new masses

SEPTEMBER 24 1946 . VOL. LX, No. 13 . 15¢; IN CANADA 20¢

ARAGON: TO ALL WRITERS OF ALL LANDS

Now, now is the time to declare your side so that there may be peace, peace which you can force men to make, and which you must force men to make today, and not tomorrow. *Whose side are you on?*

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE:

THE FLIGHT OF RUTH McKENNEYAND BRUCE MINTONBy THE EDITORSBEHIND THE WALLACE FUROREBy A. B. MAGIL

just a minute

XTHEN the American armies occupied China last year, they gave as their pretext for this act the disarming of the Japanese. This excuse had a familiar ring, and if you had read the Great Conspiracy Against Russia by Michael Sayers and Albert Kahn, you would have discovered that the Allied armies gave as their reason for the invasion of the new Soviet state in 1918-19 the disarming of the Germans. Thus you will find in the Great Conspiracy the roots and reasons of the present-day "get-toughwith-Russia" policy. That is why NM's forthcoming "Adventure Dramatic," headed by Paul Robeson and Paul Draper (see back page), is more than just a dramatic presentation. It is a visual and aural record of imperialism at work. Friend Churchill was one of the prime provocateurs against the Soviet Union after the last war, and as late as 1930 the British were attempting to stir up the Asiatic tribes within the Soviet borders to rebel against their socialist government. Today Winnie is back again, louder and "tougher" than ever. Instead of David Francis, our big business ambassador to Russia in the last war, we have many busy representatives of Anglo-American imperialism working furiously to bring about a war with the Soviet Union.

The need for dramatizing this drive is

indeed being appreciated universally. The Unity Theater of London, having read of the forthcoming production, has cabled NM for a copy of the script, as has a theater group of Toronto. The Canadian group, living in a community that has been well splattered by the spy-scare stories, has asked us to rush the script as quickly as possible.

If you want to clarify your friends who are bewildered by the seemingly inexplicable about-face of the American and British "statesmen" toward the Soviet Union, get them some tickets for our Living Newspaper theater lesson, while we still have some.

OUR ten-series forum on American Civilization (details on page 13) is rapidly taking shape. Lecturers thus far include Dr. Harry F. Ward, Dr. Samuel Sillen, Doxie Wilkerson and James Allen. By the time the roster of speakers is complete, there will be an authority on every phase of American contemporary civilization. For an objective view of the times we live in, this series will be hard to beat. The cost to non-NM subscribers is ten dollars for the series, for the subscriber, \$6.50. If you wish to become an NM subscriber at any time during the series (on an annual basis, of course), the cost of the series will revert to \$6.50. Our favorite organization, the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, notify us that they will hold their first postwar national convention on September 21 and 22. The convention will be featured by a parade, bands and all, in honor of the dead of the Spanish anti-Franco war and World War II. The line of march is tentatively fixed as beginning at Madison Square Park and ending at the Fraternal Clubhouse on West 48th Street, where the convention proper will take place.

Have you got some good ideas for cartoons? If so, send them in. NM will pay you a dollar for each one used.

The smallness of this issue is due, as you have probably surmised, to a paper shortage resulting from the refusal of the employers to grant the demands of the striking truck drivers. The N. Y. Times and other bourgeois papers, cut to less than half their usual size, have been grumbling over the "economic waste" caused by strikes. However, NM will gladly give up sixteen pages for as long as it takes to win the strike, and we are sure you feel the same way. J. F.



new	masses

1 1

EDITORIAL BOARD:

STAFF: editor: JOSEPH NORTH. executive editor: A. B. MAGIL. managing editor: LLOYD L. BROWN. FREDERICK V. FIELD, JOHN STUART. washington editor: VIRGINIA GARDNER. art editor: CHARLES KELLER. assistant editors: JOSEPH FOSTER, CHARLES HUMBOLDT. ASSOCIATES: JAMES S. ALLEN, HERBERT APTHEKER, RICHARD O. BOYER, HOWARD FAST, WILLIAM GROPPER, V. J. JEROME, ALBERT E. KAHN.

editoriai assistant: BETTY MILLARD. * business manager: PAUL KAYE. field director: DORETTA TARMON. promotion manager: BEATRICE SISKIND. advertising manager: GERTRUDE CHASE. circulation manager: CARMELA WEINSTEIN.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: LOUIS ARAGON NATHAN AUSUBEL . LIONEL BERMAN . ALVAH BESSIE . W. E. B. DuBOIS R. PALME DUTT . PHILIP EVERGOOD . SENDER GARLIN . BARBARA GILES . ROBERT GWATHMEY . ROCKWELL KENT . ALFRED KREYM-BORG . JOHN HOWARD LAWSON . MERIDEL LE SUEUR . VITO ANTON MARCANTONIO . LEWIS MERRILL PABLO NERUDA ISIDOR PAUL ROBESON HOWARD SELSAM REFREGIER • SAMUEL SILLEN JAMES TURNBULL . CHARLES SCHNEIDER . . WHITE . DOXEY WILKERSON.

A man standing Up Louis Aragon	3	
The Minton-McKenney Flight The Editors	5	
L'Anonyme: a poem Jules Alan Wein	8	
The Germany Byrnes Wants: an editorial		
John Stuart	9	
Washington Memo Virginia Gardner	10	
Behind the Wallace Furore: an editorial A. B. Magil	11	
Hecht on Horseback Moses Miller	12	

Man Charling Ha Louis Anon

Two weeks' notice is requested for change of address. Notification sent to NEW MASSES rather than the Post Office will give the best results. Vol. LX, No. 13. Published weekly by THE NEW MASSES, INC., 104 E. 9M Street, New York 3, N. Y. Copyright 1946, THE NEW MASSES, INC., Reg. U. S. Parent Office. Washington Office, 802 F St. NW, Room 28. Drawings and text may not be reprinted without permission. Entered as second-class matter, June 23, 1926, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879. Single copies 15 cents. Subscriptions \$6.00, a year in U. S. and Possessions and Mexico; six months \$3.50; three months \$2.00. Foreign, \$7.00 a year, \$4.00 for six months, \$4.00; three months, \$2.25. In Canada \$6.50 a year, \$4.00 for six months, U. S. money; single copies in Canada 20 cents Canadian money. NEW MASSES weekomes the work of new writers and artists. Manuscripts and drawings must be accompany stamped, addressed envelope.

A MAN STANDING UP

It is ten years since Maxim Gorky's death. He was "like a great tree that lets fall its shadow on your shoulders."

By LOUIS ARAGON

TEN years he has been dead. It is ten years since the alarming telegram brought me hurrying from London. I was finishing Les Beaux Quartiers on board the boat which brought me-a boat unlike any other I had ever traveled on, filled with singing, dancing and matey-ness. Gorky's own people, the people he sprang from, the people that fills his great land-sized works, led us to him across the North Sea and the Baltic at his dying hour. The sea and the music bore us on through the long soft nights which obliterate class distinctions, us and our anxiety to see him again in his life, the great legendary man. Gorky it had been who first set Elsa writing, and as for me. . . .

