

This copy for PSU Library

original

PEMBROKE STATE UNIVERSITY

PEMBROKE, NORTH CAROLINA

THE LITERATURE OF THE THIRTIES

English 456

Submitted by:

Jean A. Hammond
Jean A. Hammond

January 4, 1971

Professor:

Norman Macleod
Norman Macleod

Note:

*This copy was not annotated
after photo copies were made*

THE LITERATURE OF THE THIRTIES

Crawling on hands and knees through empty streets
To doors that seem familiar, there to weep.
While one unconscious twisted knuckle beats
For succor, for compassion and for sleep,
He rends the silence with a final cry
To which the stubborn night makes no reply.

Drums of the world, beat!
beat a loud call for war against this madness!
let the workers storm from the factories,
the peasants from the farm;
sweep the earth clean of this nightmare,
build new cities, a new world,
ringing with the clear voices of new men!

In this poem by Joseph Freeman, an editor of the New Masses, we can hear the cry of so many people in the decade of the thirties, a period of extreme social consciousness that was reflected in much of the literature expressive of that age. Why was this a period of revolt? Where did it all begin and how did it end? None of these questions can be answered completely, but there are guidelines that point to the answers. The ways in which this literature can be interpreted are numerous, but the general themes remain stable--the depression, the rise of the left, and the abundance of proletarian literature.

I believe the decade to be one of great importance, for out of its struggles have come many of the issues of our present day. Although the age did not solve our social problems in America, it did bring the issues into the open to be examined from all angles. This in itself is good, for progress in the direction of social improvement cannot be made until there is a willingness to face the problems squarely and openly.

I believe that the thirties was the period when this action was begun on a broad basis. To understand the basic events and patterns of this era, one must take a comprehensive look at the past.

Shortly after the turn of the century, there can be seen a gradual turning in the direction of pessimism. On the surface this pessimism is not obviously evident, but among an emerging group of intellectuals who began to be heard around 1910, there began the first sounds that were to express the attitudes of the stormy future. Then came the first severe blow, World War I, but pessimism was not yet completely characteristic of the intelligentsia. Writers found much to glorify and to sing about in that war. But there was still the small voice of warning that was sounded by some, among these some of the best writers of the day. Nevertheless, on the surface, things could not have appeared more gay and prosperous than they did in the 1920's. Very few people listened to the voice of writers such as T. S. Eliot, who spoke of "spiritual dryness" in his poem "The Waste Land." Despite the outward signs of health, there was decay underneath.

Many have placed the blame for the sensuality of the '20's on the advancement of science. Of particular significance to this generation

was the Freudian concept of the id, ego, and superego. Some people interpreted this theory as a justification for the alleviation of responsibility for their personal conduct, thereby allowing them to indulge themselves in sensual pleasures. But "while the rich were getting richer, the poor were getting poorer."

Meanwhile the groups of intellectuals who had been gathering in the urban centers had been discussing and debating their ideas, many of them

new or revolutionary. According to the authors of a recent study, these "intellectuals were in revolt against conservative artistic codes and nineteenth-century morals."² And they began to express themselves in strong phrases in such magazines as The Masses and Seven Arts. Before the war, they had hoped to remake society, but after the war they seemed to give up hope; and many of them alienated themselves from American society.

The words of Gertrude Stein that were quoted by Hemingway in his novel The Sun Also Rises seem to sum up the general feeling among many of the intellectuals of the day: "We are all a lost generation."³ To show the extent to which man's greed for material wealth had gone in the '20's, Barton, a writer who published a book during the decade entitled The Man Nobody Knows, undertook to set up a sort of doctrine of the divine right of business in his biography of Jesus as a master salesman."⁴

Norman Macleod expressed well the greed of the wealthy at the dawn of the thirties in his poem "Love Song":

A right romantic picture for slobs
pasty pulp for vulgarians
who revel in their exhibition dreams
the luxuries of money.
give them this day their daily
nightdream of bodylusts and wonders.
a lady for each mannikin
who pays his tribute
to the money gods and all their
modern minions.⁵

And yet, most of the leaders of the country would not recognize the deteriorating state of the country's economy. In his last address to Congress in 1928, Calvin Coolidge spoke with firm optimism about the nation's future. And even as the economy headed toward a crash, President Hoover "refused to admit publicly the gravity of the situation."⁶ After

the crash, he tried to blame foreign events. Hoover's reaction was like that of an ostrich; he refused to recognize the truth, and even as late as February, 1931, he said, "Nobody is actually starving. The hobo^as, for example, are better fed than they have ever been."⁷

