

RUSSIA AND AMERICA

An Interpretation

by

W. E. B. Du Bois

New York
1950

FOR SHIRLEY GRAHAM

THE APOLOGY

Three times during the last quarter century I have had glimpses of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. For more than four-fifths of the last hundred years I have lived in the United States of America. In 1926, for a month or more, I saw Moscow and the other chief cities of the Soviets from Leningrad to Kiev, and from Nijni Novgorod to Odessa. Ten years later in circling the earth I saw the Soviet Union from Moscow to Manchuria, over Omsk, Novosibirsk and Lake Baikal and thence to China and Japan. A third time in 1949, amid the twenty-eight marble pillars of the former Hall of Nobles in Moscow, I looked into the faces of a thousand Russians from every part of the vast nation, and joined them in a plea for peace. I read the books of other visitors. Then I said, I must write a book. So this at last is the book I have written. And may men have mercy on my word.

W. E. B. Du Bois

New York
23 West 26th Street
On a day in June, 1950

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
The Apology	iii
I. A Quest for Clarity	1
II. The Soviet Union in 1926	13
III. Blind Staggers: 1917-1936	35
IV. I Gird the Globe	52
V. The Reign of Roosevelt	112
VI. The Witch Hunt	144
VII. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 1950	177
VIII. World Peace	215

CHAPTER I

A QUEST FOR CLARITY

Erastus Milo Cravath, first president of Fisk University, looked like God. Certainly like the God which the Congregational Sunday school painted on my child mind. He was tall, a little stooped, with long white beard and silver hair, his face was misty, with lineaments like those limned by fifteenth century Italian painters; and his blue eyes hid beneath bushed brows, whence they gleamed, now stern, now somber. Sometimes we students thought they twinkled; as when he earnestly asked the Lord, as he often did, to "forgive us for our short-comings;" we were convinced he referred to little Cummings, a fellow-student who was an imp.

I was just turned twenty when we five seniors entered the President's class in Philosophy: Tyndal, dignified but dumb; Lenora, sleepy but keen, with her long black Indian hair; Edmondson, then, elegant and scholarly; Mamie, cold, spotless and bitter; and I, the youngest and most unsophisticated. To me college was very serious business. I was especially thrilled with this course. At last I was getting at the inner meaning of Things and about to face ultimate Truth. I was weary of "elements" and "introductions" and second-hand comments and descriptions.

The new text said that we were to study the "Stream of Consciousness," without reference to Space and with no limits of Time. Needless to say that eventually I was in part disappointed. On occasion when we were apparently splitting consciousness into unrelated parts, I ventured to remind our grave teacher that the knowing Mind could not thus be limited in space; he answered drily, "But it must be somewhere!"

One thing, however, that course of study did was to open vistas and resolves. I was going to know Truth. I was going to stop at no little college for colored folk in Tennessee; I was going to seek the best and largest institutions in the world until I knew what Life was and Why.

Good old Professor Chase, who taught everything called "science" and who always advised his pupils on ways of eventually earning a living, could arouse little response in me. I was not interested in earning a living. I was going to study; and when the Hartford Theological Seminary offered me a scholarship, I was almost rude. I did not regard theology as study nor was I going to be a minister. What I regarded thereafter as being Captain of my soul was of course mostly good luck; but sure enough next year, after graduation, I appeared at Harvard. It was not the Harvard of the Boston Brahmins nor the Hasty Pudding Club, of neither of which had I ever heard; nor

had I the slightest interest in Yale games. I entered the Harvard of William James, Josiah Royce, George Santayana, Nathaniel Shaler and Albert Bushnell Hart and they gave me their friendship.

Josiah Royce, with his enormous red head and incomparable mind, led me to a conception of absolute reality through philosophic idealism. This derived of course from the thinking of the Master, Emanuel Kant, and with the young George Santayana, incredibly handsome, I read the Critique der reinen Vernunft and staggered somewhat uncertainly down to the vast Hegelian system of universal comprehension. But no mention was made of Karl Marx and his application of this interpretation of the development of thought and action to the daily work and wage of men. I am sure Santayana would have regarded this as unworthy of the high aims of Philosophy.

William James in the Fall of 1888 took over Ethics, while Palmer was on leave. By his pragmatic shift from absolute right and wrong to conduct that would bring the best results, he guided my thinking from the absolute to the relative and from systems to human beings. He emphasized this by setting me to study mediaeval Scholasticism and its intricate but futile and sterile thinking; he advised me to avoid metaphysics if I could. I did so, and it was Francis Peabody's course on social problems which let new light in on my life interests. Peabody was a clergyman rather than a scientist and he was regarded rather lightly by the greater minds of the University. His course was orientated toward philanthropy and organized charity, rather than poverty-stricken and ignorant and ailing men. But it awakened me. I began to sense something wrong in the underlying organization of human work and income and something not entirely race prejudice. I began to hear of Robert Owen, Saint-Simon, Fourier and Proudhon and their criticism of modern industry. But still there came no word of Karl Marx.

It is natural that one born in the midst of a particular social problem should tend to interpret all other problems in its light. In my earlier years then the problems of property, work and poverty were to me but manifestations of the basic problem of color. My family in its various branches were poor or at best middle-class: small landholders, slipping down to house servants, barbers, waiters and laborers. So far as they were not rich and influential, the cause to my youth was clear: color-prejudice, which denied good position and fair wage to Negroes. But I was honest enough to add to this, laziness and failure to save. For in our New England village of five thousand with surrounding farmers, there was no great disparity of wealth and what existed could certainly be explained in part by thrift and saving, and much of the rest by inheritance, which was the same

thing a generation removed.

In after years I sensed there had been much before my eyes which I did not heed. There was for instance, a woolen mill in the upper town which not only fouled the lovely Housatonic river but nurtured about it a wretched slum of poor Irish and German workers. The owners, two brothers, were rich and lived downtown in fine houses. I knew for I was chum of their two sons and played and ate in their homes. I saw no close connection between the mill and its slums, and their wealth, which could not be explained by shiftlessness and saving. And the fact that the mill children disliked me, did not occur to me as possibly their opinion of a toady to the rich. Nor was I really consciously a worshipper of wealth; but since my lack of means came from lack of thrift among my folk and lack of recognition of desert by whites, my path seemed clear: hard work and enlightenment.

When I went South college, I saw poverty which was still due to shiftlessness but that shiftlessness more certainly and openly the result of past slavery of the workers and present injustice. Race problems, therefore, to my mind became the main cause of poverty, probably because I saw little of the poor whites and envisaged them as carriers of color prejudice. Nothing in my college courses at Harvard led me yet to question the essential justice of the industrial system of the nation.

I did, however, after the first year, veer from my chosen field of pure philosophy. After looking into Scholasticism of the past and the pure Idealism of the nineteenth century Germany, I sensed the dead-end ahead and talked to William James. He said frankly, "DuBois, if you've got to study Philosophy, you will. But if you can turn aside, I advise you to do so." I turned aside. I had already begun to sense the path from Metaphysics to Science — Minsterburg had just arrived — and I had not only touched Geology and Chemistry, but been attracted by the new Social Sciences, and history under Albert Bushnell Hart, particularly the history of slavery.

I gained a conception of the universe not as static and eternal Truth as my youth conceived, but as ever changing and developing facts; and of law not as statute legislation but of workable hypothesis regarding the Unknown, ready for restatement whenever new facts and a better hypothesis demanded. Hart was the antithesis of James: slave of infinite system; stickler for detailed "facts;" insatiable chronicler of deeds, he was antidote to my previous unlimited speculation; he kept me busy in tireless research; but he furnished me no broad guiding principles of interpretation for human life. I began restlessly studying and classifying.

I turned to Economics and under our keenest Economist, Frank Taussig, took his favorite course on "The wages Fund." Here my

mind began to rebel.

Taussig was logical and learned. But he was dogmatic and wrong. He set up a series of assumptions on human nature and activities in the world and then argued from these assumptions to unquestionable laws of wages and profits. The reasoning was logical. The assumptions were not allowed to be questioned, for his learning refuted every attempt. At the end of his course the Ricardian Iron Law of Wages stood fast and eternal.

It was in my senior year that I took two other courses in my search for more satisfactory orientation for life work. One was conducted by Edward Cummings, a slim newcomer from European study, who instructed us in a new subject called "Sociology," which was not recognized by Harvard as a science then nor for twenty years after. When finally it was born in the Yard, it was under the midwifery of a white Russian opponent of the Russian Revolution.

In 1890, Cummings brought us the beginnings of metaphysical sociology, based on Comte and innocent of Marx. He talked of the Social Body, its activity, thought, and Soul. If I had not already been grounded in James, Royce and Sansayana, this might have satisfied me. As it was, I was repelled and asked some disturbing questions in class, presuming on my high status as senior: where was the Ego back of this Soul? And could an unified and integrated organism exist without an Ego? There was, of course, no satisfactory answer to such queries and after a year or so, Cummings went into the ministry as assistant to Edward Everett Hale. I remembered him because through his good offices I later borrowed Hale's gorgeous academic gown for my commencement part on "Jefferson Davis as a Representative of Civilization."

My graduate work with Albert Bushnell Hart was more successful in results. Hart was not a profound scholar, but he was a systematic collector of historic documents as facts, and he inspired his students to real work in historical research. His system of filing and array of file cases was imposing and tremendously reassuring. I started with a bibliography of the Nat Turner Insurrection and ended with a Ph.D. thesis on "The Suppression of the African Slave Trade to America," which became the first number of the then new Harvard Historical Series.

Hart expected me to become a collector and arranger of historical information as he was, and he would have opened many doors for publication, even to fighting the Color Line which might have hindered my work. But I had other ideas. I was dissatisfied with my study of the Slave Trade because it ended too abruptly and yielded too narrow a field for valid judgment of human action. If I could study what man had done, why not investigate thoroughly and scientifically what he was doing now

and what he might do in the future? In other words, I was seeking a science of human action which could be used not only for studying the Negro Problem, but for all the problems of the poor and ignorant. I do not know just when or how clearly all this matured in my mind; but when I went to Germany in 1892, I was ready to study basic industrial and social reform.

It was in Germany that my first awakening to social reform began. My teachers, Adolf Wagner and Gustav Schmoller, were not radicals nor Marxists; but they were broad and inspiring men, and the atmosphere of Rudolf Virchow, "rector magnificus," when I entered the University of Berlin, led me far. Nor did the frenzied diatribes of Von Treitschke fail to open my eyes to the connection between European imperialism and race hate. I can see him now - huge, nervous, black coated, with swift, tumbling words; glaring, as it seemed, directly at me as he said, "Die Mulattern sind niedrig: sie fühlen niedrig!"

I became consequently particularly interested in the Social Democratic party; they were the greatest party in Germany but had been gerry-mandered out of their strength by Bismarck. But they were strong and growing and they emphasized the fundamental Marxian doctrine of the basic importance of labor in human culture. I attended their meetings and picnics and became strongly tinged with theoretical socialism. Moreover, I now actually saw poverty: in Germany, in Italy, in Eastern Europe; poverty which was not a matter of race, but of industrial organization. And when Race entered as a cause of social dislocation, as it did in Germany and Poland, it was a matter of white folk and not of the color line.

Returning to America in the Fall of 1892, I was plunged into the color problem again; but not with the same provincialism as before. For me social reform still meant primarily the opening of doors to black men, so that they might run the race of life in equal competition with the white. I was teaching at Wilberforce - Greek, Latin, German, everything but the new Sociology which I yearned to help build as a science, - when Booker T. Washington laid down his industrial program at Atlanta in 1895. I was all for it, save one thing: it must be implemented by the vote and not fatally ignore the suffrage; and the voter must be guided by trained minds.

After two years, came my chance to place my theories of race relations on a scientific basis, where practical statesmen could link them with the social uplift of all men. I got a year's chance to study the Negro in a single Philadelphia ward. This work, which was lengthened to nearly two years, made, for me, the problems fronting the Negroes, clear and vivid and launched me on a scientific solution of broad social measurement, presenting facts to the world for use in any way men would. In

such an ivory tower of social reform I went to a life work at Atlanta University.

But after thirteen years of effort, I found my life revolutionized; I found, on the one hand, hard as I tried to present carefully garnered and objective truth to the American world, this world would not support the effort; and that with the facts before it, lynching and lying in America increased and the Tuskegee idea, distorted from its defensible logic, was being used to close Negro colleges and make Negro labor a low-wage caste. Reluctantly I turned from science to propaganda and went to New York to help organize and conduct the new National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

I attended a Races Congress in London in 1911, and addressed it. I began to give attention to the race tensions of the East. I remember advising a high-caste Indian who was consulting me, to make alliance between India and the new British Labor Party. He stiffened and said slowly, "I do not think we would like to be associated with dirty English workers." I think we all began to think of a new era of interracial comity, but even then tremors foretelling the First World War reached us. Back in the United States, I was compelled to surrender thoughts of detached scientific study of the race problem and go into the arena as a social fighter rather than as a scientific student. I deeply disliked this role and never proved demagogue enough to be successful as popular leader or public propagandist. But I did succeed in 1910 in establishing the Crisis magazine as an organ for my ideas, and it gained wide circulation. In 1915, I took a brief trip to Jamaica and for the first time saw the colonial problem face to face.

In New York, I was thrown with Socialists; among my colleagues in the N.A.A.C.P. were Charles Edward Russell, William English Walling and Mary White Ovington, all members of the Socialist Party; there were conservatives like Oswald Garrison Villard and liberals like John Haynes Holmes and Joel Spingarn, but I joined the Socialist party in 1911, and from then forward began to regard the problem of race, more and more as part of the problem of industrial reform.

But two developments obscured my broader vision: first the extraordinary anti-Negro outbreak following the election of the first Southern-born president since the Civil War; for whose election I had left the Socialist Party in 1912 to fight; and secondly, the outbreak of the First World War, with race riots, lynching and burning; migration and hostile legislation; the appearance of the Negro as strike-breaker, and the question of his entrance into the army as private and officer.

It was then that the Russian Revolution took place and I scarce knew what it meant to me and to the world. Not much had

been said of Russia in my school days, in secondary nor high school years. In college, I remember reading George Herman's articles in the Century magazine. These stories of cruelty and injustice connected with banishment to Siberia stirred me greatly: the long trek across a quarter of the world; the tearing apart of families; the insensibility to human suffering. I have never quite outlived the impression which these stories made upon me. Rather negligently I followed what little was offered in the press on Russian history and policy. Chiefly it was a matter of Czars and Grand Dukes in their relations with Western Europe; of the folks themselves there were only incidental references to picturesque mujiks. Passing references to anarchists and the assassination of a Czar and high officials, left in my mind the current impression of Russia as semi-civilized and tyrannous.

Czar Alexander III was reigning while I was studying in Germany and in 1893, sent his fleet to France to conclude the Entente Cordial. This was impressed on me as I saw in Berlin, on the Tempelhofer Field, a celebration of the renewal of the Triple Alliance, with pomp and pageantry and with Wilhelm II and the Italian Crown Prince present. Later in 1900, I attended the most perfect of international exhibitions in Paris and crossed the Pont Alexandre which celebrated the new Franco-Russian alliance. For my exhibit on American Negroes I received a gold medal; and at the same time I noted exhibits of the new Russian industry which French investment was then nourishing.

All this was of passing interest until Russia and Japan went to war in 1904-1905. I admired the temerity of one of the Darker peoples daring to wage war against a great white power. I remember outlining its progress on the floor of the chapel of Atlanta University and using my baby daughter's choo-choo train to mark the moving of the armies along the Trans-Siberian railroad. My concept of Russia began to gain body and clearness. Already my contact with socialism in Germany had made me critical of Czarism, and there was now added the race problem in the conflict of a white and colored people. After that I followed from afar the Russians struggle for emancipation and drew parallels between Russian peasants and American Freedmen, emancipated at nearly the same moment and both kept in slavery by denial of land.

I read of the pogroms against the Jews and likened them to our lynchings, which were ominously increasing.

Then came the unthinkable First World War, which tore at the moorings of all my historical knowledge and economic foresight; and at its edge, the Russian Revolution of 1917. I was bewildered at what was happening and tried for ten years to withhold final judgment. With students and audiences and on

paper, I maintained that I did not know what was really happening in Russia or how it would, result. I certainly believed Russia needed radical reform and was encouraged at the Menshevik effort under Kerensky. When the Bolsheviks came to power, I hesitated; was this Thermidor or something more permanent and fundamental? Was Marxian Communism possible or a wild, perverted dream? I again relapsed into silence; but I did believe that the Russian people had a right to experiment and that the United States ought to recognize the new government. We had certainly recognized worse in the past.

I had succeeded in circulating the Crisis magazine widely and could now give some attention to broader aspects of social reform; and one symbolic occurrence after the Russian Revolution fastened my attention. We had gone to live in an apartment in lonely Canarsie, outside New York City, when one day a stray dog came to us; he was young, scrawny, and dirty, but had evidence of breeding. So my little daughter kept him for her own and he grew sleek and beautiful. Then one day two Russians appeared, a man and his wife. They pointed to the dog and said he had run away from them.

"It is our dog," and "Larrabee!" they called; and he went, wagging his tail. But my wife came quietly to the door and said, "Steve!" and leapt back in joy and wriggled on her and kissed her. Then there was parleying and tales of his beautiful wolfhound mother and "will you take him?" asked my wife, her voice soft with fear. The Russian woman petted the dog tenderly and said, "No, we go back to Russia, now that Revolution has brought Freedom; and leave him with you, for he loves you and you are kind."

Meantime my attention was diverted. In the peace negotiations following World War I, I conceived the idea that the emancipation of Africa from colonialism might begin. I first tried to have German Africa set up as an international domain ruled by world science and philanthropy with representation of the educated Negro world. I think this idea had some effect in implementing the final Mandates Commission. I went to France in 1918, to advocate my ideas through a Pan-African Congress which was held in Paris with the consent of Clemenceau and was followed eventually in 1921, and 1923 by further meetings in London, Paris and Brussels. Here extraordinary opposition developed among the Colonial Powers and I was accused openly in Brussels of being financed by Russia, which again called my attention to the Revolution there.

I made my first visit to Africa in 1923, visiting Liberia and few English and French colonies on the West Coast. I became vividly aware of a Negro Problem far greater than I had envisaged in America, and my mind leaped further; more or less

clearly I found myself asking: Is the problem of color and race simply and mainly a matter of difference in appearance and cultural variation, or has it something in common with the industrial organization of the world? With Poverty, Ignorance and Disease? Has Revolution in Russia something fundamental for the Negro Problem in the United States and the Colonial Problem in Africa?

But despite questionings and faith, I continued puzzled about Russia and what was happening there. The papers were flooded with tales which I did not want to believe and yet found no answer. I realized that wartime propaganda had begun to dominate newsgathering and that it was difficult to get the truth on many matters. How far this would eventually go, I did not then dream. Claude McKay took me to task in 1921, for not appreciating the meaning of the Russian Revolution. I replied in July:

"Mr. McKay is wrong in thinking that we have ever intentionally sneered at the Russian Revolution. On the contrary, time may prove, as he believes, that the Russian Revolution is the greatest event of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and its leaders the most unselfish prophets. At the same time, The Crisis does not know this to be true. Russia is incredibly vast, and the happenings there in the last five years have been intricate to a degree that must make any student pause. We sit, therefore, with waiting hands and listening ears, seeing some splendid results from Russia, like the cartoons for public education recently exhibited in America, and hearing of other things which frighten us.

"The editor of The Crisis considers himself a Socialist but he does not believe that German State Socialism or the Dictatorship of the Proletariat are perfect panaceas. He believes with most thinking men that the present method of creating, controlling and distributing wealth is desperately wrong; that there must come and is coming a social control of wealth; but he does not know just what form that control is going to take, and he is not prepared to dogmatize with Marx or Lenin. Further than that, and more fundamental to the duty and outlook of The Crisis, is this question: How far can the colored people of the world, and particularly the Negroes of the United States, trust the whole working classes?

"Many honest thinking Negroes assume, and Mr. McKay seems to be one of these, that we have only to embrace the working class program to have the working class embrace ours; that we have only to join trade Unionism and Socialism or even Communism, as they are today expounded, to have Union Labor and Socialists and Communists believe and act on the equality of mankind and the abolition of the color line. The Crisis wishes that this were true, but it is forced to the conclusion that it is not.

"The American Federation of Labor, as representing the trade unions in America, has been grossly unfair and discriminatory toward Negroes and still is. American Socialism has discriminated against black folk and before the war was prepared to go further with this discrimination. European Socialism has openly discriminated against Asiatics. Nor is this surprising. Why should we assume on the part of unlettered and suppressed masses of white workers, a clearness of thought, a sense of human brotherhood, that is sadly lacking in the most educated classes?

"Our task, therefore, as it seems to The Crisis, is clear: We have to convince the working classes of the world that black men, brown men, and yellow men are human beings and suffer the same discrimination that white workers suffer. We have, in addition to this, to espouse the cause of the white workers, only being careful that we do not in this way allow them to jeopardize our cause. We must, for instance, have bread. If our white fellow-workers drive us out of decent jobs, we are compelled to accept indecent wages, even at the price of 'scabbing.' It is a hard choice, but whose is the blame? Finally, despite public prejudice and clamor, we should examine with open mind in literature, debate, and in real life the great programs of social reform that are day by day being put forward."

In April, 1922, I spoke a stronger word: "Russia is the most amazing and most hopeful phenomenon of the postwar period. She has been murdered, bullied, lied about, and starved, and yet she maintains her government, possesses her soul and is simply compelling the world to recognize her right to freedom even if that freedom involves the industrial reconstruction of her society."

Later my views became more definite: "There can be no question but that the Russians have made a good appearance at Genoa. Their demand for recognition as a de jure government was logically inevitable and unanswerable. Their initial offer to reduce the military forces so as to lessen France's excuse for a great army was not only delicious but fair; their treaty with Germany was reasonable within itself and no one else's business; their offer to assume the pre-war debt incurred by a Czar for the purpose of enslaving the mass of Russians was generous; and their desire for a loan paralleled the desire of nearly every other nation. The world still has a right to doubt the ability of the Bolsheviki to conduct, in peace and prosperity, industry and government by democratic political methods, or even by oligarchy for the benefit of the mess of people; or of the right of a government to sequester private property and manage commercial enterprises We ourselves are doing business as

expressmen, farmers, manufacturers, bankers, miners and weather prophets. The Bolsheviki may be dreamers, but they are not fools,"

In 1923, I invited Claude McKay, who had visited Russia, to tell our readers what he saw and heard. He wrote: "Though Western Europe can be reported as being quite ignorant and apathetic of the Negro in world affairs, there is one great nation with an arm in Europe that is thinking intelligently on the Negro, as it does about all international problems. When the Russian workers overturned their infamous government in 1917, one of the first acts of the new Premier, Lenin, was a proclamation greeting all the oppressed peoples throughout the world, exhorting them to organize and unite against the common international oppressor - Private Capitalism. Later on in Moscow, Lenin himself grappled with the question of the American Negroes and spoke on the subject before the Second Congress of the Third International. He consulted with John Reed, the American Journalist, and dwelt on the urgent necessity of propoganda and organizational work among Negroes of the South.

"The subject was not allowed to drop. When Sen Katayama of Japan, the veteran revolutionist, went from the United States to Russia in 1921, he placed the American Negro problem first upon his full agenda. And ever since he has been working unceasingly and unselfishly to promote the cause of the exploited American Negroes among the Soviet Councils of Russia."

I was impressed by McKay's story of his experience in Russia, but at the same time I was upset by the current newspaper stories about Russia: Community of women; easy divorce and systematic abortions; collapse of industry, slave toil and continued incipient revolt; famine, hunger, homelessness and despair. I was determined if ever the chance came to visit Russia and see for myself.

The chance came. Into my office early in 1926, walked three strangers. One was a dark, short man, evidently educated and well-bred, who spoke only Russian and French. His attractive and carefully groomed wife spoke Russian, German, Italian, and English, all with facility. With them was a tall, blonde German, a more nervous, impatient character, who could use only his native tongue. They introduced themselves as Russians, familiar with my periodical and anxious to enlist my sympathy in their effort to obtain for Russia the recognition of the United States.

I was a little amused at their apparent ignorance of the lack of influence of a Negro with Washington; but I told them I thought recognition ought to be given, although I added frankly my usual line of not being able to judge of the new Russian regime since I knew so little about it, and found reliable

information so difficult to obtain.

The German appeared to be an impatient revolutionist who wanted action. He hinted at revolt among oppressed Negroes. I sought to explain that we were winning our fight, albeit slowly, by peaceful but continuous agitation and legal battle. He did not stay long in New York.

The other two were of different calibre. I explained to them the Negro problem as I saw it. They talked of Russia and its aims. Other calls and talks followed, which I and my wife enjoyed very much. At last, they said frankly: "would you not like to visit the Soviet Union so as to make up your mind as to its aims and accomplishment?" I said I certainly would. "I am not at all satisfied with the knowledge that I have of the Russian Revolution. I should like to learn, if possible, at first hand just what has taken place in Russia and just what the development is at present. I do not know that I could learn anything that would be of advantage to the colored people of the United States, but if there is anything to learn I am eager to learn it. On the other hand, in undertaking this or any other trip I should not want to obligate myself to come to any particular conclusions or to follow any line of action or to see the facts with any other eyes except my own."

They thereupon offered, to pay the expense of the trip, with the clear understanding that I would be free to examine conditions and come to my own conclusions. I accepted the offer with alacrity and left for Russia in the Summer of 1926.

I went to Antwerp to see Rubens. I ascended the Rhine looking again at the vaulted Cathedral at Cologne, at the Lorelei, at the Rheinfels; glancing at the old street of the Jews in Frankfort. I went up into the Thuringian forest where I first learned to know the old world and its culture, a half century ago. But all my friends in Eisenach had disappeared in the war, with little trace. I saw Berlin, a giant city which had become since the day I knew it, one of the centers of the world. But never before have I seen so many girls for open sale as on the streets of Berlin. I had to wait a week for a visa, since I could get none in the United States. When my visa came, more confusion arose since my name, "Du Bois," had been translated "Wood." A messenger had to come all the way from Russia to straighten things out. At last in the Summer of 1926 I set sail for Russia from Stettin.

Simon Peter would have called me a scoffer;

"saying, where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation!"

CHAPTER II

THE SOVIET UNION IN 1926

It is 1926. I am sitting in Revolution square opposite the Second House of the Moscow Soviets, and in a hotel run by the Soviet Government. Yonder the sun pours into my window over the domes and eagles and pointed towers of the Kremlin. Here is the old Chinese wall of the Inner City; there is the gilded glory of the Cathedral of Christ the Savior. Through yonder gate, on the vast Red Square, Lenin sleeps his last sleep, with long lines of people peering each day into his dead and speaking face. Around me roars a city of two millions.

I have been in Russia something less than two months. I did not see the Russia of war and blood and rapine. I know nothing of political prisoners, secret police and underground government. My knowledge of the Russian language is sketchy; and of this vast land, one of the largest single countries on earth, I have seen only a small part. But I have seen something. I have traveled two thousand miles and visited four of its largest cities and many of its towns. I have seen the Neva, Dnieper, Moscow, and Volga Rivers, and stretches of land and village. I have looked into the faces of its races - Russians, Ukrainians, Jews, Tartars, Gypsies, Caucasians, Armenians, and Chinese.

I have not done my sight-seeing and investigation in groups and crowds, but have in nearly all cases gone alone with one Russian-speaking friend. In this way I have seen schools, universities, factories, stores, printing establishments, government offices, palaces, museums, summer colonies of children, libraries, churches, monasteries, Boyar houses, theatres, cinemas, day nurseries and cooperatives. I have seen some celebrations - 200,000 youths inarching on Youth Day. I have talked with peasants and laborers, commissars of the Republic, teachers and children.

I have walked miles of streets in Leningrad, Moscow, Nijni Novgorod and Kiev, at morning, noon, and night; I have trafficked on the curb and in the stores; I have watched crowds and audiences. I have gathered some documents and figures, plied officials with questions and sat still and gazed at this Russia, that the spirit of its life and people might enter my veins. I stand in astonishment and wonder at the revelation of Russia that has come to me.

I may be partially deceived and half-informed, but if what I have seen with my eyes and heard with my ears in Russia is Bolshevism, I am a Bolshevik.

This enthusiasm did not mean that in 1926, Russia was a picture of happiness and success. It was not. There was stark poverty. I remember the hordes of incredibly dirty, ragged and

wild children of war and famine who were hiding in the sewers and stealing like beasts through the streets at dusk. I remember the long lines of ragged people, waiting to buy a loaf of bread. I remember also the bookstores, the readers on the trams, the crowds in museums. A poor land, but a land of enthusiasm and one which to my astonishment had not emerged from war in 1918, on Armistice Day, but was beginning just in 1926 to breathe air free from Civil War and invasion, promoted and participated in by my own nation.

We had ridden out of Stettin at eight in the morning, along flat land. The city rose a little old and yet new, with busy harbor; and we sailed the long, broided river bay and the canal mole. Three days we glided through the Baltic and the Gulf of Finland until we came to the East Sea. Some Germans aboard were returning to the Volga and they sang sad, sweet folk songs in the night. German and Russian was heard and a little French, but no English. The low, grey back of Gothland rose on the left in the late afternoon of the second day. Many ships, hurrying toward Stockholm, slipped by noiseless in the night, but in the morning low islands lay in the East. Esthonia came and a little fairy island rising eastward like a secret resting place of elves beneath the grey, cold rain.

There was ever a secret excitement among us: we whisper and speculate - Russia? We exchange rumors - we correct them and spread others - Russia! Mysterious - shnungavoll! Many of the passengers are German tourists; there was a bridal couple, very conscious; a Paris Teuton, big, calm and cold; a mother with her young, golden daughter quite spoiled by "mutti;" a big and bearded Russian, a former judge, but not a "comrade;" he hates the Bolsheviks; an actress, silked, and coifed; all the world! We sang by phonograph, "In einem Kühlen Grunde."

The chimneys of Reval smoke far away and its great lighthouses rise; a sail boat gracefully crosses our bow and then Kronstadt - long lines of empty docks - a few warships, dismantled; old yellow forts, and warehouses, some crumbling, some rebuilt - most of them empty; and above all, a golden Dome - stately in the quiet morning. This is a ghost city of a dead Empire.

I first went to St. Petersburg, now Leningrad, and walked the Nevski Prospect. I stood in the Place of the Revolution and the parade ground looking on the proudest of bridges, spanning the Neva. There was a moving monument, marble and double-eagled: a low wall of greyish brown with great square stones and wide openings; with the graves of a thousand victims dead beneath the flowers. In the center were the Sickle and Hammer, and the words:

You who fought for the freedom of the world
You who are her first victims and whom we envy

You who fighting since 1848
Deserve to lie here too.

Last night at twilight I walked in the Square before the Winter Palace. It loomed: red-brown and the statues and chimneys above it were as ghosts. It must have been a brilliant and wonderful city in the day of Czars for those who could enjoy it. There is a certain barbaric splendor that blends here and there — the red marble column to the Napoleonic Wars is almost Egyptian — the marble Atlases before the Hermitage — the gigantic bronzes of Cathorn.

Leningrad is cleaning house feverishly, raking, planting, white-washing and painting. There is not much new building, I should say. But there is so much to be done, and they're at it.

The Neva ripples — a bright and beautiful silver band, beneath a half dozen bridges, with palace and fortress and towers of churches. Last night I wandered up and down the October Prospect. The electric light came on late; people wandered; two were drunk. The park at the end was filled with a quiet, happy crowd; unaccompanied young women walked unaccosted.

It would be hard to recall my first impressions of the population of Leningrad. There are a number of whining beggars near the great hotels and even on the trams; there are some unkempt and wild-looking street gamins. Yet the off-scourings of men seem comparatively few; the level of prosperity, however is low! Poor clothes, old fashioned and patched, few silk stockings, bad shoes, and yet on the whole a contented looking folk — busy going and coming, working; not unusually gay but not morose, nor complaining.

Some of the people on the street seemed a bit gruff and envious. There are covert comments on our Western clothes. One girl streetcar conductor did not like to give us directions; she looked a fallen shopgirl; another was very kind — she looked a risen peasant. There are strong internal foes of the Bolsheviki evident: intellectuals, merchants, gentry. Manners on the street are not too good, but tempers are placid; there is some bowing and raising of hats, but few pardons are asked. With general kindness comes some rude, self-assertion from the gutter. They naturally crave for comfort and luxury. I saw a kerchiefed woman very poorly dressed, standing in perfect silence, motionless beside a window of dresses, silks, and underwear!

The public ordering of the revolution has been in some respects a masterpiece! Books, books, books, cheap and of every sort, size and subject, everywhere. Public monuments are cared for; they left Alexander III in mighty bronze and said simply: "This is the author of our troubles." They let Catherine the Great, flaunt her ample skirts without remark. The Czars, from Peter to Alexander II, lie buried in the Cathedral of Peter and

Paul, lying in simple marble state; Peter the Great rides unmolested in his great boulder; but schools, theatres, state stores, newspapers, carry a mighty propaganda. In nine years the people have had put before them a new interpretation of history and economics.

We saw the prisoners' cells in the Cathedral of St. Peter and Paul - the church of the Czars; the little house built within a house where Peter the Great lived. We rode out to the islands of the Blessed, which was once the Czar's village (Tarsko-Selo) now called the children's village (Detskoe-Seloe). Those may see the meaning of this who glance at the palace of Alexanders - that golden throne room - the rooms of amber and marble; the tables of lapis lazuli and mother of pearl, the exquisite inlaid floors.

It is a barbaric burst of splendor to titillate the jaded palates of the masters of millions - outdoing Versailles, Potsdam, Berlin, and Vienna.

Leningrad is almost surrounded with factories. They tell me of great iron and steel works, and a factory population which was the backbone of revolution. Tall chimneys smoke everywhere and large numbers of workmen pass. The ride between Leningrad and Moscow is like Southern New England in olden times: rolling pines and beeches, cattle and horses, grass. Only villages are huddled grey and poor and the crops look meager. Yonder Moscow, squats and burns, flat like a wide village, built like an irregular star of circles about the Kremlin.

First came the Kremlin as a fortress in the twelfth century; then in sixteenth century came the inner city around the Kremlin called Chinese Town; then in the seventeenth century came the enveloping wall of the White City followed by a wall of a larger city of artisans, and finally, the new suburbs of servants and artisans and further extended a greater city, one beyond even the ancient fortress and out past the new Maidens Convent.

From the Sparrow Hills of romance (the "Lenin Hills" of Revolution) Moscow looks rather splendid, laying in the wide bend of the river with its great cathedral of Christ rising in five golden domes and almost hiding the Kremlin. Moscow also is feverish with repairs - painting, whitewashing, building with wood, brick, plaster, and stone - scaffoldings rise and fall, roofs swarm with hammering; barred sidewalks drip with calcimine, roads are torn up and put down, domes are gilding; flowers are planted, old walls and monuments are restored. But with all this the city is still cold and worn. Leave any modern city unkempt for ten years and it is half-ruined. Moscow is poorly clothed - very poorly, but fairly fed and badly housed. There is a fad of careless dressing; blouses, caps, and boots, colored shirts and collars for men; blouses, kerchiefs, socks

for women; yet the women eye Western clothes hungrily, and the state taxes their import remorselessly.

I visited one of the great state factories of the Moscow cooperative where they employ 1,875 people and make candy, cookies, soap and perfume. The director was a former workman of the factory, nominated to the post by his fellows and appointed by the directors - a free, simple fellow of forty, full of enthusiasm and eager to inform, to whom the working folk raised their hats. The machinery was modern and made in England; the employees were clothed in white, simple, inexpensive cotton drill. At the expense of the factory, the meals of soup and a meat course, with bread, were furnished. Then in a clean, light living room at thirty kopeks a piece, they had a library of 4,000 books and a reading room. The librarian, a brown slip of a girl, a voluntary Communist worker, was vibrant, talkative, exact with her records and careful of her card catalog.

The children, from two to nine, were taken care of in a day nursery with nurses and daily visits by the physician. Visitors and mothers were compelled to wear cotton over their clothes and the children had aprons. They were given regular afternoon naps in bed, meals with milk and eggs. There was a garden with sand for them to play. Mothers had a clean room and table to come and nurse their children.

The products are beautifully made with clean, unadulterated materials and supplied to the public ten to twenty per cent cheaper than private firms. Above all is the spirit, the gaiety, the earnestness and rising efficiency, the health, light and air. Twenty-five per cent of the workers are Communists. Girls on piece work are said to earn normally \$25.00 a month; some men earn \$1,200 a year. All get one month's vacation with pay and free medical care and insurance.

There was one interesting incident: as we visitors came in, a big, capable working-woman pushed by. She was dissatisfied with her job in one of the stores; she did not like the manager and wanted the Director to transfer her. He promised her an answer tomorrow. "Tomorrow!" she "thou'd" him; "would you tell your wife that?" "But I must consult the manager." "You'll forget" - "No, I won't" - "Will, can't you decide now - you see it's this way," and the long explanation was gone over again. "Well, tomorrow I will see," repeated the young and harassed chief. She finally took his phone number and left. There was no anger but there was a lot of industrial democracy.

In the State Printing office, Russia is printing books for her one hundred or more languages. Everybody, even workers at lunch were eager to show us. The school had a hundred apprentices - Jewish, Chinese, Tartar, Arabic - a dozen or more people, boys and girls. School books, new alphabets, cards, placards, all

sorts of things in black and color were scattered about. Students are sent by trades-unions or at public expense. They are fixing and comparing letters of the alphabets by all sorts of devices. They have German, English and American equipment, but German is cheapest and English and German firms give credit terms. They spend 250,000 rubles a month on the work. They spent 500,000 rubles on equipment last year and will spend 400,000 next. They set type here, print, cut and bind, photograph and make plates, repair and rebuild machines. It is a little nation of nations working happily together.

I saw two universities today, the Communist University for Eastern peoples; 1,000 students with everything furnished, clothes, food, tuition and ten rubles a month for extras. Laboratory and seminar methods were used with charts, reports and careful individual records. There is a four-year course in mathematics, science and social sciences, with considerable practical work in factories and in villages. There are 72 nationalities attending; only Communists are admitted, chosen by their own nationalities. They must be healthy, have a record of two or three years work and advanced enough in education.

The Chinese University, of 300 to 400 students (60 women) with a two-year course, is privately supported, with a fine library and reading room. There are striking diagrams of China's political and economic serfdom showing England in control of customs and salt; France running the Post Office, and each foreign director with two to eight European advisors. Students are crowded in the reading and studying rooms with interpreters and Japanese dictionaries.

The great national library now named after Lenin has three million volumes - old fashioned but beginning to grow. It received only a pittance under the Czars but now has new buildings and modern equipment. A little library school trains two hundred librarians in one and two-year courses for village libraries.

The library of the Communists Academy has 800,000 volumes and has never been catalogued by modern methods. A tall, charming, and beautiful woman is at the task and had a dictionary card catalogue of 15,000 titles already started - a hard task with Russian and Latin lettering. She had worked in America seven years in the Library of Congress and at the Widener Library of Harvard. She was full of enthusiasm in her cramped but overflowing quarters and expects a modern library within two years. They spent \$100,000 last year on new books. Once she and her husband had been exiled for seven years in Siberia under the Czars, but in 1905, they escaped to America. There he made a speech in Russian and said that the revolution must in time spread to America. He was arrested and sent for a year to prison

at Easton, Pennsylvania. She said he suffered more in that year than in the seven years in Siberia and came out on a stretcher, prostrate from typhus and pneumonia. For a year he was ill.

I saw the Marx-Engels Institute - a marvelous collection of the whole literature of economic revolt the world over and in all modern tongues; books, pamphlets, and 40,000 photostatic copies. It is one of the finest working libraries I have seen, with 175,349 volumes.

The museum of the Revolution is a history of Russian effort to be free - in picture, relic, and manuscript such as the world has seldom known. It is almost unbelievable how the Russian people were murdered, oppressed and tortured. Since 1774, many have fought back; in 1825, in the 40's and in the 60's; a vast army struggled in 1905; and the first victory came in 1917. In blood and tears Russia has striven for freedom.

There is much criticism allowed in Russia. One man writes in the press of rubbers, "I suppose if I live, I may get to buy rubbers by Christmas." Mensheviks complain that the state has no money - "Where are the rubles?" Peasants complain that the new manufactures are not good. There is argument as to wages.

The theater for the people is thriving in poverty and bareness, yet with beauty. I saw Don Juan in the Experimental Theatre rarely done with the Mozart music and new words. Propaganda was there and "Revolution" rose to hunt down the profligate and save wives, daughters, and sweethearts; but it was done with a smile, gaily and artistically. I saw "Boris Gudonoff" played with historic costumes; there were magnificent settings. I saw "The Woodland" interpreted by Meyerhold; the barest mechanicisms, no scenery, footlight, no props but extraordinary acting! In one of the studios of the Art Theatres the lovely farce, "The Flea," was given - the peasant blacksmith who knew English technique and made a mechanical flea, and fitted with horseshoes and marked with his sweetheart's name. Finally, I saw Meyerhold's prophetic "Hail China!"

Russia seems to me the only modern country where people are not more or less taught and encouraged to despise and look down on some group or race. I know countries where race and color prejudice show only slight manifestations, but no country where race and color prejudice seems so absolutely absent. In Paris, I attract some attention; in London I meet elaborate blankness; anywhere in America I would get anything from curiosity to insult. In Moscow, I pass unheeded. Russians quite naturally ask me for information; women sit beside me quite confidentially and unconsciously.

Today I was on the estate of the Count of Orlof. One could still picture its former glories; a palace of marble, with silk, gold, and paintings; a vast park with noble trees, a rolling

lawn, vales and dells; a lake and the gleam of the Moscow river; parkways enough to house a town; little palaces, a beautiful bath house, rows of flowers; offices, barns and buildings. It was the kingdom of a little king, two miles from the Chinese City but now in the suburbs of Moscow.

The early Orlofs got their start when one became sweetheart of the Great Catherine. They reigned in luxury and splendor for two centuries.

Then the Soviet Republic took their property and made it into a public park and turned the palace into a furniture museum. Frankly, this property would seem to be doing Russia more good in its present use than in its former. That the present Orlofs suffer is true; but that the Orlofs from start to finish, have received ten times as much as they ever gave; and that Russia has been long carrying them as unhealthy barnacles on her body, economic and social, is quite as true.

In the Museum one noticed the beauty and splendor that once surrounded the Few. Were they high-thinking artists enjoying life? Those that were, revolted from the system. The others had their maws "filled with over-plus" and were still an-hungered. Idle profligates was the largest crop.

I went to the Tretykov Gallery today and saw the Russian world of Art preserved; an astonishingly beautiful thing; a beauty once set apart and but half known; the work of Repin; his heart-breaking "unexpected" and his "Ivan the Terrible" with his murdered son; Vereschagin's skull; marvelous religious conceptions with strong and beautiful faces; Menshikov in exile; fairies and gods; "The Last Judgment" with the golden domes of Russian churches. All about us were crowds of workers and peasants listening to art explained. I never saw or dreamed of a picture gallery with such an audience - women, children, boys, men; uncouth, crowding, but rapt.

Tonight I saw Lenin lying as if asleep. There was a long, long queue of workers, as every night. We went into the Square beneath the walls of the Kremlin. He lay so still and natural - a little man, bold and blonde, bearded, with clipped moustache, just asleep. His form was partly outlined. Above on the Kremlin burned the Red Flag. On the square directly opposite his tomb, and occupying a vast building with iron girders and shops exhibits of all kinds, were installed some of the most active retail activities of the New Economic Policy. Here one could buy almost anything in necessities and luxuries from Western markets; and the aisles were crowded.

One afternoon I visited Radek of the Executive Committee, in a room in the Kremlin in vast disorder; books, pamphlets, a wide couch bed, a desk, a table; a typewriter, chairs, tobacco and magazines: not a storehouse, but a workshop. He was a spare man,

almost insignificant, but with good eyes, pleasant voice and encyclopedic knowledge. He talks English, French and, of course, Russian. His English had a strong accent, but was good and fluent. We talked of races and racial minorities; of the 600 Chinese students in Russia, and how hard they work; of the returning power of Germany and the restoring of her colonies. He was much interested in American Negroes and incensed at the Negro-hating trade unions. He believed in the rapprochement of the colored peoples. He came with me to the gate of the Kremlin. His wife and little girl are in this country; "We revolutionists cannot afford large families - we must be on the go." Later I had tea with his family.

The Kremlin is a thing unique - fortress and royal residence set on a low hill - gleaming under gilded, copula and pointed Italian towers, and clasped by a vast brick wall with swallow tail battlements. It is a magnificent jumble of times and things, powers, tyranny, wealth, war, religion, murder, jealousy and revolution.

I saw here something of the glory of the Czars of Russia and the Russian Church, including the magnificent service which Catherine the Great gave to her favorite Orlof; the clothing of Czars, and finest of silver and gold jewels and pearls, swords, scepters; ivory in all forms, clocks, watches, crown jewels, mirrors and tables; a riot of glory of wealth and beauty. The extravagance was tempting; the icons plastered and inscribed with gold pearls and diamonds; cathedrals and palaces crowded together and the Cathedral of the Czars crowning all with its lofty arches and wealth of jewels, and paid for by starving workers and peasants.

Over the Kremlin lurks the spirit of Ivan the Terrible and his broken bell and the tower opposite; the denuded statue of the assassinated Alexander II, and the Czars in magnificent madness. Catherine is there too, her carriages, her silver, her gifts. There is a beautiful old and Byzantine palace from whose roof Napoleon saw Moscow burn and the marble statue of himself which he lugged to Moscow but had to run and leave.

Last night we were in a self-governed school session. Children, some 200 from thirteen to seventeen years of age, boys and girls, had a glorious time. They had a "wallpaper" with news; they laughed, shouted, and played tag. Finally, they took their places on benches in fairly quiet order. There was a "presidium" of four - with one girl. A black-haired boy rose to deliver the chief address - could he speak forty minutes, he asked diffidently? "No," was the cry; they allowed thirty and finally thirty-five minutes. In a matter of fact he told of the origin of the Youth Movement in Russia; how other organizations had fallen away from the Communist ideals; how the pioneers

differed from the Scours; how they must strive for world unity and against war.

They sang the Internationale, with saluting hands. Then others spoke. One boy told of what had been done to ward off tyranny and bureaucracy; a little lad of thirteen and a girl made speeches. They finally invited the principal of the school to address them. He criticized their late beginning and poor singing. Then they staged a play, impromptu: Russia, Red-flagged in distress; the Communist Cadets ran to her aid; boys and girls represented Italy, Germany, France, Spain; one represented the small nationalities of Russia and spoke broken Russian. Another represented America, talking of money and checks. There followed gymnastics, the girls barelegged and in bloomers; then "questions and answers;" dancing and singing, joy, enthusiasm, noise and lovely deference to and ignoring of the strangers present; a beautiful evening with children of workers.

I saw parts of the tenth Celebration of Youth Day in Moscow. Today 200,000 children and youth with more grown-ups marched through the Red Square: Russians of all sorts and kinds, a hundred or two Chinese, Tartars, Caucasians, Turks, two or three Negroes; — an extraordinary demonstration. First several thousand delegates from the provinces stood in the Square and listened to speeches from Commissars and guests. Then the marching began and lasted two hours. Red streamers and mottoes were carried; uniforms and everyday clothes. Some of the vagabond children in rags, were singing and marching. It looked like an enthusiastic, voluntary mass movement, tremendous in size and deep in belief. There were many groups of athletes, bare-legged boys and girls — splendid, powerfully limbed. One group of Chinese were in native costume. I never saw a greater variety of Russian types, all aggressively working-class and glorying in it. In the afternoon at the fair grounds they were at it again, marching and playing — some little horse-play but no roughness and no degeneracy.

Yesterday, my last in Moscow, we went at one o'clock to a peoples' court: a clean, square, white room with wooden benches, a table draped in red, a judge, two assessors, and a clerk. It was well filled with people.

The judge was intelligent without airs; the Assessors seemed ordinary common people. They listened but said nothing. The case was a labor dispute. The coal carriers who supplied engines had too far to walk with their coal and it ruined their clothes. They wanted state uniforms and pay for those which ought to have been furnished since 1925. A railroad man testified and the judge and all debated, the judge directing the talk. All stood within the rail around the table. There was no Bible, nor swearing of witnesses. The case was carried over. The next case

had lawyers and was postponed because of absence of witnesses.

After the court, I visited the Secretary of the Trade Union Central Organization of the USSR in a huge office building. There are twenty-three unions of workers of all Russia, with 90 per cent of all wage earners as members. The Biennial Congress had 1,800 delegates – one for each 10,000 members. State Central Organizations had delegates in proportion to institutions represented. These elect national delegates, who are uninstructed. Industries not trades are represented and all in a given industry join; transfer from industry to industry is allowed. Sweepers as well as skilled workers are all in the same union and each with one vote.

Strikes against managers occur sometimes and are arbitrated. There are 9,000,000 wage earners, and the number is increasing rapidly with increasing industrialization. All factories are now in use, but some with poor machinery. New factories are being constructed.

But after all, Moscow is the center of bureaucracy. Real Russia lies outside. I had always wanted to Nijni Novgorod, far out on the Volga. I wanted to see the Ukraine. Once at Kiev, I started to return through Poland and Berlin, but scanning my geography I figured out a bit of almost impossible romance at no greater cost, and said to myself, "Why not return by the Black Sea and Constantinople and Greece, Naples and Gibraltar?" I hesitated. It seemed almost fantastic; and yet at last I ventured.

First I went to Nijni Novgorod, tempted by the name which I remembered from my boyhood; and wishing, too, to get nearer the geographical heart of this vast land. It was a long, hard rail ride and in some ways disturbing. The name of the city was soon changed to Gorki, for awful reasons which I did not then in the least comprehend. The city, at the head of the majestic Volga, full of historic associations, suddenly seemed to mean but one thing to me – war and its pitiful aftermath. To be sure the broad and once beautiful and prosperous center of a world-wide trade was reeling to its feet; I saw schools and factories; some buildings and trade and commerce starting to revive down the river. But chiefly I saw a people shattered and torn by a war which I smugly imagined had ended nearly a decade ago. The wild and savage forays of Denekin and Kolchak on their dash to Moscow backed by British gold and American food, lived again in the battered walls and torn streets of this key city, between Asia and Western Russia.

And gleaming through the rubble peered the Church. I can see yet that gem of a cathedral – tiny, narrow, but elegant and utterly beautiful; jewelled and decorated, with the rich voices of priests still intoning; with faded Christ and Virgin peering

mistily out of rich dark walls; and without a city stricken by Civil War and foreign invasion, so far from help that all seemed lost even when the miracle came, and Moscow hurled the invaders into the Black Sea. It was a cold, hard trip back to Moscow, but with it went the thrill of realizing how near the West had come to conquering Russia and stopping the crucial effort to make socialism work, and how completely it had failed.

I turned next to Kiev. The sunflowers of Russia were blooming in the black Ukraine. The poet Schevtchenko and his black American friend, Ira Aldridge, lived in my memory. We crossed the sand-barred Dnieper, a great tower rising before us with smaller turrets of gold and wide white walls. We saw the low-flaring domes of the city. Physically Kiev is fantastic. The Dnieper almost knots itself around it and the city rises, plane on plane, each one at angles with the other, all facing different fronts and all apparently unseen and unheard of by the other. It gives the impression of three or four independent cities in juxtaposition and yet not neighbors for their streets never apparently meet nor mingle.

We went to the polytechnique with 2,500 students and well-equipped laboratories for research; then to the Lenin school for abandoned children where 1,000 children are maintained at a cost of \$135,000 a year. The children come voluntarily - on a week's trial and then are sifted and distributed to one, four, and seven-year courses with shops, common boarding, and division into circles of common living, recreation, etc. Club rooms, and theatres are furnished and most of the pupils look happy. Ten or twelve run away each year and do not return.

I visited an old fortified monastery with its great towers and clouds of golden domes. A charming lady who spoke French showed us the museum and underground catacombs with its tombs and bodies - a curious and gruesome sight. There were some icons of the sixth to the eleventh century and chests with complicated looks. There were beautiful vestments - oh, the money spent on vestments in Czarist Russia! "You should see the Ukraine in its beauty," said Madame, well-bred and a bit pitiful in manner. She had many memories. The day was grey, slightly leaden aloft. The Dnieper was a brown stream and the purple steppes shelved away into blurred shadows. I'm sure the Ukraine in Spring must have a startling beauty.

In the cities, the land the home questions are difficult to estimate. There are some new one family houses. I saw building in Nijni Novgorod and the outskirts of other cities; some large apartment houses for a hundred or more families, with one to four rooms, ere building in Moscow and Nijni Novgorod. In most cases people are swarming in buildings once built for the rich.

Odessa is decidedly Western in aspect, even more than Kiev,

with few domes and none of gold – with great square blocks of yellow stone houses.

One saw the peasant costumes of the Ukraine and people, gay, careless, fairly well satisfied, although I suspect much complaint, from the former well-to-do; and the merchant and marine workers of Odessa must complain. There is the wide sweep of the Black Sea; I walked beside it hours today; the shore plunges down in ruined wall and ravine and the dark water gleams below. There is a statue of Pushkin – "from grateful Odessa" – a beautiful opera house, once a work of consummate art. I saw the steppes and bridges of the "Battleship Potemkin."

Odessa is an imposing city from the sea, even if its harbor is empty and in disrepair. We slipped out of the harbor with red flag flying, turned sharply to the right and sailed on the dull gray Black Sea, along the way of the Golden Fleece from Byzantium to Greece. We sailed long, quiet days and nights until suddenly Constantinople flames in the morning sun. The towers of gold – clean and high – the vast, ugly and magnificent bulk of St. Sophia, the grace and mounting beauty of the Magnificent Suliman.

I remember that civilization came to Russia from Constantinople. Greek orthodox fleeing from Islam, rested and grew in Kiev and Moscow. The Iconoclasts drove the icon to Russia. St. Sophia and the East developed the dome churches and overlaid them with gold. Visitors – rich and near rich – will prefer Constantinople to Moscow. Shops here are full of luxuries for the rich; women are silk-clad and for sale. The world is ordered for the well-to-do.

In Moscow there are few prostitutes and few luxuries for sale. It is on the contrary, a straight, almost grim region of poorly clothed people and a terribly earnest attempt to erect a world of and by the workers. Beggars? There are beggars in most cities; but in Constantinople they are a permanent, stereotyped popular institution with signs for explanation and arrangement. In Russia they are a dwindling remnant.

It is on its economic problem that Russia in 1926, must primarily be judged. Russia had established a socialistic state. The world had long been veering toward Socialism. We had made essays toward socialism; but when the Socialistic state appeared full-fledged, most of us called it by other names and refused to judge it by its socialism, but rather we insisted on investigation of the ethics of the methods underlying its establishment.

What had Russia done in 1926, to establish a Socialistic State? First, it had nationalized the land. Every inch of land in Russia – the air above it and the resources beneath belong to the Russian State. Persons who wish to till the soil may have as

much land as they can successfully till, with the labor of their own family; and with the death of the father, the children may have first chance at tillage of the same soil. Preference as to kind and place of soil goes to the former users of any particular piece. The mineral and oil rights may be farmed out by the government for a term of years but the government retains ownership of mines and wells and the terms of the leases are limited. Improvement on the land — houses on farms and homes of the dwellers belong to the builders if they cost less than about \$15,000 — if more, their ownership goes to the state after forty-nine years.

The State either conducts industry itself or sets the levels of private enterprise. All of the fundamental industries — manufacture of steel and iron, preparation of foodstuffs and clothing, most of the exporting industries, like coal mining and so on, are conducted as state-owned trusts. The work of distribution of the products of these industries, in order to provide foreign industries, is conducted fully by the state, the great cooperative stores and by direct sale, and it is partly open to private enterprise. The scope of private enterprise is therefore mostly confined to imported luxuries or near luxuries.

The government conduits education on a broad scale — not simply common school and elementary training, but also higher and universal training, industrial training and techniques of all grades, as well as general social education and information, including newspapers, radio, news collection and the like. It also undertakes day nurseries, child refugees, orphanages, old age and motherhood pensions, workers vacations, and so on.

All this requires enormous capital, a wide spread bureaucracy of intricate administration and individual effort of a high order. How far is this extraordinary effort successful? The peasants are elevated with their access to the land but they have low production because of ignorance, antiquated methods and lack of machinery and markets. This the government is meeting partly by general and special education. Schools are being established slowly but in considerable numbers.

But here already in 1926 loomed trouble. I sensed it when in Leningrad our "ishvorshnik" peasant turned cabby for the winter pointed to a tractor in the suburban fields near an agricultural experiment station. "See there?" he said, "Waste of money! They have tried to teach the peasants of my village to use such contraptions; it wouldn't work. I put my horse in and pulled them out."

Never on so broad a side has an attempt been made to reach and civilize the country districts of a vast land and raise the rural economy to a level with the urban. The city is trying to help by entertaining peasant visitors. Peasant hostels are being

established; I saw the vast one in Moscow and I visited one in Nijni Novgorod. Children, students and workers are sent to the country on vacations; cooperation is taught and attempted in machinery; markets and model farms are being established. Soil investigation goes on. But all this merely scratches the surface. Russia is a wide, expansive land. The peasants are widely scattered. Some land is rich, some is very poor. In general, their winter is terrible and floods and famine must be faced now and then.

Meantime, Russia is at work. God how these officials work! Comrade H-- spends six hours in office and six to eight hours in inspection and lectures; the assistant to Lunacharsky, the Secretary of Trade Unions, the head of the Mosselprom, all are men working to the limit and even failing in health. One day I talked with the head of democratic education. He had finished a hard Saturday morning - committees, phone calls, callers, and clerks. We came at 2:30 in the afternoon and about three he began to talk and explained clearly until five! Comrade Elena works six hours in the office and eight in the field - committees, lectures, inspections. But on the building goes.

Finally, if Russia fails, reason in industry fails. If Russia succeeds gradually every modern state will socialize industry and the greater the Russian success, the less revolution.