This is a sort of confession I am making, which I never made before. In the literary sense of the word, Gorky never influenced me; it was my life he influenced, which is different and more serious. He stood over me, high over me, like a great tree that lets fall its shadow on your shoulders. I stood and meditated a very long time in that shadow. There was a quality about Gorky the writer which I could never attain to, something that cannot be imitated, the quality that gave him in his own lifetime the character of a legendary hero-his profound and perfect one-ness with his people. No other nation in the world, wherever I might turn, was privileged thus to see rising from it a man of its own stature, a man like Gorky standing up out of Russia, holding together in his big bony oldman's hands the past and the future, the long story of the centuries and the youngest hopes of life. He hauled with him into the march of history the whole old world of Russian literature, the world and people of the old ballads. He embraced them and surpassed them. It was an extraordinary world, rather like the bizarre following of clients (in the Latin sense) which gathered round him in Capri or Berlin, and was even reforming around him in the youngeyed Republic. There were figures so extravagantly romantic that it seemed Gorky had collected them for their oddity only; we were to see all too soon what a price his curiosity cost him. He embraced this world and surpassed it. We should be wrong to stand staring at its Russian picturesqueness; for are we not now, as Gorky was then, surrounded by a world of survivals, squawking, discussing, hanging in the void, and totally unaware that its feet have long since left the ground of reality? But I am wandering from my subject. I was on the brink of a confession.

The world I belonged to when I met Gorky for the first time was in a state of flux; it was a world of superstitions, a world of clouds, torn between the fetishism of taste and the call of humanity. I had already chosen my side but I was still a prey to that terror my friend Jean Paulhan writes of, which held back the authors of my generation from writing novels. In our artificial climate, in Paris where already the first fascist plots were brewing, it was fashionable to believe that one could not write a novel without being false to one's human destiny. We feared novelizing as our forefathers feared the heavens would fall. I am not writing the history of our sillinesses here. But what I want to emphasize is how much I was affected, not only by Gorky's novels themselves, but by their having been written by this man, this peerless figure, this patriarch on the threshold of the new world, Gorky: this it was that beat down in me the inhibitions which we all carried. I called my second novel, the one I finished on the boat between London and Leningrad, Les Beaux Quartiers (Residential Quarter), and I am certain that the name was an inverted echo of The Lower Depths. That will seem a niggling sort of detail, but influence is a curious thing; it is not always the direct and visible influence which has the strongest effect.

In 1934 too, at the Congress of Soviet Writers, I had been struck by Gorky's preoccupation, which I thought untimely, with Russian medieval poetry, the bylins, the heroes of the epics, the Bogatyrs who resemble the

Knights of the Round Table and differ from them as the Pripet differs from Tintagel. He had a sense of the national in poetry, of the inherited treasures of experience from the remote national past, which ran clean counter to the false image we had of the Soviet man of letters. When some poet brought on to the stage a derisive caricature of the Bogatyrs, making them out to be grotesque and brutal feudal warriors, like a prefiguring of the SS, it was from Gorky that its opponents took their criticism, and drove the work off the stage as an insult to Russia. That incident made a strong impression on me, too, and provoked a train of thought which, though it did not follow Gorky's meditation very closely, borrowed its colors from Gorky. Those who know me, know how important this train of thought was for me, and how it brought me to certain French sources whose effect is a biographical fact, traceable in my works. The shadow of Gorky stretches even that far.

The ship that carried us down the Baltic was ringing with the songs of this Russian people, perhaps at the very instant when the most purely Russian of its writers was in his agony. Should we find him still alive? We asked the accordion-players in the bows and the balalaikas in the poop. It was a terrible gap his death would leave; it was a great authoritative voice that was dying. It was the voice which had arisen and asked: "Skiem viy, mastieri Cultura?" "Whose side are you on, you lords of culture?"

No, WE were not to find him alive. In those last days of his life, sultry and thundery with the heat of June, we reached the gates of his dwelling, in the great park which the state had given him. We did not enter the house. All around the green garden, cars stood waiting like ours. Young men and girls passed on the dusty road, singing, dreaming, making love or joking aloud. From inside, where the race with death was being run, came contradictory news. The door opened for

the doctor. Later, we knew: it was a sadder drama than the simple death we imagined. Now we know what weighed so heavily on our hearts in those last hours: among the baroque retinue which this lover of human diversity had assembled round himself, crime, the worst and blackest of crimes was at work-dark conspiracy, including the doctor and others on whom Gorky had heaped his generosity. Gorky died, and a great sob went up from the whole country. I saw him sleeping surrounded with flowers and weeping plants, the great old man who took so many secrets with him, secrets hard to discover, secrets with the tracks brushed away behind them: the secret of goodness; the secret of endless curiosity about people; the secret of patience; the secret of listening, as to a fountain, to the precious unconscious murmuring of a

multitude of simple hearts. He was always a man who learned from others, and gave them back what he learnt.

Ten years ago. We are still under his shadow. It still is over us, aften ten years of history, ten of the most terrible years of this world. It is the shadow of an unanswered question that hangs over us—deaths, martyrdoms, horrible sufferings, sobs, crimes, all that horror and inhumanity can invent; and an unanswered question. . . .

Whose side are you on, you lords of culture, when preferential treatment is given to the murderer and not the victim; when heroic nations which have barely survived massacre are treated by their false allies as enemies; when those to whom the radio spoke such honeyed words yesterday, see today the old enemy in a new uniform as your precious policemen, still leagued



"Drilling (Moscow)," linecut by Albert Abramovitz.

against the poor, still leagued against those who did not sell their souls or their anger, those who believed in you, those who prayed for your coming.... Where do you stand, whose side are you on, you lords of culture, that you are not heard in the hubbub of victory?

... You see how our means of killing, of extermination, of cataclysm, have grown to the size of natural catastrophes. They are out of hand, almost out of reach of our imaginations. The danger has never been so close before, of the destruction of all that makes life worth living, the extinction of the light of the eyes, the destruction of the breath of love. You have not been so long out of danger that you have forgotten what destruction means; you are still pale from the hell you lived in. There is no time to lose. There is no calculation to make. There is no balance to cast up between all and nothing. There is no comparison to draw between Man and the void. Whose side are you on?

When he asked you that, the old man who died before you answered, he could see what was coming. He was among his people who were going to suffer as none has ever suffered; he was there in the throng of seventeen million people marked for death, a forest of trees blazed for felling! And he asked you whose side you were on. Surrounded by the huge industry of peace, the Ukrainian wheatfields, the great hydro-electric schemes, the ironfoundries talking their fiery language to the future; surrounded by dreams that were coming true, at what a price! Surrounded by the immense and peaceful reverie of a people whose greatness shocked the daylight, he knew what would come, and he gave his great, bitter cry: "Whose side? Whose side are you on?"

AM French. I speak from a little promontory of Europe which is great by the power of the human voice and by the courage of men and their obstinate hard work. I am French, and that is why I have a duty to peace which begins in Paris. From this dramatic position I shout to you what the dead man among his seventeen million dead can no longer shout: "Now, now is the time to declare your side, lords of culture, so that there may be peace, peace in the likeness of France, peace which you can force men to make, lords of culture, and which you must force men to make, today and not tomorrow. And not tomorrow! Come on, tell us: whose side are you on?"

(Translated by John Manifold.)



"Drilling (Moscow)," linecut by Albert Abramovitz.

