

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

By ARNOLD PETERSEN



***Published Online by
Socialist Labor Party of America***

<http://slp.org>

August 2007

The Old Order and the New

By ARNOLD PETERSEN

An address delivered before the Bulgarian Socialist Labor Federation Convention, Detroit, Michigan, December 27, 1941

“The chief business of statesmen,” remarked the reactionary Frenchman, Talleyrand, “is to find new names for old institutions, which, under their old names, have become odious to the public.”

The old order of poverty amidst plenty, trade wars and military conflict, has become odious to the mass of impoverished mankind. Alive to this revulsion against things as they have been, rulers everywhere promise their exploited people a “new order.” In this document the “new order” of the rulers is subjected to a Marxian analysis and shown to be the same old, obsolete system of private property and class rule camouflaged with glittering generalities.

The New Order, the society of peace and abundance for all, in short, Socialism, is attainable. It is the mission of this pamphlet to illuminate that glorious goal and to point the way to the exploited workers for achieving it.

The Old Order and the New

By Arnold Petersen

PUBLISHING HISTORY

FIRST PRINTED EDITION MARCH 1942

SECOND PRINTED EDITION FEBRUARY 1944

ONLINE EDITION AUGUST 2007

***Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official
website of the Socialist Labor Party of America
www.slp.org***

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS

P.O. BOX 218
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94042-0218

Collectivism, deprived of the fundamental principles of fraternity and self-government, is by the very nature of things a liberty-sapping doctrine.

—*Georg Brandes.*

Foreword.

The cry for a new social order, *a new social system*, issuing from the four corners of the earth and from all camps, is deeply significant and (properly considered) highly inspiring and encouraging. It is encouraging even when that cry comes from ruling class elements, for when a ruling class acknowledges that something new must take the place of the old (even though that new” is really only a dressed-up variant of the old), the fact testifies that the old order (in this case capitalism) is so defunct that it can no longer be defended—or that, at least, it cannot be justified in the degree and manner of the past. It also testifies that the demand for a new and better order of things is so strong, persistent and universal, and the pressure for a change so overwhelming, that ruling classes, everywhere find it necessary or expedient to acknowledge the demand and heed the pressure. That these ruling classes may not be, probably are not, sincere, that they may later attempt to repudiate promises and pledges wrung from them in their hour of despair, and that what they offer as the “new order” is a counterfeit substitute, does not lessen the significance of the demand and their seeming yielding to it. For where counterfeit coin can be circulated at all, the genuine coin must be present. If this were not so, the circulating of the counterfeit coin would be utterly senseless. And what is true of counterfeit coin is true of counterfeit “new orders.”

That counterfeit “new orders” *are* offered to satisfy the demand for a genuine New Order is amply demonstrated

in the pages that follow. And whether the “new order” is offered by the murderous and degenerate Nazi and fascist adventurers (prompted by whatever economic pressure and motives), or by the old-line capitalist imperialists, the promise of a “new order” certifies to the fear, the mortal terror, in which all ruling class elements stand, confronted (as they are) by the despoiled, criminally assaulted and swindled working classes everywhere.

Apart from this fact, however, is to be considered that the ruling classes of today, similar to all ruling classes of the past, simply cannot visualize that there can be a social order which is superior to, or essentially better than, their own, which operates primarily for their benefit, and to which, accordingly, they cling so desperately in substance, whatever they may think or do about forms. Even when they are confronted with the task of judging the merits of a completely revolutionary concept of society (as, for instance, Socialism), they find it utterly impossible to divorce themselves from old habits of thought in so judging it. The revolutionary principles—both as to form and substance—of the “New Order,” i.e., Socialism, they attempt to fit into the old scheme of things, and to reconcile them with their traditional concepts, and they reject them—not on their merits, but simply because they do not conform to capitalist principles and practices as substitutes for which they are obviously and frankly submitted! It is as if they would say: Socialism would be splendid if only we could hang on to capitalism!

It is this naive, this fatuous and utterly blind attitude which Marx satirizes so brilliantly when (speaking of the “radical” bourgeoisie wanting “the existing state of

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

society without its revolutionary and disintegrating elements”) he says:

“They wish for a bourgeoisie without a proletariat [i.e., a wage working class]. The bourgeoisie naturally conceives the world in which it is supreme to be the best, and bourgeois ‘Socialism’ develops this comfortable conception into various more or less complete systems. In requiring the proletariat to carry out such a system, and thereby to march straightway into the social New Jerusalem [read: “New Order”], it but requires in reality that the proletariat should remain within the bounds of existing [capitalist] society. . . .”

