new masses

3-23-44

THE PLOT TO BETRAY AMERICA

1. SCHWELLENBACH MEANT YOU by A. B. MAGIL

- 2. EMPIRE: WHY THEY CAN'T WIN by JOHN STUART
- 3. NO MAN CAN BE SILENT

by HOWARD FAST

15с

MARCH 25, 1947

VOLUMELXII

NUMBER 13

America's mind reflected America's press our people would lumber into the blackout like a witless Golem. But the brain and heart of America is not patterned after a Hearst editorial: the people honor Thomas Jefferson and not Aaron Burr.

The press today would have it appear that Aaron Burr is the spiritual godfather of our nation; but the Jefferson tradition is eternal, irreversible. The existence of NEW MASSES is a symbol of that certainty. We say this: The democratic tradition will reassert itself and remain the dominant idea.

This will not happen automatically, that you know and we know. It will happen only as we lock with the enemy, checkmate his every move to fling our nation into a 1947 version of the Third Reich. It will happen as the people realize that when Secretary Schwellenbach said "Communist" he meant "labor."

It will happen as every honest man recognizes that the effort to outlaw the Communist Party spells rejection of the Bill of Rights, of our Constitution. It will happen when the millions realize that when Rankin shrieks "Red" he means "Red, White and Blue." It will happen through unmitigated struggle.

Hence, NEW MASSES. We ask you to read this issue carefully. Ponder what we say here and what we have said in the weeks and months before these turbulent days. And thinking of these things can you tell yourself that it is not your concern whether NEW MASSES lives or dies? Or that you have done your part to keep its light burning? I am sure you cannot, will not, say that. For in these pages lie your aspirations: your rightful claim to walk freely to the polls, to choose your job freely, to raise your children freely and not as Senator Bilbo or Monsignor Sheean thinks you should.

We know we speak not only our own innermost beliefs in these pages, but yours too. And we know therefore you will not allow this voice to be drowned in the cacaphony of the fascist-shouters.

Yet . . . for the second week NM has been obliged to appear in half its size. That we appear at all is due to the gratifying support of some 150 of America's foremost artists: the sale of their paintings at NM's annual art show enabled us to pay some of our most pressing creditors, and to pay for this issue. We thank the artists and those who purchased their paintings: they give us the certainty that our readers will not let NEW MASSES down. But the danger is great, is here. Now.

For these reasons we are calling a "Save the NEW MASSES" public meeting in New York. We shall announce the date and place in a forthcoming issue. We urge our readers west of the Hudson to plan similar meetings.

Certainly the times, and not our declarations alone, demand that NEW MASSES live to help create that democratic crusade which will spell defeat for the fascistminded, the warlords in the present seats of government. We are confident you will not fail NM. And we are certain you will respond today, by return mail, to ensure publication next week and in the crucial weeks to follow.

Joseph north

Pledge Date(s)	
Name	
Address	
	Zone
State	
	Name Address City



1. SCHWELLENBACH MEANT YOU

UR country is in danger! No foreign enemy threatens our peace and security. No bombs drop or are about to drop on some new Pearl Harbor. Last week, however, America was blitzed by a political Pearl Harbor whose ultimate consequences can become far more serious than the events of December 7, 1941. This was a twopronged attack on American democracy: the demand by a Cabinet member, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach, that the Communist Party be outlawed, and President Truman's message to Congress proposing that the United States invade Greece with dollars and military personnel, and establish beachheads for the subjugation of other nations behind the fraudulent cry (which once issued from Berlin) of protecting them against "Communism."

Let us first look at the domestic part of this program for an American Century and an American Reich. Just think this over: the proposal to illegalize the Communist Party was made before the House Labor Committee during hearings on anti-labor legislation. Isn't this the tipoff? The big boys of the trusts, of the reigning financial and industrial dynasties—like their counterparts in pre-war Germany, Italy and Japan—are after much more than the scalp of the Communist Party. The outlawing of communism is only the first long step toward outlawing unionism. And the outlawing of unionism is only the prelude to stamping out every form of democratic activity and expression, whether it comes from workers, farmers, small business-

By A. B. MAGIL

men, professional people or from those capitalists who don't think America and its government ought to be Wall Street's oyster.

"Let us admit at the outset," the Republican New York *Herald Tribune* states in an editorial (March 13), "that we would rejoice extravagantly were the Communist movement in this country wiped out." But that by itself would not really get at the problem, according to this GOP mouthpiece. "The Communist Party," it continues, "is the least objectionable manifestation of the movement of which it is the official symbol. Scotch the symbol and the movement would continue more secretly than ever and possibly strengthened by recruits who resent a taboo alien to the American way."

What is this movement? The Herald Tribune doesn't say. But the Tafts, Hartleys, Rankins, Parnell Thomases and McKellars have spelled it out for us in ominous letters that show how broad a segment of American democratic life they include under the Communist symbol. Thereby they pay indirect tribute to the Communists who are in truth a symbol—an unquenchable symbol —of patriotic devotion to the welfare of the people. But is it the small number of Communists and Communist sympathizers that the Republican and Democratic *alter egos* of big business seek to bar from public office, or is it the large number of David Lilienthals? Is it the 75,000 members of the Communist Party that they want to deprive of all rights, or is it the fifteen million trade union members and the millions of other ordinary Americans?

Of course, this idea of outlawing the Communist Party was not dreamed up by the man who bears the ironic title of Secretary of Labor. The United States Chamber of Commerce has been beating that drum for a long time. And on the heels of Schwellenbach's statement and Truman's message it hastened to publish another anti-Communist tract to spur the drive on American liberties.

TONSIDER the stage setting for the Schwellenbach proposal. Since the opening of Congress some 212 antilabor bills have been introduced which. under the pretext of curbing a nonexistent labor "monopoly," would weaken the trade unions and place our entire people more completely at the mercy of the actual monopolists of Wall Street. While the Senate and House Labor Committees opened hearings on these bills, a third committee began to weave the counterpoint of a nationwide Red-scare - the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which has the distinction of having been denounced by a President and Vice-President of the United States (Franklin D. Roosevelt and Henry A. Wallace) for aiding the enemies of democracy and of our country. Sparked by the illegally elected fascist, Rankin, and the GOP's J. Parnell Thomas, this committee concocted the Gerhart Eisler frameup.

This was the cue for merging anti-Communist and anti-labor. The millionaire press and radio were bellowing for blood. There began before the House Labor Committee a steady parade of spokesmen for the shipowners, for the strikebreaking Allis-Chalmers Co., for the anti-union Thompson Products Co. (whose head is a former president of the National Association of Manufacturers), etc., all of whom called for action against "Communists" in the labor movement. Then came Eric Johnston, the suave ex-president of the US Chamber of Commerce, now czar of the motion picture industry, and, if you please, an "enlightened capitalist." He demanded that employers be allowed to fire workers on the ground of communism without falling afoul of the National Labor Relations Act and also that Congress bar Communists from leading positions in unions. One week later Secretary

Schwellenbach—further heartened no doubt by the Supreme Court's savage blow in behalf of government strikebreaking by injunction—appeared before the House Labor Committee and enthusiastically endorsed Johnston's proposals. However, he thought they didn't go far enough. After so much expert prompting, he found no difficulty in going the whole hog.

