



When China Wins BY MADAME SUN YAT-SEN

Two Years of the War in China A SUMMARY BY PHILIP J. JAFFE

Third Term for the New Deal AN EDITORIAL ARTICLE

Adventures of a Middle-Aged Man BY ELLIOT PAUL

The Ruination of Judge MacDuff A SHORT STORY BY JOSEPH MITCHELL

BETWEEN OURSELVES

J OSEPH NORTH'S two articles on the Hollywood renaissance will be followed by two by Ella Winter on the organization of the crafts in the movie industry. Other features to appear in forthcoming issues include:

Wellington Roe on Father Coughlin's Social Justice; a discussion of the recent British Labor Party conference by our European correspondent, Richard Goodman; an article in the "What I Am Doing to Fight Fascism" series by Jean Starr Untermeyer, poet and one of the founders of the old Masses; an article by NM Editor A. B. Magil on recent statements of Leon Trotsky which furnish additional proof of the charges at the Moscow trials; an



Earl Russell Browder

The General Secretary of the Communist Party, USA, was born in Wichita, Kans., on May 20, 1891, of a family that arrived on these shores in 1650. At fifteen Browder became a Socialist, quit the party in 1912 because of the expulsion of Bill Haywood and other militants. Because he opposed the war, he went to Leavenworth in 1917, charged with conspiracy to obstruct the operation of the federal oleomargarine law. He played the flute in the prison band. The Bolshevik Revolution broke while he was in jail, and inspired him to join the Communist Party immediately after his release. He has been one of its leaders ever since. Browder assumed his present position in 1930. Has traveled many times to Europe and the Soviet Union, spent some time in China in 1927. Browder has been a cash boy in a department store, a Western Union messenger, an accountant, clerk in a wholesale drug house. He and his wife and their children reside in Yonkers, N.Y. article by Joseph Freeman on "The Democratic Ideal"; a verbal portrait by Dale Kramer of George Sokolsky; two articles on Mexico by our Mexican correspondent, Marc Frank; an article on the latest developments in Cuba by J. E. Cuesta; a review of *The History of the Communist Party* of the Soviet Union by Moissaye J. Olgin; short stories by Albert Maltz, Meridel LeSueur, Eugene E. Hurley, Edward G. Wall, and Catherine Ridgely.

Readers and friends of NM who come to New York for the World's Fair are cordially invited to drop in at our offices for a visit with the staff.

"You'll never be able to do it !"

That's what the experts said when we consulted them on the matter of pushing the circulation of NM upwards ten thousand in these summer doldrum months. Well, we are doing it! We are gratified to report to our readers that for the past six weeks NM circulation has gone up slowly but steadily *each week*!

This week we pay the first slogancontest prize of \$10 to Mr. Anthony Toney of 34 East 21st St., New York City. If you've read the back covers in previous weeks' issues and this week's issue, you will be informed that there is a weekly prize of \$10 for the best slogan of the week.

Don't forget for a minute, either, that there is a grand prize of \$100 which will be awarded at the end of the contest (Labor Day) for the best slogan received.

For those who shy off at the thought of entering contests we've a special "Build NEW MASSES" inducement (see page 23). The gist of the story is this: every NM booster—and this seems to apply literally to every reader—is offered his or her choice of any one of thirteen top-notch books ranging from Ralph Bates' Sirocco to William Blake's The World Is Mine. A number of the books, incidentally, have a retail value as high as \$3 and most others average \$2.50.

The choice of a book is yours merely for the pleasant job of getting a few of your friends to become NM readers. Ten dollars' worth of subscriptions in denominations of \$1 twelve-week introductory offers or yearly \$4.50 subscriptions turns the trick for you. Now here's where the unusual part of this inducement comes in. You don't have to send in all the subscriptions at once to win the prize. Send them in as you get them and we will send you your choice of one of these exciting books as soon as you have hit the halfway mark, which means \$5 worth of subs.

After that you may send the remaining \$5 in subscriptions as you get them. You see, we have complete faith in the loyalty of our readers. It's all part of the "Build NEW MASSES" summer campaign for ten thousand new readers by Labor Day!

Who's Who

Paditor of A editor of Amerasia; his writings on the Far East have appeared before in NM. . . . The article by Earl Browder in this issue is the text of a speech delivered July 5 before the Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia. . . . Paul G. McManus is NM's Washington correspondent. . . Joseph Mitchell, author of My Ears Are Bent, is on the staff of the New Yorker. . . . Elliot Paul, newspaperman and novelist, is the author of The Stars and Stripes Forever, The Life and Death of a Spanish Town, and Concert Pitch. . . . Edwin Berry Burgum is a member of the English Department of New York University . . . Eugene Gordon, a former associate editor of NM, is a reporter and feature writer on the Daily Worker. For three years he was on the staff of the Moscow Daily News and for fifteen years on the Boston Post.

Flashback**s**

 $M_{\,\rm ers:\,the\,\,second\,\,anniversary\,\,of}^{\rm EMO}$ to the civil service workthe birth of your vigorous organization falls in this week. On July 12, 1937, John L. Lewis announced the formation of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, with two million eligible for membership. . . . Japanese Army Headquarters at Tientsin, on July 7, 1937, created the incident which began the invasion of North and Central China. . . . Three hundred armed provocateurs and spies fought a pitched battle at midnight, July 6, 1892, against the steel mill strikers at Homestead, Pa. The professional gunmen were defeated, captured, held for two days, and finally driven out of town. . . . Clara Zetkin, for fifty years active in the labor movement, a founder of the Communist Party in Germany, a member of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, and a member of the German Reichstag, was born July 6, 1857. Her American counterpart, Mother Bloor, was born just five years later, July 8, 1862. . . . The head of Thomas More, author of Utopia, was displayed on London Bridge, July 7, 1535, for the delight of the tyrannical Henry VIII.

This Week.

NEW MASSES, VOL. XXXII, No. 3

July 11, 1939

When China Wins by Madame Sun Yat-sen		•	3
Two Years of War by Philip J. Jaffe			
Map of the Chinese War Zone		•	7
USA and USSR: Good Neighbors by Eart Browde	r		9
The Ruination of Judge MacDuff A Short Story	, 1	by	
Joseph Mitchell		•	12
The New Hollywood by Joseph North	•	•	14
The Brothers La Follette by Paul G. McManus.			17
Editorial Comment			19
Third Term for the New Deal An Editorial Article			21

REVIEW AND COMMENT

Adventures of a M	iddle-Aged Man by Elliot	Paul		•	22
Waldo Frank's Nov	vel by Edwin Berry Burgun	<i>n</i> .			23
The American Neg	gro by Eugene Gordon .		•	•	26

SIGHTS AND SOUNDS

Lenin Meets the Counter-Revolution by James Dugan	•	28
Station WNYC by John Vernon	•	29
Dance Presentation by Owen Burke	•	31
Art work by McGill, Mischa Richter, Crockett Jo	hns	son,
A. Ajay, William Gropper, Richard Correll, Fred Elli	s.	,

Two weeks' notice is required for change of address. Notification direct to us rather than to the post office will give the best results. Published weekly by WEEKLY MASSES CO., INC., at 461 Fourth Are., New York City. (West Coast Bureau, 6715 Hollywood Bird., Rm 287, Hollywood, Calif.) Copyright, 1939, WEEKLY MASSES CO., INC., Reg. U. S. Patent Office, Drawings and tet may not be reprinted without permission. Entered as second-class matter, June 24, 1926 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Single copies, 15 cents. Subscription \$4.50 a year in U. S. and Colonies and Mexico. Six months \$2.50; three months \$1.25; Foreign \$5.50 a year; six months \$3; three months \$1.50. In Canada, \$5 a year, \$2.75 for six months. Subscribers are notified that no change in address can be effected in less than two weeks, NEW MASSES welcomes the work of new writers and artists. Manuscripts and drawings must be accompanied by stamped and self-addressed envelope. New MASSES does not pay for contributions.



Earl Russell Browder

New Masses

VOLUME XXXII

JULY 11, 1939

NUMBER 3

When China Wins

The sleeping giant of the Orient has risen and will build a powerful young democracy, writes Madame Sun Yat-sen. The united front the road to victory.

TRITING on the second anniversary of our war of resistance, it is no longer necessary for me to tell readers of New MASSES and all our friends in the United States that we will fight on, that our struggle shall not cease until the final victory is won. Everyone now understands this. Everyone knows that the invader has failed to destroy our fighting forces and spirit, that he has proved unable to inflict either the smashing military blow with which he planned to wipe out our army, or the political stab in the back which he hoped would break up our anti-Japanese united front. Our armies are seizing the initiative on the battlefronts. Our people and government, the Kuomintang, the Communist Party, and even the provincial militarists whom the enemy has so often tried to seduce from their allegiance have stood together against Wang Ching-wei and his band of traitors, unanimously approving their expulsion from all state posts and the orders issued for their arrest.

AFTER VICTORY, WHAT?

Our will to resist and our ultimate victory are no longer in doubt. But serious misconceptions still surround many aspects of our struggle. These misconceptions cluster most thickly around the question: "After the war, what?" How is China changing during her fight? Will she return, after the great effort, to the paths of development she was following before Marco Polo Bridge? Or will she, as our enemies constantly assert and so many of their dupes believe, "go Red" in some sudden, violent, and mysterious fashion?

Neither supposition, of course, is true. As revealed in the statements of our national leaders, the unity of the Chinese nation in the present struggle will continue after our victory in a united effort for national reconstruction and the realization of the San Min Chu I, the Three People's Principles of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, which the Kuomintang and the Communists recognize as a common national program. Only the Three People's Principles offer a solid base for the continued collaboration of all anti-Japanese political groups now and in the future. To defeat the enemy and to build a San Min Chu I republic is the aim and goal of such collaboration today.

What kind of republic will this be?

In accordance with the teachings of Dr. Sun, the Chinese republic must be based on direct rule by the people through their elected



MADAME SUN YAT-SEN. Soong Ching Ling was the maiden name of the widow of China's national hero and leader in liberation, the first president of the Chinese Republic. She has been active since 1911, is now on the Kuomintang Executive. American-educated, she speaks and writes perfect English. Her sister is Madame Chiang Kai-shek. Madame Sun is the guiding spirit of the China Defense League in Hong Kong, an organization soliciting help for the Chinese people. She helps in the organization of the Chinese Industrial Cooperatives, mentioned in Philip Jaffe's article on page 5.

representatives. The *hsien* or district must be the basic unit of self-government, as well as the constituency for electing deputies to the National Assembly. This system can grow only on the foundation of the fullest and most widespread extension of democratic rights.

REORGANIZATION

The National Assembly shall be the supreme authority from which the central government will receive its mandate, and to which it will be responsible. The relationship between central and local governments will' change. There will have to be a thorough reform of the present system of provinces, completely eliminating the traditional autonomy of the local armies. Dr. Sun Yat-sen advocated the creation in China of provinces of a new type, provinces which will be no more than convenient administrative divisions of a united nation, like the French *departements*, instead of, as too often hitherto, separate political and military domains.

The organization of the army will also be altered. Its numbers will be restricted to conform with the requirements of national security and defense and the carrying out of China's international obligations in connection with the maintenance of collective security. Superfluous military formations will be disbanded and their members transferred, in a planned way, to national reconstruction projects, industrial and agricultural. In the China of the future, mercenary armies will have no place. The principle of general conscription, already being introduced, will be carried into full effect.

The united front of national resistance, the cooperation between the Kuomintang and Communist parties, the unification of all the armies under the generalissimo and his simultaneous leadership of the government: all these represent an important step forward in the process of centralization which, with the accompanying growth of democracy, is the prime essential of our national revolution. It would be wrong to view these things simply as "wartime measures." The tendency they represent has been accelerated by the war but is, in itself, a part of a necessary historical process which will continue after the victory. The fact that the most vigorous growth is witnessed precisely at the present moment proves that the progress of our national revolution is impossible without the united front of the entire Chinese people, the collaboration of our two chief parties, the combination of our armed forces with the people's anti-Japanese movement, and determined resistance to Japanese aggression. These conditions, created by the anti-Japanese struggle, have assured our independence thus far. Further progress in national unification and democratic reforms will strengthen the foundations already laid down for the people's China of the future.

Dr. Sun's first two principles dealt with the



MADAME SUN YAT-SEN. Soong Ching Ling was the maiden name of the widow of China's national hero and leader in liberation, the first president of the Chinese Republic. She has been active since 1911, is now on the Kuomintang Executive. American-educated, she speaks and writes perfect English. Her sister is Madame Chiang Kai-shek. Madame Sun is the guiding spirit of the China Defense League in Hong Kong, an organization soliciting help for the Chinese people. She helps in the organization of the Chinese Industrial Cooperatives, mentioned in Philip Jaffe's article on page 5. 4

achievement of national independence and the introduction of democracy. The third, the principle of livelihood, was concerned with the improvement of the living conditions of the Chinese people. In our agrarian country, the land problem is of paramount importance. Dr. Sun formulated the slogan "land to those who till it." For the period of industrial growth which would follow political unification, he laid down the policy of state control of natural resources, railways, and public utilities, and the regulation of private enterprise, which was not to be repressed but, on the contrary, encouraged to develop in directions serving the needs of national economic construction. Although progress in this direction is still inadequate, we see today, in the course of our struggle, the beginnings of the realization of Dr. Sun's economic ideals. Rents and taxes have in many places been reduced. Wasteland has been put to tillage. Our wartime reconstruction is taking place under state auspices and, through organizations like the Chinese Industrial Cooperatives, on democratic lines. After the war, we look forward to a type of economic development in which all groups of China's population will share.

It should be clearly understood by those who, through malice or ignorance, paint the national united front of the Chinese people a deep red, that it is just because this front represents a real effort of all classes toward the common aim of national emancipation, that the Three People's Principles, which were first propounded as a program for such united action, form an actual basis of its policy. The Three People's Principles represent a program for the anti-imperialist democratic revolution. Within this program, the institution of private property cannot and will not be attacked or abolished, and the only feasible interference with it is the confiscation of the possessions of enemies and traitors and general legislation to distribute more equably the burden of the common struggle against the invaders.

FOREIGN' POLICY

As with domestic so with foreign capital. China welcomes foreign trade with and investments by all countries wishing to assist her reconstruction. Dr. Sun consistently declared, throughout the years of his leadership of the Kuomintang and the entire national revolutionary movement, that we would strive in every way to promote economic relations with foreign nations willing to deal with us on a basis of equality, non-aggression, and sympathy for our desire to bring China to her proper place as a member of the family of nations.

Today China fights not only for democracy and for the peoples of the world, but also for the national and economic interests of all countries threatened by the encroachments of Japanese imperialism. She is fighting, in a very real sense, as an outpost of the national defense of the United States. This is not merely a convenient slogan for propaganda. Your military and naval authorities know that it is a fact.

DUTY OF AMERICANS

To give a clear picture of the aims of our struggle, to expose and refute the lies by which the enemies of our people seek to split the forces which together would be able to swing America to a stand consonant with her interests, sympathies, and great democratic tradition—these are the duties of every American friend of China, of every American who abhors fascist militarism and national oppression, who feels that the stand his country takes in these matters is a question vital to his own future as well as to his self-respect as a citizen of the United States.

MADAME SUN YAT-SEN.



CHINA DEFENSE LEAGUE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. Reading from left to right, I. Epstein, publicity director; M. C. Dang; Mrs. M. S. Lee, the Chinese secretary; the author, who is chairman of the league; Mrs. Selwyn-Clarke; Professor N. France, treasurer; Mr. S. C. Liao.



CHINA DEFENSE LEAGUE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. Reading from left to right, I. Epstein, publicity director; M. C. Dang; Mrs. M. S. Lee, the Chinese secretary; the author, who is chairman of the league; Mrs. Selwyn-Clarke; Professor N. France, treasurer; Mr. S. C. Liao.

Two Years of War

The military, political, economic life of China two years after Marco Polo Bridge. Philip J. Jaffe, authority on the Far East, gives the facts.

N JULY 7, 1937, a small unit of Japanese troops clashed with a Chinese garrison at the Marco Polo Bridge near Peiping. From that small incident developed one of the greatest wars of aggression in modern history. Japan, conscious of her mission to conquer China, launched her attack at a time when the most populous nation in the world was on the threshold of a new life and an amazing period of modernization. The Japanese army leaders thought that within three months China would be at their mercy. This view was held by the majority of foreigners living in China. They could not believe that China, with her backward industry, her inferior armies, and a largely conservative provincialism, could stop the highly mechanized armies of Japan, backed by a strong economic setup.

JAPAN FAR FROM VICTORY

China became the battleground for a struggle between a weak and until recently backward nation, fighting for the rudimentary security of its homes and fields, and a powerful, highly militarized country, out to destroy the integrity of an ancient civilization. In two years of fighting the Japanese have occupied every important industrial city in China and established virtually complete control of the Chinese coastline. Yet Japan is further from victory today than at any time previously. Her army is at an impasse. Having occupied the coastal plain, it has ar--rived at that part of China where the rugged mountainous regions and transportation facilities not suitable for mechanized warfare have blocked it. Face to face with an aroused population, united for one purpose, the Japanese army is meeting opposition which guns cannot overcome. For the loyalists in China, from bankers and business men to illiterate peasants, have joined hands in a common battle. Today, after two years of war, China is stronger than she was at the beginning.

