

new trends ...

VOL. I., No. 7.

APRIL, 1946

FIFTEEN CENTS

Dark Currents in Russia

By GEORGE MICHEL

A GENERATION has passed since the outbreak of the Russian Revolution in March, 1917. It can no longer be argued that the judgment on that Revolution must be left to future historians. With the rapid development toward further mass destruction now going on there may be soon no historians left to draw any conclusions. But what is more important, the end of World War II finds Russia (the country in which the Revolution took place) recognized as one of the two great powers on earth — an equal to the United States, with the British Empire taking third place. This is obviously a new chapter in the history of Russia, and as this chapter opens, it is time to look back and take stock of the achievements and failures of the Revolution in Russia and the effect this greatest event of our time has had upon the rest of the world.

From Revolution to Reaction

The Russian peasantry whose mass uprising in 1917 clinched the revolution begun by sailors, soldiers and workingmen in the cities, was ready with its judgment only a few months after the Lenin seizure of power in October (November 1917). It was reported at the time that the peasants, when asked about the revolution, had this to say: the Bolsheviks are our friends but we hate the Communists. A seemingly senseless statement, it would nevertheless be difficult to improve upon this judgment today, 29 years later. The Bolshevik Party changed its name to Communist Party after the revolution. The fact escaped the illiterate peasants, but they had noted the effect. The Bolshevik revolutionaries of before the revolution had become the Communist oppressors after the revolution. This was of course not the first time in history that the oppressed of yesterday had become the new oppressors. Nor was it the first time in history that a glorious revolution was followed by an inglorious reaction. However, perhaps never before in history had the revolution itself been as profound and all-embracing as the Russian Revolution while it lasted (from March to November, 1917) and also never before in history had the reaction been as violent and destructive of the Revolution as the reaction which followed the Russian Revolution.

A fact, as clearly perceived by the peasantry of Russia for all its illiteracy, is still largely a closed book to the outside world. For outside of Russia the

vast majority of opinion on that event is unanimous in regarding the Russian Revolution which lasted six months and the Communist dictatorship which has now lasted almost 29 years as one and the same thing.

The Great "If"

As a consequence of this confusion in the "literate" world outside of Russia, the reactionary and conservative elements everywhere are opposed to the Communist dictatorship because they see in it the spirit of the Russian Revolution at work, while liberals and leftists in general are the defenders and supporters of the Russian Communist Party for the same reason. They see in any attack on the Communist Party rule in Russia an attack on the Russian Revolution whose ideals they claim to cherish. Critics of the Communist Party rule of Leninism and Stalinism in the ranks of the parties left of center can indeed be found notably among the Marxists who are social democrats, and among the liberals who support the New Deal in the United States. But this criticism rarely goes to the roots of the evil. It is a factional and impotent criticism full of Ifs: If Lenin had lived, or if Trotsky had won in his fight with Stalin, or if the Allies had not intervened in the Russian Revolution, etc. . . . It is at times a ludicrous argument advanced by anti-Stalinist Marxists. As Marxists they are, of course, devoted to the proposition that historical events are predetermined by material forces. Yet they allow

IN THIS ISSUE

<i>Dark Currents in Russia</i>	GEORGE MICHEL
<i>Food As A Political Weapon</i>	EDITORIALS
<i>Problems of Negro Migration</i>	GEORGE CREIGHTON
<i>Voices from Spain</i>	DOCUMENTS
<i>Auto Workers in Action</i>	ROSE PESOTTA
<i>De Gaulle a Prisoner</i>	PIERRE BESNARD
<i>Reveille for Mr. Alinsky</i>	J. S. WHITE
<i>Not All the Answers</i>	ERIC DUANE
<i>Letters from Holland</i>	ALBERT DE JONG

for one accident. Thus it was an accident that Stalin won in his struggle with Trotsky. Had Trotsky won, they say, the revolution which Lenin made would not have misfired.

It is most astounding, indeed, that any literate person of good will can confound the event, the Revolution itself, with the regime which the Communist Party established in Russia after the Revolution. It is astounding since the documents in the case are accessible to all without a painful journey to Russia. They are to be found in the speeches and writings of the Communists themselves, of Lenin in particular, after the seizure of power and a few weeks before that seizure, when he made himself spokesman of the Revolution by adopting the program of the Revolution as his own. This program which had evolved spontaneously among the people in revolt, as spontaneously in fact as a folk song reads as follows: "The land to the peasants, the factories to the workers, all power to the Soviets." And since such slogans are born in the process of doing only, the six months from March to November were indeed a period in which the factories were taken by the workers, the land was taken by the peasants and each village and factory was electing its own soviets or local councils for the management of their common affairs.

Adopting the Slogan

You will search all Marxian literature from 1848 to 1917 in vain for any mention of local soviets or councils to be formed by the people themselves for the management of their own affairs and as the only means of safeguarding the revolution against counter-revolution.

To the Marxist, from Karl Marx to Lenin, the only means of clinching the revolution was the seizure of the power of the state and its machinery by the Communist Party. Lenin's adoption of the slogan of the Russian Revolution was therefore for him a most radical departure from his own dogma. As a super-politician on the grand scale he saw where the tide was turning and decided to ride with the tide as the best means of being catapulted into power.

No doubt the maneuver was a resounding success. The smallest of all the revolutionary parties in Russia of Marxian persuasion was able to seize power. Had there been a national election at the time, it is even conceived that Lenin and his party would have received a majority vote. For the country wanted peace at any price, and Lenin made that his program. It wanted the land and the factories to be managed by local councils elected by the peasants and the workers on the spot, men they could trust and control at the same time, and Lenin made that his program. No doubt then that he had the confidence of the people because he had the program of the people.

Disappearance of the State

But neither can there be any doubt that he at once betrayed the confidence of the people by aban-

doning the cause and acting in accordance with his own program, the Marxian policy of seizure of the power of the state and its machinery to be controlled thereafter by him and his party alone. The state Lenin seized and its machinery was practically non-existing by the time the November revolution rolled along. For the government he overthrew was rendered powerless by the people which ruled themselves through their soviets. The army, as Lenin noted, had voted for peace with their feet. They were walking home to be in on the redistribution of the land then going on. The police dared not show itself in the streets dominated entirely by revolutionary labor. Where was the power of a government which had no army and no police and whose laws and decrees fell upon deaf ears? Where was the power of a government which was unable to oust a handful of Bolshevik party men who invaded the offices of the state and took over merely because they had decided to take over? There was no defense of the state because there was no state.

There was no state machinery which the Bolshevik party could seize, since the state had been dissolved into the soviets. Where there is no state machinery, however, it can be built up from scratch. What the people had destroyed could be reconstructed better, more powerful, more vigilant and all embracing than the Czarist regime had ever been. The building of the Communist state machinery at the same time was bound to reverse the process: the state which had dissolved into local popularly elected soviets could be reconstructed only by the abolition of the soviets. Either the slogan of the revolution: all power to the Soviets and no central all-powerful state machinery, or all power to the state and no soviets.

Rebuilding the State

Thus in the name of all power to the soviets, Lenin instead established a government where all power was concentrated into the hands of the state. In the name of the factories to the workers, the factories were nationalized and their management concentrated in the hands of the state. In the name of the land to the peasants, the land was nationalized and its management concentrated into the hands of the state. In the name of all power to the soviets, free elections in the soviets were abolished and its heads appointed by the state.

The revolution wanted one thing, the Bolshevik party wanted the opposite. The Bolshevik party won, but retained the slogan of the Revolution and proclaimed its ideals. Per force the analogy with the fate of Christianity imposes itself. The Gospel preached by the churches need only be contrasted with the action of the churches. The ideals of the Russian Revolution have become, in the hands of the state, what Christianity became in the hands of the church.

And what of the effect of the Russian Communist state upon the rest of the world? Has its example inspired the liberation of other nations as oppressed

as Russia was under the Czars? On the contrary, it set the example followed by Mussolini, Hitler, et al.

Totalitarian States Alike

What does the totalitarian state of Russia have that Germany e.g. did not have. A dictator whose word is law, a single party rule, a Gestapo or NKVD, concentration camps for real or imaginary enemies of the state, a government-directed national industry and agriculture, a mobilization of all the resources of the state, national and human, for the production of armaments and for service in the army, a foreign policy seeking the expansion of the state in the name of security, censorship of the foreign press, a government-controlled press at home, suppression of free speech, free assembly, and absolute control over education, travel and the choice of work?

Yet such is the effect of the proclaimed enmity between fascism and Bolshevism that they are conceived by a majority of people to be not only enemies but opposites. Thus if one opposes the tyranny of the Russian state, one is certain to be regarded as in league with the fascists or at least as providing ammunition for fascist guns, and if one fights the rule of nasty little Franco in Spain, one is equally certain to be treated as a communist, a Red in the pay of Moscow, an enemy of the remaining bastion of Catholic faith in the world. To be sure, the state of Germany and the state of Russia fell foul of each other, but the villain does not take on virtue by a villainous attack upon another scoundrel.

