

new trends ...

VOLUME I

SEPTEMBER 1945

NUMBER 1

THE CHALLENGE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

SO far, the only solution to the problem of unemployment under the "free enterprise" system has been the waging of war. With the substantial backing of the majority of Americans who vaguely but earnestly wished to prevent their nation and the rest of the world from being engulfed by fascism and its aggressive armies—the scientific, industrial, and human resources of America were marshalled to wage the biggest war in history, and nothing was spared to achieve the most extravagant expenditure of these resources. Three hundred billion dollars worth of goods went to the greediest of all consumers, and almost everybody had a job for a couple of years.

Today, politicians, labor leaders, economists, and even some business executives are outbidding one another in estimating unemployment during the months following the surrender of Japan. Eight million by next spring is the prediction of John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. But by the spring, Mr. Snyder blandly assures us, industrial reconversion for peacetime production will have been mostly accomplished and a new period of prosperity and full employment will follow. Government economic "planning" will be used only to fill the occasional gaps, according to his reconversion program. Apparently, he does not reckon with the tremendous psychological stimulus the dangers of war gave to industrial production, nor with the fact that sustained production at an annual level of 150 billion dollars was underwritten by guaranteed high profits, guaranteed payment, and guaranteed good behavior of labor. Mr. Sidney Hillman of the C.I.O. is worried. Perhaps his class-collaboration hand was overplayed. He guesses that "Ten million will be out of work within the next six to eight weeks."

Your guess is as good as mine, but there is no doubt the cancellation of war production contracts, the cessation of Lend-Lease, and the demobilization of millions of servicemen will end the phoney war-time prosperity.

Let us consider the outlook for the 65 million Americans who comprise the industrial workers and members of the armed forces. Will reconversion take them back to the pre-war days when one-third of our families had annual incomes of less than one thousand dollars and between ten and thirty percent of the workers were unemployed? Or will the pent-up "demand" for cars, radios, sewing machines, clocks and watches, refrigerators, new homes, electric irons, etc., start the spiral of economic boom which will absorb the demobilized soldiers and industrial workers? Or will the United States follow the trend of European countries such as Russia and England, and embark on a course of state "socialism" in one form or another in order to utilize its resources and keep the wheels of industry turning?

The answers to these questions lie not only in an analysis of the various objective economic trends, for within the framework of the economic forces of production, prices, employment levels, wages, savings, etc., there are at work the ideological, emotional, and social forces of the human

beings who created the billions of dollars worth of goods in 1944 and those who reaped the golden harvest of war profits.

Without attempting any predictions, an analysis of the objective factors in the over-all employment picture must take the following facts into consideration:

1. About a half of our industrial production has been for war goods. Most of this will stop in a matter of weeks or months.

2. The manpower requirements of the armed forces are bound to be cut by more than half. To the normal demobilization there are added the factors of new weapons such as the atomic bomb and rockets which make large armies useless, and the pressure from the public for the return home of its soldiers and sailors.

3. Total wages will drop possibly as much as thirty billion dollars (this is one economist's estimate) as a result of loss of overtime, downgrading, and people leaving the labor market.

4. In the next few months between twenty and thirty billion dollars in surplus capital goods, plants, and consumers goods will be dumped on the market by the Government. Most of this will probably go to big business for a song.

5. Living standards of some workers have improved but the myth of fabulous war savings by the average worker will soon be shattered. Most wartime savings are in the hands of large corporations and businessmen. The worker will hesitate before he spends his few hundred dollars in bonds to make the first payment on a new car or refrigerator.

6. Unemployment insurance, even at the higher level recommended by President Truman, can palliate some of the worst features of joblessness, but experience has shown that it has never been a sufficient factor to affect the business cycle.

On the other side of the picture, there are some forces tending to make for greater consumer demand and increased production, up to certain limits, such as organized labor action for higher pay scales, foreign exports for commercial sale and relief of distress, Government spending for public works and credits to stimulate business activity, and lowering of taxes. These, however, are the variables, the imponderables which still leave the control of our economy in the hands of the bankers, the industrialists, the Government bureaucracy, assisted by a good part of labor's officialdom, the same people who never knew how to utilize the full resources of the nation for peaceful purposes.

It would be the height of folly for the working class to assume a wholehearted desire by Government and business to provide socially useful and responsible work for all who want it. The scandalous behavior of Congress in taking its vacation without considering the President's "must" legislation on full employment should be viewed not as laxness but rather as an act of planned planlessness to strengthen the hands of employers. The *N. Y. Times* does

not even shrink at disclosing the intentions of the anti-labor elements. In a report by Frederick R. Barkley discussing the Senate Committee hearings on the Murray bill, the *Times* of August 26, 1945, states:

"As developments go so far, almost everyone on Capitol Hill agrees that full employment in the post-war period is desirable, although there are undertones to the effect that it is also desirable to have a few persons looking for work which they cannot get, because of the expected salutary effect on the output of others who have got their post-war jobs."

The plain fact is that the business interests have vastly greater power than labor, that they have closer ties with the Government, and that their outlook is motivated primarily by self-interest. If labor gets much more than enough to keep it alive, it will come out of the pockets of the employers. The fact that labor at the same time constitutes the market for the employers' products does not matter to the individual boss. When that market shrinks, as it is now rapidly doing, and the free market mechanism breaks down, the individual awareness tends to become class awareness. When organized, this class consciousness may take various reactionary forms. Labor must be prepared to defend its interests at all times, but even more so at crucial periods such as the present.

Unless the American working class develops a more practical technique of self-defense than it had during the war years and a far-reaching program for future progress as a controlling economic force, it will fail to achieve even elementary self-preservation.

A pre-requisite to such a program is the shedding of some illusions. First, the vain hope that the Government will provide for labor's welfare. The capitalist system may have many years of life left in it, but survival by means of a "controlled" economy crutch such as the Full Employment Bill will be at the expense of living standards, freedom and eventually the stifling of labor's initiative to the point of dehumanization.

Second, the belief that its fundamental interests lie along the lines of collaboration with the employing class. This balloon may burst when the industrial unions, particularly the C.I.O., find their membership rolls hitting rock bottom as the number of jobless increases. The peaceful partnership of capital, organized labor, and Government which served so well to line the pockets of employers will vanish when the junior partner's usefulness has ended. Labor-management cooperation during the war has sapped the initiative of the working-class so that it now finds itself caught with its pants down. The rank-and-file of labor was in this regard much more alert than the leadership, especially the "left wing" leadership hungry for large membership rolls but oblivious to the future needs of the workers. No confessions or breast-beating by the Communists or their "liberal" stooges can undo the damage wrought by this unadulterated betrayal of the interests of the workers. Victor Riesel, writing in the *N. Y. Post* of August 27, 1945, predicts that "the war-swollen C.I.O. which spent millions educating its members to respect organized labor, to fight for liberal government, and to combat intolerance may soon find itself bankrupt and down to 2,000,000 members."

Third, the notion that "private enterprise" is needed to produce and distribute goods and to make jobs. Labor's realization of its own tremendous potentialities can blossom forth with great rapidity after it takes the first steps to break the vicious circle wherein it is allowed to work and eat only if somebody else makes a profit. Despite the tragic

mistakes of restraint, of reliance upon the Government, made during the last few years by organized labor in the United States, which left it poorly prepared for the present struggle, it is in good part a young movement with immense potentialities for expansion and receptivity to new ideas. And it lives in a country where many people take seriously the idea that they have the "right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

A crisis in which the spectre of unemployment looms as the outstanding symbol of the hopelessness and inadequacy of our system now faces the working class. This challenge must be met with a twofold attack: A courageous and resolute program of independent action by labor to meet its immediate needs of maintaining and bettering wages, hours, conditions—and a long-term social policy sufficiently imaginative to envision in the near future the control and management of natural resources and basic means of production by the mass organizations of labor and consumers.

Labor's immediate program must include not only the traditional demands for better wages, less hours, no price increases, and full social insurance—it must begin to take over where the present machine breaks down. For instance, the workers who produced war materials in Government-owned plants should themselves turn these swords into ploughshares, reconvert by assuming cooperative ownership and management of these facilities, and produce goods needed by other workers. The idea of cooperative ownership is no longer so new in this country. The petroleum industry, for instance, saw \$197,000,000 worth of its products produced now embarking on an international trading venture. Workers without homes or living in slums might find a great deal in common with unemployed building workers. The determination of the kind of goods the workers want need not be the monopoly of the semi-lunatic advertising profession. Why cannot the workers designate some of their own representatives on a local, regional, and national scale, perhaps in conjunction with consumers' coops, to study the needs and desires of the worker-consumer? This is not only an essential step in achieving purposeful and useful production, but can serve as a guide in developing the strategy of the battle for a better life. The socially minded elements in the labor movement have the task of implementing and expanding such a program for the concrete expression of labor's solidarity so that the employers may not pit employed against jobless, white against Negro, industrial against agricultural, American against foreign, and veteran against non-veteran.

The long-term policy of striving towards socialism—free socialism—will be moulded to a great extent by the manner in which the immediate program is carried out. To millions of workers this word "socialism" is no longer a bogey-word. In 1942 a poll conducted by *Fortune Magazine* showed twenty five per cent of the population in this country in favor of some form of socialized economy. And to confirm an everyday observation, recent industrial research studies disclosed that the majority of workers want to feel more than anything else (next to security) that they are not commodities, that they are participating in work useful to the community, that they are important to the plant, that society has a place for them. These aspirations must be taken into account now, integrated into the program of labor's demands, so that the present struggle will lead in the direction of a society in which producers will manage production, consumers will determine what they consume, and, cooperating in an atmosphere of free give-and-take, they may strive to enjoy the fruits of a bountiful nature and man's almost unlimited capacity to make nature work for him.

S. MORRISON

THE 'FRISCO FLASCO

THE San Francisco United Nations Conference on International Organization to Keep the Peace of the World under the Baton of the Big Three Conductors has closed its doors. It has worked out a Charter which is to be a kind of new World Constitution, an International Bill of Rights, and a Bible of the Peace-Loving (whatever this may mean) Nations—all put into one.

We do not object to people sitting down at a round table attempting to set forth solutions to social evils. What we do object to is, first of all, the fact that fifty people sit down, actually representing nobody but themselves (having never been chosen by those whom they are supposed to represent), raising points of order or of disorder, while three of them pull the strings and order about the other forty-seven.

This, too, might have been considered a lesser evil, had all the fifty, and especially the three wire-pullers, been sincere in their desire to organize a body which would really avert wars and which would really stop any possible future rise of some kind of totalitarianism.

