

# new trends ...

VOL. I., No. 4.

JANUARY, 1946

FIFTEEN CENTS

Owing to an epidemic of the grippe, a serious delay in the issue of our December number compelled us to call this number our January, 1946, issue. Our

readers will be compensated by a 32-page February issue, more of which will be found in our first editorial on page two.

## U. S. A. Beats a Retreat

By George Michel

AT THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE just ended Russia has carried the day with flying colors. The US and Britain have ceded all along the line. On the point of French and Chinese participation in the making of the peace treaties as well as on all other points on which no agreement was reached at London, Russia allowed Byrnes and Bevin little more than a thin veil of compromise not enough to hide the loss of face.

France and China are henceforth excluded as policy makers, though (and this is the thin veil) they will be allowed to comment on agreements reached by the Big Three. Though the Western Allies had announced firmly that they would recognize the government of the liberated and defeated countries only if popularly elected by the people, Tito's government is now recognized as the government of Yugoslavia. Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson has announced that the governments of Rumania and Bulgaria will similarly be recognized "as soon as treaties have been concluded with these governments." This statement raises the fine point as to how a treaty can be concluded with governments which are not yet recognized. According to Ambassador Harriman in Moscow, Stalin instructed Molotov to break off the London Conference because Mr. Byrnes would not consent to Russian participation in the government of Japan. Today, it is clear that Byrnes has ceded on that point as well. From now on Russia will be part of the policy making control commission on Japan. General MacArthur retains his veto power with regard to administrative questions. This latter veil is the thinnest of all, since it makes no sense whatever.

The pattern of the post-war world (2nd installment) is now perfectly clear. Stalin's Russia is being appeased by the Western democracies exactly as Germany was being appeased until Hitler marched into Poland, and for exactly the same reason: the alternative is war.

Let's look at the record. In the summer of 1939 Russia demanded from Britain and France that they consent to Russian absorption of the Baltic states as a price for Russian participation in the war on Germany. Britain and France refused and Russia concluded the famous non-aggression pact with Germany in August 1939 for the partition of Poland. Russian armies occupied the Baltic states

after the defeat of Poland in 1939 and waged war on Finland for a strip of her territory.

When Germany attacked Russia in 1941, Russia consented to a strong and independent Poland in exchange for Allied aid (American lend-lease). Poland is now occupied by the Russian army and ruled by a Russian puppet regime.

### The Yalta Promise

At Yalta, Russia likewise agreed to joint Allied administration of the Balkan countries and pledged herself to permit free and popular elections in all of them. Instead, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania are now ruled by Russian puppet governments. Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Austria continue to enjoy a twilight existence of independence. For how long? To all of this Russia now has the consent of the Western Allies. But even before such consent was formally attained Russia proceeded to the attack upon countries with which she has not been at war. Iran, which served the cause of all the Allies well, and particularly the Russian cause, being one of the principal supply routes for lend-lease to Russia, has already been robbed of part of her territory. In the familiar style of the Goebbels propaganda organs, the ground is being prepared by

(Continued on Page 5)

### IN THIS ISSUE

*USA Beats a Retreat*.....GEORGE MICHEL

*Science as Political Weapon*.....A. S.

*Pius XII Talks Politics*

AND OTHER EDITORIALS

*White Man's Dilemma*.....JOHN NICHOLAS BEFFEL

*Italy on the March*.....LETTER FROM MILAN

*Origin of Libertarian Thought in America*

RUDOLF ROCKER

*Fascism in China*.....LETTER FROM YUNNAN

*The Tresca Case Rebounds*.....ERIC DUANE

*Comments on Contemporaries*

# 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.

## "NEW TRENDS" AND SPAIN

FRANCO Spain is again in the public eye. Fresh sentences of death, on the one side, new proposals as to how to oust Franco, on the other. The first will not stop the underground ferment which will finally undermine the Falangist regime. The second will not frighten Franco, who knows the valuelessness and the innocuousness of the political game.

We draw the attention of our readers to the double 32-page number of "New Trends," which will appear around February 1st, 1946. It will be especially devoted to the Spanish situation, with particular reference to the Spanish people's struggle within Spain and to the redistribution of forces which may bring about not only the final downfall of Franco, but a revival of the spirit which made it possible for the Spanish people to undertake, in the years of civil war, between 1936 and 1939, the social reconstruction of their country on a libertarian basis.

## FACT FINDING

THE BACKBONE of the UAW strike in the GM plants is being deliberately broken by the Administration. The fact-finding body set up by President Truman has been snubbed by GM, and no "acts" will be found to support the strikers' demands. This is just what was wanted by the Administration. This is just what the UAW should have avoided.

Trade unions still have the idea that the intervention of a government may be desirable and may avert strikes. The employers know better. No government can afford to align against it the industrial machine which in its eyes is responsible for the country's richness. "Fact finding" is but a shield to cover up the "objectiveness" of the Administration in deciding against the strikers.

## "THE WAVE OF PROSPERITY"

THE YEAR 1946 finds United States industry well on the way to completion of its reconversion process. The war has increased the total production capacity of American industry at least threefold over that of 1939 in most industries, and in some the productive plant is many times larger. Industry will have to meet an unprecedented demand for consumer and durable goods. The demand for housing alone as a result of the pre-war depression and the almost total standstill during the war

years is great enough to keep the building industry fully occupied for 10 years.

A boom is thus almost inevitable and unless new methods are developed to keep the economy on an even keel, a financial crisis and an economic depression must follow the "wave of prosperity" as it did after the "prosperity" of the 1920's. Before the crash of 1929 with its world wide repercussions economic theories regarded the business cycle with the detached calm of the man in the ivory tower. "All economic depressions," said they, "are maladjustments which adjust themselves in the long run." But, said Maynard Keynes: "in the long run we are all dead." The time to avert a depression is not when it comes upon us but before the "wave of prosperity" has hit its stride. *The time is now.*

## "FREE" ELECTIONS

THE AUSTRIAN ELECTIONS have brought about a most curious situation. The results gave to the reactionary [pseudo-democratic] People's Party about 1,600,000 votes; to the Socialist Party—about 1,430,000 votes and to the Communist Party a mere 147,000. This, in spite of the fact that the Russians are occupying the city of Vienna and a great part of Austria.

Was it Machiavellian astuteness on the part of the Kremlin agents? After all, it matters little if elections are "free," so long as the "red" occupants remain and *govern!* Meanwhile, the world will see how democratic the Moscovite totalitarian regime can be. What an example to the British in Greece!

The not too far off future will show what these "free" elections will bring to Austrian freedom.

## FRANCE COMES TO THE AID OF SPAIN

IN OUR NOVEMBER ISSUE we published an appeal to all our readers to write to their Congressmen protesting against the threatened execution of Catala, a labor leader, and governor of the province of Cuenca during the civil war. Catala's life has been saved. But neither he nor his comrades who were accused of subversive activities are free. The usual thirty years in prison have been meted out to most of the accused. They will not be free nor will the countless thousands be saved who are habitually executed in the prisons of Spain without the benefit of trial and publicity as long as Francisco Franco remains in power.

France, more directly menaced by a hostile Spain than either Britain or the United States, has taken the initiative. In a note as yet unpublished France asked the United States and Britain to enter into conversations with her on a common policy against Franco Spain. Some commentators have noted that Russia was not asked to participate. The assumption was that Russia, having no diplomatic relations with Francisco Franco, could not be invited to break relations with him. But that is not the reason why she was not invited to participate at the conference. The French government, better informed than the

leftist press in this country, knows that there is not only no communist movement in Spain, but that Spanish revolutionary labor has no wish to fight once again on two fronts: against Franco and against a communist fifth column bent upon imposing a communist party dictatorship in exchange for the dictatorship of the Falange.

But the French invitation, although accepted by both Great Britain and the U.S.A., will be far from lending a helping hand to the Spanish people. On the very contrary, a deal will be made by which, upon the insistence of the two invited governments, the Soviet government will also be a party to any future decision about Franco, and the Giral government-in-exile will be asked to include the Spanish Communists. Or else. . . .

### STATE DEPARTMENT TRIES TO LEARN

**B**Y THE WAY, that Spanish Republican Government-in-exile has its spokesmen in this country. But when our State Department wishes to discuss the Spanish situation, it invites the Communist stooge number one, and Dean Acheson, acting Secretary of State, who has already shown his hand in China where he was playing the Communist game, received Dr. Juan Negrin, whom nobody wants in Spain, but with whom he discussed the Spanish situation. The State Department is accused by some of being a Fascist hotbed, and by others of sheltering Communist agents.

Whether it's one or the other—the State Department upholds but one policy: that of totalitarianism all the world over as the main plank for its foreign policy.

### THE POPE'S POLITICAL VIEWS

**T**HE VATICAN—smallest temporal state and most powerful spiritual dictatorship for the last twenty centuries—has had its say on the dangers of dictatorship and of totalitarianism.