While warring on each other the two evils fully sustain each other. For this is the true story of our time since the Russian Revolution: that the fascists have grown in power by virtue of their quarrel with the Communists and that the Communists have grown fat and powerful by virtue of their proclaimed hatred for the fascists.

The Vicious Circle

This vicious circle cannot be broken by the defense of the status quo in the democratic countries built upon capitalist enterprise. It was so defended in the World War which has just ended. One of the leaders in this defense against totalitarianism, Winston Churchill, has just seen himself constrained to warn of the new war on the horizon, a war which this time would be fought to defend the democracies of the West against the totalitarianism of Russia. Churchill fought one enemy at a time. He fought German totalitarianism and accepted Russia as an ally. Any one, he said, who fights this evil thing will have all our aid. In any war against Russian totalitarianism he will have to accept likewise any one willing to fight. He will find himself an ally not only of the fraternal United States and all the English-speaking world, but also an ally of Franco Spain and almost certainly an ally of the remnants of the German totalitarian state, the Ger-

man people as a whole as well as the people of Japan who will use their alliance with democracies, to rebuild the shattered states, the fascist totalitarian states which the democracies destroyed in alliance with the Russian totalitarian state.

Where this will end, unless this vicious circle is broken, is not difficult to predict. The atomic bomb will come into general use until indeed nothing is left of organized human society upon earth or until all that is left will find itself under the rule of a single world dictator. The idealists will have their world government but a world government they never imagined or dreamed of. No, the vicious circle of mutual growth between communist and fascist totalitarianism can only be broken by a true turn of the tide. A world-wide movement for the fulfillment of the ideals for which the Russian people fought spontaneously during the six months that their revolution lasted.

More Liberty, Less Power

To resurrect these ideals one must, first of all, draw a clear line between the Revolution and the violent reaction which followed the Revolution. Not party dictatorship, not the centralized state, not the nationalized industry and agriculture of Communist Russia, but the complete decentralization of the state, the development of free local unions in the factories, and on the land the resurrection of local and regional self-government of the Russian Revolution, that must be the goal. The principle of the Russian Revolution was the proposition that production and distribution must be reorganized by free voluntary associations of producers, distributors and managers. It was applied in Russia in accordance with the local conditions prevailing there, it is just as applicable in the highly developed industrial countries of the west. Against the growing power of the centralized state, there is no defense except the creation of a mass movement opposed to the state *per se*, a mass movement which would seek to establish human liberty and economic equality by the only means by which such an ideal can be realized, to wit, by more liberty and by less power to the state.

In attacking the totalitarian states in these pages, in exposing its ruthless tyranny at home and abroad, we are defending the ideals of the Russian Revolution. One cannot serve God and Mammon, neither can one serve both the dictatorship of the Communist Party and the Russian Revolution.

LE LIBERTAIRE SEIZED

The March 5, 1946, issue of *Le Libertaire*, organ of the French Anarchist Federation, informs us that the previous number of this paper was seized by the French government which is dominated by a Socialist-Communist majority. No information was given as to why the seizure took place, except to say that *Le Libertaire* carried a truth which none of the other French newspapers dared to publish.

From Paris also comes word that the Bulgarian government has suspended the anarchist paper *Rabotnitcheska Missal*. Bulgaria is a satellite of Russia.

new trends...

A Magazine of Modern Thought and Action

Published Monthly by

NEW TRENDS ASSOCIATES, Inc.

60 East 42nd Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Telephone: VAnDerbilt 6-4185 - 4186

Subscription rates: 1 year: \$1.50. Single copies: 15 cents.

FOOD AS A POLITICAL WEAPON

WHAT is the Truman Administration really going to do about the millions who are starving in the war-ravaged countries? Why was Herbert Hoover appointed chairman of the Emergency Famine Committee? Did President Truman actually think that that appointment would be a popular one? Why was it necessary to send Hoover abroad to do a "survey" of existing hunger when a detailed report on the food need already had been made by Herbert H. Lehman, who lately resigned as UNRRA's head?

One notable recent incident in this connection was the side-swipe at Hoover in an utterance by Fiorello H. LaGuardia, in which the former Mayor indicated that he didn't expect much that would be constructive from the ex-President. Maybe LaGuardia, as the new director-general of UNRRA, will manage to push Hoover out of the picture. And perhaps the Little Flower, with his ingenuity and capacity for hitting hard, will be able to cut through the political barbed wire that surrounds the international food situation. We have our doubts about it, and it remains to be seen whether LaGuardia, in handling international relief, will act as a humanitarian or as a politician. Certainly that situation offers a sharp challenge to his integrity.

Any one who remembers the inhuman blockade that condemned vast multitudes of innocent humans in Europe to starvation and death following the Armistice of 1918 must be concerned about the question whether food will, in the Second World War, continue to be used by UNRRA officials as a political weapon, as it was by Hoover's American Relief Administration in the First World War. In past months there have been repeated bitter complaints that distribution of foodstuffs in Italy and Greece was contingent upon "straight" voting rather than upon the vital need of desperate and dying people.

Harking back to 1918-19, Walter W. Liggett, in his trenchant book, *The Rise of Herbert Hoover*, said: "Instead of lifting trade barriers and honestly trying to reconstruct Europe with all possible speed, the (Allied) Supreme Economic Council—of which Hoover was chairman—used its power to bludgeon the beaten nations into granting concessions." And in Russia, where Woodrow Wilson was carrying on an undeclared war in support of the White armies, the Supreme Council, ignoring Red Cross protests, imposed a blockade so tight that it even kept out medical supplies.

Carlo Tresca, in his last editorial utterance on the late war, published in his journal, *Il Martello*, on the day he was murdered, sounded a warning about post-war international relief.

"The capitalists," he wrote, "will have two means to 'restore order' at their disposal. One will be the use of the Allied troops present in Europe—the other the food supplies sent by America to the hungry peoples overseas. . . . The monopoly capitalists expect to use food and clothing as political weapons. What was done by Hoover in 1918 can be repeated."

Tresca, together with many others who lived through the First World War, clearly foresaw what is actually happening in Europe today.

WHEAT FOR THE FRENCH AND STARVATION FOR THE RUSSIANS

IT is reported that the first shipment of wheat from Russia has reached Marseilles. This gesture of left-handed solidarity with the hungry French population is in keeping with the Soviet policy of buying enslavement for a mess of pottage. They are now preparing, via wheat, the capture of power in France.

That Herbert Hoover excluded Russia from the list of starving countries because of its sending wheat to France, shows how little the ex-President understands starvation, although he does understand the political value of wheat.

NOT ENOUGH WHITEWASH

WHEN John L. Lewis spoke before the bituminous wage conference in Washington on March 12 he assailed the coal union owners for maintaining unsafe conditions which in the last 14 years, he declared, had resulted in the deaths of 28,000 miners and injury of 1,004,524. This was disputed by Harry M. Moses, head of the H. C. Frick Company, who contended that "only 14,615" had been killed in mine accidents and "only 646,591 injured."

That reminds us of the alibi offered by the central character in Stephen Crane's novel, *Maggie*, when she was criticized for having an accidental baby without benefit of clergy. "But it was such a very little one," she pleaded.

And Mr. Moses' attempt to whiten the record of the mine operators recalls a time when William J. Burns was breaking in a new detective. Instructed to "use some pretext" to get into a house where a crime had been committed, the fledgling sleuth stuck a motorman's badge in the band of his derby hat and went in as an electrical inspector.

When Burns heard about this, he handed the new man a copy of *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* and told him to take it home and read it. Four days later, the dumb one brought back the book. "I suppose, Mr. Burns," he said, "you mean if I took enough dope I'd be a great detective."

"There ain't that much dope," Burns answered.

And there ain't that much whitewash.

DE GAULLE—THE MODERN IRON MASK

OUR Paris correspondent's disclosures about General deGaulle are extremely important and symptomatic. The press, both in France and in this country, has kept an ominous silence on the former President's activities. This goes to confirm indirectly the story that de Gaulle is now a prisoner of state.

If our correspondent's sensational report proves to be true, we shall venture to assert that the re-introduction in France of the medieval system of *lettres de cachet* is but a prolongation, on French territory, of the bolshevik GPU methods ruthlessly carried out against internal enemies within the borders of Soviet Russia. Let us not forget the Communist GPU and the Communist prisons set up in Spain during the Civil War (1936-1939), not against the Franquists, but against the Loyalists and the anti-fascists. Let us not forget the assassination in cold blood of Professor Camillo Berneri and of Barbieri in Barcelona by the Spanish Bolsheviks; of Rein (the son of the well-known Menshevik leader R. Abramowitch) and of many other anti-fascists who were also anti-bolsheviks.

There must be a good sprinkling of communists among the fifty policemen who "guard" the General. Today they may keep guard over de Gaulle. Tomorrow it will be over French Socialists, and Anarchists and Syndicalists. The present predicament of de Gaulle is a portent of tomorrow.