The response to Schwellenbach's performance was a little different from what had been expected by those who directed it. The applause from the reactionaries was soon engulfed in the protests from labor organizations. and from other sections of the public. Hundreds of letters and telegrams flooded the Department of Labor. Even right-wing union leaders, who had themselves done considerable Redbaiting, joined in the protest. The leadership of the National Maritime Union, which had been divided by an internal struggle, united to blast the Schwellenbach statement, and an NMU membership meeting took similar action. Even the Republican lieutenant governor of New York entered a demurrer. Members of the New York State Senate-Democrats, Republicans and American Laboritesand members of the New York City Council voiced opposition.

 \mathbf{W} HO are the men that dictate this reactionary course in domestic and foreign affairs? Who are those that charge the unions with being undemocratic, that accuse the Communists of advocating force and violence and acting as foreign agents? Read their record in the testimony and reports of the LaFollette Civil Liberties Committee. Read their record in the documents of various Senate committees that investigated cartels. The president of Republic Steel is no Communist, but it was Republic Steel that murdered ten and wounded scores of other striking workers in the Chicago Memorial Day massacre ten years ago. The owners of General Motors, Ford, Remington Rand and other corporations are not Communists, but it was they who not merely advocated, but practiced force and violence by using spies and goons against their workers.

It was the du Ponts whose cash flowed to the American Liberty League, to the Negro-baiting demagogue, Eugene Talmadge, and to a host of subversive fascist and anti-Semitic outfits, as revealed by the Senate Committee, headed by former Senator (now Supreme Court Justice) Hugo Black, which investigated lobbying activities. All this is a matter of record. And is their record really different today? Who finances fascist treason in the person of the Gerald L. K. Smiths and Joe McWilliams' and through such organizations as the Ku Klux Klan and the Columbians? And who is behind the drive against democracy in Congress, in the press and over the radio?

Foreign agents? When Standard Oil, General Electric, the du Ponts, the Aluminum Corporation of America and other American corporations turned over secret patent processes to Nazi cartels and helped cripple our national defense, were they serving our country's interests? And when today they seek to re-establish their cartel connections and press upon our government the policy of domination over other peoples—a policy that is making our country feared and hated throughout the world—whose interests are they serving?

L IES about the Communists are necessary for the trusts and their swarm of processed politicians in order to mask their own assault on democracy at home and on the independence of other nations. It was not the Communists who overthrew the German republic, but the violent anti-Communists, the German du Ponts and Hearsts who backed Hitler. And it was the men of the two hundred families who forced the outlawing of the French Communist Party in 1939 and who later delivered the French republic into the hands of the Nazis.

The fact is that for all the ranting of Secretary Schwellenbach and others, they cannot cite a single act ever committed by the Communist Party or any of its members directed toward the forcible overthrow of the government. On the contrary. The constitution of the Communist Party specifically declares:

"Adherence to or participation in the activities of any clique, group, circle, faction or party which conspires or acts to subvert, undermine, weaken or overthrow any or all institutions of American democracy whereby the majority of the American people can maintain their right to determine their destinies in any degree, shall be punished by immediate expulsion."

That's one "Communist secret" Louis Budenz never told the Un-American Committee!

"I speak of the signs..."

In 1844, four years before the publication of the COMMUNIST MANI-FESTO, an American—a great American—wrote these words. Today he would be threatened by the Un-American Committee, grilled by the Rankins, hounded by the J. Edgar Hoovers, libeled by the press. He would defy them. His spirit is alive today in the democratic spirit of our people. That spirit shall prevail—must prevail—over the evil plans of the little men in high places.

Our part is plainly not to throw ourselves across the track, to block improvement and sit till we are stone, but to watch the uprise of successive mornings and to conspire with the new works of new days. Government has been a fossil; it should be a plant. I conceive that the office of statute law should be to express and not to impede the mind of mankind. New thoughts, new things. Trade was one instrument, but Trade is also but for a time, and must give way to somewhat broader and better, whose signs are already dawning in the sky.

I pass to speak of the signs of that which is the sequel of trade.

In consequence of the revolution in the state of society wrought by trade, Government in our times is beginning to wear a clumsy and cumbrous appearance. We have already seen our way to shorter methods. The time is full of good signs. Some of them shall ripen to fruit. All this beneficent socialism is a friendly omen, and the swelling cry of voices for the education of the people indicates that Government has other offices than those of banker and executioner. Witness the new movements in the civilized world, the Communism of France, Germany, and Switzerland; the Trades' Unions, the English League against the Corn Laws; and the whole *Industrial Statistics*, so called. In Paris, the blouse, the badge of the operative, has begun to make its appearance in the salons.

> RALPH WALDO EMERSON. (From an essay, "The Young American")

The previously quoted Herald Tribune editorial urges that Communists be banned from public office "on the ground that in taking an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States they would inevitably be com-mitting perjury." This too is a lie. The preamble of the Communist constitution states: "The Communist Party upholds the achievements of American democracy and defends the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and popular liberties." And the Communists' record shows they mean itwhich is more than can be said for those who are now trying to scrap the Bill of Rights and undermine our democratic institutions. (Believe it or not, Rankin has actually introduced a bill to outlaw "Communist ideology" -evidently a belated version of the Japanese "dangerous thoughts" law.)

Need one argue the patriotism of the thousands of American Communists who fought in the armed forces or worked on the home front during the recent war against fascism? As Major General Clayton Bissell, then head of G-2, Army Intelligence, testified in 1945 before the House Military Affairs Committee which was investigating the granting of Army commissions to Communists and alleged Communists: "These officers have shown by their deeds that they are upholding the United States by force and violence."

These men were living up to the traditions of those Communists, German refugees from political persecution, who defended the Union in our Civil War against the Rankins and Bilbos of that time who used force and violence in an effort to overthrow our government. In defending our country in World War II today's Communists no more took orders from a foreign power than did those of 1861. In peace as in war American Communists "take orders" only from the American people, responsive to both their immediate and long-term needs. In a speech on September 19, 1946, Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party, declared:

"We American Communists give allegiance to only one power: to the sovereign power that resides in the American people. We are American workers, Marxists, patriots. Today and on the morrow, as in the past, in war or in peace, we will loyally defend the genuine national interests of our people, of our country."

