

A Real American Welcome

By Tom Humphries

WHILE cannons roar salutes in his honor, a leader of the loyalists disembarks at New York.

As he walks down the gangway, he waves his hand in farewell to the sailors of the American ship which had been sent to Europe by Congress for the express purpose of bringing him to our shores.

A hundred thousand people mill in the streets, shouting their welcome to the brave fighter for liberty. Colorful flags wave from the office buildings. City officials present him the key to the city.

In Washington the Senate passes a resolution of welcome. An isolationist who fears that it may compromise American neutrality is squelched by the maiden speech of a rising young Senator from Massachusetts.

The loyalist leader pleads for the cause of his people before the City Council. He is invited to speak before the New York Bar, the militia, and Tammany Hall.

Proceeding to Washington, he is met by two outstanding senators. He is given a suite of rooms in a prominent hotel. The government foots the bill. The President asks him to the White House for lunch. He accepts invitations to speak before the House, the Senate, and the Supreme Court.

Senators and representatives tender him a subscription dinner. The Secretary of State joins in a toast to a loyalist victory.

A certain European power whose army has been active in the loyalist's country registers a protest.

Our Secretary of State replies in outspoken language, declaring that the United States will always wish success to "nations struggling for popular constitutions and national independence."

The loyalist leader makes a tour of the country, popularizing his cause and collecting money for his people. He is warmly received in New Orleans, Jacksonville, Mobile, Charleston, Richmond, and Alabama. He circles around to the West.

At Philadelphia he speaks in Independence Hall. The greatest enthusiasm is evoked in New England. He speaks three times at Faneuil Hall in Boston. He is idolized by the people of Concord and Plymouth.

Within a few months he returns to Europe. He has explained the issues at stake in his country to untold thousands. Single-handed, he has collected over a hundred thousand dollars for his cause.

Does it sound like a dream?

It wasn't.

It happened eighty-six years ago—in 1852. But it was not a Spanish loyalist who spoke before Tammany Hall and the Supreme Court. It was Lajos Kossuth, fiery leader of

the Hungarian revolution against Austria and the Holy Alliance.

In 1848 the flames of revolt roared through Europe. The middle class stormed at the last strongholds of feudalism. The growing proletarian movement, which had just given birth to the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, made its first bid for power in Paris. The Orleans monarchy crumbled into dust. The Poles rose against the Germans. A republican movement in Rome sent the Pope a-flying. Hungary declared its independence from Austria.

As governor of their new nation the Hungarians selected Lajos Kossuth, seventeen members of whose family had been executed within one generation for liberal opinions. It was Kossuth who had first popularized the secret proceedings of the Hungarian Diet by circulating an illegal hand-written newspaper. As a revolutionary leader in the Diet, he fought for abolition of the entail and other feudal burdens, for taxation of the nobles. He had forced Prince Metternich of Austria, the guiding spirit of European reaction, to grant Hungary a native ministry.

The first task of the new government was to defend its independence. Kossuth organized an army out of raw recruits. For two years the tattered Hungarians fought stubbornly against the experienced Austrian battalions.

Hungary's brave struggle echoed throughout the world and won the sympathy of all who believed in democratic forms of government.

In the United States President Taylor followed the example of Monroe, who in his presidential messages a quarter of a century

previous had supported the Greeks in their struggle for freedom from Turkey. He declared to Congress that he "wished to be the first to welcome Hungary into the family of nations."

The President sent a secret agent to Hungary, one A. Dudley Mann, with power to make commercial treaties and recognize Hungarian independence. But before Mann could reach Hungary, the brave struggle was over.

The legions of the Czar had come to the support of Austria. Invading Hungary, they had suppressed the revolution.

Reaction was triumphant in Europe. Workingmen's associations were hounded underground. Middle class liberalism was suppressed.

Kossuth fled to Turkey. In September 1851, came an unexpected ray of hope. The President of the United States had instructed the frigate *Mississippi* to offer him a haven in the great republic of the West.

Overjoyed, Kossuth boarded the *Mississippi* and sailed for the new world. In December 1851, he arrived in New York. History records that no foreigner since Lafayette had ever been accorded such a delirious welcome.

An impassioned orator, Kossuth called upon Americans to remember their own revolution. He won the support of the nation's most prominent men. He was attacked only by the hyper-isolationists and by the slave interests, who objected to his consorting with abolitionists.

It was Austria that protested against his official reception by the United States. The Secretary of State who rebuffed Austria's protest and who toasted Hungarian independence was Daniel Webster.