Let us remember that the great outcry, at the outset of the war in 1939, was "down with Fascism and Nazism," "we must never allow totalitarian ideas to rise again," etc., etc. At that time, Soviet Russia had signed a Pact with Nazi Germany. So Stalin did not object to Nazism and did not find it necessary to join in the struggle against it.

Hitler's strategic mistake made Stalin a democrat and a friend of the imperialistic democracies of England and America. This turnabout face, which added a new Ally to the anti-Nazi coalition, fooled no one, whether in Russia, or in England, or in America.

But it seems to have fooled a good many from among the fifty individuals sitting at the San Francisco Conference.

What would have been a true test of sincerity on the part of the Conferees, were actually their aim the creation of an international body bent upon nipping in the bud any attempt, anywhere in the world, of setting up any kind of regime, in any way totalitarian in character, or fascistic in ideology?

Let us try to elucidate three acid tests of sincerity:

1. *The test of ideologically totalitarian trends.*—It is clear to any sincere mind that the invitation to Argentina to become a member of the United (peace-loving) Nations was diametrically opposed to the very tenets of the Charter. That such invitation was fomented and organized by our own State Department clearly shows that there was a complete lack of sincerity on the part of those very "people's representatives" who wantonly ignored the feelings and desires of the people they so falsely represent.

Were the newly organized Security Council sincere, its first duty would be, at its very first session, to expel Argentina as represented by its present Fascist government which is poisoning the atmosphere of the Southern part of this Hemisphere.

It is not such a well-guarded military secret that the U.S.S.R. is a totalitarian state which happens to have found its way into the Allied camp by no desire of its own.

Had the San Francisco Conference been sincere, were the Security Council to take its duties in earnest, would not one of their first duties be to send a polite reminder to the Kremlin that totalitarianism is banned by the will of the millions of soldiers who fought and died "that it may never return"?

The "heroic defense of Stalingrad" is no valid argument. Soldiers die on all fronts, and "heroism" is no particular apapanage of this or that regime, of this or that battlefield.

The peasant soldiers of Stalingrad had as little to say in the shaping of their individual or social destinies as the German soldiers had, or, for the matter of that, as any soldier on any front. The important fact remains that totalitarianism is a danger to all, from whichever corner of the earth that danger arises. To be friendly to it, to kow-tow to it, and especially to give way to it opens wide the gates to new abuses, leading to new wars.

An international organization which warms in its bosom totalitarianism from the right—Argentina—or totalitarianism from the left—the U.S.S.R.—is not an organization capable of keeping the peace.

Shall we speak of Spain? Did the Charter close its door to Franco's regime? Did it call upon democracy to oust Falangist Spain? As things seem to develop, the Big Three who have the first and the last word would rather see a monarchy in Spain than a democracy. And the United Nations International Organization will see to it that Spain joins Argentina as the fifty-first "peace-loving" nation, with Franco out, but with the Falangist regime intact.

2. *The compulsory military service test.*—Germany is beaten as thoroughly as no country ever was, militarily speaking. So is Japan. Yet, we find ourselves before this curious phenomenon that a country like the U.S.A. is now on the eve of introducing compulsory military service; that the U.S.S.R. (which, by the way, always had compulsory military service) is now calling under her colors 15 and 16 year old boys for military training.

By the complete dismantling of Germany and Japan—countries which will, in addition, be policed for many years to come by the Russian, British, American and French armies of occupation—these will be physically unable to set up any kind of army, however lilliputian.

Against whom, then, are the Big Victors in World War II arraying their new armies?

This is more than suspicious. Are the chief peace-loving nations preparing for another war? Because you don't set up armies for nothing!

The minority leader of the House, Representative Joseph W. Martin Jr., has stated bluntly in his resolution on conscription that "compulsory military service has never prevented war in Europe or elsewhere, but, on the contrary, causes suspicion and fears to grow between nations and inclines the rulers of men to war rather than to peace."

Conscription in France and in Germany did not stop these two countries from being beaten on the fields of battle. And if all countries were to abolish conscription, where would the danger lie?

That the United Nations in San Francisco found no anti-conscriptionist expression in all their Charter paragraphs shows that compulsory military service has come to stay, and that is, and has been, the greatest breeder of wars. Thus, the insincerity of the United Nations is flagrant.

3. *The disarmament test.*—This results directly from the conscription test. If we are to have large standing armies recruited by compulsory military service, we will necessarily and unavoidably develop a military caste in all the "peace-loving" countries, a caste that lives and thrives on armaments, still more armaments, always armaments. Such production of arms becoming obsolete at an always faster rate as technique develops, will bring about the need for still greater arsenals and will call forth the natural desire of using these arms.

Did the San Francisco Conference of fifty nations advocate disarmament? Germany is disarmed; Japan is being disarmed. But if Russia, and the U.S.A., and the British Empire go on arming, the plain question is—what for and against whom? If it is against a still non-existing enemy, it is Quixotic. If it is against someone who may become

an enemy, where are all your Charters going to? Was it worthwhile bamboozling the whole world into believing that peace is really at hand?

The United Nations have proved beyond any speck of doubt that they will be unable to organize peace so long as there will be armies ready to fight and equipped with ever increasing stocks of modern implements of war, and that they will be unable to stop totalitarian ideologies to flourish so long as they have taken into their family of nations breeders of such ideologies.

The Charter has already become a scrap of paper.

The lust for power has overwhelmed the San Francisco talks.

We are not yet ready for an international understanding of peoples. Because the peoples have not yet any say in international gatherings.

This is why the San Francisco Conference is but the first act toward new wars, more devastating than were their predecessors.

JOS HARAP

The Anti-Franco Forces in Spain

ON the eve of D-Day, in the spring of 1944, leaders of the two revolutionary trade unions of Spain met in Madrid and drew up an agreement for common action against the regime of Generalissimo Franco. The Socialist U.G.T. and the Anarcho-Syndicalist C.N.T., each with a membership of a million to a million and a half, thus renewed their spontaneous alliance of the 18th of July, 1936, when they rose to resist the attempted seizure of power by a Junta of army officers, the Fascist Falange party and all the rightist parties in Spain. It will be remembered that the two labor unions won the fight in Madrid and in Barcelona. But for the intervention of Germany and Italy and the non-intervention of the democracies the issue would have been decided in favor of the people against the Fascists within the first twenty-four hours after the Franco uprising.

The U.G.T. - C.N.T. agreement, though arrived at some months before D-Day, was published and distributed in Spain on the 18th of July, 1944, to commemorate the spontaneous union of 1936. To date it constitutes the only hopeful event on the otherwise dark background of Spain's future. The second World War, the European phase of which started in Spain, has ended leaving Spain still in the power of a Nazi-Fascist satellite. Although at San Francisco and at Potsdam, Franco's government was barred from the Council of the United Nations, there is little hope that any step will be taken by the outside world to aid the Spanish people in their own struggle for liberation. The Spanish government-in-exile formed in Mexico and supported by a rump parliament of left republican and socialist deputies has received no encouragement from any of the big powers. . .

The task of liberating Spain thus rests squarely upon the Spanish people themselves, and more particularly on Spanish organized labor. What this means can be measured by the fact that the civil war has cost Spain in killed, crippled, exiled, political prisoners and forced labor battalions upwards of two and a half million people, or ten per cent of the Spanish population. The vast majority of victims were moreover among the people who fought against Franco. Franco's armies were largely composed of foreign legionnaires, German and Italian troops, and contained only the Carlists of Navarra as a genuinely Spanish fighting force.

It should also be borne in mind that none of the European peoples overrun by the Nazis were able to free themselves without the full support of the armies of the United Nations. Before they received arms and ammunition there was not much of a resistance movement in any of the European countries, because barricades have long since become obsolete weapons against the tanks and planes of modern invaders. It is therefore not surprising that until the liberation of France, there was virtually no underground movement in Spain, actively engaged in fighting the regime of Franco. Although Franco's armies are not

nearly as powerful as the Nazi armies of occupation, it would have been folly to try to engage them in open battle as long as the Spanish populace lacked even small arms for guerrilla warfare. Since the liberation of France, however, arms have been infiltrated into Spain. The French Maquis, grateful for the aid they received from the Spanish exiles in France during 1944, have turned over their weapons to their Spanish comrades. A chain of traditional Spanish smugglers have done the rest. A recent reliable report traces those arms and ammunition to the Allied stores as far down as the Rio Tinto in the south of Spain.

The Spanish guerrillas who have held out without arms and virtually without food these many years in the mountain ranges of Spain, have gone to work this spring. They are raiding villages and towns for provisions and have sometimes stayed long enough to put Falange officials on trial and carry out the judgment. These guerrilla armies are however too small to wage open warfare against the armies of the government, and their efforts can therefore be crowned with success only by a mass uprising of Spanish labor. It is for this reason that the agreement between the U.G.T. and the C.N.T. is of such paramount importance. For without such an agreement the two trade unions might have fallen prey to the tactics of "divide and rule" in which the regime of Generalissimo Franco is as proficient as it is incompetent in everything else. Unfortunately, even at this stage, the U.G.T. and the C.N.T. leaders were unable to arrive at a clearly defined program for the reconstruction of Spain after the overthrow of the Fascist government. At least the document makes no mention of such an agreement. It confines itself to the tactics which must be employed to oust Franco, but is silent on the differences which made the two labor unions rivals under the Republic. Presumably there is excellent reason for not describing the tactics agreed upon, but there can hardly be any reason for keeping silent on the paramount issues of Spain. Has the U.G.T. agreed to the C.N.T. program on the agrarian problem,—or vice versa? Will the U.G.T. continue to support a Socialist party in parliament with its rigid policies of centralization, of nationalization of the land and of the factories, against the C.N.T. program of complete decentralization of the state in economics and in politics? On these questions the document is silent. That is to be regretted because revolutions are never made only to oust the powers-that-be. If they are to succeed, the people who are expected to risk their lives must know not only what they do not want, but also and above all what they *do* want instead of the despotism under which they are forced to live.