NO LABOR PROTECTION IN RUSSIA

THE New York Times of April 7, 1946 prints a cable from its correspondent in Moscow quoting "Trud" (Labor), the official daily organ of the Central Council of Russian Trade Unions, saying, that "the inspector for the Central Committee of the Electrical Workers Union was forced to give orders for a temporary stoppage of work in an unidentified manufacturing plant," because of the unbearable working conditions in that plant.

That such an event — almost tantamount to a strike! — should take place in the workers' paradise is of the first magnitude. Not everything seems to be for the best in the best of the worlds and we are at a loss to guess who will get it on the knuckles — the paper that printed it, the union that gave the "close shop" order or the director of the plant who is probably a devoted member of the state party.

But why does the plant remain unidentified? Why such secrecy? Or is it all done just to show the world that public opinion does exist in Stalin's Russia?

POLITICAL ABSTENTIONISTS PRO TEM

THE recent elections in Greece have shown the Communists in a new light: they became electoral abstentionists. True, this abstentionist policy did not in the least change the results of the voting, as the Communist strength in Greece proved to be much less than 15 percent of the total elector-

ate. This, in effect, may be one of the chief reasons for the non-participating policy, so as not to give direct sign of their actual weakness. Now they can shout that the elections were carried out under British pressure (which is true) and that only 50 per cent of the electors voted, thus trying to make believe that the other half of the adult population of Greece is Communist (which is untrue).

The Greek Communists threaten today revolutionary action. They have cleared themselves for "strikes and demonstrations" by disclaiming any attachment with the present Greek Government. Their procedure is correct—not being bound to the government they are free to move in any direction they think best. We do not look to the Communists for support for our ideas, but it is not an inopportune moment to ask revolutionary Marxists why they ridiculed the abstentionist tactics of the anarcho-syndicalists.

"SETTLEMENT" IN IRAN

THE Iranian complaint against Russia was "settled" by the UN to the satisfaction of all parties concerned except the Russian government and her defenders on the radio and in the press. No one can tell now whether Russia would have moved her troops out of Iran (they are still there) without the strong pressure used by the powers through the discussion of the case at the UN. Now, however, that they are apparently moving out, after having obtained their oil concession and established a puppet government in Azerbaidjan, Russia claims that she meant to do the right thing all along. What was all the fuss about?

Perhaps the next crisis, in Trieste, in Manchuria, will be settled in the same manner. Even Hitler yielded to strong pressure. He postponed the annexation of Austria by 4 years after the first attempt misfired. The attack on Czechoslovakia, set for the spring of 1938, was postponed by six months. In the end, however, war became inevitable. History does not repeat itself, said Oscar Wilde, the historians do. Nevertheless, there is nothing more certain than that a military state with a permanent war economy, such as Soviet Russia is today, and Germany was yesterday, is bound to get itself into a war sooner or later. Russia, it is said, does not want war. But neither did Hitler and the German people want war. They wanted everyone and every country to submit to their will without war. There will indeed be no war with Russia as long as it can attain its ends without meeting any resistance. If there is a law in the behavior of states in relation with each other, it is this: that the foreign policy of any government is rigidly determined by the internal structure of the state. A government which can maintain itself at home only by the use of absolute power can maintain itself abroad only by the same method, the use of force.

Problems of Negro Migration

By GEORGE CREIGHTON

WORLD WAR I saw northern capital forced to turn from Europe to the American South as a source of labor supply for our industrial centers. Millions of Negro laborers migrated to middle-western and northern cities. In spite of inadequate housing facilities, health and welfare services our political authorities were strongly unconcerned. Their policy was one of do-nothing. Northern capitalists took the attitude that interracial antagonisms would prevent labor from presenting a common front. They were right. A series of riots resulted, beginning with that of East St. Louis in July 1917. These conflicts continued in the post-war era, some of the leaders in these upsurges being frustrated Negro soldiers who had tasted the fruits of equal treatment in France and Germany.

Southern whites played up the conflicts in the North, both to justify their own mistreatment of the Negro, and to discourage other Negroes from moving northward. These efforts were only partly successful, for the migration continued long after the industrial boom ended, though in lessened proportions.

Another migration of Negroes to the North followed in the wake of World War II. Northern communities were but little better prepared for the influx than they had been a generation earlier. Many alert Northern leaders, both white and Negro, have marvelled that there has been so little observable friction in recent months. The era of the migration is not yet in its final stages, and perhaps it is not yet too late to stimulate the process of "guided ethnic integration."

Pre-Migratory Personality Impairment

It is not difficult to point out to Northerners the more flagrant oppressions inflicted upon Southern Negroes as part of the pattern of life in the South. It is hard, however, to translate into understandable terms the mental and emotional sufferings that often result in seriously impaired personality structures of Negroes *before* they escape by migration. They are thus handicapped even before they attempt adjustment elsewhere. It is largely on account of this impairment that adequate health and welfare services must be provided and adapted to the needs of the newcomers.

Yet our states and cities almost invariably wait until there is a mushrooming of slum areas or a "crime wave" before deplorable conditions are even studied. Then, only paternalistic "relief" is given. No well-thought-out project or series of projects is ever put into action to correct the basic causes of maladjustment.

There are, of course, many conditions in Northern communities which make this section of the country far from the haven many prospective Negro mi-

grants think it to be. Recent studies, like Drake and Cayton's "Black Metropolis" (dealing with Chicago), admirably document this point. There are, nevertheless, demonstrable reasons why the North will continue to draw on the black reservoir of the South as long as Dixie holds steadfastly to its slave shibboleths.

Reasons For Migration

Like the immigrants from Europe prior to World War II, Negroes hailing from the South have come northward for a variety of reasons. Very often one parent will come and establish himself, later sending back for the rest of the family to join him. Now and then a youngster will come without much planning, in order to escape prosecution or persecution for some alleged crime. Frequently, almost a whole community is transplanted to a single northern area, including the minister, lawyer or other professional persons who will come along to service their clients. The vast majority of the migrants are, however, former farmhands, sharecroppers, domestics or laborers, who are usually seeking social and economic improvement. In the beginning, all their energies and hopes, based too frequently on an uninformed and inadequate picture of the North, are turned in the direction of escaping from a frustrating, undesirable mode of living, to an area where life promises to be richer and fuller and more rewarding in every way.

For a more complete understanding of the psychology of migration, it is perhaps just as important to know why those Negroes who remain in the South continue to stay there. In travelling below the Mason and Dixon line, the writer has asked many Negroes about their attitudes and plans regarding migration. There are many who look upon the North as some fantastic paradise where all their problems will be almost automatically solved, but a surprisingly large number correctly envisage the possibility of failure to "make a go" of life in the North. Problems in the area of personality adjustment are, however, usually passed over, which is likewise true of most laymen in any group.

Dilemma of the Uprooted

The fact that a dilemma is not recognized does not, of course, mean that the dilemma does not exist. The paramount dilemma, as this writer sees it, of a prospective migrant into an area with little or no social or economic planning, is whether the gamble with destiny, as it rightly appears to be, is worth the effort. The uprooting of people from a milieu to which they have become accustomed is a serious and potentially frustrating experience. Is it better, many Southern Negroes ask themselves, to remain in a state of subservience in the South where you know (and must accept) your inferior status, or risk a

change to what looks like Heaven, but may for any of a dozen reasons become Hell for you?

There have been times when judges, welfare workers and others in the North have seen the failure to adjust of a particular Negro, either in court or in some other unfortunate circumstances, and have remarked that it would have been better for that particular Negro to have remained in the South, where there would have been fewer demands upon him in the way of social expectation. These same officials, however, are seldom in the vanguard of those who press for diminishing the social pressures that are inflicted upon these fellow-citizens.

Vote No Factor

It is interesting to observe the continual furore that is created about the Negro and his franchise. A surprisingly large number of Negroes, both in the North and in the South, are apathetic about the use of the ballot. While some may still cling to the illusion that moving northward will afford better voting privileges and hence a chance to become a factor in politics, an increasing number is learning that economic and social redemption must be based upon a much more thorough revamping of the social and economic structure than can ever come over the hurdles of controlled ballot boxes. Failure of Congress to pass the anti-poll tax bill can therefore be practically dismissed as a factor in the migration from South to North.

By nature, the Negro, like every other ethnic group, is a lover of freedom. A study of his primitive tribal organization in Africa shows much less authoritarianism in rule than we have been led to believe. Social custom and tribal tradition usually play a much more important role in tribal life than arbitrary dictation of the "king" or "chief." What appears to be looseness or disregard of law on the part of American Negroes, living under almost impossible social and economic handicaps, is not a lack of moral sensitivity, but the Negro's spontaneous rebellion against oppressive economic and social conditions or a general protest against the seemingly hopeless position in which whites have placed him. He frequently resolves his frustration by choosing deliberately to be free of superimposed restraints.

The Negro Leader

The politicians offered no integrated plan for lifting these restraints. Democrats and Republicans—even those who pose as liberals—offer high-salaried jobs, now and then, to isolated black politicians in Northern cities. They depend on headline publicity of these jobs to keep the Negro masses quiet. The rank and file is duped into trusting these rewarded "leaders" to solve their larger problems. In the long run, the rank and file is always forgotten, and group frustration is perpetuated.

