

the war, although this guaranteed price may fluctuate as costs of production and the general level of prices fluctuate. Moderate prices for the moderate quantity of wheat which the world will be willing to take, would not satisfy all the producers but Western Canada is through with dumping wheat on a speculative market below production costs.

The time will surely come when European nations will grow more of the protective foods their people need and

buy the bulk of their wheat from the countries which can grow better quality cereals at lower costs than overseas farmers can ever hope to rival. When that time comes, Canada can profitably increase her wheat crop. In the meanwhile, a crop of between three hundred and three hundred and fifty million bushels is all that the prairie farmers should try to grow or for which our Federal Government should guarantee satisfactory floor prices.

What is a Super-State?

By EMERY REVES

IN this era so prodigiously prolific in secret weapons and political slogans another term has recently been launched which is destined to become the object of passionate debate. This term is: Super-state. It sounds terrifying. All men with healthy instincts are supposed to react in unison: We don't want it.

Those who, in many countries, pose the rhetorical question: "Do you want to join a Super-state?" should at least take the trouble to explain what they mean by this slogan. Is a Super-state a very big state? Or is it a state with an over-large population? Or is it a too-powerful state? As it does not seem that, once the Super-state slogan has been thrown into debate, we can avoid a controversy, it may be advisable to try to arrive at a definition before we get too excited about it.

What is a Super-state?

Concepts of the State

Since the beginning of thinking on human society, writings about the nature and the problems of the state fill a whole library. In this century-old search for the truth about the state, two conceptions have crystallized. One is the theory that the State is an end in itself, the purpose of society, the ultimate goal.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Mr. Reves, a well known journalist now living in New York, has made many contributions to the discussion of international policies. His book *A Democratic Manifesto* appeared two years ago. In the last few months he has dealt in several articles published by the *New York Times* with the topic discussed here.

Individuals have to obey the dictates of the state, submit to the state's rules and laws, with no right of participation in their creation. Without the state the individual cannot even exist. This conception of the state found expression in autocratic kingdoms and empires. Since the destruction of most of the absolute monarchies, it has returned in our age in the form of Fascism, Nazism, the dictatorship of a single party or a military caste.

The other conception of the state—the democratic conception—sees the ultimate goal in the individual. According to the democratic theory of the state, the individual has certain inalienable rights; sovereignty resides in the community, and the state is created by the people who delegate their sovereignty to state institutions for the purpose of protecting them—their lives, their liberties, their properties—and for maintaining law and order within the community.

It can be taken as axiomatic that our ideal is the democratic state. The state we want to live in is one which can guarantee us maximum individual liberty; maximum freedom of religion, speech, press and assembly; maximum freedom of communication, enjoyment of scientific progress and material wealth. We want the state to restrict and control these individual freedoms only to

the extent to which innumerable free individual actions interfere with each other and require the regulation of interdependence of individuals within a society, a legal order. Throughout the whole 19th century, such has been the development of the great democratic nations towards greater wealth and more individual freedom.

The Nation State

But this development reached its optimum at the beginning of the 20th century, when industrial progress began to overflow and undermine the structure of the 18th century nation-states. In order to reinforce the structure, in every one of the nation-state units, artificial measures had to be taken which could be taken only by governments. A development started which, in the greater part of the world, led to the destruction of all individual liberties.

In some countries like Germany Italy and Spain, this change was undertaken openly and purposely by suppressing individual liberties and by proclaiming the principle that salvation lies in the all-powerful totalitarian nation-state endowed with the right to dispose of the very lives of its citizens.

In other countries, in the United States, Great Britain, France and others, the development has been slow, gradual and against our will. We have continued to pay lip service to democratic ideology but step by step have given up more and more of our individual liberties in order to strengthen our respective nation-states. It is immaterial which parties were in power and were instrumental in bringing about these changes. In America the liberal New Deal, in England the conservatives Tories, in France, both the Rightist parties and the Popular Front evolved in that direction. It is wide of the mark to accuse any government or any political party for the growing centralization of state administration. The trend is irresistible. Any other governments or parties in power would have been forced to take the same measures in their struggle against involvement

in foreign wars with other nation-states and in their fight against violent social conflicts at home.

Under the double threat of imminent and inescapable war, as a pressure from outside, and growing unemployment and social conflicts, as a pressure from inside, it was and is imperative for each nation to strengthen its state by instituting or expanding military service, by accepting higher and higher taxation, by admitting more and more interference of the state in the everyday life of the individuals.

This trend seems the logical result of the present conflict between the body politic and the body economic in our states. In a world which industry and science have transformed into a big entity, our political religions and superstitions, like a pair of Chinese shoes, are hindering growth and movement.