However, on one point there is complete agreement between the U.G.T. and the C.N.T. Both unions are emphatic in their rejection of any collaboration with the Communists. Since the two unions comprise between them virtually all Spanish labor, Spain today, as before the civil war, stands in no danger of a Communist dictatorship replac-

ing the dictatorship of the Falange. To all Spanish labor this has always been clear and the unions would hardly have bothered stating their opposition to Communism, if Moscow and its spokesmen abroad had not given out the news that a Communist Junta Suprema was operating in Madrid. According to Moscow, this Junta Suprema had not only united all Spanish labor against Franco, but had also won the support of all the political parties of Spain from the Catholic right to the Socialist left. All Spanish political parties were allegedly agreed to fight the war against Franco under the leadership of Spanish Communists. To anyone who possessed even a rudimentary knowledge of Spain, the idea that any political party could assume leadership over all the others is of course a fantastic idea. Least of all could such leadership be assumed by a practically non-existing party and movement. Before the civil war, the Communist party counted some 3,000 members in all of Spain. Their influence over labor, intellectual life and politics was nil. Even during the civil war, with the full support of Russia, Communism failed to take root. Moscow knew from the start that neither the Socialist rank-and-file of the U.G.T., nor the Anarcho-Syndicalist and Anarchist members of the C.N.T. could be won over to the communist cause. Moscow consequently devoted itself to the suppression of the Socialist and Anarchist collectives in agriculture and industry formed at the beginning of the civil war. For the rest, the Communists, in one of their marvelous about faces of policy, recruited their members among the middle classes in republican territory by promising them protection against the revolutionary program of Spanish labor. Since the democracies had refused all aid to the Spanish Republic, Republican Spain had to yield the direction of the war to Russia, to the Spanish Communists and to their fellow travelers. By the spring of 1937, the government, the control over the republican armies and the police were in the hands of the Russian consuls in Barcelona and Madrid who directed the war against Franco through the good offices of Negrin, Prime Minister of the Republic, and of his Foreign Minister, Alvarez del Vayo. Nevertheless, though all the methods of repression at the disposal of a police state were used against the labor unions, the Unions proved irrepressible. By the summer of 1938, Moscow was convinced that the war against Franco, if it could still be won, would not be won for the Spanish Communist party. And since Spain would not become a satellite of Moscow, the Russians withdrew from the civil war, while the people of Spain continued the fight for another nine months without Russian arms and without hope.

Russian intervention in the Spanish civil war produced the paradoxical result that the war of the non-interventionist democracies against the Germans and the Italians was celebrated by Spanish labor as heralding its own war of liberation. While news from the Russian front and the victories of the Red Army were received in Spain with indifference, every advance of the Allies in Africa, Italy, France and Germany was celebrated by the Spanish man-in-the-street as a victory for his own cause. People who knew me would stop me in the street and give me the news: "We are advancing on all fronts." And lest I did not get the joke, they would repeat *WE* (*nosotros*), pointing to themselves.

Among the Spaniards in exile, only Negrin and del Vayo have remained faithful to the Communist cause. Characteristically, they deny that they are communists, but follow in all their action the party line laid down in Moscow. They knew well enough that they had no support among the exiled republican deputies to the last parliament of Spain, and for this reason concentrated their efforts to prevent the meeting of the parliament in Mexico. When it finally did meet, a government-in-exile was constituted

without Negrin and del Vayo and the communists have consequently refused to give their support to that government. That is all that has become of the claim that the communist Junta Suprema unites all Spanish political parties and all factions.

But the Communists are not the only ones to refuse support to the government of Jose Giral, prime minister of the Government-in-exile, and Diego Martinez Barrio, chosen provisional President of the Republic. Though the Socialist labor union is represented by socialist deputies, the Anarcho-Syndicalist C.N.T. remains steadfast in its opposition to all political action and has no delegates whether in the parliament-in-exile or in the cabinet. Moreover, though a Basque and a Catalan are in the cabinet, the Catalans and the Basques have failed to obtain a change in the constitution of 1931 which denied them full home rule.

If general elections could be held in Spain today, they would undoubtedly produce an overwhelming majority in favor of a republic. But as in the municipal elections of 1931, which ousted the monarchy, that would prove only that Spain is united against the regime it has. It would not prove that there is a stable majority in favor of the parties of left republicans and socialists which form the government-in-exile. Once the elections are over, the C.N.T. and the national minorities would demand of the new republican government the immediate economic, social and political decentralization of the state. In other words, the government-in-exile led by the provisional President Diego Martinez Barrio would be asked to preside over the dissolution of the Spanish state.

Apart from the fact that no government in history has ever consciously proceeded with a program designed to remove itself from power, there is no evidence that either the left republicans or the Socialists in exile have learned the lesson of the failure of the republic from 1931 to 1936. Yet, unless they meet the demands of the C.N.T. for a return of the land to the management of the village commune they will not stay in power for long. As in 1934, the C.N.T. will refuse to vote for the Left even at the price of securing a majority for the Right, especially if the Left fails to solve the agrarian problem. Similarly, without the support of the Catalans and the Basques, no government of the Left can stay in power and hold its own against the revolutionary opposition of the rightist parties, since these command the loyalty of the Spanish army.

Although the tiny republican parties of the Left, led by Martinez Barrio, profess to favor a federated Spain composed of self-governing states, each enjoying equal rights with Castile in a common federation or confederation, the Socialists, led by Indalecio Prieto, are as much opposed as ever to a decentralization of the state. Obviously, decentralization and local self-government are diametrically opposed to their Marxian principles of rigid centralization. Republicans and Socialists are likewise divided on the agrarian problem. The left republicans, impressed with the example of France, would like to distribute the land of the Latifundia to individual farmers. That solution would secure for them a power in Spain not unlike the power of the radical socialists in France who can always count on the vote of the farmers. The Socialist party, on the other hand, advocates the nationalization of the land.

One might argue that either solution is better than the absenteeism of the present landlords and their vast armies of starving landless laborers. However, neither solution is practicable because of the nature of the soil in the center and south of Spain. It cannot support individual farmers without a prior reconstruction of the irrigation system of the Moors, which would require at least a generation of work. Nor can the land be collectivized and managed by the state in the absence of a competent civil service and of

a vast industry ready to supply the farm machinery needed for the purpose.

What is more important—both plans are unacceptable to the peasantry. The peasants have, of course, no interest whatever in the political purpose behind the plans. They want the land to be returned to them purely and simply because their village communes can extract enough from the soil to secure at least a bare subsistence. Economically, it is the only solution which could bring them immediate relief from starvation. Communal management of the land would satisfy the deep yearning of the peasantry for local self-government and free them from the brutal guardia civil and the local political boss in the service of the landowners. Furthermore, it would right a century-old wrong the expropriation of the common lands by the liberals in 1830-55, and their sale in the public market to the middle classes in the cities of Castile.

No government of Spain can hope to function with any degree of stability if it fails to satisfy this basic economic and social aspiration of the landless laborers and small tenants in Anadaluasia and other provinces of Spain, where the land is still held in quasi-feudal tenure by absentee landlords. The republican government-in-exile will find, on its problematical return to Spain, that it will have to yield to the Anarcho-Syndicalist unions of the peasantry or suppress them by force. Like the republic of 1931-36, it will prepare its own doom if it takes the course of violence and repression.

Nor is this all. The rightist parties will, of course, participate in any general election. They can be counted upon to sit in parliament for the sole purpose of preventing any kind of agrarian reform and will oppose all demands of the Catalans and the Basques for local autonomy. On the latter point, they will vote with the Socialists and thus always secure a majority against the decentralization of the state. But, if the republic cannot live without agrarian reforms, neither can it survive if it fails to satisfy the demands of the industrial North for autonomy. Spain presents the anomaly of an idle agrarian ruling class in Madrid dominating the industries and progressive nationalities of the North, with their sound agriculture based upon family sized farms and their potential capacity for the building of modern and expanding industrial life. As long as agrarian Castile retains the hegemony over the other nationalities and provinces of Spain the centuries-old conflict between them is bound to continue and condemn all Spain to the stagnation and backwardness of its past.

If there is any solution to the perennial problems of Spain, it manifestly does not lie in a return pure and simple of the defeated republic of 1936. The possibility of general elections in Spain itself is, of course, utopian at the present moment. Such pressure as is being brought to bear upon Franco by the victorious powers is a long way from being strong enough to force him out. He is moreover resolved to resist all internal pressure of the rightist parties for a return of the monarchy. Nothing short of a social revolution, a concerted uprising of the mass of Spanish labor and of the national minorities, is likely to bring about the end of the Franco regime and that of the old ruling class of Spain, the landowners, the Church and the army at the same time. It is in such an uprising that lies the best hope of Spain for a solution to its perennial problems.

The peasantry on the Latifundia can be relied upon to seize the land of which it was robbed a century ago, without waiting for the pleasure of a divided parliament, and the Catalans, Basques, Valencians, Galicians and others can be counted upon at the same time to make their own declaration of independence from the rule of Castile.

It is the tragedy of Spain that it has failed in the past to so time its revolutions as to take advantage of the best

possible conditions beyond its frontiers. The cycle of the French Revolution did not reach Spain until France was in the grip of Napoleonic reaction; the republic of 1931 and the revolutionary resistance of the Spanish people to the fascist coup d'état in 1936 came at a time when the rest of Europe was falling rapidly victim to the spread of fascist and communist totalitarianism. Today, when no power on earth can come to the rescue of Franco and his Falange or of the old ruling class of Spain, the people may still be too exhausted to wage a war of liberation. But if they should rise in time against their internal enemies, the common people of Spain would furnish proof to the rest of the world that there is a better alternative to Fascism than the totalitarianism of Russia. Instead of replacing one totalitarianism by another, Spain would give itself a social order based upon self-governing villages, towns and provinces, freely federated with each other for the pursuit of common ends.

GABRIEL JAVSICAS

THE RUDE AWAKENING

THE American Labor Movement lived during the last decade in a fool's paradise, enjoying beautiful dreams. After half a century of desperate struggles against inhuman exploitation, starvation and slavery; after pitched battles with professional thugs and strike-breakers, police, state militia and all other organs of government arrayed against it in its struggle for improved standards of living, American labor beheld a new saviour—the "New Deal."

Under the wings of the "Blue Eagle" of N.R.A. with the sweet music of the Wagnerian Social Security, Wage Hour Law and Fair Labor Practice acts written on the statute book, Labor dozed off and dreamed of Heaven on Earth under the mighty protective arm of the government. The institution that for centuries held Labor in a vice, that aided its oppressors, that robbed it of the opportunities to defend itself, swung completely around to help and protect it. Instead of forcing Labor into submission to the dictates of industrial overlords, it forced employers to recognize Labor Unions and to bargain with them collectively; it prescribed a ceiling over hours of labor and a floor under wages; it outlawed Company Unions and prohibited the use of spies and thugs in labor disputes. In its dream, Labor saw still better laws to follow. He saw Government providing steady jobs and a guaranteed yearly income; health and old age insurance, decent housing and provision for the maintenance and education of his children. Nor will he have to strike and suffer to acquire all these blessings. All that Labor had to do, was to vote once every two years for proper representatives in Congress and elect "friends" of the common people.