But the gravity of the situation was seen and expressed by many writers of the day. Not only ~~were~~ the lower classes of the nation suffering, but in a poem by Alfred Hayes the plight of many white collar workers is described:

Here bitter with myself I sit
Holding the ashes of their prompted lies.
What shall we do? Turn on the gas?
Jump a bridge? Boxcar west?
It's all the same there's nothing anywhere.⁸

But the poem does not end on this note of despair. Something has to give. The silent will not remain in their state of apathy:

We shall not sit forever here and wait.
We shall not sit forever here and rot.
The agencies are filing cards of hate.⁹

The hypocrisy of the ruling class was not to go uncondemned.

The depression was felt in every area of the country. Erskine Caldwell jolted the reader into an awareness of the reality of the times in his Masses of Men ~~as~~ ^a he describes the dilemma of the wife of a laborer who has died. In vivid phrases, Caldwell describes their plight of no heat in freezing weather and the starvation of the little children. To keep her children from starving just one more day, the mother "sells" her daughter, who is almost ten, to a man who is willing to give her a quarter.

And in the Middle West, Meridel Le Sueur described the situation of the farmer. Some of her phrases bring to mind the plight of the Joads that is described in Steinbeck's unforgettable novel The Grapes of Wrath. In her words, "No one went outdoors. They all shut themselves up as if

some terrific crisis, some horrible massacre, were about to occur."¹⁰
 And they wait as the drought gradually spreads its vast destruction over the land. And then the dust begins to blow as hunger sets in. "There was something terrifying about this visible sign of disaster. It went into your nostrils so you couldn't breathe: the smell of hunger. It made you count your ribs with terror. You don't starve in America."¹¹

So many of the farmers moved westward, believing that there was hope and a better future waiting for them; but in reading fiction of that kind, we can begin to understand what happened to the dreams of thousands of "Okies." In California they did not escape hunger. Steinbeck's observations about squatter's camps in California revealed much of the bare truth. "It is often said that no one starves in the United States, yet in Santa Clara County last year five babies were certified by the local coroner to have died of 'malnutrition' the modern word for starvation, and the less shocking word, although in its connotation it is perhaps more horrible since [it indicates that the suffering has been long drawn out]."¹²

And if the hungry did not move on by choice, they were driven out by force because they could not pay their debts:

Rich man took my home and he drove me from my door
 And I ain't got no home in this world anymore.¹³

Even those Americans who lived abroad felt the suffering of the Great Depression. In a conference with Norman Macleod, writer and editor of several magazines during the period, I was told of a friend of Macleod's, Leigh Hoffman, who had worked for the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune, published in France, and who had been a contributor to Transition (Paris). Macleod visited Hoffman while in France, and discovered that Hoffman, ~~had~~ lost his job and was unable to get money. Later, Macleod heard that Hoffman, who was much distressed over his predicament

and was unwilling to return to America, had committed suicide.

Could such widespread distress continue without resulting in revolt from the masses? As Alfred Hayes suggested in his poem, hate and anger were beginning to stir the people. The fear that had gripped the nation was gradually turning toward a more dangerous and violent expression. The exploited and starving people had begun to realize that their only hope lay in organization; so they began to organize in the National Miners Union and in the United Mine Workers of the A. F. of L. Strikes became common. But the law on the side of big business did everything it could to obstruct the organizing of labor unions. "Shooting by deputy sheriffs in self-defense, jailing without charge, refusal of trial by jury, torture and beating by night riders"¹⁴ these are only a few samples of the kinds of repressive measures used by the oppressors against the organizers.

"State police were very brutal on the whole" were the words used by Norman Macleod to describe the situation in the early part of 1931. He was on the scene at New York City Hall where a group of starving people had organized to plead for help. Macleod saw the Mounted Police attack the crowd, and he heard the scream of one man as he tried to explain that he was not a part of the group, but was merely a business man just passing through. But they continued to beat him with nightsticks. A man in the cigar store where Macleod was watching said, "Looks like we're going to have a revolution if something isn't done." Said Macleod, "it was only a demonstration but the police made a riot out of it--on hungry people."¹⁵

Macleod also told of an assignment that he was given to investigate the coal strike in Pennsylvania. He wrote a report about it for the New Masses entitled "Coal Glows Red." In a conference ~~with~~ Macleod, ~~he~~ described some of the conditions that he found. People were starving and many of them were living off the scraps that the farmers had been giving

to the pigs. When the reporter asked a small child who was suffering from pellagra if he ever got any milk, he discovered, to his amazement, that the child did not know what milk was.

