

PACIFIC WEEKLY

A WESTERN JOURNAL OF FACT AND OPINION

SEPTEMBER 21, 1936

**FRENCH POPULAR
FRONT**

Georges Connes

**VICTORIES IN
WASHINGTON**

Cole Stevens

**WATERFRONT
WRINKLES**

John Bond

FUTURE OF EPIC

Max Khepper

**LETTUCE BEARS
THE BRUNT**

Editorial



\$3 A YEAR

VOL. V NO. 12

10 CENTS A COPY

PACIFIC WEEKLY

VOLUME V NUMBER 12

CONTENTS

NOTES AND COMMENT	178
DEMOCRACY VISITS BERKELEY, Clifton Amsbury	178
LETTUCE BEARS THE BRUNT, Editorial	179
WILLIAM LEMKE COMES TO TOWN, An Interview by Herbert Resner	180
THREE MONTHS OF FRENCH POPULAR FRONT Georges Connes	181
THIRD PARTY VICTORIES, Cole Stevens	182
WATERFRONT WRINKLES, John Bond	184
THE FUTURE OF EPIC, Max Knepper	185
PAUL GAUGUIN: EXILE TURNED SAVAGE, Raymond E. F. Larsson	187
HOLLYWOOD WEEK, Louis Norden	189
THE MOVIES TRY HARD, Winthrop Rutledge	190
BOOKS	
HISTORY WITHOUT A VIEWPOINT, R. A. Kocher	191
GROUPS IN ACTION	
PRIVATE HICKS, Ralph Bruenn	192
THEY TELL ME, Ella Winter	192
OUR CONTRIBUTORS	183

NOTES AND COMMENT

HITLER'S speech before the Nazi Party congress at Nuremberg has stirred many Americans to a realization of the fact that either the man is mad or else the whole country, and Hitler with it, suffers from a form of hysteria which is just as dangerous as madness. Even conservative papers have expressed fear and anxiety to have a man like this at the helm of events. Whether Hitler is actually suffering from a mental disease or not is not so important as the fact his speech barely covered, which was that his policies are not working out in Germany, that fascism is not feeding the people nor bringing them peace, bread or content. Enviously Hitler looked at the flourishing Soviet Union and then fell into one of his frenzies, screaming at the neighbor he was jealous of. "Just let them try and invade us!" Everyone knows the Soviet Union has no intention of invading Germany or any other country as aggressor. A very high conservative British statesman said recently in a private conversation that if the choice is between Nazism and communism, he thought communism, as exemplified in the Soviet Union, infinitely preferable.

But Hitler's mad screamings, his raving threats, bring the world another step nearer the holocaust of a world war.

LOS ANGELES is retaining its honored place as one of the most reactionary and race-prejudiced towns in America. Open-shop, anti-semitic, anti-liberal, . . . it well illustrates the characteristics that combine to form fascism. The Riverside County Board of Supervisors recently voted \$1800 to be included in the budget to "pay a full-time worker in the county schools to combat subversive influences among the students."

A correspondent writes asking us whether this informer will turn in a report on the demoralizing effect of low wages

and vigilante methods upon the students. The worst feature of such action, however, promulgated by the businessmen, is that spies have to turn in reports to earn their hire, and so they have to invent the subversive influences they cannot find. Carmel's spy "Sharkey" demonstrated that. (No charges were ever brought, but instead the Department of Justice had to investigate this spy.)

And now Dean Cromwell, coach at the University of Southern California, makes an anti-Semitic and anti-Negro talk in Los Angeles. Cromwell was one of the Olympic Games coaches and what he said was

"if you've read any of the newspaper reports of unpleasantness in Germany in the reception of the American team, don't believe them, because these adverse reports were written by boys of the wrong nationality."

He also remarked "Oh, if I could only be that handsome boy, Hitler, in New York for one hour!"

The Hollywood League Against Nazism protested these remarks at a large meeting and asked Dr. Rufus von Kleinsmid, president of U. S. C., for immediate dismissal of Cromwell. We wonder if the above mentioned secret agent might have turned in such utterances as "subversive?"

DEMOCRACY VISITS BERKELEY

AFTER the 1935 Student Peace Strike at the University of California PACIFIC WEEKLY carried an article explaining that Democracy was not dead in Berkeley. It revived in March-April 1935, and again in connection with the 1936 Peace strike. Now Berkeley democracy is having another twinge of growing pains, and again students are found in the ranks of its defenders.

Student part-time conductors on streetcars in the Eastbay are union men. Students in canneries this summer found their way into cannery workers' and warehousemen's (I.L.A. 38-44) unions. Student hashers are beginning to find advantages in the culinary workers' unions. Students who realize they are or will be workers are members of the American Student Union and they are beginning to realize that they cannot be isolated for four years before entering the struggle for a livelihood.

Berkeley, once well unionized, is now an anti-labor town. It has a whole family of subversive (from our point of view) ordinances and suppressive procedures. There was the 1913 ordinance (changed in April 1935) prohibiting distribution of handbills to individuals on the streets, and there is the 1934 ordinance against "advertising" with placards or sandwiches carried by persons. During the postwar anti-labor offensive Berkeley's city council adopted an anti-picketing ordinance forbidding any "attempt to influence any person not to purchase goods at any place of business." This ordinance is the cause of the present to-do.

Organized labor again began to clash with Berkeley authorities during the machinists' strike. Then the Eldorado Oil Co. developed a dispute with the warehousemen who struck its plants. Woolworth's also developed a contest with the warehousemen and precipitated action by that union, the culinary



unions, and the store clerks' union. Woolworth's has been on the unfair lists for years, but nothing was done about it. What could unions do in a town famed for its individual liberals, its collective scissor-bills, and its notorious administration? The only issue in years which stirred Berkeley's liberals to collective action was the case of the 18 students arrested under the old handbill ordinance. That ordinance was smashed. And now what about the Woolworth store in Berkeley? The unions asked the American Student Union for help. The Union responded.

Thursday, September 10, picketing began. Only a few pickets marched at a time; they were arrested. Police, out in force, passed out copies of the anti-picketing ordinance, read sections of it aloud, confiscated posters, and made arrests. (Although according to the *Berkeley Daily Gazette* the scene was "peaceful picketing personified.")

Bail was set at \$100 a head, but as arrests continued and only one had been bailed out, the jail became overcrowded; and the food bills would be running up. So bail was lowered to \$20; but all "prisoners" must be fingerprinted. The prisoners were being held, one might say, semi-incommunicado; no one could see them, but police would carry notes back and forth. Finally one arrived stating that those outside had decided the police were justified in demanding the prints and bail would be withdrawn if not soon accepted.



No one "outside" admits sending the note.

Two students who still held out were released without being printed. Friday more were arrested.

The real struggle is not before the court; the real struggle, as in April, 1935, is before the city council. Anti-labor and anti-democratic legislation such as the anti-picketing ordinances, must be smashed.

CLIFTON AMSBURY

LETTUCE BEARS THE BRUNT

THE Salinas Valley lettuce situation, entering a dangerous phase this week, illustrates the callousness of employers to violence when it suits their ends. For days the Hearst papers have been inciting to violence with their "riot" "guns" "bloodshed" "siege" etc. Ambitious reporters write the strike story as if it were armed civil war. The Grower-Shipper Association has made no attempt to negotiate but with the reactionary employers' Citizens' Association, the Associated Farmers and the "law and enforcement authorities" has been holding councils of war till far into the night. More attention has been paid to the details of the strikebreakers' housing and feeding, the moving of trucks under heavy armed guards, the deputizing of sheriffs (\$10 a day is being offered to "innocents") than to any attempt to make peace or find an opening even for their own "arbitration."

It is an open secret that in this "showdown" the lettuce industry and the conditions of work in the lettuce sheds are of secondary consideration. Salinas employers are working with employers in other areas; are advising with them to consider action which can be used in other parts of the state. In plain words, Salinas happens to be the chosen site for the first pitched battle between the two sides since the Stockton Conference decision to organize agricultural laborers in Cali-

fornia under the A. F. of L. It is not the final battle; it is the first. It is also part of the state and nation-wide attack on trade unionism and collective bargaining; the economic front of the political Landon-Hearst-Liberty League fascist attack on workers' liberties. No wonder thousands of dollars are being spent on machine guns and tear gas, (and, it is rumored, poison gas) on ten foot fences and barbed wire entanglements. Protests have been pouring in on Governor Merriam against the quite open use of the State Highway Patrol for strike-breaking purposes; eighty traffic motor cycles poured into the Valley in one day "to keep highways open!" The growers' pronouncements hardly take the trouble any longer to appear democratic or conciliatory. They are bent on war, on violence, and on imposing crushing and humiliating terms if they are the victors.

You hear all the old phrases "We can't let them win or they'll run the industry." "They'll take our industries away from us . . ." Smaller owners say "We don't want trouble but we're leaving it to the other fellers." They know they have to take orders, under threat of withholding of loans and other privileges by the banker-growers. One shed, the Tracy-Waldron, signed up with the Union which offered to cut, pack and crate their \$50,000 lettuce crop; immediately the Salinas Valley Ice Company refused to sell its ice to Tracy. This may be a "conspiracy in restraint of trade," but who cares? The fictions of law have long gone by the board in California agricultural strikes and this one is no exception.

Meanwhile the Salinas Central Labor Council has put lettuce on the "unfair" list of organized labor and it is possible that the "hot" lettuce, crated and shipped, will not be unloaded in Eastern markets. The workers stand firm by their demands, have used no violence even in the face of incredible and bare-faced provocation, and are asking Salinas merchantmen for their support. A valuable lesson is being taught in Salinas, if labor will learn it. It doesn't matter how "reasonable," how un-Red they are; how "American." The employers will ride their advantage, use their guns and police and scabs, and their hypocritical "Citizens' Associations," until the lesson is driven home to the least "class-conscious" workingman: there can be no permanent peace between capital and labor, and labor has to fight all the way.