In a sense, the first stage of the war has ended. Realizing that there is no prospect of a quick victory, Japan is faced with the alternatives of either continuing its frontal attacks against important Chinese centers or settling down to a long war of attrition. But Japan lacks sufficient manpower, sufficient foreign exchange to buy implements of war, and sufficient shipping facilities to send men and supplies to the mainland. The latter, Japan probably realizes, is hopeless. The hope for the Japanese army lies in the possibility that the Western powers, led by a Chamberlain, will act as "peacemakers" by using their economic power to make China listen to "sensible" peace terms. That is why the Japanese army has been provoking the West-



CHINA FIGHTS HER OWN BATTLE. But America must cease arming Japan.

ern powers, particularly Great Britain, in the hope that it will hasten a much desired Far Eastern Munich.

AMERICA'S ROLE

The American people have a special interest in the Far East. Not only do they' want to fulfill their treaty obligations to China-expressed mainly in the Nine Power Treaty of 1922-but China to them means 450,000,000 people who could become free and prosperous-economic as well as cultural friends. The most recent Gallup poll, taken on June 16, concludes that "American public sympathy for China in her war against Japan has increased sharply in the past year and a half. Today an overwhelming majority of voters favor a boycott of Japanese goods and an embargo on the shipping of American war materials to Japan." In September 1937, 2 percent of the people interviewed favored Japan, 47 percent favored China, 51 percent favored neither side. Today 2 percent still favor Japan, 74 percent now definitely favor China, only 24 percent are neutral. Today 66 percent favor a movement in this country to boycott Japanese goods, as compared with 37 percent in October 1937; and 72 percent are in favor of forbidding the shipment of arms and ammunition to Japan.

Despite this sentiment, we have continued during the entire two years of war to be Japan's chief source of strategic war materials. In 1937 we supplied Japan with 54.54 percent of her war imports. In 1938 this percentage increased to 56. The American people, though not yet moved to sufficient protest against a Congress that disregards their best interests and their expressed sentiments, are horrified at what this war of aggression, aided by our own country, has produced in misery and destruction.

The Japanese army of occupation has destroyed hundreds of colleges, schools, hospitals, thousands of industrial plants, untold numbers of homes. Innumerable small plants and the better private homes have been appropriated without compensation. Cities and villages have been looted and destroyed. Everything usable, from ordinary scrap to works of art, has been stolen and shipped to Japan. Wherever the Japanese armies tread, in their wake are opium and narcotic peddlers who demoralize the population and collect quick revenue. In addition to the wrecking of Chinese property and lives, the Japanese military has destroyed hundreds of millions of dollars worth of the property and trade of the Western nations, including the United States.

The Japanese, however, have gained nothing by their destruction and their "victories." Their political "victories" have been particularly empty. One could see some measure of sense in the actions of the Japanese militarists and industrial barons if by their tactics they gained usable plunder, but Japan is now in a worse situation than she was even two years ago. The years 1932-36 saw Japan's phenomenal rise as a major world power, but 1937-38 saw her on her way down, fighting for her life, fearful of another two years of war. Her economic life has been badly dislocated. Her export business has decreased sharply, severely straining foreign exchange reserves and necessitating strict control of imports; her gold reserves are vanishing. Agriculture, never strong in Japanese economy, has become far weaker. Manpower drawn from the agricultural areas into the army and industry has seriously undermined food production-a factor which may become the crack in Japan's armor. One of the chief causes for the cut in last year's silk production was a rural labor shortage. The present silk crisis in Japan, marked by an abnormal price increase, threatens to destroy the competitive value of one of the chief products by which Japan can obtain her foreign exchange.

TEN MILLION GUERRILLAS

Though outwardly Japanese cities present a peaceful front, this effect comes not by virtue of reality but by a censorship which prevents even Japanese in important positions from knowing the truth about China. But for the million and a half Japanese troops abroad the picture is different. They are getting tired of the war; of being continually harassed,

5

seeing their fellow soldiers wounded and killed by Chinese guerrillas.

The story of guerrilla warfare, first developed to its highest art by the Eighth Route Army, is an old one to Americans. But what is not well known is that every man and woman in China is either being trained to become a guerrilla warrior or is regarded as a potential one. Only recently has it become public that in the west of China an army of ten million is in training. In an area covering hundreds of square miles and scores of villages, these ten million, in three groups of approximately fifty divisions each, are being drilled for early service. One-third of them are to be used as mobile or guerrilla units, one-third positional troops, one-third reserves.

The population behind the Japanese lines is being organized for partisan warfare by what is, perhaps, the smartest underground feat in all military history. A gigantic offensive against the Japanese is being planned. Last April there was a trial offensive on all fronts, which proved very successful though it was limited to three objectives: (1) to prevent the Japanese from wedging between the New Fourth Army (an army modeled after the Eighth Route Army, drawn largely from the old Soviet district in Kiangsi, which today operates along the Yangtze between Anking and Nanking) and the government troops mobilized between Hankow and Chungking; (2) to test the Japanese lines; (3) to discover where the Chinese armies need strengthening.

The political and industrial mobilization of the masses of China has developed rapidly. Every Chinese is becoming active in the struggle for freedom. Every political faction recognizes the common goal. The People's Political Council—the wartime representative body of the Chinese people, inaugurated last July at Hankow—works smoothly. China is on the threshold of genuine democracy. The People's Political Council includes members, from many provinces of every class, profession, trade, representatives of every political party, including the Kuomintang, the Communist Party, the State Socialist Party, and the Chinese Youth Party. The expulsion last December of the council's chairman, Wang Ching-wei, was a large part of the job of rooting out traitors. Wang Ching-wei, working hand in hand with the Japanese, hopes to head a Chinese government under Japan's hegemony. He is hated throughout China.

THE NEW ECONOMY

Military resistance is only half the battle and China knows that. There are increasing efforts to mobilize productive energies. First, second, third, and fourth line economic defenses are developing behind the fighting lines and beyond the enemy's reach, so that the defending armies shall not lose their economic bases. The transformation of the agricultural interior into an industrial economic unit is slow and difficult, but every foreign observer reports encouragingly on the progress. Early in the war the Chinese government began removing undamaged factories into the interior, factories which could start rebuilding key industries-textiles, chemicals, and steel. In addition it has begun a new industrial economy based on small decentralized factories. The plan calls for thirty thousand Industrial Cooperatives to parallel and complement the government's big industries program. Large-scale factories are important in cities that can be defended, but their chief weakness is immobility, making them open to attack. The new project plans to establish mobile industrial units located in the hinterland. These can function even after Japanese occupation. The decentralized Industrial Cooperatives have another advantage: they can absorb idle refugee workers. Their great immediate significance, however, is that during the period of the war they will become the economic basis for continued resistance in every county. town, and village, and provide a market for Chinese agriculture even if individual Chinese cities and railway centers continue to fall.

To ease the development of these new enterprises, roads, railways, and airlines are being opened up. The three chief arteries of approach to China from the outside world the route from French Indo-China by rail

People in the War

Estimated Number Directly Involved in the War in China as of January 1	, 1939
Japanese troops landed in China to date	1,300,000
Japanese troops landed in Manchuria to date	300,000
Japanese casualties	600,000 、
Japanese killed	250,000
Chinese Government troops in the field	3,500,000
Chinese guerrillas (mobile fighters)	*
Chinese troops casualties	1,500,000
Chinese troops killed	600,000
Chinese civilian casualties: aerial bombs	150,000
Chinese civilian deaths	75,000
Chinese civilians forced to flee before invading armies	
Chinese civilian refugees in summer of 1938	30,000,000
* No estimates available, although it is known that the number runs into hundred	s of thousands.

• No estimates available, although it is known that the number runs into hundreds of thousands. Every Chinese man and woman is a potential guerrilla. and highway into Yunnan; the Burma road, running from Rangoon to Chungking, and the Northwest road running from the Soviet Union to Sian—are being improved.

THE WESTERN POWERS

China is facing difficulties not of her own making. The most contradictory forces, perhaps the most difficult to estimate, are the Western powers. Great Britain has everything to lose by a Japanese victory, but she acts as disastrously as she acted in Europe. In spite of small loans to China and her backing of the Chinese currency, Great Britain, like the United States, is aiding Japan by selling her war materials, supplying her with shipping tonnage. She swallows one insult after another with only the most timorous of protests. France, with her most important colonial possession just south of China, is as usual following Mr. Chamberlain. Germany and Italy, who would also lose economically by a Japanese victory, are tied to Japan politically. Only the USSR is loyal to China. She sells China munitions and other commodities on liberal credit terms; she has recently concluded a trade pact with China. The USSR does not sell a single dime's worth of anything to Japan or buy a single Japanese export. At Changkufeng, where the Soviet troops threw back a Japanese invasion, in the fisheries dispute when the Soviet Union stood firm against unwarranted Japanese demands, and today in its sturdy defense of Outer Mongolian territory, the USSR has shown the Western powers that the way to resist is to resist. Japan knows that one neighbor and friend of China cannot be bullied into compromise.

OUR STAKE

There is no country with a greater stake in the Far Eastern conflict than the United States. In the face of public sentiment as expressed in the Gallup poll and as expressed by every intelligent, liberal-minded person in the country, Congress would prove itself totally unresponsive if it failed to enact a law that would place an embargo against Japan on the ground that she violates the Nine Power Treaty. Many such bills are before the Congress. China does not want American soldiers to fight her battles. She is doing that for herself. But she does ask that we stop arming Japan, stop acting as a partner in the destruction of her people. Many observers think that China cannot lose this war. Given enough time she will weary the invader. She will refuse to be forced back into agricultural feudalism as a Japanese colony. The question is not whether China will win or lose, but how soon she will win. Shall we stand by and permit Japan to destroy everything in sight, leaving the world faced with a vast stretch of earth barren and impoverished to be restored only at enormous cost, or shall we use our economic power today to put a stop to this war and to permit China to march forward and join the family of independent nations? PHILIP J. JAFFE.



The Chinese War Zone

N. the average newspaper map of China, the whole war zone is usually shaded as in the smaller map shown above, outlining Manchukuo and Central China.

But within the war zone the machinery of Chinese local administration has been running smoothly in most of the counties. From fifty to one hundred counties make up a province in China and a province is the largest administrative unit in the country.

In the above map, eleven provinces have been surveyed by the Executive Cabinet of the National Government. These include Kiangsu, Chekiang, Fukien, Anhwei, Kiangsi, Hunan, Shantung, Shansi, and Hopei. It does not include Chahar, Suiyuan or Kwantung, which last has Canton for its capital.

Thus we see that out of a total of 945 counties, 570 or 59 percent of them are completely under Chinese rule and control. In thirty-five others Chinese magistrates are still carrying on their administrative duties from their county seats, although parts of those counties have been occupied by Japanese troops. In 257 counties the Chinese magistrates are functioning in the suburbs, the Japanese having occupied the county seats.

In only seventy-two counties, or a mere 8 percent of the total number, the Chinese magistrates have found it impossible to carry on their duties. In these, except for the everactive guerrillas, the Japanese rule.

These are the official figures of the Executive Cabinet released on April 15, 1939. They show just what the Japanese militarists have been able to do in their invasion of China.





USA and USSR: Good Neighbors

Earl Browder tells of the ties between the two nations with clean records in current diplomacy. Let the Red-baiters yell—American national interest calls for collaboration with the Soviets.

THE realities of international relations are so obscured for Americans by special-interest propaganda, which seems to have right-of-way in our newspapers and other periodicals of wide circulation, that the task of contributing to clarification in this field requires extreme patience and frequent reference to basic facts of sufficiently wide acceptance to escape the suspicion of propagandistic bias. These requirements are particularly incumbent upon myself since the charge has been made, even before Congressional committee hearings, that I represent a variety of special pleading for alien interests, even the accusation that my views are a variety of "war-mongering from the left" designed to entangle the United States in other peoples' quarrels. Without evading these charges, and the prejudices which they have created, it will be my purpose to answer them only by the intrinsic merits of the arguments in support of my fundamental thesis.

The main idea which I am defending in the field of foreign policy is that of ever closer collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union, as the major factor in the organization of world peace, as the chief protection of the world against the flood of fascist barbarism, for the maintenance of an ordered civilization in a large part of the world.

It is impossible to dismiss this question as of secondary importance since the two countries in question are the strongest in the world, economically, militarily, and in a strategic geographical position. If the two strongest nations can work together, then the prospects for organization of world peace are bright; otherwise they are very dark.

What are the obstacles to such cooperation? Is there any conflict of interest between the United States and the Soviet Union, in any area of international relations, which shuts the door to such cooperation? It is our contention that there is no conflict of interest, that on the contrary the interests of the two countries are parallel, with many and growing areas of complete harmony.

In the Far East, the Pacific area, those parallel interests are so obvious and fundamental that even the Harding Republican administration, in 1920, dominated as it was by a fixed and obstinate hostility to the Soviet regime that was never relaxed for twelve years under Coolidge and Hoover, was yet forced by the inexorable logic of even the narrowest conception of American national interests to put pressure upon Japan, in the Washington Conference, to evacuate the Soviet Far Eastern Maritime Provinces after the Red Army had cleared them out of the Baikal region.

How much more, then, are these common

interests of emphatic importance, since Japanese militarism has run amok in China, has embarked upon such an ambitious adventure of conquest that it openly proclaims its intention of transforming all Eastern Asia into its closed preserve and reducing its hundreds of millions of population to instruments of an all-conquering military empire; while, through its association in the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo triangle, it has become an active force in Latin American life against the United States. The Soviet Union, by its active assistance to China, has made possible the marvelously heroic and successful resistance of the Chinese people against Japanese conquest. It is a matter worthy of deep thought on the part of all Americans that this role of the Soviet Union has been at the same time most profoundly favorable to the interests of the United States. The fundamental interests of China, the Soviet Union, and the United States are in profound harmony; the cooperative protection and advancement of these common interests furnish the only possible foundation for the stable organization of peace in the Pacific.

SINCE MUNICH

Turn now to Europe. Less than a year ago, Chamberlain proclaimed "peace for our time" as the fruits of the Munich pact, which excluded the Soviet Union from the "European family of nations" while surrendering Czechoslovakia and Southeastern Europe to the mercies of the axis powers. But already the fiasco of Munich and its catastrophic consequences are openly acknowledged by the very participants in the Munich Conference. Last October it was only the Communists who were possessed of sufficient clarity and courage to openly denounce the Munich betraval. Americans might then have been excused for their confusion on the question, since they are so largely non-Communist and even anti-Communist, and only the Communists told them the truth. But the awful consequences that flowed so immediately and catastrophically from Munich are so obvious that Americans can learn part of the truth from conservative, reactionary, and anti-Communist sources, and therefore no longer have an excuse for refusing to see the facts. Peace in Europe is impossible without the active collaboration of the Soviet Union, which now, as always, is ready and anxious to participate in the organization of peace. Even Neville Chamberlain is forced to acknowledge this fundamental fact, though he seems to cling most stubbornly to the disastrous policy of surrender to the axis powers.

Our American newspapers have interpreted the difficulties in negotiating the terms of the "peace front" between the Soviet Union, France, and Great Britain as signs of Soviet reluctance to enter fully into such a front, and its wish to "drive a hard bargain" or even to come to an agreement with Hitler against the Western powers. Quite typically, even Norman Thomas has joined his voice to these stupid slanders, which are highly welcome in Berlin. Against such clouds of diplomatic poison gas, my own words would perhaps be ineffective. Allow me, therefore, to call as an expert witness the Hon. Winston Churchill, who needs no credentials from me. I select a few sentences and paragraphs from a recent article of his, syndicated among American conservative newspapers:

It is astonishing [says Mr. Churchill] how swiftly and decisively opinion in Great Britain and France has consolidated itself upon a triple alliance with Soviet Russia. The well known objections have simply ceased to count with enormous numbers of people with whom abhorrence of Communism is still a first principle. But it should not be supposed that this change arises out of any desperate strait or panic fear. It is due to the realization of the very real harmony of interests which unites the foreign policy of the three countries. . . Their common interest is peace.

Mr. Churchill's words contain a profound truth. The leaders of Britain and France could not see this last October, but the people have forced them to see it in the last months. The "common interest in peace," so disastrously threatened by the Munich "appeasement" and "non-intervention" policies, is an interest that is fully and completely shared by the United States. And if the tory leaders, with whom "abhorrence of Communism" is a fundamental principle of life, have learned of that "common interest" with the Soviet Union, it should not be so hard for Americans, even the most conservative, to learn the same lesson.

What is the significance for America of the differences between London and Moscow on the terms of establishment of the peace front? Is it really true, as the newspapers say, that they reflect Moscow's desire to "drive a hard bargain"? Again I turn for the answer to the hardboiled conservative, Churchill, who cannot be suspected of prejudice in favor of the Soviet Union. He says:

Personally, not having changed my views about Communism or past history in any respect, I have from the beginning preferred the Russian proposals to either the British or French alternatives. They are simple, they are logical, and they conform to the main groupings of common interest.

If Winston Churchill can prefer the Moscow proposals to those of either Chamberlain or Daladier, what then becomes of the idea that Moscow is "driving a hard bargain"? Churchill differs from Chamberlain and Daladier in having been against Munich and the appeasement policy *before* its bitter fruits were borne, and in having driven to the heart of the question, without squirming about in a futile effort to eat the cake and have it too, à la Chamberlain.

Americans, even of the most conservative trend, should be more attracted to the Churchill approach than to that of Chamberlain, if they are guided in their views by American national interest and not by ideological ties with Hitler. For clearly, Moscow is taking a stand very close to that which Washington would almost certainly take if our country should, in the course of development, face a similar problem of negotiating an agreement with a Chamberlain and a Daladier. Like the Soviet Union; the United States would be faced with statesmen who are being pushed, against their own will, by the overwhelming demands of their people-statesmen who, therefore, would not be directed in their proposals by the broad all-inclusive interests of peace, which are dominant for the Soviet Union and the United States, but only by their own narrow and special interests and commitments. Like the Soviet Union, the United States would also have to appeal to the people over the heads of their governments, before it would be able to force such terms as would represent the general interests of all the peoples. Winston Churchill recognized this issue, when he said:

There is a real and honorable basis of equal and rightful interest existing in external affairs between the Soviets and the parliamentary democracies. It is this that has invested the triple peace design with vitality. Matters have now gone so far that it is inconceivable that any of the three governments could take the responsibility of depriving the hundreds of millions of working people involved of this joint security for their life and progress. Agreement is driven forward by irresistible forces overriding and shearing away serious obstacles and valid prejudices as if they were but straws.