In the spring of 1932 approximately fifteen thousand unemployed war veterans went to Washington to support a bill that was being brought before Congress that would lend them aid. When the bill failed to pass, funds were given to them for their trip home. Five thousand went, and the rest were evacuated with tear gas and bayonets. Fiorello La Guardia suggested to the President a better solution: "Soup is cheaper than tear bombs and bread and butter than bullets in maintaining law and order in these times of depression, unemployment, and hunger."¹⁶

The people had turned to the government only to have, in most cases, "ashes" thrown into their faces. Where could they turn to for the help that was needed so desperately? "The only radical organization that would listen to the people was the Communist Party."¹⁷ The hope of the people was expressed in this poem written by Norman Macleod entitled "Song of the Masses":

The bodies of machines are black
dark as the reach of a race from Africa
but the future of communistic industry
is a sun to light the world,
and whether the skins of men be white
or black, the song of the masses
in the gloom is a ruddy glow.¹⁸

It soon became apparent that many forces were struggling against each other in America. But the two that were most often on the lips of the people were Fascism and Communism. As Eric Severeid, reporter at the scene, watched the police shoot at a group of unarmed pickets who were trying to stop a scab truck, he wrote, "Suddenly I understood deep in my bones and blood what Fascism was."¹⁹ It seemed to many of the people who were being

harassed that America was becoming a Fascist state, and the solution to their problems seemed to them to be answered in the leftist movement. Now the important question asked was, "Which side are you on?"

The move toward the left was seen most clearly in the literature that was written during the decade. Not all of the writers leaned to the left at the beginning of the period, but a great number of them did, including Sherwood Anderson, John Dos Passos, Lincoln Steffens and Edmund Wilson. In an article by Tillie Lerner intitled "The Strike,"¹⁹ the sentiment shown toward the Communists is seen. When speaking of a member of the party, she describes him as one "who without thanks or request came daily to the Embarcadero to sell his fellow workers hot soup to warm their bellies."²⁰

Sympathy for the Communist Party was expressed even more strongly in a novel written during the period by Richard Wright. In his book the cold hard facts concerning the plight of Negro Americans at this time are made brutally clear to the reader. In Native Son the only people who show any genuine social concern or compassion are Communists. The novel was written in such a way that the reader could not help but feel the Communists to be the champions of the underprivileged. Richard Wright at this time was himself an active member of the Communist Party.

One of the most popular and effective pieces of literature written during the decade was a play by Clifford Odets, Waiting For Lefty. Harold Clurman wrote in The Fervent Years that "When the audience at the end of the play responded to the militant question from the stage: 'Well what is the answer?' with a spontaneous roar of 'Strike! Strike!' it was something more than a tribute to the play's effectiveness, more even than a testimony of the audience's hunger for constructive social action. It was the birth cry of the thirties."²¹ This play expresses the prevalent attitude of the people who were swinging to the left. Moscow was the idealistic center of

the world to them, and many of the writers of the period went there to live and to work, among them Norman Macleod.

Proletarian became the name attached to the literature of the period. Articles were written explaining the kinds of proletarian writings. One such article which appeared in the June, 1930, issue of New Masses was "On Proletarian Poetry" by Norman Macleod, himself a writer of proletarian literature. He divided the poetry into two types; "that which is satiric and intended to demolish that which exists, and that which builds constructively with a worker's ideology irrespective of other values." He expressed the opinion that the latter kind should be emphasized.

According to the editors of Years of Protest, "Proletarian literature was undoubtedly the most distinctive literary form of the thirties; but paradoxically, no one seemed to know exactly what it was."²² But one thing was understandable; it was no coincidence that proletarian literature flourished along with the growth of the Communist Party. It was literature of a social nature that concerned the working class, and it was used as a weapon. It was no longer art for art's sake. Some of the writing, therefore, became lifeless and lacked any literary merit; it was merely a form of propaganda to be used to further the cause of the revolution. But all of it was not bad, for many good writers, some previously noted, used their skills during this period. But the question of what was good art did cause much heated debate. Especially during the latter half of the decade, tension among writers developed more strongly.

