

PACIFIC WEEKLY

A WESTERN JOURNAL OF FACT AND OPINION

JANUARY 6, 1936

THE NATURE OF AMERICAN IDEALS

BY ELMO A. ROBINSON

MARXIST REPLIES TO UPTON SINCLAIR

NEWSPAPER GUILD PAYS A DIVIDEND

**"DEATH CHAMBER" OF LOS ANGELES
POLICE DEPARTMENT**

**THE AMERICAN GUYED
STORY OF THE WRITERS' PROJECT FIASCO**

\$2 A YEAR

VOL. IV NO. 1

10 CENTS A COPY

UNITED ARTISTS

"Entertainment all should see."
—Hollywood Reporter

2ND WEEK

EUGENE O'NEILL'S

AH WILDERNESS!

WITH
WALLACE BEERY
LIONEL BARRYMORE

Added Attraction
SILLY SYMPHONY

Every Day 'til 1, 25c Underhill 1478

Make HOTEL CRANE

your "official"
San Francisco
hotel-home

\$1.00 WITHOUT BATH
\$1.50 WITH BATH
Attractive weekly rates

Clean, Modern, Convenient
Quiet and Restful

HOTEL CRANE

Jas. H. Lambert, Mgr.
245 Powell Street, San Francisco

CLASSIFIED ADS

BLOODHOUND for sale, age one year, gentle with children, of good breeding. Owner going away would like to find good home for him in the country. Price \$60. Address Lorna Lindsley, 1039 Broadway, San Francisco.

MEXICAN REVOLUTIONARY MURALS by Diego Rivera may now be secured as reproduced in lithographs from postal cards to large sizes suitable for framing. Also pictorial maps of Mexico, picturesque decorations for any room. For prices write or call: AZTEC STUDIO SHOP, Carmel, Calif.

Circulating Library
of Books on
Social and Economic
Problems

COMMONWEALTH
BOOK SHOP
12 GEARY STREET - 2ND FLOOR, S. F.

ZLODI BROS.

DAIRY LUNCH
& CAFETERIA

OPEN ALL NIGHT

67 FOURTH STREET
SAN FRANCISCO

Where intelligent
people meet and

EAT GOOD FOOD

Enjoy Mrs. Rose's Famous 'Southern Style'
WAFFLES or HOT CAKES

Breakfast, complete 20c up
Luncheon, complete . . . 25c, 35c, 40c
Dinner, complete 50c up
Special Sunday Dinner at Week-Day
Prices from 12:00 m. to 9:00 p. m.

WORTH COFFEE SHOP AND DINING ROOM

639 POST, bet. TAYLOR and JONES
SAN FRANCISCO • CALIFORNIA

Please mention PACIFIC WEEKLY when
you patronize our advertisers

A SERVICE

*and a material advantage, offered
to metropolitan business firms . . .*

A FULLY modernized and efficient plant for the production of printed matter . . . business forms, direct-by-mail advertising, books, etc . . . located at Carmel, California, offers every advantage to those desiring efficient service, designing of merit, and low cost. ¶ With men highly trained in their profession and a designer of many years' experience with major San Francisco firms . . . coupled with low overhead and efficient methods of production, a distinct advantage is assured to those who have need of the very finest in printing

CARMEL PRESS

INCORPORATED

Post Office Box 1800 • Telephone Carmel 77
Carmel-by-the-Sea • California

AN inquiry on
your stationery will bring full
details of this offer to business
men who need a service
such as we are able to furnish

PACIFIC WEEKLY

A Western Journal of Fact and Opinion

VOLUME IV

MONDAY, JANUARY 6, 1936

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

Notes and Comment	1
Lincoln Steffens' Column	3
Times Change. Continuing the Study of Marx by Harold M. King	3
Marxist Replies to Upton Sinclair	4
The Nature of American Ideals. 1. Is There a Consensus? by Elmo A. Robinson	5
The One Not "Far Behind", by Sara Bard Field	6
The Guild Pays a Dividend, by John Chester	7
"Death Chamber", by Richard Bartel	7
American Guyed, by S. L. T.	9
Hollywood-Week	9
Books	
Russian History in Documents, by Alexander Kaun	10
Book Reviews by William Millis and Richard Romain	12
Our Contributors	12
Correspondence	III
"They Tell Me—" by Ella Winter	III

NOTES AND COMMENT

A "BIGGEST" UNION FORMING

PLANS for organizing the National Communications Federation, which would be the largest union in America, were publicly announced for the first time December 21. Mervyn Rathborne, acting secretary San Francisco local American Telegraphists Association, disclosed the plans. The union would embrace all radio and telegraph operators and members of such unions as the American Newspaper Guild—in an industry now employing 575,000 workers.

The largest single union in the American Federation of Labor to-day is United Mine Workers, 400,000, organized as an industrial union.

The National Communications Federation would be an industrial union.

Organization of the telegraph operators will be the first step.

The recent national convention of A.R.T.A. voted overwhelmingly to join the A.F. of L. Vote among the A.R.T.A. members will begin January 15. Affiliation of the A.R.T.A. (3,500 members) with the Commercial Telegraphers Union (2,000 members) will be effected April 15 by vote of the A.R.T.A. membership. The C.T.U. is already affiliated with the A.F. of L.

Both unions are now on a drive for from 800 to 3,000 new members and are forming a local Communications Council to include, besides the Newspaper Guild, the Radio Telegraphers.

ANOTHER FRAME-UP FAILS

ANOTHER frame-up fell before the commonsense and fairness of a jury in San Francisco last week when the four members of the Ship Scalers Union were declared not guilty of murder in the death of Vincent Torres, who fell from a window of the scalers' headquarters during a union strike meeting on September 21. The cause of Torres' fatal injuries

were shown to have resulted from his attempt to escape from the hall during a riot caused by four men who had very clearly been planted in the meeting to stage a disturbance and break it up. But four scalers in good standing—Francisco Jiminez, Nataleo Villi, Julio Canales and Archie Brown—were arrested and charged with the Torres murder. It was clearly a frame-up and the conviction that it was pervaded the atmosphere of the court long before the case was given to the jury. The verdict of not guilty was a victory for decency and for Leo Gallagher, the fearless and able defender of so many persecuted labor men.

Three days before the return of a verdict in the case approximately 10,000 maritime workers ceased work for one half hour in San Francisco, Oakland, Stockton and Sacramento in protest against the murder charges against the four ship scalers framed by the Industrial Association and other interests.

The Ship Scalers Union and I.L.A. local No. 38-100 reported reception of 75 telephone calls sympathizing with the protest. Ninety non-union sugar boat workers were obliged to join the workless period.

The Waterfront Employers' Association next day said the hand of Moscow directed the protest.

OUT WITH THE DUNGEON

THE San Francisco News is performing a valuable service by exposing the conditions of torture in San Quentin penitentiary. The dungeon has long been notorious there. Since the death of Fremont Older, persistent and unchanging friend of convicts and supporter of humane conditions in jails, no one in San Francisco has carried on his work. Now the News seems to be stepping into his shoes, and we hope they cling to the job they have begun until some reforms are made; we hope they won't be content with whitewashing. Member of the Prison Board J. B. O'Brien (an ex-newspaper publisher from Ukiah) is also to be congratulated for his stand against the dungeon and other tortures.

This magazine would like to point out one error in the facts however. The impression has gone abroad that only hardened criminals, dangerous men are put in the dungeon. This is not so. Frequently men innocent of any crime are locked in that solitary darkness on suspicion that they know something of some prison happening the officials want to get at the bottom of; sometimes men are put there for private reasons of spite. On one occasion men kept in "Siberia" were so unhinged by that terrible experience that they decided to kick up a rumpus when the guard came by merely to get to the dungeon for a change from the maddening monotony of "the shelf". They did, and were promptly put in the dungeon. Hardly a "dangerous" or "hardened" criminal procedure!

And men have been sent to the dungeon for even lesser crimes. On July 7 the San Francisco Chronicle published this note (commented on by PACIFIC WEEKLY in its issue of July 15):

FIVE ORDERED INTO QUENTIN DUNGEON

Five men are in the dungeon at San Quentin for prison rules violations.

Three letter writers are included. Howard Ford, 25,

Alameda county robber, wrote his brother to send another prisoner \$5; M. A. Parsons, 22, Siskiyou county check writer, asked a doctor to obtain a job for William Wilson, 40-year-old Los Angeles county robber. Wilson was caught attempting to smuggle a letter he had written in search of a job.

SO WHAT, MR. GREEN?

FOLLOWING is a communication sent by President William Green to all unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor:

To National and International Unions, State Federations of Labor, City Central Bodies and A.F. of L. Organizers: Greetings:

I have before me the circular call for the "Third U. S. Congress Against War and Fascism" to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, January 3-5, 1936. In all probability a copy of this call has been sent to you.

So that you may understand what is the purpose of the American League Against War and Fascism, I quote to you herewith from the New York Communist International's Magazine, January 15, 1934, page 78:

"Our most successful application of the united front has been in the anti-war and anti-fascist movement. We led a highly successful U. S. Congress Against War" (see) "which brought together 2,616 delegates from all over the country . . . The Congress from the beginning was led by our Party quite openly.

"The Congress set up a permanent organization on a permanent basis called the American League Against War and Fascism."

Thinking probably that you might be misled by the title of the organization issuing the call, I deemed it advisable to bring the above to your direct attention.

