

NEW MASSES

ESTABLISHED 1911

Editors

BARBARA GILES, A. B. MAGIL, RUTH McKENNEY,
BRUCE MINTON, JOSEPH NORTH, JOSEPH STAROBIN,
JOHN STUART

Business Manager

CARL BRISTEL

★

Stalin's Speech

IT WAS a great fighting speech that Stalin made last week, the speech of a man who commands the confidence of his people, and who has the deepest pride and confidence in his people and his cause. It was a declaration of unlimited national emergency for the Soviet Union. In direct, straightforward language, Stalin struck hard at all complacency, heedlessness, all superficial optimism about the "life and death struggle" which the Soviet Union faces.

Stalin did not shy away from a question in the minds of his world audience. He discussed at length the reasons for the Soviet-German non-aggression pact, emphasizing the two years' time which it gave the Soviet people to prepare. He struck directly at the propaganda that the Nazi armies are invincible, and while informing his listeners frankly of the gains which the German forces had made in Lithuania, Latvia, eastern Poland, and the Ukraine, he assured them that the "main forces of the Red Army" were only "now coming into action, armed with thousands of tanks and airplanes." He placed the defense of the Soviet Union on the broadest possible level, evoking not only the devotion of the workers and peasants, but their deep national pride. He established a historical continuity between the great struggles of the Russian people against Napoleon and their just war against Hitler. And he made it very clear that this would also be a guerrilla war, robbing the invader of his loot, sapping his strength in a thousand ways in front of and behind the lines.

It was also a speech to the rest of the world. Among its most significant passages was the assurance to the Soviet nation that it shall "have loyal allies" among the advanced, the "finest men and women of Europe, America and Asia," as well as the great German people who could be counted upon to contribute to Hitler's defeat. And he foresaw that the Soviet struggle would "merge with the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for their democratic liberties and independence." It was clear from the precision of language that the Soviet Union places no barriers of past differences, or differences of ideology, in the way of cooperation with Britain and the United States. On the contrary Stalin emphasized the "feeling of gratitude in the hearts of the peoples of the Soviet Union" at Churchill's "historic utterance" and the "declarations of the United

States government signifying readiness to render aid" to the Soviet nation.

Even for those of us who have read Stalin, who have known of his place in the hearts and minds of his people, this was a speech which revealed the towering strength of his personality. The newspapers played it down shamefully in view of the fact that it came from the head of a state which occupies a sixth of the globe and whose armed forces are carrying through such a decisive battle for all of humanity. But even in the press and the radio comments, it was freely admitted that such frank, direct language could come only from a man and a government whose relations with its people are different from those of any other government in the world. Johannes Steel, radio commentator, who in the recent period could hardly be called a friend of the USSR, pointed out that no dictator, no Hitler or Mussolini, could have made a speech like that. It was the speech of a man who is both "hero and sage." No wonder that it inspires such confidence in all of us, such enthusiasm and self-sacrifice from the entire Soviet nation. And the announcement that the entire Soviet male population from seventeen to fifty-five is to be placed under arms, is further evidence of the solid support of the people for their government. Imagine what would happen to the fascist dictatorships if they placed arms in the hands of the people!

Iceland

THE occupation of Iceland by American marines crosses the meridian lines between the western hemisphere and Europe; it represents a serious challenge to Hitler's blockade of the British Isles. When the President instructs the Navy to maintain sea communications between Iceland and our own shores, to assure the protection of our supplies to Britain within at least 700 miles of Liverpool, he is beginning to implement Secretary Knox's recent proposal that the north Atlantic be swept free of Nazi sea raiders and submarines. Some time ago the Nazis announced that their war zone extended around Iceland, and the battles of the *Bismarck* and *Hood* took place just outside of Icelandic waters. Unquestionably, the Nazis, through their puppet government in Denmark, were in a position to occupy this island and thus go far toward an encirclement of Great Britain itself. By taking this action, the President is following through on the principle that our own security depends on the defeat of Hitler's power, both in the Atlantic and in Europe, the principle that our defense can only be conducted at a distance from American shores. It is also worth notice that British and Canadian troops are now made available for service elsewhere: it represents a continuation of the British withdrawal from its island outposts near our shores which began with the destroyers-bases exchange of last September.