In his Christmas Eve speech to the Catholic World, Pope Pius XII attempted to indicate “the fundamental moral prerequisites of a true and lasting peace.” He stressed the need of foregoing “the artificial creation, through the power of wealth, of arbitrary censorship, onesided judgments and false assertions, of a so-called public opinion. . .” He opposed the tyranny of the totalitarian states and apostrophized the U.S.S.R.—without mentioning it, of course: “with a stroke of the pen,” he said, “it changes the frontiers of states; by a peremptory decision it deprives a people's economy—always part of its life as a nation—of its natural outlets; with ill-concealed cruelty it, too, drives millions of men, hundreds of thousands of families, in the most squalid misery, from their homes and lands, tears them out by the roots and wrenches them from a civilization and culture which they had striven for generations to develop.

“It also sets arbitrary bounds to the necessity and right of migration, and to the desire to colonize. All

this constitutes a policy contrary to the dignity and welfare of the human race. . . .

“Within the confines of each particular nation as much as in the whole family of peoples, state totalitarianism is incompatible with a true and healthy democracy. Like a dangerous germ it infects the community of nations and renders it incapable of guaranteeing the security of individual peoples. It constitutes a continual menace of war.”

After expressing sympathy with the continued sufferings of the many thousands of prisoners of war and of the Jews still kept in concentration camps, the Pope had even a good Christian word for the political prisoners:

“And we are certain that we voice the sentiments of all right-thinking men when we extend that wish to include those political prisoners, men, women and youths, at times exposed to dire sufferings, against whom no accusation of crime or violation of the law can be brought, but, at most, only their past political views.”

The prisons of totalitarian and fascist Spain, the truest daughter of the Catholic Church, are up to this day overfilled with these prisoners who continue to suffer for their political views. One word of Pope Pius XII would compel Franco, humble son of that Church, to open wide the gates of his prisons. Need we say that we shall wait in vain for that word?

“And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye?” [Luke 6:41]

### THE ATOMIC BOMB SECRET

**S**ENSE OF HUMOR is decidedly not lost. The tragi-comic seriousness with which high-ranking politicians talk about keeping a secret which is no secret, is most instructively funny.

The communiqué of the Moscow Conference of the next-to-the-Big-Three contains over 600 words devoted exclusively to a Resolution which will be proposed to the forthcoming General Assembly of the United Nations. It will concern itself with the establishment of a Commission, with its composition, its rules of procedure, its terms of reference. . . All this to control atomic energy “to the extent necessary to insure its use only for peaceful purposes” and “for the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction.”

America has been producing atomic bombs and still continues to produce them. There is no doubt that England and Canada are doing the same. And who will guarantee that Russia does not possess the famous—or infamous—secret, with its own know-how, and is not manufacturing them as well?

But everybody keeps a straight face and talks inpressively of this “secret de Polichinelle.”

Sense of humor is certainly a great asset among the organizers of World War III.

new trends...

# Italy On the March

*Here, in part, is a letter lately received from an anti-Fascist long thought dead by friends in New York. It gives some close-up views of the Italian scene at the time of the rising which finally destroyed Fascist and Nazi power in the land of Mazzini, Garibaldi and Malatesta.*

Milan, September 4, 1945

I WON'T tell you all of my adventures in these late years, because they are so much like those of all the others. Prison, first in Belgium, always in danger of being shot, then in Italy, then in the concentration camp at Ventotene for three years and a half, then in the infamous camp at Arezzo, finally the little underground fighting that we could do. The certain thing is that our movement on the eve of the 25th of April, the day of the insurrection, was weak, and few of us thought that that insurrection would open to us such great possibilities.

Yet in only a few hours we built up military formations composed mostly of youths, and armed them (the Malatesta-Bruzzi brigades), joining in a completely autonomous way the Matteotti formations (Socialists) simply because we wanted to be granted officially the right to carry arms, to make detentions, to enjoy the service of transportation and supply, to requisition needed equipment. To you in America, knowing our anti-militarism, all this may seem contradictory, but if we had not done it we would have been forced to work underground, and with martial law in force this might have exposed us to being shot on the spot simply for carrying even a poor pistol.

Days of great enthusiasm, even for skeptics like myself. We tried from the very first to give a revolutionary and expropriative character to our action, taking part, yes, in the violent elimination of Fascist or Nazi centers of resistance, but at the same time demonstrating *with deeds* that we wanted to push the cleaning much further. We began by expropriating the property of Fascists and collaborationists, showing in this way the method necessary to bring about the social revolution. The properties that we expropriated we handed over immediately to the direct management of the industrial workers or the peasants, according to the nature of the properties, factories or fields, changing them into co-operatives; and the goods that we confiscated we distributed publicly to the populace.

For six continuous days you could see at our local in Viale Sabotino long lines of people that had come with lifted hearts to receive free packages of food, clothes, materials, shoes. . . . From the shops workers were coming to us to inquire how they could go clean out the enemy and obtain provisions. And we would tell them of the direct method, and they would understand immediately.

## Took What They Needed

In the same way we proceeded in taking over the houses of the bourgeois, Fascists and non-Fascists

alike. Barracks, Fascist clubs, fell into our hands and automatically became libertarian locals. Our central place in Via Romagnosi, which we now occupy, used to belong to the *Italia del Popolo*. We have to take into account the fact that our activity had to be developed in the face of the general hostility of the other political parties, particularly the Communist party, and the presence of the Allied troops. We had therefore to navigate among dangerous reefs that threatened our still fragile boat from all sides.

Besides, the influx into our ranks of many youthful elements, inexperienced, with great elation, and ready to give their lives at any moment, but deprived of all political and revolutionary education under the Fascist regime, imposed upon us problems of organization that necessarily were sensibly apart from the Anarchist practice.

In the first place the necessity of assuming the name of "Libertarian Communists" in the period of our underground action was dictated by the fact that the current mentality opposed Communism to Fascism as the only two forces opposed to each other, and Russia exercised upon it its attraction. The Anarchists? Who were they? Only the old knew of their existence, after twenty-two years of Fascist repression.

Therefore we chose the definition of Libertarian Communists because, although saying the same that we would say otherwise, we felt that it would help divert to us (which is exactly what happened) many who had become sick of the Communists' mysticism, without knowing what it was all about. And then we were able to explain to neophytes that it was true that we wanted Communism, but through freedom, without dictatorship and government, from the bottom up, with self government of workers' and peasants' soviets, who wanted to organize the economic life through the workers' direct management of production, from the control of the private owners to co-operatives, to communes, to federations of communes.

## No Longer Called Dreamers

These simple definitions of Libertarian Communism, placed on a ground easy to be realized and clear to everybody, do not contradict the Anarchist ideology, particularly in the economic field, which is the most pressing right now, and transfer our principles into action. The workers, the technicians, the professionals in general, and the peasants, come to us in great number even now when we have been transformed from a military insurrectional movement, to a political movement. Our adversaries are fighting us, we are discussed, but they dare not accuse us any more of being abstract dreamers. I'm not exaggerating in telling you, that every day there is a continuous flow of people who come to our

offices renouncing the Communists' card to ask for ours. . . .

Beside the activity mentioned above, we are also very active in the shops. You have to know that after the insurrection Committees of Liberation were set up in the political parties; now we demand that they be elected by the workers themselves, and are presenting our own candidates.

It is needless to tell you that the political parties are justly alarmed by this action. Such a demand has in itself revolutionary character, as it changes the habit of selecting the candidates from above, allowing us to be present ourselves in the shops, to conduct our propaganda, and to put into practice our program of transforming the Committees of Liberation of an administrative character into committees of revolutionary *social* liberation, and therefore Soviets. These local committees have nothing to do with the central Committees of Liberation, which have the function of supporting the government. So much so that in high places they would like to reduce the function of these local shop committees to purely that of control, instead of that of management.

#### Refused Permit for Paper

As for our press, we already have a great number of periodicals in different cities: Milan, Naples, Genoa, Ancona, Rome, Florence, Turin, and elsewhere. As for our paper, the *Comunista Libertario*, we are forced to publish it clandestinely, as both the Italian authorities, as well as the Allied authorities, have denied us a permit to appear. To tell the truth, we haven't even wanted to insist on having that permit. Disgusted, we have declared overtly that if we were disposed to risk being shot under the Germans, we had no reason to restrain ourselves now that we were "liberated."

In Milan we now have a weekly with a printing of about 20,000 copies and continuously on the increase. We have some 10 groups in different districts of the city, with several thousand members, and a promising youth movement. And we also have a goodly number of sections around the city and in the province. Our editorial activity is as follows: we have published a great number of pamphlets, among them 20,000 copies of Kropotkin's *Appeal to the Young*. Our purpose now is to create a specific Anarchist movement, beside the Libertarian Communist Federation, which is a kind of an Italian C.N.T. as it existed in Spain.

Of the comrades that you know, some have been shot by the Nazis either here or in concentration camps in Germany. Others are active in our work. And I? Still well, and with no intention of growing old. I leave you with a fraternal embrace from all of us. . . .

We understand that World War II cost over one trillion dollars in actual war materials. Damage to property is calculated at about one-quarter of a billion dollars.

What will education and public health cost in the next five years?