Fraternally yours,

(Signed) Wm Green

President, American Federation of Labor

A LIBERAL FALLS FOR FASCISM

AN AMUSING instance of the ensnarement of a university academician by the official apologetics for Fascism was afforded the members of the Pacific Sociological Society which met last week at Mills College. Dr. Francis E. Wilson of the University of Washington read a paper on "The Social Objectives of Fascism". Dr. Wilson, a glib, self-assured young scholar possessed of not a little of that disarming contempt for the "vulgar mind" as (as he puts it) which also characterizes the outpourings of Signor Mussolini, calls himself a "liberal", who set out with no prejudices to find out just what Fascism is. Approaching the works of Rocco, Ferrari, and other exponents of Corporatism as he would any other abstract political theory (Dr. Wilson is a political scientist), he acquired a hodge-podge of quotations, half-truths, and mystical mumbo-jumbo around which he built his paper. He admittedly avoided the study of all critical attacks on the system, holding that they were mere assumptions (and thus contained no facts) manufactured to justify the Communist cause in the U. S. Incidentally we are in no danger of Fascism in this country, according to the professor.

He arrives at the conclusion that the social objectives of

Fascism are the progress of culture and material production and the substitution of the "higher demands" of the good of the state for the old liberal ideal of the good of the individual. Education has been "reformed" to achieve this goal. The population has been made military-minded, the army is being given "laboratory work in Ethiopia", all because it is necessary to give the individual conscious feeling for and participation in State culture and morality.

And so one would gather that Fascism is a broad ethical ideal, that it was conscientiously ushered in to obtain certain objectives dear to the hearts of sociologists. What the sympathetic Dr. Wilson, lacking as he was any "preconceptions" or "biases", did not discover in his dispassionate hunt for "the truth" was that Fascism actually had no program of objectives, no theory, until it was well-entrenched in power. Neither was the good doctor aware of the class-basis for Fascism: capitalist dictatorship instituted to avert revolution and to preserve profits and private ownership. One was led to believe from his remarks that the Corporate State was some kind of third alternate between capitalism and communism, whereas any "biased" critic knows that Mussolini has preserved private business and drew his financing from it. Dr. Wilson also mentioned the famous planned economy under Fascism, instituted through the (non-existent) "corporations". The fact that capitalist Italy has been harder hit than any other industrial country in the world by the business cycle indicates the planning abilities of the regime.

The paper also contained some nonsense about rule by the "élite", borrowed from Pareto, the gangster of sociology. The Chosen Few are megalomaniacs like Mussolini, Stirace, Goebbels and Streicher, all of whom rose to power by organized gangsterism, brutality, arson, murder and similar methods reserved for the "élite" members of society.

One might go on at length about the stuff contained in this piece of scholarship, but this much is sufficient to indicate the extent to which the liberal and dispassionate academic mind can be duped when possessed of nothing but pure theory. Being unbiased, Dr. Wilson avoided all biased studies of Fascism, save the official mouthings of its defenders. He thus failed to grasp the causes and bases for Fascism, and was fooled into believing it to be a doctrine instead of a method of organized exploitation of one class by another. So Washington gets an armchair convert to the Silver Shirts.

PACIFIC WEEKLY

A Western Journal of Fact and Opinion

Published every Monday at Carmel, California. P. O. Box 1300

W. K. BASSETT, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

LINCOLN STEFFENS DANIEL T. MACDOUGAL
DOROTHEA CASTELHUN HARRY CONOVER
WINTHROP RUTLEGE SARA E. REAMER
SARA BARD FIELD

ELLA WINTER, LITERARY EDITOR

CONTRIBUTORS INCLUDE MARIE DEL. WELCH, ROBERT CANTWELL, CAREY MCWILLIAMS, TOM KROMER, DOROTHY ERSKINE, PETER QUINCE, TILLIE LERNER, ROBERT WHITAKER, JEAN WINTHROP, ROBERT BRIFFAULT, PROF. JAMES R. CALDWELL, UNA JEFFERS, PROF. ALEXANDER KAUN, CHARLES ERSKINE SCOTT WOOD, EDWARD RADENZEL, JOSEPH DANYSH, JOHN WOODBURN, GEORGE HANLIN, L. E. CLAYPOOL, HILDEGARDE FLANNER, HARRY C. STEINMETZ.

Ten cents a copy. Two dollars a year. One dollar for six months. Twenty-five cents for one month's trial. Canadian: Two dollars and twenty-five cents a year. Foreign: Two dollars and fifty cents.

LINCOLN STEFFENS SPEAKING--

CHIEF OF POLICE QUINN of San Francisco raids the bookies and rounds up a lot of them. Of course, he failed to give notice, as we do in other big cities. But he wouldn't catch so many if he sent forth the usual tip.

OUR CIVILIZATION is having a hard time with blondes just now. Suicides, murders or both, and careful probes to find out how and why they lived before justice intervened.

PATRIOTS, LIKE William Randolph Hearst, are terribly embarrassed by the departure of the Lindberghs for foreign parts to avoid the menace of foreigners over here. The family is running away from organized kidnapers, but our professional patriots have to blame communists and other foreigners and have to urge that these be sent back to where the Lindberghs have taken their second child.

THE AMERICAN STUDENTS' UNION, convening at Columbus, Ohio, promises or threatens to think thoughts we old failures did not think. They want to know why Youth can't get jobs, why there have to be wars, fascism and so much bunk. My observation is that young people are the only ones who can see and think about the problems we old geezers gave up. The aged are preparing to watch Columbus, which might teach us something, but I'm afraid we'll get only shocks of horror out of this convention at Columbus; no light.

I can remember the time when we grieved that Youth did not think at all. The old McClure's once agreed to have me inquire whether "there was any intellectual life in the universities". There wasn't in those good old days.

AN EARTHQUAKE that killed many people and swallowed many villages reminds us that there can still be disasters that are not man-made. Even in China.

HIGHER-UPS FROM Washington, D. C., prominent men in the administration, who are out here on business for the Democratic Party, say things which indicate that they don't have any idea what a service they have rendered our civilization. They (and the republicans and the good people generally) have experimented with a common American theory: that we don't have to have a revolution, we can gradually solve the universal social problem by evolution.

The President evidently believed that and he has led the Democrats to try it out in the laboratory of the actual business of the United States. To a failure. To a grand failure. The Republican, the sincere and conservative evolutionists, have resisted his evolution at every step. They have stopped him and his relief, and they are planning now to take his place and lead us back to the old ways which blew us up once, the majority of us, the American people. The Democratic Party can boast that, in power, it demonstrated the error of a practically universal American superstition.

MUSSOLINI, whom I have the same weakness for that I have for Hearst, is on the verge of a blunder. His bluff to England may get him into a big dangerous war. The English also bluff: they are at it now.

TIMES CHANGE CONTINUING THE STUDY OF MARX

BY HAROLD M. KING

AT THE time when Marx and Engels wrote the *Communist Manifesto*, the imaginary world of ideas was fixed, static. Few doubted the divine right of kings, the infallibility of the Pope, the biblical origin of man, or the universality of capitalism. Economists wrote as if God had created a full blown capitalist system when he created the world. These fixed beliefs had suffered some severe blows. The French Revolution had shaken the faith of men in King and Pope. Darwin was in the process of writing a more logical *Origin of the Species*. To this cocksure world, the *Communist Manifesto* presented a dynamic picture of class struggle. Out of this struggle the bourgeoisie had emerged as a revolutionary class; had defeated with the aid of the workers their common enemy, the feudal nobility; had utilized the new production technique to win full political sway; and now, itself the oppressor, faced overthrow by the recently emerged revolutionary proletariat.

Enemies of the labor movement accuse Marxism of being a cult, of treating Marx's works as a Bible; of sticking to the "dogmatic edicts" laid down by Marx. If these enemies had read Marx or Engels, they would find not dogmatic edicts, but: "The practical application of the general principles will depend, everywhere and at all times, on the historical conditions for the time being existing." These are the words Engels wrote in the preface of the 1887 edition. In that same preface, Engels tells the purpose of the *Manifesto*: "The *Communist Manifesto* was published as the platform of the Communist League, a workingmen's association . . . In 1847 Marx and Engels were commissioned to prepare for publication a complete theoretical and practical party program."

The working class needed clarification in 1847. In the American and French Revolutions the workers had fought to help the merchants (bourgeoisie) overthrow their feudal oppressors; the European bourgeoisie were at that moment asking their aid for the struggles that broke out in 1848. The workers had not acted as a separate class. They did not comprehend their historic role. To this utter lack of class consciousness, as well as to the utter confusion of the Utopian "Socialists" of the day, the *Manifesto* was addressed: "A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre; Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French radicals and German Police-spies." Thus opens the *Manifesto* of 1847. These lines sound strangely pertinent to-day. The role of Russia has been radically changed. But German police spies at this very moment are probably appealing to the capitalists of France (some of whom are Radical-Socialists) for a united front against Communism.

"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of the class struggle. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guildmaster and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed . . . have carried on an uninterrupted fight, that each time ended either in a revolutionary re-constitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of contending classes."

This was so distinctly a presentation of historical fact that it was not challenged until recently. We shall have more to

say later concerning the class struggle and the middle class.

In delving into the dynamic picture of the rise and impending fall of the bourgeoisie, Marx evolved a fundamental proposition which his later works have amply substantiated. In contrast with the static world classical economists like those Adam Smith had portrayed, Marx believed "that in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organizations necessarily flowing from it, form the basis upon which is built up the political and intellectual history of this epoch" Thus the introduction of machinery and power (as we shall see) led to factory life; which created cities and all the modern complexities within the Church, school, family and State.

