

politics

25¢ a copy

August, 1945

At 9:15 on the morning of August 6, 1945, an American plane dropped a single bomb on the Japanese city of Hiroshima. Exploding with the force of 20,000 tons of TNT, the bomb destroyed in a twinkling two-thirds of the city, including, presumably, most of the 343,000 human beings who lived there. No warning whatsoever was given. This atrocious action places "us", the defenders of civilization, on a moral level with "them", the beasts of Maidanek. And "we", the American people, are just as much and as little responsible for this horror as "they", the German people.

So much is obvious. But more must be said. For the "atomic" bomb renders anticlimactical even the ending of the greatest war in history (which seems imminent as this goes to press). (1) THE CONCEPTS, "WAR" AND "PROGRESS", ARE NOW OBSOLETE. Both suggest human aspirations, emotions, aims, consciousness. "The greatest achievement of organized science in history," said President Truman after the Hiroshima catastrophe—which it probably was, and so much the worse for organized science. Such "progress" fills no human needs of either the destroyed or the destroyers. And a war of atomic bombs is not a war. It is a scientific experiment. (2) THE FUTILITY OF MODERN WARFARE SHOULD NOW BE CLEAR.

Must we not now conclude, with Simone Weil, that the technical aspect of war today is the evil, regardless of political factors? Can one imagine that the atomic bomb could ever be used "in a good cause?" Do not such means instantly, of themselves, corrupt ANY cause? (3) ATOMIC BOMBS ARE THE NATURAL PRODUCT OF THE KIND OF SOCIETY WE HAVE CREATED. They are as easy, normal and unforced an expression of the American Standard of Living as electric iceboxes. We do not dream of a world in which atomic fission will be "harnessed to constructive ends." The new energy will be at the service of the rulers; it will change their strength but not their aims. The underlying population should regard this new source of energy with lively interest—the interest of victims. (4) THOSE WHO WIELD SUCH DESTRUCTIVE POWER ARE OUTCASTS FROM HUMANITY. They may be gods, they may be brutes, but they are not men. (5) WE MUST "GET" THE MODERN NATIONAL STATE BEFORE IT "GETS" US. The crazy and murderous nature of the kind of society we have created is underlined by the atomic bomb. Every individual who wants to save his humanity—and indeed his skin—had better begin thinking "dangerous thoughts" about sabotage, resistance, rebellion, and the fraternity of all men everywhere. The mental attitude known as "negativism" is a good start.

ATROCITIES OF THE MIND

THIS is an atrocity picture. It shows General George S. Patton, Jr., talking to a Sunday School class in the Church of Our Savior, San Gabriel, California, on June 10 last.

"You are the soldiers and the nurses of the next war," the general told the kids. "There will be another war. There always has been. Sunday School will make you good soldiers."

Every one knows about General Patton, of the pearl-handled revolvers, the blood and guts, the wounded-soldier-slapping, and the foul mouth. I recently saw a newsreel of Patton's speech in the Los Angeles Stadium shortly after his return from Europe. Grey-haired and erect, he had a fine presence: paternal, gruff, a bit diffident, with

Credit: International





THE PATTON OF THE PACIFIC

Above: Admiral William F. ("Bull") Halsey, who is to the Navy what Patton is to the Army only more so. Below: one of Bull's current beatitudes is inscribed on a sign overlooking Tulagi Harbor. (Snapshot sent in by a sailor-reader, Halsey's picture from Press Association.)

Last month we printed another of Bull's apothegms: "We are drowning and burning the bestial apes all over the Pacific, and it is just as much pleasure to burn them as drown them." I have been told that at a recent "off-the-record" dinner for Washington newspapermen, Bull whimsically remarked during an after-dinner speech: "I hate Japs. I'm telling you men that if I met a pregnant Japanese woman, I'd kick her in the belly."

Bull is a top-ranking naval officer, which gives him the privilege of talking in public in a way which would cause lesser citizens to be locked up in the dangerous ward of Bloomingdale Asylum. One has only to study his intelligent, humane countenance to understand why we Americans are entitled to regard the Japanese as barbarians whom we must teach (the accidental survivors of Bull's ministrations, that is) the fundamentals of civilization.



a warm smile flashing every now and then as he talked. He told of what Germany looks like today from the air, solemnly, with awe: "You cannot imagine such destruction. It was the face of hell." Perhaps I was wrong about Patton, I thought. . . . Then the fatherly voice continued: "After that we flew over the ocean. It was disappointing. There were no Germans to kill down there." And the warm, shy smile spread slowly as he stooped over the microphone, waiting for the laughter and clapping of 70,000 people to subside. A friend whose job is putting together newsreels tells me they had difficulty getting enough footage for exhibition out of this speech of Patton's, it was so full of "goddamn" and other secular expressions. The few minutes of it I heard was thus probably only a mild echo of the real thing.

General Patton made another speech, to the men of his Third Army, on the day before they took off for the landing in Normandy last spring. OWI operatives recorded the historic utterance on the spot and rushed the precious disks across the Atlantic by air, for use at war-bond rallies and other consecrated gatherings. But the speech was never released. For when the records were played over here, with a dozen topflight OWI experts listening, pencils poised, despair settled down over the gathering. Speaking to his men, the good grey general was completely uninhibited (or at least, played the part—I suspect Patton's toughness is mostly theatricalism and neuroticism). The four-letter words fell like rain: Molly Bloom and Studs Lonigan would have blushed. The speech was completely unusable: the general had, in his martial ardor, sabotaged the war effort.

Just what Patton said on D-Day-Minus-One will be known only when the OWI releases the speech: that is to say, will not be known. However, it is possible to construct a reasonable facsimile here, from two sources: an alleged text published by a *N. Y. Daily News* columnist on May 31, and some notes sent me by a friend who jotted them down from the OWI recordings. The two check pretty well. Patton's speech, shortened for space reasons and also edited with regard for the sensibilities of the postal authorities, ran as follows:

GEORGE PATTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS TO HIS TROOPS

Men! This stuff we hear about Americans wanting to stay out of this war—not wanting to fight—is a lot of

politics

VOLUME 2, NO. 8 (Whole No. 19)

AUGUST, 1945

Business Manager: Nancy Macdonald

Circulation Manager: Dorothy Brumm

Editor: Dwight Macdonald

POLITICS is published monthly at 45 Astor Place, New York 3, N. Y., by Politics Publishing Co. Telephone: GRamercy 3-1512.

Subscription \$2.50 for one year, \$4 for two years. Add 30c a year for Canada, 50c a year for all other foreign countries. Single copy: 25c. All back issues are still available. Special rate for service men and C.O.'s anywhere: \$1.75 a year.

Copyright August, 1945, by Politics Publishing Co. Entered as second-class matter March 16, 1944, at the post-office at New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879.



bulls—t. Americans love to fight, traditionally. All real Americans love the sting of clash of battle. America loves a winner. America will not tolerate a loser. Americans despise a coward. Americans play to win. That's why America has never lost and never will lose a war, for the very thought of losing is hateful to an American.

You are not all going to die. Only 2% of you right here today would be killed in a major battle. Death must not be feared. Every man is frightened at first in battle. If any man says he isn't, he's a goddamned liar. But a real man will never let the fear of death overpower his honor, his sense of duty to his country and to his manhood.

All through your army career, you've bitched about what you call "this chicken-s—t drilling." That drilling was for a purpose: instant obedience to orders and to create alertness. If not, some sonofabitch of a German will sneak up behind him and beat him to death with a sock full of s—t.

An army is a team. It lives, sleeps, eats and fights as a team. This individual hero stuff is a lot of crap. The bilious bastards who wrote that kind of stuff for the Saturday Evening Post don't know any more about real fighting under fire than they know about f——g.

Even if you are hit, you can still fight. That's not bulls—t either. . . . Every damn man has a job to do. Each man must think not only of himself but of his buddy fighting beside him. We don't want yellow cowards in this army. They should be killed off like flies. If not, they will go back home and breed more cowards. We got to save the f——g for the fighting men. The brave man will breed more brave men.

Remember, men! You don't know I'm here. . . . Let the first bastards to find out be the goddamn Germans. I want them German bastards to raise up on their hind legs and howl: "JESUS CHRIST! IT'S THE GODDAMNED THIRD ARMY AND THAT SONOFABITCH PATTON AGAIN!"

We want to get the hell over there and clean the goddamn thing up. And then we'll have to take a little jaunt against the purple-p——g Japs and clean them out before the Marines get all the credit.

There's one great thing you men will be able to say when you go home. You may all thank God that thirty years from now, when you are sitting at the fire with your grandson on your knee and he asks you what you did in the Great World War II, you won't have to say: "I shovelled s—t in Louisiana."

Spengler often refers to the "style" of a period, an essential quality which may be detected in all forms of expression from mathematics to landscape gardening. The above speech, I venture to say, will be considered by later historians as typical of the style of this war as Caesar's and Washington's and Trotsky's set speeches to their troops were in their wars. At once flat and theatrical, brutal and hysterical, coarse and affected, violent and empty—in these fatal antinomies the nature of World War II reveals itself: the maximum of physical devastation accompanied by the minimum of human meaning.

These utterances of Patton's are atrocities of the mind: atrocious in being communicated not to a psychoanalyst but to great numbers of soldiers, civilians, and school children; and atrocious as reflections of what war-making has done to the personality of Patton himself. Patton, it is true, is an extreme case, noted in the Army long before the war for his martial hysteria. But I cannot believe he has not been brutalized by the war. Certainly most of us have.

I remember when Franco's planes bombed Barcelona for the first time what a thrill of unbelieving horror and indignation went through our nerves at the idea of hundreds—yes, *hundreds*—of civilians being killed. It seems impossible that that was less than ten years ago. Franco's air force was a toy compared to the sky-filling bombing fleets deployed in this war, and the hundreds killed in Barcelona have become the thousands killed in Rotterdam and Warsaw, the tens of thousands in Hamburg and Cologne, the hundreds of thousands in Dresden, and the millions in Tokyo. A month ago, the papers reported that over one million Japanese men, women, and children had perished in the fires set by a single B-29 raid on Tokyo. One million. I saw no expression of horror or indignation in any American newspaper or magazine of sizeable circulation. We have grown calloused to massacre, and the concept of guilt has spread to include whole populations. Our hearts are hardened, our nerves steady, our imaginations under control as we read the morning paper. King Mithridates is said to have immunized himself against poison by taking small doses which he increased slowly. So the gradually increasing horrors of the last decade have made each of us to some extent a moral Mithridates, immunized against human sympathy.

THE LIBERAL ETHOS, 1945 MODEL

Reports of mass meetings in metropolitan Japan indicate that the Government intends to develop this system further, to the point, indeed, where they hope to make it necessary for us to kill every adult Japanese if we want to beat Japan. . . . The idea behind it is . . . a last-ditch appeal to American sentimentality on which they have so often counted and from which they now expect protests against devoting an entire nation to death.

—Editorial in "The New Republic", April 30.

THE MILITARY MIND (Cont'd.)

General Eisenhower declared that the European war had been a holy war—more than any war in history. "Speaking for the Allied forces," he added, "I say we are going to have peace even if we have to fight for it."

—"N. Y. Times", June 11.

IF WE HAD SOME EGGS, WE COULD HAVE A HAM OMELET, IF WE HAD SOME HAM

One of the fallacies that have given rise to the belief that we can be saved from disaster after the war only by a continuation of huge Government spending and deficit financing is the assumption that "production" and "purchasing power" are two entirely different things. . . . Economists have long recognized the real truth of the matter. This is that purchasing power grows out of production. The great producing countries are the great consuming countries. The 20th century world consumes vastly more than the 18th century world, because it produces vastly more. . . . in the aggregate, supply and demand are not merely equal but identical, since every commodity may be looked upon either as supply of its own kind or as demand for other things.

In recent years, this basic truth has been challenged by Lord Keynes among others. . . . In a reply to Keynes' criticism by Prof. Benjamin M. Anderson in "The Commercial and Financial Chronicle", Dr. Anderson concedes that the doctrine that supply creates its own demand assumes certain conditions.

It assumes a condition of equilibrium. It assumes that the proportions among various goods and services must be right; that the terms of exchange, the price relationships, among different commodities must be right. It assumes the existence of free competition and free markets to bring about these proportions and price relations. It assumes the absence of paralyzing governmental interference with the markets.

But these necessary qualifications do not change the central truth of the doctrine.

—Editorial in "N. Y. Times", Feb. 11.

There was a War!

On May 15, 1796, General Bonaparte entered Milan at the head of that youthful army which had just crossed the bridge at Lodi and shown the world that after so many centuries, Caesar and Alexander had a successor. . . .

At once a new and passionate social atmosphere materialized. A whole people realized on May 15, 1796, that everything they had respected till then was utterly absurd, if not downright hateful. The withdrawal of the last Austrian regiment marked the downfall of the old ideas; to risk one's life became fashionable. Every one began to live only to be happy after centuries of dulness and hypocrisy, every one felt he must love something passionately and be prepared to risk his neck for it. The interminable, suspicious despotism of Charles V and Philip II had plunged the Lombards in deepest night; now their statues were overturned—and suddenly everything was flooded with light. For half a century, while the Encyclopedists and Voltaire had been enlightening France, the monks had dinned it into the good people of Milan that worldly pursuits like learning to read were useless bother, and that if one paid one's tithes punctually to the priest and confessed one's little sins scrupulously, one was practically sure to go to heaven. . . . The worthy Milanese also had to put up with certain little royal exactions which had become rather irritating. For example, the archduke, who lived in Milan and governed in the name of his cousin, the Emperor, had the lucrative whim of going into the wheat business. Consequently, the peasants were forbidden to sell their grain until after His Highness had filled up his granaries.

In May, 1796, three days after the entry of the French, a young painter of miniatures, a slightly mad fellow named Gros, who has since become famous and who had come in with the troops, hearing tales in the cafes about the exploits of the archduke—who was very fat—snatched up a menu. On the back he sketched the portly archduke; a French soldier was sticking his bayonet into his belly, from which gushed, instead of blood, a copious stream of wheat. Neither satire nor caricature had been known in this land of niggling despotism. The sketch Gros left on his cafe table seemed to be a miracle come down from heaven; a plate was struck from it that very night, and the next day they sold twenty thousand copies of it.

The same day, posters were stuck up announcing a levy of six million francs for the French army which, having just won six battles and overrun twenty provinces, lacked nothing except shoes, pants, coats and hats. . . .

The exaltation was so excessive and widespread that I can explain it only by this profound historical observation: these people had been bored for a century. . . . The wild joy, the gaiety, the pleasure, the obliteration of all sad—or even reasonable—impulses, these were pushed to such a point that . . . cases are known of wealthy old merchants, of old usurers and lawyers who, during the French occupation, forgot to be disagreeable and to make money.

STENDHAL: *La Chartreuse de Parme*

(Illustrations from a print—"Entree des Francais dans Milan, le 25 Floreal, An. 4"—in *Tableaux Historiques des Campagnes d'Italie*, Paris, 1806.)



The Peace Criminals

by Louis Clair

A Master Plan for Germany

Baruch, Bernard—Wall Street operator, also elder statesman, native born, father immigrated from Eastern Prussia—has evolved a plan for Germany, a plan for the starvation of millions, a plan that spells destruction for the whole of Europe. The London *Economist* terms it “immoral, uneconomic and unworkable”, yet it is quickly becoming the master plan of American imperialism for Germany.

Mr. Baruch has one advantage over *PM*: he has a sort of unashamed matter-of-fact bluntness in enunciating the most outrageous proposals—no democratic soft soap about it. Says he: “We must keep Germany and Japan from re-establishing themselves in the exports of the world. By eliminating the subsidized and sweated competition of 170 to 200 million Germans and Japanese—among the lowest-cost producers in the world—we not only deny the enemy the wherewithal to make future wars, but we expand the industrial opportunities for the rest of the world. We open up more jobs and more business for the United Nations which enable them to help pay part of their war costs out of increased profits and greater tax revenues. We make room for the new industrialization of hitherto undeveloped countries.” To implement this, Baruch proposes, in his memorandum to President Truman, that all of Germany's heavy industry be destroyed, a great part of the rest of German industry transferred to other countries; in addition, Germany will have to pay reparations.

All this may seem the dream of a madman. For 15 years, every self-respecting soap-box speaker has pointed an accusing finger at the wanton destruction of South-American wheat and coffee and the killing of America's little pigs during the depression years. But hardly a voice is lifted now when Baruch suggests that the economy of Europe's productivity center be completely demolished so that American big business may find new markets and post-war “disruptive economic consequences” be avoided.

And yet, the measures outlined by Baruch are very closely related to earlier ones. Future historians will say: “In the thirties, productive capacity and wealth within the highly developed capitalist countries was planfully destroyed by governmental action to permit the continued functioning of the capitalist system. In the early forties, war and its destruction of wealth performed the same function. In the late forties, economic destruction no longer took place within the main imperialist nations but was instead directed to the outside. Elimination of a part of the world's industrial capacity permitted the continued functioning of the economic machinery of the leading industrial giants that had won the war.”

Even without the Baruch plan, German industry already has been destroyed to a large degree by the bombing raids—though the early estimates were apparently too ‘optimistic’. A look at the list of the top industrial advisors to General Lucius Clay, head of the American MG administration, reveals further intentions: R. J. Wysor, until recently President, Republic Steel; Edward S. Zdunek, for-

merly head of General Motors, Antwerp; Philip Gaethke, formerly with Anaconda Copper; Philip P. Clover, formerly of Socony Vacuum; Peter Hoglund, formerly of General Motors. The Economic Division of the U. S. group of the Control Council is headed by Brig.-Gen. William H. Drayer, on leave of absence from Dillon, Read & Co., Wall Street.

Clay, upon assuming his functions, has stated that “plants which cannot be converted to production of essential civilian goods will be destroyed”—‘essential civilian goods’ in AMG parlance tooth brushes or textiles but certainly not tinplate or aluminum.

The World's Industrial Reserve Army

The Baruch plan wants to eliminate “the subsidized and sweated competition of the Germans”. Nothing would be easier than to see to it that the German workers get a high standard of living, that they rebuild their unions to fight the sweating of German labor. But this is not how the Allies understand it. Radio London announces: “British correspondents report the dissolution of the Central Office for Trade Unions which had been established with AMG permission in Hamburg. The office dissolved itself after being informed by the MG that they disapproved of its activities. The MG opposed the efforts of a small group to turn the office into an active political organization. The office also made a premature attempt to establish a trade union administration for the entire country.”

While local unions are permitted if they agree not to indulge in political activities and not to strike under any conditions, all efforts to centralize unions or even to establish contacts between one local union and another are strictly forbidden.

Thus, what is clearly attempted here is the creation of a pool of sweated labor, a docile mass of individuals without any contacts, who are ready to accept any kind of work under any conditions. The Baruch and Morgenthau plans are devices for the constitution of a huge industrial reserve army in the heart of Europe. While in the rest of the world all sorts of worthy efforts are being made to keep up employment, the industrial reserve army which up to now had to be kept up in the heart of each nation, is now being created outside the borders—a gigantic effort to solve the contradiction of capitalist production on a world scale. Thus a twofold objective is being set: on the one hand, destruction of a large part of the world's industrial capacity so that the investment process can continue unhampered in the rest; on the other hand, an attempt at buying support of labor with all sorts of sixty-million jobs and Beveridge plans, at the same time threatening it with the competition of a half-starved spineless mass of industrial workers, always available, skillful and therefore by far superior to the dark races.

Breeds Without the Law

It is therefore essential that within Germany no political

regrouping of any sort be allowed among the workers. There should be no new formation of left-wing political parties, nothing that would unify a Germany now split into thousands of independent AMG principalities. A report by a British correspondent in Munich sheds some light on the situation (*Economist*, June 9):

"The first shoots of a new political life in post-Nazi Bavaria are, of course, pathetically weak. . . . The formation of any organized bodies of political opinion has been strictly prohibited by the MG which has made more than sufficiently clear that there must be 'no politics in Germany' and that the ban on political activities applies to all anti-Nazi groups without distinction. The ban on anti-Nazi groups is certainly prolonging the political formlessness which is apparent under the broken crust of the single-party system. In the closing days of the war there were some stirrings underneath. Individual survivors of the old parties of the Left—Socialists, Communists, trade unionists—came together and discussed the new position. Soon they were joined by inmates of the concentration camps. Quite independently completely new loosely united groups appeared in the turmoil. . . . It is almost impossible to measure the weight and potential elan which such rudimentary trends of new political thought in Germany would have acquired if they had not been for the time being nipped in the bud by the MG ban on politics. The German people would pretty soon have found in these organizations new spokesmen and leaders. . . . Up to a point the spiritual and political life of the German people is now clay in the hands of the potters of the MG."