For one thing, the hopes that had been raised were beginning to diminish somewhat. The hope for the realization of an ideal society that had been envisioned by many leftist writers was destroyed for many of them during the Moscow Purge Trials. Many expatriate writers left Russia to return to America. Macleod stated that this was the real

beginning of his disillusionment with the Communist Party; many of the other writers felt the same. Another event also caused people to lose faith in the Communist movement. Fascism was spreading like a plague all over Europe, and in Spain civil war had broken out. The fight against war and Fascism was a cause to which many writers could give allegiance, and men such as Stephen Spender, Christopher Caudwell and Ernest Hemingway did just that. But when the Communist Party refused to aid adequately or unselfishly in the fight against Fascism, many writers broke off any associations they had had with the communist movement. Here again was the age-old theme of unkept promises and the human tendency to teach one thing and practice another. This did not mean that the communist movement in America came to a screeching halt, but it did announce the beginning of the end. I think the feeling was captured best in the words of Richard Wright, who had been a staunch member of the Communist Party: "I remember the stories I had written, the stories in which I assigned a role of honor and glory to the Communist Party and I was glad that they were down in black and white, were finished. For I know in my heart that I should never be able to feel with that simple sharpness about life, should never again express such passionate hope, should never again make so total a commitment of faith."²³

Of primary importance during this time also were the controversies among the writers and intellectuals. According to Jack Salzman, it all began when Michael Gold attacked Thornton Wilder in an article published in The New Republic. He accused Wilder of being the poet of the "genteel bourgeoisie." Gold, who believed that art should be a weapon, accused Wilder's works of lacking in significance and purpose. In reality, Gold was attacking Humanism. Thus the war began over the issue of what role art should play in society. As proletarian art began to take precedence, the

writers who found themselves at odds with it were highly criticized and often ostracized. One of the arguments that helped point up this fact concerned William Carlos Williams. The dispute was about some articles that Williams wrote for the Partisan Review and New Masses. Williams first sent some of his work to the Trotskyite periodical, Partisan Review, at the office of which it was held for a time. Then an article appeared in New Masses which stated that Williams was listed as contributor to Partisan Review but that Williams denied the fact that he had made any contribution to the magazine. After writing to Williams, one editor of Partisan Review was told by the poet of Paterson, New Jersey: "I found the New Masses violently opposed to you on political grounds, so much so that they refused to print me if I remained a contributor to Partisan Review. I made my choice in their favor."²⁴ So the editors of Partisan Review replied as follows: "In its efforts to stifle independent left-wing expression, the New Masses has so far been signally unsuccessful. The Williams episode is its first triumph... These are the tactics of the underworld."²⁵

Other writers and magazines came under attack from the extreme left for failing to meet the standards of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers set at the Kharkov Conference. One such magazine was Front, of which Norman Macleod was American editor. In "Whose Front?: An Open Letter to the Editors and Publishers of Front," Morris Helfand accuses the magazine of being "definitely unfavorable from the point of view of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers..."²⁶ The editors were accused of not clearly stating their editorial and political position. Macleod was accused of printing too much material from the bourgeois faction. Furthermore,

"Whose Front?" stated, "It is to be hoped that the John Reed Club will point out to Macleod his errors as one of the editors of Front. Does he himself realize how dangerous his position is?"²⁷ Macleod said that some of this criticism was unwarranted. In a conference with him, he stated that "the European editor, Sonja Prins, decided what went into the magazine."²⁸

Another big argument was started over James T. Farrell's A Note on Literary Criticism published in 1936. Farrell was an influential contributor ^{to} [and critic ^{for} of the Partisan Review. That was where the argument started-- in the pages of Partisan Review--(the argument between Partisan Review and New Masses which I discussed earlier). Farrell's main contention was that "most Marxist critics, including those of New Masses did not understand dialectical materialism."²⁹ Farrell quoted the words of Engels to stress his point that many Marxist writers were failing to use the theory of Marxism properly. Engels said, "And I cannot exempt many of the more recent 'Marxists' from this reproach, for the most wonderful rubbish has been produced from this quarter too."³⁰

An article by Isidor Schneider accused Farrell of not using the Marxist method at all. V. F. Calverton and Granville Hicks sided with Schneider, and Edmund Wilson and Alan Calmer came to Farrell's aid.