There are obviously many other points to be made. But our initial attitude toward this move is frankly determined by the largest considerations of the war as a whole. In so far as

it will help American supplies to reach Britain, it is a necessary step. In so far as it will weaken Hitler's naval and air power, it is a worthwhile step. If the President means what he says when he promises to remove our troops from Iceland when the war is over, the independence of Iceland, which its people recently declared from Denmark, will not be endangered. But this measure will achieve its full meaning only if it becomes the first of a series of practical steps to assist both Britain and the Soviet Union in their war against Hitler. It is valuable if it opens up the immediate perspective of discussions among Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union for a joint defense of the Pacific, for the assurance of supplies to Vladivostok and to Murmansk. If the threat to our security is real in the north Atlantic, it is critical on the battle-fronts in eastern Europe. If we are to be defended at a distance in Iceland, the distance is even shorter between ourselves and the front lines on Soviet soil. Bold measures to challenge Hitler in the Atlantic must be succeeded by bolder measures directly aiding the major fronts. Everything depends on carrying those measures through without delay.

Other Fronts

ANTHONY EDEN's speech at Leeds last week, in which he said that "His Majesty's government is not in any circumstances prepared to negotiate with [Hitler] at any time on any subject" was intended to reject in advance German offers of peace in the next few weeks. It is a strong statement, and evidently comes in response to the demand of the People's Convention that all the Munichers be cleared out of their high places. The pressure against appeasement in Britain must be such that the government felt it necessary, within two weeks of Churchill's strong assurances, to reassure the British people that Hess' mission has completely failed.

Eden spoke of cooperation with the Soviet Union in the "military and economic sphere"; the Royal Air Force has been pressing its bombardments on German-held areas of the continent, penetrating deeply into the Ruhr and even Saxony. And evidently, from the relative quiet over British skies, the Soviet campaign is occupying all of Goering's attention. Yet thus far there have been no concrete results from the British military mission in Moscow, results which are impatiently awaited by the people, as Claude Cockburn indicates.

Other military fronts have been dwarfed in the news. But in East Africa the British are mopping up the Italian colonial empire, while in Syria they are making definite progress toward mopping up this important French colony. Strategic bases in the Syrian desert have fallen, such as Palmyra; and as the British columns approach Beirut, the strong possibility exists that the Vichy forces will sue for an armistice, or else flee into Turkey. French efforts to persuade the Turkish government to occupy the northern regions of Syria seem to have failed. At least

nothing more has been heard of the idea since the conferences two weeks ago between the French Secretary of State, Benoit-Michoist, and the Turkish President, Inonu. For the Turks to entertain such ideas would mean definitely embarking on expansion beyond their natural borders; it would not be received well by the Syrian nationalists, and might aggravate further Anglo-Turkish relations. But the British also have their difficulties on the colonial front. The removal of General Wavell seems to have been connected with his failures in the Crete and Libyan campaigns; it probably also results from the criticism of his actions in Australia and New Zealand. The dispatch of Sir Oliver Lyttleton, now an inner cabinet member, to the Near East is apparently connected with the complicated political problems in dealing with Vichy, with the Turks, and with the Syrian nationalists. The British have made many promises in their Syrian campaign, promises to establish an independent Syria. Only an independent Syrian nation, uniting all its diverse elements on the platform of national liberation, can begin to solve the age-old irritations in the Near East. Only such a Syria could be a real bulwark against Vichy, and its Nazi masters.