The situation in Bavaria — largest American-occupied zone, is typical for the rest of weaker Germany. Left movements and parties in Bavaria have been strictly forbidden: the Bavarian Freedom Action, as well as the Social-Democrats or the Communists. Only one party is being fostered officially: The Bavarian People's Party—the party of blackest reaction, whose attitude toward Hitler's plot in Bavaria was equivocal, to say the least. (Later, as Hitler's attacks on the Church increased, the members of this party also moved away from the Nazis.) The Bavarian People's Party "has always preferred to sit down with the devil rather than with the Social Democratic Party" said a Bavarian to the *Economist* correspondent. This party has been ruling in Bavaria during nearly the whole of the Weimar period and had made this province a stronghold of political and cultural reaction. A friend who grew up in Bavaria writes: "You had to be approved by a priest to be born, approved by a bishop to grow up, and you needed all the monsignores to be a street cleaner."

Cardinal Faulhaber's influence was decisive in shaping the new administration for Bavaria. Scharnagel, a prominent right-wing Catholic, is mayor of Munich. One Friedrich Schaefer, former member of the Bavarian People's Party, has been made Premier of Bavaria.

Immediately after taking office, Schaeffer in an interview stressed his friendship with and admiration for Schuschnigg and Dollfuss. Later he gave another interview: "Bavaria is not the country for political experiments, nor can she be the soil for political strife. It is a prevalently Catholic country with a conservative population. . . . Bavaria must be freed from Prussian influence and become

an independent state." Thus Schaefer is not only a representative of the worst Catholic reaction, he is also a separatist who wants to split Bavaria from the main body of Germany. What a godsend for MG!

Among Schaeffer's aides there is a certain von Zeisser, head of police. Von Zeisser is well known to Bavarian socialists: he was chiefly responsible for the repressions of left-wing activities since the days of the Munich Soviet Republic,—but he also opposed the 1923 Nazi putsch, and therefore couldn't ingratiate himself with the Nazis, and thus is now being installed as an outstanding anti-Nazi.

In other regions, MG policy is similar. In the Rhineland, some social-democrats, who held high administrative posts in pre-Nazi times, have been re-installed, but generally the bulk of the appointees are Catholics of the most rightist variety. A secondary motive for this preference may be that certain American diplomats play with the idea of a Catholic bloc englobing Italy, Austria and Southern Germany, but the main reason is to prevent any Leftists from obtaining positions of power, for MG will need completely pliable instruments to carry out its policy of hunger and destruction.

As is only natural under such conditions, former Nazis abound in the lower brackets of the administration. They belong to the 'good society', often speak English (whereas hardly any MG officer speaks German), they have administrative experience. It has been reported frequently that Germans who went to the local MG offices to demand the removal of Nazis, received the reply: "These guys know the ropes around here, why discard them?" A *New York Times* correspondent in Rosenheim, Bavaria, described the pathetic fight of the population against the AMG-appointed Nazi mayor: "Every time a German delegation called at the military government office, they were informed that 'the military governor is too busy' and the Nazi will have to remain in office until he has more time to look into the case".

It has been reported from Duesseldorf, Munich, Dachau, and a number of Ruhr cities that the AMG has dissolved anti-Nazi organizations because they had dared to come into the open and asked for the right to public meetings and participation in administration and purging of Nazis. According to an AP dispatch of June 25, Col. Charles Keegan, military governor of Bavaria, ordered the stamping out of political activities of the anti-fascist party. The party claimed 4,000 members and adopted a platform demanding "the right of the anti-fascist working class to hold meetings, to freedom of speech, press and religion, and the formation of anti-fascist committees in all towns and communities." "The Germans are conquered people and have no right to demand anything", Colonel Keegan said.

A *N. Y. Times* correspondent has reported (June 7) that no less than 11 different anti-Nazi parties or groupings have come to his knowledge, but none are allowed to function.

"They Had it Coming to Them"

There are now four Germanies instead of one. The different occupation zones have different regimes and are shut off one from the other. The main division lies between

the Russian and the Western (Franco-British-American) zone.

The Eastern provinces normally produce about 45 per cent of Germany's major foodstuff, while holding only about 15 per cent of her population. The Russians obviously do not intend to send any food into the Western part. This situation spells disaster for millions. The Allies have repeatedly stated that they do not intend to import any food into Germany. In the largest part of Germany, the population has to live on 900 to 1000 calories. (A League of Nations estimate some years ago stated that 1770 calories would be sufficient to maintain the life of an adult staying in bed continually, without any physical exercise). It is summer now—what the winter will be like is hard to fathom. The new crop has only been partly sown, and the stocks will have been exhausted by then. In the Ruhr, the AMG is asking the population to emigrate to the countryside. . . . But where shall they go? Millions are concentrated in a very small area and in the most highly industrialized regions of the world. AMG officials have estimated that "an acute food shortage of near-starvation proportions faces the 7 million residents of the Rhineland". Lt. Gen. Lucius Clay stated that "the food supply is going to be a very tight squeeze and we will be lucky if the current stocks last until harvest time" but, adds the *N. Y. Times* correspondent: "No food is going to be shipped from the U. S. merely on the assumption that some Germans are going to starve".

The MG director in the British area reported that, with the facilities now in sight, 4 million Germans face starvation in the winter in the Ruhr alone. Clay added: "We may bring in food if the Germans start starving. I would not say the policy in this has been decided. The American Congress and the American people have got to make the decision. No money has so far been appropriated" (May 17).

And what are the prospects for the years to come? How will the Western rump of Germany pay for the importation of about half her foodstuff? It could be done only if the pre-war industrial production should about be doubled. This would mean not only rebuilding the devastated industries, but expanding them vastly. But Baruch wants reparations on top of destruction.

The Allied plan for Germany would destroy the German people just as thoroughly as Hitler has succeeded in destroying the Jewish people. It is indeed a sad commentary upon our times that hardly anybody in this democratic country of ours, hardly anybody in this country where humanistic philosophy is taught at all universities and colleges, hardly anybody in this Christian land, has dared open his mouth. "They had it coming to them".

Will Baruch Win?

Thus far I have spoken only about the intentions behind the plan, but can it be implemented? The planners are businessmen: it is a plan for business. What it lacks almost completely are political-strategic considerations. It has apparently never entered the heads of these planners that what they are now creating in Germany will be the ideal breeding ground for Stalinist penetration. Granted that conditions in Russian-occupied Germany will be at

least as bad (reports from Berlin stress that the Russians remove the whole machinery of such important works as Rheinmetall Borsig and Siemens, confiscate cattle and "live on the land"), nevertheless the Russian myth and the Russian propaganda machine will be strong enough to allow the building up of tremendous support for Stalin in Western Germany. Already now, the Berlin radio conducts a huge propaganda barrage, appealing to the listeners in the other parts of Germany. The Russians allow Central Trade Unions, the Social Democratic, Communist and even some other parties. For us, who know Russian methods, it is not difficult to fathom that the Russian pick those elements of the various parties that are pliable to their wishes whereas the others disappear in labor battalions. But inside Germany, the fact that many well-known leaders of pre-Nazi days are allowed to appear openly must have tremendous appeal. The Russian radio announces concerts and theater openings and stresses daily that the Russians feel no hostility toward the German people. Thus Western Germans will compare what they hear over the Berlin radio with conditions in their own AMG-ruled town—their conclusions are obvious.

America, that waged the war so that no one power—Germany—should be able to dominate two continents, as a result would—in both cases—face that very same situation, Russia taking Germany's place.

In view of this, if the tension, with Russia increases, an effort may be made by more far-seeing imperialist circles to reverse the nonsensical destruction policy in Germany, to sacrifice certain immediate advantages in the economic sphere in favor of more important political stakes. Such a policy would meet with the support of those business interests who have important investments in Germany and thus naturally oppose industrial destruction.

In this case, an attempt would be made to rebuild a sort of German buffer state against Russia. In England, such a trend takes shape already now. The *Economist* advocates a Western Bloc with the future inclusion of Germany. The British toy with the idea of using German industry as a supplement to their own, to strengthen themselves against both the United States and Russia.

Another reason for the possible failure of the plan may lie in the lack of enthusiasm in this country for long-term policing. The American soldier has nothing of the professional; he wants to go home. The nonsensical non-fraternization order already is breaking down. The Baruch policy can be carried out only with the utmost means of terror because obviously there will be riots and "disorders" if the starvation period of the coming winter sets in. But for the suppression of such riots, what is needed is a Gestapo—as yet lacking. Illegal organizations will grow; a number of active anti-Nazi underground groups already have decided to stay underground.

It is with a feeling of joy mingled with apprehension that one reads the Manifesto which, at the very moment of their release, all German Social-Democrats in Buchenwald signed in the presence and with the approval of representatives of all European socialists imprisoned there. (Not one of the Allied correspondents who visited Buchenwald has had the guts to even mention the existence of such a document, though they must have known of it since they

spoke to some of the signers. This is the most startling example yet of how the whole American press is enlisted in the crusade for the defamation of all Germans). The Manifesto proposes an alternative to the destruction policy, it proposes the establishment in Germany "of a new type of democracy that doesn't consist of an empty, wordy parliamentarism, but in the effective participation in politics and administration by the masses of city and country". It proposes that local People's Committees be formed everywhere as a basis for "a real grass-root democracy", it makes detailed proposals on the necessary economic measures and calls for the socialization of all key industries.

We may have many quarrels with these social-democrats, we don't agree with many of their formulations, possibly with many of their aims, yet here is a brave attempt at an alternative to the mad destruction for which propaganda is carried on even in the so-called liberal press. A constructive alternative—this is why the document had to be suppressed, this is also why the Social-Democratic Party is not allowed to function in Western Germany. In this insane world of ours, words of sanity seem to come mainly from the concentration camps.*

Europe Against Her Liberators

There is no hope that the German economy can ever be rebuilt without outside help; conversely, there is no hope for the revival of the economy of the rest of Europe if the industrial center is destroyed. Thus the only hope for Europe is also the only hope for Germany. A European Federation, able to reconstruct that economic machinery which the Nazis had once built—against Europe, and to evolve a federative political framework excluding all domination by one power. Only an economy unhampered by outmoded borderlines and production barriers can hope to put up effective resistance against the colossal destructive might of the Big Three.

Such awareness is dawning only slowly in Europe, among the most advanced of the Left elements. Recently an *International Commission for a Federated Europe* met in Paris for the first time, with the participation of a number of left-socialist representatives from several important European countries, including German refugees. Likewise, the Buchenwald Manifesto emphasizes that the German problem can be solved only within the wider framework of a European Federation.

But these are tender buds. Will they arrive at fruition before the destruction of the old continent by its "liberators" has been completed?

WHERE APATHY BEGINS

HOW inefficient, then, can any organized body be? It's more than easy to climb into our own perspicacity and loudly declaim the existence (or rather, our discovery) of another example of inefficiency, of another glaring error of administration, of another blundering sample of stupid

bureaucracy. Then along comes some clever fellow to tell us that what has seemed an error in "X" Department policy is really a policy, that the administrator knew what he was doing, that bureaucrats do not bungle—they obey. Well, then, what is inefficient, and what is policy? This we are not told, neither by right, liberal nor left commentators.

Take the lovely federal red tape—Christmas all year round. It's enough to make one lose his ambition. Drown a man in routine and he'll become routine. Add investigators, a few Congressional Committees, and something called "indefinite" appointments, and you've slipped the cuffs on a few million brains.

Oh, it's easy enough to routinize your paid employees. Any government can do that. But what of Mr. I. Q. Public? Oh ho—you can't fool him so easily, now can you? Not much. Just slip him into a draft classification and start tossing him around—home to draft board to home. Build it up good with official announcements somehow primed to catch the morning editions every time. Don't let him be sure of where he stands for more than the time it takes him to realize it. And tell the world that the infantry is as tough as it is and that everybody's due for it. Resentment? You can only resent some concrete object—people don't resent "inefficiency"; they are confused by it. People don't rally about antidraft-confusion slogans; they are simply confused by an eternal mental insecurity which is too inefficient to be true. Add a threatened labor draft. And a WLB to do as little as it can. And just to pretty up the picture a little more, let's check our ration points.

The colors are similar. Once again, confusing and conflicting rules and regulations, and highly paid officials, experts every time, who just bungle things up. Sure, rationing is simple and easy. Change your point values with the market, but let the market run as it will. (Mind, now, this is not a criticism; call it a hypothesis).

Plenty of resentment, but no concrete object. Add curfews that are and aren't, and ask people to shift from oil to coal to oil to coal to low gear. No, friend, it's too inefficient to be true. Can it be a policy? A policy of planned and directed inefficiencies, directed to where they'll produce the most apathy—apathy, end-product of repeated confusion.

They used to run maze tests with rats. Very interesting little items, where the rat runs through a maze in which a lane which was once open is now closed, and *vice versa*. The poor little rodent soon gets to the point where he just won't run, where he becomes frustrated to the point of apathetic inaction.

All right, cynic, make your point. So what? Go ahead and tell me that it's possible for a government to induce popular inactivity through a series of well-planned little frustrations. Go ahead and tell me that that's a partial key to the spreading political apathy of the American people. Go ahead and tell me that there is, not inefficiency, but policy in all of this. Did you ever hear of the efficiency with which invasions and tax collections and bond drives and investigations are conducted? Or am I proving your case?

MARK ELTON

*The German text of the Buchenwald manifesto is printed in the *Neue Volkszeitung* for June 30, an English translation in *The Call* for July 9.

LOUIS ARAGON, OR THE PROFESSIONAL PATRIOT

by Jean Malaquais

*What a pity, that the good patriot
should so often be the enemy of the
rest of mankind.*

—VOLTAIRE

THE taste of that bitter fruit called "patriot" (of this, that or any country), gives me a pain in the belly.

It is a bitter and green fruit, this patriot, who professes to love "his" country, and therefore doesn't like yours. Bitter, green, shrivelled fruit, which our times produce as the snail secretes its slime, but whose makeup owes nothing to Jeanne d'Arc, Bolivar and other Maccabees. I don't know any more curious mixture of peevishness, lachrymosity and chronic constipation than the female who expands importantly when the colors of "her" fatherland are displayed on a broomstick, or than the gentleman who chokes with emotion when the drum of "his" regiment is beaten. A curious and corrosive chemistry—reacting with instant acid if somebody doesn't think quite enough of the prowess of your NCOs, the excellence of your domestic virtues, the superiority of your chewing gum. It's the psychology of the turkey that sees everything fine and rosy from the top of his dunghill, but just let another turkey poke his beak in!

Psychology of the turkey, that spreads his fan to the wind. But the turkey at least is honest. The god of turkeys has given him a caruncle, and it is only natural for him to inflate it. True to his nature, he will answer with a gobble when the heroic rattle is shaken. If he is a Moldavian he has a fit when his name on a press communiqué is preceded by that of a Batavian; if he is a Batavian, he will be proud. He swells and dilates when flattered, when applauded for his feathers, his spurs, his dung; he sees red if the applause is not loud enough. He displays every possible bad taste. He enlivens his speeches with tremolo effects. He admires statues of men on horseback. He has a preference for official poetry. He is remarkably susceptible to the tricks of stagecraft and to all official hokum; he turns up at every parade, generously applauding and nodding appreciatively. But nothing excites him more than the number of "our" bombers, the tonnage of "our" fleet, the pants buttons of "our" infantry. While he appreciates the cheeses of "our" country and the hips of "our" girls, (in fact, anything to which he can attach the possessive "our" opens his patriotic water-gates, since he is a citizen whose pride flows easily), he is above all sensitive to the charms of the trumpet and sabre. He is martial, as some men squint or have chronic catarrh; it comes to him naturally, without special effort. And the more glorious the trumpets, the louder the noise of sabre on the pavement, the prouder will the Moldavian be that he is not a Batavian, and the Batavian that he is no Moldavian.

But he is honest, at least. Not too intelligent, but honest. Patriot through force of circumstances, through force of

historic cataclysms, he sincerely thinks (so far as he thinks), that "his" country invented or contributed to the invention of most of the things listed in the encyclopedias, from romantic love to wire butter cutters. He swallows like medicine the commonplaces and platitudes of the patriotic jargon, and regurgitates them with diminished eloquence but greater volume. And though he may not always agree with this or that law of "his" country, with this or that strategy of "his" generals, he will defend them with passion should the patriot across the border venture to criticize them. He believes that dirty linen should be washed "within the family", for naturally, he believes in the national family. Just the same, since the ethics of the patriotic Moldavian and Batavian stem not from a doctrine but from a complex, not from an ideology but from a bundle of sentiments, Moldavian and Batavian alike are not professional patriots at all, but simply pitiable victims.

The professional patriot is a very different bird. He does not possess the happy certitudes of the turkey, nor has he its vanity. Though he gobbles strongly and with feeling, though he does not scorn the oratorical effects of sideshow demagogy, he does not suffer from chronic constipation. He knows he is selling a commodity, and he knows its exact price. Your Moldavian-Batavian patriot (a type comparatively old, born of the last century's wars of national liberation), shouts *Patria-Patriae* in every key and chokes with the effort. Your professional, a recent product, takes his accent from the current decadence of the national idea; he employs style and rhetorical embellishment; and he does not choke. Like the atheist who becomes a pillar of the church in old age, or the youthful anarchist who with marriage becomes a model of middle-class respectability, so the professional patriot at the outset of his career feels nothing but disgust for what he will later wallow in with joy. But even here the parallel is not exact. The former atheist and the youthful nonconformist who finally join the great army of yes-men, succumb at least to the inexorable weight of social pressures, they undergo a kind of degenerative evolution, and their convictions liquefy in the universal solvent of bourgeois norms. But the professional patriot is nearly always the conscious and deliberate renegade. What really differentiates the professional from the bleating patriot, however, is that the passions of the latter are rooted in his native soil, inseparably united with his birth-certificate, as it were; if he is a Moldavian, he swears by Moldavia, if a Batavian, then by Batavia. While the professional, whatever his native country and mother-tongue, has one and only one passion, namely: the passion for Russia-Under-Stalin. This professional patriot is in fact an expatriate, a man without a country, and curiously, he is the unique example of a man who, paying no allegiance to any country, yet pays allegiance to the most monstrous of totalitarianisms.

The prototype of this professional patriot without a country, who has acquired a kind of greatness in holding the holy-water basin for Stalin, is Louis Aragon.

Louis Aragon, poet by the grace of God, piper by grace of St. Joseph;

Louis Aragon, ex-author of *Paysan de Paris*, *Traite du Style*, ex-dadaist, ex-surrealist, ex-himself;

Louis Aragon, who once wrote: "... allow me here, in my own home, in this book, to say to the French Army that I shit on it," (I quote from memory) who wrote like this when he had genius;

Louis Aragon who shouted like the minister from Uzbekistan, "Hurrah for the Urals!" when he no longer had much genius;

Louis Aragon, now more of a flag-waving nationalist than Deroulede, who screams with the voice of a rooster: "Never extinguished . . . always flaming from the ashes . . . eternal firebrand of the Fatherland . . .", who screams thus when, instead of genius, he is left with a load of bricks.