“Yes,” the advocates of capitalist democracy will say, “we will give you a ‘new order,’ but it must be based on the ‘democracy’ that has made capitalism possible.” I Thus the “new order” turns out to be the old order which inevitably produced the war and all the other modern social evils which will continue to be produced in increasing measure by the iniquitous system of wage slavery, if the workers fail to organize politically and in Socialist Industrial Unions to put an end to it.

*

It is repeatedly said that the American people are taking the war complacently, and critics of the Administration charge that the government is altogether too complacent. However this may be, the alleged complacency toward the war is as nothing compared to the “complacency” manifested generally by rulers and ruled with respect to the overwhelming fact that, however the war may go, the civilization that we have known heretofore has arrived at the point where the next step either spells disaster and slavery for the mass

of mankind for an indefinite period, or freedom, peace and plenty for all, and for all time to come.

Doubtlessly the war is the fact of grim immediacy, the madness which for the moment must absorb all thoughts and energies. And yet the war is in itself insignificant compared to that fact of monumental dimensions of which the war itself is but an incident, a byproduct, as it were—the fact that the modern world is left no choice but between two collectivisms, the democratic collectivism called Socialism, or the autocratic collectivism variously designated as fascism, Nazism, but properly denominated industrial feudalism. The era of so-called free enterprise (that is, competitive capitalist wage slavery) is gone forever, and can no more be restored than scrambled eggs can be unscrambled. The private property principle on which it rested has in all but legal form been definitely destroyed, having for decades had no meaning anyhow except for the few.

For, however much capitalist apologists may prate about “free enterprise,” private property and “liberty,” all meaning the same thing, or being interdependent, the fact remains that for the mass of humanity there, has been neither free enterprise nor private property, nor yet essential liberty, in those respects where they really mattered. During the past decades this has been no system of general private property—it has been a system resting on the *denial* of private property to upward of 90 per cent of the human race. It is brazen insolence to designate as a private property system that which excludes the overwhelming majority from enjoyment and possession of private property.

And so this “private” property (that is, the socially operated and socially needed means of production),

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

which in fact has long since been collectivized in form, yet owned by a small minority, must be given recognition and form as an economic democratic collectivism, socially owned, which is to say industrial self-government of, by and for the workers, or *Socialism*. May the period of that inescapable transformation (inescapable, that is, if we are to go forward, and not lapse into imperialist barbarism) be attended by as little disturbance and dislocation as possible. And it *is* possible to effect the transformation in a civilized and peaceful manner, but only if the workers, at this hour of grave peril, organize properly, conscious of their historic mission and their responsibility to civilization and the future welfare of mankind.

—*Arnold Petersen.*

New York, February 15, 1942.

Repeal the Declaration of Independence, repeal all past history—you still cannot repeal human nature. It still will be in the abundance of man's heart that slavery . . . is wrong; and out of the abundance of his heart, his mouth will continue to speak.

—*Abraham Lincoln.*

Competition may be the life of commerce, but it is the ruin of the human mind—*W.B. Yeats*.

Governments [i.e., political government] show thus how successfully men can be imposed on. . . . All men recognize the right of revolution; that is, the right to refuse allegiance to, and to resist, the government, when its tyranny or its inefficiency are great and unendurable. . . . The progress from an absolute to a limited monarchy, from a limited monarchy to democracy, is a progress toward a true respect for the individual. . . . Is a democracy, such as we know it [i.e., political democracy], the last improvement possible in government? Is it not possible to take a step further toward recognizing and organizing the rights of men?—*Henry David Thoreau* (“Civil Disobedience.”)

1.

Civilization, in Peril, Shall Not Perish.

When a few months ago I accepted the invitation to address this meeting, the United States was in the deep shadow of war. The country is now in the black night of war. This momentous fact has, of course, wrought, havoc in plans more important than the relatively insignificant matter of my having had to prepare a talk for this meeting. However, the fact is that because the United States is now at war, I am not able to deliver the talk I had in preparation, partly because of the vastly changed situation, and partly because it was no longer possible to give the time and to concentrate the mind on this particular assignment to the extent originally intended and required. And so if what I may have to say does not seem to be as connected as it might be, or as well rounded out as, it could and should be, I am sure you

will understand and bear with me.