I think it is a sign of their deep patriotism that the Communists strive for American-Soviet friendship and cooperation as essential for our na-tional welfare. They have no apology to make for following the example of Jefferson who worked for cooperation with democratic France and fought the prototypes of the present anti-Communist bills, the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. Even Secretary Schwellenbach and Representative Hartley might recall that it was popular indignation at these repressive measures and at the reactionary foreign policy of the Adams administration which was largely responsible for sweeping out the Federalists and bringing Jefferson to power.

The Communists also believe that the ultimate consummation of democracy will require for America the scrapping of a system under which the price of profit and power for a few is poverty and insecurity for the many. To advocate social change is the right of any individual or group under our Constitution. To work for eventual cooperative ownership of the means of production and a genuine people's democracy-for a socialist economy of abundance for all-this, it seems to me, is the highest patriotism. It is the fulfilment of the dream Emerson, Hawthorne, Margaret Fuller, Horace Greeley and other great Americans of the nineteenth century who subscribed to a form of socialism - utopian in character — before the Communist Manifesto, which laid the foundations for Marxist scientific socialism, was written. (The Rankin bill would of course outlaw much of their writings!)

The Communists, however, propose only such immediate solutions of our national problems as history makes possible. Today the majority of our people do not yet want socialism or recognize its necessity. They want jobs and a decent livelihood, they want security and peace, they want to preserve and extend those democratic liberties which they have won by their sweat and blood and vision. It is because millions want these things and are fighting for them that the monarchs of monopoly, racing recklessly toward bigger profits—and economic collapse—seek to outlaw the Communist Party, to shackle and eventually pulverize the trade unions.

Remember 1919? Under Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer a crusade against "Bolshevism" was organized which resulted in widespread violations of civil liberties. At the same time the big corporations launched an open shop drive which cut union membership virtually in half, smashed strikes and hammered down wages.

But 1919 is not 1947. The ex-

periences of the depression, the New Deal and the people's war against fascism have not been written on water. The 15,000,000-strong labor movement, divided though it is, cannot be bludgeoned into submission. The Negro people, knowing the Communists as those who have been most ready to stick their necks out in the battle for their rights, will not readily consign their future to Rankin and his ilk. Many of the Jewish people have not forgotten that six million of their brethren, tortured to death by the Nazi sadists, are testimony that anticommunism also has another face: anti-Semitism.

The architects of the anti-democratic drive thought they would isolate the Communists from even their close friends and then proceed to chop up and annihilate every other sector of the labor and progressive movement. Instead, they have succeeded in bringing to the defense of the Communists even some who have been their opponents. Now it should be clear to everyone that Red-baiting in unions or other progressive organizations, bans on Communists and statements lumping communism and fascism only bring grist to the mill of those who would crucify democracy and betray America. Unity and struggle — this must be our banner today.

"Tyranny," wrote Tom Paine, "like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph."

2. EMPIRE: WHY THEY CAN'T WIN

S O BRAZEN were the distortions in President Truman's message, so immoral and dangerous his proposals, so revealing the omissions that we have at once a measure of the man and an outline of a disastrous policy. At the core what Truman said marks no new departure from the road he and the Republicans have been traveling these last two years. It is the final touch finishing the strategic portrait.

Just a year ago Mr. Truman sat and listened to Winston Churchill at Fulton, Missouri. He listened so well that twelve months later in Congress he gave a masterly duplication of Churchill's act. To be sure it had none of Churchill's pitch and rhetoric but in substance it was the same. The senior partner of an unholy alliance is now seemingly convinced. There is the token of how far Truman and his administration have squandered the political treasure accumulated by Roosevelt in years of killing work.

During the war Churchill was the great advocate of a military plunge into the "soft underbelly" of Europe. The objective was to contain the Balkans with Anglo-American bayonets against the outburst of inevitable change and progress. The design failed because Roosevelt would not underwrite an adventure which polished the bright gems in His Majesty's crown but delayed Hitler's defeat. Churchill's triumph, however, has come now, for Truman has taken over his design, adding to it American imperialism's aching ambition to rule Europe, the Middle East, Africa and Asia. What could not be accomplished in recent months by diplomatic intervention is now to be accomplished with mercenaries at the beck and call of Washington's hired kings and feudal lords. At long last it should be clear to the most foggy-eyed that the politics begun with food now moves relentlessly to bullets.

If we will recall Churchill's speech we will see immediately the meaning of Truman's. It had the large objectives of instilling the belief that a war with the Soviet Union is inevitable; it intended to destroy the reservoir of good will for the Russians built on all fighting fronts in the war; it sought to revise all the commitments we have made at Yalta, Potsdam and Moscow; it sought to hamper the growth of democracy predicated on self-determination; it attempted to make it appear that every social upheaval within and without the British Empire represented a menace to the United States and an expansion of Soviet power; it tried to make communism the major

By JOHN STUART

evil of our time; and, finally, it embarked on a program of buying or rallying the support of every political scoundrel and cynic around an Anglo-American bloc which in essence is a more refined and refurbished version of Hitler's *anti-Komintern*.

No one with any sense of the national interest-at the minimum, peace -could accept Churchill's policy. But Mr. Truman has. His has become the idea that every shift in the status quo is derived from Moscow. Yet he could not if he tried until doomsday present an iota of proof that Russia is behind the discontent in the Philippines, Puerto Rico, India or Southwest Africa. Every war, particularly one which reaches into the very vitals of a country, brings with it an aftermath of change. It has been true throughout history even when there was no Soviet Union. The close of this last war has merely hastened a thousand social processes which were latent in a dozen different countries for many decades. And if, as Truman insists, the status quo is not sacred, why in terms of policy and action does he fear the developments away from the archaic and the outworn? And why does he choose to ally the United States with two countries, Greece and Turkey, whose status quo is the embodiment of re-

6





action and fascism? Their status quo is not even that of the twentieth century but of eighteenth century monarchy and feudalism which in our Revolution we overthrew. Henry Wallace puts the issue clearly when in his protest denouncing the Greek proposal he says: "President Truman cannot prevent change in the world any more than he can prevent the tide from coming in or the sun from setting. But once America stands for opposition to change we are lost. America will become the most hated nation in the world."

REECE is corrupt, a caricature of a G state. It exists by terror and violence. We cannot judge its "democracy" as Mr. Truman does on the basis that the government is supported by "eighty-five percent of the members of the Greek parliament." This is a new concept for judging democracy. By that measure Hitler Germany was the most advanced democracy in the world because fully 100 percent of the Reichstag was behind the Nazi government. On that basis, too, Mississippi and Georgia and South Carolina represent the pinnacle of democracy because the state administrations are endorsed by at least fifty-one percent of the legislatures.

This is sham with hardly a parallel in presidential statements. It is of a piece with the whole of Mr. Truman's advice. And it exposes the whole trend of his thinking as well as the foreign policy he offers for national approval. Moreover, it is a sign of the kind of democracy the White House proposes for Europe---not a democracy rooted in the people but in carefully selected personalities who, when nailed together, will show a majority for any government which will serve as an American puppet.