## U. S. A. Beats a Retreat

(Continued from Page 1)

the Russian Press for a similar attack on Iraq and Turkey. Both countries are on notice that the next advance of Russian expansion will take place in their direction. Allied reaction to this attack on Turkey, a country which was a friendly neutral during the world war, is similar to Chamberlain's policy on Czechoslovakia. Turkey is a remote country and she will fight alone if she fights.

Finally, there is the atomic bomb. Russia has consented to international control of the bomb provided that the secret be revealed step by step to the international control commission and consequently also to the Russian members of that commission. What an ingenious solution to the problem.

No such concessions were ever granted to Hitler Germany. Germany was forced to invent her own secret weapons; not even Chamberlain turned over to the German air force a model of the Spitfire, or the secrets of Radar. Mr. Attlee, a sheepish socialist in sheep's clothing, is doing better than Chamberlain. In one important respect there is therefore a vast difference between the appeasement of totalitarian Germany and the appeasement of totalitarian Russia. After Munich it is the rightist parties who triumphed when Chamberlain announced "peace in our time." Today it is the leftist parties who are celebrating peace in our time. Summing up the achievements of the Moscow conference, pontificating Raymond Swing had this to say over the radio: "It would be wrong to fill in a score card as to who has triumphed. . . . This is not a Russian triumph. . . . It is a triumph of reason." The looney Cliveden set has given way to the looney fellow travelers.

What becomes now of the theory that the capitalist countries have been preparing all along for war on the "proletarian fatherland" and have been only temporarily distracted by an imperialist war against Germany? That, one must remember, was the opinion of the *Daily Worker* before the German invasion of Russia. . . .

#### Retreat Foreseen

The principal capitalist power, the USA, together with Britain and France, far from preparing war on Russia will now most certainly retreat as fast as the Russians care to push. A free hand for Russia in Europe and Asia is the new isolationism which is dawning now over the United States. This time the inspiration comes from the Left but it will be just as readily echoed by the Right. War being out of the question, there is indeed no alternative to the withdrawal of the United States armies from Europe and Asia. There will be peace, but a peace which will end in war as soon as Russian totalitarianism threatens the security of the United States as unmistakably as it was threatened by the totalitarian governments of Germany and Japan. There is nothing to indicate that Stalin will know better how to call a halt to the insatiable appetite of his totalitarian machine than Hitler knew how to stop short of the conquest of the world.

# Science As Political Weapon

By A. S.

THE ROLE of Science in the Modern World has become a burning question. The atomic age places before everybody, scientist, politician or man-in-the-street, the problem of "Science—for or against humanity?"

But the problem is much wider and much deeper. Should Science be chained to the policies of this or that state? Should Science become a tool in the hands of a political party, of a government, of a group of governments?

This question is now debated by all and sundry.

The American Association of Scientific Workers is raising the banner of co-operation between trade unions and science. Thus we learn that "there are signs that scientists are prepared to organize themselves" to secure benefits like those of post-war educational facilities for their children, job security and security against old age and disease.\* We are given to understand that "the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians; the State, County, and Municipal Workers; the United Federal Workers, and the United Office and Professional Workers number scientists among their members, as does the American Federation of Teachers, and other industrial unions." The Association of Scientific Workers in Great Britain is proud to declare that "from a mere 2,000 members" it rose to almost 25,000 two years after it had become a trade union.

## Science and Labor

This collaboration between Science and Labor is extremely important and tends to destroy one of the great obstacles which the workers have met in the past when, by placing forcibly before the world their demands for a cardinal change in their economic and social conditions, they met with no sympathy from politicians, white collar workers and scientists.

The intrmixing of manual labor and scientific research work is doing a great deal of good to the latter by broadening their outlook on social problems.

Is the reverse true, too? Are the scientific workers helping the manual workers in developing the latter's broader outlook on Science as a field which helps them in their fight for freedom and against their subjugation to the powers-that-be?

The program elaborated by the American Association of Scientific Workers (AAScW) for Science in the postwar world stresses the close relationship between scientific research and the state. It supports almost entirely the Report presented by Dr. Vannevar Bush to President Truman in July 1945 as a result of a request by the late President Roosevelt. This report relies exclusively upon federal support to Science.

Equally, the AAScW, in working out its postwar program, has no other propositions than "considerable federal assistance in planning and financing." "A Federal Office of Scientific Development . . . with powers to plan . . . is urgently needed. . . ." To solve the problems of postwar rehabilitation and retraining necessitated by wartime shifts among scientists, the AAScW has no other solution but that "again it is the federal government that will have to be called upon to act." In matters of educational revisions "again it appears that Federal funds will have to be devoted to this task."

Thus, the AAScW relies entirely on Federal Funds and on Federal organization of postwar Science. So far, therefore, this body of Scientific workers has not learned from trade unions the value of independent action. . . .

This same spirit prevails in other scientific circles. Dr. Julian Huxley, the biologist,—brother of Aldous Huxley and grandson of Thomas Henry Huxley—thinks that co-operation in scientific problems in the field of profitable results for the world should be directed by a body similar to the one proposed by President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee for the control of the atomic bomb, as if this kind of body would actually save us from a third world war.

Science seems to go on the same inclined plane as does the entire political picture all the world over: the individual at the service of the State. And Science at the service of the State.

## Science Going Totalitarian

The more welcome is the warning given by a British scientist about the great danger that Science and humanity are running head foremost toward totalitarianism and, therefore, toward destruction of human liberties.

Dr. John R. Baker, lecturer in Zoology at Oxford University, has written a book, "Science and the Planned State."\* It is a powerful argument against state control of, and state interference with, the freedom of scientific research.

Dr. Baker starts by defining words. When he comes to "this ugly mouthful" *totalitarianism*, this is what he has to say:

"The word had gained general currency as a comprehensive name for the political systems of Germany, Italy and the U.S.S.R., when Hitler's invasion of Russia made the astute editors of our daily and weekly press recognize that it might be inept to bracket our new allies with our old enemies. The word was dropped like a hot brick. It has cooled too long and I pick it up without hesitation. By totalitarianism I mean those systems of government in which the actions of individuals are to a great extent controlled by a central planning authority. It is the antithesis of anarchy, but as that is a system which no country has ever adopted, the most exact opposite in the world of reality is liberalism. . . . If we wish to arrange the various politi-

\* The Scientist's Postwar Problems, by Dr. Harry Grundfast, *The Scientific Monthly*, February 1945.

\* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1945, 120 pages, \$1.75.

cal systems in lineal order, it may be suggested that liberalism should be placed beyond, not between, Socialism and Conservatism. At one pole come the totalitarian systems (nazism, fascism and communism), in which the state is all-powerful and ruthless and the individual deprived of liberty. Next come Socialism (in the narrowest sense) and Conservatism, under both of which the State has great power but avoids ruthlessness and allows some liberties to individuals. At the opposite pole to totalitarianism stands liberalism, the system which puts the liberty of the individual above all else and regards the State merely as a mechanism for minimizing people's interference with one another's freedom. . . ."

We have quoted at length because the correct definition of a word is what is now most lacking when debating social or other problems. Liberalism, taken ethymologically, does certainly fit in with Dr. Baker's definition: it is only to be regretted that the word has obtained a different meaning by its misuse at the hands of political parties, both in Great Britain and in this country. Libertarianism has now replaced the original word Liberalism. The libertarian principle—or as Dr. Baker calls it correctly *anarchy*—is the antithesis to totalitarianism.

#### Usefulness of the Inquisition

The upholder of totalitarianism in Science (outside of the U.S.S.R.) is Mr. J. G. Crowther, who in "The Social Relations of Science," published in 1941 by the Macmillan Company, states that "Inquisition is beneficial to Science when it protects a rising class" and that "those who have revived the Inquisition, like the Pope in Galileo's time, have a better understanding of politics and realize that in crises the possession of power is more important than the cultivation of intellectual freedom." Mr. Crowther does not beat about the bush: "The danger and value of an Inquisition," writes the upholder of totalitarianism, "depend on whether it is used in behalf of a reactionary or a progressive governing class."

Dr. Baker is rightly upset by this medieval viewpoint. This point of view of Mr. Crowther's, says he, "leads by insensible steps to the conclusion that scientists should be subjected to inquisition to secure conformity with political dogmas. By a twisting of the English language a policy that involves reversion to the cruelties of Middle Ages is presented as the course of progress."

The main argument of Dr. Baker's is that Scientists do not work only for material ends. He fully endorses the well-known biochemist, Szent-Györgij, who boldly proclaims "that to judge scientific research by its usefulness is simply to kill it. Science aims at knowledge, not utility."

We remember Molière's hero in one of his sarcastic comedies exclaiming in an unwanted paraphrase: "You have to live for the sake of eating" in trying to repeat the philosopher's "you have to eat for the sake of living."

"The pretence that science only serves humanity by giving us food, health, and shelter leads to nonsense; for it means that we live only for food, health, and shelter, instead of requiring them so as to live

for something else." We quote again Dr. Baker who concludes that "the men who were struggling solely to give practical help to mankind often made little or no contribution to knowledge; but those who had an intense desire for knowledge for its own sake were doing research that is comparable with the very best that is being done today."