All the polite culture and grace of high society and wealth of Russia are in exile, with their disbelief in and contempt for democracy; bearing testimony against Soviet Russia in places of influence throughout the world.

The tremendous task of maintaining the dictatorship of the Communists and keeping inner disagreement from disrupting it, is met by denouncing, by criticism and discussion of problems of policy; shall a surplus of income go to wages or to state-owned capital? To necessities or to general culture? But at least they are openly discussing such problems, which are problems of every state, but usually decided among us by war or strike without reasonable discussion.

Nowhere in modern lands can one see less of the spender and the consumer, the rich owners and buyers of luxuries, the institutions which cater to the idle rich. One sees in Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev neither first-class hotels, nor luxurious restaurants; neither private motor cars, nor silk stockings nor prostitutes. All these insignia of the great, modern city are lacking. On the other hand, the traveler misses the courtesy and savoir faire which one meets in the hotel corridors of London and Paris; one misses the smart shops and well-groomed men and women who are so plentiful in Constantinople and Berlin. Does this mean that Russia has "put over" her new psychology? Not by any means. She is trying and trying hard, but there are plenty

of people in Russia who still hate and despise the workingman's blouse and the peasant's straw shoes; and plenty of workers who regret the passing of the free-handed Russian nobility; who miss the splendid pageantry of the Czars and who cling doggedly to religious dogma and superstition. There must be in Russia dishonest officials and inefficient statesmen. But here Russia has no monopoly. There are those in Russia and outside of Russia who say that the present effort cannot succeed for exactly the same reasons that men said the Bourgeoisie could never rule France.

But it is the organized capital of America, England, France, and Germany which is chiefly instrumental in preventing the realization of the Russian workingman's psychology. It has used every modern weapon to crush Russia. It sent against Russia every scoundrel who could lead a mob and gave him money, guns, and ammunition; and when Russia nearly committed suicide in crushing this civil war, modern industry began the industrial boycott, the refusal of capital and credit which is being carried on today just as far as international jealousy and greed will allow. And can we wonder? If modern capital is owned by the rich and handled for their power and benefit, can the rich be expected to hand it over to their avowed and actual enemies? On the contrary, if modern industry is really for the benefit of the people and if there is an effort to make the people the chief beneficiaries of industry, why is it that this same people is powerless today to help this experiment, or at least give it a clear way? On the other hand, so long as the most powerful nations in the world are determined that Russia must fail, there can be but a minimum of free discussion and democratic difference of opinion in Russia.

There is world struggle then in and about Russia; but it is not simply an ethical problem, as to whether or not the Russian Revolution was morally right; that is a question which only history will settle. It is not simply the economic question, as to whether or not Russia can conduct industry on a national scale. She is doing it today and in so doing she differs only in quantity, not in quality from every other modern country. It is not a question merely of "dictatorship." We are all subject to this form of government. The Russian question is: Can you make the worker and not the millionaire the center of modern power and culture? If you can, the Russian Revolution will sweep the world. One can stand on the streets of Moscow and Kiev and see clearly that Russia has struck at the citadels of the power that rules modern countries. Not manhood suffrage, woman's suffrage, state regulation of industry, social reform nor religious and moral teaching in any modern country have shorn organized wealth of its power as the Bolshevik Revolution has done in Russia.

Is it possible to conduct a great modern government without autocratic leadership of the rich? The answer is: this is exactly what Russia is doing today. But can she continue to do this? This is not a question of ethics or economics; it is a question of psychology. Can Russia continue to think of the State in terms of the workers? This can happen only if the Russian people believe and idealize the workingman as the chief citizen. In America we do not. The ideal of every American is the millionaire – or at least the man of "independent" means or income. We regard the laborers as the unfortunate part of the community and even liberal thought is directed toward "emancipating" the workingman by relieving him in part, if not entirely, of the necessity of work. Russia, on the contrary, is seeking to make a nation believe that work, and work that is hard and in some respects disagreeable and to a large extent physical, is a necessity of human life at present and likely to be in any conceivable future world; that the people who do this work are the ones who should determine how the national income from their combined efforts should be distributed; in fine, that the workingman is the State; that he makes civilization possible and should determine what civilization is to be.

For this purpose he must be a workingman of skill and intelligence and to this combined and Russian education is being organized. This is what the Russian Dictatorship of the Proletariat means. This dictatorship does not stop there. As the workingman is today neither skilled nor intelligent to any such extent as his responsibilities demand, there is within his ranks the Communist Party, directing the Proletariat toward their future dictatorship. This is nothing new. In this government "of the people," we have elaborate and many-sided arrangements for guiding the rulers. The test is, are we and Russia really preparing future rulers? Insofar as I could see, in 1926 in shop and school, in the press and on the radio, in books and lectures, in trade unions and National Congresses, Russia is. We are not.

Visioning now a real Dictatorship of the Proletariat, two questions follow. Is it possible today for a great nation to achieve such a worker's psychology? And secondly, if it does achieve it, what will be its effect upon the world? The achievement of such a psychology depends partly upon Russia and partly upon the United States and the Western part of Europe. In Russia one feels today, even on a casual visit, the beginning of a workingman's psychology. Workers are the people that fill the streets and live in the best houses, even though these houses are dilapidated; workers crowd (literally crowd) the museums and theatres, hold the high offices, do the public talking, travel in the trains.

The Soviet program is mainly psychological; can a people be trained to work effectively with the general prosperity as the motive and the fear of poverty and old age taken away? The present generation of lazy, indifferent and inefficient workers were trained under capitalism. Their psychology will change slowly. Leisure and taking away of the fear of poverty will mean to them loafing, laziness, and self-assertion; to a large extent, the tremendous strain of the transition period.

The Soviets have had war after war, conquest after conquest and famine, and but three years of experiment. Can the Soviets conquer jealousy and envy on the part of the workers? Yes, they answer by giving them necessities. But how about luxuries? By raising a public opinion against luxuries. There is something like this now. Moscow has no well-dressed leisure class. But it is a hard job and you and I, who have been trained to distrust human nature and believe in selfishness and lust, may easily believe a task impossible. Sometimes we seem to be right.

There is no question but that governments can carry on business. Every government does. Whether governmental industry compares in efficiency with private industry depends entirely upon what we call efficiency. And here it is and not elsewhere that the Russian experiment is astonishing and new and of fateful importance to the future of civilization. What we call efficiency in America is judged primarily by the resultant profit to the rich and only secondarily by the results to the workers. The face of industrial Europe and America is set toward private wealth; that is, toward the people who have large incomes. We recognize the economic value of small incomes mainly as a means of profit for great incomes. Russia seeks another psychology. Russia is trying to make the workingman the main object of industry. His well-being and his income are deliberately set as the chief ends of organized industry, directed by the State.

I leave one subject to the last of my 1926 observations of Russia: religion. I lived two months opposite the inscription on the Second House of the Soviets, written by Lenin:

"Religion is the opium of the people!"

Whatever was true of other lands, this was certainly true in Russia in 1926 and before. Symbols of religion dominated the city, from the vast five domes of the Cathedral of Christ — a greater and four lesser; five crosses, a greater and four lesser; and gilded lace-like chains which held them. It cost \$200,000 a year to gild the cathedral. The 350 other churches of the city dominated the landscape, as they loomed and glowed.

There gems of beautiful bejewelled churches; there hordes of priests intoning litanies, begging alms, forgiving sins. There were thousands of shrines. One of the most striking of Russian

pictures which I saw was Vasnetzof's "Last Judgment," with conventional angels, Christ and God. But the heaven in the background were the golden domes of Moscow. Only one who hears the chant of a Russian service, sees its color and genuflections; only those who know the gorgeous litany and the beautiful Russian churches can realize what Lenin meant when he called the Russian religion, "opium."

But it was worse than opium. It was the Russian Priest, Father Petrof, who said in 1908, "There is no Christian Czar and no Christian government. Conditions of life are not Christian. The upper classes rule the lower classes. A little group keeps the rest of the population enslaved. This little group has robbed the working people of wealth, power, science, art, and even religion, which they have also subjected; they have left them only ignorance and misery. In the place of pleasure they have given the people drunkenness; in the place of religion gross superstition; and beside, the work of a convict, a work without rest or reward.

"The ruling regular clergy with its cold, heartless bony fingers, has stifled the Russian Church, killed its creative spirit, chained the Gospel itself, and sold the Church to the Government. There is not an outrage, no crime, no perfidy of the state authorities, which the Monks who rule the Church would not cover with the mantle of the Church, would not bless, would not seal with their own hands."

The British Trade Union report of 1925 says: "The Holy Shrines at all the main street corners of the large cities are still open and well patronized. Priests in the dress of their calling are still seen about the streets..."

"A very strong propaganda in the Press, the schools, colleges, and Trade Union clubs is, however, carried on against religion generally, and especially as practiced by the old Orthodox Church. The kissing of crosses and ikons is prohibited by the Ministry of Health as being accountable for the spreading of infectious diseases, especially consumption and syphilis. The practice, however, still survives; though long queues of infected children waiting to receive the sacrament from the same chalice are no longer seen. The remains of certain saints, whose bodies were supposed to be preserved intact, and whose forehead was exposed through an aperture in the lid of the coffin to be kissed by thousands of pilgrims, have been exposed to public view as dust and bones, while the supposed forehead was shown to be but a puckered piece of leather fastened to the coffin lid.

"The former Government-controlled licensed houses of prostitution, where girls were exposed for hire at a recognized fee, have been closed. In Tsarist days those houses were a recognized Government institution; the opening ceremony was

undertaken by a police officer and the premises blessed by Russian Orthodox Priests."

One thing was certain: if there were to be a Russian Revolution, it had to begin by the domination of the Church by the State.

There is one thing I remember from this visit of 1926; it was not vivid at the time but came back to me later: it was the admiration which the Russians had for the United States. Chiefly it was naturally the envy of our marvelous technique; our mastery of natural forces and the deft way we turned them to our will. I remember somewhere in mid-Russia being shown through a vast repair factory for locomotives. Amid all sorts of difficulties and scarcities engines were being repaired and built. It was a miracle of desperately hard work with only fair accomplishment. The director had a right to be proud and was; but he said, apologetically, "Of course, it's nothing compared to what you do in your Pittsburgh!" The Russians in 1926 were determined to believe that the fundamental American democracy, bursting up from a land of workers, who had freed slaves and made the lowly rich, would eventually sympathize with and support the struggling Russian state. Just as in 1789, they hailed free France, and in 1848, welcomed the victims of repression. They knew, or thought they knew that in the end America would clasp hands with the U.S.S.R.

It happened that just before I went to Russia, a delegation of nine workers representing the British Trade Union Congress, left London early in November, 1924, and spent two months in sight-seeing and study. Their report of conditions at nearly the same time as I made my notes serves to confirm in my mind the fairness of my observations. I venture to quote a few paragraphs.

"The Soviet system at present consists of a series of compromises, most of them in constant change. One of the most striking characteristics of the present regime is its readiness to recognize failure. Should a Communist theory fail to give the required results it is scrapped for all practical purposes as ruthlessly as any Tsarist tradition. On the other hand, should ideas of institutions or individuals associated with the old order prove useful instruments there is no hesitation in using them.

"For all opposition is as yet silenced. But the need of it is not so much felt, owing to the extraordinary candour and criticism of those conducting affairs, and their readiness to conform their policy to new requirements of the moment. The constant elections and discussions at congresses keep those in power in touch with opinion; while the continuous stream of official publications and pronouncements keeps opinion informed

of any defects that may develop in the system and of the proposals for reform. In fact, the critical functions of an opposition both in the press and on the platform are largely performed by the Government itself. The speeches of political leaders are generally critical lectures on economics, not the appeals to passion and partisanship that are found necessary elsewhere.

"As to the persistent assertions in the Press that the present regime in Russia is a 'reign of terror,' the Delegation would wish to put on record its conviction that this could not be honestly believed by any unprejudiced person traveling within the Union and talking to its citizens."

The report, dated 1925, concludes:

"In view of the information contained in the preceding chapters - all of which has been obtained by themselves from sources and through channels that convince them as to its general accuracy - the Delegation has come to the following conclusions: That the USSR is a strong and stable State: That its Government is based firstly on a system of State Socialism that has the active support of a large majority of the workers and the acceptance of an equally large majority of the peasants; and, secondly, on a federal structure that gives very full cultural and very fair political toleration: That the machinery of government though fundamentally different from that of other States, seems to work well, and that the government it gives is not only in every way better than anything that Russia has ever yet had, but that it has done and is doing work in which older State systems have failed and are still failing; That these good results have reconciled all but a very small majority¹ to renouncing rights of opposition that are essential to political liberty elsewhere. And that this causes no resistance, partly because these rights have been replaced by others of greater value under the Soviet system, and partly because recent movements have been steadily towards their restoration: And finally, that the whole constitutes a new departure of the greatest that is well worth foreign study and a new development that may be greatly benefited by foreign assistance."

But here - here in the white Silence of the Dawn,
Before the Womb of Time
With bowed hearts all flame and shame,
We face the birth-pangs of a world:
We hear the stifled cry of Nations all but born -
The wail of women ravished of their stunted brood!
We see the nakedness of Toil, the poverty of Wealth,

¹ This probably should read "minority," both from the context and the fact that the word is circled in the original - *Transcriber's note.*

We know the Anarchy of Empire, and doleful Death of Life!
And hearing, seeing, knowing all, we cry:

Save us, World-Spirit, from our lesser selves!
Grant us that war and hatred cease,
Reveal our souls in every race and hue!
Help us, O Human God, in this Thy Truce,
To make Humanity divine!

CHAPTER III

BLIND STAGGERS, 1917-1936

Sitting in Moscow on my arrival August 28, 1926, I was reading the New York Times; it said "Revolution has broken out in Cronstadt. Streets are flowing with blood!" I stared in astonishment, for the issue was dated the very day I had landed in Cronstadt. One can know what Cronstadt looked like when I landed by reading page 14.

The dispatch was dated from Riga. That explained much. Riga was in Latvia; just south of Estonia and but 50 miles from Lithuania, these three states of Clemenceau's Cordon Sanitaire, whence European Big Capital would one day re-conquer Russia. Thus Riga had long been a nest of liars who poured fairy tales about Russia into the West. Even I had known that and how could the TIMES be misled into printing this story without confirmation? I went back in my own mind to what I had known about Russia since the Revolution and remembered that I was astonished to learn how long the war had lasted in Russia after the Armistice.

Leaving Russia in October 1926, I tried after my return to America to collect and organize my knowledge and read neglected books and reports.

The result was amazing. I presume in all our knowledge something like this takes place: save in some narrow file we know events and situations vaguely, from newspapers, magazines or a book or so. But soon we are making judgments and coming to conclusions not on a basis of carefully garnered knowledge, but on flimsy generalizations influenced tremendously by current public opinion. Thus we tend to learn our history backwards.

I had known that Czarist Russia naturally resisted the revolution. But of the extent of that counter-revolution and of the active help in manpower, material and arms, supplied by the civilized world; of the spying and intrigue from all Europe which had accompanied and inspired this war of reaction; I had but the vaguest information. Indeed I did not learn the whole story until Sayers and Kahn published their "Great Conspiracy" in 1946.

What amazed and uplifted me in 1926 was to see a nation stoutly facing a problem which most other modern nations did not dare even to admit was real. Taking inspiration directly out of the mouths and dreams of the world's savants and prophets, who had inveigled against modern industrial methods; against the co-existence of progress and poverty; against slums and disease; this new Russia led by Lenin and inspired by Marx proposed to build a socialist state with production for use and not for private profit; with ownership of land and capital goods by the

state and state control of public services including education and health. It was enough for me to see this mighty attempt. It might fail, I knew; but the effort in itself was social progress and neither foolishness nor crime.

Russia was handicapped by 95% of illiteracy among her peasants and nearly as much among her working classes; by a religion led by a venal and largely immoral priesthood, dealing in superstition and deception, and rich with the land and loot of groveling followers. Most of her industrial capital was owned by foreigners whose only interest was the 50 or 75% which they reaped from merciless exploitation. Her government had long been shot through with dishonesty and graft under dissolute nobles and fawning lackeys. Her punishment of crime and independent thought had long affronted the civilized world. Yet the best people of Europe and America seldom raised a finger of protest but fawned on Russian royalty and aristocracy, receiving them with open arms and loud sympathy when they were repudiated.

Now after this first glimpse of Russia I traveled home. I had made a great pilgrimage; the sort of journey of which one dreams. I had seen the Scheldt at Antwerp and the paintings of Rubens; I had seen the towers of Cologne, the Rhine and the Lorelei; I walked by the Rathhaus of Frankfort and through the Thuringianwald to the Wartburg of Luther; through Berlin and its Thiergarten. I had gone to the Baltic Sea, to the Nevsky Prospect and the Winter Palace; for me the Red Flag had waved above the Kremlin, the slow boats had moved down the Volga and the Great Fair had opened at Nijni Novgorod; down the Dnieper I had found the Black Sea.

Now I turned backward toward home. Going I saw glimpses of the Glory that was Greece and the Grandeur that was Rome: the foundations of that European culture into which I was born — foundations now in semi-ruin. Along the Bosphorus, villas of tarnished splendor and semi-tropical trees appear; they cluster and climb the hills to white and brown-walled terraces. There comes a narrow pass with towers mighty and crenelated. The strait opens its beautiful arms and in the evening sun burst the domes and minarets of the city, Constantinople.

The city glooms and shines with six immense vast domes and sixteen minarets; house on house piled like fortress walls rise on the right; and on the left Asia. I have never seen a city like Constantinople. It is magnificent and terrible. It is a microcosm of human life writing all its startling beauty and repulsive cruelty. The great sweep of its domes bulging toward heaven, its hills, its rivers and seas, its crowded harbor and more crowded streets all give to its 2500 years of history a vividness and measuring which gatherings of men in millions possess.

I walked the walls of Constantinople; I have seen the walls of Moscow and Nuremburg, of Carcassonne and Grenada, but never such gigantic walls of defense as the Wall of Theodosius; great wall and under-wall, deep moat and massive square and hexagonal towers. They defended African and Asiatic culture against German and Slav barbarisms for a thousand years. Vast and grim was the long, long lonesome sweep of stone interlaid with blues and browns, in part now cracked and falling, but enough by another thousand years. Yonder lies Thrace and Hungary and Europe and Kiev and Norgorod, long lonesome worlds of men.

I quailed before the city. I could get no idea of it. Its infinite winding streets were baffling. It was a great and unknown giant. Then I went down to the Golden Horn and the teeming streets of Stamboul and putting my shoes from my feet stood beneath the dome of Holy Wisdom. One great curve sweeps above the immensity of the church and looms 170 feet above the soft carpeted floor. It is a singular and mighty thing; 40 windows light it and the dome itself rests on four tremendous arches. There are four vast pillars and arcades framing perhaps the most wonderful single building in the world. For 15 centuries this thing has risen, trembled, swayed and groaned in the golden light of its old and holy beauty. It is right for men in bared feet with out-stretched hands and moving mouths to touch their foreheads in its dust.

I had one wide look over all the burning beauty of Stamboul and Persia and Galatea to Scutari and the wild rocks of the Principis of Wilson and Trotsky; the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus, the Propontis and away in the distance the shadow of the Hellespont. But all day the great golden aisle of Sant Wisdom screamed in my soul. I saw the Sarcophagous of Alexander the Great, and beyond Scutari where skilled slaves of European capital toil cheaply in quiet. Beyond them a city of the sleeping dead, high above the Golden Horn, beneath ancient cypresses. Yonder the 10,000 Greeks came to barter.

We passed through the Hellespont in starlight, the water dark silver, the sky a deepened blue, the land black and heavy; high Europe and wide Asia and across the cortege flew Hero and Leander, Xerxes and Mohammed, Lord Byron, the Turkish host and armies of Russia, England and France. Above us hung the ruins of Abydos.

Then came the night. The Bear, the Pleiades and the Milky Way shone joyously and lingeringly the day arose again on the Isles of Greece. Achilles and Patroclus lie in long last sleep. How well I remember stumbling through the mighty lines of Homer:

Menin aside thea
Peleiada Achillacs!

Yonder hidden to the left sleeps Troy. Beyond is Olympus, garlanded with snow. Lemnos comes on the right hiding Samothrace and on the right we leave Gallipoli where 10,000 British boys were murdered in 1915 for nothing; murdered and died by the blunder of "Winston Churchill.

All this by faith I see beyond the old Aegean; but real in soft morning light looms golden Euboea and Andros. We are amid the Cyclades - but empty, empty, barren and dead to all the sweet song, the myriad tongues, the plying boats, the teeming trade to the past - dead and why?

No land that lived and breathed like Greece and Lesser Asia needed to die; but any nation that sins against the Holy Ghost must die if truth lives. We thread the Cyclades, pass Chios and before us lies Greece. Bare but beautiful rise the blighted hills and mountains of Attica in the morning sun. We swept toward Salamis and the Pericleus to see the pale and deathless Parthenon peering through; to see the rose colored columns of the Temple of Jupiter and the Acropolis. It was all pitiful and forlorn in its torn and raped beauty; baked and burned and yet eternal in the perfection of the dream that built it. The theme was simple, and quiet in its restraint, yet bold in the grandeur which conceived it, on a hill amid mountains, with backdrop of seas and all about memories of Thebes and Thermopylae, Eleusis and Hymettus. The market place -where Demosthenes talked stands rough like Paul; the Dynoysian theatre crouched low to listen to Aeschylus, Euripedes and Sophocles.

Athens was a dead wreath of white dust, hot and sweltering; and through it poured refugees from war and Turkey. Tall black mountains grimly escorted us through the canal and into the Gulf of Corinth; by the heaped mass of the Peloponessus, with Platea and Mycene and other mighty names all about us. The night bell tolled for Ithaca and with morning, came Italy.

It had been 33 years since I had seen this land; again I glimpsed beautiful faces and white towns as we sped by Brindisi; saw sea and Appenines and came to the Bay of Naples. Vesuvius wore the wreath of smoke; but gone was the gayety and lazy laughter of Santa Lucia. I was whisked to a fashionable suburb and tucked into a "Grand" hotel at fabulous rates. The trains were "running on time" and the beefsteak was English; but in the little day I stayed I searched in vain for the old, care-free, dirty, jolly Naples; in its place the world was marching in uniform: officers strutting, soldiers quick-stepping, even boys parading. The Farnese Hercules was still there and the room of Titians. I saw Capri hiding beneath a broken-backed rock; in the rock is a hole; in the hole the sea blazes blue; writhes and seethes and blazes blue.

And now it is done. The blue sun set is dropping toward a sea

of molten lead. Capri rises black and cloudy sharply limbed against the Sorrento green and gold shines with the soft sheen of evening. A sullen rock with a cross which was not meant. Castles old and high, perch on its edge of heaven; ships with silver sails go reverently home.

"O I have sighed to rest me," sings the orchestra. The breath of Vesuvius spreads rose colored above the purple bulk of the long low mountain and then it slips up into grey, pink and golden clouds and wraps the skies in veils and scarfs and mists. And the sun changing is orange burnt and sudden in the sky. Vesuvius is solemn and its waving veil sinister until it strikes high Heaven and the sun. Now Capri fades and Sorrento is hard and sharp against the sky. The bay of Naples fades and dies then lives in a long string of topaz lights which run in a great circle from Pazzule to where Pompei was.

What was wrong with Greece and Rome that they died and fell? Here modern science on which we stand today was born; here beauty found rare expression which still sets ideals today; yet Greece is bare, eroded, ruined and poverty-stricken and diseased; Italy is crime cursed, sick and wretchedly poor.

We got science and Art from these beginnings; some unsurpassable heights of culture were reached, which built upon and not wasted, might still guide and enrich us. Here Faith in man and his destiny hurled great monuments to heaven and bore honest, keen, self-sacrificing servants of the common good. What happened? I see Faith which is pragmatic hypothesis going blindly and bravely and all unselfishly ahead and Science which is knowledge reaching the rough and guiding hand, until impatient Faith breaks away and lurches forward to doom, war and hate.

I wonder if Aristotle in his logical building of his city on a substratum of slaves and barbarians did not make the initial mistake which formed the morass into which the world floundered, and which made Rome a slave empire, and forced the Renaissance to give birth to slavery in the new world?

So that the Victory of Samothrace and the Moses of Michelangelo gave birth logically to black slavery in America and the Industrial Revolution in Northern Europe? Out of this conception of a slave-supported society, we must emerge. The United States had opportunity but refused it in the Reconstruction after bloody Civil War. Perhaps Russia is groping for the way out; for a civilization that will not die of its own contradictions. It must and perhaps at least try to place beneath a new conception of culture, a foundation of mass participation in civilization, which Greece never conceived, Rome thought impossible and Europe and America dreamed of but seldom tried to realize.

As I range forward in space and backward in history, through the mad ruin of this grandeur and bleak desolation of breath-taking beauty; as I foresee in France and England, New England and California this same awful metamorphosis, my mind struggles to unravel the reason beneath and the cure above.

How could I best pause to see this, and now to write it, hurrying as I was through a world staggering blindly between two wars that in ferocity and sheer human depravity spelled one of the Ends of Time? But precisely for all these reasons I must see the world, as I turn home between the daring experiment of Russia and the Western World where modern freedom was born. Through the fading fires of Greece and Rome I came back to re-interpret to myself my native land.

At Naples I boarded the magnificent liner of the Italian Line, built for the luxury trade of rich America. Although I had ordered a second cabin passage, the polite management had reserved a single first class cabin on the theory that no American was too poor to afford that, even though black. It left me practically bankrupt with the baffling problem of sufficient dress shirts. But one martyrdom I was spared. Indeed I supposed that in half the cases where all my life I have expected discrimination, I have been disappointed; it has not happened. This made it however not sweeter in the other half, where it dropped relentlessly with silent and bitter insult and cruelty. In this case a Harvard man (of all folk!) and his family made my trip most enjoyable; and the boat was a dream of luxury and taste, here on the eve of world disaster.

I returned to America late in 1926. Normalcy and Harding, the President in whose Negro descent I firmly believed, was dead. In his place reigned the colorless Coolidge, a man of my own thrifty New England, who knew as much about the world as any narrow, untravelled and unread provincial. He and his powerful industrial backers had beaten La Follette, honest but hesitant hope of the Liberals, in 1924; and now Coolidge was set to collect foreign debts and raise the tariff to unheard of heights so as to make payment of the debts impossible; to beat down the prices of farm produce, steal government oil at Tea-Pot Dome and chase the murderous liquor gangs to jail for failure to pay income taxes. War was merrily "outlawed" by the Pact of Paris in 1927.

The country was literally seething with prosperity. Wall Street gambling was reaching new heights of audacity and all the old stick-in-the-mud rules of investment were being broken. Stocks yielding six per cent were selling on a ten per cent basis because the golden age was a-coming with America in the saddle. But my little business, the CRISIS Magazine, which was paid for by low-wage black workers was losing ground. Its

subscribers were out of work. Perversely I assumed that the fault lay in me and that I was not satisfying my readers.

What was happening in the world? The United States was blissfully unaware that anything was wrong that could not be cured by quick return to 19th century methods of government and industry. What could happen to a great, rich unconquerable land like ours? Coolidge did not "choose" to run and no one chose to have him. We proceeded to elect a new President on the incidental question of whether a Catholic could sit in the White House and also as to whether Negroes had any political rights. The Negro vote was so completely ignored that the leaders of the race complained bitterly to deaf ears.

Herbert Hoover was elected president and Hoover looked like just the type of business man to restore and re-build industry, after what all Americans believed to be the last war, which modern civilization would permit to interrupt trade. Herbert Hoover had made money as an engineer out of the cheap labor of China, Mexico, Australia, India, and South Africa. Early in the new century he had invested heavily in eleven Russian oil concessions and in companies to exploit timber and minerals in the Urals. He shrewdly sold out however before 1917, when these various concessions were confiscated by the Bolsheviks. Naturally he became a bitter enemy of Bolshevism, which he said was "worse than war." When he became United States Food Administrator in 1917 to 1919 he distributed nearly all of the hundred millions which he handled among the armies and peoples who were fighting the Russian revolution. Later as Secretary of Commerce 1921-28, he was a well-known enemy of Russia.

With Hoover as President there was no hope of the recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States. But no sooner was he seated in the White House, then suddenly in 1929, the industrial organization of the United States crashed in unprecedented ruin.

I had by this time decided that my work as editor of the Crisis was no longer demanded. Quite unconsciously I had absorbed from my day the fashion of gauging usefulness and need by profit. If an enterprise was profitable, or an undertaking was paid for by the consuming public, that proved its worth automatically. If and when it did not pay, it was not needed. Such reasoning was idiotic as I soon came to realize; but also I realized that when my own effort could no longer make this periodical pay then those who thereafter helped support it, had the right to determine its policies. This latter fact hastened my change of work.

I was sure that the propaganda era of my life was at an end and that now at the end of my life — that was 21 years ago — I was 61 — I was justified in retiring from public agitation and devoting myself again to social investigation and pure

literature. The urge to do this was all the stronger because opportunity offered to work with a friend; work at the center of the Negro Problems in the state of Georgia; and to be paid a modest salary of \$4500 which was sufficient for my needs. I prepared to leave New York and the NAACP, and the deepening gravity of the CRISIS hastened my going; so that in 1934, I was at Atlanta University.

Naturally my interest in Russia kept up however and I was increasingly disturbed by the news. I did not, however, place reliance on the American Press, as I had formerly. For instance the reports of famine and trouble with the peasants did not alarm me. I expected no miracles in Russia.

I knew that she had but embarked upon a momentous and revolutionary social program and that from its inherent difficulties and those deliberately placed in its path by the Western world, she was bound to have a difficult path. Moreover from our custom of glorifying war; stopping with "victory" and then utterly ignoring the frightful recovery from murder and destruction and maiming in limb and morals — I knew that few persons criticizing Russia had any idea of her utter prostration from ten awful years of foreign and civil strife.

What happened in Russia during the 20th century? The phantasmagoria which engulfed the Soviet Union from 1917 to 1936, is almost impossible to picture clearly or concisely. I was long grasping this intricate story and I essay its outlines now with a certain trepidation. This vast land, one-sixth of the globe stood at the threshold of the new century, a miserable travesty of government and culture. Long revolutionary reaction, open and underground had shaken the land during the 18th century and the 19th. It was jolted to new life by the industrialization of Russia late in the 19th century with French, Belgian and British capital. On the right stood the nobility and high clergy; in the middle were the business men and at the left were the Social Democrats. Left of the Left came the Marxists,

Three men, all under 50, led the Russian Revolution of 1917. Vladimir Ilich Ulyanov, known as Nikolay Lenin, planned it. He was the son of a school inspector and of the daughter of a small landowner, and was born in East Central Russia. Joseph Vissarionovich Djughashvili, known as Joseph Stalin, carried Lenin's plans into execution. He was the son of a shoemaker and grandson of a Georgian serf; he knew the workers of the Russian Caucasus and their problems.

Lev Davidovich Bronstein, known as Leon Trotsky, was the brilliant idealist of the Revolution who both inspired and betrayed Russia. He was born of well-to-do Jews, not far from Odessa.

There were many other leaders, but these were outstanding.

Lenin was the man of wide reading and sound learning, who took the Marxian theory of socialism and by long scientific experimentation of trial and error adapted it to living and working Russia. Stalin was the slow, cautious but keen executive, who knew the common laboring masses of many races and religions. He took the theory of Lenin, and translated it into reality with grim steadfastness, self-effacing sacrifice and unswerving determination.

Trotsky was the brilliant propagandist and dreamer of dreams; in the stress of battle and trial of endurance he could not distinguish between his own ambition and the sacrifice demanded by principle. He helped organize the Red Army and then sold his fatherland to Germany, nearly betraying his fellow workers to the rulers of world industry.

Lenin, one of the greatest men of this century, was a social scientist; that is a man who believed that the deeds of human beings were subject to natural law and that this law could be discovered and its action measured. Others like Comte had forecast a Sociology to develop along with Physics and Biology, but practical reformers and religion balked at the concept.

A real science of human action would deny Freedom of the Will; it would contradict moral responsibility and acts of God; it was "materialistic."

But Lenin was not the sort of modern Sociologist, who boasted of his science, and did nothing to discover its laws. What laws govern human action, Lenin did not know nor pretend to know. But following Karl Marx, he saw the rhythm of history and determined to plan human life in accord with known knowledge and on such scientific hypothesis as he found would work. He stood ready and eager to revise and restate in the light of experience any hypothesis or theory he might hold. He therefore studied not only the written word of history and economics, but the actual current deeds of living men. He knew the lives of the masses; he admitted that much which men did seemed spontaneous and unconditioned and a matter of chance. But he was determined at least to measure the limits of this chance and beyond those limits, if limits there were, to plan the actual lives of man. It was this pragmatic approach to human action, either in government or revolution, that set Lenin apart from and above his followers and contemporaries and explained his life.

While yet a student, Lenin spent five years in exile in Siberia. Then he went to Western Europe to study and organize an effective Socialist Party, planned by Lenin in the All-Russian Congress of Social Democrats. His attempt at Brussels and London in 1903, resulted in division into Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, the right and left of the revolution. Lenin was overborne and after two years in Switzerland, returned to Russia late in 1905.

Meantime, far in the East, Stalin was working among the laborers of Baku. The British trade unionists described how those workers lived:

"During the investigation of the oil fields of Baku we were amazed and disgusted with the conditions of housing the workers which had formerly existed under private control. The living places were not huts; to attempt to dignify them with the name of houses would be wrong, and the nearest description we can give is the out-houses one finds in the worst slum areas at home... Long rows of dimly lighted buildings, one story high, with small windows and low-built doorways, and in some cases no flooring but the hearth. In these hovels hordes of people of various nationalities had been housed under such conditions that would subject the owner of cattle in our own country to prosecution for cruelty... We have no hesitation in saying that these conditions of housing the people were the vilest and worst we have seen in Russia or in any parts of the world known to any of the Delegation. When we remembered that the output of oil from this district can be counted in hundreds of millions of poods and that millionaires have been created in abundance from these oilfields, our indignation and disgust at the treatment of the workers was unlimited."

Stalin was inconspicuous, cautious and taciturn. He was expelled from the Theological Seminary which he had entered, and found work as a clerk. He became a socialist leader among the oil laborers, inspired demonstrations and strikes, wrote leaflets and contributed to socialist papers. He was neither quick nor brilliant; he was more than that - slow and tireless and loyal. He saw the oppression of Poles, Finns, Jews, Georgians, and religious sects. He followed the plans of Lenin as technical executive not mere propagandist, working on the gathering of hard facts. He sought methods of action to implement revolution. By 1901, at the age of 22, he was organizing the workers in the oil works owned by the Rothschild interests, and was arrested and spent three years in prison.

Stalin escaped from Siberia in the turmoil marking the opening of the Russo-Japanese war and went back to the Caucasus, where he helped in the oil workers strike which anticipated the Petersburg Revolt of 1905, and which resulted in the first collective agreement between workers and employers ever signed in Russia. The Czarists let the Black Hundred loose on Socialists and Jews and soon had the Caucasus writhing in interracial feuds. Here Stalin learned his great and never to be forgotten lesson of the dangers of race hate, which stood him in good stead during the years when he was Commissar of Nationalities. He wrote vigorously against the Czar and took the side of the Bolsheviks until his work came to the attention of

Lenin. The two met in Finland in 1905, and Stalin was surprised to see his great leader so small of stature and so modest.

The third member of the revolutionary triumvirate, Leon Trotsky, arose with the abortive Revolution of 1905, after exile in Siberia. The crazy government of the Czar was riding to its doom. In 1904, it went to war with Japan and was on the way to defeat before the end of the year. Distress spread among the workers of Russia, and in 1905 the workers of St. Petersburg, unarmed, led by a priest and carrying ikons, marched to the Winter Palace of the Czar with an humble petition. They were shot down in cold blood. Revolt flamed; it was not planned revolution, but sudden angry reaction: strikes spread from Petersburg and Moscow to the whole country; a Grand Duke was assassinated; the crew of a battle ship mutinied, and workers organizations called Soviets, began to spread.

The Petersburg Soviet became the spectacular center of this revolution and elected Leon Trotsky as its president. Trotsky had attended the London Conference in 1903 where he sided with the opponents of Lenin.

When the Japanese defeated Russia he hurried back to Petersburg and led the Petersburg revolt. He was in his element; brilliant, fiery and daring, he roused the workers to wild enthusiasm, and the revolt reached its climax in an armed uprising in Moscow in June 1906.

Meantime the Czar wavered, granted civil liberties and a duma in 1905, arrested Trotsky in the same year; called and dissolved a second duma in 1907 and then put down the Moscow revolt in a flood of blood. Lenin hurried back to this "general rehearsal."

The attempted revolution failed and Lenin returned to Geneva, prepared to wait, if necessary, 20 years, "unless Czardom is shaken by a major war." Meantime reaction in Russia triumphed; all four of the Dumas were dismissed by the Czar and most of the Socialist deputies sent to Siberia.

The following years Lenin described as the years of education for the working group. They learned not only to attack but to retreat. By 1912 the revolutionary forces began to revive.

Czarist Russia entered the First World War as a method of stopping revolution, but succeeded only in revealing the utter incompetency of the government. By 1916, the nation was prostrate and the Czar abdicated in 1917. After a vain attempt of a provisional government to rule, the Revolution of October 1917, put the power in the hands of Lenin.

What happened? The Bolsheviks, now become the Communist Party seized power and established order and made peace with Germany at the cost of much territory, but at the insistence of Lenin who saw no alternative. The Germans demanded Finland, the Ukraine, Poland and the Caucasus, together with indemnity. Lenin

frantically appealed to Britain and the United States, but got no answer. Finally he accepted the treaty, while we Americans called the Russians "butchers, assassins, madmen, scum, beasts!" In 1918, banks, insurance, mines and railways were nationalized; foreign debts repudiated and foreign trade made a state monopoly.

Western Europe had transferred to Russia as investment before 1905, certainly 10 billions, perhaps 20 billions of dollars worth of machinery, goods and technical services. It had in turn received back in processed goods, food and materials and labor of all sorts, probably far more than the original investment. It is unfortunately impossible to know these facts accurately and with confidence, because the matter of investment and ownership of property is legally and by custom so largely secret.

When the czarist regime was overthrown, the; foreign investors feared to lose all of their rights of property and they backed reaction to put down the Revolution. But the Bolsheviks in various ways offered compromise. They were willing to repay invested capital and loans at least in part, but unwilling to continue the system or to guarantee future ownership and rate of profit.

Thereupon the West from 1917 to 1922 spent \$1000 billions in war to suppress the Revolution. They financed armies, munitions, spies and brigands, besides actually invading Russia with 25,000 of their own troops and 70,000 Japanese; they and their Russian allies killed seven million Russian people and inflicted on them damage amounting to sixty billions of dollars. Whatever plans the Russians had to rebuild a new economic world were retarded for ten years. The story does not make sense. Indeed it is gauge of our modern inability or unwillingness to reason.

Consider what happened in those fatal years, from 1917 to 1926. The Petrograd garrison revolted, the Kornilov putsch backed by Britain failed and Kerensky fled. France and Britain made treaty to dismember Russia and during the next two years, 14 nations invaded Russia.

In 1918, rebellious Czech soldiers enlisted by the Allies against Russia and raided along the Trans-Siberian railroad. Kolchak proclaims himself "Supreme ruler of Russia," supported by the United States, France and Britain. He rages with murder and cruelty, even as the Armistice is signed ending war in the West. But the Russian Bear at bay, raped and bloody, turns and sinks in its claws. In a year Kolchak, loaded with a billion rubles of loot is in full flight; but Denikin and Wrangel attack from the East and rush to a point only a hundred miles of Moscow. The world sees the Bolsheviks wiped out. So Yudenich attacks Petrograd.

Three months later Denikin driven back, deserts his army to

flee on a French warship, protected by the shells of the British fleet. In the extreme North, 18,000 British troops, 5000 Americans, 1800 French, 1200 Italians, 1000 Serbs and 20,000 white Russians quarrel, parade and mutiny. When the Americans hesitated, the British parodied: "The Yanks are running, the Yanks are running everywhere!"

The Russians conquered Wrangel, shot Kolchak and drove Yudenich to Paris. The Poles with \$50 million loaned by the United States, and war supplies from the French and British join the attack, but are driven back to Warsaw. With new help from the Allies they rallied and took Western White Russia and the Ukraine from the Russians by the Peace of Riga. The allies were encouraged, and the Japanese come to the rescue with invasion in the Far East. A fantastic medieval despot leads there a war of rape, murder and robbery; nevertheless by September, his army has fled to China and he has been shot. The Japanese withdraw.

All this was made possible by the new Red Army, which the fiery Trotsky inspired and led, although he was not the actual creator of the invincible force which saved Russia. At any rate, by 1920, Russia was saved and her power consolidated. Within she was federalized into a Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; without the white armies were thoroughly beaten.

The World Revolution for which the Communists hoped did not materialize. Even Lenin had doubted if a single Socialist agricultural state could stand alone in a capitalistic industrial world: and Trotsky had insisted that the Russian Revolution wax could succeed only if it was prelude to a European uprising. Only Stalin, slowly but with ear to ground, came to believe that Russia not only could but must prepare to stand alone in the world as a socialist state.

By 1920, there were settled in the west over two million persons, representing largely the former wealth and culture of Czarist Russia with entree to the best and most powerful social, political and financial circles of Poland, Germany, France, and England.

They crystallized a world-wide opposition to the Revolution; an opposition all the more powerful and persuasive because it was based on real suffering and sincere conviction that this blasphemous revolt against divine right was something so inherently hideous as to merit any kind of suppression. Now too, came a new enemy, famine, due to disorganization, drought and peasant revolt. In 1891 the famine affected seventeen million persons; in 1906 twenty-one millions; in 1911 twenty-seven millions; but 1921, no less than forty-three millions. In the previous famines the number of peasants who could not get enough grain for seed never was more than three millions; but in 1921, thirteen millions were without seed; that is nearly half Russia

was destitute.

Uprisings took place in many places, and the garrison at Cronstadt broke into open mutiny which was suppressed in bloody retaliation. Lenin saw that socialism had gone too fast and with his far-seeing and scientific adaptability to fact, in the face of theory, he startled the 10th Congress of the Communist Party in March 1921, by proposing a "New Economic Policy." This was a retreat from socialism far enough and long enough to secure necessary consumers goods, by allowing small private business enterprises and by relaxing government controls especially over the peasants. It was as Lenin explained a step backward in order later to take two steps forward. But Trotsky called it surrender to capitalism; while the world regarded it as the confessed failure of socialism.

The New Economic Policy partly denationalized the conduct of industry but not its control. The nationalization of industry had been, in fact, much less complete than is generally assumed. "Workers' control" established November 14, 1917, was followed by confiscation of certain enterprises; but it was not until June 1918, that the large industries were nationalized. Small industries were still only dealt with specifically and sporadically.

What the New Economic Policy showed, was that the time was not ripe for socializing agriculture, and without that step, no balanced economy could be built in the Soviets. The city industries must for a space depend on private business enterprise and foreign imports for necessary consumers goods. But the new policy meant temporary confusion. If in famine years the brute instincts of the starving had been loosed, now gradually the excesses of the new rich began to be manifest.

Persons who but yesterday had been penniless, now enjoyed prosperity never before known in Soviet Russia. The demand for women increased; cafes and taverns spread and wine was again sold. There was little to bridle the instincts which had been repressed in the days of war by stern military regulation. Divorces increased and 'free love' began to degenerate into excess. Retail and wholesale dealers who had been almost driven out by the Revolution now quickly increased to half the previous number.

But socialism and its aims were not surrendered as the West expected. The state still controlled most of the wholesale trade, and gradually began to build Trusts, Syndicates and Banks, analogous to similar enterprises in capitalist countries, but operated and controlled by the state as self-governing and self-supporting enterprises. The reversal of the New Economic Policy was a gradual process and was not completed until 1928, when the first Five Year Plan was launched.

Meantime, Western Europe, convinced that the collapse of Russian Communism was only a matter of time, sought to hasten its downfall from 1920 by a campaign of secret conspiracy, with spying, bribery and incitement to inner revolt which seethed for 20 years and was finally curbed; but even then not stopped, by the Great Depression and the Second World War.

The real and powerful anti-Russian opposition center was the Paris Torgprom, an organization of Russian nobles and European millionaires, including the founder of the Nobel prizes and rich exploiters from all the world, which met in 1920, to stem the tide and systematically finance and guide the re-conquest of Russia. It commanded unlimited funds, military advice from the military chiefs of staffs of Europe and cooperation of statesmen and conspirators of the first order. Centers for training Czarist officers and soldiers were established in five or more European countries. An International anti-Soviet Conference met in Bavaria in June 1921, with delegates from all over Europe. By 1923, a plan for European military attack on Russia was matured and approved in principle by the General Staffs of Europe.

Meantime carefully organized spying on the Russian conditions with covert encouragement and organizing of internal revolt had begun. A brilliant British subject of Russian birth, Sidney Reilly, began work in 1918 and continued until 1925. He had helped organize the Torgprom and had not only become rich but counted men like Winston Churchill among his friends. He hated the Russian Revolution with perfect hatred and worshiped the memory of Napoleon. He had tried unsuccessfully to organize internal revolt in Russia in 1918, and then returned to London and Paris.

Within Russia from 1921 when Lenin introduced the New Economic Policy, Trotsky, Bukharin and Zinoviev led an opposition group designed to remove Lenin from leadership. The Party in 1921, repudiated this movement and warned Trotsky. In 1922, Stalin was elected as General Secretary. Immediately the Trotsky group went underground and adopted a secret organizing method devised earlier by the British spy, Reilly. It soon had codes and passwords and began to penetrate various governmental departments including the army.

A friend of Trotsky became Soviet Ambassador to Germany and approached the then powerful Reichswehr for support. As a result, between 1923 and 1930, 250,000 gold marks annually was furnished by the Germans to replace Lenin by Trotsky as head of the Soviet State. The bribe amounted in the end to a half million dollars. Thus supported by funds, Trotsky at the death of Lenin in 1924 made his bid for power. At the Party Congress in May, he forced the question to a vote, and was unanimously defeated by the vote of the 748 delegates.

Trotsky redoubled his efforts and after the freest and widest debate on future leadership and policy in the Soviets he was overwhelmed in a party referendum by a vote of 740,000 to 4000. He turned then to revolution.

Through Winston Churchill and the spy Reilly, he invited Savinkov, a professional assassin to come to Russia, and settled a close friend as ambassador to Great Britain. Reilly, the British spy, encouraged by the death of Lenin went again into action. He and Winston Churchill tried to induce Lloyd-George, prime Minister of England to join them in forcing Savinkov, a former Menshevik, on Russia as dictator. But Lloyd-George thought Russia already on its last legs; "the worst is over", he said.

But Reilly was not so sure and enlisted the cooperation of Detering, the oil king, who had been buying up oil claims in Russia. Mussolini was induced to invite Savinkov to Italy; the French government and British oil interests cooperated. Soon the new dictator entered the Soviet Union to head an uprising in the Caucasus; the revolt did not take place and Savinkov committed suicide in prison.

Reilly fled to the United States where he was widely welcomed. He lobbied successfully against a proposed government loan to Russia and met Henry Ford, whom a Russian reactionary had just furnished with the spurious "Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion." Then Reilly was summoned to a meeting with Trotsky in Finland and left hurriedly. He crossed into Soviet territory and was shot dead.

Trotsky set September 27, 1927, the 10th anniversary of the Russia Revolution for a revolt. It failed; Trotsky was exiled to Alma Ata a city of 200,000 persons in Southern Kazak in a climate not extreme and where he was furnished a house for his family and personal freedom for writing and correspondence. He himself said that in seven months of 1928 he received 1000 pieces of political mail and 700 telegrams and sent 800 letters and 500 telegrams. He was visited by a government official and warned. He refused to heed and in January 1929, was ordered out of the Soviet Union, to the Turkish Island of Prinkipo in the Sea of Marmora, where once Woodrow Wilson planned a Peace Congress.

He arrived in Turkey in state with an armed bodyguard and was greeted by the press of the world. He immediately began in Turkey, France, Norway and Mexico during the next eleven years, a world war against the Soviets which nearly deprived Russia of all liberal sympathy and convinced the reaction that communism was doomed. Meantime the Torgprom in Paris prepared to stop Stalin's proposed Five Year Plan of Russian industrialization. Poincare and Briand were sympathetic and an attack on Russia was

planned for 1929 or 30.

A French staff was ready with soldiers from Poland, Rumania and Finland; Wrangel's White Russian Army of 100,000 and Krasnov's Cossacks were to be prepared; British munitions makers were conferred with and money was raised to sabotage Russian industries. But before these plans came to fruition, the whole world of colonial imperialism reeled in threatened ruin. In October 1929, came the stock market crash in New York; in May 1931, came the collapse of the Austrian Credit Anstalt in Vienna and in September, of that year, the Bank of England went off the Gold Standard.

The Japanese army occupied Manchuria to "save China from Bolshevism" in 1931, and Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, wrote to M. Moret, Governor of the Bank of France: "Unless drastic measures are taken to save it, the Capitalistic system through the civilized world will be wrecked within a year."

CHAPTER IV

I GIRD THE GLOBE

In the period 1928-1933, when industry crashed headlong in the United States and Western Europe, the Soviet Union began its Second Revolution under the leadership of Joseph Stalin. The first revolution of 1917 was the well known pattern of revolt against tyranny, feudalism, and exploiting capital which first called to power the liberal republican regime of Kerensky after the yielding and reaction of the Czar. Automatically revolt of workers and peasants followed, and then Lenin took hold. War Communism followed not by careful plan but in the absence of plan.

Fortunately for the Bolsheviks, just when the people, as it now seems, were at their last gasp, the open foreign intervention came to an end. The year 1920 was the year in which War Communism reached its culmination. "That year," it has been said, "will live long in the memory of all Russians who lived through it as the coldest, hungriest and most dreadful year of the revolution." Then in the spring of 1921, came the worst famine in Russian history, and peasant revolt was followed by military mutiny. Immediately, Lenin took his one step backwards in order to make two steps forward.

Lenin but began his planning for a real socialist state in Russia, when he died. Then there ensued for three years, the widest argument and most democratic decisions as to the future plans and aims of the new state. "This took various forms. There were repeated debates in the principal legislative organs, such as the Central Executive Committee of the All Union Congress of Soviets and the Central Committee of the Communist Party. There were hot arguments in many of the local Soviets, as well as in the local Party organs. There was a vast Oppositionist literature of books and pamphlets, not stopped by the censorship, and published, indeed, by the state publishing house, extending, as it stated by one who has gone through it, to literally thousands of printed pages."

Stalin realized even better than Lenin that the objects and ideals of the city worker and the rural peasant did not agree. He climbed no new heights of theory and dug no subtle cellars of logic. He himself was a son of a Russian slave of the soil and he saw that distribution of land among the peasants, even if the State held title, would not socialize farming. On the contrary, there began forming a new agrarian capitalism with its claws on hoarded food, and without a steady and growing food supply, Russia was doomed and her industrialization and socialization would be impossible.

The Soviet Union attempted its realization by a series of

Plans, beginning in 1928. It was a time of troubles; neither Britain nor the United States recognized the Soviets; France, Poland and China were unfriendly; Trotsky was at the height of his opposition and betrayal; both capital and skilled labor were lacking. Above all, a new concerted attack on Russia from the West was scheduled for 1930.

Not only were foreign affairs critical at this time but domestic affairs were in turmoil. Trotsky was at the top of his apostasy, Nepmen were refusing to surrender and intellectuals inclining toward reaction and even sabotage. There was a dearth of the skilled labor needed, few engineers and managers. World and civil wars had reduced industrial and agricultural output far below prewar normal. It took courage to start a Five-Year Plan at this time, but Stalin had courage, determination and faith.

At first, the Bolsheviks placed hopes on voluntary farm collectives whether consisting of joint labor, or labor and joint capital, communes with joint living, with housing and other enterprises. Some 80,000 such cooperatives with 10,000,000 members arose. To these were added state farms run with hired labor. But none of these efforts sufficed and many urged that progress could only be helped by encouraging the energetic kulaks and thus building a rural capitalism.

Stalin and the Party refused this compromise. The First Five Year Plan was considered and debated from 1925 to 1927 and adopted in 1928. It proposed to make Russia industrially independent of Europe by development of new mines and oil fields, building iron and steel works, constructing railways and in general expanding heavy industry. For this the Soviets asked larger expenditures for education, scientific research, health and housing.

In industrial production, it succeeded. The gross output increased from 15.7 billion rubles in 1928 to 34.3 billion rubles in 1932 (calculated at prices prevailing in 1926-1927), which represents 218.5 per cent of 1928. The volume of industrial production in 1932 exceeded the prewar level more than threefold, and exceeded the level of 1928 more than twofold. The First Five Year Plan as a whole was fulfilled in four and a quarter years to the extent of 93.7 per cent, so far as the gross output of industry is concerned.

While this plan was being carried through, there occurred a general strike of the peasantry against the government which meant either surrender of planning or what amounted to a Second Revolution in Russia. The background of this tragic impasse involved the whole history of the Russian peasant and is paralleled by the history of agriculture the world over.

While the peasant and city worker had been coupled from the

beginning of the Revolution as the foundation of the new state, the plight of the peasant made his participation difficult. The mujik was picturesque, but he was the worst farmer in Europe. He was ignorant, the victim of age long slavery, misled by a religion which taught superstition instead of morals, and ordinarily he did not produce enough to support himself. In the half century from 1800 to 1854, there were thirty-five years of crop failure; from 1891 to 1911, there were three famines and thirteen poor harvests. From 1918 to 1927, there were two famines and five poor harvests. The reasons were clear: the peasant landholdings were small and getting smaller. They were divided into small strips often miles apart; one-third had no iron ploughs and one-fourth no horses. Fertilizers were scarce, there was no rotation of crops. In short, Russian agriculture was in the fourteenth century. Nevertheless, the number of peasants increased from 15,000,000 in 1916 to 25,000,000 in 1926, who produced less food than the former number.

Not only that, but their land hunger increased. They had begun burning estates even before the revolution, and driving off and murdering owners; after the Revolution, as men swarmed back from the front, they not only wanted more land, but changed from their traditional servility to sullen rebellion. They supported the Revolution to get land and fought the Whites to prevent land from being taken away. They yielded more to their age-old vices of laziness, drunkenness, and greed.

It was soon clear to the leaders of revolution that the cooperation of the peasants could not be relied upon; to be sure they were sorely oppressed and wretched, but their one remedy was land. Once the state distributed the land they regarded it as their personal property to be used as they pleased. They resented taxation or advice or direction as to the sale of their crops or the prices asked.

Moreover, the peasants were in three classes whose interests did not coincide: the poor, the rich kulaks, and the middle class farmers. Of these, the kulaks were dangerous and hated by all peasants. Stepniak said in 1895, "The distinctive characteristic of his class is the hard, unflinchingly cruelty of a thoroughly uneducated man who has made his way from poverty to wealth, and has come to consider money-making, by whatever means, as the only pursuit to which a rational being should devote himself."

Dillon declared in 1918, "Of all the human monsters I have ever met in my travels, I cannot recall any so malignant and odious as the Russian kulak."

Thus the future of planning was in grave danger. The peasants tried fraud by exaggerating the demand for seed and fodder and underestimating crops. When compelled to sell their crops at

established prices, they reduced the crops and slaughtered their cattle so that 270,000,000 head in 1929 were reduced to 118,000,000 in 1933. Secret agents of the Ukraine independence movement living in Prague and Paris encouraged this opposition to collectivization. Partial crop failures in 1931 and 1932 aggravated this situation. The grain storing plan of 1932 failed; whole areas were left unsown and often half of the crop unharvested; a good crop in 1933 helped but there was hunger in many parts of the land.

The kulaks had the mentality of capitalists, enforced by ignorance and custom. The opportunity to cheat and coerce the poor peasant was broad and continuous. Stalin knew the kulak; his fathers had been their slaves for generations. He did not hesitate. He broke their power by savage attack. This revolution was more radical than in 1917, and Stalin knew it. "He walked the Giant's Causeway almost without halt or rest. Behind him were tramping the myriads of weary, and bleeding Russian feet."

In January, 1933, Stalin announced his plan of counter-resistance. The Party had expected the poor peasants to assent to collectivization without trouble, as they had all to gain. Some of the middle class peasants consented. But others and the kulaks, who also carried on trade and money lending, had to be dealt with summarily. Something like a million families out of 25 million peasant families were removed. The ones thus treated were usually chosen by their fellow farmers among the poor peasants and farm hands. There was much opportunity for envy and jealousy to work and government agents were later reprimanded for harsh action. But either this revolt against farm sabotage must be broken up, or Soviet planning would fail. Those who refused to cooperate were removed to distant places and put to work at road building, cutting timber or mining. It was hard, poorly paid work, and caused much suffering. But the result was that the number of collective farms arose from 20,000 in 1927 to 211,000 in 1933.

In such a village life differs widely from that of the old fashioned mujik. He is not confined to a small world in which cultivating his various strips of land with the aid of single horse was the practice. He has become a partner on a large estate and must adapt himself to large-scale methods of agriculture and the uses of all types of machines, many of which he had never heard of before. He goes through social and political, as well as economic changes, and he is involved in new experiences with his neighbors especially. The organization of work is naturally the most important.

"Strong must have been the faith and resolute the will of the men who, in the interests of what seemed to them the public good, could take so momentous a decision." We may ask whether or

not the Russian Revolution might not have been carried through with less blood and cruelty, with less appeal to brute force. We may believe that with all the gain from the efforts of Lenin and Stalin, most of it might not have been accomplished at lower cost to the decent instincts of mankind. But Russia answers and has right to answer, that this revolution cost less in life and decency than the French Revolution, than the Protestant Reformation, and than the English Civil War; that the chief guilt for the high cost of communism was not the fault of Russia but of Europe and America which silently condoned the slavery of Russians for centuries and then at fabulous cost tried for ten years to reinslave them to the degenerate Czars and filthy priesthood. If the cost of revolution was excessive and revolting, the fault is certainly not to rest on Russia alone.

