

15

# ENEMIES OF THE PEACE

PROFILE OF THE  
'HATE-RUSSIA' GANG

BY SENDER GARLIN

ENEMIES OF  
THE PEACE: *Profile*  
*of the 'Hate-Russia' Gang*

*by* Sender Garlin

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS: *New York*

## About the Author

Sender Garlin, the author of this pamphlet, is a labor journalist whose assignments have included political reporting in all parts of the United States. He is also the author of *The Real Huey P. Long*, *The Real Rickenbacker*, *Is Dewey the Man?* and *The Truth About Reader's Digest*. Mr. Garlin was a member of the editorial staff of the *Daily Worker* from 1927 to 1944, and has been editor of the *Labor Defender*, the *Coal Digger*, and the *Western Worker*. From 1935 to 1939 he was a correspondent in the Soviet Union and reported all three of the Moscow trials for the *Daily Worker* and *People's World* of San Francisco. Mr. Garlin is a well-known lecturer and a frequent contributor to the magazine *New Masses*.



# I.

## ATOMIC BOMB DIPLOMACY

From "Somewhere in Europe" a GI wrote to his brother last June:

"My buddies and I have been discussing and mulling over the attitude at home about Russia for months and months now. We can't understand why the press and certain well-known 'figures' are deliberately provoking the Russians.

"Pick up any issue of the *Reader's Digest* and you'll find an anti-Russian story. A friend of mine receives a church paper, and in every issue of it there is what we laughingly call a 'Red menace' story. This paper probably has a wide circulation.

"First and foremost let me emphasize that the American soldier *does not want to fight Russia*. (Emphasis in original—S.G.) As far as we are concerned, we see no reason for such a war, nor can we see where our national integrity is threatened by Russia.

"As a matter of fact, from where I sit, Russia is in a position to do us more good than harm. Russia has a terrific rebuilding problem on her hands, and of course, she'll need materials to build. We are in a position to be the recipient of this business . . .

"I sure wish the jerks who start wars would have to fight them. I think they'd change their minds. They'd have a helluva time getting us to fight the Russians right now." (PM, June 15, 1945.)

This GI's viewpoint is shared by millions.

The free peoples of the world have just been victorious in a war against a powerful and cunning foe. Yet, the masses in every land already live in dread of World War III.

The atom bomb which hastened the surrender of Japan is at the same time a source of apprehension: who knows how long it will take our erstwhile enemies to ferret out its secret? Conversely, what guarantee have we that this most deadly of all weapons will not be directed against those of our allies without whose aid and sacrifices the victory of the United Nations might never have been achieved?

Powerful forces in American politics are planning the next



war. They talk ominously of the old "menace"—the Soviet Union.

These interests gave aid and comfort to the Nazis and their Japanese imperialist partners-in-crime. They helped build Hitler Germany into an aggressive power; it was they who encouraged the sale of scrap iron to Japan which was later used for munitions to kill American soldiers. These interests welcomed Munich as a means for directing the Nazi war eastward, with the Soviet Union as the target. They are the class that brought Hitler and Mussolini to power and helped erect regimes which ravaged Europe and took the lives of millions. These are the Munichmen of today who seek to build the most powerful Army, Navy and Airforce in the world, who refuse to share the secret of the atomic bomb in order to smash the growth of democratic movements abroad and embark on a war against the Soviet Union.

These reactionary groups are convinced that the best foundation for this type of rampant imperialism is to bring about an irreparable rift in American-Soviet relations. Thus they are now doing everything in their power to nullify the Potsdam agreement. At the same time they are turning over more and more authority to fascists in the conquered countries; they are encouraging the rebuilding of German heavy industry. This was the original master Plan, it was the theory behind Appeasement, but the plan miscarried. Now the imperialists hope to make another—and more successful try—at their "real enemy," the Soviet Union.

They speculate, among other things, on the proverbial short memories of the American people. They hope that the Russians' sacrifices in the United Nations war against the fascists will soon be forgotten. But glorious pages in human history cannot be erased from the record.

Citing the heroic and decisive stand of the Soviet peoples as one of the major factors which "saved the United States a war on her own soil," in his recent report to the Secretary of War, Gen. George C. Marshall, U. S. Chief of Staff, said of the epic defense of Stalingrad:

"Even after the reverse before Moscow in 1941, Germany might have avoided defeat had it not been for the campaign in 1942 which culminated in the disaster at Stalingrad..."

While the Russians were killing millions of Nazis and thus saving the lives of American, British and other allied soldiers, these propagandists filled the press and radio with yarns that the Russians would make a separate peace with Hitler. These baseless charges were made by the very persons most eager for a negotiated peace with the Nazis.

While the Russians were busy driving the Nazis from their land, the American people were told by the same groups that the Red Army would stop at its own frontier, leaving the job of finishing off Hitler to the other allies. When the Russians, having chased the Nazis off Soviet territory, pursued the fleeing Hitlerites across the border, liberating one country after another, these anti-Sovieteers, led by Hearst, proclaimed that Stalin is "a hijacker—a 'stick-up' whose purpose is to . . . communize all of Europe and who negotiates with our enemies." (*N. Y. Journal-American*, Aug. 18, 1943.)

Following the victory over Nazi Germany, when the Red Army under Marshal Georgi K. Zhukov, took Berlin, the anti-Soviet contingent asserted that the Red Army would not join the war against Japan. Informed circles knew that Stalin had pledged at conferences of the Big Three that the Russians would move against the Japanese shortly after victory in Europe.

When the U.S.S.R. declared war on Japan in fulfillment of its pledge to its allies, the hate-Russian crowd declared that the Soviets were closing in "for the kill." It was the old business of "damned if you do and damned if you don't."

### ***The "Get Tough" Boys***

Highpoint of the anti-Soviet crusade took place during the United Nations security conference in San Francisco in April, 1945. Called for the purpose of forming an international body to secure world peace, the conference became a sounding board for the most blatant anti-Soviet provocations. Encouraged by Stettinius of the State Department, Senators Connally and Vandenberg announced that the U. S. had decided to "get tough" with the Soviet Union. The press and radio engaged in a saturnalia of slander against our Soviet allies.

Quite naturally, the Hearst-McCormick-Patterson-Scripps-Howard press, joined by the Social Democrats and Trotzkyites,



took the usual position against the Soviet Union, except, as Israel Amter, New York Communist leader put in it *The Worker*, "they pounded the drums a little harder."

The N. Y. *Post* published a dispatch from a correspondent at the San Francisco conference that "the National Association of Manufacturers and the American Bar Association have formed an anti-Russian bloc among the U. S. consultants."

Bluntest of all was Senator Albert W. Hawkes of New Jersey, former president of the National Association of Manufacturers. Addressing GI's in Rome, he asked the servicemen:

"How do you men feel, the great majority of you soldiers, who have fought the war and been here a long time? *How do you feel about finishing the job by fighting the Russians?*"

Across the continent, the U. S. ambassador to the Soviet Union, W. Averell Harriman, was quoted as saying at a private gathering—off the record, of course—that "the interests of the United States and the Soviet Union are irreconcilable." Harriman's assertions were so astounding that it is reported that Roy Howard, executive editor of the N. Y. *World-Telegram*, who himself has contributed no little to the anti-Soviet campaign, was constrained to remark: "Mr. Ambassador, judging from what you say we should be sending lend-lease to Japan rather than to the Soviet Union."

### ***The Echo Lingers***

Much of the current anti-Soviet campaign is based on the growing opposition in high circles to a truly democratic and anti-fascist Europe in which the people will have the right freely to choose their own forms of government and social systems. That explains, to a large extent, the "inspired" newspaper dispatches in the capitalist press by correspondents writing about the recent London Five-Power conference, and the fulminations of the columnists in the reactionary press and on the radio.

The purpose of this campaign is to undermine American-Soviet friendship and cooperation.

Anti-Soviet agitators openly advocate that American government authorities use the threat of the atomic bomb to enforce its will in international affairs.

"These flagrant imperialists," wrote a commentator in the



authoritative Soviet publication *New Times*, "forget history's lessons. They ignore the collapse of the Hitlerite plans for world hegemony, which were based on intended utilization of temporary superiority in technical development."

Another Soviet writer observed tartly:

"There is nothing original about anti-Soviet campaigns. Such campaigns are conducted in various latitudes. Until recently they had their center in Hitler Germany. Goebbels conducted a gigantic jazz band, parts of which were seated in different countries of Europe and America. The conductor and the chief instrumentalists have now dropped out, but various anti-Soviet saxophones are still wheezing and squealing in many countries and towns."

The ironic words of Soviet Foreign Commissar Molotov emphasize the type of "moral suasion" being used by certain American interests against the Soviet Union. It is the traditional Big Stick policy concealed in an atomic bomb.

The London correspondent of the *N. Y. Post* reported the following October 1st:

"At a dinner for foreign ministers one night last week, Foreign Commissar Molotov was called on to make a small speech. He got up, grinned amiably at Secretary of State Byrnes and said:

"My speechmaking powers these days are somewhat limited. Now, when Mr. Byrnes wants to make a point he merely holds up a fragment of the atomic bomb. It is harder for me to make my points because I must make them through logic.'"

Walter Lippmann provided justification for Molotov's mordant humor when he wrote that, "Far from standing forth as the champions of morality against what it is the fashion to call power politics, we are incurring the grave suspicion of using morality as an instrument of our own power politics." Lippmann added that we are not likely to convince mankind that we believe in liberty "if the best we can do with our knowledge of the atomic bomb is to make a monopoly of it maintained by hysterical censorship . . ." (*Herald Tribune*, Oct. 18, 1945). President Truman's bellicose Navy Day speech showed that Molotov's wry comment and Lippmann's solemn rebuke were both rooted in reality.

## II.

### SABOTEURS OF THE MIND

Although the fascists have been defeated militarily on a world front, their journalistic spokesmen—still operating as their fifth column—have no intention of throwing up the sponge. During the war the McCormick Chicago *Tribune*, the Patterson N. Y. *Daily News* and Washington *Times-Herald*, the Hearst and Scripps-Howard publications kept up a running assault against the U.S.S.R. in order to divide the United Nations. Following the defeat of the Axis they remain loyal to the basic pro-fascist "philosophy" that the Soviet Union is the main "danger" to America and the Western nations.

The N. Y. *Journal-American*, which, in its issue of Jan. 26, 1938, announced that "'European appeasement' is a great and universally beneficial objective," and hailed Neville Chamberlain, the father of the Munich betrayal as "a clear-seeing and far-seeing statesman," in March, 1945, denounced the Yalta conference as another Munich.