But perhaps I am unjust. Perhaps, in venting my frank disgust for the profession of patriotic expatriate, I am pleased to pile it on so thick as to deny this man Aragon even an ounce of honest emotion. Perhaps, at the price of my own disgust, he has won other approvals, more valid, more unselfish than mine. It may be that the emetrical effect of his morals, his prose, his rhyme, upon those who cling to the dignity of man and the sacredness of human life, upon those who don't fill themselves with hate or believe that one good massacre deserves another—it may be that this effect is not the correct standard by which to judge our professional. It well may be. After all, he is applauded, he is acclaimed, he smells good to those who ostracised him in the days when his art (which was then authentic), smacked them in the face. It is for those people that he now works, that he now says: "O speak to me of love, waves, little waves . . .", for this same clientele, whom he despises while caterwauling under their windows, and who return the compliment while burying him with praise; this clientele, whom he has orders to seduce, whose basest instincts he flatters, as is natural for one who tries to make a living in the camp of the enemy. But let nobody say that I am again giving way to my disgust, for in *La Nouvelle Relève*, the respectable Catholic magazine from prudish Canada, one can read under the signature of Mr. Raymond-Marcel, (Vol. 3, No. 6, Aug.-Sept. 1944) the following:

"A few years ago, any one in Canada trying to praise books like *Les Cloches de Bâle*, *Le Mouvement Perpétuel*, *Anicet*, or to pronounce as art the obscenities of *Paramètres*, would have been an object of finger-pointing. At present, this Aragon has merely to mention France, with his hand over his heart, to conjure Dunkerque or the June 'stab in the back', and he is pardoned all his turbulent past. He is quoted in the drawing rooms, his poetry is read on the radio, with all sorts of seraphic accompaniments, and one recites him at breakfast while plunging one's jam-knife in the English marmalade jar. It is hard on the nerves of even the most easygoing critics that those people, who have never understood anything about poetry and have regarded seers and bards as streetcorner urchins,

buffoons or fanatics, that those very people now delight in Aragon as their favorite star. Bourgeois revenge upon poetry! That the symbol of disorder becomes the symbol of order and banner of the most rigid nationalism (a type of nationalism seeking to reject the past completely), that is what is slightly embarrassing. These joyous outbursts, these admiring hysterics elicited generally by the trashiest works, must surely depress the honest lover of art who understands well that poetry is always in advance of the public, and that Aragon is doing it a grave disservice by making it fall into line . . ."

But it would be a mistake to suppose that Aragon is content to regulate art alone. The passions of this patriot are so possessive, his jealousies so all-embracing that he wants to gag his beloved from above, and put her in a chastity belt from below. For, while he sings:

You can condemn a poet to silence

And make a galley slave of a bird of the skies,

But you must know that you cannot

deprive him of the right to love France . . .

he demands the galleys and twelve bullets in the stomach for anyone who refuses to think along with him, or to take off his hat when the word France—excuse me, I meant Russia—is mentioned.

"There is a poetry of baseness," writes Louis Aragon—looking into a mirror—a propos André Gide's *Pages de Journal* (1939-42), adding in the same piece, which with regard to baseness is a positive masterpiece: "I know there will be many who will say it is very easy to trace the sources of my dislike for him."

Well, thank God, there will be many. Indeed, there are too many who remember that Aragon was capitivated by every comma from Gide's pen at the time when Gide used to believe of Russia what Aragon thinks it compulsory to believe of Russia. And they remember too that he has not stopped asking for Gide's scalp since Gide dared to believe that in Russia "on la crève", one may as well croak! Too many understand the noble motives of Aragon's vehement protests against Gide's return "to us who still contemplate the bloody gaps in our ranks." Too many indeed. But, for fear that some naive persons still might not understand, Aragon himself elaborates his reasons, and bares the wounds inflicted on his heart by Gide: "This hatred, my naive little friend, I nourish because of his two books on his trips to the country of my burning passion." Aragon will not sleep soundly, Jeanne d'Arc will continue to snifle, until this deadly sin is wiped out and Gide expiates it with his own blood. True, the "bloody gaps" that the professional contemplates cannot be filled up, for the person of the great old man is missing. But our Aragon is busily trying to supply the absent cadaver, still gunning for his collection of trophies. Borne by the wings of his sacred love for the fatherland, he glides over the *Pages de Journal*, discovers to his horror that from the end of 1940 the author of *l'Immoraliste* shows a considerable interest in the German language, more precisely, in Goethe, "... as if," notes Aragon, "in view of the successes of the German Army it were a veritable obligation to read *Faust*." The true obligations, no doubt, would be to plunge into a *Life of Suvarov*, illustrated if possible, or else to compose triolets in which "Bayard" rhymes with

"gaillard", or at least to attempt a little work on the unfathomable perversity of the German people, Goethe above all. But the anxiety of our patriot without a country approaches nightmare when Gide, who always weighs his words carefully, remarks that many a peasant would agree "that Descartes and Watteau were Germans or that Descartes and Watteau were certainly not Germans, if by doing so he could sell his wheat a few cents higher." Because, doesn't everyone know that the Normands, Picards and Lorrainers would fight for a century inspired by the names of Watteau, whose *Discours* they had all read, and Descartes, whose "Fêtes Champêtres" they all admired? Aragon is the more outraged since he knows that in a country well-policed, free and socialist, the ink would turn to water in the pen of any writer who ventured to say that a Kalmuck or a Cossack didn't give a damn whether Pushkin was a Russian or a Cuban. But when Gide notes on the 14th of July, "The patriotic sentiment is hardly more persevering than our other loves," then Aragon, perseverance of whose patriotism implies a political order, simply shouts, "*Death to traitors!*"

"Death!" has always been the favorite cry of our gentleman. Even in the fulness of youth, he left behind him a certain suggestion of necrophilia. The shadow of the gallows has thrown its profile along the length of his career, and he likes to indulge his dreams of this shadow. I have heard that when one of his in-laws, a small time agent-provocateur in the pay of the GPU, ran out of luck and was executed in Russia, Aragon was seen rubbing his hands and exclaiming, "That was well done!" Nobody cried louder "Death to . . . !" during the tragic days of Barcelona in May 1937, nobody did a better job of denouncing to the police the anti-Stalinist Spanish refugees in France. Today he asks for the life of André Gide!

But who does not know this man? Who does not feel nausea when gazing at that abyss into which Louis Aragon continues to tumble head over heels? Who has not seen him, the former anti-militarist, puffing up his martially-decorated belly? Yesterday hysterically internationalist, today violently xenophobe. Is there a single mountebank's trick, a single tumbler's leap he has not executed? He has been seen doing a Cossack dance to the tune of the Marseillaise, drinking vodka while shouting, *Long live French wines!*, applauding the Moscow Trials and demanding justice, composing fresh eulogies to "Soviet democracy", while denouncing "our native fascism"; he has been seen bristling like a hedgehog at the mere mention of the Church, and making representations to Cardinal Verdier to intervene with Franco for a suspension of the bombing of Madrid during the Christmas holidays (1936); after demanding the gallows for pacifists, he alone among the prostitutes of the pen had the gall to proclaim in his Russian sheet, *Ce Soir* (Aug. 24, 1939) that the Hitler-Stalin Pact meant certain and assured peace, while France, the imperialist slut, was dreaming only of war and military prowess.

And here he is again, all dressed up in a tricolor, riding under the Arc de Triomphe and pouring out his false alexandrines and his false rhymes: *France, silence*. Here he is again, proposing the gallows for everyone who doesn't

skip to his rope,—that rope on which he and his worthy partner, Ilya Ehrenburg, jig a dance of death!

He has dishonored everything, including his own shadow; he has soiled everything including his first loves, polluted everything. . . . The bleating patriot, the Moldavian-Batavian patriot, whose ear and liver swell at the sound of Aragon's crowing, are welcome to him. They will find him at the foot of my stairway, in the ashcan. They can pick him up from there. And now I will wash my hands and my mouth.

Mexico City, March 7, 1945.

(Translated by Louis Clair and Isabella Fey)

THE NATIONAL SCENE

LABOR IS BECOMING increasingly perturbed at the way cutbacks are being handled. Formal protests have been filed by both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., as well as the big International Unions, with the White House and the Military—but all to no avail. The elaborate setup devised by WPB is not too bad in theory. Unfortunately, as was to be expected, it is honored more in the breach than in the observance.

The procedure is supposed to work something like this. When a cutback is first contemplated by the Army, Navy or other procurement agency, a Form A informs WPB of the fact that a cutback involving over \$500,000 in any one month of the succeeding 12 months is being planned in a certain area of procurement. This presumably gives WPB's Production Readjustment Committee, on which are represented all interested parties, a chance to investigate the plants producing the given item. Then, some time later, the procurement agency that has let the original price contract notifies WPB on a Form B that in its opinion the cut should be distributed in such and such a manner among the prime contractors involved. The interested agencies and parties represented on the PRC then have 24 hours in which to present alternative proposals or to concur in the recommendations. A disagreement can ultimately be appealed to the Production Executive Committee of WPB. If a cutback is believed to involve a substantial release of labor, "major case procedure" is ordered. A Form D then notifies the WPB Chairman of the local Termination Committee of the details of the cutback.

On paper it's eminently sound. The manufacturer has time to adjust his flow of materials and parts. The proper plants have been selected. *And under the law the workers are guaranteed a minimum of 7 days following receipt of Form D before their services can be terminated.* This may not be quite enough time in which to locate a new job, move the family, and get the laundry back—but *c'est la guerre!*

What, then, is all the beefing about? Labor complains, and it is freely admitted with considerable justification, that manufacturers are getting advance notice of impending cutbacks. Hence, workers are laid off before Form D formally notifies both the company and the union that production is to be reduced. This saves the manufacturer at least 7 days' wages. It makes the workers' problems completely unsolvable and union officials are feeling the pressure from an increasingly distraught membership.

There are many reasons for the criminal manner in which cutbacks are being handled, none of them very good. Frequently, the Army or Navy is perplexed as to which plants to keep in production and calls in all the manufac-

turers for a discussion of the problem. This is a perfectly legal procedure. WPB Directive 40, amended June 21, 1945, governs the handling of cutbacks. Point (f) states: "In advance of the decision to make an adjustment, preliminary discussions as to the technical problems involved are often held by the procurement agencies with the management. This is not a universal rule." It may not be a universal rule, but it often happens that management receives advance information which it uses to its own advantage.

The most effective method, however, whereby advance information is given to the manufacturer is through casual conversation with a Procurement Officer who—surprise—turns out to be a former executive of the company in question. Patriotism and financial sacrifice have their own rewards this side of heaven! And then there are innumerable instances of the Military, at the time of submitting Form A, demanding that the cutback be put into effect immediately. This hardly permits judicial and impartial determination of the location of the cutback, but it does add to our mounting unemployment problems.

No case has yet come to light of any manufacturer being prosecuted because he fired some of his workers a week or two before receiving Form D. In the few cases that have been taken to court, the employer raises his right arm and solemnly swears that the fact that he fired these workers just before receiving Form D is pure coincidence. The Judge is duly impressed by a denial made under oath and the case is dismissed.

While the Unions confine their protests to politely-worded letters and memoranda, WPB is worried about the situation. That is the reason for Krug's recently amended directive, again defining procedure in handling cutbacks. Krug's major concern appears to be the prevention of another Brewster case. Hence, the insistence that the workers affected must be notified before the story breaks in the press.

* * * * *

CHAOS IN CUTBACKS has its corollary in the new national guessing game: What will the unemployment figure be 3 months, 6 months, a year from now? Everyone from Vinson, McNutt and Krug to Congressman Lemke has had a fling at it. And the guesses range all the way from one to 27 million. No one, of course, knows or can be certain of hitting the mark within a 200% margin of error. It is not only a question of the basic imponderables, such as the length of the Japanese war, the future of foreign trade, etc. The sad truth is that, with all the many varied statistics collected by the government from business during the war, the most vital set of data for this purpose are lacking; namely, data on subcontracting. Information on prime contracts is quite complete, but when a prime contract is cut back, no one can say whether there will be twice as many workers released in plants of subcontractors as in those of prime contractors, or whether the multiplier should be 5 or 10. Needless to say, the task of analyzing where unemployment will develop has given government economists a terrific headache that no amount of aspirin can solve.

* * * * *

THE FACT IS that unemployment will be sizable during the next year. This will not be reflected in official statistics, chiefly due to the inadequacy of the methods used to estimate unemployment. While official figures will probably show no more than two million unemployed as the peak during the next 12 months—this contrasts with an estimate of about one million today—the real figure will be in the neighborhood of five million.

UNEMPLOYMENT WILL BE greater than need be chiefly due to the delays in reconversion. Heavy-handed publicity is now trying to explain to the American people that it will be well into 1946 before they can expect to buy an automobile, a house, a washing machine, refrigerator, or radio because the cutbacks have not been as large as anticipated. Hence, there is a shortage of sheet steel, lumber, lead, textiles, castings, etc. This is only part of the story. There are at least two other parts that are not being broadcast. One is the fact that government policy has dictated premature removal of controls. The reluctance of WPB to program essential civilian production is understandable. It would be difficult and would certainly not bolster the myth of "free private enterprise" as the savior of the U. S. The other, and more unsavory part, is the fact that certain industrialists and financiers look with equanimity on the prospect of sizable unemployment developing. It is even rumored that the "best circles" are privately speculating on the impact of various levels of unemployment on wage rates and the collective bargaining strength of unions.

* * * * *

OVERLOOKED IN THE plaintive cries of bewildered editors about current shortages of textiles, food, lumber and foundry products is the simple fact that these are just about the lowest paid of all major industries, not to mention the fact that they are amongst the most arduous. A 25% wage increase would dissolve most of these shortages almost overnight. But perhaps labor will be sufficiently starved and plentiful in six months or so to accept substandard wages. That, at least, is the only conscious policy that I can discern so far as eliminating these basic shortages is concerned.

* * * * *

THE GENERAL TREND is inflationary, although there will be communities, individuals and industries that will clearly be depressed during reconversion. As the Vinson report states, in a comprehensive but superficial survey of "The Road To Tokyo & Beyond," "the general character of the war period has been inflationary." This does not prevent the esteemed Judge from repeating the fiction that the cost of living has risen but 30 percent since August, 1939. The perpetuation of the fraud that the Bureau of Labor Statistics index measures the cost of living may serve to lull the bureaucrats into a state of self-deception whereby they conclude that everything is under control. The fact of the matter is that the cost of living has risen about 50% during the war and may be expected to rise rapidly during the next two or three years. At the same time, workers' standards of living will be subjected to the twin pressures of reduced take-home pay due to loss of overtime and the impact on wage rates of mass unemployment. The unions, for the most part, will be on the defensive and will pay heavily for their craven and stupid policies of class collaboration during the war. We may look for violent convulsions in the form of sudden and severe strikes and bitter conflicts over the role of the State both at home and abroad as the repressed class struggle erupts beyond the confines of government bureaus.

WALTER J. OAKES

AN EXPERT SPEAKS

Berlin, June 9—Marshal Zhukoff said today that early public trials of war criminals might be expected. Andrei Y. Vishinsky, Vice Foreign Commissar and chief prosecutor in the Moscow Trials of 1936-7, added that he knew "from personal experience that public trials are desirable."

—N. Y. Herald-Tribune, June 10.

Can Capitalism Be Humanized?

Two Reviews: (1) Beveridge on a Free Society

TWO crucial problems of social organization have to be solved if we want to prevent the next cycle of depression, counter-revolution, and war: how to plan for full employment, and how to organize a planned society which is also free and democratic. Both questions are treated, after a fashion, in Sir William Beveridge's new book, *Full Employment in a Free Society*. (W. W. Norton, \$2.75.) Being an economist, Beveridge rather lightly dismisses the problem of reconciling planning with democratic control and essential personal liberties, but his lengthy discussion of the conditions of full employment is a major contribution to a better understanding of the question, which has attracted the attention of orthodox economists only in the last two decades.

Whose Planning?

The ruling classes may be willing to pay a high price for full employment: it is essential for social stability and the continuation of their rule. On the other hand, organized labor, far from welcoming opportunities to seize power, which another period of depression, unemployment, and "social unrest" might create, is worried about the future of business unionism. Most unions fear a depression as a great weakening of their bargaining power as well as a great loss in membership dues. There is no significant wing of labor which plans aggressively ahead to use a revolutionary situation for giving the workers a new goal, beyond wages and hours.

Therefore all major labor organizations are willing to pay an exorbitant price for full employment and welcome any plan which may provide it. There are many labor leaders as well as "liberals" and "progressives" who have not yet learned that planning can be used by fascists and generals as well as by socialists. They do not understand that the real question is no longer "planning or drifting": there is no doubt that everywhere, regardless of the social system, economic planning is on the upswing, though some nations have more thorough and efficient planning than others. Who makes the plans, for whose benefit, and by what means, is much more important in our time. The liberals, however, stare fixedly at "planning" in a social vacuum. They have not even started to face the problem of democratic control in a planned economy or the relation between class structure and planning techniques. If the plan only promises 60 million jobs, even without showing specifically how to reach that goal, they are ready to accept it, lock, stock and barrel, without further examination.

After this kind of thinking, it is a pleasure to find the same problems treated in a mature and thorough manner by someone who realizes the technical and economic implications of planning for full employment, if not the social and political conditions. Beveridge's book is an intelligent and well reasoned statement of the "Spend your way to prosperity" school. Being an Englishman, Beveridge does not have to bow to our sacred cow of "private enterprise". Henry Wallace, as an American liberal, cannot stop praising free enterprise, while at the same time he advocates a great expansion of statism which will effectively limit the sphere of private capitalistic initiative.

Beveridge, on the other hand goes so far as to state, rather blandly, that the issue of socialism or capitalism is not prejudged by his report, which shows only immediate steps. Actually, his recommendations for a full employment policy make sense only under capitalism, in which production on one side, and consumption and investment on the other side, are not automatically balanced. But he expressly says that his plan does not guarantee the liberty of private citizens to own means of production and to employ others to operate them at a wage. He considers private property an economic device which may be abolished if it should prove necessary to do so in order to attain full employment.

Beveridge largely agrees with Keynes on the basic causes of crises and depression and the steps to be taken in order to overcome them. If Keynes is theoretically more profound, Beveridge's book, like his report on Social Security, has the special merit of stating the problem, and the proposed solution, in concrete terms.

Theoreticians of Mature Capitalism

Both economists reflect in their books the problems of capitalism grown old. Once, in Adam Smith's days, capitalists were praised for their "abstinence" in not consuming all their profits but saving them in order to invest them to produce new profits. This was supposed to assure unbroken economic and social progress. Today, the problem is considered to be one of spending rather than saving: "In contemporary conditions, the growth of wealth so far from being dependent on the abstinence of the rich as is commonly supposed, is more likely to be impeded by it. One of the chief social justifications of great inequality of wealth is therefore removed." These are Keynes' words, approvingly quoted by Beveridge.

Employment, according to both writers, depends on spending, either in the form of consumption or investment. Consumption gives employment, savings only if they are invested in adding to capital equipment, such as factories or machinery. But savings will not be invested if there is no reasonable expectation of profit for the potential investor. In that case the total amount of spending or outlay is inadequate and unemployment results.

This is as far as Beveridge goes in explaining the causes of unemployment, or for that matter, of economic depressions. Here as elsewhere his method is more descriptive than analytical. He does not explain, *why* at certain times investors see no profits ahead and refuse to make new investments. He admits, however, that a more even distribution of income would result in a higher amount of the national income being spent for consumption and less being saved.

This is a lefthanded restatement of the old Marxian concept that the workers, by not participating in the surplus product they have created, are, as consumers, unable to buy enough of the goods they produce. The surplus product is accumulated by the capitalists who are then confronted with the problem of investing that part of it which they do not consume. If it is invested for the purpose of new production, the same problem occurs again at the next stage. Ultimately the total product of the old and

new investments has to be consumed, either by the workers or the capitalists, and if this is not assured the investors will stop investing. If they continue to expand production at this point, overproduction occurs. In either case, depression and unemployment are the results.

The obvious suggestion of raising wages and thereby consumption, which is a perennial favorite of all labor unions, encounters very narrow limits under the capitalistic system. If wages rise too much, profits are reduced and the investors are no longer interested in putting their money to work, and a crisis results again.

If consumption cannot be raised to the necessary level by ordinary means, there remains only the planned destruction of consumers' goods and capital equipment as a last resort. This is the economic function of depressions, a function which war performs even more quickly and thoroughly. This is recognized by Beveridge when he says what has now become a commonplace: the only sovereign remedy yet discovered by capitalist democracies for unemployment is total war. The purpose of his book is to find ways and means of reaching the same goal in peace, without paying the same terrible price.

Since he does not analyze the basic causes of unemployment, his remedies are not designed to remove them. Though he criticizes the unequal distribution of wealth and favors more state control of economics, he is not in favor of any radical solutions. The essence of his policy is "the setting up of a long-term programme of planned outlay directed by social priorities and designed to give stability and expansion to the economic system." He regards stabilization of the business cycle as a by-product of long-term expansion. But the neglect of a thorough analysis of the cyclical fluctuations and of a policy to overcome them is one of the major weaknesses of his program, even on his own terms.