It is in the midst of this beautiful dream that came the rude awakening. Three "progressive" Senators, New Dealers all and therefore "friends" of organized labor, introduced a bill to deprive labor of all the privileges it had gained and, in addition, to take away its right to strike or to use its economic power in any other suitable way, so that it may defend itself or improve its working and living conditions.

The three Senators sponsoring the so-called "Industrial Relations Bill" are: Carl A. Hatch of New Mexico; Harold H. Burton of Ohio and Joseph H. Ball of Minnesota. The first one is a Democrat and an Administration man. The other two are so-called Progressive Republicans. The bill was drafted by a group of attorneys headed by Donald R. Richberg, who started his career as a Labor lawyer. And these "friends of Organized Labor" managed to frame the most vicious Union-busting bill that was ever introduced in the Congress of the United States.

The proposed bill, if it becomes law, will wreck the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, permitting once again the courts to issue injunctions against unions, as in former years. It will impose compulsory arbitration and practically wipe out the right to strike. It will outlaw "closed shop" and "union shop" agreements now enjoyed by most of the organized workers in America, and will give anti-union employers an opportunity to smash unions by discriminating against active union members and punish every attempt by the workers of their unions to defend themselves by stopping production or refusing to follow orders for speed-up. Any union which will dare to violate this law will be outlawed, and its members and officers would be subject to fines and imprisonment.

Under this law the government will practically have full control of every labor union. It will be the sole judge to grant or deny closed shop by determining whether seventy-five percent of the workers in the establishment are members and whether sixty percent of them vote for closed shop; a union that has a closed shop agreement will have no right to refuse admittance to any worker or expel a member from its ranks no matter what crime he may have committed against his fellow members. It is clear that under this bill unions will no longer be free associations of workers; they will become government bureaus, — as they are under any totalitarian regime.

No wonder therefore that the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill caused such great consternation in the ranks of organized labor and has been unanimously condemned by all trade union leaders: A. F. of L., C.I.O. and unaffiliated unions like the United Mine Workers and the Railway Brotherhoods.

One thing, however, the leaders of American labor failed to realize. They failed to see that the anti-labor legislation is a legitimate offspring of the very government policies that they themselves advocated and fought for. It is merely the reverse of the same medal.

There is a Russian saying: "If you like to ride a sleigh, you must also like to pull it." Once you permit the government to take part in industrial disputes; once labor attempts to benefit by legislation for shorter hours of work, higher minimum pay and the use of the law to compel employers to recognize unions and bargain with them collectively; once labor sets itself the task of promoting legislation favorable to its interests, it stands to reason that legislators will also take upon themselves the right to prescribe conditions of labor and rules under which the unions shall operate. By its bitter experience labor ought to know that by permitting government interference, it will be the loser in the final reckoning.

Even the benefits which labor gained through legislation are not real gains and are not lasting ones. Consider, for instance, the benefits organized labor derived from the Wagner Act. During the first ten years of that law, union membership increased fivefold. It grew from a bare three million members in 1935 to about fifteen million in 1945. About half of them joined unions with the help of the National Labor Relations Board. This, surely, is of the utmost importance to the labor movement; it is even more important than the material gains obtained by shorter hours and higher wages. If the trade unions succeed in holding their ranks intact in the post-war period, they will easily manage to defend their war-time gains and wrest further improvements. The question is only: how sure can the trade union movement be of the loyalty and determination of its millions of new recruits?

To our sorrow we must admit that these elements are far from being dependable. There is grave danger that millions of them will be lost to the labor organizations as soon as the war factories will close their doors, throwing out work-

ers into the streets to look for new jobs in establishments working for civilian production.

With a post-war depression an almost certainty; with millions of war workers turned out and millions of war veterans demobilized, competition for employment will be acute. Employers will grasp the opportunity to get rid of union control and cut wages to the very marrow bone by picking non-union men. In the scramble for jobs many a worker who joined the union through Labor Relations Board elections, will leave the union when membership therein will demand sacrifices on his part. Signs of such a tendency can already be noticed in the Auto Workers' Union.

The United Auto Workers' Union is one of the largest International Unions in America. It was born under the New Deal and almost trebled its membership during the war, when the industry was converted to war purposes. It was also the first industry to be affected by government cut-backs after the collapse of the Nazis. Now, this union lost close to a quarter of a million members in the first six months of this year, according to a report published by its Secretary-Treasurer, George Addes. The membership dropped from 1,236,580 to 1,008,159 members. The reason for it is obvious. Workers in the auto industry who lost their jobs left the union. Many more will follow when the Pacific war will be at an end, when war production will halt completely. The same pattern will be repeated in the other unions — in shipbuilding, in airplane factories, in rubber works, in aluminum production, in chemical works, etc.

For labor to gain improvements and strengthen its position in this world of ours is no easy matter, especially if it is to rely on temporary sympathies from legislative bodies or from a tolerant administration. Advantages gained this way are just as easily lost when sympathies and tolerance disappear. Labor must not be attracted by the bait of improvements through government legislation. The price it will ultimately have to pay for it is much too costly.

The economic struggle by the joint forces of united labor, relying on *its own permanent strength* rather than on the temporary goodwill of an intelligent Administrator or of a cowed Congress, this is the safest, albeit rocky road to independence and to a victorious issue of the fight for a legitimate place in the sun for those who toil and produce all that makes life worth while.

H. SIMON

THE CHARTER CAN WORK IF . . .

THERE are some very naive people indeed. An artificial enthusiasm is being worked up around the San Francisco Charter.

The failures of the past have been so gigantic that a powerful dose of injected goodwill is required to express any sympathetic concern about the new document signed by fifty nations, just a few years only after the miserable failure of the Charter that followed World War I and that gave rise to World War II just ended.

To make the new Charter at all palatable, official, semi-official and quite unofficial propagandists of a world peace emerging from the Big Three and the Little Fortyseven, we are emphatically told that the Charter *could* work if every citizen of every country *would* be sincerely impressed by the imperative need of a lasting peace.

As if we needed any Charter at all, were every citizen of the world imbued with the true spirit of peace.

The trouble is, unfortunately, that the great bulk of world citizenry, which is sincerely peace loving, has no say in the keeping and the organizing of a peaceful world.

Charters are written, alas, by people who do *not* want peace for people who do *not* want war. Result: War in 1914; war in 1939; war in 195.....

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 NUMBER ONE

WE feel no qualms about starting this magazine, although we can hear many of you exclaiming in dismay: What? Another one?

Yes, another one.

A new one.

One that has no ax to grind; and no chapel to pray in; and no party to appeal to.

Our aim is simple. Confusion reigns supreme. The thirty years' war which began in 1914, and one phase of which came to an end about four months ago, has befogged our brains and has brought disorder into our thinking.

We want to do some dusting up and some thorough spring cleaning. Perhaps we might save the slight sparks of intelligence which may yet be uncovered in the process.

Whatever will be our criticism of current events and of post-war plannings, we will accompany them by attempts at constructive thinking, giving new slants to old problems.

Our motto is Freedom — one and indivisible. We will remain true to it and will oppose any attempt to split it up into four, ten, or a hundred little freedoms—for everyone to pick and choose from. Freedom for all — or else we shall have four, ten, or a thousand and one forms of slavery.

We are not attached to any political party — whether behind us, or in front of us. Let us repeat this as emphatically as we can: we have no party shielding us from behind. We trust no party. Because we trust neither power nor capture of power,—whether for ourselves or for others.

We have no desire to create any new party: we would work against ourselves.

We want to be and remain independent; then only will we be able to fight consistently for Freedom and against power politics.

It will be a tough job.

We have no strings attached to our pen. Criticism will be distributed equally to friend or foe, so long as we consider such criticism well merited. Neither fear nor favoritism will dictate our written word.

We have no strings attached to our purse. A meager,

skinny purse which will barely permit us to live from hand to mouth, from month to month. We want no hidden purse-strings which will destroy our right to speak out.

It will be a tough job.

To fight for the right of the human being to be free within the framework of a free social structure is an uphill fight which leaves no room for illusory wishful thinking as to early successes.

So let those who want to take up this fight answer the roll call. There will be never enough of you.

Because it will be a tough job.

THREE MEN IN BERLIN . . .

THE punitive expedition known as the Big Three meeting in Potsdam has closed its arduous labors. You can read its communiqué forwards or backwards, but you will find not a single word in it which may have any close or distant bearing upon the lives of the millions of people living in Germany or in other parts of devastated Europe liberated from the Nazis.

In full agreement with the Atlantic Charter, to which the Big Three subscribed, and by which they solemnly proclaimed that none of them wished any territorial aggrandizement, a complete and most thorough vivisection of European lands is being undertaken. Half of Poland is taken over by Soviet Russia. Strips of Germany are thrown to Poland and to Russia, to say nothing of further "readjustments" to take place when the peace treaties will be signed at a future date and bits of territories will change hands in Italy, Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Rumania. Even Switzerland now wants something for having kept out of the war.

The only Potsdam mention of common-or-garden people is to be found in its statement that the years of atonement have begun for the German people.

True, at the concluding session of the San Francisco Conference, the representative of the Soviet Union asserted that the peoples of the world "must believe the Big Five desire peace." Was Stalin's mouthpiece sarcastic or did he want us to believe that the Russian people will have to trust Churchill (then still Prime Minister)? Or that the American people have to trust Stalin?

This kind of double talk gives us already an insight as to the eventual double (or treble, or quintuple) crossing which is being prepared behind the San Francisco and Potsdam stages. . .

And we should not forget that of the three governments represented at Potsdam, one speaks on behalf of Democracy, one on behalf of Labor and the third on behalf of Socialism.

That such three idealists were unable at the threshold of world peace to say a single word about the future

of the peoples they proudly represent or of the peoples they have victoriously liberated is the greatest condemnation of Democracy, of Labor, and of Socialism.

We read in the Big Three Declaration, the first signature to which is that of Stalin, that Italy is making "good progress toward the re-establishment of a democratic government and institutions," and we cannot help thinking that we are still waiting for the day when democratic institutions — we presume this to mean, as a minimum, freedom of thought, of expression and of the press — will be established elsewhere . . . among the victors. Charity does begin at home.

When the Germans invaded Eastern and Western Europe, they grabbed everything they could lay their hands on.