That this is also the view of realistic French conservatives, is shown by the words of Pertinax, prominent publicist of the "right wing," who remarked, anent Chamberlain's dilatory maneuvers:

Last September, Chamberlain knew how to move more quickly when Hitler had to be placated. He still fails to understand . . . that the fate of the continent depends upon what they [the Soviet Union] will do or not do. . . There is irony in the fact that Chamberlain, having started with outspoken antagonism to anything like cooperation with Russia, should now be compelled to bring it into existence undiluted and unguarded. Such is the ransom for Munich and for what followed Munich.

I quote at length from these two typical spokesmen of British and French conservatism, because it is my firm conviction that their evolution accurately forecasts, in its general nature and direction, the future of American policy in the growingly dangerous world situation. For the United States also, the realities of national interest are "irresistible forces" which before long will for us also be "overriding and shearing away serious obstacles and valid prejudices as if they were but straws," to repeat the words of Churchill.

Much will depend, of course, upon the outcome of the 1940 elections, as to whether the United States will pay the same heavy tribute as Britain paid at Munich, before the realities of national interest are frankly faced. If the Hoover Republicans or Garner Democrats dominate the next administration in Washington, then in all likelihood our country will repeat in all its gruesome details the tortuous course over which Chamberlain has dragged Britain. But the underlying realities will inevitably bring the same general conclusion; the United States will ultimately, despite all obstacles and prejudices, find itself in cooperation with the Soviet Union to salvage peace and civilization. The only question is whether we will march ahead consciously to that end, and thereby attain its full benefits, or whether, like Britain, we will go through the swampy bypaths of appeasement of the fascist axis, and risk the catastrophes inherent in such a policy.

THE STRENGTH OF THE USSR

Many persons are still disturbed by the propaganda, unloosed in full flood last September, to the effect that the Soviet Union is too weak to be an effective ally in a world peace front. The American Lindbergh played a prominent role in making this campaign effective; shortly after, he received a decoration from Hitler, sharing that distinction with another American, Henry Ford. This propaganda campaign played an important part in sustaining Chamberlain's appeasement policy, in making the Munich pact acceptable to the masses for a few months. Its fatal weakness lay in the demonstration, not long delayed, that Hitler did not believe it, though he was happy that it found credence in the Western democracies. Hitler has been distinguished by always striking at the point which he considered that of least resistance. And after Munich he made it clear that the axis was preparing its main blows against France, Britain, and the United States, against the traditional parliamentary democracies, in which direction he saw not only panic and confused capitulation reigning, but also, and even more important, the greatest booty to be seized. Hitler's course is the most obvious proof that he has never believed, since his own agents were exposed and eliminated in the Soviet Union, in the myth of Soviet weakness and instability; and no one doubts that Hitler is well informed of the inner conditions in every major country, including our own; it is common gossip that his answer to President Roosevelt was composed on the basis of authoritative advice from American enemies of the New Deal. No, if the Soviet Union were weak, we might assume that Hitler would know it.

It is strange indeed that the more fantastic and unreal the propaganda, the more widely it is accepted among American newspapers and their more credulous readers! Why did so many persons accept the myth of Soviet weakness? Basic facts were known and available in print, from the most authoritative sources, sufficient to explode immediately that myth for any thoughtful person. Why were these facts overlooked or forgotten so easily?

STATISTICAL TRUTH

For example, all of our American newspaper editors undoubtedly have on their office shelves the Statistical Yearbook of the League of Nations. By a simple twist of the wrist, they could have opened that document, and seen in universally accepted statistical tables the picture of the economic progress of the Soviet Union during the past ten years, and compared it with the course of all other major nations in the world. And they would have seen that the Soviet Union since 1928 had multiplied its national income by about 1,000 percent, or approximately ten times. Now, since what date in history has it ever been demonstrated that a nation, multiplying its economic production by ten times in ten years, could be described as weak? What regime in history has ever lost its hold upon the people by bringing economic prosperity to the land? If Hoover's administration had brought to America, instead of economic collapse, an enormous multiplication of the national income, can anyone doubt that the "great engineer," to resurrect an almost forgotten slogan, would now be rounding out his third term as the idolized leader of the American masses, instead of giving way in 1932 to the New Deal? All these questions, and their obvious answers, were implicit in the facts, available to every newspaper editor at least, at the moment when they were telling the American people that the Soviet Union was too weak and unstable to be relied upon in the organization of world peace. Is it stretching a point to indicate, on the basis of such evidence, that our American newspapers are more influenced by reactionary propaganda than they are by fundamental facts? And is it exaggeration to say that such propaganda, while it may serve the interests of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis, is in flagrant contradiction to the immediate and larger national interests of the United States?

If there still remains any doubt about the ability of the Soviet Union to fulfill its international obligations, in face of the military prowess of the axis powers, it is possible to take a glance 'at the latest defense budget of its government, adopted last month. That budget, representing about one-fourth of the national income, totaled in the neighborhood of \$8,000,000,000 in terms of American money, approaching in sum the total budget for all purposes of the United States government. Whatever judgment one might otherwise make, it is difficult indeed to interpret these figures as a sign of weakness. And for those who might be inclined to decry the diversion of such tremendous sums for military defense, it would be well to recall that the Soviet peoples have much to defend: one-sixth of the earth's surface, unexampled prosperity, and a 20 percent rise in living standards this year alone, guaranteed in that same budget!

There can no longer be the slightest doubt in the mind of anyone who wishes to know and face the facts. The Soviet Union is second only to the United States among world powers economically, and is second to none in defensive power and strategical position, as well as in moral and political unity of the people.

The only question still to be decided is whether the American national interests can best be served by conscious collaboration with this second greatest world power, on the basis of recognized common interests, or by isolation from it and going alone or with only the less powerful and less reliable friendly nations.

The position which I am defending is that the American national interests, the interests of the overwhelming majority of the American people, are best served by an active and conscious collaboration between the USA and the USSR. Such collaboration would quickly become the most effective conceivable organizing center for the stabilization of the world which is so dangerously unstable at present. It would provide the most effective conceivable protection of American national interests in the Far East and in Latin America. It would be the most effective conceivable guarantee of world peace, which is an American national interest just as it is a national interest of the Soviet Union.

Congressman Dies, on behalf of the anti-New Deal Democrats and the Republicans, has been working overtime in the effort to create the appearance of a great Red Peril in the United States, directed from Moscow through the Communist Party of the United States, the party for which I speak. This Red scare is brought forth in the newspapers as one of the big reasons why cooperation between the USA and the USSR is impossible or undesirable. I would be less than frank if I did not answer the issue thus raised.

Allow me to declare to you, that which is a matter of public record before the Supreme Court of the United States and other official tribunals, that the Communist Party of the USA is composed of American citizens, makes its own decisions and stands entirely upon its own feet, and is subject to no orders from abroad, from Moscow or any other place, but only to its own conventions held publicly in the United States. We consider that our country has much to learn from the Soviet Union, as that land has learned much from America, and to substantiate this we point to the tenfold increase in the national income of the Soviet Union, which we believe could be emulated by our country to its own benefit. The preamble to our constitution, which is binding upon every member, contains our basic beliefs, with which all our daily activities are in harmony. Despite the possible disagreements which some may have with it, it is clearly within that circle of questions upon which American democracy has traditionally tolerated disagreement. Our preamble states:

The Communist Party of the United States of America is a working-class political party carrying forward today the traditions of Jefferson, Paine, Jackson, and Lincoln, and of the Declaration of Independence; it upholds the achievements of democracy, the right of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and defends the United States Constitution against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and all popular liberties; it is devoted to defense of the immediate interests of workers, farmers, and all toilers against capitalist exploitation, and to preparation of the working class for its historic mission to unite and lead the American people to extend these democratic principles to their necessary and logical conclusions.

To make this general declaration even more specific, our party constitution directly repudiates the charges made against the Communists that we wish or intend to subvert American democracy, by another section which says:

The Communist Party of the USA upholds the democratic achievements of the American people. It opposes with all its power 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 have obtained power to determine their own destiny in any degree. The Communist Party of the USA, standing unqualifiedly for the right of the majority to direct the destinies of our country, will fight with all its strength against any and every effort, whether it comes from abroad or from within, to impose upon our people the arbitrary will of any selfish minority group or party or clique or conspiracy.

Having said these things, something more important remains to be observed about the Red scare and especially about the Dies committee's work in 1938. The Red scare is directed, primarily, not against the still weak and unpretentious Communist Party, which is modestly taking its place as a sector of the broadest democratic front of the majority of the people. No, its primary purpose is to smear "Red" over the simplest progressive measures of the New Deal and over the New Deal leadership. The purpose of the Redbaiters is to frighten as many as possible of the overwhelmingly non-Communist majority of the American people into the belief that the New Deal is the opening wedge of a full-fledged socialist program, and on that ground to defeat and scatter the New Deal majority in the country, thereby returning the reactionary forces to power in the country in 1940.

GENEROUS MR. DIES

Consider the facts calmly and dispassionately. Do you really think that men are primarily interested in fighting the Communist Party who will call such a person as Felix Frankfurter before them and solemnly demand his answer to the question: "Are you a member of the Communist Party?" The very fact that Justice Frankfurter was seriously suspected of being a Communist, broadcast from the Senate and the Dies committee rooms, was a tremendous political boost for the Communist Party before millions of people who knew nothing about us. Do you think it is a blow against the Communist Party, when the Dies committee broadcasts the irresponsible charge that Governor Olson of California is under its direction and that Lieutenant Governor Patterson is even formally

a member? That is another big boost for the Communist Party among the millions of voters who elected them. Do you think it makes the Communist Party unrespectable and unpopular to have the President and his very popular wife openly referred to as "Reds" and friends of the Communists? I assure you, and I know what I am talking about, that nothing the Communist Party has done or could do has spread our influence among such broad masses as has this "anti-Red" campaign which found its highest expression in the Dies committee during the 1938 elections, despite the lies and slanders which accompanied it. Why, we were even handed the delectable Shirley Temple as a Communist Party asset! The Communist Party couldn't have purchased such a volume of publicity (on the whole favorable for us, because it linked us with the most popular causes) for \$20,000,000, but Martin Dies gave it to us for nothing!

But we refuse any thanks to Mr. Dies for his gifts, for we know his reactionary and wrecking purpose. He and his kind are prepared to risk promoting the Communist Party's popularity, if only thereby they can frighten away enough people from the New Deal to ensure a reactionary victory in the 1940 elections. They are working upon exactly the same strategy as the group of wealthy Republicans who, in 1936, offered a contribution of \$250,000 to the Communist Party on the sole condition that we withdraw our Presidential candidate and endorse Roosevelt.

THE SAME OLD SCARE

The purveyors of the Red scare will surely fail in their objective, as they have always failed in critical moments of American history. The reactionary Federalist Party used the Red scare against Thomas Jefferson, because he was the firm and understanding friend of the French Revolution, as well as the leader and organizer of American democracy. But Jefferson came to power, and directed the destinies of our country for a generation, while the Federalist Party degenerated to treasonable negotiations with foreign powers against their own land, and vanished into shameful oblivion, together with their infamous Alien and Sedition Laws which reactionaries are trying to resurrect in the present Congress.

The same old Red scare was trotted out against Andrew Jackson, especially when he broke the political power of Anthony Biddle and the Bank of the United States, but Jackson's memory grows ever more green, while his enemies find no one so poor as to do them honor. Again, the Red scare was one of the principal weapons wielded against Abraham Lincoln, but that did not prevent him from performing his historical tasks and becoming immortal as the personification of the American democratic tradition. Now the same old trickery is trotted out for active duty against Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal policies, but history will write the same sort of finish to this as to former efforts to scare the American people away from the path of progress by the cry of "Red." Reality and the true issues facing the people have a way of emerging out of the fog of demagogy and misrepresentation, especially in the days of a national and international crisis such as we live through now.

So it is also with the Communist Party. The Red-baiters have spread innumerable falsehoods and slanders against us, which are immediately damaging and force us to spend much time and effort refuting them. But these faleshoods, because they are false, lose their effect, while what remains with the masses of the people forever is the fact that the Communist Party was identified with the cause of the people, and was attacked by those who prove they are the enemies of the people. In the long run we gain from these crude attempts to create a bogyman out of the Communist Party.

UNITY FOR PEACE

The reactionaries charge that the Communists cannot be sincere in our declared purpose of defending the social and national security of the United States because we are internationalists, and are associated with the Communists of other lands through the Communist International. But it is becoming clear to millions that, for example, the Communists were able to point out sharply and clearly the destructive effects upon American national interests of the Munich betrayal, last September and October, in the heat of events and not six or eight months after, precisely because we are internationalists. It is becoming clear, to take another example, that the Communists have become the most effective carriers throughout Latin America of the idea of the "good neighbor" and of Pan-American democratic unity against the invasions of fascism-surely a work in the national interest of the United States-precisely because we are internationalists, and no one suspects us of a narrow nationalist jingoism that could be contrary to their own national interests. We profoundly believe that the true national interests of our own and every other people are not in contradiction, that they are harmonious, and that one can be protected in reality only by policies and measures which conduce to the protection and security of all.

We also know that similar views guide the policy of the men and the party who direct the destinies of the Soviet Union. That is one of the reasons we are able, with full confidence, to champion the cause of the full collaboration of the United States and the Soviet Union in world affairs, in the cause of peace and orderly international relations, while basing ourselves entirely upon the defense of the national interests of the American people.

In the present world crisis, all true defenders of democracy and peace must find the way to work together, to unite their forces against the threatening flood of reaction. This is true within our country, and it is equally true between nations, on a world scale. The Communists pledge their full strength toward such unity for peace and progress.

EARL BROWDER.

The Ruination of Judge MacDuff

A short story by Joseph Mitchell, the famous interviewer whose ears were bent on the New York dailies.

HERE was a fat, blubbery-faced county judge named C. F. MacDuff in General Stonewall Jackson, N. C., the town I come from. People used to say that he had a keen sense of humor. Whenever there was a Negro to be sentenced to the electric chair the town loafers would gather in Judge Mac-Duff's courtroom; they wanted to be on hand in case the judge said, as he sometimes did in such cases, "Let this be a lesson to you, bud." When he was off the bench, the judge used to hang out in the Stonewall Drug Co. He would drink Coca-Colas, gossip, and think up practical jokes. He was always playing jokes on Mr. Turkey Ballou, a carpenter, who was the ugliest man in that part of the United States. He was called Mr. Turkey because he had a red, shrunken neck and hunched shoulders; he looked like a turkey gobbler who had just come in out of a hailstorm.

One afternoon the judge called on Miss Kitty Legree, a sour, nervous old maid who ran the Nonesuch Notions & Gift Shop on Main Street. He said he wanted to have a talk with her in private. "Miss Kitty," he said, solemnly, "I'm just after having a talk with Turkey Ballou and he said he just can't get you out of his mind. Fact of the matter is, he told me he's coming around tomorrow morning to ask for your hand in holy matrimony." Miss Kitty began to shake with anger. "That ugly old thing!" she said. The judge said, "Now, now, Miss Kitty, I want you to give this matter some serious thought. You'd make a wonderful wife for Turkey, and you know it." Then he excused himself, got in his Packard, and drove out to Mr. Turkey's home. "Turkey, my boy," he said, "I'm doing a favor for Miss Kitty Legree. She asked me to tell you to come to her store tomorrow morning. She wants you to repair a hole in her roof." Next morning Mr. Turkey went to Miss Kitty's. When he opened the door Miss Kitty grabbed an umbrella and came out from behind her counter. Gripping the umbrella in both hands as if it were a baseball bat, she advanced on Mr. Turkey. "You get right out of here, you ugly thing," she said. "I wouldn't have you if you were the last man on earth!" Then she let out a wild scream. Mr. Turkey dropped his hammer and saw, and ran. He ran into a crowded grocery store next door and shouted, "Good God Almighty, folks, do something! Get a doctor! Miss Kitty's gone crazy!"

That pleased Judge MacDuff. He did not stop laughing about it for a long time.

Soon after my sixteenth birthday the judge played a joke on me. I was planning to become a livestock breeder, and my grandfather had bought me a young Jersey bull for a birthday present. I tried to keep the bull fenced up in a pasture behind our house, but on three occasions in the first week I owned him he broke down the pasture fence and got into Mr. J. T. Buck's cornfield. Every time the bull broke out, Mr. Buck would come to our house and demand that my father pay for the damages to his corn. The third time he came, Judge MacDuff was walking by our house, and he heard Mr. Buck shout that my bull was a menace to life and property, and he heard my father promise that the bull would be butchered if he tore down any more corn.

After Mr. Buck left, I strung some barbed wire around the top of the pasture fence, and decided that my bull was safe. That night I went to call on Betty Lou Boney, a girl I had been courting for nearly a year. We sat in the swing on her porch until eight o'clock; then we decided to go down town to the drugstore for Coca-Colas. Just as we reached the drugstore, Judge MacDuff drove up in his Packard. When he saw me, he said, "Bud, that bull of yours is loose again. He's raising hell. He seems to be trying to push old man Buck's cornfield over into the next county."

