

Pm Daily

FIVE CENTS

Copyright, 1942, by Marshall Field

VOL. II - No. 220

Wednesday, April 22, 1942

Cool.

COMPLETE EDITION

THE NATION Pages 13-15

U. S. to Seize Nazi Patents

FDR and Congress today moved independently to break the grip of enemy cartels on U. S. production. The President ordered seizure of patents owned directly or indirectly by Axis nationals, and the Senate Patents Committee began considering legislation to outlaw secret cartel agreements after the war.

ABROAD Pages 18-20

United Nations Get Two Ships For One

Communique from the Far East report a Jap cruiser left "sinking," a Jap destroyer sunk and another damaged and one Australian destroyer lost.

NEW YORK Pages 20-21

Budget Aids Harlem Crime

The Secretary of the West Harlem Council of Social Agencies says the false savings in the Mayor's budget, which eliminate social services, will increase juvenile delinquency.

Does Aiding Russia Make America Red ?

Page 2

2
An Editorial by Ralph Ingersoll

Aiding Russia Does Not Make America Red . . .

"To all my other reasons to seek an understanding with Germany must be added the more compelling reason: the gigantic war Germany is waging against Bolshevism has not only widened the war but revealed its meaning."—Pierre Laval.

Pierre Laval is a very unpopular man in the U. S. A. We know all about him. He practiced his trade of selling out to the Fascists in Ethiopia; he perfected it in his native country of France. He is a suave and polished traitor, a practiced liar. In fact, Pierre Laval is such an infamous man that Americans are likely to dismiss his "case for collaboration with Germany" as simply a re-confirmation of facts long known. We are likely to think of it as simply the same old story, smelling a little ranker than usual. Or is our nose for such stories more sensitive, now that so many Americans lie dead on Bataan or at the bottom of the Atlantic, killed by the Fascists?

But if Americans dismiss Laval's statement simply because they have heard the same story before, failing to face its implications, they are avoiding an issue that has profound importance here in America. Damn Laval all you like, call the French fools for being taken in by him—but don't blind yourself to the fact that "the more compelling reason" which he gives for collaborating with Germany is a reason which still confuses many Americans. And not until we have set ourselves straight—set our hearts and our souls straight—on the issue of Bolshevism, can we afford to laugh at how Hitler and Laval fooled France. For the Germans are fooling us right here in America today on this same score.

It is not polite to say this in circles dedicated to National Unity, but the bald fact is that there still are large numbers of Americans who are so confused about the issue of Bolshevism in this war—and our relations with the Soviet Union—that it takes all their time and energy worrying about it.

It's time to face this issue squarely, as we have had to face the once delicate issue of whether we were secure enough in our faith in civil liberty to dare suppress a Fascist paper preaching violence and sedition in time of war.

To defend our alliance with Russia, to call for full partnership with Soviet Russia in the defeat of this country's mortal enemies, is not popular with liberals. Really fighting defense is left to high Government officials and military experts. Liberals speak of Russia, more often than not, with a half apology—always with a *but* of some kind, spoken or unspoken. Moreover, to speak out at all is for them to play into the hands of Martin Dies who gets money from Congress to catch Fascists and spends it smearing honest men.

PM knows well that every Fascist-line paper in the country will redouble its attack on this paper as Communist for the front page on this issue—and for this editorial. Coughlin, of course, was at it last Sunday. We are not much interested in what the Fascist-line papers say about PM. We *are* interested, however, in what Americans say to one another—and think to themselves—on this vitally important point: what about aid to Russia vis-a-vis Communism? PM is vitally interested because we believe that only the truth will save Americans in this war for survival and that the Fascists have already so obscured the truth on this point. We are afraid many Americans have missed the answer. And what a simple answer it is:

It did not make the Czarist Government of Russia a fellow traveler of democracy to be the first nation to recognize the Republic of the U. S. A. Nor did Czar Alexander II, who sold Alaska to us, thereby express his approval of the idea of commoners in the White House.