It cannot be said that the present situation came as a great surprise to the Socialist Labor Party. For years we have predicted that if the workers failed to rise in response to the imperative demands of our age, and if the working class failed to discharge its historic mission at the historically ripe and proper moment, this catastrophe, and its foreshadowed fearful consequences, would inevitably fall upon the world. We have labored unceasingly, tirelessly, to arouse the workers, to reach them with the message of emancipation, and the program that alone could effect working class emancipation, and all that is therein implied. In vain have we thus far pleaded, in vain have we shown, by logic and the plain facts, whither society was tending, and what would be in store for all of us, if the workers remained unheeding. And though serene in the knowledge of having done our full duty, we are obviously not philosophical about this terrible denouement. No, we are definitely not.

Momentarily the forces of progressive revolution are at bay; momentarily the forces of retrogressive revolution are in the ascendency. So be it. Yet, we are far from despairing. We know that as surely as tomorrow's sun will rise, so surely will the dawn of human and working class emancipation eventually break upon us in all its glory. This, friends and comrades, we need never doubt. Let us take heart, and view the future with renewed hope, in the certainty that, though the wheel of progress may be brought to a dead stop, or even given a turn or two backward, it can never be so for long. The tide of progress may recede, but it shall return, and the opportunity will then again be presented for taking it at

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

full flood, when, thereupon, it shall lead “on to fortune”—forward to that destiny, rough-hew it as we may, for which social evolution has been moulding the race, and which will mark the first great milestone in man’s physical, material and spiritual march toward ultimate ends, the nature and form of which we cannot now even guess.

And let us not also forget that never is the night in deeper gloom than immediately before dawn. And capitalism, as Daniel De Leon phrased it, is not to be saved. That much we do know. And one thing more we know: Order is the first law of the universe, even as it is the basis and indispensable condition for any form of social life. The forces of anarchy will spend themselves, and the more fiercely this anarchic fury rages, the sooner it *will* spend itself. And though we may talk of the old order and the new, the old *must* presently die; that is the law of nature and of life itself. As Shakespeare said, in the unmatched magic of his English poetic pose, or prose poetry:

“The heavens themselves, the planets and this
centre
Observe degree, priority and place,
Insisture, course, proportion, season, form,
Office and custom, in all line of order.”

Civilization, though in peril, shall not, must not perish. Countless generations have labored and suffered, and spilt the richest heart’s blood of their noblest and best to the dedication of human freedom and the higher, the finer, the richer life. Mankind surely will not now permit the precious heritage of the past to be cast away as if it were a mere bauble.

2.

Ethnic Period of Private Property Passes.

And yet, it must be repeated that the situation is grave. For this thing that we call modern civilization is at the present time passing through a series of cataclysmic changes—or perhaps one should say volcanic eruptions. The changes that have taken place since the Japanese military gangsters and the Italian banditti overran China and Ethiopia, respectively, and since the Nazi Beast broke loose, and more particularly and most recently since the Japanese imperialist thugs made their treacherous and murderous assault on Pearl Harbor, have indeed shaken society to its very foundations. These changes, volcanic in their eruptive fury, and cataclysmic in their ominous implications, have uprooted humanity as nothing else has ever done before on such a scale, and with consequences more sanguinary, more confusing and bewildering, more confounding and destructive of traditions and beliefs in “things as they are,” than anything else comparable in human history.

And the end is not yet—the end is not yet by a long stretch. Although transcending in scope and ultimate involvement, as well as in final consequence, the great French Revolution, it is nevertheless to that social volcanic eruption of one hundred fifty years ago that we most frequently look for purposes of comparison and contrast—and of such we find many, startling in their similarities. For, as the French Revolution marked the end, by and large, of feudalism, and the ending of the autocratic rule of a class grown utterly parasitical and useless, utterly divorced from socio-ethical

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

considerations, and particularly social and economic realities, their prerogatives and privileges having long ceased to have any relevancy to the new age, so the present volcanic eruption marks the end of the capitalist system, and the ending of the rule of a capitalist class which also has grown utterly useless and parasitical, whose power, prerogatives and privileges likewise have long since ceased to have any relevancy to the present socioeconomic set-up. The present-day capitalist class is utterly divorced from social and economic realities as reflected through, or implicit in the fact of, an industrial society depending wholly on wage labor for management, maintenance and survival—an industrial society that is as full-fledged and independent of the old capitalist social principle and philosophy, as that same *de facto* capitalist society one hundred fifty years ago had become full-fledged and independent of the old feudal social principle and philosophy which it finally superseded and succeeded.

