INDECISION IN THE FAR EAST by Woo Yeung-hoi

NEW MASSES



Letters from Lion Feuchtwanger, Dudley Nichols, and Upton Sinclair

DEAR FRIENDS

This is the way we figure it. Please tell us if we're wrong. We want to annihilate Hitlerism—every one of us who reads New Masses. Yes? How can we best pitch in to help the millions of brave men and women in the frontlines—those heroes on the firing lines from the Arctic to the Mediterranean, from the Orkney Islands to Landsend? These people are giving their lives in the greatest battle of all mankind—for all mankind —which means you, we, all of us. What can we, as New Masses readers and writers, do to help?

We, as editors of this magazine, want first of all to produce a publication which is a weapon—a weapon that slashes through all the confusion and hesitations engendered by the appeasers, the defeatists, the enemy agents. We need a publication that measures up to the greatest time in history.

Therefore, we need, immediately, word from those on the frontlines. That means Moscow, that means London. The writers are ready. Are we? Are you? To get their frontline reports, we must hear from them by cable, regularly, weekly.

Do you want to help us get out a great magazine one as big as today—to scores of thousands of Americans? Do you want to help us get out a publication that will help get the aid necessary to the Soviet Union and Britain? If so, then give us a hand immediately on our \$5,000 cable fund to hear from R. Palme Dutt and Claude Cockburn, from London, and from similar writers in Moscow. History moves faster than the fastest plane. So may we hear from you immediately?

The Editors.

WE HAVE on hand and hope to publish shortly an article by John Howard Lawson on technological developments in the theater.

"I had hoped for an R. Palme Dutt article," writes A. J., "and would have been most pleasantly surprised by the appearance of a Claude Cockburn dispatch. And what did I get in your last issue-both Dutt and Cockburn, nothing less. Those cables from London were wonderful firsthand reports of the impact of the Soviet-Nazi war on the situation in Britain, and my only regret is that they couldn't have been longer. I can well imagine, though, what cables cost and I think we were lucky to get that much. We'll be luckier still if we can get it every week or at least with fair regularity."

Who's Who

CLAUDE COCKBURN was editor of the internationally known Newsletter *The Week*. He was also Washington correspondent of the London *Times*. . . Ilya Ehrenbourg is a Soviet writer and correspondent. . . . Colonel T. is the pseudonym of a former army officer and writer on military subjects. . . Adam Lapin is NM's Washington correspondent. . . . Corliss Lamont is the author of several books, the latest of which is You Might Like Socialism.... Woo Yeung-hoi is the pseudonym of a Chinese writer living in this country. ... Lion Feuchtwanger is the author of several books, among them The Oppermans and Paris Gazette. He is at present in the United States at work on a new novel. ... Dudley Nichols is a well known Hollywood screen writer.

Flashbacks

BRITISH working men came to the aid of an American worker July 11, 1918, when the British Miners Federation cabled an appeal to President Wilson for a new trial for Tom Mooney. . . . On July 14, 1921, laborleading Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti were convicted on framed charges of killing a factory paymaster at South Braintree, Mass. . . . French revolutionists stormed that symbol of tyranny, the Bastille, on July 14, 1789. . . . An explosion Mellon-operated Sonman mine of Cambria County, Pa.-due to the company's failure to take safety precautions-killed sixty-three persons. The explosion took place July 15, 1940.

THIS WEEK

NEW MASSES, VOL. XL, NO. 3

July 15, 1941

How the War Is Going by Claude Cockburn and Ilya
Ehrenbourg 3
Why This Is Our War: II An editorial 5
Two Weeks of the Greatest Battle in History
by Colonel T 8
How Supplies Can Get There by Adam Lapin 10
Shoes, Shoes, Shoes by Ruth McKenney
Why We Must Aid the Soviet Union by Corliss Lamont 12
Indecision in the Far East by Woo Yeung-hoi 14
Gropper's Cartoon
He Must Be Freed An Editorial
Editorial Comment
REVIEW AND COMMENT
Mr. Shirer's Secret Diary by Samuel Sillen 22
Bucks County People by Barbara Giles
Mist and Mysticism by Charles Humboldt
wist and wrysteism by chantes mandolat to to to to a
SIGHTS AND SOUNDS
Soviet Frontiers by Joy Davidman
Behind the Barbed Wire by Alvah Bessie
Master of the Blues by Martin Mack
Artwork by Blashko, Chen I-wan, Frederick, Kravchenko,
Michaels.
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 WEBKLY MASSES CO., INC., at 461 Fourth Ave., New York City. Copyright 1941, WEBKLY 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 \$5.00 a year in U. S. and Colonies and Mexico. Six months \$2.75; three months \$1.50; Foreign \$6.00 a year; six months \$3.25; three months \$1.75. In Canada, \$5.50 a year, \$3.00 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 drawings must be accompanied by stamped, addressed envelopes. New MASSES does not pay for contributions.

NEW MASSES

VOLUME XL

JULY 15

NUMBER 3

HOW THE WAR IS GOING

Claude Cockburn, former editor of the "Week," and IIya Ehrenbourg, famous Soviet writer, cable from the frontlines. The Nazis meet a great army and London's Col. Blimps take a beating.

London (by cable).

1

DROBABLY the most important feature of this week's news is the fact that both publicly and behind the scenes there has accumulated some good evidence that at least preliminary steps are being taken toward making Anglo-Soviet cooperation a working reality. It is no secret in London's official circles, for instance, that the British mission .1 Moscow has been deeply impressed by the quiet efficiency and steady confidence displayed there. An especial point at the critical London end is that these reports from Moscow are having a really important effect on certain quarters here which would otherwise probably be displaying dangerous skepticism. In London, official circles are certainly unlikely to indulge in wishful thinking about the Red Army; particular attention is paid to the impression understood to have been given to the reports of General MacFarlane [military representative on the delegation to Moscow] who actually visited Soviet General Headquarters. It is known, moreover, that ---in contrast to certain earlier missions of unhappy memory-present British missions to Moscow have at once got down to serious vork and are understood to be holding daily conferences with officials of the same rank in the Soviet capital.

There are other developments on the home front of equally positive character. Their importance can, of course, only be understood when it is kept in mind just how strong and active is that minority of malefactors-sometimes of great wealth, sometimes of at least great influence-who are trying even now to 'put on the brake." It can be stated, however, that Churchill's government is taking steps against these persons of a character which has surprised even some of his own supporters. For instance, at a meeting a few days ago, which though private was by no means confidential, the Premier himself had some very sharp things to say on the subject of certain editorial writers and so-called military "experts" here who in pursuance of some military theories derived possibly from paper and possibly from the dodo, have seemed to rejoice in assisting Goebbels to spread "alarm and despondency" regarding the situation on Hitler's Eastern front.

I can confirm that the possibility of agreement between the Soviet government and certain emigre governments in London can now be regarded with optimism. As I reported last week, certain of these governments through their radio propaganda were apparently tending actually to produce disunity among the eastern European peoples enslaved by Hitler. Although some details of at present alleged agreements between the Soviet government and emigre governments are, I believe, far-fetched, it can be stated that considerable advance has been made by the governments toward agreement and it requires no particular emphasis to show what huge forces could be released in Europe for an outright struggle against Hitlerism on the basis of such an agreement.

While all these steps are heartily welcomed here, it is perfectly clear that there are important elements in London who are dissatisfied with the present speed and extent of British cooperation with the Soviet Union. It is notable, for instance, that the editor of the Sunday Express, Lord Beaverbrook's paper, is particularly outspoken in deploring that more ought to be done and done at once. The Sunday Pictorial Tabloid, which has a particularly large circulation in the army, covers its front page with exhortations and queries along the same lines. And these expressions in the press are the effect of a great deal more agitation going on behind scenes-some of it confirmed with very detailed and concrete plans for increasing aid to its potential maximum. All this must not be taken to mean that the battle against the enemies of the Premier's pledge to the Soviet Union has already been won hands down or anything like it. Certainly the Quislings are lying fairly low at the moment, but even now it is perfectly clear that the first instinct of certain British old school "tiesters" who have been asked or instructed to "do something about Russia" is to ring up a couple of senile White Emigres and beg them-knowing the language-to take charge of the particular hureau concerned.

Quite apart from such Blimps, there are, of course, other subtler and more powerful personalities at work in the same direction. In other words it would be stupid to ignore the fact that there is quite a fight on here —a fight which I believe the patriotic, pro-Soviet forces will win, but which will need all possible mobilization of these forces to insure the real carrying out of the Premier's pledge. It is notable that in some reports from Washington, published in the British press, there appears to be a sort of signaling going on between those reactionary elements in Washington who desire to see Germany the victor rather than an Anglo-American-Soviet United Front, and their counterparts here. Some of these reports from Washington are already the subject of rather sharply derisive comment among British military experts who are possibly in a position to know somewhat more about what is happening on the eastern front than military commentators in Manhattan.

It can be stated that the determination of organized British workers to support Churchill and Eden and their pledge to the Soviet Union is growing and is being expressed in an increasing number of messages and resolutions. Among the latest is a statement from the London District Secretary of the Amalgamated Engineering Union who has assured the People's Convention of the union's fullest support of the policy of unity with the Soviet Union. It must be realized that of all unions and sections of unions in the country, the London District of AEU is the leading key sector of the armament front. CLAUDE COCKBURN.

¥

Moscow (by cable).

ITLER stints no words in bragging about the invincibility of his army. Fascist Germany, which calls itself the Third Reich, has borrowed much from the Hohenzollern Reich. The idea of conquering Europe haunted Kaiser Wilhelm, and plans for blitzkrieg were drawn up by Wilhelm's generals long before Hitler came to power. The war of 1914-18 was Germany's first bid for world domination. At that time, too, Germany's victories were counted by the dozen: her troops were garrisoned in Lille and Nish, Ostend and Riga. But we all remember how that war ended-leaving belongings behind, the Germans retreated hastily from the Ukraine and the allied armies brought the German military command to its knees.

Germany's technical miracles, the much vaunted Big Berthas and Zeppelins, were of no avail. Today, in addition to liberal doses of schnapps, Hitler tries to intoxicate his troops with the myth that the German army is invincible. At first glance Hitler's victories may appear imposing indeed, for did he not defeat Norwegian fishermen and Greek vinegrowers? But on closer examination these



victories prove more in the nature of theatrical effects than a triumph of arms.

Can one seriously speak of resistance in the case of Norway or Holland, neither of which had an army? Or in the case of unprepared Yugoslavia, where Hitler's agents held key positions and had free rein? The new Yugoslav government had no time to act, no time even to mobilize for resistance.

IN FRANCE a German officer once asked me with a boastful grin: "Well, how did you like our march on Paris?"

I was at a loss for an answer. The seizure of Paris could hardly be described as a military campaign. The French fascists, the very men of Vichy who now cringe before Hitler, betrayed France and her army. Yet wherever French troops put up stiff resistance, the "invincible" German army was brought to a halt. The French high command went out of its way to undermine the country's defense. De Gaulle's Fourth Tank Division, for example, which repelled the Germans at Lens, was not transferred to Amiens where a decisive battle was in progress. General Corap betrayed the Ninth Army and opened the gates of the country to the Germans. General Dentz issued an order to shoot down everyone who advocated the defense of Paris. Nonetheless, fighting at Arras, the defense of Saumur, Tours, and of Lorraine fortifications showed that German troops pass all too easily from the intoxication of victory to dismay whenever they come face to face with serious resistance.

A striking picture of such a change of mood is provided by the much advertised "March on England." Hitler promised his soldiers that he would be in London by Aug. 15, 1940. His ceremonious entrance into that city has been repeatedly delayed, and has not taken place to this day. At first the Germans said, "It won't be a hard job to capture such a small island. London will never hold out against parachute troops. The English themselves will realize that we are invincible." This is the sort of talk I heard last summer; the old, old story of sour grapes.

Beside himself with fury, Hitler began to

bomb London and other English towns in an attempt to intimidate the population. But this too ended in a fiasco. Many Germans began to see that the invincibility of their army was only a myth. No doubt the German army is a strong, modern military machine, possessing many motorized and mechanized units, and precise organization of transport and communication services. But it is an army of a state based on deceit and nothing more. Its power lies in motors and in the myth of invincibility which Hitler dishes out. As soon as this army receives a telling blow, its soldiers will come to their senses, and their fighting efficiency will decrease immediately.

Like the gambler he is, Hitler has lost his head and is playing his last stake. On Sept. 19, 1939, Field Marshal Goering declared that Germany's victory was assured because, thanks to Hitler's wisdom, Germany was not forced to fight on two fronts. But today, thanks to "Hitler's wisdom," Germany is fighting on two fronts, in the east and in the west. Hitler's plan is clear—he expects to score victory in one leap, victory by blitzkrieg But descriptions of battles now going on show that the myth of an invincible fascist army will be buried on Soviet soil once and for all.

DESCRIBING the Red Army's stubborn resistance, the German radio adds, "Russian soldiers display inordinate fanaticism." These words reveal that the sobering process is setting in. Evidently, the Nazis counted on a walkover. "Fanaticism" is the name they give to the Soviet people's love for their country, to the high sense of duty of our workers and peasants, to the traditional valor and fortitude of the Russian soldier. We need only recall the fate of the Thirty-ninth German Tank Corps, commanded by General Rudolph Schmidt, one of Hitler's favorites. Schmidt won fame in Poland and Flanders, and his very name inspired Hitler's soldiers. He wa regarded as the invincible general. This thirtyninth Corps was destroyed by the Red Army. Its commander found his death in defeat and not in the glory of victory.

The German paper Lokalanzeiger tries to cheer up the German soldier by saying these are not the Napoleon times—now we have motors. Napoleon brought his army in horsecarts while Hitler's army travels in motorized units. But this is the road to the East. . . . Napoleon's men made the return trek on foot and many of them never got back. Have Hitler's legionnaires given any thought to this? We all know that motor transport plays a tremendous part in modern warfare. The Red Army too has motor transport.

But the outcome of this war will be decided by the people. Every Red Army man knows what he is fighting for, knows that this is a life and death battle. The invaders are intoxicated with the myth of their invincibility. Their sobering will be terrible. Every inch of Soviet land that is held, every smashed enemy tank, every enemy plane destroyed, and every Nazi killed brings nearer the hour of this sobering and the hour of our victory.

ILYA EHRENBOURG.



WHY THIS IS OUR WAR: II

Why everybody's destiny hangs on a defeat for Hitler. World politics are inextricably bound together. What Lindbergh and Hoover really mean. "Ersatz" independence. An editorial.

•HE first fact which must be grasped fully, if Americans are to act effectively in the coming weeks, is that we face a world crisis. If ever it were necessary to see the world as a whole-as a unit-now is the time. Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union transforms what was a war with reactionary aims on both sides into a world war, in which the people of Europe fight for everything that is progressive, everything that is modern, decent, humane. It is not a war in which Germans are fighting Russians; it is not just a war in which fascists are fighting Communists; it is not just a struggle between the two major powers of the Eurasian continent: to believe this is to miss the crucial fact that this has now become a war to etermine how all of us are going to live the rest of our lives, how the entire human race is going to live for generations after us. It is, therefore, a war which involves the future of the United States, of the American people. We live in a land discovered by Columbus. And Columbus sailed westward to prove the earth was round. We of all people should see world politics as they are: inextricably bound together with everybody's destiny hanging on a smashing defeat for Hitler.

A Hitler victory would establish the Nazi empire across the entire expanse of Eurasia; such a victory would automatically mean the betrayal and defeat of the British people; automatically the poorly industrialized milbions of China and India and Africa would e at the mercy of Hitler and his allies. Automatically, therefore, such an outcome would spell the moral, political, economic, and strategic isolation of our own country. We are not isolated from the rest of the world today. But on the morrow of a Hitler victory we certainly would be.

The simplest way to realize this truth is to consider what Charles Lindbergh told his audience at San Francisco last week. Lindbergh thinks hard, and he draws hard conclusions from his own position. He bluntly opposed support of the Soviet Union, and held forth the alternative, not just of a nonaggression pact, but an alliance with Hitler. "I would a hundred times rather see my country ally herself . . . even with Germany, with all her faults," he said. This is a clear and simple line, not just of cooperation with fascism, but of subservience to fascism. To offer Hitler such an alliance in advance is to admit that in a fascist world order, the United States would play a secondary, subsidiary, subservient role. Consider also Herbert Hoover's speech last week. He not only endorsed Lindbergh's advice in foreign policy, but he drew rigorous, inescapable conclusions in domestic affairs. Withdrawing from the world market, the United States must begin to think in terms of autarchy, of making itself "ninety-seven percent self-contained," he said. And with this goes Hoover's repeated emphasis on intensified scientific research to prepare for an "ersatz" economy, an "ersatz" independence.

Such an America could only be a fascist America, which means a fearful assault on the labor movement, on education, on the standards of the middle classes, on the democracy that is still left to us. It would be a super-militarized America, with a malignant growth of anti-Semitism, the flaming up of the lynch spirit against the Negro people, the persecution of everything that is advanced and progressive.

Of course, for the longtime friends of the Soviet Union, this may appear to be obvious. Those who have looked to the USSR since its inception as the outpost of a new civilization, those who have read the Dean of Canterbury's book, need not be convinced that on the existence of the Soviet Union hangs the future progress of all mankind. But the argument today must be made for those who are not partisans of socialism, for those millions of progressive folk who still fail to see the interconnection between their own security and the present war. Take, for example, the people who argued for aid to Britain these last fifteen months. We disagreed, and insisted that the security of our own country did not depend on Britain, so long as the Soviet Union remained out of the war, so long as the cooperation of two neutral powers, the USA and the USSR, gave a practical alternative to involvement in the war. But if it were true, as our opponents argued, that the defeat of Britain would open up Hitler's advance into the western hemisphere; if it



Alexey Kravchenko

were true that the collapse of the British Navy would make our own shores vulnerable, if it were true that the loss of Suez would open Asia and Africa to the Nazi armies, how much more true all this would be if Hitler succeeded in establishing himself across the top of the planet.