It didn't make Winston Churchill a Communist 24 hours after Russia was invaded by the Germans to announce the full military

alliance between Great Britain and Russia—and not only to announce it, but to announce it ringingly and with great warmth. Only a villain writing for fools could even make a charge so ridiculous. Did Ambassador Davies, Ambassador Steinhardt, Harry Hopkins, Averell Harriman and all the others who have seen America's interests so clearly become Communists for advocating our alliance with Russia?

Are we, for instance, made Mohammedans by sending Lend-Lease aid to Turkey? Well, Charles Coughlin accused the Administration of just that. But what do *you* think? Does it mean you want to be black because you sympathize with the Negroes' problem? Or yellow because you admire the courage and character of the Chinese?

There *is* a kind of contagion loose in the world, but you don't catch it from making a friendship against a common enemy. You catch it from shaking Hitler's hand. *There* is something for you to think about. No man has ever shaken Hitler's hand in friendship that has not been contaminated—whether he shook it physically or figuratively. Neville Chamberlain shook Hitler's hand at Munich and that was the end of him—and would have been the end of England and us if it had not been for Winston Churchill and a few men of character like him. Schuschnigg shook Hitler's hand timidly, and there was no more Austria. Men in France shook his hand and that was the end of them and their country. Sen. Wheeler began by advocating an isolation that would make Hitler victorious. He ended by Jew-baiting.

There *is* contagion loose, but it does not come from proximity to men who are dying to kill our mortal enemy.

Laval's dedication of France to the "gigantic war Germany is waging against Bolshevism" is a challenge Americans must accept. It is a challenge to America's clarity of mind, America's judgment and America's faith in itself.

For its infinitesimal part in this world struggle, PM accepts this challenge with the words that follow. We would they were more eloquent, for the need is pressing.

THE STRANGE END OF 20 YEARS

On the day that Bataan fell, many Americans died, in the jungle, where it was hot. On the same day, on the other side of the world, the Russians reported they had broken through at Orel. In war, men die when they are outnumbered and beaten. And men die when the army they belong to advances. On the day that so many Americans were dying in the heat of Bataan, Russians, too, were dying—in the cold and mud outside Orel.

This is the strange end of 20 years of history. The Russians were fighting for a nation founded by international revolutionists, which for 20 years has been advertised as democracy's enemy. Yet when they died outside Orel they were dying in the defense of this country as well as their own—against the same enemy that the same day had shot Americans in Bataan and drowned them off Norfolk.

Of the military logic of this strange circumstance, Maj. George Fielding Eliot had this to say last week:

" . . . the main task of the United States—of the United Nations in Europe this year must be to bring all possible aid to the Russian armies. The Russians bore the brunt of the fighting last year. They proved themselves soldiers of the first quality and their leaders showed ability fully equal to that of their German opponent. This year the Russian Army still remains the main fighting element of the United Nations in Europe. All other operations in Europe become, therefore, subsidiary to the Russian Front, and ought to be designed to contribute to the Russian success. This is plain, hard military logic, *though there are those in this country who appear to be unable to see the facts of the situation because of outworn prejudices and ideological niceties.* These are, nevertheless, facts upon which the whole course of this war and the future of liberty on this earth may well depend, and everyone who is interested in the future of liberty will do well to appreciate these facts while there is time to translate such appreciation into useful effort."

We will come back to the lines we have italicized. Meanwhile, what might

... Aiding Russia Can Insure the Future of Liberty

the good Major mean by the translation of "appreciation into useful effort"? PM hopes he and others will write their own inventory. As a starter we ask five provocative questions:

¶ Why isn't it an American-Russo-Anglo-Chinese War Council in Washington—instead of simply an "Anglo-American-plus-Allies" council?

¶ Why aren't the Russian General Staff and the American General Staff at work now on plans for the defense of Siberia—which, remember, is only 52 miles from American territory?