I turned to Betty Lou and said, "I'm sorry, but I've got to go catch my bull." Betty Lou had a jealous nature. "All right," she said, "you've got to choose between me and that Jersey bull. If you leave me standing here in front of this drugstore I'll never speak to you again." I was desperate. I thought it over for a moment. Then I said, "Oh, God, they'll butcher my bull if he tears up that cornfield." I edged away from Betty Lou. Then I broke into a run. I kept on running until I reached Mr. Buck's cornfield. My bull's name was Banjo, and I stood in the field and yelled, "Banjo! Where in the name of God are you, Banjo?" I scurried around in the moonlight, and discovered that Mr. Buck's corn had not been touched. Then I went into Banjo's pasture, and found him lying innocently on his side under a sweet-gum tree, switching his tail at the sting flies. I fell on the ground and hugged him. He became frightened. He jumped to his feet, fled to a far corner of the pasture, and stood there snorting and pawing the ground.

I left the pasture and struck out for the drugstore, running as fast as I could. At the drugstore the soda jerker told me that Betty Lou had gone straight home. I hastened to her home and pounded on the front door. Mrs. Boney came out and I told her I wanted to speak to Betty Lou. In a moment she returned and said, "I'm sorry, but Betty Lou doesn't want to see you."

One day, about a week later, the judge and his wife, Mrs. Eula Mae MacDuff, were visited by a lady from Washington, D. C., a big woman's club official. Mrs. Eula Mae was one of the officials of the woman's club for the state of North Carolina, and was ambitious to go higher. Consequently, she was extremely nice to the lady from Washington. Mrs. Eula Mae always had put on airs; people sometimes said she was "just too damned high class for this world." She came from South Carolina and often talked about "the Old South." Her family was wealthy, and her brothers always contributed enough cash to campaign funds to get Judge MacDuff elected. Mrs. Eula Mae did her best to impress the lady from Washington, but the judge would not cooperate. He did not like the lady. He called her "that damned old Yankee club lady." At the drugstore he said, "She's a stuckup thing. She calls a napkin a doily, and she eats like a bird. I have to use so many table manners I'm about to starve to death. I'll sure be glad when she clears out."

One Friday night, when the club lady had been at the judge's house for two weeks, Mrs. Eula Mae took her out to a bridge party. The judge stayed home. About ten o'clock he became sleepy. It was a hot, sultry night, and the judge decided, as was his custom on such nights, to sleep on a cot downstairs in the front hall, where there was always a breeze. The cot faced the front door, which was left wide open. The judge wore a long, oldfashioned nightshirt, the kind that is split down both sides. He covered himself with a sheet and went sound asleep.

About midnight he was awakened. He heard an automobile stop outside, and he knew it was Mrs. Eula Mae and the lady from Washington coming back from the bridge party. Soon the two ladies walked up on the porch. Half asleep, the judge heard them standing on the porch talking about how nice the blossoms smelled on the Cape Jasmine bush in the yard. He heard his wife say, "It's like a breath from the Old South." Then he heard her fumbling for the light switch in the hall, just inside the front door. The sleepy, barrel-bellied old judge suddenly realized that he had kicked off the sheet. At the moment Mrs. Eula Mae switched on the light he hurriedly reached down to the foot of the cot to pull the sheet back over him; instead, he got hold of the bottom of his nightshirt and pulled it up under his neck.

He was so drowsy it took him quite a while to realize why the big club lady from Washington was screaming. Then he grabbed for the sheet, but it was too late.

The club lady became hysterical, and Mrs. Eula Mae had to get a bottle of aromatic spirits of ammonia to quiet her down. When she regained her composure, Mrs. Eula Mae helped her pack her bag and drove her down to the railroad depot, where she caught the one o'clock train north. Then Mrs. Eula Mae returned and went to work on the judge. She screamed and stamped her feet. She said, "You just did it to disgrace me. You just did it to drive that nice lady away. Well, it's the last joke you'll ever play on me. I've stood your old jokes long enough. I never loved you anyway." The judge kept telling her it was all an accident, that he hadn't meant to play a joke on her. She didn't believe him. At daybreak she took the Packard and drove off to her family in South Carolina. A few hours later the judge came down town reeling drunk. He said, "My life is ruined." He put his head down on one of the marble-topped tables in the drugstore and sobbed. "It's just too awful," he said. "Oh, God, have mercy on me. My life is ruined."

Several days later, while the judge was presiding over a murder trial, two of Mrs. Eula Mae's brothers from South Carolina drove up in a truck and carried away most of the furniture in the judge's house. The judge and Mrs. Eula Mae never were reconciled. At the next election her family did not put up any money for the campaign fund, of course, and the judge was overwhelmingly defeated. Thereafter, a fat, miserable old man, he would sit around in his empty house and drink corn whisky and sob. He would tell anybody who came to see him that he was the most misunderstood man that ever lived. Most people in town were sorry for the judge, but I don't think Mr. Turkey Ballou was. I know I wasn't. JOSEPH MITCHELL.

The First in the World

THE Soviet Union is completing preparations at Ordjonikidze for the operation of an experimental hydraulic coal mining shaft, said to be the first of its kind in the world. The whole process, including the cutting and conveying of the coal, will be done by water power. Pumped from the earth's surface, the water is compressed to 30 atmospheres and sprayed against the coal surface. The cut coal is transported by the water power to the surface and dehydrated. Each pressure nozzle does the work of a dozen drill-hammers. There are no workers at the coal face, and therefore no lining is necessary in the coal shaft.



"Wanna help your great big senator celebrate, baby? Let's go to a show."

The New Hollywood

The "glamour" people face political realities. Organization and progressivism. Joseph North's second article on the films.

I see now, it was a mistake for the German citizen to believe that a man could be cultured and non-political. I realize that culture is in danger when it lacks the instinct and the desire to understand the political.—THOMAS MANN.

N 1933 they cut Miriam Hopkins' wages 50 percent. Later, in 1934, somebody gave Miss Hopkins a copy of Upton Sinclair's book I. Governor of California. The first paragraph of the book, she told a friend, describes an elderly gentleman, the author, working in his garden. He painted himself as the kind of a man who would not look good in a silk hat riding in a shiny limousine and doffing that hat. He'd rather be gardener than governor, but somebody honest ought to be governor and this man with a hoe felt he was honest. Moreover, he wanted good for the people. Miss Hopkins left for New York, and the day before the elections, her Hollywood agent wired her he had given one thousand of her dollars to elect GOP's Frank Merriam. It was being done, he said delicately. These were, of course, voluntary contributions. You didn't have to give. In fact, the entire colony was nicked for \$500,000. Election night Miss Hopkins sat sipping tea, as the story goes, in a New York night club, listening to the California returns. The reports kept ticking in-Merriam sixtyfive, say, Sinclair thirty-four. Every time that happened she thought, "There goes another of my dollars to defeat that honest old gentleman." She felt ashamed.

FOUR YEARS LATER

Most Hollywood people felt ashamed after that voluntary contribution. Philip Dunne, son of the late Peter Finley Dunne, the creator of Mr. Dooley, told the story of Miss Hopkins. One of Hollywood's ablest screen writers, he is in politics up to his neck. The Democratic Party has few more zealous partisans. In 1938 Miss Hopkins stumped the state of California along with the actor Melvyn Douglas and Mr. Dunne to elect New Deal Olson to Sacramento. The producers did not dare dip their hands into the pockets of their employees to try to elect the GOP man. They simply did not dare in 1938 what they didn't think twice about in 1934. Dignity had returned to the Hollywood hands. How come? That's quite a story.

Remember, of course, a typhoon had swept the land—not climatic, worse—economic. You can't ignore a typhoon of any category. Since 1929 all the old standards had wobbled; people kept asking, where is the country going? Is it going to the dogs or what? Hollywood actors, writers, directors (and producers) used to ask that at Musso Frank's. The twenties faded into a golden, hazy memory. The thirties had begun with a crash and continued with alarums. Shirted organizations sprang up all over America. Killer Dean of the Black Legion took men out for a ride, strung them up outside metropolitan Detroit. (It did get around that the Black Legion had Republican ties.) William Dudley Pelley communed with God for seven minutes, as he earnestly announced, and began to organize the Silver Shirts in the South. The country rang with mumbo-jumbo incantations of economic and political screwballs.

After all, Hollywood folk were no zanies. Most were bright people—many of them among the most talented artists and craftsmen in the world. They were, of course, out to do the best for themselves, and most of them wanted to do a lot for their fellowman, as all genuine artists must. The 1920's weren't conducive to that—not in America. Some forgot they came from the people.

THAT WAGE CUT

But things kept happening to remind them where they belonged. In 1933 the entire movie colony took that 50 percent cut. Now a 50 percent cut in wages is something nobody can forget. True, the studios piteously pleaded bankruptcy but the help discovered that the wage cut did not go from top to bottom. The top people did not get the slash, they came through nicely, thank you. That started something. Both "craft" as welf as "talent" people got to thinking—and grumbling. "Glamour" people proved they had something behind those classic profiles. (I shall not, in the course of this article, go into detail about the organization of the crafts. Ella Winter does that with eloquence in two articles that will follow this one.)

Now. America had got the idea that everyone in Hollywood-aside from the crafts and the extras-reveled in luxury. Borzoi hounds and racy motors and swimming pools the size of Madison Square Garden. It was all part of the glamour buildup. True, the talent did not live in penury; but they worked like dogs for what they got. Writers punched a clock, sat in cubbyholes, writing to order like tailors cutting a suit. Actors worked when they worked; up early in the morning, on location till all hours. Then, worst of all, the insecurity of the job. You got what sounded like fabulous wages in the East, while you worked. But when you thought everything might be going nicely, the telephone rang and you were out of a job. When you did get pay it vanished mysteriously. "It's not money," one writer told me. "It must be wampum they pay us." Hollywood suffers greater job insecurity than probably any industry in the land. And when you add up the total of weeks worked per year before you consider the wages per week, you discover you're not Crœsus. America did not know that—the highpower publicity men weren't paid to tell that—and Will Hays finds other troubles.

THE GUILDS

Sporadic, ineffectual attempts at organization did begin in the twenties. Equity pulled the disastrous actors' strike in 1929-too soon. The business began in earnest after the crash and the 50 percent cut in 1933. The Screen Writers Guild formed; John Howard Lawson was sent to Washington to plead for the guild under the Blue Eagle. Then came the Screen Actors Guild; their representative also went to the capital. The experiences and disappointments in the scrap for recognition under the NRA code proved a tremendous force in Hollywood's education. It did succeed in smashing the illusion of the Motion Picture Academy as a pro-labor quantity. The trip to Washington proved the MPA a stooge outfit-a glorified company unionand it was eliminated from the scene. That cleared the ground for a genuine structure.

Coincidentally another thing was happening in Hollywood. People began to see the tieup between the political system and the wage structure. What was fascism about, anyway? This is, fortunately, the age of communication. Hollywood could stand and look into the camp at Dachau. It happened in Germany. Could it here? Hollywood artists remembered the Scottsboro case; it wasn't fascism but something like it, they thought. A group of them had banded together to try to free the obviously framed Negro boys. Along about 1936, some of the men and women who had worked to help the Negro lads drew a group about them to discuss what could be done to help the people of Germany. The idea caught on; an organization was formed to raise funds for the underground workers of the Reich. Shortly afterward they began to hear the first detailed stories of Nazi and fascist organizations flourishing in America. The weekly NEW MASSES ran a nine-article series on the question by John L. Spivak late in 1934-first of all American magazines to warn the nation.

ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE

Hollywood people began to see this business was a worldwide proposition. They saw what was originally conceived as a German headache was also an American grief. They decided education and organization were necessary here too. So some 150 of them organized the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League.

The next problem: how to do the job most effectively? They set up various commissions within the league—research, cultural—decided to run a newspaper. They got out a first-class weekly Later they saw the need for a radio program. By this time organizations all over Southern California began to call upon the league for speakers. They developed a lecture bureau. Movie writers and actors set out to speak all over the state. About a thousand persons representing the entire Los Angeles community became energetic legmen in the service of democracy. About this time the Spanish invasion happened. Ralph Bates traveled across a sea and the continent to talk to Hollywood; he urged the organization of a group that would help Spain. Necessarily he came to the one organiation there — the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. Out of this appeal grew the Motion Picture Artists Committee to Help Loyalist Spain.

Hollywood's hands began to gain confidence in themselves as a politically potent group. They felt they had learned the secret of successful organization: that bred further organization. The Screen Writers began to stir from their lethargy once again. Then the Screen Directors organized a guild. Then came the Wagner act. The technicians began to develop guilds. In the spring of 1937 many of the smaller craft unions struck. During the consequent hubbub the Actors Guild achieved recognition-somewhere about the middle of that year. The National Labor Relations Act deserves special mention for the success of the organization of the screen people.

Then 1938—and the ballot box—took the Hollywood spotlight. By this time the movie community was pretty well organized. Most of its people saw that everything they labored for would be affected by the state elections. What rankled, too, was that half-million they "gave" in 1934 to elect a first-class damn fool and stooge, Frank Merriam, to Sacramento. They didn't want any of him or his like again.

These considerations led to the next logical step—the formation of the Motion Pictures Democratic Committee—perhaps their greatest organization. They brought to it all the elan they had exhibited in their previous tasks. Outstanding movie actors and writers stumped the state for the New Deal. They threw all their talents and energies into the task; they radioed, they campaigned, they composed songs, skits, and became an extremely important factor in the community.

A KICK FOR VITTORIO

About this time the fascist athlete Vittorio Mussolini ("War is the greatest sport of all") showed up and everybody all over the world knows how he got the air. Not even Hal Roach's little rascals (regimented into the job of posing with the baby-killer) could swerve public opinion. Everybody loves a love story but nobody mourned when Leni Riefenstahl, something less than an Isolde, got kicked out of the community. The label "Hitler's girl friend" was pinned to her like a tin can.

Later, delegates chosen by the Motion Picture Artists Committee traveled to Mexico City to a giant meeting in behalf of the Span-



FOR THEIR FELLOW ACTORS. Eleven stars go on the radio to save the Federal Theater: Walter Abel, Ralph Bellamy, Hugh Herbert, Gale Sondergaard, James Cagney, Henry Fonda, Joan Blondell, Dick Powell, (seated) Gloria Dickson, Patricia Morrison, and Lionel Barrymore.

ish loyalists. Every distinguished visitor from Europe came to Hollywood, feeling that no American trip was complete without a visit to the movie community. (Three years before that the community was considered about the lowest, artistically as well as politically, by all honest intellectuals.)

Important organizations began to crowd the heels of one another. It would require a dozen articles to do justice to them all. The splendid Hollywood Committee of Fifty-six grew into being to call for complete severance of relations with Nazi Germany. Branches have sprung up in more than fifty American cities and millions of signatures were returned. This committee started November 1938 and ultimately included one hundred of the top people of the community, listing the Warner Bros., Carl Laemmle, Walter Wanger, Kenneth Macgowan, Arthur Hornblow, and many associate producers. Thus a large section of Hollywood became a public-spirited community-no longer a collection of disparate individuals, each carrying his talents and his griefs by his lonesome.

ORGANIZING THE AUDIENCE

Early in its organization Hollywood came to realize the paramount need of organizing the vast movie audience of 85,000,000 throughout America. The earmark of an honest man is, I believe, his belief in his fellowman. Get a man who sneers at the virtues of mankind, then watch your pocketbook. The folk who work in the pictures have proved they believe in their fellows-their enthusiasm for an organized audience is proof. They know that if the audience can have its say, pictures will be better, all conditions will improve. They got behind the formation of the Associated Film Audiences, founded after the release of that fine trail-blazer Blockade. A meeting was addressed by Walter Wanger, Dieterle, John Ford, and John Abbott. Representatives of seventy-five organizations formed an executive committee. The importance of this organization cannot be overestimated, and all who understand the significance and potentialities of the movies for good -or for evil—must give it their heartiest support.

Add all these factors up: a middle-of-theroad President; his New Deal support; the existence of the CIO; an organized movie industry; the stimulus to organization with the existence of the Wagner act and the NLRB; a world teetering about the abyss of world war; the growing organization of film audiences and the increasing articulateness of moviegoers. Stir all these ingredients together —and add the significant fact that the boymeets-girl movies haven't been paying so well lately. Add the fact too that anti-labor pictures have been magnificent flops; and you begin to get to the truth about the works.

You see why Juarez was possible today.

Future perspectives? They depend upon a number of factors. First, I would say, is *audience organization*. If the AFA gets going, and enough of the 85,000,000 audience



Wide World

FOR THEIR FELLOW ACTORS. Eleven stars go on the radio to save the Federal Theater: Walter Abel, Ralph Bellamy, Hugh Herbert, Gale Sondergaard, James Cagney, Henry Fonda, Joan Blondell, Dick Powell, (seated) Gloria Dickson, Patricia Morrison, and Lionel Barrymore. can express their will, Wall Street will cede to Main Street. In the meanwhile do not be surprised if the money-changers try to slip dangerous ideas across, anti-democratic stuff, anti-labor. But it will not be easy going for them. New forces are making themselves felt. Extremely important is the work of the Hollywood Motion Picture Guild which is sponsoring the filming of Erika Mann's School for Barbarians. Similarly, the work of Frontier Films, of men like Joris Ivens and Herbert Kline. The New Deal government as film producer must be encouraged; remember The Plow that Broke the Plains and The River? If the men who run Hollywood see crowds jamming such films they will lose no time to go that way.