THE MINTON-McKENNEY FLIGHT

By THE EDITORS

ANY readers of New Masses were no doubt surprised to Learn that Bruce Minton and Ruth McKenney had been expelled from the Communist Party. It is always sad to discover that those who have been thought to be staunch in the battle against human enslavement and degradation have proved weak and unworthy. To the editors of New Masses, however, who were associated with Miss McKenney and Mr. Minton for more than ten years, this news has not been entirely unexpected. Our own experiences with these two writers, who are husband and wife, forced us to conclude months ago that they were moving toward a break with the Marxist movement. That break has come. In its statement on the expulsion the Connecticut State Committee of the Communist Party points out that Mr. Minton and Miss McKenney, following the recent meeting of the Party's National Committee, issued an anti-Party document "attacking the basic line of the Party and slandering its leadership, and circulated this document outside of Connecticut." The statement also characterized their position as "pettybourgeois 'radicalism'" and charged that they "were in contact with antiforces" outside their own Party branch.

NM's own relations with Mr. Minton and Miss McKenney came to an end five months ago when, beginning with our April 23 issue, we dropped them from our board of contributing editors. We took this action because over a period of months they had directed against NEW MAsses and its editors the same kind of destructive, factional attacks which they later launched against the Communist Party and its leadership. Nevertheless, we refrained from making public our differences in the hope that the passing of time and the grave national and international problems confronting the American people and its working-class party would cause Mr. Minton and Miss McKenney to abandon their puerile "leftism" and place the fight for peace, democracy and socialism above personal pique and petty individualism. Instead, they merely broadened their mud-slinging to include the

Communist Party and developed their pseudo-radical posturing into an approach to domestic and foreign affairs which is in direct conflict with that of Marxists in this and other countries. Since the facts in the case are revealing and the issues have a significance beyond the activities of these two individuals, we want our readers to understand what has happened.

On August 29, 1945 there arrived in our office a letter, signed by Ruth McKenney and Bruce Minton, which stated that "in view of our continuing objections to the reformist editorial policy pursued by the present editorial board of the magazine," they were resigning as contributing editors. The letter also requested that the resignation be announced in the forthcoming issue.

This resignation came without warning. The "continuing objections to the reformist editorial policy" was news to us. On the contrary, only a few months earlier Mr. Minton had written letters expressing the greatest warmth toward New Masses and toward the editors personally.

Instead of joining with the editors, contributors and readers of New Masses in the effort to correct the serious errors which the magazine had made, Mr. Minton and Miss McKenney set themselves up as arbiters of Marxism and from their pinnacle of purity poured down abuse and calumny.

Mr. Minton claimed that he and Miss McKenney had disagreed from the beginning with the position of Earl Browder, former head of the American Communist Party, whose policies were castigated by Jacques Duclos, French Communist leader, as a "notorious revision of Marxism." Even if true, this would not justify their later arrogance and disruption. We might add that rejection of error is not always synonymous with embracing of truth. Moreover, in a letter from San Francisco, dated May 19, 1945, Mr. Minton wrote: "I leave here optimistic and buoyed up. There are rough times ahead, very rough, but I have more confidence than ever in the correctness of our [that is, the Communist movement's] basic position, which has survived the test of very stringent events." This was written five days before the publication of the Duclos article.

M^{R.} MINTON and Miss McKenney knew of course that their statement of resignation, which they insisted be published, would be picked up by the commercial press and used against NM and the entire Marxist movement. That, after so many years of association and in a time of crisis, they could take such a drastic, highly individualistic step indicated to us that there was more in the matter than met the eye. Nevertheless, the editors of NM held their tempers and sought to dissuade them from an act that would prove damaging to much more than New Masses. To our efforts to arrange a conference Mr. Minton replied coldly and abusively. It soon became clear to us that the attack on NEW MASSES was only a pretext, that the real quarrel of Mr. Minton and Miss McKenney was with the Communist Party of the United States.

A second letter, dated August 31, 1945, also revealed something about the motivation of the attack. "... Because we have both some stake in this," Mr. Minton wrote, "we do insist on our resignation. Ruth has a reputation to keep clean, I feel, and I insist for her future writing that she finally end her association with a magazine that can only harm her standing intellectually." In what circles could her association with a Marxist magazine "harm her standing intellectually"? Mr. Minton didn't specify, but we leave it to our readers to draw their own conclusions. Only shortly before, Mr. Minton and Miss McKenney had evidently felt differently on that subject. "Your approval of her [Miss McKenney's] two pieces has meant a great deal to her," wrote Mr. Minton from San Francisco on April 8, 1945. "She has not written anything she has considered of any integrity since she left Washington, that is for publication, and the fact that you liked what she did was an immense shot in the arm and gave her the reassurance she needed for quite a time."

In another letter, dated Sept. 12, 1945, Mr. Minton demanded the im-

mediate resignation of the entire NM staff. At this point we realized that discussion would be fruitless since we were no longer dealing with colleagues in a common cause, but with rabid factionalists whose criticism was aimed at destroying rather than improving NEW MASSES.

In later months Mr. Minton decided it would be expedient to retreat a bit. He expressed a desire to write for NM and offered us for publication a speech by Miss McKenney. However, since he continued to characterize NEW MASSES as revisionist and reformist, we decided there was no basis for collaboration. When last April we introduced changes in the magazine and recast our board of contributing editors, we eliminated the names of Bruce Minton and Ruth McKenney.

MORE important than these details are the political issues involved. Let no one be seduced by the commercial press canard that the expulsion of these two individuals is evidence of "intolerance" and suppression of freedom of criticism. No member of the Communist Party is prevented from making criticism or expressing differences of opinion. The constitution of the Communist Party of the USA specifically provides that members have "not only the right but the responsibility to participate in the making of po-

Sen. Rankest Says:

licies and in the election of its leading committees." It also provides that decisions shall be by majority vote, after which "all members are duty-bound to carry out such decisions." It is Mr. Minton and Miss McKenney who are guilty of anti-democratic efforts to nullify the will of the majority. It is preposterous to speak of their intemperate diatribes and attempts to undermine Marxist institutions as criticism. The fact is that even non-Marxist organizations would not tolerate such venomous factionalism-a factionalism that helps only the enemies of the labor and progressive cause.

Ultra-leftism is not a new phenomenon in the American or international working-class movements. From the Eighties of the last century, when Frederick Engels criticized the sectarian "purity" of the early American Marxists, through the Socialist Labor Party, the IWW, the left wing of the Socialist Party and the first years of the Communist Party, ultra-left tendencies plagued the efforts to build an American movement for socialism. Internationally the situation became serious enough to cause Lenin in 1920 to write his famous brochure, "Left-Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder. Stating that the principal enemy of the working class is rightwing opportunism, Lenin in this work also pointed out: "It is not yet suffi-



"Tighter, boy, tighter—I've got to deliver an inflation speech tonight."

ciently known abroad that Bolshevism grew, took shape and became steeled in long years of struggle against pettybourgeois revolutionism, which smacks of, or borrows something from, anarchism, and which differs in all essentials from the conditions and requirements of the sustained proletarian class struggle. For Marxists it is well established theoretically-and the experience of all European revolutions and revolutionary movements has fully confirmed itthat the small proprietor . . . who under capitalism suffers constant oppression and very often an incredibly sharp and rapid worsening of conditions of life and even ruin, easily becomes extremely revolutionary, but is incapable of displaying perseverance, ability to organize, discipline and firmness." Elsewhere Lenin wrote that ultra-left is merely the obverse of the right-wing trend, both stemming from the same social roots.

