

most gratifying salary. Other jobs were taken on in the following years: the post-office, the print-shop, toy repair—jobs of real usefulness to the school and which demanded, almost of themselves, an adherence to standards of responsible work. I know, by recent observation, what a force this stimulus can be. New impulses appear: a drive to perfect the skills necessary for business-like behavior (“You really have to be quick when you make change for the customers; they get so impatient.”); a more personal interest in the study of history and geography (the Boston Post Road, the Pony Express, early New York, the Indians); and an awareness of group responsibility and cooperation (“I sometimes volunteer to do the things I don’t like so much, because it’s not fair to let the others do them all the time.”).

I Learn From Children is filled with delightful description and anecdote in convincing defence of the school’s philosophy: that “it is the whole child we must nurture, not just one part of him” and that he must be thoroughly grounded in the “here and now” before he may safely wander into the past and the far-distant. Only pity is expressed for the precocious, over-titillated child, whose parents fail to realize that “a Sunday walk down the street with a 7-year-old may be an exciting experience,” for the parent as well as for the child.

But this sensible philosophy still, obviously, represents the “school of tomorrow.” The truth of progressive education (like the truth of psychoanalysis) is monotonously evaded by the “flight into ridicule.” Even the left-wing intellectual is inwardly disturbed by the fear that liberty (for children!) may lead only to license—or at least to bad manners! Miss Pratt suggests that the more open battle, of the early days, between parental authority and the new freedom may have been better than the “concealed resentments and buried antagonisms” of today. I believe that behind the surface indifference of Americans to education there lies a deep animosity to children: we envy them and fear them. We envy them their freedom to feel and to express their feelings (the outbursts of rage and hate as well as of joy and satisfaction)—and we envy their potentialities. They also threaten our own youth; they will inevitably replace us. These feelings are “natural” in our culture; we only fail, sometimes, to realize how they stain our most precious relationships. I remember a thread of bitterness among my delighted thoughts as I first watched a group of 3-year-olds: “What could I have become, if . . .”

Even the best school philosophy cannot solve all the problems of childhood. The reader of this reassuring book may be left with the suspicion that Miss Pratt does not perceive the full significance of teachers and parents as unwitting representatives of our society—despite the best intentions. True, she set a fine precedent in choosing teachers for emotional maturity rather than academic excellence. (So far as I know, there is no such entrance requirement for parents.) For the teacher needs more than a knowledge of teaching techniques, especially in the crucial nursery years, to meet the deeper problems of emotion and behavior: “when to encourage a timid child to fight for his rights, how to meet the lack of security that often underlies unduly aggressive behavior; when to mother a child and when to serve up a little wholesome neglect, and when to step in and take responsibility from the children’s shoulders onto her own.” It seems to me that psychoanalysis is a great aid in the development of such maturity: can one fully understand the childhood (and childishness) of others, without reaching an accord with one’s own? There are underlying antagonisms—and envy and fear—in teachers as well as in parents. The modern teacher is, perhaps, aware of this, but she continues to give greater weight to the “right” word or deed, with the children, than to the underlying feelings and motives. The most serious problems are sometimes met with shallowness. There is a recurrent attempt, for example, to enlist the parents in the fight against over-competitiveness. The parents are advised not to ask the children for their paintings, clay work, etc.; and the teachers try bravely to praise the classroom work without revealing their personal comparisons. But competitiveness remains strong in the children—as it does in the grownups—and the children learn only to try to conceal it, as the parents and teachers do.

There are also the problems of aggression and sex roles, which seem “naturally” difficult and are made even more complicated

by cultural inconsistencies. The well-trained teacher is now taught that the submissive, “good” child is sometimes more neurotic than the over-belligerent one. But how is she to use this knowledge? She continues to give the over-belligerent child the greater share of attention, for he is more threatening to the smooth management of her class. At the same time, she is likely to admire, secretly, his fighting qualities (which is common in our culture), which does not help him to avoid delinquency—or, later, militarism. She may even enjoy him masochistically (the idea that his belligerence is “healthy” may be a welcome one), which encourages his sadism and the “good” child’s tendency to masochism. The latter continues to be ignored so long as he is “no trouble” to the teacher.