Mr. Truman says in effect that he will advise the Greek government to be tolerant. He asks political criminals to be tolerant, yet shows no intolerance for the way they came to power. It was by fraud and coercion that they seized the government. Last September Greek quislings stuffed ballot boxes, falsified electoral lists. Civil employes and detachments of police voted several times in different districts. Republicans took to the mountains to avoid the penalties for being genuine anti-fascists. If this were an honest election without murder and terror the monarcho-fascists would have been swept away. But instead they carried

8

the day under the protection of British gendarmes. We also forget too soon that American warships were on their way to Piraeus when this political embezzlement was carried through. And who can say therefore that we are supporting the Greek Rankins and Bilbos with reservations when American agents fully endorsed the electoral procedures of a government in no way different from Franco's in Spain or Salazar's in Portugal? All the Greek democratic movements protested this monstrous plebiscite, but Truman in his speech did not express a word of sympathy for them.

And Turkey, dear Turkey. Quaint how Mr. Truman winks and flirts with this sweet little harem belle of the Near East. Quaint how this politically diseased lady is introduced as "important to the freedom-loving peoples of the world." Mr. Truman was not President of the United States during a major part of the war, but we could expect him to remember why "Turkey was spared the disasters that have beset Greece." Not until the final days of the war, when it was clear who would be the victor, did Turkey's ruling class, cynical and bloated with war profits, end its neutrality. During that neutrality its entire policy was based on a Hitler triumph. Ninety percent of Turkish trade went to Germany, including chrome ores. There are a host of documents to show how Turkey's wartime prime minister, Sukru Saracoglu, hoped to see Germany defeat the Russians. (Is that what endears the Turkish rulers to us now?) It is also common knowledge that in violation of the Montreux convention Turkey allowed Italian and . German war vessels into the Black Sea, assisting fascist military operations in Rumania and southern Crimea. Churchill himself complained in parliament in May, 1944, that Turkey was not helping the Allies despite the Anglo-Turkish agreement. He stated it was therefore necessary for England and the United States to halt the supplies they had been sending to Ankara.

This is our new friend, where even according to Mr. Truman's standards there is no freedom either of thought or press. By any definition Turkey and Greece are police regimes, totalitarian to the core. Despite Mr. Truman's disdain for totalitarianism these totalitarianisms are acceptable to him without the slightest twinge of conscience. And they are acceptable because they are anti-Soviet, will obey orders, will act as servile colonies in payment for American handouts.

MR. TRUMAN spreads another myth when he makes muffled references to Soviet "expansion" and Communist threats. Is there any need to recount at this late date how this same myth became the excuse for aggression by the Nazis, how it cost the lives of thousands of Americans? Is there need to recount how the Communists warned against this myth and, although they were stoned, exposed its perils, the truth of which millions later learned at such a frightful price? The mythmakers have reached a point in their insolence where they think everyone will believe what they fabricate. But it is later than they think and too many men and women throughout the world know and recognize a lie when they see one. Too many know that the Soviets are not conquering the world and that this lie is used to obscure the empire grabbing, the lust for markets of the liars themselves. Too many have seen with their own eyes how their governments have been libelled by the Churchills and the Dulles' because no longer can these men dictate how they shall operate. It is too late for most of the world's people again to be taken in by the falsehood that Communists and communism are obstacles to their growth and a burden on their hopes, for these many have witnessed how the Communists have been unstinting fighters for the liberty of their countries and their peoples.

The moral onus is upon that class of Americans who write their patriotism on dollar bills. They do not bother to ask-for they cannot ask-why after millions have already been pumped into Greece that country is still in a quagmire, in the deep filth and ugliness of reaction. They cannot bother to ask why countries with much less than Greece has received are rapidly reaching stability, their people invigorated by the prospect of a happier day. In Yugoslavia, in Poland where the hold of fascism and foreign intervention has been cut, reconstruction is rapid and a new life begins to blossom. But if our rulers with their trust and cartel manias will not ask these questions, ordinary Americans will have to ask them. They will have to ask what it will profit them to have Greece in our protective custody. Who will pay the millions to maintain the mercenaries and out of whose pockets will it come and whose living standards will suffer if we adopt the policy of policing the world? For every million in profit that Wall Street will take out of Greece or the Middle East or Asia and Africa, millions more of public funds will be spent in keeping these people imprisoned. Such is the fatal lesson of empire. Probe Britain and the crisis which racks it and you will soon have the answer to the price it will cost to do what neither Britain nor Germany could do.

We shall have to ask, who are Mr. Truman's friends in this insane undertaking? There is John Foster Dulles, for example. It should be axiomatic that any project Dulles advises Americans should oppose. For what can there be in common with a man who defended the Nazi agent, Gerhard Alois Westrick; of whom Senator Pepper demanded a Congressional investigation because "one of Mr. Dulles' foreign connections, which I believe the American people are especially entitled to know about, is his relationship to the banking circles that rescued Adolf Hitler from the financial depths and set his Nazi party up as a going concern"; who in 1939 said "only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy, or Japan contemplate war upon us"; who wrote in his book War, Peace and Change, published in 1939, that "Far from being sacred, it would be iniquitous, even if it were practicable, to put shackles on the dynamic peoples [the fascist regimes] and condemn them forever to acceptance of conditions which might become intolerable."

This is Dulles, permitted by the administration to give Republican advice to General Marshall in Moscow. This polygamous political marriage which includes Vandenberg, Hoover, Dewey, can produce nothing but monsters—and graves for the sons of the men who thought they fought to finish finally the original makers of the myths and lies to poison ally against ally.

The kings of the trusts and cartels are men without countries. They buy and sell countries as they buy and sell oil or rubber or aluminum. They sold to Hitler when it meant risking our own war effort. They met secretly in Basle, Switzerland, to negotiate with the Germans, during the war, postwar banking arrangements. They attempt to overthrow governments that oppose their will. They try to shave the work-

portside patter

The Hearst papers report that their anti-vivisection drive is gaining support. Hearst is evidently out to prove that he *could* be elected dogcatcher.

San Simeon—To all editors from the Chief: All editorial pages which have not yet gone to the dogs will do so immediately. Continue anti-vivisection campaign for all dogs except Fala and Russian wolfhounds. No need to use dogs for experiments with so many New Dealers still around. Push circulation drive at all kennels and dog pounds. Hearst papers stand for a fire hydrant and two bones in every doghouse.

Hearst has been praised in the Senate for being "liberal." To get a statement like that he must have been downright generous.

Food prices have gone up 50% since OPA controls were lifted. The struggling wage-earner can find consolation in the fact that no GOP Congress will ever interfere with his right to go hungry.

By BILL RICHARDS

It has been charged that the US is still sending supplies to Chiang Kaishek. It's a case of putting your arms in a fire and getting your fingers burned later.