¶ Why haven't we sent American technicians to Russia to give them the benefit of every last ounce of knowledge there is in this country about how to make what it takes to defeat Hitler?

¶ Why do we—even Maj. Eliot—still talk of aid to Russia, when it would be more appropriate psychologically to call on Russia for aid to the democracies, since Russia's fight to date has been more effective than ours?

¶ Is the Russian battle line *first* on our priority list? That's where they're killing the most Nazis.

There is no satisfactory answer available for any of these questions. And yet:

It is obvious by now that to win this war requires not 10 per cent or 50 per cent or even 90 per cent co-operation with the Russians, but 100 per cent—100 per cent, all-wool-and-a-yard-wide, rock-ribbed and copper-riveted co-operation.

Our President and his Secretary of State have made that clear.

His adviser, Harry Hopkins, whom he sent to Moscow to see for himself, has made that clear.

Our most effective general has made that clear.

Two successive American Ambassadors have made that clear.

Commissions to Moscow—British as well as American—have made that clear.

The British people have understood it for many, many months. In Britain the Russian cause is as popular as MacArthur's is in Australia.

Every competent and intelligent military analyst in this country understands it.

One journalist after another, from Erskine Caldwell to Eve Curie, present company included, has registered an unequivocal opinion.

It is obvious that 100 per cent co-operation is indicated. It is equally obvious that 100 per cent co-operation has not yet been achieved.

Maj. Eliot has suggested why.

He referred to "outworn prejudices and ideological niceties."

What are they?

Why are they?

The prejudices referred to are prejudices against Communist doctrines. The only word in Maj. Eliot's broadcast with which I do not agree is the adjective *outworn*. It is obvious that the prejudice referred to is anything but outworn. It is still a tragically effective factor.

Two organizations are responsible for the prejudice in the U. S. A.

One is the Communist International.

The other is the Anti-Comintern.

It is time we understood what each of them means to us as citizens of the U. S. A. Our lives depend on it.

But first let's consider the subject of the prejudice:

The Soviet Union

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was founded by the Russian branch of the Communist International. The founders of the USSR—like the founders of all revolutionary governments—were zealous extremists. Some were great men and some were crackpots. The details of their epic struggle to organize a country of 160,000,000 people spread over an area of 8,819,791 square miles is not pertinent to this editorial.

What is pertinent is that for most of the last 20 years the Russians who grew up from Russia-in-Europe to the beaches on the Pacific were taught not conquest of the world by force, not the ramming of their doctrines down the throats of their neighbors with bayonets, but the building of their country for the greatest good of the greatest number of Russians.

Whether we feel, as Ambassador Davies feels, that the center of gravity of their society shifts steadily to the right toward ours, or whether we take the Russians' own belief, that 50 years from now they will have achieved democracy by a different route, the record of what Russia today is like is clear. Its ideology is foreign to ours, but:

It is a land of unique equality of opportunity, a land that believes in an enormous number of things that are fundamental with us—universal education, racial equality, recognition of ability on a competitive basis, patriotism.

The Russian Government indorsed President Roosevelt's and Winston Churchill's Four Freedoms, the Atlantic Charter.

It is in business to stay.

It is not necessary to approve of anything you don't understand or like in

Soviet Russia—any more than it is necessary for the Russians to approve or like any phenomena in our lives—in order to accept the proposition that, whatever it once was, Russia today is not a country whose prime purpose is to revolutionize the world. Russia's prime purpose is to look after the Russians—which today means killing Nazis and tomorrow will mean rebuilding their devastated country.

No objective American who has met or gotten to know the heads of the Russian Government, however much he disagreed with their politics, has failed to respect their sincerity as well as their ability. They are dedicated to the improvement of the lot of their people as respected leaders of any nation must be. No objective American has visited Russia or studied the situation impartially but has come back with the overwhelming conviction that the Russian people believe in themselves, their country and their leadership. Nor is it necessary even to rely on this testimony—for no country whose leaders were not sincere and able and whose people had not supreme confidence in them could have withstood the impact of the German war machine in 1941—when, never forget, the Russians lost most of their military equipment and much of their most productive territory.