If it were true, as President Roosevelt argued on May 27, that American businessmen could not sell their goods in Latin America against an Anglo-German coalition, if it were true that the basis of America's security lay in the freedom of the seas, how much more true this would be if Hitler could operate from Murmansk into the North Atlantic, from the Soviet sea routes across the North Pole, from the Caspian Sea through the Persian Gulf into the Indian Ocean, from Vladivostok across the waters that wash the coast of Alaska. In short, if all those who made aid-to-Britain the cornerstone of their policy are to be consistent, the battle along the Soviet borders is their battle also.

ON THE OTHER HAND SOME NEW MASSES readers are worried by the fact that we now favor full-scale aid to Britain. They are suspicious of Churchill's intentions, and even when they observe that Anthony Eden, the British Foreign Secretary, rejects in advance Germany's offer of peace, they are nevertheless worried that such a peace offensive may be proceeding despite Eden's assurances. They are worried when General Wavell speaks of a forthcoming British invasion of the continent, fearing its reactionary possibilities against the interests of the peoples of western Europe. It would be heedless to dismiss such concern; in fact, R. Palme Dutt in his cable last week specifically warns against those "reactionary, pro-fascist, anti-Soviet forces" . . . who "seek in every way to limit collaboration with the Soviet Union, to leave the Soviet Union to fight alone . . . while they prepare the way, if a turn in the situation develops, for an agreement with Hitler on the basis of a common fight against the Soviet Union."

But what must be grasped fully is the transformation which is now proceeding in the nature of Britain's war. When Churchill hastily advanced his outstretched hand to the USSR, he was in effect yielding to the powerful pressure for friendship with the Soviet people which the People's Convention has championed. Irrespective of his calculations, such as they may be, it is obviously in the interests of the Soviet Union to go as far as possible to cooperate with Britain and the United States, as Stalin indicated in welcoming Churchill's "historic utterance."

Every blow that Britain strikes on the western front strengthens the fighting forces



Alexey Kravchenko

of the Soviet Union on the eastern front; if Hitler risked a war in the East in the hope that a "phony war" would develop in the West, it is obviously in the Soviet and the British interest to merge the war, to confront Hitler with a war on two fronts, exactly the kind of war which his generals hoped to avoid, exactly the kind of war which will most quickly undermine Hitler's base among the German people. But really the whole thing goes much deeper. The closer the cooperation between Britain and the Soviet Union today, the faster the defeat of Hitler-and with that defeat would come a crushing blow to those sections of British imperialism which were responsible for building Hitler up and giving him half of Europe. The closer the cooperation between Britain and the Soviet Union, the more difficult it becomes for reactionary groupings of American imperialism to determine the course of British policy. The closer the cooperation between the British and the Soviet peoples, the more difficult it will be for the Municheers to carry out a reactionary policy in western Europe.

)

The British people have now found a powerful ally on the continent. They now see an end to the terrible night bombardments of last fall; an alliance with the USSR offers for the first time since Munich the only real hope of defeating the menace of invasion. If the British people are rallying with such enthusiasm to their new ally, if, as Claude Cockburn reported in last week's NEW MASSES, the British trade unions wish to send delegations to Moscow and receive delegations from the Soviet workers, then powerful changes are taking place within Britain. The interest of the British people is therefore our interest. Those millions of Americans who followed the heroic defense of Britain with such admiration and enthusiasm must necessarily follow them in the transformed situation of today.

THE COOPERATION of Britain and the Soviet Union has an even greater impact among the peoples of Europe, the peoples who are now awaiting the day when the power of the Nazi armies is crushed. One has only to recall the demonstrations in the streets of Belgrade on March 27, when the Yugoslav regime which wished to cooperate with Hitler was overthrown. Let us remember that the masses of Belgrade carried banners in their demonstrations hailing both Britain and the Soviet Union. And there were cheers on their lips for three countries: Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States. Instinctively, therefore, the broad masses of Europe realize that their salvation will come only through the cooperation of these three nations. It was with deep insight into the true state of mind of all the peoples of Europe that the Soviet government took such a strong stand of friendship for Yugoslavia, even though the Cabinet that was formed on March 27 was composed of pro-British as well as pro-Soviet elements.

Approach the same question from still another point of view: in the last year or more a serious discussion has developed among many

honest and intelligent Americans on the nature of a permanent peace. A widespread debate, a real searching of minds developed on some way out of the recurrent disasters of wars and aggression. The great dilemma of all these schemes was that they totally ignored the role and influence of the Soviet Union in world affairs; they projected solutions for the crisis of Europe without recognizing that the Soviet state was really the largest in Europe holding forth powerful attractions for millions of peoples in the rest of the continent. By the cooperation of the British, Soviet, and American peoples that dilemma is resolved. For irrespective of what particular politicians may do, or try to do, it becomes clear that there cannot be a permanent and lasting peace after Hitler is defeated, without the cooperation of the British, Soviet, and American peoples. All of Europe knows that today. So must we.

And for those who have feared, as NEW MASSES feared, that a peace dictated by imperialist Britain could only be a reactionary peace, another Versailles, with men like Sir Robert Vansittart or Alfred Duff Cooper advocating another "Westphalia," that is, the splitting up of the German nation, it should now be clear that the influence of the Soviet Union will make impossible the realization of such reactionary aims. How obvious, therefore, that aid to Britain today means something quite different from what it meant three weeks ago! How obvious, therefore, that it is the obligation of all people-irrespective of past difference of opinion or future differences of opinion-to support the common struggle of the Soviet and British peoples.

HOW FAR shall America go? It seems to us that it would be fatal to separate aid to Britain from aid to the Soviet Union. That is the line of those forces in American political life who are still pursuing their anti-Soviet aims. That is the line of the New York Times, which fears that American imperialism may lose, to a certain extent, its control over British policy. But the common sense of the nation demands that the war be seen as one war, that aid be given to both fronts. It would only be playing into the hands of the appeasers, of Lindbergh and Hoover, to separate the question of aid to Britain from the question of aid to the Soviet Union. It would only be insulting the British people, who await with impatience the practical results of American friendship.

There are a dozen ways of getting our materials to the Soviet front: there are ports in the Soviet Arctic; there is a railroad which runs from the Persian Gulf to the Caspian Sea, a road which is only the distance from Buffalo to Detroit, and far out of reach of Nazi bombers. There are the Soviet Far Eastern ports of Vladivostok and Nicolaevsk, capable of accepting American supplies. If we are sending goods to China over the Burma Road, if our oil tankers are traveling to the Persian Gulf every day, if our ships are entering the Red Sea, and our supplies are reaching Syria, then obviously it is possible to get our supplies to the Soviet Union. Everything we send them now eases the problem of America's defense tomorrow. For it is obvious that once the Nazi armies are crushed, then the immediate purpose of our defense program, from the point of view of the American people, has been achieved. If Britain and the Soviet Union win, which they can and will with our help, then the menace of fascist aggression to this hemisphere will be reduced, and may even disappear.

Nor is it the task of American progressives to limit the character of our country's help in this war. That is what the pro-fascists, all the Quislings are trying to do. It is not our task to prescribe in advance the precise limits of American policy in this situation. It is our job to force our own government to implement the President's pledge of assistance to the USSR. No understandable confidence in the strength of the Red Army ought to check for one moment the persistent demand that the United States give the Soviet Union everything that it needs to deliver the hammer blows against fascism.

Þ

NEW MASSES has made mistakes in the past, and it does not conceal them from its readers. We were right in assessing the anti-Soviet character of the Hess mission; we were a thousand times right in demanding a change in American policy toward the Soviet Union; in our letter to the British People's Convention last January we saw clearly the great transformations that Anglo-Soviet cooperation would make possible. But our major mistake was our failure to realize that in the era of the existence of socialism the imperialist war could not take the long, drawn out course it took twenty-five years go. Although we discussed in our pages many times the growing dangers to the Soviet Union arising from Hitler's inability to win the war quickly we failed to realize in the weeks immediately preceding the attack how near it was. And finally, in our initial reactions, we did not sufficiently emphasize how profound a change was taking place in world affairs. We did not fully stress what Stalin observed in his fighting speech last week, that the Soviet struggle "will merge with the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for their democratic liberties.

But the major mistake that could be made in the coming weeks is to dally with intriguing formulae, with elaborate debates, to substitute words for actions, to avoid the living realities. Time is a luxury. The time is now for all men and women of good will to step into the front lines of the battle in our own country. The time is now to form a powerful front of all those who want to see fascism defeated against all those who wish to temporize, conciliate or cooperate with fascism. Everything that is good and wholesome in America demands an immediate crystallization of aid to the British and Soviet peoples. On their struggle depends the future of everything that is good and wholesome in America, everything worth living for. On their fight depends our future.





TWO WEEKS OF THE GREATEST BATTLE IN HISTORY

Colonel T. examines the fronts from Murmansk to the Black Sea. Stopping the panzerdivisionen. Soviet versus Nazi strategy. The battles behind the tanks.

The second week of the Soviet-German war has brought out a number of noteworthy developments—tactical, operative, strategic, and political.

On the Finnish front. The German and Finnish troops after launching a general offensive on Sunday, June 29, were seemingly not able to carry it through and were repulsed along the whole line. Next day they concentrated their efforts in three directions: on the eastern side of the Karelian Isthmus, in the Salla sector (Finland's "waist"), and in the direction of Murmansk. A couple of days later all attacks seem to have petered out, except on the extreme northern wing of the front where about two German divisions. probably those that crossed over from Norway by the grace of Sweden, continued to exert pressure in the direction of the Soviet bases on the two little peninsulas of Sredni and Rybachi (which cover the entrance to Peetsamo Fjord and were acquired by the USSR in 1940). Nothing has been heard of this operation since July 1. The Karelian "offensive" bogged down after the defeat of two Finnish battalions. However, more will doubtless be heard from this front should the Germans succeed in approaching Leningrad from either West or South.

On the Baltic front. After the great battle of Shavli during the first week of the war, where hundreds of German tanks were destroyed, the Soviet forces began their withdrawal to the line of the Northern Dvina. On July 3 the Germans forced a crossing at Jacobstadt and Dvinsk and next day reached the eastern border of Latvia. The Red Army High Command launched a powerful tank and air counter-attack at dawn of July 5 and repulsed the German *panzerdivisionen* from the town of Ostrov and from Poltsk on the Dvina below Vitebsk.

On the Central front. On the line Warsaw-Moscow, a five-day battle of gigantic proportions has been raging on the banks of the Beresina, between Borisov and Bobruisk, with German spearheads pushing toward Orsha and Lepel. In this sector the battle is assuming a most unusual character which the "military experts" do not seem quite to understand. Three distinct battles are being waged in depth along the main axis of the "Moscow drive." Assuming that the German front is on the line Lepel-Bobruisk, the Soviet troops are fighting the German motorized infantry support west of Minsk, somewhere on the line Lida-Baranovichi, while another 150 miles west the Soviet army group which is "surrounded" in the Grodno-Bialystok area is creating havoc in the enemy rear, about 300 miles back of the German spearhead. The Germans admit these troops have been counter-attacking and that Nazi reserves had to be thrown into the battle. Fighting thus is echeloned in depth along a 300-mile line, with three battles raging roughly 150 miles apart. Here is really a new concept of defense in depth, with the "depth" stretching into the attacker's rear. On the Ukrainian front. Nothing seems to



At press time Soviet communiques reported strong Red Army counter-offensives. The invaders were pushed back along the Finnish front from Viborg to Petsamo. Other counter-actions occurred along the lines from Ostrov to Borisov beyond Minsk. Southward the Nazis were reported at the Dniester River fronting the Ukraine. Evidently the Nazi drive is disrupted; in some places halted. Their casualties are enormous; guerrillas are taking their toll, particularly in the areas around Bialystok and Przemysl, where large Soviet forces were left behind for this work. be happening between Bobruisk and Novograd Volinsk, a distance of 200 miles, covered to the west by the Pripet Marshes. The drive of the Germans to the southwest has been floundering during a whole week in and around Tarnopol and Rovno, having advanced about eighty miles in two weeks. The sledgehammer attacks of the Soviet moto-mechanized divisions have been banging this spearhead out of shape, first turning it south, then north.

On the Western Galician front. The situation is far from clear. It seems that Soviet troops in the advanced "bastion" Przemysl-Sanok-Sambor-Turka might be destined to play (or are already playing) the part which the Bialystok group has been playing for the last two weeks. There is no indication whatsoever that they had been withdrawn. The last mention of this sector was during the first week of the war when the Soviet communique announced that Przemysl had been recaptured by the Red Army, although the Stanislavov-Tarnopol gap in the rear of this bastion seems 'o be slowly closing.

On the Bessarabian front. The Germans claim that they, followed by the Rumanians, crossed the Prut in several places. The claim that they have reached the Dniester may refer to the headwaters in the North in the vicinity of Lvov.

At sea. The Soviet Black Sea squadron strongly bombarded Constanta. Two German submarines were sunk in the Baltic and one in the Black Sea.

The Soviet base at Hangö in Finland is under attack, but does not seem in any danger at present. The Aland Islands were reported in Stockholm to be occupied by the Finns, but no operations against Dagoe and Oesel were mentioned.

In the air. The following is noteworthy: oth air forces are so busy with the actual aghting at the front that neither side has conducted any important long range offensive air operations, except for German bombing of Smolensk and other Soviet towns in the near proximity of the battle lines, and Soviet fliers' continuous bombing of Finnish objectives, and Ploesti, Constanta, and Sulina in Rumania.

The Germans now claim that they have destroyed 7,000 Soviet planes since the war started. They claimed 4,107 during the first week. This is about seventy-five percent more planes than the Germans credited to the Red Air Force before the war. Back in 1937, however, the Germans asserted the Red Air Force had from 15,000 to 17,000 planes. Something must be wrong somewhere!

The Soviet summary for the week has not been published at this writing. For the first week it gave the following figures: German planes destroyed—1,500, Soviet planes lost— 650; German tanks destroyed—2,500, Soviet tanks lost—900; German prisoners taken over 30,000, Red Army fighters captured or missing—about 15,000. On Saturday, July 5, the Soviet communique put the German losses for thirteen days at about 700,000 men. It was estimated in Moscow that the Soviet losses amounted to about half that figure.

Penny-a-Word Generals

OLONEL T's illuminating comments will be especially welcome to our readers in view of the distortions of most of the "experts" of the commercial newspapers. The "experting" of two gentlemen in the New York press, Fletcher Pratt of the pseudo-liberal Post and Hanson W. Baldwin of the Times, has already assumed the proportions of out-and-out Nazi propaganda. In the Post of June 27 Pratt announced that "it will take a miracle bigger than any seen since the Bible was written to save the Reds from utter defeat in a very short time." He assured his readers that "the Russians are on their way to a debacle not paralleled in history." As evidence he offered the "extremely accurate" Nazi communiques, whereas all contrary reports come from "Red sources," and "We know from the experiences of the Finnish war that these sources are utterly untrustworthy." No doubt Pratt's sources are as accurate as the tale published in 1940 by the Post that 100 Finns defeated 100,000 Russians.

In a somewhat soberer tone Baldwin of the *Times* has been singing close harmony with Pratt. After a slow start he let Ay on July 2 with a piece which bore the headline: "Soviet Debacle Is Seen." Basing himself entirely on Nazi reports, Baldwin wrote that one-seventh to onequarter of the total number of Soviet troops on the western borders "are slowly being annihilated" north of the Pripet marshes, while "scores of thousands" of others were being trapped in other sectors.

For several successive days Baldwin's "analysis" of the war continued to be largely a rehash of Nazi claims whose untrustworthiness is notorious. But on July 7 the Red Army, which on July 2 was "slowly being annihilated," was, Baldwin was constrained to admit, still unbroken. He therefore turned to ridiculing "somewhat over-optimistic interpretations from London," and "proving" that the German army had advanced more rapidly than in the Polish, French, or Balkan campaigns. But the New York Herald Tribune, which has no love for the Red Army, on the same day pointed out editorially that the military picture in the Soviet Union is in striking contrast to the debacle in Poland, Flanders, and France after fifteen days of fighting.

How explain the distortions of these "military experts"? Assuming that they are not fascist sympathizers-an assumption which may be contrary to fact-it is evident that they view the Soviet-Nazi war through a heavy fog of prejudice. These men are infatuated with the Nazi army while, on the other hand, they are filled with contempt for everything that concerns the land of socialism. And in addition, these "experts" are also getting their "line" somewhere. On June 26 a high War Department official was reported to have told newspapermen off-the-record that the Red Army was a pushover for the Nazis. According to In Fact, this official was none other than Major Gen. George C. Marshall. army chief of staff. Evidently not all the appeasers are ex-colonels in the reserves.

Strategy. On the German side the strategy of the breakthrough is not materializing as can be plainly seen from the accompanying map. The firm resistance of the Red Army and the excellent leadership of the High Command have kept the situation constantly under control. The shuttling of the operative reserves seems to be unimpeded because so far every German increase of pressure has been met by counter-pressure within a few hours. The consecutive communiques, issued at twelve-hour intervals, often reflect that.

