

our problems among thousands of little "angels," each of whom makes a sacrifice when he sends in his modest contribution. Thousands of our readers have pooled their resources to keep NEW MASSES alive. The magazine was founded as the *Masses* in 1911 with the financial backing of the vice-president of the New York Life Insurance Co. This fortunate one-man support permitted the magazine to use coated paper, colored covers, and sell for 5 cents per copy. Today we owe our existence to thousands, to their devotion year after year. We consider ourselves most fortunate. It's good to be alive and in the fight!

#### CUTTING EXPENSES

So each year we have petitioned our readers for a "deficiency appropriation." From 1934 to 1939, we failed to raise each year a sum sufficient to cover that year's deficit. During this period we accumulated a deficit of \$50,000 consisting of accounts and loans payable, including a debt to our readers in the form of unexpired subscriptions. The loans were obtained from readers, banks, and friendly organizations. In 1939 we determined to make a special effort to arrest this alarming trend of an expanding deficit. We were substantially successful! Here is how we did it.

During 1939 we sold more subscriptions and newsstand copies, primarily because of the improved quality of the magazine, especially as regards the war. The Spivak series on Coughlin, aided by an extensive promotion campaign, brought us thousands of new readers. In the same period we reduced our expenses by more than \$5,000 as compared with 1938. This was accomplished in several ways: cutting our print orders to conform more closely to our actual circulation needs, thereby shaving our print and paper costs; curtailing our staff by two people—the rest of the staff was glad to work harder in order to reduce expenses. There were other economies, too technical to detail. Our readers conducted a splendid financial drive last year which netted us over \$30,000.

#### GOOD NEWS

The combination of these factors permitted us not only to cover the 1939 deficit of \$24,464.05, but also to reduce our accumulated deficit by about 12 percent! This is truly a new experience in the magazine's history, indicating the possibility of gradually wiping out the deficit that has accumulated through the years, thus eliminating a millstone that has always threatened NEW MASSES' existence.

This news is cause for real confidence in our future. We are highly pleased to be able to tell the good news to our readers, our real "stockholders." We are happy to be in a position where, because of our increased circulation and our generally more wholesome financial condition, we are asking our readers to contribute \$25,000 this year instead of the \$30,000 they gave in 1939.

CARL A. BRISTEL,  
Business Manager

## Readers' Forum

### "The Only Dinkum News"

TO NEW MASSES: I have sent this letter by a friend, to post in 'Frisco, not altogether through personal fear of the censorship, but rather to make sure of its delivery.

On my own personal behalf and partly on behalf of other Auckland readers of NEW MASSES, I desire to thank and congratulate you for the almost isolated and only clear scientific interpretation of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact. I cannot altogether explain the contrast between NEW MASSES and the other progressive publications of America.

You can hardly realize how much your last half-dozen issues have done to clarify the complex world war situation for us here, and I think your hardest job will be to escape the splenetic reactions of the financial brigands and war profiteers of your own country.

However, we look forward always to the arrival of the Matson liners, as they bring us the only dinkum news—through NEW MASSES. We pay a shilling (25 cents under the old exchange) for them now, but I don't care. I wouldn't miss an issue of NEW MASSES if it cost 50 cents. Good luck to you and go on with the good work. I cannot send you any financial assistance as I am an old age pensioner and I have to live on 30 shillings a week—\$7.

I would like to emphasize the great, clear, and scientific value of the articles of A. B. Magil, Alter Brody, Samuel Sillen, and Michael Gold, and I am greatly surprised at the defection of Granville Hicks.

A. M.

Auckland, N. Z.

### On the English Mind

TO NEW MASSES: A friend of mine introduced me to a copy of NEW MASSES. I read it carefully, considered its contents, compared it with other papers of the international movement, and I finally came to the following conclusion. In these days when open military conflict is afoot, it is hard to get at the truth as between Britain and Germany, but with a new factor in the struggle, the USSR, the situation is still more complex. The analyses by writers in NEW MASSES help make it clear.

To look at the Soviet Union without realizing the bases upon which she faces the problem of international complications is a mistake your paper certainly does not commit. To allow the Marxist approach to the problem to fall into a mechanical line is also a process you disallow. Your clever analyses of the psychological makeup of the English liberal as well as the Tory mind add greatly to the revolutionary movement and lift it to a higher ideological level which in turn must lift our movement into a higher position.