This early ultra-leftism expressed the growing pains of the Marxist movement when it inevitably stumbled as part of the process of learning to walk. But that which in a child is part of healthful, if complex, progress, in a mature person becomes dangerous retrogression. That is why William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, who from the outset opposed Browder's bourgeois liberal fantasies, after the ousting of Browder, while stressing the fight against right opportunism, persistently warned against swinging to the opposite-only apparently opposite - extreme, ultra-left sectarianism. There were some, who refused to heed these warnings. They attempted to live out their day-dreams, to leap over the real problems of the present-day struggle against capitalist reaction into a more advanced, more "militant" stage. Such pseudo-revolutionary escapism merely serves to leave the forces of reaction unchallenged masters of the immediate situation and therefore of the future too.

It should be noted that intellectuals. because of their social origin and their functional role under capitalism, are peculiarly susceptible to such moods, especially in periods of difficulty. There are of course in the Communist movement in this and other countries many intellectuals of another type, men and women who have genuinely assimilated the Marxist outlook, have identified themselves with the working class as the only revolutionary class and have converted their talents and training into important assets in the battle for pro-

gress and socialism. Unfortunately, Mr. Minton and Miss McKenney, valuable as their work was in certain periods, were more consistent in their wavering than in their Marxism and were all too often addicted to "pettybourgeois revolutionism." This is evident in Miss McKenney's novel, Jake Home, which for all its virtues suffers both artistically and as social history from its hothouse approach to the American class struggle and its typically middle-class conception of Communist activity as the work of a few master-minds manipulating the masses. Such weaknesses were also evident in Mr. Minton on various occasions, notably in 1942 when as Washington correspondent of NM he opposed the policy of national unity pursued by Marxists throughout the world, a unity embracing all, including capitalist elements, who sought victory over the Axis. In a series of articles he wrote, which the editors of NM rejected in their original form, he attempted to narrow this policy and to develop an approach which would have divided the anti-Axis forces and disrupted the war effort.

ALL this would not be worth recalling were it not for the fact that these sporadic "leftist" tendencies have now grown into a factional monstrosity which has nothing in common with Marxism. Concretely, what is the position of Mr. Minton and Miss McKenney on the urgent questions before the American people? In the document they are circulating they attack William Z. Foster for stating in his report to the meeting of the Communist National Committee: "The most important of all questions is the fight to maintain world peace." They insist that "there is no peace" to maintain, that the civil war in China is already an international war, and that the diplomatic war being waged by the United States against the Soviet Union and all democratic governments is tantamount to military war. Sounds very radical, doesn't it? But stop to think: wouldn't the American imperialists like nothing better than to have our people accept the notion that the fight for peace is already lost? That would relieve them of all homefront opposition to their war plans. The Minton-McKenney line on foreign affairs means in effect •abandonment of the struggle against World War III.

There is the same berserk "leftism"



"What black magician conjures up this fiend . . .?" —Richard III.

on domestic policy. The document denounces as Browderism the use of the term "progressives," describes all reference to "pro-Roosevelt forces" as "reformist illusion," and demands the formation of "a class-conscious Labor Party." Let us consider what this means. In the 1946 election the American people are not voting on the issue of socialism, even though socialism is the historic perspective of the workingclass. What they are voting on through the candidates they elect and through the political movements they support or fail to support are such issues as cooperation for peace with the USSR, the ending of American intervention in China and the reactionary policies in Europe, Asia and Latin America, the eradication of all fascist vestiges; higher wages, firm price control, a vast housing program, expanded social security, curbs on monopoly and on big business profits, the outlawing of the poll-tax and lynching, etc.-all of them issues whose outcome will not only immediately affect the lives of the people of America and the world, but will advance or retard the struggle for socialism.

It is evident that the achievement of such a program or any reasonable facsimile thereof in the 1946 election requires in the first place a politically alert labor movement, acting independently to bring its maximum strength to bear

behind these issues. Second, it requires the mobilization as labor's allies of those sections of the population-the dirt farmers, small business and professional people, Negroes and veteranswho likewise suffer from big business control of our economy and government. Third, it requires the enlisting of allies wherever else they can be found, no matter how temporary, limited and vacillating they may be. Finally, it requires the concentration of the maximum power of such a coalition against those candidates and policies behind which the forces of reaction are concentrated.

Concretely, this means strengthening the independent efforts of the CIO Political Action Committee and of allied and potentially allied groups such as the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, the National Citizens PAC, farm, Negro, veterans' and other progressive groups, including the Communists. It means the building of the Marxist vanguard, the Communist Party. It means recognizing that the Republican Party nationally remains the principal party of big business reaction while at the same time the Truman administration, as Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party, pointed out in his report at the recent National Committee meeting, "is zealously carrying out the program

of big business in both foreign and domestic affairs," though at the same time it is "still sensitive to certain mass pressures," is "still influenced by the conflicting trends, groups and opinions within the Democratic Party." These conflicts within the Democratic Party (to some extent within the GOP too) make it "essential that-while pursuing an independent working class policy and expanding its independent political organizations and activitylabor helps influence a progressive regrouping within the Democratic Party" and "achieve a working agreement" with the pro-Roosevelt elements.

It should be obvious that a coalition of this kind, broadly conceived, cannot in 1946 be predicated on an organizational break with the two major parties, but rather on a political break with the policies of the dominant leadership of those parties. Such a political break, moreover, is the indispensable ploughing of the soil out of which can rise in the post-election period a new people's anti-monopoly party led by labor. This year, however, most of the candidates supported by the coalition are Democrats with a sprinkling of progressive Republicans. At the same time, wherever the situation requires it and wherever it will strengthen the battle

L'ANONYME

And you are larger than the famed, And dearer than the legend Mourned with circumstance.

Sweet comrade,

Fallen also upon Mount Valerien Where sing the morrows of Peri, I cannot hold thee less Who walked without acclaim And died as purely.

In the day

When mourning was of triumph And of tribute, It is written

That the petals wept upon the noblest. Comrade,

There are sorrows unrecorded, Silences that bear no name.

I have thought

That in the time of testing,

If the grail of martyrdom is here,

It filters not from testament of heroes

Chanting to the rifle,

But from veins as simple and as pure as these

That opened wordlessly

And are not known.

JULES ALAN WEIN.

against reaction, Communist or other independent candidates are being put forward. The aim must at all times be, in the words of Dennis, "consolidating the unity of action of the broadest coalition of all democratic forces in the 1946 elections to prevent a reactionary Republican victory, which now looms as a distinct possibility, as well as to defeat the reactionaries and allies of the GOP in the Democratic Party." And looking beyond November, "the situation demands that broad political support for a new people's party be organized."

All this is the opposite pole of Browderism which, far from combatting monopoly capital and its reactionary program, depicted it as "progressive" and sought to make labor the submissive handyman of big business and the Truman administration.

All this is also the opposite pole of what Mr. Minton and Miss McKenney demand. A "class-conscious Labor Party" at this time would exclude most of the CIO and AFL, let alone middleclass elements. If this phrase has any meaning, it can only be synonymous with the Communist Party. The fact is the majority of trade union members are not even ready to establish an independent party with a more limited outlook. Simultaneously, Mr. Minton and Miss McKenney spurn alliances with progressives in the two capitalist parties. What they advocate is the self-isolation of the most advanced workers and the disruption of the movement for independent political action. Under cover of radical rhetoric, they propose to atomize the political opposition to reactionary big business.

Thus, by different roads both Browder and the ultra-leftists arrive at the same destination: abandonment of the struggle against the foreign and domestic policies of monopoly capital and its GOP and tory Democratic servitors.