Soviet strategy right from the start has been to fall back as slowly as possible to the historic defense line of the Dnieper and the Dvina in order to cover a mobilization not yet completed. The Germans, who were the aggressors, alone could know where and when the invasion would come. In withdrawing, the Red Army left large bodies of troops behind the enemy lines in order: (1) to fight back against motorized enemy infantry following the *panzer* spearhead; (2) to threaten enemy lines of supply, and (3) to provide nuclei and leaders for guerrilla warfare.

These bodies of troops are really:

But split into a thousand detachments is blazing a trail for the rest...

Probably most of these men will not be accounted for until the war is over. The Germans will list them as "prisoners," "deserters," and "turncoats."

All fronts. To sum up the operations of the second week of the war, it can be said that on the northern wing of the line, the attacking Germans have approximately reached the apron of the fortified line on the sector Ostrov-Bobruisk. On the Baltic sector and South of the Pripet marshes they are not even near it.

The Soviet troops have started a counterattack which may as yet prove to be of a wide but local character on the above mentioned sector near the fortified line.

Another noteworthy thing which developed during the second week of fighting is the strong guerrilla movement behind the German lines and especially in the Bialystok salient. It is spreading further west to German occupied Poland.

A glance at the map will show the German timetable has not been adhered to along the line Minsk-Smolensk, and that the timetable has been completely disrupted in the thrust toward Kiev.

The initial stunning blow did not knock out the Red Army. The several *panzer* thrusts failed to cut it up.

The Soviet Air Force, judging by the Germans' own communique, is very active. The Germans have not won the air supremacy of which they boasted.

The loss in men and materials on the German side are, no doubt, at least double those suffered by the Red Army. This in itself, with every day and every battle, brings German defeat nearer.

COLONEL T.

A legion that's never been listed, that carries no banner nor crest,

HOW SUPPLIES CAN GET THERE

Adam Lapin examines the arguments of the defeatists in Washington who say aid can't get to the USSR. Twenty-seven Soviet vessels are at hand. How planes can cross the Pacific.

Washington.

NLY a few of the calamity howlers and appeasers who oppose aid to the Soviet Union have dared to do so on strictly political or ideological grounds. Charles Lindbergh has, of course, openly advocated a Nazi victory to save the world from Communism. Senators Wheeler and Taft and the America First Committee have been only slightly less frank. But for the most part the anti-Soviet crowd has tried to camouflage its position in practical considerations.

The most frequently reiterated argument along these lines has been that the Soviet Union is already licked, and that it is too late for any effective American aid. This has not only become a favorite editorial cliche, but has been the position of a number of highly placed War Department officials. Another argument has been that all available production is needed for the defense of the United States and for Great Britain, that little can be spared for the Soviet Union and that, moreover, the difficulties in the way of shipping war supplies to the USSR are practically insurmountable.

Obviously there is nothing new in all these rationalizations. The appeasement crowd has trotted out the same arguments of defeatism and Nazi invincibility in the past. More recently the appeasers predicted that Great Britain was all washed up. They were wrong then, and they are wrong now. Fortunately there is a small group in official circles, which may be expected to grow in influence, that takes the position that Soviet strength and resistance has been greatly underestimated. Joseph Davies, former ambassador to the Soviet Union, spoke for this group when he predicted that the successes of the Red Army would "surprise" the world. It so happens that this group consists largely of officials who have made a study of Soviet affairs.

This much is certain. There is no genuine foundation in fact for the allegedly practical arguments of the appeasement crowd. There is much that this country can do to help the Red Army achieve its "surprise" in the least possible time and at the least cost.

SO FAR only a few preliminary obstacles which would block the shipment of the supplies requested by Soviet Ambassador Oumansky have been cleared out of the way. The Soviet Union will not be subjected to the new credit freezing regulations, and will be permitted to use the \$40,000,000 in credits it has in this country. The Neutrality Act will not be invoked in the Soviet-German war, and the Pacific ports of the Soviet Union will remain open to American ships.

The next stage—consideration of specific Soviet requests—has now been reached. Officials in the OPM and in other government agencies are going over the list submitted by Oumansky. There is still, however, a predilection on the part of some officials to stall.

It must be recalled that the new situation in world affairs followed a period of considerable coolness in the attitude of administration officials toward the Soviet Union. During the first three months of the current year exports to the USSR totaled \$20,000,000. This did not compare too unfavorably with the figure of \$82,092,000 for all of 1940. But during May and June of this year exports to the Soviet Union dropped off almost completely. There was practically no trade with the Soviet Union during these two months.

Official clearance was necessary before the Soviet Union could place orders with American firms. In most cases this was not forthcoming. Edward R. Stettinius, OPM's priorities chief, early in March blocked the placing of \$25,000,000 in Soviet machine tool orders in American plants. Even when orders were successfully placed and completed, export licenses were needed before the materials could be shipped. Substantial quantities of machine tools and other supplies for the Soviet Union were denied these licenses. In some cases orders were placed and licenses granted, but the Soviet Union found it impossible to charter American boats.

Most of these restrictions on Soviet trade were imposed in the name of blocking transshipments and leakages to Germany. Department of Commerce officials pointed out that increases in Soviet purchases here during 1940 and the early part of 1941 were designed primarily to offset the curtailment of supply from Great Britain. But many officials seemed only too eager to seize any pretext to penalize the Soviet Union. It took Nazi aggression to furnish them with conclusive proof that the USSR had not been supplying Hitler with American materials.

WHILE the exact list of supplies for which the Soviet Union has asked is, of course, a closely guarded diplomatic secret, it is possible from the record of past purchases to get a picture of some of the things which it needs and can obtain in this country. Machine tools are undoubtedly among the most important items needed by the Soviet Union. In 1940 machine tool purchases by Moscow from this country totaled more than \$23,000,000. Welldigging machinery for the development of oil fields has also been one of the major Soviet requests. Generally there is an apparent need for a diversity of heavy machinery.

Copper, brass, and steel sheets have also been purchased here by the Soviet Union during the past year in considerable quantity. Particularly important is molybdenum which is necessary to harden steel. The United States has a world monopoly on molybdenum, and has ample supplies for export. Soviet purchases of leather were substantial during the first quarter of 1941, and it is believed that American leather would be helpful to the Soviet Union in providing shoes and boots for the Red Army. There is little information on what the Soviet Union would like to obtain from Washington in the way of direct military supplies. It is obvious, however, that military planes would come in very handy. The USSR has made it plain that it will pay cash for supplies which it purchases.

 $\tilde{\chi}_{n}^{(2)}$

President Roosevelt indicated one important difficulty in the way of getting these supplies to the Soviet Union, at his first press conference following the Nazi invasion. He said that American factories are already working at capacity on domestic and British orders, and that it would take some time before Soviet orders could be accepted. Here, of course, is a matter of policy. It is to be hoped that administration officials begin to realize before too much time elapses that successful Soviet resistance is essential both to Great Britain and the United States. One obvious short cut would be for Great Britain to permit the Soviet Union to obtain some of the supplies which it has on order here under the lend-lease plans. It is understood that some such plan is under discussion.

Another difficulty, which has been stressed a good deal in the press, is that of transportation. The fact is, however, that Vladivostok is still open to American trade. There are now in the United States twelve Soviet ves sels which could be ready to leave as soon as supplies are available. In addition, it is understood that fifteen more Soviet vessels are now on their way to the West Coast. These vessels can carry a cargo of about 5,000 tons each. As far as planes are concerned there are at least two routes over which planes could be flown directly to the Soviet Union. The first and longest is over the Pacific from the West Coast via Hawaii and Manila. The second and shortest, but as yet comparatively untried, route is via Alaska to Komsomolsk in Siberia which is at the end of the Trans-Siberian Railroad and is only about 600-700 miles from Alaska.

Those experts in Washington who have actually studied Soviet trade are convinced that there are genuine possibilities to get effective aid to the Soviet Union in a relatively short time. Most of the so-called practical difficulties in the way of sending aid have been considerably overplayed. Secretary Knox's speech and General Marshall's report indicate that a more vigorous policy to aid Britain can now be expected. A parallel policy of effective aid to the Soviet Union is obviously in order. ADAM LAPIN.



SHOES! SHOES! SHOES!

Ast week the Nazi brownshirts clawed their way into a little section of the earth's surface called Ruthenia. Trained to frightfulness, Hitler's finest legions, the fairest flowers of the fascist military machine, appeared in the soft valleys. Their tanks spewed shells across the lovely wooded hills. Their dive bombers cast long shadows over the little villages.

The Soviet frontier guards, making the necessary strategic withdrawal, disputed every inch of Ruthenian soil with their very lives. Here, at the farthest outpost of the Soviet Union in Europe, Red Army men gave Hitler his first taste of catastrophe. The stormtrooper officers, natty in white gloves and swastikas embroidered on their faultlessly tailored uniform sleeves, came across the Soviet border that first dawn, urging their soldiers to sing a little louder, smack their lips a little more lustily. Jewish blood shall flow in the streets! Socialists shall scream under torture! Poles cry out in the dark.

But the fascists choked on their own pretty hymn of hate. Even the German communique had to admit "fresh reinforcements" were rushed into those quiet Ruthenian valleys. Ruthenia went down before fascist tanks and bayonets—but after four days' instead of four hours' fighting. Hitler can call Ruthenia his own, for the time being. He paid for it dearly.

Ruthenia! The maps rarely mark it out, and even in the finest atlas I have never seen the name "Kronenski." I suppose Nazis march down the dusty street now, batter on the doors of the thatched village houses. I wonder if Uncle Misha lived to see the brownshirts smash all his bright dreams. In a way, I think not. Uncle Misha may be hiding in the hills, teaching his sons how to fire a rifle, with a swastika caught between the gunsights. Or he may be dead, his ancient gnarled body emptied of blood, stretched out beside some fallen Red Army lad. One thing I know. Uncle Misha, if he lives, and beside Uncle Misha, every man and woman and child of Kronenski, all 117 of them, will battle the Nazi destroyers until the last breath sighs out of their throats.

I know this because I lived in Kronenski for a month. And nobody could ever forget Kronenski. Nobody.

I remember we took the night train from Vienna to Przemysl. And then a branch line, bumping endlessly across empty landscape. Finally Gerda's aunt met us with a smart carriage, the four horses complete with red plumes on their glossy black heads. We rode thirty miles across the lovely countryside, fording the little streams, riding up grassy hills, cutting through pine woods, with no sign of a road to guide us. Just before we reached the village, our horses stood panting on a little rise. The coachman's back was stiff, but Gerda's aunt pointed a bony finger into the soft purple horizon.

"Sowjieten Land!" she said, bitterly.

Gerda and I looked, curious.

"My dears," said Gerda's aunt in her precise German, "across that border lies the greatest menace in human history."

Gerda and I goggled. We were young and dumb and heedless. An hour before, old tante had struck me as quite a romantic character. In her blithe youth she had been the toast of Vienna, the proud owner of an ancient title and, so the story went, also of the fleeting attentions of Franz Joseph himself. So tante's papa suddenly became the owner of 576 acres of what was then Austrian Poland.

"My dears," said the old lady, "my only thought has always been the welfare of my peasants. But shoes!"

"Shoes?" Gerda said.

"Shoes!" replied tante firmly. "Only fancy, across the border, they give shoes to peasants!"

Gerda and I considered this. Finally Gerda said, apologetically, "But doesn't it get awfully cold here? Mamma said she used to wear fur boots on top of her shoes. Mamma said she had ermine boots!"

Tante smiled tenderly. "So she did, my dear, such pretty little feet your mamma had. I remember so well—"

"But then . . ."

Tante turned to her niece. "My *dear*. In a moment you will be saying, as they say across the border, that every peasant *should* have shoes. Just because it gets cold!"

Gerda and I examined our fingernails. Tante poked the coachman on the back with her cane, and the horses began trotting downhill. "Of course," tante said thoughtfully, "I do believe they should have cloth for wrapping



their feet, in especially cold winters, anyway. Last winter, four men each lost a foot, besides those who lost only toes." Tante sighed. "But how is one to know when the winter will be too bad? If I were to give them extra cloth every year, they would only use it stupidly. Marilya, would you believe it, stole a nightgown from my wash line. Do you know how she used it?"

Gerda and I looked up, but tante had spent eighty years being an aristocrat and didn't notice.

"She made a dress for her baby!" Tante laughed.

Gerda said, "Perhaps she was short of things for the layette?"

Tante's face got a delicate pink. "My dear! Peasant babies don't need clothing. The farm women just wrap them in an old shawl or something."

Gerda and I looked into the landscape.

Tante, pleased by an audience, said, "Really, you can't imagine how difficult everything has become. In the old days, papa had only to give a peasant or two his proper medicine at the wrong end of a whip, and that was the end of trouble. But now! You know it is death for a peasant to cross the border. And yet, somehow, those sly scoundrels manage it."

We looked down our noses.

"And you know what they say, forever, constantly!"

"What?" Gerda asked coldly.

"Shoes!" Tante growled. "Shoes! Always shoes! It's like a secret code!"

The coachman's back shifted. Gerda raised an eyebrow to her tante. "Oh," tante said, laughing heartily, "he's just a peasant."

Tante, however, was mistaken. The coachman was Uncle Misha. I saw his picture imagine, what a piece of luck—in the Daily Worker a few months ago. The photograph was rather blurred, but nobody could mistake Uncle Misha. He stood there, his whole body part of his immense grin, and on his feet were large, spectacular, and very new shoes. The caption said, "Joyful farmers welcome Soviet progress." The picture showed a cow, a tractor, and a moving picture machine, but I mostly saw the shoes.

Well, the Nazi officers must remind Uncle Misha of tante's dear papa, who believed a few lashes could cure wild ideas. But I know the brownshirts have not destroyed the dream in Uncle Misha's heart. For tante was right. The word, the battle-cry, SHOES! was indeed a code. In this little village, deep in the heart of Ruthenia, SHOES! was the quick, easy way of saying: men will fight forever to create human dignity.

SHOES! The men and women and children of Kronenski will destroy the Nazi invaders, and side by side with men of decency and good will from every country of the earth, will wipe their very memory from the record of mankind. Uncle Misha has tasted happiness. It only lasted a year, a brief little year. But a year is long enough. The men who learned the future, will not now submit to the past. SHOES! SHOES! SHOES!

NM July 15, 1941

WHY WE MUST AID THE SOVIET UNION

Corliss Lamont says "Every consideration of American defense and intelligent self-interest" demands cooperation with the USSR against Hitler. What every American should remember.

THE ferocious Nazi attack upon the Soviet Union brings home to us in the United States more than ever before the full meaning of Hitler and Hitlerism. Finally and unmistakably the American people, of every political and religious affiliation, are face to face with the greatest issue of these times: whether or not Adolph Hitler and his Nazi mechanical men will succeed in enslaving the peoples of the earth under the horror of fascist dicatorship.

As long as the Soviet Union was able to maintain its neutrality, to keep on developing in peace and plenty its new socialist society, there remained an immense and powerful country, stretching far over both Europe and Asia, that stood outside this terrible war as a beacon of light and hope for the stricken nations of the world. But if Soviet Russia itself is now overcome by the Nazi onslaught, the greatest bulwark against fascism on the continents of Europe and Asia goes down. And that will be one of the most evil days that ever fell upon mankind. This must not, this cannot, this *shall* not happen.

For us in America the issue is clear. We cannot afford to see Hitler's brutalitarians conquer the USSR. When a great nation of almost 200,000,000 people enters a great war, naturally the situation changes to a great extent. And when this nation happens to be the Soviet Union, with its record of progress and its ideals of peace and democracy, the situation changes to an even greater extent. We talk today about mobile armies, armies that can move and maneuver swiftly. There must be and are such armies to stop Hitler. But mobile minds are just as important, minds that keep pace with events, acute and flexible and realistic minds that know today is not vesterday and the fragrant summer of 1941 not like any summer that has ever occurred in history.

Specifically, let us ask ourselves how we would like to see the rich grain fields and material resources of the Ukraine at the disposal of the Nazis. Let us ask ourselves, improbable as this idea is, how we would like to see the ruthless militarists of Germany in control of eastern Siberia and constructing air bases near Bering Strait where the island frontiers of the Soviet Union and America's Alaska are separated by only two miles of water. Let us ask ourselves how we would like to see the Japanese invaders finally inflict defeat on the Chinese Republic, whose chief supporter, in both a moral and material sense, has been Soviet Russia during these entire four years of invasion.

EVERY CONSIDERATION of American defense and intelligent self-interest demands that President Roosevelt's policy of cooperation with the Soviet Union during this new crisis be carried out to the full. For many years I have been one of those who have kept urging closer relations between these two great countries, the United States and Russia. Now, the dramatic events of the past two weeks make such collaboration an absolute necessity. Those events demand, in addition to continued aid for Great Britain, immediate and effective cooperation, both diplomatic and economic, with the Soviet Union, fighting to the death against the enemy of all humanity. In fact, our government is already starting such cooperation; and the Soviet government has expressed its satisfaction with the steps being taken.

In supporting the Soviet Union in this tremendous ordeal, there is no need for any American to support the particular economic and political system that exists in the USSR. We in America, whatever our political persuasion, whatever our religious faith, whatever our national or racial origin, can and must unite upon the end of stopping Hitler and *smashing* Hitler, now and forever. Even those of us who have been frankly sympathetic to the Soviet Union have never claimed that it is a Utopia. Certainly it has made its mistakes.

Yes, there are plenty of things to criticize about Soviet socialism. But those things are irrelevant to the great issue that is before us. Russia is fighting the Nazis; Russia provides the man power and the continental base for defeating the Nazis; Russia's fight is everyone's fight who wishes the fascist scourge wiped from the face of the earth. And if Americans at this critical moment let themselves be confused by talk about the menace of Communism and the wickedness of Joseph Stalin, they will be playing Hitler's game. For one of his big reasons in invading Russia was precisely to try and split public opinion in England and the United States and to bring about another Munich appeasement settlement at the expense of the USSR. The Munich conference resulted disastrously for the Western democracies. And these democracies must not again fall for Hitler's vicious propaganda, though it is already being peddled about by certain American newspapers and certain American political leaders.