The failures of the old parties have given talking points to left-wing ideologies with authoritarian leanings. The Communist party, for instance, has tried to regiment Negroes into their disciplines. Angelo

Herndon and Richard Wright, both migrants from the South, sought a solution to their dilemmas by joining that organization. Stifled by its regimentation they soon parted company with the Communist party.

Other thinking Negro migrants from the South have sought to join hands with their colored and white brothers in the North for obtaining interrelated social objectives. Among these goals are adequate low-cost housing in place of black ghettos, fair and unbiased unionism, and education that will lead to happier community living as a right and not as privilege.

Libertarian Approach Needed

Transition from the well-known disadvantages of Southern life to the more subtle forms of discrimination in the North is a potentially upsetting experience. Adjustments made at the expense of good mental health are socially harmful. They may lead to mental illness in the individual. They often stimulate group frustrations that manifest themselves in conflict situations like the riots mentioned above. What libertarians propose is the freeing of our masses from all the frustrations that slums, industrial inequality and social inequality is bound to impose.

Ways of organizing Negro and white workers to attain these objectives must be found. Libertarian goals are clear cut, but libertarian methodology needs refining. Once that is achieved—and it must be done in cooperation with Negro workers—problems created by the influx of Southern Negro labor can be faced and solved.

GOYA'S REBEL ART LIVES ON

March 30 marked the 200th anniversary of the birth of Francisco Jose Goya, immortal artist. Some of his etchings portraying the barbarities of war, in which only the costumes are different from those in horrors of years just past, were reproduced next day with an article by Charles Poore in the *Sunday Times Magazine*.

"The broken and dispossessed who today wander through the rubble that is Hitler's legacy to Europe," Poore wrote, "are reflected in Goya's prints of the Napoleonic Wars' disasters. Hunger and terror and want stalk through his grim drawings. . . . He saw how the forces of bigotry and intolerance could lead to persecutions that crushed the lives of the persecuted and warped the lives of those who indulged in them. He drew what he saw. . . ."

"When King Ferdinand's brutal dictatorship was slowly strangling Spain after the Napoleonic Wars were over, Goya, like many other Spaniards, went into exile in France. Another dictatorship holds Spain today, throttling it in a medieval grip, and many Spaniards are in exile. It is not necessary to speculate on what Goya would have made of this new tyranny. He has expressed himself on tyrannies once and for all."

TO BUILD A NEW POSTWAR WORLD
REQUIRES NEW IDEAS, NEW METHODS,
NEW PRINCIPLES OF RECONSTRUCTION
IF YOU LIKE "NEW TRENDS . . ." GIVE
IT TO YOUR FRIENDS TO READ
MAKE THEM SUBSCRIBE TO IT

FOR A LIBERATED SPAIN

(Editor's note: As fresh developments will occur in Spain we shall endeavor to give our readers documentary evidence of the struggle for the complete destruction of Franco and his Falangist henchmen. Our last issue contained a number of documents dealing with the internal struggle within the National Confederation of Labor (CNT) on the question of close collaboration with the Spanish Government-in-Exile and with a future Republican Government within Spain.

We are printing below a further document which, although published over six months ago, is valuable insofar as it was issued inside Spain and gives the attitude of the left wing groups who have combined to overthrow Franco.

The Manifesto of the National Alliance of Democratic Forces as well as the introductory paragraphs are translated from "Solidaridad Obrera" of Mexico City where they were published in its issue of November 10, 1945.)

Voices Out of Spain

BELOW is the most recent manifesto of the National Alliance of Democratic Forces. It is the clearest expression of the men who in Spain carry on the struggle against Franco and the Falange, a permanent and systematic struggle led by the body which unites the majority of anti-fascist Spaniards under the banner of those who battle on our soil day in and day out to bring about the liberation of Spain and, with the liberation, the reconquest of the people's liberties.

The National Alliance of Democratic Forces is the only legitimate instrument of the war against the shame of Francoism. At its service we find all the forces who consider that the authentic representatives of the Spanish people are inside Spain where we also find the most solid and heroic representation of resistance.

We ourselves are at the service of the Alliance because we are certain that in carrying out the will of those who are inside Spain we are giving our support to the only way there is to achieve the liberation. Because it is there that we find the source of Spanish salvation we declare ourselves unconditional servants of this fighting organization. Created in the heart of suffering it comes forth as an implacable enemy and a decisive menace to the shame of Francoism.

In the manifesto the Alliance reveals the character of the fight against Franco's terror! it urges all Spaniards to carry out all the instructions which it may give in the future. These will at all times be in harmony with internal developments. Today there is one task, tomorrow there will be another, until the moment arrives for violent action. The Alliance declares that it can have no other object than the reconquest of the Republic, despite all the vile maneuvers of Franco to maintain himself in power and also despite all those whose intentions conflict with the real interests of the Spanish people and who would make the latter a bone of contention in and out of Spain.

There is no need for further comment. We call upon all Spaniards definitely to proclaim their subordination to the Alliance, so that in accordance with its instructions—the instructions of those who fight inside Spain—they may collaborate in the reconquest of liberty in Spain.

Text of the Manifesto

Spaniards!

The hour of our liberation has struck at last. All the political maneuvers of Franco, the electoral bluff of the Falange, all the internal and external acrobatics of the Spanish nazi-fascist state have brought forth only what it predicted it would: POTSDAM. The three chiefs of the three great powers of the world have excluded Spain, and Spain only, from the community of nations. They are preparing suitable and infallible means to liquidate the political terrorist apparatus of Franco. That is our hope, and we regret only that by the leniency of some countries this decision has been so long postponed. It is useless, therefore, for the Falangists to rack their brains in search of new tricks to maintain themselves in power a little longer. It is useless to announce restoration of the monarchy, or liberal dictatorships, or Regencies. Everything that Franco plans or does is but an expression of treason and neither Spaniards nor the outside world are willing to tolerate it.

Solution Depends On Ourselves

Spaniards!

Despite diplomatic decisions the final deeds rest with us, the anti-fascists. We have to set ourselves to the task of liberation here in Spain, Franco's terror notwithstanding. We must fight to merit aid and thus facilitate by a violent internal movement the task of diplomatic action of the democracies. The moment of resistance has arrived. It will be passive at first and violent thereafter. We must refuse to pay the imposed contributions of the Falange toward "Social Aid"; we refuse to participate in demonstrations ordered by the Falange, such as elections, fascist salutes, etc. Our violent action will increase the fear of us among the assassins and bandits of the regime. Our passivity and obedience, on the contrary, give aid and comfort to all those outside Spain who proclaim that we are fervently supporting the regime. The National Alliance of the Democratic Forces and the Alliance of the CNT-UGT will give instructions so that by successive stages we shall achieve the overthrow of the nazi-fascist regime.

Spaniards!

We must give proof of the life of our nation. Our voice must be heard and we must express our

thoughts. Spain no longer wishes to play the clown among the nations. It wants Democracy and the Republic. It will accept nothing but these two formulas which in effect are one political doctrine. We ask of all anti-fascists supreme unity and we desire that by joining us, the Republican forces, socialists and libertarians, all the leftists who are not yet with us may be united. The Alliance is prepared to overthrow the power which is now in the hands of the camarilla which misgoverns us. The Alliance is prepared to re-establish the legitimate democratic institutions. We need for the fulfilment of our task the fervent support and the most disinterested collaboration of all free democratic and revolutionary Spaniards. We have confidence in particular, that the organized masses will show sufficient discipline, not to act sporadically but to submit strictly to the instructions and orders of its national directives. We know that the Falange is armed. We know also that massacres of unarmed anti-fascist prisoners are being prepared. But we have confidence in ourselves and in the rapidity and courage with which we can confound the perfidy of those who stand without glory or nobility before us.

World On Our Side

Spaniards!

At last the world is coming around to our side. All the peoples of Europe are agitating toward social democracy, toward unrestricted liberty. The last hope of Franco is failing visibly. The British elections have shown that the British though they admire and respect the man Churchill, they condemn his politics of flirting and tolerating reactionary and fascist regimes. The triumph of the Labor Party in England is the triumph of the Spanish people and also of the free and progressive peoples of Europe. Mr. Attlee and Professor Laski have repeatedly expressed their hatred of all forms of totalitarianism. Laski in particular did so in resounding and sensational terms. He has signed the death sentence of all obsolete and monarchical fossils of Europe. The Spanish people and the Alliance of Democratic Forces speaking in its name salute the labor leaders and congratulate the British people for the clear vision which has inspired their political decisions. England will benefit by its decision as well as the people of Europe. Naturally, Franco and his Falange are now becoming labor men and we shall not be at all surprised if the *Caudillo* decides to send a telegram of congratulations to the new head of the British government.

Alert For New Spain

Spaniards!