For a people who have murdered, raped and crippled so many billions over the whole world for so many centuries suddenly to get sympathetic with thieves, liars, and criminals, does much more credit to their hearts than their heads.

We must remember that this problem of the farmer in modern life has been neglected to our cost. Here are folk who in every land have been physically by-passed by science, education and technique; they have in all lands been natural victims of exploitation and propaganda and in the automatic world market have been deprived of a decent income. In defense their leaders, climbing ruthlessly to the top, enslaved workers and made common cause with urban industry. This has stopped democracy in France, Germany, Britain, and the United States.

In the Soviet Union, following the liquidation of the kulaks, began a Five Year Plan which proceeded with its industrialization and included collective farms and the development of heavy industry in coal, oil, electricity, blast furnaces, automobiles and machines.

Coincident with this came a gigantic effort to send the millions of Russian illiterates to school. On a scale never before seen in this world, Russia in a generation turned millions of illiterates into a nation with ninety per cent of literacy. It was a gesture which proved to the world that whatever mistakes Russia might make in the future, they would not be due to ignorance. The success of this effort hurried the Torgprom, into planned attack on Russia in 1929 or 1930. But the financial crisis spreading over the world, stopped these preparations while the Russians proceeded into a second Five Years Plan from 1933 to 1938 devoted to the making of consumers goods and calculated to meet the sacrifice and unrest of carrying out the development of heavy industry.

Thus between 1917 and 1935, Russia carried through the three revolutions which took the attention of Western Europe from 1500

to 1900; the Reformation of religion; the control of industry and agriculture; and the authority of the mass of the people in government of the State. No one can compute the sum of human suffering caused by this triple revolution over so vast an area, in so brief a time, amid the most embittered civil war, supported by half a dozen foreign armies actually invading soviet territory. Yet the total cost was less than Western Europe paid. Whether the result was better or not, Time must tell.

It is not until after the event – often long after – that wise men can evaluate the contemporary scene. I realized this in the Desperate Decade from 1926 to 1936. We were passing through one of the periods of Boom and Bust which Marxian philosophy claimed was the inescapable destiny of the Capitalist system. I had lived through some seven depressions; that of 1873 I remembered, because of the huge silver dollar which my uncle gave me as a child and which was my first sight of real money. During the depression of 1893 I was abroad, and that of 1907 found me teaching and served to keep my salary at \$1,200 a year or less. I now realize how differently business expansion and depression affect social classes; the rich and well-to-do, already comfortable, get unneeded income, resulting in luxuries and power; but the lowest class of laborers living below decent standards begin to get necessities when suddenly at the first sign of depression they are plunged into utter poverty.

Especially at this time, 1926 to 1936, I was eager to know much better than I did, just what "drastic measures" were being taken in high places to save the system of culture into which I had been born. Especially, I wanted to learn, not only -what was being done, but how these plans would affect the Negro peoples, not simply in the United States but in Africa; and I wanted to know what part Russia and Communism would play in the coming change. Like all Americans of that day, I was tremendously influenced by Leon Trotsky and the propoganda he was loosing on the world. I did not realize clearly just what was happening in the Soviet Union and the press was not helping me or the public.

The most extraordinary tales of the Soviets were current. The series of trials of saboteurs and traitors, from 1930 to 1937, were pictured in the press as false persecutions with savage punishments. The Soviets had sought to open the doors of the nation by an Intourist plan with new hotels and guided travel. But incensed by the lurid reports of our press, the Soviet Union began to lower the "Iron Curtain" and go its own way in grim silence. But that left the world with almost unanswered propoganda, and many like myself were sorely puzzled. Several leading American liberals, formerly sympathetic with the Soviets, withdrew into silence or active opposition. I was

puzzled but not convinced. I knew only too well what the American and the European press could do with facts, when they related to black folk or to brown and yellow; or to any unpopular or threatening minority.

But with most folk, I had been caught with Trotsky's brilliant qualities and thought of him as embodying the revolution next to Lenin himself, I looked on Trotsky as typifying the Revolution. But his full career was partially hidden. Of it, I learned only long afterwards.

No complete study of the extraordinary personality of Leon Trotsky has yet been undertaken. He was convinced of his mission to lead the world to communism. To his egocentric mind, he was not betraying Russia but leading it to head world revolution; he was not selling himself to the Germans but deceiving the dull Teutons into delivering themselves into his power; he was not surrendering to capitalism but inducing capitalism to establish communism. It all worked back to his fanatical belief in his own wisdom and cunning and it all made him one of the great traitors of history.

He began with "My Life," a fictionalized account of his career as the real leader of the Russian Revolution. This was followed by four other books and a stream of articles, which found world circulation, as grist in the mill of reaction and threw confusion into the ranks of the friends of Russia. The campaign raged through the Great Depression, confusing the thinking of liberals and running consecutively with Fascism in Italy and Nazism in Germany. Trotsky's son, settled in Germany, got into connection with the German technicians and engineers working in Russia and with the German spy service. Sabotage on the new Russian industry was organized. Secret terrorist calls, composed of all the varieties of enemies of the revolution, spread.

In 1933, when Hitler came to power in Germany, Trotsky moved to France, with the blessing of Daladier, and got in touch with the Nazis through Hess and Rosenberg; and with soldiers like Tukhachevsky of Russia, back of Trotsky began to gather an extraordinary aggregation of czarists, reactionaries, Fascists, liberals and dissident radicals.

Dangerous evidences of this world plot began to appear, strengthened by the success of the Russian Five Year Plan and the increasing prosperity of the Soviets in the midst of the industrial crisis elsewhere. The next year Japan was drawn in, and things began to happen. In the coal mines of Siberia accidents became common and an engineer who reported this was found dead. Molotov, then chairman of Commissars, was nearly killed. Trotsky gave orders for the assassination of Stalin, Voroshilov, the Commissar for War and Kirov; most of the attempts miscarried, but Kirov, one of Stalin's closest co-

workers was murdered in December, 1934. Several arrests were made but the real conspiracy was not then unearthed.

A series of fiendishly clever murders by physicians' collaboration culminated in the death of Gorki in June, 1936. In October, 1935, Mussolini invaded Ethiopia; sabotage efforts, directed by Germans and Japanese, in cooperation with Trotskyites, spread in many parts of Russia, in mines, railroads, power plants and construction jobs. In June, 1935, Leon Blum's Popular Front government forced Trotsky to flee to Norway where he settled near Oslo, and near Major Vidun Quisling, who also was attacking Russia.

Trotsky became impatient. He ordered Radek to cooperate with the Japanese and Germans, proposed territorial concessions to Germany and the entrance of capital from Germany and Japan for exploitation. In return, he reported "an absolutely definite" agreement with Hitler to establish the Trotskyites in power in Russia. He said war would come in 1937.

The Soviet Government was aware of the conspiracy but it had long and carefully gathered its case. In 1930, eight members of the industrial party were arrested for conspiracy and sent to prison. Next year, fourteen former Mensheviks were accused of sabotage and of receiving 500,000 rubles from the Torgprom and other sources. They were all found guilty and imprisoned. Then in 1933, six British and ten Russian engineers were arrested and charged with sabotage for the British Intelligence Service. The Russians, with one exception, were all found guilty and sentenced to prison terms. One British subject was acquitted and the other five found guilty.

In the summer of 1936, the Soviets began to strike hard. In August by retrying Zinoviev and Kamenev with new evidence, they started the first of the celebrated Moscow trials and sentenced 16 to be shot. They then arrested Radek and three others and removed Yagoda. In January, 1937, they sentenced Radek and three others to be imprisoned and thirteen to be shot. Later they tried Tukhachevsky and sentenced him and seven generals to be shot. Finally, in the last of the Moscow trials, they shot Yagoda and eighteen others and imprisoned three.

The trials were fair and the testimony overwhelming. The American Ambassador wrote to the Secretary of State: "I talked to many, if not all, of the members of the Diplomatic Corps here and, with possibly one exception, they are all of the opinion that the proceedings established clearly the existence of a political plot and conspiracy to overthrow the government. But America and the Western world were given the idea that all this was simply Communistic brutality."

This Judgment was bolstered by the final efforts of Trotsky. Forced to leave Norway in 1936, he fled to Mexico, and from

there spread world-wide propaganda. He enlisted wide American sympathy and cooperation, and was welcomed to the best magazines and periodicals. A Committee of Defense, with prominent names was formed but the hearings produced nothing beyond Trotsky's own testimony. He tried to enter the United States and testify before the Dies Un-American Activities Committee, but did not succeed. He was killed by a colleague in 1939² in a dispute over a woman. The Soviet Union was accused of responsibility for this crime.

This story I knew, only in part in the early thirties. All the liberal magazines told the facts as Trotsky gave them. Even radicals, like Max Eastman, spread tales which history fails to substantiate. I found myself at the time wavering in mists of knowledge, and I was upset by Trotsky's exile; by the treason trials and by the repeated assurance that the whole Soviet system was on the verge of collapse. But my former visit to the Soviets did not let me believe all I heard. I was the more eager to see the Soviet Union again, and, also, to see the world - this side and beyond it.

While I was writing my interpretation of the Reconstruction period in American history, I was seeking also a chance to spend some time in Europe to see first-hand what was happening. I had no funds of my own to spend for such an investigation. No institution seemed prepared to finance me, especially as I could not guarantee to what conclusions I might come. I did, however, center on Germany as the key area for study, because I knew its language, people, and culture best; and because I was convinced that Germany was a critical point where the fate of modern culture would be settled. From Germany my observations could extend to Russia and I had a dream that by some legerdemain I might even view Asia.

I started by getting in touch with the Karl Schurz Foundation which was furthering German-American Friendship. I asked in 1931 for the opportunity to go to Germany and make contact with those organizations which in the past and at present were interested in German colonies, particularly in Africa, and which represented the liberal and progressive spirit. The Board declined, saying in 1932: "We realize that you are in a position to make such a study as you propose making... However, our most effective contribution to the welfare of the American people seems to lie in other directions." But they had under their administration the Oberlaender Trust which offered fellowships for study in Germany and the Secretary wrote me in 1934 suggesting that I might make a study of Black Troops in Germany. I eagerly assented, but nothing more was said, until I called on

² Trotsky was actually killed in 1940 - *Transcriber's note.*

the Secretary in Philadelphia. On his advice in 1935, I asked to "investigate Germany and Austria and the relation of education to industry."

As a result of this request, I was granted \$1,600 for six months study in Germany during the year 1936. By teaching in summer school in Atlanta, I arranged a semester's leave of absence in the Fall with pay, and I planned to stay four or five months in Germany and spend the balance of the leave in Russia and, if possible, to return by Japan and China.

I knew as I left America in June, 1936, something of what had happened to the world. European culture in the nineteenth century had rested on four institutions:

1. Peace between the Great Powers
2. A world market regulated by the international demands of trade
3. A gold standard for prices regulated by international High Finance
4. Wide freedom of initiative in industry for the white world

Peace among the great powers did not spell peace in the world. Between 1815 and 1915 there were over a hundred wars for acquiring colonies, expanding spheres of influence, crushing revolt in colonies and intercolonial strife; but the relations between the Great Powers was at least stable enough not to interfere seriously with the world market, the gold standard, and industrial free enterprise for those who controlled world industry. Through this arrangement, the white people of Europe and North America gained control over the darker peoples of the earth. This economic imperialism was not democratically controlled nor did it involve individual freedom. On the contrary, the industrial organization was increasingly an oligarchy, the darker peoples were serfs without land control, and even in white nations democracy was limited to certain political areas and was excluded from the vital areas of industry. Freedom of individual action was decreased by the rise of Big Business, monopoly and industrial combination, and international colonial imperialism.

The break in this system in the twentieth century did not come from revolt of the darker races, so much as from jealousy among the leading white nations over the division of profits, especially from the world market and the control of colonies. Germany, Italy, and Japan were insisting on a larger share of colonial empire and equal voice with Britain, France, and the United States in the world market and high finance.

The result was the First World War, with Germany and Italy fighting for colonies against the great colonial powers and the United States and these allies securing the cooperation of Japan, whose price was recognition as copartner and equal of the

dominant white European powers. This war disrupted the industrial organization on which the nineteenth century rested. The world market and the gold standard ceased to function and Russia came forward to challenge industry by planned economy and the raising of workers' share of income.

After the war, desperate effort was made from 1918 to 1929 to restore the world market and the gold standard; and to resist Communism in Russia. It was the irony of fate that just as Western Europe was practically united to overthrow Russia by force of arms, the system of culture which had lifted these nations to world dominance during the nineteenth century, built originally on Negro slavery in America, the cotton kingdom, and the Industrial Revolution, and then on the factory system, world commerce, and colonial imperialism, crashed in unprecedented ruin.

None in Europe, however, doubted but what the collapse was temporary, caused by war and destruction and capable of restoration within a reasonable time. From 1929 to 1939, every effort was made to accomplish such restoration. But in Italy and Germany the methods adduced were disconcerting to Britain, the United States, and France; since they were frankly socialistic in method and propaganda.

Socialism is state control of industry through a planned economy. Usually social theorists have assumed that the chief if not sole beneficiary of socialism, would be the mass of the working class of the socialized nation.

But German state socialism under Bismark and his successors had shown that a state economy might be partially socialized for the benefit of landlords and a hereditary nobility and only in part for the benefit of labor. And now came Mussolini and Hitler with a socialized state, in which again, labor was only a partial beneficiary, while the bulk of the benefits went to a ruling oligarchy with a dictator. This was a step toward a socialism under complete control of labor, with the workers as the only beneficiaries. Neither Britain nor France; nor indeed Italy or Germany believed such a state could succeed; but if two dictators, who were themselves little more than ordinary artisans, could seize and successfully conduct a planned state for the benefit of any group, the next step would certainly be the overthrow of the dictators and the attempted rule of the mob. Temporarily it was reassuring that in both Italy and Germany, the power behind the dictators were the owners and managers of industry. This organized industry recognized and applauded the dictatorship; capital was protected; profits were maintained and factories and railroads efficiently run. But what of the future? Who would succeed Hitler and Mussolini and their gangs? Would industry always be able to control such men,

especially when these rulers were paying such prices for labor support in full employment, good if not yet high wages and endless and increasing outlay for housing, roads, public entertainment, social security and the like? Where was all this to end and how was "democratic" control of the state, i.e. control by industry under current forms of indirect rule by wealth – how could this be restored before this dictatorship got into the wrong hands?

Those who believed a limited and controlled democracy consistent with free capitalist industry were aghast at the dictatorship of the Fascists, but attracted by their growing concentration on the conquest of Russia. While the Fascists were torn by greed for the resources of Russia and hatred of the colonial monopoly of France and England.

In the midst of this persisted the doctrines of Communism. The Soviet Union was saying that industry under free individual initiative was slavery and anarchy; that it reduced the worker to slavery; took over his contribution to wealth as private profit and led directly to industrial crises and war. To remedy this a planned economy was needed based on scientific study and measurement of human action and aimed at distributing the results of work among men justly and not by chance or force.

There is, of course, strange contradiction between the concept of human life as ruled by natural law and subject to the same law of evolution and development as the material world; and the concept of human life as ruled not only by law but by that interruption of law which allows life to be guided in certain directions and thus places responsibility for the outcome of life upon those who can exercise this power of choice. But singularly enough, those like Karl Marx, who insist on the rule of natural law in human action also stress the duty of man to change conditions of life; and who stress the freedom of human action, rely on natural law always to bring good and order out of the unregulated actions of men.

The understanding of this paradox lies in the fact that there is as yet no reality back of the ideas of Cause and Freedom to which we can appeal: to assert the universality of Cause does not explain its mystery; and to stress freedom of action, does not explain its inner contradiction. We are thinking beyond experience and our only appeal is not to logic but to experiment: if increasingly exact and long continued observation and measurement of human action, reveals an inexplicable and irreducible element of the Unpredictable, or as exact science would put it, Change; then scientific hypothesis must say, here lies evidence of that miraculous freedom of action which is the Uncaused Cause of a certain human deed and of development of human life and, perhaps, of other manifestations of Life.

The science upon which Karl Marx relied for knowledge of human action, was exact planning and measurement, guided by the hypothesis of the possibility of deliberate change but always checked by the meticulously observed fact; leaving to a more instructed age and much fuller knowledge the possible explanation of what is today the inexplicable paradox. Here lies the task of Sociology, which the Western World shirks and which only the Soviet Union and its followers have assumed on a scale adequate to real scientific advance in the paradox of human deed.

In the midst of this embittered calm which was prelude to another and even more horrible world war, I returned to Germany in 1936, after a lapse of forty tragic years since I first saw the Rhine and walked the Unter den Linden. I had strong affection for Germany, because in the days of my Sturm and Drang, this was the land where I first met white folk who treated me as a human being. At the time it bolstered my faith in the world and gave me strength to face and fight its wrongdoing.

The plan for restoration of European economy after the war was based largely on the restoration and development of colonial imperialism. But this could not apply to Germany. Even if Germany recovered her lost colonies – and this she proposed to do – she would still not have space and resources to support her economy and enable her to rival Britain, and France. Only larger colonies torn from England and France could do this and such a plan was costly even if any way possible. But there was another possibility and that was occupation and exploitation of the Russian Heartland. This was doubly attractive, because by such a venture the demands of German capital and labor could both be met and the menace of Communism destroyed forever. The lure of the program was all the greater because of the economic history of Germany since the First World War. Wealth and power in western Europe had been shaken but not overthrown. In Germany it had been shattered.

There were three points of view in Europe: the British, which was to restore the industrial system of the nineteenth century by keeping her colonial empire, and increasing the profits made there on cheap labor and raw materials but yielding larger share of this profit to home labor, so as to temper their rising demands. The sale of British manufactures to the rest of the world would return to normal if Britain could continue to undersell competitors.

In the case of Italy, Britain had egged the Italians on when the Black Mahdi drove the English out of the Sudan and Italy attempted to annex Ethiopia. She was soundly thrashed at Adua, but was offered by England in 1906 a free hand, to try again, as

price of her entrance on the side of the Allies in the First World War. The Congress of Versailles refused to honor this promise and when Mussolini saw his opportunity, he invaded Ethiopia as the one way to restore Italian economy by making her a colonial power. I was in London when Anthony Eden stood before the House of Commons and announced England's decision not to oppose Italy. This defied the League of Nations, but it increased the imperial power of colonialism and might help save the economy of the British Empire.

Belgium is a third case illustrating the plight of Europe in 1936. I stopped in Belgium to see Tervourien again. I had seen it in 1921, at the Second Pan-African Congress. It is perhaps the greatest single collection of Africana in the world. Berlin and London have valuable collections, and even the one in Dresden, which I saw is better than anything we have in America. But this whole museum, with its beautiful building and magnificent park, sets its own false note when it begins, in its first room with an exhibit of the exploitable riches of Africa. The Congo, fourteen times the size of Belgium, has from the first been and still is regarded primarily as a profitable investment for Belgian and European capital. The worst outrages of capitalism have been curbed at the demand of humanity the world over. Missions are at work and restraining laws have been enacted. But the chief end of the Belgian Congo is today as it was under Leopold I: to increase the private fortunes of Belgian capitalists. And if Belgian labor is today in a sorry plight, it is because in the day when Socialists ruled Belgium, they could not see that the cause of the black slave in the Congo was one with that of his white fellow in Belgium. I talked of this to Emil Vandervelde before the World War I and after, in America and Europe. His reply was to cite the new laws to curb capital in Africa. But what are such laws when they are dictated by investors in the interest of their own incomes?

And consider the human beings whose well-being Belgium is thus neglecting: magnificent physical specimens, as the great museum at Tervourien attests. Men of taste and skill. Men with a history, capable of all human advancement. Yet in 1936 few black men of the Congo were attending any Belgian University; not a single Congolese had a legal right to an acre of his own soil which the State had seized; not a single one had any political power to dispose of the immense annual wealth created by his labor.

Out of the Congo was coming increasing tons of copper and tin, together with oils, ivory, cotton and all fibres. The wealth of Belgium is primarily the wealth of black Congo, and that wealth is being used to curb the labor movement in Belgium and everywhere else it can.

Before 1914, Germany was planning a gigantic industrial machine. With a carefully planned economy, led by the best engineers of a new technical age, she was planning to become the greatest manufacturing nation of the world. In 1913, she was making nearly a third of all the world's machines and her methods and organization were the wonder of the world. The clouds in her sky were the industrial rivalry and monopolies of England, France, and America, and the growing demand of the working classes for a larger share of the product of labor, which in the teaching of some amounted actually to the abolition of all private profit and the ownership of capital by the state.

The German State before World War I had apparently yielded to this by becoming partner in great industries like steel, chemicals, shipbuilding, transportation, and communications; and Germany spent more for research in industry than any other country. Over this state, however, ruled the landed aristocracy, through the managers and engineers who formed perhaps the most powerful trade union in the world. Such industrial combinations, backed by the state, were necessary, if Germany was to enter modern industry in competition with England and France. She, therefore, entered international commercial combinations, cartels, export unions and finance consortiums. The First World War was fought to extend these industrial forays into the colonial and semi-colonial areas of the world, dominated by Britain and France. Defeat was revolution.

When a group or a nation acts incomprehensively, the answer lies in a background of fact, unknown or imperfectly comprehended by the onlooker. So it is in this case. Germany reeled under five blows, 1914 to 1933, which no people can experience and remain entirely normal. These were: War, the treaty of Versailles; Inflation, Depression, and Revolution. There is a war monument in Hamburg which is a most eloquent and ghastly memorial. It is a square straight shaft of gray granite, and it says simply: "40,000 sons of this city gave their lives for you in 1914-1918." Forty thousand dead youths from a single German city!

Then came a treaty of peace which was no less than devilish in its concealed ingenuity. One might agree in blaming the expanding industry of Germany for the war, although this is by no means so clear today as it once seemed; but who of the laymen knew or dreamed that what the Peace Treaty did was so to hamstring German industry as to make the earning of a living in Germany so difficult that bankruptcy followed on a scale that was revolutionary? The treaty deprived Germany not simply of one-eighth of her territory, population and arable land, but what was far more important, of a fifth of her coke; three-fourths of her iron, one-fourth of her blast furnaces, two-

thirds of her zinc foundries, one-fifth of her livestock, all of her merchant marine, and most of her railway equipment. And then saddled her with a debt based on unheard of principles, which no land could or did pay. In other words, in order to establish peace, the industrial masters of England, France, and the United States made the orderly return of Germany to work and self-support impossible without internal revolution.

This revolution meant a redistribution of wealth and income in Germany comparable only to the French and Russian revolutions. The people in Germany who paid were the thrifty, the workers, the civil employees, the very classes who had opposed war in the first place. And the persons who bore the brunt of criticism in Germany for the treaty were the labor unions, the teachers, the middle-class who hated war and wanted to build a new state, above the power of capital and the army. Adolf Hitler rode into power eventually by calling the government of Germany, which negotiated the Treaty of Versailles, traitors who stabbed Germany in the back when she was down.

Germany not only had the flower of her youth murdered in a senseless war, but she had her bread and butter taken away in an equally senseless peace. The accumulated savings of the nation disappeared; pensions, in a land of pensioned civil servants, were stopped; loans were paid in worthless money; property values dropped to nothing; industry was in bankruptcy and labor out of work. She struggled up and partially out of the morass, but when depression settled upon the world, Germany was worse off than others, because she was hopelessly in debt, and by the unanimous decision of the world not allowed to pay her in the only possible way — by the export of her manufactures.

Moreover, back of all this, the role of Big Business must be remembered. Organized Industry remained powerful in Germany because of planning or as it was called "rationalization." This planning was for the owners of industry and not for the worker; it first rationed production in the heavy industries; then it reorganized plants and businesses, specialized the plants, closed down badly located and poorly equipped plants and scrapped old buildings and old equipment. This industry could do because inflation wiped out their debts and allowed a small number of wealthy organizations to accumulate huge properties. Next industry began positive plans for scientific technique and equipment in every avenue of production, distribution, and consumption.

All this seemed in line with the plans of the Socialists who as modified Marxists were ruling the state under the Weimar Constitution. They helped industrial trusts, cartels and combinations under government control, and a national economic council. But they could agree on no plans for control of private

industry, which had raised a few industrial leaders to great power. The workers demanded higher wages and increased taxation for social service. By 1928 the taxes took 27 per cent of the national income and reparation payments absorbed much of this. Tariff walls and colonial ownership by others kept Germany from selling her goods abroad. The depression turned Germany into a socialistic state, with the problem for what class this state was to be run.

Had the German workers had a different training and leadership, Germany would have become Communist. But her labor leaders quarreled and some of the best of them were deliberately murdered. Thereupon industry made desperate effort to save German capital investment. They yielded to socialism – they had to, for the German state was already a large owner of capital. But they sought to build a national German socialism, to avoid international working class movements, and to save capital and private profit by yielding enough to the German worker to keep him quiet and satisfied.

Here came Adolf Hitler, a psychopath and a dreamer, with delusions of grandeur, frustrated by poverty and war; ruthless in his idealism, bold, cunning with a voice of brass and a knowledge of the human soul; this was the instrument which the captains of German industry picked out at the time of his defeat and despair to become master, not only of Germany but of Europe, and at one time near-master of the modern world.

Hitler was an artisan. He came from a part of Austria where the anti-Jewish feeling was strong, and his own economic rivalry with Jews as a worker had strengthened this. Here was an asset which would appeal to artisans, small shopkeepers, and racial fanatics. He was a popular orator just at the time that the radio and loudspeaker made speaking a possible state monopoly. In 1931, the financial collapse engulfed central Europe, and, in 1932, there were 7,000,000 unemployed in Germany.

Then came hope, although desperate hope, in the rising National Socialists, led by Hitler. The country was near anarchy. The next year, although still a minority, the Nazis attacked Jews, burned the Reichstag building and took power. Germany was revolutionized from a federation of largely independent units to a centralized dictatorship of a singularly constituted group of adventurers. They did away with political parties; they changed legal procedure and courts; they attacked the churches; they opened labor camps and eliminated unemployment; they built an army by restoring universal military service and allayed unrest by an ambitious youth movement.

In June, 1934, Hitler killed seventy-three of his followers so as to eliminate radicals who were set to attack property and capital, and his followers killed Dollfus in Austria, who

represented reaction toward the right. Now Hitler was prepared to rebuild the army and navy, he made naval agreement with England and seized the industries of the Saar. I arrived in Berlin just before the last act of this drama occurred: the Berlin-Rome axis and the recognition of Franco's Spain.

Revolution was staring Germany in the face, and a Marxian revolution which would make a dictatorship of the proletariat in a socialistic state. Industry was frightened, the Junkers (landed nobility) were frightened, the managers, engineers and small shopkeepers were frightened; they all submitted to a man who had been at first a joke, then a pest, and now who suddenly loomed as a dictator. Union labor, with its 8,000,000 members, holding the wide balance of power in the state, proceeded to squabble as to whether to usher in the millennium immediately or gradually, and through this squabble Adolf Hitler and Big Industry drove a carriage and four.

Hitler set up a tyranny; a state with a mighty police force, a growing army, a host of spies and informers, secret espionage, backed by swift and cruel punishment, which might vary from loss of job to imprisonment, incommunicado and without trial, to cold murder.

But this was not all that Hitler did. Had it been, he and his state would soon have disappeared. He showed Germany a way out where most Germans saw nothing and he made the vast majority of Germans believe that his way was the only way and that it was actually leading to the promised land. Nine out of every ten Germans believed this in 1936, and as long as they were convinced, they were going to uphold Hitler.

The philosophy of Hitlerism is not logical nor complete. Based on the old German idea of the state, it declares that the state and not the working class is the real unit to be developed. All opposition to the state must disappear. The interests of capitalist and worker are one. They must, by superior authority be forced into unity, and then the resultant state must be conducted in the interest of all. Moreover, this new state which Germany was building was something holy and superior. It is composed of pure Nordics, with no contamination of Jews nor of inferior races. Its in-born superiority was proven by history and experience. Germany was not beaten in the World War. She fought fourteen nations to a standstill, and only succumbed when her own people betrayed her. This must never happen again. The new Germany must be one. This unity means national health, a living wage, public works, a planned economy with workers trained to fit into the plan, and capital subservient to the great end of building a united and happy people. The success of this plan depended on a strong government, obeyed without discussion or argument or hesitation, with the power in the

hands of a supreme Leader, who was Adolf Hitler.

To secure such a government, and keep it in power, it is only necessary for the mass of the people firmly to believe that the thing works; that the Nazi state is doing what it promised and nearing its goal. Part of the work of a community or government is too subtle to be easily seen or measured. It is here that Propaganda comes in. The greatest single invention of World War I was propaganda: the systematic distortion of the truth, for the purpose of making large numbers of people believe anything authority wishes them to believe in, grew into an art, if not a science.

Nowhere was it used to such tremendous advantage as in Germany. Newspapers, public speakers, the radio, expositions, celebrations, books and periodicals, every possible vehicle of information and training, including schools, were used on German people to teach them that they are the most remarkable people on earth; that the national socialist government is the best government for Germany, if not for the world; that other countries, especially Russia, are in the depths of misery, and that Jews are responsible for all criticism heaped on Germany and for most of the other ills of modern countries.

Adolf Hitler hardly ever made a speech – and his speeches reached every corner of Germany by radio, newspaper, placard, films, and public announcement – without belittling, blaming or cursing Jews. From my window as I write I see a great red poster, seven feet high, asking the German people to contribute to winter relief of the poor, so that Germany will not sink to the level of the "Jewish-Bolshevist countries of the rest of the world."

At Nuremberg he accused the "foreign Jewish element" as causing the rotting of the Aryan world. His propaganda minister was more insulting, and said that the whole oppression of Germany by the world was caused by Jewish emigrants. Every misfortune of the world is in whole or in part blamed on Jews: the Spanish rebellion, the obstruction to world trade, and so on. One finds cases in the papers of Jews jailed for sex relations with German women, a marriage disallowed because a Jewish Justice of the Peace witnessed it, Masons excluded from office in the National Socialistic Party, because Jews are Masons; advertisements excluding Jews, the total disfranchisement of all Jews; deprivation of civil rights and the inability to remain or become German citizens, limit rights of education, and narrowly limited right to work in trades, professions and the civil service, the threat of boycott, loss of work and even mob violence for any German who trades with a Jew; and, above all, the continued circulation of Julius Streicher's Steuermer, the most shameless, lying advocate of

race hate in the world,

Germany in overwhelming majority stood back of Adolf Hitler in 1936. Germany had food and housing, and was on the whole contented and prosperous. Unemployment in four years had been reduced from seven to two millions or less. The whole nation was dotted with new homes for the common people, new roads, new public buildings and new public works of all kinds. Food was good, pure, and cheap. Public order was perfect, and there was almost no visible crime. And yet, in direct and contradictory paradox to all of this, Germany was silent, nervous, suppressed, it spoke in whispers, there was no public opinion, no opposition, no discussion of anything; there were waves of enthusiasm, but never any protest of the slightest degree.

I came to Germany to learn, among other things, something of industrial education as carried on in a country where the industrial and technical development has been greater in the last fifty years than in any other land on earth. "What Germany has is not Industrial Education, but Education for Industry. Or, in other words, Germany in general was not seeking to use industry and industrial processes as a means of education, but, on the contrary, was using education as a means of carrying on and perfecting industry.

The electrical industry of Germany, and of a considerable part of Europe was divided in 1936 between two great German corporations, of which Siemens is one, and the oldest and largest. It represented a capital of a \$100,000,000 and employed over 60,000 of the most highly skilled workers of Europe.

Werner Siemens was the German Ford, and his great concern made telephone and telegraph apparatus, railway and police signals, electric motors, locomotives, refrigerators, radios, electric light bulbs, and what not. It had sixty-three branch offices in Germany and branches in practically every European country, including England, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, all of Scandinavia, Austria and the Balkans, and it had close working agreements and exchanges of patents with the electric industry in the United States,

In other words, I walked this morning into one of the most powerful centers, not only of world industry, but of social and political power. Few states in the United States exercise the power of Siemens-Stadt, and the United States government itself feels its power. I came here to ask how are the citizens and workers of this Industrial state trained, and by whom, and what role does the State play in this education?

Among the buildings of the industrial plant of Siemens City, standing cheek-by-jowl with its factories was a large seven-story building. It is built in the same style as the other factory houses, and indeed does some of the actual productive

work of the factory. But the chief aim of this building is to produce a human product of the most careful and precise nature which can be used in the productive processes of this mighty industry. Here, then, at the very forefront stands out the meaning and method of industrial training in Germany: what one sees here is not Industrial Education but Educational Industry. That is Industry taking up Education as an industrial process. Nor does this imply something entirely mechanical. When Industry uses cotton, it studies cotton, experiments with it; it does not try forcibly or ignorantly to treat it like wool. So with men. Knowing exactly what it wants men for, Industry proceeds with painstaking care, endless experiment and expert training and delivers a finished product, which is unsurpassed in the world for efficient, delicate, precise, and regular workmanship,

I went to the schoolroom – a long, light hall, with work benches and machinery and a part of the 150 apprentices which Siemens takes each year. They are selected from grammar school graduates or first year high pupils and must have done well in school in all of their studies. Other things equal, the children of employees get the preference, and the supply enables the school to select only the very best material. Those I saw averaged from twelve to fifteen years of age. The course is four years. An entrance test is given – written, mechanical, and psychological. Then comes a general year of seeking the ability of the student and his fitness for the various branches of work. Then three years of work, hard and exacting. The spirit is remarkable, and no wonder; these students do not pay, they are paid to study – not much, to be sure, but an increasing part of their living expenses as they progress. They are entering on a life work and will live and be pensioned and die at this job.

Having now a skilled working class, educated for specific life work, how far could democratic control of the state be entrusted to their hands? Not far, if industry in Europe was to be conducted by a closely knit oligarchy for the support of a wealthy class to whom the bulk of the income and consequent power was to be concentrated. Such democratic power as the working class possessed in Britain and France was confined in various ways to choice of officials and local matters. In the great matters of the distribution of finance capital, industrial aim and organization, colonial administration, neither of these nations were really democracies. However, any insistent demand from the workers, particularly through their increasing trade unions, must be heeded; and since these unions' demands were mainly wages, which must be taken from profits, wages and conditions of work had to be improved. The most spectacular development in this direction had been in the United States where the standard of living of labor had reached the highest

level in the world, but still American industry was not democratic, and high income was due to natural resources and free trade. In Britain and France, the comparatively wage had been made possible without lowering profit by ownership of colonies with their serf labor and land monopoly.

If postwar Germany was to equal Britain and France in industry, with equally high profits, it must have colonies; and not merely the lost colonies which were small, but larger colonial territory. This might be secured by concessions from Britain or France in the face of a new German army and navy. Or colonial territory might be taken from conquest of Bolshevik Russia. This was a growing aim with the Hitler regime and with the Reichswehr power which preceded him. It was for this that they bribed Trotsky.

When the Trotsky conspiracy failed and the Soviet Union moved successfully into the Five Year Plans, Germany began furious propaganda against the Soviets. In 1936, Hitler and his followers denounced Communism, recounted its crimes, and foretold its inevitable failure, and, at the same time, imitated nearly every method and adopted theoretically nearly every goal that Russia had followed or announced.

The longer I looked at Hitler's Germany, the more I realized that it was a socialistic state. It was copying the Soviet Union in innumerable ways: its ownership and control of industry; its control of money and banking; its steps toward land ownership and control by government; its ordering of work and wages; its building of roads and homes; its youth movement; its one-party state at elections. In certain respects it differed from the Soviets: while the State controlled industry, the state itself was controlled by a clique. That clique was financed by industry but industry did not control it; it controlled industry through the state. There was no suggestion of democratic control of the state; rather, that was openly repudiated; the system of education was curtailed, rather than enlarged, and aimed increasingly at service to industry.

At first, Europe and America applauded Mussolini and Hitler on their states. Industry saw in them an answer to Communism. Then doubt obtruded. If these dictators continued to control industry, how would industry emerge and with how much autonomy? Was socialism under a dictator, the answer to Communism under mass dictatorship as in the Soviet Union? Were either preferable to the anarchy of individual initiative, even when that initiative was being centralized under group control?

Indeed, was not fascism simply another form of socialism, rather than an answer? Meantime, Hitler's own answer was to attack the Soviet Union and revile and decry its every effort.

I saw Hitler in 1936, at the zenith of his power, and his one

final word then was, "Conquer Russia; overthrow Communism." I was astonished to find Russia so in the center of European thought. In my own mind, Russia was significant, important. But I thought of its problem as local and national, of tremendous importance to the world if it succeeded, but no threat, rather an experiment, a dream yet to be realized or to die with noble memories. But in Germany in 1936, Russia was a fact; an accomplished experiment, so successful as to pose the immediate question of acceptance by modern culture or violent uprooting by every means. Britain was an enemy, but an enemy to be copied in success and method. France was an ideal which needed only German science. Italy was an ally. But Russia was something threatening which must be put under German control.

And now from Germany, where I had been made repeatedly aware of the pervading and growing influence of the Union of Soviet Republics, I turned with renewed interest and curiosity toward the East. Around me were ominous occurrences. Indeed, the whole world situation was so confused that I could not grasp all of its ramifications and meaning; Japan was secure in Manchuria, and to my mind then, Japan was the hope of the colored world. The New Deal of distinctly socialist legislation had begun in the United States. In 1934, the European unrest had increased. The King of Yugoslavia and the French Cabinet Minister, Barthou, had been assassinated. Italy was in Albania, and Hitler had visited Rome. In December, Stalin's friend, Kirov, was murdered, and Italy, in Africa, had begun aggression on Ethiopia.

There was sabotage and murder in Russia to halt the Soviet program in 1935; the war in Africa continued, despite the insincere efforts of the League of Nations; and the Soviets sought alliance with France and Czechoslovakia. Britain consented to German rearming; a German-Japanese attack on Russia was planned, and Trotsky in Norway plotted to yield territory and capitalistic concessions in Russia to Germany.

In 1936, the year I was in Germany, Ethiopia was conquered, civil war broke out in Spain, and Metaxis made his coup in Greece; another treason trial took place in Russia, and Hitler furiously denounced Bolshevism at the Nuremburg meeting of the Nazis. I heard its echoes all over Germany with reproductions of charts showing alleged wretched conditions of the Soviet workers. A great colonial exhibition was planned for Breslau and I saw the exhibits; but news of it was suppressed outside of Germany.

I wrote to the Soviet Union for permission to visit the country, especially to see and study the interracial situation, and, also, to pass through the land on my way to China and Japan. Also, I wrote Radek, telling him of my plans. This was not wise, since Radek at the time was deep in the Trotsky

conspiracy and early in 1937 was convicted. At any rate, my request to stop for study in Russia was not granted, but passage through to Manchuria was permitted. I then wrote my friend, Mrs. Williana Burroughs, an American colored woman long connected with the Moscow Daily News, but she replied, "I made inquiry right away as to what could be done about the visa. I was informed that it would be quite impossible to change this decision. It is not as easy as formerly to get permission to come here." She added, "I really believe, as I told you in my last letter, that with the short time at your disposal, and with the people who could help you so occupied, it would be quite useless to try to cover so large a subject as the position of the minority groups in the Soviet Union. On the national policy of Soviet Russia, which has international meaning, such a structure of well-being and new life has grown up, that six months could well be devoted to it."

Afterward, I understood better why the Soviet Union was not welcoming visitors, especially from the United States and en route to Japan. This was for Russia a time of trouble and her experience in seeking to attract visitors through the "Intourist" organization had been disappointing.

So I started east, with promise of but short glance at Moscow, but a long ride on the Trans-Siberian railroad - 4,000 miles in ten leisurely days, with frequent stops. Moreover, on this trip I had the advantage of many reports and studies on Russia made during the last decade; the monumental study by Sidney and Beatrice Webb; the British Trade Union report; the Brailsord pamphlet and numbers of essays and articles. I determined to examine those for background, adding to them conversations and all that I could see.

I glimpsed Poland but dimly, passing through on the express from Berlin. Warsaw rose mistily in the early morning, a fleeting glimmer of broad greys and yellows of a considerable city. The whole land beyond lay low and beautifully rolling. Villages crouched dark and old, sometimes poor, never new. The land is rich, black, and empty - great, broad stretches, which are the beginning of that vast plain, sweeping from the Alps to Manchuria, on which so fateful dramas of human history have been played. Here and there a church points up, lonely on the horizon. I hear Polish music on the earphone, which a coy newsmaid comes and smiling adjusts. It is sad and gray. There are more clustered villages, with little homes hugging each other for warmth.

There are a few cities after Warsaw, such as Bialystok, Wolkowysk, and Stonim. There are pine forests and a far-off shadow of mountains. Here I pass a rich estate, with great brick barns and a white two-story villa, hidden in trees. Beyond are

broad fields, heaving with winter wheat, and bee-hives. I think I see here and there a roadside shrine. Haystacks are black and close-girded. Roofs are often thatched, cows are black and white, the land is not poor but undeveloped. Domes of the Bast, white, bulging and curving, are appearing on the Churches. There are soldiers with guns – not many, but always a few. At one station were drawn up a dozen or more ancient one-horse drosckes.

It has been ten years since I had seen Moscow. The changes in that time have not been striking, but subtle and significant. There is no brave show of square and smart shop, of residential suburb and other insignia of wealth and growth of private fortunes. There are a few changes that indicate less expenditure and display than in 1926: the golden domes, so characteristic of old Moscow, are disappearing. The vast Cathedral of Christ the Redeemer, which must have cost Czarist Russia 100 million loaves of bread, is gone and in its place only a vast hole and foundations. Foundations! That is the word that characterizes Russia of today. Foundations are not beautiful, nor even interesting, unless one has far-reaching imagination.

It is October, 1936, I am in Russia. I am here where the world's greatest experiment in organized life is making, whether it fails or not. Nothing since the discovery of America and the French Revolution is of equal importance. And yet, this experiment is being made in the midst of unexampled hostility; amid deep-seated bitterness and recrimination, such as men reserve usually for crime, degeneracy, blasphemy. I listened to the frenzy of hate and loathing when the Nazis at Nuernberg frothed and spit on Russia; I have just read the prayer of that old and dying priest whom millions call the successor of Jesus Christ, as he brackets War and Communism in one curse.

Yet can one doubt the sincerity of Russia? Can one question for a moment the gain to civilization if it were proven possible to make human welfare rather than profit the chief end of industry? Even if Russia fails to accomplish this, or accomplishes it only in part, what a stupendous adventure, what a search magnificent, and at a cost so far less than that of any similar revolution in world history, if perchance there ever was such an effort on such a scale.

What is the sober truth? This is no Utopia, no fairy land of joy and plenty. Moscow looks much like other cities. There are people in crowds – well clothed and ill. There are various insignia of poverty and crowding. There are poor homes, crowded streetcars, tired workers. But with all that one conventionally expects in a modern city, there are some things astonishing. First of all, one misses the stores. Conceive a great modern city without street upon street of shops – stores and again more

stores; duplicate stores; stores for necessities, for luxuries, for frivolities, for food and clothing. There are stores in Moscow, but few, widely spaced and run by the state. Think first of the space and rent saved; think of the saving in advertising alone. On the other hand, the comparative paucity of stores must entail trouble and loss of time. One sees long queues at the shops waiting to be served. Yet here is an attempt at system in the most anarchic part of capitalistic enterprise – the distribution of goods to the consumer.

The private shops of the N.E.P. have disappeared from opposite the Kremlin. The state directs retail trade. There are compact, well-stocked stores, here and there throughout the city; to all appearance efficiently manned and run, with goods aplenty. But not all goods: there are a few luxuries – perfume, face powder, and other bits that my friend says were either unpurchaseable in 1926, or imported at high prices. These are "Made in Russia." Most goods for sale are necessities, made not because they bring the greatest profit to someone who has the power to say what shall be manufactured, but because the mass of the people need them and because the state alone has the power to say what goods shall be made. This is tyranny; this is interference with the liberty of action which some few folk have had for ages. But this liberty was bought at the price of poverty for most people who had no such liberty.

Differences and considerable differences in income are visible in Russia, more so my friends say today than in 1926. There are no idle rich; no leisure class. One sees furs, silks, and good woolen cloth among some folk, and rags on others. It is hard, however, to say how far this difference goes and how symptomatic it is. One has a feeling that the back of extreme poverty is broken and that the mass of Russians have enough to eat and clothing enough to keep warm, and shelter of a sort.

There are new buildings in Moscow – mostly great office buildings for the officials of administration. They take the place – with less duplication – of the endless office buildings of New York and London. In them the socialistic state, guides and regulates production of goods, manufacture of goods, distribution of goods, application and training of human services. Here, then, is a civil service, which adds to what we are used to regard as the functions of government, all those matters which we thought must by order of nature be done by unregulated private initiative. In the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics an effort is making on a tremendous scale to prove that government must and can regulate the economic as well as the political functions of men and substitute public welfare for private profit. Is this possible?

Russia is a world. From San Francisco to New York one gains

four hours of time. From Moscow to Vladivostok one gains six hours! Wide, wild, and wonderful is Russia: monotonous for hundreds of miles with its broad, level empty acres, yet varying infinitely in succession of village and town, swamp and forest, noble rivers. At Perm, the Northern branch of the Volga flowed black and mighty, by the low-lying electric-lighted city. Then came the rolling hills of the Urals, and finally, the ice and snow of Siberia. We passed forest, swamp, and lake; we went over the Yenessei on a succession of new steel arches. The soil is of every variety. South of us in the Ukraine the black loam is a foot deep, but here, in mid-Russia, it is a yard deep, with an unplumbed fertility. What will the wheat fields of Iowa and Canada do when Russian agriculture really extends itself?

One sees little dun-colored crouching villages; usually with homes stretched along one muddy street. It is the same sort of drab village life that exists in the West and South of the United States. Yet there is a difference. There are few stores, no saloons. Always there is a new school house, often of brick and usually the best building in town, next to the Center. The Center of the Communist Party is a common meeting place, a means of adult education and propoganda, a place where the radio brings news and entertainment.

We came to Irkutsk in the black mist of early morning. I struggled reluctantly up from the drug of dream and saw the sunrise on Lake Baikal. Baikal is a jewel hung in space at that fateful spot where Europe becomes Asia and where the waters part to make Pacific and Atlantic. Behind is Russia and Europe; before is Russia and China. Here meet the Past, the Present, and What Will Be. Our steam in the cold blast falls and lies low like lace across the waters. The sun casts aside her morning mantle of mist and shines white and clear. More and more recklessly we bore into the mountains, and the mountains ahead rise in ranks, black in front from iron, silver and snow behind. Slowly, persistently was the rush, hour after hour, mile after mile; the Lake reveals some warning of its vast size and grandeur; it is a sea, a rift in a continent, born of some ancient rift in Heaven. Six long hours we fly along its shores and yet, when we leave it and plunge toward Manchuria, we have only skirted the small curve of its lower border. It is four hundred miles long and twenty miles wide.

Consider the enormous tasks to which Russia had set herself. She proposed to make a nation where the masses rule. Many wise men earnestly and honestly believe the task is impossible; that for all foreseeable time, the mass of men will serve some form of aristocracy, while civilization will always mean the culture of the few. Consider though the grandeur of the vision which makes this possible best, consist of all men. First of all, we

must face the inevitable difficulties of all beginnings. One found in Russia in 1936, dirt and bad manners. Eating and bathing habits were unpleasant. Equality of status, where there is as yet no real equality of culture and habit, has been endlessly inveighed against, from the French Revolution to the Emancipation of American Negroes. This, in 1936, greatly bothered observers of Russia. They were obsessed by the glamour of culture and wealth in a few, despite the degradation of the mass on which this culture was built. Wealthy East Indians, rich Chinese, Russian Grand Dukes, bring to such people only the deepest admiration and envy. They mention them with hushed voices and accept their notice with reverence. What American, who rails at the rule of Russian peasants, would not have accepted a summons to the Winter Palace with tears of gratitude?

In 1923, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics proclaimed, "to all the Governments and to all the Peoples of the Earth" that they had started the "enormous task of restoring the national economy on the basis of the new economic structure of society, after it has passed through unprecedented calamities."

Russia of the Czars was a colony ruled by the aristocracy of a superior race and inhabited by more than a hundred different nationalities. "We are," declared Lenin in 1921, "a beggarly, uncultured people. We should speak of that semi-Asiatic cultural backwardness, which we have not yet thrown off... We are a people, to put it mildly, on the level, as it were, of semi-barbarism." The Russian peasants often lived in hovels filthier than pigsties, without meat, eggs, butter or milk. In 1921, industry had sunk to one-fifth of its prewar production, and agriculture to one-half; disease and starvation were making a fearful mortality. The land was "medieval" in its institutions, Asiatic in its strivings, and prehistoric in its conceptions of life.

It was this land, far behind Western Europe in cultural or economic standards that the Bolsheviki proposed to transform. They proposed a nation based on the suppression of the landlord and capitalist and of all forms of private profit-making. In a declaration of Rights, July, 1918, they abolished private property in land; which was to be national property and given the peasants without rent; likewise, all forests, mines, and water rights and livestock were nationalized; workers were to control industry as a step toward transferring all means of production and transport to the Soviet Republic,

Never before had a government tried entirely to recast its economic and social life, including habits, health, occupations and ideals; and to make a new civilization. Many said the proposal was impossible, even Russian Bolsheviki like Trotsky insisted that trying to build socialism in a single country with

the opposition of a capitalistic world, and particularly in a backward land like Russia with little industry, was impracticable; that first a world revolution must prepare the way.

But Lenin and his followers insisted on trying their program, in Russia alone. They knew the risk but they took it, even after world attack. They agreed on their fundamental law in 1918, and then changed and amended this until it emerged as a constitution in 1922-1923.

In visiting Russia in 1936, my object was to see how the experiment, which I had seen briefly and broadly in 1926, had succeeded in practical effort. Then I had in a sense examined a dream; now in cold survey I wanted to see the facts of the situation. I had, naturally, neither time nor permission to make a personal study, even had I been equal to it in a land so large and complicated. But from 1926 to 1936 there had been numerous students of Russia whose published conclusions were now available; there had been a succession of Soviet studies and government reports, which seemed to me quite as reliable as government reports anywhere; requiring, to be sure, evaluation in the light of national susceptibilities, which in the case of the Soviet Union naturally weighed heavily. To this I wanted to add whatever personal observation and human contact I could in a brief glimpse of Moscow and a ten-day journey from Moscow to Manchuria.

The problem of Democracy in Russia, in 1917, was appalling. Here were over a 100,000,000 people in a land extending from the Arctic to the Black Sea and the Pacific to the Baltic; over two-thirds illiterate, belonging to many different races, cultures, and languages and religions. No constitution based on universal suffrage according to the theoretical Western model would have worked. Lenin and his followers evolved the plan of basing nationwide democratic control on a large number of small meetings of neighbors, to discuss matters of intimate knowledge and interest. Here would be chosen persons whom they knew to represent them at district meetings and so on up to the All-Union Congress. Thus the masses would learn the technique of representative government, and yet be held together as a state. With education and leadership such a state would eventually become a democracy. The leadership consisted in control from above, administered by the Communist Party.

The 70,000 village and shop Soviets were allowed the utmost freedom of discussion. There was practically nothing they were not allowed and even encouraged to discuss and deal with, so far as it touched their interests; but neither village nor district nor province had any rights which the higher body could not curtail or veto; in other words, the Russian primary unit or

intermediate governmental body was not given legal rights which belonged exclusively to them and with which "States' Rights", the higher authority could not interfere. Thus the Russian Federated Government avoided the tyranny of local rule but laid itself open to imposed authority. Here, however, authority could never act in ignorance, because the criticism on local and national matters was literally boundless and continuous.

As a writer in the Moscow News wrote: "Herein lies the essence of our democracy. Our Soviet democracy is not expressed in our official edicts. Our Soviet Democracy is expressed in broad activity, when every decision is worked out by the masses, criticized hundreds of times by the collective farmers, by the individual peasants from every possible angle. Herein lies the difference and the intricacy of the work of leaders of village Soviets."

What does the mass of people think of this democracy? Testimony as to this lies in their voting. The Russians vote more widely and frequently than the people of any land. In 1934, 77,000,000 persons voted, or 85 per cent of those eligible. The voting age is eighteen, and there are no limits of sex, race, or religion, illiteracy or pauperism, so long as the person is engaged in "socially useful work of hand or brain." About 2.5 per cent are disfranchised. The voters take part in a million or more meetings during the year where in town or factory meetings they elect delegates to local governing bodies, who in turn elect to district bodies, and they to provincial bodies; and thus up to the All-Union Congress of Soviets, a body of 3,000 delegates. There were in 1936 600,000 villages electing 2,000,000 delegates to 70,000 local governing bodies.

The Soviet citizen votes not only as a political citizen, but as an individual producer, as a social consumer, and (if he belongs to the Communist Party) as a member of the leadership group. For each of these functions there arises a governmental pyramid similar to that of the political soviets. The government in Moscow thus is the apex of a half dozen pyramidal social structures, covering the Union, each based on a vast number of small meetings for almost continuous discussion and for periodical direct election of primary representative councils. The very multiformity of the Soviet administration gives a vitality. It pledges a common single aim and a rich common experience.

The single party slate of the Soviets is not necessarily a denial of democracy. When democracy first came to England, the constituency naturally was divided between Liberals and Conservatives. We had in most democracies two parties standing for differing fundamental policies, or if not two parties in agreement, differing only on methods. Sometimes this led to

splinter parties which represented particular groups and personalities. This goes to the ultimate in the Soviet Union. There is but one party and its aim at present was settled in 1928. Now the Soviets emphasize mainly means and personalities in elections, sifting and arguing in primary assemblies on what persons shall represent them in higher bodies and recalling them at any time. They insist that in main party matters there is and can be but one party, based on science and experience. This argument may be wrong, but it is not a deception. In future and within the framework of Communism there might conceivably arise broad differences of policy which would give rise to parties; but the absence of parties today is not necessarily a denial of democracy, any more than the presence of parties ensures democracy.

How far is this voting and local activity a proof of real power, or how far is it but the semblance of power, while the reality rests above? Certainly the local bodies believe they have wide democratic control and are extraordinarily interested and busy. The village Soviet or town meeting rules the town and keeps order. There is, "practically nothing that the Soviet may not organize, regulate or provide at public expense, from roads and water supplies, through club houses and dance floors, up to schools, theatres, and hospitals." It also inspects the state manufacturing and trading departments in its borders and the consumers' cooperatives. It raises taxes and spends them on education and health, roads and bridges; but the budget must be approved by higher bodies to which they elect delegates. The villages keep practically all the taxes they collect, and, in addition, usually receive grants or remissions from the higher units of government to pay for and expand their budgets.

If anyone doubts this, the planning for democracy in this nation, the system of Soviet education would seem a sufficient answer. If a mass of people are to be misled and used by others for selfish and anti-social interests, they must not be educated save in limited ways. This explains why black slaves in the United States were denied by law the right to learn to read and write; it explains the determined limitation of native education in all colonies. But in Soviet Russia from the beginning, the Revolution stressed education. From 1914 to 1921, education sank to its lowest depths. Then came an effort to educate a nation unparalleled in modern times. "There is no other fragment of earth's surface at all comparable in extent, in which anything like this conception of an educational service prevails." It is fit universal compulsory education free of expense, not only for literacy but for life; with no restrictions of race, sex, color, or creed. School attendance increased from 14,000,000 in 1929 to 26,000,000 in 1933. Illiteracy was reduced to ten per cent in

1933. College enrolment increased from 207,000 to 491,000 and most of the students were workers' and peasants' children. As a result, reading habits increased and newspaper circulation rose from 12,500,000 in 1929 to 36,000,000 in 1933.

No matter how much of false propoganda and deception may have crept into the Soviet government, it has taken the one sure path eventually to base Russian life on intelligence and right. Everywhere in Russia in 1936, one saw the school house.

The center of this vast interlocking government, the All-Union Congress of Soviets, a body of 2,200 delegates in 1936 with 800 alternates, meets every three or four years. It is too large to transact business, but it expresses opinions and is representative of every part of the land. The effective powers of government lie in the hands of its Executive Committee and the Council which it appoints. This central government makes the budget for the nation.

Because the state controls industry, its revenue comes from industries like railroads, mines, oil wells, and from manufacturing and trading establishments. These sources of income amount to several times the total monies received from taxation, by localities and the central government. Half of this income goes back to local governments as subventions to local authorities.

The expenditures fall into three main parts:

1. Capital investment
2. Social welfare, including health, insurance and education, expenses of government, justice and defense
3. The remainder is the wages fund for consumer expenditure.

From 1927 to 1934, the Soviet Union saved over twenty per cent of its income for new capital as compared to ten per cent in Great Britain. The Union also saved the expense of advertising which costs the United States at least a half billion dollars a year. Planning for all of this, did away with unemployment, preserved natural resources, and even encouraged voluntary labor by the laborers and not confined to the well-to-do.

The peculiarity of the Union of Soviet Republics as a government, lies in the fact that it includes both politics and industry in its control. The criticism leveled at this unusual undertaking is that it supplants the vital impulse of private profit and that no state can conduct industry successfully because of the nature of the task. The Soviet answer is first, that if the state can conduct industry then industry will be aimed at the objects for which the state exists; and if those objects are the well-being of the mass of inhabitants the nation will be better off; secondly, the Soviets say that as a matter

of fact, they are successfully conducting industry. On the basis of prices prevailing in 1926-1927, Russian production increased from sixteen to thirty-four billion rubles, for the period 1928 to 1932. It exceeded the prewar level more than threefold and the 1928 level more than twofold.

Sidney and Beatrice Webb say:

"Viewed in comparison with other nations that suffered from the Great War, and measured either by capacity to produce, or by the aggregate of commodities and services distributed, there seems no doubt that the material progress of the USSR, from the exceptionally low level to which it had been reduced in 1921, has not only been enormous, but has even been proportionately greater than that of any other country. In fact, the Soviet Union has quite obviously grown richer in the very years in which most, if not all, other countries have grown poorer."