The *Daily News* wrote, three weeks before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, that:

"Of all the Oriental peoples, the Japanese are most nearly like us . . . They are physically clean . . . think baseball is a fine game . . . are fiercely patriotic, whereas most Orientals are not . . . It is against these people that our war hawks are proposing that we fight a war. The Japanese don't want to fight us. They have gone to the length of Clipping a special envoy over here to make another bid for peace."

At the height of the war the *Daily News* expressed the fear that the Nazis were getting too heavy a beating from the Red Army. The paper warned against "the ultimate smashing of the German military power." During the same week it added China to the list of America's "enemies." It whispered in the best quisling style that, "We may face a powerful coalition run either by Japan or China."

Its pro-fascist line continues into the postwar period. Hate-Russia editorials are buttressed by anonymous and many patently fictitious letters in its Voice of the People department.

On the more ludicrous side, the *Daily News* created a stir among millions of Americans during the summer of 1944 with



a cable from one of its correspondents reporting an alleged interview with American fliers returning from a shuttle-bombing trip, who were quoted as telling of an "organized prostitution" service for Americans. A dispatch from Ella Winter, N. Y. *Post* correspondent completely exposed this fable with the blunt statement that twenty correspondents who had visited U. S. air bases in Russia and had questioned Americans about the *Daily News* story flatly denied the yarn.

The correspondent added:

"The press had a conference with Ambassador Harriman and several meetings with members of our military mission. They all expressed amazement at the story."

The *Daily News* was recently under fire again after its Washington columnist, John ("Iron Cross") O'Donnell charged that influential American Jews had been responsible for Gen. George Patton's removal by Eisenhower. Outraged protests from people of all strata forced O'Donnell to publish a retraction.

Clearly, the most authoritative witnesses on the services rendered the Nazis by their American newspaper friends are the Nazis themselves. A short wave radio report broadcast from Berlin at 5:28 P.M. on Aug. 21, 1942, carried the following testimonial, according to the official U. S. report:

"Berlin, commenting on the 'so-called free press of America' today, cited the *Chicago Tribune*, the N. Y. *Daily News* and the *Washington Times-Herald* as typical examples of what the American press was up against under Roosevelt's dictatorship . . . These newspapers, being true American papers and representing the majority of the American people, are being persecuted by the Roosevelt administration even to being accused as saboteurs of the war effort."

### ***The Lies of Our Times***

Poisoning the minds of the American people against the Soviets is not a contemporary phenomenon. For years there was no lie too outrageous to print about the Russian people, whether it concerned cannibalism or the "nationalization of women."

In 1920, two American journalists, Walter Lippmann and Charles Merz, made a study of news reports about Russia in the



N. Y. *Times* for the period between March, 1917, and March, 1920. They examined more than 1,000 issues of that newspaper. In their conclusions (published as a supplement to the *New Republic*, Aug. 4, 1920, later in a pamphlet, *The Test of the News*), the authors concluded that "the news on one matter of transcendent importance to America (Soviet Russia—S. G.) has been dubious." Their study showed "how seriously misled was the *Times* by its reliance upon the official purveyors of information." Moreover, "that certain correspondents are totally untrustworthy because their sympathies are too deeply engaged."

Mr. Lippmann is now a noted newspaper commentator. His colleague in this devastating expose of the N. Y. *Times*, Mr. Merz, is now Editor of the *Times*. But the *Times* still lies about Russia.

### ***Hoover Speaks a Truth***

From 1917 on, the American reading and listening public has been deluged with outright lies and misinformation about the U.S.S.R. But this campaign has not remained unanswered. Tens of thousands of Americans have visited the Land of Socialism and have observed conditions for themselves. These have included clergymen, scientists, authors, artists—and trade unionists. The militant labor press—notably the *Daily Worker* and *New Masses*—for years were almost alone in telling the true story of the advance of Socialism.

Most important, the valor of the Red Army and the Soviet people in resisting the Nazi invaders stirred the admiration of millions of Americans, many of whom sought to understand the political and social basis which made their armies so effective and their people so staunch.

Nevertheless, the anti-Soviet field is still a fertile one.

Currently, Senators Vandenberg and Taft, Governor Dewey—and their mentor, Herbert Hoover—are the prime political intriguers for war against the Soviet Union.

Hoover is an old hand at anti-Soviet conspiracy.

"To tell the truth," he confided on one occasion, "the ambition of my life is to crush out Soviet Russia."

Incredible as this may sound, this assertion was made to Benjamin C. Marsh, secretary of the People's Lobby, and ap-

peared in an interview in the *San Francisco News* of Aug. 13, 1931.

Millions are under the erroneous impression that Hoover, as U. S. food administrator during World War I, succoured starving Europe. But fewer people are aware of the fact that Hoover used food as a club to destroy democratic governments, as in the case of Hungary, Finland and other countries.

While President of the U. S. (1929-1933), Hoover—according to a detailed study by Robert W. Dunn and Charles J. Coe—refused to make even a gesture in the direction of recognition of the Soviet Union.

As the authors point out, despite the progressive growth of Soviet trade and industry and the improvement of the general welfare of the people, Hoover, referring specifically to the Soviet Union in the second year of its Five-Year Plan, declared:

“The world in this hour is witnessing the most overwhelming tragedy of ten centuries in the heart-breaking life and death struggle with starvation by a nation of 150 millions of people. In Russia under the new tyranny a group, in pursuit of social theories, has destroyed the primary self-interest impulse of the individual to production.”

As millions of Americans will recall, Hoover, during the crisis years of 1929-1932, provided Americans with ample opportunity to encourage their “primary self-interest impulse” by selling apples to each other.

Hoover made a most revelatory statement in a speech in his home city of Palo Alto, Calif., in 1936:

“My thinking always comes to a precipice when I reflect on the profit system, for beyond the precipice I see either communism or fascism. Personally, I prefer fascism.” (Federated Press, Feb. 18, 1936.)

It is not at all surprising that Hoover's disciple, Dewey, shares the views of his mentor on Soviet-American relations. Dewey has proclaimed:

“It has recently been revealed that within the past year the administration (headed by the late President Roosevelt—S.G.) seriously considered still another deal with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In a futile attempt to avert war, it actually explored the possibilities of a fantastic partnership with Rus-

sia . . . We need no such partnerships . . . " (As reported in the N. Y. *Times*, Jan. 21, 1940.)

In the same speech—at the 19th annual luncheon of the Women's National Republican Club at the Hotel Astor—Dewey said:

"Insofar as the present administration has adhered to the policies of its predecessors, it has met with the general approval of the American people. But it has occasionally strayed from the path. A conspicuous and most unfortunate departure was the recognition by the New Deal of Soviet Russia."

In striking contrast to this position was that of the late Wendell Willkie, the GOP's standard bearer in 1940, who in assailing the 1944 Republican platform makers who nominated Dewey for President, declared:

"We know from bitter experience that the United States cannot survive militarily, politically or economically in the modern world without close and continuing cooperation with other peace-loving nations. On the necessity for such cooperation we should speak in words forthright, clear and strong."

### *Behind the Scenes*

Joining Hoover in his anti-Soviet campaign is the notorious pro-Nazi leader of the American isolationists, Senator Burton K. Wheeler of Montana. Like Lyons, Gerald L. K. Smith and numerous *Reader's Digest* contributors, Wheeler was a prime favorite of the Nazis during the height of the war. In a speech in Chicago, reported by the Associated Press, Aug. 3, 1945, Wheeler said:

"I look for revolutions and counter-revolutions all over Europe as soon as the American Army is pulled out of there."

He added:

"So far as I can see, the war has resulted in only one thing: We have substituted Stalin for Hitler."

This stuff is, of course, not original with Wheeler. It is an echo of the wails of the Nazi general staff and the rest of the fascist clique whose plans for world conquest were defeated.

Back of the political front men and their press attaches who are whooping it up for another war loom the sinister figures of some of the biggest monied interests in the U. S. They are the powers behind those who do the dirty work. They are the



duPonts, the Henry Ford dynasty, reactionaries within the National Association of Manufacturers and others who hate our friend Russia more than our enemy, fascism.

They are the ones who worked and plotted in secret, here at home as well as through international tie-ups, to keep fascism in power abroad and permit it to fatten upon the peace-loving peoples of neighboring lands. They are the ones who over decades have tried to stem the true American way of life while posing as super-patriots. They are the ones who can be credited with leaving our country almost defenseless by a softening-up process of years of isolationist propaganda.

They hate unions and higher wages almost as much as they hate the U.S.S.R. They hate and fear the American people who want the better world for which they have bled.

To them the broken bones of young girls and old people slaughtered by the Nazis, the blood drained from the veins of children, bring no pang. They are concerned only with holding and extending their power by whatever hidden or overt method. They want the world to exploit for their own gain. They hate anything that stands in the way.

And the greatest dam to their ambitions is continuing friendship with a mighty nation which will not brook domination, exploitation, or provocation to new wars with defenseless peoples as victims.

The Hoovers, Vandenberg, Tafts, Deweys and Wheelers are the politicians who seek to make anti-Sovietism a keystone of government policy.

### III.

## THE JOURNALISTIC GOON SQUAD

Their propaganda salesmen dress up the politics of anti-Sovietism for presentation to the public in newspaper columns, magazines, and on radio forums.

Let no one underestimate their effectiveness and the harm they do to the cause of world peace which, in the first instance, is based on cooperation between the two most powerful nations—the U. S. and the U.S.S.R.

Among these journalistic trumpeters are William C. Bullitt, Clare Luce, William Henry Chamberlin, Eugene Lyons, West-

brook Pegler, George E. Sokolsky, Max Eastman, Louis Fischer, William L. White, Isaac Don Levine, David Dallin, Alexander Barmine—and other *Reader's Digest* favorites.

Let us examine their records, their associations, their claims to objectivity and the real meaning of their anti-Soviet activity.

### ***The Strange Career of William Bullitt***

When the armies of the United Nations were on the verge of giving the *coup de grace* to the fascists, a former American ambassador served notice on the American people that they must be prepared to fight World War III. Moreover, that their enemy then would be, not Hitler and Hirohito, but Joseph Stalin, leader of a people's army that was contributing more than its fair share of the fighting against the Axis.

Mr. William C. Bullitt, ex-envoy to France and to the U.S.S.R., availed himself of the hospitable pages of Henry Luce's *Life* magazine for these anti-Soviet incitations. Popping up simultaneously as a holder of a commission in the French army and credentials from *Life* as a "special correspondent," Mr. Bullitt clamored for a split between America and its Russian partner in war, at the same time ascribing all of his overt propaganda to unnamed citizens of Rome, from which capital he was at the moment presumably writing.

Numerous commentators at that time characterized the Bullitt intrigue as an effort to undo what the allied armies had achieved at the cost of so much blood, misery and sacrifice.