One of Saint Adolph's claims is that he is now waging a crusade for "Christian civilization." No true Christian, however, can possibly take this seriously. Apparently the Pope, upon whom the fascists were heavily counting, does not feel that he can entrust the future of Catholicism to the Nazis. And the head of the Russian Orthodox Church, the Metropolitan Sergius of Moscow, has issued a statement in support of the Soviet army in its defense of the USSR. The head of the Russian Orthodox Church in America, the Metropolitan Benjamin, has done likewise and made a stirring speech to this effect in the recent mass rally at Madison Square Garden under the auspices of the American Council on Soviet Relations. Specifically on the religious issue His Grace asserted: "To the hypocritical call of the enemies—'against atheism'—the Church has already answered: 'The believers are holding services all over the Soviet land.'"

One of the few people who agrees that Hitler is to be accepted as the savior of Christianity and religion is Charles A. Lindbergh. In a speech at San Francisco he asserted that "every Christian" should oppose cooperation between America and Russia. And he went on to say that rather than an American-Soviet alliance he would prefer, not just twice as much or ten times as much/ but a hundred times as much, an alliance with Nazi Germany, "with all her faults." It seems to me that it is high time for the Lone Eagle to fly to the Bavarian Alps and settle in the cozy nest that is awaiting him there at Adolph Hitler's Berchtesgaden retreat.

The new international situation created by the Nazi invasion of the USSR proves up to the hilt how false and malicious is the charge that Soviet socialism and fascism are essentially the same. And it brings out crystal clear the fact that the Soviet Union is and has been, since Mussolini seized the government of Italy back in 1922, fundamentally and consistently anti-fascist and anti-Nazi. Soviet Russia has made numerous treaties and non-aggression pacts, for good and sufficient reasons which I shall not attempt to review here. But it has always remained opposed to fascism in its every variety, whether Italian or German or Spanish or Japanese or French or Finnish or any other kind. However, the Russians know what we all know-that every form of fascism is today dependent, directly or indirectly, on the continued existence and strength of German Nazism. So the all-important battle is against Hitler, who has reached the climax of his attempt at world dominion in his all-important battle against the Soviets.

THROUGH that beautiful and abundant Soviet land that is now the scene of terrific and titanic combat between millions of soldiers and tanks and airplanes I have myself traveled more than once. I feel that the best possible description of what the Soviet Union is like is contained in the Song of the Motherland that is so popular among the Soviet people. Here is an English rendering for which I am primarily indebted to Mike Gold:

Like the opulent Volga,

Everywhere our life flows free and broad-Our native land is vast; She has many forests, fields and rivers.

I know of no other country where man can breathe so freely.

Our proudest and dearest word is Comrade. We are friends of all races;

Everywhere we are at home.

The word Comrade has swept away the barrier between black and white; We have dear friends in all the world.

How vast is our native land! Its fields no eye can contain; You cannot remember all our cities. For youth all roads are open; And the aged are respected. All are welcome to our table— Humanity is master in our great motherland.

In golden letters we have written our Constitution.

The glory of its law no years will erase;

- Man will always have the right to learn, to work, to rest.
- Yes, a spring breeze blows across our great land.

Each day life grows more joyful with us.

Who knows better than we how to laugh and to love?

Yet if an enemy should think to attack us, let him beware. Sternly will we answer him;

We are always ready to crush him. We love our country like a bride— We will guard her like a mother.

Yes, let the Nazi enemy beware. And let those gentlemen in our own country, some of them pro-Hitler, some just ignorant, who keep harping on the alleged weakness of the Soviet Union and predicting its collapse within three weeks-let them be careful of the bets they make. As for the American press in general, it is quite obviously caught on the horns of an embarrassing dilemma: Britain and America cannot win against the Nazis unless the Soviets are strong from the viewpoint of morale, military power, and economic organization. But to admit such strength on the part of the Soviets would be to acknowledge that socialism in the USSR has been quite a success. And that is something that no capitalist newspaper wishes to do.

In any case we can state categorically that Russia, which is almost three times the size of China, is a difficult country to conquer. Armies that invade it find it easier to get in than to get out. However, I doubt personally whether the campaign of Napoleon is going to be repeated, for I do not think that Hitler will ever penetrate as far as Moscow. Probably the war will be of long duration. And this consideration completely knocks out the argument of American defeatists who say that we do not have *time* to send effective aid to the Soviet Union.

With the active cooperation of England and the United States, with the help and

My Stand on the War

"New Masses" has invited a number of prominent individuals to comment on the Soviet-Nazi war and on the question of aid to the USSR in order to defeat Hitlerism. In publishing them, "New Masses" does not necessarily agree with all that is said. Whatever differences there may be, however, we feel that the most important thing at this time is to unite all those who wish the defeat of Hitlerism behind a program of full assistance to the Soviet Union, Britain, and the peoples fighting Nazism.—The Editors.

Lion Feuchtwanger

The enemies of the USSR have tried to hide the truth about the Soviet people behind a screen of fog. The Nazi assault on the Soviets, though it may cause much misery, has one advantage: it disperses most of this fog.

When I came to this country I was astonished that, contrary to the clearest evidence, so many false reports were spread about the Soviet Union. By now much of this malicious gossip has been shattered. By now many people in this country, who could not see or did not want to see, have had their eyes opened. Events are forcing people, even though painfully and reluctantly, to take a better look at the USSR. And the Soviet people can only win when one takes a better look at them.

In the Soviet Union, too, many prejudices had been spread about the United States. Their common enemy, their common fight, however, forces both the United States and the Soviet Union to face each other. It is a good thing that both of these peoples will now learn facts about each other instead of opinions.

During these first weeks of the war, the Soviet peoples have revealed indisputably how deeply they are united and how strong the bonds are between them and their leadership. The courage with which the Soviet peoples defend their country and their ideas (even their enemies have to admit it) has made a deep impression in this country. Stalin's speeches with their bold and simple realism stand in glowing contrast to the drivel handed out by the fascist leaders. The recognition that the Soviet peoples fight for America's safety—a recognition expressed in the statements of the American government—is spreading rapidly among the American people, and with it the readiness to help as well as a firm confidence in the final outcome of the anti-fascist struggle.

Upton Sinclair

For twenty years I have been denouncing fascism and Nazism as the greatest menace in modern history. The tragedy has been that the forward-looking nations could not get together to oppose it at the same time. I have long been in favor of United States aid to every nation which is fighting Hitler; but the technical question of what aid can be sent is one which I have to leave to other informed persons.

Dudley Nichols

By all means all-out aid for the Soviet Union in fighting the common enemy. Let military strategists remember that through Russia is the only battleground we can reach in Europe now. There is no other foothold. You cannot fight Nazism in the British Isles unless Hitler comes there, which of course he will attempt if he wins in Russia. Let the American masses remember what will happen to American labor if the Nazis vanquish the Soviet. Let American Catholics beware of the "Holy Crusade" which is being whipped up by American as well as European fascists, Fanatical religionists who flock to the fascist banners are the enemies of Catholicism and of every religion. Vicious and bloody-minded people of the stamp of Jane Anderson [who broadcasts over the Nazi short-wave radio] are the greatest menace to the Church because their tactics will separate the Church from the people, where alone it can live. Religion must make its fight for survival in the hearts of men and not on the battlefield: hence the so-called "Holy Crusade" of fascist propaganda is a delusion and a snare for the unthinking devout. Devotion and fanaticism are contrary things and cannot co-exist. The greatest mockery of our age is the fascist czars, who have flouted every precept of Christ, now pretending to campaign for Christ. It should be obvious to the world that what is now being tried out in Europe is Nietzscheism, with the higher argument of tanks and planes, and Nietzsche's fondest dream was of the Anti-Christ. I believe this "Holy Crusade"-a savage war against human freedom under the cloak of religion-to be our greatest danger now both in Europe and the United States.

hopes of all the free peoples of the earth, we know that the Soviet people cannot and will not fail. There will be disappointments. There will be defeats. But the Soviets will never yield. They will fight on their plains, they will fight in their mountains, they will fight along their rivers, their lakes and their seas, till the trampling march of Nazi power dies away into the silence of history.

CORLISS LAMONT.

INDECISION IN THE FAR EAST

The Japanese warlords try to make up their minds. They are aligned with the Axis but they recall the defeats the Red Army handed them. The fourth anniversary of the Far Eastern war.

APAN is not the main force in the Far East today, but American newspapers have been discussing the new Asiatic situation entirely in terms of what Japan may or may not do. It is therefore important to note that, although the Soviet-German war was far less of a surprise to Tokyo than the non-aggression pact of 1939, Japan today faces great difficulties in formulating policy. Even the reaction of the leaders in the crisis of 1939 and 1941 has been similar. On Aug. 23, 1939, Premier Abe told newspapermen that he had no ideas about the new situation arising from the Soviet-German non-aggression pact, but would inform them as soon as a thought came to him. Two weeks ago, when questioned, Foreign Minister Matsuoka admitted to the press that his head was "empty." These remarks, in themselves unimportant, shed light on Japan's weakness and reduced status among the powers. In 1931 Nippon in effect initiated the second world war by boldly invading Manchuria. Now-a decade laterthe initiative lies in other hands. The Tokyo statesmen are disturbed by every sharp turn in world affairs, even when that turn is the result of an ally's action. This is why for a week and a half after the outbreak of the Soviet-German war, the Gaimusho, the Japanese Foreign Office, reached no conclusion on policy, despite constant discussion in governmental circles. This is why, after a decision purportedly reached, Matsuoka anwas nounced it only in the vaguest generalities.

SUPERFICIALLY, the problems involved are the result of certain formal difficulties. On the one hand, Japan is aligned with Germany and Italy under the Tripartite Pact of Sept. 27, 1940. On the other, it is pledged to peace with the Soviet Union under the Neutrality Pact and Frontier Declaration of April 13, 1941. The Tripartite Pact, in effect, bound Tokyo to fight with Germany and Italy, if either should be attacked by a country not at war with them at the time of the pact's signature. This could mean either the Soviet Union or the United States, but another clause specifically stated that the Soviet Union was not intended. The Soviet-Japanese agreements bound the two parties to a policy of nonaggression toward each other and provided that if either "should . . . become the object of hostilities on the part of one or several third powers, the other contracting party will observe neutrality throughout the duration of the conflict." Since Germany was the aggressor against the USSR, Japan can easily adhere to both pacts by staying out of the Soviet-German war.

This, however, is a verbal solution of the problem. As an imperialist power, Japan constantly seeks to expand economically or politi-



Chen I-wan (Jack Chen)

cally. Expansion can come only as the result of an active Japanese policy, but it is precisely the costs of such action that Tokyo mortally fears. This contradiction arises from the primary fact in the present Far Eastern situation: the unyielding struggle of China for national liberation. Despite all economic, political, and international difficulties, Chinese unity and resistance continue to drain Japan of its economic and political substance, thus partly immobilizing her as a leading power. We are therefore obliged to judge the possibilities of Nipponese action, not by the hugeness of Konoye's eyes, but by the strength of his hands. Japan is not Germany and, unless absolutely desperate or completely assured of success, is not likely to exchange two wars for one.

IN RELATION to a possible Soviet-Japanese war, for example, can one imagine Japan as anxious to fight the USSR? The Imperial Army has not forgotten the sharp defeats it received at Changkufeng in the summer of 1938 and at Nomonhan in the summer of 1939, at Soviet hands. It is true, of course, that the Soviet Union was not occupied militarily in the West at that time, but it is also true that the China war was not then four years old. It is known, moreover, that the USSR has a powerful Far Eastern Army which it has sought to make as autonomous as possible, providing it with its own stocks and sources of supplies. Hanson Baldwin estimated in the New York Times of June 27 that the USSR could concentrate some fiftytwo divisions along the Amur and in the Maritime Province against Japan's eleven in Manchukuo. Japan could increase these forces greatly only if she withdrew troops

from China—obviously an unsatisfactory step in view of Chinese guerrilla warfare.

War with the USSR would be a very hazardous enterprise for Japan. It would expose the island empire to air attacks. It would result in serious difficulties for Nipponese shipping and fisheries in the North Pacific. Perhaps it would prove an unsettling phenomenon in oppressed Manchukuo and Korea-both right across the Soviet Far Eastern frontier. It should be remembered that the Soviet-Japanese agreements were concluded only two months or so before the German invasion. Since we now know that informed diplomatic circles had been discussing the new war as a serious possibility as early as the beginning of the year, it is reasonable to assume that when Matsuoka visited Berlin and signed the agreements in Moscow, he was fully aware of this situation. One may conclude that one of the objects of rapprochement with the USSR was to give Japan the possibility of neutrality in case of a German attack on the Soviet western frontiers.

Despite its great hatred for the Soviet Union, Gaimusho must inevitably be more interested in southeastern Asia than Siberia. The rubber, tin, oil, and teeming millions of Malaya and the Indies constitute a far richer loot than anything that could be hoped for in the North. In the southeast, also, Japan could perhaps be very useful to Germany, by busying the United States and Great Britain. Yet, in the face of such speculation, the fact is that in the year since the fall of the Netherlands and France, Tokyo-despite its desires-has not taken a decisive step in the Pacific colonial belt. The advances in connection with Indo-China improved Japan's position, but did not alter it fundamentally. Only a few days before the Soviet-German war began, the Imperial representatives at Batavia backed down on the question of forcing from the Netherlands East Indies a more favorable trade agreement. Obviously the United States and Great Britain were supporting the Dutch behind the scenes, and Japan was too weak to accept the challenge.

TODAY Tokyo is less able than before to accept such a challenge, because the involvement of Soviet military power in the war has strengthened Great Britain and the United States. Hitler's prospects of victory must seem neither so immediate nor bright to the Japanese as they appeared a short time ago. The interests of Japanese imperialism required a short European war of limited scope, climaxed by German victory. It is therefore not surprising that Tokyo opinion is in complete ferment and that the police have had to warn against the spreading of rumors. The new situation has improved Britain's possibilities in



Chen I-wan (Jack Chen)

the Atlantic, while making it more possible for the United States—if it should so decide —to keep a good section of its fleet in the Pacific. On the other hand, if, in accordance with Navy Secretary Knox's suggestion, we should carry through an all-out naval war against Germany in the Atlantic, this temporary weakening of our position in the Orient would certainly not encourage Japan to believe in a German victory.

On the basis of all these considerations Japan can be expected to watch how things develop, attempting to prevent the European and Far Eastern wars from being completely joined. Tokyo can, however, also be expected to act in sympathy with the Axis in a nonmilitary way. The tone of the Japanese press and the Axis recognition of the puppet, Wang Ching-wei, indicate that hope of true neutrality in Nippon is an empty dream. Japan will, as before, seek to deter the United States from action against Germany and will now have the added function of working to keep the Anglo-American combination apart from he Soviet Union. This is the meaning of statements about the "threat" that would be involved in possible American shipments to Vladivostok. This is also part of Konoye's meaning, when he states plainly that the object of the Tripartite Pact was to keep the United States out of the European war. Obviously, the old appeal to American appeasement tendencies is being advanced in the hope that we will nibble once more at this malodorous morsel.

The continued vigor of these appeasement tendencies in Washington was indicated by the first reaction to the Soviet-German war. According to Frank Kluckhohn of the New York Times, there was hope in high circles that Japan would break with the Axis. "There is some reason to believe," he wrote, "that shis government has been pointing out to Japan that, while a Russian-German war might give Japan some temporary advantages, in the long run Germany is as much of a menace to Japan as to any other country. . . ." Only babes in diplomacy will imagine that Japan could be talked out of its fundamental policy of sympathy with the Axis by a logical discussion of current conditions. What is really implied is the buying off of Japan. This could only mean abandonment of China in the hope of keeping the aggressor neutral. Appeasement, however, is a skeleton whose bones may rattle, but never can be clothed with the flesh and blood of true peace. Of course, the type of appeasement just described-the abandonment of China-is not a practical issue right now. More popular is the appeasement view that, while continuing to give China blood transfusions, we should do nothing to excite Japan greatly. In other words, we should continue to help Japan with oil and other supplies and use against Tokyo a supposedly subtle method of small pressures.

The fallacy behind this view has often been exposed. Such action, or rather inaction, would simply give Japan a breathing spell within which to recover from the shock of transition into a new diplomatic period. Instead of taking advantage of Tokyo's weakness to administer a sharp setback, we would be helping the Imperial Army and Navy to surmount their difficulties. Consequently, we might find the world reaching a point at which Japan would, because of its own desperation and the decisive character of the international conflict, finally enter and cast its lot fully with the Axis. Despite all that has been said above about confusion in Tokyo, strong Nipponese action is still possible if the Mikado's diplomats are given time to catch their breath. The sooner we act, however, the less likely it is to come.

There are many reasons for America's appeasement tendencies toward Japan, but anti-Soviet feeling and fear of a truly independent China are not least among them. If China were to realize its full liberation, this would be the first time an important semicolonial nation had completely driven out a great imperialist power. Many high personages in the American government, overlooking the necessities of American policy, wish to have as little as possible to do with such a conclusion. They are afraid of the effects of a Chinese victory on the whole colonial world. Therefore they want China to resist Japan only to the degree necessary to insure the dominance of America over the Far East. They now see that the entrance of the Soviet Union into the war brings up more than ever the question of National Liberation versus Imperialism. The Bolshevik Revolution caused a tremendous ferment throughout Asia, and that at a time when the nationalist movements were weak. How much greater will be the ultimate ferment resulting from the defeat of German fascism! The imperialist appeasers wish to hold back China's liberation movement, the better to limit it later under more crucial conditions.