On the subject of the Soviet Union, the most authoritative textbook by an American and for Americans is Ambassador Joseph E. Davies's *Mission to Moscow*. It is *absolute must* reading—in fact I do not think this statement too strong: no American has a right to an opinion on contemporary Soviet-American relations until he has read this book.

Read in *Mission to Moscow* how conspicuous the role of the Communist International has been in Russo-American affairs—how conspicuous by its absence. Ex-Ambassador Davies is shrewd, well informed—and conservative. The case of one wing of the radical movement, ever since Trotsky's exile from the Soviet Union, bears the same witness from an opposite point of view: after they've done playing with bugaboos, their case against the Soviet always boils down to the charge that Stalin abandoned the world revolution in favor of developing Russia along nationalistic lines.

So much for the country that was founded by a branch of the Communist International. The role of the Communist International in Russian affairs, then, is obviously not what is responsible for America's prejudice against Communism. What is set down above is only of importance in a direct consideration of Russia as a military ally. We are not, after all, talking about *marrying the Russians*. We're talking about a working partnership with them. The "prejudices and the ideological niceties" that have affected and still affect our judgment must concern matters closer to home.

The Communists in America

Let us turn to the record of the Communist International in America.

America gave the world a revolutionary doctrine 165 years ago. That was in 1775. Not until 1918 did America get one back. For 143 years, American revolutionary principles—the democratic doctrines of our forefathers—had been spreading over the world, overthrowing or curtailing the power of one royal house after another. In 1918, an America grown conservative got the first dose of its own medicine. The success of the Communist International in Russia began to interest Americans in Marxism, the doctrine on which the Communist International was founded.

The precise history of the movement is somewhat obscure—because of some confusion in terminology and the factionalism that seems always to accompany revolutionary movements—but some time in the 1920s, on the foundations of older radical labor movements, the structure of the American Communist Party was erected. Just as dreams based on American parliamentary democracy spread over the world following our successful revolution, dreams based on Marxist Socialism spread over the world following the successful revolution in Russia.

That was approximately 20 years ago. Putting Charles Coughlin's and Herbert Hoover's opinions aside, what actually happened during those 20 years?

At the end of 20 years of propagandizing, the American branch of the Communist International could boast of around 100,000 members. By the theory of their revolutionary organization, each one of these members was expected to be peculiarly effective—so that this handful is not an accurate measure of the Communists' success. What is the measure? Success of a political party can be measured by:

¶ Its representatives in key places.

¶ Its mass following.

After 20 years' work, the Communists in America have elected no President, have placed no members in the Cabinet, have elected no Senators. In Congress there has been an occasional individual the line of whose politics has identified him with the Communist Party. Such cases have been very rare exceptions. In this inventory I am being harshly realistic about who is a Communist and who isn't, crediting the Communists with any public figure whose political line has followed, jog for jog, curlicue for curlicue, the announced political line of the Party itself. Neither Communists nor clearly identified fellow travelers have ever controlled important committees in Congress or a State Legislature, or even a City Council.

So much for key places. Now as to mass following. Communists have

MORE →

CONTINUED

Editorial

never won an election that amounted to anything on their own. Not in the whole 20 years of their proselytizing.

In the trade union field the three largest and most powerful national union groups are the AFL, CIO and the Railway Brotherhoods. The Communists control none of these organizations. The most powerful single figure in labor has for many years been John L. Lewis. John L. Lewis has often sought to be all things to all labor men, but the record is now crystal clear: John L. Lewis is no Communist.