An Economic Substitute for War

To replace war spending, Beveridge proposes a planned attack on the "giant social evils of Want, Disease, Ignorance and Squalor". The main instrument for carrying out his program is a new type of annual budget, which takes manpower as its basic datum and plans to assure a total national outlay big enough to provide jobs for all and directed according to social priorities. This budget will be concerned with the income and expenditure of the community as a whole, not only with public finance, and fiscal considerations will be less important in making it up than factors creating full employment.

Beveridge enumerates five kinds of outlay. Number one is State spending on non-marketable goods and services, "including defence, order, free education", health services, roads, etc. The second type consists of public business investment in industries now under public control or to be publicly controlled in the future, such as utilities. Private business investment is the third type; it should be coordinated and made more effective by receiving directions from a National Investment Board. Then there is the biggest form of outlay: private consumption, "which can be both increased and steadied by State action in redistributing income, by measures of Social Security, and by progressive taxation". Finally, there is what Beveridge calls "joint consumption outlay", "under which the State takes the initiative by placing collective orders—for food, fuel and perhaps other necessities—with a view to re-selling them later to private consumers at a price which may at need be lowered by a subsidy."

Some of these devices are familiar in this country too.

The budget based on manpower is incorporated in the Murray bill, which has been pending in Congress for some months. The technique of "joint consumption outlay" was used in the food stamp plan of a few years ago. But the main virtue of Beveridge's policy is the systematic analysis of the different forms of spending and their coordination in such a way that the total outlay is always sufficient to give full employment. He discusses alternative routes of achieving this objective: reduction of taxes to stimulate private investment, or increased public outlay together with an increase of taxation sufficient to balance it. But he rejects both methods in favor of a third one: increasing the public outlay without increasing taxation. This would result both in a budgetary deficit and increased consumption expenditure which would create new employment. Beveridge is not afraid of unbalanced budgets and does not share the opinion of many economy-minded senators that State budgets should be kept as low as possible. A steadily expanding economy can afford to pay more interest and amortization charges on internal loans taken to stimulate economic activity.

There are many other interesting remarks in Beveridge's report, for example on the stabilization of basic raw material prices, but they are not of major importance in judging his whole policy. But two conditions of full employment which have to accompany the total planned outlay are significant: planned location of industry and mobility of labor.

The Mobility of Labor

Beveridge finds after a detailed statistical analysis that British labor moves easily from one industry to another, but not easily from one region to another one. This has led to high unemployment in some localities while simultaneously other regions had a fair employment rate. In a society which guarantees full employment, i.e. more jobs than there are workers available, this is a serious problem. Rather than shifting workers around from one place to another, he recommends locating all new industries according to the availability of labor supply, a recommendation from which our War Production Board could have profited. Industry is no longer as dependent on closeness to its raw materials as it used to be, and its location is increasingly determined on proximity to markets. In England this meant over-concentration of industry around London and shrinking industrial importance of the more outlying regions. Full control of industrial locations according to plan is therefore a prime necessity, not only in order to assure a more rational land use, but also to avoid structural unemployment. Town and country planning on a large scale to avoid overcrowding of metropolitan areas and all its consequences, and to save smaller towns from dying is one of the principal positive suggestions of Beveridge's report. It should be eagerly seized by city planners, and it goes far beyond the studies of the same subjects which the National Resources Planning Board prepared in this country.

The better the location of industry is controlled, the less it will be necessary to make workers move from one city to another. If Beveridge advocates controlled mobility of labor, he mainly wants to secure a planned movement of workers from one trade or industry to another, if necessary. Beveridge believes that changing from one job to another one in the same locality in a planned way should not be difficult, if the workers are assured of a job at comparable pay and the necessary training is provided for them. Mild as these proposals are, especially in comparison with the strict wartime con-

trois of labor in Britain, Beveridge seems to be especially afraid of being misunderstood in this respect. So he points out that organized mobility of labor does not mean perpetual motion of workers from one job to another, but only flexibility of labor supply when demand is assured. All this seems reasonable enough on his premises, and as part of his whole plan. It becomes more sinister only when it is taken out of the context and used for other purposes which are not recommended by Beveridge.

The recent attempt in America to establish a labor draft provides a good example of how such measures can be abused and their meaning perverted. The avowed purpose of the labor draft bills was, besides considerations of "morale", to control labor in the difficult period of reconversion from war to peace production and perhaps for many years after, while no similar control of industrial locations was provided. Needless to say that the sponsors of these bills had given no thought to any plans for an expanding economy which would assure full employment. If organized mobility of labor is a necessary and hardly objectionable part of Beveridge's plan under conditions of full employment and high national outlay directed by social priorities, similar measures mean enslavement if these social priorities are not recognized nor full employment achieved. The situation is comparable to measures aimed at controlling inflation: wage control, though less desirable and effective than taxation for this purpose, may be acceptable if prices and profits are also controlled to the same extent; it becomes vicious if the other controls are not established or inadequately enforced. And all experience to date shows us that the second is what actually happens.

Beveridge's Political Dilemma

Beveridge realizes that the disappearance of the "industrial reserve army" through full employment raises a number of other questions, but he glosses over them. Labor would enjoy a seller's market and use it to obtain a larger share of the national product. If prices were stable this would reduce and eventually eliminate profits and thus result in a change of the social system which would of course be resisted by the ruling classes with all, not only economic, means. Since this is not the purpose of the plan, there are two alternative ways of preventing it. One is lifting of price controls; in this case, steady wage increases would lead to inflation and thus be lost again. Beveridge is not in favor of inflation and therefore recommends the other alternative, effective wage controls, by arbitration or other means. He also relies on the "sense of citizenship and responsibility" which British labor "has sufficiently demonstrated", so that machinery can be created which will provide for a continuous, "if not spectacular, rise" of wages, to keep step with, or even slightly exceed, the rising productivity. His confidence in the unions is probably justified: they have proved to be the stablest props of capitalism. But will the workers, under favorable conditions, always be satisfied with business unionism?

This brings us to the principal weakness of Beveridge's plan: the political implications. He is one of many victims of the departmentalization of the sciences: he considers only the economic techniques and the government machinery required to carry his plan into practice, but he does not consider its political conditions and effects. His plan amounts to a mild but steady redistribution of income. It will not favor the accumulation of new wealth and will eventually reduce the existing wealth of individuals and the power that goes with it. It is a plan, then, which

will give the ruling classes the assurance of temporary social stability through full employment, but threatens them with the gradual loss of their wealth and power.

On the other hand, Beveridge seems to expect no major political change before his plan is carried out. Thus the same people whose power will be reduced by his plan and can accurately foresee its long-term effect are expected to make and administer the policies he advocates. This seems like a rather high demand on their unselfishness. No ruling class in history has ever relinquished its power without a fight, and the British ruling class is certainly no exception, as their policy in India shows.

There are then two alternatives: one is that the plans are carried out by the working classes. This means they would have to seize power, peacefully or otherwise, before putting the plan into effect. But if they are in power, and had to fight for it, they do not need a system as complicated as Beveridge's, and they can find a more inspiring one to fight for. A socialist society would have no problem balancing national income and outlay, or production and consumption and investment. It would perhaps adopt some of the techniques suggested by Beveridge, such as controlling the location of industry, and it might have the same social priorities, but the chief problem of assuring an adequate total outlay would cease to be a problem.

The other alternative is the rejection of the plan by the ruling class or, what is more likely, its abuse and change for different purposes. Certain of the techniques which Beveridge outlines can be used for entirely different purposes than those he mentions. An adequate total outlay can be assured by war production as well as by his list of social priorities, and instead of fighting the "giant evils of Want, Disease, Ignorance and Squalor," the fight may be directed against imperialist competitors or rebellious colonies. If this unproductive use of the national productive effort will make it difficult to pay increased interest and amortization charges on the loans which accompany an unbalanced budget, there is every assurance that this state of things will not last long, as the next war is not too far distant. It will then turn out that these expenditures were really more productive from the point of view of capitalism than those which Beveridge recommended. Controlled mobility of labor will then become an essential, and rigidly enforced, part of the permanent war economy, and location of industry will depend more on the possibility of avoiding robot bombs than on the population distribution. Such a policy would not necessarily exclude at least some concessions to workers, especially measures of public health which would increase their efficiency. But it would certainly see to it, by strict wage controls, that the absence of unemployment does not result in "excessive wages."

How Can We Be "Free"?

There is a final touch of irony in Beveridge's description of his system as a "Free Society", though it amounts, at best, to a benevolent paternalism, and at its worst leads to a very malevolent form of slavery. He hopes to achieve freedom by guaranteeing a list of "essential citizen liberties", such as freedom of speech, association, choice of occupation, and freedom in the management of personal income. The list does not include the freedom to own means of production and exploit others, but he includes, though somewhat reluctantly, the right to strike. These liberties define the limits of the centralized planning authority exercised by the state.

This purely negative approach is quite ineffective in the face of the ever increasing power of an efficient govern-

ment machine which makes and executes the plan. Any negative limitations can be easily overrun by a powerful bureaucracy, in spite of all constitutional guaranties. The problem is not so much one of restricting the planners as one of controlling them. Beveridge does not face it; he cannot face it since effective democratic control would require a complete change of our political and social system, a change which he does not welcome.

Therefore he does not touch the basic problem which confronts us now, both under planned capitalism and under the type of planning which the Russians have, by whatever name you may wish to call it: how to have centralized and efficient planning and democratic control, too. The high degree of technical knowledge and specialization which is required of those who run the plan makes their control all the more difficult, however good or bad their intentions may be. Many of the democratic liberties we now enjoy in the capitalist democracies are precisely the result of their inefficiency as economic mechanisms, for

which they may be blessed by their opponents. But once the system becomes more efficient by planning, better means of democratic control have to be found.

Devices such as decentralization and direct citizen participation in local and regional planning have been suggested, as well as the possibility of removing any elected official at any time by a vote of his constituents. But these essentially constitutional devices are not infallible either. Soviet Russia had them all, more or less, in the early stages after the revolution, and the pressure of economic circumstances created by Russian isolation and backwardness made them soon ineffective and helped the bureaucracy in establishing itself in power. (They may be more effective, however, under conditions of economic abundance and security.)

This is a matter which deserves much more intensive study than it has so far received. Whether a satisfactory solution can be found and carried out will determine if we can have a free society.

ROBERT ANDERS

Notes on Abba P. Lerner's *The Economics of Control — Principles of Welfare Economy* (Macmillan, \$3.75)

Welfare Economy" goes back to mercantilism. Progressive servants of the king then complained that individual "merchants" begrudge measures which are for the good of all merchants as a whole. Today, the same progressive intellectuals are decried as "reds" and accused of "statism." A. P. Lerner's merit is to have refuted this slander. Using methods developed by Professor Pigou, he investigates the basic assumptions of welfare economy, and finds that they not only are compatible with, but actually call for, Free Enterprise, Private Property and other paraphernalia of our economic faith.

The aim of the new welfare party, like that of the old mercantilists, is to use all resources available to society. It is symbolized in the slogan of Full Employment which was first used by continental labor unions and supported by the International Labor Office. Indeed, the prospect of ten million unemployed a few years hence has brought it home to organized labor that its old tactics and principles are being scrapped by the increase of productivity. Nationwide planning is required to assure "jobs for all" and to control the business cycle.

I. An Undogmatic Economy

"Control" towards which we are drifting, Mr. Lerner asserts, rejects all dogmatism concerning social ideals and systems. It is a policy or technique which borrows the best from all techniques and so "reconciles" socialism and capitalism. To some degree it includes the techniques of the Russian NEP, the New Deal, Dr. Schacht's total mobilization and the present war economy. An occasional phrase on behalf of "democratic government," surreptitiously slipped in, does not invalidate the basic statement that we need not inquire who runs the economy for whose benefit and who owns its product. Application of the right technique, it is claimed, implies guidance by the right principles and purposes. Substitution of techniques for aims is the most outstanding characteristic of our generation anyhow. The old aim of mankind, full enjoyment of its resources, is replaced by full employment. Social welfare, it is alleged, looks after itself when full employment prevails.

Full employment is defined as optimum use of all resources. This is achieved when each concern maximizes its profits. A simple tautologism: the total is largest when

the sum of all parts is highest. And a little trick: drop the word "concern" in the above sentence. Then the dogma that some people do not earn profits but wages will not stand in the way of the assertion that profit to each means profit to all. Dogmatists alone call that begging the question and insist that "profit to all" may mean entirely different things in different societies. In a society of small independent producers, social benefit is almost identical with individual profits. Not so in our industrialized, acquisitive economy. A distributive society, again, determines its social benefit by an accounting system essentially different from these both. It does not identify maximum profit with maximum benefit.

"Profit" here, as in common usage, means managerial income plus dividend on capital plus undistributed surplus. This latter element in particular is the main source of capital accumulation and output expansion, hence of the business cycle. Undogmatic economics, not concerned with any specific economy, ignores this and denies that any problem is created by the drive of capital for remunerative employment. Instead, profit is defined as the speculative gain which enterprisers make by outsmarting each other. Profit, Lerner asserts, arises only if resources are maldistributed, particularly through monopolistic appropriation of markets. The specific paradox of capitalist society, that expansion presupposes profit while more profit does not necessarily imply "more jobs", is supposed to be non-existent. The only question discussed is how to assure normal functioning of free competition. This trick can be achieved only through a return to the pre-Adam-Smith era.

II. From Ricardo to Robinson

The model of economic transactions in Mr. Lerner's technological wonderland is a society of small producers who enjoy perfect competition and use "satisfactions" as their system of accountancy. Robinson Crusoe leaning on his hoe at sun-set weighs the additional satisfaction, to be gained by a little more work, against the additional back-ache resulting therefrom. Having collected his crop, he meets another Robinson who happens to have meat. Weighing their respective appetites and love of variety against each other, between them they figure the prices of

fruit and meat—prices which, if neither cheated, reflect either's satisfaction.

Mr. Lerner assumes what is good for Robinson is also good for us, and with a little sleight-of-hand he adds: the price mechanism assures the most effective distribution, hence, the greatest social benefit.

True, if (and only if) incomes are equal and hypothetically, goods are available in unlimited quantity, the simple mechanics of supply and demand assures the most equitable distribution of consumer goods. However, a society which had achieved equal incomes would hardly rely on such a clumsy and impractical device as the price mechanism to determine its needs. Mr. Lerner admits that inequality is an essential characteristic of the society he analyzes—which does not prevent him from continuing to pretend that the play of prices and profits assures maximum social benefit. His basic assumptions derived from a more primitive society are decreed to be valid in a totally different society, without the slightest attempt to test whether they still apply. Later he leaves the admittedly unknown satisfactions untouched and proceeds in terms of prices, still assuming, or pretending to assume, that prices correspond to satisfactions. This is as metaphysical a dogma as the "metaphysical" labor theory of value, which he chooses to ridicule.

Only theologians pretend to know what they prove one can't know. Science uses the method of abstraction.

No stone ever falls with the velocity $S = \frac{1}{2} g.t^2$. But the formula gives the model of free fall; it disregards deviations which are due to accidental influences not inherent in the conditions of free fall. Likewise, a theoretical model assuming a standard hour of labor is only a pale abstraction from a more complex reality, but it permits us to study specific relations in a specific society and does not gloss over fundamental characteristics of its economic operation. Notably it reveals that no magic welfare equation assures automatic adjustment of prices, profits and social benefit. It does not confuse an abstract simplified model of something complicated with the model of a simpler, more primitive function. Finally, it applies to perfect competition as well as to imperfect competition. This is not the case of Mr. Lerner's assumption that prices reflect satisfaction, which combines all the above fallacies.

III. The Metaphysical Perfection of Imperfect Metaphysics

Competition, namely is never perfect empirically, and under any industrial system it will be imperfect for the structural reason that no large production unit can be put into operation piecemeal. Moreover, units such as railways require proportional investments in subsidiary industries. Under capitalism additional reasons militate against perfect competition: industrial property is in the hands of management and individual profits should be maximized. Even if no mistake in speculative investment is made, the accounting system leads to inadequate employment of resources; capital outlay must be earned and interest on it must be paid; actual production never matches actual demand and the balance of savings is never precisely equal to income minus optimum consumer benefit. To earn capital outlay, it may pay a concern to operate at a loss (if the loss is smaller than interest and depreciation). This will alter the price structure so that prices are unequal to satisfactions.

Mr. Lerner has a few masterly pages in which he proves that under such conditions maximum social benefit is not equal to the total of maximized private profits. He also

shows that the business cycle originates in the rigidities of imperfect competition. If competition is perfect, he says, an equilibrium situation with full employment tends to be reached in a purely capitalist economy. Indignantly he scorns "simple-minded planners" who, ignorant of the intricacies involved in organizing a modern economy, blame on perfect competition the failure of equilibrium to occur automatically. It is the absence of perfect conditions which spoils the benefit to be derived from competition. And then the unexpected happens:

After so much proof has been given that the absence of perfect conditions is *inherent* in the conditions of perfect competition, the argument proceeds as though perfect competition continues to prevail or is established by certain devices. Mr. Lerner claims that "control" re-establishes free competition.

The stone deviates from the law of free fall because of external interference. Free competition exists only through external interference with its law which in operation constantly suspends itself.

Whenever Mr. Lerner talks of cost, profit, interest or other real and dogmatic features of his economy, we find characteristics of imperfect competition. Only when the question is of social benefit, then infallibly the two theological Robinsons appear with their metaphysical satisfactions. A theory should not only be "refined," it also should apply to the subject under analysis.

IV. Capital and Labor in Wonderland

As a human being, Mr. Lerner asserts he is much concerned about the well-being of other human beings. In science, the latter only create confusion. Labor, he says, should be treated as a "factor" which is "applied" like other factors of production. Robinson, indeed, can decide how much back-ache he wants to "apply." But the assumption hardly holds good elsewhere, not even in slave-owning society which has certain moral inhibitions against killing and eating, like a cow, a factor who does not earn what he eats. In fact it does not apply to any society whose labor is not supplied exclusively by cows. In an industrial society, the suppliers of labor can neither be scrapped like a machine nor stored away like a bale of cotton if there is no use for them. The whole system of economic activity is kept going because the worker is also and simultaneously the ultimate consumer.

Factors may be unemployed for various reasons—natural catastrophes, seasons, turnover, migration, substitution of new products or materials for old, erroneous forecast of demand (misplaced investment), shock- or wave-like expansion and contraction of new discoveries and inventions or of specific consumer or investment needs. This can happen in any society. In a rationally organized economy this will create problems, more or less easily solved by transfer of labor, restriction (or expansion) of labor time or of the labor force, emergency relief. Under free (perfect-imperfect) competition, two specific kinds of unemployment occur — structural or technological unemployment, and cyclical unemployment. Both are due to institutional causes, not to natural catastrophes. The first, which today is the most important, is not mentioned by Mr. Lerner (nor by Sir William Beveridge), though it affords important clues to the analysis of the other variant. Structural unemployment means that productivity has grown so high that a few "factor" units can do the work of all. An hour of labor produces more goods. The labor hour is worth more in terms of goods; goods are worth less in terms of labor hours. Any answer to this problem which

does not eventually mean lesser working hours per man and higher real wage per hour is quackery.

Now in a capitalist economy the opposite is required. The correct answer to glutted markets is wage reduction and creation of more "work." Trade unions which propose to "enlarge purchasing power" by raising the price of labor, thereby discourage investment. They are a monopolistic element preventing the smooth adjustment which is guaranteed in perfect competition. So Lerner.

The reason is inherent in the accounting system of a competitive society, characterized by two contradictory requirements: Today's consumption must be paid out of yesterday's earnings, after allowance for investment and replacement of capital—and production must be determined by the need for extant capital to be employed remuneratively enough to pay replacement and interest. The hiatus between production and consumption is bridged by the profit motive. This, in turn, does not function if capital is allowed to lie idle. The cost of capital—interest—enters into the cost accounting of every product. Past investment of capital is paid for by currently distributed purchasing power.