"From the serfs of the Middle Ages sprang the chartered burghers of the earliest towns. From these burgesses the first elements of the bourgeoisie were developed."

Feudalism was a land economy. There were no factories, no stores, no railroads for transport. The vast majority of the population were serfs who worked the land with antiquated implements. On the manors they would sometimes barter among themselves. The lords believed primarily in "production for use"—their own use; most of the produce was consumed on the manor. Trading was restricted to the "merchant guilds" in the towns; but even their trading was curbed by law. Land was the measure of wealth. The landowner was king, duke or lord; the rest of the population pledged allegiance to his person. This form of economy, and the personal relations flowing from it to the peculiar forms of the State, the Church, the school and the family of the Middle Ages. Only such an economy could give rise to the Divine Right of Kings; the infallibility of the Pope; patronage of the Arts; tithes; and primogeniture.

As the population grew, this antiquated form of production failed to meet the new needs. Famines occurred more frequently. More often they led to peasant uprisings. The spoils grew smaller. King and nobles fell out over its division. Freemen used one oppressor against another to win concessions. Thus they received royal charters erecting certain boroughs wherein the freemen had full political rights.

"The discovery of America, the rounding of the Cape, opened up fresh ground for the rising bourgeoisie. The East-Indian and Chinese markets, the colonization of America, trade with the colonies generally, gave to commerce, to navigation, to industry an impulse never before known, and thereby, to the revolutionary element in the tottering feudal society, a rapid development."

Some day a Marxian historian will give America its due credit in the world's revolutionary history. The very fact that our continent helped prove that the world was round; that there were other races than the white and black pushed back old barriers. America has participated on every revolutionary front.

"The feudal system of industry, in which industrial production was monopolized by closed guilds (with monopoly rights) now no longer sufficed for the growing wants of the new markets. The manufacturing (making by hand) system took its place . . . division of labor between the different guilds vanished in the face of division of labor in each single workshop."

The environment changed with the discovery of America, and of the water route to India and China. The reaction to this change of environment was a change in the mode of production. Whereas each process of manufacture had been conducted by a separate guild, now a forerunner of our modern factories was set up, wherein the several journeymen

skilled in the separate processes were housed under one roof. This higher efficiency increased production.

"Meantime the markets kept ever growing, the demand ever rising. Even manufacture no longer sufficed. Thereupon, steam and machinery revolutionized industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, modern industry; the place of the industrial middle class by industrial millionaires—the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeoisie.

"Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. An oppressed class under the sway of feudal nobility, it became an armed and self-governing association in the mediæval commune . . . the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of modern industry and of the world market, conquered for itself exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie."

REPLY TO UPTON SINCLAIR

UPTON SINCLAIR quotes Marx: "We know that special regard must be paid to the institutions, customs and traditions of various lands, and we do not deny that there are certain countries, such as the U. S. and England, in which the workers may hope to secure their ends by peaceful means."

Ungraciously and incorrectly Sinclair has added: "So-called Marxists do not even know they (these words) were spoken." It so happens that in this week's article on the *Communist Manifesto* appear these words: "The practical application of the general principles will depend, everywhere and at all times, on the historical conditions for the time being existing."

Mr. Sinclair is incorrect in believing that his differences with "so-called Marxists" evolve from the difference in their methods of achieving the collective society. It is more basic than that. Mr. Sinclair cannot hide under the analysis Marx made of the America of 1872. America has changed. The Marxists believe that Sinclair has not correctly analyzed the historical conditions of present day America, and has therefore drawn the wrong conclusions from the wrong major premise.

His major premise, which appears in *We, The People*, is that "Ours is not a working class country". Is this true? Read Charles A. Beard's *Rise of the American Civilization*, and you will realize how untrue it is. Read the *Epic Weekly* and you will learn of strikes, wage cuts, WPA marches upon the relief authorities. America is a working class country, and is subject to the very same class struggle which dominates life in all capitalist countries.

How does Mr. Sinclair attempt to prove his premise? He shows that the American workers are not sufficiently CLASS CONSCIOUS of the struggle. They go to middle class movies, read middle class papers, hear middle class radios, etc. That is an entirely different matter. Unfortunately that is very true.

If Mr. Sinclair will agree that objectively there is a class struggle, but that subjectively the workers are not aware of it, then what follows? Obviously, it becomes the duty of all leaders in the movement towards a collective society to use their papers, their radio programs, their motion pictures to teach the working class (and this includes brain workers as well as hand workers) of their true objective conditions. And it is precisely this that Mr. Sinclair has refused to do.

Quite the contrary, he has called upon monopoly capitalists to help him with the Epic Plan. He has denounced the Communists so roundly that only in Epic Clubs, of all liberal organizations, is there an active anti-Communist bias.

Mr. Sinclair may have further arguments to prove that his

analysis of historic conditions of current America are correct. I sincerely hope that the editors will invite him to take issue with me on this point. I hope he answers this letter in the spirit of education rather than that of political controversy.

—HAROLD M. KING



THE NATURE OF AMERICAN IDEALS

I- IS THERE A CONSENSUS?

BY ELMO A. ROBINSON

THE upholding of American ideals! The advocacy of un-American ideals! Charges brought against the colleges and the college professors! These phrases will serve to call to mind the emotional discussions of the past months concerning some aspects of patriotism. The thoughtless ease with which the indictment of fostering un-American ideals has been flung about prompted the writer, in connection with a short course for college freshmen, to seek to arrive at some definite conclusions concerning the nature of truly American ideals.

One of the most frequent attitudes which one meets is that which inquires whether or not there are any ideals specifically American. "May I ask," writes one correspondent, "whether 'American' ideals are different from those of any other nationality? Don't all groups of human beings strive, in one fashion or another, towards the same goal, *id est*: security for all?" Justice is an American ideal, but it is symbolized by a Roman figure. Democracy is an American ideal, but it came to our shores from what are now alien lands. The British people were perhaps the most conspicuous source, and among the British the protestant Independents especially. They in turn found justification for democracy in the organization of the early Christian churches of the Roman empire, and in the Old Testament as well as the New. Among the ancient forerunners of democracy one must include Elijah, the critic of Ahab in connection with the little deal of Naboth's vineyard.

If it be true, as some of our courts have asserted, that ours is a Christian nation, then American ideals are Christian ideals. But Christian ideals know no national boundaries and American ideals will not differ, unless by reason of faulty interpretation of Christianity, from those of other Christian nations. The same sort of conclusion would follow if it be assumed that the United States is an ethical nation, for however much moral customs may vary the principles of ethics are generally held to be universal. These theoretical arguments for the non-existence of American ideals are reinforced by such facts as that our Declaration of Independence, usually conceded to be a statement of American ideals, was asserted by a contemporary critic to have been copied by Jefferson from the works of an Englishman, John Locke—an allegation which Jefferson quite properly denied, yet without claiming any originality for what he had written.

Before attempting to offer an opinion as to whether there are any ideals specifically American, I wish to raise a number of other questions. Assuming that there do exist certain

ideals which are properly to be labeled American, how does one go about it to discover what they are? If the question were put to you how would you reply? What are American ideals? Would you answer according to what you personally believe, or with reference to what you suppose others to believe? Would you answer in terms of ideals which you think actually exist in the minds of Americans, or would you enumerate the ideals which you think your fellow-Americans ought to embrace?

In connection with the course in American ideals this census method of enumerating our ideals was tried out on a small scale in three separate experiments. On short notice a list of possible ideals, including both conservative and communist slogans, was submitted to the Patrons' Association of the college (an organization similar to the Parent-Teachers' Association), each woman present being requested to check the truly American ideals in the list. Later the same list was checked by the members of the class. The results were without statistical significance, but were adequate for indicating the variation, the confusion, and the inconsistencies with respect to American ideals, at least when these are phrased in the conventional stereotypes. Taking the results at their face value the mature patrons showed about as much tendency towards radicalism as did the freshmen students.

In connection with a public announcement prior to the beginning of the course some three hundred letters were written to persons of various occupations, asking for comment and advice. A few liberals and radicals were included in the mailing list, but a large majority of the names were those of supposed conservatives, including many known to be critical of the colleges. Copies of the sixty replies received were placed in the library for student use. Some of the most outspoken in their public accusations of un-Americanism in the colleges failed to reply.

The letter of inquiry asked each correspondent to contribute his own ideas of what constitutes true American ideals, the ideals which should be taught in American colleges. To stimulate thought and to give some unity to the replies a few specific questions were included. "Do you believe that American colleges are teaching radicalism?" "That they are fostering un-American ideals?" "What ideals are characteristically American?" "Who among American men and women best exemplify these ideals in their lives?" "What selections from American writers ought to be assigned to students?" Of those who answered the first question twenty denied that the colleges are teaching radicalism—sometimes with such comments

as "they would not dare", "colleges are too conservative", etc. The twelve who answered affirmatively qualified their answers in some way. "Colleges allow radical members of the faculty to promote un-Americanism". "Five per cent of instructors." "In a few instances." "Not intentionally."

Some of the replies contained a minimum of suggestions. One member of a city government carried the letter of inquiry in his pocket nearly a month hoping that a concrete suggestion would occur to him, but finally had to reply without answering the questions. A university professor excused himself on the ground that "opinions which are not based upon careful investigation and clear thinking are of little if any value" and asserted that he could not reply because his "studies and investigations for almost thirty years have concerned the history of — rather than of the United States". At the other extreme were very carefully pondered expressions from teachers, clergymen, bankers, business men, lawyers, and spokesmen for labor, frequently containing valuable suggestions. Many of these correspondents devoted considerable time and thought to the formulation of their replies. That others felt it impossible to give the inquiry adequate attention should not be the cause for undue criticism. And yet one is inclined to feel that any educated citizen ought to be able to write a few intelligent sentences concerning the ideals of his country.