When the Allies occupied Germany, they grabbed everything they could lay their hands on,—officially, as per paragraphs so-and-so of the Potsdam Declaration. What a wonderful example to the vanquished, as well as to the peoples of the victorious countries! And what a fine distinction we are making between illegal robbery and robbery legalized by a document to which are affixed the three seals of the three peace-loving governments who, being thoroughly educated, are anxious to re-educate others.

So, the Big Three of Potsdam have nothing to say to the peoples of the world. Why should they? And how could they?

The peoples of the world want *real* peace, and there can be no real peace where there is inequality and injustice, where freedomlessness reigns supreme, where one man can exploit hundreds and thousands of his democratically "equals"; where a powerful state machine destroys political freedom and trade union democracy. There can be no *real* peace where there is no *real* equality, whatever happens to be the race, creed or color of the individual.

To proclaim true peace would have meant for the Big Three to resign their powers over the Underdog. It would have meant that Government was incapable of actually organizing life on a basis of freedom to speak, freedom to write, freedom to work and freedom to eat. "Law and Order" — this bogey invented by governments, for governments — is a misnomer for oppression, exploitation and police control.

The Declaration of Potsdam is an international proclamation of "law and order." That is why it cannot satisfy whether the people of Germany or the people of the victorious and liberated countries.

That is why the people everywhere will have to think it over once again, and see whether this time they will reach the conclusion that it might be better — it would certainly not be worse — if they could take matters into their own hands. They have already developed a whole net of their own organizations — trade unions, consumers' and producers' cooperatives, educational institutions, to mention only the largest. Per-

haps they will brood over the constant failure of governments and states — democratic or dictatorial — to organize life decently, and to avert wars.

Perhaps they may draw some interesting conclusions.

new trends...

Atomic Fissure vs. Civilization

SO, we have discovered the greatest destructive energy yet unearthed by modern science.

We have not yet forgotten that the Nobel Peace prize was created by the inventor of dynamite. That we proclaimed from all roof tops that such an invention should be used for peace. That we very well know that it was almost exclusively used for war.

Many scientists who began their studies on the release of atomic energy in Germany under Hitler, will now receive new Peace prizes, and we will all proclaim that the atomic fissure is the greatest victory that Peace ever had.

And it will become the new dynamite, to be used for destruction or as a threat of destruction. It will become the chief blackmailing tool of the strongest against any one who will seek another solution than the one offered by that strongest "partner."

The clash of ideologies, which was at the bottom of the struggle led by a handful of sincere men and women who opposed Fascism and Nazism from their very birth, has become, by the will of the mighty warriors, the clash of dynamite, TNT and atomic fissures.

Nazism lost by a hair's breadth, because it did not find the atomic fissure in time. Democracy wins not because its ideals were right, but because the German scientists who began their work for the greatness of their Fatherland, finished it, by no free will of their own, as refugees in Sweden, England and the United States.

We wonder what our great Ally, the Soviet Union, thinks of the new discovery. Stalin, too, proclaims his democratic ideal of an authoritarian and totalitarian state. Will he not feel — if his scientists do not hurry up with a still greater destructive discovery — that the next Big Three meeting may discuss democracy through an atomic fissure? What could he put up against such weighty and powerful argument? It might bring to a sudden end the present Munich-like appeasement of the fissure-less Stalin, might it not?

No. The war against Germany and Italy was not a war of different ideologies. It was, and it still remains, a war between techniques. The better technique wins.

And let us take on a bet. While the first atomic bomb was released upon a Japanese city hardly a couple of weeks after the final experiments were concluded, it will take a good few years, now that we are at peace, before the atomic fissure, so jealously controlled by the powers-that-be, will be used to alleviate suffering, instead of causing it.

RAPHAEL SICO

Since the above was written, two news items are of special interest:

Prof. Waldemar Kaempffert writes in the New York Times Magazine (August 19) that it may take fifty years to put the Atomic Energy for man's benefit.

C. L. Sulzberger cables from Paris to the New York Times (August 19); "A Yugoslav scientist who has specialized in the study of atomic energy has been summoned to Moscow from Belgrade. . . . It is natural to speculate that Soviet authorities are anxious on their own to consult . . . on the subject . . . and to pool accessible information."

Notes and Comments on Our Contemporaries

Leo M. Cherne analyzes in *Common Sense* (July 1945) the failure of the San Francisco Conference: "When peace depends on the willingness of any one nation to keep it, war has not ended. San Francisco is constructing a security organization to prevent the recurrence of World War II—not one that will prevent a World War III." Thus, the new Charter equals the old League of Nations Covenant. Words and titles change but the quintessence remains: Peace charters prepared from above contain the seeds of future wars. Leo M. Cherne sees no solution, although he foresees the problem: "Unemployment is already the grinning ghost of the peace table, and hunger is leading in the race of the four horsemen. This is the revolution of our times. It will yet take a strong stomach to see it through and a strong mind to understand it." And, let us add, a people conscious of its own strength to carry on that revolution to a truly victorious end.

* * *

Politics (July 1945) is still busy with Dwight Macdonald's publicity stunt, "Moral v. Political Responsibility." We see his initial long, all-too long, article being now monthly complemented, supplemented and post-scripted from all cardinal and much less than cardinal points. In the July issue, Mr. Macdonald has a confession to make: "I was wholly wrong when I wrote that what the Nazis did in the death camps was 'done as publicly and proclaimed as exultantly as the winning of a great battle.' On the contrary * * *. Why I wrote so false a statement I don't know; there was no evidence for it; the intoxication of rhetoric must be my only feeble excuse." After this frank and freudially outspoken opinion about his own rhetorical in- or ex-hibitions, we take it that Dwight Macdonald will henceforth entitle his series "Moral v. Political Irresponsibility."

* * *

In the July-August issue of *The Network*, Ruth Fischer quotes Paul Merker, writing in "Freies Deutschland" (Mexico), as saying that the German workers' "co-responsibility is based on the fact that they have tolerated the coming to power of Nazism; every people shares the responsibility for the actions of its government." Ruth Fischer finds that "there is no

way back to German Communism of the time of Lenin and Liebknecht" and that "Stalinism and its offspring, Nazism, devastated the international labor movement in Europe; no phraseology can overcome this basic fact." And Ruth Fischer thus concludes her remarks about the future of communism: "From Kronstadt in March 1921 to the shameful disaster of the Thaelmann Party in March 1933 there is an unbroken line of disintegration of international Communism, ending with the complete transformation of all Comintern parties into sections of the Russian State Party and State Police. . . ."

May we remind Ruth Fischer that while her conclusions are historically correct *today*, they were as historically correct under Lenin and Trotsky even before the Kronstadt rebellion, to say nothing of the fact that the latter was quelled in blood by Lenin and by Trotsky at a moment when Stalin was a nonentity. The international labor movement in Europe was destroyed not by Stalin, who but continued the policy of Lenin and Trotsky; it was destroyed by the very idea of party dictatorship "ueber alles."

* * *

The *New York Times Magazine* (June 24, 1945) has a very interesting article by Prof. Friedrich A. Hayek entitled "Tomorrow's World: Is it going Left?" We can do no better than give a few excerpts:

"The radical parties almost everywhere become parties of pure expediency, lacking any clear principles, and for that reason continue to drift toward that totalitarian socialism which, at the same time, they are beginning to dread. They have not yet even comprehended that the time for 'Fronts Populaires' is past. . . ."

How true it is can be seen from the fact, noted almost in every country in Europe, that the Communists are still at their old game of offering united fronts, while holding a dagger behind their backs.

The author of "The Road to Serfdom" clearly sees the inner contradictions within modern radical thought:

"It may be well that, in spite of the victory over one totalitarian power, European civilization will not recover on this side of the Atlantic, and that it is destined to disappear under a new tyranny. . . ."

Prof. Hayek grows very pessimistic when he writes that—

"the century from 1848 to 1948 will probably come to be known as the century of Socialist delusion"

and

"that those delusions have led to the disappearance of almost all truly progressive movements and have now left the ordinary person little political choice but between one group committed to a pernicious program and another, whose majority seems frankly reactionary. . . ."

But Prof. Hayek leaves us a ray of hope for the future:

"There is every ground for hoping that wherever and whenever free discussion of the great problems of social order reopens, the forces of reason, the men who believe, above all, in individual freedom will be represented in a strength in which they have not been seen for a long time. . . ."

Although this last thought tends to contradict Prof. Hayek's black outlook of the world's disappearance under a new tyranny, we will grab this salvation straw of the world fight for individual—and social—freedom.

But why should not Prof. Hayek tell us in what direction, according to him, should the forces of reason act?

* * *

"After Churchill—what?" is the title of the most un-illuminating article written on the possible results of the British elections by Johannes Fellow Traveler Steel (*This Month*, August 1945). Five pages of the most scientifically complete vacuum ever having filled space on this side of the stratosphere. Let us but read the last two sentences: "That is why no one will make any forecasts. And that is why your guess about Churchill's successor is as good as mine." It makes you think of Moliere's "Et voila pourquoi votre fille est muette." But the gist of the article by the well-known foreseer of events, printed in bold type at the head of the five pages, is the following 'my guess is as good as yours': "We venture the guess that there will be no removal vans at No. 10 Downing Street for some time to come."

As another part of *This Month* has it: "You pays your money and takes your choice."

France of Today and of Tomorrow

By PIERRE BESNARD

The Labor Situation

WHEN France was liberated in August of last year, the Communists who were almost the only ones to possess arms occupied the offices of the various trade unions. They drove out the earlier office holders who had formerly driven out the Communists at the time of the Stalin-Hitler Pact which was the spark that let loose World War II. They took over the General Confederation of Labor (C.G.T.) and completely suppressed labor democracy. Union membership was never consulted on any matter. The Communists just issued orders. But a strong minority soon grew up within the C.G.T. under the name of the Coordinating Committee, with its own paper "La Bataille Syndicaliste." This Committee is made up of the various oppositions to Communist dictatorship within the French labor organizations. Its activities have compelled the Communists to some maneuvering. Thus, the French Communist Party had its annual convention recently. Up to that time, some of the members of the Party's Central Committee were simultaneously secretaries of the C.G.T. The outcry against this dualism so reminiscent of Moscow methods compelled the Convention to demand the resignation from the Central Committee of those of its members who were secretaries of the C.G.T.: Frachon, Monmousseau and Racamond. These three Communist leaders will now have to devote their time exclusively to the C.G.T. activities. This decision aimed at three things: 1) to make believe that the C.G.T. was not a tool in the hands of the Communist Party; 2) to give the impression that the C.G.T. was completely free to choose its own line of conduct; 3) to attempt to disarm criticism from the minority within the C.G.T.

