

a specific issue involving the lives and rights of existing men—as in the recent case of the Trenton Six—they are not to be found in the lists. They abandon such earthy matters to organizations designated “subversive” by the attorney-general, meanwhile engaging their own energies in the production of spirited manifestos in support of the status quo antebellum, which is the furthestmost limit of their aspirations.

The self-conscious label “non-Communist left,” indicating more what the worshippers are not than what they are, is naturally reflected in cult policy. Any serious examination of the sacred writings of the “non-Communist left” reveals that it has, in fact, become the “non-anti-fascist left.” Its collective zeal is expended not in being “non-Communist” but in a fight waged almost exclusively against Communists. The difference is not subtle. It transforms the whole spirit of the movement. Its dogma has become nine parts anti-Communism to one part anti-Toryism, or anti-reaction, or—comically enough—anti-anything but fascism. For fascism in the dirty word of the sect: it must not be used because it has been willed out of existence.

During a period when Communists, real or alleged or only suspected, are being prosecuted everywhere for their thoughts and speech and never for their acts, the “non-Communist left” has invoked a unique attack upon all who protest such obvious violations of civil rights. “Would you,” they demand, “protest so loudly if the victims were fascists?”—thus beclouding the fact that except for the fascist Terminiello, who was freed by the Supreme Court on the grounds that his right of free speech had been violated, there is no single instance in the country today of a fascist being haled before any tribunal to account for his thought or speech, or even being seriously prosecuted for the commission of such actual crimes as lynching, flogging and arson. By equating Communism with fascism they bring to mind that other “non-Communist left” which on May 17, 1933 gave a unanimous vote of confidence to Hitler’s foreign policy—and four weeks later found itself outlawed by the policy it had endorsed.

The New Liberals are fondest of citing the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact of August 23, 1939 as authority for a doctrine formerly subscribed to only by Mr. William Randolph Hearst and his peers. But search through their holy writings as you may, you will find no mention of the French-Italian agreement of January 7, 1935; the Anglo-Nazi Naval treaty of June 18, 1935; the British-Italian accord of April 16, 1938; the Munich pact of September 29, 1938; the Anglo-Nazi non-aggression pact of September 30, 1938; or the French-Nazi non-aggression pact of December 6, 1938—all of which preceded and considerably affected the one pact they cherish and recall.