Partisan Review, the Trotskyite magazine which was involved in all this heated discussion, is a good example of how the attitude of many writers had changed toward the Communist Party. It first began publication [as an organ of the John Reed Club of New York City in 1934. The next year it disassociated itself from the club at the orders of the party and was being edited by young Communists who planned to use revolutionary literature and Marxist criticism as a weapon in defense of the Trotsky position. But in 1936 the magazine merged with The Anvil. Then the

magazine stopped publication for a time. In December, 1937, publication of the magazine ~~was~~ resumed, but its editorial position seemed ambiguous. The editors claimed to be aware of their responsibility to the revolutionary movement, but stated, "We disclaim obligation to any of its organized political expressions. Indeed, we think that the cause of revolutionary literature is best served by a policy of no commitments to any political party."³¹ The editors of the Partisan Review had, from the beginning, been rather liberal. Now they were engaged in a quiet feud with New Masses, and as time passed, the quarrel became loud and clear.

I believe that this very spirit of free speech and press is one of the things that kept the left movement from becoming the dominant force in America. Writers were able to air their views and to agree or disagree in public. Consequently, they were able to argue the issues, pro and con, for literate people to consider. The Moscow Trials were, I think, the death blow to the movement, for men were able to see that the idealism of the Communist Manifesto was not so idealistic in actual practice. The fallibility of human nature seemingly was present in all societies.

The statement I have just made reflects the thinking of Henry Miller, a writer who was violently opposed to proletarian ideas. During the decade, he remained in Paris claiming to be liberated from the United States of America. Partly because of his rejection of leftist esthetics, he was ignored during this period, but it was during this time that he wrote his best works. He believed in individual freedom and responsibility. He felt this to be necessary to the survival of the artist, for he said, "If we want to lead a creative life it is absolutely just that we should be responsible for our own destiny,"³² and furthermore, if things are to be ideal as man desires it, "The whole damned universe has to be taken apart, brick

by brick, and reconstructed. Every atom has to be rearranged."³²

Another ardent voice in the opposition was that of E. E. Cummings, who visited Russia, and then published a harsh attack on the Soviet system. But at the same time, he was also criticizing the capitalistic forces on the grounds that it also destroyed the individual.

Neither did Robinson Jeffers want to be associated with either system. Consequently, by the mid-thirties his popularity began to wane. His philosophy which was asocial in a decade that was very social made him an outsider. In one of his poems "Night Without Sleep," he attacked the power structure in America by observing: "The greatest civilization that has ever existed builds itself higher towers on breaking foundations."³³

If these three men remained individualists throughout the period, it can be said of Archibald MacLeish that he started as one. He was fiercely attacked by the leftst writers because he believed that the true artist must remain aloof from politics and society. In "Invocation to a Social Muse" he asserts that "There is nothing worse for our trade than to be in style/ He that goes naked goes further at last than another."³⁴ But later, MacLeish felt that Fascism had to be stopped; so he wrote Panic, an anti-Fascist work. Then he was highly praised by the left, but he never allied himself with the communist movement.

William Carlos Williams and Henry Roth can be placed in the category of the unusual. Both were sympathetic toward the leftist movement and wrote much to try to further its cause, but both "were unable to keep their art within the framework of a proletarian literature."³⁵ Williams tried very hard to do so, but his talent overran the bounds of the proletarian mold. His story "The Dawn of Another Day" is typical of his well-intended, but "confused" attempt to stay within the mold. Maybe it is to his advantage

that his writing was of this nature because Williams is increasing in popularity in the present age.

And sharing somewhat the views of Williams is William Saroyan, who was also sympathetic to the cause of the left but, unlike Williams, did not try to force his writing into the proletarian mold. Rather he maintained his own separate way. His sympathies did not detract from his individualism, [and his refusal to accept a Pulitzer Prize shows how firmly he held to his ideals concerning art.