Go down the line and you come to locals in the labor movement. There are about 40,000,000 wage earners in the United States, of whom 11,000,000 are members of unions. The maximum under the influence of Communist leadership would subject less than a million to their influence. Not the most zealous witch-hunters would accuse very many of these workmen of being Communists. They are simply members of unions whose leaders are sympathetic to the Communist line. The Communists have not been able to control even this small minority—they could not, for instance, persuade it to vote against Roosevelt in the last election.

So this is the highwater mark of the Communist movement in this country:

It has failed dismally and consistently in politics.

It has never achieved mass support.

So the plain, common garden truth of the matter is that Communism is not and never has been a menace to this country. The American people rejected Communism long before most of its present enemies began attacking it.

Why, then, are the "prejudices and the ideologic niceties" which surround Communism so effective in this country? It is not as mysterious as you think. The reason is as clear as the above facts.

The Anti-Comintern

The Anti-Comintern with its doctrine of Fascism came into our lives later than the promises of International Communism. The Anti-Comintern's promise to the western democracies was security from Communism. No later than last week the Rome and Berlin radios, defending Charles Coughlin, were still talking about it. For almost 10 years the Anti-Comintern has been promising us security from the Communists. And what we got from the Anti-Comintern was a war to annihilate not Communism, but us.

Hitler talked for eight years about destroying the "godless Russians." In 1939 he had an absolutely free choice of whom to attack. He could attack "godless Russia"—or he could attack England and France. He made his choice. His choice was to destroy not "godless Russia" but God-fearing England and France. He has destroyed France. That he has not destroyed England is not, after all, his fault.

It is now just as obvious as the above facts that the Anti-Comintern has been, is now, and so long as it exists always will be, a racket.

Here is how Ambassador Winant's predecessor at Geneva* put it:

"Long before Germany possessed an army and an air force he [Hitler] had won a resounding victory by persuading the wealthy in many countries that he alone stood between Europe and Bolshevism. He did it in Germany, he did it in France, he even did it to some extent in Britain. The majority of foreigners, including a considerable number of influential Englishmen . . . were obsessed by the Red bogey. They cheered Hitler's diatribes against Stalin and his henchmen, and naively looked on him as the savior of Western civilization."

The Anti-Comintern was, and still is, a racket.

The word *racket* is used in the precise American meaning. The American gangster made a racket of the peace-loving shopkeepers' fear of violence—to blackmail him first into paying tribute and finally into handing over his business. By means of the Anti-Comintern, Hitler made a racket of America's fear of the alien doctrine of Communism—playing, on us, the same trick he played on the Europe he has since conquered.

There was never any reason for us to be afraid of being swept out of our churches and our legislatures by the Communists. Yet, when Fascist doctrine first reached this country, Americans had lost just enough confidence in themselves—as a result of the depression—to be vulnerable to Hitler's blackmail.

This is the true picture of the America of our times:

America was healthy enough to withstand the doctrines of Communism—which would have us abandon parliamentary democracy for totalitarian Socialism—

America was just weak enough to catch a dose of Fascism.

Fascism in America

I have set down an inventory of what the Communists were able to accomplish after 20 years of proselytizing in this country.

Here is a partial inventory of what the Fascists have been able to accomplish in less than 10 years of proselytizing in this country.

Using the same standards by which the above inventory of Communism

*Harold Beresford Butler, Deputy Director of the International Labor Office at Geneva from 1920 to 1932—in his book *The Lost Peace*.

was made—not confining my list of Fascists to registered foreign agents but including men who have openly advocated Fascist doctrines—Fascism in America has gained:

No President, but—

Important Senators.

A whole bloc of Congressmen.

The control of important committees in Congress.

At least one pure Fascist Governor—Huey Long.

All criminal racketeers—who believe in rule by blackmail and force—are native American Fascists. That element of the labor movement that Mr. Pegler loves to bathe in—the crooked racketeering element that is so often in collusion with corrupt politicians and employes—has always been the Anti-Comintern's natural ally.