There is a fitting epilogue to all this super-revolutionary sound and fury. Mr. Minton and Miss McKenney are planning to leave for France for a prolonged stay. The former has told friends that the victory of fascism is inevitable in this country, that the crackdown will soon come, and that he considers it his duty to leave and urges others to do likewise in order to preserve the revolutionary forces for the future. The circle is completed. They began by deserting first NEW MASSES and then the Communist Party; they end by deserting the struggle against reaction, fascism and war.

portside patter by BILL RICHARDS

Officials state that American aid to the Kuomintang consists only of surplus material. People are probably wondering just when the Marines were declared surplus.

•

Upton Close has proposed New Guinea as a Jewish homeland. It's almost as hot there as the place Close has been told to go.

•

President Truman takes his morning exercise at the regulation Army pace of 120 steps a minute. Some quarters see this as a sign that Truman will not choose to run.

•

Several American warships stopped off at Greece on their Mediterranean tour. The visit was described as a "courtesy" call, although the Greeks may have a word for it too.

The Bulgarian people have voted overwhelmingly against the monarchy.

Obviously the issues in the plebiscite weren't Greek to them.

A Hearst columnist reports that "a chunk of Communist propaganda" was found hidden in the dialogue of *Forever Amber*. Hearst has evidently not discovered it but the heroine also

Senator Vandenburg has vehemently denied ever taking orders from Gerald L. K. Smith. He merely gives that impression occasionally.

favored unions.

Virtual civil war rages in the Philippines. After only a few months of independence the country is going on the Roxas.

Foreign theaters, at least, got a

chance to see Jane Russell in "The Outlaw." The rest of the world will probably never see a better example of American expansion.

THE GERMANY BYRNES WANTS

An Editorial by JOHN STUART

THE most biting and revealing commentary on Secretary Byrnes' Stuttgart speech came, it seems to me, in a brief news dispatch to the New York Herald Tribune of September 12. Like a lightning flash across stormy heavens, this cable from Frankfurt illuminates clearly what Byrnes is doing and whom it benefits most. As a result of his speech, says the report, "industrial stocks on the Frankfurt Exchange have risen an average of ten percent while bank stocks have risen as much as thirty percent. . . . This price rise is symptomatic of a growing optimism among German industrialists and financiers. . . . Even the outlawed Vereinigte Stahlwerke shares [among the most powerful steel cartels in the world] still quoted, recovered from 80 to 101. ... They [the German industrialists] believe that America and Britain have definitely decided to build up western Germany as a balance against the Russian zone."

In itself, the ringing of bells on the Frankfurt Exchange is sufficient judgment of Byrnes' speech—a blistering condemnation of American political operations in Germany. But there is more. For although many American newspapers persist in making comparisons, in Byrnes' favor of course, between his declaration of policy and Molotov's statements on Germany of last July, these newspapers cannot present a shred of evidence that after Molotov spoke Hitler's financiers cheered. The difference in the response of German imperialists to Byrnes and to Molotov is a difference which contains the largest meaning for the future of world peace as much as it does for the future of Germany.

American policy in Germany is, of course, a geographical application of a fundamental policy that runs beyond that area. One cannot believe that the Truman administration means to destroy the roots of German aggression, to denazify and democratize, when in China it supports with dollars and arms a Chinese version of Nazism. It taxes common sense to believe that Byrnes with the aid of Vandenberg will cleanse Germany, when in Greece they support the same classes which brought Germany to catastrophe. It is beyond credibility that Byrnes can wave the banner of democracy in Germany when in Spain he recognizes the flag of Franco fascism. All of Byrnes' Aesopian words on Germany cannot wipe away these facts, and when Byrnes speaks of democracy, the Deutsche Herren know exactly what he means. Thus, the "growing optimism among German industrialists and financiers."

Toward the close of his speech Byrnes remarked that "all that the Allied governments can and should do is lay down the rules under which Germany can govern itself." This is a fantastic definition of America's function as a victory power.

If the State Department restricts its function to "laying down rules"—if that is how it visualizes its task—then one can legitimately ask why we did not retain Admiral Doenitz, who would have happily followed the rules. Our task as an occupying force was unmistakably defined in the Potsdam agreement which Byrnes perverts both in spirit and in fact. The whole agreement was predicated, as any careful reading of it shows, on the *economic extirpation of* fascism and its war potential as the indispensable condition for the reconstruction of German political life. The gist of Potsdam, in addition, was that economic unification of Germany was a step dependent on the destruction of the German monopolies and cartels. All this is what the Soviets have been doing in their zone. But if by the test of Potsdam one is to judge American accomplishment in its zone, then we must conclude that the State Department has deliberately allowed the cart to pull the horse, and therefore has intentionally gotten nowhere. The American approach has been to return political power to reactionary Germans-and Byrnes now seeks to expand that transference of government on a nationwide scale-before economic cleansing. Raymond Daniell, in commenting on the Stuttgart speech in the New York Times of September 8, wrote that "the risk of a revival of a militant nationalism [read fascism and reaction] is inherent in Mr. Byrnes' proposal for the immediate establishment of a central German agency of government to draft a constitution for a federated democratic state."

Not only is American imperialism advocating through Byrnes a prompt return of political power to the rabid nationalists and adherents of the Nazi program, as in Bavaria, but it is preparing the economic groundwork for their strengthening. To my mind what Byrnes had to say on reparations indicates this clearly. At the present moment an effort is being made by the United States to revise out of existence the reparations principle as embodied in the Potsdam accord. For several months the Americans have failed to deliver, as they are committed to, reparations to the Russians. And on August 15 Byrnes noted that "reparations deliveries . . . take valuable assets from the impoverished lands and necessarily slow down their recovery." Germany, which raped and plundered the entire Continent, suddenly finds itself tenderly referred to as an "impoverished land" while the victims of the Wehrmacht are tacitly portrayed as economic aggressors. This is not to say that the industry of enemy countries should not be revived for peaceful purposes; but it is quite another thing to insist that reparations from them are unjust. Germany's recovery is important but the recovery of the allied nations which suffered most in the struggle against fascism is by any measure of justice paramount.

Why Byrnes in agreement with Bevin is opposed to the reparation agreement as outlined at Potsdam is not hard to fathom. They are opposed to the strengthening of the Eastern European states and in particular the USSR. They are opposed to reconstruction programs which do not invite the "help and guidance" of Wall Street and the City. Much more on changing Anglo-American attitudes toward reparations will become clear when the secret negotiations between Byrnes and Bevin find their expression in political steps.

In the interim the German gentry, who for a while thought they lost the war, are beginning to discover that perhaps they have not been defeated. One more speech such as Byrnes' and they will indeed march in victory parades.

WASHINGTON MEMO

By Virginia Gardner

THE Senate Campaign Expenditures Committee is looking for a staff of investigators to probe the Bilbo and McKellar campaigns. At least the Semite-conscious Robert Barker, former Dies snooper who conducted the committee's Montana hearings on the Burton K. Wheeler-Leif Erickson campaign, will not go. He is no longer with the committee. But for some reason he has been putting on a one-man campaign—unsuccessful, so far—to get the Montana hearings published.

The testimony, which establishes little except the anti-Semitism of Barker in his conduct of the hearing, includes some brief "questioning" of Senator Wheeler. The Senator managed to get into the record, in the event anyone was in doubt about it, that he was "proud of the fact the Communists are against me," that he thought it a "badge of honor." (The Senator was defeated in the primary by a liberal candidate, Leif Erickson, who faces stiff Republican opposition in November.)