The Senator from Massachusetts who defended the resolution of welcome against the isolationists was Charles Sumner, the abolitionist who four years later was to speak out bravely against slavery in Kansas and be beaten nearly to death in the Senate chamber by a representative of the slaveryocracy.

In June 1852, Kossuth sailed for Turin, Italy, where he later joined with Mazzini and Garibaldi against Austrian domination in Italy.

Thus ended a chapter in the history of American democracy, a glorious chapter in which the leaders of our democracy realized that the fight for human freedom extended beyond our own shores.



John Hellker

"I'm sure those who wanted democracy in 1776 were a much nicer class of people."

SAVAGE SYMPHONY

by EVA LIPS

*With an introduction by DOROTHY THOMPSON
Translated from the German by Caroline Newton*

*The dramatic story
of an Aryan scientist
who would not yield
to HITLER*

WHAT happens to scholars—liberals—
non-political professionals — when Fascism
takes power

?

They coordinate, or else!

This is no news to anyone who has read the papers while Hitler and Mussolini turn the clock back in Europe and try to force the whole world back into the Dark Ages. What is so impossible for Americans to realize is the series of personal humiliations, petty persecutions, and unbelievably gross stupidities by which these power-mad "leaders" seek to win or ruin the intellectuals whose support and prestige they covet.

This is the story of Jules Lips and his wife, who refused to coordinate, and of some of their friends who did not have the courage to say "No."

Professor Lips was the world-famous director of the Cologne Museum. He was 100 percent Aryan, a war veteran, a scientist who never even thought of politics. All he needed to do to assure himself riches and a prominent position in the Third Reich, was to raise his right hand to Hitler and lend his support as an anthropologist to the Nazi nonsense. His family, his friends, high Nazi officials, urged him to yield. He refused.

Professor Lips is now head of the Department of Anthropology at Howard University. In this simple, day-to-day account of how the Nazis drove him from his Museum, his home, and finally from his country, his wife has written a vivid, personal story that will give a new understanding of the refined horrors of Fascism, and renewed faith in the courage of human beings. And it is a warning to all who think that political indifference or inactivity is any basis for exemption when the dark forces of Reaction take things in their relentless hand.

Random House is proud to publish this book under its imprint.

R H
RANDOM HOUSE—\$3

20 East 57 Street, New York

Please mention NEW MASSES when patronizing advertisers

Reaction Loses in Duluth

By William F. Dunne

THE Duluth convention of the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Association could be reported with considerable accuracy merely by quoting the headlines of the local Republican Party press just before, during, and after the three-day sessions March 25, 26, 27. They were attended by some thirteen hundred delegates and alternates, and hundreds of worker and farmer spectators, who filled the seats and standing room in the huge Armory looking out over the vast reaches of Lake Superior to the Wisconsin shore.

Inside and outside of the convention were forces working both openly and covertly for a split. This was the first objective of the Republican Party strategists and their agents. The second objective was to exert sufficient pressure through the Hjalmar Peterson group, the bureaucracy of the American Federation of Labor organizations, that of the Railway Brotherhoods, and the Trotskyites working in close unity with these forces, to compel the adoption of a program far to the right and the launching of a campaign of Red-baiting and expulsions.

Not a single one of these objectives was reached. But on Friday, March 25, the Duluth *News-Tribune* had said in its eight-column banner and the two-column and one-column decks that "F-L Girds for Fight at Parley Today; Battle on Red Purge, Other Issues Loom; Women's Meeting Split by Dispute of Two Factions; Old Guard Wins."

Harold R. Atwood, Railway and Warehouse Commissioner, appointed by Hjalmar Peterson while he was Governor, following the death of Floyd Olson, was the choice for reelection to his present post of the undercover Peterson forces and the right wing as a whole.

The unprincipled character of the opposition forces became clear when they made the question of Atwood's endorsement by the convention an ultimatum which carried with it a threat of a split. Around Atwood every questionable element rallied, although many honest delegates supported him, believing he was the best man for the job. Atwood got the endorsement of the convention by a very narrow margin, and only after he had made both an oral and written statement pledging himself to support the Farmer-Labor ticket from top to bottom.

The vote showed that Atwood could have been defeated easily. He was nominated only by votes of delegates from unions, coöperatives, and Farmer-Labor clubs who are Communists, and by the most conscious and progressive delegations. They voted for Atwood, as they told the convention, for the sake of unifying the convention and the Farmer-Labor Party. A candidate seldom gets the thorough going over that was the lot of Atwood in this convention.