As a result of the stir caused by Juarez and Confessions of a Nazi Spy, producers are working on It Can't Happen Here (Metro), The Bishop Who Walked with God, the story of Pastor Niemoeller (Warners); Vincent Sheean's Personal History (Wanger). Charlie Chaplin, of course, is working on The Great Dictator. What happens with The Grapes of Wrath remains to be seen: rumors —and Hollywood has more than its share have it that a bank had Zanuck buy Steinbeck's work to keep it from being filmed. Paramount has a vile anti-labor play under production. (They'll keep trying to get their licks in, no doubt of that.)

But the answer is organization. Just as the artists have organized, as the craftsmen have banded together, so must the audiences. The cinema is far too potent an instrument to ignore. It can be an incalculable good; its potentialities for evil are just as great. It all depends upon the moviegoers. Wall Street will battle a consistently progressive trend in the movies, no doubt about that either. Bankers are the most class-conscious aggregate in America on the other side of the fence. But even Wall Street must cede where profits figure. Yet their Hollywood agents will hamper the noblest attempts of the directors and writers. But they have come to realize that their majestic omnipotence has vanished. The world markets have been slipping since the axis powers have been on the move. The American audience will have a bigger say in the kind of pictures it wants-if it will say it. That is the big job today.

WHICH FILMS DO YOU LIKE?

Associated Film Audiences puts out crackerjack bulletins. One of them says: "Would you like to see films like *Pasteur*, *Zola*, *The Informer*, *Blockade*, *They Won't Forget*, *Black Legion*, *Fury*, more than once or twice a year? Or are you satisfied with a steady motion picture diet of *Boy Gets Girl*, *Reporter Gets Scoop*, *Cop Catches Robber*, *Cowboy Ropes Steer?*" The bulletin adds: "The Motion Picture Industry Will Give You What You Want."

For people have come to realize the movies are not only entertainment: they can be the cheapest and most effective means of education. They can help swing close to a hundred



million people behind progress. The AFA bulletin puts it succinctly: "Would you like to see films which present the contemporary scene constructively?—which portray the American scene honestly . . . foster traditions of American democracy . . . promote world peace, develop understanding amongst religious, racial, social, and economic groups?" The moral is clear: Organize.

You can see why Fritz Kuhn has entered suit for \$5,000,000 against Warners for Confessions of a Nazi Spy. He understands the role of the progressive American movie only too well. The Bund and its allies in America slash the seats in the movies where progressive films are being shown. They threaten riots, throw stink-bombs, they bluster, they sabotage. They petition reaction in Congress to throttle the best coming out of Hollywood. But, as I showed briefly in my previous article, America built this giant industry on its nickels and dimes. Not Wall Street, nor even the pristine Zukors and Warners ... but the audience ... the people ...

For a long time Hollywood's theme song was I Can't Give You Anything but Love, Baby. The inevitable reply came through. We want more. What's more, we'll get more. Love ain't enough, baby.

JOSEPH NORTH.

Back to Methuselah

FRANK RYAN, Irish hero of the International Brigade in Spain, is still in a Franco prison. English liberals, organizing a campaign to force his release, asked George Bernard Shaw to sign their petition. Shaw answered on one of his famous postcards: "I regret to say that I know nothing of Mr. F. R., and cannot honestly sign the petition. I am so old that my knowledge of the political world is somewhat out of date."

The Brothers La Follette Bob and Phil think hard since last November. Where are the

Washington.

WW HEN Wisconsin's National Progressives went boom last November and former Gov. Phil La Follette found himself on the outside looking in, the La Follette boys took time out to think things over.

National Progressives now?

Brothers Bob and Phil held innumerable little conferences. Phil pilgrimaged to Washington and was closeted with the President. Bob, conversely, spent more weekends at home among the dairy farmers, and a strange neutrality pervaded his activities in the Senate. The brothers La Follette were thinking.

Two things were obvious: that the National Progressives, the launching of which shocked progressives because of its divisive character and anti-New Deal overtones, had come a cropper; and that it was the farmers, of all the individual political factors within the state, who had defeated Phil La Follette.

The effects of the defeat were most noticeable on brother Bob. Where previously he had been in the forefront of New Deal battles, he now shrank from controversy. Where he had been forthright and outspoken, he was now silent. He avoided all spotlights. He handled gingerly even his own fosterchild, the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, and he left in the hands of others the vital task of rejuvenating it. Whispers were heard that Bob no longer cared whether the committee was continued or not, and that should it be continued, he would petition to be replaced as its chairman.

He hid his lassitude behind the pledge he had made to refrain from asking for more funds after last session's appropriation, but the logic of his reticence was as obvious as it was disturbing. Brother Bob was wishfully thinking that, having won himself labor's support by his activities, he might now soothe the opposition of misguided sections of the farmers by inactivity.

THE COMMITTEE CHANGES SPONSORS

There were two immediate consequences. Since it was obvious that, lacking even La Follette's active interest, the tory-minded Messrs. Garner and Byrnes could spike the Senate's entire civil liberties program, steps were taken to transfer as much of it as possible to the Justice Department's newly created Civil Liberties Bureau. Early in May, Byrnes and red-headed Attorney General Murphy spent a weekend together on the Presidential yacht on the Potomac, and tentative arrangements were made for the transfer. It was a bitter dose for the administration. The Justice Department, restricted as it is to prosecution, could never take the place of the searching inquiry of the committee; it could never, as the committee has, subpœna men to testify against themselves and thus bring out the full picture of industrial iniquities; but it was something in the place of nothing. And Jack Garner, knowing the department's limitations, was content.

The second consequence was the ultimate undoing of the first. Associated Farmers, which is emphatically big business, feeling safe under Mr. Garner's protecting ægis, moved eastward, establishing headquarters in Minnesota and Wisconsin. Concurrently they opened lobbying offices in Washington under the nom de guerre of the Agricultural Producers Labor Committee, where they are leading the present intense drive against the Wages and Hours Act. But it was their settling in his own back yard that got young Bob La Follette mad. Now, Bob may have been foolhardy enough to imagine he could assuage the discontented farmers by doing nothing, but he was also realist enough to know that when it comes to such fascist groups as Associated Farmers, the only answer is "fight." That he prepared to do.

BOB'S COMEBACK

About a month ago, aware of La Follette's change of heart, Murphy advised Roosevelt that it was beyond the scope of the Justice Department to carry on the functions of the Civil Liberties Committee. That same weekend, Roosevelt and Murphy conferred on shipboard with Senator Schwellenbach, cosponsor of the pending resolution to grant the committee another \$100,000. In midweek, after much pressure, Senator Byrnes crawled out of a tight spot by avowing that the only reason he had hesitated to report the measure favorably was that La Follette did not want it. Should La Follette speak up for the resolution, he said, he would report it out in a jiffy. Recently Bob prepared a fighting speech for utterance on the Senate floor, urging action.

At the same time steps were taken to strengthen the home front and save Wisconsin's twelve electoral college votes for Democracy. Now, Wisconsin's Democrats have been a headache to the New Deal for some time. The right-wingers, who occupied key places in the party machine, fought the La Follettes tooth and nail at the last election, to end up a dreary third with Republican Heil in the governor's armchair. They led the smear campaign on Tom Amlie when Roosevelt nominated that progressive to the ICC-even to the point of forwarding a formal resolution to the already rebellious U.S. Senate, opposing the appointment. They have, in short, established themselves as typical Republicrats.

But in recent months, the situation has changed slowly for the better. New Dealers are forging to the front as a natural result of

the right-wing Democrats' drubbing last November. And the time has come for overtures of unity toward the Progressives. So the weekend of June 17-18 saw two important pilgrimages to the Milk Bowl-Henry Wallace to the state's Democrats, and Frank Murphy to its Progressives. Wallace journeyed to Milwaukee, where he addressed a Democratic dinner party. Recalling last year's conflicts, he admonished, "If this country wants reaction, it will vote Republican." Murphy, houseguesting at the La Follette's Madison home, carried the slogan of the "united front" to the Progressive camp. Commemorating the fourteenth anniversary of the death of Bob La Follette, Sr., he took occasion, in a White House-approved speech, to laud the La Follettes as the finest political stock in the country. And he carried official overtures to the sometimes critical descendants of "Old Bob" to reenter the New Deal camp in 1940.

Meanwhile, Republican Julius Heil has been doing his bit to help the New Deal cause. Disporting himself politically as ineptly as a monkey in a taffy pot, the machinery mogul has caused a definite revulsion from the tory standard. Labor and farmers alike are up in arms at his blind reactionary approach to all fundamental problems. But Mr. Heil, not content with his governorship, is said to be bending a jealous eye on Young Bob's Senate seat. With his money behind him, Heil may well get the Republican nomination. It may be one of the best things that could happen for Wisconsin liberals.

But in all the political stew, the main danger, the thing to watch, will be the activities of Associated Farmers, which is sure to capitalize upon farm unrest by an attempt to build a following for their fascist movement. There are two immediate antidotes for that: first, more funds for the La Follette committee; and second, that Wallace supplement his persuasive speechmaking with more concrete aid to the farmers.

PAUL G. MCMANUS.

Socialist Logic

MONTHS ago the London County Council, controlled by Socialists, banned the Soviet film Professor Mamlock from showings in London, on the ground that its attack on anti-Semitism would cause "riots in the theaters." Recently they passed the American film Coafessions of a Nazi Spy, which has London saying that the County Council has one law for America and another for the Soviet Union.

Pollinate Me, Kamerad!

G ERMAN propaganda agencies all over the world are circulating a new justification for the rape of Austria and Czechoslovakia, by claiming that the plants and animals of the seized territories are of the same racial stocks as the flora and fauna of Naziland.







THEODORE DRAPER, JOSEPH FREEMAN, MICHAEL GOLD, WILLIAM GROPPER, JOSHUA KUNITZ, HERMAN MICHEL-SON, BRUCE MINTON, ISIDOR SCHNEIDER, ROBERT TERRALL, RICHARD WRIGHT, MARGUERITE YOUNG

Business Manager CARL BRISTEL West Coast Representative George Willner.

Advertising Manager Eric Bernay. Circulation Manager H. C. Adamson.

Made in Germany

A NOTHER made-in-Germany crisis is coming to a head over Danzig. The plot is familiar (see Czechoslovakia R.I.P.), the lines and gestures are all well known. It is the technique of conquest by war scare. And though putting this swindle across has been made enormously more difficult since Munich, there is still Chamberlain in London and Bonnet in Paris. A number of propositions appear to us to accord most with the facts of the present situation:

1. Hitler will not risk war if he can get what he is after without it. So long as Chamberlain stands at the helm of British policy, periodically emitting appeasement offers and showing no disposition to resist even in face of such direct threats to British interests as the Japanese blockade at Tientsin, Hitler is encouraged to pursue aggression by the "bloodless" Munich path. He is further encouraged by such action as that of our House of Representatives in voting a new and only slightly modified arms embargo.

2. Hitler will not risk war and certain defeat if he is confronted with an Anglo-French-Soviet alliance. Such an alliance, if Britain and France live up to their commitments, will also mean the end of further aggression in Europe.

3. Hitler will ultimately risk war-if, because of Polish resistance and the opposition of the British people to a new sellout, a second Munich becomes impossible and if Chamberlain and Bonnet continue to stall on a Soviet alliance and American foreign policy continues to drift in the shoals of isolationism.

The danger of a second Munich is something more than conjectural. In his speech last Thursday Lord Halifax, British foreign secretary, as usual carried water on both shoulders. True, the anti-aggression emphasis was the strongest that has yet come from a high official of the British government. But Halifax reverted toward the end to the appeasement note, offering Germany new negotiations concerning colonies, "Lebensraum," and other matters. And the failure to mention Danzig—an omission which was repeated by Chamberlain in a broadcast Sunday—is ominous. It is like writing a book about England and omitting all reference to London. Danzig is the crux of the European crisis, though the fate of Danzig is being determined not in Europe alone, but in the Far East and the United States as well.

The Church Militant

G ROUPS and individuals in the Roman Catholic Church who have watched horror-stricken the snakelike growth of fascism within their organizations and social bodies seem to be wakening to its menace to all morality and the very existence of the church on earth.

On June 5, the Rev. James R. Cox of St. Patrick's Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., spoke on the Catholic attitude towards religious and civil freedom in general and Father Coughlin in particular. He affirmed the right of every American to hold any or no religious belief and to be "a Socialist, a radical, a Republican, or a Democrat or what-have-you—yes, and even a Communist." Concerning the Royal Oak Goebbels, Father Cox made a telling point:

If Father Coughlin is right, then the Ku Klux Klan is right, and if the Ku Klux Klan is right about the Jews, it is also right about the Catholics and colored people, and Father Coughlin thereby condemns himself and all that he represents.

Another sign of healthful Christianity exhibits itself in the new paper, the *Voice*, organ of the Committee of Catholics to Fight Anti-Semitism, recently published in New York. In tabloid newspaper format, designed to reach the widest audience of the people, the *Voice* amply succeeds in the committee's aim "to popularize genuine Christian teaching among our Catholic people in all walks of life."

The Mongolian Border

CCORDING to Tass, official Soviet news A agency, large-scale warfare has been in progress along the Mongolian-Manchukuo frontier, just southeast of Lake Bor, since May 11. On that date a detachment of Manchukuoan soldiers, directed by the Japanese Kwangtung Army, compelled a Mongolian border patrol to retreat sixteen miles to the Khalginkol River. Augmented by Soviet patrols, the Mongolian People's Army soon reestablished its original positions. Frontier clashes ensued almost daily, and in one engagement the Japanese retired with four hundred losses. Beginning with May 28, the warfare entered a second stage as the Japanese returned to the battle with planes. Half a dozen aerial battles followed, in some of which over two hundred planes were engaged in combat at the same time. During the week of June 22-29, eighty-six Japanese planes were lost as against twenty-six for the Soviet-Mongolian army.

Just as in the Lake Khasan battle last summer, there is no doubt which forces came off second best. Nor is there any confusion as to the responsibility or purpose of this adventure. The Kwangtung Army, stationed in this area since Japan's initial aggression in September 1931, has consistently demanded from its government a more provocative anti-Soviet policy. Likewise, the officers of this army strongly favor outright Japanese adherence to the military alliance of the Rome-Berlin axis, and resent the depletion of their forces for the ruinous and disappointing war against China.

In this instance, however, the independence of the Kwangtung Army need not be exaggerated. For this adventure coincides perfectly with Tokyo's present drive against Great Britain and the United States. More than that, it was obviously designed to reveal vulnerable spots in the Russian armor during the Anglo-Soviet discussions in Moscow. However, just as in the Lake Khasan incident, there is no comfort here for the anti-Soviet ax-grinders in Tokyo or Berlin. No, not even in London.

Not So Smart

 \mathbf{K}^{EN} is ceasing publication. In business only a year and a half, the magazine whose opening announcements were a delight to progressive journalists and readers has found that it is not a paying proposition.

There were rumors about Ken two years ago. Arnold Gingrich, at the time editing *Esquire* and *Coronet*, also published by David Smart, wrote in the prospectus that freedom of the press existed for the publishers alone, and that "half of them are busy salaaming sacred cows, and the other half are grinding axes on the emery wheel of their own prejudice." Ken was to be different. It was to be "one step left of center . . . anti-war and anti-fascist." It sounded good.

Even before the magazine appeared, the publishers began to give way. Jay Allen was the first editor, then George Seldes. Both parted company with Smart because he, fearing business pressure, would not print what Allen and Seldes were writing and soliciting. To knock fascism in Germany and Italy is one thing, was Smart's attitude, but to go snooping around for it in this country is quite another. Moving still further toward reaction, Smart wanted to hire George Sokolsky. He began to Red-bait.

Smart and his best writers broke. Ernest Hemingway and Paul de Kruif had been big drawing cards for the magazine, but they refused to be bullied into toadying to the business office. *Ken*, with its stars gone, became worse and worse, right up to the current issue, which has a faked piece on Stalin's private life by someone called Nicholas Basseches. Lacking good material, Ken began to lean heavily on cheese pictures, and daring exposes of life behind the footlights of burlesque. But it didn't bring circulation. The advertisers stayed away—no amount of editorial sop makes up for lack of readers.

Ken could have been a success. Had Smart

not antagonized his writers and many of his readers, had he stuck to the truth about fascism *everywhere*, his product would have been good, his readers enthusiastic. But he didn't. His magazine has folded, a lesson to all who think progressivism can be halfhearted and two-faced.

On Three Fronts

I N Haverhill, Mass., a World War veteran hanged himself. He had no persecution mania, he was not shell-shocked. He had just been fired from WPA. In New York, while Federal Theater workers were burying their beloved Pinocchio, a cabaret dancer pitched herself from a ninth-story window. The tabloids couldn't do much with this one—no love-nest angle. The boy she wanted to marry had no job and with WPA being cut saw no chance to get one. He told her so. She killed herself.

In Washington the House was finishing a week of vulgar bickering in which the hoodlums kept the floor to themselves. One buffoon amused himself by turning literary critic and making stupid insinuations about plays that people have loved for centuries—Moliere, Sheridan, Shakespeare. Clifton Woodrum, the Virginia cavalier who led the hatchet gang, drew smirks by dirty allusions to the art projects. The tories laughed. Vito Marcantonio tried to protest, but he was howled down. Progressives tried to say that these fools were playing with the lives of millions. But the fools went on. No one else could speak. Philistinism, unconcerned cruelty, reaction held sway as they have not done in many years.

The House cut and crippled WPA. Hundreds of thousands join the unemployed and relief rolls. The figure \$1,477,000,000 is nearly \$800,000,000 below what is needed, what the Casey-Murray bill asked. The theater project is no more. The other arts projects go unless they find local sponsorship—highly improbable in most places. Every eighteen months the remaining workers get a month's vacation—many will not return. Building projects are limited to \$52,000, which means that many schools, hospitals, valuable public buildings will never be seen. The National Youth Administration loses \$23,000,000. The Wood-'rum committee get an additional grant to ape the Dies committee and see what can be done about eliminating WPA altogether.