But, asks the Western world, if this is true, what has been the Social cost? Germany under Hitler raised production but it was at the cost of eliminating the trade unions as effective instruments of industrial democracy. What has happened to Soviet unions?

The Soviet trade union is both a government agency and the voice of labor in industry. Its primary unit is the factory, mine, or industrial establishment where men work, and all who work in a single establishment producing the same commodity or service belong to that union, no matter in what capacity they labor. The members in each shop or factory elect councils; these councils elect delegates to district councils and they to republic councils up to the All-Union Congress of the 154 trade unions of the Soviet Union.

The Russian union is not, therefore, like the American union, a group designed to fight an employer or an industry for higher wages or pensions or better conditions. These things they want and fight for, but the path to achieving this is through the trade union hierarchy, which means that all industry is taken into account and not a single plant or one branch of industry. But into this account the interest of the worker is considered by his representatives elected by the voice of each little group of shop employees. They vote in union meetings and elect delegates to district meetings; the district organization elects provincial bodies and so on up to the All-Union Congress of Trade Unions which is an organ of government, considered by Lenin as first in importance. No government policy is decided without consulting this body.

For all local disputes as to wages, hours and conditions of work, immediate hearing is given and arbitration instituted; the board, consisting of three representatives - one for the management, one the leading union official in the plant, and

third, a member of the local Communist cell. Such arbitration is usually successful; if it is not, it can be appealed to a higher body with similar representation; or to the National Commissariat of Labor.

The 18,000,000 workers in the Soviet Union in 1936 were grouped in 154 unions, in tens of thousands of establishments. They elect 186,640 factory and local committees, who conduct more collective bargaining than any other labor union system in the world. The object of that bargaining is not confined to local conditions, but extends to the problem of increasing national production so that all wages can be increased and better conditions of work for all workers be realized. Wage rates depend on this general level of production and not simply on the conditions in one factory. They can study facts and figures concerning the level of industry over the nation, and consider the part which can be allocated to their industry and yet leave enough for others.

The Soviet trade union is interested in protection against industrial accidents; healthfulness and pleasantness of working places; plans for the factory conduct; correcting and punishing delinquencies of their members; food and prices in their cooperative; insurance for sickness, accidents and old age; housing; club houses for recreation; travel and holidays; tickets for theaters. For these matters the unions handle five billion rubles annually for insurance, pensions, rest homes, and hospitals. Naturally, this attitude of mind toward industry has been a slow growth. It took a decade for unions not to conceive of the union as primarily an organ of revolt against capitalist employers.

The inauguration of the first planning of industry brought conflicts as to the role of the unions; should each union be free to press for its own advantages in wages, hours, and so forth, or act as a unit to increase production for the whole nation and not for their industry alone? The latter attitude eventually prevailed. As a result, there is no effort to curtail output; there is general approval of pay based on piece work and there are no craft jurisdictional disputes. Every facility is afforded for upgrading of workers who apply, even to opportunity for study, with pay.

One notices about the Russian workers not only preoccupation with his job and the local conditions, but also reliance on his future security in accident or old age; the certainty that his children's education will be provided for and that he will have vacations with pay. My conductor on the Trans-Siberian trip was planning on a vacation in that part of the Soviet Union which corresponds to our Florida; and rejoiced in the fact that his two children were in school and in line to learn a skill or

profession which would furnish a livelihood and promotion.

The government of the Soviets makes what we regard as private business a part of government. Practically all the heavy industry, and most of the light industries, together with nearly all transport and all foreign commerce, are conducted by public departments, which are established and directed by the federal government. To an American this seems utterly unworkable. But a moment's reflection proves that this vast oversight and planning must proceed in every great, modern industrial nation. In the United States and Britain it is done by private business organizations instead of by the government. Often such industrial trusts are larger than many actual governments in smaller lands and even rival in income and power many divisions of their own governments. Russia in this respect is like the combination of a hundred or more of our great industrial combines: like the Steel Trust or General Electric or the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company into a super organization or state. The difference lies in the fact that the object of the Soviet industries is general welfare, while that of the private firms is, at least in theory, no more than private profit. Even this calls for careful planning of industry, trained technical management and efficient and loyal workers.

The first criticism of this governmental excursion into industry which occurs to an American, is that it lacks that incentive to effort which the profit motive provides. In Western countries the greater part of the production and distribution of commodities and services is conducted by private persons, with the object of making profit for themselves; and not aiming directly at service to the community. Indeed, if profitable and a disservice, it may be still allowed to continue.

Nevertheless, incentives to work have bothered all employers of labor. Higher wage, shorter hours, and better conditions of labor are the usual incentives in Western lands. But in the Soviet Union the workers had to be asked to adjust their demand for wages to the level of production, which meant sacrifice for the poor who had never had much. To induce competition and extra effort among workers was a difficult task in a world where most laborers tried to reduce output, discouraged piece-work pay, and malingered on the job as a matter of policy. The Soviets try to combat this by encouraging competition in work; emulation, voluntary effort, like that which helped build in Moscow the most beautiful subway in the world. A series of public awards and orders have been instituted for manual labor as well as scientific research or art creation; and suggestions have been encouraged and rewarded in every line of work. In 1930, over a half-million rationalization suggestions from workers were received by the state, which resulted in savings of 20,000,000

rubles. Stalin said in 1933:

"The most remarkable feature of competition is the radical revolution it has wrought in men's views of labor, because it transforms labor from a disgraceful and painful burden, as it was reckoned before, into a matter of honor, a matter of glory, a matter of valor and heroism. There is not and cannot be anything similar to it in capitalist countries. There, under the capitalists, the most desirable aid which earns social approval is to have an income from investments, to live on interest and to be freed from toil, which is regarded as a contemptible occupation."

This program calls for planning of human action and control of the material world on a scale never before attempted and to an extent which modern civilization has hitherto regarded as impracticable. To the astonishment of the Western World, the first Five Year Plan, even enlarged in scope, was substantially fulfilled in four and a quarter years. A second Five Year Plan, for 1933-1937, was immediately put into operation. The significance of this was increased by the financial collapse of the western European world in 1929, which made the projected invasion of Russia impossible. This confirmed the Russians in their firm belief that Western capitalism was on the edge of complete collapse because of inherent contradictions and paradoxes.

The Soviets argue that this planning is the only alternative to the anarchy of individual free initiative with its recurrent booms and slumps and with its perpetual mass of unemployed. They say that demand for goods and services is fairly stable and can be calculated. That production to meet this demand can be arranged without letting speculation over-produce in particular lines for possible individual profit, or make artificial scarcities for higher prices. Thus financial storms and panics can be avoided. Only long experience over a span of years can prove this. But the experience of the Soviet Republics up to 1936, cannot be ignored.

The Western world answers that planning involves the slavery of the working class. But does it involve more slavery than other methods of doing the world's work? If a man lives, he must work himself or live off the work of others; labor on the part of somebody is compulsory. The choice of labor is wide in Russia, by educational opportunity, by promotion according to ability, by desert. But for the total amount of labor and its efficiency and distribution there is compulsion. But such compulsion exists everywhere and always has. It is greater in Russia than elsewhere, if we remember that the Soviets allow no idle rich.

It is, however, clear that for such a planned state there must

be leadership. The conventional industrial state of the western world, depended on the self-appointed leadership of Captains of Industry with profit as the chief motive. This had to be supplemented by philanthropy and the ideals of human progress as expressed by popular leaders in literature and art; in religion and in social progress. The occurrence and efficiency of such social leadership was left mostly to chance. There was little effort to substitute Science for chance in human social progress.

This was because such scientific leadership in human conduct was regarded as impossible. In Soviet Russia, the Communist Party in 1936 appeared not as a conventional political party, but as an organization designed to train leaders for the state. The function of its membership was extra-legal and thus certainly liable to abuse. But on the other hand, its objects were clear and its ideals high. It based action on the Communism of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, as modified by Lenin and Stalin and by decisions of the Party Congress after long discussion and broad experience.

The party requires in its membership, the same regularity and obedience to decision and discipline which political parties usually ask. Like members of a religious order, the Communist must obey orders as to work and place of work; and he takes what is in reality a vow of poverty or at least low income. The chief fact is that an attempt is seriously made to keep membership on a high level of intelligence and character, and periodical dismissals from membership are made when the members fall below the standard. Of course, the members have certain privileges and this tempts many to join who are in fact below the ideals.

They attempt to base leadership first on Science; and secondly, on special training and actual experience. Their scientific foundation is Marxism, as modified by Lenin and Stalin and others, and their course of study and action is membership in the Communist Party, with its discipline, study and

[Pages 120 & 121 missing]

1917, said: "Mohammedans of Russia, Tartars of the Volga and Crimea; Kirghiz and Sartes of Siberia and Turkestan; Turks and Tartars of Transcaucasia, your beliefs and customs, your national institutions and culture are hereafter free and inviolable. You have the right to them; know your rights, as well as those of all the peoples of Russia, are under the powerful protection of the Revolution, and of the organs of the Soviets for workers, soldiers, and peasants." This did not remain mere declamation. The pogrom against Jews, which long played in Russia the role of lynching in the United States,

disappeared forthwith; and in 1936, over the whole area between the Arctic Ocean and the Black Sea and the Asian mountains, with vastly differing races and nationalities, men and women, irrespective of physical traits or color of skin, even including occasional African Negroes; could associate freely; travel in the same public vehicles and go to the same restaurants and hotels; sit next to each other in the same colleges and places of amusement; marry wherever there is mutual liking; engage in any craft or profession for which they are qualified; join the same societies; pay the same taxes and be elected to any office without exception. No other nation on earth can boast of such a situation.

Nor did the Soviets forget the oppressed peoples of the earth — the colored races, the colonial peoples, the exploited nations. They declared in 1923:

"As the natural ally of oppressed peoples, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics seeks to live in peace and friendly relations with all peoples and to establish economic cooperation with them. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics places before itself the aim of furthering the interests of the laboring masses of the whole world. Over the enormous territory stretching from the Baltic to the Black and White Seas and to the Pacific Ocean, the Union is already realizing the fraternity of nations and the triumph of labor, but it is striving at the same time to bring about friendly cooperation between the peoples of the whole world."

No modern nation has equalled the Soviets in the emancipation of women. They were not content with removing legal disabilities and enfranchising them, but gave women, also, economic and household freedom. "A victory for socialism," Lenin had said, "is impossible until a whole half of toiling mankind, the working women, enjoys equal rights with men; and until she no longer is kept a slave by her household and family."

Sex equality from the first was the object of all legislation. Women, married or single, could vote and hold office; could work at any task at the same wage as men, with the same chance of promotion; they shared all rights of property, and the same rights as men in divorce and care of children. By 1920, Lenin could say that no country in the world was so free from sex disabilities in law or custom as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In the matter of religion, Russia has come in for endless criticism. This is partly because of the status of the church in modern lands, and partly because of conditions peculiar to Russia. An organization which claims knowledge above science and the right to dictate the distinction between right and wrong conduct for individuals, must, of necessity, be reactionary and

slow in every reform. Why in England was the Church opposed to universal suffrage and trade unions? Why in the United States did the main body of churchgoers fight the abolition of slavery, Negro suffrage, and Negro equality? Why did the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People have the greatest difficulty in inducing the churches to oppose lynching?

Because the Church stands and must stand for things as they are, for reaction, for dogma. The Church may conserve, after the battle for righteousness has been fought, but it never has fought and never can fight as a body for unpopular ideals. Thus every cause, be it right or wrong, must begin by an attack on established religion, or it will never begin. Even after the rise of modern science, and the rejection of religious dogma by educated men, there remains a disposition to refrain from disturbing the faith of the ignorant masses «f men, because this might encourage despair and revolt.

Most modern lands have, therefore, been content with a strange dichotomy between its professed creeds and the real beliefs of its leading minds. If, however, the masses of people could and would be raised to intelligent action, this dichotomy must disappear. With the rise of democracy and broader political action in the western world, there came what used to be called the battle between Faith and Science, which after the Industrial Revolution tended toward a synthesis of modified church dogma and religious double-talk on the part of scientists and educated folk in general. Church dogma was sustained by belief that after all the masses of folk could not in our time, at least, be raised so as not to need the opium of religion.

This, Russian Communism challenged for the first time in actual political life and not merely in the classroom. This meant inevitably a fight with dogmatic religion and with all forces and people interested in sustaining and prolonging the power of the Church. Whatever chance there was to postpone or evade this battle was made impossible by the very character of the Russian established Church. With an establishment like this church in almost total control of the minds, beliefs, hopes, hates and fears of the masses, Communist government, if it hoped even to begin its reforms, must start with a duel to the death.

The Russian Orthodox Church in the early twentieth century represented the worst tendencies of religion. The Czar as head of the Church had in 1916, as one of his chief advisors, a drunken, thieving, dissolute monk, who disgusted the world. The village priests were for the most part ignorant and superstitious. The wealthy monasteries thrived on "miracles." An English professor of moral philosophy, John MacMurray, said in 1934:

"Nearly all that religion has been, and has meant, in Russia

ought to perish forever from the face of the earth and from the memory of men." If then, the Soviet government was to survive it had to begin with a fight on the established church.

The Soviets early took a stand against supernaturalism and closed miracle-selling shrines. They encouraged the formation of Anti-Religious societies which had in 1929 a half million members. Energetic campaigns against religion was made part of the first Five Year Plan. The atheistic movement grew rapidly and had, in 1936, many million followers.

However, the Soviets did not ban churches entirely, nor did they attempt to abolish religion. They limited religious activity and stripped the Orthodox Church of its immense wealth. But neither Christians, Jews, Moslems, nor Buddhists were persecuted and there was no law against the private practice of any creed.

This was the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as I saw it and read about it in 1936. I was convinced that it has earned its right to exist and carry on its work. I believed that the success which it had made already, despite mistakes and in the midst of unexampled difficulties, proved that many, if not most, of its beliefs and methods would influence the world and spread to its lands and peoples. Especially was I convinced that fear of Communism was groundless and attempts to suppress it doomed to failure. Indeed, it has been said that in the history of human government there "has been no such colossal and exciting an experiment" as centers here. So I continued my long journey from Moscow to Manchuria, in November, 1936.

We were nearing Mongolia, and already in the Province of the Buriats. The slim firs stood sturdily, with straight heads and shoulders sagging with snow. The lonely silence of a Siberian night was about us. We climbed down a pass in the Black Mountains, following a river half hidden in ice. Suddenly, the tempo of the scene changed. A large new factory blazed up in the night. Great piles of lumber lined the river bank. An electric road showed a beginning of modern road making. Tracks of rails stretched wide on either side, until a modern railway yard was evident. Then we swept into Vereudinsk, now newly named, and the world was soldiers. They filled the depot, covered the platform, crowded a standing train and marched about in overcoats to their heels, buttoned closely; some with guns, some with bundles. All was now clear. This was a frontier point of concentration against the threat of Japan.

It brought me back to this horrible waste of war in 1936. All Europe, all of Asia was in arms. As if Russia did not have a task big enough and well worth at least the respectful waiting of the world, without having to arm herself against mankind. The only hope of human unity today lies in the common cause, the

common interests of the working classes in Europe, Africa, and in Asia. This is why in the custom house of Otpor, the last outpost of Russia, stood the motto in all languages. "Workers of the World Unite!" Yet in the face of world militarism and new nationalism, Russia, intent on her internal tasks, must put down Trotskyism with ruthless hand, lest the armed world smash in blood the hopeful beginnings of a state seeking to replace private profit with public welfare.

All this was true. Yet, as I looked out of the window at soldiers, arms, factories, all for war preparation, I felt the earth beneath my feet smoldering and quaking with the flames of coming war. I could not believe it. I would not. But I felt the hidden flame.

The problem of Orientals in the United States had interested me from my youth because they were colored people and, therefore, a part of the question of the color line. In high school and college I had followed the restrictions on the Chinese in California and the federal exclusion acts. The Sino-Japanese War perplexed me. Our remission of the Boxer indemnity pleased me, but as I contrasted this with the humiliation which Germany imposed on China, I was really uplifted by the Japanese defeat of Russia in 1904, and saw in this event the beginning of the overthrow of white supremacy.

Then came the consequent increase of Japanese migration to the United States and the anti-Japanese movement in the West. The "Gentlemen's Agreement" of 1907 followed, and Theodore Roosevelt's fight for Japanese right to hold land and attend unsegregated schools. In 1913, California forbade Japanese landownership. Later, I realized in visiting the West, how Japanese hard work and competition in market gardening and their clannish organization for distributing their vegetables direct to customers, had aroused the economic rivalry of business interests and determined them to stop competition by law.

I began to look upon the Japanese as leaders of the world fight against white imperialism. Especially was I encouraged in this idea by her unsuccessful attempt to force a declaration of racial equality through the League of Nations in 1919; the effort of Europe to limit her navy in 1922 confirmed my thought, I even interpreted her pressure on China as an indirect attack on European imperialism in Asia.

About 1930, I made the acquaintance of a young Japanese student, who may have had official connections with his government, although this I never knew. We did talk much about Japan and he urged me to visit his country. When I went to Russia and Germany in 1936, I arranged through him to come home by way of Japan. He gave me advice and letters of introduction, which proved of great value.

</2-2.30

Thus after my visit to the Soviet Union in 1936, I returned home through Manchuria, with brief visits to China and Japan. For, next to Russia, Japan intrigued me as holding the destiny of the darker work in its hands. And who has not dreamed of China?

Ten thousand miles east of our East lies a land, lonely and dust-swept, pregnant with history in the dim past. Hence, came the Mongol hordes that swept from Asia to France and Italy, and changed the history of the modern world. Brown men they were and yellow, with broad faces and flat noses, and wild, straight, black hair. They are here about me today, November, 1936 - perhaps 25,000,000 of them - in Inner and Outer Mongolia, and in Manchuria. Inner Mongolia is Chinese; Outer Mongolia is under Russian influence; Manchuria is Japanese. This makes a border filled with signs of war, watched eagerly by the rest of the world. We could see the thicker concentration of troops on the Russian side as we approached Japan. The Soviets have stretched their military power thin in the vast sweep of land between the Volga and Baikal, and concentrated it here in the East.

The approaching of this fatal border in the night was eerie. Between three and four o'clock in the morning of November 12, the porter knocked on my door and said, "Otpor, Chass." I piled out as the train crept on slowly in the darkness. We stopped at a dark little station, in the bitter morning cold, and all of our luggage was taken by porters. Here it was examined minutely by Russian customs officers. They were courteous but thorough, handling each piece of paper and inquiring about money. Then again the porters took our bags and put them back on the same train. All of the Russian porters, waiters, and officials silently disappeared. We were like a ghost train moving quietly and slowly into another land.

We were in Manchuria. "Passports!" came the rather peremptory call in the dim light. Again we climbed down at six-thirty in the morning, still before breakfast. Again porters shouldered our bags, and we were before another set of inspectors. I was rather wearily waiting, watching the struggle of an English lady with a rather rough inspector, who mused up her bags and fingered the negatives of some films, when suddenly I heard a voice beside me, "Is this Mr. DuBois?" I looked around a bit suspiciously and admitted the accusation. A dapper gold-faced young man in uniform stood beside me bowing. "I have," he said politely, "a first-class pass for you over the State Railways of Manchuria, and some letters of introduction. Will you please meet the station master?" I nearly passed out. Remember, this was before breakfast, on a bitter cold morning, and after two custom inspections and almost no sleep. The only courtesy I ever received from a railroad was the privilege of buying, at top

prices, something that nobody else wanted. And here I was 10,000 miles from home, being offered a free pass in a first-class carriage; and lest I have to rest in a common waiting room, I was ushered into the station-master's private parlor, where I reposed on plush. The English lady came near being sent back to Siberia for resenting the gruffness of the customs inspector. "For heaven's sake don't leave me," she pleaded, turning to me.

I walked in Manchouli, after breakfast, waiting for the afternoon train. It was a straggling town on a dusty plain, with Russian and Chinese signs. A Chinese lady drove past in a Russian droschke, in brilliant kimono and black and high-piled hair. Another passed on the street, in a coat of many colors. A dark old Mongol, with his two wives, bargained for a ride. School children, looking like Christmas dolls, straggled by.

It was a new world. My color was nothing unusual. All the world was sallow, yellow, or brown, except the often blonde white Russian girls who waited table in the restaurants and on the dining car. The train swung out toward the East. I was in a Pullman car made in America. The porter was not of my own expert race, and I felt like giving him a few pointers. The roadbed was better than in Siberia. Always war hovered near us. They pulled down the curtains early. I wanted to look out, but fortunately I first read the posted notices: "Passengers between Hake and Agounor must not look out of the windows, on penalty of severe punishment." I did not look out.

We swept along a great, wide plain, and the cold wind poured straight down from the North pole. It was a desolate barren land, and the seldom folk crept wearily along the lonely way. "What would one do," asked the Norwegian on his way to China, "if set out on that plain?" Someone suggested the radio. But could you get a station whose language you understood? Then the scene began to change and here was the Sungari river, flowing north to Amur and the Arctic Ocean. It was filled with shipping, driven south by the ice and about to tie up for the winter. Then came Harbin, the first city of Manchoukuo, a big and busy place, the only remaining center of Czarist Russia on earth.

The whole scene changed as if by magic. We rode out of the desert and desolation of the northern desert. We flew easily on a perfect roadbed, ballasted with rock, and in Japanese cars better than Pullmans. The service was perfect. We were leaving the old border and haunts of the bandits, the modern successors of Ghenghis Khan. We came to Hsinksing, capital of the new Manchurian state, set up by Japan in 1932. The Hotel Yamato was a joy. I had a room with a bath and did I bathe! There all of those little Japanese touches — white runners over the stair carpets, spotless and clean; a clean blue kimono for each guest; slippers in each room; cool drinking water in thermos jugs; a

cloth damp with hot water, passed to each guest in the grill, to wipe his hands and face before eating; and exact, quick and, oh, so courteous service.

The hotel had once been a Russian club, and sits amid ancient acacias. To the right, as one emerges in the stilling wind, lies the characteristic Chinese city, huddled and crouching, with its strange signs and ancient insignia; its push of folk, its little mysterious shops, its air at once sordid and romantic. Then to the left of the hotel rises the beginnings of the new Japanese city, or the city of the new Manchoukuo, planned by the Japanese. It is cast with broad streets, beautiful and large public buildings, some finished, some yet building, some only projected. Clearly this colonial effort of a colored nation is something to watch.

I am in the ancient capital of the Manchu emperors. Here, in 1936, live 424,000 persons. Here started that Manchu dynasty which for 267 years ruled China. In 1625, the Tsing dynasty, conquering the celebrated Chinese Mings, made this town their capital, until in 1644 they moved to Peking, and Mukden became Pei-tu, or Home capital. Here, in 1905, was fought that awful battle between the Russians and the Japanese, when 160,000 human beings were killed and wounded, and Japan took her place among the Powers, It is a singular city; an ancient walled town, three hundred years old, with palaces, tombs, walls within walls; a new Japanese city, broad and square, busy and beautiful.

This is surely the place to pause and ask what is this Manchurian venture of Japan, and what does it mean?

Today, November, 1936, I am standing where in 1905, Japan blockaded the Russian fleet in yonder shining harbor of the Yellow Sea; and creeping up the great harsh peaks of these wild mountains, made Europe surrender to Asia. It was historic ground. Manchuria is the natural mainland of the isles of Japan. She wrested it from China in the war of 1895, but Europe made her surrender it. Then the Russians calmly walked in and took it. They extended the Siberian railroad through it and seizing the harbor of Port Arthur, fortified it, and built the city of Dalny. Along came Germany and seized the Peninsula of Shantung, just south, and fortified that. Already England had seized Hong Kong, while France was in Indo-China. Japan was surrounded with guns pointed at her heart. Then came the Russian-Japanese war and Japan secured the extreme point of the cape as a lease, but Russia was still behind her and Germany at her side.

After the first World War, the situation changed. Japan said to England, who held India, Hong Kong, half of Africa and all of the continent of Australia; to France, who had North Africa and Syria; to America, who held half of Mexico, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and the Canal Zone, "I need Manchuria more than you

need any of these territories. Manchuria today has no government, but is in the hands of roving bandits. Its land and materials are absolutely necessary to my development and expansion as a nation." Moreover, there was one thing more which Japan did not say aloud, but which was even more true: "Unless I take Manchuria now, when you cannot stop me, you will seize it at the very first moment you can." England, France, and America, gorged with the loot of the world, suddenly became highly moral on the subject of annexing other people's land. No! they said, and Japan walked out of the League of Nations and kept Manchuria.

What is Japan doing for the people of Manchuria and how is she doing it? Is she building up a caste of superiors and inferiors? Is she reducing the mass of the people to slavery and poverty? Is she stealing the land and monopolizing the natural resources? Are the people of Manchuria happier or more miserable for the presence of this foreign power on their soil?

Doubtless there was much to complain of in Manchukuo in 1936, but given the colonial nexus, Japan seemed to me to be doing better work than Great Britain or France were doing. I sensed that Japan was a fourth partner among the dictators of world organization, in which Great Britain and Western Europe, Italy and Eastern Europe, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were the other three. Japan was determined to be recognized as a world power and her ultimate aim was domination of Asia. I was curious to know just how far this domination would follow the western model, or how far it would follow some form of socialism. For historic and other reasons, it would not follow Russia; but there was at least equal reason for refusing the lead of Great Britain or France or the United States.

On this matter I took occasion to talk a half hour with Yosuka Matsuoka, the man who led the Japanese delegates when they walked out of the League of Nations in 1935. He is a quiet man, slow and low of speech, who as president of the state railways of Manchuria, ranks as a viceroy and premier, with the destinies of 30,000,000 in his hands. And moreover, with the responsibility of proving to the world, that colonial enterprise by a colored nation, need not imply the caste, exploitation, and subjection which it has always implied in the case of white Europe. He took time to talk with me while automobiles with visitors and officials waited, not because I represented power, influence or publicity, but because I, too, was a colored man and interested in the development and independence of the colored peoples of the world.

We talked of industry, capitalism and communism. He said that in some ways Japan was the most communistic of modern states. In Japan there had never been that strong sense of individual

ownership of property that characterizes so many people. There was, on the contrary, through the family and clan a strong sense of common ownership of all wealth, of willingness to give to others and sacrifice for the common good. I ventured boldly to add, "You Japanese, by your marvelous national discipline, were able without revolution to transform Japan from Feudalism to Industrialism. May it not be possible, again without revolution, and with that same discipline and sacrifice, for Japan to make that further inevitable change from private profit to public welfare?" Matsuoka expressed agreement with me and I think he was sincere. But Japan was under curious double control at the time, which later I was to realize.

Meantime, I hurried to China which was end and aim of all imperial planning, from America to Japan, and from the tenth century to the twentieth. In the morning I went down to the great harbor of Dairen. My friends handed me three colored streamers of farewell, and following the beautiful Japanese custom, I and a dozen others held one end while the friends ashore unwound the other ends, until a rainbow of colored strips of paper streamed from ship to shore and I bade Manchoukuo goodbye.

We sailed into the Yellow Sea on a perfect day. Rough brown mountains lined the left, with oil refineries and factories, boats and trains. Then, further out, the hills became barren, except where the Japanese with infinite patience are covering them with tiny pine trees, whose sturdy roots will in some fifty years break up the barren waste which Russia left and clothe the hills again in green. Further and further the mountains retreated on our left. A precipitous isle came and went and we were on the open water, sailing to China. I went out to watch the death of day. The sun was a ball of beaten gold, with pink and purple cloud streamers floating east. Quickly it became a flattened burning egg resting on the horizon. Then it fell into the green waters of the Yellow Sea, hissing with silent light, and sending glory cries to high heaven.

China is inconceivable. Here first, a man out of the empty West, realizes where the population of the world really centers. Never before has a land so affected me. For Africa I had more emotion – a greater wave of understanding and recognition. But China to the wayfarer of a little week, and I suspect of a little year, is incomprehensible. I have, of course, a theory and explanation which brings some vague meaning to the mass of things I have seen and heard. But I understand now as never before how I have mistrusted human history and missed the whole meaning of a people. And this I know: any attempt to explain the world, without giving China a place of extraordinary prominence is futile. Perhaps the riddle of the universe will be settled in

China; and if not, in no part of the world which ignores China.

Pekin, or Peiping as it was then, stands on that wide north plain, sweeping up to Siberia and down to the Yangtze Kiang. It is bathed in cold sunshine. It lies in two great rectangles, with a square within. The square to the north, with vast, grey, massive walls, is the Tartar city. This was a thousand years old when Christ was born, and two thousand years old when Ghengis Khan made it his capital. Here the Manchu emperors ruled China for three hundred years, building their power on the magnificence of the Sung and Mings.

Within this Tartar city, surrounded by pink walls, twenty feet high and occupying two square miles, is the Imperial city; and within the Imperial city is the red-walled Forbidden city, which no foreigner entered until 1900. Outside and to the south of the Tartar city, lies the oblong Chinese city, with Walls thirty feet high. With these walls and walls within walls, dwell a million and a half of people on twenty square miles of land, packed with monuments, buildings, towers, arches, tile, porcelain, jewels, inscriptions, manuscripts, and customs, habits, songs and a strange language, that go back and illustrate and explain the history of 500,000,000 people for five thousand years.

Nearly everyone has seen some echo or imitation of a Chinese city. There is one in New York; one in Chicago; and a real one in San Francisco. The casual observer might think these imitations, caricatures. But one sees Chien Men Street in Peiping, and one knows that this human organism is a typical Chinese invention, age-old, rooted in the soul of a people, end expressing as well as any one thing can express, their life and work and play. First of all, it is full of people; it reeks with humanity, it crowds, pushes, swarms. The first day I was in Peiping I must have walked ten miles on this street and its cross allies. It is a continuous succession of little shops, stores, artisans, workshops, restaurants, amusement centers, sidewalk markets, personal services. It is commercialism, ingrained, concentrated, complete. It caters to every want of the streaming humanity that eddies through it like an endless flood.

In some Negro sections of New Orleans or Charleston, there is a faint approach to this situation, but only faint, for this is infinitely older, with a tradition and autonomy which the newer Negro city lacks. Perhaps in the Africa of the Middle Ages there was something like it. Crowded as are the merchants and purveyors to human want, humanity, the buyers, the seekers, are more numerous. Someone has said, that if the population of Europe were swept away tomorrow, it could be re-peopled from China, and yet leave behind a population as dense as that of the

United States. It is in the sheer weight of numbers that China must be hearkened to, if for nothing else. Babies, babies, everywhere, and women nowhere, save as mothers, housekeepers and followers of the world's oldest profession.

I have seen the Temple of Heaven – one of the world's most beautiful monuments; the Forbidden City, with its Peacock Throne, its palaces and store of treasure, despite the loot which drunken Europe stole after the Boxer War, and carried away in the name of Christianity. There was the Temple of Confucius and the stone classic writings of old China; there was the Lhama Monastery of Buddha, and of the statues of the eighteen disciples, six black and six brown, who brought Buddhism to China.

At last, two things whose memory lingers: that Summer Palace, which the intrepid Empress Dowager set upon a hill in unearthly splendor. That stone faced woman, who laughed at fate and took \$20,000,000 set aside for a navy and built a fairy land with lake, and marble bridge, and glory-roofed palaces, rising one above the other until they stood above the earth and just beneath the sky, looking down on imperial Pekin. She lost an empire, but gained immortality. Then and now, Europe prefers navies.

Amid this amorphous mass of men, with its age-old monuments of human power, beauty, and glory; with its helpless, undefended welter of misery and toil, there is an organization of life and impenetrable will to survive that neither imperial tyranny, nor industrial exploitation, nor famine, starvation, nor pestilence can kill – it is Eternal Life, facing disaster and triumphing imperturbably.

There passed a glory from the earth when Imperial China fell. Built as it was on skulls, it was bravely built and its remains are magnificent. In all essential respects they surpass the Stones of Europe. Where Europe counts its years in hundreds, Asia counts its thousands. There is absent that all too apparent European effort to dramatize and exaggerate and misrepresent the past; to emphasize war and personal glory; China shows a finer effort to let the Past stand silent, frank, and unadorned; to tell the truth simply about men and fully; and to record the triumphs of education, family, life, and literature far more than murder.

All that Europe has done China did before, save in the rapid, breathless material capitalistic technique of the nineteenth century. With that transitory flash of power and that alone, Europe raped and enslaved the world from 1600 to 1900. She used China exactly as she did Africa, South and Central America, and her own working classes. It is essential to grasp that this profit-making by monopoly of capital and purchase of labor as a

commodity is the universal European technique, applied to all peoples – European workers, African transported slaves, American imported slaves and immigrant workers, and Asiatic coolies.

I write this standing on the Great Wall of China, with twenty-three centuries beneath my feet. The purple drags of Manchuria lie beyond the valley, while behind are the yellow and brown mountains of China. For seventy cents I have been carried upon the shoulders of four men and down again. And here I stand on what has been called the only work of man, visible from Mars. It is no mud fence or pile of cobbles. It surpasses that mighty bastion of Constantinople, which so many centuries saved Mediterranean civilization from German barbarism. This is a wall of carefully cut stone, fitted and laid with perfect matching and eternal mortar, from twenty to fifty feet high and 2,500 miles long; built by a million men, castellated with perfect brick, and standing mute and immutable for more than two thousand years. Such is China.

Shanghai is an epitome of the racial strife, the economic struggle, the human paradox of modern life. Here is the greatest city of the most populous nation on earth, with the larger part of it owned, governed and policed by foreign nations. With Europe largely controlling its capital, commerce, mines, rivers and manufactures; with a vast welter of the hardest working-class in the world, paid less than an average of twenty-five cents a day; with a glittering modern life of skyscrapers, majestic hotels, theatres and night clubs. In this city of nations are 19,000 Japanese, 11,000 British, 10,000 Russians, 4,000 Americans, and 10,000 foreigners of other nationality living in the midst of 3,000,000 Chinese. The city is divided openly by nations; foreign troops parade its streets, foreign warships sit calmly in her gates; foreigners tell this city what it may and may not do. Even at that, matters are not as bad as they once were. In 1936, foreigners acknowledge that Chinese have some rights in China. Chinese who can afford it may even visit the city race track from which they were long excluded. It is not common now to kick a coolie or throw a rickshaw's fare on the ground. Yet, yesterday afternoon I saw a little English boy of perhaps four years, order three Chinese children out of his imperial way on the sidewalk of the Bund; and they meekly obeyed and stepped into the gutter. It looked quite like Mississippi. And, too, I met a "missionary" from Mississippi, teaching in the Baptist University of Shanghai!

The explanation is simple: Capital. Into a land, rich in fertility, natural resources and great water highways, white Europe has poured machinery, tools, and materials so as to put the hardest working people on earth to making goods and rendering services for Europe. The profit has been enormous. Not

only Europe, but Asia has joined in exploitation – Japanese and Chinese have invested in Chinese cheap labor and called it Progress. The result is baffling. Always there is this mass of labor. Labor that has never learned to revolt, to demand, and is only beginning to strike in a few mass industries ideal labor for profits.

The wage is low and only balanced by low cost of living. The rickshaw man drags you, running five miles or more in a half hour, for a cent-and-one-half to three cents. A gardener gets five dollars a month with room and board, which is rice and a bit else; a factory hand, I have been told, may get twelve cents a day; a miner's wage of twenty-five cents a day was cited as high, since he could live on less than ten cents.

I went by invitation to the American-supported University of Shanghai and I said to the President that I would like to talk to a group of Chinese and discuss frankly racial and social matters. He arranged a luncheon at the Chinese Bankers' Club. There were present one of the editors of the China Press, the Secretary-General of the Bank of China, the General Manager of the China Publishing Company, the Director of the Chinese Schools for Shanghai, and the Executive Secretary of the China Institute of International Relations.

We talked nearly three hours. I plunged in recklessly. I told them of my slave ancestors, of my education and travels. Of the Negro problem. Then I turned on them and said, "How far do you think Europe can continue to dominate the world, or how far do you envisage a world whose spiritual center is Asia and the colored races? You have escaped from the domination of Europe politically since the World War – at least in part; but how do you propose to escape from the domination of European capital? How are your working classes progressing? Why is it that you hate Japan more than Europe when you have suffered more from England, France, and Germany than from Japan?"

There ensued a considerable silence in which I joined. Then we talked, and it was a most illuminating conversation, which I may paraphrase as follows: Asia is still under the spell of Europe, although not as completely as a while back. It is not our ideal simply to ape Europe. We know little of India or Africa, or Africa in America. We see the danger of European capital and are slowly extricating ourselves, by seeking to establish control of capital by the political power of taxation and regulation. We have stabilized our currency – no longer do English Hong Kong notes form our chief circulating medium. Our wages are too low but slowly rising; labor legislation is appearing; we have 16,000,000 children in school with short terms and inadequate equipment, but a beginning of the fight against our 90 per cent illiteracy.

The whole emancipation of China was primarily an emancipation from European capitalistic control. They knew it. They told me some of the plans and work toward freedom. I even went down and visited that new ghost capital between Shanghai and the sea, which was planned to cut Shanghai's supremacy in trade and transfer it to a Chinese city ruled by the Chinese. But it was a thing half-begun and half-done. A beautiful and empty library stood there; a marble city hall. Streets were there and some houses; everything but people. And they explained that it took capital to do this. They did not have the capital.

And therein lay the secret. They proposed to out-capital capital. They were going to build a new Chinese industry which should emancipate them from European industry; and they felt themselves able to do this. But they bitterly resented the intrusion of Japan, coming in as though she were a western power destined to dominate Orientals; as though she, the culture child of China, was going to show China the way of life; that China which had lived a thousand years before Japan was born and would live long after Japan's end.

The intrusion of Japan was resented because of its very success and because of its all too apt imitation of western technique. The Chinese had not been invited to hold hands with their yellow brother and march side by side toward freedom. They were ordered rather to put their manpower at the mercy of Japanese exploitation and let Japan finish what England, France, and Germany had begun, but would never now complete. There was more they might have said — much more. But it was difficult for this mixed group to phrase it, and they were not sure how much I knew or just where my sympathies would be.

But I knew something of the tragedy of China, Japan and Europe in the nineteenth century. Here were kindred peoples in eastern Asia, stretching from Sakhalin to the Indies and mingling their blood with the whites of Siberia and the blacks of the South Seas. On a fringe of northern islands Japan developed a variation of Chinese culture; on the continent the Chinese built a magnificent pattern of life. To these in the nineteenth century came Britain and America to trade. America forced its way into Japan and Britain opened China, to the Indian opium which the British were determined to sell from their Indian colony.

Trade ensued, slowly and methodically in Japan; roughly and drunkenly in China, until by the time of the American Civil War China was all but a British colony, while Japan was silently preparing to meet the whites on their own ground. Rebellion and hatred of the whites ebbed and flowed in China, while industry grew in Japan, and by 1894 Japan challenged China and disclosed her weakness to Europe, insisting only on being counted in among

the harpies who gathered about the corpse. It was a curious flanking movement toward power. As partial master of China, Japan appeared as partner of Europe in the further exploitation of Asia. The very boldness of this move showed a deference to the power and methods of Europe, which was flattering. It made no bid for an Asia independent of Europe. It only asked partnership with Europe in Asiatic domination. Britain rose promptly to the bait. But China was not dead; the Boxers arose in rebellion, the intrepid Empress Dowager played politics, and a dreamer and reformer, Sun Yat-Sen, began to loosen the Manchus on their throne. Japan conquered Czarist Russia but Communist Russia gave advice and training to Sun Yat-Sen, when the Manchus were overthrown.

Europe and the United States were set on the control of Asia, but Japan was a problem. Could a colored nation be allowed to equal the white in exploitation of Asia? After the Russo-Japanese war, Britain thought Yes. After the first World War, Australia and the United States persuaded her to change her mind. So Japan, egged on by her military masters, took the bit into her teeth and resolved to conquer Asia in the face of the World. She discounted China as too weak and submissive to be a partner and gained the bitter enmity of those Chinese who were destined to rebuild China.

It was at this point, that I landed in China and had a glimpse of Japan. I had seen the Chinese University in Moscow in 1926 and I knew how Sun Yat-Sen, son of a peasant, had received sympathy and cooperation from Russia alone when he appealed to the West for help to establish the Chinese Republic after the overthrow of the Manchus. He saw the Russian Revolution in 1917, the year his Kuomintang party attempted to take charge of China. The divisions in China were irreconcilable and he appealed to the Soviets; he received trained leaders and Borodin was sent as adviser and ambassador. At the first party congress, held in 1924, Communists were admitted. A military academy was founded and a certain young man of thirty-eight years of age named Chiang Kai-shek, educated in Japan, was on Borodin's advice made head of it. Cancer and continual internal bickering among his followers killed the great Sun Yat-Sen in March, 1925, and in September Chiang Kai-shek became commander of the Kuomintang army and proceeded to organize the party. The next year he had deserted the Communists, murdered thousands of students and workers, and with the help of rich bankers set up rule in Shanghai, while Borodin and the Communists ruled in Hankow five hundred miles west. But Chiang proved the stronger. His armies moved north and seized Peiping and his government gained recognition from all Europe.

Chiang pretended to keep Sun Yat-Sen's principles of

rationalism, democracy, and people's livelihood, but he married into the rich Soong family and ended in such dictatorship and reaction, that even while I was in China, in December, 1936, the northern Chinese, both warlord and Communist, resented his surrender to Japanese imperialism, kidnapped him, hiding on a rock in his nightshirt and without his false teeth; and held him until he promised to fight Japan.

Sun Yat-Sen's program was Communism; not the complete Russian line, but an extreme socialism which envisaged division of the land, control of industry, ownership of capital in heavy industry, and the welfare state. How interesting it would have been if Russia and China had been able to cooperate in 1936, as in 1926!

On the contrary, in 1936, an uncertain, distracted China, led by a greedy crafty man of no ideals or integrity, was face to face with a great, new Asiatic imperialism, set to challenge the imperialism of Europe on its own grounds and with its own methods.

The most disconcerting thing about Asia in 1936 was the burning hatred of China and Japan. It was a vivid, real thing and a major threat to the peace of the world. I discounted it before I came to Asia - then I could scarcely exaggerate it. With China and Japan in understanding and in co-operation, the domination of Europe, the enslavement and insult and exploitation of the darker majority of mankind would have been at an everlasting end. But -with China and Japan in rivalry, war and hatred, Europe still continued in 1936 to rule the world for her own ends.

What is the basis of the trouble between China and Japan? China's submission to white aggression and Japanese resistance; Japanese determination to cooperate with Europe, even when that involved aggression in China; the disappearance of central control in China and the growth of perfect team work in Japan; finally, the open and veiled effort of Europe to increase in every way the break between these cousins. Thus Asia is the prize of the world; its materials, its millions of cheap, docile workers; its climate, rivers, and mountains - all this means wealth, luxury and magnificence to those who own, control and exploit China.

Across the narrow straits, is a people determined to wrest control of China from the white world. Japan proposes to accomplish this by using the white world's technique and organization which she has learned meticulously ever since Perry forced her gates and insulted her. Deftly and courteously she evaded western control. Thoroughly and continuously she studied western methods, until in 1936 the West feared Japanese industrial organization more than any in the world.

I left the bustle and roar of Shanghai, December 1, 1936. We sailed the Sea of Japan and all night it rained. Next noon, I was at Nagasaki - busy, quiet, polite and disciplined; yes, disciplined, that is the word for Japan. Why do we always instinctively think of islands as flat and low? I suppose it is the influence of maps. Japan is mountain peak in every guise, fashion and height. It gives a primary impression of soaring height and strength as I sail the Inland Sea, from Nagasaki to Kobe. There is quiet, efficiency and order, in the porters, in the hills, in the villages nestling low on the sides of mountains.

I have never been welcomed to a land, least of all my own, as I was welcomed to Japan. I was helped past the port officials, white Americans being politely but firmly elbowed aside, to their open-mouthed surprise. It was astonishing to be at last in a colored country, able and determined to run itself without white advice. And Japan considers itself colored and not white. I have already tested this in conversation and suggestion. I was passed deftly through customs. The young fellow, who examined my books and papers, seemed a bit suspicious at several volumes. He balked definitely at a translation of Karl Marx's Capital, and sent it to higher authority; but it came back uncensored. We climbed into a taxi and rode from Kobe to Osaka, the industrial capital of Japan. It was almost a continuous city from the great importing center to the chief manufacturing and exporting center of Japan. My hotel had been selected and the manager was there in front to welcome me with a host of bowing servants. Never before has any land indicated that it knew or cared whether I arrived or not; except, of course, Africa.

What is Japan? I am I admit prejudiced in its favor. But I am trying to judge it fairly. First of all, it is colored. The blonde-haired world of my summer and fall is gone. The hair of the Japanese is coal black, with one in a thousand a faint brown. The skins vary from white to sallow, and then to yellow and brown. Casually, if I woke up suddenly in Japan, I should imagine myself among New Orleans or Charleston mulattoes.

But the most extraordinary thing about the Japanese is not physical; it is spiritual. They are independent and self-reliant and self-sufficient colored folk in a white world. They have no fear of white folk or secret envy. Whatever white folk do or have done, the Japanese are sure they can do better.

And they do. They are more prompt than New England. Even their ships start on the minute, and you can set your watch by their trains. They are cleaner than the Dutch. And for politeness and courtesy in public and private, the French are not even in the running.

Their cities? Let me say a word of Osaka, It has 3,000,000

people and is the seventh city of the world. It has 10,600 factories producing \$420,000,000 worth of goods a year; it receives 20,000,000 tons of goods a year and ships out 12,300,000 tons. It has 8,000 business firms and a harbor which accommodates 184,000 domestic vessels and 2,900 ocean-going steamers a year. It is a clean city, beautiful city, built low and broad, rather than high, with a fine subway, electric cars and buses, and an automobile traffic rivaling European cities. It has broad thoroughfares and narrow winding streets. I found no slums; tiny, crowded quarters there were, but always neat and quiet. The red-light district, with the geisha girls, was quietest most respectable looking of all. It is a busy hard-working city, but there are no such signs of poverty and grinding, bitter toil as I saw in Shanghai. The rickshaw has almost disappeared from the streets. Wages are undoubtedly low, but I saw little begging. A leading paper cites 90,000 on relief, mostly old people and children. The intelligence of the public is shown by the numerous bookshops and the fact that the leading paper, circulating in several other cities beside Osaka, has 5,000,000 readers.

The accomplishment of Japan has been to realize the meaning of European aggression on the darker peoples, to discover the secret of the white man's power, and then, without revolutionary violence, to change her whole civilization and attitude toward the world, so as to emerge in the twentieth century as the equal in education, technique, health, industry and art of any nation on earth. It was a colossal task. It called for sacrifice. It called for genius. It called for team work. All this involved cost. It cost freedom and meant severe discipline. It meant severe repression. It meant force. But it was accomplished, and Japan is proud.

But in her very pride and accomplishment lies danger. The Europe which she copied was no perfect land. The technique of industry which Japan mastered; the capitalistic regime which she adopted so successfully, has, as all thinking men can see today, threatening, if not fatal tendencies. And now, with a herculean task just behind her, Japan is called again to lead world revolution, and lead it with the minimum of violence and upheaval. In the nineteenth century Japan saved the world from slavery to Europe. In the twentieth century she is called to save the world from the slavery to capital.

Japan has one tremendous advantage. She owns and controls her own capital. She need beg neither Wall Street nor Lombard Street for capital. She has her own engineers and technicians. Above all, she has a labor force that can live in contentment and health on twenty-five cents a day. Consequently, she is beating the commercial world today, and underselling every nation in

world markets. She is reaching out with her capital and technique and controlling industry in China, and some parts of the South Seas. World Commerce is beginning to depend on Japanese goods. Go into any Woolworth store and see. Japanese labor in Japan is displacing white labor in England, France, Germany, and America.

Japan today is thinking in terms of capitalistic advance and not primarily in terms of human culture. Her attitude toward China is the main case in point. In the nineteenth century, Japan had to protect China against herself, or otherwise Europe moving from the domination of the Chinese would have sunk little Japan into the sea. China patriots today may not forget that they owe their chance for independence today to the fight the Japanese made against European aggression. The great Wall made it impossible for Europe to dominate the East, and the World War was caused by unbridled capitalism.

Japan, after the war, determined to dominate China and other parts of Asia, so as to make a recurrence of European aggression impossible. This is the secret of her military policy. But Japan forgets the danger of capitalism. Unbridled production cannot continue indefinitely. Cheap labor is not in the end cheap for the nation that seeks to build prosperity on it. If Japan, in 1936, avoiding temptation, had raised the standard of living among her laborers, she could still compete with the world and at the same time develop a mass of workers who would be the most intelligent and gifted the world has ever seen. Democracy would become possible in a great land based on a really intelligent people. Industry would exist, not for Production, but for the widest and most profitable Consumption, made possible by rational distribution of such goods as the people really need for their weal.

China resented the patronage and attempted leadership of Japan, just as blacks in the West Indies have often resented the leadership of mulattoes. What was this upstart Japan, but the child of ancient Chinese culture. The aggression of war in 1894-1895 came just as Sun Yat-Sen, a young man of twenty-eight, was organizing his first societies to overthrow the Manchus, and helped open the doors of China to western aggression, in which Japan joined; she was among those nations who put down the Boxers in 1900. During the first World War, Japan made demands on China which only a conqueror could expect to attain, and which were probably made in anticipation of the coming end of European domination of Asia. But the Nine Power Treaty of 1922 restored international accord on China and left China open to the Revolution under Sun Yat-Sen. Japan continued interference, since she feared loss of Chinese markets.

The Shanghai incident came in January, 1932, and was caused by

an increasing agitation and boycott in South and Middle China, especially at Shanghai, damaging Japan's Chinese trade after the Manchurian crisis. There were mobs and murders. Troops of the various countries were called out, and hostilities between the Japanese and Chinese ensued. Japan seized Manchuria, and February 24, 1933, the Assembly of the League of Nations, by unanimous vote, condemned Japan for this action. Matsuoka announced withdrawal from the League of Nations in 1935.

It was the fear of England that was pushing Japan. England dominated China and India, Australia and New Zealand. But for the grace of God and the vigilance of the Japanese, she would own Japan. At one time during and after the Russo-Japanese war, recognizing the power and ability of the Japanese, England made alliance with her as an equal. Then, with no reason, except the unstated one of color prejudice in America, South Africa, and Australia and even Britain, of unwillingness to link her fortunes with yellow people, the alliance lapsed in 1921.

When after the World War, China was disintegrating, Japan knew that unless she seized Manchuria, Europe would — just as England seized and holds Hong Kong; France, Annam; and Germany and Russia large and larger slices, before the war. When Japan seized that part of China which was nearest anarchy, England, America, and the white world howled. China braced herself and, protected by European weakness and Europe's fear of Japan, began a forward development. But she let her bitterness toward Japanese aggression become a leading motive in her quest for new unity and strength, forgetting all about the worse and longer aggressions of white Europe.

Japan found herself between the devil and the deep blue sea; rapprochement with China, based on blood kinship and cultural likeness, was stopped by war and boycott, that reached unbelievable depths of hatred. Europeans secretly and openly encouraged a split between colored people which played directly into their hands. English papers, in 1936, in Shanghai retailed with calm impartiality every scrap of news and gossip calculated to influence China against Japan. Then came rearmament in Europe, with Japan outside. There seemed nothing for her to do but seek alliance with Germany and Italy, despite the fact that Germany despises yellow races, and Italy's hands are red with the blood of black Africa.

Worst of all, this alliance of Japan with Fascism sets her down as the enemy of Russia. It was, of course, logical for Japan to recoil from her first European antagonist, whose defeat placed her in the family of nations. Moreover, certain points of the Russian Revolution touch Japan on the raw — the attack on clan rule and religious dogma. But the Japanese family group was widely different from what Russia rightly attacked; and the

Russian orthodox Church had no remote resemblance to Shinto cultural traditions and customs, or even to tolerant Buddhism as it exists in Japan.

These things disposed Japan to oppose the Soviets. But, of course, the underlying motive was the fear among the capitalists. Japanese industry is controlled by five great groups of capitalists. They are generous and patriotic men. They have been helped and often financed and furnished technique by the government, at the expense of the taxpayer. They would not and could not deny any demand of that government in the line of taxation or cooperation. Also clan affiliation ties them to the lowest peasant, but they are capitalists and allied with international capital. They fear Russian Communism with its broad class strata and prefer their own vertical family division. Yet their supremacy in government influence is not as great as in many European lands. Above them stands Imperial authority and the power of the Japanese family, and the deep belief of the Japanese people in their destiny.

There is poverty in Japan; there is oppression; there is no democratic freedom. But nowhere in the modern world is there higher literacy, as newspaper circulations of one, three, and even five millions prove. The Japanese laborer is not happy but he is not hopelessly discontented, and this is not stupor, but rather age-long memory of simple wants and joys, and firm faith in ultimate Good.

Where, then, in spite of cruel misunderstanding and frustration, in spite of the rule of wealth and industry for private profit; in spite of the dominant military spirit, no worse but just as bad as in America, where else in the modern world is there a people so intelligent, so disciplined, so clean and punctual, so instinctively conscious of human good and ill, as the Japanese? And where could the world of 1936 better look for leadership eventually toward industry based on well-being and not on private profit, and to a democracy which includes the masses of people and is conducted for their benefit? Japan was far from this in 1936. Few voted and voters were limited in power. Wealth ruled in Tokyo, as well as in New York and London, and Paris.

The resistance of China to this program was great and growing. What next? Next could come a change in object on the part of Japan, and a change would mean that Japan and China together as equals would try to industrialize the East and produce goods which the East itself needs, as well as goods needed by the rest of the world. And these goods which the masses of China and Japan need, would by the pressure of the communistic trends in China be distributed upon a new basis, not according to the ideals of the West which Japan is now following so strictly; but

according to a new ideal much nearer that of Russia and strangely enough corresponding also in part with that integration of Japanese family industry, which makes the nation one industrial whole instead of the class-divided industrial system which one expects.

It must, of course, be Marxian in its abolition of industrial profit, toward which family and state communism in Asia already tends, but which has been frustrated by European influence. It must be Marxian in its division of income according to need; but it may be distinctly Asiatic in its use of the vertical clan division and family tie, instead of reaction toward a new bourgeoisie along horizontal class layers which must be the temptation of Europe.

It would take a new way of thinking on Asiatic lines to work this out; but there would be a chance that out of India, out of Buddhism and Shintoism, out of the age-old virtues of Japan and China itself, to provide for this different kind of Communism, a thing which so far all attempts at a socialistic state in Europe have failed to produce; that is a communism with its Asiatic stress on character, on goodness, on spirit, through family loyalty and affection might ward off Thermidor; might stop the tendency of the Western socialistic state to freeze into bureaucracy. It might through the philosophy of Gandhi and Tagore, of Japan and China, really create a vast democracy into which the ruling dictatorship of the proletariat would fuse and deliquesce; and thus instead of socialism even becoming a stark negation of the freedom of thought and a tyranny of action and propaganda of science and art, it would expand to a great democracy of the spirit.

There is hope here, vast hope. But the horror of it all is to see the fear of Soviet Russia and the blandishments of Germany and, perhaps, even of Italy, seducing Japan away from China and Asia and seeking to create a Fascist bloc which the finer world eventually must kill, or itself perish.

To me, the tragedy of this epoch was that Japan learned Western ways too soon and too well, and turned from Asia to Europe. She had a fine culture and exquisite art, and an industrial technique unsurpassed in workmanship and adaptability. The Japanese clan was an effective social organ and her art expression was unsurpassed. She might have led Asia and the world into a new era. But her headstrong leaders chose to apply Western imperialism to her domination of the East, and Western profit-making replaced Eastern idealism. If she had succeeded, it might have happened that she would have spread her culture and achieved a co-prosperity sphere with freedom of soul. Perhaps.

In the dying days of 1936, while great Fujiyama still veiled

its silver face, I went down to Yokohama and set foot upon the sea. I sailed east into the sunset again to discover America, in my own thought and through the thinking and doing of other folk. Ten days I journeyed until I came, at Christmas, to an unbelievable land of raining sunshine and everlasting flowers, called Hawaii.

New Years, 1937, I stood in California of fact and fable, with the city of St. Francis of poverty and the birds before me and lifted up mine eyes to the hills beyond the Golden Gate, which form the rock-bound spinal column of America. Lifted them and let drop two small years; two little years; suddenly I saw the whole world aflame.

CHAPTER V

THE REIGN OF ROOSEVELT

I am an American. My forefathers have been Americans for three hundred years, and most of them have served America, honestly and unstintingly. All of us have lived our lives in this land, mostly in New England and New York, often in the West and South. We have not greatly prospered; none have been rich but few have been paupers; few have attained exceptional eminence.

Assembling the sixteen of my great grand-parents, so as to avoid recent race mixture, it would appear from what I can learn, that nine of them were black Africans; and seven European whites. Of these whites, two were French, two others of Latin American descent, one Dutch, and one may have been a New England Puritan, although I trust not. Of these white folk, I know little. Two were Huguenots, probably honest artisans fleeing from persecution and poverty; another was a stodgy farmer, of the new world Dutch; a third was possibly a commercial trader, of the others I know nothing.

The mulatto Du Boises were eminently respectable folk; I remember my grave, gray, unsmiling grandfather as one who rather overdid the respectability line and caused revolt in my handsome, gay and irresponsible father. My calm and even-tempered mother helped to balance the brood. She was of the black Burghardts, who were different - loud and lusty; drinkers of hard cider and whiskey, and never avoiding a good fight. All these forebears served, as farmers, laborers, servants and soldiers, their country and their Gods.

To describe my feelings toward the United States as Love would not be English. My love was always for folk of dark skin to whom I gave my complete loyalty. France for years I have theoretically loved; not for her blamelessness, but because in a half century of visiting her soil, I have always met sympathy and courtesy without suing for it. Despite finer souls, some of whom I have known, I have always disliked the English, for their intolerable assumptions of superiority to everybody, their snobbery and cold hypocrisy. I cannot forget their contribution to the slave trade and slavery of my folk.