BOARD OF EDITORS

Marie de L. Welch
Sara Bard Field
Ella Winter
Ernest Albee

Winthrop Rutledge
Harry Conover
Carey McWilliams
Redfern Mason

Business Manager: G. Schoeninger

Published every Monday by Pacific Associates, Box 1350
Carmel, California

PACIFIC WEEKLY subscription rates: \$3.00 a year, \$1.75 for six months in the United States, its territories and possessions, and Mexico; \$3.50 a year, \$2.10 for six months in Canada and foreign countries. Single copies ten cents. Rates for advertising, display and classified, will be furnished upon request.

PACIFIC WEEKLY is not at present able to pay for contributions, but welcomes fact and opinion reporting, particularly in the Pacific region. No responsibility can be taken for any Manuscripts, and only Manuscripts accompanied by stamped, addressed envelopes can be returned.

Entered as second-class matter October 25, 1934 at the Post Office at Carmel, California, under the act of March 3, 1879

WILLIAM LEMKE COMES TO TOWN

An Interview

HERBERT RESNER

WEEK BEFORE LAST the circus came to town. Last week it was Mr. Lemke's turn. More versatile than Belinda the bare-back rider, Mr. Lemke pitched his tent at the Palace Hotel in San Francisco and put on his act in which he rode four horses in four directions. The horses were named Coughlin, Townsend, Gerald Smith and Inflation. There is no logic or reason in that array except that it represents to Mr. Lemke some kind of a mass following. But who can expect reason or logic from that weird collection of political drum beaters?

I telephoned for an interview, and was asked to come up. I had to wait a few minutes. Mr. Lemke was resting, explained his secretary, after a long hard trip. A couple of fat, slick looking gentlemen sat around. Cigar ashes were strewn all over the floor.

The door opened suddenly, and Mr. Lemke entered the sitting room. He walked briskly, shook hands eagerly. He looked tired, dishevelled. His clothes needed pressing. That was the common man touch. He doesn't have much hair, a few gray strands surrounding his temples. His face is freckled, pock-marked. One of his eyes is glass, the other genuine but slightly cocked. He has a long, large nose, a prognathus mouth. He spoke quickly, earnestly.

In answer to my question of greeting, he liked California, had been here two or three times before. He was going to speak at Dreamland Auditorium that night.

"How does the Frazier-Lemke Bill stand at this time?" I asked.

"The Frazier-Lemke Bill is still before Congress and will be there until it is passed."

"How much numerical support have you in the Congress?"

"That is impossible for me to tell until the election is over. Last time it was 218 signed in the House. When the President ganged up with the reactionary Republicans, there were 152 paired for it. It was offered as an amendment to the Guffey Bill in the Senate, but the bill was defeated and so was the amendment."

"What is your idea of the economic effects it will have?"

"It is just the beginning of driving the money-changers out of the temple by the government issuing and controlling money for the farmers of this nation in place of a few international bankers. It will take \$3,000,000,000." He rolled the figure off like Congressmen who are used to talking in big money.

"Isn't the bill an inflation bill?"

"I am sorry when you use the word 'inflation.' The word 'inflation' is a meaningless expression to hide people's ignorance. There is inflation and it is the \$36,000,000,000 tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds from which the New York international bankers clip coupons. That is the only inflation I know anything about."

"What do you think of the Frazier-Lundeen Workers Social Insurance Bill?" I asked, turning to another subject.

"I have not given the bill any serious study, for the reason that the bill was not up for serious consideration. There was an appropriation of \$5,000,000,000 but no one ever explained to me where they were going to get it. It was not written by Mr. Frazier or Mr. Lundeen, but was written by some group

in New York. The object of the bill was very lofty. I won't say it's practical. The bill did not provide for gathering the \$5,000,000,000 and when I asked where they intended to get it, they never answered." (The Frazier-Lundeen Bill is a social security bill, not a taxing bill. The money is to be raised by regular taxation means, with emphasis on taxation of accumulated wealth. I didn't think there was any point to pressing this matter further with Mr. Lemke.)

"What is your idea of a sound scheme for social security?"

"That is the question that I will discuss this evening. The government of the United States taking full and complete control of the money and credit of this nation for all the people, and for an adequate old age pension."

"Are you in favor of the Townsend plan?"

"I voted for the McGroarty Bill and not the fake bill that the President put across."

"Have you the actual support of the Coughlin, Smith and Townsend forces?"

"Everyone knows they have come out openly for me."

"In view of the fact that you claim Coughlin's support, what do you think of his remarks concerning the Jews at the Cleveland convention?"

"I did not hear his statement. I am not in a position to comment on the subject. Father Coughlin will have to answer that for himself. Father Coughlin did answer that in the last issue of Social Justice. Furthermore, I am not a bit interested in race or religious questions. They are not issues in this campaign. Let us get down to the issues in this campaign."

In spite of this outburst of contradictions, I persisted. "The same charges of anti-Semitism are levied against your supporter Gerald L. K. Smith. Would your answer be the same as regards him?"

"I hadn't heard that about Gerald Smith. Yes, my answer is the same." Mr. Lemke sat forward in his chair. "Let me tell you something. The Jews should forget their persecution complex. There's a lot of anti-Semitic feeling dormant in this country and the Jews are doing their best to stir it up. That is bad business. That's what Jews do when they go around talking about such things as they charge Father Coughlin with. There are some Jews in Congress who do the same thing. They talk too much. The way to handle the situation is to ignore it."

"You wouldn't expose groups like Pelley's Silver Shirts?"

"No. Let them alone. They blow up of their own account."

Silently I thought about Hitler, the Black Legion, and similar fascist movements. Ignoring them didn't stamp them out. They didn't collapse of their own accord pursuant to Mr. Lemke's formula.

Mr. Lemke kept on talking, seriously, rather plaintively, trying to prove his point.

"Let me give you some advice. You're a young fellow. If you're married and let your wife dictate to you for awhile, you'll find she'll turn out to be a dictator. That's the way it's been in some European countries and that's the way it will be here unless we're careful. We mustn't excite people. I'm not a Catholic and I'm not against the Catholics. And I'm not a Jew and I'm not against the Jews. I am a Democrat and

(Continued on page 191)

FRENCH POPULAR FRONT

GEORGES CONNES

FRANCE has had a most extraordinary government for the last three months. Just think: they said that if returned to power they would do a certain number of things, and they are doing them: they have done them already! This is a dumbfounding novelty in a world, and chiefly in a country, in which it seemed to be understood that you say what you like *before* and do what you can *after*. Foes are amazed and friends perhaps also a little surprised.

They said they would declare a forty hour week for all salaried employees, and they have declared it. They said they would make collective bargaining of wages and working conditions a law, and they have made it a law. They said they would enforce a two week paid holiday for all workers in somebody's employment, and they have enforced it; with the result that the country just now is overrun by tens and tens of thousands who had never had a holiday in their lives, and nothing like the present volume of home tourism has ever been known! They said they would dissolve the fascist leagues and they have done so. The fascists of course have not changed their minds, but there is an end at least and last of their uniforms, drilling, military maneuvers and preparedness. They said they would make the Banque de France the bank of France indeed, and they have made it that. The old regents, some of whom had had the job in their families for 130 years, since the bank started, have been turned out, and replaced by a council of representatives of all the real activities and interests of the country, including among others Léon Jouhaux of the C.G.T., the French equivalents of William Green and the A. F. of L. All shareholders, and no longer the 200 biggest only, will elect two representatives on a board of eighteen. This is a deadly, if not a death-blow, to "the two hundred families."

They said they would nationalize or at least take control of all armament industries, and they have been empowered to do so by March 31, 1937 at the latest. They said they would put an end to all speculation on wheat by brokers and middlemen, and the National Wheat Administration will be in action by September 1—no middlemen, one price, one buyer, the State; the smaller producers sure to sell their whole crop, and the bigger ones a proportional percentage according to the nation's wants.

They said they would revoke all cuts in salaries of national servants, and they have revoked them already to the extent of 80 to 90 per cent; the rest will follow at the end of the year.

These seven points are only the most important in an already tremendous legislative achievement, unparalleled in the previous history of the French Republic, and perhaps of the world. This has been effected with never the slightest sign of a rift in the massive, coherent majority of 380 deputies of the Popular Front in the Chamber. So irresistible was the current that the minority of some 200 reactionaries diminished to 130 on the Bank of France reform bill, and dwindled to 80 on nationalization of armaments. The older men in the Senate, whose left wing majority consists chiefly of "radicals," the least advanced element of the Popular Front, showed some reluctance on minor points, but never dared to try and stem the tide.

My contention and hope is that, thanks to the formation of the Popular Front, the French democracy has at last enter-

ed the sane and healthy course of the two party system; there is no reason why it should not, and every reason why it should, stick to it.

One is bound to feel all the more admiration for Léon Blum and his collaborators when one reflects that these enormous successes have been achieved in the midst of a labor crisis and struggle out of all proportion to anything France had ever known before. For size, it bears comparison with the English general strike of 1926 only; as to character, it was entirely different and original—it seems that nothing like it had ever been known anywhere. So acute had the sufferings of the working-class under deflation become, so impatient had they grown of alleviation to their intolerable lot, that even before Blum took office at the beginning of June, a vast movement of "down tools" had started all over the country. The remarkable fact about it was its spontaneity; it took by surprise and escaped the control of all political parties and labor unions. The reactionaries' clamor that it was, of course, Moscow's work is absolutely lacking in any basis of fact. The plain truth is, it spread like a disease, escaping all prognostication and management. It was very naturally born of mingled suffering and hope in the new régime. It immediately resorted to so-called "occupation" of the plants, which was in fact nothing other and more than peaceful remaining on the premises, for fear the employers would bring in strike-breakers. Not one fatal clash resulted, not one tool was broken, not one machine willfully damaged. The men just sat down on their haunches and waited. They rightly knew that the Popular Front's government would not call out the militia against them, in spite of clamor from the rightist press.