In fact, however, nothing will be changed. The three who were asked to resign will continue to sit, in an unofficial capacity, at the meetings of the Party's Central Committee. Moreover, Monmousseau who reports on labor questions declared in his report to the Convention that anarcho-syndicalism has to be exterminated.

As to the Socialists who always act too little and too late, they decided recently to show an interest in the Factory Committees which are being set up now almost everywhere, compelling their members to participate actively in their activities. This—no doubt to regain ground lost to the Communists.

The face saving withdrawal of the Communist leaders in the C.G.T. from the Central Committee shows that the Communists do not feel themselves strong enough within the C.G.T. Their declaration of war to the Syndicalists proves, too, that they have ceased to consider the latter as a negligible quantity.

As a matter of fact, a new opposition has just arisen within the very Executive Body of the C.G.T. This new opposition is headed by no one else than Saillant, the secretary *pro tem.* of the C.G.T. while Leon Jouhaux was in a German concentration camp, and Bothereau, another secretary of the C.G.T. This is an important development, showing that the Communist yoke will be seriously shaken. On the other hand, the offer made by the Communist Convention for unity of the two parties has little chance of being accepted by the forthcoming Convention of the Socialist Party which is generally suspicious of anything the Communists propose. Leon Blum, uncontested leader of the Socialist Party, has already taken his stand against Communist unity.

What we need is moral and financial assistance from across the Ocean. The Communists have money and means; if we let them go, Europe will be swept by a Communist wave which will bode no good for future peace. Do the labor organizations in America understand this? The Soviet Government is helping the French Communists, now carriers of the Soviet Comintern policy. We do not ask help from any Government. But we have a right to expect it from fraternal labor organizations: their help can stem the onrushing tide.

The Jewish Question

Officially, there is no Jewish question in France. Nevertheless, it exists and it would be a grievous mistake to ignore it.

There were about 250,000 Jews in France in 1938, the great majority of them living in Paris.

If one is to believe a German publication issued in April 1944,—that is under German occupation—and devoted to the Jewish question, the number of Jews in France reached 800,000 by the time of the 1941 invasion. This would tend to show that during the period from 1938 to the fall of France over half-a-million Jews of various nationalities had managed to find asylum there. This figure seems to be exaggerated and has been used, no doubt, to bolster up public opinion in an unfavorable direction. Although no statistics are available, it is presumed that 150,000 to 200,000 Jews did find refuge in France, thus raising the total Jewish population, by 1941, to about 450,000. (These figures do not, of course, take into consideration French Jews, considered as Frenchmen.)

Were the figures of the German publication correct, it would indicate that a considerable number of non-French Jews have been murdered either in the French or in the German concentration camps, or were deported to Poland without going through the Drancy camp which was the center for the grouping of deportable Jews. On the other hand, a great number of Jews were also deported and otherwise dealt with not so much because they were Jews, but as political enemies.

It is estimated that about 180,000 Jews have passed through the Drancy camp. Among them were few German and Austrian Jews. This figure is probably below the truth.

The Vichy government never intervened in favor of Jews arrested or deported. Many Catholic and Protestant priests kept a considerable number of Jews hidden in their seminaries. Frequently, thanks to humane police agents who had informed Jews in time, a certain number were able to hide or escape to less dangerous zones. Many Jewish children were also adopted by French families.

The Jewish question in France is of a rather complex nature. There seems to be at present a kind of artificially raised slogan "not to talk about Jews." Many Jews themselves seem to feel that way. Perhaps are they afraid that five years of Nazi or Vichy propaganda have borne fruit and have influenced the population. There is a certain measure of truth in it—even in certain labor circles or in left wing movements. But, really, there is nothing that could be called even as a beginning of any anti-Semitic movement.

With the exception of a few degenerate fools, all those

who use reason live in good and friendly companionship with the Jews. I am convinced that Jews would gain a great deal by mixing more frequently with the general population and by learning the language of the country they live in. Many are trying hard to be in constant touch with French families and have not forgotten what the latter have done for them during the German occupation.

There are only those who have profited by the expropriation of Jews and who see their "income" disappear by the abolition of racial laws that remain doggedly opposed to the Jews and who attempt to create a movement of dissatisfaction against them, because they want to keep what they had stolen—whether apartments or businesses. . .

To sum up: officially—there is no Jewish question, and since our liberation the Jews get back, gradually and legally, their goods and chattels and their rights. But there reigns a certain uneasiness, and public opinion, with-

out being particularly indignant of the systematic massacre of Jews—and of its own kith and kin—is not set against them either. The behavior of the Jews themselves can do a great deal to turn this rather apathetic public opinion wholly in their favor. The Jews have to show some understanding, some tactfulness, some sense of proportion. Interpenetration, mutual understanding, sincere appreciation on either side is extremely desirable if one wants to kill from the very outset a kind of latent anti-Semitism kept up by people who nourish self-interest. Humanity has known enough misfortunes, mournings and ruins to need a new series of misfortunes and shames. . .

The most important of all seems to me to place the Jewish question on its true social foundations. It is from this angle that it should be raised—and solved.

I will return to this side of the problem at another occasion.

Literature and Life

James Joyce

NOVELISTS have had varied views of the world and different conceptions as to how to present to society what they have seen, a task complicated by the role they considered the artist played as an intermediary between the world they saw and the world they wrote about. Some have placed themselves outside of purposeful, creative social endeavor. They felt themselves above such mundane tasks and attempted to create some pure form of beauty. Their relation, or the relation of beauty to the mass of visionless, plodding individuals was not something with which to concern themselves. A social orientation, they thought, could not be demanded of the writer-artist because it robbed him of his "freedom" and of his right to pursue his art wherever his selective vision of beauty led him. They failed to see that the writer, living among his fellow-men, in a particular society, accepted it or rejected it with or without alternatives and reservations. They never got above society, and "art for art's sake" became merely a convenient theory by which they were enabled to accept what existed, because it was too troublesome to react against and change these conditions. "Art for art's sake" was an attitude which they confused with an inner desire to be free from the repressive ugly elements in society. Theirs was unconscious escapism. Paradoxically, these artists became free by accepting the basic tenets of their society, thus placing themselves outside the battle.

James Joyce lived outside of his world, but was peculiarly part of it. As a matter of extreme technical virtuosity he will be remembered for his perfection of the stream of consciousness technique as it was handled in "Ulysses" and the stream of dream unconsciousness, as he developed it in "Finnegan's Wake." He can be classed with Thomas Mann in the use of the myth and symbol for the building up of plot and presentation of manifold meaning. A further contribution was his utilization of language so that it gave an auditory image as well as an apperceptive image; we had to hear it at the same time that we read it if we were to understand his compound meanings and allusions. Yet, in spite of his technical contributions to contemporary literature, we are led to ask ourselves, after we have read, and of necessity, re-read Joyce: What has he given us? What human values can we derive from him? This is a fair question to raise, for Joyce does not pretend that his contributions end with his technical innovations, and his consummate artisanship is woven about a philosophy of

history and a conception of the individual which results from deep psycho-analytic consideration.

Joyce has given us a rather full picture of his world. In "Dubliners" he collects his significant experiences of Dublin life. Here is realism — but a realism that smacks of revelation. For implicit in each story, in the very selections in this seeming haphazard collection, as it starts out in the "Sisters" with a child and death to the final and longest story, "The Dead," that deals with the ultimate aloneness of the individual even in relationship, we find the unvoiced statement that the story transcends its characters and its locale. Educated in a Catholic institution, a Jesuit school, having trained for and almost become a priest, Joyce cannot be expected to be a pure realist. His mind was keyed to the bigger truths behind the facts. Realism may exist on the earth but the realities were in the next world. It is in spiritual and bodily agony that the cleavage between worldly realism and religious reality is drawn. In "A Portrait of the Artist" we see the intense struggle that takes place between Stephen Dedalus' body and soul, as he sins helplessly and is presented with the grinding, horrifying picture of eternal damnation. He retires to his room, stricken to his very core, and vomits out his bodily impurity. For a time he is renegade, but for a time only. The call of the world, of the body, is overpowering. The Catholic picture of damnation is too terrible to admit of the acceptance of God. The worldly alliances of the Church are ignoble to him. He is led to the rejection of Catholicism: he refused to serve the church in any willing acknowledged capacity, refused allegiance to the fox that gnawed at the living soul. But the sense of sin that Catholicism had fastened upon him neither his writings nor his intellect could exorcise. He trod the rest of his life the difficult path of a mighty mind obsessed with rebellion and held to guilt.

He rejected, too, the world of the "Dubliners," the middle class society in Dublin, many of whose characters move through the pages of "Ulysses." He could not bear with their politics that sacrificed the Irish hero Parnell, their narrow nationalism, their church-going and spiritual darkness, their drinking and insensitivity.

And so he left the church and Dublin; and as he did so, Stephen, in ecstasy, cries out: "Welcome, O life! I go to encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience and to forge in the smithy of my soul the uncreated consciousness of my race."

He left Dublin, but he was tied with an endless unseverable umbilical cord to his mother city; travel where

he might he was nourished by the city that he had rejected and which, at the same time, had rejected him.

In "Ulysses" and "Finnegan's Wake," Joyce wrote of Dublin and, in mind at least, walked its streets and entered its stores and pubs. In his exile he became more than ever fascinated with the isolation of the individual among his fellow-men. His strongest story in "Dubliners," "The Dead," develops the theme which constantly beset them — the problem of the divided relationship. His characters search to establish a relationship. In "Ulysses," Stephen seeks a father, Bloom a son, Molly, a lover — from Bloom, now discarded, to Stephen the sought-for-son. They do so unsuccessfully or futilely. The division is not merely between people: his people are aspects of one person. In Joyce's sinning and his aspiration for priesthood, we find the basis for the dual nature of his characters. Earwicker's twin children symbolize the Cain and Abel of the world, the inner antagonisms of the individual. The dualism which his Catholicism taught him remained forever with him, and he implicitly accepted its attack upon the body as an evil, lustful thing leading one to everlasting hell. The search for a communal relationship he felt, too, in the hold that his despised Dublin had upon him. In "Finnegan's Wake," Joyce confesses that Dublin was a sour grape anyway.

If Joyce finally found a fundamental relationship it resided in the darkness of the deep unconsciousness — it was the relationship of the indiscriminate man with the receptive, affirmative woman. This is Freudianism with the early, rigid sexual emphasis.