The variety of ideals suggested as American by the writers of the sixty letters is indicated by the following list which I have grouped under five headings.

1. *International ideals*: political independence, no entangling alliances, army and navy equal to any emergency, generosity towards small nations, faith that our government has offered the greatest amount of political freedom, opportunity, and advantages, faith that ours is the greatest nation in the world.
2. *Civil and political ideals*: democracy, popular sovereignty, representative government, constitutional government, consent of the governed, majority rule, freedom from boss rule, checks and balances, independent judiciary, taxation of all institutions not maintained by public funds, taxation in proportion to benefits received, abolition of special privilege groups, square deal for all, fair play, justice, equality before the law.
3. *Social and industrial ideals*: no titles of nobility, rugged individualism, pioneering, private initiative, private property, private contract, humanitarianism, highest possible standard of living, Americanization, civil service, use of national resources for benefit of people, public ownership, free public education.
4. *Ideals of individual rights*: liberty, freedom, free speech, free press, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, habeas corpus, universal suffrage, trial by jury, protection from unwarranted searches and seizures, safety when abroad, right to criticize government and government officials, to agitate against any law, doing as one pleases so long as rights of others are not infringed.
5. *Ideals of individual duties*: Americanism, love of home, of country, patriotism, obedience to law, obedience to all laws, exercise of franchise, resourcefulness, accumulate rather than take wealth, self-help, energy, industry, work well done, thrift, truthfulness, lend-a-hand, social responsibility, generosity, development of and respect for personality, chastity, straight thinking, intelligence, good horse-sense.

A similar divergence of opinion is found in the nominations of the men and women who best exemplify American ideals in their lives.

Lincoln received 13 votes, Washington 9, Jefferson 7, Franklin and Theodore Roosevelt 5 each, Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt and Jane Addams 4 each, Frances Perkins 3. Two votes went to each of the following: John Q. Adams, Edison, Henry Ford, (Judge) Oliver Holmes, Hoover, Jackson, LaFollette Sr., Madison, Marshall, Monroe, Norris, Josephine Roche, Anna Roosevelt. And among the "also-rans" were those who received one vote each: Boone, Brandeis, Burbank, Carrie Catt, Clemens, Cleveland, Coolidge, Grace Coolidge, Cordoza, Amelia Earhart, Emerson, James Farley, Carter Glass, Grant, Hamilton, Lou Hoover, Julia Ward Howe, Hughes, Hiram Johnson, Lee, Mary Lyon, Horace Mann, Lucretia Mott, Ruth Owens, Thomas Paine, Edith Roberts, Almon Roth, Anna Shaw, Elizabeth Stanton, Harriet B. Stowe, Thoreau, Booker Washington, Webster, Whitman, Frances Willard, Mary Wovley, Owen Young.

Had the correspondents been given a list of names to check, doubtless the results would have been different. But this list as it stands represents the spontaneous idea of the writers who replied to this particular question. It is apparently considerably easier to think of men who exemplify our national ideals than it is to think of women (about 4 to 1). And, in spite of the fact that most of the replies came from Californians, no one nominated David Starr Jordan, nor Thomas Starr King, nor any other person intimately associated with the history of California except Hiram Johnson.

A third informal attempt at a small census sample was undertaken by asking each member of the class to interview five persons representing five occupational classes (professional, semi-professional, skilled labor, semi-skilled, and common labor). This was largely a teaching device, the reports from which were too dissimilar for tabulation. But it was common for the student interviewer to meet suspicion, cynicism, and even complete lack of comprehension as to what the questioner was talking about. Apparently many persons have no constructive associations whatever when they hear a reference to American ideals.



THE ONE NOT "FAR BEHIND"

"Now is the winter of our discontent"

But if it come "can Spring be far behind?"

- ▲ Cry Shelley to the sun in banishment,
The censored birdsong, star-eyed night struck blind.
Let the Dictator North on warful beast
Imprison rebel sprouts and the last trees
With late brave colored gonfalon released
Be mobbed by black-flagged winds from Arctic seas.
For this unbridled government is sum
Of witherings that vanish on the blast.
The one not "far behind" leads life to come
Against this mobilizer of the past
Who leaves tomorrow unimpeded way
Down roads he clears of crumbings and decay.

—SARA BARD FIELD

THE GUILD PAYS A DIVIDEND

BY JOHN CHESTER

THE Northern California Newspaper Guild has paid its first dividend.

William Randolph Hearst, who was powerful enough to tell the President of the United States what to do in the Guild's first great crisis, has returned the five-day week to employees of his two San Francisco papers.

The "impotent" Guild has obtained for *Call-Bulletin* and *Examiner* editorial workers a boon denied other Hearst employees throughout the United States.

There was no threat of a strike. There was no picket line; no flaming defiance of the country's most consistent bitter-ender. There was no excitement. But the Guild got what it wanted.

Now, all editorial employees of the *Examiner* and *Call-Bulletin* are not Guild members. In fact, there are a good many men on both papers who are downright antagonistic to organization. Yet the Guild put those two papers back on the five-day week.

It was all so quiet-like. A few Guild members sat themselves down at their typewriters and ground out dozens of resolutions condemning the six-day week. Then those resolutions were taken to nearly all the locals of San Francisco unions. The unions passed the resolutions.

Into the *Call-Bulletin* and *Examiner* came a flood of letters condemning the creation of unemployment when profits are jumping. By two and three and four a day came those resolutions, all with the seals of honest A. F. of L. unions.

And the *Call-Bulletin* suddenly announced that the five-day week was back, after the six-day week had been in force for reporters, photographers, re-write men and beat men for more than two months (the copy desk never had lost its five-day week).

A week later, the *Examiner* followed suit. Hearst men elsewhere continue to labor six days, but those in San Francisco get an extra day off.

Strangely enough, Guild members were surprised at the unexpected capitulation. Some of the lads think that the Baron of San Simeon did it out of philanthropy and kind-heartedness.

Philanthropy, hell! Hearst, who has never known any compulsion save that of force, who created a war to sell papers, who was willing to ruin Senators in an effort to create another war, who has ridden rough-shod over every ethic known to man—that guy a philanthropist?

Hearst restored the five-day week to the *Call-Bulletin* and *Examiner* because he is afraid of the Guild. And the biggest task of the Guild right now—a task that is hardly recognized—is to convince its members of their own power. That is one reason this is written.

* * *

But there is another story to tell.

The *Chronicle*, too, was deluged with resolutions. The *Chronicle's* publishers, too, were afraid of the Guild. But the *Chronicle* pulled a fast one, and the employees thereof sold their birthright for a bowl of soup and a soda cracker.

The *Chronicle*, with a sanctimonious air, called the lads together one day and offered them a choice of three working schedules:

1. Alternate weeks of five and six days.

2. The five-day week six months of the year and the six-day week for the other six months.

3. The six-day week all year, but a month's vacation with pay.

The *Chronicle* executives hinted delicately that they would like the third schedule much the best. The *Chronicle* employees took the bait like good little fish and voted in favor of the month-long vacation idea.

So, mes amis, there appeared upon the *Chronicle's* front page an elegant yarn about the *Chronicle's* munificence. The *Associated Press* and *United Press* sent out nice pieces about the affair (both ignored the restoration of the five-day week on the Hearst sheets). The public was made to believe that the *Chronicle* had done swell by its folks.

The fact remains: *The Chronicle* was afraid of the Guild, and doubtless would have granted the five-day week if its employees had used a little sense. But the *Chronicle* employees didn't see the hook in the bait, and probably believe to-day that they got something pretty nice for Christmas.

The Guild objects to the *Chronicle* settlement for these reasons:

1. The whole affair has a strong odor of company union. The Guild was the proper collective bargaining agency. Guild members on the *Chronicle* should have wrinkled up their noses and seen to it that the Guild stepped in.

2. The *Chronicle* men were given 14 more days off a year. They turned down two offers that would have given them about 25 more a year. They could have had about 50 more a year if they'd been smart.

3. The *Chronicle* schedule endangers the five-day week on other papers, particularly on the *Examiner* (also a morning publication, you will remember), since the *Chronicle* will now be paying a smaller labor bill.

All *Associated Press* reporters (dignified in city directories by the term "editors") are still on the six-day week, of course. The AP, too, is going to be bombarded with resolutions. The Guild is strong in the AP, especially in the New York and San Francisco bureaus, and there is no reason why the Guild cannot restore the five-day week.

Anyway, the Guild has paid a dividend. When a reporter now asks the immemorial question: "What am I getting out of the Guild?" he need only be told that his extra snooze-day would never have materialized if the Guild hadn't been about.



"DEATH CHAMBER"

BY RICHARD BARTEL

THE notorious "death chamber" of the Los Angeles Police Department, sometimes known as the "drunk tank", located in the Lincoln Heights jail, has claimed in the last six months, the lives of seven men, all of whom were arrested on the charge of drunkenness and who had the misfortune of

being sent to the above jail.

It had been the custom in the past to point out the Hearst and Hynes "red" squad as the quintessence of police brutality in this city, but now they too must make way for their betters. Their betters, the "death" squad of the Lincoln Heights Jail.