John O'Donnell, "Daily News" columnist, prints a letter from a medium who claims to have contacted FDR. O'Donnell will be the first to know when he is awarded a second Iron Cross.

•

Sixteen freshman Senators complain that they're not being consulted on GOP affairs. Taft probably feels that they lack enough experience to make mistakes.

Bilbo is wearing a mask to hide the scars of his recent operation. Out of consideration for his KKK friends he should at least wear a hood.

Bilbo's chances of sitting in the Senate again are considered good. At least one of his colleagues should be able to arrange a gallery pass. er's dollar until he is merely a beast of burden.

What can the majority of Americans have in common with these princes of greed, these perpetrators of race hatred? Can we wonder why they circumvent the United Nations when they are afraid that world opinion will expose and condemn their tramping on Greece; why Truman moves with such haste and why the State Department helps inspire the anti-Soviet furies? Or why this moment was chosen, the moment when the settlement of Germany is being negotiated, to shake the world with a fake crisis?

The answers are many but their common denominator is fear of the great wave of democracy that sweeps every corner of the earth. In Greece they fear that real help to the Greek democrats will mean the end of the Greek tyrants. In Eastern Europe they fear they have lost and they are preparing not to lose in Western Europe. They will not abide a democracy beyond what they choose to call democracy. In the colonial world the pattern is no different, India and China are awake and on the threshold of liberation from imperialism. They lead millions upon millions and help to strengthen the ties that bind all working peoples throughout the world. And in our own country there is no apathy but the slow searching for the heavily camouflaged oppressors. These oppressors fear what this search will reveal and in their desperation they let caution fly. They are caught in a web of their own making. A threat to suppress the Communist Party brings to its defense non-Communists and, yes, even anti-Communists. We have no illusions as to the nature of the struggle before us. But the fight for an abundant, vigorous democracy will bring men and women who will learn in the heat of struggle that their freedom to live in dignity is more precious than their prejudices. On the Greek and Turkish issue there is already visible a profound stirring and anger. Henry Wallace spoke the minds of large masses of people when he noted that "President Truman has summoned in a Century of Fear." The PCA mirrored the feelings of hundreds of thousands with its strong protest. In most every area of the American community - among veterans, workers, students, mothersthe alarm is great. Together we will win. Of that we are deeply confident.

9

RUMBLE IN THE SENATE

Our Washington correspondent gathers the opinions of Pepper, Taylor and Aiken on the Schwellenbach proposal to outlaw the Communists.

By VIRGINIA GARDNER

Washington.

CEN. CLAUDE PEPPER had made an almost two-hour long speech at the first of the Senate night sessions, and stayed for the balance of the session, when I caught him as he was departing. The Senator had interpreted the bill to submit for ratification a limitation on the succession of a President, a bill which excluded the present chief executive, as "aimed directly at the Presidency and the record of Franklin D. Roosevelt." Although he lost, and the bill passed, he had made such an eloquent plea that most of the Democratic Senators came over to shake him by the hand, and the galleries filled, and the people stayed, many standing, hanging on his words. It was a tribute both to FDR and Sen. Pepper, and coming only a few hours after the President had made his speech on Greece, it had a particularly poignant and dramatic quality.

And when Sen. C. Wayland ("Curly") Brooks had interrupted to say proudly that he had voted against lend-lease and that "If the Republicans had prevailed then and had let the Germans eat up Russia" things would be different, but that "Now we have got to fight Russia," an audible gasp swept the galleries. When Sen. Brooks tried baiting the Senator from Florida by speaking of "the Russian communism about which the Senator . . . has spoken so eloquently," Sen. Pepper challenged him. Sen. Brooks then altered his remarks, saying Sen. Pepper had "decried every protest against Russia." He asked him to "distinguish between Russia and communism."

"Yes," said Sen. Pepper, "I shall gladly do so. It was Russia that saved more than a million American lives by killing Germans. That is the Russia I am talking about. It is the Russia that I do not want to go to war with America, that I am talking about when I discuss American foreign policy."

And despite their surface agreement in opposing President Truman's policy on Greece, which both had criticized in statements to the press, Sen. Pepper said shortly: "Mr. President, I have no doubt that the Senator from Illinois would be ready to go to war with Russia. He did not seem, however, so anxious that we should fight against Hitler back there in the days when Hitler was threatening our country and our kind of a world." At this point he asked how Sen. Brooks had voted on one of the defense issues. But Sen. Brooks was chatting and laughing with Sen. Robert A. Taft, so that a Senator in the rear had to call audibly, "Curly," and Sen. Pepper had to ask for his attention before he replied.

It was in this grim atmosphere that I waited to see Sen. Pepper, and when he came out, weary but courteous as ever, I had to repeat my question befor he understood. Secretary Schwellenbach's statement had been made only the day before, but things were moving so swiftly in Washington it seemed for a moment difficult to recall. The Senator's reply was brief.

"In all such things I believe in looking at the substance, not the form," he said. "If some party or person is to be 'outlawed' I would like to know for what, what it is they stand for. If they contemplate overthrow of the government by force, then yes; but if they have a constitutional opinion which they present in an orderly way, then that is another matter. Under the Constitution we have a right to a free press, freedom of faith, of political belief, if it does not go outside the Constitution. Principle, not a name, should be our criterion."

SEN. GEORGE D. AIKEN (R., Vt.) customarily says what he thinks and he did in this instance, too, when asked to comment on the significance of Sec. Schwellenbach's proposals. He wanted to word a statement carefully, however, he said as I saw him during a recess of his Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. When I returned to his office at the appointed time, however, he was dashing away from a sandwich and milk to a meeting of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. He had had no time to word anything, he said. Going down the halls and down the elevator to the little subway trolley which trundles the Senators to the Capitol, he gave me some off-the-cuff reactions.

"Under our Constitution every person in the United States has a right to his own political convictions, so long as he doesn't advocate the forcible overthrow of the government," he said.

"Which the Communist Party specifically does not do," I said, "as is set forth in the Communist Party constitution."

"I don't think the business men of the country will be for it," said the Senator. "I talked to one of them at noon after I saw you and he was opposed to it [Schwellenbach's proposal]." Again, he said, "I don't know why he did it. I was surprised at his statement."

Earlier Sen. Aiken had said, in reply to a query, that he "presumed" it was "tied in" with the developments on Greece. "So far as the unions are concerned," he volunteered, "I understand that the Communists who are in there were elected democratically. If the others were asleep, I don't know what you can do about it."

I was the middle of the afternoon following the Truman speech and I had been waiting in Sen. Glen Taylor's office after padding up and down marble corridors and talking to Senators all day, when he came in. He looked dog-tired. When he let me come into his office he greeted me with a wan smile. Like others I had talked to, he had the air of a man who had been stunned. He talked in a low voice, in a tired monotone. I told him I had come to see him to find out what he thought about Secretary Schwellenbach's proposal to outlaw the Com-. munist Party.