#### Science and Obligatory Teamwork

Dr. Baker supports this statement by facts collected from scientific history: the studies of Réaumur and of Trembley about the middle of the eighteenth century and the work of Einstein in our own lifetime. It was Einstein who said that "the satisfaction of physical needs is indeed the indispensable precondition of a satisfactory existence, but in itself it is not enough. In order to be content, men must also have the possibility of developing their intellectual and artistic powers *to whatever extent accords with their personal characteristics and abilities.*"\*

This desire of developing one's inner powers is the main driving force of Science; to chain it by compulsory team-work is as nefarious to the scientist as to humanity as a whole. To state, as Prof. J. D. Bernal does—he is a great admirer of the Soviets—that "practically the whole of the great advances of Science in the twentieth century were achieved not by scientists working as individuals, but in organized groups," is branded by Dr. Baker as "contrary to the demonstrable facts." "When two or three scientists work and publish together . . . *no one has coerced them into working together.*\*\* They find it convenient, for a special purpose, to collaborate. That is a very different thing from organized team-work, such as that in force in the Physico-Technical Institute at Kharkov, in the U.S.S.R., where the investigators are organized in brigades, and no one is allowed to start working on a new problem without permission."

Dr. Baker goes on giving examples of fundamental scientific discoveries having been made by scientists working as individuals. He does not object to co-operation among scientists and considers that such co-operation has given wonderful results, but he opposes the "directed team-work":

"The people who want to *follow* a new line often do excellently in teams and they can be fitted satisfactorily into planned research. They have neither the wish nor the ability to think originally. . . . If science is to flourish, however, encouragement must be given to people of independent spirit who want no master."

In a special chapter devoted to "Science under Totalitarianism," Dr. Baker examines in detail scientific developments in the U.S.S.R. And first of all he has some truths to say to those who have nothing but praise for the Soviet regime:

"It cannot be right to praise the science of another country simply because that country is our ally. . . . We rightly

\* A. Einstein: chapter on "Freedom and Science" in "Freedom, its Meaning," edited by R. N. Anshen; George Allen and Unwin, London, 1934. The italics are ours (Ed.).

\*\* The italics are ours (Ed.).

hear and commend the great music of German and Austrian composers. That we fight those countries is irrelevant. . . .

"When the U.S.S.R. attacked Finland there was no outburst of praise for Soviet Science in Britain." When Stalin made a pact with Hitler, *Nature* did not print columns of praise for the science of the U.S.S.R. But when Hitler attacked and thus made Britain and the U.S.S.R. allies, all those who believe in the central planning of science saw that their chance had come. . . .

"The totalitarian idea of science has gained power as a result of the invasion of the U.S.S.R. by Germany. There are those who would have us believe that the success of the Soviet armies is evidence of the success of Soviet Science. . . . If military might were indeed such an index, then we should praise Nazi science above that of all other countries. . . ."

Dr. Baker shows how science in the U.S.S.R. is harnessed to serve the interests of the Soviet State; how the second "Five-Year Plan" for science, issued for the period 1932-1937, kept Russian Scientists within the narrow limits selected by that Plan. "People may perhaps be inclined," says Dr. Baker, "to reply that research was in fact done in the U.S.S.R." on some of the subjects despite their exclusion from the Five-Year Plan. "This is irrelevant to the argument," he concludes, "*for it is the central planning of research that I condemn, not disobedience to central planning.*"\*\*

### Science and Marxism

The Soviet scientists were vying with each other in their servility to the Five-Year Plan. One of the most important exponents of state-harnessed science is Academician T. D. Lysenko, who seems to be its "ideological" dictator. His pronouncements in the field of Soviet biology are law: "We must proceed," says Prof. Polyakov, "from dialectical materialism; it is from this position that we must appreciate . . . what Comrade Lysenko has to offer." "Soviet biologists," says another professor, M. B. Mitin, "must master dialectical and historical materialism, and learn to apply the dialectic method to their scientific work." "The whole Soviet people, says yet another scientific "comrade," V. K. Milovanov, "thousands of specialists and collective farmers,"\*\*\* who are doing wonderful work under his supervision are with Lysenko."

We could continue *ad libitum* quotations from servile scientists who have learned the lesson first given by Bukharin, (shot later by order of Stalin), that Marxism is *logically* "a scientific system, a scientific outlook and scientific practice." And not to adopt Marxism as a social driving force was found to be most dangerous . . . for scientists as well.

### Freedom for Science

Dr. Baker draws the only conclusion that must present itself to any independent thinker: "Science

\* All remarks made by Dr. Baker refer to his own country, England. They are just as applicable to this country (Ed.).

\*\* Italics are our own (Ed.).

\*\*\* The italics are our own. All these excerpts are from discussions at the Conference on Genetics and Selection held in Russia in 1939 and published in the review "Under the Banner of Marxism." (Ed.).

can flourish only if free from state control" and "if the selection of scientific personnel is left to the state, the wrong men are likely to be given important posts, because those who are not themselves scientists will be led astray by the false alarms and pretences of ignorant and foolish persons. As we have seen, such persons may even become academicians [this refers, no doubt, to T. L. Lysenko, Director of the Academy of Agricultural Science] and be given wide powers to control scientific research. Worse still, scientists *may exhibit a servile obedience to their political bosses and let dogmas and slogans affect their science.*"\*

### Science for Freedom

These conclusions of an independent scientist and researcher are a complete vindication of freedom of science and of scientific research stripped from every kind of state interference; and as Dr. Baker puts it emphatically and trenchantly, "*the central planning of science is essentially part of the totalitarian theory of the state.*"\* But the scientist who has come to that conclusion does not stop at the narrow scientific argument. Once he has found out how dangerous the state is in his own field of activities, he cannot help taking a broader, more social viewpoint. In politics, says Dr. Baker, the scientist "must raise his voice against all irreversible decisions"; he should be opposed to "all tyrannical monarchies, such as that of the Czars and all totalitarian regimes, whether national socialist, fascist, or communist." And reaching the climax as to the value of unfettered improvement of social conditions, he sets forth the two vital principles of healthy and sound politics which have to be defended against all comers: free speech and valid argument.

When free speech is prevalent and is actually (and not virtually) free, valid argument would decidedly be the only argument to impress listeners and readers. And the valid argument would be made as acceptable as psychologically possible. The trouble is that free speech [and free press, as both cannot otherwise than go hand in hand] is not so very free in the democratic states either. Who is not aware of the fact that the big press is a servile and frequently mercenary tool in the hands of financial trusts or of democratic governments? Who does not know—to take but one example—that the "free" press in France was almost entirely bought by state and capitalist interests? Who does not know that in the most democratic countries, people are unable frequently to hire halls or to express opinions if such opinions happen to be not to the liking of the democratic powers-that-be or even if their color or race is not a likeable one?

True free speech and true free press is still to be won. This, nevertheless, does not weaken in the least the stand taken by Dr. Baker against totalitarianism, whether in science or in politics.

We welcome Dr. Baker's outspoken criticism of totalitarianism, his vindication of freedom and in-

\* Italics are our own (Ed.).



# White Man's Dilemma

By John Nicholas Beffel

WHEN I WENT to see Lillian Smith's provocative play, *Strange Fruit*, I had the distinct advantage over various other spectators of not having read the book. So I had no preconceived notions of what the drama form should be.

At no time did I find the performance tedious, as some of the professional commentators did. Instead much of it, to me, was profoundly moving. Three Broadway critics called the show dull and boring; all three, according to Miss Smith, are white Southerners. Others found merit in it, beauty and dignity and power, though some considered it too detailed. At least three stamped the play as "sprawling."

The story has to do with life in a Georgia mill-town, involving particularly the love-affair of Nonnie Anderson, an educated and well-poised light brown Negro girl, and Tracy Dean, a white youth, son of a hard-working physician and a sentimental, religious mother, and the events leading up to the lynching of an innocent dark-skinned victim.

Nonnie and Tracy were playmates as children, and there is a nostalgic tryst scene on a ridge beyond the town, where they hark back to happy days while they were growing up. The youth has long found a haven of understanding with this girl that has been denied him at home.

## Between Two Pressures

Tragedy's shadow falls upon them when Nonnie tells Tracy that she is to have a child. She makes no demands upon him, has no anxiety about what lies ahead, is glad a baby is coming, because it will mean something more to live for. Tracy ponders the idea of marrying Nonnie and running away with her to France, where they can live together openly and no one will raise an eyebrow.

But there is a revival in town, and weighty pressure is put upon the young man by his mother and by a traveling evangelist who admits that he was a sinner himself before he found Jesus. As a result, Tracy turns to the church, decides to wed a white girl,

and casts Nonnie off. He offers her money, which she won't touch, and then arranges (without Nonnie's knowledge) to have Henry, his dark, not-too-bright body servant, marry her and give the child a name.

Flush with funds, Henry talks too much in Salamander's cafe, and Nonnie's doting brother, home from Washington, where he has a job, kills Tracy. He gets away on a train. Suspicion attaches itself to Henry, word spreads that a mob is gathering. Henry is put in jail "for his own protection." A young Negro doctor, hurrying to the mill office, makes a deeply stirring plea to the owner to do something, voices a heart-stirring outcry against inhumanities that so often have crucified his race.