There was a time when Mr. Bullitt was regarded as a liberal, but closer study has revealed that Bullitt even in those days was sailing under false colors. Immediately after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, Bullitt was a member of an American mission to Russia. It was on this mission that he won a reputation as a liberal.

Yet it is a matter of record that his report contained recommendations strikingly similar to the methods used by Herbert Hoover to smash people's governments by the threat of withholding food—a method that is winning increasing favor in reactionary circles at the present time.

## The "Hunger Cure"

In Conclusion 3 of his report to President Wilson, Bullitt had urged:

"If the blockade is lifted and supplies begin to be delivered regularly to Soviet Russia, a more powerful hold over the Russian people will be established than by the blockade itself—the hold given by fear that this delivery of supplies may be stopped."

When Bullitt was named the first U. S. ambassador to the Soviet Union, following recognition in 1933, progressives not too familiar with his background were heartened. They saw in Bullitt a genuine proponent of Soviet-American amity. But before long Bullitt became "disillusioned" and turned against the U.S.S.R. One theory that has been advanced by observers is that Bullitt sought to persuade the Russians to pay the debts contracted in the U. S. by the short-lived and discredited Kerensky regime and was embittered at his failure to accomplish this end and score a whirlwind diplomatic triumph.

Shifted to Paris, Bullitt joined in every intrigue against the Soviet Union. The late William E. Dodd, who served the U. S. as ambassador to Nazi Germany during 1933-1938, recorded in his famous *Diary* that Bullitt stood for "unrestricted aggression against the Soviet Union from east and west."

In France, Bullitt helped to smash the Franco-Soviet pact, misled American authorities with inaccurate stories about the alleged weaknesses of Soviet armed forces, just as Lindbergh had done in order to justify the Munich betrayal; intrigued against the French Popular Front and—finally—by his own admission helped the Nazis take over Paris. He later explained that he did so to protect the city from "revolutionary elements."

Following his return to the U. S. Bullitt hailed the traitor Petain in these words:

"Marshal Petain has a tremendous reputation and he is thoroughly honest and straightforward. Marshal Petain is universally respected in France as he is throughout the world. He is trying to do his best in an extraordinary difficult situation."

Bullitt's provocations against the Soviet Union in the midst of global war against the fascists shocked even conservative



commentators. William L. Shirer, the famous war correspondent, writing of Bullitt's *Life* article in the N. Y. *Herald Tribune*, noted that:

"The Nazis in Berlin were quick last week to turn to their own propaganda purposes William C. Bullitt's article in *Life* magazine. Dr. Goebbel's henchmen, and especially his top broadcaster, Hans Fritzsche, leaped with joy on Mr. Bullitt's words, asserting that Europe feared Russian domination . . . After all, that has been one of the main lines of Nazi propaganda."

### ***The Female of the Species: Clare Luce***

A conspicuous advance "plug" for the mischievous Bullitt article appeared in the Aug. 30, 1944, issue of the Philadelphia *Inquirer*. The paper reported that:

"Biggest journalistic bombshell on Roosevelt diplomacy to date will be Bill Bullitt's article, written from Rome, shortly to appear in *Life* . . . In his article, Bill tells how Italy and half of Europe, in the absence of any coherent White House foreign policy, is being communized with the help of Soviet money . . ."

These words appeared under a signed column contributed to the *Inquirer* by Rep. Clare Luce, the wife of the publisher of *Life*.

Kindling anti-Soviet prejudices has been one of Mrs. Luce's chief activities on behalf of the reactionary clique in control of the Republican party. Mrs. Luce seldom makes a public statement in which Soviet-baiting is missing.

In an address before a meeting of the Men's Faculty Club of Columbia University, May 27, 1945, Mrs. Luce went so far as to say that ". . . the Russians are using murder as an instrument of political policy. This policy is being used by the Soviet Union all over Europe today." (*Herald Tribune*, May 28, 1945.)

That she should echo Hitler dogma is not surprising in view of her acceptance of the prime principle of Nazi propaganda, as expressed in Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, extolling the virtue of the Big Lie. For Mrs. Luce has written that:

"Lying increases the creative faculties, expands the ego, lessens the friction of social contacts . . . It is only in lies,

wholeheartedly and bravely told, that human nature attains through words and speech and forbearance, the nobility, the romance, the idealism, that—being what it is—it falls so short of in fact and in deed." (*Vanity Fair*, Oct., 1930.)

Mrs. Luce is obviously derivative, for Hitler wrote, in *Mein Kampf*, that:

"... In the big lie there is always a certain force of credibility . . . The grossly impudent lie always leaves traces behind it, even after it has been nailed down, a fact which is known to all expert liars in this world and to all who conspire together in the art of lying."

How fitting, therefore, that Mrs. Luce's speeches should be featured in the October, 1945, issue of Gerald L. K. Smith's *Cross and Flag*. Smith's fascist publication is carrying on for the suppressed *Social Justice*, organ of Charles E. Coughlin. Dr. Robert Ley, Nazi Labor Front leader, who committed suicide in order to evade trial as a war criminal, had requested Coughlin as his defense counsel, according to Maj. Douglas M. Kelley of San Francisco.

Public-spirited Americans have assailed Mrs. Luce for her irresponsible slanders against the Soviet Union. Typical was the statement made by Rep. Emanuel Celler, Brooklyn Democrat, who said that she was "playing a dangerous" game.

"I don't cut across the face of a friend with the whip of abuse," Rep. Celler observed. "Our attacks upon Russia directly after the last World War were most destructive of good will and yielded us no dividends."

One of the most effective rebukes administered Mrs. Luce for her anti-Soviet game came from a kin of a distinguished American fighter for women's rights—one whose pioneering work made possible the election of Mrs. Luce and other women to high office.

As reported by the Associated Press from Philadelphia, Oct. 10, 1944, Susan B. Anthony 2nd, great-niece of the famous exponent of woman suffrage, asserted in a radio address that Mrs. Luce had given "an exhibition of shallowness, derision and so-called glamor" in place of "the strength and dignity and powers of womanly statesmanship in the terrible tragedy of these (war) days."

Miss Anthony added:



"My aunt Susan would turn in her grave if she knew that her victory had resulted in bringing high public office in this crisis to one who uses that office, her influence and her position to play cheap politics.

"*Her voice and her pen have sought to array us against our Russian allies, to stir up capital against labor, Gentile against Jew, native-born against foreign-born, and servicemen against their Commander-Chief.* (My emphasis—S.G.)

"The place of Mrs. Luce is back home—back on her estate in Connecticut or back on her plantation in South Carolina or back in her apartment in the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City. Then Clare can clear everything with Henry."

### ***Chamberlin's Crusade***

One of the oldest-established anti-Soviet firms is run by William Henry Chamberlin. A slick operator, he has for nearly twenty years actively agitated for the destruction of the Soviet regime. It has been the very hardihood of the U.S.S.R. which provided Chamberlin with business. For, despite his hostility to the U.S.S.R., it is one of journalism's little ironies that Chamberlin's activities depend upon the continued solvency of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Chamberlin spent about ten years in the Soviet Union as correspondent for the *Christian Science Monitor*. He is regarded by such an avowed enemy of the U.S.S.R. as Eugene Lyons as "one of the foremost foreign students of the Russian Revolution." (*We Cover The World*, edited by Eugene Lyons, 1937.)

Authorship of several books in hard covers has given Chamberlin a synthetic reputation for scholarship. This he has found useful for planting his anti-Soviet propaganda in staid publications like the *Atlantic Monthly* and the *Yale Review* which would perhaps be reluctant to welcome to its chaste pages the more raucous members of the "I-hate-Russia" school such as Lyons and Isaac Don Levine.

Chamberlin's career provides a case study of a man whose repudiation of his early convictions (if such they were), impelled him to rationalize his present philosophy with such violence that his present position on the Soviet Union cannot be differentiated from fascists like Lawrence Dennis. He

sturdily denies that he is opposed to the Russian people and cites his passion for Turgenev. According to Chamberlin, it is the Soviet regime (which was decisive in the triumph over Hitlerism) that he hates.

His newspaper career began on the Philadelphia *Ledger*. Not long afterward he came to New York. He reports somewhere that he did a little irregular book reviewing for the N. Y. *Tribune* "and for some of the liberal magazines."

The "liberal magazines" included not only the *Nation* and the *New Republic* but also the magazine section of the old Socialist New York *Call* for which Chamberlin, later snugly ensconced in Moscow as correspondent for the *Christian Science Monitor*, wrote passionate defenses of Soviet Russia under the pseudonym of A. C. Freeman. In later years Chamberlin was to jeer at his early friendship for the Russian cause.

When Chamberlin and his wife went to Russia in 1922 he did not yet envisage a career as an anti-Soviet authority. He had no specific newspaper connection, only a general invitation to contribute mail articles to the *Christian Science Monitor*. "Our plan," he later related with characteristic lack of feeling toward the human implications of the German inflationary period, "was to be abroad at the most for a year and to spend part of that time in Germany, where inflation at that time made it possible for a foreigner to live in comfort, and even luxury for a few dollars a week."

In Russia, his newspaper connection with the *Monitor* became less tenuous, and after a time he was put on regular salary.

Although he announces piously that he "lacked the mental make-up . . . to shout 'Hallelujah' with equal enthusiasm after two completely contradictory decisions by the higher party authorities," in the same breath he tells of his "boyish delight" in giving the inquiring Communist reporter of a Kharkov newspaper two interviews, "one as the representative of the 'bourgeois-liberal' *Christian Science Monitor*, the other as the revolutionary A. C. Freeman. In the first I let myself go with all my New York fervor, denouncing American reaction, and even voiced the . . . hope that the American workers would soon follow the example of their Russian comrades."

Chamberlin's first book, based on his Russian experience,



*Soviet Russia: A Living Record*, is the least vicious of his creations, though hostility to the Soviet social system is already marked in its pages. This book, despite the sour notes already sounded in it, has embarrassed Chamberlin. He described his violently anti-Soviet *Russia's Iron Age*, published in 1934, as a "badly needed and overdue corrective of *Soviet Russia*."

### ***Apologist for Aggression***

Chamberlin's "Russian education," as he terms his stay in the Soviet Union, ended in 1935 when he was transferred to Japan.

"I went to the Soviet Union with favorable prepossessions, which were completely reversed, so far as the dominant regime was concerned," Chamberlin reports, adding: "I went to Japan without prepossessions at all . . . I left it . . . without any strong reaction, favorable or unfavorable."