With 19th century Germany, I felt a kinship second only to that which bound me to Negroes. In part this was the accident of being, in my critical young manhood, thrown in close contact with the best of pre-war Germany and thus having revealed to me a white folk different to any I had ever before met.

On the other hand, America has always to my mind been associated with repression if not insult. Not that all or even most of my American contacts and experiences involved such treatment. I have had many close and dear white friends; once

four little Congregational churches in Connecticut, for three years, furnished me a scholarship of one hundred dollars a year while I was in college. I have usually lived a normal American life, without hunger, with adequate clothes and shelter and with unusual opportunities for education. With this, however and inextricably and continuously intertwined with it, went inhibitions, pinpricks and open insults which grew and swelled in my soul to proportions far beyond their intrinsic worth: where could I eat? Where must I live? What could I do for self-support? Was I among the "public" invited? Was it worth while entering this competition? Was the Harvard Glee Club fair in judging my voice? Was the Pullman sleeper really sold out? In all these ways and a hundred more, all my life, I was trained to expect discrimination. Often, probably most times, there was no unfairness; but my fatherland conditioned me for a half century to expect this, and too often I met what I looked for, and despite reason and philosophy, I nurtured hate for a nation with this cast of mind.

Then beyond myself, I saw and knew what America did to less fortunate Negroes than myself. I searched for and read details of every lynching and died horribly with the victim. I vividly imagined what I did not see or even hear of. I was soon clothed with a spiritual provincialism, and an inner withdrawal and antagonism, beyond reason and experience.

Thus to me, my native land spelled not affection, but grim duty. This is my native land. I shall never live elsewhere. I could not if I would. I would not if I could. Probably nowhere else would I have received more if as much, in inspiration and opportunity. Had I been born in Africa, in 1868, I would have grown up to be slave of European or of American investment. If I had been born in England, I would have had even less opportunity than in the United States. In France, I would have had more; but would have been cut off from the Negro people and never known them or their problems. That would have meant that the plight of the poor and ignorant and sick of the world, would hardly have touched me at all or certainly not as deeply and intimately as it had to penetrate the soul of an American Negro.

That is why I spurned the well-meant advice a great and liberal white Georgian gave me: "You're right in your fight and your demands," he said, "but you can never win equality in this land; your struggle is in vain. Why do you not go to France and live?" I answered in my breast: "All right then, I'll lose. I'd rather lose fighting here where I was born than win in Europe. And why? Because this nation belongs to me, even if I have never belonged to this nation. And no God-damned Southerner nor cowardly Northern Copperhead nor servile 'white folks' was going to stop my fight for the absolute freedom and equality of Black

Folk in America."

But I am not so narrow as to think of the United States solely from the interests of me and my people. I know what America has meant to the world. Here for the first in modern days, Liberty and Equality blossomed to real flower; here Democracy received a trying-out like nothing Europe nor Asia ever saw. Here on vaster scale than elsewhere ever, myriads of men - aye and of women - of differing nationalities and capacity, have lived together in peace and happiness, and worked widely as they chose, and thought as they would. America is triumph and accomplishment for more men than ever anywhere before.

It only happens that my fate has been, not to be regarded as a fellow human being by most Americans and not treated as such. I will not forget or understate what America has meant to white folk; and too I will not bear false witness as to me and mine, either by lauding my slavery or thanking Abraham Lincoln for emancipation. I have said and will always continue to say while I speak that the treatment of Negroes in this land, past and now, shames and besmirches the escutcheon of a great and mighty nation whose son despite this it is my privilege to be.

The experience has narrowed my vision and made me provincial. I have seen Irishmen crawling out of the filth of their bogs to step in my face and crow; hill-billies and crackers from Alabama and Arkansas could spit on me to the applause of thousands; German peasants newly free could insult me; and Italians and Slovaks and a thousand others, could not only deprive me of a living but depend on white American mobs and police to jail or even lynch me for protesting.

When in season and out I protest, it is pointed out with perfect truth that in America, I have received food and clothes, adequate shelter, education far beyond my fellows, black and white, and not little honor and appreciation. I still maintain that my treatment in America has been exceptional and not characteristic. That my fate was not due to my desert but to lucky chance more often than to philanthropy. Had I been born on a Mississippi plantation instead of in a New England village; had not liberalism at Harvard in the last decade of the 19th century cracked its doors to a few students from beyond Back Bay; if Rutherford Hayes, perhaps with some qualms at his role in Reconstruction, had not given me a Slater Fund Fellowship against the advice of respectable America, I might now lie buried as deep as thousands of unknown black boys of quite equal gifts.

This land is at fault and grievously guilty for not doing for thousands of more worthy Negroes what she has inadvertently done for me; and for utterly discouraging black boys and girls less stubborn and lucky than I, to reach for stars instead of being

content in the gutter. Only a few years ago a professor at (Bowdoin protested against sending a brilliant black student to Harvard on fellowship, lest "he become bitter like Du Bois." And when Harvard gave him a doctorate and used his thesis as a classroom text, the head of his department said confidentially to a friend of mine: "We'd keep him here to teach if he wasn't a nigger!" Far more important than this, I contend that the United States in suppressing her millions of black folk has ruined the ideals of liberty, equality and democracy for the mass of her white citizens and for the world. No double standard of decency can bring the millennium.

My reasoning may be strained; but whether the reader agrees or not, I am sure he can understand the impact which Russia had upon me in 1926. I was not naive enough to think I had visited Utopia. On the contrary I knew quite well that I had had but a brief glance at small part of a vast land and of a desperately complicated problem. I boasted to my intimates that I was at the time the one American who had been a month in Russia and had not written a book about it. If I may quote a sour-mouthed old virago, whom the New York Board of Education insists on keeping to teach "niggers" and Jews their places, I have gained most of my advantages in America by insisting "on being where I was not wanted."

There have, to be sure, been times when pushing in, I have found courtesy and welcome, but not usually. Why then over long years and with bitten lips have I continued to push? Because I wanted the opportunities of Harvard; because I wanted to hear the Ring of the Nibelungs; because I was tired and hungry; otherwise, believe me, I would have been as absent always as I was sometimes.

I cannot avoid being surprised when a white American treats me with courtesy. This is unfair to many white folk, because usually they are reasonably polite. But because of memories of a long past and because at time, somewhere, I can be sure of more or less direct insult, —it is this sort of thing that makes living in the United States no unalloyed joy for black folk.

I can thus at once look on the United States as an outsider and continuous visitor, unintegrated into its culture and yet knowing and sharing it. I can see as few others can, the way in which the presence of a depressed class of human beings has distorted and still distorts our social development. My emotional sympathy with this group will doubtless exaggerate its influence, and for this margin of error the reader must make allowance, nevertheless my total view is worth setting down.

Meantime my full and unstinting loyalty and service went to my fellows of Negro descent, not simply in the United States, but in the West Indies and in Africa, which I never saw until I was

sixty. Thence by logic I gave my friendship to all colored folk, in Asia and in the South Seas, hoping that in some way the dark world would unite forces and thrust itself across the color bar. In earlier years I pictured this as conquest of the whites by revolt and war. After the First World War, I renounced force, convinced that by war alone no cause can win. Afterward I looked increasingly for mental and moral victories of black over white.

When the free land and resources of America were thrown open to Europe they became in part a gift to the landless poor of Europe and a gateway to freedom of speech, freedom of belief, and freedom from want and fear. But the presence of Indians and Negroes as low paid labor, depressed by slavery and caste, also made this continent a boon to producers of basic material in the world-wide demand, which were exchanged into capital goods and became the foundation of a new capitalism out of which the swiftly growing technique developed an Industrial Revolution.

Thus both individual freedom and exploitation of labor developed side by side in America and were confused in world thought, as differing aspects of the same expanding culture. This was possible because Negroes came to be regarded as not human in the same sense as whites, and as thus presenting no challenge to humanity or religion. When modern capitalism, built on the slave trade and slavery, began to raise Europe to Wealth and Power, the white workers of both Europe and America, began also to feel the pinch of poverty in the midst of progress and struck back in an organized labor movement which gained them political power and elementary education; and in America developed into an attempt to limit the area of slave labor and especially to keep from the slave system the vast free land acreage of the West.

Economic power in the United States opposed this with an attempt to preserve slave labor and the cotton and sugar which it used, and extend its area not only in this country but also to the Southwest and the Caribbean area. This aroused an organized anti-slavery movement, helped by fugitive slaves; and by white laborers who sought to get rid of slave competition. Civil War ensued, which resulted in victory for the North, when the Southern slaves began to desert the plantation and even to enter the ranks of the Northern armies as soldiers.

There were in 1864, two hundred thousand armed black soldiers in the Union army used as shock troops and for garrison duty. Beside these there were at least 250,000 black laborers, scouts and servants. There was no reason that by 1866, these numbers might not be increased to a million. It was this clear fact, unmentioned by North or South, which brought surrender in 1865.

Dilemma thereupon faced the nation. It had not at first fought to free the slaves, but to prevent the spread of slave labor. It

accepted slaves' help to win the war and emancipation as a war measure. Now it looked on 4,000,000 poor and ignorant freedmen. What was to be done? Both Philanthropy and decency demanded for these victims of 250 years of exploitation and degradation, a system of adequate employment with decent wages, civil rights, a minimum of land and tools, and education. An attempt was made toward this, first in education by the more democratic churches. Then a Freedmen's Bureau was proposed by Sumner and Stephens, in whose charge the freedmen and white refugees were to be placed and trained for full citizenship. This was a great start toward real democracy and incipient socialism in the United States, without color caste and with full economic opportunity. It was stopped and frustrated by Threat and Compromise: The threat of the beaten slave power to use their increased political power based on emancipation, to lower the tariff and repudiate the war debt. Swift retaliation on the part of that industry which had been built on the war tariff and by finance holding millions of gold bonds resulted in the enfranchisement of the freedmen. The white South was aghast; but still based hope on the certain failure of Negroes as voters. Negroes did not fail. They attempted a social dictatorship of labor black and white and succeeded in establishing free education, some division of the land and welfare legislation. Northerners helped them and poor white labor began to join the blacks.

If the South had regarded Negroes as human; if it had seen abolition as a benefit instead of as a threat; it would have consented to build a New South on equality, democracy and education. This effort the whole nation should have helped generously, considering the losses and distress of war.

But no substantial part of the South would consider this for a moment. The whole training of the South for centuries had been toward petty aristocracy and slave labor. The overwhelming majority wanted past conditions restored as nearly and completely as possible. They envied the rich North. They hated "Niggers."

The industrial leaders of the North were equally indifferent or even immune to democracy. They had come out of the war with wealth, monopoly and privilege. Protected by tariff legislation, federal subsidy for ships and railroads, new machinery and the latest technique, the North stood tip-toe on the vastest expansion of industry the world had ever known. The White South, both former masters and ambitious poor whites, were asked to promise not to touch the tariff, not to scale the national debt, and to give the nation control of industry, without state interference. In return for this, the South was tacitly assured that they could lynch, mob and kill Negroes and treat black labor as slave in almost everything but name. This bargain was

consummated in 1876, after a hectic decade of struggle, when the temporarily enfranchised Negroes put up a tragic and hopeless struggle to enter modern democracy as free men, despite their handicap of ignorance and poverty. Their effort did not wholly fail. It succeeded in many ways. This success doomed it.

White American labor, war-weary and confused, accepted this compromise, convinced that Negroes were not their equals and failing to realize how this exploited minority would help to keep down their wage. To the disfranchised Negro was added, 1861-1900, 14 million white immigrants who flooded the labor market, lowered wage and living standards and precipitated a new civil war of labor and capital. In 1877, the white world looked on complacently, drugged by the upsurge of capitalism the world over, now developing into colonial imperialism, and rationalizing its Progress on the theory of inferior races working for the comfort and luxury of white Europe. This was exactly what British and French aristocracy and plutocracy wanted before the Civil War, and were about to achieve when emancipation threatened to upset their plans. Now with new and triumphant industry in America all this was accomplished and the American Negroes were kept in slavery in all but name, so as to encourage no ambitions among the dark serfs of Africa and Asia.

By 1885, the United States had adopted its basic philosophy: Life was Business and Business was Life; Civilization was the product of Industry and Industry was seed and product of Human Culture. Without profitable Industry nothing worth while was possible and Science, Art and Religion were the gracious gifts of the Merchant and his Banker. The United States entered upon its fabulous modern career as the greatest industrial nation on earth. Business enterprise was free of practically all moral, conventional and religious restraints. Americans lied, stole, murdered, lynched and mobbed. Their untrammelled exploits became world legends. But wages rose, comforts multiplied and the national standard of living increased. The poor boy who rose from poverty to wealth beyond the dreams of avarice by any sort of cheating and lying he could use; the errant boy who came to rule an empire of business assisted by violence and murder; the industry which extended over the nation and reached Europe and Asia by high-jacking and deception; the technique which performed miracles unheard of and undreamed of, for manufacturing millionaires; this was America. This was white supremacy.

Big Business consolidated its power in the last quarter of the 19th century under reckless, able and unscrupulous leaders. By 1894, Industry became a fight of everybody for himself, with monopoly of the necessities of life as the prizes. Millions of property were transferred from the possession of the many to

that of the few, without the knowledge of the many, nor their consent; without compensation and by falsehood and in violation of law. "Every great fortune that rolled out of the 19th century was rooted in fraud." "In their absorbing passion for the accumulation of wealth, men were plundering the resources of the country like burglars looting a palace." The share of the national income received by the richest 1.6% of the population rose nearly 100%, from 10.8% in 1896 to 19% in 1909.

Meantime, in this same America, free individual enterprise was reaching its practical limits. Cutthroat competition, anarchy of method, aim and plan was throwing business into industrial chaos. Fortunes were mounting, millionaires multiplying, but the total economy was not safe. Here was a chance for the socialist theories of Europe to be applied and our own dreamers like Henry George and Bellamy began to point this out. But the United States turned to another direction. Through private planning and volunteer combinations, industrial effort began to be centralized and competition limited. This put curbs on individual initiative. The vaunted American freedom was disappearing and liberals complained. But Business answered that this was in the nature of modern industry and social laws. To which the logical reply was that the State, the legal expression of the Public Will, was the natural organ to take over such private industry as could not be conducted efficiently by separate individuals.

To this answer, America would not listen. In 1894, there were already over 400 combinations to monopolize the necessities of life. The census of 1900 showed that half of these combinations controlled one-third of the manufacturing resources of the nation; by 1908, there were 10,000 combinations with 31 billions of capital. In the 20th century while the farmers' income fell and wages stood still, incomes of \$10,000 and up, rose 114% in nine years. The number of persons with incomes of \$100,000 up increased from 6,633 in 1916, to 14,816 in 1929. Huge corporations replaced individual enterprise and business increased to vast dimensions. But in such integration, there was not only no democratic control, but as one millionaire said, it was personal or oligarchic rule by divine right, in the hands of men "to whom God in his wisdom had entrusted this wealth."

But these corporations, to function properly and completely, had to have certain functions of government: police power, court injunctions, eminent domain in acquiring land and other property; control of money and credit and fixing of wages and profits. To attain such powers, the corporations went into politics: first to prevent democratic government from exercising these functions against monopoly business; next to control their exercise by the representatives of industry.

"The rise of the modern corporation has brought a concentration of economic power which can compete on equal terms with the modern state - economic power versus political power, each strong in its own field. The state seeks in some aspects to regulate the corporation, while the corporation steadily becoming more powerful, makes every effort to avoid such regulation. Where its own interests are concerned, it even attempts to dominate the state. The future may see the economic organism, now typified by the corporation, not only on an equal plane with the state, but possibly even superseding it as the dominant form of social organization." (Berle and Means, 357)

It was not so much government taking over private enterprise, as private enterprise taking over the functions of government. In Wilson's administration, automobile interests secured \$240,000,000 of public funds to promote road-building. Soon the United States had the most elaborate system of roads in the world, ostensibly for the farmers, but really for an infant industry set on its feet at public expense. The airplane industry was financed by government funds. The pioneer inventors like the Wrights got next to nothing, while financiers reaped fortunes. The same was true of shipping, railroads, radio and other industries. "Pioneering don't pay," said Andrew Carnegie.

In many industries which individuals cannot develop, corporations are brought in and become more powerful than the state. There are in the United States thirty corporations with assets of more than \$1,000,000,000 each. Thus, United States Steel, United States Rubber and General Motors take over the name and many of the functions of government and yet make profit as private individuals. Thus, often the private corporation or even individuals can perform functions of a public nature which the state is unable to perform; as when a single millionaire provides a site for the United Nations; or when a corporation televises their proceedings. These may be public spirited acts, but they are public functions and it is a question if wealth should be allowed to accumulate under private control so as to perform work which the government under democratic control should be able to do.

A society in which production is governed by general economic forces is being replaced by one in which production is carried on under the control of a handful of individuals. "The economic power in the hands of the few persons who control a giant corporation is a tremendous force which can harm or benefit a multitude of individuals, affect whole districts, shift the currents of trade, bring ruin to one community and prosperity to another. The organizations which they control have passed far beyond the realm of private enterprise - they have become more nearly social institutions."

Private wealth by bribing public officials got incalculable values for almost nothing, as at Tea-Pot Dome and in this and analogous cases, control of industry began to be effected not by persons investing their own resources, but by the power which banks as custodians exercise over these resources. As Justice Brandeis said, such control of other people's money made for recklessness, speculation and the reaping of enormous profits, which the real owners of capital did not share. Law makers were bribed and even elections of presidents controlled as in the Bryan-McKinley contest.

World War burst on this development. We tried at first to stand aside and use the war for profit. Then when we had to enter, we let business profit in the handling of army funds; in the purchase of lands and materials and in shipping; until the South especially became rich through international disaster.

Of the causes of the First World War, President Wilson said: "The real reason that the war that we have just finished took place, was that Germany was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her; and the reason why some nations went into the war against Germany was that they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them. The seed of the jealousy, the seed of the deep-seated hatred, was successful commercial and industrial rivalry."

Following the war, came a hectic spurt of business with a pause in 1920 and then a wild rush of speculation from 1922 to 1929. The American world went money-mad. A new economic era was opening with profits incalculable. Banks and corporations poured surplus cash into the money market and contributed heavily to the campaigns, which put Harding, Coolidge and Hoover in the White House. Then came the day of reckoning. Black panic engulfed the nation on October 29, 1929; 16 million shares in corporations changed hands in five hours, dragging down millions of paper profits. Millionaires became paupers, captains of industry committed suicide and the world stared at the worst depression in modern days.

At the helm of state was the easy-going Harding, the colorless Coolidge and at the crash, Herbert Hoover. Hoover for 20 years had been a promoter and investor for Britain in Asia, Africa and Australia. He had heavy investments in Russian oil and lumber before the Revolution. In some years he drew salaries aggregating \$100,000 a year. As food commissioner during and after the war he helped the war against Russia. As Secretary of Commerce he acted so as to nullify the laws against trusts, by furnishing government data to help corporations set prices. This gained him the Presidency; with the help of prejudice against Catholics. As President, he drove the veterans out of Washington, signed the highest tariff law in history against the

advice of the economists, and when the crisis broke, refused the demands of Congress for aid to the unemployed.

Thus when capitalism collapsed throughout Europe, our business enterprise was largely under control of trusts, our international trade stopped by tariffs, the whole of our banking system near bankruptcy; the gold standard began to totter and ten million American workers were unemployed and facing starvation. Hoover remained firm and stubborn. This was but a temporary upset. Our economy was fundamentally sound. "Prosperity was just around the corner." Capital needed temporary help and capital, once on its feet, would take care of labor.

Then in 1933, Franklin Delano Roosevelt became President of the United States and remained in that position until his death in 1945; twelve pregnant years for the world, and years of revolution for America. Who was this man Roosevelt and what did he try to do? He was not like Hoover, a business man and industrial promoter; he was not like Coolidge, a conventional New England farmer. He was a politician but of higher type than Harding or Truman. He was a man of manners and training, with knowledge of polite society, literature and sports. He was a man of inherited wealth, who had never had to earn a living; he enjoyed an unearned income but could not conceive making money as a main object of life.

He said bluntly; in his first inaugural speech: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself - nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance... We face our common difficulties. They concern, thank God, only material things. Values have shrunk to fantastic levels; taxes have risen; our ability to pay has fallen; government of all kinds is faced by serious curtailment of income; the means of exchange are frozen in the currents of trade; the withered leaves of industrial enterprise lie on every side; farmers find no markets for their produce, and the savings of many years in thousands of families are gone.

"More important, a host of unemployed citizens face the grim problem of existence, and an equally great number toil with little return. Only a foolish optimist can deny the dark realities of the moment.

"And yet our distress comes from no failure of substance. We are stricken by no plague of locusts. Compared with the perils which our forefathers conquered because they believed and were not afraid, we have still much to be thankful for. Nature still offers her bounty, and human efforts have multiplied it. Plenty is at our doorstep, but a generous use of it languished in the very sight of the supply.

"Primarily, this is because the rulers of the exchange of

mankind's goods have failed through their own stubbornness and their own incompetence, have admitted their failure and have abdicated. Practices of the unscrupulous money changers stand indicted in the court of public opinion, rejected by the hearts of minds of men...

"Yes, the money changers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization. We may now restore that temple to the ancient truths. The measure of the restoration lies in the extent to which we apply social values more noble than mere monetary profit."

There is here no doubt of Roosevelt's radical thought; Roosevelt was not a socialist, but he was tremendously impressed by socialism; he was stirred by the socialistic legislation of Britain, Germany and France in the early 20th century. Especially did the idea of a planned economy, espoused by the Soviet Revolution of 1917, attract him as it attracted all inquiring minds of that day. He said once in the early days of Communism: "I recognized that many leaders in Russia were bringing education and better health and above all, better opportunity to millions who had been kept in ignorance and serfdom under the imperial regime. I disliked the regimentation under communism. I abhorred the indiscriminate killings of thousands of innocent victims. I heartily deprecated the banishment of religion." This fact is forgotten or ignored today. The Trotsky propaganda and the extirpation of Russian treason had repelled him and many others but the basic plan of economic reform sank deep in the minds of all liberals, even of many who today are swearing by high heaven that they never, never saw anything hopeful in the Soviet Union. The fact remains that Roosevelt recognized the Soviet Union in the first year of his administration, after Wilson, Harding, Coolidge and Hoover had waited 16 years to perform this simple act of justice.

It was the educational system of his day which failed Roosevelt in his deepest need. His experience in industrial organization was not wide; his knowledge of the social developments of his age was narrow. He and his fellows of that day, did not receive in school or college any broad foundation in social science. He needed the guidance of a Karl Marx, a Friedrich Engels, a Lenin; who had plumbed the depth and breadth of modern industrial development.

But such men were not mentioned, much less studied in the American college of Roosevelt's day. At Harvard they were heresy; and elsewhere anathema. But they were attacked by silence and neglect, not yet by witch-hunting as today, although by 1936, more teachers had been dismissed for unorthodox economics than ever before.

Roosevelt's Brain Trust was ridiculed, because an executive

tried to appeal to science instead of industry for guidance; the appeal was not conspicuously successful, because science – more especially social science – was in its Ivory Tower stage and had little truck with politics and business. The Harvard Professor on whom he called for advice on finance was far too theoretical for current money problems; in general it was clear that American study of social problems was superficial and academic, and furnished slight hope or scientific help for Roosevelt.

Sociology in the United States had not yet taken itself seriously; with Harvard it long hesitated even to call itself a science; but modestly regarded itself as a collection of miscellaneous facts about human beings, arranged in statistical tables or mathematical formulae. A real science of human conduct was simply beyond the conception of most teachers of sociology. Human action was viewed therefore either as pure chance or the result of undiscovered or undiscoverable law.

There was one teacher in a small western college, Macau, who helped Roosevelt immeasurably by teaching a gangling youth, Harry Hopkins, to take social reform seriously. Hopkins had studied poverty and charity on New York's East Side. He had lived in social settlements, those 19th century efforts to see "how the other half lives" and do something about it. He and I both used to frequent Lillian Wald's settlement; but we did not speak; there was a wall between us, which confined me in action and interest to the narrow and quasi-nationalistic field of black folk. He was reaching out to the world. He had already given Roosevelt hard work and loyalty of a rare order and eventually supplied the socialist twist to his policies.

So Franklin Roosevelt started with the strong word of his cousin Teddy at John Brown's Ossawatimie in 1910 – strong but never implemented; "We grudge no man a fortune in civil life if it is honorably obtained and well used. It is not enough that it should have been gained without doing damage to the country. We should permit it to be gained only so long as the gaining represents benefits to the community. This, I know, implies a policy of far more active government interference with social and economic conditions in this country than we have yet had, but I think we have got to face the fact that such an increase in governmental control is necessary..."

Roosevelt faced three fields of effort: Restoration of industry; relief distress and reform of the social organization. The Soviet Union would have advised, first Reform; then relief and finally restoration; with the thought that an overall plan of re-organized economic life would be pre-requisite to any permanent relief, or any re-organization of industry, which would avoid waste. But this would have been impossible in a land which was sure that despite temporary disasters, ours was the

last word in industrial organization.

Moreover, Hoover had already made a start to re-habilitate the tottering banking structure. Roosevelt moved to reopen the banks and restore confidence, following with surrendering the gold standard, and curiously enough, government insurance of small depositors. Here was the opportunity and duty to assume national control of banking, which would have been following the clear trend of scientific thought. Government control of money, credit and distribution of capital was spreading in the world and after the war seemed, to most thinkers, even to those who were not socialistic, as imperative as the postal service.

Neither Roosevelt nor his advisers had any clear overall conception of the economic status of the world and its development and cure. They paid no attention to Karl Marx, St. Simon, Fourier, Robert Owen or Louis Blanc. They had assimilated the American obsession that normal life is mainly industry. When therefore Business failed, the one duty was to restore it, rehabilitate it. That the system of industry which the 19th century had raised to world rule, had itself collapsed not only on account of world war, but from subtler reasons which they did not grasp. Whether the former industrial set-up could be restored or how it could be improved or whether it must be replaced - these were certainly questions which all called for study and examination. There is no indication that in the United States or in the councils of the government, or in the world of science, any such attitude was contemplated. Without hesitation or inquiry it was assumed that the only problem before America was how Industry could most quickly be restored to its former stature and functions. And the reason for this unrealistic and unscientific state of mind was the extent to which the United States was ruled, directed and schooled by organized industry.

Indeed it was the firm belief of America that human action was so unpredictable that planning for the future on any national scale was futile, and every action must be guided by individual and local trial and error. Yet most men knew that this attitude was unrealistic and forced on the country by selfish business interests. This land should and could know accurately the income of all citizens and its source and kind; it could know what taxes each person pays for the support of government; it could know price levels and changes; costs of processing; property and ownership and rents; ownerships of corporations with income and expense, salaries and dividends. We could measure sickness and death, education and occupation far more accurately than our hit or miss census methods now accomplish. With this body of knowledge and a mass of other data concerning life and deeds of men, we could act and legislate with some accuracy and not by guess work, without infringing any privacy to which men have any

essential right.

Relief came next. When Roosevelt came to power he faced thirteen million unemployed. Unemployment was too critical and explosive a matter to be handled entirely by Industry. Here naked socialism entered despite furious opposition. Under Harry Hopkins, 20,000,000 independent, free Americans received millions of dollars in doles and were thus raised from poverty, despair and crime. It was an astonishing performance for America and to many seemed the end of the world. Why should a rich land, where everybody was free to initiate enterprise and accumulate wealth, resort to charity in order to survive? The plain answer was that millions of Americans were not free, could not earn a living, and faced starvation; that millions more of Americans dependent on the spendings of the presently unemployed faced analogous disaster. The country had no time even to enquire into the real causes of this situation before they must feed the hungry and make work for the idle.

Hopkins said: "I have never liked poverty. I have never believed that with our capitalistic system people have to be poor. I think it is an outrage that we should permit hundreds and hundreds of people to be ill clad, to live in miserable homes, not to have enough to eat; not to be able to send their children to school for the only reason that they are poor. I don't believe ever again in America are we going to permit the things to happen that have happened in the past to people. We are never going back again, in my opinion, to the days of putting the old people in the alms houses, when a decent dignified pension at home will keep them there. We are coming to the day when we are going to have decent houses for the poor, Then there is genuine and real security for everybody. I have gone all over the moral hurdles that people are poor because they are bad. I don't believe it. A system of government on that basis is fallacious."

In October, 1933, Hopkins knew that with winter coming on the unemployment problem was bound to become more desperate and that the only solution was a huge work program. Thus by his advice the CWA succeeded state and local programs of relief, and was operated and 90% of its support came from federal funds. This aroused keen fears of socialism among many. It was one of the broadest programs ever instituted by the United States Government; and sought to provide individual work as near as possible to previous employment with pay prevailing wages with a minimum of thirty cents an hour.

The winter of 1933-4 was a terrible one with severe cold, and later floods and hurricanes. Suffering was wide spread and the initial appropriation of \$400 millions was supplemented by \$950 millions to sustain 20,000,000 in distress. In three and a half

months the CWA built or improved 40,000 school houses; laid 12,000,000 feet of sewer pipe; built 469 airports and improved 529 others; built or improved 255,000 miles of rail; employed 50,000 teachers to teach adults and open rural schools; built or improved 3,700 playgrounds and athletic fields.

Among the 4,264,000 for whom work was found, were 3,000 writers and artists. It will take the nation long to realize what was done for American culture by this great gesture before it was sabotaged by organized industry. Indeed under present restrictions the truth may never be known. Borglum the sculptor wrote: "You have the only department that is free to help the creative impulses of the Nation, all other aids take , 'n the character of hard business." This part of the program brought the most bitter criticism and was the first to be dropped.

With the passage of the omnibus work relief bill, there appeared three divisions of the relief program, a general clearing house, the PNA under Ickes, designed to help private enterprise by pump priming; and the WPA under Hopkins, designed to furnish work, regardless of its commercial value. This program eventually cost \$10 billion dollars.

The enemies of the New Deal pounced on the WPA, as a matter of "handouts to Pan-Handlers." Only Roosevelt's popularity saved it; it rescued not only 20,000,000 needy, but the manufacturers, shop-keepers and landlords, dependent on them.

The attempt to rescue the farmers from bankruptcy followed in part the American industrial pattern, which was to raise prices by artificial scarcity. Thus in a hungry and naked world, we had the extraordinary spectacle of food being destroyed and the production of necessary materials curtailed. Yet for a hundred years it had been known that the earth could provide for the wants of men, if reasonably distributed. A national survey in 1934, when there were 12 million unemployed and nearly 20 million on relief, reported that there could be plenty for all. But as Roosevelt groped toward that ideal, in that same year, the superintendent of schools of Gary, Indiana, that Steel Trust Town, made headlines and secured investigation by Congress when he declared that certain members of the "Brain Trust" had confessed to him that they aimed at overthrowing our government and establishing Communism in this country!

The real underlying effort was to transfer some of the swollen income of industry to the persons who raised basic materials. Big Business was ever concerned to prevent abundance of goods from flooding the market. The New Deal sought to bring agriculture into this program, because the farmers during the war had so increased production that now farm prices were about to collapse. To do this directly by taxation on business was opposed by Industry; but since it must be done, it was

accomplished by destruction of food and by bonus. But the bonuses instead of reaching the dirt farmer, quite often reached only the Junker land monopoly which was applying capitalist methods to farming and reducing the dirt farmer to tenancy. The attempt to go further and help the small farmer with his mortgages was sabotaged largely by the Supreme Court.

But that Roosevelt was far ahead in his thinking of the average intelligent American was clear from the revolutionary nature of his next steps: the Tennessee Valley Authority and the National Recovery Act, both of which involved reform of the basic American economy. The most startling measure of the New Deal, was the National Recovery Act, by which the government tried temporarily to assume direct control over the entire business of the country. It did not directly take over industries, but invited representatives to Washington to work out "codes" of fair dealing to be followed. Industries which refused might be put under a "blanket code"; those which violated the code would have the Blue Eagle, symbol of cooperation, taken away. By the end of Roosevelt's first year nearly 400 codes had been drawn up, and 90 per cent of the industrialists of the country were supporting the NRA. The terms fixed minimum wages, prescribed hours of labor, abolished sweatshop and child labor in various industries, and required business men to submit to the examination of their books by government inspectors.

This measure took imagination and courage. Organized industry, reeling under national panic, accepted the effort with a wry face. American labor had clung to its "laissez-faire" objection to government interference in its business; but now with one sweep the NRA, turned it into a semi-public trade unionism. One section of the NRA strengthened organized labor by forbidding employers to discharge men for belonging to a union "of their own choosing." This abolished the "open shop;" nor could the employees be forced to join the "company unions controlled by the employers." The terms of the act were resisted by some manufacturers, but most of them complied under the pressure of public opinion and the threats of General Johnson.

Before this act had been thoroughly tried out the Supreme Court, long representatives of business interests, outlawed its main features. However in the Wagner Act of 1935, the right of labor to bargain, long recognized by all civilized lands, was at last conceded by this nation and it was admitted that coal mines might be run without machine guns and Pinkerton detectives. Court Injunctions were curbed in order to induce labor unions not to use their political power and form a real labor party.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was a perfectly clear case of government intrusion in an area of economic endeavor where

private enterprise could not enter save with powers of government. It had been championed in vain for years by George Norris. It at last was forced through Congress amid the bitter opposition of Industry. For Industry knew that this was the entering wedge for similar projects covering the river system of the whole country and destined to break the private monopoly of public wealth in agriculture, forestry and power control. Franklin Roosevelt deserves credit for this consumption of the life work and fine vision of Senator Norris.

The President said: "It is clear, that the Muscle Shoals development is but a small part of the potential public usefulness of the entire Tennessee River. Such use, if envisioned in its entirety, transcends mere power development: it enters the wide fields of flood control, soil erosion, afforestation, elimination from agricultural use of marginal lands, and distribution and diversification of industry. In short, this power development of war days leads logically to national planning for a complete river watershed involving many states and the future lives and welfare of millions. It touches and gives life to all forms of human concern."

Industry submitted to this at first because of panic and the tottering of all security. Then it began to fight back against the "Red in the White House." The Supreme Court, long representatives of business interests, threw out Roosevelt's attempt to regulate industry by codes, emasculated his attempt to refinance farm mortgages and stopped the stabilizing of the bituminous coal industry. Of his nine main measures, the Court spoiled seven. Roosevelt attempted to curtail the reaction of these "nine old men", but failed until death and age helped him out.

From here Roosevelt went forward to curbing the "unjust concentration of wealth and economic power" by surtaxes on income. This was the most dangerous invasion on the inner control of the nation by monopoly which the President dared. It caused his election to a second term by overwhelming vote of 27 to 16 million votes and an almost unanimous electoral vote.

The people of the United States were behind Roosevelt. If he had had an overhead guiding plan toward which he was steering, he might have transformed the nation from a plutocracy to a social democracy. But he was hampered by the courts, that part of our political structure which the founders purposely left outside democratic control. The size and power of organized industry was so great that Roosevelt would have had a life task to curb it, even if he had really sensed its power. He did not, although his vision was growing and clearing. He began to conceive of taxation as a means of transferring wealth from the rich to the poor, and Townsend and Huey Long did not stand in

his mind as mere demagogues.

The President said in his second inaugural address: "I see one third of a nation, ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished." The Bureau of Labor Statistics and the National Resources Committee showed, in depression years, that nearly one-third of all American incomes were under \$750 a year and nearly half under \$1,000. Since then the national income, in dollars, has increased, even though the dollar has decreased in value and yet eight million American families and individuals in 1948 received cash incomes of less than \$1000. THE NEW YORK TIMES, admits "relatively few of our population can save enough during the most useful working years to sustain them during the years when they are too old or too feeble to work."

The resistance of Big Business to the Roosevelt New Deal was unremitting. The chief Republican paper in April, 1934, declared that administration's policies had been a succession of unrelated and hastily devised remedies and that "so far from producing a planned economy, the New Deal has produced an economic chaos, with no end in sight."

Aubrey Williams said: the fight was against "the Security and Exchange Commission which required them to tell the truth about what they were selling; the Wages and Hours Act which provided a living wage; and the Labor Standards Act which prevented them from throwing a man into jail for asking his fellow worker to join a union." To destroy these and other laws enacted in behalf of the people, "they have undertaken to poison the people against the people's government." They marked for destruction:

The Wages and Hours Act
The Fair Labor Standards Act
The Securities Exchange Act
The Fair Employment Practices Commission
The Federal Communications Commission
The Unemployment feature of the Social Security Act
The Farm Security Administration
The Production Credit Administration
The National Housing Administration
The Bank for co-operatives
The Tennessee Valley Authority
The HOLC

Congress echoed the fight of industry because Congress was under control of industry rather than democracy.

But neither Roosevelt nor his followers realized just how this was happening. It was not only in the controlled voting of the East and Middle West, but in the utter suppression of democracy in the South. Here the withheld voting power of the Negroes was not eliminated, but was exercised by the white majority; and not

by white laborers but by capitalists and employers. Here then could be sent to Congress and kept there the most reactionary defenders of wealth and monopoly to inherit the most powerful committee assignments. This hard immovable core of opposition could not be met by democratic methods of reason and appeal.

The plight of the Negroes themselves aggravated the unemployment situation by furnishing a mass of labor which had to accept wage at any level offered. New techniques, new enterprises, mass production, impersonal ownership and control, had largely displaced the skilled Negro worker in tobacco manufacturing, in iron and steel, in lumbering and mining, and in transportation, and confined their common labor and domestic service to the lowest paid and worst conditioned varieties. In the new textile, chemical and other manufacturers, Negroes were nearly excluded. Just as slavery excluded the poor white from agriculture, so freedom excluded the poor Negro from rising and expanding manufacture. On the other hand, the world-wide fall of agriculture carried the mass of black farmers more and more down to the level of landless tenants and peons.

The world war and its wild aftermath, seemed for a moment to open a new door; two million black workers rushed North to work in iron and steel industries to make automobiles, pack meat, build houses and do the heavy toil in factories. They met the closed trade union, which pressed them to the wall, into the low-wage gutter, denied them homes and mobbed them; and then the depression met all.

In the Depression, Negro workers, like white workers, lost their jobs; had mortgages foreclosed on their farms and homes and used up their small savings. But in the case of the Negro worker, everything was worse in larger or smaller degree; the loss was greater and more permanent; technological displacement begun before the depression, was accelerated. The unemployment and fall in wage, struck black men sooner, lasted longer, and went to lower levels. In the rural South, their education almost ceased, while Southern city schools were crowded to suffocation.

Above all, in the Negro's case, local and Federal relief helped him last. It was easily explicable human nature that the unemployed white man and the starving white child, should be relieved first by local authorities who regarded them as fellowmen, and regarded the Negroes as sub-human. Moreover, it might happen, that while the white worker was given more than relief and helped to his feet, the black worker was pauperized by being just kept from starvation; and even when finally plans were making for national rehabilitation, and the re-building of the whole industrial system, such plans called for decision as to the Negro's future and his relations to industry and culture in this country, which the country was not prepared to make, and

therefore often refused to consider.

The basic problem of the "New Deal" was whether to make its objective an effort to "restore" former "prosperity" or some more fundamental change in the essential economic structure of the nation to bring greater stability and economic justice. If it was the first, there was not much hope for the Negro. He simply could look forward to being "restored" to a situation in which his prospects for economic development were growing less and less. If Southern agriculture was to be put on its feet again by government aid, the Negro would remain mainly the tenant farmer and exploited casual laborer. If the great industries were to be similarly "restored" the Negro would still be the reservoir of unskilled labor with uncertain employment and low wage. And the restoration of banking and credit would mean comparatively little to a poverty-stricken horde of laborers.

On the other hand, if the relation of industry to labor in general was to be overhauled and readjusted, if the whole relation of the farming industry to the other industry of the land was to be carefully readjusted with regard to prices, methods, machines and markets; if unemployment was to be eradicated by shorter hours, minimum wage, the forbidding of child labor and the arrangement of old-age security, if these and similar measures were going to change radically the basis of American life, then the American Negro, barring gross discrimination, was going to have a "New Deal", a new change to improve his condition.

The first blow to Negroes came when farm laborers and domestics were not included under the protection of the N.R.A. codes for industry. Thus three million Negro workers, more than half of the total number who must work for their livelihood, were not covered by the industrial codes. These three million were the backbone of the Negro consumer market. For them an immediate rise in prices meant additional insecurity and suffering. Furthermore, in certain areas where uniform minimum wages were established for black and white workers, employers replaced Negroes with whites rather than pay the same wages.

Thus the New Deal not only met opposition of concentrated wealth based on Negro disfranchisement, but also increased the opposition of white labor by increasing or failing greatly to decrease the number of poor and unemployed Negroes whose plight threatened the white standard of living. The result was violence and race riots.

Instead of decreasing in wealth and power during the crisis of 1929-33, America's richest families were strengthened, while masses of citizens were reduced to beggary. And even though many people were lifted from extreme, low economic levels by some

restoration of employment, the basic inequalities, issuing from no fundamental differences in skill or merit, remained as great as ever. Paralleling re-employment, which reduced the aggregate of joblessness from about twenty million in 1932, to about ten million in 1937, fantastic dividend and interest payments were automatically returned to the top income group of not more than six thousand adults.

The United States has not only nurtured the wealthiest class history has ever known, but it has also spawned an immense, possibly permanent, army of paupers – the unemployed. One expects to find millions of impoverished in backward economies such as India and China, Japan or formerly in Czarist Russia. In the advanced economic and cultural environment of North America, with all its natural resources, the phenomenon is tragically absurd. Fewer than twenty per cent of the people possess nearly everything while nearly eighty per cent own practically nothing.

None can say how far Franklin Roosevelt would have gone in reorganizing the economy of the nation if the work of the first five years of his reign had continued and expanded. We might now have lived in a different world.

But war intervened, and once again as so often in the past, ruined the future of mankind. It was a senseless, inexplicable war, which none wanted, none foresaw. Its genesis was the First World War which halted the colonial imperialism of Europe and laid its industrial organization in ruins. The one cure for this, on which Europe was practically unanimous, was the suppression of the Russian Revolution of 1917. From that time until the collapse of industry in 1930, Europe had waged war, directly, or through spies and propaganda against Russia. The dictatorships of Mussolini and Hitler were strengthened by the belief that Germany and Italy meant the fall of the Soviets.

When Germany and Italy attacked Britain and France, the world was aghast. Franklin Roosevelt particularly was turned entirely from his task of the New Deal, to the salvation of the British Empire which to him and his class stood for all that civilization meant. He did not grasp the meaning of the Soviets or the part they played. He tended rather to ignore them as of minor significance, until later, far later in the conflict. It was this threat to Britain far more than any conception of the place of the United States in international industry and trade that seemed behind his desire to enter the Second World War. Nor was his grasp of the international plight of total industrial organization enlarged. Rather the world situation looked to him as primarily political.

All his education and social conditioning went toward his primary effort to save British culture. He forced the nation into virtual war, before war was declared; furnishing battle-

craft and "lend-lease" of material to bolster the tottering British Empire. Russia entered but casually into his thought, although he had, as one of his first official acts as President, ended our silly refusal to recognize the Soviets. But Russia in 1939, seemed to Roosevelt negligible; he accepted the current American belief that the country was essaying an impossible economic experiment, soon doomed to inner collapse from starvation or revolution. Neither he nor the British made any real effort to make alliance with Russia.

When Sumner Wells was sent to sound out Europe on peace, Russia was not included. Roosevelt did not feel that such a visit would be of any use and regarded Russia as a certain victim of Hitler. Roosevelt did not at the time understand in the least the intricate problems that faced the Soviets or the situation which forced the war against Finland. Thus although both the British and Americans knew that Hitler was planning to attack Russia, no plans were mentioned to secure Russia's help, which was not regarded worth the effort. Churchill forecast the march of Hitler through the Balkans, Russia and even "to the gates of India."

Lend-lease was debated two months and was admitted as necessary to save Britain, Greece and China. Open permission for the President to include other countries, especially Russia, brought sharp opposition. There was a hard fight and compromise was suggested, but the President was firm and got the power to extend lend-lease to the Soviets if Hitler or Japan attacked her.

Stalin in 1939, had no faith in the ability of Britain, France or the United States to stop Hitler. Russia had long regarded Germany as her eventual ally. She had, until the rise of Hitler, hoped that the German communists would gain control and swing Germany toward the East. But as Hitler and German industry gained control, Stalin knew that Hitler meant to conquer Russia if possible and destroy communism. He sought alliance then knowing that Hitler could not be trusted, but also knowing that every moment of delay gained, would enable the Soviet Union better to prepare for the inevitable attack.

Every effort has been made to obscure this role of Russia from 1933 to 1939. Yet the facts are clear: when the Nazi revolution came Russia tried to insure world peace. She joined the League of Nations, made mutual aid treaties with France and Czechoslovakia, urged sanctions against Mussolini in his attack on Ethiopia; aided the Spanish republic, helped China against Japan and asked for an international conference against Hitler after his seizure of Austria. Had this Russian initiative been followed, World War II, would never have occurred.

But France and Britain refused because such a policy would

have protected Russia and they wanted Hitler to conquer Russia and remove this menace to world capitalism, which they had tried to eliminate since 1917. The United States also refused cooperation with Russia, although Roosevelt was dissatisfied by this attitude. He was held back by Congress, the State Department and the Catholic Church.

Western Europe hoped that Hitler would leave it in peace while he attacked Russia. For this they were willing to give up the League of Nations, yield Manchuria to Japan, let Germany re-arm and take Austria, Czechoslovakia and the Rhineland; give Ethiopia to Italy and Spain to Franco. Our own Bullitt said: "It would be the wish of the democratic countries that armed conflict would break out in the East between the German Reich and Russia. Germany would be obliged to wage a long and weakening war." The Dodd Diary says that Britain, the Nazis and Bullitt favored dividing the world, with Germany dominating all of Europe. Japan was to control Asia."

But in March 1939, Hitler made it clear that he proposed to attack the West before crushing Russia. Britain and France were dismayed but persisted in seeking to appease Hitler at the expense of Russia. Britain proposed a curious pact: that Russia should undertake "if Desired" to fight Germany in case Germany attacked Poland or Rumania; and this after Poland had refused to permit Russia's soldiers on her soil. There was no suggestion that England would fight Germany, if Germany attacked Russia; and naturally Russia refused such a commitment. A month later, Chamberlain, although refusing to visit Russia, proposed a Soviet alliance but with no commitment as to the future of the Baltic states, which for 20 years had been the spearhead for Western conquest of Russia.

He finally sent a minor official to Russia by slow boat, with power to agree only to "consultation" in case Russia was attacked. Roosevelt could take no action, but a member of the United States staff in Russia gave Germany every encouragement. Finally in July, Chamberlain agreed to a "military mission to Moscow" composed of men of no standing and no power. Because of Britain's refusal to make a treaty of mutual assistance, the Soviets determined to make alliance with Germany, if they could obtain defense of their own frontiers in Poland and the Baltic states. This pact enabled Russia to seize so much of Poland as would ensure her own defense against Germany; nor was any other procedure possible, since neither Poland nor England would consent to Russia's defense of Poland.

Already in May, France and Britain knew that a German-Soviet Treaty involving seizure of Poland, would follow failure to make a treaty between Russia and the West. They refused to do this, and instead in January, 1940, they agreed to wage war themselves

on Russia in Finland and in the Soviet oilfields in the Southwest. They had a hundred thousand troops to which Sweden refused passage in March. After the Soviets and Finland made peace, the French and British staffs continued to plan war against Russia in the Caucasus oil fields. Meantime, in November, 1940, Russia tried to sound out Hitler in accord with his proposal of a more extended alliance, but already Hitler without knowledge of many of his trusted advisers, had determined in August to fight Russia. War began in June, 1941.

While war is waging, all thought of its cause is submerged in the all-out struggle to win. And when in addition, the expenditure of war solves problems of unemployment and profit, then danger mounts with victory and is at the same time disguised. This was the case of Roosevelt in the Second World War. His and the Nation's attention was diverted from fundamental domestic problems, to saving Great Britain, and to a personal devil called Hitler, who came to stand for all evil. But behind the phenomena of Hitler and Mussolini, lurked and festered basic problems, which were the counter-part of those which caused the crash of 1929 in America. The economic organization of the world had cracked widely if not permanently. In that world organization America had played an essential role, not less important because it was industrial rather than political. To recover from collapse, effort on a world scale, with world-planning was essential. The United States attempted the impossible task of national and internal recovery, separate from world adjustment.

On this theory the socialism of the New Deal was based, and could at best have been but partially successful. But it was a forward step and was leading straight to international effort; first by tariff reduction, and then by economy planned for the world and not just for America. This tendency Fascism halted by attempting the restoration of world economy, not so much by fundamental changers by simply by changing the beneficiaries of the system. Germany and Italy were to share equally in the profits of colonialism and world trade. To intensify and integrate this demand both these lands effected a new internal distribution of wealth which was a national but not international socialism.

American recovery had no international aims and small national transfer of wealth. But there had appeared in Russia a new international socialism which both Fascism on the one side and the dictatorship of organized wealth in the United States and Britain feared. After a world war to crush Russian Communism, failed because the organizations of world industry, which it was protecting, broke down, every effort was made to effect a modus vivendi between the German and British control of world trade.

It would have been successful had not megalomania, approaching insanity, taken grip on Hitler. He began to conceive himself not as equal partner of the industrial giants, Britain, France and the United States, but as conqueror of Russia and master of the world. He accomplished recognition and full partnership in world industry so easily during the years of industrial disaster, that in 1939, he entered arrogantly on his vaster and more fantastic mission.

He determined to conquer France and Britain in turn, and then ignoring the United States, crush Russia and with Japan work his will in Asia. This wild dream could have been stopped in its tracks, by a combination of Britain, Russia and the United States. But both Britain and France discounted Russia: first they thought her weak and on the verge of collapse, because of her planned economy; and second they feared that in case her socialism was successful, it might spread by example or force to the British Empire and America.

The war itself was a set of contradictions. Britain and France did not wish to fight Germany or Italy. They were ready to make every appeasement. They gave Ethiopia to Italy almost gladly. They were ready to yield Hitler everything in reason and more: he could take back the Rhineland; he could re-arm; he could have his colonies in Africa back, if he wished; he could re-partition Poland; he could have Austria and most of Czechoslovakia; he could take the Baltic states, and attack Russia; he could join Japan in dominance of Asia. All that imperial Britain and France asked, was a fair division of the spoils of empire, in a new arrangement of the world domination of Europe.

But if Hitler was going to dictate terms and dominate the world through Germany, then they would and must fight and call America to aid. The United States displayed no enthusiasm. We had pulled England's chestnuts out of the fire before; we did not like France for various reasons, not the least of which, was her lack of color hate; we sympathized with Germany. Then Industry and Finance had a word to say. Suppose the British Empire and the vast dominion of France fell, who would be heirs but America? It was the American Century by logic and no need fighting for it. Let socialism in Germany and the Soviet Union kill each other off, while we inherited the earth.

Against some such philosophy as this, more or less clearly conceived, Franklin Roosevelt fought from 1938 to 1941. He turned from the New Deal and on the strength of his third triumphant victory in 1940, forced the nation into war, by gift and agreement, lend-lease, annexation and war-ships; he took Republicans into the cabinet, got millions appropriated for defense and with Churchill drafted the Atlantic Charter, on old and nearly forgotten terms of no new territorial annexation;

self-government, free trade, free travel, better labor conditions and world government.

Yet the United States stubbornly stayed out of war, until with unbelievable effrontery, Japan attacked the United States. Japan was colored. The United States had brow-beat her, cajoled her, insulted her, admired her but refused her recognition as an equal, and induced Great Britain to do the same. But these little brown men had persisted, had built a mighty empire and demanded partnership with the white world. Her military might and her marvelous expanding industry was making her a feared rival of white imperialism in Yellow Asia. Finally this Japan made alliance with Germany, and while feigning negotiation destroyed our sea power in Hawaii. This made war not only possible but imperative, backed by American color prejudice.

[One page, 193, missing]

to Britain in return for military bases. Congress voted 18 billions of dollars for armament and established the draft.

In March, lend-lease was authorized by Congress. By June, Hitler had turned on Russia and Roosevelt saw that lend-lease must go to her. He and Churchill met in Mid-Atlantic in August, and framed the Atlantic Charter. Still the United States paused until Pearl Harbor. Then all America wanted the United States to attack and conquer Japan quickly. But as to Europe, there was no unanimity. Most Americans wanted Russia to lose; many wanted Britain to lose and some wanted Roosevelt to lose. Of course the United States with Great Britain and the Soviet Union could win; but who wanted to unite with Russia? Meantime Big Business went to work; here was a chance to get even with

"The Red New Deal with a Soviet seal
endorsed by a Moscow hand;"

and three phases of attitudes toward the war ensued:

1. The "sitdown" strike of the corporations which refused to go into production of both the defense program of 1939 and the first war-time program of 1941-42.
2. Profiteering and robbery of the American people; manufacture and delivery of defective airplane motors, copper, wire, bullets and other war materials, resulting in endangering the lives of American soldiers.
3. The secret cartel deals by which the biggest American corporations supplied nations soon to be our enemies with materials and information, and kept America unprepared.

The rubber famine lasted for years because Standard Oil had suppressed the artificial rubber patents; the aluminum shortage

arose because the Mellon interests were in a cartel with the Nazis; the Steel interests refused to expand. The Allied nations, notably Britain and Russia, held the military lines at a loss of millions of men and homes and billions in treasure, while the United States spent two years getting into production of the instruments for winning the war.

Those owning copper mines, managed by Barney Baruch, made extravagant profits; a billion dollars were spent on airplanes before a single one was delivered; steel plate costing \$315 a ton was sold to the Government for \$400 to \$600 a ton; the government spent over \$100,000,000 for nitrates, but got none before the Armistice; \$400,000,000 was spent on 1900 contracts for shells which never reached the firing line; shipping lines sold ships to the government for \$2,000,000 each and bought them back for \$300,000.

It was clear that the industrial leader, in business for profit, refused to take the risk of expanding their plants for a war of indefinite length; especially since business in consumer goods like automobiles, was booming. Moreover in war production, he faced strikes. His recourse was to demand enormous profit for all he did. This he got, while America gambled in death and Britain was at the point of collapse.

Both Britain and the United States rebuffed Russia's frantic efforts to make alliance with them and forced her either to ally herself with Hitler or fight the world. The Western world was aghast when Hitler offered Russia the alliance which they had refused. They knew the truce was phoney and so did Russia; but Russia immediately moved to strengthen her western frontier in Poland while Hitler crushed France and had Britain gasping for breath, when the United States rescued her with arms and materials. Balked here, Germany turned and attacked Russia. Here was the opportunity of the modern world; immediate and concerted efforts could have contained Hitler and Mussolini and united Europe could have held Japan in Asia. But this would have made Russia a co-partner with the erstwhile masters of the world. To this, Britain, the United States nor France were prepared to assent.

Hitler, with startling change, turned east to conquer Bolshevism and control Asia through Japan, before finishing the conquest of the West. The West awaited with relief and almost with complacency, the quick overthrow of Russia. This would at least give breathing space and a chance eventually to make terms with Hitler by restoring German colonies in Africa and elsewhere, with such other compromises as were necessary. And at any rate with the certainty that the threat of communism in the world, would be laid for a generation if not forever.

The United States finally started her war effort, with

appropriations rising to nearly eight billions a month by the middle of 1943, which showed not only our sacrifice but even more the profits of our industry. We had an army of four million by the Fall of 1942, and then we entered the war. We gave away 15 billions of dollars in lend-lease by September, 1943, but our armies and navy, late in 1942, went to Asia and African not to Europe. Back of this move was the desire to save the world of colonial peoples from Germany and Italy and part of it showed the hope that Germany and the Soviets would kill each other off, leaving Western Europe to recover slowly and divide the earth with the United States.

But the West was surprised and bewildered by the resistance which Russia exhibited to the fierce onslaught of the Germans. The British immediately suggested American lend-lease to the Soviets; it would not save them but it would give Britain longer breathing spell and forward that mutual annihilation of two enemies which might save the world. Roosevelt agreed and sent Harry Hopkins to Russia. This was a master stroke, Hopkins found in Stalin a blunt, straight-forward man, fighting to win a war, with a nation back of him. A human nexus between two great countries was established and grew from then until Roosevelt's death and until Jimmy Burns tried to "get tough" with Russia and gain by threats of the atom bomb what Roosevelt got by compromise and friendship.

The Russian resistance grew and hardened. The German attack became an all-out struggle of vast proportions. MacArthur wrote in 1942: "The world situation at the present time indicates that the hopes of civilization rest on the worthy banners of the courageous Russian Army. During my lifetime I have participated in a number of wars and witnessed others, as well as studying in great detail the campaigns of outstanding leaders of the past. In none have I observed such effective resistance to the heaviest blows of a hitherto undefeated enemy, followed by a smashing counterattack which is driving the enemy back to his own land. The scale and grandeur of this effort marks it as the greatest military achievement in all history."

If the West had responded by an equally strong push on Hitler's bare rear, the war might have been settled in 1943. But the world and its military experts refused to believe their eyes and was sure that Russia must eventually be completely vanquished. Hopkins wrote Churchill: "There is still an amazing number of people here who do not want to help Russia and who don't seem to be able to pound into their thick heads the strategic importance of that front."

Lord Beaverbrook wrote in 1943: "Can we afford more time for preparation? The Germans have a most powerful army in the East. The Russians used up men and resources at a heavy rate last

winter in an offensive which stopped short of its fullest aims. There is always the risk that Japan will stab in the back. It cannot be said that Moscow, Baku or Leningrad are out of danger. It can still less be said that we and the Americans could in any measurable space of time win without Russian Assistance."

Stalin pled in vain for counter attack on Hitler's rear; but it was not until July, 1943, that the Americans and British attacked southern Italy and did not reach Rome until June, 1944, And Eisenhower did not land in Normandy until that same month, after it was clear that Russia was driving Hitler to the wall.