Charles Coughlin has done his best to make it appear that one of the most powerful and best loved religions in this country is on Hitler's side. He has not succeeded—but that is not because he did not try. There was one period in his career when shrewd observers estimated that he could have outdrawn Franklin D. Roosevelt if they opened up rival shows on opposite street corners.

The Communists in America have always been poor. Their professionals lead the lives of threadbare missionaries. The Fascists in America have never lacked for money. They have had the support of powerful industrialists. They have had the Nation's once most popular aviator as an ally—Charles A. Lindbergh—and the man already listed as America's most dynamic labor leader—John L. Lewis.

The richly financed, ably administered America First Committee, whose officers included many of our most respected citizens—did the Anti-Comintern's work well, organizing for England's defeat and trying to keep us so weak and confused that we could not, would not be able to fight for our lives when the time came.

The seeds of Communism fell on barren soil in this country. The seeds of Fascism fell on rich soil. Let the moralists explain how it came about; I am here concerned only with the end results, with the present facts which explain the present prejudice against co-operating with Russia.

I believe this prejudice is founded not on fact but on hoax.

The American people have been maliciously and purposely sold a bill of goods by the agents of the Anti-Comintern and by the Anti-Comintern's sympathizers in this country.

America has a faith and purpose of its own. It can be true to this faith and continue to pursue this purpose only if it remains a free country in control of its destiny—in other words, if it is allowed to live.

America has no interest in the political faith of the Russians. The people of this country have made that abundantly clear in the last 20 years. But the point of collaboration with the Soviet Union against the Axis is this: the Soviet Union wants us to live; the Axis has sworn that as a nation we shall die.

As for my own point of view on collaboration, I am not a Russian and never want to be. I admire the Russians greatly, even envy them some things. But theirs is not only an alien land, it is a land with an alien political philosophy. I did not become a Russian when I went to Russia any more than I became an Englishman when I went to England. But if I have faith in the future of no other country than America, and if I never want to live anywhere but in America, and if America is the only country for which I would work and risk dying—even though all these things are true—still I am not a fool. And only a fool would base his patriotism on such hatred of any other country that no matter how friendly an alien country might be, or in what dire distress his own, he would rather die than accept a foreigner's help.

There are other considerations which are not unimportant. One is this: the total war for survival in which we are engaged is between men who have faith in the common people and men who have no faith but would order the lives of common people to satisfy their own selfish desires.

Completely different as are the ideologies of America and Russia, both are countries founded on faith in the future of the common people. We go about fulfilling the destiny of the common man in wholly different ways. We have wholly different backgrounds, culture and geography. But we share the faith that neither bloodlines nor vested interests, but a healthier and better educated "common" people will best solve the problems we leave to our children.

There are not the right words to describe this division of the world into social philosophies—*democracy* doesn't do it, for neither Russia, nor China, nor England is a democracy as Americans still dream their own shall be. But there is nevertheless that division between the cynics and those who have faith, and our three great allies are all on our side of that imaginary line.

The British keep their King and Queen in considerable style, scores of millions of Chinese have never cast a vote for anything and the Russians are so single-minded that they cannot even understand what we mean by respect for a minority opinion. But all three states, each in its own way, are built on faith in the common people and believe in the justice and wisdom of universal education. All seek to achieve a workable equality of opportunity.

However we differ about how to insure the greatest good for the greatest number—and the four of us differ plenty—that is our common end and that is what we are all fighting for: our right to pursue this end undisturbed. Those who have told you that the Russian Government has any other objective—for instance, that its leaders are the kind of racketeers that run Germany and Italy—are plain or fancy liars. Russia has been in business for over 20 years. What it

CONTINUED

Editorial

has done with these 20 years is there for anyone to see. It is a country run for the benefit of the common people—to feed and clothe and educate them.

We in America, who need strong friends as never before in our history, can thank God the Russians are there—and that they have held out the hand of friendship to us. The man who denies that is America's enemy.