By June 15th, some 20,000,000 men and women had been or still were thus striking on the premises, patiently waiting for arrangements to be made. The Popular municipalities everywhere sent bedding and food, took care of the children,



and by the end of the month, three-fourths of the number had attained their ends and gone back to work. By the end of July, the last strikers had willingly withdrawn from the last plants they "occupied," under persuasion of members of the government or its officials, and submitted the unsolved disputes to arbitration.

It will be one of the unforgettable remembrances of my life, which already has a few, to have seen a Minister of the French Republic pay a friendly visit to a plant "occupied" by its workers under the red flag, side by side with the tricolor, and welcomed with cheers and flowers. My friend Robert Jardillier, Postmaster General in the Blum Cabinet and mayor of this city, tells me he had these words from Léon Blum: "We have achieved a revolution and saved the country a civil war."

A great example it is France has given the world by thus effecting radical changes in a peaceful way. The traditional "French wisdom" now asserts itself in an amazingly new manner: it no longer stands for pusillanimous preservation of things as they are; it is with those who look towards the future, no longer with the fanatics of the past and do-nothingism.

Let us call things by their names. What is France doing?

The long and the short of it is, it is just trying a New Deal adapted to its own ways and wants. There is no question of real socialism, far less of communism. The Popular Front has no mandate from the people to do any such thing. What it holds a brief for is just realization of a definite number and class of reformatory measures. Some of us never had enough gibes for President Roosevelt when he started "propping up tottering capitalism"; but that is exactly what we are doing in our turn. There is no lack in the two proletarian parties of those who think that that is not what the parties are for. The experiment, however, will have to be carried to its logical end, whatever that may be. Its success, strangely enough, depends on support by the bourgeoisie, as it does in America. It would seem that they should understand that this is their last chance, and be eager and willing to help; but there is very little sign that they do, and there are very many signs that they don't.

If our desperate attempt to save the motive of profit should be defeated, if it should turn out that money, a mere medium and means, stands intolerably between man and his wants, and the superabundant wealth to satisfy them with, then the conclusion might be easily reached that we can do without money and profit. And then we might see things indeed.

THIRD PARTY VICTORIES

The Washington Commonwealth Federation Shows its Strength

COLE STEVENS

AS THE smoke screen clears away from the dirtiest and most exciting primary campaign in Washington history, the Washington Commonwealth Federation emerges as the most powerful political minority in the state. It won a partial victory in the primaries, at the same time transforming itself into a new, strong third party. While its gubernatorial candidate, "Radio Speaker" John C. Stevenson, lost the Democratic nomination to the incumbent, Governor Clarence D. Martin, it is clear that Stevenson had a majority of the Democratic votes. Republican votes gave Martin his majority; there were about four votes for Democratic candidates to every one for Republicans. This 4 to 1 ratio is without precedent, and can only mean a united front of the reactionaries against the W.C.F.

The successes of the W.C.F. in the campaign ending September 8, however, are fully as impressive as the losses. Four of the six congressional candidates endorsed by the federation won Democratic nominations. In the Seattle district, County Prosecutor Warren G. Magnuson, running for the place vacated by the recent Zioncheck tragedy, polled 30,601 to his nearest opponent's 11,645. In the Tacoma district, John M. Coffee managed to pass his conservative runner-up by a few hundred votes. The other two successful endorsees, Martin Smith and Knute Hill, were unopposed incumbents and were endorsed by Townsendites as well as the W.C.F. In the race for Lieutenant-Governor, orchestra leader Victor A. Myers, incumbent and W.C.F. nominee, polled more votes than all his 19 rivals in both parties put together. For Superintendent of Public Instruction, Stanley A. Atwood, endorsed by the American Federation of Teachers' joint council and by the W.C.F., holds a lead over other Democrats, and will oppose Republican incumbent Noah Showalter in November.

Legislative candidates won nominations in 13 out of 28 cases in King County, and it seems assured that the left-wing forces will be stronger than in the last legislature, when returns from outlying districts are in. The federation's only two candidates for Superior Court benches won nominations, liberal incumbent Kazis Kay coming in first. And last but not least, W.C.F. candidate Tom Smith, who was nearly nominated for Mayor last Spring by the federation, led the field by a wide margin in the race for the important office of King County Commissioner vacated by gubernatorial candidate Stevenson.

The defeat of Stevenson was far more honorable than the victory of Martin, who achieved an all-time low in dirty tactics. Having repudiated the platform written by rank and file delegates of his own Democratic Party last May, he appealed to Republicans to save him from defeat—and they did. Probably more Republicans than Democrats voted for him, being frightened by his red-baiting propaganda against Stevenson. "A vote for me is two votes against Communism," he advertised. A week before the election, a little yellow throw-away handbill appeared on the streets and church doorsteps of Seattle and every city in the state. "VOTE COMMUNIST for governor—our candidate is John C. Stevenson—endorsed by the Communist Party and Howard Costigan—Oppose War and Fascism—Defend the Soviet Union." No union "bug" appeared. A clever reporter for the *Commonwealth News* traced the handbill to the Martin-for-Governor office, and found that they had been ordered in the name of J. Anderson of Bremerton, who distributes literature for Pelley's Christian Party! A special edition of 200,000 copies of the *News* distributed throughout the state carried this information to some, but not all, of the voters.

In addition to this reactionary strategy, every trick in the

bag was tried, and new ones invented. Signs printed on state paper, saying "What is the candidate's real name? John C. Stockman for Governor," appeared along state highways. This referred to charges of dishonesty, dating back to 1922, which a reporter from the Hearst P.-I. dug up in Buffalo two years ago in an attempt to discredit Stevenson, who was then running for the U. S. Senate.

A man named H. G. Stevenson was filed for governor, and without campaigning he received about 10,000 votes undoubtedly intended for the other Stevenson. An 85-year-old man, Tom G. Smith, was forced by threats to file for County Commissioner against W.C.F. candidate Tom E. Smith, but he later signed an affidavit to the fact and withdrew from the race. More important than these, however, was the candidacy of Otto A. Case for Governor. Case, although he had the Townsend indorsement, was not a serious contender. He spent his well-financed campaign attacking Stevenson, instead of Martin, under whom he had served as state treasurer for four years. Case had refused to file for Congress in Zion-check's old district, although obviously he would have been able to do more for the Townsend movement in Washington D. C. Case's votes, which gave him a poor third place in the Democratic race, would have nominated Stevenson by a wide margin had they not been split off in this way.

The most unethical trick of all, except perhaps for the cutting of the fabric on Stevenson's airplane when he was about to take off with his wife and children on a short campaign tour, was the sudden appearance of the "Washington Liberal Coalition," an obvious imitation of the W.C.F. On expensive radio programs, Robert Day, formerly a Technocrat and Liberty Partyite, shrilly inveighed against the Commonwealth "dictatorship"—a joke in view of the entirely voluntary unity achieved by all the labor and liberal elements in the present campaign. The star on this program was George Gannon, appointed by Martin as head of the state WPA and later fired for misuse of funds, who tried to swing his personal following as a self-styled "progressive" away from Stevenson. The reactionary *Seattle Times* printed Gannon's attack, but not the reply of the allegedly "insincere politician" Stevenson. These and a thousand similar tricks, reminiscent of those of the wrecking crew that fought Upton Sinclair in 1934, were the main causes of Stevenson's defeat.

The new blanket primary law, which made it possible for Republicans to vote for the Democrat Martin while voting for Republicans for other offices, was sponsored by the state Grange and other liberal elements as a step away from the party system. But since the Republican and Democrat who received the most votes for each office are nominated, the new law really defeats democracy. With returns in from 2351 out of 2866 precincts, Martin received 136,502 votes, Stevenson 97,956, Case 60,319, and the Republican nominee, former Governor Roland H. Hartley, only 48,621. Yet Stevenson is eliminated, and Hartley, with less than half as many votes, is nominated. It is clear that the blanket primary law, to be democratic in operation, must eliminate party labels altogether. If that had been done, Martin and Stevenson, representing a clear division of conservative and progressive points of view, would be in the run-off.

The campaign showed up certain weakness in the W.C.F. as clearly as it showed the complete unscrupulousness of the reactionaries. Stevenson might have won had he waged a more militant campaign. Instead, with the W.C.F. endorsement in his pocket, he set about avoiding basic issues, apparently in the hope that he would not scare away any votes.

He answered charges when he might have been campaigning for the program of the W.C.F. with more effect. Senator Homer T. Bone proved this in 1932 when he campaigned against capitalism in every corner of the state, and won with hands down. The second defect in the federation itself was its organizational weakness in outlying parts of the state, especially in Eastern Washington. Stevenson beat Martin by more than 500 votes in the Seattle district, but was snowed under when the returns came in from the farming districts. More spade-work will have to be done there in the future.

Perhaps the greatest achievement of this primary day was the nomination of an independent W.C.F. ticket for the finals. This course had been predetermined by the July convention of the federation, with the understanding that the independent nominees would not run if the Democratic Party endorsees won out. So on September 8, a state convention met in Seattle and chose Howard G. Costigan, young, dynamic and popular executive director of the federation, as its standard-bearer in the November race for governor. Independent action in the finals is probable but not entirely certain. Costigan has not yet filed but if he does run he will put on a rousing campaign for the federation program and its Production for Use initiative, which will be voted on in the final election. Costigan would be subjected to a terrific barrage of red-baiting because the W.C.F. includes Communists, though only as individuals and not as a party. He has already demonstrated his ability to answer this type of attack effectively in his nightly radio broadcasts. On an intensive campaign, he should be able to organize for the W.C.F. in parts of the state hitherto untouched. Also nominated were A. G. Cook for Attorney General, and Robert Pearsall for Commissioner of Public Lands, an important office in view of the way timber lands have been practically given away to the Weyerhaeuser interests in past years. Liberal Professor Richard G. Tyler of the University of Washington was nominated for Superintendent of Public Instruction, but will not make the race because of the success of Stanley Atwood in the primaries.