The Western armies had stalled hoping that Germany and Russia would destroy each other and thus eliminate the two greatest threats to the restoration of the former world industrial imperialism. They were deceived. Russia proved stronger, far stronger than they thought possible. She conquered Germany and entered Berlin, April 30, 1945, just as the allies captured Italy and three months after the near disaster of the Bulge. Asia conquered by Japanese refused on Japan's defeat to return to her colonial role. The world had to be recast with Russia as one of the main partners, with Asia starting toward autonomy not simply in political control but in economic independence.

It was here that Roosevelt turned back from war to economic reconstruction and played his greatest role, disastrously interrupted by death in 1945. Britain, interested in her African and Asiatic empire, had turned her strength to North Africa instead of France and Germany. The United States was induced to join this effort and then strike at the Mediterranean and the Near East instead of Germany. There was shrewd calculation here, to appease the certain wrath of Hitler by saving him from defeat in Europe, while strengthening British hold on Asia and the near East, and using this for bargaining after Hitler's delayed triumph. The sudden uprush and miraculous foray of Japan threw consternation into both Britain and America. Russia instead of figuring as a threat and nuisance who might serve to weaken Hitler, became the one great nation which might wipe out the German menace and contain Japan.

Here Roosevelt rose to statesmanship. He set out to build friendship with the Union of Soviets and dragged Churchill with him. The only man in the world at the time capable of getting the trust and friendship of Stalin was Franklin Roosevelt; and he accomplished this by frankness and honest dealing. He knew that Stalin was no fool nor barbarian. He knew that Russia had demands and was capable of enforcing them. He knew that Stalin kept his word but was not to be misled by flattery nor double talk. Personal conferences were arranged between Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin and Chiang Kai-Shek at Cairo, Teheran and Yalta, and at a cost in sheer physical strain that killed

Roosevelt. But it brought peace to the world. The Soviet Union denounced its neutrality pact with Japan in 1945 and Japan was called upon to surrender or face complete destruction. She refused and was blockaded. On August 6, the first atomic bomb was dropped and on the 14th Japan surrendered.

Stalin had demanded a strong attack from the West through France and Germany, with war material to keep his armies in the field; in return for this, Russia had offered 15 million lives and the destruction of her best in new industrial regions. After peace, she wanted the cordon sanitaire under her control so that the threat of Western invasion of Russia through the Baltic states, Poland and the Balkans should be stopped forever; and she asked Western tools and machinery to rebuild her stricken economy after she had delivered the world from the threat of Adolf Hitler.

Roosevelt offered continued and increased supplies; pushed the long delayed Western attack; did not oppose the eventual annexation of the Baltic states and in turn asked the entrance of Russia into the War against Japan. This was the story of these four world conferences, which stopped the war and sought to stop all war forever by eventual world organization and understanding. In March, 1945, Roosevelt reported to Congress on Yalta:

"The structure of world peace cannot be the work of one man, or of one party, or one nation, it cannot be just an American peace, or a British peace, or a Russian, or a French or a Chinese peace. It cannot be a peace of a large nation or of small nations. It must be a peace which rests on the cooperative effort of the whole world.

"It cannot be what some people think – a structure of complete perfection at first. But it can be a peace, and it will be a peace, based on the sound and just principles of the Atlantic Charter – on the concept of the dignity of the human being – and on the guarantees of tolerance and freedom of religious worship."

Tremendous further agreements were necessary and the implementation and refining of those agreed on in principle. Had Roosevelt lived, this had every chance of being accomplished, not without friction, but with faith, understanding and good will. But at Roosevelt's death, Big Business stepped in on both sides of the seas to stop the Soviet Union from restoring her economy; to retain the industry and land monopoly of the Baltic States and the Balkans; to keep the Soviets out of the Germany which her blood had redeemed; to renew on a bitter scale the fight against communism. Here was built the foundations of a Third World War.

Joseph C, Hirsch wrote, in the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, "The

Yalta Conference stands out as a conference of decision. The meetings which produced that Atlantic Charter and at Casablanca, Teheran and Quebec were declarations of policy, of intents. The meeting at Yalta was plainly dominated by a desire, willingness and determination to reach solid decisions."

Hopkins later said: "We really believed in our hearts that this was the dawn of the new day we had all been praying for and talking about for so many years. We were absolutely certain that we had won the first great victory of the peace – and, by 'we', I mean ALL of us, the whole civilized human race. The Russians had proved that they could be reasonable and farseeing and there wasn't any doubt in the minds of the President or any of us that we could live with them and get along with them peacefully for as far into the future as any of us could imagine."

So Franklin Delano Roosevelt died in the 63rd year of his life and in the twelfth year of his reign as President of the United States. This was a man! A tall, handsome athlete, he was stricken in his young manhood by a malady which would have sent a lesser person into bitter, hopeless old age; he was rich and never played, but worked tirelessly to keep wealth from suicide, and poverty from despair; he was a gentleman but became the target of gutter-snipes who used a venial press to make lies true and paint Truth as a lie; he was hated by every jackal who dogged his life and desecrated his grave, but loved by every honest man. He saved the British Empire and the French Republic by firmly grasping the hand of Russia and letting her pull them and the United States out of defeat; he was father of a family which from mother to grandchild posed him every problem of life which can try a man's heart; he neither whined nor whimpered, but could curse Hell in Heaven to summon Right. In all and with all, he kept his soul serene, met the mornings with a smile and talked to the hearts of his countrymen as never President talked before. He died in harness – that harness of pounds of hard steel, under which he grimly bent every waking hour. His reach was not wide but his grasp was mighty, and gripping, he

Never faltered but marched breast forward
Never dreamed though right were conquered,
Wrong would triumph; held we fall to rise;
Are baffled to fight better
Sleep to wake.

CHAPTER VI
THE WITCH HUNT

We are a frightened people. Fear amounting often to hysteria fills the air. In coming years, we will look back on 1950 with astonishment, explaining laboriously to our grandchildren why sane people acted as they did and yet wanted right and justice to prevail. We are becoming a police state, with secret espionage, tapping of private telephone conversations, and filling of dossiers of accusations against thousands of persons unaccused by police or courts, but denounced by gossip, rumors, hearsay and the testimony of professional informers. Our freedom of speech, writing and assembly, is widely curtailed and courts and juries are under suspicion of reflecting our fears rather than dispensing justice; for many of us, live in fear of losing our means of livelihood, of having our income decreased, or our property impaired or lost. And all this, so mindful of Germany under Hitler, arises from the widespread belief that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the doctrines of Communism and socialism, are threats to our security and our continued existence as a nation.

Our plight is psychological and part of a world-wide reaction to two of the greatest upheavals the world has ever known; with so many millions of people killed, wounded, crippled, driven insane and sent homeless and wandering, as to defy accurate calculation; with so great destruction of homes, wealth, and materials, tools and machinery as to make full restoration a matter of centuries. This in itself calls for patience and charity, but even more for clear understanding. We must seek and know causes, so that this abnormal situation shall endure no longer than it must and never recur if we can prevent it. For civilization and culture, art and faith await its passing.

One cause of our present plight lies in the structure of our government. The Constitution of the United States is not perfect. The wonder is that the eighteenth century political theorists were able to do so fine a job as they did. The weakness of our government is the doctrinaire effort to separate the executive and legislative, which in times of crisis may paralyze effective government. It did so in the term of Buchanan and resulted in Civil War. It would have done so in 1932, had not Franklin D. Roosevelt become president, and united in himself executive power and control of legislation, to an extent seldom accomplished before in our history. Suppose Harry Truman had become President in 1933, or Herbert Hoover?

Thus, there died in April, 1945, just at the end of the Second World War, a man who to an unprecedented degree united in himself the power of making and carrying out of law and helping

in its interpretation. His ability to do this rested on the will of the people who could hear his words and arguments with their own ears and who turned deaf ears on an almost united press and widespread and bitter opposition.

On the other hand, in April, 1945, there came suddenly into power an accident of political manipulation. It was not the fault of Mr. Truman that he had forced upon him a position of great and even appalling difficulty. It was the fault of our impossible American assumption, springing again from the eighteenth century, that government being of negligible importance, can be handed to any chance person and done by him as well as by the next, since it is of small import, compared with manufacturing, trade, and engineering. So for five fatal years, a man without training, preparation or background, was called to lead the most powerful nation in the world and through it to seek to set the course of future civilization.

This was a calamity of measureless proportions, even granted that Truman had nothing but the best of motives. For he did not in the least realize that immediately the hand of a strong and sophisticated executive was removed, the suppressed and frustrated desires of scores of interests would move into action; and in such case, the mighty appeal to public opinion which Roosevelt used so effectively had disappeared. For now, five years, the full effect of powerful and organized industry with its monopoly of the press and of the news-gathering associations in the United States has been felt in full force. Where can Americans get the truth these days? Not certainly from the Big Business interests which own the sources of news and the persons who interpret it. Screened by press and magazines, industrial and business interests moved into control of government before the Truman administration realized what was happening.

In 1945, two atomic bombs were dropped on open, unprotected cities, killing 150,000 men, women, and children. This marked an era in human culture. That same year Lend-Lease was suddenly terminated. The Soviet Union had been bled white; much of her best new industrial installations had been destroyed; she had given at least 15,000,000 lives to save the world from Hitler. She had been granted lend-lease of war materials while fighting; but suddenly, with peace, she was refused a cent for reconstruction. Others got loans; not Russia; although the United Nations Rehabilitation Administration helped a little.

This year, also, James Byrnes of South Carolina was made Secretary of State. He had no knowledge of the history of foreign affairs nor economics. His knowledge of democracy arose from a political career in South Carolina, where from 70 to 90 per cent of the electorate is disfranchised, allowing men to go

to Congress and stay there indefinitely supported by one-tenth of the number of electors required for a Congressman in the state of New York. It was Byrnes who "got tough" with Russia and began the overthrow of the confidence and friendship built by Roosevelt and Hopkins. In 1946, the pace backward hastened.

Further, Truman was induced to support by his presence and applause a demand by Churchill that the United States and Britain join forces against the Soviets, while Henry Wallace was working for understanding and peace. As a result, Wallace was forced out of the cabinet as Secretary of Commerce, and the United States adopted an atomic bomb policy of secrecy and threat. In 1947, Truman by-passed United Nations leadership and entered on a program which meant the attempt of the United States to control the world. UNNRA was discarded entirely as giving too much aid to the Communist countries; the "Truman Doctrine" of unilateral effort on our part to contain Communism was announced and the Marshall Plan to aid Europe by financing European industry for trade with the United States. George Marshall, a military man with small knowledge of diplomacy or history or economics, was put forward to initiate this economic program for Europe, by being made Secretary of State to succeed the inept Byrnes. All persons showing evidence of revolt against control of government by business were pilloried by the Attorney General and a list of ninety "subversive" organizations was drawn up, without the organizations being given opportunity of hearing or defense. Signs of economic depression, through rising prices, began to appear, and organized business began its fight against Labor through the Taft-Hartley bill. Too late, Truman tried to prevent this sabotage of the Roosevelt New Deal. His veto was overwhelmingly defeated.

In 1948, we moved faster toward war and the police state. The Atlantic Pact took the matter of peace and war out of the hands of the United Nations and split the One World of Willkie's vision into two worlds with the United States pledged to arm European soldiers to do the brunt of the fighting in a third World War. Hope of understanding with the Soviet Union was surrendered and she was openly named as the enemy against whom we were arming and securing military bases. Suddenly, on March 17, 1948, President Truman urged, it is said, by misinterpretation of facts sent out by one of our spies, almost asked open war. He told a joint session of Congress that the Soviet Union and its agents had "destroyed the independence and democratic character of a whole series of nations in Eastern and Central Europe," and was conspiring to extend their domination over all of Europe. To combat the "threatened" Communist control and police state rule, he urged immediate enactment of the Marshall European Recovery Program, universal military training,

and restoration of the draft.

Meantime, the leaders of the Communist Party were arrested. Men were being threatened for supposed sympathy with Communism; for refusing to reveal their co-workers; for treason. The persecution of Hiss began; Duggan and Smith committed suicide; and in Berlin, the "airlift" of materials into Berlin began over the Soviet zone, and in logical sequence of the utterly impossible attempt to divide Germany between enemies. From here we drifted to the suicide of Forrestal, just resigned as Secretary of Defense and representative of finance capital in government. In his delirium he saw the Russian army upon us, just as many a saner American also imagined. This tragedy was capped by Truman's calm, almost jaunty announcement of our development of the hydrogen bomb.

What forces were back of this descent into hell? Not one force, but many, and not at first united; competitive business, small in extent and carried on after the American tradition, wanted war to cease and business allowed to proceed without the encumbrances of war restraints. It cut down the army and tossed away price controls. But organized and monopolized Big Business, on the other hand, knew that the old prewar conditions were obsolete and that the United States, in order to maintain its war-gearred industry and mass production at full capacity and avoid depression, must have world markets in Europe, Asia and Africa.

In other words, the World Market which the First World War had destroyed, with its Gold Standard of value, under the hegemony of the British Empire and France, with Germany and Japan edging in, must now be restored by the United States with the dollar as the world standard. After the First World War, this development seemed axiomatic and doubtless this belief hastened the depression.

When World War II opened, Big Business in the United States did not desire to save the world rule of the British Empire. The ambitions of Germany and Italy seemed reconcilable with our leadership, until the world grasp of Hitler alarmed us, and the rashness of Japan threw us into hostilities. To the dismay of Industry, we found ourselves eventually in alliance with the Soviet Union, the one power to whose whole outlook and plans, Big Business was fundamentally opposed. But there intervened the conviction that the inevitable end of this war would be the annihilation of both Germany and the Soviets, with the United States industry as heirs.

Meantime, the overthrow of Japan must be certain. For Japan, this nation feared with perfect fear; she was colored, and, therefore, "inferior." Japan was destined to dominate Asia, unless beaten to her knees, and Asia was just the slice of earth

staked off specifically for American control. Japan's sudden and phenomenal sweep of conquest had shown the colored peoples of the world that the white race, with American wealth and the British navy, was not invulnerable; and, finally, we believed that Japan could only be held by the Soviet armies.

Big Business was more than content at Yalta to buy Soviet alliance against Japan at any price, because Japan was still a formidable and unconquered force, the atom bomb untried, and Russia had armies immeasurably superior to the combined might of the world. Let Russia have the Baltic states; let her dominate Poland and the Balkans, especially since with her development definitely held up by the greatest military effort in history and with her communistic state soon bound to fail, she and her satellites were sure to fall into the industrial orbit of the United States.

It did not work out that way; and when we saw the Soviet Union emerging from war, hurt but not crippled, bloody but not destroyed, Big Business suddenly became military-minded and cultivated the idea that armed conflict with Russia was necessary to world domination of American industry. This attitude was encouraged by the fact that unless industry continued to profit by huge military outlay, another collapse comparable to that of 1929 might develop. Thereupon, Big Business got back of the vast expansion of military expenditure which has marked recent years. The military leaders whom Truman put into high political position helped this outcome. We had a General for Secretary of State; an Admiral remained as his close military adviser; generals represented us in Russia and Germany as diplomats and the military was powerful in atomic policy.

On the other hand, the public had small chance to decide on the facts of the situation. The Russian Revolution had at first appealed to American traditions. Then the nation was alienated, first by investors like Hoover, but more by the overwhelming and world-wide propaganda of Leon Trotsky. By 1939, we regarded Stalin as a usurper and the Soviet Union as an utopian dream; unscientific, impossible of realization and insincere. Then, paradoxically, led by Roosevelt, we found ourselves allied with the Soviets in a life and death struggle. With the heroic defense and triumph of Stalingrad, Russia rose in popular appreciation.

But the apprehension of Big Business was quickly borne out. Russia was not about to collapse and although she needed our machinery and consumption goods, our offers under the Marshall Plan to integrate her into our economy was brusquely refused. Then the government and the press began to build up Russia as the great enemy of democracy, and as an imperialism set to dominate the world and establish the slave state, even in

America.

The campaign to prove this was vicious. It became impossible not only to get an audience for the Russian side of the controversy, but it became dangerous for anyone even to believe that Russia had any side to defend, or even to associate with Russian sympathizers, or to believe in any of the communistic aims. The opposition to the Soviets and hate and fear of Russia reached a crescendo. There were persons of standing who did not believe this anti-Russian propaganda. There were others who were hesitant and unconvinced. There were some who sincerely believed in the Soviets and their future. All these groups together, however, were united in feeling that wherever the Truth lay, War was not the solution. They united in March, 1949, in a great demonstration, not in favor of the Union of Russian Soviets; not in favor of Communism or Socialism; but in declaring their determination:

"To create an environment in which our lives prosper; to discover a process whereby man's fruitful aspirations may find a future in the atomic age; to contribute to the establishment of an environment in which reason may operate as a scourge of fear and hatred; to take from the shoulders of the creators of the earth's wealth, its people, the dead burden of armies and their armaments and to remove from their minds the rending shocks of insecurity; to reaffirm the duty of artists, scientists and workers in the professions to toil for a society of nations founded on justice for all."

They continued in their resolutions:

"The hour is late to unite for peace but there is yet time to save the peace if we truly unite. Humanity does not want another war. Peace is necessary and peace is possible. The maintenance of peace is the responsibility of all peoples. If the American people recognize their solemn duty and affirm their will, they can do their share to maintain peace.

"The peril of the times has united us who are gathered here. The deliberations of this conference have strengthened our unity. The issue of peace, irrespective of difference on other subjects, we propose to take our stand."

And they said this is our stand:

"We wish to open and keep open the channels of communication among the peace-minded peoples of all lands and in particular between our country and the Soviet Union. It was to this purpose that the conference was called. We have succeeded in demonstrating that the channels can be kept open. Those who have tried to discredit our efforts, because they have already yielded to fear, hate, and hysteria, have failed in their purpose. We invite them to reconsider their position and to join us in a common endeavor to save the future."

This was the first postwar effort to focus public opinion on Peace, and oppose propaganda for war. The call was signed by 550 persons, representing an excellent cross-section of American life. Representatives from the Soviet Union, Poland, France, and England, many of world-wide renown, accepted the invitation to attend and speak.

The result was astounding. The government of the United States, through the Secretary of State, denounced the conference, even before it met, as a "sounding board for communist propaganda." It denied many distinguished foreign visitors visas, alleging they were Communists, which in several cases was untrue; and, then issued visas only to those who represented communistic states officially, so as to prove its contention this was a communist demonstration promoted by Russia. It treated these representatives when they arrived like criminals, by refusing to let them travel or speak outside of New York City.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Un-American Committee of Congress sent observers to the meetings. Pickets were solicited by organizations and churches; and by newspapers, which reported their number as 100,000, although they never exceeded 2,000 and were usually a few hundred. Riot squads of police were ostentatiously put on duty. Two Canadian delegates were arrested and deported at the opening dinner. A press bureau was set up in the hotel which announced that sponsors were withdrawing "by droves;" that Russia was paying the expenses of the meeting, and that secret Russian police were present!

With the aid of the State Department, a small rival congress was organized and given wide publicity. Only two newspapers made any attempt to report the speeches, and in the nine leading New York dailies, during the week of the conference, there were 1,090 items on the Congress charged with appeal to emotion rather than to facts; 205 items making unsupported charges; and 139 items which were quite false. Of all the items, 468 were distinctly opposed to the conference; 28 were favorable, and the rest were neutral.

The United States thus gave notice in March, 1949, that war was no longer debatable but was a set policy of the Government. Nevertheless, the thousands of people who braved police and spies to attend the week-long sessions of this conference showed that the official attitude did not reflect the belief of all Americans. Professor F. O. Matthiessen of Harvard, who in 1950 committed suicide, because he could not reconcile Socialism and Christianity with present trends, said to the assembly: "Fifty years ago Leo Tolstoi sent a message to America which we might well heed today. Urging us to rediscover the greatness of our writers of the 1850's he wrote, 'I should like to ask American

people why they do not pay more attention to these voices – hardly to be replaced by those of financial and industrial millionaires, or successful generals and admirals – and continue the good work in which they made such hopeful progress.' "

That something is radically wrong with the United States today is manifest. Just what is the cause? One cause certainly is the growth of private and corporate wealth and its increasing concentration in a few hands. We sense this more or less vaguely, but we dislike to discuss it. We cling to the idea that wealth is "private" and is nobody's business but the man who "made" it and now has legal title to it. We have not yet fully realized that wealth is a social product, but that its ownership is mainly in the hands of men who by this ownership can exercise oligarchic power. It does not follow that all possessors of wealth are criminals. They may be as much victims of a system as our paupers. Nevertheless, it is our duty to understand just what the present ownership of wealth is doing to our social order.

That it is plunging us into repeated financial crises is well known. In 1837, 1857, 1873 we wallowed in depression. Omitting minor upsets, we suffered again from low economic periods in 1893, 1907, and 1929. Meantime, we have today eight hundred huge corporations which increased their capital 64 per cent between 1939 and 1945, and which literally own America; and they are absorbing the others at an increasing rate.

Government reports in 1948, declared that 8,000,000 American families lived on less than \$1,000 a year; 15,000,000 on less than \$2,000 annually, and 24,000,000 had less than \$3,000 on which to live. The Bureau of Labor demands \$3,000 for a healthful standard of living. The lower fifth of our families received but four per cent of the money income and the top fifth nearly fifty per cent of it.

Corporate profits have so increased that the Federal Trade Commission has said, "if nothing is done to check the growth in concentration, either the giant corporations will ultimately take over the country, or the Government will be compelled to step in and impose some form of direct regulation."

But this government, which should step in, is largely directed by business men who represent these corporations. Bankers, executives of mail-order houses, insurance officials, cartel attorneys all stand high in cabinet and administrative positions.

The development of atomic energy, which when we recover from war hysteria, may be the greatest boon to human comfort and relief from toil, is now being surrendered, so far as possible, to the control of private business. The nation paid the huge bill for its development, but private industry got the

contracts, controlled the administering advisory groups; and instead of building up a government industry, private corporations received knowledge of techniques, private patents, and fees for management. Lilienthal himself said, "private industry can alone develop atomic industry and must be given opportunities for profit."

It has been authoritatively said that "concentration of economic power creates great inequality of opportunity, sustains conditions prejudicial to democratic ideals, and makes those who are dependent on or subservient to the powerful, the instruments of the interests of the few, with little consideration for the welfare of the many."

Is it any wonder that many men over a long period have seen in socialism a cure for the ills of America. Scott Nearing says;

"Money reform, trust regulation, the protection of small business concerns, the control of privately owned public utilities, have been tried in the United States since the Civil War. What has been the result? Step by step the economy has passed from individual to corporate ownership. Year by year the stranglehold of Big Business has tightened on the economy and on the country, until a point has been reached at which a rich, powerful minority owns, controls, and dominates the American scene, securing its income and exercising its authority in the name of an economic apparatus which can no longer function except on a basis of large-scale military spending."

Albert Einstein says:

"I am convinced there is only one way to eliminate these grave evils, namely through the establishment of a socialist economy, accompanied by an educational system which would be oriented toward social goals. In such an economy, the means of production are owned by society itself and are utilized in a planned fashion. A planned economy, which adjusts production to the needs of the community, would distribute the work to be done among all those able to work and would guarantee a livelihood to every man, woman, and child. The education of the individual, in addition to promoting his own innate abilities, would attempt to develop in him a sense of responsibility for his fellow men in place of the glorification of power and success in our present society."

The rise of modern business in the United States has been instructive. First we had the small, separate shops and factories for making goods and others for selling them, both financed by savings as capital. They were in keen competition with each other for trade, and got advantage usually by better methods, harder work, and greater ability. When such shops wanted to expand beyond the limits of capital saved, they borrowed money from the local public through banks. Then shops

became factories with savings in method and material and power control, and with a laboring class of poor artisans who sold the future products of their toil for present food and shelter; shops became stores, with a similar economics, with white collar wage workers and with increased sharp practices to kill off competition, in addition to better methods.

There grew up but one standard of success in business and industry, and that was the power which it put in the hands of its owners to secure goods, services, and social standing. This so-called Profit was increased by the beginning of combinations in industrial effort; and concentration in ownership; not only bigger stores and factories, but by vertical union of factory and store, and even of factory, store and mine; and horizontal combination of many stores and factories into larger units. But this required increased planning of industry, large purchase of materials and machinery and big wage funds with longer wait for the end result. Those, therefore, who secured control of goods and money, loaned these to industry in return for a share of the profit and control of object and methods. Industry, both processing and selling, became integrated in great groups, which began not only to cover the nation but the international. World finance and a world market appeared.

All this, especially as laborers became educated and united in unions and conscious of political power, called for increased control of government by industry, if industry was to rule, in order to guide the power which the masses through political democracy began to exercise over industry; and, also, to secure for industry, certain powers of government which industry must have, to control the power which profit puts in its hands. Legislative lobbies, bribery, and control of news increased.

Certain kinds of business had long been carried on by government because it was difficult to so organize them as to yield private profit. Such government industry was subject to democratic control, and soon the public, especially labor, was beginning to demand that government go further into industry, especially into those vast monopolies like railroads, telephones, mining, and even manufacturing of certain integrated categories. This theory of democratic control of business and industry, called Socialism, was bitterly opposed by industry, not because it entailed planning, which all industry must use; not because it could not be done, since the same kind of persons run industry, as vote and run the government; but because -while industry is autocratic in control, government is at least to a degree democratic.

Democracy in industry would, on the other hand, cut down private profits; that is, it would decrease the present power of industry to control through a few private owners, industrial

processes, aims, goods, and ultimate distribution. This is a tremendous power, the greatest in the modern world; and since the impact of the Industrial Revolution, it has been challenged and efforts made to subject this power to democratic control. It was thought in the nineteenth century that this could be accomplished by voluntary effort in group cooperation. Then gradual evolution of state control of industry was tried.

But industry, through control of the press and education, convinced most men that State socialism was an inevitable failure. Nevertheless, with modern national monopoly and cartels, it became clear that something must be done, if human effort was not to succumb to oligarchical control, at just the era when technique was able to make plenty, and content and freedom of thought and imagination could be universal. This was the basis of the extreme proposal of Communism, which sought to base industry on natural law and erect a state with industry under the complete control of democratic government.

The trend toward socialism and Communism was precipitated by the breakdown of the capitalist system in the first quarter of the twentieth century, because of inner quarrels among its dictators. The world market was broken up, with the cartels and state monopolies which supported it, World industry because of war sank in unprecedented depression and its revival was sought by a new orientation of economic power in the West and by communist revolution in Russia, all of which led to a second and more devastating war.

Individual wealth in itself is not evil but useless. The amount which a person can consume in food and clothing is quite limited; housing and personal service can be costly and extravagant and we have some palaces and principalities in the United States! Of course, luxury and entertainment can reach large figures. But American wealth has not on the whole been noted for conspicuous expenditure. Our huge profits have been used for power over production, exchange, and consumption, and over government; with the paradoxical object of accumulating more wealth for more power; and also lately to found dynasties of industrial rulers.

Two characteristics mark the power of industry in the United States. One is the effort to make the State furnish the capital and to take the risks while turning over management and profit to private industry. When complaint was voiced that industry opposed the development of the Columbia River power, the president of the National Association of Manufacturers said that it was not opposed to developing areas like the Columbia River, it is just that the job was so vast that the government should do it, providing after it was done, private industry was allowed to take it over!

Secondly, industry is steadily and with determination increasing its control of government, local, state, and national, in administration and through the courts. This industrial control of government is now reaching out to world domination. The world market is to be restored under American instead of British and French control. This was to be accomplished by a huge navy, subsidies to shipping and aviation, and by the Marshall Plan.

The Marshall Plan was conceived in charity but carried out for private profit. It was put into the mouth of a well-intentioned military man who knew nothing of business, but did know poverty, destruction, and need. It was announced on the presumably unprejudiced campus of a great university whose graduate school of Business, endowed by rich industrialists, has been of immense influence in popularizing American business methods. It appealed at once to the generous heart of the American people; but it was implemented by a government directed by representatives of finance capital and carried out by Big Business.

Before the Marshall Plan was inaugurated, industrial production in Europe as a whole had reached prewar levels; the recovery in agriculture was not so fast and that in foreign trade was fair. The Marshall Plan came in with political, strategic, and, finally, economic purposes. First, it was to maintain "the American way of life," and oppose postwar planning, especially communism. Russia and Eastern Europe immediately refused to participate. Molotov said that the internal policies of each nation must not be subordinated to foreign support. Even Western Europe, according to the New York Times, feared there would be "a goodly number of plums pulled out of the pie by big American companies in the form of markets and commitments of European governments to keep hands off their operations."

This was immediately proven, by the breaking up of the natural and essential east-west trade, through which Western Europe received agricultural products for machinery, and manufactures. But this would give Russia "strategic materials" and was forbidden. On the other hand, the exports of the United States to Western Europe were not on the whole what Europe wanted and were too highly priced for Europe's exports. Moreover, what could be bought from America was decided by Americans. The "gift" was made, but must be matched by a fund set up in the benefiting nation. The spending of this fund was controlled by United States officials. Europe needed capital equipment; but America limited and directed this and compelled the purchase of certain goods she wished to sell, - trucks, soft drinks, and often surplus stocks in the United States. On all of these goods, prices rose in the United States and freight rates

skyrocketed, especially as fifty per cent of the carrying vessels must be American.

Moreover, the Marshall aid was used for an American imperialism in colonies. For "strategic" purposes, the United States required colonial products to the amount of \$250,000,000 a year; private American business organizations, during the period 1946-1948, were investing a billion dollars a year in foreign projects and had in 1949, \$15,000,000,000 throughout the world in quasi-colonies. America complained of slow recovery and Europe complained of American prices. America suggested ways by which through dropping of tariff walls and integrating methods of economy, Europe might purchase more from America. But the United States refused to lower her tariff walls or to reduce prices to any appreciable degree. Britain solved her plight in part through her colonies; cocoa and palm oil in West Africa and tin and rubber in Asia furnished her goods which she could sell at high enough prices in America to help buy food, provided she kept African and Asiatic wages down. This made trouble on both continents.

In two great areas which America counted on to complete her world economic empire, Eastern Europe and China, the Soviet Union and her followers declined to allow America to infiltrate and dominate. These countries refused the Marshall Plan, thus removing an immense prospective market from the United States. In China, we trusted Chiang Kai-shek to keep that great market and reservoir of labor and materials subservient to the United States, as heir of the British Empire. This plan backfired and China joined the Russian orbit. In the Middle East, the United States and Britain are still locked in bitter but polite rivalry for control of oil, which is blocking the development of Israel.

This forced American Business to take another step and depend on the threat of war to break the communist group. The Atlantic Pact was adopted ostensibly in defense, but in reality as an offensive against the Soviets backed by the atom bomb. It contradicted the Marshall Plan by compelling Western European nations to spend from one-fifth to one-third of their income for war. This has finally forced us to promise a Plan to finance war in Europe. Thus Big Business based its domination of the world market and restoration of nineteenth century capitalism on exploitation of Europe and war against Russia and socialism; and financed this venture by an unprecedented expenditure on preparation for war. This so far has kept the United States out of the depression which threatened to follow war, murder, and waste. Moreover, it made one further advance: colonies were still buttressing the economics of Britain and France, Holland, and Belgium. American business financed rubber in Indonesia, copper and uranium in the Belgian Congo, and gold, minerals, and

diamonds in the Union of South Africa. It proposed by the celebrated Point Four Program to penetrate other colonial regions.

Meantime, the American people had no clear understanding of the economic tangle which was bewildering the world, while Big Business made all-out effort to lay the blame of distress, frustration and unrest on the Soviet Union, and built up the nation to hysterical suspicion of communism and socialism. They called them Heresy and Conspiracy, Threat to Freedom and Democracy. They prepared for a Holy Crusade, led by the Christian Church. If the strong common sense of the nation refuses the adventure of war and secures an era of peace and freedom, in which to study and reflect, it will soon discover that this development of Big Business points directly to the Government in Business and the Welfare State.

Already many business organizations are equal to states in size and wealth; already many of them need the powers of government to function properly; already the government is furnishing capital for much of the activity of private enterprise; and already government enterprises, like the Tennessee Valley Authority, have been enormously successful. Why then should such enterprises become the property of government rather than remain private? Whether private or public, the same sort of folk conduct therewith the same technique; why then change? Because of one tremendous reason: public business organization is controlled in object and method by democracy; private business is at best an autocracy and at worst a world oligarchy. Its objects vary from personal philanthropy to a revival of colonial imperialism and slave labor. Moreover, the fond hope that labor unions in alliance with private business would work out a voluntary democracy has failed to come true, as the Taft-Hartley law indicates.

Meantime, the socialization of America is increasing. A textbook in use in the public schools was recently banned in Texas because of this true passage: "The United States is called a capitalistic country, but it does not have pure capitalism. It has capitalism subject to increasing Government control, as our manner of living becomes more complex. The country is capitalistic with strong socialistic and even communistic trends. The postal system, power projects, and progressive taxes are bits of socialism; and public free education and old age assistance are examples of communism 'to each according to his need.' "

Despite this and other efforts to conceal this truth, socialization grows as industry expands and consolidates. To preserve the forests of the West, for natural beauty and water, the United States owns 53 per cent of all land of the eleven

states of the Far West, and its function is unquestioned, save by selfish private interests, because the United States is consuming twice as much timber as it is growing; despite government efforts, three-fourth of our forest land still remains in private hands, with few efforts at conservation.

The great and outstanding example of socialism in our government is the T.V.A., the government-controlled development of the great Tennessee river valley, for which Senator George Norris and his colleagues fought for years and which is still periodically under attack. Similar developments of all our great river systems would save us from annual floods, death, and sickness and destruction, while preserving water and furnishing cheap power. But so far Big Business and monopoly have either blocked this development entirely or secured most of the results for private profit.

This illustrates a new and growing demand from private capital. Let the taxpayer furnish the capital and take the risk; let Business be run by oligarchical methods and mainly for private profit and not for public welfare. Then Business will take over and conduct the project without interference from government. It is this demand of business for control of public monies plus assumption of many governmental functions, that is leading many persons, who know nothing of theoretical socialism, to ask why control of the most important functions of life should be surrendered to private hands at public expense?

Contrasting with our great wealth in America is our poverty. An expert recently said at a Congressional hearing: "A third of all our people in the year 1948, a peak of American prosperity, had so little income, such meager culture, and living standards so low, as to be set apart. In effect, they were a drag upon the rest of us, unable to pull their full share of the load, denied many of the good things of life which we have, and a possible threat to our free democratic institutions."

The current taxation falls heavily on the poor. Sales taxes, the most inequitable of taxes, are increasing in states and cities. Tax relief has gone to the rich; corporations pay twice as high taxes as in 1939; but a man earning \$5,200 a year pays nine times as much. Colleges engaging in business avoid \$50,000,000 a year in taxation; and wealthy men by forming philanthropic foundations, not only escape taxes but gain increased control of industry without government interference.

This poverty does not bother many business philosophers. Barrons, the national business weekly says, "The cycle of boom and bust is a basic principle of nature. Planets have their orbits and years their seasons. Night follows day. Recessions and depressions are unpleasant, but there are times when recessions are needed. Lay-offs are painful, but they do induce

those who are still on the job to work harder, and they tend to reduce the working force of the nation down to where it includes those who really want jobs... It is hoped that depressions are never abolished for they have many desirable features."

Poverty and uncertainty encourage gambling. It has been said that in 1949, the entire nation spent in gambling or sports \$15,000,000,000, while for education, only \$2,500,000,000 and for research in mental illness not over \$300,000. Barkley, Vice President of the United States, has told the thoroughbred racing association of New York that the revenue from horse racing has been enough to operate the government of six states and pay off the debt of fifteen states.

A reporter says, "if there is one persistent American dream embedded in the subconscious of our modern American culture, it is the dream that someday, somehow, like a bolt of lightning, you are going to strike it rich. This is shown by horse players in iron betting machines, in the bingo players, and in the people who buy Irish sweepstake tickets, in audiences led by the radio give-away shows."

There is lawlessness and crime in the United States today, but in individuals this is explicable from the upheaval of wars with disruption of family life, poor schools and uncertainty of occupation. But there is a lawlessness which the nation faces helplessly, and that is the refusal of corporations to obey the law, or their power to prevent the enactment of enforceable law. So far our attempt to stop or control the concentration of capital in growing monopolies has had little success. Almost anything which a great, rich corporation wishes to do, it does, and public opinion seems helpless: "The trust, the pool, the combination, and other techniques of the past, and even the powerful trade association of the present are rendered quite unnecessary in these industries where the number of producers is so limited that a gentleman's world of 'live and let live' can be effectuated without formality, without overt evidence of collusion, and without fear of prosecution."

We are neglecting the national health. There are fewer medical students today than forty-five years ago; yet of 25,000 applicants in 1949, only 6,387 were admitted to medical schools. We need practitioners, hospitals, nurses; our mental cases are wretchedly cared for, with resulting increase of crime. We need socialized medical system for the nation; but the American Medical Association is fighting this, with a huge lobbying fund and trained lobbyists.

Because of war and interruption of normal building and repairs, the nation needs to build at least a million and one-half homes a year for ten years. The real estate and building interests have held this down to less than 150,000 units and

also blocked modern ways of mass construction, while we allow rise in rents.

Four million American children are not in school and two million are being taught by teachers with substandard certificates. Hundreds of thousands of teachers are still receiving poverty-level salaries. There is a nationwide shortage of school buildings. More than twenty per cent of the city children in the United States are assigned to overcrowded classrooms and hundreds of thousands of pupils are on half-day sessions. There are 10,000,000 functional illiterates. "Comic books", the low form of literature which floods our newsstands, are the addiction and virtually the only reading matter in three out of four American homes.

The future of the United States rests largely on our colleges and universities, which train teachers, scientists, physicians, architects, engineers, lawyers and increasingly legislators, businessmen and journalists. Despite this, we have been spending a smaller percentage of our national income on higher education each year. In 1932, we spent on colleges and universities, one per cent of the national income, and in 1947, one-half of one per cent. We are spending half as much of our national income to educate almost twice as large a proportion of our population. Tuition has increased over fifty per cent since 1941, and the children of the rich have three or four times the chance to go to college as the children of the middle class and poor. Salaries of professors are too low to secure first-class teaching. Of one hundred who enter the public schools, only three go to college. Yet some fear these college graduates. The Chancellor of the New York Board of Regents recently objected to the belief that the government should provide opportunity for higher education for all who desire it: "We are likely to educate many more men and women than can earn a living in the fields which they have chosen or anywhere else, and they will become embittered with their frustration and will turn upon society and government more effective and better armed in their destructive wrath by the education we have given them."

This is the reason that propaganda is directed toward the public schools by Big Business, the government, and the military establishments. The National Association of Manufacturers has a well-financed program to influence schools and screen textbooks. The United States gives one hundred million dollars a year to colleges chiefly through the military establishment for research; and private industry gives another twenty-five million dollars in addition. Of the government subsidy the University of Michigan gets \$5,000,000, Harvard \$2,225,000, and Columbia University \$3,300,000. This means business and the military influence, if not control, much of our higher training.

But most disturbing today is the Press, daily, weekly and, monthly; with newsgathering agencies, the films, and the radio. In 1947, a commission, headed by the Chancellor of the University of Chicago said: "The freedom of the press in the United States is in danger; for three reasons: its increased importance to the people; the decreasing proportion of people allowed to express their opinions; the inadequate service rendered the people by those who can use it; the habit of those who control the press of engaging in practices which society condemns, and which it will inevitably try to control." The report added:

"Anybody with nothing to say can say it by mass communication, if he has a knowing press agent, or a considerable reputation, or an active pressure group behind him; whereas, even with such advantages, anybody with something to say has a hard time getting it said by mass communication, if it runs counter to the ideas of owners, editors, opposing pressure groups, of popular prejudice."

It is clear that wealth in the United States, represented by the large corporations organized for profit, own and control the press in the nation. The small papers and independent magazines are disappearing. These periodicals, have a difficult time existing. In the big press the owners pay fabulous prices for columnists and writers. They gather news from the ends of the earth, and color and slant it; they omit what they wish and in some cases actually invent and mislead. The periodical press is no longer a forum for ideas and opinions, but chooses writers who agree with their policy, or are willing for a price to follow their line of propaganda. Once I wrote a balanced criticism of the effect of Roosevelt's New Deal on the Negro. The magazine editor to whom I sent it wrote back, briefly, "Change this to an attack on Roosevelt and we will publish it."

All the newspapers, with their enormous circulation and special services, must cater to their advertisers, who may indeed be their indirect owners. The advertising carried on by the press is one of the nation's biggest businesses and represents immense revenue. Last year probably \$5,000,000,000 was spent on advertising. This represents not only a tremendous bribe for opinion, news, and silence, but a decisive psychological influence on the public mind. Newspapers, magazines, radio and television bombard the public with inducements to spend money, to such an extent that the public wants things they do not need and often wants them for the wrong reasons. Emotional immaturity is encouraged and waste arises from aroused demand for useless and harmful things. Almost any product can be sold America by a sufficiently wide, loud, and costly advertising campaign. This is peculiarly true in the

immense sale of drugs and patent medicines.

Chemists are adulterating and poisoning food and the newspapers carry their advertising and the radio spreads their wares. Some of the best known nationally advertised products have been charged with fraudulent advertising and thousands of advertised articles have been proved fakes. The Federal Trade Commission continues to issue these facts 365 days in the year, and the press, for the most part, continued to suppress the news. Our Christmas holiday season has been turned into an orgy of purposeless spending and waste by manufacturers, retail merchants, and their advertising. Thus American culture has been turned from its higher aims and efforts into a machine for making and selling for profit, so as to make and sell again. So that meat is worth more than life and raiment is more valuable than the body.

The recent curtailment of civil liberties in the United States is frightening. In 1940, the Smith Bill was passed which made thoughts liable to suppression; then came arrests of persons for refusing to reveal confidential data; a congressional committee publicly accused persons without allowing them legal counsel or names of accusers; the Attorney General of the nation pilloried dozens of organizations as "subversive," without giving them opportunity for explanation or for defense; men and women were arrested and jailed for refusing to tattle on friends accused of no crime; workers were discharged for being accused of believing in Communism. Finally, the eleven official heads of the Communist Party were arrested and tried in a court proceeding which had faint semblance of justice and, although no illegal act was even alleged, they and their lawyers were sentenced to jail.

The Taft-Hartley act was passed restoring court control of labor unions and limiting the right to strike and bargain. Foreign-born citizens have been threatened and hounded until today more than 150 non-citizens in twenty-one states are under arrest for deportation, while 3,000 others are under investigation, and 3,000,000 non-citizens and 11,000,000 naturalized citizens live in danger. Investigations and loyalty orders have been made. Civil servants have been investigated; with secret trials and arbitrary decisions, some eighty-three have been discharged and 900 resigned.

The American Civil Liberties Union adds that "1949 witnessed an unprecedented array of barriers to free association, of forced declarations of loyalty, of blacklists and purges; and, most menacing to the spirit of liberty, of taboos on those progressive programs and principles which are the heart of any expanding democracy." It is reported that 7,600 employees have been accused and are being investigated. Under President

Truman's order 9835, a person is liable to investigation if he ever:

Spoke against racial and religious discrimination

Attended a social gathering, no matter how large, at which a "subversive" was present.

Contributed money to help the victims of Franco Spain.

Owned a low-cost life insurance policy issued by the International Workers Order.

Attended a public meeting of the National Negro Congress or any one of dozens of other legal, loyal, but liberal organizations.

Talked, even to neighbors and friends, about controversial issues.

A new State Department code of principles was adopted, even more drastic than the loyalty order. The Hollywood writers were intimidated; mob action prevented meetings of the Progressive Party; censorship of teachers and students came in universities. Columbia University, the College of the City of New York, Brooklyn College, Hunter College, all banned leading American writers; George Washington University denied a charter to the American Veterans Committee and the Young Progressives. Books of leading authors, living and dead, have been barred, like Arthur Miller, Charles Darwin, Thomas Paine, Louis Adamic, Stuart Chase, Charles Beard and others.

The University of Washington discharged three professors, who had been on the faculty from eighteen to twenty years, for unorthodox political views. Alger Hiss, Judith Coplon and the Russian, Gubitshev, have been tried under pressure of public opinion, so that few persons believe them guilty of any illegal acts. Harry Bridges has been repeatedly tried and finally convicted on the testimony of hired witnesses. His real crime was the successful leadership of the Longshoremen in conflict with the shipping interests. Secret espionage and tapping of telephone wires by government agents have been resorted to, until Bernard De Voto, of Harper's Magazine, said publicly: "Representatives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other official investigating bodies have questioned me, in the past, about a number of people and I have answered their questions. That's over. If it is my duty as a citizen to tell what I know about someone, I will perform that duty under subpoena, in open court, before that person and his attorney. This notice is posted in the courthouse square; I will not discuss anyone in private with any government investigator."

Almost every strike is called Communist inspired; therefore, the threat of communism becomes the threat of higher wages in

the face of increased cost of living. The Progressive Party, fighting for the Negro vote in the South, was promptly branded part of the Communist conspiracy. The crowning indignity comes with the declaration of the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, Wheary, who says, that if the Supreme Court upholds the conviction of the Communist leaders, the Department of Justice will arrest and try 21,105 persons who "appear to be acting in concert with Russian interests."

Finally, there is before Congress now a bill which a Senator thus characterizes: "This bill, if enacted, would constitute the greatest threat to American civil liberties since the Alien and Sedition laws of 1798. Like that bill, it is the product of hysteria and frantic, unthinking fear. Like that bill, it would strike at the very foundations of our democratic institutions — the right of the people to speak their minds, to hear every viewpoint on public questions, and to associate together freely to advance their common views. Like that bill, it merits the opposition of all who cherish liberty."

Because the business interests which are dominating the nation, see no way of restoring the world market, under American domination, except through war on Russia and communism, the United States has become today the greatest military power which the world has ever known and is spending more money for war than any other nation ever spent. For military preparedness we are spending directly \$13,000,000,000 a year; indirect expenses, like interest on war debts, pensions for veterans, foreign aid, atomic energy and the like, bring the total to at least \$31,000,000,000, which is 71 per cent of our total outlay. Only five per cent of our gross national income goes to such general welfare as health, education, housing, agriculture, communications, power and natural resources, and for regulation of trade and industry,

We have never before been an armed nation in time of peace. We have never spent so much money, or so much of our income for war. We have never given so much power to military men. This concentration of power is a threat to freedom, and the taxes to support it an intolerable burden to the whole nation. Moreover, the kind of war we are preparing for, is the most indiscriminating destruction ever envisioned. We propose to kill men, women and children in unprotected cities in unlimited devastation. Hessler, a former navy officer, warns: "The United States alone is building a strategic air force planned to lay waste to cities such as ours." In other words, it is the American concept of strategic air power which is guiding future war into the pattern of blind devastation. Today, the American people, whipped to a false hysteria by anti-Communist tom-toms, and frightened by horrifying weapons of their own devising, have

become the world's only nation relying on the arms designed for systematic massacre. The threat of war by mass annihilation is a basic American foreign policy today.

Einstein, the world's greatest physicist, declares: "Disarm or we die." He says, "The idea of achieving security through national armament is at the present state of military technique a disastrous illusion." War and preparation for war are driving the nation mad. Science is its captive. "There is at present," says The American Association for the Advancement of Science, "a tendency in public thinking to relate scientific activity almost wholly to military activity." Edward Condon, who has been dogged and smeared, says that scientists have probably suffered more than any other group from the postwar loyalty hysteria. The attempt to advocate peace has met every obstacle. Foreigners of highest reputation have been refused visas because they came to advocate peace.

Because of the billions of dollars to be spent on war, there is no plan of public works to give employment to the unemployed, no unemployment insurance, no decent wage increases, only \$4,000,000,000 for housing when \$17,000,000,000 are needed. Slums are thus being created quicker than they are being cleared.

There is nothing for school buildings, nothing for subsistence for those unable to continue in school, nothing for scholarships, no disability insurance for young people temporarily disabled, no maternity benefits for young mothers, no youth centers to provide opportunities for sports and recreation.

We hire spies, of course. All nations in this crisis try to find out as much as possible about their neighbor's deeds and actions and aims. But when our "intelligence" breaks down or is exposed, we indignantly deny it and charge foreigners with lying. For such reasons; because our charity, real as it is for the taxpayers, is changed by the merchants to profit-making and economic compulsion, it is true as all travellers can testify, that Americans are hated everywhere in Europe. Their real financial assistance is either not known or it is interpreted as malicious and selfish. Ignorance about America is stronger than ever before among both intellectuals and common people. Everything Americans have done and everything they are planning to do is vicious. They are ill-mannered, imperialistic materialists. What is true in Europe is even more true in Asia and South America.

We are relying on the strange belief that our defeat of Japan has turned her into our ally and that the future bastion of American expansion in the Orient will be Japan. This can scarcely be true. Japanese culture is very old and wise. No man

like Douglass MacArthur will easily deceive the Japanese. The insults which the United States long heaped on this land will not be forgotten in our day nor allayed by mild but strong control. Sometime Japan will be free again. She will regain her efficiency and power. She will never be servant of the West nor of the white race; but if she has learned her lesson well, she may yet join China and India in leadership of that Asia which her outbreak in 1941 sparked into freedom and autonomy.

How then shall we lead the world? On one point more than others, our motives and acts are suspect; and that is, the treatment of minorities, especially Negroes and colored groups in our democracy. Everywhere in Europe, Asia, and Africa this crucial test of our profession is known. We can reply that race relations in this land have improved in the last fifty years; but their unsatisfactory condition today simply emphasizes the depth of our guilt in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Race relations have been bettered, but this has been in large part due to the unremitting efforts of Negroes themselves, who, for a generation have been the defenders of democracy in the United States, of which they themselves were so widely deprived. With all this and with the help and sympathy of thousands of liberal white Americans, North and South, the situation today is not good. The report of the American Jewish Congress and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in civil rights for 1949 says: "The darker side of the picture still remains dominant. Segregation continues virtually unbroken in Southern government. Throughout most of the country, racial discrimination governs the sale and lease of housing, while discrimination in employment and education still affects all minority groups. Finally, the international scandal of segregation in the nation's capital persists."

In the schools of the nation, textbooks still misrepresent the past. Slavery is depicted as a benevolent institution: "It was often a happy life for the slaves, they had no cares except to do their work well." Again: "On the whole, the slaves of the South were considerably treated." Or a new text, published in 1949, says: "Most of the slaves were happy, they did not want to be free."

The President in his campaign promised a program of civil rights for the Negroes in accord with the report of his Civil Rights Committee; he repeats this promise regularly. Two years after this report not one of its major recommendations have been adopted. States have done something. Eight have laws outlawing race discrimination in employment and seventeen prohibit discrimination in schools; but forty other states have no such employment laws and seventeen make segregation in education

compulsory. Eighteen leaders in American life, including John Dewey, Harry Emerson Fosdick, and John Haynes Holmes, declare that states having segregated school systems, expend an average of almost twice as much for the education of a white child as for a Negro child. The existence of segregated schools is in itself a blot on the American public school system. Today a map of discrimination in the United States shows that in most of the states, segregation and discrimination affecting voting, schools, marriage, or other rights, are in force. In some cases, race segregation has been broken down by facts, rather than theory: in the Battle of the Bulge Negro soldiers had to be used along with whites to beat back Von Runstedt.

In most cases Americans think that this condition is the rapidly passing result of former slavery, and affects but a small part of the nation; but this part amounts to nearly a tenth of the inhabitants and at least a quarter of the working class. Their condition affects the nation and particularly the laboring class. As low paid, ignorant and sick competitors they keep down production and wages and their condition increases the income and power of capital, just as slavery a century ago increased the political power of planters, Northern manufacturers and traders, and the British merchants.

These race and economic problems in the United States lead to curious paradoxes. It is, of course, natural that a white American of education and good income should be content with "the American way of life," and look on change or complaint as wrong, or even treasonable. But we buy gold feverishly from the slave labor of South Africa, from the bankrupt economy of war-torn Europe. We run home and bury millions of this in the earth. It sounds like madness. It is madness. We live in a naked, hungry world. Our rich soil raises too much. We pay our farmers to raise less or destroy part of what they have raised. We store the rest in the earth. Our storage bins are already bursting at the seams.

This summer our carry-over of cotton will reach 9,000,000,000 bales. The carry-over of wheat will be 300,000,000 bushels; of corn 1,000,000,000 bushels. Already the Commodity Credit Corporation, which buys and stores supported products, is close to the limit of its borrowing power. The support program cost \$600,000,000 in 1949. This year its cost will be much higher. Where will this insanity end?

Americans have many fine and outstanding qualities: their resourcefulness; their initiative; their keen common sense; their sympathy and generosity, and their sense of human equality. Much of this has been encouraged by the freedom of action and thought which they have always had, the vast resources of their country and the beckoning frontier which

lasted so many years. But their very virtues have brought reactionary evils; their initiative has often been used to the hurt of others. They have not recognized as equals many millions of their fellows; their chance for gain has brought not only vast riches, but deep poverty, and their freedom has often degenerated into license and bad manners. And now, that the frontier has disappeared or been transformed from physical limits to mental problems, the old liberty must be curbed by social compulsion, leaving a realm of freedom only in thought and spirit. Just here in thought and spirit, we are now frantically limiting freedom and compelling agreement by threatening all with hunger, loss of status, or conformity.

It would seem that either Big Business will continue to take over control of the United States or the United States will nationalize the railroads, mines, forests, the telephone and telegraph facilities, the steel and aluminum trusts, the Du Pont chemical empire, and Standard oil.

British capital cannot rescue India, and American capital will not, for it can get no guarantee of continued control. Chinese Communism can and will save India, if once it succeeds in saving itself. Then French and British West Africa will pour down the Nile with a new Middle East, rescue dead Egypt and turning back, absorb Kenya, the Rhodesias, the Congo, and South Africa. Mexico, South America and the West Indies, fighting Church and capital, will slowly follow this new world. With industry in state control and the state run for the welfare of all, there will emerge a new freedom in Art and Literature and a flowering of Science not dreamed of since the seventeenth century. Either this, or Big Business will increase its control of American life and thought and, through America, will move towards control of the world. A third World War will inevitably ensue - and Chaos.

Each morning now I look around at my country. I see its mountains and cities, its hills and homes, its rivers and cities, its men, women, and children. I sigh and ask: Where is the Land of my dreams, and of the dreams and faith of so many, many men? Where is the courage and high resolve, for a Land of the Free, a land of refuge for the weak and hunted, the friend of dissent and heresy, the hope of Peace on earth, Good Will towards men? The land that chained but freed the slave, gave votes to women and welcomed the poor and needy from the ends of the earth? What has happened to make her today the great warmonger of the world? Her battleships prowling in Saigon, her airplanes riding above Libau and patrolling the Seven Seas; her armies sitting in Germany, Japan, Greece, Korea, and Alaska?

We police the world and scan the stars. We are supermen, masters of everything and rulers of all, and yet, afraid of each other; searching, spying, questioning, burrowing into the minds

and hearts of men. We fashion weapons madly and thrust them into the unwilling hands of English, French and Italians and order them where and how to fight and keep fighting; these folks, with eyes still wet with tears for the dead and crazy and crippled. We shout defiance and murder to starving, naked and homeless people. We invent and manufacture death, and bury food and gold. We are howling wolves of hate, faring through the world on wire and telephone crying and crying again, Fight! Kill! Maim! Exterminate! The anti-Christ comes, the End of All. Our newspapers take up the tale, so that each morning begins poisoned with suspicion and hate. The magazines picture horror, dressed with fashions for Spring. We are afraid, afraid – but of what – of just what? No hostile armies are in miles of us; no ships or planes, save in the minds of idiots are near us. What frightens us? Why in God's name is this great, rich, secure nation literally scared to death?

The obvious answer is: Russia. Not the Russia of the czars; we endured that Russia, even with its indecent pageantry of royalty; its poverty and illiteracy; its pogroms against Jews. The Russia of the Revolution we regarded with pity and contempt. But not with fear. The Russia of Hitler we ignored as of no value for alliance and the sure and easy victims of the invincible Germany army, of god-like Nordics. We watched Soviet victory with disbelief and lend-lease, and then with dismay. We hastened to make alliance and gave generous praise to what General MacArthur called "the greatest military effort in history." And then, from 1945 until today all this has turned from distaste to frantic fear. Why?

There, was a long day when no respectable man of brains and social standing referred to the French Revolution in any terms except of disdain, repulsion and disgust. Yet the time came when that Revolution was recognized as one of the great landmarks of human progress; naturally, with mistakes and excesses; but with vast preponderance of good. This may yet mark American attitude toward the Russian Revolution. But today as a nation we loath and fear it. The Archbishop of York reported after a visit to America, that "the dread of communism is more common and violent than it is in England, degenerating sometimes into an almost hysterical suspicion of those who hold left views."

A composer who had lived in this country for years was deported because his brother was a Communist. Shostakovich, the great Russian composer, was refused a hall on the campus of Yale University in which to give a concert. Picasso, one of the world's greatest painters, was refused a visa because as a Communist he wanted to plead for peace. The Reverend Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, a man of Peace and Love, may not set foot in the United States. When Sidney Webb, the great British

socialist died, American reviews made no mention of his monumental study of Russia. Repeated attacks have been made on Einstein, because of his mild socialism. A Rear Admiral says, "If Einstein doesn't like Americanism or our nationalism, then he should go back where he came from and try Mr. Hitler again."

An article in Harper's Magazine for September, 1947, by Henry Steele Commager, Professor of History at Columbia University, depicts not only the intelligence of the average American teacher, but his courage and independence as well: "May 6, 1947, a Russian-born girl gave a talk to the students of the Western High School of Washington, D. C. She talked about Russia - its school system, its public health program, the position of women, of the aged, of the workers, the farmers, and the professional classes - and compared some American and Russian social institutions. The speech reprinted for us in The Congressional Record does not disclose a single disparagement of anything American, unless it is a quasi-humorous reference to the cost of having a baby and of dental treatment in this country. She said nothing that any normal person could find objectionable.

"Her speech, however, created a sensation. A few students walked out on it. Others improvised placards proclaiming their devotion to Americanism. Indignant mothers telephoned their protests. Newspapers took a strong stand against the outrage. The District of Columbia Committee went into a huddle; there were demands for housecleaning in the whole school system, which was obviously shot through and through with Communism."