Two world wars in our lifetime should prove that every armed conflict from now on will result in a global war, that these violent conflicts between nations are the inevitable consequences of an ineffectively and inadequately organized relationship between the nations and that we shall never be able to escape another, and another world war as long as we do not recognize the first and elementary principle of any society, according to which violent conflicts are inevitable if, in a given society, sovereign power resides in the individual units of that society and not in society itself.

The Super State

It is a strange distortion of facts that at the suggestion of a world organization which could guarantee to mankind freedom from war at least for a few generations and, consequently, more individual liberty, all the worshippers of the present nation-states snipe: "Super-state!"

The reality is that the present nation-state has become a Super-state. During the past decades this nation-state has become universally more and more totalitarian and tyrannical, gradually destroying those cherished individual rights for which our ancestors fought for cen-

turies and which they established by the sacrifice of their lives so that we may enjoy their benefits.

It is this nation-state which to-day is making serfs of its citizens. This is the state which, to protect its selfish vested interests, takes away the earnings of the people and wastes them on munitions in the constant fear of being attacked and destroyed by any other nation-state. This is the state which does not allow us to move freely by forcing passports and visas upon us. This is the state which, wherever it exists, does not permit its citizens to enjoy the fruits of modern science and technology by keeping prices high through artificial tariffs, believing that every state must be economically self-supporting. This is the state which interferes more and more with our everyday life and tends to prescribe every minute of our existence.

This is the "Super-state!"

It is not a future nightmare or a proposal which we can freely accept or reject. We are living in it to-day. We are entirely in its orbit, whether in America, in England, in Russia or Argentina, in Portugal or Turkey.

And we shall become more and more subjected to this all-powerful Super-state if our supreme goal is to maintain the nation-state structure of the world. Under the constant threat of foreign wars and under the boiling pressure of economic problems, insoluble on a national basis, we are forced to relinquish one liberty after the other to the nation-state because, in the final analysis, our nationalism is stronger than our love of freedom or our economic self-interest. This development is inexorable and unavoidable if, in the present and coming gigantic conflicts between these rigid units of human society, we believe in the sacredness and unchangeability of an institution which is, after all, nothing but a human institution, which has existed for the short period of hardly more than 150 years and which, as a human institution, has more than fulfilled its purpose during a long and progressive century. But at the present stage of industrialism,

the nation-states can maintain themselves in one way alone: by becoming Super-states.

The Super-state which we all should dread and abhor cannot be characterized by the territory over which it extends or by the number of citizens over which it has authority. The criterion of a Super-state can be only the degree to which it interferes in individual liberties and by the degree of collective control it imposes on its citizens. The Italy of Mussolini in 1925 was much more a "Super-state" than the United States of Coolidge, although the latter is twenty-five times larger. The minuscule Latvia under the dictatorship of Ulmanis was much more a "Super-state" than the Commonwealth of Australia, covering a whole continent.

The Way to Peace

Recent history shows that individual liberties can be maintained much more easily in states covering large territories, particularly if comprising a multitude of nationalities. During the past fifty years, citizens of the United States and individuals living in the vast structure of the British Empire, both covering large territories and comprising a multitude of nationalities, have been "free" in a much higher degree, enjoyed a much higher standard of living and had much greater opportunities than peoples living in their small, isolated nation-states. It is very probable, however, that owing to a complete confusion of principles, we shall blindly follow the fundamentally anti-democratic doctrine of Hitler and Mussolini, who justified their dictatorships by the greatest of all social lies, which they succeeded in having accepted by their peoples, that individuals cannot have freedom unless first the state in which they live has absolute freedom: meaning absolute state domination. No matter how it hurts our deepest metaphysical dogmas, we have to realize that in our industrialized world, the greatest menace to individual liberties is the ever-growing power of the national Super-state.

It is now the declared policy of the great Allied powers that, at the end of this holocaust, we shall once again try to keep peace between sovereign nation-states by inviting them to sit down around a conference table and be reasonable and kind to each other. After having seen the League of Nations fail in every respect, as indeed it was bound to fail from the moment of its inception whether America belonged to it or not, we shall try to revive this dead but not-yet-buried body. The argument of those who want to repeat this historic failure is extremely strange. They say:

1. That our purpose is to prevent a third world war,
2. That any measure proposed which would involve delegation of parts of the sovereignty of the peoples to democratically-controlled bodies higher than the nation-states is impractical because:
3. Such proposals would not be accepted by the present governments of the nation-states.

Is it too much to ask those who take part in this debate so vital for our future that they first train their minds, studying at least Aristotle and Descartes, and try to think logically?