This is, strictly speaking, not true. For Chamberlin has contributed an apology for Japan's ferocious assault upon the Chinese people—and later against the U. S.—sounding very much like an echo of the Nazis' demand for *lebensraum*. Summing up his experience in Japan, Chamberlin wrote in *Confessions of an Individualist*: "Sometimes, when I read or hear an American denunciation of Japanese aggression as purely and only the result of a diabolical tenfold dose of original sin, I am tempted to try the experiment of putting the shoe on the other foot. Suppose that we Americans numbered seventy millions and were obliged to live on an area about the size of California and in some ways, less rich than California in natural resources."

In the same vein, in an article, "As I think of Japan Now," in *Asia* (April, 1940), Chamberlin asserted: "A political execution in Japan is an extremely rare event. There are no concentration camps in Japan. And, while Japanese police methods with political suspects are far from gentle, this is certainly equally true of police in all dictatorial states."

Unmoved by the unspeakable atrocities committed against the Chinese people by the Japanese aggressors, Chamberlin writes:

"I suppose I should have felt more righteous indignation against Japan than I did. What the Japanese were doing on

the continent, trying to shoot and bomb the Chinese into subjection, was only too reminiscent of the Soviet dictatorship . . . ”

Small wonder Chamberlin got along so swimmingly in Tokyo or that he found that “Japan’s treatment of foreign journalists compares favorably” with that of the European countries!

It is doubtful whether another American journalist, J. B. Powell, would share Chamberlin’s enthusiasm. Until he was arrested by the Japanese on December 20, 1941, Mr. Powell was editor and publisher of the *China Weekly Review* and managing director of the China Press in Shanghai. He spent more than a year and a half in the notorious Bridge House Prison, where he lost his feet from gangrene, before he was repatriated on the Gripsholm in August, 1942.

Returning to the U. S. after his sojourn in Japan, Chamberlin set up shop as a free lance journalist and lecturer, specializing on such subjects as “What Is Stalin’s Game?” He became a frequent contributor to the *Atlantic Monthly*, *Asia* and *Foreign Affairs*. He is a special favorite of the *American Mercury*, edited until recently by another leader of the anti-Soviet contingent, Eugene Lyons. He also conducts a splenetic column in the *New Leader*, organ of the New York Social Democrats, of which he is a contributing editor. Virtually all books on the Soviet Union which require “special treatment” are farmed out of the *N. Y. Times Book Review* to Chamberlin. In his *New Leader* column he pulls out all stops when discussing Russia. The strain of being “subtle,” a task imposed upon Chamberlin by the editors of the *N. Y. Times*, is not a requisite for his *New Leader* pieces.

In addition to these regular accounts, the prolific Chamberlin is a contributing editor to a weird news letter called *Human Events*, published in Washington by a Frank C. Hanighen. Blatantly isolationist, it might conceivably be gotten up from a clippingsheet issued by Col. Robert R. McCormick’s *Chicago Tribune*. He also writes regularly for *The Progressive*, misnamed organ of the Wisconsin isolationists led by the brothers LaFollette.



## **Propagandist for Anti-Semitism**

Chamberlin's fellow-contributor to *The Progressive* is the former America First propagandist Milton Mayer, who authored the disgraceful anti-Semitic article, "The Case Against the Jews," for the *Saturday Evening Post*. Why Chamberlin feels political kinship with Mayer can be understood from the following paragraph tossed off by the former in recalling his Soviet experiences: "Considerable numbers of Jews have made careers in Soviet bureaucracy. Of perhaps a dozen officials whom I knew in the Press Department of the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, I recall only one who was not a Jew. Indeed the predominance of Jews in this Commissariat at the time of my stay in Russia was almost ludicrous." (From his *Confessions of an Individualist*, p. 118, Macmillan, 1940.)

H. M. Kiplinger, in "Washington Is Like That," (digested in *Reader's Digest*) created a national scandal by indulging in the Goebbels' theme to the effect that "Jews (in the U. S.) have become concentrated in a few government agencies," and strongly implying the desirability of Jewish quotas.

Chamberlin presumably has the same formula for the Soviet Union, which long ago extirpated anti-Semitism and the ghetto. In a fit of candor, Chamberlin confesses, in his memoirs, that "the Soviet Union is the only country where I have had to struggle against an occasional anti-Semitic impulse. Sonya (his wife) and I sometimes privately referred to the Jews as 'the dominant race,' and many of the Jewish Soviet officials were decidedly unprepossessing types, bumptious, arrogant, shifty, suspicious, and rather obsessed with a well founded inferiority complex." (From *Confessions of an Individualist*, p. 118.)

The late Goebbels in his heyday could hardly have been more trenchant.

The Hearst press has found Chamberlin's writings useful for its pro-fascist purposes. One of his articles, "Coddling Communism," originally written for the *Christian Science Monitor*, bloomed forth in the Hearst N. Y. *American* (Oct. 4, 1935). The article followed the Dies' pattern, attacking progressive movements as "of inestimable benefit to Mussolini and Hitler, in rallying the frightened middle classes to the banner of

dictatorship." Chamberlin argued, in effect, that the way to prevent fascism is to surrender to it.

The benefits of the anti-Soviet cartel are apparently extended to wives of members as well. Chamberlin exhausted his superlatives in discussing *My Lives in Russia* by Markoosha Fischer (Mrs. Louis Fischer) in the *N. Y. Times Book Review* of May 15, 1944.

Nor does Mr. Chamberlin confine his book reviews to friends and associates. Discussing Nehru's *Toward Freedom* in the *Saturday Review of Literature* (Feb. 15, 1944) he noted that "one point which a practical revolutionary, like Lenin or Hitler or Mussolini would have regarded as supremely important is largely passed over in Nehru's work. This is the problem of the seizure of power." (My emphasis—S.G.)

The device represented by the seemingly casual reference to "Lenin or Hitler or Mussolini" is characteristic of Chamberlin's technique. While maintaining the pose of the objective student of politics, he seeks his effects by sly and dishonest innuendo and by malicious coupling of antithetical concepts and personalities.

### ***Defender of Pro-Fascists***

Using *The Christian Century* as a sounding board, Chamberlin emerged as a defender of civil liberties in wartime (Jan. 13, 1943). He complained that the U.S. government was engaged in "systematic persecution" of *The Militant*, Trotskyite sheet, of Jan Valtin, and of Ralph Townsend, one-time assistant editor of the pro-fascist *Scribner's Commentator*.

In defending the man who contrived *Out of the Night*, Chamberlin wrote significantly that "there has been no intimation in the reports of Valtin's detention, of any new evidence of subversive activity. . . ." (My emphasis—S.G.)

Pleading for the pro-fascist Townsend, Chamberlin warned: "A trial that will bear close watching by those who believe in civil liberties has ben heralded by an indictment charging twenty-eight persons with conspiracy to injure the morale of the armed forces."

Townsend, accused of being a Japanese agent before he was

hired by the *Commentator*, drew a sentence of eight months to two years.

Faint rays of unconscious humor sometimes reveal themselves in Chamberlin's writings. For he discovered, on Oct. 12, 1942, an "entente between Wall Street and Stalinite communism." The cause of this outburst was a letter published in the N. Y. *Times* by the senior partner of the House of Morgan, Thomas W. Lamont. The financier had urged Soviet-American cooperation as a war measure.

Chamberlin's heart went out to Mannerheim Finland. "The Finnish decision to fight on," he wrote on one occasion, "is understandable in the light of the Soviet demands and the weakness . . . of Anglo-American diplomacy in Eastern Europe." The State Department's action, under Cordell Hull, in ordering the expulsion of Finnish Minister Procope for engaging in activities "inimical to the United States" brought forth anguished cries from Chamberlin. "Those who are personally acquainted with Mr. Procope," Chamberlin wailed, "found him a high-minded patriot and a sincere friend of this country!"

The July, 1944, issue of *The American Mercury* contained an article by Chamberlin entitled, "The Tragic Case of Finland," in which he calmly denied an alliance existed between Nazi Germany and Finland. Both Finland and the U.S. seem to have played a nasty trick on Chamberlin. For his article appeared just as the Nazis received an official request from the Finns for additional military aid, which was promptly forthcoming, and several days later the U.S. formally severed relations with Helsinki, with Secretary Hull denouncing Finland as a "willing Nazi puppet."

Even after influential sections of the American press, including *Time*, *Life* and the N.Y. *Times* had reluctantly acknowledged that Marshal Tito was the fighting leader of the Yugoslav partisans—and not the Axis puppet Mikhailovich—Chamberlin was still hurling epithets at Tito. Peevishly, he asserted "there has never been a Yugoslav Marshal, so the title is about as significant as the rank of 'colonel' which is bestowed so generously in some sections of the South."

With a slyness typically Chamberlinian, he reports, in one of his columns an obviously apocryphal conversation that subtly condones Nazi crimes:



"The conversation turned to world affairs. How many human beings were suffering the living death of Soviet concentration camps? No one doubted that the figure was to be reckoned in millions. . . . The other debates were about how many Jews had been killed during the Nazi occupation of Kiev. Pessimists thought the figure might be as high as 80,000."

This little parable requires no comment.

The *Russian Review* is a publication which Chamberlin edits in collaboration with a group of White Guard emigres. In a foreword to the first issue of the magazine Chamberlin wrote: "No doubt many Russians . . . hope that out . . . of the present ordeal will emerge, by some play of events the outline of which cannot now be foreseen with precision, a Free Russia as part of a Free Europe." One need not be able to foresee the "outline of events with precision" to assert that the idea of a "Free Russia" of the Kerensky type envisaged by Chamberlin and his anti-Soviet crew is one which the Russian people overthrew because it betrayed them and whose return they will never permit.

### *The Company He Keeps*

Chamberlin's social and political milieu is revealed at first hand in his nostalgic description of "a Muscovite evening at the home of Eugene Lyons" in New York. Almost all the guests had been in the U.S.S.R., he reports, "and the atmosphere recalled the large parties which Lyons and his exuberant wife, Billie, used to give in their apartment in Moscow."

Item: "The climax of the evening was reached when Joe Shaplen, whom I counted with Isaac Don Levine, Lyons, Malcolm Muggeridge, and myself among the few honest members of the 'anti-Comintern front,' dashed in with several copies of the latest issue of the *Saturday Evening Post*, containing one of the very interesting articles of . . . Krivitzky. He gave a detailed account of Soviet intervention in Spain. . . ."

Shaplen, N. Y. *Times* reporter, is understood to have authored the amazingly indigenous statement for the press issued last year by the Red Army deserter Victor A. Kravchen-

ko. As for "the very interesting articles of Krivitzky," they were prepared by another guest at this gay party—Isaac Don Levine. That perhaps explains why Soviet aid to the Spanish Republicans fighting the German and Italian fascist invaders is described as "Soviet intervention in Spain."