Moreover, owning capital is a productive function, Mr. Lerner asserts. Capital invested in a machine must be considered as laid up as long as the machine is not fully paid off; a stock of grain set aside for next year's sowing, represents "postponed consumption." In both cases, Mr. Lerner says, the owners deliberately deprive themselves of immediate satisfaction, and such virtue must be rewarded.

Nowhere does Mr. Lerner's bias for undogmatic capitalism appear more clearly than in this solicitude for the abstract value of capital and in his naive assumption that any society must comply with the accounting system of profitability. According to his "Rule," production must be expanded as long as it pays to apply a factor. Capital must be utilized as long as there is an owner. A distributive society can leave capital lying idle or write it off entirely whenever there is no societal use for it. In Mr. Lerner's accounting system the first is the greatest sin and the second a major catastrophe.

V. *The Bondage of the Past*

A trade union which increases the price of labor naively assumes that the accounting system of all economies is determined by criteria of technical possibilities. It has no consideration for the profit motive and the need of capital to be employed and to yield profit or interest. Erroneously it uses the yardstick of a distributive society which strives to save labor and make the expenditure of human energy and time in the production process as valuable as possible. It is indifferent to the basic condition of capitalism that past investment must be earned (at whatever cost to society). An acquisitive economy is wasteful of human labor; a distributive society is wasteful of the treasures of the past—i.e., capital.

These are two entirely different accounting systems which cannot be "reconciled" unless violence is done to one of them. Mr. Lerner resolutely chose his side. We shall now see how he tries to evade the consequences. He claims that there is a third possibility which uses the mechanism of perfect competition but avoids its pitfalls. The device consists in regulating government expenditure so that the rigidities of imperfection are prevented from interfering with those adjustments automatically achieved in perfect competition.

The device is not new. Government credit and exchange banks were the panacea of all French socialists

in the early 19th century. The fact that their ideas can now be expressed much more precisely in terms of mathematical economics has not added a single new insight. All economists now agree on the essential theoretical points: the trade cycle is due to certain disproportions in production and consumption—perfect competition will restore the equilibrium through wage cuts or expansion of investment—as long as investment expands under prospects of remunerative employment of capital, no wage cut is necessary—the credit mechanism and cheap money are helpful to maintain such prospects—capitalist equilibrium can be established, therefore, only as a dynamic equilibrium, with capital investment increasing at a more rapid rate than wages and consumer expenditure.

That much had been established without appeal by Tugan-Baranowski forty years ago. He had also drawn the absurd but correct conclusion that capitalism can be in a perfect working condition if there was only one worker left to move a gigantic machinery which is constantly kept expanding for its own sake. The only provision for an expanding equilibrium is that the ultimate consumer does not have to supply the purchasing power and the need for the increasing output. Industry must work for industry.

The basic paradox, that income and employment depend on investment but increasing investment reduces that proportion of income which consumers spend to buy goods produced through investment—that paradox cannot be solved in the framework of capitalist economy. Something outside this accounting system is required to fill the balance. Either additional demand must be created or additional investment to provide purchasing power for such demand, or both. Since the earliest times of economic thought, the public debt has been considered as such a general lever of economic wealth. It has been praised or denounced by representatives of all parties, capitalists and anti-capitalists, orthodox and heretical theorists. The new turn which this idea was given after the Great Depression is that it is meant to "create jobs."

Let us consider what this implies. "Simple-minded planners" might speculate that if the public debt is such a miracle-working agent and if the government is to be given such immense powers of making economic decisions, it might as well plan what and how should be invested and how purchasing power is to be distributed. This, however, is not the meaning of "control." Public works are not considered necessary because sanitary installations or means of communication are inadequate. It is the other way round—if employment is found inadequate to supply purchasing power to buy the goods supplied by private enterprise, we have to find a road which might be improved or a sanitary installation which might be necessary. This is really the world topsy-turvy and reason upside down, but it makes sense in Mr. Lerner's system which starts from the proposition that the free play of private competition must not be interfered with, and that capital must earn its remuneration.

Employment is also chained to the chariot of capital remuneration. When productivity increases sufficiently so that trade unions would increase the price of labor and reduce working hours, Mr. Lerner has to create more work in order to keep all factors employed, and to maximize profits.

It is obvious that the "reconciliation" is all one-sided and that the non-capitalistic accounting, far from being made to govern economy, is used as a stand-by to implement the defects of the preferred accounting system of private enterprise. This will be even more evident when

we consider the working mechanism of wonderland, as described by Mr. Lerner.

VI. Socialized Bankruptcy

Mr. Lerner has the merit of boldness and of consequential discussion. His technical mastery in using the methods of modern mathematical analysis enables him to supply a complete and detailed theory of controlled economy, admirable in the rigidity of its definitions and enviable with respect to the ease with which the fruit of hard thinking is expounded. Anyhow it is far more profound than the well-intentioned expositions of knighted gentlemen. If you get over the basic dishonesty of the whole concept and manage to keep a code by the side to decipher what it all means in terms of reality, then you will read the technical chapters on the various devices of welfare economy with greatest advantage. They reveal what it can do and what not with much more clarity than any refutation of these suggestions which I have seen so far. There are, in particular, three chapters on foreign trade which I do not hesitate to call a little classic. Mr. Lerner does not shrink from any consequence, be it the most absurd, if his system leads him to accept it. In places one wonders whether the whole book is not meant ironically, whether it conceals an able and vigorous attack on the system of free enterprise.

In spite of its value, Mr. Lerner's technical argument seems unsatisfactory to me. However, detailed technical discussion would require more space and pre-suppose more technical knowledge on the part of the reader than the editor is prepared to admit. I have to summarize.

The devices of controlled economy are: (a) the "social dividend," a minimum wage or tax remission granted as long as there is not adequate consumer demand; and (b) public spending as long as there is not sufficient investment to establish equilibrium under conditions of full employment. Both may be financed either by taxation or by increase of the public debt or simply by printing money. All leftists agree that more good than harm will be done by such measures in times of depression. The problem starts the moment "full employment" is reached. Then the inflationary tendencies must be checked—unless we follow Lord Keynes who says that inflation is required to decrease real wages at the peak of the boom. In both cases, consumer income in terms of real value or satisfactions will decrease just at the time when peak productivity demands its expansion. Deflation is required for the sake of the profit motive just at the time when additional spending is required for the sake of maintaining the dynamic equilibrium of the capital structure. As has been pointed out elsewhere, in the final analysis the Keynesian expandible economy reduces itself to the classical model (which always starts out from the assumption of full employment) just at the time when its method appears to triumph. Under conditions of private investment, the depression originates in full employment.

Mr. Lerner admits as much when he points out that highly industrialized production units then operate at a loss. Surprisingly enough, this prophet of perfect competition then recommends that either the public take over the losses or that monopolies be established "to make both ends meet," admitting that this implies social losses and failure to achieve maximum satisfactions. He then urges the managers of public enterprises (admittedly operating at a loss) to compete successfully with private enterprise under conditions of free competition. Though Mr. Lerner does not say so explicitly, I suppose the government is supposed to supply money to bridge all the gaps. This Utopia

is, of course, nonsensical in every respect except the one which concerns private capital. Its remuneration is guaranteed, perish everything else.

VII. Omnipotent Government

It is obvious that the socialization of losses is a cumulative process. The more we have "full employment" the more frequently the government has to intervene and to save concerns from impending or incurred losses. The more also we have monopolies organizing the socialization of losses. Contrary to Mr. Lerner's (and in fact all economists') belief that equalized income assured smoothest working of economy, capital income is going to outrun consumer income. The more so the more the government is compelled, under full employment, to finance its intervention out of borrowing instead of pump-priming. This phase is neglected in the assinine assertion that "we" owe the public debt "to ourselves." In fact Kentucky owes it to New York and taxpayers to capital owners. The public debt is a device to redistribute income in the direction of more inequality, and in many countries it is one of the principal levers by which capital-owning classes control the policy of the government, however "democratic" it may be by its constitution.

Mr. Lerner claims that his system prevents totalitarian government and maintains free competition. He has not proven the first and definitely disproven the second assertion. There will be monopoly (private or state-owned) and a government bound by the necessity of constantly intervening on behalf of capital. There is no automatism which assures its intervention on behalf of consumers and their satisfactions. The system of controlled economy certainly does not require so many interventions in details as is the case in the present uncoordinated war economy. But the central unified control of investment policy which Mr. Lerner requires certainly is stronger and more efficient than the current ukases which patch a gap by opening another. The fact that government control is indirect instead of immediate, and general instead of specific does not make the difference between a totalitarian and a non-totalitarian government. In fact, the Nazi system would have required much less direct control, had a similar system existed in all major countries. The tie-in with monopoly, on the other hand, caused regulations to be very specific. Now Mr. Lerner admits that technical requirements of his system lead to monopolistic arrangements, in the long run incompatible with democratic government. Democracy, from the outset nowhere institutionally anchored in his system, must remain less than a pious hope, a practical impossibility. No economic system can be technologically aloof and ignore the kind of government it pre-supposes. No one can furtively by-pass the question who owns and controls the means of production and hope to arrive at an equitable solution.

ARNOLD BRUGGERS

THE INSCRUTABLE ORIENT

Question: Have new difficulties arisen in Syria and the Lebanon?

Answer: These are eternal difficulties from which new difficulties arise. I believe the world knows that serious and annoying difficulties were created for France in the territories of Syria and the Lebanon, where France voluntarily instituted and was the first to recognize the independence of these two states. This is a very difficult subject for many reasons, primarily because Oriental affairs are always difficult in all regions, not only in Syria and the Lebanon, but also, I believe, in Iraq, Transjordan, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, Palestine, and Iran. The Orient is a region where problems are always difficult.

—General DeGaulle at a press conference, Jan. 28.

The Soldier Reports

The foreign correspondent has become an important figure in our cultural life. Sometimes he is really good; more often, his reputation is absurdly inflated, as in the cases of John Gunther and Walter Duranty. In any case, his information of necessity is usually gathered at the top levels of power, from generals and foreign secretaries. This war seems to be producing another kind of foreign correspondent, one who gets about as widely as the professionals do, but who sees history from the bottom, and who does not think of himself as a reporter at all. For some time, letters have been coming in to the office from our soldier and sailor readers scattered over the globe which give an informal, human, bottom-dog view of events, often with a personal emotion which the newspaper correspondents can rarely afford and which renders the reality of things all the more accurately for this reason. This kind of reportage seems too valuable not to share with our readers. Therefore, from time to time, extracts from such letters will appear in this new department. We hope our armed-forces readers will continue to keep us supplied with such material.—ED.

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING TWO LETTERS WERE WRITTEN BY THE SAME SOLDIER. THE CHANGE IN HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GERMAN PEOPLE, AFTER A MONTH'S EXPERIENCE WITH THE AMERICAN OCCUPATION FORCES, IS NOT THEIR LEAST INTERESTING FEATURE.

(1)

Germany, April 30

So what can we do with Germany? I know what the Marxist line will be, and I know that some day I shall be inclined to agree with it, but today, here and now, I live in a different sort of milieu, a hard nasty warlike one, and the things that are happening appear to be all that could happen. Faced with the flaccid, self-pitying apathy of the Germans, it is hard to be forgiving. The closer war breathes on one's neck, the more subjective it becomes, and the more impossible it is to take the "intelligent" perspective. One, at times, gets rather contemptuous of "intelligence", of "reasonableness", of "science". . . .

I'll give you a typical story of a German soldier today. Flushed out of his own home in civilian clothes, a 16 year old boy, two months in service. He had never been taught how to use a grenade, so within 4 days, he had blown his hand to hell with one. Sent to a hospital in the West, he was shortly bombed out of it by American planes, and in the confusion slipped off to his home, where he hid from the SS till the Americans came. His mother cried when he was marched off as a prisoner of war. . . .

It's all very confused, very shabby and very tiresome—this breakup of a whole social pattern even if it is one that you have always hated. Today I was shown photos of Buchenwald. . . . Horrible, horrible, clearcut pictures, and I had to calm myself down by saying over and over again that Germans had also died there—and I know that is rational and real—but it doesn't excuse the Germans who didn't die there. . . .

My analysis of Germany is this: a nation whose moral fibre has been destroyed, a nation of apathy and despair, a nation incapable of any longer making history. And I am utterly confused. My whole background teaches me that history "abhors a vacuum" and yet I am being subjected to the terrifying spectacle of history without air. . . .

As for the theory that the American soldier will become

more politically conscious through "sympathetic suffering" with the people of Europe, I don't think it works at all. Even I become haughty, become the contemptuous conqueror in the midst of horror. . . . And so I hold my head high and laugh with delight as we rumble through German towns and the master race scurries for cover.

(2)

Austria, May 23

The dilemma of the German war in its last stage was that the Nazis were obviously fighting for time—for a better bargaining position—while the Allies were less obviously fighting to perpetuate the Nazi regime until it would be crushed along with the German masses. Germany had to be atomized and *conquered* and the worst disaster that the Allies could suffer would be internal German revolt against Hitler; any resistance of the German masses had to be *identified* to the world with Nazi resistance. Therefore in actuality both sides were fighting for the perpetuation (at least temporarily) of the Nazi regime—and it expressed itself on the Allied side politically in unconditional surrender and militarily in the terror air raid and the "Aachen" policy.

Who split the Gordian knot—who solved the puzzle? I saw the German people solve it—and with what *Stars & Stripes* until recently liked to call apathy. The German nation and the German army simply refused to continue the struggle; refused to make Breslau out of every German city; refused to resist because any resistance would have been labeled "Nazi." It was the most intelligent thing that Germans could do—lacking as they did—the physical power to overthrow Hitler—but being able to force him to suicide by becoming a nation of Gandhis. So you see, I admit my errors on the German people and rather admire their unpretty but reasonable performance.

What happens now. First—the surrender stabilized the German army. The German officers and non-coms had lost control—there were no mutinies but the soldiers simply refused to fight—I saw that happen. In the prison camps, the ruling hierarchy was returned "for administrative purposes". *Stars & Stripes* reports a more terrifying example: "Utrecht, Holland, May 19 (AP):

"The discipline of the 98,000 German troops in Holland is being kept at a high level and the Germans are handing out heavy punishments to their own men.

"On May 15 the German commander, Field Marshal Johannes Blaskowitz, had ten of his troops shot for desertion. They were arrested trying to make a getaway as civilians and after a summary trial were sentenced to death. The Canadians were asked to lend 10 rifles and 100 rounds of ammunition for the execution and the request was granted.

"The Germans turn in complete accounts of incidents together with punishment meted out. A German soldier in a concentration area lit a cigarette and threw away the burning match, which set four gallons of gasoline on fire. One of his officers standing near drew his pistol and shot the man dead. 'We mustn't run the risk of sabotage at this stage' the officer remarked to a Canadian. 'We must make an example'."

Note that these sentences are made by the Germans and punishments are evidently not even reviewed by the Canadians—but only reported to them. Also note the fact—which I can substantiate from personal knowledge—that the German officer keeps his arms. . . .

Our policy toward Austrian civilians is already provocative which I suppose is necessary. I believe that it is essential to the Allies to prod the Germans into resistance to the occupation; which resistance of course, will be called

Nazi and posited as the celebrated Nazi underground which is at the moment as nebulous as the defense of the Bavarian Alpine redoubt proved to be. Non-fraternization and strict curfews are still in force—and the warm attitude with which the Austrians received us is already becoming soured. . . .

I almost hope that my outfit will be sent to CBI shortly. It's the most corroding sort of experience to have to participate in this business of occupation. Even though one can maintain a fair sort of individual integrity, one is still part of the machine. I would rather kill people who shoot back than those who don't; I'd rather be involved in a war of quick brutal annihilation than in one where only one side annihilates and slowly, but slowly.*

Dusseldorf, Germany

Things are going very quietly and very poorly here, within the range of my observation. Dusseldorf, according to civilian reports, was a strong Communist center before and even during Hitler's reign; now the civilians claim that it is the poorest fed city in Germany. I heard a story (which one may or may not believe, although I am inclined to believe it) that Hitler had come only once to Dusseldorf because the people lining the streets had included a few vegetables in the flowers they threw at him and had mixed the Communist salute with the Nazi one. At any rate, I believe that the Allies are missing a great chance to win the favor of the German people. They had undoubtedly been pleased at our arrival. We came as liberators: from the bombs and, they supposed, from hunger. The Americans, whom the German people seem to prefer to the British, were going to feed them and free them from Nazi oppression. Instead, we are now starving them, and things happen such as the Cologne incident. (See "Politics" for June) Biggest thing I have yet heard is the rumor that Dusseldorf Commies delivered some sort of ultimatum to the local Burgomeister stating that if the food situation is not improved, comes the revolution.

This of course would be a rather wonderful thing except that it would not succeed. Some of the vast firepower that is called the Allied army would merely be brought to bear on the revolutionists and they would die and with them a great deal of the future of Germany, even if they are Stalinists. And speaking of the Stalinists: people keep telling me about the marvelous speed of the rehabilitation work the Russians are doing in Berlin. Fifty some-odd movie theaters were reopened within a couple of weeks after the end of the war. Food is being brought in for the people. And transportation and industrial machinery is being set into operation again. Why don't they do that here? is of course always the question that follows. And another fairly big thing: Radio Berlin announced, shortly after the Allies had announced their plan for starvation rations for civilians, that they would feed the civilians under their jurisdiction much better than we do. . . .

As for fraternization: I will admit that I have seen a great many encouraging signs, but I still believe that the official line has succeeded. In *Yank* magazine, the editors reported that the percentage of letters received ran to 75/25 in favor of the army's stand. The myth of German militarism has sunk home with practically every soldier, and the stories of the concentration camps are accepted as evidence of the guilt of the whole people. Of course there is a percentage

of soldiers who are able to see beyond their nose in this matter, but they are for the most part above-average (and I mean *well* above) persons who would probably not have supported the war anyway. Very few of the people who read *PM* and *The New Republic* object to the principle, although they don't go around breaking up all groups of three or more civilians. And yet, despite all this, the non-fraternization rule is being steadily broken down. There is practically no-one I know who has not at some time or other visited one of the local *mädchens*. Prophylactic stations have been officially opened and rubber contraceptives are being issued. This was announced with the assertion that this was in *no* way to be construed as a relaxation of non-fraternization regulations, but it was also announced that records of the medical dept. may not be used as evidence in a court martial case. Did I say *naive*? There ought to be another word, but I can't think of it just now.

Salonika, Greece

POLITICS is doing an extremely worthwhile and important job, and for that reason I'd like to contribute my own small fund of information about Greece to your series. Very few American ships get to Greece, and it was only by accident that ours did. We were in Italy unloading cargo, and were notified that a British ship scheduled to go to Greece had been damaged and that we would make the trip instead. We went to Salonika and stayed there twelve days, from May 6 to 18.

The visit started auspiciously with the spectacle of a massacre in the main square of Salonika, where eight *Elas* men and/or bystanders got themselves killed by the Royalist soldiers. What had happened was that a gigantic victory celebration was being held by the city to mark V-E Day, and through some mysterious circumstances both Left and Right were allowed to meet in the same Square, altho at different parts of it, separated by an outdoor concert orchestra busily playing Beethoven's Fifth throughout the whole business, and also while a costumed children's pageant marking the victory was going on. The *Elas* sympathizers, many thousands strong, were having a happy time singing and shouting rather innocuous slogans, and then a nineteen year old girl had the bad taste to sing a partisan song. At that a soldier walked up to her and cut her throat. Then other soldiers closed in murderously and made it clear that the singing interlude was over and that the people had better start running. But hundreds, with fantastic courage waiting to be charged, shot and killed, stood there singing the Workers funeral anthem again and again while the girl's body lay there in a cleared space in front to us, and then knelt in prayer for the girl.

All around me people were shouting to me to "tell them in America we have fascism here, they kill us, we starve" but there was the classic working-class picture of masses locked in the slaughterhouse, with the key thrown away, showing courage when they had already been disarmed and when it was too late. As I said, seven more were killed before the Square was cleared. Then, at precisely the right moment, after the British-trained Greek soldiers had gotten their work done, the British MP's showed up to preserve law and order, impartially, don't you know. I might add that the MP's are unarmed, and simply punch with bare fists, but if any man had the bad judgment to fight back or injure one of them, there are plenty of men with tanks and artillery in town to clear up the place. These forces are three-quarters native Indian regiments (Punjab, Sikh and Gurka) and one-quarter elite British units like the Gordon Highlanders, who would be the least likely to show any pity or interest in the Greek people.