The war is over. Our future is at stake. The anti-fascist people, the true Spanish people who desire to be masters of their own destiny, will not tolerate any kind of political blackmail which would destroy their final aim: The Republic. We know the worthless sleight-of-hand of Franco. But it is not by characters who are politically dead that crucified Spain

will be saved. Only a government on a broad anti-fascist basis, composed of the parties and organization which worked underground, can and should take in hand the direction of the state without compromise or heistation of any kind. All other solutions are artificial, condemned by the people and will not be tolerated by the anti-fascists. We must impress our opinion in the only way possible: by a national demonstration against Franco and his schemes. Be alert and wait for our instructions. The voice of Spain will be heard very soon.

Long live Democracy!

Long live the National Alliance of Democratic Forces!

Long live the Republic!

*Republican Party; Labor Party of Spain;
UGT; Libertarian Movement; CNT.*

Somewhere in Spain, September, 1945.

An Interview with Araquistain On the CNT

"*Solidaridad Obrera*" of Mexico (Nov. 10, 1945) interviewed Luis Araquistain, former Republican Ambassador of Spain at the Court of St. James, who declared:

"The National Alliance of Democratic Forces appears to me a shining jewel. Every Spanish alliance of parties and labor unions, excluding, of course, the Communists, always seemed to me a good thing; above all, if it establishes itself permanently. But this ultimate condition depends entirely on the CNT (National Conference of Labor). What will be the CNT's attitude once the Republic has been re-established? If the CNT returns to its tent and closes the cycle of its collaboration with government, what will become of the Alliance? Can it remain an effective instrument in the reconstruction of Spain?"

"You may be certain that the 1931 constitution will be radically changed. I believe we made a mistake when we created a constitution which was excessively parliamentary. We must create by the side of Parliament an organism, which I don't venture to call a Senate, the object of which would be to study all national and international problems from a technical point of view. What we call politics today must be evermore and better organized technically, putting an end to matters which are purely verbal in parliamentary traditions.

"I think that Europe is entering upon a new phase, a new experiment with various methods but which are fundamentally socialist. France, Italy and above all Germany, are prepared to open new opportunities in the life of nations.

"As regards the orientation of Spanish Republican politics, this should in my opinion be directed entirely from the interior of Spain."

"*Solidaridad Obrera*" gives these views of the Socialist leader Araquistain without comment.

Reveille for Mr. Alinsky

By J. S. WHITE

"REVEILLE for Radicals,"* is not merely a call for radicals to awake to the crisis of the times but for them to awake to new ideas and tactics so that the people—the men and women that make up America—might be awakened. For without popular participation and initiative democracy cannot live. When Mr. Alinsky speaks of democracy he does not limit his meaning to the particular form it takes in a capitalistic economy, but speaks in a fundamental sense, with the aim of evoking action from below and putting an end to the laddling out by any paternal government of favors from above. Satisfaction and meaning, he correctly points out, are obtained through personal struggle and achievement—not by the lazy receipt of handouts. The latter only lulls man into inaction, makes him the ready dupe of a scheming leader and paves the way to totalitarianism. Democratic action, participation and cooperation are the antithesis and antidote to fascism and dictatorship whose road "is paved with apathy, hopelessness, frustration, futility, and despair in the masses of the people . . . which ultimately makes them relinquish all control over their lives and turn the power over to a dictator."

Liberal Versus Radical

Mr. Alinsky clamors for action and makes a sharp distinction between the liberal and radical. The liberal, to him, is a man of words, a "well-balanced" person, impartial, coldly objective, but relatively bloodless. He pins his hopes for the creation of a better world on the radical—the man of vitality, to whom thought means action, whose partisanship on the side of right involves him in a struggle for that right. The radical is a man who likes people with not only his mind, as Mr. Alinsky contends the liberal does, but with his heart as well. The two categories thus set up and defined no doubt overlap. There are radicals who are so only intellectually and only the occasion of a crisis can prompt them to translate their thoughts into action. Would those be liberals according to our author? And there are liberals who like people with their hearts—are these then radicals? Some of the traits set forth for the liberal — impartiality, balanced thought — could well be used by the radical. The radical and liberal created by Mr. Alinsky seem to be idealized types. What he is driving at is the *creation* of a radical — a man of loving kindness, yet a tower of strength and adaptability and action. No one can have much quarrel with such a creation.

Creating People's Organizations

Endowed with these characteristics, the radical has the task of stimulating the creation of "people's organizations." This is done by the building up of

an organization formed of the various labor unions, churches, athletic clubs, nationality groups, business associations, and women's clubs in the community. This is to be done not by any legerdemain from on top—which can result in only a fictitious people's organization—but by activity from below and through "native leadership." Native leadership is grass roots leadership and cannot be found in any Who's Who or in any roster of the heads of the usual social agencies. They are discovered only through close contact with the people, for these leaders are the little Joes whom the neighborhood emulates and follows. It may be the local politician or gangster. Yet they are the powers that must be contended with and sought out if any popular and active organization is to be established. For, without the acceptance of the movement by little Joe, his friends and followers are sure not to accept. Once the native leadership does join in, then a powerful and dynamic movement is set in motion. For nothing can stop an interested and aroused popular movement. Here Mr. Alinsky strikes a bedrock of truth. No movement today can be strong and maintain itself without popular acceptance and enthusiasm. Not even in the totalitarian countries does the leadership completely forsake popular approval. Approval, even if based on lies and misrepresentation, is sought. Therefore there are elections under authentic authoritarian regimes — and these are not always as fictitious as the hatreds of fascism would prefer to believe. If one peers below the surface one can see great popular activity and acceptance of the regime. Modern propaganda can fashion people's thinking. Thus large scale activity by the people does not necessarily coincide solely with democracy.

So while Mr. Alinsky is right in maintaining the paramount necessity of creating an organization that will embody the popular will and stimulate initiative and participation, this activity is not in itself democracy nor does it embody the basic principles of the liberal tradition. These principles are not bound to our present system, though the 19th century has historically identified them so. It will be better to call them the principles of libertarianism so as to disentangle this connection and to establish them as basic human modes of living.

Question of Program

Mr. Alinsky's emphasis is nevertheless of great importance insofar as it combats the growing acceptance of the leader principle, of greater centralization and governmental control, by the exponents of the fascist right and Marxist left abetted by the liberals of the "Nation" variety. But beyond this, "Reveille for Radicals" does not give a statement of even a tentative nature as to how the "people's organization" is going to build its revolution, nor does it even hint at the functional organization that is to keep the wheels of the new society rolling. The

* "Reveille For Radicals," by Saul D. Alinsky. 228 pp. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. \$2.50.

very failure to set forth such a conception is an indication of the limited character of the author's thinking as well as the *cul-de-sac* in which he places his "people's organization." Certain questions inevitably crop up: Where are these ideas leading? Where does united action with corrupt labor leaders, corrupt politicians, nationality and church leaders, local gang leaders, take us? Neither Mr. Alinsky's enthusiasm nor the tricky exploits of his people's organizers results in a conviction that an "orderly revolution" is being carried forward. In fact, the people's organization is a somewhat close restatement of the old "popular front" which is a far cry from revolution, orderly or otherwise. And the radical organizers of the new organization (what are their ideological foundations and their program anyway?) seem, even on setting out, to be travelling the slippery ground of reformism.

Unions Counterpart of Capital

But the clearest evidence of Mr. Alinsky's failure to grasp the problem of revolution and the surest sign of the bleak dawn to which his radicals will awaken lies in his lack of comprehension of the role of the labor movement. He sees the labor unions as the reverse side of the coin of capitalism. Its counterpart is organized capital. They both stand "for a system of monopolist capitalist economy." This is true, he adds, on the part of labor with rare exceptions. He gives a number of illustrations to show the limitations, the shortsightedness, the prejudices and the selfishness of our labor unions. He finally caps his analysis with the following statement:

"The function of a labor union is first of all to bargain collectively between employers and employees. Under socialism, which would involve public ownership of the means of production, the collective bargaining would have to take place between the government (the employer) and the unions. If the government is a people's government, from the Socialist or Communist point of view, representing the working classes, the question could well be raised as to what sense there would be for the people to establish labor unions in order to protect themselves against their own government or themselves."

If the question were well raised it could be further asked why under a people's government should people with similar interests group themselves together. The only answer is: for the advancement of their interests, and legitimately so. Even a perverted Communism—Russian Bolshevism—does not deny the essential importance of an independent labor movement, no matter how the governing class there mutilates its function in practice. But the question has even more serious implications not recognized by Mr. Alinsky. For it is not enough to say that labor today adheres to a "static, segmental, narrow warped view in what they call *straight trade unionism*," or that the remedy is the creation of an over-all philosophy which sees a \$2.00 pay increase in its complex social repercussions. Labor, he continues, cannot speak for itself, nor business for itself, nor the veteran for himself, but they must all see and talk for the general interests. And so:

"If the organized labor movement cannot stretch to the broad horizon of objectives, it must then help in the building of a broad general People's Organization whose very character would involve an over-all philosophy and attack. In its simplest sense it would be the extension of the principles and practices of organized collective bargaining beyond the present confines of the factory gate. In this kind of People's Organization the organized labor movement by virtue of its popular constituency would be an essential element."