Finnish Epilogue

HISTORY has its own way of settling scores, but rarely has its retribution been so swift and complete as in the epilogue to the drama entitled *There Shall Be No Night or Little Finland*, starring Herbert Hoover, Robert Sherwood, Norman Thomas, and the ghost of Neville Chamberlain. The pith of that ironic epilogue was contained in a Stockholm dispatch to the *New York Times* of July 5. The British consul general in Finland, H. M. Bell, has been expelled from that country despite the fact that "he had resided in Finland from the first day of Finnish independence, was decorated with the highest Finnish order and was also known as a personal friend of Field Marshal Baron Carl Mannerheim." "The 120 British volunteers who went last year to fight for Finland," the dispatch continues, "have also been ordered out of the country, and were allowed to take with them only twenty percent of their personal money. Forty Blenheim bombers lent by the British to Finland last year are now fighting with the Nazi air fleet." And a children's home, built with money from the British Help to Finland fund, is now being used by Nazi troops.

Think what this means. The British people are being bombed by Nazi planes and threatened with enslavement by German fascism; but forty of their own planes, built by British workers, are today fighting for their enemies, turned over to them, via Mannerheim, by their own former government. One hundred and twenty British boys, deluded into risking their lives for Finnish "democracy," are summarily kicked out by their hosts. And the pennies wrung out of the poor for that ignoble anti-Soviet crusade are now providing shelter for the Nazi "liberators." How vast

should be the indignation of those both in England and this country who were so shamefully duped and betrayed.

And what of the "Socialist" leaders of Finland? They too have run true to form. Tanner, leader of the Social-Democratic Party, has reentered the government to aid Hitler's war, while the Social-Democratic Party itself and the leadership of the trade unions have sent a message to the British Labor Party and the Trades Union Congress justifying their alliance with Nazism.

It is small comfort to us to recall that we were of that minority who insisted that "little Finland" had big bosses and that its government was a White-Guard dictatorship. Today this is obvious to millions. And even a newspaper like *PM*, in an article by Vaughan Henry, points out: "The Finnish uppercrust minority, governmental and industrial—always fascist inclined—has been wholly won to the Nazi cause for some time past and has sold out Finland to Hitler." What we are primarily concerned with is the lessons to be drawn from this episode. The *New Republic* is reluctant to draw those lessons, still speaks of Stalin's "cruel aggression," continues to cling to the patently false judgment that "the dominant forces in Finland were enlightened and democratic." But large numbers of liberals have had their eyes opened; they are beginning to understand that the Soviet action in Finland was in truth defensive, that had it not been taken, the Nazi legions would today be at the gates of Leningrad if not in the city itself, and that the generous terms offered by the USSR to the Finnish government were in the interest not only of the Soviet people, but the Finnish people themselves.

Regulating Prices

RISE prices are one of those nettles that can only be handled with a firm grasp. Thus far the Roosevelt administration has approached the problem in the most gingerly fashion, and the results have been nil. But action cannot be delayed much longer if an inflationary situation, undermining the American standard of living and bankrupting many small business men, is to be avoided. The wholesale prices of all commodities have risen 49 percent since August 1939. Only a small proportion of these increases has as yet been reflected in retail prices, but, according to Labor Research Association's *Economic Notes*, "a much more rapid climb [in living costs] from now on is indicated." In the last war, too, living costs at first rose slowly, but later gathered tremendous momentum. For millions of housewives this prospect is like the crack of doom.

The efforts of the government to control prices through the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply have been confused and ineffectual. When Leon Henderson was appointed to head this office, he expressed faith that expanded production of both defense and non-defense goods would prevent sharp price increases. But monopoly has been allowed to have its own sweet way in this matter, with the result that civilian produc-

tion is going down (one-quarter of all manufacturers are already curtailing non-defense output) and prices are going up. Henderson's efforts to impose price ceilings on certain items have also brought indifferent results, while his request to Chrysler to rescind a boost in car prices met with a flat refusal. In fact, Henderson's legal authority to regulate prices has been challenged by big business. And President Roosevelt has not yet threatened to call out the troops against Chrysler or any other corporation.