The ineptness of Barker in trying to lug in Red-baiting makes for funny reading. A witness had said he was a "regular reader of the Saturday Review of Literature." He also read newspapers, it seems, and said, rather vaguely, that "they were gunning for him (Wheeler) in all the papers in New York, well, I would say the liberal papers. . . Generally speaking, the Herald Tribune, New York News and PM."

This was apparently said in all sobriety, and Barker, hot on the scent of Reds, immediately questioned: "And the NEW MASSES?"

"All the broad, radical newspapers, I suppose," the witness replied.

Barker asked Erickson about Henry Hoke, author of *Blackmail* and *It's A* Secret, who freely discusses Senator Wheeler's defense of some of the alleged seditionists when they were on trial. Did Erickson know whether Hoke was a member of the National Citizens Political Action Committee? No. Did he know whether he was connected with the Anti-Defamation League? No. Did he know what Sidney Hillman's connection (this was before his death) was with the National Citizens Political Action Committee? This apparently was too much for Erickson, who replied with a question. "Are you testifying?" he asked his questioner. Then Erickson went on to say that Senator Wheeler had made the statement that the PAC was spending \$200,000 to defeat him. But, said Erickson ruefully, his campaign never got it.

When Wheeler's defense of the seditionists was alluded to, Barker said, defensively, albeit a little bumbingly, "That sedition trial in Washington was also participated in by many members of the Senate including Taft of Ohio, was it not?"

Erickson replied: "I would class Senator Taft of Ohio and Senator Wheeler together. They usually vote together."

The principal anti-Semitism was revealed in a long memorandum Barker introduced through George E. Cooper, a District of Columbia Red Squad policeman he borrowed and took along to help in his investigating.

Not only did Barker borrow two DC cops, but he put to work two New York City policemen, W. T. Parry and William Kip. I have since learned that Barker hired them himself and paid their expenses, and the committee refused to allow him funds, so that they came out of his pocket. Barker himself reportedly was hired on Senator Wheeler's suggestion, and Sen. Edwin C. Johnson, who has since retired from the committee in a huff, told me that Barker conferred with Wheeler when he went to Montana. "But he had not been instructed to, and he had not been told to bring in PAC," said Senator Johnson.

The memorandum read was based



on information they supplied about persons he asked to have investigated in New York, one of whom sent \$1,000 to Sen. James E. Murray, who contributed \$1,000 to the Erickson campaign fund, said Barker. Each name in the memo was followed with the comment that the individual was Jewish.

"He is wealthy and Jewish and is chairman of the Advisory Board of the Anti-Defamation League. . . ." ". . . are Jewish and live at 29 Beekman place," it says of Albert D. Lasker and wife. They also endorsed presidential electors for Communist candidates, it said. Another name: ". . . also Jewish . . . is wealthy, according to his own statement."

R_{committee} for some information.

"I can't hear you, Miss Gardner, there seems to be some interference on the line," he said. "Suppose you call me back," and he gave me another number. "No, it's the same," he said when I again reached him. "It's on your end of the line."

He ought to know. I was talking to John Carrington of the Un-American Activities Committee staff.

PASSAGE of the Full Employment Act of 1946 even in its extremely innocuous form often is alluded to as one of the achievements of the donothing 79th Congress. Yet for months after its passage the President failed to appoint anyone to administer it. A council was to be set up which was to recommend ways to maintain maximum employment and avoid depressions. How conservative these recommendations are apt to be under the three-man Council of Economic Advisers Mr. Truman finally named is suggested by some recently published testimony of the chairman, Edwin G. Nourse, vice president of the conservative Brookings Institution. The testimony was part of the hearings before the Agriculture and Mining Subcommittee of the Colmer Postwar Economic Policy Committee, withheld for publication until August 6 last, when the committee report was issued. Here we see Dr. Nourse (May 24, 1945) confiding in the subcommittee, after outlining his ideas and describing himself as "something more

than a mere trade-union agricultural economist":

"I recall some years ago talking somewhat along this line to a Farmers' Week audience and Radio Town Meeting at the University of Ohio. As we left the platform, Mordecai Ezekiel, who had been the other speaker, said to me, 'I hadn't realized how much of an advocate of laissez faire you are.'

"I protested then and want to protest most strongly now that what I am talking is not laissez faire at all but simply a common-sense recognition that piling up mutually offsetting privileges and restraints makes government a burdensome complication of economic life. . . ." He was, he said, for "the American way of life" and free enterprise, and he saw no reason why rising productivity should mean "higher rates of profit or higher rates of wages." And above all he was for "free bargaining in an open market."

Behind the Wallace Furore

Own of the penalties of being a weekly magazine, particularly one that operates under handicaps such as don't afflict commercial publications, is that important events have a way of ignoring deadlines. That is why we'll have to content ourselves in this issue with only brief comment on the Wallace-Truman-Byrnes political tornado.

Two things stand out amid the fury of controversy. First, Secretary of Commerce Wallace's speech last week, despite serious shortcomings, was a criticism of the reactionary Byrnes-Vandenberg foreign policy and revealed a cleavage in the cabinet on the whole get-toughwith-Russia line at a time when Byrnes and Vandenberg were pressing this line in all directions at the Paris peace conference. Second, President Truman, after at first endorsing the Wallace speech as a votecatching maneuver, did a shameless about-face and showed himself the willing prisoner and accomplice of the big business imperialists who are hell-bent on global domination and World War III.

The core of Wallace's address was its attack on the policy of Anglo-American alliance directed against the Soviet Union and the new people's democracies of eastern Europe. The fact that he placed the onus for this policy on London rather than on Washington, that he conceived of cooperative relations with Russia in terms of adjusting spheres of influence rather than of collaboration in the struggle to strengthen democracy against reaction and fascism—these and other shortcomings are secondary. On the main issues on which world peace depends, Wallace broke sharply with the GOP-tory democratic coalition that is in command of foreign affairs. And through Wallace there spoke the plain people of America—and undoubtedly certain more realistic businessmen too—who had supported the FDR policy of Big Three unity and today are deeply perturbed by the reckless course of those who have betrayed the Roosevelt heritage.

The consternation in the American delegation at Paris, the loud cries of pain from Senators Vandenberg and Connally, from Senator Taft and Rep. E. E. Cox of Georgia, from the millionaire press, are a measure of the power of the Wallace blow. It has shaken up the seats of the mighty, disoriented, temporarily at least, their strategy, laid bare the deep rifts in the vaunted bipartisan unity on foreign affairs, and given dramatic emphasis to the central issue in the 1946 election. Like the recent stock market break, the conflict over foreign policy is one more intimation that American imperialism, which is trying to bully every nation, including its own, into submission, is in reality a sick giant.

Let the people follow up Wallace's attack, follow up the even clearer assault of Senator Pepper against a policy that is leading our country to disaster. This is the time to build the peace front, for the November election and after. This is the time to tell the Munich-men, the capitalist gamblers with life and death, that it is we the people, passionately seeking peace and a democratic world, who shall not be moved.

---A. B. Magil.





HECHT ON HORSEBACK

"A Flag is Born" undermines morale. It adds to the welter of confusion on an issue deeply in need of clarity and sanity.