"Oh, that," he said dully. It was as if in the welter of attacks from reaction on all sides he had forgotten it. "I don't see how they're going to solve anyone's problems by trying to outlaw anything. The more you try to outlaw a thing, the more attractive it becomes. Look at Christianity—they tried every way in the world to stamp it out, and the more they were persecuted, the more they thrived."

I asked him if the Rankin bill (HR 1884) which provides a penalty of up to ten years in prison and a fine up to \$10,000 for attempting to send in the mails any publication, including a letter, "which expresses or conveys the impression of sympathy with or approval of, communism or Communist

Can it happen here? Shall the Communist Party be outlawed, the Bill of Rights reduced to a sham? These prominent Americans of various political views say NO!

LOUIS UNTERMEYER Poet

"To define my position, let me say that I am not a Communist, and that I definitely disagree with the application of its principles to America. But I have read Secretary Schwellenbach's statement with great misgivings. This country has all sorts of safeguards to preserve itself and its integrity. There are powerful laws to protect it from adverse and overt acts or any attempt to overthrow the government.

"As President Truman himself assured us in his speech to Congress, "This is still a country of free institutions, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion,' and the basic right to vote as we please. But what Secretary Schellenbach proposes is a complete violation of the Bill of Rights, it strikes at the heart of the democratic spirit. It looks so much like the methods which have been the prelude to fascism that every American should raise his voice in protest."

STANLEY ISAACS

Republican New York City Councilman "Nobody has ever been able to show or can show that the Communist Party is a conspiracy to overthrow this country by force and violence. It is not a question of approving or disapproving of the program of the Communist Party. It is an issue of pure civil liberties, and I don't think there is anything in our Constitution that would permit such a step." ideology" would not shut down labor or liberal publications as well as Communist.

"Oh, it isn't a drive against the Communists only," he said. "It includes all liberals. You can see the viewpoint in the Senators who said they would vote against [David] Lilienthal because he was a New Dealer."

As for the Rankin bill, which forbids, under the same penalties, anyone teaching in any public or private school "to express or convey the impression of sympathy with or approval of, communism or Communist ideology," he found this the worst section. "It's a hell of a thing when you can't teach the meaning of all sorts of philoso-



"Remember," he said, "that Hitler burned books, too. Any time you start suppressing knowledge you start making it more attractive."

"If the Rankins and Thomases," I asked, "were laying the groundwork for a fascist state wouldn't they do all these things, including the outlawing of the Communist Party?"

"They're working toward fascism, all right," he said. "But I don't know whether it's conscious. Sometimes I think they don't know the difference between fascism and a hole in the ground—except by instict. They're doing it by instinct."

(Continued on page 14)

REV. J. FLETCHER

Boston Episcopal Theological School "I think Secretary Schwellenbach's statement is nonsense. I don't think we should exclude any party."

JACK RYAN

Executive Secretary, New York Newspaper Guild

"This is obviously a step in the direction of fascism. This was the same as the moves made by Mussolini in the first instance, and then by Hitler. If the Communist Party can be outlawed then any other party can be outlawed."

W. A. BROWER

Philadelphia Editor, Baltimore Afro-American

"Democracy is big enough to include various ideologies including that of the Communist Party. It is interesting that nobody speaks up for condemning the Gerald L. K. Smith groups . . . A little more attention should be paid to the persons who are for downright persecution of minority groups instead of this incessant Red-baiting."

REV. THOMAS S. HARTEN

Holy Trinity Baptist Church

"I am not a Communist but I have very closely observed many of their good works among my people. I feel they are entitled to every fight and privilege any other American person or group enjoys. The Secretary of Labor's words were un-Christian and certainly un-American. It must not happen here."



FRANCIS FISHER KANE

Former Federal Attorney

subversive of our government than the

denial of the suffrage to any group of

citizens because of our dislike for their

MARTHA DODD

Novelist

with the aims of communism. Nevertheless,

having studied German fascism at first

hand I recognize that the attempt to ille-

galize the Communist Party is one of the

VINCENT SHEEAN

Author "Schwellenbach's proposal is obviously

unconstitutional. I doubt very much if it

would get across the US Supreme Court.

Schwellenbach seems to be trying to curry

PAUL J. KERN

Former New York City Civil

Service Commissioner "That's the way Hitler started. I think

Harry Truman is trying to start a war be-

fore 1948 so he can be reelected."

favor with the Republican reactionaries."

first steps toward fascism."

"I am not a Communist, nor do I agree

political beliefs."

"It's hard to imagine anything more

NO MAN CAN BE SILENT

by Howard Fast

TN A BOX in a cupboard my father kept three somewhat old, somewhat ragged American flags. We were poor people with few possessions, but wherever we went the flags went too. One of them, the best of the three, came out for holidays. It didn't matter what the importance of the holiday was; whether it was Decoration Day or Columbus Day out came the best of the three flags to be draped over a window sill or tied onto a pole.

I asked him once why he kept the old flags and he said that they were entitled to it, he thought; you didn't throw a flag away; it was more than old clothes, more than a shirt whose destiny was to become a dustrag.

My brother still has the flags. My father, many years since, was laid away in the good earth of this country which he loved so well, so deeply, so unreservedly, so simply and so lastingly. His love for America was not the cheap thing that Rotarians call patriotism; it was the attachment of the child to the mother; it had some of what the farmer feels when he picks up the black earth and crumbles it in his fingers; it was respect born out of understanding, and though I value many things he gave me, I think I value that most.

People have asked me, too often perhaps, why I write the kind of books I do; they ask me where my ideas come from, and if I were to say that my writing and all in it comes from the land that bore me and nurtured me, it would be pat and evident, but the truth nevertheless. It is a hard thing to say; even as, in this day and this situation, we are being robbed of our ideals and our principles, so are we being robbed of the ability to say a basic thing simply and straightforwardly and unashamedly.

Whatever I am, America made me; I say that proudly and will, I trust, continue to say it until I die. For a decade and a half I have tried, in every way I know, to understand my country and to serve her. I have never put pen to paper except with that purpose in mind, and sometimes I have succeeded poorly and sometimes well. I think I can say that. This is no time for modesty, but a time for courage and greatness. Many men will speak out, and it is fitting that they should speak out with all their hearts and all their strength.

I have lived through the history of this land, roamed through it, and had the good fortune to understand some very great men who are dead these many years. Also I came to know some of the living, so that I can tell my children some day how I took the hand of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and talked with him and ate with him—and the hands of others too. And this I know: that never in all its time and history was our land in such peril, such terrible, mortal peril! What a craven, miserable creature a man must be to remain silent at a time like this! What a poor thing it is to sell one's birthright for a mess of pottage and less!