*Several persons have told me recently that they were offered very well-paying jobs by various Government agencies trying to collect staffs for work in the American occupational zone in Germany. Each of them refused because he didn't want to be identified with American policy over there; each had the impression the Government is finding it very hard to recruit qualified persons for this dirty work.—ED.

I've spoken to many of these British soldiers and officers over there, and not one has any real desire to break discipline—nothing beyond being fed up, bored and discontented and wanting to go home, and all have the same stock of atrocity stories about the Elás, "what they did to our chaps they took prisoner—made them walk about barefoot in the snow" etc. etc. I recall one of them describing a raid by Greek Royalist soldiers made on the village of Daphne to look for "communist murderers", after which ten were carried off under arrest. I asked the man how he knew they were communist murderers, and he answered, with surprise and bewilderment, that of course they were the men wanted, or else they wouldn't be in the village waiting to be arrested in the first place. Blessed simplicity.

The man hunt goes on anyway, with Elás men being driven farther and farther into remote regions, and then over the frontier into Bulgaria or Yugoslavia to save their lives, which, according to the British, proves they were communist agents in the first place, working for Tito and Stalin. My own opinion which by no means is that of an experienced or trained observer, is that right now the Greek masses have very little chance; the country has been so thoroughly "pacified" that the British feel safe in withdrawing some of their units, and the more "sporting" of the British officers are restless and bored at the lack of violent opposition which would give them something to do. Events have worked out in full measure to fulfill the division of Europe made at Teheran and Yalta.

H. L. (Merchant Seaman)

Philippine Islands

I'm not in a combat zone now, and I'm getting restless. I believe it's because my conscience bothers me that I've got it quite easy compared to the boys up front. And too, I'm afraid of the outcome of the Philippine liberation movement. Afraid that all my hopes concerning it are slowly being dashed. So I want to run away, to a combat zone, where a guy can soldier and dream and wish. And regardless of how naive his dreams in the practical sense are, still because he is in a combat zone and things are so screwy, he has a peculiar sense of comfort in that things can't always be that way. Somebody, somewhere, he hopes, knows the score and sure as hell is going to do something about it.

Elections are to be held in November. Mudslinging, evasion, personalities, every dirty device used by our politicians is being used here with an especial Filipino flavor. The guerrilleros, who should be the most politically conscious, seem to have no sense of political responsibility. They've taken a terrible beating because of it. In some cases families of men fighting in the mountains today have been found starving. Some of the leaders, though sincere, have the knack of stepping on people's toes. And the average guerrillero, somehow, just doesn't see how to continue to fight and he isn't being offered leadership. I'm rather friendly with a number here. I ask them, "Well, the fighting will soon be over, what do you plan to do?" They say, "We want to send some of our men over to Japan with the Americans." "Then what?" I ask. No answer. They just shrug their shoulders. This inability to recognize that the military fight will have been lost if the political fight is not won is the most galling thing for me to run into. But these guerrilleros are in the main simple people, with just one aim, to beat hell out of the Jap. A lot like our own soldiers. Anyway it is distressing to see men and women whose once latent talents were brought out and sharpened

during the Jap occupation, slip back and become dormant. The men will go back to the rice paddies; the women to the kids and diapers.

Popular Culture

Jazz, Clock & Song of our Anxiety

JAZZ is our only functioning folk art—that is, our only art having a mass of skilled, intuitive practitioners and a mass audience (albeit but a hundredth as great as the bastardizing performers and bastardizing listeners). Though it has in recent years attracted the attention of a few serious critics of music and inspired amateurs (almost all of whom have written passionate Baedekers to recorded jazz) and though its history has been rather thoroughly traced—no one has yet said what jazz is. This brief paper is an attempt to define jazz and to discover the nature of its impulse. These two tasks may be distinguished only verbally, and are, indeed, one.

The Rhythm: The Clock of Anxiety

A man helpless, waiting, will beat his fist evenly on the table in an unpremeditated effort to give order and a sense of security to his passive expectancy. Music which is dominated by an ineluctable rhythm—the music of certain primitive cultures, for example, and jazz—is the song of a similar dread feeling of impotence.

Extreme consciousness of time is the burden of the man whose will operates only reactively. The unanswering world surrounds him, its bewitching constancy suspect, hostile and unpredictable. He cannot alter the terrible significance of time, but he can alter, at least temporarily, the sensations it produces in him. He can alleviate the pain of waiting by creating a known expectation in time. *The measured beat—the precisely repeated sounding of the drum—creates a predictable future, gives time an abstract order and an imagined benevolence.* His drum purges time of the unknown devil who might bring no answer to his pain, or bring catastrophe.

The heavy percussive music of primitive societies, and of our landscaped industrial jungle, manifest qualitatively different anxieties. The anxiety of the primitives is conscious, simple as the act of vision is simple, a direct reaction to the external world. Our anxiety is not conscious, but sophisticated: fear confounded by the masque self-assurances necessary for participation in a Christian, exploitative, vitaminized society. And our anxiety, and its attendant time-terror, are exacerbated by the dictatorship of the clock.

* * *

All music, the music of Mozart as well as that of Pete Johnson, places an arbitrary order on time. But the heavy, tense measure that dominates jazz is produced by a culture in which the terror of time is a major element of experience.

The heavy repetitious rhythm of the drum—the clock of anxious submission to fate—implies a pleasurable self-abnegation in the submission. For the certain rhythm pro-

duces a constant awareness of the ineluctable uncertainty that lurks behind it, that instigates it. It is ominous in that its very attack on uncertainty—the isolation of time in a perfect repetitive abstraction—the dead measure—marks the undeniable progress of time toward a terrible conclusion. *Each boom of the drum has a double meaning: it secures time for the moment and lulls the apprehension of the future, but says "What is going to happen next?"*

Perhaps jazz syncopation is a means for breaking the terror of this question—breaking its terror by giving the too-empty rhythm the ornament of an uncertainty that is nearer to the rhythm of living. Perhaps it has the purpose, too, of producing terror: momentarily suspending the promised securing beat creates the titillation of a certainly undangerous danger.

The excitement of hot syncopation lies in the momentary freedom obtained from the rule of time. The rhythm isn't elaborated but threatened. It wears a slightly different face while the syncopation is in force—and quickly regains its former identity and perfection. The excitement is the thrill produced by the sensation of losing one's footing and finding it again—by the momentary loss and recovery of security. It is like the pleasure of the cyclist who lets go of the handle bars for a moment.

The Tension Between Time and Melody

The accents and intonations of speech vary immediately with the burden of the speech. So in classical music the rhythm may be altered by syncopation to give a fitting carriage to the weight and mood of the melody. In swing the syncopation serves no such simple, productive purpose. For the melody in swing is in essential conflict with the rhythm—and the syncopation is a betrayal of the time in favor of its melodic opponent.*

It is this tension between time and melody which is the hallmark of jazz, the characteristic which distinguishes it from other musical forms. In academic music, time serves as an authoritative architecture for the melody. In jazz, the rhythm is both father to the melody and its satanic inhibitor. The melody is in a constant state of tension in relation to its time pattern—an intuitive opposition marked by an unpredictable fusion with and flight from the rhythmic skeleton.

The heavy measure, born of anxiety, assumes the role of surrogate for the ominous force it was meant to appease. The players, chained to the diabolic certainty of the rhythm, try incessantly to escape it. The melody follows the rhythm, strains away from it, teeters on the brink of final flight, and returns. The more intense, ticklish and teasing the tension between time and melody, the "hotter" the jazz. The two forces are kept intuitively in delicate imbalance, a strengthening of one of the forces calling forth an intensification in its opponent. Emphasis of the rhythm exacerbates the eruption and flight of the melody: The strengthening of compulsion calls forth more violent, or larger, dreams.

*The word *melody* as used here is not to be taken to signify what might better be called a *tune*—a recognizable progression of notes in a set time. In jazz such tunes (e.g. *Dinah* or *Sweet Georgia Brown*) are used as a starting point or fundament for the music. The melody—the actual immediate progression of sounds—will have some musical, but little or no psychological, relationship to the *tune*.

The Aesthetic Organization of Anxiety

This music—the exasperating counterplay of rhythm and melody, rule and feeling—is an exact, abstract expression of the anxiety of everyday life. The heavy, monotonous, basic time-pattern repeats the unyieldingness of the world and the terror of its inhabitants. The crepitant, yearning, never-complete melody is the voice of their religious and garish dreams.

Jazz is the intense, purified expression of a conflict which is always felt but never "known"—never lived out directly. By giving aesthetic organization to the anxiety that we all feel it redeems the anxiety—providing a social avenue for its energy, and the saving sense of control and communion. Neither the players nor the dancers resolve the conflict between time and feeling. In the ritual of jazz they reiterate the conflict—abandoning themselves to their fear and yearning—assuaging the routine terror of everyday life by giving it clock and song.

Jazz is totally divorced from the psychology of faith. Its soul—formed by a world that invites the free operation of the will but which castrates it through the inexorable operation of an unknown terror (the unseen vast economic forces)—is the frenetic *id* of Western man.

Because it has no faith it cannot, like flamenco or the spiritual, dream or pray, or, like classical music, make statements. Passive and passionate, it makes satanic counter-cries. Its difference from all other musical forms—impulse sprung from the fantastic combination of terror and sophistication—is derived from a unique social ground, the Frankenstein kindergarten that is 20th century America.

* * *

American Negroes were the inventors of jazz and are its most accomplished creators, for two reasons: (1) Having been denied equal participation in a bourgeois society, they are the least bourgeois and hence the least divorced from life and feeling. And (2) because they suffer most intensely the spiritual disenfranchisement by our world that is part of the normal experience of us all, they feel most sharply the conflict that is the wellspring of jazz music.

ARTHUR STEIG

WITH THE MARXICOLOGISTS: DOG BITES MAN DEPT.

(1)

"Backs Profit System" (Caption under picture of President Truman in "Labor Action" for June 11.)

(2)

"Hayek Pleads for Capitalism" (Title of a feature article in "Fourth International" for June.)

BIRDS OF A FEATHER

"Can we work better for those things which will make peace more likely if, with Socialist approval, the United States ratifies the San Francisco Agreement? My present tentative answer is, Yes."

—Norman Thomas, as quoted in "Human Events" for June 21.

"If General DeGaulle is still today the man who is most qualified to lead the French people, it is because he can lead them in the paths of heroism and lift them up to the greatest heights. I am addressing this great mind, whom I know to be lofty and isolated. Let him be confident in the French people and in international democracy, for trust and confidence are contagious."

—Leon Blum, as quoted by French Ministry of Information, June 22.

It Happened in the U.S.A.

Some Footnotes on a News Item

During his stay in the bare, barred "juvenile tank" of Seattle's King County Jail, 16-year old John Emberg often wished he were dead. He was a dull, shy slack-chinned boy. When a tough red head named Chuck Thomas forced other boys to fight him, he backed away, posturing timidly. When he was beaten with shoes and belts, he wept.

Sometimes he screamed with pain. One night he was tied, head down, against the bars, and left with lighted cigarets between his toes. Jailers never bothered to investigate, and he was too terrified to complain. But last week, after he had been found dead in the tank's shower room, his teen-age cellmates callously told his story for him:

"A boy named Don took a dollar bill out of Emberg's pocket. Then Red Thomas asked him, 'Where's my dollar?' Emberg said, 'The other boys got it.' Red went in and got a shower handle and put it in his hand, under his glove, and began socking the boy. Red said grab his arms. A couple of boys grabbed his arms and Earl stepped on his leg. Then Red hit him in the nose and mouth until he was bleeding. Then Red told him to take a shower, and Red ate dinner.

"After dinner Red made Emberg stand there. The boy kept putting his hands up in front of his face. Red kept making him take them down, and then hitting him. Red knocked him down and kneeled on him. The boy said not to hit him in the face any more. Red said, 'Don't worry, we won't.'

"So he and some others started hitting him over the heart. Milton and I forget who the other one was burned his feet with matches. They let him lay for a while. One of the boys started to give him artificial respiration but Red said not to, to let him die. Then his face turned white and then purple and he died.

"They dragged him into the shower place and Red gave a couple of little boys some socks so they wouldn't squeal. Then the rest of the boys started fooling around, wrestling, boxing and stuff like that."

—*"Time"*, February 5, 1945.

Time's story, while accurate in most of the physical details, gives a one-sided picture of an extremely complex situation. It is based on statements taken in the middle of the night from boys very much confused and frightened by the tragedy. From the trial, which I attended, and from personal interviews with the parents of Thomas and Emberg, with three of the boys involved, and with the lawyers in the case, I have made some notes which may bring out the human and social reality more accurately.

DRAMATIS PERSONAE:

Red Thomas, 16, is the son of silver-anniversary parents who have raised four children. Red's friendly disposition endeared him to playmates and older acquaintances; his neighborhood reputation was excellent. Several years ago he began to suffer from rheumatic heart, had to miss school. He was unable to finish the sixth grade, and every job he tried he quit after a few days. Often he must have wondered about his future. When, last December, a group of boys invited him for a joy ride, he accepted in good faith and took a turn at driving. It was during his turn that the police arrived and arrested him for car-stealing. His parents, reading the headline, "BOY 16 FOUND BEATEN TO DEATH IN COUNTY JAIL," were sure it was their son who had died.

Chester Mabe, 15, grew up in "children's homes" because the Juvenile Court, through prejudice, would not allow him to live with his father and stepmother. This intelligent and sensitive youngster was put in jail for running away from his most recent "home" and was later tried, along with Red, for murder.

Donald Beal, also 15, had been living in a "correctional" school because he had played hookey. He refused to "snitch" on companions involved in a cigarette theft; so his promised Christmas visit to his mother was suddenly denied him. He skipped, ended in the jail, and was also tried for murder.

John Emberg, son of shipyard-working parents, brother of Jimmy (13) and two sisters (2 and 8), wanted to fight in the war. He was arrested wearing a sergeant's uniform. Once before he had tried to enlist, and had spent 11 months in a "correctional" school in California where he was observed to be shy, unadjusted, a perennial scapegoat. For almost a month this boy who needed special attention suffered in King County Jail, without a hearing, for when it was discovered he was a California parolee inquiries had to be sent to determine jurisdiction. John's "crime" was to follow at the hero-worship age the heroes provided by our society. He was caught, and died.

Other boys in jail had stolen a car, gasoline, driven through a red light, disturbed the peace, violated the curfew, had liquor in car, happened to be in relatives' hotel when police raided it, broke into house to steal alarm clock, fountain pen and six pennies; one 14-year-old was locked up for being reported a missing boy. There is a state law against imprisoning boys under 16 in King County Jail, but then there is also a state law against refusing public facilities to Negroes.

JAILS, JAILORS. AND JUDGES:

Two "tanks" with table, benches, and slits for inmate-visitor conversations were allotted to juveniles. In each cage some eight to a dozen boys, all 16 or younger, were confined without recreation facilities or supervision. The jailor could not see into the tanks without entering and admitted that he had the duties of ten men and could only rarely visit each room. Night cells lined the tanks' sides. Not thoroughly "checked in", often four to six boys would crowd into one cell, hiding under bunks until the jailor had gone.

Boys who "needed extra correction" were locked for periods up to 20 days in a drafty and unlighted special cell, without bunks. Red, John Emberg, Chester, and Donald, along with other tankmates, had all been incarcerated here for several days because boys had smashed light globes in the tank.

In the sheriff's words, recreation was "what the boys provided for themselves!" They ate candy and cakes bought from a candy-man, smoked cigarettes smuggled in by adults at 80c a pack, and they fought. Personality conflicts were increased by close confinement, much as happened in Rickenbacker's "adventure" in the life raft. Before the arrival of any of the boys in the tank when John Emberg died, someone had tried sex experimentation. The practices spread through both tanks and were combined with fighting. A former inmate had left the jail with two-inch high initials carved on his back and chest, probably with a sharpened spoon. Floggings were administered with socks packed solid with soap, which was wet and dried until hard. The jailor could never "pin anything" on the boys; bruises came from "falling out of bunks." One boy asked his father to inform the jailor and have him moved

to the other tank. This was done, but no further concern was shown for the situation. Beaten boys were removed, temporarily to the jail "hospital", a room equipped with beds, dental chair, and emergency aid, but no records of patients were kept.

Organized about a year ago, the "kangaroo court" was the juveniles' "legal" body, presided over by a "judge" and his appointed "sheriffs". Money and cigarettes were taken from new inmates; the food, notoriously bad and given but twice a day, was apportioned out of buckets by "court" officials. Some boys never had enough to eat.

On one visit Mrs. Thomas found Red with black and blue chest, and told a juvenile officer, only to receive the reply "What of it?" Another mother saw John Emberg with a bloody face every time she visited her son. And during this period John was not in the same tank as the boys who were tried for his death. This mother, finding that the boys had nothing to read, asked an official whether she could donate books obtained from a sympathetic store manager. "I'm sorry. They say it's too much trouble. The boys destroy the books," the official explained.

Red Thomas was put in jail December 12, then released to his home December 21, on doctor's orders. He had not yet been before the Juvenile Court. On December 29 he was locked up again, finally discharged to his parents with the understanding that he was only awaiting transfer to the state training school at Chehalis for a period of nine months. The doctor told Red he had six months to live.

Red's parents and neighbors found him a changed boy during two visits home. He could talk only of what happened in the jail, could not sit still to eat, ran outdoors without a shirt; at intervals he burst into hysterical sobs: "If I've got six months to live I ain't going to Chehalis to die!" He phoned the Juvenile Court, "Come and get me. I might run away." And the police arrived, entering two doors at once, to find Red sitting on his suitcases and crying in terror.

After a time at the jail he was sent to County Hospital for a health check-up, but was so upset that the staff found him unmanageable and discharged him prematurely. This was the day John Emberg died.

Time does not tell that Chester turned pale, got up and walked away from John, urged the others off, gave artificial respiration, and tried to call a guard. "He's faking," Red declared, not knowing what was happening. He had beaten the boy, as so many before him had done.

Mr. and Mrs. Emberg broke down and cried at the jail. Jimmy Emberg would hardly speak, would not enter the room he and John had shared. Mr. Emberg, realizing the conditions which lay behind his son's death, said "I'm not revengeful or vindictive. I think he's better out of a world like this. I don't feel hateful towards . . . the boys . . . I'm interested in seeing that what happened to my boy doesn't happen again." And Mrs. Emberg came to the trial to console the other mothers.

AFTERMATH:

The entire state was shaken by a long-overdue hullabaloo. Hundreds of people wrote to Seattle newspapers which carried editorials, features, and censored coverage of the inquest to which some 700 people sought admittance. State legislation created a committee to study juvenile conditions; hearings are now under way and jail rules have been changed. The Federal government ordered all Federal prisoners removed to other jails. Detention quarters were established elsewhere for boys under 16. A new ward is being built for girls.

But Red Thomas, Chester Mabe, and Donald Beal were charged with murder in the second degree. Ever since January, Red has been kept in solitary confinement, without light. Here his parents have visited him, his face all broken out from anxiety, his stomach perpetually hungry.

THE TRIAL

On March 28 the trial began, not a juvenile affair but an adult function of the Superior Court. It lasted over three weeks. The Prosecutor told the jury not to regard these defendants as boys, for there was no difference between them and men of 40 to 50. Like a tiger who has once tasted blood, he said, they will taste it more eagerly the next time, until it becomes "a cinch" to kill.

Day after day the three boys sat at a table in the courtroom, without a thing to do but scribble. Red Thomas kept his chin up with what the newspapers called "bravado". But, underneath, these desperate children cried out for support as a starving man cries for food. "Beal's morale is low," Chester told me one morning. "What can I do about it?" He relaxed his tight forehead an instant, very slightly winked his right eye to designate the telegraph-morale system which grew up spontaneously; "Just keep on doing what you've been doing."

Time and again the defense begged that each boy be tried separately, that the case be referred to the juvenile court for humanitarian reasons, that the charges be reduced. Denied. And in the name of law all testimony concerning the conditions in the jail was barred. The assistant director of the California school where John Emberg had been was brought to the trial and then not allowed to show how John tended to "make trouble" wherever he was.