THE SOVIET STRUGGLE against the Nazis will undoubtedly greatly hearten China and help to recement Chinese unity. This will be true whatever effects the war with Germany may



or may not have on Soviet material aid to China, for in the kind of war China is fighting political problems are primary. Even before the new war began, China had successfully come through the crisis in unity created by the attack on the New Fourth Army last January. This was indicated by the more friendly attitude taken toward Chou En-lai and the Communist Eighteenth Group Army at the end of May by the Ta Kung Pao, the Kuomintang newspaper. It is difficult to imagine that today, under changed conditions, Chinese armies will be ordered to attack other Chinese forces. This arises from the two-fold significance of the new situation for China: on the one hand it is more encouraging to unity; on the other it makes dissension more dangerous, since the world situation is so critical.

Though the Chinese government has issued no formal statement on the new war, the official newspaper, the Central Daily News, soon declared: "We express unreserved sympathy for Russia. Germany is the aggressor; Russia is fighting for justice, her rights and her territory. We are confident Russia will win the final victory." Similarly, the Ta Kung Pao recalled the great aid given China by the Soviet Union and promised that China "will do all she can to help Russia." At the end of June, when Quo Eai-chi, the new Foreign Minister of China, was inducted into office, he said: "We were prepared to fight to the bitter end when we were fighting alone. Now, when our friends are similarly engaged in Europe and Asia, we believe that a settlement of the Far East issue must be a part of the whole world-wide settlement."

One may surmise that some circles in Chungking regret the new situation in so far as it promises to push them further away from the possibility of compromise in their own war and makes action against the Communists more difficult. What is important, however, is not the question of subjective misgivings, but the objective realities which cannot be avoided. Recent events have weakened the position of the pro-Axis group in Chungking and strengthened those who wish to see Anglo-American-Soviet cooperation with China.

NEVERTHELESS, as I have indicated, American policy is holding back from the actions which it should properly take in the Far East. These actions should include: (1) Agreements or understandings definitely linking the United States, Great Britain, China, and the Soviet Union; (2) Discussion by these four powers of the problems involved in supplying China under present conditions; (3) Strong American efforts to establish Chinese unity on a firmer basis; (4) All possible American effort to deliver supplies to the Soviet Union via Vladivostok; (5) The end of all American appeasement of Japan. On this fourth anniversary of the Far Eastern war it is clear that these measures, if properly carried through, would contribute considerably to the defeat of Hitler.

WOO YEUNG-HOI.



A. Blashko





HE MUST BE FREED

An Editorial

NE need not be a graduate of West Point to understand this: good soldiers seek good allies. It is an ancient military maxim, but it holds good today for all warriors who are worth their salt. Every man who has committed himself to the obliteration of Hitlerism here and the world over, must realize that maxim. The unity of all anti-Nazi groupings, the fullest cooperation of all anti-Hitler allies, is fundamental to successful struggle. Hitler realizes this only too well. His basic strategy since the bierhaus putsch has been to divide, to disperse, to destroy his opponents separately. Today his insidious agents burrow through the body politic, frenziedly invoking the false issue of Communism -that slogan which he used so well before coming to power and ever since. It was the consequences of this slogan that destroyed Spain; it was this that laid the basis for Munich. "War on Communism" was his horrendous battle-cry with which he sought to disperse, to frighten, to split the unity of all men of good will who stood against his barbaric progress. One of the men who pointed this tactic out, who labored unceasingly to forewarn and hence to forearm the American people that disunity meant defeat, was Earl Browder, leader of the American Communist Party.

For Browder, like the Communists in Germany and throughout the world, was the first to sound the alarm. In the dungeons of Hitler's Reich sits another Browder, a man buried alive for eight years: a man by the name of Ernst Thaelmann, Hitler's deadliest enemy. For he is the incarnation of everything the Nazis fear: the wrath of the people. And so he has been locked away from humanity for these eight long years. There was much dirty work to be done and Thaelmann had to be put away first.

Five thousand miles across the ocean another Thaelmann is locked from his people. No Reichstag burning was the pretext for his imprisonment: a word on a passport was the charge. Two men behind stone walls 5,000 miles apart: yet Hitler would have imprisoned both. Both equally represent the direct threat to his way of life. If Mr. Gallup were to conduct a poll in America today asking whether the American people favor the freedom of all anti-fascists from prison to take their ranks in the armies against Hitler, the response would be obvious. The answer of all men who genuinely hate fascism would naturally be to invite the aid of all who wish to fight side by side with them. Americans, therefore, must ask themselves if they can afford to allow Earl Browder, the American Thaelmann, to remain behind prison bars. Can they afford to permit the demobilization of men of outstanding abilities in this common struggle? Dare they keep the lion-hearted from the fray? Here is a great general of the people, should he not be called to his place in the battle: he, who was first to warn of the enemy at the gates, of the enemy's secret lieutenants within?

For to keep Earl Browder in prison today is to play Hitler's game. To give him his liberty—he and all who have been imprisoned for fighting against the evidences of Hitlerism in America —would strike heavy blows against the enemy. To free Browder would be to liberate the man who spoke out most clearly against those who gave evil counsel: to free Browder is to liberate the man who spoke out most ardently against war for world domination; he is the man who long ago espoused the doctrine of a foreign policy for America which would align this country with all anti-Munich forces in the world, and especially with the strongest anti-fascist power, the Soviet Union. Reread his speeches, recall his radio addresses—it's all there, the guidance of one of America's greatest men. Look into his books: What Is Communism? The People's Front, Fighting for Peace, into his numerous pamphlets, and you will find the warnings, lucid, simple, fervent, and you will find, too, proposals which could have circumvented much of the harm Hitlerism has dealt the peoples of the world.

Suppose the doors opened on Earl Browder tomorrow and he walked out of Atlanta, a free man. The meaning of that action would electrify America. The hour it happened the cables would carry the word to Berlin. Wherever Hitler would be-whether on his highest perch at Berchtesgaden dreaming of world conquest -or scanning the dispatches somewhere behind the Eastern front -word would get to him swiftly. One need not be clairvoyant to surmise the effect. Hitler would understand that America means business. For that reason alone-among others-it must happen. For it would indicate much more than the liberation of one of America's foremost anti-fascists, it would express the strengthening of the anti-fascist unity of the American people. It would be a setback to the lieutenants of Hitler here in America; it would be a signal that the drive on civil liberties in America has been checked; it would be a terrific blow to those who seek to split the ranks of labor-and it is labor, in the first and final analysis, that will constitute the backbone of anti-Hitler resistance in America. Hitler realizes that German Nazism cannot be destroyed if democracy is shattered in the camp of his enemy.

This is a thought that is occurring today to many who want to see Hitlerism destroyed. One need not agree with the tenets of the Communist Party to realize that. One need only agree upon the necessity to defeat Hitlerism. One need only agree that all men who seek the defeat of Hitler should be allies. For the enemy is powerful, insidious, treacherous. Who does not know today that he has allies operating secretly in high places? Therefore all the enemies of Hitler must work together in a vast and international front to annihilate the common enemy.

Many see this today. In Latin America, where the oppressed and the dispossessed millions struggle to win a measure of independence and security, the ideas of Hitlerism have been most abhorrent. And the demand consequently for the liberation of Browder has come most significantly from there. Labor unions and progressives in Mexico, Venezuela, Cuba, Chile, Colombia all the neighboring nations on this continent have urged the freedom of that man, whose name more than any other in America today, means liberty, signifies an uncompromising, relentless fight against imperialism, against Hitlerism in any of its aspects.

Earl Browder—the antithesis of all that Hitler and Hitlerism represents—is in Atlanta Penitentiary today. This man is needed now more than ever. The historic national and social needs of this country demand that he be liberated. Our country is in danger. All that is good in the world, all that represents the progress of man throughout the centuries, is at stake. Dare any of us who seek the victory of progress over abysmal reaction stay silent? We need our best sons to lead us in this epochal combat between the peoples of the world and their barbaric oppressors. Earl Browder is such a leader.

He must be freed.



ESTABLISHED 1911

Editors

BARBARA GILES, A. B. MAGIL, RUTH MCKENNEY, BRUCE MINTÓN, JOSEPH NORTH, JOSEPH STAROBIN, JOHN STUART

> Business Manager CARL BRISTEL

Stalin's Speech

1

(

T WAS a great fighting speech that Stalin made last week, the speech of a man who commands the confidence of his people, and who has the deepest pride and confidence in his people and his cause. It was a declaration of unlimited national emergency for the Soviet Union. In direct, straightforward language, Stalin struck hard at all complacency, heedlessness, all superficial optimism about the "life and death struggle" which the Soviet Union faces.

Stalin did not shy away from a question in the minds of his world audience. He discussed at length the reasons for the Soviet-German non-aggression pact, emphasizing the two years' time which it gave the Soviet people to prepare. He struck directly at the propaganda that the Nazi armies are invincible, and while informing his listeners frankly of the gains which the German forces had made in Lithuania, Latvia, eastern Poland, and the Ukraine, he assured them that the "main forces of the Red Army" were only "now coming into action, armed with thousands of tanks and airplanes." He placed the defense of the Soviet Union on the broadest possible level, evoking not only the devotion of the workers and peasants, but their deep national pride. He established a historical continuity between the great struggles of the Russian people against Napoleon and their just war against Hitler. And he made it very clear that this would also be a guerrilla war, robbing the invader of his loot, sapping his strength in a thousand ways in front of and behind the lines.

It was also a speech to the rest of the world. Among its most significant passages was the assurance to the Soviet nation that it shall "have loyal allies" among the advanced, the "finest men and women of Europe, America and Asia," as well as the great German people who could be counted upon to contribute to Hitler's defeat. And he foresaw that the Soviet struggle would "merge with the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for their democratic liberties and independence." It was clear from the precision of language that the Soviet Union places no barriers of past differences, or differences of ideology, in the way of cooperation with Britain and the United States. On the contrary Stalin emphasized the "feeling of gratitude in the hearts of the peoples of the Soviet Union" at Churchill's "historic utterance" and the ""declarations of the United

States government signifying readiness to render aid" to the Soviet nation.

Even for those of us who have read Stalin. who have known of his place in the hearts and minds of his people, this was a speech which revealed the towering strength of his personality. The newspapers played it down shamefully in view of the fact that it came from the head of a state which occupies a sixth of the globe and whose armed forces are carrying through such a decisive battle for all of humanity. But even in the press and the radio comments, it was freely admitted that such frank, direct language could come only from a man and a government whose relations with its people are different from those of any other government in the world. Johannes Steel, radio commentator, who in the recent period could hardly be called a friend of the USSR, pointed out that no dictator, no Hitler or Mussolini, could have made a speech like that. It was the speech of a man who is both "hero and sage." No wonder that it inspires such confidence in all of us, such enthusiasm and self-sacrifice from the entire Soviet nation. And the announcement that the entire Soviet male population from seventeen to fifty-five is to be placed under arms, is further evidence of the solid support of the people for their government. Imagine what would happen to the fascist dictatorships if they placed arms in the hands of the people!

Iceland

THE occupation of Iceland by American marines crosses the meridian lines between the western hemisphere and Europe; it represents a serious challenge to Hitler's blockade of the British Isles. When the President instructs the Navy to maintain sea communications between Iceland and our own shores, to assure the protection of our supplies to Britain within at least 700 miles of Liverpool, he is beginning to implement Secretary Knox's recent proposal that the north Atlantic be swept free of Nazi sea raiders and submarines. Some time ago the Nazis announced that their war zone extended around Iceland, and the battles of the Bismarck and Hood took place just outside of Icelandic waters. Unquestionably, the Nazis, through their puppet government in Denmark, were in a position to occupy this island and thus go far toward an encirclement of Great Britain itself. By taking this action, the President is following through on the principle that our own security depends on the defeat of Hitler's power, both in the Atlantic and in Europe, the principle that our defense can only be conducted at a distance from American shores. It is also worth notice that British and Canadian troops are now made available for service elsewhere: it represents a continuation of the British withdrawal from its island outposts near our shores which began with the destroyers-bases exchange of last September.

There are obviously many other points to be made. But our initial attitude toward this move is frankly determined by the largest considerations of the war as a whole. In so far as it will help American supplies to reach Britain, it is a necessary step. In so far as it will weaken Hitler's naval and air power, it is a worthwhile step. If the President means what he says when he promises to remove our troops from Iceland when the war is over, the independence of Iceland, which its people recently declared from Denmark, will not be endangered. But this measure will achieve its full meaning only if it becomes the first of a series of practical steps to assist both Britain and the Soviet Union in their war against Hitler. It is valuable if it opens up the immediate perspective of discussions among Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union for a joint defense of the Pacific, for the assurance of supplies to Vladivostok and to Murmansk. If the threat to our security is real in the north Atlantic, it is critical on the battlefronts in eastern Europe. If we are to be defended at a distance in Iceland, the distance is even shorter between ourselves and the front lines on Soviet soil. Bold measures to challenge Hitler in the Atlantic must be succeeded by bolder measures directly aiding the major fronts. Everything depends on carrying those measures through without delay.

Other Fronts

NTHONY EDEN'S speech at Leeds last week, in which he said that "His Majesty's government is not in any circumstances prepared to negotiate with [Hitler] at any time on any subject" was intended to reject in advance German offers of peace in the next few weeks. It is a strong statement, and evidently comes in response to the demand of the People's Convention that all the Municheers be cleared out of their high places. The pressure against appeasement in Britain must be such that the government felt it necessary, within two weeks of Churchill's strong assurances, to reassure the British people that Hess' mission has completely failed.

Eden spoke of cooperation with the Soviet Union in the "military and economic sphere"; the Royal Air Force has been pressing its bombardments on German-held areas of the continent, penetrating deeply into the Ruhr and even Saxony. And evidently, from the relative quiet over British skies, the Soviet campaign is occupying all of Goering's attention. Yet thus far there have been no concrete results from the British military mission in Moscow, results which are impatiently awaited by the people, as Claude Cockburn indicates.

Other military fronts have been dwarfed in the news. But in East Africa the British are mopping up the Italian colonial empire, while in Syria they are making definite progress toward mopping up this important French colony. Strategic bases in the Syrian desert have fallen, such as Palmyra; and as the British columns approach Beirut, the strong possibility exists that the Vichy forces will sue for an armistice, or else flee into Turkey. French efforts to persuade the Turkish government to occupy the northern regions of Syria seem to have failed. At least

nothing more has been heard of the idea since the conferences two weeks ago between the French Secretary of State, Benoit-Michoist, and the Turkish President, Inonu. For the Turks to entertain such ideas would mean definitely embarking on expansion beyond their natural borders; it would not be received well by the Syrian nationalists, and might aggravate further Anglo-Turkish relations. But the British also have their difficulties on the colonial front. The removal of General Wavell seems to have been connected with his failures in the Crete and Libyan campaigns; it probably also results from the criticism of his actions in Australia and New Zealand. The dispatch of Sir Oliver Lyttleton, now an inner cabinet member, to the Near East is apparently connected with the complicated political problems in dealing with Vichy, with the Turks, and with the Syrian nationalists. The British have made many promises in their Syrian campaign, promises to establish an independent Syria. Only an independent Syrian nation, uniting all its diverse elements on the platform of national liberation, can begin to solve the age-old irritations in the Near East. Only such a Syria could be a real bulwark against Vichy, and its Nazi masters.

Finnish Epilogue

ISTORY has its own way of settling scores, but rarely has its retribution been so swift and complete as in the epilogue to the drama entitled There Shall Be No Night or Little Finland, starring Herbert Hoover, Robert Sherwood, Norman Thomas, and the ghost of Neville Chamberlain. The pith of that ironic epilogue was contained in a Stockholm dispatch to the New York Times of July 5. The British consul general in Finland, H. M. Bell, has been expelled from that country despite the fact that "he had resided in Finland from the first day of Finnish independence, was decorated with the highest Finnish order and was also known as a personal friend of Field Marshal Baron Carl Mannerheim." "The 120 British volunteers who went last year to fight for Finland," the dispatch continues, "have also been ordered out of the country, and were allowed to take with them only twenty percent of their personal money. Forty Blenheim bombers lent by the British to Finland last year are now fighting with the Nazi air fleet." And a children's home, built with money from the British Help to Finland fund, is now being used by Nazi troops.

Think what this means. The British people are being bombed by Nazi planes and threatened with enslavement by German fascism; but forty of their own planes, built by British workers, are today fighting for their enemies, turned over to them, via Mannerheim, by their own former government. One hundred and twenty British boys, deluded into risking their lives for Finnish "democracy," are summarily kicked out by their hosts. And the pennies wrung out of the poor for that ignoble anti-Soviet crusade are now providing shelter for the Nazi "liberators." How vast should be the indignation of those both in England and this country who were so shamefully duped and betrayed.

And what of the "Socialist" leaders of Finland? They too have run true to form. Tanner, leader of the Social-Democratic Party, has reentered the government to aid Hitler's war, while the Social-Democratic Party itself and the leadership of the trade unions have sent a message to the British Labor Party and the Trades Union Congress justifying their alliance with Nazism.