It was a shameful, misery-breeding action. It will hit back at the tories in a hundred ways. It slices away many of the most valuable things in American life, things not dreamed of a few years back. Progressives must fight for deficiency appropriations and repeal of the anti-democratic curbs, must insist that every available part of WPA be salvaged, must see that America has a decent system of work relief.

T HE tory-Democrat and Republican attack on the President's control of the dollar represents more than personal hatred, although Sen. Millard Tydings of Maryland struck a new low in spite when he talked dollar control and the stabilization fund to a temporary death. The larger motive is to knife the New Deal, saw confusion in the country, defeat the administration's efforts for peace.

The President's discretionary power to devalue the gold dollar and the two billion dollar stabilization fund have served as weapons against speculators and against the fascist countries which often strike at a democracy through manipulation of the currency. By preventing passage of the bill extending the President's control the right-wing coalition scrapped, for the present at least, this guarantee of the nation's currency. It once again turned the dollar over to the mercies of Wall Street and practically invited the fascists to cause trouble by speculative buying in the dollar exchanges. And by depriving the United States of a potent weapon to meet wholesale dumping, the tories are encouraging fascist penetration of Latin America. President Roosevelt was thus entirely right when he charged them with endangering the national safety. It is to be hoped that in the next few days Congress will end this sabotage and pass the monetary bill reported by the joint Senate-House conference committee.

"T HEY Must Not Pass!" screeched a headline in the June 26 issue of Father Coughlin's Social Justice. The "they" referred to the Bloom and Pittman bills revising the Neutrality Act. On June 30 the House of Representatives defeated the Bloom bill. Father Coughlin—and the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo alliance for whom he speaks—had won. Will they win in the Senate too?

As far back as April the Gallup poll reported that 57 percent of American voters favored changing the neutrality law to permit the sale of war materials to Britain and France in case of war. The House of Representatives ignored that mandate. Harried by Coughlin, Ham Fish, and other reactionary isolationists, it rejected the Bloom cash-and-carry proposals and, instead, wrote into the new Neutrality Bill almost the same automatic arms embargo which makes the present law so objectionable. This embargo encourages fascist aggression by barring aid to its victims.

The fight now goes to the Senate, where the difficulties in the way of cash-and-carry legislation are believed to be even greater. It is one of the tragedies of our day that neither House nor Senate accurately reflects the sentiment of the country on the crucial issue of foreign policy. In both houses isolationist strength is out of all proportion to its strength among the people. It was for this reason that the administration proceeded with such caution in approaching neutrality revision, but its caution, as we have pointed out before, has been excessive and has now proved self-defeating. The majority of Americans, who want a real change in neutrality legislation, were not roused to action.

The New Deal has thus suffered defeat on three fronts in the past week. But these lost battles do not necessarily mean a lost war: the struggle over Supreme Court reform and the Reorganization Bill showed that. The monetary bill and revision of the Neutrality Act can still be saved, while it is not too early to prepare for a new WPA deficiency appropriation that will restore the Federal Theater and eliminate the other crippling restrictions of the present measure. And the bi-partisan Roosevelthating cabal are providing the New Deal with the issues on which it can carry the country in 1940.

Ι T A N \boldsymbol{E} D 0 R Ι A L A R TΙ C L E

Third Term for the New Deal

Progress versus reaction is still the issue. It may be Roosevelt, it may be one of a dozen others, but it must be a New Deal candidate.

The YEAR 1940 sprawls hugely over the American scene. The Presidential elections are sixteen months away, but the campaign has already begun. No candidates have yet been picked, but all sorts of men of destiny are panting hard from the race. Issues? There is one that is the central nexus of them all: the New Deal versus reaction. Sharp and implacable alternatives, it is true, but in times like these there can be no others.

The crisis our country and the world is passing through is no small or ephemeral thing. Titanic stresses and strains are tearing at the fabric of civilization. In Europe millions of armed men gaze darkly across frontiers, awaiting the order to march. In Asia the second imperialist war pounds on into its third year. In America ten or twelve million are unemployed, the air is filled with attack and counter-attack, numberless millions ask: where do we go from here?

Both the New Deal and the anti-New Deal camps are giving their answers. The new \$3,860,000,000 lending program, the efforts to save WPA, the refusal to be stampeded into crippling the National Labor Relations Act, the broadening of social security legislation, the Mead bill to provide capital and credit for little business, the attempt to create a positive peace policy that will enable America to give some assistance to the victims of aggression-these are some of the answers of the New Deal. They are hesitant answers, often vague and inadequate, but they are on the right road. They aim to keep America moving toward economic recovery, greater well-being for the common people, peace, and a more palpable democracy.

The answers of the anti-New Deal forces, represented by the alliance of Republicans and right-wing Democrats, is, if anything, even more clearcut. WPA has saved lives, has created millions of dollars in new assets, has helped energize American culture. But it costs money. Off with its head, say the moneyed men and their political flunkeys. And the anti-New Dealers give the same kind of answer to the wage-earners, the farmers, the small business men, the professionals. They give it on basic questions of civil liberties. The people be damned, bellows the Wall Street chorus.

Will the people be damned in 1940? Let's get down to first principles. The issue in 1940 is not a third term for President Roosevelt; it is a third term for the New Deal. Keep that in mind when the jackals start howling. The Democratic candidate, whoever he may be, can win only if he is an active New Dealer. In 1936 Roosevelt was reelected by an overwhelming majority. He won not because he

has charm and a mellifluous speaking voice though these helped—but because he stood for something that the majority of the voters wanted. We believe the majority still want what the President stands for. If this requires that he run for a third term, it would be folly to make a fetish of precedent and deny the American people their democratic right to elect the kind of government they desire.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY HISTORY

Oswald Garrison Villard, with his uncanny genius for serving as sounding-board to the reactionaries, in a recent issue of the Nation used such harsh words as "dictatorship" and "treason" regarding the third-term proposal. He called for "an immediate movement to head off that nomination." Mr. Villard's appeal will warm the hearts of the Garnercrats and the Hoover disciples, but we do not think he represents majority liberal opinion. It is the growth of treason in the land-treason to democracy-and the very real threat of dictatorship from the right that have spontaneously precipitated from among ever widening circles of the people the demand that Roosevelt be a candidate for a third term. The continuance of the New Deal becomes particularly urgent in view of the fact that it is already evident that the overriding single issue in 1940 will be foreign policy.

Earl Browder recently made some penetrating observations concerning the Democratic Party's perspectives in 1940. His discussion may be summarized as follows:

Only three Democrats, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, have been elected to the Presidency since the Civil War. All were elected twice, but the first two received on each occasion a minority of the popular vote. Roosevelt is the first majority President that the Democratic Party has elected since the Civil War. Moreover, the Democratic Party has, with a single exception-Cleveland's second election-made an especially poor showing when its Presidential candidate was a conservative. In 1896 and 1900 the "radical," Bryan, came close to victory; in 1904 the conservative, Parker, was left far behind. The conservative, Cox, polled only 35 percent of the total vote in 1920, while the Wall Street lawyer, Davis, dropped to 29 percent in 1924. Al Smith, who at that time professed to be a progressive, lifted the Democratic total to 40 percent in 1928 despite the Ku Klux campaign of religious incitement organized against him.

In the Republican Party progressive strength has also been manifested in the launching of Theodore Roosevelt's Bull

Moose Party in 1912 and the La Follette movement in 1924, both of which polled a considerable vote. Browder concludes that three main voting groups have been crystallizing in this country, particularly since the economic collapse of 1929. One group votes regularly Democratic, the second regularly Republican, and the third turns to one or the other of the two major parties or to a third party, depending on which gives most effective expression to its progressive and 'radical" needs and aspirations. The New Deal, through the person of President Roosevelt, has effected a coalition between the regular Democrats and the more consistently progressive third group of independent voters. It was this coalition that carried the day in 1936. It is this coalition that can bring victory in 1940. The candidacy of Garner or a Garner man will split this bloc and spell certain defeat for the Democratic Party.

21

Those who saw premonitions of certain New Deal disaster in last November's elections are already being refuted by events. That the tide has once more begun to turn toward the New Deal is evident from recent municipal elections in San Francisco, San Antonio, Chicago, Minneapolis, and other cities where progressives won.

AMERICA NEEDS . . .

Progressive sentiment is undoubtedly still the majority sentiment in the country. But what happened last November is a warning that not all of this sentiment is clear of vision and understanding. Without adequate organization and leadership behind a bold and challenging program, there remains the danger that portions of it will be funneled off into dangerous channels. American democracy, if it is to win, needs a unified labor movement. It needs a more effective struggle against the virus of religious and racial bigotry and against all legislative encroachments on civil liberties. It needs to give a larger measure of security to the masses of the population, with particular attention to the needs of the farmers and small business men. It needs an affirmative peace policy based on distinguishing between aggressor and victim and on collaboration between the United States, the Soviet Union, and other peaceloving states. And it needs a far more comprehensive recovery program than has vet been proposed, a program that will include an annual expenditure of \$5,000,000,000 for housing and slum clearance, nationalization of the railroads, and nationalization of the three key banking monopolies, Morgan, Rockefeller, and Kuhn, Loeb.

Adventures of a Middle-Aged Man

Elliot Paul adds some background material to the strange story of John Dos Passos, supplementing Samuel Sillen's review of last week.

J OHN DOS PASSOS no doubt wrote The Adventures of a Young Man in the belief that left-wing writers would call him a fascist and a Trotskyite and that afterward he could enjoy a spot of internal suffering and weep on the shoulders of that group of critics who, like Dos Passos, E. E. Cummings, Edmund Wilson, and many others, pretend to be anti-fascist but get the vapors when any practical method of combating the fascist menace is put into practice.

There is no harder luck I could wish either Hitler or Trotsky than to have a million Dos Passos' on their side. That, however desirable, can never be. Men of his temperament are never on any side of anything. To them the troubled world is a sort of training camp where they can spar and skip the rope with their ideals and principles in preparation for a bout that never comes off. They are entertaining chaps in peace time, and, oh, so very well-mannered, but they are a definite nuisance when there is work to be done.

Dos Passos' experiences in loyalist Spain would make interesting reading if he would write them truly, but he never will, not because he is dishonest but because he cannot digest experience in a violent era. A nice quiet one would be just right for him.

When I was in Madrid in the summer of 1937, I was given much help and information by a young man who was Spanish-born and had spent many winters in Baltimore. He was gracious and intelligent to a high degree, and was working effectively for his country not less than eighteen hours a day. He had known Dos Passos, in America and in Spain, and asked me what Dos Passos was doing for the cause in the United States.

"I'm afraid Dos Passos isn't doing anything," I said. "The government shot some friend of his, a professor from Johns Hopkins..."

The young man looked me straight in the eye, with a great deal of sadness but an essential firmness and clarity I can only wish our friends might possess who dislike blacks and whites and want only gentle, misty grays.

"That man was my father," he said simply. "I hope Dos Passos won't lose interest on that account."

Of course, I thought that the young man might be the only wayward member of a reactionary family but later, when the World Youth Congress was held in the United States, the sister of that young man and the daughter of the professor who was shot was proud to represent the Negrin government as Spain's delegate.

The last I heard of the young man, he had

been taken prisoner by Franco's forces of Italians in an action near Saragossa. Nothing I have been able to do, no inquiries I have been able to make, have given me a single clue to his fate. Trotsky or anybody who wants him can have Dos Passos. I'll take young Roberto —, if he's alive, and I'll cherish his memory if he's dead.

Mr. John Chamberlain, in the Saturday Review of Literature, tells a characteristic tale of Dos Passos. It seems that Dos Passos had made a visit to Moscow in 1928, before many things necessary to the comfort of Harvard alumni were in working order. A group of factory workers, also interested in the theater, went to the station to say goodby to Dos Passos and, through an interpreter, asked him one simple question: "How do you stand politically? Are you with us?"

I shall not try to improve on Mr. Chamberlain's own words as to what followed:

One who knows Dos Passos can imagine him standing there in the cold Northern twilight, the piston-rods of the engine already pumping slowly beside him. . . Scrupulously polite, given to deprecatory gestures, he starts up like a flushed partridge, his baldish head bobbing, his nearsighted eyes soft with pleased surprise. He wants to be kind, to make a gesture of solidarity, yet there is something in him goading him on, as always, to the absolute truth.

That mysterious something, at the moment in question, did not goad him quite hard enough, apparently, for he said: "But let me see, but maybe I can explain. . . . But in so short a time . . . there's no time."

One cannot imagine Ernest Hemingway, or even Patrick Henry, starting up like a flushed partridge when asked where he stood. The answer would have been either "Sure" or "No."

Dos Passos is credited with a wisecrack which is sharper than any of his answers to



chard Correll

questions: "Writers of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your brains." That is woefully untrue. A writer must have guts as well as brains. He must be as well aware of the sufferings of his fellow beings who are forced actively to resist oppression as of the intellectual difficulties of spine-entrenched litterateurs. Moreover, if by uniting with other men, by fighting tough organizations with evil purposes by joining tougher organizations with honest purposes, a writing man is afraid of losing his brains, he would be better off without them, no matter what artistic perceptions or college educations may be contained in them.

There is little need today for bowing and flushing like partridges. There is a crying need for organization and concerted action. How any man who can pretend to have loved Spain or freedom or humanity, how a writer who has seen with his own eves the heroic losing fight the Spaniards put up to save themselves from slavery, how an honest man who even mentions his brains could have witnessed Dr. Negrin's brave leadership and then helped to spread the lie that loyal Spanish resistance was a Communist movement and therefore dangerous, is beyond my understanding. And in recent bloody years my understanding of human depravity and meanness has been broadened considerably.

What prompts a man to place his qualms and indecisions like a screen between his common sense and the spectacle of organized savagery before him? That same mysterious something that keeps him from answering simple questions.

The Communists gave heroic aid in Spain, and the party gained strength as the war proceeded because Spain's fighting men and capable leaders were impressed by the spirit and discipline and effectiveness of the Communists. The Communists did not lie down, they did not try to fight a modern war as if it were a free-for-all game of drop the handkerchief. All credit to them, and more shame to those who wish to use Communist aid and its conspicuous service to mankind as an excuse for abandoning democracy to the jackals of Hitler and Mussolini.

Francisco Franco, who is murdering helpless civilians as fast today as he did when he rained Italian bombs on Madrid and Barcelona, should be sent a copy of *The Adventures of a Young Man* accompanied by a wreath of pale sweet-peas.

In France today are 450,000 Spaniards who are being treated with studied brutality, and eventually will be turned over to Franco for slaughter and enslavement. I wonder if



Richard Correll

NM July 11, 1939

Dos Passos, giving comfort to the enemy, ever winces when stray visions of their agonized faces intrude into his bewildered consciousness. What an achievement for an artist and a writer with brains and human sympathies, to help gloss over Franco's barbarity, to help soil Negrin's splendid efforts. Such an act, by a man who understood it thoroughly, would be dastardly and cowardly. A man who fails to understand it should get rid of his brains as quickly as possible, but not by uniting with the writers of the world. They will not have him.

Elliot Paul.

Waldo Frank's Novel "The Bridegroom Cometh" reviewed by Edwin Berry Burgum.

HE action in Waldo Frank's new novel (The Bridegroom Cometh, Doubleday, Doran & Co., \$2.75) can be reduced to simple terms. It is the story of Mary and Martha, born of a shrewd and pious couple in a New England village. Each girl escapes from this archaic environment in her own way. Martha goes to New York, marries a racketeer, and appears to live happily in flashy extravagance. But when her husband is knocked off (behind the scenes), she rejects Mary's proffer of intimacy and drowns herself. The way of the spirit is the more complex and ultimately the more rewarding. Mary goes to college on a scholarship where she is converted to socialism by a modern woman, temporarily on the faculty. Later she too goes to New York where she marries the son of a wealthy and selfindulgent Jewish woman. Unable to stand the combination of a husband dominated by his mother and a mother oblivious to the problems of the poor, Mary leaves her husband and supports herself by working in a factory. She lives among unionists and radicals, but her problems, in Frank's opinion, are deeper than theirs; and after numerous attempts to find the love her nature requires from either man or woman, she finally achieves an understanding and a confidence in her ability to share her understanding with another. She meets Markand, the eminent radical, and discovering him to be riddled by secret doubts, she rescues him through the magnetism of her new personality.

From this brief outline, obviously, The Bridegroom Cometh belongs to the type of fiction which was considered startling and progressive during the era of the Great War. D. H. Lawrence and Sherwood Anderson were then rebelling against the inhibitions of puritanism. Sexual adjustment was the paramount theme of the better fiction which was transferring from poetry the earlier romantic belief that love is the instinctive commingling of body and spirit. In its extreme extension, in some of Eugene O'Neill's plays, the prostitute became the goddess of healing, who, by giving of her boundless love to any man, wipes out spiritual isolation and exalts the fraternity of mankind. In Frank's novel the

ABSOLUTELY FREE! A GIFT TO YOU

Secure ten dollars' worth of subscriptions to *New Masses* in any denominations and you will be awarded *your choice* of any one of the thirteen books listed below.