Clearly, legislation is needed to regulate prices before they get out of hand. But one note of warning is in order. Certain reactionaries have begun to clamor for price-fixing legislation which would include wages. They even dream of outlawing strikes for higher wages by this device. But despite statements to the contrary, the principal cause of the upward movement of prices has not been wage increases. Wages in 1939 constituted only 15.9 percent of the value of all manufactured products. Thus a ten percent pay rise for the entire American working class could be compensated by only a 1.6 percent increase in prices—far less than has actually taken place. The actual situation was also indicated by Leon Henderson in a speech at Chicago in which he pointed out: "The price level has risen more than the labor rate level since this push started." The *CIO Economic Outlook* for May lists four major causes for price increases: shortage of specific essential materials, specialized equipment and (very soon) transportation; monopoly control of prices; price speculation and excessive accumulation of inventories; and unplanned public purchasing.

From this one must conclude that whatever legislation is adopted must be directed toward curbing monopoly prices and profits and eliminating the other inflationary factors, and not toward freezing wages or the prices farmers receive. At the same time the administration should abandon all attempts to curtail purchasing power, as exemplified in the new tax bill, and should, instead, press for a great expansion of consumers goods production to meet the needs of the people.

ALCOA in the Frying Pan

A SINGLE bombing plane requires as much aluminum as 60,000 coffee percolators. In fact, about ninety-five percent of the aluminum now being produced goes into defense, and twice as much is being produced as last year. Yet we are short on the metal, so short that housewives are being asked to turn in their old pots and pans to the government. Why? Don't ask the Aluminum Co. of America. Officials of Mellon's great big monopoly claim that it isn't *their* fault, they would have been glad to produce ever so much more aluminum if they'd only known it was necessary. But Secretary of the Interior Ickes and the Truman Senate committee investigating the defense program say differently. The Truman committee found that ALCOA, in its determination to sustain the unreasonable price of aluminum, deliberately refused to expand production.

Not only this—ALCOA also tried to thwart increased production by the Reynolds Metal Co., which only recently entered into competition with Mellon's outfit. It is impossible even to summarize the Truman committee's report on ALCOA here, but an instance of the company's methods may suffice. One of ALCOA's officials declared that the company was willing to develop the Fontana, N. C., hydroelectric project (ALCOA owns the site) for aluminum production, provided the RFC put up the funds. But then the company backed down—it discovered that the government had the right to capture the plant *at the end of fifty years*, upon payment of the owners' investment minus depreciation! The company refused to play on such terms. Now the Tennessee Valley Authority will go ahead with the development, under an agreement with ALCOA; and the Federal Power Commission has arranged a seventeen-state "power pool" for aluminum production. Meanwhile kitchenware is being sacrificed and defense aluminum needs are barely met—because monopoly wouldn't dream of letting a little thing like patriotism interfere with its old, old habit of hiking prices by restricting production.

Victory in the South

IT TOOK three long months to force the Southern coal operators into line. The owners resorted to every trick—to bluffs and lockouts, to vigilante terror and violence, to "appeals" appearing in expensive newspaper advertisements which told the story except for the truth, to "mediation" and the refusal to mediate, to pleas for government intervention followed by sudden withdrawals from negotiations. Finally, the Southern operators were forced to follow their Northern colleagues, forced to sign with the United Mine Workers. There is a lesson in that. The determined unity of the miners brought victory; the refusal to be intimidated or bludgeoned out of just demands, the strong leadership provided by John L. Lewis, the very real warning that if the Southern operators persisted in their anti-union policy they would precipitate a strike, finally made it clear to the corporations that either they must talk sense or take the consequences. There was no other way once the union refused to temporize.