Krivitzky, a self-styled "Red Army general," brought consternation into the ranks of the anti-Sovietees by giving their game away when he committed suicide in 1941, leaving a letter confessing that he found it impossible to live any longer under the weight of his "big sins."

Appeasement and its goals have no sincerer mourner than Chamberlin. A reviewer in the *N.Y. Times Book Review* (Nov. 30, 1941) declared that "William Henry Chamberlin thinks Western sanity should have contrived to set Hitler and Stalin at each other's throats in 1939." (My emphasis—S.G.) This was of course the keystone of Munichism around which World War II was erected.

Having defended the Japanese imperialists and incited war against the Soviet people, Chamberlin—following V-J Day—rushed to the aid of the war criminals. In a column in the *New Leader*, of which he is an associate editor, he discovered that numerous "ethical issues [are] involved in these trials of vanquished by victors."

Chamberlin deplored the outcome of the trial of the arch-traitor Pierre Laval and said it afforded "an excellent model to avoid." On the other hand, he recommended as "an excellent model to follow" the conduct of Major Thomas Winwood, defender of the sadistic Josef Kramer and his fellow-sadists who slaughtered millions in the notorious Belsen concentration camp. It was Major Winwood, who in defending Kramer, offered as mitigation of his unspeakable crimes, the Nazi view that the victims were "the dregs of the ghetto." (For Chamberlin's shocking views on this subject, see the *New Leader* of Oct. 27, 1945.)

#### IV.

### ROLLING AMMUNITION FOR FASCISM

One of the most active and persistent anti-Sovietees in America is Eugene Lyons. During the war against the Axis

his activities assumed a world-wide character, for the Nazis found in his writings an effective divisive weapon against the United Nations.

Born in the home of a poor Jewish immigrant family on New York's east side, Lyons as a youth took an interest in Socialist activities. He began his newspaper career as a reporter on the Erie, Pa. *Dispatch*, later moving to *Financial America*, a Wall Street publication. During his brief association with the radical movement Lyons edited *Soviet Russia Pictorial*, did publicity work for the Sacco-Vanzetti Committee, and, following the execution of the two Italian workers, wrote *The Life and Death of Sacco and Vanzetti*. In 1928 he obtained the United Press assignment as correspondent in Moscow because the U.P., then headed by Karl Bickel, favored U.S. recognition of the Soviet Union and apparently felt that by naming a "radical," U.P. would get an "inside track" in the U.S.S.R.

In Moscow Lyons soon gathered about him a group of the *ancien regime*, remnants of a dying class, and entertained in style. Experts on each other's vices, Louis Fischer in his *Men and Politics* wrote of Lyons:

"Eugene Lyons, Moscow correspondent of the United Press, lived on a social island to which a certain type of Soviet citizen rowed over from the Soviet mainland in search of the warmth and light that comes with good food, dancing and pleasant hosts. . . . He rarely if ever visited Soviet factories . . . and when he visited a village it was usually to buy antique furniture."

As Lyons stayed on in the U.S.S.R. his dispatches assumed a more and more carping tone. He vied with the Hearst writers in spreading the lie that the Soviet government had deliberately starved millions of peasants in order to force them into the collective farm system. Some of his Moscow colleagues have sought to explain Lyons' "disillusionment" as based on disappointment that the Russians did not receive him with fanfare although he had been a "radical" in New York. They say that when the Soviets treated him with the same objective, detached manner as the "bourgeois correspondents," he was quite disappointed, and this colored his thinking and ultimately changed his views. While this is only



part of the story, it suggests that only a careerist who viewed the great events in the U.S.S.R. simply as a backdrop for personal aggrandizement could have reacted in the way that Lyons did.

### *"Disillusionment" as a Career*

While he was still in the Soviet Union Lyons wrote *Moscow Carousel*. It didn't cause a ripple. A later book, however, *Assignment in Utopia* (1937), which appeared after he had been dismissed by the U.P. and had returned to the United States, brought him huge royalties and laid the basis for his subsequent reputation as an anti-Soviet "expert."

In 1933, at the height of the Roosevelt-Litvinoff conversations in Washington which led to U.S. recognition of the Soviet Union, Lyons filed a story with the United Press (he circumvented the Soviet censors by telephoning the story to the London U.P. office) that Russian anti-aircraft guns had fired on Japanese planes flying over Siberia. According to Lyons, bodies of Japanese flyers were handed over the Japanese border, and Russian ships equipped with cannon had presumably sunk Japanese fishing trawlers in Russian waters. The strategy of Lyons—or those who were feeding him this phony "tip"—was, evidently, that if the U.S.S.R. was at war with Japan, then the U.S. was in a stronger bargaining position with the Soviets.

The Russians promptly and categorically denied the Lyons' story. Proven unreliable even as a capitalist journalist, Lyons was recalled by the United Press. According to Arthur Upham Pope, who provides some interesting details of this episode in his biography of Litvinoff, Lyons had two versions of his downfall; the first, that Japanese "news contacts" in Moscow had furnished him with the information; the second, that he had been "framed" by the Soviet authorities. He used these two alibis interchangeably, but there is little doubt that the first version is the true one, although Lyons, for obvious reasons, preferred to peddle the second.

Out of a job, Lyons tried his hand at publicity, made an unsuccessful foray in Hollywood and emerged with an article on "Red infiltration" in the film city which Martin Dies used in his press releases together with the startling information

that Shirley Temple was a dangerous agitator. He finally wound up as editor of *The American Mercury*. Under his editorship anti-Soviet articles were published in virtually every issue, many of them "reprinted" in *Reader's Digest* by prior arrangement. Lyons published a lurid anti-Soviet article by Jan Valtin, two years before the latter's *Out of the Night* appeared. Later, when Valtin was arrested as a dangerous enemy alien, Lyons, with Max Eastman, David Dubinsky and others, joined in forming a defense committee for the self-confessed Gestapo agent.

In recent years Lyons has been a regular contributor to the Hearst and Scripps-Howard press whenever an anti-Soviet drive was on. He wrote extensively and with characteristic disregard for facts on the Moscow trials, which, according to former Ambassador Joseph E. Davies, destroyed Hitler's fifth column in the Soviet Union. Lyons assailed Davies' *Mission to Moscow* in the Scripps-Howard press. Anti-Soviet provocations (in regard to Poland, for example) appearing in the capitalist press in the form of letters invariably include Lyons' name among the signators. He has attacked the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, issued blasts against Henry Wallace at the same time that he defended Senator Burton K. Wheeler and the rest of the pro-Nazi, soft-peace, isolationist gang. Of the notorious Dies Committee, Lyons has written that, "Time has more than justified the committee's work."

### *Favorite of the Nazis*

Lyons was a top-priority source of propaganda for both the German and Italian fascist army commands. Among the tons of propaganda found in the cache of an Italian lakeside villa were the writings of "Eugene Lyons, anti-Russian-American journalist who once edited the *American Mercury* magazine. . . ."

This vital fact was reported in the U.S. Army newspaper, *Stars and Stripes*, in a story by staff correspondent Sgt. Stan Swinton (May 19, 1945).

More recently, Moscow Radio's correspondent reported his findings in the American editorial office of the German propaganda apparatus at Koenigswusterhausen. The reporter said: "There were also many articles by the American writer,



Eugene Lyons. His article in the 1943 issue of the *American Mercury* was considered quite a choice piece by the Hitlerites. The fascists were so enthusiastic about another article by Lyons that they even published it on their own press."

The Moscow Radio correspondent added that in the American section there was a feature file entitled "Moscow Seen Through American Eyes." He continues: "And there is again an article by Eugene Lyons on Willkie's impressions of the Soviet Union. As might well be expected, the *American Mercury* is presented by the Hitlerite propagandists as the influential magazine of the United States."

Essaying the role of analyst, Lyons announced over a nationwide radio hookup the day Hitler invaded the Soviet Union that the Red Army would "not last two weeks—it has no morale." Later he wrote that "Only political morons could contemplate without goosepimples the possibilities of the Red Forces licking Hitler's hordes (and) pursuing an advantage westward."

The same year Lyons published *The Red Decade* in which hundreds of progressives and liberals who had contributed to Loyalist Spain and had otherwise displayed a generous impulse were labeled "stooges of Moscow." Included in this designation were men like Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, Goodwin Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Prof. George S. Counts, who later became Lyons' co-worker in the Social-Democratic Liberal Party.

### ***The Man Who Hates Millions***

The Detroit fascist, Gerald L. K. Smith, recommended *The Red Decade*, organized its sale at meetings and plugged it in his magazine, *The Cross and Flag*. The Nazi radio quoted Lyons' book with enthusiasm.

The definitive estimate of Lyons was given by William Bird, a former foreign correspondent. Reviewing *The Red Decade* in the ultra-conservative N. Y. *Sun* (Aug. 28, 1941), Mr. Bird wrote:

"Eugene Lyons . . . having mourned for the Trotzkyites, having made their cause his own . . . is close to being obligated, in logic, to embrace Hitler's cause."

Unlike some of the other journalistic goons, Pegler's "spe-



ciality" is not the U.S.S.R., but his espousal of every reactionary cause necessarily creates the political climate for every type of anti-Soviet slander. (His third column in the Scripps-Howard press on December 13, 1933, was a glorification of lynching.) With Pegler's principal targets the C.I.O., the Roosevelt family, the Communists and all progressive tendencies in American life, it goes without saying that he loses no opportunity to distort and misrepresent the role of the Soviet Union in world affairs.

During the war Westbrook Pegler repeatedly attacked the United Nations' alliance. Following the military victory against the fascists, he joined the reactionary chorus which sang that the Soviet Union is seeking to "communize" Europe. Six months after the Nazi invasion of the U.S.S.R., after millions of Russians had given their lives in the struggle against our common foe, Pegler wrote sneeringly:

"Our people are not going to believe that our gallant allies of Russia are fighting for the four freedoms and the principles expressed in our American Bill of Rights and I think it is a mistake to ask them to, because you thereby insult their intelligence." (From his syndicated column, Dec. 17, 1941.)

Nine days earlier—and less than twenty-four hours after the sneak Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor—Pegler had dashed off these words:

"We all know that most of the arguments that the America First crowd used against President Roosevelt were true. He put us in the war against Germany by evading the constitution and his promises that American boys would not be sent to a foreign war were campaign trickery to get himself elected."

During the 1944 presidential campaign Pegler stimulated racial hatreds by his thinly-veiled anti-Semitic attacks upon Sidney Hillman. He has even included David Dubinsky, head of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and one of the leaders of anti-Soviet propaganda in the labor movement as among "a lot of men with their roots still in European soil." But the basic political kinship between Pegler and Dubinsky impelled the latter to praise Pegler in a speech at the I.L.G.W.U. convention in 1944, while the *New Leader*, one of Dubinsky's chief mouthpieces, ran a "critical" series which in fact was a glorification of the Hearst propagandist.