By MOSES MILLER

N 1940, the Emergency Council for Zionist Affairs, representing all of the major Zionist organizations of America, published a pamphlet attacking the Revisionists (the extreme right wing group in the Zionist movement) and their front organizations. It stated: "Psychologically the moment is propitious for the man on horseback. Precisely because Jews have never felt so desperate, so helpless, so terrified as today, the sound of sabre rattling and trumpet blasts is welcome. The sabre may not cut; the blasts may frighten nobody, but the gesture is an emotional release."

This statement kept coming back to me again and again as I sat in a New York theater and watched the unfolding of Ben Hecht's play, *A Flag is Born.* The play was moving because it uncovered old wounds that had not yet healed, because it reminded us once again of the indescribable tragedy which has overtaken the Jewish people with their 6,000,000 dead. Yet here was the Man on Horseback with a vengeance, taking advantage of the deep sentiments and feelings of Jews to urge upon them a program bred of despair, of futility, of hopelessness.

Briefly, the theme of the play is that there is no one upon whom the Jew can rely. He is alone in a hostile world. Anti-Semitism is inexplicable. It is a mysterious and eternal disease

that pursues the Jew wherever he may be. "The name of my enemy is the world," says Tevya in the play to King Solomon. "The reason I don't know. Who can know the reason why he [the Jew] is hated? Because we are weak, we are hated. Because we are strong, we are hated. . . . Wherever there is a reason that fits nothing and nobody, that's the reason why we are hated." Europe is one vast graveyard for the Jews. They can no longer live or breathe there. The Jews must forsake Europe. Through Ben Hecht, David, the young man who is on his way to Palestine, says: "My father taught me that I belonged in the land where I was born. Then, one day, all the Jews in that land were gathered together like a pile of garbage and burned up. From this I learned that the teachings of my father were wrong. Now the English say to me, 'Come, go back to your father's village-and start over again and breed another garbage pile for Europe.' And I answered them, 'A curse on all the lands and villages of Europe. I go to find a corner of the earth where Jews do not turn into garbage-where Jews can die on the battlefields-instead of a crematorium.'"

What Hecht has done in this play is what its sponsor, the League for a Free Palestine, has been doing for a long time. He has mixed truths with half-truths and thus added to the welter of confusion on a critical issue so deeply in need of clarity and sanity.

Are there Jews who no longer want to live in Europe? Certainly there are. Large numbers of Jews are psychologically incapable of rebuilding their lives in the lands, cities and villages where they witnessed the slaughter of those so dear to them. No one who has any feeling or humanitarian instinct would oppose their leaving.

It is one thing, however, to understand the psychological basis for the desire to leave. But it is quite another thing to say, as Hecht does, that all Jews must leave, that Europe must become "Juden-rein," because anti-Semitism is eternal. Democracy may grow and expand. The old regimes and their fascist leaders who were responsible for the death and torture of the Jews may be wiped out, and in some countries are being wiped out. To Hecht all this matters very little. Europe to him is a garbage dump and thus it will remain forever and ever.

Such an approach will no doubt delight all the fascists and reactionaries who, from Hitler on down, have long been proclaiming that Europe must be rid of its Jews. The belief that the Jew is an alien in all the lands in which he lives is abject defeatism. It is a call to mass suicide. Had Hecht been thoroughly consistent in his play, he would have called not only for exodus from Europe but for exodus from America as well. For once one accepts the premise that anti-Semitism is eternal and that what the Nazis have ordained the Jews must fulfill, the basis of Jewish existence has been undermined in all countries. Let some tin-horn fuehrers in America demand that all Jews leave, and the logic of Hecht's play is that the Jews must do as they are told—and agree to leave.

IF ANTI-SEMITISM is eternal, there is ▲ no hope for the Jew anywhere, not even in Palestine. The Arabs, too, are non-Jews and therefore anti-Semitism will be eternal amongst them. What chance then has the Jew for security and peace surrounded by the millions of Arabs of the Middle East? "In Palestine we will fight on our own battlefield," shouts Hecht. But whom does he want to fight there? Will he fight British and American imperialism, which care nothing for either Jew or Arab but are concerned only with their imperialist interests? Or will he fight the Arabs, over whom he fawns in his play, but whom his Irgunists and Revisionists have attacked verbally and otherwise time and again, as has been proved by leading Zionists throughout the world? Or will he fight the whole world by himself? One wonders what kind of future Hecht offers to the Jewish community in Palestine. Is it a future where people will have to live in an eternal state of war, with sentries at all gates, on constant guard against the invader?

In his play Hecht, consistent with this point of view, cannot even resist taking a poke at the Soviet Union. "Russia does not tolerate either Semitism or anti-Semitism," he has the Soviet representative say when Tevya appears before the assembly of nations. And later on: "Russia considers clarification unnecessary and imperialistic." Ben Hecht certainly knows, as do millions of others, that anti-Semitism is a criminal offense in the Soviet Union and that there is complete equality. And that also in Bulgaria, Hungary, Yugoslavia and Poland, countries friendly to the Soviet Union, laws have been passed making anti-Semitism a crime.

To make his attack on the USSR, Hecht willfully ignores the statements of Louis Levine, an ardent Zionist and chairman of the Jewish Committee of Russian Relief, who, after returning from an extensive tour of the Soviet

what makes politics tick?

Let keen, competent Jefferson School instructors put you wise, point out the inner workings of politics and politicians on local, national and international levels. You'll find these courses on the subject particularly worth-while:

- ★ Principles of Marxism I and II every evening
- ★ Political Economy III: Imperialism Albert Prago
- ★ The Theory of the State Max Gordon and William Weinstone
- ★ Monopoly Capital After World War II James S. Allen
- * World Politics David Goldway

Registration now going on daily 2 to 9 Saturday 10 to 3

100 courses in History, Politics, Economics, Labor, The Arts, Workshop Courses.



NEW MASSES PRESENTS:

10 WEEKLY FORUMS on "AMERICAN CIVILIZATION"

Science - Literature - Politics - Foreign Policy - Intellectual Life -Labor Movement - Religion - Art - Economic Outlook.

LECTURES BY

DR. HARRY F. WARD, DOXEY WILKERSON, JAMES S. ALLEN, ROB F. HALL, DR. SAMUEL SILLEN, JOHN STUART. Others to be announced

at the WEBSTER HALL - 119 East 11th Street

MONDAY EVENINGS—8:00 P.M. beginning Monday, October 21, ending Monday, December 23

Single Admission—\$1.00; Season pass for subscribers only—\$6.50 RESERVE YOUR TICKETS NOW. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

NEW MASSES 104 East 9th Street New York 3, N. Y. Telephone: GR 3-5146

Enclosed please find \$..... for Season tickets at \$6.50 (to subscribers only)

for Single admission at \$1.00 each (indicate subjects)



Crystal Lake Lodge

year 'round in the Adirondacks

SPRING-FED SIXTY ACRE LAKE 1400 ACRES OF GORGEOUS WOODLANDS, ALL PRIVATE ALL OUTDOOR SPORTS INFORMAL ENTERTAINMENT LUXURIOUS ACCOMMODATIONS

> BERNIE ASBEL, Noted Folk-Singer

MORRIS SCHAPPES

CRYSTAL LAKE

Chestertown, New York

TELEPHONE: CHESTERTOWN 2490



Union, wrote: "For one, they [the Soviets] have banished forever anti-Semitism from their land; I did not find a single trace of it anywhere, any time, during my tour. Religious practices are observed freely and by large numbers of Soviet Jews. Jewish culture-education, theater, literature, etc.-flourishes." And Hecht must also ignore a statement made in 1942 by James N. Rosenberg, honorary chairman of the Joint Distribution Committee: "Of some 1,750,000 Jews who succeeded in escaping the Axis . . . about 1,600,000 were evacuated by the Soviet government from Eastern Poland and subsequently occupied Soviet territory and transported far into the Russian interior and beyond the Urals. About 150,000 others managed to reach Palestine, the United States and other countries beyond the seas. . . . On the basis of this data, which I believe to be conservative, Russia has saved over ten times as many Jews from Nazi extermination as all the rest of the world put together...."

