

TOMORROW'S PROBLEMS DISCUSSED TODAY

By J. WINSCHUH

Among the outstanding economic and social problems unsolved at the outbreak of the present war were that of the relationship between town and country and that of the relationship between man and property. With regard to these problems, the war has furnished added experience, particularly in Germany where, in expectation of the air war, the diffusion of industry and consequently the intermingling of city and country have been carried out on an unprecedented scale, and where the bombing of many cities has raised anew the old problem of property.

The following article does not offer definite solutions for these two problems, but it shows how these problems are being discussed in Germany. The author is the Economics Editor of one of Germany's leading newspapers.—K.M.

I. THE FUTURE RELATIONS OF TOWN AND COUNTRY

IT is impossible to bring the town and the country together as friendly neighbors by resettling industry. The present relocation of industry and settlement of workers in rural districts is an essential war measure, but it is not an ideal. In former years, many people in Germany dreamed of the reciprocal penetration of town and country and pointed to the example of Württemberg. After 1933, attempts were made in East Prussia to follow this example. Today our ideas have changed. The rural combination of industry and agriculture has turned out to be a cancerous growth in the body of the farm population. In the close interlacing of agriculture and industry in Württemberg, it is only industry which has profited. The advantages for industry consisted of a more healthy distribution, of cheap land leases and housing for its workers, of an extended source of labor supply opened up by commuting facilities. Moreover, industry did not suffer from labor migration, the worker settled in the country being attached to his house, garden, and village and being better able to withstand periods of economic crisis. But the farm population was sucked dry and enfeebled.

We quote the following interesting letter addressed to us by a Bavarian farmer, who criticizes the relocation of industry in rural districts and writes:

"I must protest against the intention of extending that which has resulted—rightly or wrongly—from the war to times of peace. The pumping of hitherto centralized industry

into small rural communities, and the scattering of hitherto concentrated plants over the countryside, may look very nice on paper. In practice, however, its sole effect is, apart from the incomparably more difficult technique of administration, a total destruction of rural conditions of production, especially of agricultural labor conditions, all of which must necessarily be founded on stability. With this relocation, by which heavy industry would like in future to unburden its old social sins onto the countryside, it will not be possible to deflate the cities and make up for the depopulation of the countryside. The only result would be a condition by which the unstable ideas of the industrial world and the hectic urban mentality are transplanted into the villages. The rural population has always underestimated the value of the food products, etc., it obtained as a return for its work, and overestimated the urban standard of living. Even before the present war, wherever the omnibuses with organized urban visitors made their appearance in the country, the farmers had a hard time finding stable maids, because all the girls wished to join the doubtlessly very honorable guild of silk-stockinged typists. The rural resettlement of industry will enhance this effect."

This letter does not direct its criticism against the war-time relocation of industry, even where it harms the rural population; but for the future its warning deserves full attention. Whether we like it or not, we are bound to arrive at the conclusion that the resettlement of industry in rural districts is healthy, indeed often necessary, for in-

dustry, but that—provided conditions, especially the differences in prices and wages between industry and agriculture, remain as they are—it intensifies the crisis obtaining in rural districts. The farm population is helpless in the face of this infiltration.

The objection might be raised: Although the trends to be observed in Württemberg may have a grave effect on the rural population from a socio-biological point of view, the question remains to be examined whether these ill effects are not made up for or perhaps even outweighed by the socio-biological advantages accruing to the industrial population. This objection is well founded, and indeed the biological advantages for the industrial population involved in the resettlement are great. Some sociologists are even of the opinion that the worker can in the long run only stand the entirely mechanized automatic mass production without suffering harm if, after his work, he is compensated by a semirural organic life.

But is it a satisfactory condition that this improvement is bought at the cost of agriculture, of the valuable farm population which has anyway already been strongly reduced? Hardly. We must therefore try to find other means; we must re-examine the fashionable conceptions about the adjustment between town and country. Might the right path be the following: on the one hand, the true town, on the other the true village; maintenance of pronounced agricultural zones; no mingling, above all no mixing up of factory and farm? Can, however, this mingling still be avoided in an age of increasing communications and of an industrial decentralization which can no longer be separated from a further expansion of industry? Regional planning is faced here with problems of the greatest social and national significance, unless a radical solution is sought in a leveling of prices and wages in industry and agriculture and in handing over agriculture to technology.

II. PRIVATE PROPERTY

LARGE-scale evacuations are a necessary evil; however, they may also be regarded as a great social experiment. The evacuations have been supplying concrete experience which is far more comprehensive than any scientific study or political questionnaire could provide. There is one result which stands out above all others: love of one's home is not restricted to the village,

the small town, or the lovely countryside—it applies just as much to big cities and industrial centers, down to the street and even the tenement. In this respect, the experience provided by the evacuations equals a plebiscite. The German, even the poorest German, has given a clear vote in favor of private property.