And yet, the comparisons and contrasts cannot be considered wholly adequate nor entirely correct. For while it is true that the two great social upheavals mark the termination of social systems, the present upheaval goes far beyond that: It marks not merely the end of the social system, capitalism, *but it marks the termination of a whole ethnic period in which feudalism and capitalism were merely subordinate and succeeding links.* However much capitalism differed from feudalism, and feudalism in turn from the system of absolute or chattel slavery, they all had these basic elements in common: Private property, human slavery in one form or another, and the political form of government, or the territorial and class State as the central or collective agency. If society takes

the next step forward—as it bids fair to do, and as all who subscribe to the principle of social progress must hope and expect it will do—then these three elements, common to all three preceding social systems, must and will perish. For they are but the various parts of a garment—the political garment if you like—that society has utterly outgrown and into which it cannot any longer be fitted except under penalty of stunting its growth, and eventually constricting it altogether, with stagnation inevitable, and resultant social death. For the society aborning—the Socialist, or Industrial Union, society, the society resting on common ownership of the things man needs to sustain life collectively, in comfort, peace, affluence and, above all, in social and economic freedom—that new society must, as it will, discard the trammels and trappings of old, even as the child discards the swaddling clothes of puling infancy, and as the grown man discards the clothes of later childhood.

In emphasizing the unique character of the present social upheaval as compared with those that preceded it (notably the French Revolution), it should be clear, then, that in so doing we are not merely making a distinction without a difference. The difference is there, and it is fundamental and all-determining as far as future social development and relations go. And in the failure to comprehend that important difference lies the explanation, mainly, for the, confusion and bewilderment, not merely of the property-blinded ruling class, and the untutored generally, but of the so-called radical elements which otherwise proclaim their acceptance of the principle that capitalism is doomed and that Socialism (as they think they understand it) will succeed it.

What “New Order” Out of Present War?

That the confusion and lack of understanding of the true nature of the current volcanic eruption are great is obvious to any intelligent observer, and particularly so, of course, to the Marxian Socialist. With but slight adaptation this’ confusion and ignorance find apt description in the, opening lines of Dickens’s famous story of the French Revolution, *A Tale of Two Cities*. I quote them here:

“It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to Heaven, we were all going direct the other way—in short, the period was . . . like the present period. . . .”

It *was*, strikingly so, like this present period, with the exceptions noted. And that is why everywhere these days men are, talking about the Old Order which is passing, and about the New Order which must be, or is being, instituted. But strangely enough, what one faction is hailing as the “New Order” is denounced as the Old Order by the opposing faction, and vice versa, which naturally suggesting the conclusion that they are both right as to the other fellow’s “Order” really being old, and that they are both wrong as to their claims of newness for their own respective, proposed “Order”! As a

matter of fact we know that neither one side nor the other really intends to establish a *new* order of things for society as a whole. We know that the phrase “New Order” is a slogan exactly as the phrase “Make the world safe for Democracy” was and, for that matter, still *is* a slogan.

They are slogans used, instinctively or otherwise, to cover up the real purposes of ruling classes, which purposes, basically, resolve themselves into efforts to establish supremacy for their respective capitalist classes in the world market, or to maintain, and defend against aggression by rival capitalist nations, their supremacy or vital share in the markets of the world. For essentially this war, like the first world war a quarter of a century ago, is a war for markets and basic raw materials and natural resources, all superficial appearances and claims to the contrary notwithstanding. As the Socialist Labor Party has recently stated in its, Declaration on America’s entry into the world war, this war, in its origin, is a war of capitalism. By that is meant specifically that it is a war that logically and inescapably results from a social system organized on the principle of the present capitalist system of production for profit; that, moreover, it is a war such as could *only* take place under a system of society such as capitalism; finally that it is a war which (barring the introduction—and maintenance—of a new, higher social principle into the affairs of the nations now waging war against each other) is fated to strengthen the cause, and to multiply the very evils, which cumulatively produced this present war. History proves it, experience teaches it, the economic factors involved render it inevitable.

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

This war is also a war for the preservation of political society, i.e., the system of society resting on territorial lines, private or State-owned property, and the continued exploitation of the working classes of the world by the ruling classes, or ruling political cliques of the world. There are divergent interests within the ruling class bodies of the world; they do not all want precisely the same things, nor do they want them in quite the same way. But the one thing they do want, all of them, is power, political and economic power over materials and man-power, power built and maintained on the forced labor of the toiling masses. I say “forced labor” advisedly, though the kind of force applied may vary according to the ideas and preferred system of the ruling groups—it may be either the naked force of the Nazi and fascist governmental gangsters, or the veiled yet potent, force implicit in the artificially maintained condition which in the so-called democratic camp leaves the working classes collectively no choice but to sweat and toil almost from cradle to grave for a pittance which rarely exceeds the slave’s allowance and frequently falls below it, and then generally without the security which at least the slave usually “enjoyed.”