There is, also, in some of the best schools, a curious feminism, legacy of the early equalitarian movement. Despite the attractive new play materials, the little girls of Miss Pratt’s 1914 group clung to their domestic interests (cooking, washing, feeding baby). Miss Pratt’s explanation is that in those early days, “Woman’s place in our society was still in the home.” But the little girls of today still play house more often than the boys do (Charlotte Bühler, *From Birth to Maturity*, Kegan Paul 1947); and it is possible that their choice may be compelled by a very natural and valuable desire to emulate the mother in her motherly functions. (They seem to catch up to the boys, academically, soon enough, despite this initial “handicap”!) Some teachers, however, may openly assert that “boys are more fun”; for their greater curiosity about things outside the home, and their preference for blocks, may be more exciting to the teacher, and is considered a higher step in the learning scale. But perhaps the higher rating is only another instance of our culture’s depreciation of “woman’s work,” while doll-play may be a painful goad to the teacher’s own inferiority feelings.

Many other teaching problems can be made easier through psychoanalysis: the acceptance of dirt and mess; of exhibitionism; of sex-play. The problems I have mentioned may not be the most difficult. However, psychoanalysis for teachers (and parents) seems now to be an unimaginable goal: one does not undertake the hard work and suffering without courage; and few can afford the fees. But how terribly wasteful are our present penny-pinching ways in the education of children!

ETHEL GOLDWATER

DIE KOMMUNISTISCHE PARTEI DEUTSCHLANDS IN DER WEIMAR REPUBLIK. By Ossip K. Flechtheim. Bollwerk Verlag (Germany), 1948. \$5.00. (Available in the USA direct from author: O. K. Flechtheim, Colby College, Waterville, Maine.)

An excellent short (300-pages) but scholarly history of the German Communist Party. First two-thirds are devoted to a history of the KPD from 1914 to 1933, plus a lengthy chapter on the party’s sociology and ideology. Latter third contains a very rich bibliography and a documentary appendix presenting such important texts as the 1918 Spartacus Program, the 1925 Statutes of the KPD, the Declaration Concerning the National and Social Liberation of the German People (1930), and the once-famous but now almost forgotten letter by Clara Zetkin from Moscow in which, speaking for Brandler, she attacks the party’s tendency toward opportunism and putschism.

The author is an independent socialist, with no political axes to grind. When he speaks of the twisted and tortuous paths of the two great German proletarian parties and their interminable, suicidal strife, his heart hurts him considerably. His history is a well-documented tragedy which, like any drama, draws a moral conclusion without any preaching. If the material is dull at times, it is more the fault of the material than of the author: he is telling the story of little men who were trying to ride out a storm which, to them, was just a series of intrigues, resolutions, and political shenanigans aimed at patching up an unpatchable society, and conducted on the backs of docile workingmen organized into the two rival mass-parties. The author could have written a book which accuses or defends; instead he has chosen to tell the story in the actors’ own words; these monologues, resolutions, and shortsighted bickerings speak for themselves quite

eloquently; they reveal the attitude that governed all the marionettes involved—the belief that material questions alone determine success or failure in the political struggle.

ROBERT BEK-GRAN

Letters

Heinz Norden Objects

Sir:

In an article on "AMG in Germany" in your Summer 1948 issue Peter Blake discusses my person and my editorship in 1946-47 of the picture magazine *Heute*, published by U.S. Military Government in Germany. Mr. Blake chooses to bracket me with what he calls "Stalinist agents," an imputation I must emphatically reject.

The article as a whole contains a number of crude factual errors and misstatements that are in my opinion unworthy of a reputable journal. I am specifically concerned, of course, with the misrepresentations concerning myself, which call for correction.