In his column of Oct. 31, 1941, Pegler wrote, "I am a reactionary, that is what I am." The late unlamented Benito Mussolini had likewise written in one of his proclamations, "Fascism . . . did not fear to call itself reactionary."

This, of course, is not a matter of plagiarism. More important, it reveals a spiritual kinship that is deathless.

### *The Sins of Sokolsky*

Anti-Soviet agitation has been the stock in trade of George E. Sokolsky for decades. He has been in the business almost continuously since the Russian Revolution of 1917. Now a columnist for the *N. Y. Sun*, his stuff is syndicated in numerous other newspapers.

Born in New York, George Ephraim Sokolsky attended the city's public schools. Following graduation from high school he enrolled in the School of Journalism of Columbia University.

One afternoon young Sokolsky was summoned to the office of the director of the school, Dr. Talcott Williams, and given a terrific verbal shellacking. According to the stenographic report of that historic meeting, Dr. Talcott spoke thus:

"In talking with your instructors in regard to your absences I find the general impression among them is that you are not honest-minded. . . . There is a general impression that you are a grafter and a sponge, that you raise money by borrowing, that you ask for what you want and are willing to take it wherever you get it. . . . You have no weight in your class. You have no influence in the school and you are looked upon all around by those who come in contact with you as a man who does not have and does not understand the truthfulness that lies behind the truth. . . . If you had gone to jail and served time, you could get over that more easily than you can get over this impression which now surrounds you at all points."

The venerable Dr. Williams must have had clairvoyant powers, for he saw in the budding venal journalist the beginnings of those vices which guaranteed his success as an "author and lecturer," as he was described by the American Iron and Steel Institute when—twenty years later—it put Sokolsky on its payroll as a secret open-shop propagandist.

Dr. Williams continued:

" . . . Make good? If by making good you mean you will always be able to pick up a living, and that on every new group of people you will make an impression with your bright eyes, your capacity for expression, your ready phrase-making, and your habit of commenting upon what pleases you, that you leave the impression that your acts and efforts are guided by principle and a desire to serve, you will. These all will carry you for a while, you will begin with influence but you will lose it, and you will have all through life (unless you change) to be perpetually seeking new groups as you have in the three years you have been in school. You are always looking for a buffer against the hard knocks of life. . . . And you have made the impression that whatever else happens, you intend to have an easy exit from trouble. . . . Unless you change, your end is certain."

And so, on June 7, 1917, an official Columbia University card read: "*Mr. G. E. Sokolsky [School of] Journalism, was dropped for discipline.*"

### *Secret Agent*

After this castigation young Sokolsky probably blushed a bit, but he had already learned to turn things to his own account. Listening to the elderly gentleman who had just paddled him, Sokolsky apparently concluded that if Dr. Williams' analysis of him were true—and it was difficult to challenge it—then the surest road to success with that kind of personal equipment would be capitalist journalism.

Following his dismissal from Columbia he went to Russia with credentials from a British newspaper, during the short-lived Kerensky regime. Soon after he went to China in company of some White Guard emigres. After working as a house boy for a wealthy Chinese he became editor of the Japanese-controlled *Far Eastern Review*. (Not long ago, an issue of the *China Weekly Review* listed Sokolsky as a Japanese propagandist.)

In 1938 the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, headed by Senator Robert M. LaFollette of Wisconsin, disclosed the fact that Sokolsky had received \$29,599 from June, 1936 to Janu-



ary, 1938, chiefly for services to the American Iron and Steel Institute. Said services were for writings and lectures in the interests of the open shop. Sokolsky also made a deal with the National Association of Manufacturers for \$1,000 a month. The N.A.M. sent out bulletins describing their agent as ". . . a Communist and radical." They added, however, that ". . . he has now reformed and has a real message to deliver to those who are interested in the welfare of industry."

It should occasion no surprise, therefore, that Sokolsky wrote a syndicated column attacking the American Communists for urging closer relations between the U.S., China and the U.S.S.R. as a means for winning an enduring peace. Sokolsky wrote that ". . . it is preferable to suffer the agonies of a prolonged war than to accept peace as a bounty from Stalin."

While the financial arrangements with the American Iron and Steel Institute and the National Association of Manufacturers remained a top secret until exposed by the LaFollette Committee, Sokolsky appeared openly as a devotee of N.A.M. open shop "ideals." On one occasion he delivered an address, "Platform Pioneering by the N.A.M.," before a luncheon session of the Congress of American Industry and the annual convention of the National Association of Manufacturers at the Waldorf-Astoria.

Sokolsky told the assembled industrialists, among other things:

"You opposed the Wagner Bill and now you oppose the Wages and Hours Bill, and you have been right."

The speech made December 8, 1937 was later issued by the N.A.M. as a pamphlet and given wide distribution in open-shop circles.

Sokolsky has been hailed by Henry Luce's *Time* magazine as "a star spangled spieler for capitalism" and a "one-man intellectual front for conservative capital."

His book, *The Tinder Box of Asia*, brought this comment from the *Nation*:

"If Mr. Sokolsky's book has not been written by the National Association of Manufacturers, it should have been. . . . It is sheer propaganda, crude, stupid and vicious." This characterization has been more than justified by Sokolsky's per-

sistent campaign—before and after Pearl Harbor—advocating the “wisdom” of remaining friendly with Japan, and later, for a soft peace with the Japan militarists.

Drew Pearson, in his widely syndicated column of Dec. 12, 1944, disclosed the fact that Sokolsky had aided the fascist U.S. Senator W. Lee (Pappy) O’Daniel in his campaign in the South. Wrote Pearson:

“Sokolsky, one-time apologist for the Japs and paid publicity agent for the National Association of Manufacturers, Tom Girdler and Ernest Weir, has been revealed as one of the master minds behind the Lee O’Daniel *News* . . . a rabid, anti-Roosevelt propaganda sheet which dripped vitriol last summer. . . .”

In brief, Sokolsky has had a varied career—in which he has always worked for the highest bidder.

### *The Degeneration of Max Eastman*

A more deceptively urbane but equally dangerous anti-Soviet propagandist is Max Eastman. As a “roving editor” of the *Reader’s Digest*, Eastman’s journalistic activities have now become truly international, for this sinister little magazine reaches millions of readers throughout the world with its numerous foreign editions.

A former instructor at Columbia University, Eastman became editor of the old *Masses* shortly after it was founded in 1911. During the first World War the magazine was suppressed by the U.S. government for publishing anti-war material and several editors, including Eastman, were indicted and put on trial. At the first trial the jury disagreed; at the second also; but at the latter trial Eastman took the stand and sought to explain that he had changed his views about the war and was now convinced that it was a war for liberty and democracy. In this respect he showed far less courage than Charles E. Ruthenberg, Eugene V. Debs and others of the time who fought for their convictions and stood ready to pay the penalty for maintaining them in the face of prejudice and the mass propaganda organized by the American imperialists.

Eastman was for several years a member of the Communist Party until expelled from its ranks. Although he spent less than two years (1922-24) in Soviet Russia, he has been operat-

ing as an expert on the subject ever since. He has written numerous books attacking the Soviet Union, and was for many years the official translator and agent of Trotsky's counter-revolutionary writings.

Eastman took an active part in organizing the attempt to whitewash Trotsky in the form of the farcical "investigation" inspired by Trotsky and his personal lieutenants in Mexico City in 1937. Together with Lyons he attacked the Moscow trials in the reactionary sections of the American press. During the 1944 election campaign, when the election of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt was so crucial to victory over the fascists, Eastman joined with Lyons in a series in the Scripps-Howard press aimed to prove that the campaign to re-elect Roosevelt was a "Kremlin plot" in which the American Communists were the prime "conspirators."

In his "Letter to Americans," published in July, 1941, Eastman wrote: "I find Lindbergh's demonstration that America is not in danger of immediate military attack impressive." This was the type of pro-Nazi propaganda then being peddled by the American isolationists headed by Col. Robert R. McCormick of the *Chicago Tribune*, Capt. Joseph Patterson of the N.Y. *Daily News* and the Hearst press.

Slandering the growing movement for world trade union unity, Eastman wrote in the *New Leader*, of which he is a contributing editor: "It is blind folly for the C.I.O. to join hands with the totalitarian slave drivers who run the Russian so-called trade unions, in order to achieve a pretended solidarity of world labor." (Dec. 30, 1944.)

Eastman was one of the *Digest* editors who worked on the condensation of Friedrich A. Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom*, a contemporary handbook for reaction. The Hearst newspaper chain urged every "free-acting, free-thinking American" to "lose no time in getting hold of the book" and "reading every line of its 244 pages." The pro-fascist volume was similarly touted by the National Association of Manufacturers, General Motors and other powerful anti-union groups.

Eastman's attack on Russian war relief, which appeared in the July, 1943, issue of *Reader's Digest*, was praised by Gerald L. K. Smith, and summarized by the Axis radio (July 20, 1943) for an anti-United Nations propaganda broadcast to



Asia, according to the Columbia Broadcasting Company which recorded it.

William L. White, like Max Eastman, is also a "roving editor" of *Reader's Digest*. That publication presented a gift to the Nazis in the form of a condensation of White's *Report on the Russians*. A reviewer in the *N.Y. Times* was impelled to report that "nothing makes bad blood or sets up solid, ugly opposition more than to malign an ally. . . . Mr. White fires no guns for fascism, but he rolls ammunition for it." A reviewer in the *N.Y. Post* called the book "the shabbiest performance any established writer has foisted upon the American public for years. . . ." The foreign editor of the *N.Y. Herald Tribune* said White's concoction was "a travesty of a report on the Russians."

A group of world-famous foreign correspondents in Moscow, headed by Quentin Reynolds, denounced the book after reading the "condensation" in *Reader's Digest*.

Nonetheless, White's "bazooka," as it was aptly described by correspondent Alexander Kendrick in the *Nation*, received favorable publicity in many quarters through its sponsorship by the Book-of-the-Month Club (which four years earlier had polluted hundreds of thousands of American homes with Jan Valtin's *Out of the Night*).

### "Adventures" of Louis Fischer

Some months ago, Louis Fischer turned in his resignation as a contributing editor of the *Nation*. In truculent tones, Fischer accused the magazine of following a "party line" in its discussion of Soviet-American affairs. What Fischer meant, of course, was that the *Nation* had declined to join the anti-Soviet chorus.

Shortly after Fischer's ostentatious and self-righteous letter appeared, the magazine reported that the response from its readers indicated a three to one support of the *Nation's* position on the U.S.S.R.