Yet, in saying that this is a war of capitalism, all has not been said. All wars, for whatever specific, planned purpose they may have been started, acquire laws and motions of their own, more or less independently of the ruling classes that may have unleashed them. A war on a grand Scale is like an economy within an economy—a State within the State, so to speak. While wars obviously reflect the social and economic conditions under which they take place, it is also true that wars on a large scale mightily affect the social order even to the point

sometimes of fanning the smouldering embers of resentment and rebellion into the flames and conflagration of revolution. The ancient Roman historian observed that it is always easy to begin a war, but very difficult to terminate it since beginning and ending are not controlled by the same elements. If this was true 2,000 years ago, it is a thousand times truer today, and it is particularly true of the present world war which has now increased in scope and taken a direction and acquired a momentum as much beyond the original calculation of the immediate Nazi and fascist aggressors as it is now beyond their control. For if ever a war on a grand scale was charged with revolution—social, universal revolution—it is this war. Its revolutionary character is, of course, still only implicit, and whether or not its explicit character shall finally become retrogressive-revolutionary or progressive-revolutionary is a question the answer to which is awaited anxiously by partisans in the camps of reaction and progress alike. As De Leon penetratingly remarked:

“Not all wars are for markets. Some wars are volcanic explosions strongly dashed with the flavor of Revolution—of Revolution progressward.”

Shall this current war become “strongly dashed with the flavor of Revolution”? Or should the question, perhaps, be phrased: *When* and *how* may this war be expected to become one of “revolution progressward”? Upon the answer to that momentous question hangs, indeed, the fate of civilization, and the hopes of a triumphant resurgence of the working classes of the world.

Capitalist Wage Slavery Nullifies Political Democracy.

The old order has been a brutal and a bloody one. It has rested, for the greater part, on naked force, and the current sesquicentennial of the American Bill of Rights reminds us how very recent even an inadequate attempt has been made to substitute the principle of naked force and brutal might for that of reason and some regard for human decency, and for man's rights as an individual. And in passing we may well salute those noble men of one hundred fifty years ago (notably Jefferson and Madison, and their supporters) who fought so hard to incorporate in our basic law those guarantees which, if preserved and faithfully adhered to, and rendered applicable to the new conditions and needs, shall bring to all men full freedom and that untrammelled pursuit of happiness envisioned by our revolutionary sires.

Yet, even that degree of freedom from force thus far attained has been greatly conditioned, and has been (so far as the workers are concerned) in considerable measure cancelled by the fact of an economic despotism which has grown up within the shell of political freedom. For, although the workers of America are free men in the sense that they can, by their vote, abolish forms of government, and elect to office whomsoever they please, they are in fact the subjects of a despotism far greater and more menacing than the political despotism overthrown in 1776, namely, the economic, or industrial, despotism exercised by the owners and masters of the workshops of the nation.

And so we find ourselves faced with the anomalous situation that on the political field, where the influence of the individual worker is only indirect, his participation of annual occurrence only, and his real interest far removed from his vital day-to-day concern—we find on the political field the sound democratic principle promulgated and established by the founders of the republic is affirmed and upheld, whereas that same democratic principle is denied, emphatically denied, on the economic field—that is, in the industries, the mills and the mines and workshops generally—where the worker’s interests are immediate, his participation daily and hourly, and his influence direct and all-inclusive! It is as if the revolutionary fathers had laid down the principle that a citizen would be qualified to vote once every four years for a President of the United States, but he would not be qualified to vote for representatives to the Town Council, State Assembly, nor for a State Governor and members of the United States Congress!

Indeed, the contradiction between the workers’ political and industrial status—between their status as political citizens and industrial “citizens”—is far greater and far more preposterous than would have been the contradiction between being allowed to vote nationally only every four years, and not at all for local candidates, or for candidates to those minor offices much closer (in the early days, at least) to the interests and needs of the citizen. We can hardly doubt, for example, that if Jefferson were to return and behold the contradiction between the theory and practice of political liberty, on the one hand, and the fact of economic, or industrial, despotism, on the other, he would cry out aloud against

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

such a denial of essential democracy, and denounce the fact of what to him would surely appear as an unlimited, arbitrary monarchy in industry!