It is small comfort to us to recall that we were of that minority who insisted that "little Finland" had big bosses and that its government was a White-Guard dictatorship. Today this is obvious to millions. And even a newspaper like PM, in an article by Vaughan Henry, points out: "The Finnish uppercrust minority, governmental and industrial-always fascist inclined-has been wholly won to the Nazi cause for some time past and has sold out Finland to Hitler." What we are primarily concerned with is the lessons to be drawn from this episode. The New Republic is reluctant to draw those lessons, still speaks of Stalin's "cruel aggression," continues to cling to the patently false judgment that "the dominant forces in Finland were enlightened and democratic." But large numbers of liberals have had their eyes opened; they are beginning to understand that the Soviet action in Finland was in truth defensive, that had it not been taken, the Nazi legions would today be at the gates of Leningrad if not in the city itself, and that the generous terms offered by the USSR to the Finnish government were in the interest not only of the Soviet people, but the Finnish people themselves.

Regulating Prices

 $R^{\ \rm ISING}$ prices are one of those nettles that can only be handled with a firm grasp. Thus far the Roosevelt administration has approached the problem in the most gingerly fashion, and the results have been nil. But action cannot be delayed much longer if an inflationary situation, undermining the American standard of living and bankrupting many small business men, is to be avoided. The wholesale prices of all commodities have risen 49 percent since August 1939. Only a small proportion of these increases has as yet been reflected in retail prices, but, according to Labor Research Association's Economic Notes, "a much more rapid climb [in living costs] from now on is indicated." In the last war, too, living costs at first rose slowly, but later gathered tremendous momentum. For millions of housewives this prospect is like the crack of doom.

The efforts of the government to control prices through the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply have been confused and ineffectual. When Leon Henderson was appointed to head this office, he expressed faith that expanded production of both defense and non-defense goods would prevent sharp price increases. But monopoly has been allowed to have its own sweet way in this matter, with the result that civilian production is going down (one-quarter of all manufacturers are already curtailing non-defense output) and prices are going up. Henderson's efforts to impose price ceilings on certain items have also brought indifferent results, while his request to Chrysler to rescind a boost in car prices met with a flat refusal. In fact, Henderson's legal authority to regulate prices has been challenged by big business. And President Roosevelt has not yet threatened to call out the troops against Chrysler or any other corporation.

Clearly, legislation is needed to regulate prices before they get out of hand. But one note of warning is in order. Certain reactionaries have begun to clamor for price-fixing legislation which would include wages. They even dream of outlawing strikes for higher wages by this device. But despite statements to the contrary, the principal cause of the upward movement of prices has not been wage increases. Wages in 1939 constituted only 15.9 percent of the value of all manufactured products. Thus a ten percent pay rise for the entire American working class could be compensated by only a 1.6 percent increase in prices-far less than has actually taken place. The actual situation was also indicated by Leon Henderson in a speech at Chicago in which he pointed out: "The price level has risen more than the labor rate level since this push started." The CIO Economic Outlook for May lists four major causes for price increases: shortage of specific essential materials, specialized equipment and (very soon) transportation; monopoly control of prices; price speculation and excessive accumulation of inventories; and unplanned public purchasing.

From this one must conclude that whatever legislation is adopted must be directed toward curbing monopoly prices and profits and eliminating the other inflationary factors, and not toward freezing wages or the prices farmers receive. At the same time the administration should abandon all attempts to curtail purchasing power, as exemplified in the new tax bill, and should, instead, press for a great expansion of consumers goods production to meet the needs of the people.

ALCOA in the Frying Pan

A SINGLE bombing plane requires as much aluminum as 60,000 coffee percolators. In fact, about ninety-five percent of the aluminum now being produced goes into defense, and twice as much is being produced as last year. Yet we are short on the metal, so short that housewives are being asked to turn in their old pots and pans to the government. Why? Don't ask the Aluminum Co. of America. Officials of Mellon's great big monopoly claim that it isn't their fault, they would have been glad to produce ever so much more aluminum if they'd only known it was necessary. But Secretary of the Interior Ickes and the Truman Senate committee investigating the defense program say differently. The Truman committee found that ALCOA, in its determination to sustain the unreasonable price of aluminum, deliberately refused to expand production.

Not only this-ALCOA also tried to thwart increased production by the Reynolds Metal Co., which only recently entered into competition with Mellon's outfit. It is impossible even to summarize the Truman committee's report on ALCOA here, but an instance of the company's methods may suffice. One of ALCOA's officials declared that the company was willing to develop the Fontana, N. C., hydroelectric project (ALCOA owns the site) for aluminum production, provided the RFC put up the funds. But then the company backed down-it discovered that the government had the right to capture the plant at the end of fifty years, upon payment of the owners' investment minus depreciation! The company refused to play on such terms. Now the Tennessee Valley Authority will go ahead with the development, under an agreement with ALCOA; and the Federal Power Commission has arranged a seventeen-state "power pool" for aluminum production. Meanwhile kitchenware is being sacrificed and defense aluminum needs are barely met-because monopoly wouldn't dream of letting a little thing like patriotism interfere with its old, old habit of hiking prices by restricting production.

Victory in the South

T TOOK three long months to force the Southern coal operators into line. The owners resorted to every trick-to bluffs and lockouts, to vigilante terror and violence, to "appeals" appearing in expensive newspaper advertisements which told the story except for the truth, to "mediation" and the refusal to mediate, to pleas for government intervention followed by sudden withdrawals from negotiations. Finally, the Southern operators were forced to follow their Northern colleagues, forced to sign with the United Mine Workers. There is a lesson in that. The determined unity of the miners brought victory; the refusal to be intimidated or bludgeoned out of just demands, the strong leadership provided by John L. Lewis, the very real warning that if the Southern operators persisted in their anti-union policy they would precipitate a strike, finally made it clear to the corporations that either they must talk sense or take the consequences. There was no other way once the union refused to temporize.

The contract won was even more than a major victory for the mine union, more than the guarantee of higher wages. For the first time the ugly discrimination separating Northern and Southern workers was broken. And with the elimination of this arbitrary differential, the strategic position of the open shoppers is greatly weakened. The UMW's contract means new hope; victory once won, can be won again, can be extended among wider and wider sections of the working class. The labor movement having now gained a foothold in the South, can bring democracy even to those states now writhing under the dictatorship of such native fascists as Cotton Ed Smith, Gene Talmadge, Martin Dies, and other enemies of all that means progress and democracy for our country.

Follow-Up in the North

THE UMW success was the result of the miners' refusal to give up their right to strike. Pressing forward from this great victory. 300 delegates of CIO international unions and state councils, at a legislative parley in Washington called by President Philip Murray, unanimously adopted a program of resistance to all attacks on the rights of labor. The conference called for "increased industrial and corporate taxes upon the higher income brackets," condemned "hidden wage cuts," and demanded full labor representation in defense councils. The delegates urged immediate steps by President Roosevelt to provide additional funds for WPA. They condemned the flood of anti-labor legislation in Congress, warning legislators that they must "choose between labor support on the one hand, and their own support of these anti-labor bills on the other." In particular, the conference attacked the Connally-May strikebreaking amendment legalizing the use of troops against strikers and making mass picketing punishable as sabotage. The restrictive Ball and Vinson bills for compulsory mediation of labor disputes and other such legislation designed to prevent organization and to smash unions already in existence, were also denounced.

Here John L. Lewis rose to speak out boldly against the use of troops against strikers at the North American Aviation plant. Further, Lewis pointed out that Sidney Hillman, by approving such actions, by his attempt to confuse and delay negotiations for a contract between miners and Southern operators, had certainly not acted as "labor's representative." The labor movement, taking a leaf from the successful miners, could only survive if it resisted any incursion on its basic rights.

The Youth Speak Up

N THEIR declaration of support to all peoples attacked by Hitlerism, the 1,200 delegates to the Seventh American Youth Congress gave a demonstration of purpose, unanimity, and enthusiasm that would be hard to beat. Spokesmen of the many groups comprising the AYC -Jewish and Christian, trade union, student, Negro, among others-spoke also for the 5,-500,000 membership represented in the congress when they said in various words, "Stop Hitler! Full aid to the people of Britain and the USSR." New Masses will shortly carry a full article on the congress. The best we can do in the space of an editorial is to touch on its most meaningful features. An outstanding one was the harmony of the meeting. These young people, and there were delegates from some 800 local and national organizations, united on a program of both foreign and domestic policy embracing a multitude of programs: friendship and collaboration with the Latin American peoples; aid to China; against racial discrimination, anti-labor measures, domestic fascism of any kind; for proper housing, health, and recreational facilities for conscripts.

A resolution opposing an AEF was adopted

after considerable discussion, many expressing concern that American troops might be used for imperialist rather than anti-fascist purposes. The Young Communist League abstained from voting on this resolution, its spokesman, John Gates, pointing out that with the changed character of the war, all measures, economic, political and military, were required to defeat Hitlerism.

Perhaps delegates will remember, more than anything else at the congress, the truly stirring message to the youth of the world, which ends with a call to a World Congress of Youth. Yes, a *world* congress—even in a world fearfully disrupted by war. For American youth, like those of other lands, know how to surmount the physical forces of disruption, to build a solidarity which will endure against *panzerdivisionen* and bombs.

For Reading and Thinking

MORRIS U. SCHAPPES, young English teacher at the College of the City of New York, was haled before the Rapp-Coudert inquisition, whose main task was to destroy the Teachers Union so that educational budgets could be slashed without fear of opposition. Schappes, a Communist Party member from 1936-39 (when he resigned to write a book), was asked many questions. He did not give the lying answers he was told to give, so he was dragged into court, tried for perjury, and convicted. He faces twenty years in the penitentiary for his refusal to lie. Sufficient protest can force Judge Jonah Goldstein, General Sessions Court, New York City, to suspend sentence on Schappes. For Schappes' persecution is an example of American fascism, the attempt to stamp out education, to destroy the unions, to penalize free speech and liberty.

Mrs. Ina Wood, young wife of a Communist organizer, was sentenced by an Oklahoma court to ten years in prison. The Ku Klux Klan and the court objected to the books she read and punished her accordingly. Her husband, Robert Wood, and two other workers, Eli Jaffe and Alan Shaw, received similar sentences for similar crimes. They can be freed by mass protest—so says the International Labor Defense, 112 East 19th Street, New York City. They are victims of American fascism, as surely as prisoners in German concentration camps are victims of Nazism. The St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* in an editorial declared:

Mrs. Wood did not murder anyone. She did not commit sabotage. She did not steal. She did not cheat on her income tax. She did not violate any of the basic laws of the land. We want to ask a question.... Since when has it become a crime to think, to read, and to talk?

Since when? American fascism has victimized Morris Schappes, Mrs. Wood, and the other Oklahoma defendants. But we demand their right—and by so demanding we protect the right of all the rest of us in this country —to read, to think, to talk.

REVIEW

MR. SHIRER'S SECRET DIARY

The Berlin man for the Columbia Broadcasting System couldn't say what he wanted to over the air. Jottings in his personal journal. The truths he couldn't tell. A review by Samuel Sillen.

N

A

D

C

0

M

BERLIN DIARY, by William L. Shirer. Alfred A. Knopf. \$3.

T IS not hard to understand why Mr. Shirer should have kept a diary during his years in Berlin as representative of the Columbia Broadcasting System. He had no other means of expressing what he really felt about life under the Nazis. What irony! Here was a man whose job it was to inform Americans about the state of affairs in Germany. Night after night he broadcast "firsthand" reports over short wave. And after each broadcast he would hurry home to jot down in a secret journal all the things he could not say over the air. The fault, of course, was not Mr. Shirer's. Indeed, the keeping of a diary was in itself a courageous act punishable at any moment by the snooping Gestapo. In the end, Mr. Shirer could no longer stomach the Nazi handouts which he had to read over the air as "news," and he scrambled out of Berlin with understandable relief. His experience as a radio correspondent underscores the fact that virtually everything we hear from German official sources is a lie, and that even the bestintentioned correspondent must keep a diary if he wants to tell the truth.

The German people themselves, as Mr. Shirer reports, are terribly cut off both from outside news and news of their own country. At one time, they stormed the newsstands to buy the Baseler Nachrichten, a Swiss German-language paper which sold more copies in Germany than in Switzerland. Circulation of the paper was, of course, banned as a result. There are other interesting stories. Dr. Hugo Eckener, for example, had a great deal of contempt for Goebbels. Asked once about balloting on the Hindenburg, Eckener fired back: "Goebbels hung up a record. There were forty persons on the Hindenburg. Fortytwo Ja votes were counted." One couldn't very well repeat that over the air with a Gestapo man in the studio.

The diary was a consolation, and in it Mr. Shirer recorded his impressions since 1937. These impressions are not unified by any consistent analysis of the historic events which Mr. Shirer describes. To be sure, there is a deep core of anti-fascist feeling in the book, and much of its substance contributes to the fight against Nazism which the whole civilized world must wage today. But like so many other "foreign correspondent" books, its antifascist drive is blunted and confused by a failure to grasp the underlying continuity of the day-to-day events which it chronicles. Insofar as the book confines itself to details which the author has actually observed with his own eyes, it is a rewarding study. As soon as the author begins to generalize from these events, or as soon as he begins to speculate about situations which he has not himself experienced, the book falls apart. There is a contradiction between experience and theory throughout.

The best example is to be found in Mr. Shirer's treatment of the disastrous appeasement policy which led to Munich and war. There is superb material here for anyone who is inclined to forget that Hitler was helped by fascist-minded friends in England and America. From 1935 through 1938 Mr. Shirer notes the visits to Germany of pro-Nazis like Lord Rothermere, Lord Londonderry, Lord Lothian, and others. "The Lindberghs are here," he writes in July of 1936, "and the Nazis, led by Goering, are making a great play for them. . . ." He reports that Ham Fish seemed completely taken in by Ribbentrop. On one occasion, Dr. Boehmer of the Propaganda Ministry insisted that Mr. Shirer share a double bed with an American fascist, Phillip Johnson, who said he represented Father Coughlin's Social Justice. On July 5, 1937, he noted that "The Austrian Minister tells me that the new British Ambassador here, Sir Nevile Henderson, has told Goering, with whom he is on very chummy terms, that Hitler can have his Austria as far as he, Henderson, is concerned. Henderson strikes me as being very 'pro.'" A month before, Shirer and Gordon Young of Reuter's had run into Lord Lothian in the lobby of the Adlon. Young asked the Lord why he had come to Berlin. "Oh, Goering asked me to," he replied, and the two reporters wanted to ask him since when he was under orders from Goering, but refrained. And in Prague on Aug. 4, 1938, Shirer confided to his diary that Runciman, whose bald head looked like a misshapen egg, "arrived today to gum up the works and sell the Czechs short if he can."

In short, this diary provides abundant evidence of the appeasement conspiracy. And yet the basic significance of this conspiracy is not really understood by the radio reporter. When the Tories signed the naval agreement with Hitler in 1935, Shirer commented: "Why the British have agreed to this is beyond me." Why Blum appeased Franco was equally a "mystery" to him. His friend, Norman Ebbutt, Berlin correspondent of the London Times, complained to Shirer in private that "the Times does not print all he sends, that it does not want to hear too much of the bad side of Nazi Germany and apparently has been captured by the pro-Nazis in London." But the purpose of this orientation, its anti-Soviet

objective, escapes him as he writes these highly significant notes.

E

M

N

T

The materials for such an understanding were everywhere present. There was Chamberlain at Munich, whom Shirer compared to one of the black vultures over the Parsi in Bombay, pleased with himself. And by contrast, on Sept. 12, 1938, the Russians "did a beautiful job of jamming Hitler's speech tonight." After Munich, Shirer went to Paris, where he saw fat bankers and businessmen toasting "Peace" at Fouquet's and Maxim's with rivers of champagne. And seven months later at Warsaw, dining with old Pilsudski legionnaires and Poles from the army and Foreign Office, Shirer heard nothing but the "dangers" of Russian help.

The failure to understand the significance of these impressions led directly to Shirer's complete misunderstanding of the Soviet-German non-aggression pact. A "virtual alliance," he exclaimed at the time, along with many of his colleagues. But as we continue reading in the diary we see what kind of "alliance" this was. "Hitler has won the war in Poland and lost the peace there-to Russia." Again, he learns that butter, flour, and other foods from Slovakia and Bohemia are being marked "Made in Russia" on orders from Berlin in order to show how much "help" is coming from the Soviets. His own observations completely refute the poppycock of "virtual alliance" which he so glibly had uttered, so glibly, indeed, that he didn't recognize that he was talking the propaganda line of the Nazis. And similarly in regard to the Soviet-Finnish war, when Shirer couldn't sleep for thirty-six hours because the "revolution had been betraved." This defensive move of the Soviet Union against aggression he would have welcomed on the part of France and England, whose "inactivity" he could not fathom in the Munich days!

Nowhere in these pages does one gather that Nazism has been imposed on the German people not merely by Hitler and Goering, but by the ruling financial and industrial oligarchy as a class. One should not, perhaps, expect detailed social analysis in a diary, but the absence of such analysis in Shirer's own mind has led him to almost incredible absurdities. He is inclined, for example, to adopt the very same racial concepts which he despises. He attacks not only the German rulers but the Germans as a people. He notes their "strong sadism and masochism." He speaks of their "ingrained" militarism and their "strange soul." He indicts a whole people. And yet, here again the sweeping generalization does not square with the specific fact. Deeply ingrained militarists? How, then, does he explain his notation of Aug. 31, 1939: "Everybody against the war. People talking openly. How can a country get into a major war with a population so dead against it?" Or of Sept. 2, 1940: "They long for peace. And they want it before the winter comes." And similar observations in other periods.