The independent campaign of the W.C.F. will, at the very least, result in its getting 10 per cent of the vote and therefore becoming a major party in the 1938 primaries. At best, there is a very fair chance of splitting the conservative vote between Hartley and Martin, and with a vigorous campaign, winning office with perhaps 40 per cent of the total vote in November. The danger of causing the election of

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

CLIFTON AMSBURY is an undergraduate at the University of California.

HERBERT RESNER is a San Francisco lawyer and journalist.

GEORGES CONNES, director of English studies at the University of Dijon, is at present representing that institution at the Harvard Tercentenary celebration. He is the author of several books about Shakespeare and H. G. Wells, and is administrator of hospitals as a member of the Popular Front government of the city of Dijon. This is the third article he has written especially for "Pacific Weekly."

COLE STEVENS is a student of political and social movements in Seattle. He has contributed frequently to "Pacific Weekly."

MAX KNEPPER is one of the editors of "Epic News" and covered the Mooney trial for that paper.

RAYMOND E. F. LARSSON is an art critic in San Francisco who has contributed a number of articles to "Pacific Weekly."

R. A. KOCHER is a research scientist and physician living in Carmel. He is at work on a book on nutrition.

Hartley, who campaigned chiefly on a platform of calling out the state police or National Guards to break the P.-I. strike, is minimized by the large vote Martin received; many Republicans will go on to vote for Martin in the finals.

The picture is complicated by the nomination of other third party candidates. The Townsends nominated William Pemberton to carry on for Otto Case, and the fake Liberal Coalition and a mushroom organization calling itself the "Progressive Democrats" also nominated candidates, apparently to try to split and confuse the liberal forces in the final campaign. If an agreement between the W.C.F. and the Townsend forces can be reached, however, the result should be the long needed Farmer-Labor or Commonwealth Party comprising practically all progressive forces. Such an alliance could make a powerful bid for office, stronger than the W.C.F. alone could make.

The final campaign may receive a voice at last in the long-needed liberal daily paper very soon. Harvey O'Connor, author of "Mellon's Millions," came out from Pittsburgh to his old home town, where he will edit the new W.C.F. weekly 16-page tabloid newspaper, the *Commonwealth News*. He will also continue the drive to start a real daily paper.

The *Guild Daily*, published by the P.-I. strikers, is still going strong, with growing news coverage and carrier service. The Hearst management is making no attempt to reopen the P.-I., so eventually the new paper may replace the *Guild Daily* if the strikers find it impractical to continue. Such a move would furnish work to the victims of Hearst's unwillingness to negotiate with the Guild, as well as guaranteeing a fair hearing to the Commonwealth candidates. Meanwhile, the National Labor Relations Board opened its hearing on the P.-I. case on September 10. The Guild won the first round when trial examiner Edwin S. Smith denied the management's two motions to dismiss and one to quash the case. The trial will probably last some days, with Hearst preparing to appeal if the outcome is unfavorable to him.

In the economic field, Seattle labor produced a magnificent demonstration of its solidarity in the first Labor Day Parade in 17 years. For the first time, newspaper editorial workers, teachers and the WCF appeared among the 20,000 marchers. The motif was against Hearst and for 100 per cent union organization in Seattle. Labor thus announces its determination to fight for its rights in the economic as well as the political field.

WATERFRONT WRINKLES

JOHN BOND

EVENTS on the waterfront continue to march steadily toward a climax. Marked by *l'affaire Hoover*, the calling of a national conference of the I.L.A., scheduling national meetings of licensed officers unions, the shipowners renewing negotiations with the maritime unions, events during the past week still maintain a course which makes trouble September 30 likely.

The Dollar Line's luxury liner *President Hoover*, after a five day tie up over alleged discrimination against a sailor, and neglect of safety laws by the captain, left San Francisco for its round the world voyage. Significant was *l'affaire Hoover*, not for the causes of the tie up, but for the action of the Maritime Federation, and the position of the shipowners.

The Sailors Union upon tying up the *Hoover* sat back evidently intending to keep her in port regardless of the consequences, either upon their own negotiations or upon those of other unions. The Sailors, shortly after the tieup, were informed by the shipowners that they were breaking off relations with the union.

The Maritime Federation meeting on the situation took the position that regardless of the merits of the case, the Sailors union must consider the effect of their action on all the unions; that this was not the time to press such "beefs" as had taken place on the *Hoover*; that the action of the Sailors might bring about the break sought by the shipowners through a situation where the onus could be placed on the maritime unions; that the smart thing to head for if a break was inevitable, was to force the shipowners to take the positive action thereby placing the onus for trouble on them.

Result: though the sailors remained adamant in their position the Federation made it clear that it was not functioning for the benefit of one union but for all the unions, and finally brought the sailors around to agreeing to a settlement on the *Hoover*.

Observers are still trying to figure out the position main-

tained by the shipowners in this dispute. From the point of view of the employers the tieup of the *Hoover* was right down their alley. Job action in "violation" of the agreement, the sailors refusing arbitration of the dispute, the opportunity was present to break off relations with the unions at a time when the public was confused as to the issues, with a good chance of laying in the laps of the unions all blame for resulting trouble. The shipowners had already broken off relations with the sailors. To complete the job all they had to do was to carry out their threat to sail a scab crew of sailors, and this would have brought out the rest of the maritime unions. Then, undoubtedly picket lines would have been established with the longshoremen refusing to go through them, thereby giving the shipowners an excuse to break off with the I.L.A.

But "Tear Gas" Plant and Co. did not do this. Did they muff an opportunity, or seeing the chance did they refuse the moment? And if so, why? Are the shipowners bluffing, are they putting on a big show hoping to dramatize the maritime workers into an easy settlement?

Whatever the answer to these queries may be, the unions are taking nothing for granted. They all moved in strong to get the sailors in line, and made it clear that all unions will be held strictly accountable to the Maritime Federation for any actions that may affect other unions in the Federation.

The longshoremen are holding a national conference to solidify their policy and position; and Joseph P. Ryan backs the position of Harry Bridges.

Forced by evergrowing pressure of the rank and file on the Atlantic and in the Gulf, and realizing a blowup on the Pacific Coast this year will spread to all fronts, Ryan decided to adopt the suggestion of his opponents. The Pacific Coast District I.L.A. had urged him to call a National Conference. The results of this conference can be of prime importance. Already Ryan has informed the coast shipowners that he is

in agreement with the Coast District Executive Boards' position that before arbitration is considered, further attempts at direct negotiations between the parties should be made.

Joseph Ryan is still to be watched. That old advice about leopards not changing their spots, at least not readily, is still a sound dictum.

At the same time that longshoremen are meeting in New York, Pacific Coast representatives of the Masters Mates and Pilots, and the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association will be holding conferences either in New York or Washington D. C., on the maritime situation as it stacks up at present. The conferences will be with national officials and local officers of Atlantic and Gulf affiliates. Undoubtedly these unions will be in contact with the I.L.A., meeting in New York. It would not be surprising if out of these conferences there develops a national program for all unions bringing together the Gulf, Atlantic and Pacific Coasts, united in a joint program for the first time in history.

Meanwhile longshore locals along the coast are preparing for any eventuality. Voting is proceeding on the employers' demand to arbitrate their proposals. All indications point to a unanimous no to the shipowners' request. Such a stand on the part of the I.L.A., does not necessarily mean that arbitration is turned down. Such a vote will only mean that the longshore-

men are refusing to submit to an arbitration board the shipowners' present demands that the longshoremen accept conditions as they existed prior to 1934, and worse.

The San Francisco longshoremen balloting for local officers elected Henry Schmidt president. Schmidt, a steady plugging veteran of the 1934 strike, guarantees honest leadership to local 38-79 in the tradition of Harry Bridges, whose policies he has long supported.

In addition to renewing relations with the Sailors Union, one of the conditions included in the settlement of the Hoover difficulty, the shipowners have commenced negotiations with the Marine, Cooks and Stewards. Meetings thus far resulted in exchange of proposals by both parties. The employers ask for penalties for violations of the agreement. Arrangements have been made to continue these meetings to a conclusion, before shipowners meet with other unions. The deadline which the shipowners had set for licensed officers' unions to answer their demands on advance acceptance of blanket arbitration has been lifted.

Thus the maritime picture unfolds itself. Desiring peace, but preparing for war, the maritime unions stand united against the shipowners' challenge. The first line of defense against a programed attack on organized labor as a whole, the waterfront workers stand as one.

THE FUTURE OF EPIC

MAX KNEPPER

THE Epic-sponsored conference of delegates from all non-political organizations in California, held in Los Angeles last May 10, was an important milestone in the course of the liberal movement in California.

One can scarcely contradict the fact that the EPIC movement has been the most influential liberal mass protest movement in California. While the Townsend organization during the last two years has gained more recruits, it is not, except in a certain indirect sense, of vital importance in effecting social change. Townsendism either ignores or denies the economic and social implications of our present system, confining its demand to a pension for one group of the citizenry in the same way the American Legion demands bonuses for veterans.

EPIC, however, is based upon the premise that the capitalist system is in a state of permanent collapse, and as a result there will always be a large class of unemployed as long as capitalism remains established. EPIC received the approbation of almost a million California voters in 1934. None of the orthodox radical movements have ever been able to gain more than 70,000 adherents in the state as represented by votes for their leading candidates.

The practical result of EPIC is that thousands of middle class Californians, never reached by either socialism or communism, have had a thorough education in the principles of production for use and in the inherent weakness of the capitalist system.