True Role of Union

This reads well, but the problem is much more fundamental. The function of the labor organizations in a socialist society is the control and management of industry by the unions or, as they are called in Europe, the syndicates. The "government" is then, not above the union, legislating for it, and "protecting" its interests, but the union is an arm of the "government" or administration itself. "Government" thus changes its very nature becoming functional and direct. For when to it is added the other basic organizations of the people — consumption, public service, agriculture — we have the people's government.

Such a "government," let us call it administration, has been historically identified with the philosophy and tactics of—a difficult word to mouth—anarcho-syndicalism. If the radicals are to awake it must be to an anarcho-syndicalist structure of society, federalist in form, cooperative and free in spirit and philosophy.

DO THEY UNDERSTAND?

The Militant, Trotskyist organ, quotes approvingly the *Air Bag*, paper of the Akron Goodrich Local 5, CIO Rubber Workers, which corrects misleading accounts published in newspapers. These papers gave credit to government conciliators for the satisfactory settlement gained by the rubber workers in their new contract. The *Air Bag* writes:

"The fact is that no governmental agency had any formal part in these negotiations. On the contrary this was an outstanding case in which the union representatives and company representatives fought it out without any outside interference or government meddling.

"We do not believe it is necessary to go through complicated governmental machinery and red tape. The results of the negotiations show that it is better to battle it out union to company directly."

A rose by any other name smells as sweet. But the above statement is syndicalistic. It places reliance upon the workers to achieve their demands through direct action. It indicates a refusal by the workers to be hoodwinked and blinded into complacency by reliance on the conciliatory ministrations of government agencies. These syndicalist tactics have too often been the target of Trotskyist (and Marxist in general) attacks for us to believe they understand the implications of the *Air Bag's* statement.

GPU IN PARIS

The NKVD (GPU) center for western Europe is Paris, capital of a country which has, at present, the strongest Communist Party outside Russia. The Communist Party of France had about 300,000 members after "liberation." It now has about 1,000,000 members and numerous ramifications in addition.

(From "The Russian State Party," newsletter on contemporary communism; April 1, 1946.)

Not All the Answers

By ERIC DUANE

WE have never seen a review of the *World Almanac*, and have often wondered why somebody didn't do one. That manual, now in its 61st year, is edited by E. Eastman Irvine, and published by the *New York World-Telegram*. The 1946 issue comprises 816 pages, and commendably contains no advertising.

No available book offers a greater mass of useful information than this for 75 cents. Yet some curious omissions are noted by one assiduous user of the *Almanac*. Likely no two persons could agree on what such a work should include. But pertinent questions come to mind for which there are no answers in its pages.

Why, for instance, does it no longer give totals of coal mine fatalities in the United States? True, coal mine disasters are listed, but these show only a small percentage of the actual deaths in those mines. Why is there no mention of Jim Crowism, of the aggressive campaign against it, nor of the fight to abolish the iniquitous poll tax in the South?

No Figures on Airplane Crashes

One reads that 3,783 persons were killed in railroad accidents in 1943, but looks in vain for figures on deaths in airplane crashes. Surely the scores of girls who train yearly for jobs as plane stewards are entitled to know what are their statistical chances of being killed when a pilot runs into a mountain in a fog! The *Almanac* does not even refer to industrial accidents.

Homicides totalled 6,690 in 1943, and arrests in that connection 4,769, but no figures are given on convictions for murder, and there were only 135 executions. The murder of Carlo Tresca, anti-totalitarian editor, still unsolved after three years, is not cited.

Counted by research workers as having large value, the Memorable Dates section strangely ignores the 1937 Memorial Day massacre of 10 steel strike pickets by Chicago police. Yet surely the staff which compiled the *Almanac* must know of the news-reel pictures of that wanton wholesale killing, so widely publicized by the LaFollette Civil Liberties Committee. Likewise the 1932 listing contains nothing about the killing of four men and wounding of many when police in Dearborn, Michigan, fired into a crowd of 4,000 seeking entrance to the Ford plant to protest against mass lay-offs.

Mr. Ford Changes His Mind

The 1946 edition went to press too early to record the point that the Ford Motor Company had recognized the United Automobile Workers and conceded a wage rise. But when the 1947 *Almanac* comes out, it should reprint an entry from the 1938 issue to show that on April 7, 1937, after a short-lived strike in his St. Louis plant, Henry Ford declared he would "never recognize any union."

For at least 11 years the *Almanac* has been printing a fantastic bit of misinformation under Fast Trips Around the World. It reports a globe-girdling journey in 1901 "by Charles Fitzmorris, Chief of Police of Chicago," in 60 days, 13 hours, 29 minutes. But when Charlie Fitzmorris made that trip he was a high school boy, who just before or just afterward also was an office boy for Hearst's *Chicago American*. He was not police chief until 1920-23. . . . Bartolomeo Vanzetti's name is misspelled. And a financial panic is dated 1908; it should be 1907.

There is no listing of the present great fortunes, nor of individuals receiving the highest salaries; no indication that Hetty Green ever lived; no mention of her daughter, Sylvia Green Wilks, now reputed to be the richest woman in the country, with an estimated fortune of \$101,000,000.

Emphasis is laid in the *Almanac* on the Four Freedoms, for which this nation supposedly fought in the recent war, but there is no reference to the great free speech fight by the Industrial Workers of the World in Spokane, Washington, in 1909-10, when 1,800 volunteer soap-boxers were jailed before the fight was won. . . . Hanging of four and life terms for two defendants in the Chicago Haymarket case are recorded, but nothing is said about Governor Altgeld of Illinois freeing those two lifers in 1893, nor of his finding that the trial was illegal, the judge prejudiced, and that the defendants had not been proven guilty.

But There Was No Plot

The *World Almanac* continues to cite as factual the supposed Negro plot to burn New York City in 1741. Yet its compilers would find, if they checked the records, that it had no more tangible basis than the Salem witchcraft delusion. Because of the false testimony of a pliable indentured servant, Mary Burton, who was paid £100 for the "evidence" she gave, 13 Negroes were burned at the stake near where the Municipal Building now stands, 18 persons were hanged, and 71 were deported.

Religious populations of the world are given, but no statistics are given on unbelievers; no indication is made of the existence anywhere of atheists, agnostics, or free-thinkers. . . . Apparently the Black Market is not spoken of, though a section is devoted to the Office of Price Administration.

In 1945 the U. S. Treasury profited on an institution that is illegal in many parts of the country. It collected \$7,556,200 in taxes on 75,562 slot machines. "In most States there are laws that bar the 'one-arm bandits,' but the federal government does not bother owners so long as they pay the \$100 tax for each machine."

Build A Libertarian Movement!
Subscribe to NEW TRENDS!

Letters from Holland

One of the best known figures in the libertarian and anti-militarist movement in pre-war Holland, Albert de Jong, writes to us on the situation in his country. We extract the following passages from two letters received from him:

"The situation here is very much similar as in the other European countries: totalitarian state in the name of Democracy and even of Socialism. On a fixed date, all the Dutchmen, whatever their age may have been on that date,—this includes, therefore, all new-born babes as well,—received from the Dutch government ten dutch florins of the new issue, while all the old notes had to be handed over to the state. The banks control everything. Workers demand a wage increase. The employers are willing to agree, but the Government puts its veto on it and . . . does not release the money. The workers want to resort to strikes. The strike funds are frozen by the banks who have been ordered by the government not to pay out any moneys to be used for strike purposes. This monetary recovery and this lifting of secrecy of banking operations is considered by Socialist idealists and other idiots as a step toward Socialism!

It goes so far that the employers exclaim: dear workingman, we are willing to pay you better wages. Why not? But we must not, because the government forbids us to do it. It is not at all our intention to make large profits; we cannot keep more than 6 per cent of such profits, — the rest is pocketed by the State. The State has thus become the direct exploiter for the sake of covering the interest on war debts, heavy expenditure on militarism and on the incredible red tape. And the State, say the Socialists,—this is the community of interests, society as a whole, which represents the general welfare. You know well this "leitmotiv," don't you?

Humanity has lost in these two wars its instinct of individuality and of freedom."

March 23, 1946

. . . The workers learned by experience during the Nazi occupation that unity without the influence of party or church politics was their only salvation. For instance, in a large metal factory in the east of Holland the leader of the Nazi Labor-Front would be scheduled to speak to the workers at 11 o'clock in the morning. At that very hour, 2,900 out of the 3,000 workers would leave the factory.

As a result of the unity, direct action and solidarity during the war tens of thousands of working men who refused to go back in the old Catholic, Protestant or Reformist organizations formed spontaneously a new organization called the "Einheids Vak Beweging" (United Labor Movement). It now has a membership of 200,000. In the face of this, it would be very unwise on our part to reorganize our own syndicalist unions. We decided to join the E.V.B. The danger for the E.V.B. lies, of course, in the presence of the Bolsheviks and of the Reform-

ists. Unity is the slogan of the day! Hence the Socialists have formed a single Labor Party with the Liberal Democrats, Christian Socialists and others. The Bolsheviks, too, are trying very hard to join this Labor Party. At present they are clamoring to have the E.V.B. join the Reformist trade unions. The danger of this is great but there is a strong opposition in the E.V.B. and our libertarian friends in it will do everything possible to prevent this kind of "unity."