1

Fanaticism, terror, brutality? Yes. But on the part of the Nazis, whose bestiality hangs over the lives of the people, as Shirer says, like a dark, brooding cloud. This diary confirms those distressing tales of human suffering which every honest observer in Germany has reported. When the Nazis marched into Vienna in March, 1938, Jewish men and women, hundreds of them, were picked off the street at random and forced to scrub the toilets of Nazi boys. The profiteering economy of the Nazis has imposed incredible hardship on the people. Babies must have ration cards for clothing. "A country is hard up," Shirer says grimly, "when it has to save on diapers." Guns not butter. Flame-throwers not diapers. And winter conditions are particularly severe on a population deprived of coal which must be used to fuel a bandit army. The reports of "mercy" killings under the Nazis are enough to turn one's stomach with loathing for the race-purifiers.

And Hitler. There is a telling picture of him in this diary. Shirer saw him once in the garden of the Dreesen Hotel in Godesburg, cocking his right shoulder nervously, his left leg snapping up as he did so, the ugly black patches under his eyes. The Party hacks called Adolph the "Teppichfresser," the "carpet-eater." Whenever he goes on a rampage about Benes or the Czechs he flings himself to the floor and chews the edges of the carpet, hence the "Teppichfresser."

But his greedy maw is not content with carpets. He and his crew and their paymasters want to gobble up the world. Now, as the spokesman of the Soviet Bureau of Information, S. A. Lozovsky, has put it, they have grabbed a bear that won't let go. In reporting the German attack on France, Shirer came to the reluctant conclusion that the treacherous French generals did not fight. They answered the German assault with loud-speaker attacks across the trenches on the Soviets. But the Red Army does not fight with loud-speakers or with Quislings. It is the obligation of men like William L. Shirer to implement their anti-Nazi feelings and their distrust of appeasers by supporting the "bear that won't let go."

SAMUEL SILLEN.

Bucks County People

SATAN'S SERGEANTS, by Josephine Herbst. Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.50.

N THE Bucks County, Pa., locality that Miss Herbst writes about, the natives have been shoved back to the canal banks. Their sturdy old farmhouses and land are summer retreats for city folk, Hollywood and New York refugees seeking peace or a quiet





spot to write that book they've always planned. But little writing results, and not much peace. The invaders are too busy playing pioneer, polishing and refurbishing their rural hideouts. They post no-trespassing signs, stack their barns with possessions, and buy antique doll dishes from the native children to sell at a 200-per cent profit. For the insensitive, this activity is enough. The others-and they are the major characters-are still imprisoned in personal dissatisfactions, most important of which is a feeling of inadequacy. Each has lost some part of himself, some confidence necessary to break through the loneliness and inertia of his comfortable life. Most of them have, at some previous crisis, surrendered to dependence on one other individual, thereby building for themselves a jail of isolation.

Among the villagers this pattern is partly repeated in the case of the Armstrong family. Will Armstrong's life is governed by the savage feud between himself and a tyrannical mother, and a brooding sense of inferiority occasioned many years ago by a mistake which resulted in another's death. It is for the sake of self-assertion that Will cuts off young Johnny Armstrong's education and sends him into the paper mill. And Johnny, victimized first by his elders' tortured frustrations, is finally devoured by the mill as one more sacrifice to an employer policy that fails to protect workers' lives with decent safeguards. There are others in the village besides Will Armstrong who have succumbed to personal failure-but, unlike the visiting residents, they are more the casualties of economic battle than of the personal dilemmas arising from the superstructures of society.

When a fire breaks out, threatening to eat up farms and village, Miss Herbst's assorted characters come together and the collective experience, pervaded by excitement, releases a number of minds from conventional cramp. The result is to change some lives permanently. One person rediscovers a lost ability to "be with strangers, simply, as one of them," another the faith of "something inside . . hard and good, believing in man himself." There is at once a deeper understanding of themselves and a breaking away from sterile preoccupations with self. But these changes take place mostly among some of the "outsiders." For the village people the thing to be remembered about the fire is that Johnny Armstrong got his boots soaking wet and was electrocuted the next day as he stood on a faulty rubber mat.

Miss Herbst, it seems to me, succeeds better with her villagers than with the city people. I should have liked to know more about the Armstrongs, although they receive a much greater amount of space than is accorded other native families. The pictures we do get of the latter are rather tantalizing in the glimpses they afford of a hard existence tempered by neighborly interest and, in time of tragedy, by comradeship. Their problems are more absorbing than those of the New York, Hollywood dwellers to whom the major part of the book is devoted. And, while the author's





Private Car Service Daily — Daily Buses Direct From Bronx — Brooklyn — Manhattan, Midtown Bus Terminal, 43rd St. bet. Broadway & 6th Ave. BR yant 9-3800 City Information: Dickens 2-5786

Please mention NEW MASSES when patronizing advertisers





(



Newburah



Intriguing country: interesting food: woodland pool; tennis, sports; accommodations for 50; reasonable rates. Make reservations early. WOODSTOCK, N. Y. **TELEPHONE 14 F 13**

200 YEARS OLD

2000 YEARS OLD BARLOW FARM in the midst of Magnificent Candle-wood Lake and Berkshire Hills provides you friendly home for satisfying vacation. Only 65 miles from the City, Swimming, tennis on premises, free boat-ing. Hot and cold running water and showers. Rus-sian-American kitchen. Romantic campfires. Con-genial crowd. \$4.00 per day. \$22.50 per week. Special family rates. For free booklet and reserva-tions write to STANLEY LAPINSKY, BARLOW FARM, SHERMAN, CONN. or call New Milford 756J3. FARM, 756J3.

handling of individual incidents in the community drama of fire-fighting is remarkably skillful, the psychological aftermath could be more convincing. The changes wrought in individual attitudes seem a little sudden and are not too well explained. One might also wish that the narrative had been better integrated with the theme of struggle between two groups-represented on one side by the successful landowner who believes that no man is worth more than twenty cents an hour, and on the other by the farmers he has dispossessed and made his employees. By more emphasis on such aspects, Miss Herbst would have, I think, added greatly to a book which excels in craftsmanship and insight but falls short of her previous novels in social clarity and power.

BARBARA GILES.

Mist and Mysticism

darwin, marx, wagner, critique of a heritage, byJaques Barzun. An Atlantic Monthly Press Publication. Little, Brown & Co. \$2.75.

IKE other present day champions of "the spirit," Dr. Barzun looks with disfavor upon mere "facts." They are only second rate truths, not to be compared with certain purifying "spiritual" realities. Thus Darwin, Marx, and Wagner, all rude materialists, fall victims to his critical approach. They constitute a pernicious heritage from which only idealists, released from the sciences, can deliver us.

The wide range of Dr. Barzun's research is proof of a roving if not universal mind. A little more intense study of one field might be better suited to his abilities; however, he has evidently decided that wisdom rather than knowledge should be his province. But his wisdom is combined with a surprising amount of irritability. He resorts to considerable personal abuse of his subjects, and his considered judgment is that "Of the many books which Darwin, Marx and Wagner left us not one is a masterpiece." It is only fair to note that Dr. Barzun's book is no masterpiece either.

What is the method and point of Dr. Barzun's argument? He is obviously not equipped for a technical discussion of biology or political economy. Natural selection in his pages becomes not a subject for research so much as a horrible picture painted by Darwin showing nature, "red in tooth and claw," devoid of heart or purpose. Dr. Barzun joins the crowd of the pious who in Darwin's time regarded the struggle for existence as specially, if unconsciously, designed by Darwin to justify commercial rapacity. Likewise the class struggle is not a fact but a hideous contraption developed to perfection by Marx to set the rich and the poor against one another. Dr. Barzun would not deny that they had clashed some before Marx. But Marx had introduced devilish science which made the whole thing so plain and cut and dried, even to the bitter end -the "brutish" dictatorship of the proletariat.

Dr. Barzun is a little like those people who say that there must be a God, for if they were sure there was none, they would do all sorts of dreadful things. In the same way, if species



S-FAST TENNIS COURTS-BADMIND





THE MOMENTOUS ISSUE!

In response to numerous requests

NEW MASSES

has arranged an exciting

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION

on the

NAZI-SOVIET \//AR

to be held on

WEDNESDAY, JULY 30th, 8 P. M.

at

AIR - CONDITIONED

MANHATTAN CENTER

34th St. and 8th Ave.

Foreign Editors and Political Commentators have been invited

Tickets 50c in advance...65c at the door...on sale at Bookshop, 50 E. 13th St., Bookfair, 133 West 44th, New Masses, 461 4th Ave.

WATCH THE MAGAZINE FOR FURTHER DETAILS

are going to survive through the possession of certain characteristics which preserve a creature here and there out of millions who perish —well, is life worth living? So there must be a Purpose. Unfortunately Dr. Barzun, no biologist, cannot even speculate on how this Purpose operates in the organic world.

That men in the course of social production enter into definite relations which are independent of their wills and to which definite forms of social consciousness correspond, Dr. Barzun regards as a degrading theory. Surely there must be some independent way of philosophizing, some way of giving credit to thinkers whose ideas bear no remote relation to social production. If the facts do not seem to bear out this flattering view, then you simply reinterpret the facts, which are not really facts after all but fluid experiences to be molded at will.

This is no rude parody of Dr. Barzun's ideas, but the wall of the blind alley to which all good pragmatists come. The criterion of reality is not whether something is true but whether it is advisable. It is not so unless it can be repeated before Junior. Once again the vulgar opportunism which Lenin denounced in Materialism and Empirio-Criticism makes its claim as the modern idealist philosophy. Lenin showed clearly the anti-intellectualist trend which hid behind the pretentious broadmindedness of the pragmatists, and how they were driven back upon the platitudes of "faith" in spite of their disavowal of absolutes. Just so Dr. Barzun, He is all out against heartless concepts like Natural Selection and the Labor Theory of Value and all for warm, human, "natural" feeling. And what are his thoughts on the matter? "Conceptual reason will show that love is a foolish thing and dangerous; the perceptions of instinct will contradict reason and win the day." Theory abdicates in favor of "flowing precepts" closely resembling newspaper hints to the lovelorn.

Dr. Barzun makes no exception to the antimaterialist scholars' habit of attributing most of the "ills of our century" to the way of thinking of Darwin, Marx, and also Wagner to whom life was a "meaningless round of lust and death." He would sooner blame the *Communist Manifesto* and the Dragon in "Siegfried" for fascism than the objective factor of capitalist production. For capitalist production is a material cause, and Dr. Barzun is a devotee of the "new" physics which dispenses with causality.

Incidentally, Dr. Barzun is obsessed with the question of originality. He devotes considerable time to tracing the antecedents of his three subjects to prove what is a commonplace in public school textbooks—that there is such a thing as tradition. But that is not what he wanted to prove. What he really meant is on page 359 for all to see: "That it is easily possible to be more original than Darwin, Marx or Wagner should be clear from a reading of these pages." We look forward to Dr. Barzun's forthcoming attack on all theories of slips of the tongue.

CHARLES HUMBOLDT.

١

S

G

I

H 1

S

N

Π

S

SOVIET FRONTIERS

How the Bessarabian peasants greeted the Red Army last year. Marshal Timoshenko comes home to his native village. What a happy people really look like. Joy Davidman reviews a Soviet documentary film.

N or so long ago, the Nazis were sending America newsreels of their march into Austria, into Czechoslovakia. Nazi troops stalked through the conquered cities, while on every side the "enthusiasm" of the population was held firmly in check by a cordon of armed guards. Now and then, in a mechanical way, a few in the front row of spectators would give a few heils. They didn't seem happy, these new members of the Reich.

Now we have Soviet Frontiers on the Danube, playing at New York's Central Theater, and you can see what happy people really look like. When the Red Army marched ito Bessarabia, years of misery and persecution were wiped out. A people whose language was proscribed, whose land was stolen, whose bravest leaders were imprisoned, were at last back where they belonged. There was no question of "invasion" in Bessarabia and Bukovina; it was a matter of a people whose home was returned.

Soviet Frontiers is a documentary film, made on the spot and at the moment of the entry of the Red Army. Prefaced with shots of the golden fertility of the Soviet Ukraine, it crosses the Dniester to present, with brilliant and incisive camera work, a portrait of Bessarabia. This is rolling farmland, potentially as rich as the Ukraine-but the low hills undulate to the horizon, striped like a zebra's coat, blistered with tank traps. The tripes are the narrow fields of a starved peasantry, fields often no wider than a fairsized room. Half a million Bessarabian peasants own no land at all. The camera passes over the bare, gnarled feet of a farmer, the pinched faces of children, the nauseous and unbelievable rags which serve many of these people for clothing. In the miserable factories, men are pouring molten metal by hand. They spend their noon hour lying exhausted in the shade, eyes staring like the eyes of a skull. In the cities there is a street of luxurious hotels-and a slum district, compared to which Harlem is palatial. Children play on garbage heaps. Everywhere are signs: "Speak Rumanian Only."

Then the Red Army marches in peacefully. The Soviets need no guards between themselves and the people; throughout the villages, the entire population swarms out, clambers over the tanks, brings little bunches of wild flowers and presses them into soldiers' hands. An old man welcomes the army to his village with the traditional gift of bread and salt. A young man, embracing a soldier, weeps unashamedly. There is no heiling here, no regimented salute. Instead there is a spontaneous joy that no actor in the world could counterfeit, much less a whole population. Thousands of faces, worn old men and women, undernourished youths, tattered children —all those faces have the look of people who have just come into the sunlight again.

Marshal Timoshenko comes home to his native village. The big marshal, stepping from his airplane, is surrounded by his relatives and boyhood friends. They can hardly believe he's real; they finger the medals on his tunic. They walk through the village with their arms around him.

In one small town the village band comes out to welcome the Red Army, the battered men with their battered instruments fumbling for a Red Army song. A village elder in a ragged shirt, the cords standing out on the emaciated neck, makes a speech of welcome. Red Army soldiers read the newspaper to the peasants. With an improvised measuring rod, the peasants mark off the land which is now theirs, caressing the wheat with their fingertips.

Those who were slaughtered for revolting against the Rumanian fascists have lain for years in a nameless grave, visited only at night. Now, in daylight, the peasants come with the Red Army and place a sign over the grave. The women weep for their dead, but not altogether in sorrow. The prison doors are opened and the political prisoners come out, like lean ghosts, raising clenched fists in salute. Their wives, laughing and crying, rush into their arms. On the ground is a heap of iron chains and rings, handcuffs and the torturing thumb-chains.

Only one group somehow can't bring itself to share in the universal joy; the Rumanian officers look downright peeved. They're a sour-faced lot, trimmed with a great deal of unnecessary gold braid. One willowy young lieutenant, searched for arms by laughing peasants, has a large pocket mirror. Preparing to evacuate, the officers are watched by the people whom they have terrorized—and there are grim smiles on the faces of the villagers. The Rumanian army withdraws in farm carts pulled by starved donkeys; a wickedly humorous touch is the exit of the carts at one end of the village while a Soviet tank comes in at the other end.

But the rank and file of the Rumanian soldiery is not too eager to leave. Many of them desert at the first opportunity and come streaming back to Soviet territory, throwing away their uniforms and their guns. The road is filled with them. Later the refugees from other sections of Rumania come, slipping across the Prut River, often under fire. The Red Army improvises a soup kitchen and feeds them.

One could go on forever without conveying a tenth of the emotional power of Soviet Frontiers. This reviewer does not, ordinarily, label films "must"; but Soviet Frontiers is a "must" picture. You have to go and see it; you can't afford not to. You have to see what the Red Army is like in planes, in tanks, in guns, pontoon bridges, river flotillas; what the Red Army is like in spirit. (There is a short film on the Red Army playing with Soviet Frontiers, an illuminating study of the army's cultural and athletic activities as well as of its fighting force.) You have to see the Soviets patrolling the Danube, where Ger-



MARSHAL TIMOSHENKO in the documentary film "Soviet Frontiers on the Danube."



MARSHAL TIMOSHENKO in the documentary film "Soviet Frontiers on the Danube."



ON THE Soviet Union

Samuel Sillen Suggests:

Soviet Power—Dean Canterbury\$.35
We Didn't Ask Utopia, Timbres 1.29
I Change Worlds, Strong
Land of the Soviets, Mikhailov
The Way Out, E. Browder
Women of the Soviet East, Halle69
You Might Like Socialism, Lamont .95
Economics of Communism,
Browder
Russia Without Illusions, Sloan75
History of the Communist Party
of the Soviet Union
Changing Man, King
Culture and the People, Gorky 1.50
Red Army Today, Voroshilov
Stalin and the Red Army
Red Army and Navy—Pictorial39
Soviet Aviation—Pictorial
The Growing Prosperity of USSR .18
Constitution of the USSR
Constitution of the USSK
Downhist Librows on the Societ
Pamphlet Library on the Soviet Union, 58 titles, boxed
Each of these booklets covers a different phase of life in the USSR, all written by authorities in that field.
Send for Complete List
WODVEDS DOOV SHOD
WORKERS BOOK SHOP 50 E. 13 ST., N. Y. C.

Please mention NEW MASSES when patronizing advertisers

man and Rumanian attacks are being smashed. You've got to go to the Central Theater for *Soviet Frontier*, and you'd better take all your relatives with you.

THE BEST of the anti-Nazi thrillers of recent months is unquestionably Underground, now at the Globe in New York. This is the story of the underground movement in Germany, and while it has certain important omissions and distortions of perspective-such as its bland ignoring of the fact that a large and heroic section of the underground movement is Communist-it is still an intelligent analysis of Nazism at home. There is no attempt here to malign the entire German people; most characters are quiet citizens who hate and fear the Nazis. The hero is a Nazi soldier who comes back from the front without an arm, but still, being a trusting young man, believes what the Fuehrer tells him until the facts painfully prove otherwise. The Gestapo agents are presented with extraordinary skill at characterization; they are mean, twisted, cruel human beings.