I have mentioned a few of the magazines that were published during the period, but I think that a more detailed discussion of them would prove enlightening. The little magazines, later called by some editors "advance guard," did not begin in the thirties but go back to the turn of the century. It was in those early magazines that the movement toward the left began, in periodicals such as The Masses, The Liberator, and Mother Earth. "The real distinction between left-wing magazines before 1930 and those of the thirties seemed to be this: in the early years, the accent was upon criticism of, and the need for, reform within the capitalist system; after the financial crash, left-wingers gained the confidence of hundreds of writers, and magazines spoke forthrightly of revolution."³⁶ The thirties were considered the "active" period, for at this time intellectuals adopted the left-wing ideas and actively promoted them as an alternative to capitalism. The little magazines are the primary sources in which this new literature can be found.

Little magazines were not very profitable because their audience was small. They gave to many writers their first chance to have material printed. It is interesting to note that they can truly be called advance guard, for many now famous authors' works such as those of Faulkner,

Hemingway and Eliot were first printed in advance guard magazines. To be more explicit, "A little magazine is a magazine designed to print artistic work which for reasons of commercial expediency is not acceptable to the money-minded periodicals or presses."³⁷ A variety of personalities *edited and* contributed to them, including such men as Ezra Pound, called a Fascist by many, William Carlos Williams, Norman Macleod, Eugene Jolas and Ernest J. Walsh. Most of the contributors were unhappy with things as they were and revolted against trying to write to suit the tastes of the public.

The authors of The Little Magazine, A History and a Bibliography expressed the trend of the literature: "For the most part writers concentrated upon the task of picturing the disgusting lives of the oppressor and the distressing lives of the oppressed. For example, the magazine, The Left gave space to the young writers who were underlining in their poems and stories the courage of the worker and the evil of his 'owner': Jack Conroy, Norman Macleod, Albert Halper and S. Funaroff."³⁸

But there was often debate about how extreme these should be. Should they print everything that is ugly or true to life? Much of the disagreement among writers and editors was over this point; how far could radicalism go and still retain some degree of literary honesty? There were some who felt that the little magazines went to the extreme, as I have pointed out earlier in this paper.

Norman Macleod, editor and writer, who at the beginning of the decade believed that the left offered the answer to the social problems of America, had his own opinion. He said, "The little magazine has a place which cannot be filled by the 'bourgeois commercial publications.' Its role is to report the decay of capitalism (in its finest expression) and the growth of the literature of the revolutionary proletariat."³⁹ Like so many other writers and editors, it is interesting to note how the

Moscow Purge Trials did much to dampen this strong spirit of hope seen in Macleod. ^{fe}One of the first to reject the popular leftist ideas, Macleod later wrote a novel called You Get What You Ask For, which defined his rejection of communism. "Though the radical magazine perhaps represents the strongest characteristics of the time, it was by no means alone in the literary world. Most interesting of all is the little magazine which tried to remain impartial and tolerant of varying ideologies in a time when one ideology made unceasing demands upon the writers' conscience."⁴⁰ Many of these were editors who felt that capitalism was not working but neither did communism have the solution to our problems. There seemed to be no answer.

But much good did come out of the age. Something very interesting that developed because of the little magazines that will make it easier for future critics was the coming of age of American literary criticism. In many instances, literary criticism was written by writers who had themselves contributed to the magazines. This made it possible for readers, in a sense, to watch them grow. Among the notable writers who also wrote criticism were Ezra Pound, Henry Miller, Norman Macleod and William Carlos Williams.

Much more could be said about the advance guard magazines, but I think that it is sufficient to say that the literature of the period was encouraged and often published for the first time in the little magazines. It is within their covers that the story of the thirties is told.

Many critics have underestimated the decade of the thirties, ~~it~~ ^{but it} should not be so, for I believe that the period was necessary to the progress of literature and society as it has developed to the present day. Although it might be true that a vast portion of it spoke only to the age

itself, much of it still speaks to our present condition. It gave critics a wider scope and posed a question that had been asked throughout the ages and must continue to be asked in each age.

I also feel that the freedom of the press and the ideas that were expressed through these magazines served as a kind of release from the tensions of a society that might have otherwise destroyed itself had there been no outlet. Surely the age added to mankind's knowledge in his search for truth. The thirties did not come up with all of the answers, but the age can be given credit for seeking to do something about the condition of the post-world-war-~~one~~^{the} generation and the writers of the twenties as described by Gertrude Stein when she told Ernest Hemingway: "We are all a lost generation." The writers of the thirties dedicated themselves to the purpose of seeking solutions that would help to solve the problem of man's inhumanity to man.