## One Man Against the Mob

The telephone rings. Henry has been taken out of jail. The mill-owner speeds to overtake the mob, tries to save its prisoner, but is swept aside, and the luckless Henry is lynched and burned. We do not see this lynching. We hear about it afterward in the mill office as the owner's son, who saw the mob at work, answers some of his sister's questions. "It was pretty bad."

There are thirty-four players in the cast, and many of them are often on the stage, with numerous entrances and exists. Too many, some of the critics averred, saying their presence slowed down the play's action. I know that there are slow spots in *Strange Fruit*, yet obviously Miss Smith put all those characters in for background, and I can see where she might find it difficult to choose what to cut. The extra people are part of the life of the town. Their lives, their actions, their speeches and attitudes, are all components of the background against which the tragedies of a Nonnie Anderson and a Tracy Dean, either on the stage or in reality, are set.

One turning in the plot, however, I found difficult to accept—the overnight decision of Tracy to join the church and marry the white girl. At the end of the dialogue between Tracy and the evangelist in the drug-store, it seemed to me that he would continue to resist the pressure of the revivalist, with his moralistic talk about the youth's debt to Jesus and to his mother. The transition seemed too abrupt. Yet I realize that it *could* happen. Individuals *do* make sudden sharp decisions, without our knowing what has gone on in their minds, and we have to reckon with those decisions.

## This Remarkable Quietude

The drama, in the main, was played in low key. Well acted and effectively cast, it provided a strong contrast to the melodrama to which many New Yorkers are accustomed. Sometimes one wondered at the quietude of some of the scenes. Miss Smith assures us that this quietude is typical of the South that she knows. But I felt that something was lacking in the final scenes having to do with the lynching, that they were *too quiet*. There might be some added touches here, perhaps only two or three extra lines, that would heighten the action even if only a little and

---

dependence in all fields of human activities and his opposition to "irreversibles." He has confirmed, from practical considerations and from a close analysis of contemporary trends, what Peter Kropotkin, he, too, a great scientist, said about half-a-century ago:

"In a society developed on these lines [by free agreements concluded between territorial and professional groups] the voluntary associations which already now begin to cover the fields of human activity would have a still greater extension so as to substitute themselves for the State in all its functions. They would represent an interwoven network, composed of an infinite variety of groups and federations. . . . Moreover, such a society would represent *nothing immutable*. On the contrary—as is seen in *organic life at large*—harmony would result from an ever-changing adjustment and readjustment. . . ."

make it more credible to Northern minds. Yet if Miss Smith feels that such changes would violate the integrity of her work, one can have no quarrel with her.

She preferred to do the dramatization of her book, in collaboration with her sister, who is head of the dramatic art department of Western Maryland College, because she knew of no playwright whom she could trust to do that dramatization as she felt it should be done.

"If you ask people what *Strange Fruit* is about," Miss Smith said recently in discussing white culture and her play, 'you will get many different answers. Many whites will tell you that it is about the 'Negro problem,' whatever that is. Others will tell you that the author is in favor of intermarriage (she certainly has no objection to it) and that this is her defense of it. A few will tell you that it is an insult to Negro womanhood, and others that it is a sneer at white mothers and their sons. . . .

"Yet, from Montreal to Toronto, to Boston, to Philadelphia, to New York, not one critic has said what the play is really about, and that seems incredible. It is a play about human beings trapped and destroyed by segregation, the prevailing pattern of our white culture; but no one has said so. It is about the deep heart-breaking conflict between Christianity and White Supremacy, but no one has mentioned this.

#### A Disease of Heart and Mind

"It is about the white man and his infatuation with his own importance; it is about a disease of the heart and mind that destroys all our people, whatever their color, if they come too close to it. It is a play about you and me and the profound difficulty we have in becoming sane, mature human beings, but no one has mentioned this.

"Yet the play goes on, making friends and enemies, and lots of them. One wonders which will win as the weeks go by, the friends or the enemies. For the decision may be important, not for the play's author, nor its producers, but for white people and colored people living in this segregated culture of ours."

The so-called "Negro problem" is only a projection of the white man's own problem, Miss Smith contends. She does not offer a solution in her play. She poses the problem, and properly leaves it to the rest of us to solve it. Perhaps it is more of a white man's problem than that of the Negro, at least in the United States, because there are more of us whites.

When people say that *Strange Fruit* advocates intermarriage, *which it does not*, I think of what Art Young said in reply to a question when he was on trial for alleged sedition for some of his anti-war cartoons in the old *Masses*. One of the prosecutors asked: "Mr. Young, do you believe in the class struggle?" Art's answer was: "When you've got the measles you've got to believe in them."

High praise is due to Lillian Smith for squarely facing issues which so many contemporary artists cravenly avoid.

## Tresca Case Dogs Hogan

By Eric Duane

STEADILY RISING CLAMOR for definite action toward finding the slayers of Carlo Tresca, anarcho-syndicalist editor, trailed District Attorney Frank S. Hogan all through December as he prepared to be sworn in for a second term of office. Both the daily and weekly press carried stories of fresh criticism of Hogan for failure to solve the three-year-old mystery.

When the *New York Post* disclosed that Assistant District Attorney Eleazar Lipsky, assigned late in 1944 to handle the Tresca investigation, was resigning, Norman Thomas, chairman of the Tresca Memorial Committee, wrote the prosecutor asking what would now become of that inquiry. Hogan answered that another aide will take charge, and asserted that several investigators were constantly busy on the case.

Mr. Thomas promptly threw a shadow of doubt on the District Attorney's claim in another letter to him, in which he charged that "one of Tresca's closest friends" had never been questioned by Hogan's office, and that another friend, whose name was given to him sixteen months ago, also had not yet been examined.

"This remarkable failure to cover obvious ground in a major criminal case," Mr. Thomas wrote Hogan, "does not square with your recent statements that several detectives were 'devoting full time' to it, and were 'investigating all leads' on the Tresca killing."

Men and women of widely varying convictions will pay tribute to Tresca's memory in Cooper Union Institute on Thursday, January 10, at 5:15 p.m. They will speak from the stage where Abraham Lincoln assailed slavery in 1860. Admission will be free.

Among the speakers will be State Industrial Commissioner Edward Corsi, whose father and Tresca were both political exiles from Sulmona, Italy; Arturo Giovannitti, poet, labor organizer, and historian; Harry Kelly, veteran libertarian; Eduard C. Lindeman, member of the New York School of Social Work faculty; Rose Pesotta, and Giralamo Valenti.

"There will be no controversial guesses as to the identity of Tresca's assassins in the speeches," Norman Thomas said, "but only united insistence that the authorities hunt down the guilty, and that this country be freed from the curse of murder as a political weapon.

"Whether, like Lincoln, Carlo was murdered by a fanatic, or was killed by order of some group because of his outspoken opposition to totalitarianism, it is the duty of the public officials of both New York State and City to see that the perpetrators of this wanton crime are brought to justice. The greater the crowd at Cooper Union, the sooner the authorities will act."

# Origin of Libertarian Thought in America

By Rudolf Rocker

[This article, printed with the special permission of the author, is the concluding chapter of an important unpublished work by Rudolf Rocker on the *Pioneers of American Freedom*. The book has appeared in a Spanish translation (*El Pensamiento Liberal en los Estados Unidos*, Buenos Aires, 1944) but is still in manuscript form in English. It is hoped that arrangements could be made for an early publication of this work in this country.

Its author is well known in literary, political and radical circles all the world over. Among his earlier works we can mention: *Nationalism and Culture*, 1937; *Influence of Absolutist Ideas in Socialism*, 1945; *Anarcho-Syndicalism*, 1938; *The Second World War*, 1943; *The Tragedy of Spain*, 1937; and many others.]

THE HISTORY of individualist or, as Benjamin Tucker called it, philosophic anarchism, differs essentially by its genuine American origin from the libertarian ideas brought to America by the European emigration which almost exclusively followed the concepts of Peter Kropotkin, Elisée Reclus and their followers. The anarchism which developed on American soil has its starting point in the philosophic ideas of the Eighteenth Century which circulated in England and were brought here by the Fathers of this country and modified under the influence of a new environment. But above all it is rooted in the peculiar social conditions of America which differed fundamentally from those of Europe. Warren, Andrews, Greene, Heywood and Tucker all came from Massachusetts, and were therefore genuine Yankees, for this word which today serves as a nickname for all Americans was originally applied only to the inhabitants of the New England states who regarded themselves as the élite of America.

They were not only American because the accident of birth made them so, but because they were deeply rooted and nurtured in the history and traditions of their country. For this reason they regarded their ideas only as a logical extension and development of those traditions and worked quite deliberately in this direction. Thus wrote C. L. James, one of the gifted representatives of this tendency, in his *Origin of Anarchism*:

"Thus purely indigenous English and American Anarchism is much earlier than the French, German, or Russian kind. It is, therefore, quite a mistake to regard Anarchism as a peculiarity of the *foreigners* against whom there is so much foolish prejudice. Anarchism is the child of our own institutions; and they have got to rear it."

