips of the newspaperman, that America must get ready to go to war and go soon, which is what our homegrown fascists want us to believe.

Francis Lederer, who turned in a good job in *Confessions of a Nazi Spy*, again dominates the screen. He is a convincing Nazi fanatic. Mr. Nolan's newspaperman is one of the few credible specimens of the breed to be exhibited on celluloid, and Irving Pichel's direction is nimble and swiftly paced. But you will not have missed very much if you miss *The Man I Married*.

"THE SEA HAWK"

Out of Sabatini by way of a couple of other guys (Howard Koch and Seton Miller) the Brothers Warner have invested \$1,500,000in *The Sea Hawk* (New York, Strand). The new version bears some resemblance to the original, but the original has been lost in the process. In this instance it doesn't make much difference, and there are sequences in the superfilm that the author should admire.

Here is England in the time of the Virgin Queen and her privateers, before the Spanish Armada made its attempt to blitzkrieg the tight little isle. Spain was the dominant colonial power at the time, and the good queen winked at the activities of her "sea hawks," who were nothing better than pirates operating in restraint of trade and contrary to early international "law." Regularly they attacked and looted the Spanish galleons, and if Warner Bros.' historiographers are correct, Francis Thorpe and his *Albatross* were among the most successful.

We find the boy, in the person of Mr. Errol Flynn, leaping nimbly about among the rigging, attacking Philip of Spain's ambassadorial ship and capturing the arriving plenipotentiary (Claude Rains) and his beautiful Hollywood niece (Brenda Marshall). Need we tell you that despite this ungentlemanly act, Brenda falls in love with Errol and vice versa? The Spanish ambassador is in cahoots with her Brittanic majesty's traitorous chancellor Wolfingham, and what follows is a tale of high and low adventure on a few of the seven seas and some of the New World's jungles, with Flynn captured by the Spanish and sentenced to the galley, escaping, freeing his fellow slaves, hijacking a Spanish ship, arriving in England, fighting sixteen duels simultaneously and being knighted by the queen for furnishing proof of Wolfingham's duplicity.

There are sequences in this film in which the skill of director Michael Curtiz successfully evokes the sixteenth century atmosphere; there are moments when you can forget that fifty thousand sailors, slaves, soldiers, mobs are hired by Central Casting; notably, the early battle between the ambassador's ship and the *Albatross*, which is as gripping as any costume piece that Hollywood has ever produced. You can do nothing but admire the superb technical facility of the medium and the intelligence with which it has been employed. During such moments the camera becomes more than an eye. But these moments are few enough in the



NEW MASSES Classified Ads 50c a line. Payable In Advance. Min. charge \$1.50 Approx. 7 words to a line. Deadline Fri. 4 p.m. CHILDREN BOARDED TEACHER'S beautiful up-state farm home. Tutoring. Guidance. New Masses, Box No. 1741. FURS PARISIAN FUR CRAFTSMAN with factory in Whole-sale district can give you 35% below retail rates on re-modeling and repairing of any fur garment. Storage vaults at Revillon Freres, minimum \$2.50. ARMAND ET SOEUR, 145 West 30 St. CHickering 4-1424. INSURANCE Whatever your needs — PAUL CROSBIE, established since 1908—FREQUENT SAVINGS, 135 William St., N. Y. Tel. BEekman 3-5262. PIANO TUNING **PIANO TUNING** regulating, repairing and voicing. Pianos appraised. Excellennt work. Ralph J. Appleton, 505 Fifth Avenue. Tel. MUrray Hill 2-2291. **REDUCING FOR WOMEN** Swedish Massage—Posture Correction—Tennis Instruc-tion. Solarium. Low summer rates. Complete trial \$2. Goodwin's Gym—Roof, 1457 B'way (42 St.). WI 7-8250 VACATION RESORTS. ETC. Maine Vacation—CANNONDALE—Rivers, woods, out-door sports, excellent meals. Reasonable. L. A. Cannon, North Newcastle, Me., or 79 Perry St., NYC. CH 3-4280. THE PINECREST: Watchung Mts., Martinsville, N. J. Beautiful location, BABBLING BROOK, Swimming, Ideal for Rest, Relaxation, Comfort, Diversions, Excel-lent Food. \$18 wk., \$3 day. Tel. Bound Brook 325-W-1. PRIMROSE FARM, New City, N. Y. Tel. 2156, Tennis — Swimming — Ping Pong — Boarding or Housekeeping. Reasonable. 29 miles from George Washington Bridge. RIP VAN WINKLE LAND: Romantic Vacations in the Switzerland of America. 250 acres, elevation 2,000 feet. Modern, cozy rooms. Picturesque surroundings; stimulating climate. Swimming, bicycles and sports. Ex-cellent food. \$16.00 weekly. ELMWOOD FARM, Rip Van Winkle Trail, Hunter, N. Y. RIVERSIDE INN, Seymour, Conn., on Lake HAU-SATONIC. Swimming, Boating, Tennis, Excellent Food. \$18 wk., \$3 day. R. R. Station, Derby. Tel. Derby 3935. FOR A DELIGHTFUL Vacation or weekend visit Martha Berlin's TANGLEWOOD, Woodstock, N. Y. Call Woodstock 1, 4, F 1, 3 or write. \$3.50 day, \$18 wk. VACATION BARGAIN for YOUNG MEN. Horseback, tennis, all water sports. \$18 per week for a limited time only. New Masses, Box 1739. VINEYARD LODGE, Ulster Park, New York. Modern Conveniences on 200-acre grape and fruit farm. All Sports. Kingston 3430. VOLUNTEERS FOR NEW MASSES WANTED NEW MASSES would be grateful for VOLUNTEER clerical HELP in circulation campaign. Apply Room 1204, 461 Fourth Avenue, N. Y. C. **GOINGS ON** ALFRED GOLDSTEIN, popular political analyst, re-views THE NEWS OF THE WEEK every SUNDAY EVENING at Workers School, 2nd floor, 35 East 12 Street. Admission 25c. **CAMP BEACON** BEACON. N. Y. **TELEPHONE: BEACON 731** -For the Coolest Pool in the **Mountains** -For Glorious Scenery—All Sports—Boating to Ping Pong— Up to the Minute Entertainment -For Thrilling Vacation Fare \$3.25 per Day