The contract won was even more than a major victory for the mine union, more than the guarantee of higher wages. For the first time the ugly discrimination separating Northern and Southern workers was broken. And with the elimination of this arbitrary differential, the strategic position of the open shoppers is greatly weakened. The UMW's contract means new hope; victory once won, can be won again, can be extended among wider and wider sections of the working class. The labor movement having now gained a foothold in the South, can bring democracy even to those states now writhing under the dictatorship of such native fascists as Cotton Ed Smith, Gene Talmadge, Martin Dies, and other enemies of all that means progress and democracy for our country.

Follow-Up in the North

THE UMW success was the result of the miners' refusal to give up their right to strike. Pressing forward from this great victory, 300 delegates of CIO international unions and state councils, at a legislative parley in Washington called by President Philip Murray, unanimously adopted a program of resistance to all attacks on the rights of labor. The conference called for "increased industrial and corporate taxes upon the higher income brackets," condemned "hidden wage cuts," and demanded full labor representation in defense councils. The delegates urged immediate steps by President Roosevelt to provide additional funds for WPA. They condemned the flood of anti-labor legislation in Congress, warning legislators that they must "choose between labor support on the one hand, and their own support of these anti-labor bills on the other." In particular, the conference attacked the Connally-May strikebreaking amendment legalizing the use of troops against strikers and making mass picketing punishable as sabotage. The restrictive Ball and Vinson bills for compulsory mediation of labor disputes and other such legislation designed to prevent organization and to smash unions already in existence, were also denounced.

Here John L. Lewis rose to speak out boldly against the use of troops against strikers at the North American Aviation plant. Further, Lewis pointed out that Sidney Hillman, by approving such actions, by his attempt to confuse and delay negotiations for a contract between miners and Southern operators, had certainly not acted as "labor's representative." The labor movement, taking a leaf from the successful miners, could only survive if it resisted any incursion on its basic rights.

The Youth Speak Up

IN THEIR declaration of support to all peoples attacked by Hitlerism, the 1,200 delegates to the Seventh American Youth Congress gave a demonstration of purpose, unanimity, and enthusiasm that would be hard to beat. Spokesmen of the many groups comprising the AYC—Jewish and Christian, trade union, student, Negro, among others—spoke also for the 5,500,000 membership represented in the congress when they said in various words, "Stop Hitler! Full aid to the people of Britain and the USSR." NEW MASSES will shortly carry a full article on the congress. The best we can do in the space of an editorial is to touch on its most meaningful features. An outstanding one was the harmony of the meeting. These young people, and there were delegates from some 800 local and national organizations, united on a program of both foreign and domestic policy embracing a multitude of programs: friendship and collaboration with the Latin American peoples; aid to China; against racial discrimination, anti-labor measures, domestic fascism of any kind; for proper housing, health, and recreational facilities for conscripts.

A resolution opposing an AEF was adopted

after considerable discussion, many expressing concern that American troops might be used for imperialist rather than anti-fascist purposes. The Young Communist League abstained from voting on this resolution, its spokesman, John Gates, pointing out that with the changed character of the war, all measures, economic, political and military, were required to defeat Hitlerism.

Perhaps delegates will remember, more than anything else at the congress, the truly stirring message to the youth of the world, which ends with a call to a World Congress of Youth. Yes, a *world* congress—even in a world fearfully disrupted by war. For American youth, like those of other lands, know how to surmount the physical forces of disruption, to build a solidarity which will endure against *panzerdivisionen* and bombs.

For Reading and Thinking

MORRIS U. SCHAPPES, young English teacher at the College of the City of New York, was haled before the Rapp-Coudert inquisition, whose main task was to destroy the Teachers Union so that educational budgets could be slashed without fear of opposition. Schappes, a Communist Party member from 1936-39 (when he resigned to write a book), was asked many questions. He did not give the lying answers he was told to give, so he was dragged into court, tried for perjury, and convicted. He faces twenty years in the penitentiary for his refusal to lie. Sufficient protest can force Judge Jonah Goldstein, General Sessions Court, New York City, to suspend sentence on Schappes. For Schappes' persecution is an example of American fascism, the attempt to stamp out education, to destroy the unions, to penalize free speech and liberty.