C. L. James points out that since the appearance of Edmund Burke's *Vindication of Natural Society* (1760), England and America have never been without thinkers of an anarchistic viewpoint and that immediately after the publication of the famous *Junius Letters* in England and their "leitmotiv":

"It is not the disorder, but the physician; it is the pernicious hand of government alone which can make a whole people desperate," Paine and Jefferson came forth with their first political doctrines and shattered the blind belief in the inviolability of the state.

William B. Greene in his book, *The Sovereignty of the People* (1863), based his entire criticism of the political and social conditions upon the historical traditions of America when he wrote as follows:

"In theory the government of a free people is not one which shall in all circumstances govern, but one that shall effectually govern while it is maintaining right against wrong, and shall begin to fall in pieces as soon as it begins to maintain wrong against right. No country is truly free whose constitution does not furnish the citizens with protection against the wrong-doing of other citizens, and also guarantees him against the wrong-doing of the government itself. No oppressor is so intolerable as an oppressive government; for the private oppressor acts with his own force only, while the governmental oppressor acts with the irresistible force of the whole people."

Ezra Heywood wrote in his article, *The Great Strike*, in Tucker's *Radical Review*, that Anarchism is "only a new assertion of the ideas of self-rule and self-support which Jefferson put into the Declaration of Independence, 1776, and that Josiah Warren's doctrine of the *sovereignty of the individual* on the basis of the *cost principle* only set forth a natural proposal of this fundamental."

## Liberal Traditions Show the Way

Voltairine de Cleyre in her illuminating essay, *Anarchism and American Traditions*, traced the whole idea of the anarchistic conception in America to the liberal traditions of this country, drawing the conclusion:

"As to the American tradition of non-meddling, Anarchism asks that it be carried down to the individual himself. It demands no jealous barrier of isolation; it knows that such isolation is undesirable and impossible; but it teaches that by all men's strictly minding their own business, a fluid society, freely adapting itself to mutual needs, wherein all the world shall belong to all men, as much as each has need or desire, will result. And when Modern Revolution has thus been carried to the heart of the whole world—if it ever shall be, as I hope it will,—then may we hope to see a resurrection of that proud spirit of our fathers which put the simple dignity of Man above the gauds of wealth and class, and hold that to be an American was greater than to be a king."

## The Declaration of Independence

Stephen P. Andrews, Lysander Spooner and others have said the same thing in different words. The truth of the matter is that whenever American Anarchists of that time were influenced by foreign ideas these had their origin in the same source which gave birth to the *Declaration of Independence* and guided those English thinkers who, following Locke, progressed in a similar direction as for instance

Joseph Priestley, Richard Price, Jeremy Bentham, and later John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer. Max Stirner had a certain influence only on Tucker and his circle. The only foreigner who made a deep impression on this school of thought was Pierre Joseph Proudhon, and that was due to the fact that his ideas were so close to the concepts of the older English-American radicalism, and his practical proposals so full of promise for a young country like America.

On the other hand one must never overlook that the founders of American liberalism were not in any way satisfied with the political principles laid down in the *Declaration of Independence*, but endeavored in their fashion to anchor those principles in the social and economic conditions of the country. Thus Tom Paine propounded already in the second part of his *Rights of Man* a far reaching social reform which had particularly in view a modification of the system of taxation, the relief of unemployment, and old age pensions for impoverished veterans of labor. In his *Agrarian Justice* he went deeper into these ideas and declared that since man did not create the earth he could have no permanent title to the land, for it is not recorded that God, the Creator of all things, ever made a business of selling property rights. Therefore, he demanded that those robbed of their natural right to the earth have their claim restored in such a way as to remedy the wrongs of the past and to this end he developed a very detailed plan.

Thomas Jefferson, greatly influenced by Paine, declared: "I set out on this ground, which I suppose to be self-evident, that the earth belongs in usufruct to the living; that the dead have neither powers nor rights over it. The portion occupied by any individual ceases to be his when himself ceases to be, and reverts to society." It is also known how hostile Jefferson was to the financial speculation of the banks Hamilton had established, as a letter of January 16, 1814, to Dr. Thomas Cooper shows: "It is cruel that such revolutions in private fortunes should be at the mercy of avaricious adventurers, who, instead of employing their capital, if any they have, in manufactures, commerce and other useful pursuits, make it an instrument to burden all the interchanges of property with their swindling profits, profits which are the price of no useful industry of theirs."

One cannot pretend therefore that Paine and Jefferson had no understanding of economic and social reform. Daniel Webster's declaration, "The freest government cannot long endure when the tendency of the law is to create a rapid accumulation of property in the hands of a few, and to render the masses poor and dependent," shows, too, that they were well aware of the danger of such a development. But later liberals as well displayed a definite interest in social reforms, which would serve as a support for their political principles. Ralph Waldo Emerson's study of the ideas of Fourierism and his interest in the Brook Farm Experiment

is well known. The same is true of Wendell Phillip's propaganda for currency reform and W. L. Garrison's activity as a single taxer. Thus, even in this respect, there is no definite boundary line between the great interpreters of American liberalism and the first Anarchists in this country. Just as in England William Godwin's work, *Political Justice*, was the logical result of that great spiritual tendency which would draw the narrowest bounds around the power of the State and refuse to let it control the spiritual and social life of man, so too were the ideas of Josiah Warren and his followers only the natural result of that social and political tendency to which America was indebted for the *Declaration of Independence* and which in Jefferson, Paine and their followers had found its greatest advocates.

The whole activity of individualistic anarchism in America from Warren to Tucker and his adherents was exclusively conducted within American circles. Their endeavors therefore represent a definite phase in the intellectual evolution of this country, as real as is the spiritual influence of Paine, Jefferson, Emerson, Thoreau, Phillips and Garrison.

#### Individualist Anarchism

Like every intellectual movement, the individualistic Anarchists of America have their various shades of opinion. Yet it is not difficult to discover certain fundamental principles which are common to all of them and which divide them sharply from all other varieties of socialism. They all agree that man be given the full reward of his labor, and recognize in this right the economic basis of all personal liberty. They all regard the free competition of individual and social forces as something inherent in human nature, which if suppressed will inevitably lead to the destruction of the social equilibrium. They answered the socialists of other schools who saw in *free competition* one of the destructive elements of capitalist society that the evil lies in the fact that today we have too little rather than too much competition, since the power of monopoly has made competition impossible. Starting from this viewpoint they rejected fundamentally every communistic solution of the social problem and opposed just as intensely the ideas of state socialism as the tendencies of Peter Kropotkin and of communist anarchism. This is particularly true of Tucker and his circle.

Nevertheless, there were also among the so-called individualists a considerable number of men who in this respect were broader in their views and rightly believed that mutualism, collectivism and communism represent only different methods of economy, the practical possibilities of which have yet to be tested, and that the first objective is to secure the personal and social freedom of men no matter upon which economic basis this is to be accomplished. They therefore did not follow Tucker's example and condemn every other tendency as *archistic*, but only reserved for themselves the right of expression, to go their own ways and let others

do the same. To this group belonged especially William Holmes, C. G. James, and Dyer D. Lum, author of *The Economics of Anarchy*, whose life and work Voltairine de Cleyre has so eloquently described.

### Sex Freedom

The second point on which all adherents of individualistic anarchism in America were in agreement was their strong emphasis on the equal rights of the sexes and their support for *sex freedom*. In the controversy over these issues they showed far more militancy than any similar group in Europe. Some of them, including Tucker himself, repudiated monogamy on the grounds that it is contrary to human nature and imposes on the gratification of the sexual urge such restraints which in the long run can be only harmful. But all recognized that the mutual sex relations cannot be governed by any fixed system and must be left to the judgment of the people concerned. A considerable number of them, as Ezra Heywood, Moses Harman, D. M. Bennett, E. C. Walker and others were subjected to severe persecution in the time of the Comstock regime, occasionally receiving prison sentences on account of these views.

### Non-Violence But Not Pacifism

The third point on which they were all agreed was their rejection of any propaganda of violence. None of them was an adherent of absolute pacifism which on purely ethical grounds rejects every use of force. They all recognized the right of using force in resisting a despotism which had become intolerable, a right Jefferson himself had written into the *Declaration of Independence*. But they realized that anarchism can be neither achieved nor maintained by force. Therefore, they laid the emphasis of their propaganda upon the education, instruction and persuasion of men so as to prepare them for a condition where authority would no longer rule. They rejected therefore the use of all coercive means on tactical grounds so long as society was granting them the right to work for the propaganda of their ideas and to seek a peaceful transformation. They felt that passive resistance had more prospects of succeeding than violent insurrection, and justified the latter only when the growth of despotism made impossible the use of other means. Each of them placed the greatest emphasis on man's sense of responsibility and believed in the gradual vanishing of all forms of compulsion by the ascendancy of ideas and the free compact among men.

And there was also a fourth point common to all of them. They believed in the effectiveness of practical experiment, which is particularly evident in Josiah Warren and his adherents. But contrary to the exponents of earlier experimental socialism they did not believe in the success of small communities which separate themselves from society in order to practice their own ideas in the hope that the world will follow their example. They rather felt that such experiments must be undertaken with-

in society through individual or cooperative enterprises to be financed by a banking system of mutual credit free of interest charge. These ideas found particularly strong advocates in W. Greene, L. Spooner, E. Heywood, B. R. Tucker, E. N. Fulton and F. D. Tandy.