When the writer of this pamphlet was in the Soviet Union as a correspondent (1935-39), he noticed in studying Fischer that the latter viewed every public speech, declaration, or official action with chronic suspicion. It was a reflex action. If the Soviet government reported an increase in the

budget for education, Fischer must find some dark and hidden meaning behind the advance. If the Soviet authorities—following a nationwide discussion in the factories, on the collective farms and in the press—enacted legislation illegalizing abortions, Fischer must prove that the move is calculated to build a “Red imperialist” army.

For nearly fifteen years Fischer wandered in and out of the U.S.S.R. Actually, he used the Soviet capital as a dateline center of operations, while he flitted about various European centers in quest of the great and near-great. While in Moscow he fancied himself the unofficial ambassador of the liberal intelligentsia of the U. S., whom he later, in a book of memoirs, reviled as “intellectual slummers and dissatisfied women.”

“After Munich,” Fischer has written, “people like Edgar Mowrer and myself who had grown attached to Europe got together and mourned.” The tragedy of Czechoslovakia—prelude to the horrors of World War II—seemed to Fischer a minor detail compared with his own nostalgia for the Europe that had ceased to exist for him.

Fischer has always been much taken with the so-called aristocracy. One learns from his writings, for example, that Mr. So-and-So was born in “fashionable Rittenhouse Square,” and that Count Brockdorff-Rantzau, one-time German ambassador to Moscow, “descended from an old Prussian line.” Moreover, that the noble count “recoiled from fleshy, smelly, earthy Moscow and the heavy tongues, heavy boots, and heavy manners of the average Bolsheviki.” Likewise, Trotzky’s “light” manners—as well as his counter-revolutionary activities—has always fascinated Fischer.

Few things reveal this anti-Soviet journalist’s egocentricity and callousness more than his calm reference to the war in Spain in 1936. “I was happy,” he has recorded, “that a situation had arisen which took me away from Russia.” It seems to have been a stroke of personal good fortune for Fischer that Hitler, Mussolini and Franco launched their murderous assault upon the Spanish people and thus laid the basis for World War II.

Concluding that it would be high adventure to enroll in the International Brigades, Fischer worked in the quartermaster’s corps for several weeks, but the job seemed to him to be lack-

ing in color and romance. He then sought to advise the Republican leaders on the conduct of the war and affairs of state, but he seems to have met with as little success in this field as he had in the Soviet Union. "Heads of states," Fischer later wrote with staggering modesty in recording this episode, "are often insufficiently informed."

### *Anti-Soviet Handyman*

Whenever Hearst launches an anti-Soviet campaign he always calls upon his old reliable, Isaac Don Levine. And whenever there's a special ghosting job to be done for some political adventurer, those who want to get a start in the New World with a fantastic potboiler know just where to go.

Born in Mosir, Russia in 1892, Levine came to the United States in 1911. Ambitious to achieve success as a journalist, Levine as early as 1915 began to capitalize on his Russian background with articles as an "expert" in the American press. In one of his first articles (in *The Outlook*, June 23, 1915), Levine challenged George Kennan—noted for his exposes of the tsarist Siberian prison system—who predicted a revolution in Russia.

In the *Review of Reviews* (April, 1917), Levine hailed the counter-revolutionary Kerensky ministry as "the cream of Russia." He took the same position, with elaborations, in his book, *The Russian Revolution*, published at the end of 1917.

In a three-cornered debate the same year, he appeared as an advocate of Miliukov, and in the *New Republic* (Feb. 15, 1919) he denounced Kerensky for not having crushed the Soviet regime.

Levine's claim to being an "authority" on Soviet Russia was most eloquently revealed in his book *Red Smoke*, published in 1932 and presumably written the previous year. In this volume attacking Soviet Russia's Five Year plans, the first of which was rapidly heading toward successful completion, Levine said that "Russia, as far as natural resources are concerned, ranks among the lowest countries in the world. In fact, agriculturally these resources are just as inadequate for the huge and growing population as the mineral resources are for industrial progress."

During the Moscow treason trials, Levine's name was espe-



cially conspicuous in the Hearst press for which he wrote a column, "So Runs the World." He confessed, in a talk before the Overseas Press Club, to having ghosted the late "General" Walter Krivitsky's memoirs which appeared in book form after its appearance in a series of articles in the *Saturday Evening Post*. (Levine's confession was reported by Leonard Lyons in his syndicated column of March 15, 1943.) It is significant that Krivitsky's entry into the U. S. was sponsored by William C. Bullitt. This was the boast of Krivitzky's attorney, Louis Waldman, according to an Associated Press dispatch.

Levine claimed public notice most recently by his glorification of the Red Army deserter Victor Kravchenko, in Hearst's *Cosmopolitan* magazine.

From time to time the regular corps of anti-Sovieteers is joined by a new recruit. He may be a renegade from the Communist movement—or an out-and-out spy; often he is a deserter from the Soviets. In the latter category have been "General" Krivitzky, Kravchenko and, more recently, Alexander Barmine.

### ***One Who Deserted: Alexander Barmine***

Barmine, by his own confession in his recent book *One Who Survived*, was an intimate associate of many of the Trotskyite saboteurs and wreckers who were smoked out by the Soviet government.

Sensing that the jig was up, following the revelations at the Moscow trials, Barmine deserted a minor diplomatic post at Athens and skipped to Paris.

*One Who Survived* has scant political or literary merit. It is a rehash of the writings of warmed-over slops from the Trotskyite garbage cans. Nevertheless, the book did its bit for the Nazis in their last desperate days.

Indeed, so useful did the Nazis consider Barmine's lies against the Soviets that in March 1945 they bombarded American troops in Italy with 105 mm. shells loaded with pamphlet reprints of an article by him which had originally appeared in *Reader's Digest* under the title, "The New Communist Conspiracy." The Nazi version was retitled, "The New Communist Conspiracy and the Blindness of the United Nations."

A soldier sent this shocking information to the New York Teachers Union, and the facts were first made public by Dr. Samuel Sillen in *The Worker* of July 29, 1945.

Barmine's book was "blurbed" on the jacket by William Henry Chamberlin and John Chamberlain, the latter an editor of Henry Luce's *Life* magazine. It was hailed in the Book of the Month Club News. Edmund Wilson wrote lyrically of Barmine's provocations in the *New Yorker*, and Manya Gordon (wife of Simeon Strunsky of the *New York Times*' "Topics of the Times") gurgled over it in the *Saturday Review of Literature*. It was showered with praise in the *New Leader*. But it remained for the book critic of the conservative New York *Herald Tribune*, Lewis Gannett, to call *One Who Survived* the work of a "careerist" who was as "blind . . . as Hitler himself." And Mr. Foster Rhea Dulles, the author of *The Road to Teheran*, reviewing the book for the Sunday book section of the *Herald Tribune*, called it a "bitterly prejudiced picture," adding that "the book can be only destructive so far as it may affect present-day efforts to establish a basis for Russian-American friendship and world peace."

*One Who Survived* first appeared in France in 1939 as "Vingt Ans au Service de l'U.S.S.R.; Souvenirs d'un Diplomate Sovietique." It had been translated from the Russian by the notorious anti-Soviet intriguer Victor Serge, from whose published fulminations Barmine, incidentally, had borrowed generously for his own book.

Even before the war against the Nazis had been won, Barmine, now in the U. S., sensed the resurgence of an anti-Soviet "literary" market. Hastily bringing his original concoction up to date, he presented it to the American reading public six years later with an introduction by Max Eastman.

It would be foolhardy to underestimate such propaganda as Barmine issued. The Nazis didn't. Carrying the imprint of a reputable publishing house, promoted by the Book of the Month Club, praised by "big names" in the magazine and newspaper world, the book has doubtless found its way into many homes and public libraries. Although the progressive and labor press has vigorously exposed this type of "literature" there is no denying the truth of the old proverb that "a lie



can travel around the earth while the truth is tying its shoelaces."

The anti-Soviet brigade, some years back, gained a new commando in the person of David J. Dallin, long an emigre who built his career on "inside" knowledge of Soviet policy. In a number of books, Dallin worked actively to "roll ammunition for the fascists," to employ Francis Hackett's characterization of William L. White. Incidentally, Dallin hasn't been on Soviet soil for more than 20 years.

The titles of Dallin's books vary, but the theme is always the same. Some raucous, some muted, Dallin's pleas are ever for struggle against the Soviets. His most recent book, *The Big Three*, was reviewed in the *Nation* by Albert Guerard, whom not even Dallin can accuse of being a Soviet "agent." Yet this is what Guerard said of Dallin's volume:

"... In the conclusion there is more than a hint that the disturbing element is the U.S.S.R.; and that it is high time for England and America to take up the work of Hitler and Franco, so unfortunately interrupted."

Most of the members of the anti-Soviet brigade operate from the Social-Democratic centre. Thus, Chamberlin and Dallin are associate editors and Eastman and Lyons contributing editors of the *New Leader*. The paper's managing editor is Liston Oak, who played a dubious role in the P.O.U.M. uprising in Barcelona at the height of the Spanish war against the fascist interventionists.

Another contributing editor who writes frequently for the *New Leader* is Harry D. Gideonse, President of Brooklyn College. A professional Red-baiter, Gideonse took a prominent part in the Rapp-Coudert persecution of anti-fascist teachers in recent years. This Social-Democrat was in a hot spot some months ago following the arrest of several members of the Brooklyn College basketball team who were bribed by professional gamblers to throw intercollegiate games. Evidently preoccupied with Red-baiting Liberal Party politics, Gideonse pleaded that he was too-busy to notice that at least one of the accused varsity men was not even enrolled as a student!

In this cabal is also found every variety of anti-Soviet emigre, White Guardist, deserter—and even Nazi spy. Proof of the latter is found in the ardent sponsorship by the *New Leader*



and its financial angel, Dubinsky, of Richard Julius Herman Krebs, a shady character known to the book buying public as Jan Valtin. A decision of the U. S. Board of Immigration Appeals has noted that “. . . Within the past five years the subject [Krebs] has been considered an agent of Nazi Germany.” (Nov. 24, 1942.)

With no mass support, the anti-Soviet contingent—working closely with their Social-Democratic and Trotskyite friends—has functioned as disrupters in the trade union movement and as “idea givers” to the bourgeoisie. Trading on their rdaical past, men like Chamberlin, Eastman, Lyons and others have been well rewarded for their services in the form of payments for magazine articles, books and lectures. (Many of them are featured orators at the Town Meetings of the Air, sponsored by the *Reader's Digest*.) In this connection, it is worth noting that Frederick Woltman, the anti-Red “expert” of the *World-Telegram* has carved out a career in the anti-labor press by diligent combing of the Communist press for names of progressives he can link with alleged Red organizations.