L IBERTY, democracy, human rights—these are words we wrote across the sky in starry letters. It was our tiny revolutionary army that taught the world an eternal lesson in freedom. It was in our land that the dignity of the individual was exalted. It was our Bill of Rights that sanctified the security of the citizen, and it was our Civil War that taught the world a lesson in the price that freedom requires.

And what do we see now? A congressman whose very name has become a shameful and international badge of iniquity and hatred proposes in Congress a bill which at one stroke would wipe out all our rights, all our hard-won freedom. And there are men who stay silent.

A member of the Cabinet calls for the suppression of a political party which has worked tirelessly and unceasingly for civil rights and for the cause of labor and the people. And some men say: after all it is not my party, and I will stay silent; perhaps they will forget me and leave me alone.

A President of this land calls for a world empire, for forcible intervention in any land which strikes our fancy, and implicit in his words is the threat of a war which could wipe out a hundred million or five hundred million human souls, a war against a former ally of ours—and the Congress listens to him and applauds him.

What have we come to? Did Germany teach us no lessons? Do we still believe the insane illusion that by silence men can make their peace with fascism? Are we to become so like insects, so like beetles and roaches that we believe in the security of the crevices into which frightened men crawl?

This is no time for complicated preachments. The simple fact is this: that all we believe in and all we value is at stake.



Poor, naked Adam digs this grave Where Cain and Abel both are slain And Eve returns the rib of pain With all the flesh she gave. Sweet flesh, there is no breath to grieve Nor, overwhelmed, no mind to break That must endure. If we believe The old outlives the new, The living must with life unmake This desert where their garden grew. Seed the earth between these bones, Harvest from these weeping stones.

A. M. KRICH.

WHAT THE SUPREME COURT "FORGOT"

The three political acts against the miners are masked as a judicial opinion. Analyzing the case.

By ABRAHAM UNGER

THE decision of the Supreme Court in the Lewis case reminds us again how acute was Finley Peter Dunne, whose Mr. Dooley said that the Supreme Court follows the election returns, and how cynical was the judge who said that the law is what the courts say it is. Could any worker two years ago have conceived that the Supreme Court would soon strike down the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction act? Could any lawyer have predicted two years ago that the Supreme Court would subject a defendant to punishment for contempt of an order which the Court had no jurisdiction to grant? Could any person have foreseen two years ago that a union would be fined the enormous sum of \$700,000 for insisting on the right of its members to cease work in the absence of a contract?

Those are the three political acts committed by the Court in the form of judicial opinion rendered by a majority of seven of the nine justices.

The majority opinion was written by Chief Justice Vinson, recently appointed by President Truman. He concedes that the Norris-LaGuardia Act specifically provides that "no court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue any restraining order, or temporary or permanent injunction in any case involving or growing out of any labor dispute. . . ." To support the conclusion that these words do not mean what they say he argues that the government, being sovereign, was not subject to its own law. But as Justice Murphy pointed out "the touchstone of the Norris-LaGuardia Act is the existence of a labor dispute, not the status of the parties.'

The Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed by Congress precisely to end the notorious evil of court injunctions obtained by the government as a means of breaking strikes of unions against employers. In the Debs, Hayes and Railway Shopmen's cases it was the government which had served as the employers' agent to break strikes through injunction. To use the theory of "sovereignty" as an escape from the clear language of a Congressional statute is transparent sophistry.

The Court was not unaware of the weakness of that argument. To bolster it Judge Vinson then argued the Act did not apply because in this case the government was the employer, unlike the Debs case where it intervened in behalf of an employer. He sought to prove his point by referring to the Congressional debates which preceded the Act's adoption in 1932. But the Court is on weak ground again since the record shows that a motion to exclude the government from the effect of the Norris-LaGuardia bill was defeated by Congress, 125 to 21.

But even more convincing evidence is available which demolishes this feeble case, assembled like a defective jig-saw puzzle from meaningless debates and inapplicable citations.

The US government comes into this case by reason of its seizure of the coal mines under the War Labor Disputes Act (the Smith-Connally Law). It gave the government power to seize plants and fixed criminal penalties for violations. But one thing it did not do —it did not give the government power to obtain, or the court power to grant, injunctions against the workers. And this in war time.

Nor was this an oversight. Senator Connally actually introduced an amendment to permit injunctions. The Senate rejected it. In the House, an amendment specifically excluding the safeguards of the Norris-LaGuardia Act was adopted. In Senate-House conference the House bill was rejected, the Senate bill approved; and so it was finally adopted by Congress.

But this irrefutable Congressional history left Justice Vinson unperturbed. "We thus find nothing," says the Court, "in the legislative background of the War Labor Disputes Act which



"De minimis non curat lex may be all right—but where does it say how to dig coal?"



For 15 children between ages of 7-11 in comfortable farm home in Green Mountaius. 125 acres of meadow, brook and woodland. Swimming pool on premises and lake nearby. Careful attention to health and diet. Family life-Farm activities-Sports – Music – Arts and Crafts. \$325 – season. Phone Wilmington 16 R. 5 MANNY and GRACE GRANICH Wilmington, Vermont

RESORTS

TAKE A SENSIBLE EASTER-SPRING VA-CATION AT HEALTH REST VEGETARIAN RESORT. FOR RESERVATION PHONE NANUET 2316, NANUET, N. Y.

VINEYARD LODGE

Charming modern farm hotel, 200 acresunusually beautiful country, seasonal sport new tile showers, wood burning fireplace well balanced American Jewish meals. Adults only. Open all year. Vineyard Lodge, Ulister Park, New York. Kingston 659 J2.

CAMP FOR CHILDREN

CAMP WAYWAYANDA—For young folks 3-9 years, 3 hours from N. Y. in the Berkshires. Professional staff, small groups, private lake. Creative activities including gardening and care of animals. \$425 per season. Write Waywayanda P. O., Copake Falls, N. Y. New York phone MU 2-4232.

How About That Ad?

People are living in crowded quarters. They are going to start early with Summer Vacation Plans.

Already they are consulting us. Is yours going to be one of the resorts we can tell them about?

For years we have been glad to give this service.

So why not plan your Summer advertising now?

Write: G. Chase - New Masses 104 East 9th Street GRamercy 3-5146 constitutes an authoritative expression of Congress directing the Court to withhold from the US injunctive relief in connection with an Act designed to strengthen the hand of the government in serious labor disputes." There are none so blind . . .!

It is not surprising that a court which could "find nothing" thus far would be equally myopic in further search. Evidently still disturbed by its inadequacy to this point, the majority seeks to prove that the miners were government employes, not employes of the mine owners. Justice Murphy's answer is: "the miners remained private employes despite the temporary gloss of government possession and operation of the mines; they bear no resemblance whatever to employes of the executive departments, the independent agencies and the other branches of the government."