Through the uninterrupted use of the "death chamber" the Lincoln Heights "death" squad has compiled since July 1, of this year, with its blackjack tactics, a fatality record so singular in its effect, that it has become the envy of all other police branches in the city and has surpassed any like performance in the history of sustained crime and criminal negligence within the Police Department.

The local police had the pleasure of playing the temporary host for their seven involuntary guests, now deceased, all who were later found guilty by the coroner's jury, of the crime of murdering themselves accidentally, after being arrested and confined in the Lincoln Heights jail.

Yes, they entered the "death chamber" and died quite accidentally, all seven of them, according to the guardians of the law, who should know, since they were there, and died as the records show, and as Police Chief James E. Davis himself publicly admitted on November 21, from either the results of a blood clot on the brain or a basal fracture of the skull, received after and not before they were arrested and thrown into the "drunk tank".

Three deaths occurred under strange circumstances during the week of November 15. Among these will be found the case of Harry King, fifty years of age, who had the ill fortune to be arrested in the hall of a rooming house by officers S. H. Russell and J. L. Dykes, on a drunk complaint. He was taken to the Lincoln Heights jail for a few hours and then to the night court for pleading. While waiting in the anteroom of the night court, he toppled over from the bench on which he was sitting, so the police conveniently say, and died.

But at the morgue it was discovered that King had in all appearances been badly beaten up previous to his death, for his body was literally covered with black and blue marks. Coroner F. A. Nance thought so little of King's death at that time that he did not order an inquest be made on the body until forced to do so by public opinion.

The coroner's jury concluded its investigation at the inquest with the verdict that "no negligence or act of any person contributed to the death", thereby completely absolving the police officers and jailers in charge, but not, however, to the satisfaction of various interested organizations who demanded, but not successfully, a Grand Jury investigation of this and similar deaths which have been occurring so frequently at the Lincoln Heights jail.

Another recent death occurred in the same week on November 19. On the preceding day Glen C. Hood, a World War veteran, was arrested for drunkenness and thrown into the "drunk tank" at the Lincoln Heights jail. According to Carl W. Bittner, assistant jailer at that police station, testifying before the coroner's jury, Hood met death "accidentally" by falling eighteen inches from his bunk to the cement floor of the jail. He said he noticed Hood thrashing about in his bunk as though he were going to fall out. He started to rush toward him, he said, but before he could reach him, Hood had fallen out of the bunk onto the cement floor.

But the coroner's jury with its customary consistency dismissed the case by exonerating everyone concerned. The circumstances under which Hood's death occurred were so strange that even after the vindicating verdict of the coroner's jury, Councilman Earl C. Gay, head of the police and fire committee of the city council, said that he would demand that

the council conduct a complete investigation on its own behalf, to learn the true facts appertaining to the case.

And members of the United Veterans of the Republic and the Hollywood American Legion Post to which Hood belonged presented a formal demand for a grand jury investigation of the conditions and the handling of prisoners at Lincoln Heights jail. But nothing materialized—for the simple reason that "dead men tell no tales".

The most sensational death of the same week, however, was that of Louis F. Schuette, a homeless fifty-three-year old Spanish War veteran. He was arrested on November 15 by officer J. F. Gayley on a drunk charge and then taken to the Lincoln Heights jail, but died the very next day of what County Autopsy Surgeon Wagner described as a basal fracture of the skull.

Jail Ambulance Surgeons Donald Klaussman and Harry H. Hanlon stated, however, that before Schuette had been taken to the Lincoln Heights jail, they had examined him separately and at that time he unmistakably did not have the skull fracture.

"I examined this man's face, scalp and head," Dr. Klaussman said, "and found no injury except a slight cut about a quarter of an inch over the right eye. There was a strong odor of alcohol on his breath but he was normal in every way."

"You understand," asked Chief Complaint Deputy District Attorney George C. Jonson at the inquest, "that Schuette died of a basal skull fracture?" "Yes," said Dr. Klaussman, "but I found no bruises on his head—only a slight cut over the eye."

"Could it have been caused by a fall," asked Johnson. "It could have," replied Klaussman, "but it is not likely in this case, as there were no bruises around the cut, which was little more than a scratch."

Completely disregarding this evidence the coroner's jury exonerated the police department of all blame in the case, remarking in its official verdict: "Deceased came to his death from a basal fracture of the skull. We, the jury, are unable to determine how or when the deceased sustained the injury which caused his death, but we find this to be an accidental injury and find no negligence on the part of the police department."

Truly a remarkable bit of reasoning. They don't know, nor can they determine how or when the deceased sustained his injury which caused his death after listening to Dr. Klaussman's testimony, stating emphatically that Schuette did not have the skull injury when arrested, and then continuing their masterpiece of logic by stating that they do know, however, that the police department is not responsible for the tragedy.

When a man dies under mysterious circumstances in a police station because of fatalities received after he had been arrested, we hesitate to accuse the authorities in charge of being directly or indirectly responsible for the death in view of their own testimonial evidence disproving their participation in the crime. But when still another man dies under similar circumstances and then five more, as Chief James E. Davis admitted recently, due to blood clots on the brain or basal fractures of the skull received in the police station, after being arrested, it is time not to hesitate, but to accuse and condemn.

In accusing we accuse not only those inimitable police officers and jailers of the Lincoln Heights "death" squad of violent sadism, blood-brother to the Nazi brand, but also their superiors, of criminal negligence. Their superiors, mainly Chief Davis, who have tolerated in the past the fatal exploits of their subordinates, and who continue to tolerate them, irre-

spective of the stream of public protest.

Perhaps Police Chief Davis cannot spare time to clean up his own backyard. You see, he spends so much time addressing the same women's clubs of the city on the subversive influence of the 'reds' in Uncle Sam's backyard, and then anticipating and receiving a pat on the back by the Hearst newspapers.

Los Angeles is a city of many distinctions, and to those distinctions we must add one more. In other cities, to be arrested for drunkenness is a misfortune; in Los Angeles it is a tragedy.



AMERICAN GUYED

A "JOB LOCAL" with the practically unanimous backing of the writers on the San Francisco Federal Writers Project of the Works Progress Administration, with a charter requested from the Washington office of the American Federation of Government Employees, and with similar locals forming in Los Angeles and Oakland, has been formed. This is the result of a remarkable series of arbitrary and autocratic actions on the part of the Washington Administration of the Federal Writers Projects, involving a complete regimentation of the WPA writers in the United States within the commercial demands of a swollen Baedeker to be known as the "American Guide".

The Guide has been characterized by George Cronin, assistant to Henry G. Alsberg, Washington director of the Federal Writers Projects, as "the most colossal, stupendous and remarkable thing of its kind that has ever been done in America"! Cronin, recently in San Francisco, in the role of Lord High Executioner of the smoothly-functioning projects, organized by Dr. Paul Radin under Washington authority of this same Henry G. Alsberg, unblushingly admits that the Guide project was put over on the writers by "the most powerful interests in the United States", Chambers of Commerce, transportation companies, railroads, industrial, commercial, hotel and other tourist-conscious interests—in other words, the very interests that recently so loudly proclaimed their intention of "ganging up" on the Roosevelt Administration.

On October 17, 1935, Dr. Paul Radin, as California director of the Federal Writers Projects, was empowered in a letter, signed by Alsberg, "to approve or disapprove on the basis of their fitness as units of the Federal Writers Projects, projects calling for the employment of writers and persons of related abilities in the State of California". Several literary projects the personnel of which had had many months of intensive training, were carried over from the SERA, and new projects organized were manned by a personnel carefully selected with respect to experience and ability. The project supervisors chosen were men who had distinguished themselves for efficiency as administrators in the SERA.

Enthusiasm and efficiency characterized the California Writers Projects during a period when confusion was the order of the day on other WPA projects. It seemed that a miracle had occurred; that at last a genuinely enlightened national administration had recognized the social rather than

the commercial value of writing. But it was too good to be true. The telephone rang. Washington speaking. "Whatdya mean—writers' projects? There is only one Writers' Project—the American Guide." Dr. Radin then prepared to junk his projects, the Documentary History of the Labor Movement, Cultural Anthropology, National Minorities, California Literary Research, and the Creative Writers' Project. Speeding up the process came one George Cronin, evangelist of the Guide, demanding Dr. Radin's resignation and the demotion of all supervisors, with the ukase "the writers have got to do the Guide and they have got to do it the way we want it or we won't do it".

For some curious reason the enemies of the Administration now seem to have first say in what sort of work the WPA writers shall do. So complete is this dictation that letters from the Redwood Empire Association, the Southern Pacific Railroad, etc., accompanying about two tons of advertising matter, arrived at San Francisco Headquarters to congratulate the initiation of the American Guide before the State officials of the Writers Projects had heard a single word of the "reorganization". But for many Pacific Coast writers the "ganging up" of industrial interests to destroy independent effort on the part of the intellectuals is but an old story repeated.

Even before the formation of the union, the writers sent the following telegram to President Roosevelt, Harry L. Hopkins, and Henry G. Alsberg:

Workers on the Writers Projects in San Francisco ninety-eight in all, protest change of State and local administration as announced by George Cronin. We demand that Paul Radin and Maurice Mandell and all project supervisors be retained in present positions. We demand that entire personnel of Writers Projects be retained in present positions. We demand that entire personnel of Writers Projects be guaranteed job security for duration of WPA. We object strongly to arbitrary and unjust action of Cronin.