It is a bit of irony that Woltman drifted into his slimy type of journalism after being fired as an instructor by the University of Pittsburgh following a “free speech” controversy.

### “Spiritual Sabotage”

One of the most damning pieces of evidence against these enemies of the people was brought to light recently by *Reporter*, a publication issued by the National Council of American Soviet Friendship, which cited an article appearing in the *Nippon Times Review* of Tokyo shortly before the end of the European war.

“Behind the apparent unity of the American nation, there is a phenomenon which deserves attention. . . . We refer to the existence of a number of Americans who are yet too few and too lacking in political influence, but who are gaining ground inch by inch and beginning to form a considerable cohesive body. They are not refusing to cooperate in the war effort . . . but their hearts are not there. They are saboteurs, not in action but in spirit. For the sake of convenience let us call them spiritual saboteurs.

"They do not agree on all questions, but they agree on enough of them to constitute an effective body. . . . The hatred of Russia by this group was already so openly displayed that in his message to Congress Pres. Roosevelt had to warn the people against their propaganda. Indeed they have voiced their opinions and fears in a few magazines of wide circulation. . . . Max Eastman for example. . . . We find in the *Reader's Digest*, July 1943, Max Eastman's article, 'We Must Face the Facts About Russia.' . . .

"Another spokesman of this group which the U.S. government would fain suppress is Eugene Lyons, who has been publishing a series of articles in the *American Mercury*. . . . The Office of War Information complains that while these critics say many hundreds of words about the wickedness of the Russians, they hardly utter a word against Germany or Japan. . . ."

Experience, particularly in the recent war years, has shown that enmity toward American-Soviet relations in practice operates against the best interests of America.

## V.

### AMERICA'S CHOICE

That the press as a whole has improved comparatively little as a source of unbiased news on Russia since 1920 when Walter Lippmann and Charles Merz indicted the *N.Y. Times* in their famous *Test of the News*, was indicated in a poll made by *Fortune* magazine in the summer of 1945.

The poll put a series of "information questions" to the public and found that "barely 12 per cent" could be considered "well-informed" on the U.S.S.R.; only 22 per cent "fairly well-informed"; while the remaining 66 per cent were about evenly divided between "poorly informed" and "uninformed."

Even more appalling, the *Fortune* poll found that for the 18 weeks ending June 23, 1945, only 60 per cent of the references in the press to the Soviet Union were "favorable," while 40 per cent were unfavorable. And this was during the period when the joint military and civilian efforts of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. were finishing off the Axis foe!



Ironically enough, the very phrasing of the questions put by *Fortune* itself revealed the same sort of bias it reported as existing in the American press. It asked, for example, whether friendship with the U.S.S.R. was so important that we should make many "concessions" to the Russians. Thus, friendship with the Soviet Union is put on a basis in which our motives are altruistic, while those of the Russians are predatory.

Despite the nature of the questions asked and the relatively confused state of the American press readers polled, it is significant that the largest group interviewed asserted their belief that the Soviet Union was mainly interested in security.

Several weeks later—in September 1945—a Gallup poll disclosed a greater public confidence in the Soviet Union than previously reported. Responding to the question, "Do you think Russia can be trusted to cooperate with us after the war?", 54 per cent answered Yes, 30 per cent No, and 16 per cent were undecided. The 54 per cent who replied affirmatively show a 15 per cent increase over March 1942. It is worth noting that like the *Fortune* poll, the questions asked by the Gallup poll are obviously loaded. For instance: "Do you think Russia can be *trusted*" . . . etc.

As for the radio, the little unbiased news and interpretation which American listeners now get on world affairs will be cut down even more if Congressional reactionaries like Rankin succeed in gagging liberal commentators. As the situation now stands, about 50 powerful corporations, members of the National Association of Manufacturers, exercise a virtual monopoly over the air waves through their fabulous expenditures on network time.

### *Voices of Reason*

One would be naive to assume that because much of the anti-Soviet propaganda is lurid, irresponsible and provocative, that it does not have its desired effects. Millions of well-intentioned Americans have been systematically poisoned by misinformation and prejudice. But there are vigorous and authoritative voices which cry out against this shameful villification of the Soviet people—not only as a matter of simple justice to a valiant ally but in America's own national interests.



Speaking of the "hate-Russia" propagandists, Secretary of Commerce Wallace said on July 4, 1945:

"Before the blood of our boys is dry on the field of battle, these enemies of peace try to lay the foundation for World War III."

During the anti-Soviet frenzy stimulated by the reactionary press during the San Francisco World Security Conference, *Commonweal*, influential Catholic publication, declared in its issue of June 8, 1945:

"We must remember that after 25 years of suspicion—not to call it anything worse—Russia has psychologically more reason to be distrustful of Britain and ourselves than we have to be distrustful of her."

The *N.Y. Times*, which blows hot and cold in its policy on the U.S.S.R. (as evidenced by the unreliable articles by its correspondents in the Balkans and its "dope stories" on the London conference of foreign ministers), nevertheless found it necessary to publish a lengthy statement by 14 members of the Yale University faculty on June 3, 1945 attacking the "inevitable war" talk against the Soviet Union. The statement declared that:

"None of the issues outstanding between us and the Soviet Union is of fundamental importance to the security of either country nor do . . . they outweigh the common interest of both countries in achieving a system for maintaining peace."

And Samuel Grafton in his syndicated column asked cogently: "Are we building a League to police the Soviet Union—or Germany?"

Even the conservative *Herald Tribune* has lashed out at those individuals and organizations seeking to provoke hostility toward the Soviet Union. That newspaper disclosed editorially (May 29, 1945):

"There is something dispiriting about the number of vocal and frequently influential persons and organizations in this country who are urging a violent crusade against our Russian allies without offering an indication of what specific action they are either trying to or expect to bring about.

"Thus, Rep. Clare Luce has issued a clarion call to stem the tide of Communism. If Communism is bad for the world—as Mrs. Luce like many others, believes it to be—then it is

'bad for us' and this country should 'support every European statesman who is not a Communist or a Fascist regardless of what else his connections are.' It is a resounding declaration. But what does 'support' mean? With speeches? With diplomatic maneuvers backed by nothing but good intentions? Or with arms?"

### *The Great Decision*

Concealing their aims behind pious words about "democratic principles," dominant groups in the United States and Great Britain are seeking to create an anti-Soviet bloc. The reason for the breakdown of the London conference is to be found in the attempt to defeat the very purposes for which the war was fought.

Powerful military and financial interests are determined to dodge the task of destroying fascism, root and branch. MacArthur's kid glove policy toward the Japanese militarists and their financial masters is a reflection of this program. So is the scandal which forced Gen. Eisenhower to oust Patton from Bavaria.

In this connection, Eleanor Roosevelt, in her column of October 13, last, assailed the American and British monopolist conspiracy to rebuild German armaments. She wrote:

"Our economic advisers—looking primarily to the interests of the industrialists of this country, backed by a similar group of industrialists in England—are saying that we should re-establish the industries of Germany so that Germany may live.

"Anyone who looks at the German people knows that they have suffered less than any people in Europe. What are we doing? Are we planning to make them strong again so we can have another war? Small wonder the Russians and some of the other European people are frightened by our attitude. . . ."

The Axis armies have bombed open cities, have tortured, hanged and shot countless civilians, including old men, women and children. Millions (5,700,000 of them Jews) were systematically slaughtered in gas chambers in concentration camps throughout Europe. Of the 9,381,986 specific cases of murder, nearly 9,000,000 occurred in Russian territory, according to the indictment of the war criminals handed down by the International Military Tribunal.



Millions in Europe face starvation. The youth see before them a future that is filled with foreboding. The sacrifices that the peoples of the world have made to achieve victory over the fascists are incalculable.

Mankind wants no return to the terrors of recent years. It yearns for peace: for the opportunity to work and live and to build its own free and democratic institutions. It wants no repetition of World War II!

Shall we permit a rebirth of the forces that led to German and Japanese aggression? Shall we encourage new Belsens, Buchenwalds and Maidaneks—with their gas chambers and human pyres? Must the peoples' sacrifices be in vain?

Only the people can decide. Upon their decision rests the future of America—and the world.

\* \* \* \* \*

*Which choice America makes is all-important to you personally, as well as to the future of your country. What can you do to see that the right choice is made?*

- *Whenever you hear a misstatement, distortion or lie which would sow discord between us and our Soviet ally, nail it—don't let it pass.*

- *Use this pamphlet to help expose "hate-Russia" propagandists—in the press, on the radio and on the platform.*

- *Be alert against Congress or any individual legislator attempting to put over in legal or oratorical form the hate-Russia ideology. Let your Congressmen know you are watching and listening.*

- *Support all institutions and activities which promote better understanding and cooperation between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Advance this work within your own community, fraternal or union organization.*

- *When you hear "hate-Russia" propaganda on the radio, protest to the sponsor and to the broadcasting station.*

- *Spread the facts about the enemies of the peace through available literature and by word of mouth.*

- *Help America make the right choice! Defeat the enemies of the peace!*



## **THE TRUTH ABOUT SOVIET RUSSIA**

---

### **WHAT RUSSIA DID FOR VICTORY**

By **SERGEI KOURNAKOFF**

A distinguished military analyst weighs the Soviet military effort and compares the U.S.S.R.'s contributions to victory with those of the other major allies. This fully documented study refutes the allegations that the most decisive factors in the United Nations victory over Nazi Germany were lend-lease, Allied air bombing of industrial objectives, etc.

Price \$2.50

### **THE SOVIET SPIRIT**

By **DR. HARRY F. WARD**

A study of incentives to achievement under the socialist system as it operates in the U.S.S.R. This comprehensive work is based on first-hand investigation and long years of study and research which brought the author to the farthest corners of the multi-national country which was our strongest ally in the war.

Price \$5.00

### **THE GREAT PATRIOTIC WAR OF THE SOVIET UNION**

By **JOSEPH STALIN**

All of the wartime speeches, Orders of the Day, and letters to foreign correspondents, covering the period from the blitzkrieg invasion of the U.S.S.R. by Hitler's armies to the May 9, 1945, Victory Order of the Day announcing Germany's defeat and unconditional surrender. A brilliant analysis of each stage of the war and the political foundations upon which the victorious Anglo-Soviet-American coalition was forged.

Price \$1.75

### **THE SOVIET POWER**

By **HEWLETT JOHNSON, DEAN OF CANTERBURY**

A human and dramatic book about the socialist sixth of the world, by one of the world's best-known church leaders. This book sold more than two million copies in the U.S.A. and was translated into twelve foreign languages. Indispensable for a true understanding of the Soviet Union.

Price \$6.00

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.**

**VICTORY BOOK SHOP**  
**265 ST. CATHERINE W.**

**HA. 5776**