FOOTNOTES

¹Joseph Freeman, from "Four Poems," Years of Protest (New York, 1967), pp. 356-358.

²John D. Hicks, George E. Mowry and Robert E. Burke, The American Nation (Boston, 1965), p. 518.

³Jonathan Daniels, The Time Between the Wars (Garden City, New York, 1966), p. 137.

⁴The Time Between the Wars, p. 136.

⁵New Masses (June, 1930), included in the personal papers of Norman Macleod.

⁶Years of Protest, p. 11.

⁷Years of Protest, p. 10.

⁸Years of Protest, p. 17.

⁹Years of Protest, p. 18.

¹⁰Meridel Le Sueur, from "Cows and Horses Are Hungry," Years of Protest, (New York, 1967), p. 69.

¹¹Years of Protest, p. 63.

¹²John Steinbeck, from "Dubious Battle in California," Years of Protest, p. 69.

¹³Woody Guthrie, from "I Ain't Got No Home," Years of Protest, p. 74.

¹⁴John Steinbeck, from "Dubious Battle in California," Years of Protest, p. 70.

¹⁵Private Conference with Norman Macleod, October 15, 1970.

¹⁶Salzman and Wallenstein, eds., Years of Protest, p. 86.

¹⁷Conference with Norman Macleod, July 27, 1970.

¹⁸New Masses (June, 1930), included in the personal papers of Norman Macleod.

(Footnotes continued)

¹⁹Salzman and Wallenstein, eds., Years of Protest (New York, 1967), p. 87.

²⁰Years of Protest, p. 143.

²¹Years of Protest, p. 156.

²²Years of Protest, P. 309.

²³Richard Wright, The God That Failed, quoted in Years of Protest, p. 354.

²⁴Years of Protest, p. 296.

²⁵Years of Protest, p. 297.

²⁶Literature of the World Revolutions, 1931, No. 1-5, (New York, 1970), p. 115.

²⁷Literature of the World Revolutions, pp. 130 & 133.

²⁸Conference with Norman Macleod, August 10, 1970.

²⁹Salzman and Wallenstein, eds., Years of Protest (New York, 1967), p. 276.

³⁰James T. Farrell, from A Note on Literary Criticism, Years of Protest (New York, 1967) p. 276.

³¹Quoted from the editors of Partisan Review, Years of Protest, p. 294.

³²Henry Miller, from The Cosmological Eye, Years of Protest, pp. 381-383.

³³Robinson Jeffers, from "Night Without Sleep," Years of Protest, p. 387.

³⁴Salzman and Wallenstein, eds., Years of Protest (New York, 1967), p. 240.

³⁵Years of Protest, p. 377.

³⁶Frederick J. Hoffman, Charles Allen and Carolyn F. Ulrich, The Little Magazine, A History and a Bibliography (New Jersey, 1947), p. 149.

³⁷The Little Magazine, A History and a Bibliography, p. 2.

³⁸The Little Magazine, A History and a Bibliography, pp. 157-158.

(Footnotes continued)

³⁹The Little Magazine, A History and a Bibliography, pp. 162-163.

⁴⁰Conference with Norman Macleod, August 3, 1970.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Contact: An American Quarterly Review. 1. (February, 1932).

Daniels, Jonathan. The Time Between the Wars. New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1966.

Halpert, Stephen, and Richard Johns. A Return to Paganry. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Hicks, John D., George E. Mowry and Robert E. Burke. The American Nation. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965.

Hoffman, Frederick J., Charles Allen, and Carolyn F. Ulrich. The Little Magazine, A History and a Bibliography. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947.

Hound and Horn. 7. No. 1 (Oct.-Dec., 1932).

Literature of the World Revolution. 1931. New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1970.

MacLeod, Norman. Conferences: July 20, July 27, August 3, August 10, & October 15, 1970.

MacLeod, Norman. Thanksgiving Before November. New York: Parnassus Press, 1936.

New Masses. June, 1930.

Paganry, A Native Quarterly. 1, 1930. ~~Reprint by~~ New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1966.

Salzman, Jack, and Barry Wallenstein. Years of Protest. New York: Western Publishing Co., 1967.

The Sewanee Review. 44 & 45, 1931. New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1966.

Steinbeck, John. The Grapes of Wrath. 1939. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1969.

Wright, Richard. Native Son. New York: Harper & Row, 1940.