Dr. Radin is "out" and the Guide is floundering on its way with a new state director, Jimmie Hopper, of Carmel, in charge. But under union pressure Washington is showing signs of relenting. Unofficially some projects have been reinstated on a part-time basis and some former supervisors have been put back to work, though at a reduced scale of pay. The writers continue to protest; their case is publicized widely in the San Francisco News and the San Francisco Chronicle, and they will continue to demand job security, professional wages for all professionals (in only a few cases is this wage now paid), the reinstatement of Dr. Radin and complete reinstatement of all the old projects.

—S. L. T.

HOLLYWOOD-WEEK

(Hollywood News Bureau—Exclusive to PACIFIC WEEKLY)

CLOSE-OUT

WAMPAS (Western Association Motion Picture Advertisers), only organization of Hollywood publicity and advertising men, this week gave up the ghost after 13 years of existence. The sinking fund was distributed to 80 paid-up members on

basis of \$7.80 per year of membership. Thirty-one received as high as \$92 each, and the average was \$50. The death of Wampas is no indication of unwillingness of rank and file to organize, for a new group, *Spancs*, (Society of Publicists and News Correspondents), is now being formed, correcting the mistakes Wampas made.

OLYMPICS

RECOGNITION of the mass basis behind the protest against U. S. participation in Nazi Olympics this week keeps Hollywood producers on edge, with the Olympic Games Finance Committee asking for use of Hollywood stars for publicity purposes and the producers refusing. The Screen Actors' Guild, representing foremost stars and featured players in industry, is broadcasting appeal to members to refuse publicity aid, reminding them that they are members of American Federation of Labor which has already gone on record against Hitler's sports fest. Yet, in the East, Dr. Jesse Feiring Williams, head of the Department of Physical Education, Teachers' College, Columbia University, is attempting to rally sentiment of college alumni for support of a study group he is planning to take to Germany in June for the Olympics.

NOTES OF THE WEEK

CHAPLIN's *A Modern Symphony*, musical score of his new film, *Modern Times*, (scheduled for New York release on February 1 at the Rivoli), is to be played by Leopold Stokowski and the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra. . . . Rene Clair's first English picture, *Ghost Goes West*, which he wrote and directed for Alexander Korda's London Films, is getting sensational reviews in the London bourgeois press. . . . The foremost American authority on the dance, according to *World Wide Encyclopedia*, is Dave Gould, dance director at MGM, who has just been selected to write an article for the new edition. . . . Sidney Kingsley's exciting drama of the making of a gangster, *Dead End*, top-notch hit in New York, is coming to San Francisco and Los Angeles in February. Kingsley and Norman Bel Geddes are coming West to handle the production here. . . . Of the \$50,000 paid by 20th Century Fox for the appearance of the Dionne quintuplets in *The Country Doctor*, \$30,000 has already come back to the studio through a tie-up with cereal manufacturers who paid to get a line in the script saying that the sisters like oatmeal.

CONTRAST

WITH HOLLYWOOD's efficiency experts struggling to cut down pro-rata overhead by keeping all sound stages busy and even hiring directors to shoot still incompleting scripts, Russia this week announces the construction of a Soviet "Hollywood" at Sukhum in the Caucasus, to contain 40 studios and cover 20 square miles!

RANK AND FILE

FRANCIS EDWARD FARRAGOH, who took part in launching the Workers' Drama League (now national New Theater League) and the New Playwrights' Theatre in New York with John Howard Lawson, Michael Gold, Em Jo Basshe and John D's Passos, has been elected vice-president of the Screen Writers' Guild.—Sidney Buchman, who has just returned from a trip to Russia, has been named executive board member.—The Franchot Tones (Joan Crawford) have been named to executive board of the Screen Actors' Guild.

Tone started his work in the theater with Farragoh, Lawson, Gold and then joined the anti-fascist Group Theater.

CHECK-LIST

NUMBER ONE on list of boycott-films is MGM's *Riff-Raff*, this week previewed with comment from Hollywood's *Daily Variety*: "As pic it rates its name". . . . Pictures now in production to be watched for attempts to build up reactionary following: At Columbia, *Devil's Squadron*, with Richard Dix and Karen Morley; *Money Mad* with Bruce Cabot and Ann Sothorn, and, of course, Republic's *The Leathernecks Are Coming*. Watch, too, an attempt by 20th Century-Fox to build up pro-fascist Irvin S. Cobb as another Will Rogers in *Everybody's Old Man* with Rochelle Hudson. . . . Can you imagine Britain's delight at MGM's announcement of the preparation of Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* with Freddie Bartholomew? Sharpening of native resistance to British imperialist rule to-day makes Kipling's treatment of colonials a perfect story for the winning of popular support in England for the continuance of British domination of India. . . . War spirit here will be built up by film production of *Comme Ça*, a sop musical comedy which toured the American Expeditionary Force during the war. The film, recently revived for Ohio road show, will be produced by W. R. Rowland who ran the war-time company. . . . Walter Futter's two-reel short subject, *Find the Man*, will help bolster the Federal campaign for universal finger-printing.

BOOKS

RUSSIAN HISTORY IN DOCUMENTS

BY ALEXANDER KAUN

REMARKABLY good work has been done under the auspices of the Hoover War Library at Stanford University in the field of publications. Under the able editorship of Professor H. H. Fisher there have recently appeared several stimulating books* on Russia just before and since the war and the Revolution. The editor's aim is to present authentic documents, with the minimum of commentary, so as to enable the thinking reader to draw unforced conclusions. Such a purpose must be greeted with enthusiasm by anyone who wants to know, and not merely confirm what he thinks he knows.

An unwittingly severe arraignment of Tsaristic Russia is presented in the memoirs of Count V. N. Kokovtsov. The Count was an ideal servant of the last Tsar, and therefore he is an ideal spokesman for the old regime. Practically all

*OUT OF MY PAST. The Memoirs of Count Kokovtsov. Edited by H. H. Fisher. Translated by Laura Matveev. (Stanford University Press 1935) \$5.50

THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION, 1917-1918. Documents and Materials. By James Bunyan and H. H. Fisher. (Stanford University Press 1934) \$6

THE TESTIMONY OF KOLCHAK, AND OTHER SIBERIAN MATERIALS. Edited by Elena Varneck and H. H. Fisher. (Stanford University Press 1935) \$5

his life Kokovtsov spent in government service, occupying responsible posts, from that of department head to those of Minister of Finance and Prime Minister. His style, even in translation, is imbued with the obsequiousness and evasiveness of a courtier. In the original Russian he capitalizes the h's when he speaks of the person of Nicholas II, and oozes with unctuous servility and lachrymose ecstasy even when he plainly demonstrates (at least to the reader) the imbecility and callousness of his adored monarch. Kokovtsov appealed to the Tsar because of his technical experience in finance and general administration, but mainly because of his pedestrian personality. The Tsar felt ill at ease with strong-willed men, like Witte, Stolypin, Sazonov, Polivanov, or even such a faithful watchdog as Plehve, and he sighed with relief when he dismissed them, or when a Revolutionist's bullet or bomb "liquidated" them. Yet even the nonentity Kokovtsov experienced the whimsical petulance of the Tsar, whenever he made a faint effort at rising above the level of a sworn yes-man.

One should read the suave, loquacious, often naïve memoirs of Kokovtsov, if only in order to realize in whose hands lay a huge state and a great nation. The dreary accounts of interviews with the Tsar, the Kaiser, the President of France, Berlin and Paris bankers, and representatives of the "How much?" press at home and abroad; of intrigues and gossip in the St. Petersburg chanceries and salons; of perjury, graft, and criminal inefficiency in high and low official circles; of the farcical part played by the pseudo-parliament, the State Duma—these accounts fill one with a sense of tragedy and imminent doom. The amazing thing, or perhaps the natural thing, about these "rulers" and "statesmen" is that most of them gave no heed to the numerous seismic warnings they had been given in the last two decades of their regime. Kokovtsov insists on this point, and with disarming frankness reiterates his utter unpreparedness for the turn things took in 1917.

What took place in 1917 and after is breath-takingly told in No. 3 of the Hoover Library Publications. This expertly culled and organized set of documents seems to follow the late F. A. Golder's *Documents of Russian History, 1915-1917*, and it should be followed by other similar volumes, covering the Civil Wars and Intervention, the NEP period, and the Pyatiletkas. Here the drama moves with dizzying swiftness, from the toppling of the putrescent throne, through the summer of Kerensky's verbiage and national chaos, to the meteoric victory of the Bolsheviks and its consolidation in the face of terrific odds. And throughout, like the Lord of Genesis over the chaotic waters, moves the mind of Lenin. His intransigence in principle and flexibility in details of tactics and strategy, his merciless logic and analytic dynamics, his knowledge *where and how he was going*, vibrated like heat-lightnings in the charged air of Russia and molded the shape of events. Only a dead certainty of direction and method can explain Lenin's fearless resoluteness in his letters, articles, speeches and decrees, even before he set foot at the Finland Station in Petrograd, and thereafter, while hiding from Kerensky's police within an hour's ride from the capital, and upon assuming the post of Chairman of the People's Commissars. To be sure, he was human, and he erred on occasion, and no over-zealous hagiographers can, or need, conceal that. In essentials, however, his perspicacity was amazing, as these "unpartisan" documents show time and again.

Examples could be multiplied, but one will suffice. In advocating his non-Bolshevik land decree, Lenin had this to say, on November 8, 1917 (italics mine):

"I hear voices raised here to the effect that both the decree and the land mandate were drafted by the Socialist-Revolutionists. Well, suppose they were? What does it matter who drafted them? As a democratic government we cannot ignore the resolutions of the lower strata of the people, even though we may not be in sympathy with them. In actual practice the peasants will find out for themselves where the truth lies. And even if the peasants should continue to follow the Social-

ist-Revolutionists. . . . We shall say to them: Good and well! Life is the best teacher; it will show in the long run who is right. Let the peasants from their end proceed to solve that question; we shall proceed similarly, and life will force us to approach each other in the common stream of revolutionary creative activity. In the forging of new institutions, we must follow in the footsteps of life, allowing complete creative freedom to the masses . . ."