Mrs. Ina Wood, young wife of a Communist organizer, was sentenced by an Oklahoma court to ten years in prison. The Ku Klux Klan and the court objected to the books she read and punished her accordingly. Her husband, Robert Wood, and two other workers, Eli Jaffe and Alan Shaw, received similar sentences for similar crimes. They can be freed by mass protest—so says the International Labor Defense, 112 East 19th Street, New York City. They are victims of American fascism, as surely as prisoners in German concentration camps are victims of Nazism. The St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* in an editorial declared:

Mrs. Wood did not murder anyone. She did not commit sabotage. She did not steal. She did not cheat on her income tax. She did not violate any of the basic laws of the land. We want to ask a question. . . . Since when has it become a crime to think, to read, and to talk?

Since when? American fascism has victimized Morris Schappes, Mrs. Wood, and the other Oklahoma defendants. But we demand their right—and by so demanding we protect the right of all the rest of us in this country—to read, to think, to talk.

MR. SHIRER'S SECRET DIARY

The Berlin man for the Columbia Broadcasting System couldn't say what he wanted to over the air. Jottings in his personal journal. The truths he couldn't tell. A review by Samuel Sillen.

BERLIN DIARY, by William L. Shirer. Alfred A. Knopf. \$3.

IT is not hard to understand why Mr. Shirer should have kept a diary during his years in Berlin as representative of the Columbia Broadcasting System. He had no other means of expressing what he really felt about life under the Nazis. What irony! Here was a man whose job it was to inform Americans about the state of affairs in Germany. Night after night he broadcast "firsthand" reports over short wave. And after each broadcast he would hurry home to jot down in a secret journal all the things he could not say over the air. The fault, of course, was not Mr. Shirer's. Indeed, the keeping of a diary was in itself a courageous act punishable at any moment by the snooping Gestapo. In the end, Mr. Shirer could no longer stomach the Nazi handouts which he had to read over the air as "news," and he scrambled out of Berlin with understandable relief. His experience as a radio correspondent underscores the fact that virtually everything we hear from German official sources is a lie, and that even the best-intentioned correspondent must keep a *diary* if he wants to tell the truth.

The German people themselves, as Mr. Shirer reports, are terribly cut off both from outside news and news of their own country. At one time, they stormed the newsstands to buy the *Baseler Nachrichten*, a Swiss German-language paper which sold more copies in Germany than in Switzerland. Circulation of the paper was, of course, banned as a result. There are other interesting stories. Dr. Hugo Eckener, for example, had a great deal of contempt for Goebbels. Asked once about balloting on the *Hindenburg*, Eckener fired back: "Goebbels hung up a record. There were forty persons on the *Hindenburg*. Forty-two *Ja* votes were counted." One couldn't very well repeat that over the air with a Gestapo man in the studio.

The diary was a consolation, and in it Mr. Shirer recorded his impressions since 1937. These impressions are not unified by any consistent analysis of the historic events which Mr. Shirer describes. To be sure, there is a deep core of anti-fascist feeling in the book, and much of its substance contributes to the fight against Nazism which the whole civilized world must wage today. But like so many other "foreign correspondent" books, its anti-fascist drive is blunted and confused by a failure to grasp the underlying continuity of the day-to-day events which it chronicles. Insofar as the book confines itself to details which the author has actually observed with

his own eyes, it is a rewarding study. As soon as the author begins to generalize from these events, or as soon as he begins to speculate about situations which he has not himself experienced, the book falls apart. There is a contradiction between experience and theory throughout.

