

the answers to the problems of Europe and Asia, of an urge to recommend indiscriminate hate in unlimited doses as the sure way to win the war and the peace, and eager to regiment a legion of writers to promote his theories. It is invariably and significantly authors of very limited artistic gifts who go in heavily for emotional war profiteering.

Our profiteer may also be a scholar of more or less eminence in a specialized branch who succumbs to a fatal impulse to climb down from his ivory tower. No one can be quite as far off the mark as the professor enraged. He may begin to write three-column letters, long on words, short on concrete ideas, to leading newspapers. Or he may undertake the Sisyphus task of whitewashing every one of the innumerable political executions and disappearances of eminent old revolutionaries under the Stalinite dispensation.

The intellectual, like the financial, war profiteer cannot be eliminated by any simple rule-of-thumb method. Both not infrequently cloak themselves in the pseudo-patriotism that blunt old Dr. Johnson once defined as the last refuge of the scoundrel. But war profiteering in the realm of ideas is more dangerous than is generally

realized. By appealing to mean and ungenerous impulses, by operating in a cloud-world of fancies and gross exaggerations, of half-truths, quarter-truths and downright lies, it gravely diminishes the chances of an intelligent and lasting peace.

There is just one formula for keeping the intellectual war profiteer in check. That formula is more intestinal fortitude on the home front.

— WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

#### END OF THE COMINTERN?

PERSONS afflicted with a good memory find it more difficult to work up enthusiasm for the recent dissolution of the Third or Communist International than commentators and editorial writers not thus handicapped. They recall that the "American" Communist Party, though it formally severed connections with the International in 1940, has followed zealously every turn and twist of the party line since then notwithstanding. They recall, too, that another Muscovite world organization—the Profintern or Red Trade Union International—had been disbanded back in 1935. Far from ending party-line infiltration of American labor unions, that dissolution signaled a peculiarly energetic period of communist union-split-

ting and union capture tactics.

Most important of all, such people cannot help recalling that the Communist International in the last fifteen years had been increasingly the inert puppet of the Foreign Office, the GPU and other branches of the Soviet régime. It held only one world congress after 1928. It had ceased long ago to initiate anything, serving simply as a formal channel for conveying the instructions of the dictatorship to its foreign legions. Unless more tangible proofs that the conspiratorial aspects of this world organization have been abandoned are forthcoming, the liquidation, therefore, means only a change in the messenger service, the elimination of an intermediary who enjoyed no independent influence or functions.

It should be remembered that Moscow never had any physical or police control of its foreign parties. Obedience has been a voluntary discipline by job-holders and faithful believers. The erasure of the International does not in itself affect that discipline. There is as yet no reason for doubting that the party line will be followed with the same slavish and unthinking enthusiasm as in the past. The speed and unanimity with which some thirty national parties accepted

and confirmed the order of dissolution in itself fortifies suspicions as to the genuineness of the gesture. Had the action meant any profound organizational or ideological revolution, at least one of the orphaned sections would have raised a howl of despair. The very act of relaxing centralized control of this world organization has demonstrated its amazing cohesion and the completeness of its subordination to the Soviet dictatorship.

A time may come, of course, when the USSR will decide to sacrifice the political leverage it now possesses in foreign countries through its rubberstamp parties and its great array of "front" organizations. If and when that happens we shall know it beyond peradventure of doubt, because it will be manifest in a collapse of existing Communist Parties, stooge organizations, subsidized newspapers and the rest of the propaganda and pressure mechanism. That functioning apparatus, rather than the Communist International label, is the core of the matter. When it is disowned and dismantled, the world will know that Moscow-controlled world-wide communist operations have in truth been given up.

The dissolution of the Comin-

tern, in short, means nothing until we have positive answers to questions such as these:

Will the Imprecor and the Inter-continent News and other propaganda services for the communist press out of Moscow be discontinued?

Will the Pan-Slav movement under communist guidance here and in many other countries be liquidated?

Will the so-called Partisans, led by imported and local communists, cease their private civil war against General Draja Mihailovich and his Chetniks in Yugoslavia?

Will the Chinese communists, whose activities are tying up a large section of the Nationalist forces, merge themselves with the larger Chinese forces against Japan?

Will the special "Polish Army" recently set up in Russia, without the consent of the Polish government-in-exile recognized by all the United Nations except Russia, be dispersed?

Will the communist contingent in the De Gaulle movement break its pipelines to Moscow and follow a purely French policy unrelated to Russia's larger plans?

Will communist infiltration of refugee groups—such as the Italian exiles in America and England—now cease, and one of the disrupt-

tive influences in the shaping of postwar plans thus be removed?

The mere formulation of such questions indicates the nature of a true dissolution of the international communist network. Only those willing to accept the word for the deed can overlook them. The word itself, the gesture of dissolution, may have certain propaganda values, but those who think or pretend that a genuine change has already taken place are helping to pile up dangerous illusions.

— E. L.

#### CALL FOR RELIGIOUS BIOGRAPHERS

THE past two decades have seen a renewal of interest in the great writers of the New England Golden Age, together with a new appreciation of their stature. Not only have Melville, Emerson and Thoreau been brought back to their true places in the history of American letters, but even such lesser lights as Margaret Fuller, Longfellow and Whittier have at long last been cleansed of the infamy assigned to them by critics more eager to shock than to evaluate honestly. All this has long been overdue, for surely in our brief literary annals we have produced a unique and highly respectable mass of writing, especially in the