In our own ranks, instead of forming a new Anarchist-Syndicalist organization we have organized a "Foundation" which is publishing a paper called "Socialisme Van Onder Op!" (Socialism from Below Up!). We hope to unite all Syndicalists, Anarchists (not individualists) and anti-militarists. We intend to write about free Socialism, education, art and so on. But our primary aim is to publish a great deal about the Anarcho-Syndicalist movement in Spain and other countries. We shall defend the theory of unity, direct action, federalism, independence from all political parties, as the true principles of the E.V.B. We shall publish *the facts* about the splits within the old Dutch trade unions by the political parties. We hope that the United Labor Front will develop into a real Syndicalist organization. But should it return to the Reformists it will only be a part of it which will do so—the others will then form an independent Syndicalist organization.

I have just organized a branch of the "Foundation" in Groningen.

ALBERT de JONG

Vishinsky Outlaws Tolerance

By JOSEPH ROSE

It was commonly accepted that the sell-out at Munich was engineered by conservatives of the worst type, reactionaries and outright supporters of Nazism. It was not merely the threats of Hitler but the similarity of viewpoints of those who were assembled at this meeting that brought about the agreements that practically gave Europe to the Nazis. The world knew it was a betrayal and men of good will began to watch with horrified eyes the death throes of pre-war (what was left of it) democratic Europe.

Tolerance Created Munich!

Comrade Vishinsky now tells us quite a different story. The sell-out on the part of those who came to visit Hitler at Munich was the result of *tolerance*! Hitler cried like a baby and Neville Chamberlain and Daladier, such exemplary, good-natured democrats, took him in their arms and petted him and very tolerantly yielded him the lollipop he so ardently desired! The working-class of France was being squeezed to death by fascist Italy, fascist (praise be to tolerance and non-intervention!) Spain and the ever-growing might of Nazi Germany. There was no plot against the people, it was only kindly *tolerance* at work! Bankers and industrialists in France, England, the United States actively support-

Auto Delegates in Action

By ROSE PESOTTA

March 30, 1946
Atlantic City, N. J.

The much publicized, turbulent, tenth annual UAW-CIO convention has come to a close. The autoworkers delegates, after having spent a hectic week in Atlantic City, have gone home with more confidence in themselves.

To newcomers in the labor movement the convention was something of a phenomenon—rarely does one have the guts at a labor conclave, these days, to stand up against the steam roller of a well-oiled machine, firmly entrenched in the saddle, controlling, through its lieutenants, a docile, complacent membership.

But the UAW is a somewhat different union. It is a youthful, vibrant, democratic organization, representing a cross-section of American workers-in-the-raw, reminiscent of the days when at labor conventions delegates representing the rank and file membership had a voice and vote, overruling even their leadership. These auto workers know that their union is dealing with the most ruthless and powerful industrialists in the world; that their elected leadership must at all times represent the needs of the members. And they acted, some of them attending a labor convention for the first time, precisely as other rank-and-file members did at labor conventions of bygone days.

Looking Backward

In order to judge these auto workers in the proper light, one must look back ten years. On April 27, 1936, the first constitutional convention of the International Automobile Workers' Union, then affiliated with the A. F. of L., was officially called to order in South Bend, Indiana. For the first time in the existence of the automotive industry 216 delegates, representing an alleged 40,000 organized auto workers, were duly seated—at the risk of losing their jobs. Several men came as non-participating observers from 'independent' unions, were suspected plants of the auto manufacturers. One of them was exposed as a Pinkerton spy.

ed Hitler because they were lovers of tolerance—not of Hitler!

And so Comrade Vishinsky, chief Soviet delegate to the UNO, attacked the recommendation of the committee on refugee problems which declared that refugees should determine for themselves whether or not they wished to return to their native lands. He introduced, then, the following amendment: "No propaganda should be permitted in refugee and displaced persons camps against the interests of the Organization of the United Nations or her members, or propaganda against returning to their native countries." The purpose of Vishinsky's amendment is to silence all criticism against the Soviet government and its satellites—express reference is made to Tito and the Polish government. His argument is rather confusing. After pointing out that freedom is limited by life itself, he says that "we are not asking that freedom of speech or propaganda should be limited. What we are asking is that the incitement which leads to the commissions of crime against the members of the United Nations be limited."

What Is Propaganda?

And what, may we ask, is the value of freedom of speech or propaganda that does not lead to action? Freedom of speech and propaganda is the

For decades the heads of the automotive industry had been sure of their undisputed position, had defied the law, disregarded common decency in human relations. Industrial spies were always planted in labor meetings to frustrate any attempts at unionization of their employees. Later some of them found ways to circumvent labor legislation, notably the NLRA, by forming company-controlled unions run by their own stooges.

And it is to the credit of those youthful pioneers of that first convention that they took up the fight against great odds, and helped to consolidate the widely scattered, struggling federal locals into an international auto workers' union. The late 30's will be remembered as the decade of Industrial Unionism in America.

Following the sit-downs staged by General Motors workers in Flint, Michigan, and other sections of the U.S.A. and Canada, the hitherto docile, brow-beaten and mercilessly exploited workers of the conveyor-belts learned that in union there is strength and they have always adamantly guarded their hard won rights. Since the first 'GM sit-downs' were staged they succeeded in penetrating the zealously guarded industrial fortresses of Ford, Chrysler and other automotive manufacturers, and in one decade grew from a mere handful to over a million organized automobile, farm implement and aircraft workers during the war.

Wages and "Salaries"

In a fight they pull no punches. A classic example of their mentality was the constitutional committee's recommendation for a per annum salary increase to the international officers — to the president, secretary-treasurer and both vice-presidents, \$1,000 a piece, and \$1,500 to each executive board member. As the chairman of the committee mentioned the office and the current salary, a collective good-natured "it's too much as is" was heard from different sections of the assemblage, but when he read of the proposed increases, louder shouts and boos went through the convention hall. Several amendments, recommendations and substitutes had been fanned in a free-for-all discussion. One earnest looking young delegate "speaking agin" admitted frankly that he could not go back to his membership with two propositions: to increase their monthly dues fifty cents, which was passed by the

democratic way of life—it is democracy's peculiar way of accomplishing things. It sets a strike for higher wages and better living conditions into motion, it may stop the movement of supplies into fascist countries, it may prevent aggression against a socialist country by its enemies. Who shall say whether these actions are crimes or incitement to crimes? We are very likely to get as many interpretations as there are members of the UNO. We are not much inclined to accept Comrade Vishinsky's interpretation.

Propaganda does not operate in a vacuum. It cannot result in any significant popular action (crime or the incitement to crime) if there are no social or economic causes for discontent. When there is such discontent the proper procedure is to do away with its causes and not to silence the propaganda which arises from it. The answer cannot be, to quote Comrade Vishinsky: "We do not want to accept tolerance. . . . We do not want such a tolerance (it enabled Hitler's armies to destroy and kill)" which, in history, is known by the name of "Munichan'."

Thus we have two falsities set before us: one, that Munich was the result of tolerance and, two, social evils are best handled by outlawing propaganda.

convention earlier in the week, and by the same token report also that he had voted an increase in their officers' salaries. This might be construed to indicate, he argued, that the dues increase had been railroaded by the convention in order to pass around the money in increases to officials, instead of replenishing their union's depleted treasury.

A considerable majority voted down the committee's report with a recommendation to postpone the matter until the 1947 convention.

Compare this action with some stereotyped pow-wows which are periodically held in place of labor conventions, where cut and dried, ready-to-vote, formulas are presented from the platform to empty chairs; it was gratifying to note that no officer in this labor union can easily misuse the membership dues. To prevent a fast one being pulled in their absence the delegates rarely left their seats.

One was much more concerned with the attitude of the rank-and-file as a whole rather than with the factional disputes which had been over-publicized in the daily press. It is a healthy sign for a union to vote down a proposition made not only by their own administration but defying even the instructions of the CIO president. That fact made the incoming officers aware that the membership was on the alert and ready to act on its own behalf.

Political issues injected by some elements were ill timed and ill advised, and went over the heads of most of those present who were unaware that a "new line" was currently in vogue and a handful of Communist Party members were trying to foist it upon the convention.

The Real Victor

Aside from the fact that the progressives scored a moral victory at this convention, the real victor, to my mind, was the quiet-spoken, efficient, shrewd, handsome George Addes, secretary-treasurer, and since 1936, undisputed boss of the union. Whereas at each annual gathering there is a contest for the presidency, never was there any aspirant for his job, all sides maintaining that he is the best and most honest secretary-treasurer of their union. I have reason to believe that the clever George Addes, who conducts the chair at the convention, so efficiently, who knows every delegate by his first name, who knows how much per capita tax each local pays, guided that convention with an iron hand and tongue in cheek. No matter who is elected president he remains secretary-treasurer, and in this strategic position is the real power behind the throne. George Addes bears watching, for he knows on what side his bread is buttered, and will always stick to the strongest faction in his union. I am confident, however, that with the alert new president and recent gains achieved through the bitter strike of General Motors, even Addes will understand that one cannot serve two masters. The auto workers set a pattern for the rest of the industrial workers in the CIO and in the AFL: for the attainment of better conditions: through direct action and armed with an understanding of economics to counteract every move by their employers.

