## Speak Out!

## LESTER COHEN

E ARE TOLD we must be quiet, we must not protest the murder of our race, we must not cry out against the Nazi murderers.

The limping ape tells us, the Goebbels, the minister of Nazi propaganda, the creator of race myths, the recreator of the medieval ghetto, the medieval world.

"The Jews are our hostages, given us by God"
—so they have spoken, the torturers of Spain, of
Czechoslovakia, of the Jews.

Hostages—500,000 hostages, imprisoned in the greatest fortress country of the modern world, 500,000 hostages to be tortured, to be ground back a thousand years, to lie broken and slain in the Nazi slaughter house.

And we are to be quiet.

The ape, the homunculus, the monster tells us—we are to be quiet.

To the Jews—no.

To all those within the realm of humanity—no.

If it is necessary that 500,000 hostages die in order that the truth be told—

Let the truth be told.

It is a solemn duty, not only to the Jews, but to all humanity.

Tell the truth—that in the fortress-country, there is a monstrosity, the greatest monstrosity since ancient Rome.

It has swallowed Austria.

Torn apart Czechoslovakia.

Bombed Spain.

And besides these crimes against the nations—

It has eaten the flesh of the Jews

And drunk the blood of the Jews

And gnawed the bones of the Jews.

Say t.

It is true.

Sav t.

Say not "Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses?"

But say "Hath not a Nazi hands, organs, dimensions, senses?"

Examine it. Let us see.

There he stands, before history—the Caesar-Shylock, with blood on his hands, his sword in his hands, and demands his bond:

400,000,000 dollars

Silence

And the flesh of 500,000 hostages.

That is the picture. The Nazis made it. There it stands, before history.

Speak out.

Say so.

Say who can be a friend to this man?

Say who wants to be kin to this man?

Speak out.

Say so.

Do not be intimidated by the threats against the hostages. Many of the hostages will die. They are as good as dead, they are worse than dead. And he cannot kill all of them, he needs them as an excuse, they are the *Ersatz* he must feed to the German people because he is not making butter, he is making history.

And making hamburger, out of the hostages.

Say so.

Speak out.

On all his crimes,

Those now, and those to come.

Say so.

Speak out.



Grolp

## The Election Results

Losses, Gains, Their Extent and Causes

## EARL BROWDER

Rectionary circles throughout the United States are jubilant over the election results of November 8. We cannot, indeed, deny that they have reason. The Republican Party increased the number of states in its control from seven to eighteen, including Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and almost doubled its numbers in Congress. Unquestionably, the economic royalists who rely mainly upon the Republican Party strengthened their positions of power in the government of the country, and the positions held by the democratic masses were correspondingly weakened.

Nothing is ever gained by underestimating the effective forces of the enemy. And we must say frankly that the people suffered many defeats. But it is equally important to avoid any exaggeration of the enemy's victories, and to understand exactly how and why these things took place. And when the reactionaries hail these victories as a turn of mass sentiment against the New Deal, and against President Roosevelt, it is necessary to subject such claims to the most searching examination. If true, it would have the most far-reaching consequences. We must know if it is true or false.

It is my considered opinion that this claim of a turn of the tide away from Roosevelt and the New Deal is profoundly incorrect. In outlining the main reasons for this view we will also discover the answer to the problem of how to reclaim the lost positions of democracy and progress.

In most states the Republicans carefully avoided the New Deal as the central issue; indeed, they generally accepted the objectives of the New Deal and almost all of its established policies that are now written into law. They pictured themselves as "better New Dealers" than their opponents. They acted as if they believed the majority of the voters supported Roosevelt and the New Deal and that any head-on collision would spell certain defeat. The event confirmed this belief. Only in Pennsylvania did an openly reactionary campaign result in Republican victory. In California it carried a long-established administration down to overwhelming defeat. In New York, a "liberal" Republican face and campaign could not overcome the New Deal lead, and O'Brian's campaign against Wagner on the issue of amending the National Labor Relations Act flopped miserably, leaving O'Brian far behind his ticket.