### Is Anarchism Made Abroad?

It is not the purpose of this study to provide a critical survey of the ideas and methods of the individualistic anarchists or to press the strong or weak points of their propaganda. Its purpose is rather to present an objective view of their doctrines and especially to show that Anarchism in America is not a *foreign importation* but a product of the social conditions of this country and of its historical traditions. Anarchism existed in America at a time when no indication of an anarchist movement was to be discovered in Europe. Its basic economic and political ideas were already worked out by J. Warren before Proudhon conceived his great historical task. It must be regarded therefore as a part of American history, the recording of which would be defective and incomplete if one should overlook this side of intellectual life in America.

It is true that American anarchism was also influenced later by European ideas; on the other hand, it also had an influence in Europe however slight. This is merely another illustration of the old truth that ideas are not bound by any political boundaries but have their fountain head in the universal sphere of culture to which we belong. To stigmatize an inconvenient idea or movement by branding it *Un-American* is not to uphold the best traditions of this country but to adopt the cheap slogans of Hitler and Mussolini and to prepare the way for the totalitarian state.

The so-called white civilization of this continent is the work of European immigrants. All religious, political and economic institutions in North and South America have developed under this influence, and the elements which were driven out of European countries by religious and political persecution and sought and found new opportunities in this country were by no means the worst.

### Civilization is International

Once again let it be said: Civilization as a whole is neither European nor American but embodies humanity in its entirety. Its external characteristics may vary according to the conditions it encounters in the different countries, but its essential life content remains the same. It represents the eternal struggle of mankind to overcome the restricting limitations of primitive natural environment and make its life conform with the higher purposes it has conceived.

The freedom of a people, however, is measured according to the degree of tolerance it shows for the personal conceptions and intellectual needs of its individual members. Every idea, as such, is justified as long as it springs from the honest convictions of its bearers. It will become a despotism only when its exponents attempt to impose it upon others

## Will China Turn Fascist?

[The author of the letter we print below has been Professor at the Chinese University, first in Peking, then in Tientsin, and now in Kunming, for over 15 years. European himself, he has kept out of Chinese politics, but is a keen observer of current events. His first letter gives a general picture of the situation as he found it upon his return to the university after a six months' leave in Europe.]

Kunming (Yunnan), December 15, 1945

I have come back to China. Through the back door. That's Yunnan. If the plateau of Pamir is the roof of the world, then the plateau of Yunnan may well be called the roof of China. Its chaos of mountains towers 6,000 feet above Indochina to the south, with Burma to the west, Szechuan to the north. Separated from the rest of China by steep mountain ranges, its isolation was first broken 40 years ago when French capital and colonizing ambitions built a railway from Indochina—an engineering feat at the time,—and later an automobile highway leading toward central China. Haiphong harbor is the nearest outlet for the province, but the railway, torn of many miles of its rails to be used during the war for building other lines, will need at least one year before it can be put back into condition.

### Back to Yunnan

An almost forgotten spot until a few years ago, Yunnan sprung into prominence when it became the great American air base in China and one of China's last bastions of resistance. Among many fantastic war deeds, this one does not seem quite so fantastic. It is no less remarkable. Cut on all sides from the outside, China would inevitably have had to yield to the blockade had not the Americans crossed the Himalayan hump to bring a much needed relief. Thousands of them gave their lives in the attempt. There was no emergency landing along the route followed, and many of those who jumped in their parachutes to avoid crashing to earth never found their way out of the deserts mountain ranges bordering northern Burma and north-western Yunnan.

For some time Kunming was said to be the most active air base in the world in terms of imported tonnage, under the slogan "a plane a minute." Day and night the constant stream of twin- and four-engined planes made a great roar which never subsided. In order to link China with Allied

---

by force and against their will. Even in this case, it is not the idea itself but the instruments of compulsion which justify opposition and make self-defense the order of the day.

If the word Democracy has any meaning at all, it is that instead of relying on the power of the State to thwart the designs of despotism it will prevail by virtue of its own moral influence and, as Proudhon said, awaken in man the realization that his freedom finds its confirmation rather than its limitation in the freedom of others.

To those, however, whose "hundred per cent" nationalism consists in stigmatizing every idea they do not understand or do not like as an alien product for which the foreigner has to be blamed and punished, I shall reply with Jefferson: "It is error alone which needs the support of government. Truth can stand by itself."

bases in northern Assam and avoid as much as possible enemy-occupied Burma, planes had to fly at 16,000 feet and even above.

This period is over. From Calcutta, our planes cut straight above central Burma, and fly over steep ridges at 12,000 feet. The going is definitely bumpy, and when the Kunming lake is sighted in the distance after a six hours flight, there is a sigh of relief.

### The Yanks Have Gone

The great airfield is almost deserted now. Their job done the Americans have gone home. Socially they had brought to this backwater place, with their all-powerful dollars and impulses, many forms of corruption. As a whole, however, they have remained popular with the local population. There remain now some French soldiers, vestiges of the army which resisted the Japs in Tonkin in March and who had to retreat across the Yunnan border. They offer a slim compensation, though, to local profiteers who preyed on the Yanks.

The Americans have left behind enormous stocks, especially canned food. The latter is rationed out every month to students and professors of the local universities. For eight years, these people have withstood all kinds of hardships and have seldom eaten their fill. Now, they swim in butter, bacon, cheese and other delicacies little known in Chinese cuisine.

Kunming has not resumed, after the departure of the Americans, its pre-war calm. Ever since 1938 - 1939 it became the abode of many thousands of refugees from the coastal provinces invaded by the Japs—especially intellectuals. At one time, about a dozen colleges had their temporary location in or around Kunming. Now there are still four universities—not counting the Yunnan University, which had to trek all the way from Peking and Tientsin to China's south-westernmost corner.

One would assume that several months after the Japanese surrender schools would begin to move back. Not so in China. Communications, which were never well developed, especially in the interior, are in a complete state of disruption. The best transportation from here to north China would be first by rail to Indochina, then by ship from Haiphong to Tientsin; but this will probably not be possible before 1947. The alternative route would be by truck to Szechuan—a 3 to 5 days' trip—then by boat down the Yangtse river, then by train from Hankow or from Nanking to the north. Unfortunately, trucks are few, river boats still fewer at present, and railways still need repair. And there is also the war against the Communists going on in the North. But this is another story. . . . So every one has to remain for the time being in his war-time shed.

Another aspect of war-time Kunming is the cost of living, which makes it the most expensive place in China, and probably in the world. As a result of both inflation and speculation, for about six years until last August, prices have doubled every 3 months or so. The Japanese surrender brought a sharp decline, until they were stabilized at the present level, *about 6,000 times the pre-war prices*. As an example, a pound of bread costs 500 Chinese dollars instead of 7 or 8 cents!

### A Chinese Coup d'Etat

Politically this province has seen a big change last October, when the feudal government of General Lung Yun, a local chieftain, was replaced by the Central government's administration. The latter cleverly took advantage of the absence of the Yunnanese army, sent to occupy north Indochina. While Lung received an invitation to take another job in Chungking—a polite way of getting rid of any high official—his last troops that remained here were to have been disarmed. However, it didn't quite work according to plan. For 5 days a bloody battle was fought all around Kunming, with heavy casualties. Meanwhile

the terror-stricken population had to remain indoors and go without food.

Has the new provisional regime brought about a little more justice or honesty? Many have doubts about it. While the old regime was very corrupt indeed, in other ways it was remarkably tolerant, and no one had ever been bothered because of his opinions. But this question oversteps local boundaries. . . .

### Toward a Compromise?

China is confronted at present with a very serious problem, that of the relations between the Chungking Central government, headed by Chiang Kai-shek in the name of the Kuomin party, and the Communist government of Yen-an, in the Northwest. Will they eventually strike a compromise or fight a nation-wide civil war?

The Chinese intelligentsia is especially preoccupied with the present situation, lest the country be flung into a new period of internal strife and turmoil. The great majority, without favoring the Communists, are strongly advocating a compromise, which would safeguard China's national unity and open an era of rehabilitation. The fascist right-wing of the Kuomintang, on the other hand, under the leadership of "C.C." (the two brothers Chen Kuo-fu and Chen Li-fu), is intent on the rapid extermination of the Communists. It also stresses the urgency of enforcing strict political discipline ("Gleichschaltung") over the college people, guilty of liberalism. And this brings us back to local politics.

Now, this reactionary clique is strongly represented in the councils of the new provisional government, and never before were the Central Gestapo-men in such numbers in Kunming. The stage is thus set for the drama.