What has happened is that our unjustified fears of Communism in this country, our lack of faith in our democratic principles, have been preyed upon until fear of the Communists has become almost a national obsession. If we do not get over it, it is an obsession of which this democracy will die—as other countries in Europe died of the same obsession artificially inspired by the same source—not the alien Communist International but the enemy Anti-Comintern.

This is a strange irony of 20 years of history in this country:

The American Communist Party, that threatened revolution, ends up trying to crawl back into the good graces of America by supporting the Government as zealously as it once tried to undermine it.

The Anti-Comintern, that promised us protection from revolution, has now undertaken our total destruction—not only the destruction of our armies on the far shores and our ships on the high seas, but destruction of our Government at home.

These are the cold facts America must face—and as Maj. Eliot said, "while there is still time to translate understanding into useful effort." For it is America's still imperfect understanding of these facts that stands between the full military alliance, the full partnership of two great independent countries as equals.

To say Americans have nothing to fear from the Russians is an understatement so fantastic it is ridiculous. Americans have not merely nothing to fear from the Russians; they have—again I quote Maj. Eliot: the future of liberty to win. As no two great people in the world's history ever needed each other before, the Americans and Russians need each other—along with the British and the Chinese. The sum total of our strength is not so great that we can sacrifice one iota of it to indulge "outworn prejudices and ideological niceties"—let alone lose our most effective ally for prejudice and niceties which are enemy-inspired and nurtured.

We Americans have written and said to ourselves many times that the mask is off Hitler. But so long as we stop short of the last full measure of alliance with Russia to save the world from Fascism, Hitler has a right to chuckle. So long as those American prejudices remain uncorrected, so long as they are allowed to block total collaboration with Russia—Hitler is still fooling us.

That is what Pierre Laval had to say to us.

— RALPH INGERSOLL



RALPH INGERSOLL, Editor; JOHN P. LEWIS, Managing Editor; RAE O. WEIMER, VOLTA TORREY, Assistant Managing Editors; LOUIS KRONENBERGER, Theaters; JOHN T. McMANUS, Films; JAMES T. HOWARD, City; ALEXANDER UHL, Foreign-National; KENNETH G. CRAWFORD, Washington Bureau; WESLEY PRICE, Picture Magazine; RUSSELL COUNTRYMAN, Art; WILLIAM BAUMRUCKER, JR., Business Manager; ROBERT A. MILLER, Treasurer; JAMES H. McGOWAN Production Manager; HARRY C. HOLDEN, Subscription Manager; HARRY FELDMAN, Circulator; VIRGINIA SCHOALES, T. M. CLELAND, BARBARA GRAVES, Assistants to Publisher.

PM receives the full 24-hour leased wire of THE UNITED PRESS.

Owned and published daily, Monday to Friday inclusive (National Edition, Tuesday to Saturday inclusive) by Marshall Field doing business as The Newspaper PM. PM's Weekly (PM's Sunday edition) on sale Saturday evening. Offices: 147 West 42d St., New York, N. Y.; 27 Sixth Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. (Address all communications here except letters concerning mail subscriptions, which should be addressed to HARRY C. HOLDEN, Subscription Manager, P. O. Box 81, Times Square Station, New York, N. Y.); Telephone: Circulation, TRIangle 5-8025; News and Business Office, STerling 3-2501. Entered as second-class matter June 18, 1940, at post office at New York, N. Y., under Act of March 8, 1879. Back numbers may be obtained from the Back Numbers Dept., PM, 24 Johnson St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Subscription Rate—By Mail, including Postage; United States, Possessions and Territories: Canadian and foreign rates on request. Single copies in U. S. A.: daily, 5 cents; PM's Weekly, 10 cents.

	One Year	6 months	3 months	1 month
Daily and Sunday	\$14.00	\$7.25	\$3.90	\$1.50
Daily only	10.00	5.25	2.75	1.00
Sunday only (PM's Weekly)	4.50	2.35	1.25	—