Admittedly, many of the 900,000 Sinclair voters in 1934 never learned anything fundamental about economics, and many more have forgotten the lessons they learned. Quite a number of EPICS, disappointed in Sinclair's failure to capture the governorship, turned to other leaders, two of them Father Coughlin and Gerald Smith. Many of these people, while protesting their belief in orderly change and voicing

their disapproval of revolutionary movements, apparently expect the process of social-economic evolution to take place in the course of a single gubernatorial campaign!

But the strength of EPIC can be measured in the vote which Upton Sinclair received in the presidential primary this Spring. Sinclair, as an opponent of Roosevelt, received 107,000 votes for president, or about one to six. Roosevelt's nearest opponent in the primaries in other states (Washington excepted) got about one to twenty.

Thus after two years of the most tragic mismanagement on the part of the End Poverty League officials, of intrigue, quarrels, and splits in the field, and after two years of retirement, Sinclair was able to command more than 100,000 California votes for president.

Of course the professional politicians and the unthinking took the results of the May primary to be proof that the EPIC movement had died sometime during the previous year. While actually Sinclair's vote of more than 100,000, in the face of Roosevelt's popularity and the lack-of-money handicap, is astonishing, even many EPIC supporters regarded the election as the final blow to the movement.

But the future course of EPIC, and the preservation of the movement, were being determined even before the May 5 primary election. To understand the line that the EPICS are now following, we must go back to a Board of Directors meeting late in February of this year. In this meeting the directors ousted the executive committee which had been running the League ever since its democratization in July, 1935. The ousted executive committee represented the extreme right wing of the EPIC movement. (It should be understood that the terms "right" and "left" apropos of EPIC are relative. All EPICS are Left from a conservative standpoint, and all EPICS are "Right" from the orthodox radical premise.) The right-wing clique were fundamentally Demo-

crats, and were liberal only in comparison with Democrats such as McAdoo and Ham Cotton. The principle of production for use and the opposition of EPIC to the status quo were soft-pedalled. And the bare mention of the word "communist" or "Red" was enough to send the former executive committee into gibbering hysterics.

With the removal of this executive committee and the installation of representatives of the left wing, the movement began to veer toward a militant liberalism unknown since the gubernatorial campaign of 1934.

As a protest to the removal of Kate Richards O'Hare and W. Luther Bailey, some of the directors, also right wingers, resigned from the Board. Their loyalty to the movement and production for use can be judged from their actions, spent chiefly in sowing seeds of dissension in the field, while the left-wing elements were making every effort to elect the Sinclair-PFU slate to the national convention.

Even before May 5, many of the conservative EPIC clubs gave up their EPIC charters and became purely Democratic organizations. Nevertheless, at the EPIC-sponsored united liberal conference of May 10, more than one third of the nine hundred odd delegates were EPICS.

This conference was called by the new executive committee of the End Poverty League at Sinclair's suggestion. Unable to take the field as an active political figure and to spend his time as an active organizer, Sinclair realized the EPICS could not be a dominating political factor by themselves. Rather than see the movement fall into the hands of the old Democratic bosses, Sinclair signified his wish that a conference of delegates from all progressive non-political groups work out a program for maintaining an effective militant liberal force in the political field.

This conference was held on May 10, as previously stated, and voted at that time to form a State Constitution Committee for United Political Action, composed of a delegate from each group represented in the conference. It was the duty of the Continuation Committee to organize local councils in each assembly district, comprising all progressive groups, for the purpose of endorsing candidates for the August primaries.

At the May 10 conference action on a third party, Farmer-Labor or otherwise, was deferred until a Fall convention, which was scheduled for September 19-20.

Thus it came about that after a year of strict isolation, the EPICS united with other liberal and progressive groups for political action. At the conference in the McLarty resolution, which established the united political action program, it was clearly set forth that each participating group would retain its own identity. Contrary to hostile rumors, the Continuation Committee did not take over EPIC for the simple reason that the Committee cannot do so.

However, no sooner had the May 10 conference adjourned than the right wingers formerly in control of the EPIC movement began to spread the word far and wide that the communists had seized control of EPIC. Shortly after the May 10 conference, the last right winger in headquarters was removed from power when Leonard Miller was fired from the editorship of the *Epic News*.

Miller, some of the resigned directors, and the ousted executive committee could find no better employment for their time and talents than informing the field membership that their successors represented communist control. Some criterion of Mr. Miller's social viewpoints may be gotten from the fact that during his tenure as editor of the *Epic News*

it was "verboten" to mention the American League Against War and Fascism, the International Labor Defense, or similar organizations. The circulation of these stories by the ousted right wingers of course injured the movement.

However, gradually the field began recovering from defeat at the polls in May. Having been politically active during the past two years, the EPICS could no more remain aloof from politics than a movie star from publicity. Many active EPICS took the initiative in organizing united political action councils in their districts. For instance, in San Diego where the movement was virtually dead this Spring, the EPIC clubs have been revived and are as active as any in the state.

In other districts where councils were formed, EPICS discovered that no communist propaganda was being foisted on them. They were not solicited to take part in communist activities, and they found that united political action and communism are not synonymous. Indeed, in many, if not most, councils the EPICS dominated.

Consequently, in Southern California there has been a wide revival of interest and activity in the field. The organization department has issued calls for elections of new directors, and in general the work of the End Poverty League is resuming after the temporary paralysis resulting from the defeat in May and the split with the right wing faction.

Announcing

BOOK SALE EXTRAORDINARY

SEPTEMBER 18 TO OCTOBER 3

History of the American Working Class (Bimba)	99c
The Nature of Capitalist Crisis (Strachey)	98c
The Coming Struggle for Power (Strachey)	79c
Capital, Vol. I (Marx)	79c
Labor Fact Book No. 3	79c
Fascism and Social Revolution (Dutt)	72c
Literature and Dialectical Materialism (Strachey)	39c

ETXRA SPECIAL!

WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

(Earl Browder)

Cloth

NOW ONLY \$1.00

And hundreds of other books . . . in fact, every book in the shop . . . at greatly reduced prices!

SAN FRANCISCO:

170 Golden Gate Avenue, (International Book Shop)
121 Haight Street, (Workers' Book Shop)

LOS ANGELES:

230 South Spring Street, (Workers' Book Shop)
321 West Second Street, (Peoples' Book Shop)

But although the EPIC movement has definitely embarked on a leftward course, the field will not necessarily accept the complete program of the extreme left. In the Northern part of the state, the stronghold of the right wing, united political action has not been generally accepted by EPICS. The red herring is frequently employed.

Even in Southern California, where the clubs for the most part have accepted united political action, the idea of moving too far to the Left is repugnant to many. Being a lower middle class social protest movement, EPICS regard social and economic problems from a middle class viewpoint, and EPIC will probably remain a more or less right wing organization in the united left wing movement.

As I write this on the eve of a convention of the united po-

litical action movement, I issue a brief warning to the leaders of the more radical organizations. Whether the rank-and-file EPICS will support a third party depends upon the character and leadership of that party. The time element, also, will play an important part in the winning of EPIC support. As a big majority of EPICS are solidly behind Roosevelt, any organization of a third party now while the presidential campaign is in progress would, in my opinion, be a tactical error.

EPICS are moving to the Left, but they are moving at their own pace. To attempt to radicalize them faster than they wish to go would drive them from the threshold of a broad progressive movement back into the lap of the reactionary Democrats. With more than 100,000 EPICS in California at stake, any such action would be a tragedy.

PAUL GAUGUIN: EXILE TURNED SAVAGE

I. SEQUEL AS PREFACE

LET me tell the sequel first:

In the world of flowers and superstition and eroticism in which Gauguin died, the Marquesas, there is no cure or staunching of the disease which caused his death: those who have it live in their death, as lepers. It was in May, 1903, that M. Vernier, a Protestant minister, found Gauguin dying. Once before he had gone to the house and Gauguin had roused himself from suffering to discuss with him "Salammbô." But the disease was like autumn tugging, tugging with windy death the blotched life of Gauguin. On May 8, there was no discussion of Flaubert, of Mallarmé, painting: there were inarticulate sounds, the sound made by breath carried off on the dark, last winds. They swept among the living, increasing, diminishing their cry: "Va mate Gauguin, ua pete enata"—"Gauguin is dead, we are lost!"

Some friends of mine (Mrs. M. Ashton Lindsley and her daughter, Leonora) have just returned from Tahiti. By accident, when they were looking for a house in Papeete, they heard of a house which none but more courageous natives had lived in for years, a house in Panaauia. It was *taboo*, haunted, but they rented it nevertheless—"furnished": a house of "dilapidated wood, split bamboo, corrugated iron and pandanus leaves" supplied with an incomparable list of furnishings—"two tables, three chairs, four beds with no mattresses, three sheets, six napkins, six couverts, two lamps, two kerosene tins covered with an iron grille made out of old bed-springs for a stove, some lanterns, straw mats, fish spears." It had one other extraordinary feature: the native owner had added a verandah—corinthian columns, doves, *flambeaux* painted red, green. It was made out of an old hearse sent to Papeete from California, which displeased the natives so definitely it had been sold—part to become a verandah, part to haul coconuts to Papeete. The house was Gauguin's.

In such a house, one might not be surprised if "things happened." They did. One night, Leonora awoke. Floating in the room in which she slept were two suffering eyes. She wasn't frightened: she *knew* they were Gauguin's.

There is now a plan in the mind of the native owner of the *Maison Gauguin*. He plans other houses: they will have a

RAYMOND E. F. LARSSON

name, "Gauguin Village," be a sort of "tourists' rest haven."

And that is all, except legend, which remains of Gauguin in Tahiti. There are no pictures: the last was owned by a Frenchman who gave it to Gauguin's half-breed son. He sold it—for two bottles of rum. (It was sold again in Paris for 100,000 frs.) The innumerable sketches, oils, mural paintings Gauguin gave natives have disappeared—lost, destroyed by indifferent owners. Two of the *cyndres sculptes* Gauguin carved, in the manner of native carvings, were the last things discovered. They were being used as posts in a barbed-wire fence.