Your excellent paper makes its mark in clearing away the emotional feeling which so blinds the average Englishman to the reality of the Soviet-German Pact that he thinks, or rather, feels, the Soviets made an alliance with the Nazis. What a throwback, we English are the cream of the earth—but the average Englishman is blind to the role played by Englishmen in sabotaging a pact between Britain, France, and the Soviet Union. He can't see that his own Englishmen are the destroyers of English prestige.

Everything holds the elements of its own destruction, even London with its Englishmen. When one contrasts the dialectic exposition in NEW MASSES with the mechanical process in English journalism, one realizes why the English mind can be used in the interest of certain Englishmen, at the expense of certain other Englishmen. This, of course, the average Englishman would deny, since England is a democracy.

Germany is no democracy but if England destroys Hitler's power, what will she put in his place in Germany to retain the status quo?

But to come home—what do NEW MASSES readers think of an economic system whereby a Labor government gives blind support to the Chamberlain government and pays £21,000,000 per year interest, enlists men, clothes and equips them, and sends them overseas to fight for they know not what—while a rationalist Labor acting prime minister presents each New Zealand soldier with a copy of the Bible?

The breezy approach to the problem shows the confidence of your writers. The realism developed in them away from the conventional forms of old England adds grist to the mill of the proletarian struggle.

Long may you carry on, and many happy birthdays.

F. H.

Auckland, N. Z.

### Memo to Liberals

TO NEW MASSES: Ever since the days of the First Imperialist War the decline of the moral stamina of men and women who were supposed to be staunchly liberal has continued unabated. Now that the second such war is ravishing humanity, the sprinkling of liberals everywhere has dwindled to almost zero.

Walter Lippmann said in his column of Jan. 25, "People just before election cannot tell the difference between a Republican and a Democrat." In much the same way, it is true that in these days of deep capitalist crisis one can hardly distinguish between a liberal and a conservative for they have joined hands in the holy crusade to maintain capitalist exploitation and imperialism by means of war and the armaments which they say are necessary for "defense." The "defense" is that of the privileges of the wealthy at the expense of the welfare of the working men and women of the world.

The moral and intellectual bankruptcy of liberalism in our time is one of the major tragedies that have overtaken mankind in this death-agony period of capitalist-managed democracy and civilization.

The liberals have become tired; by this very fact they are proving more dangerously conservative and reactionary than those who have never been anything else. Witness the ignominious running for cover by journalists of two national weeklies published in New York, and above all, the complete turnabout of Mr. Franklin Delano Roosevelt who appears to be dead-set on exerting the influence of his office toward the United States' assuming a large share of the financing and supplying of armaments and materials to spread the European conflict. To this end he sponsors a "cannon-not-butter" budget.

Because of the liberals' abdication of courage and reason, we are experiencing the tremors of catastrophe starting from the time that a majority of the world's liberals shamefacedly acclaimed Chamberlain-Daladier's evil deed at Munich.

A. GARCIA DIAZ.

New York City.

## Arms and the Manns

Erika and Klaus Mann's "The Other Germany" reveals the tragic weaknesses of liberal logic in support of imperialist war. Some notes on Federal Union.

THE OTHER GERMANY, by Erika and Klaus Mann. Modern Age Books. \$2.75.

LESS than a year ago Erika and Klaus Mann's *Escape to Life* was published. *The Other Germany* is their escape from life. They have written, not an article or pamphlet, but 318 pages defending the Allied cause as a crusade against barbarism. Liberals should study the result. It reveals, among other things, that all the sincerity and humanism in the world are not proof against the embarrassments of liberal logic trapped in the service of imperialism. It also demonstrates that no one can discuss the world, avoiding one-sixth of its territory and millions of its people in every country, without making some remarkably silly statements.

First the authors sacrifice the meaning of their title. It is impossible to establish the thesis that Chamberlain and Daladier are fighting *only* Nazism, not "the other Germany." So, even before beginning the book, we encounter a quotation from Harold Nicolson on the flyleaf: "The German character is one of the finest but most inconvenient developments of human nature." This is startling. Writers of good will and intelligence usually do not subscribe to such generalizations about the character of a people—especially their own people. But the Manns go much further than Mr. Nicolson. In the first sixty pages they revile this "German character" in at least ten direct references. Listen:

No error, which France may or may not have committed [at Versailles] is sufficient to explain the moral and intellectual aberration of the German people. A case of collective insanity such as National Socialism has deep roots in the character and psyche of the stricken nation. [page 33]

To be sure, there is much to abhor in the German people, and during the last few years they have shown their most repulsive features. [page 16]

... that certain tendency toward anarchy, want of moderation, and recklessness which is inherent in the German character. [page 52]

How did the German people earn this fate [of being called Boches and Huns]? What were the shortcomings and vices that caused so much resentment? [page 33]

These are only samples. In addition, the authors accept the charge that Germany was to blame for the First World War. They "hope and pray" that the Allies will win the second.