If our purpose is to prevent another world war, then the practicality or impracticality of a proposed method can be judged only in relation to the goal set, namely: Can it or can it not prevent another world war? It is illogical nonsense to say that a method proposed to prevent another world war is impractical because of a third element in this peculiar logical construction, namely: because it will not be accepted by the national governments now holding power.

If our purpose is to produce methods acceptable to the present-day governments of the national Super-states, then there can be no argument that only methods which are acceptable to these national governments can be regarded as practical. But then let us be frank and say that this is our purpose. Let us not continue to delude the people that

such methods will prevent a third world war. They will not.

To revive the old League of Nations or to create a United Nations Council on a similar basis (composed of representatives of sovereign nation-states), is extremely simple, although some people are becoming emotional in debating about the role of great powers and small powers in such a council. This great power versus small power controversy will no doubt be overcome as the entire issue is irrelevant.

To believe, however, that such an organization of sovereign nations, as presented by Dumkarton Oaks agreements, whether on equal or unequal footing, could prevent another war, is sheer Utopia. It expresses a degree of idealism bordering on naivete. Such a council of sovereign units could prevent another war only if it could change human nature and make it act and react differently from the way it has been acting and reacting throughout the ages.

The national interests of the powers, large and small, do not run parallel, just as the selfish interests of individuals never run parallel. If we want to remain on a sovereign nation-state basis, then the only chance of a somewhat longer period without a shooting war is to keep the sovereign nation-states as far apart as possible, to reduce contact between them to a minimum and not to bring them together in one organization where the crystallization of the divergencies of their interests will only be accelerated.

We have to fight the Super-state idea with all our strength to prevent this modern Moloch from destroying all the achievements of twenty centuries. But it is high time to realize that the Super-state we all abhor is the modern nation-state to which, ironically, goes all our devotion and adoration. The liberation of the individual from the clutches of the Super-state can be achieved only if the peoples reorganize democratically-controlled state machinery on a broad enough foundation upon which industrial society can progress in freedom, without the irresistible necessity for men to become

slaves while defending the idol of the outworn nation-state.

Only a governmental organization on an international, if possible, global, basis

can free the individual from the ever-growing restrictions imposed on him by the many conflicting national Super-states.

Health Protection in the U.S.S.R.

By N. PROPPER-GRASHCHENKOV

EVERYTHING connected with public health in the U. S. S. R. is in the hands of the state and is provided for by the state budget. Medical establishments, staffs and scientific and everyday work of medical institutions and organizations are all planned. At the beginning of every fiscal year, the People's Commissariat of Public Health of the U. S. S. R. together with the People's Commissariats of Public Health of the various republics and the local Boards of Health determine where hospitals, polyclinics, maternity homes, nurseries, sanatoriums, scientific institutes, medical schools and the like are needed and how many should be built. At the same time the most important tasks for the coming year are also determined.

Organization

The fact that all public health work is centrally directed makes possible the proper utilization of all the facilities of the country, the widespread application of the latest achievements in medical science, and unified methods of work. The medical establishments and organizations of the Soviet Union are not isolated, insular institutions, but are closely interconnected and work according to a common plan of preventive and curative measures, with efforts directed primarily towards preventing illnesses and safeguarding the population against sickness.

The public health system includes numerous and widespread specialized sanitation organizations which engage in work in the field of industrial hygiene

and labor protection, housing and municipal sanitation and food hygiene, and which combat epidemics. There is an extensive network of scientific research institutes of hygienics, sanitation centers and laboratories which serve as bases for the public health officers in their prophylactic work. However, it is not these sanitation organizations alone that concern themselves with prophylactic measures. The entire Soviet public health system concerns itself with this work. Even the establishments for treating ill people, and practising physicians base their activities on preventive medicine. For this reason hygiene is a science that is particularly widely taught in all medical schools.

Public organizations of the working people do much to assist the public health institutions. Every City and District Soviet has its Board of Health. Hospitals and prophylactic institutes have the cooperation of public commissions. Sanitation commissions are organized in apartment houses; collective farms have their sanitary inspectors. The members of these commissions and the inspectors are elected by the local population and go through special training courses in the Hygiene Educational Centers. These commissions and collective farm inspectors keep a check on the work of medical establishments, and assist the latter to carry out the prophylactic measures by interesting the public in questions of health protection and making them conscious of the necessity of observing the rules of hygiene at home and at work.

Soviet public health work has been efficacious because of the very nature

EDITOR'S NOTE: Professor N. Propper-Grashchenkov is Assistant People's Commissar of Public Health of the U.S.S.R. and Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.