Mr. Blake accepts at face value certain flimsy allegations about my prewar activities and affiliations. Unfortunately for him, my militant advocacy of slum clearance and better housing cannot be tortured into a picture of "political agitation." For some five years in the Army, before I was assigned to Counter Intelligence and to *Heute*, my record was subject to repeated official investigation. In every case, including a full-dress Loyalty Board hearing, I was cleared. I myself publicly refuted the malicious red smear, the result of an anonymous denunciation (*Washington Post*, Dec. 19, 1947, and Apr. 23, 1948; *New York Times*, Jan. 17, 1948) and the facts I set forth have not and cannot be challenged.

Mr. Blake, who falsely calls me "fanatically anti-German," states that my editorial policies on *Heute* were previously under attack. This is not a fact. During and after the entire controversy that ultimately led to my ouster, under circumstances that left a bad taste in many mouths, the quality of my editorship was not once called into question. On the contrary, at my departure General Clay himself wrote me: "I am very glad to state that your work with us in editing the Magazine *Heute* has been of high quality and has contributed materially to the accomplishment of our broad objective in Germany to reorient its people to a more democratic way of thinking."

This is likely to carry little weight with Mr. Blake, who attacks the whole policy of U.S. Military Government. I may add that I myself have grown bitterly critical of the Ilse Koch turn that policy has taken, though my criticism is rooted in views very different from those of Mr. Blake. Nevertheless, Mr. Blake ought to know that my editorship was the subject of repeated favorable comment in the conservative wing of the American press.

It is Mr. Blake who wins the dubious honor of being the first to attack my editorship as such. He is able to do so only by misrepresenting the editorial contents of *Heute* so grossly that the most charitable conclusion is the Mr. Blake does not read German very well.

His "analysis" of ten issues of *Heute* teems with outright errors of fact. There is no space to set forth these errors in detail. Suffice it to say that in more than a dozen instances Mr. Blake describes articles in *Heute* in terms that factually have nothing in common with the plain, unarguable text. In other instances Mr. Blake grossly distorts meanings that should have been and were apparent to every unbiased reader.

Perhaps worst of all, Mr. Blake infers that *Heute* devoted but insignificant space to the U.S., and then only to its most trivial aspects. Both quantitatively and qualitatively, the inference is unequivocally false. *Heute* gave almost 40% of its columns to significant news and features about America.

I do not think it is honest journalism, for example, to state that in a given issue the U.S. was represented by an Article

about Lily Daché, while neglecting to mention that the same issue carried an eloquent spread about the New England Town Meeting. This is but one of many similar examples. Mr. Blake fails altogether to give credit to my pioneer work on behalf of the CARE organization and in publicizing the U.S. Constitution (*New York Times*, Dec. 28, 1947).

I am proud to be called a progressive, and I think I can safely let my record on *Heute* speak for itself. The clearest evidence is that, contrary to Mr. Blake's assertion, the editorial policies I helped to set have been closely followed since I relinquished the editorship. Mr. Blake is entitled to his opinions and interpretations, but he should stick to the facts.

New York City

HEINZ NORDEN

Reply by Peter Blake

Mr. Norden in effect accuses me of two things: First, of having utterly misrepresented the editorial content and policies of *Heute*; and, secondly, of having smeared him,

1. My selection from *Heute* covered ten issues, all of them published after Byrnes' Stuttgart speech of September 1946, which marked a turning point in AMG policy. Of about 35 editorial items cited by me, Mr. Norden challenges "more than a dozen." Among them is my selection from the January 15, 1947 issue. It is quite true that this issue contained other American material in addition to the 4-page article on Lily Daché (*San Francisco skyscrapers, Katherine Dunham, etc.*). But since Mr. Norden claims that the editorial policy of *Heute* has not changed since he left, I tried to find some stories of the type that appeared in the post-Norden issue (1-12-47) which I quoted in my article. For in the weeks when Mr. Norden published a sprightly, frivolous story on women's hats, European democrats were risking their heads: in Poland, the Peasant Party was being bloodily suppressed just prior to the elections; and in Belgrade three US Embassy servants were being sentenced to death for "espionage." Today *Heute* would print that story. In January 1947 it didn't.

I wish to restate my personal impression of *Heute*: It seemed to be a kind of fortnightly PM, full of good works, full of subtle implications that, consciously or not, would lead its readers to a so-called "objective" view of the Soviet slave system, and full of picture stories that, consciously or not, would give comfort to

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946.