Who can say that Lenin was an impractical doctrinaire?

Step by step the documents evolve the situation. We become aware of the prodigious difficulties facing the Bolsheviks "the morning after", from within and without. Disintegration and insurrection at home, hostility and eventually intervention and invasion on the part of the "Allies", on top of an early invasion by General Hoffmann's troops. Seeming isolation. Where were the voices of the world proletariat? How heartening must have been to them the presence of a few foreign friends, like Sadoul and John Reed. What a warm applause greeted the short but eloquent speech of Albert Rhys Williams at the first session of the Third Congress of Soviets on January 23, 1918!

The volume stops in the midst of turmoil and peril on every side, with the tone of Lenin not a whit less resolute or confident.

The tenth volume in this series offers a glimpse at the period of civil war and Japanese intervention in Siberia. Of all the intervening, would-be saviors of Russia, Admiral Kolchak was credited, even by his enemies, with comparative decency and scrupulousness. His own testimony, before his execution, demonstrates, however, how pathetically helpless he was about curbing brutality, arbitrary executions, debauchery and rank disobedience on the part of his subordinates. If Professor Fisher ever undertakes the history of the invasions of Denikin, Petlyura, Yudenich, Wrangel and their brethren, he will have a much bloodier story to tell. One hopes that he will. There are mountains of material awaiting his attention, of much greater vitality than the chatter of Kokovtsov (in my humble opinion his memoirs were not abridged drastically enough).

THE LAST WAR AND THE NEXT

AMERICAN NEUTRALITY, 1914-1917, by Charles Seymour. (Yale University Press) \$2

BY PACIFIC MEANS, by Manley O. Hudson. (Yale University Press) \$2.50

(Reviewed by William Millis)

A RMS and the Men", an article published in *Fortune* magazine more than a year ago, proved an international sensation, precipitated the still-continuing U. S. Senate investigation of "the munitions makers", and directed world attention to the economic causes of modern war. Contemporary popular opinion has pretty nearly reached the position that war is a "capitalist racket". *Road to War*, by Walter Millis, has had great influence in spreading that opinion. The more-recently published *Memoirs of former Secretary of State Robert Lansing* gave further backing to the economic analysis.

Now along comes Charles Seymour to write *American Neutrality, 1914-1917*, and throw cold water upon the whole idea, and, by using "the great man" theory of history, to aver that our entrance into the World War was caused almost entirely by Woodrow Wilson's opposition to the unrestricted submarine warfare of Germany, which was renewed in the winter of 1917. Seymour has written a scholarly and historically valuable book, but not a completely honest one. In attacking the economic interpretation, he has made merry with extracts from recent oratorical fulminations of various American senators, but he is careful to avoid any consideration of more sober and more complete histories written by

such men as Walter Millis or C. Hartley Grattan, both of which are concerned with the commercial entanglements which drew us into the last war.

Curiously enough, Seymour, by his very emphasis upon the U-boat campaign of Germany, brings us right back again to the underlying economic factors. Presenting important documentary German sources, Seymour shows that the purposes of the unrestricted submarine campaign were no mere restriction of America's munitions trade with the Allies, but were aimed at effecting the industrial disorganization and actual starvation of England by destroying its vital shipping resources.

Seymour's conclusions as to the problems of future American neutrality via "sanctions" or embargoes, are considerably more accurate than his insufficient reasons for our entrance into the War in 1917. As he says:

"The moment such restrictions are anything more than a gesture, that is, the moment they become of vital importance to belligerents, they tend to become unacceptable to Americans . . . Peace cannot be legislated through Senate resolutions any more than sobriety could be legislated through Prohibition."

Another book on international relations published recently at Yale, *By Pacific Means*, is about an organization which says much but does little—the League of Nations. This book, by Manley O. Hudson, is a lawyer's book and is, as a consequence, filled with a lengthy amount of uninformation. The first part of the book is a record of the "progress" of international arbitration organization up until 1914 and the World War which it didn't prevent. In discussing the history of the League of Nations, Mr. Hudson implies that the many and serious failures of the League outweigh its few and minor successes, but he is naive enough to believe that the organization of the League will survive the next World War. He is blindly optimistic about the future, beaming: "Defeat after defeat piles up at Geneva, only to form a springboard to later success."

By Pacific Means is a completely unsatisfactory book, but it didn't need to be. The author, a member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, has had the background for writing an honest history of the League, its failures, and the causes of those failures. But to have done that he would have had to study the imperialist rivalries of modern capitalist states—and such nationalist states in the final analysis know nothing of "international responsibility, friendship and peace", know nothing of "moral law beyond their own self-protection and aggrandizement."

A POTENT MYTH

DWIGHT MORROW, by Harold Nicolson. (Harcourt, Brace & Co.) \$3

(Reviewed by Richard Romain)

IT WAS Morrow's breadth of vision and understanding, his comprehension of the slow movement of history and human development, that made him one of the outstanding men of our time."—Prof. Gilbert Murray.

"The peculiar genius of Dwight Morrow lay in the fact that he kept mystical faith in men without losing his own intellectual standards."—Walter Lippmann.

"What renders Dwight Morrow so fascinating a subject for biography is that, in the varied and rapid expansion of his career, he developed a new type of civilized mind."—Harold Nicolson.

The lavish rhapsodies which the name of Dwight Morrow evokes suggests that the extraordinary personal charm he dispersed will endure as a potent myth long after the details of his career are forgotten. The cult of private control needs its saints, its "human personalities", and the likable, blue-eyed boy, with the dancing-master's bow, from Allegheny, Penna.,

who diligently worked as board boy at the stock exchange, made his way through Amherst by tutoring, and reaped the reward of his pinchpenny days at Columbia Law School by scaling the ladder of J. P. Morgan, is excellently adapted to meet the requirements of a humanizing legend.

The genius of Ivy Lee in personalizing the arid world of finance capitalism to the American public could have asked for no better model than Morrow's career. Morrow combined an ability to deal expertly with bond issues—to the satisfaction of the bondholders—with an affection for reading the Bible with his wife and participating in the more austere civic duties of attending Dr. Purvis' Presbyterian church in New York and voting the Republican ticket. His virtue had its reward: in Morrow's fourteen years as corporation lawyer he earned \$100,000; during his association with J. P. Morgan and Company his fortune rose to the million mark.

The "new type of civilized mind" attributed to Morrow by his biographer is more accurately that of a nineteenth century liberal. He believed the evils of capitalism were due to selfish men. He apparently saw no relation between the \$162,000,000 Anglo-French loan, floated by the House of Morgan in 1915, and America's entry into the War, even though his Morgan associates, Davison and Cravath, wanted to form a committee to "educate American opinion regarding the democratic principles for which Great Britain and France were fighting". Nor did Morrow see inconsistency in his efforts as ambassador to Mexico to reconcile the semi-socialistic program of that nation with the interests of the International Committee of Bankers on Mexico, created "for the purpose of protecting the holders of securities of the Mexican republic".

Morrow's great personal charm, his various skills as negotiator and financier were employed in the interests of those values which monopoly capitalism fostered. Therefore, it was inadmissible that the drives of finance capital might generate violent collisions between nations and precipitate widespread insecurity. In the rarefied atmosphere of corporate finance, war became to Morrow a problem of organizing syndicates to float the loans of the Allies, of treating complex tables of transport, tonnage and import figures.

Biographer Nicolson expends his superb style and glowing prose upon Morrow and the House of Morgan, which he declares showed admirable courage in floating loans for France and Britain when President Wilson had publicly pledged this country to a policy of neutrality.



CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

SARA BARD FIELD is author of "The Pale Woman" and "Barabas" and contributes poems to a number of national weeklies. Her new book, "Darkling Plain", will be published in the spring by Random House.

ELMO A. ROBINSON is associate professor of philosophy at State College, San Jose, California.

JOHN CHESTER is a San Francisco bay district newspaperman.

HAROLD M. KING is a Southern California educator, student of social and political economy.

S. L. T. is a member of the publicity committee of the WPA Federal Writers' Project.

RICHARD BARTEL, who lives in Los Angeles, is a poet by profession and now working on a long philosophic dramatic poem.

RICHARD ROMAIN has contributed reviews to various San Francisco newspapers and periodicals.

ALEXANDER KAUN—See "They Tell Me—" page III

WILLIAM MILLIS is an undergraduate student at Stanford University.

CORRESPONDENCE

READING AND UNDERSTANDING MARX

Editor, Pacific Weekly

In this column last week Upton Sinclair quoted Karl Marx's statement of 1872 that in a country like the United States and England, possessing democratic forms of government, it is possible to obtain peacefully. Reading Marx does not necessarily imply understanding it. Marxism, as all of his followers should know, is not a static formula or dogma but a living method of analyzing and solving the contradictions of capitalist society. The essence of his teachings is dialectical materialism which accepts the proposition that the individual's ideology (subjectivity) is determined by his material environment (objectivity) and that development of realities is motivated due to the activity of inherent contradictions.