Swapping Places

From the day this boisterous convention opened, and all through the week, most, if not all of the 2,000 delegates participated vociferously in some turbulent sessions, rarely staged nowadays at labor union conventions. Each faction made eloquent speeches from the platform of the convention floor, preceding the election of president and two vice-presidents. Both sides claimed a victory. The Walter P. Reuther group succeeded in electing him president and the R. J. Thomas group retained their defeated leader in high office as first vice-president and his man, Richard T. Leonard, as second vice-president.

A Pledge—and a Principle

The closing pledge of caution by the young, smiling and able GM union leader, president Walter P. Reuther, rung in the ears. He urged the delegates to recall the fact that

De Gaulle A Prisoner

By PIERRE BESNARD

[Editor's note: The paucity of news in the American press concerning General deGaulle would appear to give support to the sensational development reported by our French correspondent to the effect that deGaulle is being held a virtual prisoner by the French government. We have not yet received further confirmation of this story from any other source.]

Events have indeed taken an extraordinary turn since my last letter.

The resignation of General deGaulle plunged France into a very troubled situation—a situation aggravated by the fact that the General neither gave nor could give any reason for his departure. Some are inclined to believe that after his trip to Antibes he was disheartened by the dispute among his colleagues who proved incapable of bringing about any solution to the pressing food problem which was becoming more and more critical. Instead of understanding and social courage, one found political ambitions and sordid conniving, each party concerned only with shifting to the others that which was unquestionably the responsibility of all. Naturally in this game the Communists played the strongest hand, as usual, and we now have a Cabinet with a Socialist at the head, but with the Communist Party and the M.R.P. sharing power equally.

But here is where the scandal comes in. This new Cabinet, apparently fearing the former head of the government for some reason or other, confined General deGaulle at Marly (a suburb of Paris), in the old hunting lodge of the President of the Republic. Technically at liberty "under supervision," he has been nonetheless a prisoner of the government for a month and a half at the time this communication is written. All his letters are first read by the chief of the corps of policemen assigned to guard him, and, I am assured, they number at least 50. No less!

He cannot, moreover, receive his friends, not even his most intimate; Admiral d'Argenlieu had to return to Indo-China without paying his respects. A few days ago the General's brother died at Grenoble and, although the press announced that the General was to be at the funeral, he did not attend because the trip would have to be made under police guard and he would not have been allowed to speak to anyone, not even his family.

That's the situation! Except for a few individuals, nobody is aware of it. The press maintains an absolute silence on these facts and so do the party leaders. It may well be that Frenchmen will get their first news of this from abroad. Imagine the consequences when the French people do find out! . . .

* * *

As for other developments in France, things seem to be worse than ever. . . .

At present this country requires 5,580 billion francs to take care of its needs and to finance its reconstruction—and we don't even have a sou towards that amount. Foreign credits are either refused or offered under conditions which cannot be accepted. England has just informed us that it cannot make any further advances, but on the contrary, would like to receive immediate repayment of a debt of nearly 200 billion francs. The United States gov-

in 1936-1937 the only reward for their efforts to unionize the industry was a cracked skull and broken bones, while today after a long and bitter fight with General Motors the union came out stronger than ever before and determined to forge ahead to more victories. The recent strike of the GM workers proved conclusively that when a principle is involved, auto workers will stay on picket lines as long as necessary to win better conditions for themselves, and indirectly, for other workers.

ernment does not appear to be disposed to extending any significant credits at this time. Leon Blum has delayed his trip to the United States and is confined to bed by a case of "diplomatic" grippe. As for Russia, she is quite willing to give 5 million quintals of "propaganda" wheat. France is thus left to her own resources, which leaves her in quite a spot.

* * *

In the French labor movement the situation is perhaps worse. Since the meeting of the Confederal Committee last September the CGT (the French General Labor Federation) has been going through a severe crisis. Workers are so dissatisfied with their central labor organization that dues payments have fallen off at least forty per cent. Now that the Communists and Socialists have come into power, the militant workers realize that their legitimate demands as opposition elements were merely used as stepping stones by the politicians, and now they feel as though they have been completely abandoned. This was amply demonstrated in the strike of the public utility workers of Paris; and by the recent printing pressmen's strike which paralyzed all Parisian newspapers at the time of the cabinet crisis. It is interesting that this strike was called over the heads of the Printing Trades Council of the CGT and was led by our elements (anarcho-syndicalists) almost everywhere—and subsequently the elections to the Inter-union Committee of the Printing Trades provided an opportunity of getting rid of almost all the Communist officials and replacing them by syndicalists.

The arbitration of Saillant, president of the National Committee of Liberation, was overruled by the government in the person of the Communist labor minister Croizat, who refused not only to recognize the award, but declared that he would never officially approve the higher wage scales which were granted. This is how things stand now, but they will not remain that way for long and the next favorable opportunity may witness a resumption of the strike. The strike may spread to other unions and possibly the entire CGT in spite of official disapproval.

At present the CGT—or rather the Communists who control it—are feverishly preparing for the convention in April. They are "manufacturing" union locals wholesale. A case in point is the Metal Workers Union of Seine, which has just sprouted 63 new unions, which, of course, all vote alike in the Confederal Committee; and the same thing is being done in all the federations. The convention will be thoroughly oiled for the steamroller which will crush all minority elements and distort the constitution and statutes of the CGT, for the purpose of giving the Communist Party complete mastery over this organization.

The minority groups are wide awake to the potentialities of the situation and are making good progress in their *Comite de Defense Syndicaliste* (trade union defense committee) which unites opposition unionists within the CGT, and the French Syndicalist Federation, which is composed of workers who wish to break with the CGT. There appears to be an excellent chance for these two bodies to get together—and the possibility of a split from the CGT is indeed strong. What are the chances of success? I cannot say at this time, but we certainly have a large number of workers with us and I hope we will be able to establish a new *National Confederation of Labor* in France, in spite of the scepticism with which this project is viewed by our comrades abroad.

GOVERNMENT "DECEPTION"

Counsel for Henry Lustig, owner of the Longchamps restaurant chain, charges that the U. S. Government broke a promise that it would not prosecute Lustig and five others criminally for allegedly defrauding it of \$1,800,000 in income tax. The promise was made, counsel said, because the six "voluntarily" disclosed their deficiencies. We remember a St. Louis traveling man who would have been sympathetic to Lustig. Asked by a friend how he got the battered face, he said: "A woman deceived me—she told me her husband was out of town."

From Our Readers

Tucson, Arizona

Dear Sirs:

I received the February-March issue of your magazine the other day. As I find myself more and more interested in Anarcho-Syndicalism I was very glad to see that you are against collaboration with other forces. With totalitarianism staring us in the face from all sides around the world, there is only one course to pursue if we are to rid ourselves of our hated masters and that is to fight on alone. I will never subscribe to any course of action that will give me half a loaf.

As I am an American who until the past twelve years was only partially awake to the dishonesty, corruption and inequality of our present system of government one might question why I should be so aroused now. It is probably because I discovered in the Roosevelt era that I had been duped and propagandized all my life. I realized all of a sudden that everything relating to government was wrong, that the majority rule business was a fake, that the system that I had been raised up under was based on lies, inequalities and hypocrisies. The transition was complete. Now I want no more of this thing called government. I am an anarchist in the full sense of the word, but I have not known just how to go about being one.

I have no idea that this interests you. I have derived much satisfaction reading Dwight Macdonald's *Politics* and yet I am still seeking a base, if you know what I mean. Unfortunately for me I am so placed that I am at present completely out of tune with friends and associates around me, that is, they dislike my thinking. Being the conservative American type, they simply cannot understand me now.

I most assuredly do not wish to bore you with personal matters but I am coming to believe that there must be more to this thing that has so enveloped my entire line of thinking than just *reading* about it. What is the position of Anarcho-Syndicalism in our country today? What chance is there for it ever to be a success here?

I know that I am a rebel, that this is final. I think I like your magazine, although if one is to be an anarchist and true to this belief, there can be no middle ground nor any collaboration with other societies or groups. Aren't you falling over backwards giving space to those who would join up with those of totalitarian leanings no matter how innocent or necessary or expedient such a course might appear to be now? I will subscribe for a year hoping your principles are mine.

My idea, of course, is that you are either an anarchist or you are not an anarchist. It is the only form of socialism that does not require a boss to run it. I have no faith in those who say they will give the control back to the people when they get around to it. This idea is too reminiscent of Leninism and Stalinism.

Sincerely yours,

H. L. S.

NEW TRENDS . . .

60 E. 42d Street, N. Y. C.

Subscription: One Year \$1.50

Enclosed please find \$1.50 for one year's subscription to NEW TRENDS. . . .

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY ZONE

STATE