Of Politics, published quarterly at New York, N. Y. for October 1, 1948. State of New York County of New York, ss.

Before me, a notary public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Judy Miller, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that she is the business manager of the Politics, and that the following is, to the best of her knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily, weekly, semiweekly or triweekly newspaper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the acts of March 3, 1933, and July 2, 1946 (section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations), printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, Politics Publishing Co., 45 Astor Place, New York 3, N. Y.; Editor Dwight Macdonald, 117 E. 10 St., New York 3, N. Y.

Managing editor none; Business manager Nancy Macdonald, 117 E. 10 St., New York 3, N. Y.; Business manager Judy Miller, 242 W. 10 St., New York 14, N. Y.

2. That the owner is: Politics Publishing Co., 45 Astor Place, New York 3, N. Y. (Business owned by Dwight Macdonald, 117 E. 10 St., N. Y. 3, N. Y.)

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: none

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 9th September, 1948.

JUDY MILLER, Business Manager
HERMAN LEITNER, Notary Public
(My commission expires March 30, 1950)

the Cominform. These items were all "little sins" in themselves. Added up, over the months they amounted, I think, to a rather "big sin," a sin of omission (as shown above) as well as of commission. Underlying all the good works there was a picture of the USA as the land of huge, vulgar wealth, and of abject poverty; of sex, lack of culture, and plenty of cash—and so on. It is clever picture-editing, I suppose, to show Red Army soldiers in Potsdam (German HQ of the NKVD) fondling their baby carriages and, a few issues later, show American GIs fondling their looted Leica cameras. That is all very innocent fun if published in New York; it takes on a very different meaning in Munich. I repeat, therefore, that *Heute* was an extremely "blunt . . . democratic weapon."

2. I do not believe Mr. Norden to be a Communist, and I did not say he was. I said he had been a member of several organizations, including the ALP. Rep. Dondero who, as I indicated in my article, made these allegations, also stated that Mr. Norden had been (a) Chairman of the City-Wide Tenants' Council (apparently a CP front); (b) member of the Consumers National Federation (apparently CP dominated); (c) member, Board of Directors, N.Y. Conference for Inalienable Rights (apparently a CP front); (d) translator of books by Czech Communist F. C. Weiskopf and *National Guardian* contributor Max Werner; (e) member of apparently CP dominated Unions. None of these facts is in any way conclusive in itself. Added up, they represent a pattern which, it was my thesis, should have made Mr. Norden unfit to edit the principal US picture-propaganda organ in Germany. AMG did not think so, and that prompted my article. I have no axe to grind against Mr. Norden personally. His appointment simply happened to be an outstanding example of a mistaken policy.

Mr. Norden recalls his Army loyalty checks, but seems to have forgotten that the Navy discharged him in 1942 after two weeks of service because, according to its Bureau of Personnel, Mr. Norden "had, while in New York City, close and active association with and in behalf of groups considered to have interests inimical to those of the United States." I don't believe the Navy ever discharged a man for slum clearance.

A Correction:

Sir:

Several weeks ago. Mr. Sam Warhaftig, an official of Military Government in Germany, was returned to this country under suspicion of disloyalty, and, presumably, for a hearing in Washington. Since my article in the last issue of *POLITICS* indirectly referred to certain events within Mr. Warhaftig's sphere of activities (without mentioning Mr. Warhaftig's name), I met with him a few days ago. As a result of our conversation I feel that I should correct and clarify several statements in my article:

1. Mr. Warhaftig's position in MG was not as important as I had thought. He was merely a member, and later the head of the Elections and Political Parties Branch.

2. Mr. Warhaftig states that he not only did not select, but actually disapproved of Venedey and Mueller, and that Venedey in turn disapproved of him. He further states that, while he did persuade other Germans to serve in the Hesse Government, neither Venedey nor Mueller needed persuasion.