Because we want to get things humming right away and because we are lucky enough to have the kind of readers that we do, we make the following proposition: You don't have to wait until you have secured the entire \$10 worth of subscriptions to win a prize—send in \$5 worth of subs now—and we'll mail you the book right away and trust to that impeccable NM loyalty of yours to send in the balance of the \$5 worth of subscriptions as soon as you secure 'em. Start today!

	re is my remittance for \$ (five dollars or more). Please send w Masses to the addresses on the enclosed list for the lengths of time
	icated next to each name. (One year subscription, \$4.50; six-months 50; twelve-week trial, \$1.) Send me the book I have checked below
Na	me
Ad	dress
•	•••••••••••••••••••••••
	CHECK YOUR GIFT
En	ust Toller Look Thru the Bars (\$2.75)
Wi	liam Blake The World Is Mine (\$3.00)
Ra	lph Bates Rainbow Fish (\$2.00)
Ro	main Rolland Death of a World (\$2.50)
Mil	len Brand The Outward Room (\$1.25)
Lea	ne Zugsmith A Time to Remember (\$2.00)
A.	B. Magil and Henry Stevens The Peril of Fascism (\$2.00)
N.	Ostrovsky Born of the Storm (\$1.50)
Fo	ur Soviet Plays (\$1.75)
Ra	ph Bates Sirocco (\$2.50)
Ell	iot Paul Concert Pitch (\$2.50)
Ro	bert Graves Claudius, the God ($\$3.00$)
Syl	via Townsend Warner Summer Will Show (\$2.50)
	(Figures in parenthesis are retail prices of the books)



Please mention NEW MASSES when patronizing advertisers

from \$27.50

doctrine is not pushed to this extreme, but is more like an ambiguous restatement of Anderson's theme. The individual, integrated through love, has discovered the secret of comradeship, and, if anything further is required, can then function with spirit as well as brain to promote the unionization of workers and the new society of a decent livelihood for all men.

Throughout the novel there is, therefore, a latent uneasy suspicion of the systematic methods for achieving these objectives which have become more prominent in our own period. If puritanism has left people with complexes and contradictions, Frank seems to feel, with this older school of novelists, that reform can come only through the hit-or-miss process of personal experience. His suspicion falls upon two particular methods, psychoanalysis and Marxism, which become incidental themes in a novel chiefly given over to the biography of Mary Donald. Mary is disturbed by a "parent fixation," which an analyst suggests he can cure. Frank presents this analyst as having an elaborate office far above the turmoil and poverty of the streets, which he leaves each evening for the quiet of an estate on Long Island and a group of domesticated animals he calls his family. Through his business he hypocritically rounds out life's pleasures; for his treatment consists of transferring the guilty affection for a parent to himself by the process of seduction. But Mary is a girl who learns from experience, and her scientific seduction has the profit that she herself rejects the process. It would be difficult to find a novel giving a more preposterous and libelous account of the practice of psychoanalysis.

And yet it cannot be said that Frank altogether rejects the method. Sarcastic insinuations occasionally give way before passages of "objective" writing, which set up the inference that there may be a germ of truth in psychoanalysis. He is somewhat less ambiguous about Marxism. He seems to accept Marxism pragmatically as a fact; it is a method of functioning prevalent in wide circles of the working class and the intelligentsia, and Frank often "objectively" reflects the existing situation. But he accepts it only to pull away from it, not with the sarcasm he feels about psychoanalysis, but the melancholy reluctance with which one begins to recognize serious defects in an old friend. Mary acquiesces with misgivings when the party closes the progressive school for children in which she has been teaching, because it fails to drill the joyous children in the rigors of the class struggle. Markand steals away from the official atmosphere for the relaxation and freedom of a little cafe run by an anarcho-syndicalist. Lida and her boy friend outrage Frank's conception of integrity by submitting to marriage at party orders before leaving to organize Southern workers, because the party does not desire to outrage 'the Southern prejudice against free love. But Mary also objects to her friends' going at all, in what is the most



For information write James or Nellie Dick, Modern School, Carmel, N. Y. Phone Carmel 334



it sheds on Frank's conception of the class struggle. She cannot understand why they should seek out hazard and possible martyrdom. The desire for martyrdom is one of the neuroses Mary has luckily not been heir to. She counsels her friends to remain in New York and organize the workers there, though that is what they have been doing and what they will return to do. Behind her friendly advice, one suspects, is the belief that two people should not disturb their personal happiness by what is irrelevant to it. There is a golden mean, doubtless, in this matter of the class struggle.

Behind all the brave words of The Bridegroom Cometh I find this essential shrinking from pain. Instinct prevents its indulgence from going too far. Mary will never commit suicide like her sister. But this acceptance of evil is a new element in Frank, caught from the later decadent period of the twenties. The ecstatic emphasis upon love continues. But love has now become the preponderant member of a dualism with pain. Frank's world is no longer monistic. And now even into the experience of love an exultant masochism insinuates itself and debases into sensuality almost every passage in which love is supposed to dominate. Mary does not so much feel the real urge of Jeffers' heroine in Roan Stallion, as a fantasy of the imagination which instinct will always manage to temper or to discharge abruptly. For Mary, like Dreiser's Sister Carrie, has a power of self-preservation which prevents her from ever making the same mistake twice or permitting herself to be victimized twice by the same man. And so the ecstasy of love and pain never actually deepens into a conflict between love and death. Towards the end of the book such a conflict appears personified in the relation between Mary and Markand. Markand tells her the personal motivation behind the support of labor that has given him his position of leadership. His choice, he confides, will force upon him ultimately the sweet annihilation of the martyr. Indeed, "for every person, Mary, there is one fate: Destruction." But Mary does not accept Markand's justification for taking part in the class struggle. Death, she admits, is the truth to be feared. But for her there is a greater truth, the truth to be loved, which is love, and which, in the language of Lawrence, Frank calls the truth of the Son. But all this, we may be permitted to interpret, is mere talk. We are not at all afraid of Markand's committing suicide. For Mary becomes transformed as she talks and looks at Markand. "In her loins the world stirred, sweet with her blood-huge." We are supposed to believe that Love, now become dominant in Mary, is enabling her to escape the domination of others, and instead to instill in Markand her own proud integration. In any event, it is plain that she has acquired a new lover.

There is a cruel irony in the fact that The Bridegroom Cometh appears at the same time as John Steinbeck's The Grapes of Wrath. For Steinbeck's distinguished novel eloquently attests that the struggle against puritanism is



25

Please mention NEW MASSES when patronizing advertisers

Liberty 1390



26

A Real Holiday at the HARMONY COUNTRY CLUB ON LAKE ANAWANA, Hurleyville, N. Y. Phone Monticello 711 City Information PR esident 3-7954 Sports — Activities — Tonnis, Handball, Private Lake, Solariums, Entertainment — Shows, Harmony, Musie Hall Concerts, Celebrities, Dancing.

Please mention NEW MASSES when patronizing advertisers

a dead issue. The working girl need no longer rediscover her kind after passage through the turmoils of a prosperous bourgeois marriage. The opening pages of Frank's novel set the angle of distortion. His family of camp-meeting revivalists were never as common in New England as in the rest of the country, and they can hardly be said to have survived in any typical sense at the present day. A similar distortion pervades the book, now and then alternating with objective detail and always, after the opening chapters, blurred, as a photographer blurs a picture, by the thesis of sentimental love. But distortion is relative to the period and the individual. Published before the war, The Bridegroom Cometh would probably have been described as a realistic novel. And readers who continue to live according to the attitudes of the pre-war period in American literature will fail to recognize the distortion they have failed to out-EDWIN BERRY BURGUM. grow.

The American Negro

Elizabeth Lawson's "Study Outline" traces his history, 1619-1918.

S HOWING evidence of persistent research and intelligent selection of material, Elizabeth Lawson's 101-page rotographed Study Outline: History of the American Negro People, 1619-1918 (Workers Bookshop, New York, 40 cents) sets out to sketch the story of the Negro in this country from his landing as an indentured servant at Jamestown, Va., in 1619, to his participation in the imperialist World War of 1914-18. The outline was prepared on the basis of a series of lectures delivered by Miss Lawson as chairman of the history department of the New York Workers School.

The booklet covers the beginning of slavery on this continent; shows the Negro's relation to the American Revolution; describes the slave system of the United States; lists some of the main events of United States history (in relation to slavery); discusses insurrections and the Abolition movement; describes the principal forces lined up against one another in the Civil War; gives some little known and important facts about the Reconstruction period; tells about the Negro both in relation to and exclusive of the labor movement; and analyzes the imperialist World War in relation to the Negro people of the United States.

From the death of Crispus Attucks, Negro patriot and first among the Americans to die for the Colonies' right to self-determination, the struggle of the American Negro has been on the side of progress. Today the Negro people, by and large, form one of the most politically advanced minorities in the United States. While youthful capitalism in the North and in new territories elsewhere outside the South was fighting to defeat slavery, the slaves were themselves struggling to break their chains. Running away from slavery was also a form of struggle, just as much as the BEACON shows the way

to something new in Vacations.

CAMP BEACON

Formerly NITGEDAIGET

BEACON, N.Y.

Beacon 731

Announces

A streamlined summer season featuring THE NEW LAKE BEACON

> And a program of OUTDOOR and INDOOR ACTIVITIES

> > under the direction of

author of "Chamberlain Crawl" and "Abraham Lincoln Lives Again"

> and a TOPNOTCH SOCIAL STAFF

\$17.00 per week. \$3.00 per day

City Phone: EStabrook 8-1400

CARS LEAVE daily and Sunday from 2700 Bronx Park East at 10:30 A.M., Friday and Saturday at 10 A.M., 2:30 and 7 P.M. Take Lexington Ave. subway to Allerton Ave. station. For further information call EStabrook 8-1400.



Please mention New Masses when patronizing advertisers



insurrections led by Denmark Vesey, Nat Turner, and hundreds of unnamed Negro heroes. Miss Lawson might have added that the Negro's service in the Confederate Army, even, was designed by him, although illadvisedly, as a battering ram to crash through to freedom.

The victorious close of the war meant the crushing of the armed counter-revolution, but it left a number of tasks yet to be fulfilled. These tasks, including confiscation of landed estates and their distribution among the former slaves and poor whites, would have guaranteed complete destruction of the economic and political power of the ex-slaveowners. But the bourgeoisie turned from its revolutionary path, never completing some of its tasks. These remain today as tasks of the democratic and people's front, the progressive forces in North and South.

Shortcomings of Miss Lawson's Study Outline can readily be overcome in the course of lectures in the future. One of these is the author's neglect to point out unequivocally in the early pages why African civilizations, denied intercourse with civilizations on other continents through a combination of circumstances, were retarded. She should make it clear also how, lacking certain physical preconditions and historic prerequisites for cultural progress, certain African peoples were easy prey for the slave raiders. Clarification of this kind is necessary today more than ever before.

At a time when rubbish about this "white man's country" and this "white man's civilization" is being taken seriously by too many persons who need simply to have their ignorance displaced with knowledge, it is most important for us continually to show the interdependence of the various nationalities in the roles they have played as builders of civilization in the United States. Elizabeth Lawson has done a splendid job in showing this fact with respect to the Negro. She ought to expand her outline into a full-bodied volume. EUGENE GORDON.





Please mention NEW MASSES when patronising advertisers





Lenin Meets the Counter-Revolution

The cast of characters in "Lenin in 1918" includes Lenin, Stalin, Gorky, Voroshilov, Dzerzhinsky, Sverdlov, Krupskaya . . . and some traitors.

The most dramatic years in Lincoln's career, I think, were the two between the War Governors Conference in 1863 and the end at Ford's Theater. This tumultuous period in the Second American Revolution, in which corruption, despair, weakness and treachery, and the absence of disciplined party support were posed against the lone ordeal of Lincoln, is stuff of great drama and political pertinence. We may never know how far organized treason went in White House circles; and who was the brokenlegged man who died in the barn. History calls him John Wilkes Booth but he was also Counter-Revolution.

A similar period in the Russian Revolution is the subject of Mosfilm's Lenin in 1918, now playing at the Cameo (N. Y.). Lenin was more fortunate than Lincoln in having Marx, the strong Bolshevik Party, Stalin, Sverdlov, and Dzerzhinsky to help him The picture deals with treason-the many-motivated betrayals that come forth during social upheavals. Trotsky and Bukharin, the permaent oppositionists of the "Left Communists," cooperate with the Right Social Revolutionaries in fighting Lenin and the masses. The Right Revolutionaries in turn are plotting with foreign interventionists. In a box at the ballet one of the interested foreign ambassadors asks Konstantinov, leader of the foreign plotters, if the Left Communists "know they're working for us." Konstantinov answers, "Evidently they think we're working for them." Here is the heart of the opportunist fallacy that leads to outright treason, beautifully illustrated in the Casado putsch in Madrid. The same kind of plot was smashed in Soviet Russia, although it took twenty years to tear out the roots.

At the beginning Lenin is visited by Maxim Gorky, who comes to plead for food and equipment for the university intelligentsia, and to say he thinks the revolution has been cruel to them. Lenin, who is trying to figure out how he can feed the whole of blockaded Moscow, tells Gorky that the Bolsheviks honor learning but not all the intellectuals are friends of the people; many of them are conspiring against the revolution. Men like Pavlov, who stuck with Russia when other scholars fled the country, are priceless, but one must not sentimentally overlook the enemy intellectuals.

As the story proceeds Maxim Gorky sees why. The traitors plan the simultaneous assassination of the Bolshevik leadership from Lenin to his most trusted lieutenants; they attempt unsuccessfully to bribe Matveyev, commandant of the Kremlin garrison, to admit hostile troops. The assassination plot is suc-



LENIN AND STALIN. Shchukin and Gelovani play the parts of the Bolshevik leaders in Mosfilm's "Lenin in 1918."

cessful against Uritsky, and Lenin himself is shot by a Right Social Revolutionary, Fanny Kaplan, in the yard of the Michelson steel plant. In this sequence, director Mikhail Romm achieves a grand dramatic effect by a scrupulous reenactment of the actual incident. Romm creates crowd shots worthy of Eisenstein as the assassin is safeguarded through a raging mass of workers. The people gather in great crowds for bulletins from the bedside. Lenin is in a grave condition. In his delirium the fate of the revolution hangs uncertainly. Gorky comes to the bedside, and Krupskaya, and even the traitor Bukharin makes an appearance. The turning point for recovery comes when Stalin wires from Tsaritsvn that he and Voroshilov have driven the enemy back across the Don.

Soon there is no keeping him in bed. He escapes his nurses to go to his desk. Sverdlov and the implacable Dzerzhinsky are routing out the spies, and the interventionist wave is slowly ebbing under the attacks of the newly born Red Army. The director writes a finish that is a beginning, in the last shot, symbolizing the forward and upward surge of Soviet power. Across a distant, low horizon a line of figures rises up the width of the screen, long ranks spring up before them, one after another, nearing the camera and running toward it until the earth is tossing like a wheatfield with Red Army men running forward on that vast plain. The wave of men fills the screen!

The technique of *Lenin in 1918* has been learned from the documentary, and the type

of contemporary Soviet film biography exemplified by *Chapayev*, in which the story of the mass is not lost but leavened by the intimate story of one of their leaders. The frame of the picture and its length of over two hours provides a three-dimensional view of the period. As close to the folk as Lincoln, Lenin can hold an important interview with a recalcitrant kulak leader while watching an old peasant woman's milk boiling. The problem of taking care of an orphaned child he finds wandering in the Kremlin is handled as seriously as the task of getting eighty thousand poods of bread for the famished people of Moscow.

The direct materialistic handling of the film becomes a triumph in the acting of the historic persons. Boris V. Shchukin is again Lenin, a job superior to his work in Lenin in October. There is a story that Krupskaya, Lenin's widow, complained that Shchukin's portraval in the first film was too jerky. Jerky it was, because the actor's gestures had been studied from newsreel clips of Lenin without taking into account the jittering of early movies. Now he is perfect, so sensitive to his craft that you cannot glimpse anything of Shchukin in it. I'm beginning to get monotonous on the subject of Nikolai Cherkassov, the greatest movie actor on earth. If you haven't gotten the idea by this time, look at his presentation of the tall, stooped Gorky in this film. The Soviet kino has paid a beautiful tribute to his writing in The Childhood of Maxim Gorky; now Cherkassov honors the man in a magical effigy. Stalin, who has

TTO CAMACOLOS



LENIN AND STALIN. Shchukin and Gelovani play the parts of the Bolshevik leaders in Mosfilm's "Lenin in 1918."

been woodenly played in previous pictures, is brought to life here by M. G. Gelovani. It is a good impression of the keen, logical Georgian who came through with two trainloads of bread for Moscow, and defied the paper generals by slamming into the enemy at Tsaritsyn and scattering them in a panic. His lively aide, young Klim Voroshilov, now the graying war-commissar of the USSR, is played by N. Bogolyubov, last seen as the Communist, Werner, in The Oppenheim Family. The other actual people, Sverdlov, Dzerzhinsky, Krupskaya, Fanny Kaplan, and Konstantinov, are validly created. A bit player who made my Russian friend say, "My God, it's Bukharin!" receives no program credit, a modesty understandable in the light of Bukharin's character.

The Moscow Ballet appears in a fine sequence and the battle scenes are rousingly directed. I have no patience with the pettish people who ask that a theme like this be confined to the length of a Charlie Chan doublebiller. It is a long picture, dull perhaps for dullards, but completely fascinating for anyone who takes the movies or history seriously. It must not be missed.

JAMES DUGAN.

Station WNYC

New York City's own radio station a model for broadcasting systems.

I N STATION WNYC, New York City has the only municipally owned, non-commercial broadcasting system in the United States. The municipally controlled units of other cities, such as WCAM of Camden, N. J., cater to commercial sponsors and, consequently, are more or less restricted in their policies. There are at present about thirty non-commercial stations throughout the country—most of them attached to universities but none can touch the high standards set by WNYC. And this quality can be attributed to the complete absence of political domination, and the unhampered activities of its competent personnel.