"Va mate Gauguin, ua pete enata!" they said in the Marquesas. And the wind silenced even that sound-o' the wind, the sea-sound, the dropping leaf's sound, the sound of opening flower.

II. GAUGUIN AND HIS PERIOD

In 1848, in the rue Notre Dame de Lorette in Paris, the Creole Peruvian wife of Clovis Gauguin, a *journaliste*, gave birth to a son, Paul. At three, when his father died, the child was taken to live with relatives in Peru, and his travels began. At seven, they were resumed: returned to France, the child was entered in a Jesuit seminary in Orleans. So far, his travels depended on the desire and convenience of his mother. But in 1865, the strange saga of Gauguin's will satisfying itself in the world of things, appetites, activities, ideas, places, began: on the "Luzitano," he set sail as a pilot's apprentice for Rio de Janeiro, and the estrangement and detachment of his ego from the circumspect order of society had begun. In 1865, returned to France, he enlisted in the Navy. His compulsory period of service ended in 1871 and so, it appeared, did his travel: in the establishment of a M. Bertin, he became a broker in the rue Lafitte. But if he married a Danish wife, sired five children, he was not fully circumspect even then: the leisure of his Sundays were not employed in paying calls and receiving visits, but, in resolution of a desire of obscure history, in the awkward first advances of an untutored man to painting. It was as a "Sunday painter" he met Pissarro, and through this fecundating minor

painter, fellow countryman of Gauguin's mother, Gauguin's desire to paint began to consume him—his responsibilities, his future in the present, his heart. In 1876, he exhibited in the Salon. In 1881, he had sufficiently mastered brush and oils to cause J. K. Huysmans to write of a nude he was showing, "I do not hesitate to declare that, among the contemporary painters who have done nudes, none has achieved such a forceful note of reality." In 1863, paint had sufficiently mastered him: he put away his portfolios in the rue Lafitte, walked out of the establishment of M. Bertin, and was free—to be bound thereafter to paint, be the slave thereafter of his wilful heart.

In 1883, his wife became martyr to Gauguin's heart and his brushes, as Gauguin himself did: he left her, his children, with her relatives in Copenhagen, returned to Paris and to poverty and blank canvas to be covered by Gauguin's heart in exile.

One of the most fecund dates in the history of "modern" art is 1886. In that year, Gauguin met Van Gogh. But the significance of that meeting remained obscure: in 1887, Gauguin went to Martinique, the blank canvas demanded more—more colour, more freedom from rule, rarer landscape, unknown and darker figures to people it. Returned to France in 1888, painters, if not buyers of pictures, found him and his talent taking form. So were his theories, and "Synthesism." At Pont-Aven, surrounded by friends as followers, he was something of the master of a school.

It was that same year, in October, he joined Van Gogh in Arles. "Gauguin gives me courage to imagine things and certainly things from the imagination take on a more mysterious character," wrote Van Gogh. From Gauguin, Van Gogh received stimuli for bold design, colour. From Van Gogh, Gauguin, after a bitter quarrel, received Van Gogh's ear. It was after this terrible manifestation of Van Gogh's epilepsy that Gauguin returned to Paris. But not for long.

He left Arles in December. By having a sale at Hotel Drouot, where Degas and other friends, bought, he acquired money to whet the appetite of his canvas, his palette again for colour, form, darker people. June 8, 1891, he arrived in Tahiti.

There is a vast and extraordinary book to be written on the influence of the savage on the civilization of Europe—the savage and islands, the "land of the blessed," but importantly the savage. How old the avid appetite of France for the great Orient strangenesses, the barbaric and the savage is, I do not know. It is older than Maundeville, as new as the introduction of savage African sculpture into European painting by way of Cubism. And the source of that is Gauguin.

Until Gauguin went to Tahiti, his art remained only superficially differentiated from that of his contemporaries. Tahiti removed him from Paris and his period. It made of the Parisian a savage, of a XIX Century painter sufficient of an "original" to be the master and the contemporary of the Surrealists. It developed, like a photographic fixative, Gauguin—ego, "original"; painter related to "the tradition," one, judged by the standards of "the tradition," a savage. In Tahiti, his canvases no longer "stink of models, of technique, or of pretended rules"; his drawing resembles primitive distortion, neither the Greek canon nor David; his colour is as violent as Neon or that of Eastern pheasants; his "rule" is the appetite of his canvas for more, more—colour, form, the darker people. Even the "philosophical background" of his pictures changed. One marks again and again how the illumination of his canvas is from the foreground and the

earth upward. The Earth had become his light, the Earth of the savage. For the Mystery that is the basis of European culture since Christ, he came on the mystery of the savage consciousness—elements, forces, death that is the form of life, not life that is the form of death.

Disease caught him in the Earth. Death was at his feet, drawing him under it. "Before death," he said. "Before death" he painted. "D'ou Venons Nous, Que Sommes Nous, Ou Allons Nous?"—it is a great canvas in size, in importance so far as Gauguin's art is concerned. It took him a month to paint it, savagely, "brutally" as he would have said. "Where do we go?" The Earth only answered—with leaf-fall, wind, rotting fruit. When it was finished, he found it "a philosophical work on a theme comparable to that of the Gospel," but one looks in vain for confirmation of his evaluation. When it was finished, so was life. In the mountains, "where my body would have been devoured by the ants," he took arsenic—"saved up while I was so ill with eczema." He vomited all night. In the morning, he went weakly back.

Gauguin is of, and not of, his times. His art's relationship to the late XIX Century is obvious: to Purvis de Chavannes', to Lautrec's, to such a decorator as Beardsley. He was dependent and independent: he borrowed (from Pissarro, Seurat, de Chavannes, so on), used, discarded, invented. His art is a decadent one in its relation to the Renaissance. As an anatomist, he is a sad one, a proud one. "If Bouguereau made an arm too long," he wrote, "ah yes! what would be left of him? His artistic will consists only in stupid precision." His distortions are the contrary of those of Greece: they stultify his figures, bring them nearer earth, not nearer the sky. His colour's violence is his own: nobody else has poisoned green as he has, made it almost malevolent. His violent earth is master: man walks entangled in it. Even his flowers are violent, resemble elemental forces. Only his sea speaks softly, symbol of his heart, the mermaid enticing his canvas.

Among XIX Century painters? Gauguin must be left so: among XIX Century painters. To me, he is patently the inferior of Van Gogh—in his own art. True, Van Gogh's influence is the lesser—still. Not even Picasso has escaped Gauguin's. But Gauguin is primarily a decorator. It is a classification in which he finds the extremity of his stature. It is a classification which is his wonderland: when he leaves it, his stature is less. Even so he is still there, among the XIX Century masters: Van Gogh, Cezanne, Degas, Seurat, affirmative, a "character," at home from his exile—a savage.

COMING!

THE CITY DIFFERENT

A Study of Santa Fe, by Miriam Toller

WHY I LEFT THE SOCIALIST PARTY

A Critique of Trotskyism Today
By a Socialist Party Worker

BROWDER COMES TO DETROIT

By Phil McCann

THE M. AND M. MEETS AN ENEMY

An Eye-witness account of the Labor Day Parade in Los Angeles

And Short stories by Tom Kromer, Langston Hughes, A. I. Bezzerides, John J. Gross, Ronald Cooley and others

HOLLYWOOD WEEK

LOUIS NORDEN

ISSUE OF THE WEEK: Though more than 13,000 extras are making the starvation wage of \$8.00 a week or LESS, studios continue to ignore the problem.

This week, for example, Paramount had "Roe Bowl" in production, a new college football picture planned for Fall release. A section of a football field and grandstand was built on the back lot. While two football teams battled on the field, 250 extras and 250 dummies furnished by the property department filled the grandstand. The extras were told to help make the dummies look real by giving them some animation every time the extra moved.

Dummies and cardboard cut-outs are one of the studio's methods of saving money on production by starving 13,000 extras in Hollywood. But organized extras can refuse to work in scenes where such dummies and cut-outs are used. Thus would studios be forcibly stopped from their starvation program directed against human beings for higher profits. This is the issue of the day for the Junior Screen Actors' Guild. Its 3,000 members demand that it find ways and means of helping them earn a living slightly higher than the \$8.00 or less they now earn weekly.



PEOPLE: John O'Hara, author of "Appointment in Samarra" has been signed to write for Samuel Goldwyn's unit at United Artists. His first screen credit, however, was for acting. He appears in the role of the reporter aboard the Shanghai train in "The General Died at Dawn." He, Odets and Sidney Skolsky were all in that scene, though in the final cutting, Odets and Skolsky remained, together, on the cutting room floor. . . . Lester Cohen, author of the recently published "Two Worlds" has also been signed by the same studio to write a script for a remake of "Stella Dallas". . . . Rumor has it that Harpo Marx will utter understandable sounds in "A Day at the Races," the brothers' new M.G.M. picture about to go into production. It will be the first time Harpo has talked on the stage or screen in years, since, he says, "in Portland, when I asked for a raise. I don't think anybody heard me, though. I got no response." . . . Kurt Bois, outstanding German actor banished by Hitler, is now starred in New York in the WPA Federal Theater Project show, "Help Yourself," at the Adelphi Theater. Bois was revered abroad. He fled to America after Hitler's advent, got a job in a John Golden flop. After a year's layoff, Bois went on WPA at a salary of \$23.86 weekly. Says Bois: "It's better than being in Germany". . . . When "The General Died at Dawn" was previewed, Lewis Milestone and Clifford Odets jointly took the

usual page in the *Daily Variety* to advertise their thanks to the film's producer. When the *Hollywood Reporter* ran its advertising section on the picture, Odet's name was missing from the page. He had refused to advertise in the *Reporter*, following the example set by Dudley Nichols, remembering the bias shown by that paper during the provoked controversy within the Screen Writers' Guild. . . . True to her word, Marlene Dietrich did not return to Germany on her vacation. She has been the house guest of Max Reinhardt at his castle, Leopoldskron, near Salzburg.