"Finnegan's Wake" is the conclusion of "Ulysses." After we walk the streets with Bloom and Stephen and follow the thoughts of Molly as she is about to fall asleep, we sink into the dream world of Earwicker and finally waken in the morning with him and his children. The awakening of Earwicker, his rising from the pit, is the beginning of a new day, a day of beer tapping for him in his pub. Thus the cycle of Dublin life, of city life, begins anew. This is the philosophy of history that Joyce adopts from Vico: history repeats itself. Or, as Joyce puts it, life is a "vicous cicle."

Joyce places us in an endless futile maze. From dawn until sleep overtakes us till we rise again, we follow a goalless path. The phoenix that awakens from our dream-bed takes us to Healiopolis, no city of the sun, but the city of Healy, of Dublin, of London, Paris, New York. We are left hopeless, there is no escape to some happier life in which we find an interrelationship with other human beings.

The period in which we are living is one of transition, a period without a community of belief. Joyce represents this transition which has left behind and discarded the old beliefs as inadequate to meet the arising problems, and which has not as yet realized a new community of belief. This transition period is one of groping, of blindness, of disillusion and of seeming chaos. Joyce's greatness as a writer lay in his ability to express the chaotic aridness that permeates so much of our present living and to do it with a technique that is representative of this living. But in not being able to express any communal feeling and action, a lack which was implicit in his own alienation from society, he demonstrated his great limitation. For, from the artist who assigned himself the task of commenting on civilization and man, and especially from one who set out to forge the "uncreated consciousness" of his race, we have a right to expect something more than an echo of breakdown and chaos. Of all people we may ask, but of him demand, the creation of a bridge that will lead us out of the wilderness of transition to the new land of communal consciousness and belief.

In this transition period there are those who have dedicated themselves to the labor of planning and working for a new society,—one built on a basis of socialist federalism that will halt the growing leviathan of economic and political centralization and authoritarianism. For if the independent, creative spirit of the artist is to continue to function, it must not merely build bulwarks against the rising tide of totalitarianism whether flowing from capitalism or from state "socialism"; it must become an aggressive force and create a spiritual awakening that will enhance again the individual and reaffirm the values of freedom that have received a setback at the hands of the bureaucrats and commissars. This is not to ask the novelist to drop his art for the role of pamphleteer or professional revolutionary, but to seek, within the scope of the work in which he has selected certain ideas and sectors of society for portrayal, an emergent spirit of new hope and life. The answer to the question, "what if the artist sees and feels neither a new hope nor a new society?" is that, then, it is the duty of the critic, and others, to bring the awareness to him.

It may be bold, iconoclastic, to say of such a literary figure as James Joyce that he has borrowed too much, — which is no argument against what he said, — and has given us too little beyond a marvelously clothed erudition and a lively, playful fantasy. Joyce leaves us dazzled, fascinated, but unsatisfied.

JACK WHITE

The Fate of International Labor

The wrangle over the question who will pull the wires of International Labor still goes on unabated. The pre-war International Federation of Trade Unions must be frankly admitted to be dead, dead as a doornail. Its leaders have been caught in the very fine spider's web spun by the Russian Communists, and are now just no more than dried up flies unable to wriggle any further.

The assistance given to the Soviet Unions by the C.I.O. was no doubt of very great value, especially as the British Trade Unions had slightly miscalculated the specific gravity of the C.I.O. as against the A.F. of L.

The internal wrangle between the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O., too, has helped the Russians who, while "regretting" the absence of the former, have patted the latter on the back and have drawn to their bosom the "anti-Communist" Sidney Hillman.

All this international labor squabble means much more

than simply setting up a new World Federation of Trade Unions. The coming lean years all the world over are an exceptionally fertile soil for unrest in the wake of hunger and cold. And the Soviets are great hands at fishing in troubled waters. Now that the Russians feel sure they have enmeshed the British Trade Unions into an inextricable position, they are hurrying through the process of setting up trade unions in those countries where they possess a political fist. We learn that eighteen labor unions have just been set up in Berlin . . . in that part of Berlin, of course, which is under Bolshevik control. And before even these eighteen unions were able to meet and organize themselves, a self-appointed (or rather Moscow appointed) Council of eight members has been set up, four of whom are Communists. This "roof organization" has already a name: Freie Deutsche Gewerkschaftsbund (Free German Trade Union Council). We do not know as yet whether

"free" refers to the Germans, to the Trade Unions or to the Council. But we do know that the Central Soviet Council of Trade Unions in Moscow is as free to make its own decisions in matters of labor as a prisoner is free to decide of his movements. . . . It is not difficult, therefore, to picture to oneself the freedom which this Moscow organized German Council of Trade Unions will have in handling labor difficulties within the Soviet occupied zone of Berlin. Ominously enough, one of the eighteen unions permitted by the Russians to be set up is that of the policemen. . . .

Need we add that the other Allies did not find it necessary to do the same within their own sphere of occupation. Thus, the capture of labor by bolshevism marches on unhampered.

But Soviet neo-imperialism does not stop at "unifying" international labor under its wing. At the International Conference of Cooperatives, recently held in London, the three Republics set up after World War I and obliterated by the Red Army in World War II—Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia—were recognized at the bidding of the Soviet delegation as "independent national republics." This gave three further votes for Moscow, besides White Russia and the Ukraine.

Thus goes on the capture of all labor and cooperative organizations by the Bolshevik Moloch, without any active opposition on the part of those who have an inner dread of the new totalitarian ideology which is getting hold of the puny and of the meek.

George Meany's attack at the Blackpool meeting of the British Trade Union Congress on the Russian trade unions which he rightly branded as channels of "virtual enslavement" is but a second edition of his last year's similar criticism under exactly similar conditions.

But the A.F. of L., in whose name George Meany spoke, seems to be thoroughly satisfied that all that is needed is to make every year a "fraternal" speech at the British Trade Union Congress. This policy of "laissez-faire" is dangerous both for the A.F. of L. and for international labor as a whole.

Politically, everybody now agrees that the whole world is interrelated. The international fight against a particular form of totalitarianism—Fascism and Nazism—must be developed into as *international* a struggle against any kind of totalitarianism. "Fraternal" attacks at Conventions are useless and childish. A constant open struggle must be waged day in and day out against the "virtual enslavement" of Eastern Europe, of Central Europe and, at no distant date, of Western Europe. Distances do not count any longer. Totalitarianism destroys humanity as ruthlessly as the atomic bomb does. And America is not impregnable, especially if Europe falls victim to that new danger. Here at home, as well as on the international battlegrounds of enslaved labor, our voice must be heard daily.

Trade Union movements begin to show in many countries signs of revival after the tragic years of Nazi and Fascist domination. It would be criminal to allow Russian secret diplomacy to break up these attempts at reconstitution. All those labor organizations which, in this country, are opposed to virtual and global enslavement of the working class, have a duty to perform: that of supporting, by all the means at their disposal, any attempt in Europe at re-creating truly independent trade unions.

Now is the chance—and it may be the last chance—to try and stem the tide of red dictatorship cleverly maneuvering to replace the other kind.

Our own duty is clear: we have to wage a relentless war against totalitarianism everywhere, until the last vestige of such enslaving ideology will disappear from the surface of the earth.

Books of Today

A Marxist Hears Voices

THOMAS MANN, in the "Magic Mountain," speaks of music as being politically suspect. Settembrini, his Italian humanist, says: "Let music play her loftiest role, she will thereby kindle the emotions, whereas what concerns us is to awaken the reason . . . my aversion to music rests on political grounds." This kindling of the emotions can be utilized by any political ideology — reactionary or revolutionary — to support its program. Slochower ends his "No Voice Is Wholly Lost. . . ." on a musical parallel: "The goal is the interplay between individual genius and public organization — a symphony of voices where each singer carries his individual tune and where each tune merges with the total melody." He follows Malraux, one of his favored thinkers, in using this musical device to clinch his point. In "Man's Hope," Malraux, whose revolutionary, says Slochower, "is a man of heroic stature and vision," attempts by means of a background of Beethoven's music to integrate and resolve the antagonism between the two counter-currents which absorb his attention—individual expression and social control. This struggle takes place in the communist Manuel, who, as he rises to the upper layer of the military organization, finds himself more and more separated from his fellow-men and acting counter to them. The resort to music to reconcile his social problem is an admission of failure on the part of Malraux. Music remains "politically suspect" and Slochower's chorus is dominated by the voice of Malraux's Manuels who dictate social action separated as they have become from the common man.

The failure of Marxist literature and criticism (Slochower is a Marxist of the Stalinist kind) lies in its inability to integrate related points of view, talk as it will about it. Its "integration" is a suppression of differences. In literary criticism, as exemplified in "No Voice Is Wholly Lost. . . ." this suppression takes place through the operation of an intellectual blindness (when it is not conscious distortion) which can see only in terms of its own preconceived methods and solutions. Marxism has compensated these critics for their intellectual blindness by endowing them with a mental agility called dialectics which enables them to leap hurdles set up by consistent and honest thinking.

It is to the tune of centralized control that Slochower's heart beats. It sings when discussing the characters in Hemingway's "For Whom the Bell Tolls." "Although these people are primitive anarchic characters, with little understanding of the social import," writes Slochower, "they submit to centralized control and offer their homes and lives in behalf of the cause. This is the novel's great tribute to the social compulsiveness of the Loyalist struggle." It is this authoritarian social orientation that dominates Slochower's thinking and leads to the distortion in his analysis of such an anti-fascist writer as Silone. He condemns Silone through his central character Spina ("Bread and Wine" and "Seed Beneath the Snow"), who "breaks with his society, as well as with Marxist movement which attacks this society. But he breaks with neither cleanly. He can neither breathe the stagnant air of coordination, nor exist in the pure air of negativistic withdrawal." Slochower's attempt is to coordinate Silone by attacking his "negativistic withdrawal." The term "negativistic withdrawal" is one of Slochower's own choosing and is indicative of the appreciation felt by the realist politicians at the growing realization by many writers (like Arthur Koestler, whose voice is not heard in the book), unable

* "No Voice Is Wholly Lost. . . ." by Harry Slochower. New York: Creative Age Press; 1945. 404 pages, \$3.75.

to accept coordination and "withdraw" from "societal controls" to the extent that individual expression and needs are satisfied. Spina withdraws only to be closer to the people, to live with them and be one with them in their work and joys and sorrows. In this way, Spina believes, can a new life, a life of brotherhood and understanding, emerge. The basic goodness which Spina finds in human nature and which he tries to develop and stimulate by close contact with the Italian people, is glossed over by Slochower in dealing with Silone, but is favorably commented upon by him in dealing with Anna Seghers who is more amenable to Slochower's type of organizational control. For her novel "points to the anti-fascist potential existing in the very non-political elements of the German population. The fight against nazism appears as a struggle for the human idea itself" — except when the emphasis is upon the individual touch and approach as in Silone!