The station's present efficiency was developed under the LaGuardia administration; things were different in the early days. WNYC was born fifteen years ago, in the heyday of Tammanyism. A Tammany stooge, one Christy Bohnsack, was slapped in with the title of program director. We won't dwell too long on the painful details of Christy's regime other than to say that New York City, and more embarrassing still, New Jersey and parts of Connecticut, heard radio at its worst. Programs (the word is used charitably) were rarely prepared more than a day ahead, and consisted largely of a fourth- or ninth-assistant district attorney talking about himself. The station folded up for lunch; it was completely run down, and never even pretended to fulfill its purpose of devotion to public service. It merely created a number of sine-



"I am a **DOCTOR** ... The new

chemo-therapy does not puzzle me."

T ODAY vast and rapid changes are taking place in medical knowledge and practice.

We doctors have been able to use new medical knowledge. We are constantly training ourselves. The problems arising from the new chemotherapies, — sulfapyridine, protamine zinc insulin, the hormones, the vitamins, —we have welcomed and studied.

But the problems arising from the social and economic implications of the practice of medicine in modern society have confused us and thrown us into groups contending at cross purposes.

In this confusion, *New Masses* gives us doctors the new social knowledge and shows us the way out.

New Masses crystallizes for us doctors what we already know from our own experience—that people do not get adequate medical care because of its high cost.

We doctors know that the study and treatment of a patient's case under modern scientific methods is costly. That numerous specialists may be involved, as well as the application of many laboratory investigations.

And NM makes clear to us doctors, and to laymen, too, that the high cost of medical care cannot be attributed to physicians' "exorbitant" fees, directing attention to the fact that while a negligible number of doctors at the top of the profession are rich, half of all doctors in the United States earn less than \$3,100 a year, nearly a third less than \$2,000, and about a sixth less than \$1,200.

Such a situation, in which doctors who need patients are standing back to back with patients who need doctors, NM sees as shameful waste, and points out that mutual benefits would result to doctors and patients if they would turn around face to face and shake hands.

The demands of my work limit the time I can devote to reading. Out of the hundreds of medical and scientific journals published in the United States, I can select only a few which give me the *best scientific knowledge*. From the hundreds of other magazines, I choose *New Masses* first because it gives me the best social knowledge.

I'm filling out the coupon below at once, and I further intend to prescribe it for my numerous professional acquaintances and friends, whose names I am forwarding to you.

الله الجد أنحد محد الحد تجير بعد عند حد حد حد بد بدر بدي بدي الدر ال

NEW MASSES, 461 FOURTH AVENUE, N. Y. C. Please send me *New Masses* for 52 wgeks. I, as a member of the medical profession, feel that your magazine is a must on my weekly reading list. I enclose \$4.50 for a one year's subscription. I enclose \$2.50 for a six months' subscription.

Name .	•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	• • •	• • •	
Address		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
City and S	tato	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	. 7	2439D	



CARS LEAVE daily and Sunday from 5720360 EARS LEAVE daily and Sunday from 2700 Bronx Park East at 10:30 A.M., Friday and Saturday at 10 A.M., 2:30 and 7 P.M. Take Lexington Ave. subway to Allerton Ave. station, For further information call GR am 5-2898.

Please mention New Masses when patronizing advertisers

cures, beyond even the capabilities of a Tammanyite to handle.

With the advent of the LaGuardia administration, things began to hum. Christy was eased by degrees into the background and soon heaved out entirely. In 1934, Dr. Seymour Siegal came in as program director, and, for four years, laid a vast groundwork for improvement. M. S. Novik took charge in February of last year and, together with Dr. Siegal, has lifted the station-now described by Variety as a "revitalized WNYC" -to its present position of high excellence. These executives have clearly proved that the elimination of reactionary politics can contribute immeasurably toward instituting a good non-commercial station.

One of the most important features introduced by the present management is the broadcasting of the complete proceedings of the New York City Council. This is the first time in the history of American radio that such an experiment has been undertaken. Recently, however, a number of our tory political "do nothings" have been starting a movement to do away with the station's appropriation. Perhaps those parasites can't be blamed. After all, it is taking a chance to permit the broadcasting of one's incompetence to a listening public.

The general program activities of WNYC splendidly combine variety with high quality. Political speeches, as a form of ballyhoo, are now taboo; but discussions on social and political questions of local or national interest are regular offerings. Education is a conspicuous item in the arrangements of the station. A practice especially interesting to children is the broadcasts to schoolrooms during class hours. Elementary, junior high, and high school are all covered in these programs, and the subjects treated include comments on the current news, high school English, foreign languages, mathematics, speech, appreciation of music, history, and natural history. These broadcasts, conducted in cooperation with the Board of Education, serve a double purpose in that they also reach adults who may be listening in at home. An additional list of subjects, exclusively for grownups, is handled in conjunction with New York University, Brooklyn College, City College of New York, and various museums throughout the municipality.

Housewives and merchants find the daily shopping guide, prepared with the cooperation of the city's Department of Markets, decidedly helpful.

The Negro also comes in for his share of air time. Broadcasts by the Negro Arts Singers and the Negro Melody Singers have been featured in the past, and the National Urban League, an organization to aid the colored people, is given generous air privileges in connection with its activities.

Children's hours have received careful and scientific consideration. The blood-curdling serial thriller that might prepare many a youngster for an evening of nightmares is forbidden by the station. Instead, an effort | Please mention NEW MASSES when patronizing advertisers

SURVEY COURSE IN PHOTOGRAPHY

Thursday evenings, 8 p.m., July 6 to September 7, at the A. C. A. Gallery, 52 West 8th Street, N. Y. C. Tuition for the course is \$5. Admission to individual lectures, 75 cents,

THE MINIATURE CAMERA Robert Disraeli July 6, 13 PORTRAITURE Alfredo Valente July 20, 27 PHOTO JOURNALISM Eliot Elisofon August 3, 10 PHOTOMONTAGE Barbara Morgan . . . August 17, 24 COLOR PHOTOGRAPHY Henry M. Lester . August 31, September 7

Also a BEGINNERS' COURSE will be given every

Wednesday evening at 8 p.m., July 5 to September 6. Tuition is \$10. M. H. Nichols is the instructor.

Apply for registration by July 3 with the Secretary of the Photo League. Hours between 1:00 and 5:30 p.m. with the exception of Saturdays and Sundays. Tuition must be paid at time of registration.

PHOTO LEAGUE 31 EAST 21st STREET, N. Y. C.

GR amercy 5-8704



NEW MASSES Classified Ads

Min. charge \$1.50 50c a line Deadline Fri. 5 p.m. 7 words in a line Classified ads can not be accepted over the telephone, and must be paid for in advance.

APARTMENTS TO SUBLET-FURNISHED

1%-ROOM apartment to sublet. Furnished. For two months, at 161 West 16th St., Apt. 15F, New York City.

SEAGATE, 3815 Cypress Ave. Nice modern apartment for sublet for summer or will rent 2 rooms. Furnished. Call ES 2-6808.

FURNISHED ROOM FOR RENT

ATTRACTIVE bed-sitting room in 6-room floor-through apt. Ideal for professional who wants quiet, privacy, and most convenient location in town. 4th Ave. & 17th St. \$5 wk. Call CA 5-3076, Ext. 2, 11 a.m. to 5 p.m.

INSURANCE

Whatever your needs — PAUL CROSBIE, established since 1908 — FREQUENT SAVINGS, 185 William St. N. Y. Tel. BEekman 3-5262.

MAILING SERVICE

COMPLETE MAILING SERVICE. We are prepared to handle your Printing, Multigraphing, Mimeographing and Mailing needs. Quick service, low prices, any quan-tities. MAILERS ADVERTISING SERVICE, 1133 Broadway, N. Y. C. CHelsea 2-4255.

PIANO TUNING

PIANO TUNING, regulating and repairing. Tone restoring and voicing. Excellent work. Ralph J. Appleton, 505 Fifth Ave. Tel. MUrray Hill 2-2291.

SITUATIONS WANTED

SITUATIONS WANTED, Men with character and background, formerly with Abraham Lincoln Brigade in Spain. Professional and technical abilities, skilled and unskilled. Can fill any position. Call D. Groden, Friends Abraham Lincoln Brigade, 125 W. 45th St. LO 3-6214.

SUMMER RENTALS

IDEAL, Camp facilities, beautiful location, Spring water Kosher, \$18-\$20 weekly, July, August. Hotel Capitol, Livingston Manor.

NEW BUNGALOWS, all improvements, showers, hand-ball court. Lake on premises. Beautiful grounds. Own farm products. Rates \$16. William Nelson, RFD 1. Cochecton, New York.

STUDIO BUNGALOW, delightfully cool, near lake, running water, electricity, shower, Suitable 3 or 4. Rea-sonable. Long season. Commuting distance. Ideal for artists or writers. CAledonia 5-9124.

VACATION RESORTS

RIP VAN WINKLE LAND. Informal ease at pictur-esque Elmwood. 250 acres. Elevation 2,000 feet. Spring water. Farm products. Swimming, sports. All conveniences. Rates \$10.\$16 weekly. Day Line Boat to Catskill. Moun-tain Bus Line to Elmwood Farm, Hunter, N. Y. Hunter 3812.

YOUNG MEN, here's a break. Reduced rates at adult camp on private lake. \$18 for early reservations. N. M. Box 1591.

LIVE AT Lerner's Lodge. Seagate, New York Harbor. 1-room apartments by the season. Reasonable rates. 4018 Manhattan Ave. ESplanade 2-9505.

CAMP FOLLOWERS of the TRAIL. Ideal vacation place. Excellent food. Tennis courts, swimming. All sports facilities. \$14.50 weekly. \$3 weekends. N. Y. Cen-tral to Peekskill. By boat to Indian Point. Write Bu-chanan, N. Y. Tel.: Peekskill 2879.

RIVERSIDE INN, Seymour, Conn. On Housatonic. Swimming, boating, tennis. Excellent food. Rates \$3 day; \$18 week. R.R. Station Derby. Tel.: Derby 3935.

CAMP RIVERSIDE. Amidst beautiful hills, on banks of Neversink River. Swimming, fishing, all sports. July: \$15 wkly. Aug.: \$16 wkly. Fox & Mufson, Parksville, N. Y.

EAGER MOUNTAIN HOUSE, Catskill, N. Y. Delight-ful vacation spot, Modern, Sports, Social Staff, Lake & Falls, Low Rates. Write, Call or Come.

VERMONT VACATION

UNSPOILED VERMONT! Peace, quiet, beauty with small group. \$15-\$18 a week. Write to Reland Gray, Ethan Allan Farm, RFD 2, Chester, Vt.

"GOINGS ON"

OPEN MEETING. Wagner Health Bill discussed by prominent Public Health Authority. Tuesday, Jul. 11, 9:30 p.m. 16 W. Mt. Eden Ave. Ausp. Bronx Dentists Unit of the Communist Party. Admission Free.

Please mention New Masses when patronizing advertisers

has been made to combine entertainment with education in such offerings as Roy Harris' "Let's Make Music," the Police Athletic League, the Junior Inspectors Club, "Music for Young People," and Settlement House and Board of Education programs.

Perhaps this station's finest contribution lies in what it has done for American composers and musicians. It is no exaggeration to say that WNYC has accomplished more in awakening interest in American music than any other single radio station in the country. The quantity of this type of program presented by New York City's system has far exceeded that heard elsewhere. The Lewisohn Stadium and Federal Symphony concerts and the daily recorded Masterwork Hour bring the best in the world of music into hundreds of thousands of homes. Nothing more need be said in this regard than that the National Association of Composers and Conductors has presented WNYC with a merit medal for outstanding service to American music.

JOHN VERNON.

Dance Presentation

Federal Theater's "Fantasy 1939" an excellent performance.

With the Woodrum ax poised to swing and Washington reactionaries straining to pull down the last asbestos curtain, the Federal Theater, however limited financially, however harassed by fascist-tempered politicians, continued to produce. At the Adelphi Theater (N. Y.) it was the third dance presentation of the season, Fantasy 1939choreography by Berta Ochsner of Chicago, music by David Campbell.

The Fantasy was concerned with human energy, the wasting of it in ignorance, escape, and confusion, the hope for it in collective thinking and action. The first section of the work, "Deep in This Maze," began with a surrealist descent down a ladder-like series of steps (an effective dramatic prop) and was divided into five rather muddy episodes which, unfortunately, depended on some less profound evidence of the wasting of human energies in this completely realistic era of the sitdown of finance capital. Consequently, the second section-"Return to Place and Festive Conclusion"—a rhapsodic, lyric dance of faith in man, lacked the drive it might well have offered; it had little contact with the struggles of a real people in a real world.

Less fantasy and more reality would have made for a better production of an excellent theme.

The dancers, as always in Federal Theater, gave the composition a fine performance. Technically well equipped, at home whoever the choreographer, whatever the special idiom, the work of these young people is one more solid and incontrovertible argument for federally sponsored arts.

OWEN BURKE.



Why not drop in and let Janet, Guy or Sam pile you up with a lot of books you'll want to read during your vacation? You'll find hundreds of titles like The Wild Goose Chase by Rex Warner or The Outward Room by Millen Brand reduced as low as 49c. We guarantee to make your vacation complete. Drop in and see our experts. **PROGRESSIVE BOOKSHOP, Inc.**

133 West 44th St., N. Y. C. Hrs.: 10 A.M. - 12 P.M. BRy 9-5824





Students wanted to sell New Masses subscriptions, various points throughout city. Leads given. Earn substantial vacation money. Liberal commission. Fastest selling weekly magazine. Apply all day, Circulation Department, New Masses, 461 Fourth Ave., or call CAledonia 5-3076.

Please mention New MASSES when patronizing advertisers



like being paid to sip Champagne

Ever sip fine champagne? Watching the New Masses grow is an equally pleasant experience. Here's an opportunity to *help* it grow and in addition qualify for \$200.00 in prize money offered for the best slogan describing N.M.

The Winner of the Week!

This week's prize of \$10 is unanimously awarded to Anthony Toney of 34 East 21st St., New York, New York. His prizewinning slogan which was selected by the contest judges is:

"AMERICAN DEMOCRACY'S WEEKLY"

Mr. Toney, your check for \$10 has been mailed to you today! Now, let's have an additional flood of slogans for this week's \$10 prize. And don't forget that your slogans are all competing for the \$100 GRAND PRIZE which will be awarded at the end of the contest.

WIN WITH A SLOGAN

New MASSES wants a smashing slogan to describe the magazine that champions progress and democracy. New MASSES will pay \$200.00 in eleven (11) cash prizes to get the slogans. New MASSES will pay ten dollars a week for ten weeks for the best weekly slogan with a grand prize of \$100.00 for the best of all.

A CASH PRIZE EVERY WEEK \$100.00 GRAND PRIZE

\$10.00 Weekly Prize Every Week for TEN Weeks

SAMPLE SLOGANS

"America's Indispensable Weekly"—"America's Ace Popular Political Weekly"—"Today's Events in Present Tense"—"The Stopwatch of Contemporary History"—"America's Champion News Interpreter"—"America's Crack Viewsmagazine"

The important thing to remember as you talk to your friends is that the slogan must be a thrilling, hard-hitting sales talk for New MASSES in not more than five words.

Reach for a pencil. Start making lists of everybody you know, getting a buck or more from them for a sub, and then get them to enter the contest too. It's really a sort of a giant Build NEW MASSES chain letter idea, isn't it?

So get your pencil and start competing-TODAY!

HERE ARE THE RULES

- 1. Everyone but NM staff members and their relatives is eligible.
- 2. The contest opens June 22 and closes September 4 (Labor Day).
- 3. Slogans must not exceed five words but may be less.
- 4. Here's how to qualify for the contest: Go to your friends, relatives, and professional acquaintances and convince them to become regular NEW MASSES readers. While you are showing them the magazine and talking about its fine points you will find yourself expressing its qualities in terms your listeners are interested in. This is what will make up the grand prize slogan —a sharp, terse, and dramatic description of the usefulness of the magazine to progressive people. For every \$1 twelve-week trial sub-

For every \$1 twelve-week trial subscription you secure you may submit one slogan.

For every \$2.50 six-month subscription you may submit two slogans. For every \$4.50 yearly subscription

you may submit three slogans. There is no limit to the number of slogans you may submit. Simply accompany them with the required number of cash subscriptions. The greater the number of slogans you submit, the greater your chance of winning the weekly prize of \$10 and the grand prize of \$100.00. If you are not a subscriber now,

- If you are not a subscriber now, you may enter the contest by sending in your own yearly subscription (\$4.50). If you are a subscriber, you may enter the contest merely by extending the life of your own current subscription for one year (\$4.50).
- 5. The first contest winner will be announced in the issue of NEW MASSES that appears July 6. In that issue and in each of the next nine issues we will reprint the winning slogan and award the weekly prize of \$10.00. One month after the closing date of the contest, we will announce the winner of the grand prize of \$100.00.
- 6. All slogans submitted, whether winners or not, become the property of NEW MASSES, and cannot be returned. In the event of a tie for weekly or grand prize the full amount of the prize will be awarded to each tying contestant.
- 7. Judges of the contest will be three editors of NEW MASSES—Joseph North, A. B. Magil, Samuel Sillen. Their decisions are final.

Ruild New Masses Slogan Contact

build New Masses Slogali Concest	JULY 11, 1939
ROOM 1204, 461 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY	
Gentlemen: Here is my slogan entry. Please send New M ssues for \$1 as per your trial offer []; for six months at \$ rear at \$4.50 [] to:	

Name of New Subscriber	•
Address	•
My Slogan for New Masses Is	•
•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•
My Name 1s	•
Address	•
THIS COUPON IS FOR YOUR CONVENIENCE-USE YOUR OWN FORM IF YOU PREFER	