About 98 per cent of the daily reporting of news from Eastern Europe is unfavorable of them; only in a few papers the truth may appear in a feature article of the Sunday edition, or in a special article on the editorial page. Erroneous facts about Russia are made and reiterated so that they are received as gospel. An air force general said at a Washington hearing, that all that was necessary to subdue Russia was to let Russian soldiers see the West: "There those boys would see a way of life, a freedom, a dignity of the individual that they never imagined before. It would be psychological warfare at its best. Stalin would lose control, and he could not discipline them. Russia doesn't like the system she is living under; and once the Red Army sees a better way of life, Stalin will never get it back under totalitarian control again. The Red Army will disintegrate in Europe." Continual "factual" statements are made of Russian labor. That Russians work 81 hours to earn what Americans earn in ten. Any story unfavorable to Russia is printed in the United States. The effort to show communism as criminal is repeatedly printed.

But worse than this popular impression of the Soviet Union rife in America, is the acceptance of this picture by the

leaders of thought in the United States. Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, offered peace to the Soviet Union. He said: "Good and Evil can and do exist concurrently in the whole great realm of human life;" therefore, the United States, being Good, and the Soviet Union being Evil, can possibly live together. Thereupon he accuses Russia of keeping Germany, Japan and Austria from being "free countries;" of keeping various nations by military force and under a regime which their people do not want; of refusing to assent to control of atomic weapons or to disarmament; of subverting friendly government; of not treating diplomatic officials with respect; of lying to Russians about the United States and the world.

There has not been in modern history a more deliberately insulting "offer" of peace. No person who really wanted peace, would have couched an offer in such terms, even if he himself believed the accusations.

Frank Graham, an outstanding liberal, says: "Totalitarian tyranny must sometime begin to give way to human freedom now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain, but never dead within the human spirit." In an editorial in The New York Times it is stated that the Russian "system has been able to win its victories by representing itself as a 'new and higher type of democracy,' which is to enrich the underprivileged at the expense of the possessing classes and thereby bring 'true' freedom to all. In actual practice it has only brought misery to those who have come under its sway — and the reason it has done so is that its use of the word 'democracy' is as fraudulent as its promises.

"Under such a system there can be neither self-government nor freedom, but only the most rigid and stifling regimentation of all phases of a nation's life. To make this regimentation absolute, the Communist dictatorship openly espouses terror as the best means of mass control."

It carries its distaste even to refusing any restraint on Formosa to stop bombing of American vessels: "In actual practice the overwhelming force of wrathful American public opinion would prevent the United States from using its proud Navy to open up a supply line for the Chinese Communists. Common decency would prevent us from stooping so low."

Bertrand Russell tells Americans, that East of the Iron Curtain, "all that has made Europe valuable to mankind is extinct. And the Iron Curtain, alas, is capable of moving Westwards." He puts the issue of war or peace on the Russians and rests his hopes on civilization, military preparedness, and the Atlantic Pact.

Our representative in the United Nations said: "Confidence in Soviet pledges has been undermined by the experience of the past

few years. To find cause for concern, it is not necessary to recall the friendship pact with Nazi Germany, or the Soviet non-aggression pact with Finland, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. We need only look at the long, unhappy list of broken Soviet pledges that has grown since we have been engaged in the common effort to create the United Nations.

"The principle of unanimity of the five permanent members of the Security Council is based on the assumption that they will cooperate toward a common goal of peace. But the Soviet Union has twisted that principle into a weapon of obstruction and sabotage of world peace."

Enemies of Russia have every facility of publicity given them in our press and radio: "Any disgruntled journalist or diplomat or engineer, or so-called 'general'; any incompetent employee, any correspondent expelled from the Soviets for having lied about them, any dismissed incompetent technician, any scoundrel, swindler or careerist; any abominable or repugnant character; any international renegade, criminal, derelict or outcast; any adventurer or unsuccessful writer, any semi-socialist, anyone who has failed in everything is sure to reestablish his fortune by defaming the Soviet Union, The American press, the American magazines, the American editors, hold their arms wide open to them, and the American feebleminded public embraces them, receives them warmly and enthusiastically and generously displays its purse to them."

Even Henry A. Wallace, leader of the Progressive Party, declares both the United States and the Soviet Union are "brutes of force, both countries' policies rest on the doctrine of force. The Soviet Union uses one kind of force, the United States another. Both countries interfere in affairs of other nations. Both, certain of the righteousness of their cause, are plunging headlong toward mutual destruction."

Communism is continually described as a conspiracy of ruthless scoundrels; the Republicans say, "Communism is an international conspiracy aiming at world-wide dictatorship and the suppression of religious, political, and economic freedoms throughout the world. It corrupts ideals, corrodes basic religious teachings, destroys the fiber of man and denies the existence of God, It is imperative that the nations of the world develop new methods to offset this frontal attack on civilization."

Another widespread accusation is that Russia is a slave state, with all liberties curtailed and millions in labor concentration camps. The Vice President said on April 15, 1950, "The propagandists for this foe claim to be apostles of freedom, yet, in their so-called labor camps are more slaves than have been kept in bondage by any nation at any time in the history of the world. No citizen is free from searches and seizures of the

secret police. Trial by unimagined tortures take the place of trials by jury. There is no freedom of expression, no freedom of the press, no freedom to worship in one's own way, no freedom of enterprise, no freedom to enjoy the profits of one's labors. Especially it is said there is no democracy or freedom of election." Communism is often described as deliberately false doctrine which takes advantage of poverty and distress with impossible promises.

At the end of the Second World War the rearmament of Germany was held to be the greatest threat to the peace of the world by General Marshall, Eisenhower, and others. Today, however, General Montgomery is preparing to create a Nazi army; the British Foreign Office believes this is inevitable. The United States Generals cannot say so publicly but privately they agree that a revived Germany army of some sort must be put into the field against Soviet Russia; and that our armed forces are in Germany to protect the West against the East.

A leading newspaper says in an editorial: "We cannot question the necessity for adequate security measures, if we cannot protect our country against military aggression, then we may not long have any civil or economic rights to worry about. Disarmament is no solution; in a community of lambs, the wolf will rule."

Bernard M. Baruch called for a military establishment able to strike "immediately", insure prompt retaliation and deter aggression and, also, to deal with possible civil war abroad. Secondly, a mobilization plan which will act swiftly with all our resources, men, money and material in case we or our allies are attacked. Third, organization of spies to provide information. Fourth, a general staff to formulate global strategy."

There is a less definite but very general charge that the Russians are liars, murderers, and conspirators whose every word and act are suspect. At the center of all Red-baiting today stands the charge that all Communism and all Communists are agents of a foreign power; so in 1928, it was said that Alfred E. Smith could not be President because he would be subservient to a foreign power; and finally, it is said that the Soviet Union is not democratic but totalitarian without real elections or any popular government. Such would seem to be the overwhelming opinion of leaders of American public opinion today.

But there are opposing views. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, said at the hearings on the Atlantic Pact: "During the past four years we have appropriated more than \$50,000,000,000 for their use to build up a stock pile of atom bombs, maintain an air force to deliver the bombs in large

quantity anywhere on the globe, maintain the largest military force of manpower in our peacetime history, finance peacetime military conscription in this country, and build military bases all over the world. No military machine is worth a nickel without an enemy, and the avowed enemy of our military leaders is communism and the spread of the Russian orbit. We contend that despite the almost unlimited resources at their disposal, our military leaders have failed to achieve their avowed purpose, and for two basic reasons:

1. Communism, like democracy or Christianity, is an ideology against which no military machine or threat of force can be successfully pitted.
2. Economic poverty breeds communism, and by voting UNRRA out of existence, and by diverting our resources to enormous military preparations, including this even more conscienceless step of paying for the machines of mass murder for whole sections of war-gutted Europe, we are indirectly responsible for the very conditions in which communism is flourishing in the war-ravaged nations of the world...

This is a wicked proposal, born of greed and self interest which will largely accrue to the conscienceless benefit of a handful of both American and European business interests. In the long run such temporary benefits will work to the advantage of such have-not regimes as Russia, China, and other Iron Curtain and similar backward countries of the world and give further strength to the contention of our military leaders – that we should further tax our own economic and social resources for ever-increasing militarism."

When the President ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to make hydrogen bombs, Congress and the public praised the decision, but twelve leading atomic scientists said that few of the men who publicly urged the President to make this decision can realize its full import. No nation has the right to such a bomb no matter how righteous its cause. The bomb is no longer a weapon of war but a means of extermination of whole populations. Its use would be a betrayal of all standards of morality and of Christian civilization itself.

Russia's record on atomic armaments is morally stronger than America's. Russia has dropped no bomb, she has amassed no huge stockpile of bombs, she has not threatened other nations with the bomb, or used it in a form of pressure. Instead Soviet leaders have insisted that they will not use the bomb as a weapon of attack; and that they will build only enough bombs to

protect their own nation.

The result of the fight which the United States is making against socialism and communism in defense of American business methods, is shown by the astonishing fact that this policy has forced us into alliance with nearly every reactionary nation and movement on earth; even when this policy is against our wish and past traditions. We are upholding decadent and corrupt monarchy in Greece; land monopoly in Italy; we are helping fascist Turkey equip an army; we have welcomed the reactionary Shah of Iran; our trade is the chief support of Rhodesia and the Belgian Congo; we favor and help arm Pakistan over India; we have poured treasure and military aid into Nationalist China; and are now in military alliance with the puppet Bao Dai in French Indo-China; and have raised no finger to aid the peasants of Madagascar. We have defended the landlords of southern Korea and the present inept regime in the Philippines; we gave the Dutch more help in Indonesia than we gave the native government; in the West Indies, we have given more help to the dictator of the Dominican Republic than to Haiti; we have given Mexico little support, and more to the Argentine, and to Chile, and to other reactionary regimes in South America. Wherever in the world there is poverty, hunger, and distress fighting against vested interests and land monopoly, there is the United States, in nearly every case, aiding and abetting the oppressor.

This is not the real intention of America; it is not in accord with the genius of our institutions; it is the fatal paradox into which Big Business and industrial monopoly in this nation has landed us, camouflaged as a fight against World Evil.

So here we stand. The obvious next step for thinking people is Light, More light. We must know the facts. What is Russia today and what are her plans? This reduces itself to answers to these questions:

1. How much personal freedom is there in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?
2. Is the Soviet Union giving its people real education?
3. Even if we grant that Russia has a successful system of popular education, is there any democracy in the Soviet government with popular election to office? Does not the one-party system show that this cannot be true?
4. Has the Soviet Union been able to carry on a planned socialist economy for Russia with State Control?
5. Is the Soviet Union a slave state?
6. Does the Soviet Union suppress religion?
7. Does the Soviet Union today represent an aggressive and

expanding imperialism?

8. Is it true that the Soviet Union has driven out race prejudice?
9. How far does the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics restrict Art and Literature?
10. How free is Science in the Soviet Union?

Whether or not Russian Communism is a success is beside the point; the point is, are the ideals of human uplift as conceived by Karl Marx and Nicholai Lenin ideals which ought to be realized? If so, how can they best be realized? Even if Communism as tried in Russia had completely failed, it was a splendid effort, a magnificent vision. Moreover, if it has failed, and in so far as it has not reached complete success, the reason is crystal clear: it is the long and contemptible effort of the civilized world to prevent its success by every possible means of slander, sabotage, and war.

Ruling classes have always used the tactics of smearing against those who threaten their status. They accuse the group of all manner of infamies and crime and treat as criminals all who can be directly or indirectly associated with it. This tactic was widely used against the Christians under the Roman Empire. Nero, it is said, was induced to denounce Christians as the authors of the burning of Rome "to perpetuate the popular feeling, for none others were so detested for their strange and mischievous superstitions or so generally held guilty of the most abominable crimes, of the crime, indeed of hatred toward the whole human race." The same tactics were used against the French and American revolutions.

It will be the aim of the next chapter on Russia to answer these ten crucial questions.

CHAPTER VII

THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, 1950

To me, sitting in my office, in 1949, came the Councillor of the Soviet Embassy and said: "We hold a Peace Congress in Moscow, August 25; we are inviting you and a half dozen other Americans to attend." I did not hesitate. I had just returned from the Paris World Peace Congress in May, but this chance to make a third visit to the Soviets seemed the opportunity of a lifetime. I left New York at noon, August 20, had breakfast in Scotland, slept in Stockholm and next night, Monday the 22nd, landed in Moscow, feeling slightly like something out of the Arabian Nights.

During 1949, I attended three Peace Congresses and strongly desired to attend the fourth in Mexico. The Congress in New York was large and influential. It tried to arouse America against war. It was notable for the studied misrepresentation of its aims by the Federal Government and the press. The Paris World Congress was the greatest of modern times and rallied the world for a peace offensive.

The Moscow Congress was different; not so large as the others and more national than international, it was designed to bring the attention of the Soviet Union and its allies, to the fact that it is not enough not to want war; it must be clear to all that the threat of war must be actively opposed.

For this purpose all Russia sent 1000 delegates to Moscow, August, 25 to 27, 1949, and they were joined by delegations from some 14 foreign lands. Most of these were friendly neighbors, like Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania; from the borderland; from Austria and East and West Germany; but none from Yugoslavia. From the western lands, came eight from Britain including the Dean of Canterbury and Professor Bernal; from France came four with La Fitte the Secretary of the World Peace Congress and D'Arbussier the African; from Italy came Nenni and seven others; from the United States, only myself, although several others had been especially invited.

The first session of the All Union Conference of the Partisans of Peace took place Thursday, August 25, at 5 p.m. in the Hall of Columns of The Trade Union Headquarters. It had a beautiful setting; a lofty white hall, flanked by 28 white corinthian columns of marble, with crimson curtains and 54 brilliant chandeliers; a huge bank of flowers on the rostrum under pictures of Lenin and Stalin. On the presidium were Fadeev, Shostakovich, the Dean of Canterbury, Arenburg and a host of Soviet officials, like the head of The Trade Unions, the head of the International Women's Organization, the head of the Collective Farms of the Ukraine, and a high official from

Rumania.

The audience had representatives from every province of Russia and all classes, from miners and peasants to professors and professional men. It was no gathering of ragtag, but of intelligent, well-dressed men and women. After preliminaries of electing committees, etc, the speaking began. There were seven speakers, the first day, lasting until 10:30 at night. All the speakers were Russian save two, a Rumanian and a Britisher. Most of the speakers were hortatory lauding the Soviets, scorning capitalism and blaming Britain and America for warmongering. They spared no accusations nor epithets.

The center of the theme was Russia and before us the Soviet Republics were ranged in microcosm; every corner was represented from White Russia to the Ukraine; the far-off Uzbeks, the Turkomen, Kirghis, and Tashkent; north were the Karelians, neighbors of the Finns; and all the cities, Leningrad, Kiev, Gorki, Odessa and others. There were notables in the audience and on the platform: Gerhardt Eisler from Berlin; Wayland Rodd, an American Negro artist now resident in Russia; leading women from Poland, Britain, Italy and Czechoslovakia.

That crowd was a sight to make one bend forward and stare. There was nothing bizarre or especially strange about it. These were ordinary human folk, dressed up but not conspicuously; quiet but enthusiastic. One would rate them as middle class, with artisans, miners, peasants, workers, intellectuals and professional men; and a large proportion of well dressed, but not over dressed women. There was no display of wealth — I saw one white fur jacket and many earrings. There was no poverty. It was a literate throng, which had read considerably and now bought many books in the anterooms. All listened with an absorbed intentness which put me to shame.

Three days, in double sessions of five or more hours each, we sat and heard talks. There was no let-up, no entertainment and only one or two, ten minute rest intervals during each day. Ear phones helped us foreigners, but watching the faces wars was more revealing. This was no crowd of cringing slaves nor fearful followers of command. Here were eager and sincere workers and inquirers. They had deep convictions and wanted more information.

It is naturally hard to indicate the lines of talk, so much was said in 22 hours. All was in open session; there were no panels. The seats for the audience and presidium were never bare and usually full.

There were learned talks from heads of academies, scientists, leaders of Collective farms, labor unions and local leaders. Most of the talks were hortatory and inspirational but not effusive nor loudly oratorical. They emphasized the theme that

"Anglo-American Imperialism" was intent on fomenting war. Britain and the United States came in for most blame; France was less often mentioned; Holland now and then, and Belgium never. Faith in socialism and the Soviets were dominant themes and Stalin's name always was cheered to the echo. They spared no phrases nor innuendos in attacking the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact.

In addition to this and among these periods, much information and indications of attitude came. A leader of Ukrainian Collective farms said that the Ukraine had lost 45 million rubles of property and nearly all their stock during the last war, but now was recovered in part and was making an annual profit of two million rubles. He said they wanted neither war nor conquest; only peace to work out their plans. A Rumanian gave a picture of recovery and told of the emancipation of his country by the help and example of Russia. He told of farmers and city folk working together; of scientists and artists; and pled for peace that this work might go on.

A peasant from Uzbek thanked the Soviets for rescuing his land from slavery: in nine years, schools had increased 60 fold and in the country districts 300 fold. He noted the decline of superstition. Science and drama had been encouraged. Georgia (absit omen!) reported the integration of workers, intellectuals and artists. They now had electric trams, schools and an academy of science.

Albania reported schools, factories and railroads, "thanks to the Soviets." An Austrian woman said: "Thousands of Austrians want peace and friendship with the Soviets". The largest cultural organization in Austria is the one for Soviet Friendship. The Karelian reported reaction and propaganda from Finland to promote war. Western Germany demanded unity and independence for Germany and declared that capitalism failed in social aims.

In Tadjik peasants used to be beaten for non-payment of taxes. Now collective farms concentrate on cotton and they have just erected a palace of Culture costing five million rubles. The people are far better off than neighboring India and Afghanistan.

In Latvia, 70 per cent of the investment before the last war was foreign. The terrible condition of Turkomenia before the revolution was pictured by a dark broad-faced Oriental, as contrasted with the progress now. Khirgis reported: "We have recovered our pre-war status in Agriculture." D'Arbussier spoke of Africa and the French colonies and was enthusiastically applauded.

The schools in Moldavia were increasing and as one woman said: "We workers strive to make all things which meet the vital needs

of men." Others declared: "women have become a great and creative force in the Soviets." Russian women told how they had done men's work during the war; how they had fought beside the soldiers and lost husbands, sweethearts, and sons. They appealed to the women of the world to stop war.

All this report of progress was bound up with reference to the hurt and uselessness of war. This rank and file of Russians asked only peace and time to bind the wounds and push forward to a social progress in which they expressed boundless faith. They did not want, they could not believe in war. As a Polish woman of amazonian proportions declared, leaning over the rostrum with tears in her eyes, "Every drop of blood in my heart shouts: "Never again War." When later I saw Warsaw, I knew what she meant.

There were bitter references to the last war; a Hungarian reported that his land had lost more men in the last war than the United States and England combined.

Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, pointed out that Russia had never started a war but had been the continuous victim. He told of the growing British Peace Movement and referred to his successful lecture tour in the United States, where audiences ranging from two to five thousand crowded to hear him. He did not probably realize that news of this was apparently not handled by the Associated Press and reached few of the citizens of this country. His Christmas broadcast done in California by special request was given no wide hook-up. He said Japan was not conquered by the Atom bomb, so much as by fear of Russia.

Continually the delegates said, "We are against war; we want no war;" but added: "We are not afraid!" Both La Fitte and Hewlett Johnson said "Hail to the Conquerors of Stalingrad." One realized what that great victory had meant to Britain and France.

There was little official entertainment. The foreign delegates viewed the Kremlin on Monday. We were told that an American Senator on seeing the extravagance of Czarist wealth and power, remarked: "No wonder they had a revolution!" We were all invited to a Goethe celebration where the influence of the French Revolution on him was stressed and the need for Russian and German friendship despite the last war.

The audience was not there for entertainment but to hear a very long discourse on the poet and one short one from a German woman. She stressed the influence of the French Revolution on Goethe and asked for friendship between Germany and Russia, despite what Russia had suffered from Germany. A concert of Russian, German and French classical music followed for an hour. I sat in a box with a Chinese lady and other foreigners; we were plentifully photographed.

The closing reception was most enjoyable. The restaurant was vast, with three or more great halls. The occasion informal but crowded; the food was abundant and good; most stood and ate but special guests were seated and waited upon. We had wines and champagne, caviar and watermelon; sprightly conversation and toasts, even with translation; I saw D'Arbussier having a jolly time. My interpreter danced with the leading ballerina. I stayed from 9:30 to 11:30 p.m.

I spent ten days in Moscow and sensed the substance and reality of what we call the Soviet Republics beginning to take definite form. I do not yet know this land in any scientific sense of the word. But in the three visits in 23 years I have a sort of spectroscopic roundness of conception and sense of time which replaces figures. First as to my impression of the city which has today perhaps seven million people living in an area of 2715 square miles.

Today I had a long ride on the Moscow subway, six or eight stations and one transfer. It is the most beautiful in the world: the stations are very large and decorated in variegated marbles; each station with a different pattern so one can tell his station by the appearance without reading the name. Trains are frequent, running smoothly and with seats cushioned and upholstered in real leather. Last New Year, six new stations were opened, adding five miles to the system and forming the first section of the ring which will encircle the city. These "Palaces of the People" began with the Kursk station with red Georgian marble walls, huge columns of gray marble and mural paintings. Most of the stations have neon lights in special glass torchieres, telephone booths and rapid movement escalators. There is some crowding, standing and pushing in loading and unloading, probably bad at rush hour. There are no expresses and no advertisements!

Strangers who have heard about this subway but have not seen it, must be a bit skeptical; because after all it is not merely a means of transportation. It is a great accomplishment which the people gave to themselves; working folk gave voluntary labor and put into it all the skill of which they were capable. They have time to give this labor because their hours of work leaves them leisure. The result is a thing of sheer beauty, spaciousness with big curved domes and gracious pillars, with difference and individuality in decoration; with the evident idea of making something which will not only serve but please, and which will be a monument to the accomplishment of a free labor state.

I am on Gorki Street, at the corner of the vast Manezhnaya Square. The Red Square is not more than a block away, with the Kremlin and the twirled towers of old St. Basil and the dark red

bulk of Lenin's tomb where he lies life-like forever. Opposite is a new, tall office building and katercornered the new Hotel Moscow. The street below me is one of the broadest in the world. Gorki street which in 1926 was a conventional narrow busy street is now about 140 feet wide with side walks 20 feet wide at either side. There is an unused space of 25 feet along the center, with no traffic where the traffic officers pace. The width of the street and the auto traffic which is considerable but of course not nearly that of New York or London, makes crossing difficult; one cannot make it on the green light and must usually stop in the middle. Right turns on red are allowed, but no left turns.

This boulevard runs from the vast Square a distance of ten or more miles. Another boulevard crosses it at the Square and there are a half dozen such wide boulevards in various parts of the city. These streets are being planted with young trees and are paved with asphalt. Moscow has today probably the longest mileage of broad boulevards of any city in the world. Since the government owns all the land, city planning is easy and is hindered by no vast cost of vested legal rights. The whole edifice of real estate values is non-existent. Henry George must lie quiet and happy in his grave at this development. The rebuilding of Moscow has been rated and has its raw spots; behind the impressive new facades one sees here and there old and ugly Moscow; falling court-yards and stuffy dwellings; but the result of re-birth is impressive. Sometimes the new building material is not good, and in some cases the planning has run ahead of actual development; as when the first story of some new housing units, left for stores, are not so occupied but have families living behind the wide, curtained windows.

The folk are all clean, but with little jewelry or ornaments. Roughly I should describe a Moscow crowd as varying from the well-to-do to the poor with a preponderance of the comfortable. On the street one sees no idle rich, no elements of luxury and display and ostentation. It is a world of busy working people. There is no loitering nor loafing. Crowds go about their business briskly, stores are crowded, especially food stores but the crowd hurries. The integration of classes is noticeable. Every effort is evidently being made to make the artisan and handworker the social equal of the white collar worker, the professional man, the teacher, the civil servant. Tipping is rare. Incomes are not graded so as to exalt the scientist and professional man. The Deputy Chief of a Bureau who interpreted for me said his income was less than that of many artisans. But aside from income, the expense is less: my interpreter pays less than five per cent of his wage in taxes; his rent for a bachelor apartment, is about 30 rubles a month. His education through the

university was paid for by the State and he has no fear for old age, unemployment or sickness. He goes to the Caucasus for vacations — the Florida of Russia.

Is there left incentive for good, hard continuous work? There are rewards and medals for laborers and professional men and they are worn with pride; there is promotion with increased income and public honor.

The people look healthy; they are not handsome but sturdy and well built; the women are not pretty, but well-made and upstanding. All are frank and cordial. They push in crowds, but are inherently courteous — twice in one long ride in the subway, young women gave me a seat, to my ill-concealed astonishment. As I noticed in 1926, crowds filled the museums and art galleries. The crowd before some of the best pictures made viewing them difficult.

There is much less drinking of alcohol and decreased smoking, compared with 1926. Hoodlums and impudent children are not in evidence. Cinemas and concerts are well-attended. I saw no evidence of dives, gambling and nightclubs, but I could not make enough investigation of this aspect of life to be sure. There was no evidence on the streets of prostitution.

A colored woman from New York visited Moscow last December; she said that the stores were crowded. Luxuries were high priced, but necessities were reasonable; beautiful apartment houses were going up with low rents; the people were sensibly and comfortably dressed; "you don't see Moscow kids loitering on the streets; school and studies, libraries and social games keep them occupied." The theatres are crowded and clean; and finally: "no," she said, "I was impressed by the equal treatment, the respect shown to people of different nationalities. Never for a minute was I made to feel by anyone, by look or action, that I wasn't their equal." And she added, "I wasn't excluded from a single place in Moscow either."

Russia before the revolution was a priest-ridden land. Moscow was dotted with the domes of churches, looking like a sea with islands of gold as late as 1926; shrines to collect copecks and forgive sin were common; and superstition covered the land like a blight. The Soviet State seized this sickness with a firm and ruthless hand. Today I have not seen a church in Moscow. Of course, there are some, but a comparative few. The average Moscowite is as unmoved by religion as the average New Yorker or Londoner. Probably the church is still influential among peasants but nothing like before. Lenin's word is still on his museum, formerly the city hall; "Religion is the opium of the people;" but no one notes it. It is dusty and lost. My interpreter, a young man of 28, has never heard of it. Within the Kremlin, like museum pieces, gleam the dome of churches and

cathedrals; St. Basil twists without the main gate. Crowds still visit Lenin's tomb.

Americans and Western Europeans are unused to the deference and almost worship rendered Stalin: his picture appears everywhere, his statue in marble and bronze; and his name provokes great applause. It must be remembered that the reasons for this are partly cultural and partly personal. To illustrate the cultural element: I noticed with interest that when the speakers at the Congress were applauded, they themselves also clapped vigorously. This is a Russian way of thanking the audience for its appreciation. It certainly gives the victim of prolonged applause something to do beside looking silly; but it strikes a Westerner as decidedly odd.

In some similar way, the Russians for generations have paid high tribute to their rulers; the "little White Czar" was almost God and provoked not simply applause but obedience and open devotion. Today Russians cannot give less tribute to the leaders raised to power by the people; they even exaggerate their loyalty in this way; it is a tribute different in degree but not in kind to the British "God save the King." Then too, this present ruler of Russia is a fellow citizen, they like to call him, not Marshal, nor Chief Executive, but "Comrade." Beyond this is the fact that Joseph Stalin is a great man who has done a hard and successful job. He has steered the nation since Lenin's premature death, putting down treason, driving out invaders, formulating economic plans and finally defending his country in the greatest war of the age; he has made the world bow before the might of Russia and yield respect to her as never before in history. He has made peace possible between Socialist Russia and the Western World. As a man and statesman he deserves the high respect of his country and of the world.

On my last nights in Moscow, I saw Offenbach's "Fair Helen" a comedy based on the Paris and Helen story. It was well-acted in a garden theatre. The next night, I went to the golden Bolshoi theater with its six great balconies and crimson trimmings. I saw "Swan Lake," a ballet by Tchaikowsky beautifully danced, with bewitching music and costuming, and lovely scenery. I noted the beautiful movements of the dancers with marked absence of mechanical precision. It was the most delicately wrought ballet I have ever seen, by the best set of performers in the World. The mechanical puppets of Radio City are ghastly compared with the Bolshoi.

The chance to rebuild and improve cities is notable. Henry George, a half century ago, demanded what Russia now practices: confiscation of all unearned increment from land. Take "real estate"; the "Earth is the Lord's" but the real estate owner and the speculator in New York and London has taken charge; he uses

a piece of land as if he had made it. When persons needing this land, crowd in upon it and give it increased value, this social value goes to the owner, until in a city like New York most of the counted "Wealth" is this legal ownership of the soil by a few persons. There can be but limited city planning – the costs are too fantastic. London, planned centuries since and still struggling with its cowpaths, may be bombed out of recognition; but no real replanning can ensue, because of the feudal exactions of the "owners" of London soil. The Soviets simply recognize no such titles, and no such wealth. They rebuilt Moscow and pay no tribute to private landowners.

The Collective Farm is a tremendous invention and may revolutionize the modern world. It brings the machine age to agriculture; it raises the farmer to economic equality with the trader and consumer. It enables modern conveniences: schools, electricity, automobiles, and theaters to penetrate the country districts and raises them from neglected, exploited slums to abodes of civilized folk. In America, the collective farm is a rich monopoly with impoverished tenant farmers, who must often be supported by the state. The profits go to the owners and they collect, also, federal aid. The representatives of the Soviet collective farms were among the most convincing and realistic delegates to the Peace Congress.

As I look back upon those ten days in Russia, seeing glimpses of the countryside with harvested fields, and the huddled villages; with passing glimpses of great cities like Leningrad and Moscow and lesser cities; I seem to have brought away with me a feeling of the confidence and serenity of this land. There is a calmness today that contrasts with the excitement and even apprehension of other years.

Here is a land which has found itself and believes in its destiny. It is no longer performing for a world audience and asking anxiously for approval. It is looking inward upon itself and what it sees seems good. There is no evidence of fear or cringing and, on the other hand, no boasting. There are bookstores, daily papers, parks are everywhere being built, and widened. These are a contented folk.

It was fitting that on the way from the Soviet Union, I should catch a brief glimpse of other lands behind the curtain which has been called "Iron." I saw Prague, which I remember as a student in the late nineteenth century. There was still the great hill and castle and the bronze statues; but there was also a bigger accomplishment in the midst of difficult problems which made the city not perhaps as beautiful, or with the same sort of memories of religious wars, that I caught in other years; but with a sense of hope and accomplishment and organization. But most startling was my sight of Warsaw and of other parts of

Poland. I visited Poland once as the guest of Stanislaus Von Estreicher, when his father was librarian of the University of Cracow. I remember him saying to me, "You do not know what the race problem is; you should know what has happened to Poland under the Germans."

I saw Warsaw in 1936; but at midnight, with but shadows and a confused sense of a great city. I see it again on the clear, sunny morning of September 3, 1949; I look down on its ruins. I come to the airport and am met by two officials of the Cultus ministry and the Peace society, whose guest I am. Their English is labored and their French is little better; but we are delighted in finding a common language in German. I am driven to a hotel, the Bristol. It has been but partially damaged, although in need of repairs. My room with bath has a vast window facing the city, but to my distress there are no curtains for it, making the room a flood of light; frantic phoning in French brings a change to a nice fourth floor room, looking on a large court.

Today, Sunday the fourth of September, we rode over the city. No African barbarian, having heard of civilization in Europe and the perfect religion of Christianity could believe that civilized men could do to a city of 1,000,000 folk what Germany did to Warsaw; the tale seems unbelievable; the fiends poured bombs from the air on everything; they trained their artillery and machine guns on wall, tower, and street; finally, the soldiers lugged cans of gasoline from house to house and put all that stood to flame.

I saw the Ghetto where the desperate Jews broke out into last revolt. It was literally reduced to ashes. Around it now apartment houses begin to rise and in its center stands the gray statue done by an American Jewish sculptor, a monument to a struggling group of those who died.

Much of the city was reduced to rubble; but everywhere stood sightless, empty houses and buildings, destroyed churches and monuments; and over all memories of the scream of the dying and silence of the dead. Today, amid the remains of this incredible ruthlessness, rises the new city; flowers in beds and windows; trees and grass in parks, cleaned brick in pile after pile; and new buildings rising everywhere; every bridge over the Vistula was destroyed and is rebuilt; every museum was raped of its art treasures and only the smaller part have been found and returned.

This is a city where a man can weep and cry for sheer joy in the possibilities of the human soul. The landlords who raped Poland for centuries are today on the run; some are in America, preaching war! The land has been divided among the peasants, perhaps the most oppressed peasants of all Europe, except those

of Russia at the time of the czars. I remember back in 1893, in another part of Poland, seeing them groveling like animals on their knees in a Catholic Church. Their emancipation has begun; already there are cooperative farms.

At dinner I joined a labor leader and Professor Lange, once Polish Ambassador in America and member of the Security Council of the United Nations. Lange has taught at the Universities of California, Michigan, and Chicago. He has spoken at Howard and taught John Hope II. He told me of Polish land: in 1943, Poland dispossessed all landholders with more than fifty hectares (those with 100 in the Western section) without compensation, but pensions for themselves and wives. The fifty hectares must be selected outside their former holdings. Most of the aristocrats moved to England and America. The middle class became kulak leaders in their districts - Michiolaczyck was one and the right reaction gathered about him. Then voluntary cooperative farming began, perhaps one per cent. Next, collective farming as in Russia will be introduced, as machinery and fertilizer become available, under the Six Year Industrialization program. Now peasants are taken on excursions to view Russian collectives.

Last night, my young guide, his little wife, and a Czechoslovakian friend, went to a folk theater; it was based on folk ways, with authentic costumes, songs, and dances; there was the courting, the request for the bride, the engagement and the wedding; it was interesting, simple and well done. Today, we went to the bank and went through endless ceremony and signatures to get dollars changed into zloties at the rate of 400 to one. Then to a museum with a good Egyptian selection. The Germans caroused here and stole all the art; only a part of it has been recovered. We walked through a street which was rebuilding. It had been literally swept out of existence but now is being reconstructed from photographs.

When I said to a young friend of mine, "I have just returned from Russia," she said, "Did they handcuff you?" She was not joking entirely; she was expressing facetiously the idea rife in America that Russia is a "slave state" in contrast to free America. Others bewail the absence of Democracy, the suppression of religion, and the general poverty and misery of the people.

Let me, therefore, consider consecutively certain questions which have arisen in American minds concerning the Soviet Union.

1. How much personal freedom is there in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics? There is not in Russia so much freedom of action, either in theory or practice as in the United States. Our theory of freedom is that a man should have the right to do anything he wishes to do, anytime, anywhere; in practice this is limited by the right of others to act; and always by general

considerations of peace and morality. But it is also distinctly limited today by the necessity of earning a living at the job which is open and under the conditions of work prevailing. The old freedom of throwing up jobs, changing homes, and trying different vocations at will is not gone but distinctly going. American life is limited by income, and income depends on the opportunity to work, which is also limited.

In the Soviets, the theory of freedom is discipline for the public good; and the public good is conceived of as involving work, production of goods, or the rendering of useful service. Morality is looked on as prohibiting profit from a wage contract involving another's labor; prohibiting neglect of children, and prohibiting idleness. The state guarantees a job with a living wage, but the choice of a job is limited. This leaves considerable difference between Russia and America in the conception of freedom, but not absolute difference.

For instance, loafing without means of support would lead to arrest in Russia; living on unearned private income would lead to heavy taxation and severe public disapproval. Poor work on the job or neglect would lead to reprimand and possible arrest. No one would be permitted to build an elaborate house, exceeding his needs or that of his family; and when the law says not to park a car or not to turn left, the law means what it says. With us, laws are disregarded, work is regarded as a private matter, and loafing the right of anyone who can manage to live that way.

The extreme of these theories are license in America and regimentation in the Soviets. Nevertheless, in the United States, we know there is too much license and lawlessness and we are fighting against this; and in the Soviet Union, the average man is not a slave but submits to discipline willingly because he sees its results in regular work, with no fear of old age, with his children in school and a vacation with pay every year. Certain kinds of undisciplined persons recoil at the picture of Russian discipline for the public good; certain Americans fear the license and anarchy of America.

2. Is the Soviet Union giving its people read education? If the planning for a nation's welfare is a matter of autocratic power from above, we have a totalitarian state, which in the end will be almost inevitably conducted for the benefit of an aristocracy or a plutocracy or a junta of capable but unmoral conspirators like the Nazis; this is the picture of the Soviets which has been painted in the United States. The facts in Russia do not support this thesis.

First of all, no oligarchy educates or tries to educate the people. No educated mass of people can long be kept in slavery, serfdom or poverty. This is the reason that the Southern part of the United States has always opposed the education of Negroes;

and why Great Britain today, even under a labor government does not give free education to the masses. On the other hand, Russia has today, without doubt, the best system of popular education in the world. Its preeminence in comparison with other lands is in part due to the collapse of education in Germany, the poverty of England and France, and the neglect of the United States. But absolutely, the effort at education in the Soviets is the most outstanding in human history.

The Constitution of the Soviet Union declares: "The right of every citizen of the U.S.S.R. to education." In 1941, there were 1,200,000 teachers; the war reduced these to 775,000, and 84,000 schools and libraries were destroyed. But in 1949, there were 1,225,000 teachers, compared with 900,000 in the United States and 34,000,000 children in primary and secondary schools, compared with 21,000,000 in our schools; there were 5,000,000 pupils in kindergarten and millions in nursery schools.

Before the war, the number of students attending higher schools in the Soviet Union exceeded that in any of twenty-two countries of Europe, including Britain, France, Germany and Italy. At present, there are over 800 higher institutions of learning in the Soviet Union, with an enrollment of 1,000,000 students. Moscow alone has more university and college students than any country in Europe. With each passing year the Soviet State allocates ever-increasing funds for cultural needs. Under the U.S.S.R. state budget for 1949, over 119,000,000 rubles were allocated for social-cultural measures. This is 12.9 per cent higher than the allocations of the previous year and fifteen times as much as the Czarist government ever assigned to the needs of education. In the U.S.S.R. budget and in those of the various republics, expenditures for culture and education constitute basic items. For instance in 1949, they come to 71 per cent of the budget of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic; 66 per cent of the budget of the Ukrainian Republic, and so on. Pre-revolutionary public libraries in Russia had only 640 books per 10,000 residents, while in 1938, there were 8,160 books for each 10,000 persons. The Government budget for education rose from 12,000,000 rubles in 1943 to 60,000,000,000 in 1950, or 26 per cent of the total budget. All schools have clubs for sports, arts, handicrafts and hobbies.

Adult education is carried on so as to provide for all, the equivalent of secondary education. The goal is eventually to make higher education universal. Technical education is carried on in twenty different types of institutes with 1,000 to 4,000 students each. There are widely distributed lecture courses and 94,000 workers clubs with "palaces of culture." Primary and secondary education for children are free and compulsory. By a series of examinations the road to higher education is open to

all, while tuition is charged, the amount is small and scholarships usual.

In Moscow University, the fee is 400 rubles a year; it is less in other schools. Actually, not many have to pay. Those who get excellent marks are exempt. Veterans and their children and orphans are exempt. For those who need it, a room can be secured in the dormitory with meals free of charge. In addition, everyone making "good progress" gets a stipend, beginning at 250 rubles a month; and this is increased for the better students.

Last January, 1949, I attended an "off the record" meeting addressed by the president of a leading American university. He told us, incidentally, that on his one trip to Moscow he was unable to get information about entrance examinations to Soviet universities; on return, he learned the Communist Party had forbidden all examinations!

In reply to his assertion, Jessica Smith said, "It is simply impossible that a higher education official could have said that there were not examinations — unless he was referring simply to the fact that those students who graduate from high schools with excellent marks and receive excellent marks in their final exams are admitted to higher educational institutions without further examinations, which is the case in this country for students receiving high average."

The early days of the Soviet Republic were a period of extensive experimentation in education. They used widely what has been known in the United States as "progressive education," the complex, or project system without regular classes; and in those days marks and examinations were abolished. The pupils were given an extraordinary amount of initiative, but the teachers had little authority.

When experience showed that these methods did not work; that while they resulted in a creative initiative, the basic formal tools of learning that all human beings require were sadly lacking, a change was made. While the best features of the former methods were retained (as for instance combining practical with theoretical work, linking up education closely with life itself, independent research, and so on), regular, formal classes were reestablished, and marks and examinations introduced again. This happened by a special Government decree back in 1932, and the system of marks and examinations has been continued to this day.

3. Even if we grant that Russia has a successful system of popular education, is there any democracy in Soviet Government with popular election to office? Does not the one-party system show that this cannot be true? It is a mistake to think democracy has been throttled in the Soviet Republics. The Soviet is the cell of democracy just as the town meeting was the

nucleus of New England democracy. The people come together to talk, propose, argue, and to decide; to elect a delegate to a higher Soviet which in turn elects to one still higher and so on to the Supreme Soviet. Here is pure and effective democracy, such as has almost disappeared from the United States.

Then comes a difference. At the top of authority, conformity is imposed; but it has two guides: the overall plan of a socialist state as laid down by Lenin and developed by Stalin and others, and confirmed by the party councils; and in addition to this, the wish and will of the people are known from the free discussion of the Soviets.

Only in crisis is this will ignored, as in the case of the peasants and their farms. Like all peasants the Russian mujik was ignorant, superstitiously religious, custom-bound, rooted to his little farm-strip and his home. He wanted no collectivism, no cooperation, no compulsion as to crops and methods. I remember the peasant cabman pointing out a tractor to me in 1926, in the suburbs of Moscow: "They want to introduce contraptions like that," he said, "they'll never do it." Peasant public opinion, especially that of the richer and most influential peasants never would have done it, but power from the top down compelled them and thus introduced the Collective farm, the greatest step forward in agriculture for a thousand years.

What would happen if the Supreme Soviet was wrong and made unwise or fatal decisions? That is a grave question and unanswerable; but after all, what happens if Congress or Parliament go wrong? Democratic public opinion armed with the mass of knowledge of the people change this in time. I see no reason why this the socialistic state succeeds. It would, of course, be a longer process than with us or in England, at least in theory; since it would involve change in the fundamentals of Russian socialism as now defined. But that socialism has changed and grown since 1917. Doubtless, it will continue to change, albeit slowly, and, indeed, fundamental changes in "free enterprise" have not occurred overnight.

There is one puzzling phenomenon to those used to the British party system. We think there is something sacred and essentially democratic about two political parties. Russia thinks that in a socialistic state there is but one party; decisions are made before voting for officials; in the vote for officials persons are chosen to carry out decisions, not to make them. Therefore, one party and one ticket is logical. We may disagree with this, but it has logic. And the American election of 1948 shows how little effect the election may have on decisions.

The Soviet Union insists that outside the question of division of income between classes there are no problems which naturally

divide peoples into parties. There used to be; there still are in backward lands. But in modern nations it is not a question of party difference as to whether man should eat or wear clothes or have homes. The details as to how this shall be accomplished or how quickly or in what quantity, must be thought out and debated; and the character of the engineers and managers must be continuously inquired into. But above and beyond details, there is but one opinion, one party – to get these things done. Consider the party differences between Republicans and Democrats; Laborites and Conservatives; Socialists and MRP? They cannot even be stated, much less put in action, outside the question as to who is to control the national income. The Soviets insist that since this basic question has been settled in Russia there is and need be at present but one party.

With all of our talk about democracy, there is not today a single nation in the world, which attempts to practice democratic government without modifications and restraints. In the United States, our election of the president, appointment of judges, representation in the Senate and inequality of electoral districts show the legal restraints on democracy; while extra-legally but by common consent are the disfranchisement of Negroes and the poor, the use of money in elections, and the well-paid lobbyists of Big Business in our legislatures, not to mention the press and periodical monopoly. It is with the greatest difficulty that the American electorate gets a chance to express its mind or receive the truth upon which to make up its mind; or secure sanctions by which it may make its legislators carry out the popular will.

In both Great Britain and France, and in pre-war Germany and Italy, and certainly in the United States, the will of the people has long been thwarted by wealth, privilege, and ignorance.

Elections in themselves are not proof of democracy. Elections in most of South America, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East are farces or pretenses because of the methods and the number legally or illegally disfranchised. In the Union of South Africa and the Rhodesias, the minority composed of whites who have the right to vote, impose its will on all. In India, illiteracy and poverty make popular elections a very imperfect expression of the public will. In Poland and the Balkan states, before the war, the landholders controlled the voters. The voting in Italy today expresses the power of property and of the Church. Even in typical democracies, like the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and Scandinavia, an election expresses, the will of those who are in social control of the nation, by privilege, by monopoly, or by economic ownership.

No real democratic decisions can be made unless the electorate

is intelligent and free to decide questions without fear of loss of income or status. There is no pretense of democracy in Georgia or Mississippi; in Spain nor Bolivia. In most states of the United States, wealth and industry have overwhelming influence in the elections; while in Britain, Canada, and Scandinavia, where the popular will comes nearest full expression, it is greatly influenced by fear of poverty or lowering the standard of living. This makes "plebiscites" so unsatisfactory. They are nearly always rigged in favor of the holders of wealth or power cloaked in religion or prejudice.

Russia is not today a democracy, and elections are influenced by the Communist party. But the Russian people, of both sexes and all economic classes and all races and groups, take wider and more continued and more intelligent part in democratic processes than is the case in any other modern nation. In no country on earth, do over ninety per cent of the qualified voters go annually, to the polls to elect directly their highest law-making body. And that act is not the beginning of their democratic functions; it is the end of a long series of arguments, debates, decisions and elections which culminates in this final act.

What are the difficulties which every attempt at democracy faces? They are:

- A. Stupidity of the voters.
- B. Lack of time or interest for anything outside of earning a living.
- C. Local conditions and inability to change.
- D. Ignorance of national affairs.

Most politicians in a democracy take to demagoguery in despair, since the voters are too ignorant to understand issues or too uninformed to listen to discussion; so the candidate entertains them with jokes and platitudes and gets them jobs and graft. Moreover, people working ten hours a day and worrying about low wage and high costs, anxious about their children and their jobs, cannot be interested in politics. They are interested in bread and clothes and shelter. In the United States it takes a most strenuous campaign to bring half the voters to the polls, and even then the candidates on the ballot mean nothing to most voters and interest is centered on the candidates for president and not on representatives in the state legislatures, or on the city councils.

In the Soviet Union, on the contrary, political activity begins where it should - in the village, the farm and the city ward; it begins with matters of vital interest to the people, that is, work and wage and living conditions - matters not simply of interest, but of personal knowledge and experience. Everybody wants to talk about these matters; everyone attends

meetings twice or three times a week; they discuss the local industries; the water supply, the schools and the man or woman best fitted to represent their thought and decision in the county meetings. If the delegate selected does not act and vote as they wish, they promptly recall him and substitute another.

In most democracies, the powers of the localities, states and national governments are all limited by written constitutions or long custom; so that there are wide areas of "no-man's land" in government where nobody has any right of rule and matters adjust themselves by chance, or just "muddle along." This was in accord with eighteenth century ideas that the least government is the best; and where work, wealth and wage were designedly excluded from government control so as to leave more "freedom" for capital, privilege, and monopoly, none of which were subject to democratic control.

The Russian state seeks to change all of this. There is nothing which a village soviet cannot discuss and express opinion upon and take preliminary action on matters pertaining to local, provincial, or national life. If, however, the village takes any action which the province in which it is located decides is unwise or beyond the power of the locality, it can veto such action; and in turn the actions of provincial and state legislatures can be vetoed by the all-union legislature. But manifestly, if such power of veto were used often and arbitrarily, the local interest would soon die. On the contrary, the locality is listened to with care in Moscow. On the local matters its decisions have great weight and are interfered with only when they infringe on rights and needs of other or larger units. The local discussions and vote is an invaluable sounding board for public opinion and maladjustment. It is listened to. The veto is used but as rarely as possible. However, more than this is needed. The people must be kept informed. Their mistakes in decision are more often due to lack of understanding than to bad intent. They need knowledge and direction. They must be taught history, they must understand the aims of the State, and its ideals. Here is the function of the Communist Party.

This organization is not a political party, in the sense of the English Conservatives or Republicans. Such political divisions occur in Russia but they are the local splinter groups which the Western democracies regard as indications of political immaturity. On the contrary, the Russians realize that public opinion on human affairs seldom falls nicely into two or three distinct categories. In the European eighteenth century there might have been two clear-cut sides to the question as to whether or not the masses should vote. But in France of the twentieth century there are indeed six or seven, if not a dozen, clear differences of opinion as to public policy in general; and

in particular touching dozens of localities and social problems. It is this situation which Russia is trying to meet and guide to solution.

Just after the Revolution there was a time when two distinct national parties in Russia divided finally between Trotsky and Stalin. Stalin won; since then the one political question in Russia is the technique of carrying out socialism in a single state until full communism is possible. This is a matter of infinite trials and decisions; but not of national party division. It is always possible, especially with growing national intelligence and scientific advance, that large party differences will appear in the future. But this the leaders of Communism hope to forestall by social experiment, hypothesis, and research, so that Government will approach a Science and not be merely Opinion and Experiment.

The so-called Communist Party then is not a political party, but an over-all agency of adult education, carefully selected from the best elements of the Union, and regularly reorganized so as to represent the best in character and ideals. It is not a privileged aristocracy, cultured and pampered and confined to the great cities; but a section of all the workers and managers and thinkers distributed to every part of the Union; doing the labor and sharing the fare and receiving the wage of the masses; and yet, organized in a hierarchy to meet regularly and discuss from complete knowledge all aspects of the life of Russia. From such members, every locality of Russia gets information and guidance and usually at the desire of the localities and their insistence, rather than forced down from above. For here at their own factory or farm, is a fellow-worker who can and will teach and whom they trust.

One may say that this is ingenious propaganda. If it is, then the test is, does it work? Does the land prosper under this regime? Has a nation been organized and put to work? Has it been willing to give life and fortune to defend this land? The answer is, Yes, Perhaps the greatest tribute and proof of success of the Soviet Republic is the type of public servant that has emerged from the travail of founding a new government; for hard work and sacrifice, for clear vision and courage, the world must acknowledge the work of Lenin, Stalin, Molotov and Vishinsky, and of thousands of others less well known. How has this been accomplished? By a planned economy on a scale never before attempted on earth.

4. Has the Soviet Union been able to carry on a planned socialist economy for Russia with State control? The Soviet Union has taken no census since the war; but it is estimated that there are now 200,000,000 inhabitants of the sixteen constituent republics and thirty-three other territories,

occupying an area two and one-half times the size of the United States. There are more than sixty nationalities in the nation and in addition many smaller groups. The economy of the land is Socialist; that is, property belongs to the State, or to cooperative groups, or to individuals. To the State belongs the land and its resources; waters and forests; mines, factories, and railroads; post offices, telephones and telegraphs, banks and state farms, municipal enterprises and most city homes. Cooperative groups own jointly, farms with buildings, livestock and implements. Individuals have private use of farms which employ no outside labor; they own the income from their labor; their savings; their household furnishings and tools and utensils, and articles for personal use. All of these goods may be inherited and bequeathed.

The industry of the nation is directed by a state national plan, which locates the centers, the kind of enterprises, the amount and sort of goods produced, and the relation of industry to agriculture and cultural activities. The progress of this planning is checked as it progresses and full statistics are kept. The planning coordinates the smallest units into the overall plan.

The planning since 1928, has been forecast in five-year periods. The first and second Five Year Plans, 1928 to 1937, socialized all industry and over ninety per cent of the agriculture. Production was doubled and private enterprise reduced to less than six per cent of production. Illiteracy was almost eliminated and universal free and compulsory elementary education introduced. A third Five Year Plan, 1938 to 1942, was disrupted by the Second World War. Its object had been to increase the production of consumer goods so as to ease the strenuous lives of the people and thus progress from Socialism, which was based on the dictum "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work;" to Communism, which would declare "To each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

This goal had to be changed to defense in war against the greatest military machine of modern times. Consumer goods had to be held up to allow a 76 per cent increase in machines for military effort, and the nation plunged into the very depths of a life and death struggle for survival. Directly and indirectly, the Soviets lost 15,000,000 human beings; 32,000 industries with 4,000,000 workers were destroyed; including the gigantic power installations into which the nation had poured its labor, sacrifice, and pride. Mines, which yielded annually a 100,000,000 tons of coal were closed.

Over 600,000 square miles of territory with a population of 88,000,000 were occupied by the enemy armies at the height of

the German invasion. In this area the invaders demolished and burned, completely or partially, 1,710 towns, over 70,000 villages, 98,000 collective farms, over 6,000,000 buildings, 31,580 industrial enterprises, 40,000 hospitals and medical institutions, 84,000 schools, 48,000 public libraries, and 25,000,000 people were deprived of their homes. The devastated area included some of the richest and most highly developed industrial sections of the country, accounting for about one-third of the prewar industrial output.

Beginning in 1946, a year after the Peace, the Fourth Plan was inaugurated and is now in operation, hampered by the "Cold War," and the grim necessity of maintaining and defending the nation's integrity and especially guaranteeing her borders against infiltration; but even more, the task of maintaining against resurgent capitalism in America and Western Europe, the right of a socialist state to live and function.

It is a most difficult task, but there are signs of success. By the second quarter of 1949, industrial output had increased 41 per cent over 1941, the first war year; real wages since 1948 have been doubled, and the total expenditure on education and social services has greatly increased.

The average annual wage is now 6,000 rubles, and the average worker has a forty-eight-hour week, and an annual vacation with pay.

When one compares the standard of living in the U.S.S.R. with other countries, allowance must be made for social service, such as medical care, birth-expectancy vacations, and regular vacations; free education and payments made to students in higher schools and extra payments to large families. These items increase money wages by about 38 per cent.

To illustrate this, take the case of Praskovja Pavlovna Zaikina, who lives at 64 Trifonouskaya Street, Moscow. Praskovja started work in 1925 as a knitter at the Nogin Stocking Factory. Some years later she received three months leave with pay to learn how to overhaul machinery. Every year she received a vacation during which her wages were paid. She paid two-thirds of the cost of her vacation expenses; for instance, in 1947, she stayed at a Rest Home near Moscow; the cost was 400 rubles but she paid only 120 rubles. In 1948, while her children were at camp, she spent a month in a mountain sanitarium in the Caucasus. The cost was 1,000 rubles of which she paid 300. Meantime, she received her factory wages. One winter her daughter had grippe and measles; and later she herself was ill in bed. Medical care cost her nothing and she received her salary while ill.

After the death of her husband, a pension was arranged for the children. Her own earnings were 1,000 rubles a month and the

children's pension 200, making 1,200 rubles in all. For her apartment, two rooms and a kitchen, she pays 47 rubles a month. Her children attend school free. The girl is in the Second Grade, while the boy, fifteen years old, has completed seven years of education. He will enter a machine building high school next year and will receive wages while studying.

In summer, the children go to a Pioneer Camp. The expenses for the summer vacation, 800 rubles each, is paid by the factory trade union. The family had given them a lot for gardening also by the trade union. Here they can raise their own vegetables. Libraries are near where they can borrow books without charge and there are clubs and parks. "When the widow is too old to work she will receive a pension from the state.

By 1948, Soviet industry was about restored to its prewar level and volume, and a great increase is expected in 1950. Russia is today the second greatest industrial power in the world. She will soon be the first.

5. Is the Soviet Union a slave state? There have been lately, stories of increasing virulence, accusing the Soviet Union of forced labor, and declaring from 1,000,000 to 14,000,000 laborers are in concentration camps or otherwise forced to work as prisoners of the state. The Russian trade unions especially have been accused as state-controlled.

It is easy to see how in time of war and recovery, and in the case of a nation whose whole economy is under suspicion and attack, such accusations should arise. Labor in the Soviets is under stricter discipline than in Western lands and in return has greater protection and social insurance. There were in the Soviet Union labor drafts during the war; there were millions of war prisoners; there were the criminals. Of these, some were recalcitrants, like the evacuated kulaks, and some had committed conventional crimes. Before the last war, crime decreased markedly in the Soviet Union between 1922 and 1928. With the forced farm collectivization it increased between 1929 and 1933. Between 1933 and 1937 it decreased over fifty per cent.

The problem of the treatment of war prisoners was difficult and aroused bitter feelings. Ehrenburg said, "We will not asphyxiate people with gases or bury them alive, or cut off girls' breasts. We will not yield to the instinct of revenge. But we want to know that Smolensk, Warsaw, Rouen and Belgrade are rebuilt before the Germans are allowed to rebuild Lübeck or Cologne."

Without doubt, war prisoners in Russia had a hard time. But Russia, with her own criminals and recalcitrants, had a method and an aim. I saw it in her dealings with the "wild children" in 1926. Her method is not simply punishment, it is also reeducation by labor. It was hard labor, but not useless "made"

work. It is well known that the great Baltic-White Sea Canal was built by convict and kulak labor. It was bitter labor, but the prisoners were not cruelly treated. They had food and clothing; and some won public awards. Drafted labor in wartime is understandable and in the Soviets at the time it was done willingly. All of this would account for a large, but not unreasonable number of forced workers, decreasing as prisoners were sent home and as war emergencies disappeared.

There are other gruesome stories of forced labor in the Soviet Union which lack verification. Some are spread by professional enemies of communism who do not seem themselves to have had any chance to verify their charges. The Soviet Secret Police under Beria are said to be in official charge of a vast forced labor reservoir. There can be no proof of this unless the U.S.S.R. gives us figures or allows inspection, which is not likely under present conditions. It does not seem probable that Soviet economy is to any large degree dependent today on slaves.