\$17 per Week

HOW TO GET TO CAMP BEACON:

Camp ears leave daily from 2700 Bronx Park East directly to camp. Trains from Grand Central Station to Beacon, N. Y .--- taxi to camp. City Office: 2800 Bronx Park East Telephone: OLinville 5-8639

two-and-a-half-hour film, and most of the time you cannot forget the handsome face of Mr. Flynn or the pretty Brenda Marshall. Both would seem more appropriately cast in a latestmodel sports roadster.

There should be a word or two of praise for a few performances-Claude Rains is a convincing Spaniard, Flora Robson (of Ladies in Retirement) offers a new slant on the manyfaceted character of Queen Elizabeth, and a host of minor players, shrewdly cast to type, occasionally bring you up short with an illusion of reality. On the whole the pageantry and movement of the film should provide a pleasant evening's entertainment. But this is history a la Warner, and they will not let you forget it for a moment.

"UNTAMED"

Sinclair Lewis' novel Mantrap was one of his less consequential efforts, and the second cinematic remake of it, under the title Untamed, is faithful to the spirit and the achievement of the original. (The film was made some years ago with Clara Bow.)

Filmed 100 percent in technicolor, the new version's chief claim to your attention is the technical near-perfection of the color medium. The Canadian north woods, in both summer and winter, provide a beautiful locale for director George Archainbaud's mobile camera, and Miss Patricia Morison's coloring is delightful. Snow and summer's greenery offer charming contrasts, and the plot is far less important than color and design.

Ray Milland is an alcoholic doctor who goes to the north woods to reclaim his health. There he meets and falls in love with the Seattle-born bride of his French-Canadian guide, Akim Tamiroff. (Mr. Tamiroff utilizes his permanent Russian accent, whether he is playing Russians, Chinese, or French Canadians.) The town gossips cluck and whisper; Miss Morison's blue-gray eyes flash prettily; Mr. Milland's fine suntan warms vour face. And the result is inevitable. Melodrama pulls the long arm of coincidence almost out of its socket, and you know that (1) Mr. Milland and Miss Morison will get together; (2) Akim Tamiroff, swell guy, will have to die; (3) the new city doctor will remain in the Canadian fur-trading town. All this, miraculously, comes to pass.

An excellent cast (exclusive of the stars) finds little to do, and you cannot help but wonder why such players as J. M. Kerrigan, Jane Darwell, and J. Farrell MacDonald seem so helpless and even less imposing than the stars. The story might have something to do with it.

FILM COMEDY IN AMERICA

The Museum of Modern Art is currently running a series of "Forty Years of American Film Comedy," daily at 4:00 p.m., Sundays at 2:00 and 4:00. Notable films include It Happened One Night, Duck Soup, The Freshman, early Mack Sennett slapsticks, many of Chaplin's greatest successes (1914-16). The series will run through September 29.

ALVAH BESSIE.





FFECTIVE September 16, 1940, the subscription rate to New Masses is being increased as follows:

Annual subscription —from \$4.50 to \$5 per year.

Semi-annual subscription — from \$2.50 to \$2.75 per year.

Our readers will appreciate that this increase is made necessary by the effects of the war on publishing conditions. Paper prices, for one thing, have shot up steeply. For ten months NEW MASSES has absorbed such operating expenses and still tried to keep within its budget for the year—a budget which our readers helped us sustain by their splendid response to our annual financial campaign last winter and spring. But we cannot do so any longer, without stretching to an impossible point the meager margins on which we work.

Get Under the Wire . . . Before September 16, 1940

To all those who are about to subscribe and to our readers whose subscriptions expire now or within the next few months, we are making the following extraordinary offer—good only until September 16, inclusive:

One year of NEW MASSES at the old rate-plus one of these books, absolutely free:	~
1. Born of the Storm, a Soviet novel by Nicholas Ostrovsky	\$4.50
2. The Professor, a novel of England by Rex Warner	\$4.50
3. Change the World, a collection of essays by Mike Gold	\$4.50
4. China Fights Back by Agnes Smedley	\$4.50
5. Changing Man, the Soviet Educational System by Beatrice King	\$4.50
6. You Might Like Socialism by Corliss Lamont	\$4.50
7. Post-War History of the British Working Class by G. Allen Hutt	\$4.50
Or else-one year of NEW MASSES at the old rate plus one of the following books at a slight charge:	extra
8. The Way Things Are, a collection of short stories, by Albert Maltz	\$5.00
9. Rulers of America, a study of finance capital, by Anna Rochester	\$5.00
10. A Philosophy for the Modern Man by Hyman Levy	\$5.00
11. Salute to Spring, the new volume of short stories by Meridel LeSueur	\$5.50
12. The Fat Years and the Lean, the new volume by Bruce Minton and John Stuart	\$5.50
13. The Moscow Folio, twenty-four prints in color suitable for framing	\$5.50

SELECT PREMIUM By Number