STORIES: Only 40 per cent of all stories purchased by major studios finally reach the screen, according to a statement this week by the head of Paramount's editorial board. . . . Demonstration of statement's truth: Warner is shelving "The Story of Beethoven" which was to have starred Edward G. Robinson. They are also shelving the script on Sheridan's "The Rivals". . . . And M.G.M., after all the fanfare, is shelving the "Major" Rupert Hughes' script tentatively titled, "Mr. and Mrs. Washington." Not only are American patriotic subjects offensive in England, M.G.M. now declares, but Irving Thalberg asserted that the life of George Washington is a **CONTROVERSIAL SUBJECT**. Recall the Hays' forecast of the great picture of the future: "Fantasies built around the lives of insects". . . . Film rights to Fannie Hurst's new novel, "Great Laughter," were sold this week before publication to M.G.M. for \$100,000. . . . Robert Sisk, R.K.O. Radio producer, formerly Theater Guild press agent, will produce S. N. Behrman's play, "The Second Man." S. K. Lauren is now working on the adaptation. . . . Paul Robeson's next picture for Gainsborough of England is "King Solomon's Mines" in which he is co-starred with Roland Young and John Loder. . . . William Cameron Menzies ("Things to Come") is to direct "Fire Over England" from a script by the anti-Nazi, Erich Pommer, a story of rebellion aboard a British troopship. . . . The Elizabeth Bergner-Paul Czinner production of "As You Like It" received excellent notices at the London opening this week. It will soon be released in America. . . . Norma Shearer and Clark Gable are to be co-starred in the screen production of Jane Austen's "Pride and Prejudice". . . . M.G.M. is ready to start filming Kipling's "Captain Courageous" with Lionel Barrymore, Spencer Tracy and Freddie Bartholomew. . . . Charles G. Booth, author of the original story of "The General Died at Dawn," has just sold another original, "Caviar for His Excellency" to Paramount.

POLITICS: When the monopolistic motion picture industry refused to release the Resettlement Administration's "The Plow That Broke the Plains," the government sponsors were forced to show the picture on Federal Theater Project programs and in a few independent theaters. In the future, the government is to take no chances, will distribute its films in new channels, as well as in the few co-operative independent theaters. New films will be shown in schools and before civic groups on screens and projectors and sound equipment purchased by these organizations with government financial aid. The Electric Farm and Home Authority has been authorized to discount all such purchases, the groups repaying the EFHA at the rate of \$10 monthly. All 1400 CCC camps will also be supplied with equipment.

This is an excellent opportunity for mass organizations to purchase their own film projection equipment. For there are many other outlets, other than the government, distributing 16 mm. films. Bell and Howell has a complete library. The

New Film Alliance, the Film and Photo League and other organizations have films which may be rented and shown for education or entertainment.

In addition, pressure of such groups can force the film industry to release special 16 mm. prints of major pictures. The move is of great benefit to the masses of the people, but not to the independent theater operator who is fighting the monopoly-controlled big theaters.

SCIENCE: Two complete motion picture newsreels were this week televised a distance of 3½ miles over Stations KHJ (for sound) and W6XAO (for vision). The image received was of unusual clarity. Witnessing the demonstrations were representatives of the two American Institutes of Radio and Electrical Engineers.

FOREIGN: The Reichsfilmkammer, Nazi body in charge of the regulation of motion pictures, this week arbitrarily ordered a cut in the film salaries of top directors and stars, in some cases up to 75 per cent. Though the first cut hit only the big-salaried employees, their resistance to the cut and their importance to the fast-dwindling German industry, will throw the wage cut to the backs of all small salaried employees.

The reason for the bad state of the German industry is two-fold. Heretofore, 40 per cent of the cost of German pictures was returned from the foreign market. Today but 10 per cent is received from this source, due to the boycott and the poor quality of Nazi pictures. In addition, the domestic market has fallen, theater receipts having dropped sixty-five per cent. Thus Hitler proceeds to tighten the belts of German film workers.

LABOR: The Los Angeles local of the Culinary Workers' Union will demand an A. F. of L. boycott of all R.K.O. Radio pictures at the October meeting of the executive council of the Federation.

Four months ago, studio executives locked out union cooks and waiters, cut salaries in the studio commissary. Promptly all studio labor backed the culinary workers, issued a leaflet calling for a boycott of the restaurant. The Screen Actors' Guild, IATSE, IBEW, studio drivers and other unions issued and stuck to boycott orders. The union workers are still locked out. The local Central Labor Council has supported the local sympathy boycott.

The national film boycott is needed to show the strength of union labor against a lockout. The same appeal should be made to the CIO.

All but 39 theatres affiliated with the Independent Theater Owners' Association of Southern California have signed union contracts. This week, officials of the Projectionists Local 150, IATSE, went into conference with the owners to sign up these houses. When this is accomplished, action will then be taken against the same number of houses not affiliated with the owner's organization.

Unorganized Paramount workers in both the New York and Hollywood offices face a 10 per cent salary cut as part of the new Board of Directors' economy program. Union and Guild-organized labor is already prepared to turn down the cut. A succession of million dollar flops on last year's release schedule caused by the stupidity of the Board of Directors, has forced the Board to resort to this way of making a profit for the bankers out of the hides of the workers.

THE MOVIES TRY HARD

WINTHROP RUTLEGE

WHEN Clifford Odets went to Hollywood and started preparing the script of "The General Died at Dawn" at a four-figure salary per week, daily *Variety* remarked with its usual cynicism that the big money was turning the tint of the once "red" Odets to something less than pale pink. "Odets," cracked *Variety*, "where is thy sting?" Clever and amusing, but not necessarily in keeping with the facts.

"The General Died at Dawn," which ran two weeks at the Paramount, is a film with a sex-befuddled plot and passionately eloquent dialogue. Paramount Film Foundries, Inc. is responsible for the former, Odets for the latter.

As the American aviator who went to China to drop a war-lord's bombs on the suffering workers and peasants, and who quit because he found his sympathies with his targets rather than with his boss, Gary Cooper speaks the Odets dialogue with telling effect. In angry Odetsian poetry he tells how, because he knew oppression in his homeland, he threw his lot with the Chinese masses and undertook a perilous journey to buy them new munitions with which to fight their way to freedom. He describes Yang, the war lord as "a heart breaker, a home breaker and a strike breaker—in short, a hundred per cent rat."

He fights Yang, and when he becomes his prisoner, jeers at him and tells him of the day when the peasants will cut the war-racketeer and his hirelings down like rice. About to be tortured, he laughs at his captor as have heroic revolutionists down through history. The dialogue given Cooper by Odets is inspiring stuff; I'm sure Paramount audiences felt its power, and that without their realizing it, is why they liked the film well enough to keep it in town two weeks.

But, alas! "The General Died at Dawn" is in toto just another blonde-love-sex melodrama with a two-fisted American as the hero and a suave and insidious Oriental as its heavy. Cooper is hot for the lush Madeleine Carroll and she for him. She betrays him, repents. He socks her in the puss, repents. They face death together, battle for each other. Love becomes paramount (Paramount Film Foundries, Inc.) It pushes history into the background. Who cares if a million people die for the ideal of a decent society; Hollywood Happy Endings Inc. are the things that matter. And "The General Died at Dawn" has 'em. God's still in His Blue Heaven. "It's a terrific picture, boy! The public may be getting a little tired of the Chinese stuff, but just the same it's grand entertainment. Plenty of boy-and-girl stuff, and that's what they want." I say "nuts!"

But you can't blame Odets. In the department assigned to him, he excelled. He gave the film its only distinguishing element, its angry and rebellious lyricism. And what more can an intelligent and socially conscious poet do in Paramount Film Foundries, Inc?

"My Man Godfrey" (Orpheum) is being touted, and not without some justification, as the reigning comedy of the season. It really isn't comedy at all, but farce—at times ironic farce—with William Powell, Carole Lombard and Alice Brady as its chief exponents of genial and engaging insanity.

Miss Lombard, playing a new socialite game, goes to the city dump to find a forgotten man. There she finds Powell, handsomely forbidding in rags and whiskers, and takes him to a swank hotel and shows him off and wins a prize. Then

she hires him as the family butler and spends the remaining reels in a sustained effort to have him for husband.

The film reflects some opulent Universal official's resentment against the Roosevelt tax program and it ends with a vaguely fake panacea for the ills of the unfortunates who live in packing boxes on the East River dump. But it is fun—splendidly idiotic fun. Miss Brady's hangover solicitude for the "little men" who march about her room on the morning after a successful social function, is something to behold. And Miss Lombard's magnificently vacuous antics stamp her as one of the film colony's ranking comediennesses.

I could have wished, however, that the character she played had been made a little more cerebral, which it could have been without being any the less delightfully eccentric. This would have lent a satisfying and needed touch of logic to Powell's eventual capitulation to his languishing employer.

The most biting lines in the film are Powell's, and he does handsomely by them. When dragged from his city dump to the "scavenger party" at the expensive hotel, he is called upon for a speech. He says:

"My purpose in coming here was twofold. I wanted to help this young lady (Miss Lombard) and I wanted to see how a crowd of empty-headed nitwits behave themselves. My curiosity has been satisfied. I assure you it will be a pleasure to return to the company of really important people."

With that he starts back to the dump colony.



HISTORY WITHOUT A VIEWPOINT

R. A. KOCHER

THE author, president of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, has compiled this book* from lectures he delivered at University College, London. There is therefore a certain lack of continuity in the subject matter, and lack of a clean-cut philosophical viewpoint. Perhaps a historian should have no viewpoint but merely report accurately historical data without opinion. Many historical events worth recording deal with human beings in their differences on some particular issue. In the light of historical perspective one side or the other in these conflicts may be universally vindicated; some issues remain in doubt. It is for the historian to evaluate such evidence at hand, and from the mass of data clarify the issues for his readers. It is here that he must proceed from a point of view, and I prefer to read history by someone who makes clear the angle from which he draws his inferences.