Red Thomas's defense rested on his mental condition in the jail. But the legal definition of insanity is "knowing right from wrong" and psychiatrists declared that Red could tell the difference between right and wrong when John Emberg died. The other boys had only followed Red's orders. None had intended to kill John. In final argument the defense pleaded that this case should set a precedent. These boys needed help, not punishment, so they might be cured instead of ruined for life.

The prosecution warned the jury against sympathy. We have the law. We did not make it. We can't change it. We must not think of these defendants as boys; they were "fiends", "wolves." (But, as the defense pointed out, if the wolves in the Seattle zoo had been treated as badly as these boys, both in jail and at the trial, the S.P.C.A. would have done something about it.)

For some 10 hours the jury deliberated. Every one was taking hope; it meant a hang-up. But at four o'clock on April 19, the verdict came:

Red Thomas—guilty of murder in the second degree.

Chester Mabe—guilty of same.

Donald Beal—guilty of same.

Each of the boys was sentenced to 20 years at hard labor.

FRANCY CALHOUN

THE MARSHAL KEEPS AN EYE PEELED

Field Marshal Montgomery said German girls appeared to be carrying out an organized striptease to wear down the Allied will to maintain non-fraternization. His troops are "putting up a good show" in resisting the tantalizations constantly paraded before them. "I think the situation needs very careful watching," he said.

—"N. Y. Times", June 22.

BUT WHAT ABOUT THE MORNING AFTER?

First political drink of the year is being served at the Club Balalaika. It's the "Yalta Collins", based on rum, guaranteed to produce a happy meeting of minds.

—Society column in "Washington Post", June 8.

Books

A SOCIAL HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN FAMILY: From Colonial Times to the Present. By Arthur W. Calhoun. Barnes & Noble. \$7.50.

This is a reprint, in one volume of 1149 pages, of a standard work originally issued in three volumes in 1917-1919 and long out of print. The author is an outstanding sociologist of leftwing views, once associated with Brookwood Labor College and now Dean of Sterling College in Kansas. (POLITICS readers will recall his article in the February, 1945, issue: "Can American Politics Be Socialized.") I can't pronounce on its scholarly merits or on how it compares with other works in the field—though I am told that nothing else exists of comparable scope. For the general readers, however, it is rich and fascinating stuff—certainly one of the few important books published this year.

Besides the main theme of family life—and, to a lesser degree, sexual mores—certain special themes are developed in great detail: sexual race relations in the South (these chapters might well be published separately for the historical background they provide to the crucial race question today); the place of the child—Calhoun calls the 1800-1920 period "the century of the child"; the social position of women. All these themes are treated regionally as well as nationally; the awareness of the importance of regional culture in American history must have been rather unusual at the time the book was written. The materialistic and non-moralistic approach to sexual customs must also have been unusual thirty years ago, and may explain why the book has not been reprinted until now.

The book has the merits and the defects of the modern American scholarly tradition, which is pragmatic, fact-gathering, non-theoretical. The merits are: a willingness to let the material speak for itself without imposing a rigid (and often devitalizing) overall pattern on it; energy in collecting data; and an admirable catholicity of value-judgment and respect for what really happened (as against what one should have liked to have happened) so that very little escapes his wideflung net. But there is also the defect that the material is—not too plentiful in itself, but too plentiful for the slender theoretical framework, which often seems unable to bear its weight. The very catholicity of Calhoun's interests makes it all the more confusing; too many trees for one to see the woods.

Contradictory generalizations also abound. On page 10 of Volume Two, for instance, we read that the unmarried man or woman was hard put to it to survive on the frontier, so that "the pioneer settler's time was divided mostly between home building and home protection" and "the family was the one substantial social institution." But on page 132 we read: "The abundant opportunities of the new country, the relative ease of getting along, the certainty that the children would be able to find good openings, tended to loosen family attachments. . . . The family ceased to be an economic unit." Again, on page 80 we read: "And in the new world a woman without a man was so helpless, having no protection against frontier perils and small opportunity for procuring a satisfactory livelihood . . . that woman still ranked as a dependent on man . . . and could not logically claim equality." But 23 pages later on: "In the pioneer regions women were unusually scarce and hence were highly esteemed. . . . The deficit of women on the

frontier accounts for their superior standing in some of the newest states." (The first quotation is from the chapter on "The Social Subordination of Women", the second from that on "The Emergence of Woman.")

The point is not that only one of each of the two above pairs of antithetical generalizations can be true; even if one were simpliminded enough to try to apply such un-dialectical logic to history, one would have to admit that the data Calhoun marshals shows that *all four* statements are true. The point is rather that a historian has an obligation to form a theoretical concept which will undercut the surface contradictions to show their dialectical unity. This, however, Calhoun rarely does, for the pragmatic and anti-theoretical bent of American scholarship is unfriendly to such imaginative feats. The data which proves "A" is scrupulously and neatly arranged in one chapter; that which proves "Not A" is assembled in another chapter; and the reader is left to "draw his own conclusions", i.e., to perform creative feat of synthesizing the two. Our American scholars could stand a touch of the old Germanic weakness for grandiose theoretical vistas.

This is a useful and valuable work. It would have been a great one had the author been willing and able to work out the general theoretical meaning of the vast amount of material he so honestly and intelligently presents.

DWIGHT MACDONALD

A Note on Anti-Semitism among Negroes

Anti-Semitism among Negroes and its converse, anti-Negro feeling among Jews, are two of the sadder manifestations of the times. That these most-suffering minorities should each join in the community's vilification of the other is more than pathetic—it is suicidal, binding both to the standards of oppression and subverting rational self-interest to illusory satisfactions. In the mechanism of such satisfactions afforded the under-privileged in lieu of material gain, will be found a key to the functioning of all exploitation and the inextinguishable persistence of bigotry.

While much bruted in gossip, our subject has, unfortunately, been little studied in fact. In the great volume of material accumulated on "the Negro problem" during the last decade, few references have been made to it. A chapter in Ottley's *New World A-Coming*, an article by Reddick in *The Negro Quarterly* and editorials in *Crisis* or *Opportunity* summarize the readily accessible information.

Lunabelle Wedlock's study* is the only major one in the field, and her survey of the Negro press from 1933 to 1940 promises a ready compilation of important, ephemeral sources. Hence the result is particularly disappointing. Her approach is narrow to the point of restriction, the treatment of potentially valuable data superficial and endlessly repetitive, and the analyses pedestrian. Withal, much information regarding the Negro's attitudes toward the Jew can be gleaned from pages of chaff.

It is unanimously agreed that racial tensions have increased dangerously under war-induced social pressures, and the explosions that have already occurred may only introduce a more violent and bitter post-war period. Likewise with anti-Semitism. Gunnar Myrdal indicates in *An American Dilemma* that "in most places [in the United States] anti-Semitism is strong and has apparently been growing for the last ten years." He adds that "It is the present writer's impression that anti-Semitism, as he ob-

*Lunabelle Wedlock. *The Reaction of Negro Publications and Organizations to German Anti-Semitism*, Howard University, Washington, D. C., 1942.

served it in America during the last years before the Second World War, probably was somewhat stronger than in Germany before the Nazi regime."

Anti-Semitism among Negroes seems to be following the general pattern. Though roots may be observed down through antiquity, the phenomenon is recent in any virulence. This is undoubtedly attributable to the Negro's rising status in Northern urban areas (where Negro anti-Semitism also appears to be concentrated) and to the crisis thus being precipitated in his relations with dominant white society. Slaves can not afford many enemies, nor are their opinions to be counted; but freedom brings the strength to threaten others and the opinions of a people thrice as numerous as the Jews must give the latter pause, as we are pausing now.

Of the existence of that threat there can be no doubt. From the days of Marcus Garvey there have been Negro leaders, writers, and publications of varied influence that have attacked the Jews—some stridently and continuously like Sufi Abdul Hamid (the "Black Hitler" of Harlem's depression) or the nasty, short-lived sheets *Dynamite* and *Negro Youth*; others intermittently, like J. A. Rogers, George Schuyler, *The Pittsburgh Courier* and *The Philadelphia Tribune*. Street-corner speakers in Negro districts have openly voiced this anti-Semitic feeling; merchants and mountebanks have combined to conduct boycotts of Jewish stores in Pittsburgh, New York and Philadelphia.

This is not to say that anti-Semitism is any more pronounced among Negroes than among other elements of the population. It may be so, but there is simply no evidence one way or another and any statement must remain purely speculative. Nor is it implied that Negro anti-Semitism is especially rabid, focussing on the street-corner and degenerate press. The politer forms of intolerance are included in our meaning, though expressed by the mildest gentleman who would not throw a snowball at a lamp post.

Still, in one form or another, anti-Jewish sentiment pervades all classes of Negroes. "It is a fact that in all of the cities studied there is a feeling among domestic workers that they do not want to work for Jewish housewives . . . Advertisements for domestic work inserted by colored girls and women often read, 'Gentile family only.'" (Wedlock, pp. 24, 116) Tests on Negro students reveal them to hold the typical stereotyped picture of "the Jew." And the Negro middle-class and intelligentsia enjoy their share of anti-Semitism:

"Despite the fact that the majority of Negro writers do denounce German anti-Semitism with varied degrees of intensity, a close perusal of the articles forces one to the belief that the writers, with a few outstanding exceptions, are either indifferent to German anti-Semitism or view with *evident pleasure* the degradation of a minority group other than their own." [My italics.] (Wedlock, P. 83)

Concerning the cause of this anti-Semitism, much has been made of the Jew's contact with the Negro on an exploitative or competitive level as landlord, shopkeeper, pawnshop operator, employer, doctor, lawyer or social worker. It may be asked how else two peoples between whom there are no social or family bonds can meet in our unfriendly society. "Competition" may be viewed as "service" if one is so minded; clearly the Negro is not. "Service" comes from a source to which one gives allegiance; the Negro gives no allegiance to a system that dehumanizes and condemns him from birth.

But, beyond the minimal necessity of providing an object for disaffection, degree of contact is clearly not the relevant factor in promoting Negro anti-Semitism. Rather is contact ancillary to the primary social situation which identifies

Negroes and Jews, respectively, as an outcast and a marginal group.

In this situation and its subsequent effects on personality is to be found the cause of the Negro's anti-Semitism. Confronted by a world that is all barred, whose walls are painted with macabre stripes, black and white, black and tan, whose very gravestones exude a silent mockery, clustered by colors, black and white, black and white, there wells up within the Negro a burden of bitterness and despair that seeks only occasion for its release. The Jew is one occasion.

It is futile to debate the subject rationally, as has been done—to compute the proportion of Harlem landlords who actually are Jews, or to point out that rent collecting is typical of *landlords* and not of Jews. Emotional needs are not to be countered statistically. Certain social scientists currently investigating the precise psychological derivation of anti-Semitism and how it may best be fought are starting from this realization; their approach leans, for example, to the construction of counter-stereotypes of "race-hater" and "fascist" to offset that of "Jew," and to the employment of fluid, virile media such as cinema and radio to spread the new stereotype.

But one may predict that these ultra-modern techniques will be as unsuccessful in halting anti-Semitism as are the older hush-hush or super-patriotic policies of conservative Jewish organizations. For men are not instruments to be manipulated at will by the social technician. Basic to the whole problem of combatting anti-Semitism among Negroes or any other group is the matter of orientation for or against the present structure of capitalist society.

So long as tolerance-propaganda is conducted within the framework of the existing social order, attempting merely to modify one unpleasant feature of that order, it is doomed to failure. Indeed, this may be accounted the primary reason for the continuance of anti-Semitism among Negroes and of anti-Negroism among Jews. Each group directs its main efforts toward *accommodating* with the majority, white, Christian society, wishing only exemption for itself from depredation. Such accommodation necessitates acceptance of the dominant precepts of caste and bigotry, and the host of contented attitudes that mark their owners lean cows in Augean stables. Respectable Negro organizations do not *want* too much Jewish support, and vice versa. This would defeat their chief aim, which is to escape minority status and gain acceptance by the majority culture:

"The cooperation which exists between Jewish and Negro organizations . . . is often superficial. In fact, some Negroes told the writer that it is necessary to pay lip-service to cooperation between Jews and Negroes, but that neither they nor the Jewish leaders really mean to do any more about it than pay lip-service to it." (Wedlock, P. 29)

The lower-class Negro is less interested in accommodation, more rebellious. Still, oppression burns. For him the Jew fulfills a vital function. The Jew is of higher social status; and he is weak and safe to taunt. Attacking him serves through indirection a dual purpose denied direct expression by the overwhelming power of white society—revenge on the white man (the Jew is white) and alliance with him (against the Jew).

A society can not be reconstituted piecemeal in the psychologist's laboratory. The Negro cannot be taught to countenance war, unemployment, private profit and Jim Crow and yet accept the Jew whose predatory image is as much a parcel of America as the benign visage of Mr. Roosevelt. Only when propaganda is directed *against* accommodation and against the totality of our venomous culture can it hope to be effective, for then the Jew emerges as a fellow sufferer

and ally in the battle against privilege, instead of a competitor for lackey status.

Of course, in this light, the concepts "Jew" and "Negro" must be re-examined, since both groups will be broken functionally into class elements with opposite aspirations for and against the status quo. This would take us beyond our subject to broader considerations of social dynamics. It is enough to indicate here that tolerance can not be grafted on an alien body—and it is alien to America today. Freedom is indivisible and is not to be won on one battlefield or in one war. The enemy will be found across the length and depth of the country and in each home, in the gilded fabric of our business, our prayer, our entertainment. Only when that fabric is refashioned will the Jew and the Negro arise, free and equal, as simple human beings.

HAROLD ORLANSKY

The Intelligence Office

"The Responsibility of Peoples"

A Letter from Victor Serge

Several of us here have read enthusiastically your article, with which, personally, I am in full agreement. I only regret you could not devote double the space to the subject. There are, however, some *lacunae*:

(1) As to documentation: you mention only the American commercial press in writing of the extermination of the Jews. Fairness demands also mention of organizations like the Jewish Workers Committee of New York which tried to break the strange and ominous silence which for a long time obtained in the matter. (I was then writing regularly for the big Mexican weekly, *Así*, and found I could not get anything printed on the subject.) Also you might have mentioned *The Ghetto Speaks* and *The Black Book of Polish Jewry*.

(2) You are correct in writing that these mass killings are a new historical phenomenon which calls into question all the humane values acquired in the course of centuries; and of an incalculable psychological importance, too. (When I insisted on this two years ago during certain discussion-meetings down here, the local Trotskyists were indignant, refusing to see any significant difference between Nazi anti-Semitism and, for instance, colonial atrocities.) The monstrous originality of the exterminating anti-Semitism of the Nazis consists in killing off a whole white people in the heart of Europe, and doing it without any "rationality", because of a kind of official paranoia, and by the use of modern scientific and industrial technology pressed into the service of barbarism.

You show clearly that the Nazi atrocities are not specifically German. But I should like to add the following data:

(A) What I would term "the psychosis of anti-Semitic massacre" first appeared in *modern times* in Russia, around 1905-6, as the deliberate creation of the Czarist regime: the pogroms, especially the Kishineff massacre in 1905, the fabrication of stories of ritual-murders and of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* by the secret police, the memorable Beylis trial, the formation of the pro-Czarist anti-Semitic "Black Hundreds".

(B) The first attempts at the systematic extermination of entire Jewish populations were made during the 1918-20 Civil War in the Ukraine and in White Russia by Czarist and nationalist movements (notably the anti-Bolshevik Ukrainian "peasant republic"). During this period there

were more than 1500 pogroms in 900 different places. According to reliable Soviet sources, these caused 200,000 deaths. I myself took part in the inquiry into the massacre of the Jews of Proskourov by Ukrainian atamans. The victory of the revolution finally put an end to these horrors.

(C) The fact must be emphasized that Nazi anti-Semitism found accomplices, both ideologically and physically, in every European country: in Russia, they were the troops of General Vlassov, a captured Red Army commander; in Holland, Mussert's movement; in Italy, the fascists; in France, Vichy; etc. In France, for example, it was the French police which arrested, interned, and later sent off to the death camps the Jews, acting on orders of Petain and with the vociferous approval of such anti-Semite intellectuals as Charles Maurras, Robert Brasillach, Henri Beraud, Philippe Henriot.

(D) A number of Jewish capitalists and adventurers themselves helped Nazism to power and made money out of it later; and the Nazi executioners found in the ghettos and even in the death camps Jews who cooperated with them in the hope of surviving a little longer. . . . I see I omitted above the terrible anti-Semitic acts of the Horthy regime in Hungary in 1919-20—all the more significant in that all civilized Europe, as represented by its governments and political leaders, gave a tacit consent to it.

(E) The whole problem should be related to that of *the value of human life*. The last attempts to exterminate a whole defeated people in Europe date from the religious wars of the 16th century. From then on, the tendency toward tolerance and humanitarianism grew until it came close to victory in the 19th century. It is true that the capitalist humanitarianism of that century was limited to the white race and only slowly spread to include—and never completely—colored peoples. But since capitalism aimed at increasing the number of producers and consumers, its prosperity was incompatible with large-scale massacre and also with the direct enslavement of industrial populations.

Massive extermination of enemy peoples was reintroduced into Western *mores* by class warfare, the first instances being the massacre of the workers of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine in 1848 and of some 30,000 Parisian workers in 1871 after the defeat of the Commune. French capitalism thus has the honor of inaugurating this custom. The tradition was carried on by the Red terror during the Russian revolution in 1918, only directed against the bourgeoisie (though one should remember that the *first massacre* of the Russian revolution was perpetrated, in November 1917, by the Whites against the workers of the Kremlin arsenal). The fact is, nonetheless, that respect for human life fell steeply in revolutionary Russia when two terrors, Red and White, each attempted total extermination of the enemy. It was, in my opinion, a great mistake for the Russian revolutionary leaders not to proclaim a doctrine of the Rights of Man.

The rival exterminating terrors clashed once more in the Spanish Civil War, although the Republicans always maintained an incontestable superiority in human terms.

I think these problems today are central, and that contemporary socialism should frankly recognize its past mistakes in this field and should put itself forward as the uncompromising defender of human life and human rights.

MEXICO CITY

VICTOR SERGE

FROM FRANCE

Sir:

Four numbers of "Politics" have reached me; I hope to receive the rest soon. I am sure I will read them from

the first to the last page with a sympathetic feeling which no publication has awakened in me for a long time. . . . Louis Clair, I think, was a bit too optimistic about the outlook here in France, as he has doubtless since recognized. (See Clair's "Retreat in France", February 1945 issue—ED.)

Your "negativism" is a thousand times welcome as against the cult of the "lesser evil" that is now so fashionable. As a small token of solidarity, I am now translating some of the articles which have especially impressed me and I shall make them known to a few people who will get something out of them. In a word, the fact that "Politics" exists is, for me, a real consolation in the face of the anguish and the dismal perspectives of our times.

TOULOUSE, FRANCE

XYZ

RELIGIOUS LEADERS PROVIDE THE CLIMAX!

Sir:

At the Woodrum Committee hearings on universal military training recently, the Chief of Chaplains of the War Department, Brig. Gen. Luther D. Miller, advocating conscription, said, "It is no exaggeration to say that our boys in the army and navy come into more vital contact with the ministry of religion than they ever did or could at home. . . . If our parents, our educators, and our churchmen will do their part, something which they now accept as military necessity may become under their guidance a great democratic and spiritual experience."

Daniel Poling, speaking as an individual and as editor of the *Christian Herald*, proclaimed that "no plan now proposed within religious groups offers so large a hope for strengthening of America in her moral and spiritual life. . . . If the Chaplains' Corps receives in the peace the recognition, opportunity and support given it in wartime by the government and by commanding officers, and if the churches of our faiths give to the chaplains their loyalty and support, then, gentlemen of the Committee, we shall have in universal military training America's greatest moral and religious opportunity since Independence Day, 1776."