One of the most essential things that separate us from Bolshevism is private property. Beside religion and national feeling, it is also one of the things most feared as a reality and for its propaganda value by the Bolsheviks. Hence the secular fight against the Bolshevik threat must rely to a large extent on the endeavor to create more property among the people. This does not mean, however, accumulating it in the hands of a few or replacing it largely by impersonal social property, even in the form of "national property."

Before the Great War, the somewhat eccentric English author Hilaire Belloc published a remarkable book called *The Slave State*. Its main idea was: "Unless we restore the institution of property we cannot but restore the institution of slavery: there is no other alternative." Although this is putting it too strongly, Belloc is right in principle. If one studies the decline of Rome one will discover one of its reasons to have been the agglomeration (*ergo* destruction) of property.

According to Occidental ideas, private property is one of the essentials and chief aids to personality and culture. The rural population with its regenerating power is especially bound to property, but so is the entire aristocratic and urban culture. The Occidental feels a deep spiritual bond with his property. When he cares for something particularly, he makes it part of that which is "his own," he feels a duty toward it and treats it as if it were part of himself. This is enough to indicate that, in a true conception of property, rights are balanced by duties. When we meet with property that is employed with a sense of social and cultural responsibility giving rise to new life and benefiting others, we feel pleasure and the desire to act similarly. On the other hand, an antisocial exploitation of property—as, for instance, in capitalism but also in bygone centuries—does not speak against property: it merely indicates that the times were socially diseased.

The feeling of the Occidental for property has always been so pronounced that excuses

have been made even for the shady origin of some property or the circumstance that private property is more the result of social conditions than of the individual's having earned it. Indeed, a lot of abuse of property must have accumulated to give rise to that bitter and explosive sentence: property is theft.

Marxism made the property of the means of production the hinge of its doctrine. The only way out of the agglomeration of capital, which separated the people from property and created on the one side proletarians and on the other monopoly powers, seemed to be a state economy in which the property belonged to everybody and nobody. But by doing away with the abuse of property in this manner, the advantageous forces of property, its inherent ethical power, were also killed off. The free property of capitalism which lacked all restrictions was replaced by the equally one-sided and inhuman propertylessness of Communism.

The beneficial forces of property are to be found between the two extremes of its arbitrariness and oppression. The following conception of property is eternally valid, and mankind will always have to return to it: property must be personal, not anonymous. Its employment must be ethical. Aristoteles once formulated it in this way: property must be divided, but a common ethical attitude must make its employment a common one.

It will be our task to create more private property. Large property will remain essential to modern economics. Its private possession no longer forms a social threat, as it has been placed in the service of the community and is supervised by it, especially as a means of production. What is most valuable is the small and medium property. Germany must not only maintain but even increase the middle classes, and the working classes, too, must form property and be able to enjoy its privileges and responsibility.

WORLD PRESS DIGEST

US LANDING VESSELS

(Condensed from "Time," New York)

Up till now the US Navy has produced 11 basic designs of landing vessels. They are:

LSD (Landing Ship, Dock), a 450-ft. floating dock for use after assault;

LST (Landing Ship, Tank), a 328-ft., ocean-going ship with a tank ramp in the bow;

LCI (Landing Craft, Infantry), 157 ft. long, 200-troop capacity, with multiple ramps for fast debarkation;

LCT (Landing Craft, Tank), 100 ft. long, transportable, for tanks, trucks, or troops;

LCM (Landing Craft, Medium), in 50- and 56-ft. lengths, for a bulldozer or medium tank;

LCP (Landing Craft, Personnel), 36 ft. long, with or without ramp, for 30 to 36 assault troops;

LCV (Landing Craft, Vehicle), like LCP with exclusive landing facilities for vehicles, or for vehicles and troops;

LCS (Landing Craft, Support), 36½ ft. long, armed and armored, for fire support in landing areas;

LVT (Landing Vehicle, Tracked), amphibious "Water Buffalo" 21 ft. long, 20-troop capacity, for storming swamps, coral reefs, otherwise inaccessible places;

LCR (Landing Craft, Rubber), in 12- and 16-ft. sizes, to land patrols of seven to ten men;

LSM (Landing Ship, Medium), between LST and LCT.

ALEXIS CARREL AND THE NEW MAN

(On October 8, 1944, the De Gaulle authorities arrested Dr. Alexis Carrel on the charge of collaboration with the Germans. The shock was more than the aged French scientist could stand; he died on November 4. With him, the world lost one of its most progressive scientific minds, a winner of the Nobel Prize and the author of the best-seller "Man the Unknown." The following interview, condensed from an article by Dr. Heinz Graupner in "Signal," Berlin, occurred shortly before the evacuation of Paris by the Germans.)

The unassuming plaque bearing the inscription "La Fondation Française pour l'étude des problèmes humains" (The French Foundation for the Study of Human Prob-