This discussion by the Benson forces was on a high plane. The traditions and struggles of the F.L.P. in the early days were recounted and the attitude of its pioneer organizers and leaders placed in sharpest contrast to the careerist position taken by Atwood and many of his supporters. The close vote was a demonstration for the benefit of these forces that the Farmer-Labor Association has a program and principles that must come before the personal or political aspirations of individuals. The whole procedure on this issue was a political and moral defeat for the Peterson forces in and out of the convention.

Hjalmar Peterson, announcing his intention to oppose Governor Benson in the June primaries, opened headquarters in the Spalding Hotel and flooded the convention with literature. He will run as a Farmer-Laborite, but his main issue—Red-baiting and an attack on the integrity of Governor Benson and the present administration—identifies him with the Republican Party, Hearst, and the Liberty League. One quotation from a Peterson folder entitled "Let the People Decide" and distributed to all convention delegates is enough to prove the above statement:

The fate of our party is in your hands. The issue is not one of an individual against another. It is Farmer-Labor principles against Communism and Capitol Hill racketeering. The Farmer-Labor Party has been betrayed and must be saved in the June primaries by you farmers, you laborers, you businessmen, and you women of Minnesota who hold the church sacred and the home the keystone to democracy.

I abhor the Communistic teachings of overthrow of government by revolution and the destruction of the church. I would rather be defeated without the support of this un-American element than elected with it. I will not bargain with those seeking to lead us from the principles of our party and our departed leaders. My concern is the fate of our party and the fate of the great liberal movement in Minnesota. We must purge our party of Communists—those borers from within—if we intend to keep it a Farmer-Labor Party.

The Peterson forces did not dare to bring the issue of his endorsement before the convention, and Atwood's desertion of him under the fierce fire of the delegates leaves him more than ever dependent upon support from Republicans and other enemies of the F.L.P. in the June primaries. His defeat is certain.

The reactionary opposition in and out of the convention was no more successful in their efforts to compel a revision of the platform toward the right than they were in their attempts to initiate a Red-baiting drive or engineer a split. The 1938 platform is in full accord with the declaration of principles adopted by the State Conference on March 25, 1925, which is the basis of its program. In this document the Farmer-Labor Association declares

that the government at present is dominated by the few and its powers are used to serve special interests. Money and credits, market and exchange facilities, the means of transportation and communication and the natural resources and other basic industries of the nation are practically monopolized by a financial and industrial oligarchy, which is in a position to exact tribute from all who live by labor and to keep great masses of people in a condition of unemployment and destitution by manipulating the productive powers of the nation.

The Declaration of Principles further states that the Farmer-Labor movement

claims to rescue the government from the control of the privileged few and make it function for the use and benefit of all by abolishing monopoly in every form, and to establish in place thereof a system of public ownership and operation of monopolized industries, which will afford every able and willing worker an opportunity to work and will guarantee the enjoyment of the proceeds thereof, thus increasing the amount of available wealth, eradicating unemployment and destitution and abolishing industrial autocracy.

The preamble to the platform adopted unanimously by the Duluth convention says:

We recognize it as our duty and privilege to propose a platform and adequate program that will materially assist in restoring to the people of the state and nation the right and opportunity of living conditions befitting American citizens. We also realize that in the solution of social and economic problems confronting the state it will be necessary to adopt forceful and vigorous measures to pioneer in the field of economics and make fundamental changes in our social system.

Throughout the world the democratic rights of the people are being threatened and democracy itself is being held up to scorn. International morality has virtually disappeared and militaristic governments are threatening another world war.

In this critical situation, the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Association pledges itself to carry forward the people's demand for democracy, social justice, and peace.

This certainly does not sound like an abandonment of the basic principles of the Farmer-Labor Party, but the Minneapolis *Tribune*, having failed in company with the rest of the Republican Party press, the Peterson forces, and their Trotskyist allies to organize a split from the right, on the day after the convention tried to create suspicion among the progressive rank and file not present at the convention. Its headline said: "F-L Convention Makes a Swing to Conservatism." Its analysis was as false as its predictions had been fallacious.

The platform clauses on peace, civil liberties, labor, agriculture, taxation, social security, education, general welfare, banking, etc., are all of definite progressive character. The clause on peace follows the line of collective security and provides for shipment of needed materials to nations attacked. This clause reads as follows:

We advocate coöperation with all forces genuinely seeking peace in their efforts to promote peace; we are opposed to entangling alliances and to increased