And the final fact is that had it not been for the Red Army's heroic stand at Stalingrad, forcing Hitler to divert troops from the Middle East, Palestine would have been overrun by the Wehrmacht.

Many people have been deceived into believing that Hecht and his American League for a Free Palestine are really serious about fighting imperialism; that they really want to kick Britain out of Palestine. Yet neither he nor the League has ever said a word against American and British imperialism and their treatment of the Jews in the Displaced Persons camps. Neither Hecht nor the League has ever protested against the fact that in those zones which imperialism controls, Nazis are still running wild and murdering Jews. They have never told the people that one fundamental reason for pogroms in Poland today derives from the moral, financial and material assistance which Washington and London are giving such fascists as General Anders and General Bor. And naturally Hecht would keep secret the fact that in the Soviet zone in Germany there never were any DP camps for Jews and that Jews were given every opportunity to rebuild their lives with the full assistance of the Red Army.

It would be well for American Jewry, as for Americans generally, to



Classified Advertisements

50¢ a fine. Payable in advance. Min. charge \$1.50. Approx. 7 words to a line. Deadline, Fri., 4 p.m.

RoKo GALLERY RoKo FRAMES NEW PAINTINGS BY 15 ARTISTS Expert Framing at Reasonable Prices We solve all framing problems. CHelses 2-7645 51 Greenwich Ave. (East of 7th Ave. 2 11 St.)

LECTURE SEPT. 25

LECTURE SERIES, by Eli Siegel, "Aesthetic Analysis Sees Dreams This Way," Sept. 26; "What Aesthetic Analysis Is and Is Not," Oct. 3. Auspices Committee for Aesthetic Analysis. Steinway Hall, 112 W. 57th St., N. Y. C., Room 718. 8:30 P.M. Admission \$1.00 (incl. tax).

INSURANCE

CARL BRODSKY—Automobile, fire, life, liability burglary, plate glass, surety bonds, compensation etc. Any kind of insurance, 759 Broadway, New York City. Tel. GRamercy 5-3826.

EYE CARE

EUGENE STEIN, Optometrist Hye examinations-Glasses Fitted-Visual Training. Room 507, 13 Astor Place (140 Bast Sth St.), NY 3. GR. 7-0930.

PIANO TUNING

Plano tuning, repairing, tone restoring and refinishing. Planos bought and sold, Ralph J Appleton, 595 Fifth Ave., New York 17, N. Y Tel. PL. 8-0566.

TYPEWRITER CO.

Typewriters, mimeos, adders, effice machines repaired. Buy, sell exchange .Mosthly service. 100% union. Vets. A & B Typewriter-633 Melrose-JE 8-1604.

MOVING AND STORAGE

Call Ed Wendel, Veteran, medera warehouse, individual rooms, reasonable rates, courteous service. JErome 7-3998 till 6 P.M.

WANTED-URGENT

Room and bath or apartment in Washington Heights by October 1st. Box 51.

VINEYARD LODGE

Beautiful 200-acre farm. Tennis, Handball, Lake nearby, Bicycles, Recordings. Woll-balanced American-Jewish meals. Moderate prices. Adults only. Vineyard Lodge, Ulster Park, N. Y., tel. Kingston 3438. Open all year.

THE HEALTH REST

Newest Type of Health Buildiag Resort — Vegetarian—Delightful Estate; Special Diets. Spring Valley, N. Y. Phone Nanuet 2316.





Camp Lakeland ON SYLVAN LAKE HOPEWELL JUNCTION, N. Y. Telephone: Hopeweil Junction 85

With All Facilities for a COMPLETE VACATION

DELICIOUS FOODS : : ALL SPORTS TOP-NOTCH ENTERTAINMENT N.Y.C.R. to Pawling; bus to Camp Telephone: GRamercy 7-8659 New York Office: I UNION SQUARE W.

heed not the Hechts and the host of other self-appointed spokesmen for European Jewry, but the leaders of European Jewry themselves, who rose to leadership in the ghettoes of Warsaw and Bialystok and Vilno, in the forests and swamps and concentration camps. Dr. Adolph Berman, a leading Zionist, a vice president of the Jewish Central Committee in Poland and a member of the Polish National Council, stated in the summer of 1945: "Our great joy in this hour of liberation is dimmed by the great destruction and the great cemetery into which Polish Jewry has been flung. But life is stronger than death. Before our very eyes there begins to sprout new Jewish communities in tens of cities and villages. Life begins to throb again. Our economic and cultural positions must be rebuilt. . . . The interests of tens of thousands of our people demand this of us. Our national honor demands this. This reconstruction must be the symbol of the will to live, of the fortitude and the courage of the Jewish people."

Hecht and his League have attempted to make the issue one of "Palestine Versus Europe," and have thereby done much damage not only to European but Palestine Jewry as well. For there is an inexorable relationship between persecution in Europe and in Palestine, and it is the very same imperialist forces that are responsible for both. If these forces are victorious in Europe, the fate of Palestinian Jewry will be a very doubtful one.

Hecht refuses to face the fact that the fundamental cause of Palestine's repeated crises is imperialism's policies. He therefore says nothing of one of imperialism's major weapons-divide and rule-and that the only way to overcome it is through the unity of the Jewish and Arab masses against imperialism in order to establish a free and democratic Palestine where both peoples will be able to achieve their national rights.

What Hecht preaches is a renunciation of the basic principle that the only guarantee of security and democracy in any country, for any people, lies in the struggle to maintain and extend democratic institutions. Hecht's outlook can only sap and undermine the morale of a people because it immobilizes them and paralyzes any effective struggle against fascism and anti-Semitism.



ERN e ol receipt la STANDARD CE LONDUNPO VIA MACKAY 18 SEP 10 1946 CANL405/GK302 P519CDC DAG INTL PLEASE OBLIGE SEND SCRIPT THE GREAT CONSPIRACY UNITY THEATRE DOLLINGTON NLT NORTH STREET LONDONNWI 325P you don't have to go to London Jo See Jo Hear **Conspiracy Against Russia**" **PAUL ROBESON** sing _ Jo Watch **PAUL DRAPER** dance Jo Enjoy m a s s e s' new **ADVENTURE DRAMATIC**"

CARNEGIE HALL · SUNDAY · SEPT. 22 · 8:30 P. M.

TICKETS: \$1.20, \$1.80, \$2.40, \$3.60, \$4.20 and \$10.00

ON SALE AT: New Masses, 104 East 9th St., GR. 3-5146; Book Fair, 133 West 44th St., BR. 9-4824; Workers Bookshop, 50 East 13th St., AL. 4-6953; Jefferson Bookshop, 575 6th Avenue, WA. 9-1602; Skazka, 227 West 46th Street, Cl. 6-7957; Stage for Action, 130 West 42nd St.; Modern Book Shop, 216 Halsey St., Newark, N. J.