Twist and turn as it may, the majority cannot escape the fact that the case presents a "labor dispute" (be the miners government employes or private employes), and that the law expressly prohibits injunctions in such cases. On the one hand the majority seeks to invest the government with all the attributes of sovereignty, thus placing it above the law. On the other it is equally eager to picture the government as an employer, lest it appear that the government is acting as a strikebreaker exactly as it did in the notorious Debs and Hayes cases. The Court fails in both attempts.

The miners are obviously not employes of the government in its sovereign capacity; they are not carrying out the normal function of government as it is known commonly and in law. Nor are they employes of government acting in a proprietary capacity. The mines were not, like TVA, the property of the government, owned and operated by and for the government. These were seized mines, in no way changing the relation between the mine owners and the mine workers. The miners are not chattels to be "seized" from the mine owners one day and "returned" the next. Whatever rights they possess as employes under various statutes-unemployment insurance, fair labor standards, workmen's compensation-remained intact, and that not by means of any provision of the Smith-Connally Act but because of their basic unaltered employe status.

Nor is the Supreme Court unaware

that this is the law unless, again, it "cannot find" its own decision in the Hust case rendered only a year ago. There the government specifically described itself in contracts as the owner of the ships, operated by the shipping companies as "agents," and the seamen were designated as its employes. Yet the Supreme Court held that the seamen were in law as in fact employes of the shipowners. Between the Hust and Lewis decisions lies a sharp change, not in the law, but in the political forces which shape the course of the state.

The second and concluding installment of this article will be published next week.

Rumble in the Senate

(Continued from page 11)

He bit on an unlighted cigar, rolled it between his teeth. There was an angry light in his pale gray eyes. His carefully trimmed hair was a little mussed and I noticed he was graying at the temples. Yes, the dapper Senator from Idaho visibly had taken on a little mileage in his short time here. He had got to Washington by hiring himself a cowboy band and touring his state, since the newspapers gave him the cold shoulder, and he had got to the people. Once here, he hadn't forgotten them, but it had been rough going.

"We had about stopped 'em in this Red-baiting on Lilienthal, they made themselves so utterly ridiculous," he said. "We made a stand and made a counterattack and it was successful. But now the Red-baiting drive has a shot in the arm with the foreign policy development, and it looks as if it's going on to bigger and better things."

I mentioned that one Senator had told me about the recent Democratic caucus actually held, he said, as was the Republican caucus, for Senators NEW MASSES

Classified Advertisements

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

RoKo GALLERY RoKo FRAMES

PAINTINGS - PRINTS - SCULPTURE

Expert framing at reasonable prices 51 Greenwich Ave. (east of 7th Ave. & 11 St.)

LANGUAGE EXCHANGE

Exchange your language (whatever it may be) for English. For information write Box 61, New Masses.

FOR SALE

Linguaphone Russian language set, new, cost \$50, ask \$40. Records, books, case. First M.O. Mayers, 208 Schaeffer St., Brooklyn.

STENOTYPE REPORTING

Stenotype reporter, vet-conventions, meetings, legal and labor proceedings. Notary Harry Birnbaum, Tel. OL 2-5827.

INSURANCE

LEON BENOFF, serving a satisfied elientele since 1919, with every kind of insurance, including LIFE INSURANCE, 391 East 145th St., N. Y. Call Me, 5-6954.

INSURANCE

CARL BRODSKY-Automobile, fire, life, liability, burglary, plate glass, surety bonds. compensation etc. Any kind of insurance, 799 Broadway, New York City. Tel. GRamercy 5-3826.

EYE CARE

EUGENE STEIN, Optometrist—Eye examinations—Glasses Fitted—Visual Training. Room 507, 13 Astor Place (140 East 5th St.), NY 3 GRamercy 7-0330.

WATCH & CLOCK REPAIRS

Reliable watch and clock repairing. Prempt attention to mail orders. Eckert, 220 8th Ave. (near 22nd), New York 11.

RADIO REPAIRS

Without paying high prices. Itemized estimates given before work is started. Call N. Walkind, HA. 6-6719, evenings.

PIANO TUNING

Piano tuning, repairing, tone restoring and reconditioning. Pianos bought & sold, Ralph J. Appleton. 595 Fifth Ave., New York 17, N. Y. Tel. DI. 6-5777, after 6 P.M.

TYPEWRITER CO.

Typewriters, mimees, adders, office machines repaired. Buy, sell, exchange, Monthly service 100% union, Vets, A & B Typewriter-633 Melrose-JE 8-1684.

VOLUNTEER WORKERS

Interesting work and opportunity to gain experience. Typists, stenographers, or general office workers. Full or part time with progressive magazine. Call Gr. 3-5146 ex. 15.

NOTARY PUBLIC-STENOGRAPHER

All kinds of work well done organizational, legal documents and manuscripts. Phone NEvins 8-3743, Saturdays all day and evenings from 7 til 10 P.M.

SUMMER PROPERTIES

SPRING is the time to buy Hotels, Farms, Summer Cottages; 100 miles from N. Y. State needs. Address Agent, Box 39, West Copake, N. Y.

WILL SHARE APT.

Employed woman wants to share apartment or rent housekeeping room with congenial family. Midtown preferred. Call evenings, TR. 4-3128. Barkley and Vandenberg respectively to take up the question of Greece after seeing Mr. Truman. "He said everyone was agreed that the Greek people should have relief, food, but that he was pleased at the resistance to the idea of military or political intervention. Now, he said, the resistance seems to be wilting."

"I don't know that it is," said Sen. Taylor, one of those who condemned the policy. "There are a lot of them that don't like it on both sides of the aisle-though I hate to be in such bad company." For the first time he gave something like the semblance of his usual grin. "A lot of them are opposing it not because of their belief in democracy or liberties. Personally, I'd like to help the Greek people. If they could give me any reasonable hope that we would give them civil liberties I'd be for it-but I can't see my way clear to giving King George money to fight people who fought Hitler. I admit there probably are quite a few Communists among them, but they aren't all Communists."

"Another Senator I talked to said he thought the business men themselves would oppose Secretary Schwellenbach's proposal; do you?" I asked.

"Some will be opposed, because there are some decent business men, but a majority will think it's swell dope. If they can get a law saying they can fire a Red, what could be better?"

"The Lilienthal hearings went on for many weeks. What part do you think the American people played in the results?" I asked.

"The American people have a sense of fair play which came into operation," he said.

Then I asked one more question of the Senator who in and out of committee has put up such a strong fight to save rent control, while the one man who voted in committee against the appointment of Lilienthal as head of the Atomic Energy Commission, Sen. John W. Bricker, fights to carry out the National Association of Real Estate Boards' instructions.

"Do you think the American people can stop this drive on civil liberties which is starting with the move to outlaw the Communist Party?"

For a moment he was silent, rolling his cigar back and forth, and when he answered I knew it was not just to create the sound of words. "I don't know," he said somberly, "but I know the American people hate to be told what they can and can't do."



501 Monmouth Ave., Lakewood, N. J.

LAkewood 6-0819, 6-1222