The point to which Slochower is led by his argument is a strange one indeed — it reveals to him a "dialectic irony"! For in his analysis of Spina's assumption of responsibility for the murder of the father of the deaf-mute by the latter and Spina's surrender to the authorities, our critic finds Spina emerging "from his underground isolation. The sociality is neither the Catholic nor the Marxist—both of which Spina has repudiated — but the Fascist State. His is an embrace, in reverse, of authoritarianism." Slochower cannot see Silone's identification of the deaf-mute with the Italian people nor can he accept, if he recognizes, Spina's individual action in assuming the guilt, and offering himself as a shield for his fellow men. To the Marxist mind, no seed can take root, no spirituality can perform its work but that it must have Marxist organizational sanction. (It is rather ironic to note that Silone, after a period of probation to see whether he would follow the Italian Socialist Party in kneeling before the Italian Communist Party, has been accepted as a member of the Executive Committee of the Socialist Party. This is an act of embrace, though not in reverse, of authoritarianism.)

The ultimate goal of socialism, Slochower quotes Marx as saying, is "the free association of individuals." We may refresh Slochower's memory that this is a distinguishing feature of Anarchist thought, which Marxism calls a petty-bourgeois ideology. Lenin in his "State and Revolution," written during the Russian Revolution, speaks of Anarchism as the ultimate goal of the revolution. The cemetery of time is filled with the graves of ideas and lives that have been sacrificed to the dialectics of Marxism in its heavy march to the goal. Slochower is now an authentic apologist for the necessity of such burials. He says: "Marxism breaks sharply with the idealistic ethics of the Kantian and Deweyan persuasion (what ethics does he retain?). If the latter would use methods which are the same nature as the ends, Marxism insists that historic conditions, not personal moral preferences, determine method. . . . It is a question of ultimate directives." It is Slochower's task to watch carefully each thought wave emerging from the social organism which tends to enhance the role of the individual as a spiritual force and as opposed to the organizational controls with which society surrounds him, and to guide it to its proper subordinate position in the Marxist set-up. Malraux is of the utmost significance to him because the former's "basic problem is the differential between organized control and unique expression." The Spanish Civil War highlighted this problem for Malraux as no other social situation anywhere else could have. For it was here that the Anarchists were powerfully organized in the F.A.I. (Iberian Anarchist Federation) and the C.N.T. (National Confederation of Labor) and exercised a strong voice in the complicated questions of those tragic days. It is either a woeful ignorance of the facts, or a knavish neglect of them, that caused Slochower

to say of the Anarchists, following the confusion of the much more perturbed and conscientious Malraux: "For them the revolution has meaning while it is in its romantic-individualistic stage of careless rapture.* This is an easy rhetorical formulation which lends itself to a perfectly wonderful ideational development and is representative of the jargon of ideas and phrases which Slochower throws around.

"No Voice Is Wholly Lost. . . ." is full of ideas and makes an inclusive sweep of writers and thinkers. In the wide sweep of Slochower's analysis he has corralled Freud for the Marxists "for both Marx and Freud's culture are determined by physical factors and both seek to discover the connection between the 'body' and the 'mind.' Freud's thesis that neuroses are a consequence of repressions is the psychological equivalent of the notion that social and personal disharmony results from suppression by social authority." Thus he accepts the earlier Freudianism which saw in art the neuroses of the artist, and holds to Marxism which sees no individual psychic processes in the art creation. In his ideological straight-jacket, art cannot be regarded by him as a creative process in which the artist moves up and back between the individual and group as a socializing medium. It is enough for Slochower to capture the greatness of the name if not the vital substance of the theory.

The book is both a contribution to Marxist thought and an exhibit of the type of thinking that posits the free individual and then negates him in his process of development.

J. W.

* Careless rapture indeed, with C.N.T. control and organization of large sections of agriculture, industry and public services in line with libertarian Socialism as differentiated from authoritarian (so-called) Socialism! To the Anarchists the war and the revolution were inseparable and were taking place at the same time. The weak Communist Party, buttressed by Russian aid, spoke of the "democratic republic" which no longer existed, and of lack of organization, that is, organization under their control for their ends.

IS WORLD WAR III INEVITABLE?

We have received a number of Circulars under the general title "L'Action Syndicaliste." These are published in Paris by the French Syndicalist Federation. In Circular No. 3 (May, 1945), an article "The Coming War . . . and Revolution" speaks of a possible third world war in the next 5 or 10 years:

"War between Russia, the undoubted military victor of this war, and America, the no less indiscutable economic victor, is unavoidable, just as war was unavoidable, in the Pacific, between Japan and the United States. The latter war was spoken of for the last 30 years; the next one will take less time . . ."

The author considers that only the working class in its capacity of true creator of Peace will be able to withstand the abortive Peace now offered to the world, and that only the international organization of labor will be able to carry on the fight for true Peace to a victorious conclusion.

FREE GRANTS OF TERRITORIES

THE Czechoslovak Government has most graciously presented the Soviet Government with a chunk of its Eastern territory known as Sub-Carpathian Rus (Ruthenia). The opinion of the Ruthenians was never asked, but we are given to understand that the grant was wholehearted and that there was no, oh no, pressure to bear on the part of the government of the U.S.S.R.

We remember how, just a few paltry years ago, the very same Czechoslovak Government presented the German Third Reich, led by Adolf Hitler, with a chunk of its territory known as Sudetenland. In this case, too, there was no pressure whatever on the part of Hitler. . . .

FACTS AND DEFECTS

The British Elections

THE final tabulation of the recent election results in Great Britain gives to the Labor Government a clear majority of 145 over all other parties put together. Curiously enough, the 302 labor M.P.'s have mustered 12 million votes; the other 247 mustered 13 million votes. Thus, the majority in Parliament is but a minority in the country.

This is the first time that England has a Labor Government completely independent of any third party manipulations in the voting room. In the first two Labor Cabinets, the Liberal votes were the balance of power at the moment of voting, and Labor had always the argument that it did not possess a clear-cut majority in the House of Commons for radical labor legislation.

And now, for the deeds. Will the people of England, will organized labor be able to show their strength if not altogether as organizers of the economic life of the country, at least as controllers of its economic machinery? Will India obtain its political freedom? Will British post-war imperialism change its face and its policy? Will Bevin return Hong Kong to the Chinese and Singapore to the Malaysians? Or will Attlee go the bolshevik way and begin nationalizing some of the country's key industries?

Let us not forget that "nationalization" does not mean handing over of industries to the people (or to the organization of producers); it means their appropriation by the state, thus strengthening the latter against the producer. Such nationalization could not but bring us nearer to the era of economic dictatorship by the state . . . which leads straight to political dictatorship . . . today by the Labor Party, tomorrow — at the next swing of the pendulum — by Winston Churchill and his successors.

Were British Labor truly devoted to the cause of the working class, its first duty would have to be to ask the Trades Union Congress to take over the organization of production. If the Labor Government leaves this task to itself and to Capital, nothing will be changed in Great Britain but a misleading label.

We await the first reaction of Britain's trade unions.

Bolshevism v. The Russian People

IT has now become a current truism, especially among intellectuals, to proclaim that whoever expresses even a doubt about the regime existing in the U.S.S.R. is to be automatically branded as an enemy of the Russian people.

This blackmailing device must be exploded once and for all. It has been used from the very day Bolshevism took the reins of power in Russia by cleverly deviating the 1917 Revolution into false channels. Everybody who dared to express the mildest criticism was branded a counter-revolutionist. Later came the Trotskyite branding mixed to a dose of being agent of British Imperialism, or of American plutocracy, or of the German Gestapo.

The intellectual weaklings, who are now doing their uttermost to represent modern thought, have definitely adopted the principle that might IS right. And Stalin is mighty, isn't he? So—whatever Stalin says is holy gospel.

We think that we have as much a right to criticize Stalin the Almighty as to give our opinion on Hirohito, the God-Emperor. Especially as the Russian people have not had any occasion so far to say anything at all as to whether "all is for the best in the best of worlds." The Russian trade unions, as everybody knows, including the intellectual fellow travelers, have nothing to say unless it is

first OK'd by the Soviet political machine. No newspaper, other than the official sheets, has as yet appeared on the Soviet horizon, and will not appear so long as the Guepeou continues to rule.

But we know, on the other hand, that thousands upon thousands have been executed in Russia for a slight freedom of thought, to say nothing of speech. That tens of thousands of Russians — flesh and blood of the Russian people — are dying in the Soviet Socialist concentration camps.

The Russian people are muzzled. If the Russian people are really at one with the Soviet hierarchy, why be afraid of them? Why not give them freedom of speech, of meeting, of organization?

Until this is done, we will take upon ourselves the right to separate Stalin and his Kremlin crowd from the Russian people as a whole. This — bolshevik agents of all degrees notwithstanding, and in spite of those among the intellectuals who have decided to kneel before the great and the mighty.

Julian Huxley's Discovery

Julian Huxley, in a recent article in *The New Republic* has at last discovered that "there is no pretense of equality in the present set-up in Russia." Class privileges, he says, are "more marked than in Britain or the United States, though the classes are different."

The question is not whether class distinctions in Russia are more marked or not than elsewhere. The important point is that class distinction exists under a regime which has allegedly abolished classes.

This tends to show that Marxism in practice cannot avoid repeating the mistakes of Capitalism, and that the more the state strengthens its hold on the political and economic structure of a country, the more will it develop class differentiation.

And as Marxism is but centralization brought to the pitch of perfection, class distinction will necessarily permeate the entire state structure and will infect the population as a whole, because there is but one employer—the state.

The Italian Imbroglio

The scheme for making peace with Italy (as if that meant anything when the war is over) is in a blind alley. It turns especially around the question of the Italian colonies. As an enemy country such colonies are to be taken away from Italy. But who is to get them? Russia has some claims; Yugoslavia wants some territories; Greece puts in a word for the Dodecanese. England wants to keep everybody else out and wants the whole hand in the pie.

So—Italy will keep the colonies as a trustee for the United Nations to which it does not belong.

This is the kind of bastard solution which will have to be found in many of the peace treaties which will be worked out in the next year or two or more.

As the Frenchman says, the more it changes the more it is the same thing.

The Big Powers would like to return to the state of things before World War II . . . except Russia which wants a little finger in every pie. This kind of struggle bodes endless political restlessness. The example of Italy is a sign of what is to come, especially when the Balkan question will come to be thrashed out.

Did any one say that we fought the last war?