Tactics and strategy could receive incomplete treatment in time of Marx owing to the early stage of development of the working class movement. The practical work of Marx was to prepare the working class forces during ascendant capitalism. Marx's object was not to prognosticate the detailed events of the world revolution. He considered that in a decision to be rendered on any historical moment, in a certain country and under certain conditions, one must scientifically study all the features of the given changing situation and not only analyze the particular country but the world.

Marx's view was justifiable in 1872 due to Germany and France being absolute monarchies but during the present epoch of imperialism the United States and England do not materially differ from any other imperialist country. Therefore the supposition is antiquated in the light of new conditions because any opinion rendered of the future is subject to an immediate dialectical analysis.

Marx should be studied for enlightenment, not repeated parrot-like, for he is not infallible but a human genius who scientifically compiled a solution to to-day's social problems. Is Mr. Sinclair's misinterpretation of Marx necessary to condone his reformist policy of collaboration with privileged interests and sabotaging of united front efforts which paved the road for fascism in Germany, Italy and Austria? Does history cite one instance where ruling class power was changed except by revolution?

Los Angeles

C. Nowacki

WHAT MARX MEANT

Editor, Pacific Weekly

The quotation from Marx by Upton Sinclair last week is a singular example of good Christians digging into the Bible and bringing up samples to justify their actions. Suppose Marx said that in 1872 "workers in England and the U. S. may hope to secure their ends

by peaceful means", who has it got to do as an excuse for the Epic's "production for use" plan? Marx would sneer at all such futilitarians as Epics, Technocrats, Social Creditarians, Single-Taxers, Townsends, etc., that did not recognize the workers, the proletariat, as the means whereby any fundamental change in society would come about. As Engels said at Marx's grave: "Before all else Marx was a revolutionist." And all his teachings are opposed to the "newtopians" which are springing up in this era of stress.

Evidently Mr. Sinclair thinks the date of 1872 has some significance, this being Marx's mature judgment; his early years being given over to radical doctrines which time (and a fuller pocketbook) urged towards conservatism, according to the "new" interpreters. But if we are going to stress dates we can go on to 1875, three years later, where Marx stressed the follies of the opportunists, the "Eisenachers", the later Social Democratic Party of Germany that quietly handed the country over to Hitler only the other day, which, incidentally, was a prediction of Marx's if Bebel, Kautsky and Liebknecht (the father of Karl, that the social fascists killed), kept on in their determination to suck around the Junkers of the period, just as the Epics are sucking around the petty bourgeoisie here to-day.

It was in this **Gotha Programme** that Marx insisted on the "dictatorship of the proletariat". And whether the method of the workers is "peaceful" or otherwise (as if the capitalists would allow it to be peaceful) political or economic, this ideology runs through the whole of the works of Marx and Engels.

And this is not all, if dates are important. From 1875 to Engels last letter in 1891 this point of view was defended against the opportunism of the Kautskyites, who actually refused to print the letters in the official papers of the Party without expurgating them. In these later letters Marx and Engels demanded "relentless self-criticism" against the doctrines of Lassalle, the opportunist, who was willing to sell the workers' program down the river, just as the opportunists of today are trying to do, and all in the name of Marx! What other purpose can putting the unemployed to work producing for themselves have other than relieving the small business men of heavy taxation? In short, preserving the petty bourgeoisie, the very class that Marx insisted must be abolished before any headway could be made in the march towards socialism. In fact, this extirpation of the cockroach businessman by the larger capitalists is the dynamic that makes Marxian economics scientific.

Another quotation that Mr. Sinclair makes is also a rationalization, either to kid himself or his followers that he knows his Marx, to wit: "I am not a Marxist." This quote by itself is very much like the one ham actors and noosepaper drama critics use over the radio when they talk about their Shakespearian knowledge and quote Hamlet as saying: "The Play's the thing", when, of course, it was intended that this particular play that Hamlet induced the Players to play before the court was the one that would catch the conscience of the king. As a matter of fact it was against the tripe that Sinclair is putting out, the opportunist stuff, that Marx said that he was no Marxist. Sure, this statement should "be more frequently quoted", but let us have it with the correct Marxian connotation, not as an excuse to join the Democratic Party and usher in State Capitalism.

San Francisco

R. I. Pearson

"THEY TELL ME--"

ALEXANDER KAUN, of the Slavic Department of the University of California, is contemplating a new book on the reflection in Soviet Literature of the new trends in Soviet life. The visit of Ilf and Petroff made him change his plans, however, and he thinks now he will include only Soviet humor—how the life of Revolutionary Russia is reflected in humor and satire.

There is quite a new kind of satire in his country, Prof. Kaun says. Our satire has always had of necessity to be destructive—meant to destroy the things satirized, and finally the whole society of which they are an integral part. But in Soviet Russia satire is constructive—the satirists know that the foibles satirized are superficial, "remnants of the past", excrescences of the system, and that the system itself is healthy and sound. So they feel their job is to get corrected the things they satirize, and they are frequently successful.

Before the Revolution in Russia there were a number of excellent satirists, but since literature was heavily censored these had to develop a method of hiding their stabs in amusing and gentle columns. They developed this art to a high level, said Kaun.

He tried to catch out Ilf and Petroff and find at what point they were dictated to by

the uniformed art dictators of their country, but the Soviet Mark Twains were very sly: Kaun couldn't worm an admission out of them.

ANNA LOUISE STRONG, author of "I Change Worlds", a best seller last spring, will be in New York in January, where one of her first jobs will be a debate with Tatiana Tchernavin on Soviet Women. Anna Louise will say that they have gained by the Revolution, Mme. Tchernavin that they haven't. One of the best books ever written on the subject of women in that much debated land was done by Jessica Smith who has just replaced Edwin Seaver as editor of "Soviet Russia Today", the magazine whose special issues sell in editions of 100,000. (Lincoln Steffens contributes an article on Lenin in the January number.) The subject of Soviet women seems to the fore East and West just now.

MRS. CARVETH WELLS spoke last week in Los Angeles at Trinity Auditorium, which holds several thousand people. About 75 attended her talk, and they were asked to move to the front in order that the emptiness would not be so chilling. Mrs. Wells—wife of the Carveth Wells who states that small boys in Russia bite the hands of tourists in order to give them syphilis—did not like Russia. She said they couldn't bathe for more than a

month, but no one else did, so why worry, that courtesy had been banned in Russia, and you had to swear and curse before you could get the chicken, wine and caviar, etc., that the top-Communists rated. She mentioned she was there in 1932, but talked as if they had returned yesterday. There were people in garbage heaps, dead of starvation, etc.

It was noticeable when Mr. and Mrs. Wells came West that no San Francisco paper except the Hearst ones printed a line about them. The lecture ended with a regular Hearst tirade against Reds in the U. S. and with a whooping-up for a big Army and Navy.

Paul Elder is allowing her to display her wares at his gallery in San Francisco January 7, the lecture advertised "for women only". Lucky men.

JAMES WHITALL, whose "English Years" was reviewed in Pacific Weekly Dec. 9, writes to Una Jeffers about Ella Winter's "major literary sensation". "How could James Stephens have expected to get away with such an absurd statement? Actually I often saw the ms of 'A Story Teller's Holiday' and it was in Moore's usual triple-spaced dictation on bluish paper. Also I heard him tell many of the stories, told therein, in the well-known Moore way."

ELLA WINTER

NEXT WEEK

HERE AND THERE IN SCIENTIFIC RE- SEARCH.

Dr. D. T. MacDougal summarizes the activities of President Roosevelt's Science Advisory Board.

THE SHAME OF OREGON.

Kenneth Fitzgerald tells the story of the Walter Baer deportation case. A surprising chapter in the history of frame-ups.

ARE IDEALS HELD BY AMERICANS AMERICAN IDEALS?

The second installment of Professor Elmo A. Robinson's 'The Nature of American Ideals.'

LINCOLN STEFFENS' COLUMN HOLLYWOOD-WEEK

True pictures of events in the motion picture capital.

"THEY TELL ME--"

Ella Winter's intimate column about literary people and literary happenings.

IN

PACIFIC WEEKLY

DO YOU WANT YOUR

PACIFIC WEEKLY

UNIFORMLY BOUND?

Those who may like to keep their files of this magazine in uniform bindings may obtain bound volumes through this office, complete with title page and index.

Volume III will be available within the month.

If you send us your 26 issues, dated from July to December, inclusive, the charge for the bound volume will be \$3.00.

If you want us to supply the complete file the charge will be \$4.50.

These prices will be less if orders are sufficient for us to get the higher-quantity rate from the bookbinder.

Send your file and order to
PACIFIC WEEKLY, Carmel, California.

PACIFIC WEEKLY HAS THE LARGEST CIRCULATION PER COPY OF ANY MAGAZINE IN AMERICA

We have been convinced of this during the past six months by people who tell us:
"No, we don't happen to be subscribers, but we read So and So's copy."

We know of one case where a subscriber has a waiting list of seven for his copy of Pacific Weekly.

A San Diego woman came in last week and piled on the final wisp that fractured our vertebrae. She said:

"I'm the eighteenth on a list of twenty people who read Mr. McGillicuddy's Pacific Weekly."

Despite the fact that we were paralyzed below the neck, we could talk, and by all the green and gold gods, that lady left a dollar for a six-months' subscription.

How about you? If you like Pacific Weekly enough to stand in line, how about helping to assure its permanency? How about your dollar—and now?

We haven't printed a subscription blank here, as we usually do, because—well, this isn't your magazine; it's Mrs. Puyster's, which you borrowed, and you can't tear a piece out of HER PACIFIC WEEKLY, can you?

But a postal card will do the trick.

HOW ABOUT IT?