NEW YORK CITY

A. J. MUSTE

Comment

The Pot v. the Kettle A mighty scandal has exploded in the press about the mistreatment of wounded soldiers in our veterans' hospitals, so mighty that the Veterans' Administration has a new head. The American people are now showing indignation over such facts as that veterans with battle neuroses are regularly beaten up by attendants at certain Government hospitals, that medical care in almost all veterans' hospitals is sub-standard, that mortality rates are high and discharged-as-cured rates low, etc. Presumably, wounded soldiers have a special claim on the public's sympathy; yet they have been mistreated for years without any one doing much about it. Likewise with the care of patients in our public mental hospitals. I have talked with CO's who have worked in them, and have read other CO reports. The description of conditions in such places is gruesome: callous and often brutal treatment by ignorant and underpaid attendants; incredibly poor food; only the sketchiest care given even seriously ill patients—"it's like an orderly battlefield," one CO summed up. Apparently, this has been going on for generations. Only when, by the accident of war, a large number of relatively humane and articulate persons were

taken into the system as attendants, was some light thrown into this dark corner of our society. (The CO's engaged in this kind of work have founded a little periodical, *The Attendant*, the first to be devoted to public mental hospitals.)

The reason for the persistence of these conditions—and our prison system might be added—is simply that very few Americans have enough imagination, sensibility, time and ability to keep any effective watch on what happens to such unfortunate fellow-citizens as are consigned to State institutions. The "system" is just too complicated, and life too short. If the German people are to be held morally responsible for Nazi atrocities (the worst of which, the death camps, they hardly even knew existed), how much heavier the responsibility of us Americans for the sufferings of our wounded veterans and our aged and psychotic civilians, since we would have risked nothing save the loss of time had we insisted on these wrongs being righted! The Responsibility of Peoples is indeed a two-edged sword which infants like Rex Stout and Kip Fadiman should not be permitted to play with.

Truman IS Human On the record to date, I seem to have been all wrong about the political effect of Truman's becoming President. Far from pursuing "undraped Rightist policies" and thus bringing class conflicts out into the open, Truman has behaved just about like Roosevelt only more so. He reappointed the liberal Lilienthal chairman of TVA, over the objections of certain powerful Senators. He asked for more generous Federal unemployment compensation and a wider coverage of workers. (The response of Congress was said to be "unenthusiastic".) Most surprising of all, he publicly urged Congress to pass the bill for a permanent FEPC, and even wired a message to a mass meeting in New York which began: "I hope the 'Save FEPC' rally will have the effect of arousing the community and the nation." Roosevelt, so far as I recall, never went so far. Considering Truman's border-state background and also such reports as those of the Milgrams' (*Common Sense*, October 1944) on his personal notions on race relations, his action on FEPC is striking.

So striking, in fact, that it suggests that perhaps Truman's non-liberal reputation has actually caused him to go farther to the left than Roosevelt had to of late years, so as to hold his left-of-center supporters in line. This is a subtlety of practical politics which I was, frankly, not prepared for. Like Roosevelt, Truman is apparently an eminently practical politician, willing to make concessions wherever they will gain him votes.

The Inertia of Office Another reason for Truman's liberalistic behavior is simply the sheer gravitational pull—or perhaps "inertia" would be better—of the high office he inherits. The governmental mechanism is so massive and has so compelling a logic of its own; the necessities of war-making are so clear; the demands of an interventionist foreign policy so unambiguous; that any individual in the Presidency is bound to behave—"react" would be better—very much as Roosevelt did.*

*The fact that Truman, the colorless mediocre narrowminded provincial machine-politician, seems to be carrying on about the same policies, and about as adequately, as the brilliant masterful cosmopolitan charmer, the Grand Old Man of world liberalism—this indicates that either (a) Roosevelt was overrated personally, or (b) the difference between Ordinary People and Great Men is generally exaggerated, the office making the man rather than the other way around. Both are probably somewhat true.

By the "inertia" of the Presidential office, I mean mostly the necessity of taking certain steps, even over the objections of powerful sections of the populace, in order to achieve a more efficient and centralized State capitalism. The liberal moves noted above may thus be explained: the extension of TVA-type plans, the easing of racial tensions, and the provision of adequate social security are all desirable if a united and healthy people are to exert their maximum power in international imperialist competition, military and economic.

There is already, also, a long list of other actions in which Truman has shown the true Rooseveltian spirit.

Like Roosevelt, he has backed OWI against a Congress which sees it as a New Deal propaganda mill and would therefore hamstring it by cutting its appropriation.

Like Roosevelt, he has backed the armed forces on peacetime conscription and on their free use of 18-year olds in combat.

Like Roosevelt, he has clashed with the powerful farm bloc. Twice already: (1) vetoing a resolution deferring farm workers from the draft; (2) condemning a Senate-approved amendment creating a cost-plus formula for farm products.

Like Roosevelt, he has stated "emphatically" that the Little Steel Formula stands for the present. Like Roosevelt, he has used the Federal power ruthlessly against strikers: the Chicago truck-drivers' strike was finally broken after all draft-age strikers had been put in I-A and no less than 15,000 soldiers had been brought into the city to drive and guard trucks.

On foreign policy, of course, Truman has been impeccably Rooseveltian—as almost everybody else has become, for that matter. Party lines have melted in the heat of world power-politics, the Republicans becoming internationalist and the Democrats imperialist and the whole simmering down into a gelatinous mass in which Henry Wallace can hardly be distinguished from Henry Luce, and which can only be called "interperialist." Thus the House gave Truman a 345 to 18 majority on the Bretton Woods agreement (138 of the majority being Republicans); and the Senate, 54 to 21, gave him power to reduce tariffs up to 50% (15 of the majority being Republicans). Thus Governor Dewey on June 7 put "his personal support behind virtually every major phase of the Democratic foreign economic policy", from Bretton Woods to lend-lease and reciprocal trade pacts. Dewey has also, by the way, neatly paralleled Truman's FEPC gesture by recently taking the initiative in putting through the first state-wide FEPC. When one adds the recent liberalistic behavior—also including the race issue—of Governor Warren of California, another strong contender for the 1948 Republican nomination, certain conclusions as to the insubstantial character of the conventional progressive-reactionary categories suggest themselves. But that is another story, in which Truman's Rooseveltian behavior is an episode.

Totalitarian Liberalism— People often ask what one means by "totalitarian liberalism." The expression sounds like a simple term of abuse. It has a definite meaning, however, which may be suggested by the following examples of "totalitarian liberal" thinking, drawn from recent issues of *The New Republic*:*

*The other great source, of course, would be "The Nation." There is a perceptible difference, however, between the two: "The Nation" is more fuzzyminded, naive, and "idealistic" than its colleague; it adopts approximately the same attitudes towards the Big Three, the Great Experiment of Comrade Stalin, and World War II, but its

(1)

Words should not intimidate us. Compulsory labor is not always slave labor; neither is it, of course, the free labor of peacetime. Compulsory labor becomes slave labor only when it is used in the interest of enriching private individuals and groups. But compulsory labor at critical moments in the life of a nation, used in the interests of society, is not slavery.

It is true, of course, that the use of compulsory labor poses the problem of the social order in all its sharpness. From this point of view, in the USSR, where there is no private profit and where all labor is performed in the service of society . . . the compulsory labor of both the Soviet citizens and the German workers will be most efficient.

(A. Yugow, "Shall German Labor Rebuild Europe"; *The New Republic*, May 7.)

(2)

Facts do not mean much to the Germans, who live in a world of unreality shaped in accordance with their wishful thinking, their "ideology." . . . Nazi education heightened this attitude by frustrating—under pain of punishment—every attempt at independent political thinking. . . . Hitler knew the Germans and how to influence them. . . . Our approach must be . . . to hammer home the truth that it was Germany which started the war and plunged the whole of humanity into unspeakable misery—the Germans, not the "Jews" or the "Bolsheviks" or the "plutocrats" or the "British imperialists." . . . They must be faced continuously with the basic fact of their collective guilt. As Hitler said: "The most brilliant propaganda technique will yield no success unless one fundamental principle is borne in mind constantly and with unflagging attention: it must confine itself to a few points and repeat them over and over . . ." We must never forget that our propaganda—or educational effort—is directed toward Germans, not toward Americans.

(Alfred Kantorowicz, "The OWI in Germany"; *The New Republic*, May 14.)

(3)

The hue and cry is ever more frequently raised nowadays that the plan for an international security organization drafted at Dumbarton Oaks institutionalizes a system in which the so-called small nations are at the mercy of the big powers. . . . The point really at issue, however, is not the big powers' ability to intervene in a small country's internal affairs, but the wise use of the power of intervention when a small country's domestic policies seem to endanger peace. . . .

A genuinely democratic and peaceful country need not fear the intervention of a well-intentioned big power. The recent Finnish elections are interesting in this connection. The issue at stake was Finland's readiness for peaceful co-operation with Russia. A few days before the elections, Premier Paasikivi had warned his people that "new men must be elected to the Diet instead of those who during

betrayal of liberal principles is performed with a virginal innocence, a dogooder enthusiasm which is quite foreign to the more cool and sophisticated tone of "The New Republic." The editors of the latter magazine seem to have arrived, consciously, at a "totalitarian liberal" philosophy which the editors of "The Nation" still reject on the conscious level (while constantly forced to accept it in practice and piecemeal). The result is that "The Nation" sometimes prints honest articles and still has a crevice open to the impact of reality, while "The New Republic" is almost hermetically sealed against critical protest. The result is also, taken another way, that "The New Republic" is *intellectually* the better magazine, just as "The Nation" is *morally* the better.

the past years followed the wrong policy" so that "a co-operation policy can be followed which will arouse confidence in the Soviet Union and the other United Nations." The Finnish people took this advice to heart. The new pro-Soviet Democratic Union made a decisive show of strength. . . .

What would have happened if the elections had strengthened the anti-democratic and anti-Soviet forces? They were certainly a test of a big power's sincerity in abiding by the results of a free expression of the people's will. *Pravda* bluntly stated the alternative on March 12, saying that "under the present circumstances, the elections in Finland cannot be considered as Finland's exclusively internal affair." In other words, no country, big or small, can be permitted to have just any government it pleases. As it is the responsibility of the big nations to use their power wisely in their relations with the small ones, so the latter are equally obligated to conduct their internal affairs in a way which arouses confidence on the part of the big powers.

(Editorial: "On War and Politics"; *The New Republic*, April 2.)

From these texts, some basic features of "totalitarian liberalism" may be generalized:

1. *Principles yield to circumstances.* Here we find anti-liberal policies advocated in order to arrive at "practical" solutions. The "practicality" of these solutions is not in the sphere of human interests but in that of the existing power-structure. Slavery is abhorrent to liberal principles, but not when used "in the interests of society". The "interests of society" would seem at first to be a general principle (however open to question), but closer inspection reveals that by it is meant the interests of the existing state systems of the United Nations, especially Russia, and that Hitler's use of forced labor is not intended to be included thereunder. So, too, irrational demagoguery is abhorrent to liberalism, but in dealing with *Germans*, it is permissible to use Hitler's propaganda methods. This leads us to:

2. *A double standard of political morality is employed.* "We" may do things with impunity and even approbation which become crimes against humanity if "they" do them. Slave labor, demagoguery, imperialist domination of small nations smell to heaven in Nazi hands but give off sweet perfume in "ours."

3. *Effective power carries its own justification; to be weak is the only unforgivable crime.* Here No. 3 is especially striking. The big powers have *rights* (which they are exhorted to exercise "wisely"), the small ones have *responsibilities*. Even if we accept this weighting of the scales, who is to determine when the big fellows are "wisely" exercising their rights, and when the small fry are living up to their responsibilities? Not only is it left up to the big powers to decide when a small nation's domestic policies—domestic, mind you—are "endangering peace", but no principles are laid down by which the big powers are supposed to be guided; their only criterion is to be—actually!—whether the small nations' policies "arouse confidence" in them. But what if, say, Sweden, feels no "confidence" in, say, Russia's domestic policies, feeling they are undemocratic and peace-endangering? It is not hard to guess the reaction of *The New Republic's* editors to such a situation; nor Stalin's. He would instantly lose *his* confidence in Sweden, we may be sure, just as Hitler lost *his* confidence in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, etc. If "confidence" is the point, it is hard to see why *The New Republic* got so excited about Nazi Germany; and if the editors reply that the Nazis violated certain general principles, then

one may ask them why they no longer refer to these principles.

4. *Abstractly put: the form is liberal, the content totalitarian.* Slave labor, Nazi propaganda methods, and imperialism are justified, respectively, in the name of social progress, democratic re-education, and world peace.

5. *Concretely put: Soviet Russia is the repository of all political virtue.* Here we have a nation whose governmental system is so democratic, progressive and peace-loving that it can transmute the base metal of slavery into "service for society", and is praised for its devotion to peace and democracy when it threatens to intervene into a weak neighbor's elections.

6. *Society is the end: human beings the means.* Hence, no concern for the Rights of Man (or of nations), for even-handed justice or the freedom of the individual, but simply for the effective perpetuation of the existing social systems. The editors praise the Finnish people not for progressing towards a richer democratic life in their elections but for "arousing confidence" in their great imperialist neighbor by electing pro-Moscow representatives. And Yugow actually makes the *efficiency* of Soviet compulsory labor an argument in its favor.

Another Puzzle On June 20, three Senators introduced for Liblabs a Federal Labor Relations Bill designed to modernize the Wagner Act in the light of what its sponsors believe are the necessities of the postwar period. The bill, which was at once violently denounced by the CIO, AFL and UMW and praised with equal fervor by businessminded columnists like Arthur Krock, provides, among other things, for:

(1) the outlawing of strikes in all disputes "that may arise out of differing interpretations of labor-management contracts." Such disputes are to be compulsorily arbitrated, as are *all* disputes "affecting public utilities or public services, such as milk, coal or oil."

(2) All decisions of the agencies set up by the bill to deal with labor disputes are to be reviewable by the courts. (This means years of delay in any case where the employer wants to stall; NLRB decisions under the Wagner Act are not so reviewable.)

(3) Unfair practices of employees as well as of employers are forbidden, and some vital sections of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Labor-Injunction Act are nullified.

(4) The closed shop is made considerably more difficult to attain.

(5) Establishments with less than 20 workers and all those not *directly engaged in interstate commerce* are excluded from the scope of the act.

This remarkable proposal, which goes farther than any responsible business group has so far publicly ventured in emasculating the Wagner Act and weakening unions, is no lunatic-fringe dream. It was drawn up, after 18 months of study financed by Samuel A. Fels, a rich Philadelphia soap manufacturer, by a "Committee to Promote Industrial Peace" headed by Donald A. Richberg, the former labor lawyer who once headed NRA and is now a conservative corporation counsel. The committee consists of lawyers and businessmen exclusively, with not a single labor representative, not even a rightwing AFL chieftain.

So far the pattern is familiar. It is when we come to the three Senators who are sponsoring the bill that the Modern Note is struck. They are Hatch, Ball and Burton, three of the famous four-man "B³H²" combination which won undying liblab glory earlier this year with its bill calling for America to take the lead in postwar "international cooperation." Thus the most aggressive internationalists in the Senate now turn out to be also the most aggressive labor-baiters. This may be a most significant

turn. Up to now, the leading figures of American Imperialist expansion have been taking the line that the unions can be trusted to keep their members in line in the interest of National Unity, and hence should be utilized as aids of the State controlling the postwar labor force as they have been used during the war. But Messrs. Hatch, Ball, and Burton seem to have concluded that the unions can not be so trusted and must therefore be destroyed if National Unity is to prevail. If they are followed by the bulk of the business community, sharp class warfare may again be on the agenda sooner than one had thought.

It should be added that the difference of opinion between these Senators and such pro-union spokesmen as Wallace are as to techniques for controlling labor, not as to the control itself. Wallace wants to use the unions; B²H¹ want to make the employer once more "master in his own house". Both policies flow from the basic policy which Daniel Bell indicated in the May issue:

"Decisions on labor are not made in an independent frame of reference; nor is any social issue today autonomous; they are all linked to the drag anchor of foreign policy. . . . The usurpation of labor's function in wartime is no chance event, but a logical outgrowth of the need to prevent it from setting its own conditions of work. And this will carry over too [into the postwar period]: the social power of unionism must not be allowed to interfere with the political designs of imperialism."

"It Takes a Real Man . . ." Writing in the June issue of *The International Teamster*, organ of the powerful AFL teamsters' union, President Daniel J. Tobin instructed his 630,000 members as follows:

"Most of those fellows who refuse to go through picket-lines are yellow. It takes a real man to go through a picket-line when he is ordered to do so by his international union. The man who observes the laws and the ruling and decisions of his superior officers in the union is the real union man. The other fellow is, in most instances, a bunko artist who is looking for a chance to prove how good he is. We know who is right and who is wrong in the labor movement, and we can tell our local unions what to do and we will not shirk our responsibility. . . ."

These sentiments are remarkable, even in the AFL. They were prompted by the hesitation of some of Tobin's teamsters to cross picket lines during the recent strike of independent teamsters in Chicago. Tobin's arguments—perhaps backed up in certain ways—apparently were effective: at least, the Chicago employers finally found some 5,000 "real men", all members of Tobin's union, to help the Army break the strike.

It might be added that on June 16, Dave Beck, a worthy vice-president of Tobin's union and the autocrat of the West Coast trucking industry, issued a statement putting his teamsters on record against taking any Japanese, whether citizens or not, into their union unless they had served in the U. S. armed forces.

It is perhaps superfluous to add that Dan Tobin is the Boss Hague of the labor movement: a petty-minded ignoramus; arrogant, dictatorial, and without any discernible allegiance to the most rudimentary workingclass viewpoint; the man mostly responsible for the Federal persecution of the Minneapolis Trotskyists (who controlled a union Tobin wanted); a warmonger of such super-PM proportions that he had his union organ denounce A. Philip Randolph for criticising military jimcrow, and called Norman Thomas a fascist (for which he is now being sued); and finally, like Boss Hague, a trusted lieutenant of the late FDR, whose sudden death was so terrible a blow to the American common people.

DOG-BITES-MAN DEPT.

Howard Fast says "The Cross and the Arrow" by Albert Maltz is "a superb work of art."

—Advt. in "The New Republic", April 16.

THE MARCH OF PROGRESS IN INDIA

Human skeletons to be used for educational purposes may be exported from India . . . according to the "Delhi Dauen". It is recalled that eighteen years ago medical schools in India imported their own skeletons from England. Today India can meet her own demands and also some orders from abroad.

—"N. Y. Times", Jan. 3, 1945.

"WHY AM I FIGHTING?"

Schenectady, May 16 (AP)—Sixth Grade pupils of Draper School will have one less textbook for the balance of the present school term—a volume referring to the Japanese as "friendly, beauty-loving, alert, clean and intelligent" people. The Board of Education voted unanimously last night to have the pre-war book, "The Old World and its Gifts", removed.

On Monday, John W. Park, Superintendent of Albany Schools, ordered that pages of the book referring to the Japanese be stapled together.

—"N. Y. Sun", May 17.

NEVER ARGUE WITH A C.O.

There have been several letters about women smoking and about Conscientious Objectors—and it is useless to argue the questions.

Nobody can ever convince a woman or a C.O. Their minds are made up or they would not be what they are or do what they do.

I say they (CO's) are wrong to carry on during war. They should do their objecting during peacetime, when people have a normal attitude.

—J. H. Wise in the "Fresno (Cal.) Bee", as quoted in "The Conscientious Objector" for June.

CONTRIBUTORS

Jean Malaquais, author of *Men from Java* and *War Diary*, is now living in Mexico City . . . Walter J. Oakes, whose "Toward a Permanent War Economy?" appeared in our first issue, will contribute regularly from now on a page of notes on current trends in labor and economics . . . Arthur Steig is a toolmaker who writes and paints in his spare time: a volume of his poems, "Communications", appeared last year . . . Francys Calhoun lives in Seattle, where she and her husband, Don Calhoun, are active in the pacifist movement . . . Harold Orlansky is a young C.O. who is now working as an attendant in a mental hospital; last year his pamphlet study of the 1943 Harlem riot was published.

*The only way to be sure of getting every issue of **politics** is to subscribe. It costs \$4 for two years, \$2.50 a year, Add 30c a year for Canada, 50c elsewhere. Servicemen and C.O.'s anywhere may subscribe for \$1.75 a year.*

Address Nancy Macdonald, Business Manager.

Nancy Macdonald, Politics, 45 Astor Place, New York 3, N.Y.
Enclosed find \$..... Please send me one (two) year (s) of "Politics."

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY..... UNIT..... STATE.....