In some states the Republicans boldly set out to outbid the New Deal. Harold E. Stassen in Minnesota almost forgot he was a Re-

publican, and ran as the inheritor of the mantle of the late Farmer-Labor governor, Floyd B. Olson; he promised more aid and government jobs for workers and farmers than Governor Benson had provided; he promised higher old-age pensions; and he promised, also, lower taxes and a balanced budget. He promised everything to everybody. Gov. Elmer Benson looked like a staid old conservative beside him. Leverett Saltonstall in Massachusetts made the Townsend plan, which promises \$200 per month old-age pensions to all over sixty years of age, one of his principal attractions. Republicans generally flirted with, where they did not endorse, the Townsend plan, and received the votes of that section of the old-age pension

The Republican campaign was a flank attack against the New Deal, carefully camouflaged with demagogy and promises of all things to all men. That it deceived an important section of the voters is unquestionable, but that it registered a serious political turn of those voters is more than doubtful. All the evidence points the other way. The very nature of the Republican campaign proves that the masses demand more, not less, of governmental aid and control of economic life.

One distinct shift of voters was more conscious and fundamental. That was the desertion of Roosevelt by almost all his former upper-class supporters. The so-called upper classes went Republican *en bloc*.

They poured out campaign funds in an unprecedented stream. They even obeyed their leaders and kept their "hate Roosevelt" propaganda confined to their own clubs and parlors, so as not to alienate the masses. They practiced "fraternizing" with the Townsend leaders, and patted them on the back. They concealed their smiles at the "liberal" speeches of their candidates. They knew exactly what they wanted—power—and they were out to get it at any cost. This stratum is no loss to the New Deal, which had just as well make up its mind to kiss the upper classes goodby for good. Hoover (and Chamberlain) typifies their natural leadership.

It was among farmers and city middle classes that the Republicans registered those gains which changed defeat to victory. Even here, it was not so much that they were able to swing New Deal supporters to anti-New Deal moods and policies; it was rather that the Republicans were able to bring out the full strength they had polled in 1936, the presidential year, while the New Dealers

could mobilize their full strength only among the workers, but found the farmers and middle classes more apathetic, with a distinct section, confused by demagogy and Red-baiting, inclined to ignore the elections.

It is probably no exaggeration to say that the working-class vote was stronger for the New Deal than in any previous election. This was true in spite of the damaging split of labor, which William Green tried with might and main to carry over into the elections for the benefit of the Republicans. The Republican strategy of splitting the New Deal support had less success among the workers than anywhere else. In state after state the local AFL organizations repudiated William Green's orders and went down the line in unity with Labor's Non-Partisan League. Where the split in labor's national leadership was very damaging, however, was in its effect in discouraging and alienating sections of the farmers and middle classes.

Considerable help was given the Republicans by organized splitting policies carried out among the progressive forces by the Socialist leaders and by Phil La Follette. Norman Thomas and his followers largely liquidated their own voting strength in the country, by the nature of their campaign, which was directed almost 100 percent against the New Deal; but they undoubtedly did much damage by sowing confusion and apathy among their former followers. The Old Guard Socialists in Connecticut ran up an unprecedented vote of 165,000, with the result of giving the Republican Party control of the state with only 35 percent of the total vote. The Old Guard Socialists in New York damaged the American Labor Party ticket, by splitting appeals directed against some of the most popular candidates on its ticket, denouncing them in the most approved Dies-committee style as "Communists"; but it is highly significant that the two outstanding Labor Party victories, Vito Marcantonio to Congress and Oscar Garcia-Rivera to the State Assembly, were precisely the two candidacies against which the Old Guard directed their heaviest fire. The Socialists, with their Trotskyist and Lovestoneite allies, also carried on damaging work against Governor Murphy in Michigan, as well as in other states. In California and elsewhere, Trotskyites were openly taken into the service of the anti-New Deal election campaign apparatus.

To Phil La Follette and his vest-pocket "National Progressives" must be assigned the main responsibility for Republican victories in Wisconsin and Minnesota. With his vicious attack against the New Deal, his fascist-like trimmings, and his intrigues within the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota (also extended into other states), he brought demoralization and feuds into the progressive camp as far as the prestige of his famous father's name could carry him.

The chief national campaign instruments of the Republicans were, strangely enough,