In general and in normal labor relations, the task of Soviet workers does not seem hard. Of 30,000,000 Soviet workers, 28,000,000 are enrolled in trade unions. These unions are concerned with the workers' welfare; administer social insurance, recreation and health activities, and oversee safety and working conditions. They make agreements with managers on conditions of work which are subject to arbitration and frequent review. The dues are one per cent of wages yearly. In social services they fare better than Western workers: medical and dental care are free; there are 700,000 free hospital beds; workers are paid when ill and compensated for injuries; mothers have maternity care with pay; there is life, fire and theft insurance. Education is free and adult education is always available.

It is in the wage contract that the worker in the Soviet differs from other labor. In the Western world the wage contract is usually between worker and private employer, and the union is chiefly an organization to increase wages and better working conditions, by bringing pressure upon the employer through contract or strike. In the Soviet Union the employer is the State and the Trade Union Organization is an integral part of the state. An analogous situation is arising in Western lands where the union is composed of Civil servants, like police or post office employees. Legally they can strike, but they seldom do. If in addition, they had representation in, to influence legislation and management, they would approximate the Soviet trade union. The Soviet labor unions participate in all labor legislation, and the union labor codes are much broader than those in Western areas. The All-Union Central Council of Trades Unions is the staff headquarters, with departments covering

wages, organization, labor protection, safety, insurance, rest homes and sanitariums, hospitals, culture and education, physical culture, sports, publications, housing and living conditions; legal matters, international relations, and statistics. The unions may propose new laws. Strikes are legal but rare; because the object of industry is not private profit, leading to continual strife on the part of management to lower wages and on the part of labor to raise them. The object of both labor and management is to increase production and at the same time increase the living standards of workers. Workers then voluntarily speed up production and share in the sacrifice of wages which are geared to national welfare. Government and unions collaborate on wage scales. From eight to twelve categories of pay are set according to skill and a basic hourly rate for each grade. For instance, in one industry the base pay is eight rubles a day for unskilled work, rising to 28.5 rubles a day for the highest skilled work. This is the usual method; but much work is paid for on a piece-work system. Steel workers who earn from 7,200 a year from common labor to 30,000 annually for the most skilled, averaged in 1945, 10,800 rubles. The top managers get ten times as much; while in the United States they often get as much as one hundred times as much.

Most Russian workers regard their paid vacations as their best incentive, along with medical care, insurance and education. The Soviet effort to protect motherhood and care for children is without doubt the best in the world, with prenatal care, nursery schools, and kindergartens.

6. Does the Soviet Union suppress religion? The Soviet Union broke the power of the Russian Church, and taught atheism in school and by propaganda organizations. Moscow, which once was studded with the golden domes of churches, had in 1948, some thirty churches, while New York has 2,000. The younger educated people are atheists or agnostics; but there are 1,000,000 Catholics, 2,000,000 Protestants, 3,000,000 Jews, 500,000 Buddhists, besides 30,000,000 whose background is Moslem; and at least 100,000,000 from Russian Orthodox families. But this does not mean that many of these connected with the larger religions, are today orthodox communicants of their churches. There are in Russia today some 15,000 priests as compared with 70,000 before the Revolution. Russia represents today that emancipation from dogmatic religion which Western Europe has professed since the Protestant revolt, but which has been only partially realized; indeed, today Europe and America can praise the Soviet Union for establishing actual freedom of religious belief.

I know nothing today which does more harm to our ability to think logically and act rationally than our conventional lying about religious beliefs. Very few intelligent, educated adults

today believe in current religious dogma; they do not believe in God, unless one means by God some impersonal force like Gravitation; they do not believe in Prayer, unless prayer is interpreted as earnest wish; they do not believe that any priest is in such personal communication with the ruling forces of the universe as to receive miraculous knowledge of past or future.

Yet, for the object of guiding children and overawing the ignorant masses, we regularly and unashamedly and publicly declare our belief in a personal and benevolent ruler of the world, who on request may change the course of nature or adapt it for our benefit; and in a human organization which knows more about the past and present and future than science has learned. Yet, in the face of this reiterated declaration of belief, we talk and act with absolutely no reference to such assumed facts, causing amazement, bitter protest and mental confusion among the naive persons who assume we are telling the truth. I can see in my mind's eye that bemused and bewildered young priest in Vienna, who recently refused a bishopric in what seemed to him a world of lying or heresy. The picture of his innocent and bewildered face tells the story of disillusionment.

The Soviet Union is seeking to establish a nation of people who have the right to live and talk in accord with scientific truth so far as discovered. This attitude they teach their children and try to guide the state, their work, and all social activity along this line. They do not forbid, but they discourage citizens of their country from joining churches or adopting dogmatic creeds of "revealed" religion. It has been commonly assumed in civilized lands that this was already among the liberties of modern times, gained by the bloody Protestant Reformation; that the battle of freedom of religion had been fought and won, save in ignorant and backward countries.

As a lad, I was taught in American schools that the battle for freedom of belief was fought in Europe in the seventeenth century against the totalitarianism of the universal Catholic Church; that for thirty long years of total war Germany was devastated from end to end to establish the great principle of the right of man to think his own thoughts. It was drilled into me that the United States of America was founded as living example of a land free to worship God as it would, or not to worship if it would not. Yet I have lived to see honest men hailed before Congressional committees without rights of defense granted to criminals; brow-beaten by representatives of Mississippi disfranchisement and New Jersey theft and lying, and ordered to reveal their beliefs or go to jail, while the Supreme Court turned its silken backsides. There can be no doubt but that the body of great Americans who drafted the Constitutions deliberately left out of that document all reference to God,

Christ, or revealed religion, in deference to the atheists and free thinkers in that body and to confirm the principle that the right to believe or not believe in religion was fundamental to the law of the United States.

Yet today in the United States, the president of Columbia University can justify war on Russia, because "hundreds of millions behind the iron curtain are daily drilled in the slogan, 'There is no God and religion is an opiate'." Has a nation no right to do this?

It is not so much a matter of invective and crusade, as of explaining to honest folk, why it is that in lands which profess the most intimate relations with the Almighty, there is and has been the most cruel denial of basic human rights; as in Protestant countries like the Southern United States and the Union of South Africa; and in Catholic countries like Italy and Franco's Spain?

7. Does the Soviet Union today represent an aggressive and expanding imperialism? The charge of imperialist aggression on the part of Russia is undoubtedly at the basis of the "cold war" and the main expressed threat of a Third World War. It usually bases itself on:

- A. The annexation of the Baltic states
- B. The rise of Communist states in Poland and the Balkans
- C. The triumph of the Communists in China and the threat of Communism in eastern Asia.

The Baltic states of Esthonia, Latvia and Lithuania were integral parts of prewar Russia since the eighteenth century. They were made separate nations after the Revolution of 1917 for the express purpose of establishing a "cordon sanitaire" from which the West in time could overthrow the Soviets. For a decade these states and Poland were the source of repeated attacks on Russia and the lowest slander. It became, therefore, a matter of faith for the Soviet Union after World War II to demand the incorporation of these lands for essential self-defense. This was clearly understood by the West.

The Balkans have for centuries been the center of unrest and oppression, dominated by greedy landlords and privileged nobles, and gradually becoming the center of increased capitalist exploitation by investors from Western Europe and America. As the industrial and investing nations became bitter enemies of Russian socialism, it was a question as to whether the West or the Soviets should dominate these lands. Domination did not come by Russian conquest; but rather by Russian refusal to allow Western capital in union with landlords and native exploiters to take over countries, where the vast majority of the workers and peasants were striving for emancipation.

It is, of course, doubtful if the ignorant proletariat alone

could have planned freedom and industry, if left to the power and influence of Western Europe. But with the vast Russian armies in readiness to repel interference from the West, these lands started to plan socialist regimes. There can be no doubt but that all of them today show greater economic and social progress than ever before in their history. This was not Russian imperialism; it was the refusal of Russia to allow Western imperialism to take over these nations. It was the knowledge that force would be met by Russian armies from the East. Russia gave Revolutionary China education and training in leadership at the request of her great leader, Sun Yat-Sen. Later, under Chiang Kai-shek, Russian influence was driven out, and for many long years the West tried to seize China by every available means of armed force, deception, lying, stealing, and bribes. America wasted \$6,000,000,000 of her taxes on the poor to establish a scoundrel as master of 450,000,000 slaves for the white world. Who is the United States to talk of imperialism?

China, without the help of Soviet soldiers, beat back traitors and invaders and established the present republic, upon socialist principles. This was not an imperial conquest by the Soviet Union; it was the victory of the Chinese people despite arms and bribes from free America.

It is not then, that the Union of Soviets is imperialistic in design which has spread Communism in the world; but the impact of an idea and a way of life. It has met world-wide opposition. Russia has not attacked the world; the world of wealth and social and military power has attacked and plans still to attack Russia and to eliminate Communism, not by argument or example but by brute force. This was what Lenin and the early leaders of the Soviets feared; that is why they insisted at first that without worldwide socialism Communism in one land could never succeed. They may have been right. To this idea Trotsky adhered and made his attempted treason with Hitler. But Lenin was willing to try Russian Communism without the world; and Stalin eventually carried his policy to the present triumph.

This opposition slowed up the development of socialism by forcing its pace toward industrial organization and collective farms to heartbreaking speed; by involving Russia in two World Wars with endless fighting between cold and hot. Today, Russia has no plan of conquest. She does not have to. If the present spread of socialism is maintained, the world conquest will be moral and economic, not physical nor murderous. If the Soviets had succumbed to capitalism and welcomed Western investment; if with dividends and cartels, they had joined Great Britain, France, and the ambitious United States and added the rich Heartland and Balkans to the world areas of loot, where profits of 50 to 100 per cent could be expected, the Soviets would today

be safe from war and as honored and worshipped as in the days of the czars and grand dukes. But would Mankind have been as happy or as hopeful?

8. Is it true that the Soviet Union has driven out race prejudice? It seems to me true, that in no modern land which I have visited, is there so little consciousness of racial differences as in Russia today. In the great Moscow Peace Congress which I visited, on the streets of Moscow and Gorki and Odessa, in social intercourse and in current literature, I, who am supersensitive in matters of discrimination, could see none in the Union of Soviets, Patent differences of physical type were manifest. At the Congress were black, yellow, brown, and white faces; especially was the Mongolian type frequently seen. There was no shadow of segregation nor discrimination.

Of course, the law is clear; but for that matter so is the law in London and New York. In neither place am I protected from discrimination based solely on race. The reason for Russia's attitude is not superior ethics, but her early consciousness of the danger of racial and cultural discrimination. The leadership of the Jews in the revolutionary movements emphasized this attitude; but the early experience and convictions of Joseph Stalin were invaluable in implementing this attitude. Born and nurtured in a congeries of races and religions, he sensed from the first the tyrant's rule of "Divide and Conquer" on which the British Empire was built; he experienced pogroms of Czarist times; and from the first, in building Communism, he was the leader most conscious of the dangers of race prejudice; and as commissar in charge of Nationalities, he implemented the legislation.

Moreover, the Soviets saw in race antagonism, only a variation of class struggle and it was class differences which they were set to abolish. They knew that race prejudice in Russia, America, Spain, and Britain had been the basis of class exploitation for economic power. Inferiority did not enslave Negroes in the United States, but the slavery of labor in the cotton kingdom made Negroes highly profitable. The British slave trade in Africa was a paying investment which was the foundation of commercial empire and not simply of racial hierarchy. This the Soviet Union planned to avoid and succeeded.

Of course, in Russia, the problem of Jews was from the first uppermost, for religious and economic reasons. The religious disabilities were quickly swept away. When economic exploitation appeared, whether by Jews or Gentiles, it was suppressed. It is possible that certain actions against the threat of exploitation or against the more likely rise of religious autonomy, which appear in the Soviet Union today, can be misinterpreted as resurgent anti-Semitism. There is no proof, however, that this

is true, although the fact is being alleged by enemies of the Soviets.

9. How far does the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics restrict Art and Literature? The Soviet Union aims at the Good Life, with freedom and variety; but it recognizes that first, men must eat; that no enduring culture with adequate art expression can be founded on poverty, ignorance and disease, Whenever and wherever that is attempted, there results the civilization and art of a small section of the nation and world, threatened without by the rude and hungry barbarians and within by eventual dry rot.

The Soviets began with an ignorant and poor folk, with perverted standards of servility and selfishness, and with not much of value in cultural heritage; and all of these overawed and frightened by the worst forms of dogmatic religion. The transforming of this mass into an intelligent nation, with adequate income for all, a high standard of living, ideals based on the best which the world has known and creative energy for the future – all of this called for thought, effort, experiment, and time.

Time, the Union of Soviets has not had. Subtracting the waste of foreign and civil wars, this new pioneer among nations has had less than a generation for constructive work. Yet education must go on side by side with production of food, shelter and clothes and defense. The path to the ideal must be guided and straight. Error and decadence; debauchery and luxury must be kept at bay.

So the Soviets have restricted art and literature to what they think is inspiring, uplifting and informing. "The force of Soviet literature lies in the fact that it neither has nor can have any other interests except those of the people and of the State. Its task is to help the State to educate the youth." They have sternly excluded American "comics," French pornography, and British aristocratic ideals. They have reverted to the classics of all tongues as embodying the tested taste of humanity.

In painting and sculpture they have exhibited in popular and daily crowded museums the best examples of the past, with little of the still disputed modern art. They have induced the masses of people to read to an extent never equaled in ancient, mediaeval or modern times by any nation on earth. The Soviet Union is today the leading European country in book publication with almost 40,000 titles annually; an overall circulation of 800,000,000 copies, distributed through 3,000 bookshops.

The leading place in published books belongs to the mulatto, Pushkin. Within the last thirty years, his various works attained a circulation of 35,000,000 copies; on occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth, no less than 250 titles by or

about Pushkin were published, totalling 11,000,000 copies. Leo Tolstoy comes second; almost 1,000,000 of his works are sold yearly. Turgenev, Gogol, Lermontov, Nekrasov, Saltykov-Shchedrin are also among the favorites, and their works, published in many millions of copies, are avidly bought and read by the average Russian.

Statistics of the Soviet Book Chamber for the past thirty years indicate that European classics in translation are also high in publishing totals. Victor Hugo 4,000,000 are followed by Guy de Maupassant 4,000,000, Balzac, 2,000,000; Stendhal and Anatole France 1,800,000 each; Dickens 2,340,000 and Shakespeare 1,611,000. Cervantes, Schiller, Goethe, Byron are also widely read, and their works are published in hundreds of thousands of copies.

Among American writers, Jack London, James Fenimore Cooper, Mark Twain and Bret Harte are the favorites. Contemporary writers like Sholokhov, Shastokovich, Fadeev and Ostrovsky have a circulation of 2 to 6 million copies.

The 7,200 Soviet newspapers have a daily circulation of over 31 million. One-third are printed in 80 non-Russian languages. All republics, regions and cities have their own papers. Pravda, with its daily circulation of over two million, has one of the largest circulations of any single newspaper in the world.

"The Soviet Government has encouraged high standards in the opera, ballet and radio programs. The ballets of Moscow and Leningrad are the best in the world, and the legitimate theatre is excellent. The States sees to it that musicians can compose and play, writers can write and artists can paint in comfortable circumstances; because the government is well aware that the task of raising the cultural level of the Soviet people to that of most of their European neighbors still is far from complete."

It is often explained to the uninitiated, that all present Russian culture does not stem from the Revolution; that much in the ballet and drama, literature, art and architecture, comes down from Czarist times. This is no criticism of communism but rather a tribute; for leadership consists not simply in innovation and invention, but even more in selection, preservation and re-building on old foundations. This communism has done. Moreover the Empire of the czars owed much of its culture to the revolutionary elements preceding the successful overturn and only partially used under the empire.

There are altogether 926 theaters and opera houses in the USSR, including dramatic theaters, opera and ballet theaters, musical comedy and operetta theaters, collective farm theaters, and children's theaters. Thousands of special theaters and musical groups are run by trade unions and other organizations, and hundreds of concert halls. The all-Union Art Exhibition,

which is to be opened in Moscow this Autumn, will display the works of 2,000 painters, sculptors and engravers from all of the sixteen republics of the Soviet Union, Art is encouraged by teaching music, painting in schools and academies.

On the other hand, they have restricted originality in lines which they feared might be misleading or arouse dangerous tendencies. They have not hesitated to criticize composers, reject experiments in literature and drama. Here lies the danger of censorship by the State and the cramping or stifling of originality of genius. Education itself is at present unduly slanted toward machine production and progress measured too much by material advance.

The Soviet leaders recognize this danger. They have eased censorship materially so that new authors and playwrights and composers continually appear and the present output of Soviet art and literature is by no means negligible. But, say these leaders, the nation must eat and eat well; it must produce and produce much more widely, largely because world commerce is denied us save on fatal terms, We must see that our folk know and recognize what part civilization has left us before they start to create without standards.

The Soviet Union appreciates the Good Life, with Freedom and Variety. It knows that this cannot be created and enjoyed in a moment. It sees in the United States a free land, debauching its freedom from failure to know the past. It refuses to duplicate this mistake even at the cost of some repression. It says: Once we have set for this nation, standards of taste founded on the best things of the past; once it has food and clothes and shelter so as to be free of fear and want. Once we have peace, then we will set no barriers to genius and innovation trusting the judgment of a great intelligent nation to choose the best and preserve the worthy. Until then, even with some chance of loss we will guide the mass and suffer what we now regard as evil.

10. How free is Science in the Soviet Union? Science has never been free; the danger of knowledge has always been felt and it has been chained by dogma since the beginning; but equally it has repeatedly freed itself, for man must know in order to live. Usually science, systematic and integrated knowledge, has been the secret and perquisite of the few and has been used to guarantee their power; it was kept from the masses lest they misuse it and thus either hurt science or with it displace the Priest or Landlord. So life has been the continuous unbinding and binding of knowledge, as well as its slow broadening and integrating.

In the modern Western world the freedom of science has been opposed by the Church and by society, organized in social and

economic groups. The church long imprisoned astronomy and biology; and social organization kept learning away from the poor and thus permitted anti-social activities.

In science the Soviets are facing a problem which the West has refused to face: how far is Science a servant of the common weal and how far independent, self-sufficient and individual? Science as aimless, unconditioned search for knowledge has wrought havoc in labor and technique; it helped form the factory system with its wretched poverty; it joined slavery and factory to fasten colonial imperialism on the world; it developed mass production and opened the way to two world wars; it unharnessed atomic energy and made the destruction of the earth possible. What is the remedy? We want surely to leave speculation and curiosity free; ingenuity uncurbed; but unless we are willing to arm evil with all devices to destroy, the nation must in some way and by some method control the scientist and make him a social agent for good, and not a man so free that he cannot be held responsible in any way for anything he does. This is the problem facing American science today.

But Science in the 20th century has not been as free as we love to picture it. It was directed by colleges dependent on the rich and on government in the hands of business men. No American history which attacked slavery or social science which taught the essential equality of men, got the endowment needed for buildings, book and laboratories, nor did scientists who denied the inferiority of Negroes get the better appointments. Thus the wide acceptance of Mendelism was not entirely a matter of free scientific inquiry; it was in part the pressure of income based on the subjection of the darker races to the greed of the whites.

Recalling the Lysenko controversy in the Soviet Union, the Western world has welcomed the scientific hypothesis of the unlikelihood of acquired characteristics being inherited; because it justified the popular doctrine of race and group inferiority and made American Negro slavery justifiable. This defense was a matter of private organizations and not of the state; and yet private churches and cotton manufacturers and captains of trade easily made the policy of the state which passed the slave codes.

Lysenko said: "You must not think that science or thoughts are planned in this country. The tasks are planned. The thoughts are free. You have certain jobs to do. You can think out how these jobs should be done."

Russia needed winter wheat to be grown in the cold of Siberia; it needed to increase its crop of millet five-fold; it needed better all-purpose cattle. Lysenko accomplished these results, not by solving the mystery of chromosomes but by taking the

whole set-up, seed and plant, land and weather, man and machine; and leaving aside the theory and the conditioned experiment, he worked until he got the wheat, millet and cattle. The Soviet Union decided to give its official support to his methods, because Russia must have food; they did not, as has been alleged, kill or starve those scientists who wanted to work in other ways and for objects more nearly approaching "pure" science; they gave them work and wage, but removed them from control of the main work of the state for increasing the crops and bettering the animals of the Soviet Union. Thus in a way they narrowed the freedom of science, but certainly no more than science has been curtailed in all Europe for many centuries.

Any interference with the freedom of science is dangerous; but the reasons for such interference are various: they may be to buttress the power of religion; or to save the ignorant from inflicting harm; or and more often, for making money for the few. None of these motives led the Soviets. Soviet philosophy of the state at present disavows the Ivory Tower aspect of science in the West. The Soviet Union regards science as an instrument for the uplift of the masses. It refuses to regard science as a plaything for an elect few; or as an ideal pursuit without definite goal. Not Truth as such, but Truth for the welfare of the people is the goal, and in the current titanic struggle of the world, all and everything must yield to the public welfare as the Soviets see it.

Doubtless just here the Soviets justify their action in the Lysenko controversy: if their decision results in better crops and stock, they will pursue it; if not they will repudiate it. If no decisive judgment is indicated, they will pursue their way as now, but with intense effort to get indisputable results. Following this aim, Soviet Science has flourished. Already with her intellectual career hardly begun, this nation has encouraged scientific work begun before the revolution and forged forward notably in nearly every area of scientific research. It may be that in eugenics, it has allowed economic expediency, and the desperate necessity of pushing production at top pace for war reconstruction and defense against increasing western threats, to forestall full free scientific inquiry. Of this I am not sure, but it may be so. But even if it is, the vast effort at education in this nation is sure in the end to rectify the mistake. The Soviet Union is never dogmatic in its theory or decisions. It has always been ready to rectify mistakes. With increasing intelligence among the mass, the area of scientific freedom in the Union must increase and be increasingly regarded as inviolable.

The Communists rest their ultimate appeal to mankind on exact science. They seek to build a state on foundations of natural

law and guide it by careful measurements, made continuously and tested frequently. The only variation from this fundamental thesis would be threat to the very existence of the state from within or without. Even this should be resorted to most infrequently and its threat to basic science and ultimate knowledge ever recognized. This was true in Lenin's surrender to NEP and in the purges of recalcitrants and traitors in 1928 and 1938.

Today, the union of the most powerful part of the world in military alliance against the growth and existence of communism, means that socialist nations must strain every nerve to be sure of food and clothing and defense with their own borders. If making science the slave of production can be used to accomplish this end, it surely is justified. But only on the assurance that this step is necessary, is temporary, and its danger fully appreciated. On the other hand, if contrary to the conviction of scientists like Julian Huxley, Mendelism should ultimately be disproven, then Soviet science can only be blamed for premature faith in a hypothesis at the time unproven.

On the other hand, for nations like Italy, Britain and the United States to wax lyric in attack on this binding of the hands of free scientific inquiry, in view of the doctrines of religious inquisition, race inferiority and survival of the "fittest" on which these nations have based wealth and power by chaining free thought, seems hardly convincing.

The Academy of Sciences of the USSR, the leading scientific institution in the Soviet Union has increased its membership twenty-fold. In 1947, it numbered 436 Academicians and Corresponding members; and 4350 scientific workers and 1050 post-graduate students were engaged in its various institutions. The same year the Academy of Sciences had nearly sixty scientific research institutes in Moscow and Leningrad, thirty other branch institutes and bases, sixteen independent laboratories functioning on the basis of institutes, more than thirty commissions and committees, five councils, fifteen museums, thirty-five stations, seven scientific societies and seventy-three libraries.

At the beginning of 1947, there were 921 agricultural research institutions; 1,664 sectors for the production of high-quality seed; 4,924 seed control laboratories, and 88 agricultural colleges. Great, too, is the concern of the Soviet state for the development of medicine. At the beginning of the Second World War, the Soviet health protection system included 213 research institutes; 70 research laboratories and 72 medical institutes. Extensive research work is likewise being carried on in all branches of the national economy and culture.

In 1947, there were about 100,000 scientific workers in the

country, among them over 10,000 Doctors of Sciences and Professors and about 25,000 Masters of Sciences and Instructors. During the decade following Stalin's speech at the reception of higher education workers, held at the Kremlin in 1938, a large amount of work was accomplished in training scientific forces. In the higher schools alone, the number of scientific workers increased from 53,000 in 1938; to 80,000 in 1948. During this period more than 6,000 persons received Doctor's degrees and nearly 25,000 Master's degrees in the sciences; 6,000 became professors and 21,500 docents and senior scientific associates. At the universities and research institutes extensive work is in progress for the training of scientific personnel. In 1948, there were 13,000 post-graduate students in the USSR.

Soviet History tells of the past, so as to increase appreciation of the present. It is too bad to omit Trotsky from history in order to erase the error of his treason; it is too bad not to record the accomplishments as well as the failures of America; but it must not be forgotten that the exploitation and aggression of the West is in part responsible for this. A nation which must protect itself against the atom bomb and the largest navy in history, cannot be too nice in its pedagogy. But the people of the Soviet Union read. They will progressively read more widely and with more variety. In time they will read not only what they believe but what they do not believe and know that this is the beginning of wisdom.

The years of abundance and the classless state have not yet been realized in Russia; but who can say what may happen in a century, there and in Asia? The disappearance even of the State itself may in some far day prove the prophecy of Karl Marx.

11. Is the Soviet Union a civilized state worthy of recognition? Recently there have been reiterated accusations that the Soviet Government encourages lying and obstruction, does not keep its treaty obligations and maintains fifth columns in foreign lands. These statements, often repeated by responsible persons, are so clearly the outcome of hysteria that no reasonable answer can be made. I find no proof that the Soviets have broken treaty obligations or failed in keeping commitments. They have declined to follow majority decisions or to accept the interpretations put on agreements by other countries. Their so-called obstruction in the United Nations was perfectly legal, even if it was not in accord with our judgment.

We helped insert the Veto in the United Nations Charter and we would not sit in the Security Council if Ireland represented Great Britain. We have no right to insist that only our unchangeable formula for disarmament be adopted. In Greece, Korea, and China our role has been clearly outside interference, against the will of large minorities or even vast majorities of

the peoples involved. The Soviets may have been equally to blame in the Balkans; but certainly they could not be more to blame.

But it is not true that the Soviet Union is unworthy of faith and recognition. Her saving of Western Civilization from Hitler amply proves that; and all nations bore testimony to this fact at the time. That this mutual faith and cooperation has been broken is the calamity of our day and calls for redoubled effort to repair the breach.

I can interpret the Soviet Union today through my experience with ten million American Negroes in the last half of the nineteenth century. Despite all we knew and saw, we shrivelled before the judgments of men - casual men, twisted men, men who saw what they wished to see. They saw our laziness from car windows; our incompetence from their servants; our crime from a thousand alleged thefts and rapes. We shuddered when we faced investigation; and went to Hell when we saw the activities of our traitors and "white folks' niggers." In defense, we boasted sometimes beyond the fact and retorted often with bitterness and hate. The tangled complex of our feeling of inferiority before arrogance and power tore the finer fabric from our inner soul and left us too often naked to ridicule and rebuttal. Yet we were right, as all men realize today; we were not supermen but men, with brain and heart and guts; and that we were and are going somewhere up yonder where our ideals gleam, most men now admit; but I remember the day when, to America, nothing black was beautiful, nor is it indeed to many today.

It is not an easy task to judge a nation, whether it be of ten or two hundred millions. It calls for Faith and Prophecy as well as Fact to build Truth. And neither one-eyed men, distorted souls nor ingrown self-worshippers can interpret a miracle, even when it is clear. In a recent book six men tell how they turned for salvation to communism and failed to find it. Three of them were from the first, distorted souls born in Black America, the torn Balkans, and Fascist South Italy. Richard Wright came out of childhood in the American South with faith in nobody, and faith in human beings he will never achieve. He was a cynical, suspicious soul, despising Negroes little less than he hated whites. He wanted to be a writer and a group of Chicago Communists helped him generously. But soon he found himself at odds with the blacks because he was an "intellectual" and with the whites because discipline irked him. Of Communism itself and of the USSR, he knew nothing and cared less. He left the party. No system nor philosophy of any kind will ever convince Wright. He will remain always expatriate and alone.

Arthur Koestler was dragged from the middle class comfort of a childhood in Hungary into a Germany about to surrender to Hitler, with Communism as a distraught, ineffective underground

conspiracy. He escaped to the Soviet Union, just when it was in the throes of the Trotsky conspiracy ;and finally fell into the prisons of Franco. He denounced Communism when the USSR chose alliance with Hitler, rather than face Hitler's world alone; and in order to have time to prepare for Hitler's attack.

Silone was an Italian peasant and victim of poverty and Mussolini. He helped form the Communist party of Italy, and visited the Soviet Union for a number of congresses. He, too, was caught in the conspiring and evasions of the Trotsky treason, and saw his concept of liberty unrealized. He broke with his comrade Togliatti, and became a wandering exile until he returned to Italy in 1944, still in search of liberty and still unable to find it.

Fischer was an American reporter, descended from poor Russian peasants. He visited the Soviet Union first in 1922 and sympathized with Communism. He saw the Soviets as an imperfect state struggling like Laccoon with the snakes of Europe. He hoped they might be scotched, but lost faith during the treason trials; had it revived in the Spanish interlude, and then it disappeared with the Hitler alliance. He believes that liberty is dead in the Soviets; and that without liberty as Americans conceive of it, life has no meaning.

These four are joined by Gide and Spender, two intellectual exquisites, products of the wealthy and aristocratic cultures of France and Britain. They never had to earn a living and regarded work philosophically from afar. They could never quite grasp a culture founded on work of the hands, out and up from which it struggled to build all. Such an effort to Gide end Spender failed before it began, despite the thrill of a first glimpse.

One was a religious mystic in temperament who recoiled from Sin in any guise, even that of revolutionary struggle. The other was a born non-conformist who worshipped liberty as a God and not as an end. The mess of the Spanish uprising drove Spender out of Communism, after knowledge of a few weeks and with no visit to the Soviet Union.

Gide saw the dream of Communism as seers see Truth: but the grim reality of its birth-pains, with bad manners and sweat, revolted him and he turned his back on the struggle. But Time is not yet ended and there are a host of witnesses who still hope and believe.

Between the two World Wars, Sydney and Beatrice Webb, after long study pronounced the USSR a "new civilization" of the very highest promise. "Will this new civilization, with its abandonment of the incentive of profit-making, its extinction of unemployment, its planned production for community consumption, and the consequent liquidation of the landlord and the capitalist, spread to other countries? Our own reply is: Yes, it

will."

Lord Keynes added: "Whatever the content of Russian Communism may be, it represents a gigantic human enterprise. In it men have resolutely embraced a purpose of reform and live tensely under the discipline that faith instills in them. It is simply a misunderstanding of the European, to expect that he can hear unmoved that call to new action when he has no standard of a cause as great to unfurl in opposition."

What has happened to change these judgments, since the Second World War, where, in the eyes of the most reactionary soldier of our day, the Soviets made the greatest military effort in history and insured the victory of Great Britain and the United States over Germany and liberated France?

What has happened, is crystal clear: two world wars fought to restore, re-arrange and establish more firmly the colonial imperialism of Europe over the world, with the United States as senior partner. The result of the unexpected advent of the Soviet Union, in a major role with Communism as a dominant and growing economic philosophy, was to make this aim of the West impossible so long as the Union of Soviet Republics persisted and grew strong. It was this fact which has convinced men like Herbert Hoover, Henry Luce, and Dean Acheson that a Third World War to overthrow Communism is inevitable.

CHAPTER VIII

WORLD PEACE

There are two great objects which ought to bind the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics together in indissoluble alliance; and they are the abolition of war and the abolition of poverty. Both nations realize that another world war will fasten poverty on earth for a thousand years. Both nations know that in modern days they have led the world in realistic attack upon the degradation of the worker. It was revolution in the United States against exploitation of colonial labor that led to echoing revolution in France and Haiti, and resulted in uplift of labor throughout Europe and particularly in the great republic this side of the seas, where the wage and standard of living among the working masses today leads the whole world.

It was revolution in Russia that founded a nation built on the determination to abolish poverty in the modern world by equitable redistribution of wealth made through the democratic power of an intelligent people; and to start toward this great end by making the mass of people intelligent.

Thus peace and prosperity for all citizens of the state are the objects of both of these nations. They may differ, and have a right to differ, as to the immediate way and means of accomplishing these ends; but there is and can be no question as to the desire of both nations to abolish war and poverty.

In such case, any agitation or careless and wicked mouthing of the possibility of war between these two peoples is worse than insanity; it is an attack upon mankind and civilization. It is a direct challenge to all men of good will to take firm and open stand not simply against war, but especially against all causes of war. It calls upon intelligent men to admit that the greatest cause of war in the last five hundred years has been the degradation of the worker, especially through the colonial system and the human slavery upon which the colonial imperialism was originally built.

We know well that the main hindrance to security and democracy has been the fact that the attempt to raise the status of labor in civilized lands has for centuries been accompanied by the deliberate degradation of the laboring masses in colonial regions. The greatest insurance against future wars, which will continue to masquerade as national expansion and self-defense, will be the clear recognition of the right of colonial peoples to a living wage, education, and self-government. This desperately necessary advance step of mankind was foreshadowed in the Charter of the United Nations. But steps toward that preliminary trusteeship which will lead to the rise of the

colonial peoples have as yet been slow and halting. This fact and crisis should bind the United States and the Soviet Republics in common striving against the determination of any country to perpetuate the colonial system.

This country cannot forget; and especially 16,000,000 American Negroes, victims of human slavery and the colonial system, must not forget that the slave system which stifled democracy in the United States for a century after the first brave effort to declare all men equal, is today denying under various guises the equal humanity of the majority of mankind; and here Americans should be the first to praise any attempt on the part of any nation to abolish race and class discrimination within the nation and in colonies which the nations control:

In considering any war between the United States and the Soviet Union, certain facts stand out clearly:

1. In war as fought today no amount of previous preparation can insure victory. If the Hitler war machine failed, it proved that the most careful preparedness for war faces today too many uncertainties to insure the outcome.
2. In any war between these two countries and their allies, no decisive victory seems possible; the stretches of territory are too large, the number of persons involved too great, and the costs in wealth, manpower, and materials too staggering to make conclusive victory probable.
3. The moral risks involved in such a war are too great for present civilization to survive: involving as the struggle must wholesale poisoning, mass murder of men, women and children, old and young, and total devastation, of land, forest, buildings, and vegetation. No dogma of brotherly love, self-sacrifice or divine guidance could survive such a shock.
4. The partial stalemate which would follow such a war could summon no conceivable allies in morality, science, art, or human health to rebuild in reasonable time the loss, frustration, and hopelessness which must follow such a cultural collapse. The ensuing dark age would transfer civilization from Europe and America to Asia and Africa.
5. The European world, which knows, as we do not, what war means, would not join us in a Third World War, if by any possible maneuver it could keep clear.

Since the Civil War, eighty-six years ago, the United States has had no wide experience of the real meaning of war. In the proposed world struggle, Americans would face as never before, blood and dirt, pain and want right on their own hearth. It is by no means certain how far or how long this nation and all parts of it would respond to a call to fight for unreal and ill-defined issues.

6. There are today no issues or differences between the United States and Russia which could not more easily be resolved now in peace and patience than during war; or after either victory or defeat; or as is much more likely, in the ensuing stalemate.

We Americans have been called incurable romantics; and in no respect is this clearer than in our attitude toward war. Nowhere else in the modern world is careless, irresponsible reaction toward war so clear as in the United States. Nowhere in Europe is the state and its social institutions surrender so lightly to military men or are army officers so prodigally rewarded. This is because we are still under the spell of the old glorification of war which used to fill our school books and novels and is now current in our press. We are to be sure beginning to feel the pinch of taxation for the last world war, as we felt it for the first in the thirties. But the impact of our childhood lore, with centuries of propaganda has not been yet outlived. We still thrill to martial music and glittering uniforms, "with trumpet and with drum!" We still see plumed knights plunging ahead on neighing chargers, waving gleaming swords, and rescuing Virtue from Vice with glittering arms and thundering cannon. Our national anthems, with few exceptions, are hymns of hate and hopelessly intertwined with patriotism, self-righteousness and glory. And even if some have outgrown this fantasy, there lingers in nearly all, the assumption that most of what civilization has gained has been through war. This is what conventional and current history still in the main teaches; war won way for art in Athens and law in Rome; war won the Renaissance and Reformation; war built England and rebuilt France; war freed the American colonies and freed the slave; war united Italy and Germany; in fine, war is the world's great weapon of progress.

It is true that this war psychosis is not universal, nor is its contradiction unknown or untaught. But this contradiction is far from penetrating the mass of Americans as any reading of present school texts will show.

Yet all men should know how dirty, cruel, and horribly inconclusive a mess war is at best and how utterly indefensible

at its worst. It is and must be primarily planned murder and maiming; dirt, theft, and rape; sweat, drunkenness and destruction; and utter losing of nearly all restraints of religion, morals, and decency. Wars are continually fought for objects vague or quite unknown to the fighters; or for aims changed while fighting or improvised to inspire lagging morale. The results of wars are usually far from what they first aimed at or last dreamed.

Yet we have learned to think of war as indissolubly bound up with progress, absolutely inevitable, forever impossible of abolition, even when we know also how often war has proved the first resort of liars, aggressors, thieves, and fools; and the last remedy for human ill.

Whatever excuse and justification for this attitude the past may have offered, has disappeared completely in the tragedy which faces us today. We must not only reassess in the light of critical and scientific history, the real place of war in civilization and begin to teach this interpretation in school and college; but first of all, we must seize the present threat of war as the day of all days and perhaps the last opportunity of civilized man, to save the world by outlawing war as an instrument of human progress.

The maddening fact, which frustrates the world today, is that the overwhelming majority of men, not only in the world and in Europe, but precisely in the bristling nations of the Soviet Union and the United States do not want war, do not believe that war will settle any essential aspect of matters in dispute, and yet are moving or being moved just as rapidly toward war as is humanly possible.

Here, if anywhere, or if ever, comes clarion call for common sense to override army, air force, and navy; blind members of the legislative branches of the government, and stubborn executives; and urge for reasonable people to take charge of the two nations. Out with double-talk and with such mysticism as the young American clergyman who staged a mumbo-jumbo tryst of prayer for peace and then refused to join a peace congress because forsooth he suspected communists might attend! Out with Russians who will not believe that most America praises what the Soviets have done to raise the working people of Russia; sternly putting the intransigents aside and refusing to look for guidance in a propagandist press, let us face facts and acts accordingly.

What are the issues in dispute between the Soviet Union and the United States?

1. The USSR believes that the United States wishes by armed force to suppress communism, not only in the Soviet Union but elsewhere in the world,

2. That the United States is working to spread her control of labor and materials through the world by force,
3. That for these reasons the United States deliberately misrepresents conditions in the USSR and seeks on the basis of these alleged facts to stir up attack on the USSR from without and within.

The United States believes:

1. That communism is a failure and has erected in the USSR a police state with slave labor and restricted liberties.
2. That the USSR has forced communism on her bordering states and the Balkans and indirectly on China; that only fear of the United States army has saved Greece and Turkey and that the USSR is now threatening Asia and Africa.
3. That the Soviets through local communist parties, maintain fifth columns in all countries possible in order to subvert their economics and culture; and that these parties are directed and financed by the USSR.

In this dispute it should be easy for both parties to agree:

1. That military force or threat of force to dictate the way of life in another nation with regard to its economic or social institutions is inadmissible.
2. That criticism of conditions anywhere in the world, which anybody thinks detrimental to human progress is rightly the concern of all men. Investigation, comment, and criticism should be encouraged, if carried out with reasonable courtesy, sympathy, and honesty of purpose and without irritating condescension of some folk toward foreigners. Deliberate liars and scandalmongers cannot expect international welcome, but the time has come for wide encouragement of criticism and visiting among nations.
3. It is everywhere conceded that the economic status of human beings today is unsatisfactory over large areas and among the majority of folk in all nations. All lands agree in the necessity of radical reform but disagree widely on method and ideal. Recognizing this world-wide situation, charity and unbiased judgment of efforts at reform are called for, with strict refusal of all effort to use force or threat of force in directing the business of any people save our own.
4. That the right of people anywhere to follow their own line of thought and action, in accord with the thought of

any nation is sacred so far as there is no attempt to transgress the law; in that case the men should be punished for illegal action and not for unpopular opinion.

It is difficult to see why some such basis of agreement might not be reached by leaders of thought in the United States and the Soviet Union without invading in any degree the right of either nation to pursue its own way at home and abroad. The American Friends Service Committee after careful inquiry has expressed its conviction that peace is possible for the following reasons:

1. The fact that there is widespread and sincere desire for peace.
2. The conviction that both the Soviet social organization and the type of social organization prevailing in the western world are likely to persist for some time and that attention should be directed to their coexistence, rather than to the victory of either over the other.
3. The conclusion, that while there are drastic differences in the methods of the two systems and some differences in their aims, both systems attempt to promote the general welfare, while defining it differently.
4. The belief that there is the possibility of sufficient accommodation between the two systems, as evidenced by changes that have occurred in both, to permit them to coexist and to compete peacefully in the same world.
5. The probability that much of the present tension between the United States and the Soviet Union reflects the mutual fear felt by each of attack by the other.
6. The improbability of overcoming this fear and attaining either the impression or the fact of security by arms competition.
7. The desirability of reducing armaments and the reliance on the military weapons before the burdens of an arms competition weakens democratic institutions.
8. The likelihood that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union intends at the present time to promote its foreign policy by means of direct military aggression.

Upon such agreement might come disarmament, including the atom bomb; the progressive freeing of trade between nations, whether the traders be individuals or states; and the final ridding of the world of all vestiges of colonialism, whether through political control or investment; end a new and generous rivalry

among nations to find the best ways of human progress and freely invite criticism and exchange knowledge.

Already the world movement for peace is much further advanced than most Americans realize. I have spoken of the peace meetings in New York in March, and in August, in Moscow, and I was due at the Congress in Mexico the same month; but the greatest came in Paris, in May, 1949.

This seemed to me the greatest meeting of men ever assembled in modern times to advance the progress of all men. The Races Congress of 1911 in London was comparable, but was quickly forgotten in the onset of the First World War. The first meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations in that little Geneva church, raised hopes of universal significance, despite the fatal absence of the United States. The United Nations Organization at San Francisco, after the Second World War, lifted the hearts of men, until the long, drawn-out horse-trading on trusteeships revealed the determination to hold in serfdom the majority of men.

The Paris outpouring was extraordinary; not simply because of the heartbreaking preliminary preparation which brought together 2,192 delegates from seventy-two countries, representing 600,000,000 people; and with 213 delegates from thirteen other lands, meeting in Prague; but because of the single-hearted earnestness, the deep determination, the unflagging interest which kept 3,000 persons fastened to their seats for eleven sessions covering five full days and a sixth day devoted to the most impressive mass demonstration I ever saw.

Add to this, the so impressive fact to me, that the colored world was present; not simply on sufferance; not with the well-known Anglo-Saxon condescension; but as members of a world movement in full right and with full participation. I sat on the Presidential Tribune, representing the United States. I looked out across the sea of faces hour after hour and saw seven Haitians; 27 from India; two from Indonesia; 12 from Madagascar; four from Morocco; three from Mongolia; five from Puerto Rico; 18 from Tunis; 60 from Viet-Nam, and 18 from black French Africa. There were other colored folk from France itself, from Cuba, Central and South America, and two from the United States.

And these colored folk took part. At two sessions, black men presided. One of the very best speeches was delivered on Thursday by Gabriel d'Arbousier, Vice President of the African Democratic Rally, for whom the audience rose to applaud. Paul Robeson appeared unannounced on Wednesday, and was given a tumultuous ovation when he dared to say that no Negro should ever fight against Russia. Madam Thai Thi Lien spoke for Viet Nam, with long applause following her discourse. On the World Committee, elected by the Congress, was a black African vice

chairman, and among the 140 members, 13 were colored.

To all this, should be added the colored contingent of the Prague Congress, those delegates refused visas to enter France. Foremost, of course, among these were the forty delegates from China and eight from Korea.

The Manifesto of the World Congress faced definitely the colonial question and the color question: "We are against colonialism, which continually breeds armed conflicts and threatens to play a decisive part in unleashing a new World War."

"We condemn... the fostering of race hatred and enmity among peoples." But it was no mere matter of race and color. It was the suffering of a crucified world made visible. I saw that tall, white-haired Russian woman with a face like the mother of Jesus, stand and tell how her eighteen-year old daughter went to war to defend "democracy;" how she was stripped by the Nazis and driven naked into the winter cold, beaten with straps and hanged, yet never betrayed her comrades. Madame Kosmodemianskaia did not sob. She paused and swallowed, as she went on to tell of her sixteen-year old son, who followed his sister to death. A few nights later, in the home of a woman deputy of the French Parliament, I sat beside a beautiful young woman, almost youthful save for tired lines that dimly crossed her face. I looked down and on her wrist saw the concentration camp numbers burned into her flesh. She said simply, "I lost my mother and father; my brother and — my husband."

In the Congress and out, I saw the crippled and maimed — one soldier with no legs talked to us. I visioned the poverty, the hurt, the misery of a world crying, for God's sake let us at least have Peace, to heal our wounds. I sensed the bitter hatred toward an America determined to make money out of the world's misery. Tractors of French make wheeled before us May Day, labelled, "We cannot make these; we must buy them from America." I saw the leather workers unemployed, because their leather was sent to Germany.

Above all this, looms in my memory that spectacle of Sunday, when from all of France and half the world, 500,000 persons filed through the Buffalo stadium; a hundred thousand at a time filed out to let another hundred thousand in. I never saw before a hundred thousand human beings in one group. And they were not strutting and showing off. They were walking and hobbling and falling in faintness and crying, Peace! Peace! It was unforgettable. No lying, distortion and twisting of the American press can conceal or erase the heartbreaking significance of this spectacle. None who saw it will ever forget.

On the tribune sat Joliet-Curie, Aragon, Picasso, Nickolas, the Metropolitan of the Russian Church; the fearless Jesuit,

Abbe Boulier, whose desperate desire to come to America and tell us that all Catholics were not reactionary, was vetoed by Cardinal Spellman; the Bishop of the Calvinist Church of Hungary; the Red Dean of Canterbury, Zilliacus of England, Howard Fast of America, Fadeev of Russia, and Hamzah of Indonesia spoke. Children sang, men and women shouted and wept, and the Marseillaise roared.

When I was invited to this meeting, I did not ask nor care -who organized or called. I was all the happier when I realized that communism was back of this undertaking. To this day I cannot understand why persons who want peace with Russia, recoil when Russia wants peace. This almost seems as though we feared that the Soviet did not want war. The explanation that we fear they are not sincere and want war, not peace, is so easily capable of proof: Will they, beside us, take steps toward peace? Certainly every word said at Paris indicated this:

We are for the Charter of the United Nations and against military alliances that make the Charter a dead letter and lead to war.

We are against the crushing burden of military expenditures that reduce the peoples to poverty.

We are for the prohibition of atomic and other means of mass destruction, the limitation of the armed forces of the great powers, and the establishment of an effective system of international control to make certain that atomic energy is utilized exclusively for peaceful purposes and the good of mankind.

We are protagonists of national independence and peaceful cooperation of all peoples, and of the right of national self-determination, as essential conditions of freedom and peace.

We take a firm stand against policies which feverishly seek to curtail and suppress democratic freedoms in order to pave the way to war.

We are the world front for the defense of truth and reason, for the defeat of propaganda which prepares public opinion for war.

We condemn war hysteria and the fostering of race hatred and enmity among peoples. We advocate the denunciation and boycott of those periodicals, books, films, individuals, and organizations which are engaged in war propaganda.

In the face of these words, the one obstacle to understanding is the reiterated charge that the Soviet Union will not outlaw

the atom bomb and has obstructed the work of the United Nations and repeatedly broken her plighted word. I cannot see that a single one of these charges is true. We invented the atom bomb. We are the only nation in the world which has ever used this bomb in war; we began the stockpiling of the bomb for future warfare; and our national reputation for telling the truth is certainly no better than Russia's.

And finally, our proposal for international control was not an offer to consult, but a blunt "take it or leave it," arrogantly given and since followed by refusal even to consider other terms. The Baruch plan of June, 1946, proposed to hand over the ownership and control of all atomic plants to an international commission, on which at present and probably for a long time to come, the United States and its friends would have a clear majority of votes. The United States would have the right to retain its stockpile of bombs as long as it thought best, after the commission started work; and the veto which any of the Five Great Powers have over Security Council action would not apply to the work of this commission. This was a proposal which the Soviet Union could not and was not expected to accept. The Russians in return proposed to outlaw the bomb, destruction of all existing bombs, and the prevention of the manufacture of new bombs; and then, to make provision for control of atomic energy with limited international inspection and with maintenance of the veto power.

So long as the United States had the monopoly of the atom bomb, we had a pistol aimed at the head of every nation in the world and could set our own terms of international control. It was not a position calculated to reassure peoples, doubtful of the purity of our motives; but it was a bleak fact. When, however, in 1949 it was revealed that the Soviet Union had the secret of the atom bomb, the situation changed. Evidently the world must disarm or go bankrupt or infinitely worse than either, go to war. For this the recent session of the World Peace Committee at Stockholm, 1949, proposes:

Nous exigeons l'interdiction absolue de l'arme atomique, arme d'épouvante et d'extermination massive des populations.

Nous exigeons l'établissement d'un rigoureux contrôle international pour assurer l'application de cette mesure d'interdiction.

We call for the absolute banning of atomic weapons and of all terror weapons of mass destruction.

We call for the establishment of strict international control to insure that, this ban is rigorously

observed.

We declare that any government which first uses atomic weapons against no matter which other country, shall be branded as guilty of a crime against humanity and shall be treated as a war criminal.

Nous considérons que le gouvernement qui, le premier, utiliserait, contra n'importe quel pays, l'arme atomique, commettrait un crime contre l'humanité, et serait à traiter comme criminel de guerre.

Nous appelons tous les hommes de bonne volonté, dans le monde à signer cet appel.

Vishinsky emphasized at Lake Success in November, 1949, the efforts made for peace in the Soviet Union: "The Soviet Union policy is a policy of peace. The Soviet Union stands for peace and consistently and determinedly defends the cause of peace. It struggles against those who want to violate peace and foist a new war on the nations of the world."

He recounted the entrance of the Soviets into the League of Nations in 1934, and their efforts for peace in 1935; the peace treaties with France, Czechoslovakia, and China during the period 1935-1937; and her signing of the treaties at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam:

"The Soviet Union proposals for the general regulation and reduction of armaments... for the prohibition of atomic weapons... for the condemnation of propaganda in any form for a new war... for the reduction by the Five Powers by one-third of their armies and armed forces, all these proposals submitted by the Soviet Union in 1946, 1947, 1948, and finally, 1949, serve one purpose, to strengthen the peace and to insure the security of nations."

One of the most persistent arguments against Soviet Peace efforts is the existence of Communist parties in various countries of the world under the control of Moscow. Outside the 10,000,000 Communists in the Soviet Union and China, there are in the communist nations of Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia, perhaps 6,000,000 party members. In Western Europe, there are in Italy, 2,500,000; France has 800,000 members, and elsewhere there is possibly 2,000,000 or more in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America. It is charged that these parties, outside communist countries, are fifth columns for Moscow and centers of conspiracy and violence. Against this charge is the obvious fact that these parties are composed of native citizens and not of Russians; that these citizens of France, Italy, the United States are presumably persons capable of thinking for themselves and not simply puppets of a foreign

country; and, finally, it has become lately customary to accuse Communists and the Soviets for all opposition, all strikes, all violence which may happen among the underpaid workers of France, the starving peasants of Italy, the strikers of the United States, and anyone anywhere who is dissatisfied with local conditions.

That communist parties follow the main lines of argument and action dominant in the Soviet Union is as probable as that the rightist parties of most lands follow the line of investment, colonial control, and protection of private property prevalent in Great Britain and the United States. That Communist parties outside of Russia follow the Soviet "line" is natural; since the Soviet Union is the greatest experiment in socialism ever attempted that a change in that line should be followed by corresponding change in foreign nations is conceivable. Who in the world did not change ideas and judgments when Russia and Germany made alliance, and then two years later made war? Was it proof of treason that the Communist Party in the United States reversed many of its policies in these years, or proof of common sense?

International exchange of ideas and policies; international action through parliamentary unions, health and sanitary programs and even socialist internationals have long been countenanced. If at any time anywhere these organizations transgress the laws of a country, they are justly liable to punishment or suppression. And any individual is always amenable to law. But hitherto in the civilized world, thought has sought freedom; speech within reasonable limits has been free. It is monstrous for any civilized land to silence or jail people for what they believe, regardless of what they do. This is not democracy. It is tyranny.

After all, this is true, as the great Harold Laski said a few months before his untimely death: "Without patience and understanding the stage is set for a third world war; and at its close there would be tyranny everywhere. If some critics say they do not desire accommodation with Communist Russia but would prefer to fight it out, my reply is simply that they are enemies of the human race. If they complain that accommodation means 'appeasement' and that we gained nothing from the appeasement of Hitler, there is, I think, a decisive reply; on the evidence, the supreme objective of Hitler was the domination of the world by the Nazi state, and to this end the German people were his first and hapless victims; above all, those Germans who were of Jewish birth or descent. Hitler sought, of set purpose, to drive a cultivated people into an ignorance which should be the parent of their permanent blind obedience. On the evidence, I believe no such charge can be made against Soviet Russia."

In illustration of what I have said and believe, may I end this book with a creed for the United States of America in the meridian of the Twentieth Century:

The American people want Peace. They want neither to conquer the world nor police it. They have no desire to meddle in other people's affairs, or censor their thought or control their industry. They want to spend the billions now wasting in war on human education and uplift for all men.

We ask the United Nations to remember that their main object and reason for being is Peace and to this end, we need wider cooperation, greater faith in each other, mutual disarmament and effort to achieve World Government with freedom, autonomy and abundance for all peoples.

We are threatened by no nation. There is no disagreement between us and the Soviet Union, which Force can settle, or which conference cannot resolve.

We are blood-guilty in first and unnecessarily using the frightful atom bomb to kill women and children; in refusing now to outlaw the weapon, save on our own narrow terms; in curtailing its peacetime use, surrendering this use largely to monopoly; and in planning even more frightful weapons.

We believe in the self-determination of all peoples regardless of color, race, belief, or political philosophy. We congratulate China on achieving rule of the people and demand her recognition with refusal of further aid or recognition to Chiang Kai-shek and his kind.

Especially do we demand the abolition of the colonial system and freedom from its tentacles of all present peoples who suffer from control by foreign masters. We see in this system endless cause of war, poverty, ignorance and disease. We must not build high profit and high wage in Europe and the United States on poverty and starvation in Asia, Africa, Central and South America, and the beautiful, raped islands of the Seven Seas.

We demand that the Marshall Plan be confined to restoring the economy of the victims of war and not used for land monopoly, industrial investment, and thought control. We must buy as much as we sell and stop hoarding food in a starving world to maintain profits. We repudiate the Truman Doctrine wherever it supports oligarchy and reaction as in Greece, Indo-China, and Korea.

Not by might nor by power of far-flung armies, navies, and aircraft can we help the world, but by sacrifice and example; we gain little by boasting of a democracy which we do not practice, or of riches and comfort which at least a third of our population do not share. We are ruled today by corporate wealth; and blessed as we are in natural resources, never before have so few owned so much at the expense of so many. Public welfare must

replace private profit, and planned economy must bring order and justice out of the anarchy of Free Enterprise and Private Initiative. No pauper is free, no public service can be private, and the sick and ignorant cannot initiate enterprise.

We demand control of industry, public ownership of banking, transport and communications, of mines and oil wells, of all government subsidized industry, and of all business which needs for proper functioning, police power and use of public property.

We demand limitation and such control of income, rents, profits, and prices as is necessary to insure a decent standard of living and to curb excessive personal wealth; and we ask a tax structure calculated to achieve these ends by stopping tax exemption for the greedy and decreasing the tax burden of the needy.

We demand immediate suppression of attempts at thought control by congressional committees, secret police methods as used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and witch-hunting by officials and the press. Communists, Catholics, and Pacifists have the same right to think, to vote, and to act within the law as other Americans; and injustice in the courts must not be used to punish freedom of belief and legal defense of accused persons.

We demand for every American citizen, no matter what his color, race, or belief, the right to vote and hold office; the right to live where other people live and on the same conditions; the right to work according to ability and income according to accomplishment; the right to move without segregation and to receive education and other public benefits without discrimination. This means fair employment legislation and laws against lynching and the poll tax.

The foundations of our democracy rest on free and equal elections. We should stop rewarding disfranchisement in sections like the South by giving 7,000 votes in South Carolina as much power as 70,000 in Michigan, and consequent committee chairmanships and rights to filibuster. Representation should be based on votes cast. Only in this way can the democratic weapon of the Third Party be able to oust corruption, connivance, and reaction.

We demand federal aid to education without segregation or discrimination by race, color, or belief, and we believe that education is the function of the State and not of the Church.

We defend the right of working people to organize and bargain, whether in public or private employ, and resent the use of court injunctions to limit this right. We demand of labor unions freedom of admission to their ranks for competitive workers, of every race and color and of any shade of political opinion.

We call for increased government control of land ownership and

use; for socialized medicine to protect the public health; for abolition of slums, and for publicly subsidized housing on a nation-wide scale; for unemployment relief, sickness and old age security on levels sufficient for decent life; for the protection and subsidization of workers in any essential industry like farming which has suffered from present organization of industry; we believe in the encouragement of all forms of self-help, like consumers cooperation.

We have come out of war a frightened, suspicious, money-mad people, without Love, Faith, or Hope and with our charity married to profit. We must cease to make science the prisoner of Big Business, government the slave of the army, religion the leader of war, and education the plaything of propaganda.

And finally and above all, let us restore the freedom of our press and rescue it from monopoly and greed and make it again the purveyor of Truth and the Forum of Ideas.

Americans, Russians: In a third World War, whoever wins, will lose; what any nation gains, the world will pay for; world conquest through force, means the death of civilization for a thousand years.

LET liars fear, let cowards shrink,
Let traitors turn away,
Whatever we have dared to think
That dare we also say

James Russell Lowell