### Army and Gestapo Against Students

It started on the night of Sunday, November 25th, when the army surrounded the compound of the largest university, located outside the city boundaries. On the campus, the students of Kunming colleges—several thousands of them—were holding a meeting of protest against civil war. Several well-known professors had been invited to speak. While the meeting was proceeding, the soldiers suddenly opened fire. The students, who were sitting on the grass, fell on the ground, and most of the bullets passed over their heads. The speaker, with bullets whistling around his head, did not lose his self-control. He went on. "I beg of you," said he, "not to be afraid. My voice must be heard above the sound of gun-fire." The meeting continued. By loud-speaker, the army gave the order to disperse. It was ignored. Acetylene lamps were brought to replace electric light, which had been cut. The attitude of calm and contempt on the part of the students was entirely unexpected by the army. It dared not interfere any more.

This strange aggression, the first of its kind in the history of Chinese education, roused the students to greater democracy, by giving it a new, more concrete significance. During the days that followed, their energy was wholly spent on intense propaganda. A strike was declared, and the college students, followed by high school boys and girls, went into the city, covering the walls with inscriptions and posters, distributing tracts, proclamations and publications of all kinds, holding soap-box meetings in the streets. They were at every point waylaid by plain-clothes men, beaten by them and thrown into prison. But nothing could stop the students, so great was their spirit of sacrifice. The greater the beatings the stronger developed the spirit of resistance. On Friday, November 30, no less than twenty girls were beaten and arrested.

The slogans were: "Democracy and Freedom," "Down with Dictatorship," "Back to the Three Principles" (of Sun Yat-Sen), "Establishment of a Democratic Coalition Government," and more than any other: "Oppose Civil War."

The third act was still bloodier. Enraged by the stu-

dents' agitation, the Gestapo decided to put an end to it, once and for all. On Saturday morning, December 1, gangs of soldiers and thugs employed by the Party in power, several hundred strong, stormed the gates of all the colleges which had been closed and guarded by the students since the first incidents. In some places they were repulsed. Elsewhere, the soldiers succeeded in getting inside, attacking students with knives or bayonets, or throwing hand-grenades through windows.

A girl was slain and trampled to death. A wounded boy was followed inside the hospital where he was being taken by his fellow students and brutally killed. Everywhere stretcher-bearers were attacked. Altogether four students were killed and a large number wounded.

### A Fascist Dress Rehearsal

I have given a somewhat detailed account of the affair, because I think that it is a warning of things to come; it becomes an event of historical importance.

There is no doubt that the fascist right-wing of the Kuomintang, frightened by the rising tide of democracy, wants to act swiftly and crush the forces working in favor of a compromise with the Communists. The universities stationed in Kunming are well known as the main seat of liberalism in China. It is therefore natural that they should be the first to come under fire, under the usual charge of "communism." Whoever is not in favor of the Central government is now branded a communist.

At the time of writing, the Central government, which needs a more or less democratic facade to please the Americans, has given a little leeway to the schools: the students have been granted permission to parade the coffins of the victims; the garrison commander, at least nominally responsible, has been recalled, two of the grenade throwers have been shot. . . .

It has brought little relief, however; the students are exalted and in despair. They insist on their demands which include: 1) The trial of the garrison commander and of the interim governor, said to be a dangerous (Party) Gestapo-trained man; 2) a guarantee that freedom of speech and assembly will be respected.

In my opinion, we have lived through the first public demonstration of fascism in China. A grave danger lies in the fact that the army may join that movement and help the "C.C." clique to seize power.

From the social point of view, the wonderful Chinese people are subject to deep divisions which, in the near future, are going to express themselves into acute conflicts. The army, formerly held in complete contempt, has gradually, within eight years of war, taken stock of its new importance in the country, and is inclined to be arrogant with everybody, just as it was with the depressed classes. On the other hand, the intelligentsia, traditionally the elite of the country, will not be looked upon with the same respect as in the past.

Seldom have the students been more completely united for a definite aim as they are at present: democracy in a broader sense.

### ATOMIC [LACK OF] ENERGY

If the development of nuclear technology follows the usual course of development, its first application will probably prove to be too expensive for immediate commercial use, but not too expensive for immediate naval use. It may well be that the greatest strides which we will make in the next few years in harnessing atomic energy will be in connection with its employment aboard ship.

(Rear Admiral Harold G. Bowen before the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.)

# Comments on Contemporaries

In its World Events Section, *The New Leader* (December 22, 1945) publishes an interesting study of David J. Dallin on "Germany Between War and Peace."

After an analysis of Communist tactics towards Germany, both during the war and since the occupation of that country by the U.S.S.R., Dallin attempts to work out a "clear-cut" program for Germany. He begins with a correct evaluation of the difficulties:

"To crush the military machine of Germany, only a few years of war were necessary. To eradicate militaristic nationalism and the belief in a "German destiny" and in German superiority, neither guns nor planes are sufficient. A semi-religious, fanatical nationalism does not die simply because of a military defeat. Itself a product of historical conditions, it will disappear only in a new historical environment. Millions, having been disarmed, must be persuaded by facts and deeds as well as by propaganda; they must come to feel in their hearts that National-Socialism was wrong and outrageous. This will take time. The process has only been timidly begun. The victors have not done very much to accelerate it. In fact, what they have done has frequently had a contrary effect."

Education, of course, is the only healthy way. Here again Dallin sees the pitfalls:

"It is all very well for a child to be taught at school that a democratic Germany will be a nobler system than the dictatorship under Hitler. But this child may well attend classes without having had any breakfast. The superiority of democracy is therefore not quite so apparent to him. If fathers and brothers must perform slave labor outside the country, if personal property has been "liberated" by foreign soldiers, if there are many outrages against women by the troops, then no well-meant sermons of democracy will avail.

"The political reality today is certain to be regarded by many Germans as a rehabilitation of National Socialism."

But when he attempts to approach closer to an effective solution to the question "What to do with Germany," Dallin has but one offer to make: Let America take up the "liberation" of Germany. And although he himself had just stated that guns and planes are insufficient to destroy the German militarist spirit, he advocates the same guns and planes: "America possesses," he says, "sufficient military and political influence to change rapidly the economic and social picture in the part of Germany which remains outside the area of Soviet occupation." What could such "military influence" really mean is not explained; but while Dallin advises the U. S. Government to make use of its military power [against the Soviet is occupied part of Germany?], the Soviets, in their zone of occupation have distributed among 280,000 German peasants no less than four million acres of land owned formerly by Junkers and Nazis.

We wonder whether it would not be better if in the American, British and French zones of occupation, a better system would not have been to do the same not only with land to the peasants, but with industries to the workers? The ensuing industrial revolution would have been a much better method of "influencing" all and sundry toward developing a healthier Germany rid of the Junkers and of the Nazi supporting industrialists.

\* \* \*

It is curious how correspondents writing about the political situation in the countries to which they are accredited always miss what is actually happening among the very people they are supposed to write about. They think that by reporting about the doings of political parties and the behind the scene intrigues between politicians they are carrying out their duties to the best of their abilities. They religiously ignore the people's activities. A reporter from Spain will forget that the Spanish people have better means

of expression than the midget Communist Party of Spain—but he will dwell upon the latter. . .

The same has happened to the Rome correspondent of *Partisan Review* who, in its Fall number, writes at length on Italian politics but does not trouble about finding out facts concerning what the Italian *people* are doing while the politicians squabble.

True, this correspondent has found out that the British and the Americans in Italy "have been driving the Italian masses further into the arms of the Russians. This seems particularly true up north. . . . Russia is now the reservoir into which the general popular discontent is drained off and channeled as Stalinism, because there's been no other adequate leadership to tap the popular unrest."

The correspondent goes on to praise the Italian Socialist Party which, as a result of Labor's victory at the British elections, "can now look to Western Europe instead of the East." It seems, however, that the Socialist Party "is still honeycombed with Stalinists who have infiltrated under the orders of the Communist Party." . . .

Socialist Party, Communist Party, elections, intrigues, governments that come and governments that go! But why not take the trouble of finding out what the Italian common man is doing? We advise this correspondent, when he goes up north in Italy, to look him up. And we refer our readers to a report on what is going on there in this very same issue of "New Trends." . . .

\* \* \*

The *Saturday Evening Post* of December 22 published an article by Mr. Edgar Snow, describing in detail the life of an average Russian family. The head of the family works as an accountant and earns about 2000 rubles a month for a 10 to 12 hour day. But his home-take pay amounts only to 900 rubles after deduction of government taxes, social and health insurance, etc. This last summer he was to have his first vacation in four years. He had looked forward to this vacation but he decided instead to work. He earned an extra 2000 rubles which he spent on a pair of good leather shoes for his daughter who was walking about in wooden home made clogs. His wife spends from 3 to 4 hours daily in queues to shop for the family. Shopping for bread alone absorbs a whole hour. Her leisure time she spends on needle-work for a government store to supplement the earnings of her husband. Asked whether the couple could look forward to a better time once the new five-year program was fulfilled, the man was skeptical. He pointed out that the government is not reconverting industry from war to peace production and that whatever increased production capacity Russia was now building would have to go into the construction of atomic bombs and similar devices of war.

The story reminds us of a remark we overheard in a public meeting of laboring men in France before the war: "When Russian workers," said one of the French workingmen in reply to a communist propagandist, "eat as well as we do, I shall look into the matter to see what communism can do for France."

NEW TRENDS . . .

Subscription: One Year \$1.50

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

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... ZONE.....

STATE .....