3. Mr. Warhaftig indicates that only part of the German Police of Hesse was under the direction of the Ministry of the Interior: The Gendarmerie, including State Troopers and Border Guards; and that it was, further, supervised not by his Branch of MG, but by the Public Safety Branch.

4. Mr. Warhaftig admits that there existed innumerable rumors and polemics against him among certain groups of Germans, but that democratic, anti-Stalinist Germans and Americans saw in him a trustworthy friend. He documented this statement with impressive proof.

5. Mr. Warhaftig knows that he has been under a loyalty investigation for over two years. He once saw eight specific charges against him, seven of which seemed far-fetched to me as he recalled them. The eighth concerned his friendship with a prominent German Communist, a relationship which seemed to me to

show an astonishingly naive attitude in a man holding an important MG post.

My feeling after my talk with Mr. Warhaftig was that I was mistaken in believing that he had a part in the pro-Stalinist MG decisions which I described. But while I was impressed by his self-avowed good intentions, I found it upsetting to know that a man with Mr. Warhaftig's political insouciance was fighting the democratic fight for us in Germany.

New York City, Feb. 12, 1949

PETER BLAKE

Editor's Footnote: Since Mr. Blake wrote the above—a copy of which he made available to the Army Loyalty Board—the Board has suspended Mr. Warhaftig without pay; he is preparing an appeal, at his own expense. I may add (1) I agree with Mr. Blake's political estimate of Mr. Warhaftig, but (2) the Army Loyalty Board's procedure was stupid and unjust: not one definite name or fact was cited in the charges, nor did the defendant have a chance to confront his accusers. Nothing, so far, has been proved one way or the other by this absurd and outrageous mock trial; it can benefit only the Communists.

Is There a Pacifist Dilemma?

Sir:

In the first part of his "dilemma" statement in the last issue of *POLITICS*, the editor seems to me to confuse considerations relating to Stalinist versus democratic ideologies and values, and considerations relating to the power struggle between Russia and the United States. The result is to give a misleading picture of the role of the USA in the power struggle and needlessly to give plausibility to the idea that war against Russia might after all be the lesser evil.

Stalinism, we are told, is the chief enemy. If this means that the values of the Judeo-Christian, democratic way of life are to be preferred to and maintained against the values in Stalinist totalitarianism, that is a correct statement and its importance can hardly be exaggerated. But even in this field it must be noted that the practice does not—fortunately—fully accord with the theory in Russia, where life does not represent unrelieved evil; and that in the Western world the practice unfortunately falls far short of the profession. Furthermore, war is the one way in which democratic and humane, or Christian, values cannot possibly be preserved.

To go on from there to say that "in the many conflicts between USA and USSR since 1945" it is the former that enlists one's preference, seems to me a non-sequitur and utterly misleading. Here we are dealing with the mores of Russia and U.S. in the power struggle and the basic fact is that they are two sides of the same coin. Neither would exist or behave in anything like its present form without the other. Over against Russian behavior in Eastern Europe, conflicts in the U.N. and so on, you can attack the American use of the atomic bomb in completely inexcusable and irresponsible fashion, the equally inexcusable and irresponsible stockpiling of such weapons, the adventure in Greece and Turkey, the taking over of the Atlantic, Pacific, Mediterranean and way stations as American lakes, the refusal to establish trusteeship in the Pacific islands, and so on. To say that one or other is, on this level, the main enemy is to utter an irrelevancy. Here the war-making, conscripting, power-state is the enemy. The fatal thing is to direct the attention of people in either nation to the militarism of the other. Each people must address itself to the destruction of its own militarism. As Lenin taught, the results which may flow therefrom will not all be pleasant but they will be verily "the lesser evil."

This leads to my only other observation. The only chance there is for averting World War III and/or the spread of totalitarianism over the world is to give the Russian people a chance to complete their revolution which in its inception was of course aimed at achieving the prophetic vision of a class-less and warless world. Negatively, it is impossible for that revolution to be accomplished under the continued threat of war and capitalist expansionism from without. This strengthens the counter-revolution. Only a non-violent people's movement which consists of people who refuse to be dupes or slaves of their own national militarism and expansionism can successfully appeal to the Rus-