Nevertheless, the Manns insist, there is still that other Germany. There is the Germany of Goethe, of great musicians, scientists, writers; the Germany that will rise

"when the false, evil, hateful Germany will have been destroyed—and this time for more than fourteen years." It is "the Germany that we simply lump together under the name of 'Weimar.'" It must be rescued from the false, evil, hateful one. By whom? Chamberlain's Britain, Daladier's France.

Let us try to understand: The Manns have experienced the Hitler terror firsthand; they chose exile rather than submission; the horrors which they fled still cross their dreams. Nor do we forget their record of vigorous words and actions on behalf of liberty. It is at least comprehensible that the most imperfect democracy should seem to them better than "the world's nightmare" of Nazism. The danger is, they carry this attitude to a point where one is reminded of the small boy who beat his head against the wall because it felt so good when he stopped. True democracy does not yet exist, they say; at best it is only a hope. But destroy Hitler lest he destroy that hope. . . .

Still, being liberals, they cannot stop with this negative concept. The other Germany must be located more exactly and given its place in world democracy; the democracy itself needs a shot of something positive. How do they do this? "The spirit of Weimar—the European spirit" comes closest to a specific definition of what they mean by their Germany-which-is-not-Hitler. But an *improved* Weimar: one that will accord with the improved Europe which is to emerge in the peace following this war. "Europe hankers after a new order. Such an order will come, after Hitler has been overthrown." And—"The Germans' are to be won back, are to resume their place in the comity of civilized nations." In brief: European civilization has for years been thwarted in its highly civilized mission by the bad boy, Germany. Thrash him, break his spirit, then accept his European self in—yes, Federal Union!

Where, in all this high moral reordering of the world, is an economic program? Where, in fact, is there any real recognition of the economic forces that underly political developments? Or of the further recognition, following upon the first, that civilization is not forced to choose between capitalist democracy and fascism: there is a *third* way open—the way of socialist democracy. Erika and Klaus Mann virtually ignore this.

Take their section on the Weimar republic, which contains a good deal of lucid, progressive analysis. The Social Democratic leaders' surrender of revolutionary strength, their cowardice toward and ultimate collaboration with subversive reaction, are set

down in some detail. Now, there was a political party which fought—valiantly, without compromise—against these betrayals. Two of its forerunners the Manns admire, Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. They were "able and willing to soften the unrealistic and often utterly irresponsible radicalism of the leftist opposition and to lead its adherents toward a lawful and democratic policy." Aside from the wholly distorted effect of limiting these two revolutionists' role to one of moderation, this is an extraordinarily oversimplified picture of tactical differences in the left movement. However, let the Manns continue. Liebknecht and Luxemburg, they say, should have fled the police, escaped death—to "preserve their moderating influence for the future." Still shaking their heads over this piece of revolutionary shortsightedness, the authors proceed to fill pages with the gruesome story of what happened during Weimar to hundreds of people who were *not* "irresponsible" and "unrealistic"—not Communists at all. The authors conclude grimly: "They were consistent, these gentlemen of the right. They did away with everyone who appeared troublesome or dangerous." Consistent, yes—terribly and fearfully more so than these two liberals who disdain leftist opposition while they despise the timidity of Social Democracy.

Do not forget, though, that Weimar (improved) is the authors' conception of a Germany that will take its place in the new Europe. The German republic, they tell us in italics, "*was far from bad.*" Under its reign, art and music, drama and literature flourished again. The constitution was not followed, but just the same it was a wonderfully humane, democratic work—full of excellent intentions. Above all, there was that spirit of liberty, which fights on today by "your side." In their entire discussion there is scarcely a word to remind one of the root cause of Weimar's miserable failure—the impossibility of erecting a truly democratic state on an exhausted, Junker-ridden economy.

I have dealt at some length with their treatment of the republic because it reveals an attitude which is crucial to the tragic nonsense of their—and other liberals'—Pan-European arguments. This section on Weimar is not so absurd. Despite the illogic quoted above (and there is more of it), their treatment has a surface persuasiveness of fact and philosophy. The Manns—*pere, fils, et fille*—have always examined superstructures with an exceptional talent of originality and cultural understanding; they have been guided by an instinct toward order, reason, humane-