The best example is to be found in Mr. Shirer's treatment of the disastrous appeasement policy which led to Munich and war. There is superb material here for anyone who is inclined to forget that Hitler was helped by fascist-minded friends in England and America. From 1935 through 1938 Mr. Shirer notes the visits to Germany of pro-Nazis like Lord Rothermere, Lord Londonderry, Lord Lothian, and others. "The Lindberghs are here," he writes in July of 1936, "and the Nazis, led by Goering, are making a great play for them. . . ." He reports that Ham Fish seemed completely taken in by Ribbentrop. On one occasion, Dr. Boehmer of the Propaganda Ministry insisted that Mr. Shirer share a double bed with an American fascist, Phillip Johnson, who said he represented Father Coughlin's *Social Justice*. On July 5, 1937, he noted that "The Austrian Minister tells me that the new British Ambassador here, Sir Neville Henderson, has told Goering, with whom he is on very chummy terms, that Hitler can have his Austria as far as he, Henderson, is concerned. Henderson strikes me as being very 'pro.'" A month before, Shirer and Gordon Young of Reuter's had run into Lord Lothian in the lobby of the Adlon. Young asked the Lord why he had come to Berlin. "Oh, Goering asked me to," he replied, and the two reporters wanted to ask him since when he was under orders from Goering, but refrained. And in Prague on Aug. 4, 1938, Shirer confided to his diary that Runciman, whose bald head looked like a misshapen egg, "arrived today to gum up the works and sell the Czechs short if he can."

In short, this diary provides abundant evidence of the appeasement conspiracy. And yet the basic significance of this conspiracy is not really understood by the radio reporter. When the Tories signed the naval agreement with Hitler in 1935, Shirer commented: "Why the British have agreed to this is beyond me." Why Blum appeased Franco was equally a "mystery" to him. His friend, Norman Ebbutt, Berlin correspondent of the *London Times*, complained to Shirer in private that "the *Times* does not print all he sends, that it does not want to hear too much of the bad side of Nazi Germany and apparently has been captured by the pro-Nazis in London." But the purpose of this orientation, its anti-Soviet

objective, escapes him as he writes these highly significant notes.

The materials for such an understanding were everywhere present. There was Chamberlain at Munich, whom Shirer compared to one of the black vultures over the Parsi in Bombay, pleased with himself. And by contrast, on Sept. 12, 1938, the Russians "did a beautiful job of jamming Hitler's speech to-night." After Munich, Shirer went to Paris, where he saw fat bankers and businessmen toasting "Peace" at Fouquet's and Maxim's with rivers of champagne. And seven months later at Warsaw, dining with old Pilsudski legionnaires and Poles from the army and Foreign Office, Shirer heard nothing but the "dangers" of Russian help.

The failure to understand the significance of these impressions led directly to Shirer's complete misunderstanding of the Soviet-German non-aggression pact. A "virtual alliance," he exclaimed at the time, along with many of his colleagues. But as we continue reading in the diary we see what kind of "alliance" this was. "Hitler has won the war in Poland and lost the peace there—to Russia." Again, he learns that butter, flour, and other foods from Slovakia and Bohemia are being marked "Made in Russia" on orders from Berlin in order to show how much "help" is coming from the Soviets. His own observations completely refute the poppycock of "virtual alliance" which he so glibly had uttered, so glibly, indeed, that he didn't recognize that he was talking the propaganda line of the Nazis. And similarly in regard to the Soviet-Finnish war, when Shirer couldn't sleep for thirty-six hours because the "revolution had been betrayed." This defensive move of the Soviet Union against aggression he would have welcomed on the part of France and England, whose "inactivity" he could not fathom in the Munich days!

Nowhere in these pages does one gather that Nazism has been imposed on the German people not merely by Hitler and Goering, but by the ruling financial and industrial oligarchy as a class. One should not, perhaps, expect detailed social analysis in a diary, but the absence of such analysis in Shirer's own mind has led him to almost incredible absurdities. He is inclined, for example, to adopt the very same racial concepts which he despises. He attacks not only the German rulers but the Germans as a people. He notes their "strong sadism and masochism." He speaks of their "ingrained" militarism and their "strange soul." He indicts a whole people. And yet, here again the sweeping generalization does not square with the specific