Influenced both by Odets' Till the Day I Die and Wolf's Professor Mamlock, the film has many scenes of great dramatic power. The old man who defies his Nazi torturers to defend the underground movement is admirable, although he lacks the direction and intensity of Mamlock's great political speech. The underground fighter who is broken by the concentration camp is a pitiable figure. Best of all are the unconquerable members of the underground movement, who move their illegal radio station about, one jump ahead of the Gestapo; and the grim ending of the film, in which one broadcaster is executed even while the station resumes sending through the voice of his brother, is unmarred by any sentimentality.

A cast largely composed of refugee actors goes far to make Underground notable. Martin Kosleck as the Nazi torturer-in-chief and Philip Dorn as an underground leader both turn in magnificent performances. Kosleck's characterization combines cold cruelty with eager ambition and whining self-pity, while Dorn acts better than any handsome young man we have seen. Mona Maris and Kaaren Verne, as women workers in the underground movement, are extraordinarily forthright and unaffected., with no simpering cuteness about them. Minor parts are equally well handled. In addition, the film is swiftly and economically directed and incisively written; it achieves a fine irony in the scenes of Gestapo officials whispering about Goebbels' and Goering's investments in foreign countries. JOY DAVIDMAN.

Behind the Barbed Wire

Alvah Bessie tells of the new collection of concentration camp songs.

WE HAVE heard the story so often now that perhaps we have become a little calloused. For after all, you cannot hold the image of such suffering in your mind, the



The Woodlands

vision of such inhumanity, for long at a time. We first heard the story out of the "New" Germany of Adolph Hitler, and it was documented for us in The Brown Book of the Hitler Terror. Since then we have heard the story over and over again, as the mechanized forces of the Third Reich moved through Europe. But the story remains the same, and the suffering is not mitigated.

The supreme irony of our time was the treatment accorded the Spanish anti-fascists and the heroic front-fighters when Spain collapsed under the combined blows of fascist intervention and international appeasement. Over the snowbound passes of the Pyrenees, whence had come men of twenty-seven nations to fight for them, there streamed the thousands who managed to escape the advancing fascists. They sought haven in a France they still believed was democratic, despite ample evidence to the contrary. And their haven closed around them like a trap. Their samaritans-the French fascists-locked them behind the barbed wire of Gurs and Vernet 'Ariege, of Argeles-sur-Mer. No torture .nambers ever bore such lovely names.

In the fortress of Gurs, on the sands of Argeles and Vernet, these thousands have been starving, dying. They starved and died while the French fascists accomplished the defeat of their native land at the hands of Adolph Hitler. His Gestapo, with long lists in hand, winnowed from the concentration camps that so conveniently held his enemies, the most militant among the prisoners-the incorrigible democrats, the steeled front-fighters of the International Brigades. Franco had claimed others from time to time, and Petain had handed them over to him to be killed.

The other night I met a man-a Brazilian anti-fascist and member of the International Brigades, whose freedom had just been accomlished after more than two years in the forcress of Gurs. Physically there was nothing left of him; the donated clothes he wore hung like drapery on his wasted body. But there was a smile on his tanned face and a fire in his eyes such as still burns in the eyes of those who are left in the camps. He had joined these men, women, and children in song in those camps, and six more of those songs have now been recorded and collected in an album bearing the title: Behind the Barbed Wire.

The idea for this project was first conceived in connection with the recent Congress of the League of American Writers. (The records may be ordered for \$2.75 through the League's office, 381 Fourth Avenue, N.Y.C.) It was a significant inception. For, as Earl Robinson, who writes the introduction to this album, says, "It happens almost invariably in the history of the world that during periods of historical change, periods in which masses of people are involved in democratic ferment, great art and great literature are produced." What then more fitting than that the League should have assisted in making permanent a record of these great human songs, songs still sung in the camps, songs sung wherever men strive for liberty?

You have heard the singer of these songs: Bart van der Schelling. A monument of a man, he arrived in Spain in February 1937, and served at the Jarama front where the fascists were kept from Madrid. Seriously wounded at Brunete, he spent six months in a hospital and returned to be wounded again at Teruel. In August 1938, when he was at the front of the Ebro, he was declared to be inutile total-unfit for military service because of wounds. He returned to America with a brace about his neck and chin, which he still wears. But his stance on the concert platform is the stance of a soldier, and his magnificent natural voice is wonderfully adapted to the singing of these songs. Official singer for the American survivors of the International Brigades, Bart has here joined with Earl Robinson and the Exiles Chorus to memorialize these songs of the people.

What are these songs? There is the magnificent Thaelmann-Kolonne, of the 11th IB, the anti-Nazi Germans, with its stirring chorus:

> Die Heimat is weit, doch wir sind bereit. Wir kampfen und siegen fur dich: Freiheit! Far off is our land, Yet ready we stand, We're fighting and winning for you:

Freedom!

(Freely translated) There is the song of the Spanish youth organizations, which they adapted from the French, La Joven Guardia (The Young Guard). There is the song the Garibaldini sang when they attacked Mussolini's legionnaires at Guadalajara-La Guardia Rossa (The Red Guard). It will not be sung by the motorized division Mussolini says he is sending to fight against the Soviet Union, but it is not unlikely that they will hear it sung, in Italian, from the other side of the fighting lines.

There is a song that the Franco-Belge boys sang, with words by Louis Aragon to the music of the Soviet composer Shostakovitch. In this version it is called Au Devant de la Vie (Marching Ahead), and its human refrain couples the beloved with the native land and all humanity. It is a happy song.

> Debout, ma blond'! Chantons au vent! Debout. amis! Il va vers le soleil levant Notre Pays! Arise, my sweetheart! Sing to the wind! Arise, friends! Toward the rising sun, Our homeland moves. (Freely translated)

There is a sad song, too, a song whose melancholy overtones are stiffened by its undertone of inflexible determination. This is the Catalan national hymn, Els Segadors (The Reapers), which the Spanish Caudillo has forbidden to be sung, just as he has forbidden the national language of these great people



THERE ARE two kinds of military analysts who write for newspapers today. There are the "pin-stickers" who, from the depth of their armchairs, push pins into a map, dust off their classical volumes dealing with military strategy, and draw glib conclusions which they bolster with rumors.

Then there are those rare few who realize that armies are made up of people, and that their strength depends not upon their equipment alone, but also upon the people behind the army, their unity, their morale, their will to victory.

Never before in history did people have such military significance as in this present war. Never before did the pins mean so little.

The DAILY WORKER is featuring articles of military analysis written by "A VETERAN COMMANDER." These articles are outstanding for their thorough appraisal not only of military tactics, but of the political and moral forces at play in the great struggle which, in the words of Stalin, "will be a united front of peoples standing for freedom and against enslavement. . . ."

For a fundamental understanding of the present war, follow

"A VETERAN COMMANDER"

in the

DAILY WORKER

50 EAST 13 STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

5c AT YOUR NEWSSTAND

Write for subscription rates and free sample copy



 Name
 City
 State

 Address
 City
 State

 Name
 City
 State

 Address
 City
 State

who, in the last days in Spain, defended their capital of Barcelona with their bare flesh. The "reapers" are the forces of democracy, who mow down with their *falc* the enemies of their life and freedom. Schelling sings this moving melody, with its semi-oriental overtones, entirely unaccompanied.

It is only fitting that in the final song of this collection the singer should reach his finest expression. This song was composed by one Eberhard Schmitt, a veteran of the Thaelmann Battalion whom van der Schelling first met in the hospital of Murcia. Later he was interned in the fortress of Gurs, where he composed this song, Wir Hinterm Draht (We Behind the Wire). Like the magnificent Moorsoldaten (Peat Bog Soldiers) it is instinct with the repressed emotion of men and women in confinement; its melancholy verse is counterbalanced by the defiant chorus. No one now knows anything about the fate of its composer, Schmitt, but his song will live forever. It is great music, and its words are perfectly integrated with its music. These words and music reached America directly from the concentration camp of Gurs in a manner that stirs the imagination, and bolsters the determination of all decent people never to relent in the fight that is now intensified all over the world with the entry into the war of the Soviet Union. A book was written and illustrated by the men and women interned in Gurs-it was written surreptitiously, illustrated at night by candlelight and smuggled to America by willing hands. It is called Lagerstimme (Camp Voice). These voices of the camps that reaction everywhere fastens upon its progressives, will be heard wherever men are free.

ALVAH BESSIE.

Master of the Blues

Sidney Bechet's trumpet sounds at Camp Unity.

T IS good to hear that Sidney Bechet is playing at Camp Unity this summer. His is a music at once simple and incredibly complex; simple, because its melodic content consists of the Negro "blues" and "rags" that go back to the past century, and complex, because of its harmonic subtlety, its intricate figuration, its amazingly varied rhythmic accents. Bechet is perhaps the greatest living master of the instrumental style which grew out of the work songs, spirituals, wandering ballads, and "cake-walks" of the Southern Negro and poor white. And it is because he is so completely the spokesman, in his music, of a whole nation, that his art is so rich in feeling, so exuberant in vitality.

The melodic line of his slow blues is carved out hard and clear, deep in feeling but never fuzzy or sentimental. His tone is the true "blues" tone, not sensuous but meant to jerk the audience into listening, with its alternation of sweet and rough notes. His attack in fast numbers, for which he prefers the powerful soprano sax rather than the clarinet, is trumpet-like in its impact. There is nothing else in jazz like the long solo he will spin in a fast number, mixing great, sweeping blues phrases and little decorative figures, slow in tempo but with off-beat accents that give an impression of irresistible speed. There is nothing else in jazz like the series of ornamental figures he will weave in a climaxing "ensemble," a true counterpoint, an independent melodic line knocking off sparks every time it hits the "lead" melody.

He plays a small-band music of the kind that has almost been banished by radio, wired music, and the tawdry plugged tunes of tin pan alley. But it is a music whose basic impulse still exists. It is perhaps the most socially created music in America, born out of a perfect understanding between creator and audience.

The records listed below will give people a memento of his art, and a chance to study it. Notice first that the music on these records contains not only the "hot style," of which modern swing music boasts, but a rich content. "Wild Man," "2:19," "Perdido Street," Bechet's blues solo in "Buddy Bolden," are as fine a set of melodies as can be heard in any folk music. "High Society," "Sweetie Dear," "Shake It and Break It," are jolly and robust rags, going back to New Orleans street marches, dances, and festivals. Notice also the complete absence of "hot solos" in the modern sense. It is rather a playing born out of a love for the music itself, with a two or three part "ensemble" texture whose subtleties only many playings will reveal, with solos that are melodic rather than virtuoso, with a constant backing of one player by another, with a fertility of variation which comes directly out of the players' sense of contrapuntal design. It is music of sensitive structure, as in "I've Found a New Baby," with its long and brilliant Bechet solo, the inversion of the tune that follows, the ensemble climax.

The first five records may be purchased altogether for less than two dollars, a worthwhile investment. The last two are twelveinchers, put out by the small companies that are trying to keep hot jazz alive, and are necessarily more expensive, \$1.50 each. They, are worth knowing, however. "Lonesome Blues" is one of the most touching of slow blues, perfectly played. "China Boy" is one of the best examples of Bechet's fast improvisation.

Bechet and his New Orleans Feetwarmers: "I've Found a New Baby" and "Shag"; "Maple Rag" and "Sweetie Dear" (Bluebird). "Wild Man Blues" and "Shake It and Break It" (Victor).

Jelly Roll Morton's New Orleans Jazzmen: "High Society" and "I Thought I Heard Buddy Bolden Play" (Bluebird).

Louis Armstrong and Orchestra: "Perdido Street Blues" and "2:19 Blues" (Decca, in "New Orleans Jazz" Album).

Bechet Quintet: "Lonesome Blues" and "Dear Old Southland" (Blue Note).

Bechet-Spanier Big Four: "China Boy" and "Four or Five Times." MARTIN MACK.

NEW MASSES Classified Ads

S. S. S. S.

50c a line. Payable in Advance. Min. charge \$1.50 Approx. 7 words to a line. Deadline Fri. 4 p.m.

FOR RENT

LARGE ROOM, PRIVATE. In modern apartment with couple. TO RENT, FURNISHED, \$25 per month includes linen, household expenses, telephone. East 8th Street between 1st and 2nd Avenue. Call GR 7-4036.

FURNISHED ROOM. Large, Light, Convenient Kitchen privileges, REASONABLE. Call all week. 8 Barrow St., Apt. 12A.

FURS

PARISIAN FUR CRAFTSMAN in wholesale district can give you 35% below retail rates on REMODELING, REPAIRING & CUSTOM MADE COATS & JACK-ETS. Storage facilities, minimum \$2.50. ASK FOR MR. ARMAND, ARMAND ET SOEUR, 145 West 30 St., N. Y. C. CHi 4-1424.

INSURANCE

Whatever your needs — PAUL CROSBIE, established since 1908 — FREQUENT SAVINGS, 42 Broadway. TRADE UNION AGENCY. Tel. HAnover 2-3435.

SCHOOL REGISTRATION

WORKERS SCHOOL—Summer term registration now going on. CLASSES START JULY 7th. Courses in Hisory of C.P.S.U., Marxism-Leninism, Political Economy, rinciples of Communism, The Negro Question, Imperialsm, Soviet Policy and World Affairs, Public Speaking, Trade Unionism, Mimeograph Technique, American History, etc. Catalogues available at office, Room 301, 35 E. 12 St., N. Y.

VACATION RESORTS

AVANTA FARM, Ulster Park, N. Y. Telephone 591 M 1. Ideal Resting Place. Jewish-American table. Bathing. \$14 week, \$2.50 day. Children \$9.

EAST HILL FARM, Youngsville, N. Y. Breezy vacation spot on the mountain top. Modernized. Colorful bedrooms, rustic dining room. Swimming, tennis, etc. And food! Mmm! \$15 week, \$2.75 day. Tel. Jeffersonville 78F21. Booklet on request. Managers: Four Young City Slickers.

ELMWOOD FARM invites you to spend your vacation or weekends in the Switzerland of America. Comfortable rooms, excellent food, congenial company. Hiking, bicycling, fishing. ELMWOOD FARM, HUNTER, New York.

RIVERSIDE INN, Seymour, Conn., on Lake Housatonic. Swimming, Boating, Tennis. Excellent Food, \$18 week. \$3.50 day. Rooms for Rent. Phone Derby 598-12.

ACKS FARM, Saugerties, N. Y. Telephone 590 J Intimate, Informal. Unusually beautiful countryside. Picturesque hiking trails without number. Acres of pine woods. Finest home cooking. Sports. Low rates. MAKE EARLY RESERVATIONS.

Modernized old house, fireplace, comfortable beds, delicious food, beautiful mountain country, hour from N. Y., '20 per week. THE DINNER BELL. Ethel Breene, Hillrest Rd. & Emerson Lane, R.F.D. 3, Plainfield, N. J. Plainfield 6-3090.

WANTED FOR NEW MASSES

Wanted for NM Fund Drive — Light, small car, good condition, cheap as possible. Call CA 5-3076 (daytime).

CAMPUS AGENTS WANTED by NEW MASSES. Enterprising students can earn high commissions through sale of subscriptions and individual copies. For details write: Promotional Director, NEW MASSES, 461 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

SALESMEN WANTED TO SELL NEW MASSES on streets. Very high commissions-energetic young men can earn \$3 to \$5 a day. Apply Promotion Director, New Masses, 461 Fourth Ave., N. Y. C.

ORDER NOW

THIS

OUT

FL

NEW MASSES would be grateful for **VOLUNTEER** clerical **HELP** in circulation campaign. Apply Room 1204, 461 Fourth Ave., N. Y. C.

DECEMBER 17, 1940 ISSUE for our own files. Please send to Circulation Department, 461 Fourth Avenue, Room 1204, New York City.

GOINGS ON

MARXIST ANALYSIS OF THE WEEK'S NEWS, by A. B. Magil, editor New Masses, July 13, 8:30 P.M. Workers School, 50 E. 13 Street. Admission 25 cents.

LIGHT ON THE USSR

one year of new masses plus . . .

A book about the Soviet Union plus one year of NEW MASSES* at a special combination price.

*Regularly \$5

NM

Combination

Price



		11100
A SHORT HISTORY OF THE USSR edited by	Prof. Shostokov list price \$.60	\$5.00
RUSSIA WITHOUT ILLUSIONS by Pat Sloan .	list price \$.75	5.25
I CHANGE WORLDS by Anna Louise Strong .	list price \$3.00	5.25
WOMAN IN THE SOVIET EAST by Fanina Halle	list price \$4.00	5.25
LAND OF THE SOVIETS by Nicholas Mikhailov	list price \$2.50	5.50
YOU MIGHT LIKE SOCIALISM by Corliss Lamon	nt list price \$.95	5.50
LIFE ON AN ICE FLOE by Ivan Papanin	list price \$2.50	5.50
WE DIDN'T ASK UTOPIA by Harry & Rebecca T	imbres list price \$2.50	5.75
CULTURE AND THE PEOPLE by Maxim Gorky	list price \$2.50	6.00
NEW MASSES, 461 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y. Gentlemen: I wish to take advantage of your combination Enclosed find \$ The book I desire is	book-and-subscri	ption offer.
Name		
The one-year subscription (or renewal) to NEW	MASSES you ma	ay send to:
Name		
City	State	7-15-41
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

HOW DOES THE BATTLE GO?

New Masses correspondents in London and Moscow are ready to cable us the decisive facts. We know you want them to rush their information, their interpretation of events. But cables cost money. So New Masses puts it up to you. Will you help us raise a \$5,000 fund for these cables? Speed your contribution to make the weekly articles from London and Moscow possible.