In the present book I fail to detect a point of view, unless it is polyanna, for the book ends on the note: though the

plight of the farmer is not what it should be, all will be well in the end.

Most of the book deals with the colonial period and the first years of American farming following the adoption of the Constitution. It gives a fair picture of the establishment of New England subsistence farms, the Yankee handyman, the method of land acquisition, the beginnings of business farming and exploitation. There is a discussion of slavery versus contract labor in farming, the nature of planter aristocracy, absentee ownership, the characteristics of farms and ranches cultivated by their owners, the effects of foreign immigration upon farm labor. The significance of industrialization for farming this author seems to have completely failed to understand.

Finally, there is a brief discussion of the New Deal and A.A.A. which does not add very much.

LEMKE COMES TO TOWN

(Continued from page 180)

and I'm going to see democratic and representative government in the United States of America. And I think you youngsters should join us."

"If you don't expose fascist groups, they'll attempt to seize power as they are doing in Spain," I argued.

"If we permit the international bankers to run this nation any longer, that is what will happen here," said Mr. Lemke.

But Mr. Lemke surprised me when he said, "I believe that if anybody wants to be a Communist that is their business. I would let them alone."

Mr. Lemke's aides were getting a little impatient. They interrupted to say that some people were waiting downstairs for him. Mr. Lemke kept on talking. He is a voluble spirit.

"How many votes do you think you'll poll?" I asked.

"Enough to be the next President of the United States."

He said that as though he meant it. I think he's really talked himself into believing that he'll be the next president, even though he can not qualify for and will not be on the ballot in most states, and in spite of the fact that his following is more tenuous than real. The Union Party is claimed to be an offspring of the Liberty League designed to take votes away from Roosevelt and let Landon slip in. Paul Ward, writing from Washington, says it will be the other way around. All the votes that Landon will get will be anti-Roosevelt votes. Those are the only kind of votes that Lemke can expect also. Therefore, the only effect of Lemke's being in the race will be to divide the anti-Roosevelt vote. But Lemke still believes he will be elected.

Politics never made a stranger bedfellow than William Lemke. Himself a greenback man reared in the independent agrarian tradition of North Dakota, he has aligned himself with the silver-advocating fascist Father Coughlin, the rabble-rousing, share-the-wealth fascist Gerald L. K. Smith, and the simple, easily-led Dr. Townsend who has become so self-important since his unsound and inadequate plan won substantial popular support. This is one of the strangest alliances American politics has ever seen. But one thing it is not, and that is the bona-fide third party that will one day sweep the United States.

I took my leave from Mr. Lemke. Going down the elevator, we met again. "Come and see me in the White House after January 20," said Mr. Lemke. "The door will always be open."

THE SOCIAL HISTORY OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, by Joseph Schafer. (The Macmillan Co.) \$2.50

GROUPS IN ACTION

PRIVATE HICKS

The performances of San Francisco New Theater Group's "Private Hicks" start Friday, September 18, Saturday and Sunday, the 19th and 20th; and the same three days of the weekend following (25, 26, 27.) All performances will take place in the evening, at the Group's Pine Street Playhouse, 1609 Pine Street, near Van Ness.

"Private Hicks," first published in New Theatre Magazine in December, 1935, was the New Theatre League prize winning play for that year. Subsequent productions in New York and in all the large cities of the country indicate a popularity ranking close to that of "Waiting for Lefty." "Lefty" was the previous production of the local group now showing "Private Hicks."

Like Odets' play, "Hicks" is a strike drama. It deals with the use of the soldiery against striking workers, revealing Fascist tactics used by large employers when faced by the reasonable demands of suffering workers. "New Theatre" of November last year, in announcing this prize winning play declared:

"It is significant that at this time when the militia is being used against American labor in practically every major strike struggle, we should have a strong and convincing play dealing with the fight against reaction and terror in this country. Productions of this play, now being planned from Connecticut to California, will strike a decisive blow at Fascism in America."

Alfred Maltz, author of "Private Hicks," collaborated with George Sklar in writing the sensational drama of the New Orleans docks, "Stevedore." As in "Stevedore," the men in "Hicks" are convincingly ordinary men. And this is what lends their actions such importance, for it is the great mass of ordinary people who make up the most real part of the world—the working part. These are the people whose needs are never recognized until the strength of their united minds and bodies blocks the golden flow of profits which they create.

"Private Hicks" is a very ordinary young American. Yet he carries through to a conclusion dangerous to himself a very extraordinary act. He is a militiaman who refuses to shoot down strikers.

The play unfolds a development of action and idea which not only make this extraordinary act seem reasonable, but show it as an irresistible result of experience, of living. "Private Hicks" is a fine and important play because it succeeds in revealing an accepted part of our social behavior as directly opposed to our best interests and the interests of the entire working population.

We need more plays like "Private Hicks." And if we are to have more men as sensible, as bold, and as useful as this lone soldier, we need large audiences for plays like this.

On the same program with the play will be a mass chant: "Stop Those War Drums"; and a Carol Beals Group Dance, "Waterfront, 1934."

Ralph Bruenn

CALIFORNIA ART SHOW

The San Francisco Art Center announces a showing of oils by Hugh Littlejohn, and a group showing of watercolors by Don Kingman, John Langley Howard, Frede Vidar and others, from September 21st to October 3rd.

Make checks or money orders payable to:

BOX 1350 PACIFIC ASSOCIATES CARMEL, CALIF.

[] Enter my subscription for 1 year, for \$3; Canada and foreign \$3.50

[] Enter my subscription for 6 months, for \$1.75; Canada and foreign \$2.10

[] Enter my subscription for 20 weeks for \$1.00

Name

Address

Made up by Union Labor

THEY TELL ME . . .

A HANDY LITTLE booklet is the "Left Book News," published by Victor Gollancz of London—the publisher of cheaper "left" books. This book news is an interesting little magazine. Number 4, "Popular Front Number," carries reviews by Ralph Bates of the Left Club book choices for August: Malraux's "Days of Contempt" (called in this country "Days of Wrath") and "Choose a Bright Morning" by Hillel Bernstein. The September choice will be "Walls Have Mouths" by W. F. R. Macartney. The general price of this book is ten shillings and sixpence (about two and a half dollars), the Left Book Club price two-and-six: about fifty cents. That is the standard price for all left club books. Almost 20,000 have joined this club in England. Other articles in the "News" are "A People's Front for Britain?" by John Strachey, and a full report of the speech of Maurice Thorez to the National Conference of the French Communist Party in July of this year. Left Book News can be bought from Victor Gollancz at 14 Henrietta Street, London W. C. 2.

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY, the Marxian Quarterly, announces the addition to its staff, as Foreign Editors, of Prof. H. Levy of the Imperial College of Science, London, Prof. J. D. Bernal of Cambridge University, and Prof. H. J. Muller of the Institute of Genetics, Leningrad. The first issue of this new quarterly will appear for October 1st publication, and will contain, among other features, articles on mathematics, philosophy, and linguistics by Professors D. J. Struik of M. I. T., V. J. McGill of Hunter, and Margaret Schlauch of N. Y. U., along with reviews by Prof. Broadus Mitchell of Johns Hopkins, Prof. E. Berry Burgum of N. Y. U., Dr. Ernest Nagel of Columbia, and Kenneth Burke.

THE AMERICAN Writers' Union sends the following press release:

"HALL OF SHAME" GETS NEW MEMBERS:

New elections held at Local 1 of the American Writers' Union bring to a total of eleven the Union's nominations to the "Hall of Shame" for "undemocratic, anti-labor and imperialistic" writing. The following were "elected": Arthur Brisbane, H. R. Knickerbocker, Benjamin De Casseres, Rupert Hughes, Bernarr MacFadden, Abe Kahn, Walter Lippman, Arnaldo Cortesi, William Dudley Pelley, Floyd Gibbons, and Paul Block.

THE SEPTEMBER issue of "Soviet Russia Today" features articles by two writers of world prominence, Emil Ludwig and Norman Angell, one of the world's leading peace advocates. . . . The flight of Lev. evsky, ace Soviet flyer, from Los Angeles to Moscow through the sub-polar regions is the subject of an article by Robin Kinkead, who spent three years in Moscow and was assistant correspondent there of the New York "Times." Kinkead is now assistant to Jimmy Hopper on the WPA.

"SPRING UP, O WELL" by Dorothy Ruth Kahn, to be published in September by Henry Holt, is a novel of the new Jewish life in Palestine—both in that "sudden" town, Tel Aviv, and in the kvuzoth—as seen by an American girl who shuts her eyes to none of the difficulties and disappointments but who has none the less given up her American citizenship. She writes:

"The kvuzoth are the simplest institutions in Palestine. The chalutzim who live in the kvuzoth are the simplest people. The chalutzim are the pioneers who have come to Palestine to live in the land community. The chalutzim believe in the return of the Jews to the soil. The chalutzim believe that no man should have more than he needs and that every man should have as much as he needs. They believe this and they live it . . . There is no more for one. No less for another . . . and this is almost the whole story. As simple as the exhortation of Hillel to love your neighbor as yourself. No more than this. And no less."

QUINCY HOWE announces for Simon and Schuster that Trotsky's "History of the Russian Revolution" is now available in one volume at \$2.98. In view of the Trotskyist charges made at many ex-revolutionaries in the Soviet Union it is felt that this book, stating Trotsky's position, should find a wide reading public. It is certainly important to understand Trotskyism today, both as an historical factor and a psychological state of mind.

WE HAVE just unearthed the following verse by Thomas Hardy, called "Christmas, 1924."

"Peace on Earth was said. We sing it,
And pay a million priests to bring it.
After two thousand years of mass
We've got as far as poison gas."

The title might be changed to "1936"; or possibly, to "Salinas."

ELLA WINTER