The fact is, and to repeat, that society has outgrown its political clothes (political institutions) political clothes which now neither can, nor should be, patched nor stretched to fit its huge industrial bulk. And the efforts made to fit it nevertheless, and to deny democracy where it is truly and desperately needed, is precisely the basic cause of the world upheaval and convulsions of our time. The attempt to maintain the old order on the old political and individualistic principle, or to maintain the, old despotic-economic principle within a “streamlined” body of non-political, i.e., non-parliamentarian collectivism, is what is tearing society to pieces. For either we apply the political democratic principle to the industries, in which case there is self-government and economic independence; or we maintain the present state of working class economic dependence on capitalist owners, which in fact means economic serfdom for the workers, in which case the political principle is in practice, if not in theory, nullified.

But so preponderant is the force of economic despotism—and the more titanic industry becomes, the more preponderant becomes this force—that the political democratic principle ultimately becomes nullified in theory as well as in fact (as witness in Germany, Italy, etc.), the political principle (bereft of its democratic premise and implications) becoming an integral part of the economic despotism—its buffer and open defender, as it were. The fiction of political freedom having been revealed, the fact of economic despotism being overwhelming, there is no longer any need of

ARNOLD PETERSEN

maintaining the pretense of political democracy, which then is openly discarded. Italy and Germany, notably, illustrate the point and the process.

There can be no compromise in the given premises: Either we have an Industrial Administration of plutocrats, an economic collectivism devoid entirely of the democratic principle in every sense; or we have an Industrial Administration of Labor, an economic collectivism based upon and thoroughly infused with the democratic principle. The former would be Industrial Feudalism; the latter would be the Socialist Industrial Republic of free men and women. The former would be the Old Order in a new suit; the latter would truly be the New Order, suit, body and spirit—the *only* New Order worthy the name.

NEW ORDER vs. “New Order.”

The root of the problem, of course, lies in the question of the right of *private* property in socially produced, *socially operated*, and *socially* needed things, the things produced solely by labor, but owned mainly by capitalists, the things absolutely essential to the enjoyment of life, liberty and the normal pursuit of happiness. While there was a scarcity of the good things of life, the problem was relatively simple. For where not enough exists, or can be produced, to satisfy all in amplitude, the strong and the ruthless take the lion's share, and can in any case thereafter point to the obvious fact that there is no more to be had, and where nothing is even the gods sup with empty spoons! And where there is not plenty for all, the few had to be supplied at the expense of the mass, lest society stagnate and all remain in ignorance as well as poverty.

But now, in a condition of plenty for all, the problem has grown complex. Not complex in logic, but complex because the social theory of the old order* is being clung to when there is no longer any need of so doing, with the result, among others, that masses starve in the midst of plenty, and even with potentialities of producing in such amplitude as to stagger the imagination. To solve the problem, the ownership principle must be harmonized with the production and operation principle—in short, ownership must be social, just as production, operation and distribution are social. And there is the rub, and there is where the real trouble begins. For failure to

harmonize these principles has produced, and will continue to produce, the national and international political and economic crises which have found their climax in universal war, bankruptcy and threatened destruction of our civilization. And attempts, or proposals, to harmonize these principles, have aroused the property beast to fury—and than the furies of private interests there are none more violent and ferocious.

And so, the struggle rages, men die by the millions, wealth is destroyed in incalculable magnitude, and all but a handful of humanity stand bewildered, making demands for the present and for the future which have no relevancy to the realities of the basic problem, some clamoring for the good old times while all clamor for what they call a new order of things, though what is visualized or demanded is not new at all. The Marxist alone presents a really New Order—new, because it thoroughly rejects the old, now false theory of private ownership in the socially conducted and socially needed means of production; new, moreover, because it casts aside all other conflicting economic theories and political principles, and by harmonizing production and exchange releases the now restricted or suppressed potentialities of plenty, insuring peace and liberty for all. For, to paraphrase ourselves, where plenty is, even the devil sups with laden spoon!

But we are now in the midst of the gruelling conflict, not merely the military conflict, but the social and economic conflict—the conflict as to which social and economic principle shall prevail. Shall it be the “good old” capitalist days of *laissez faire*, competition and so-called free enterprise? Or shall it be a collective

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

despotism, or, if you like, a despotic collectivism? Or shall it, finally, be a democratic collectivism, or, in other words, Socialism, i.e., the Socialist Industrial Union Republic? Messrs. Roosevelt, Churchill and their associates sigh for the good old days of “free enterprise,” under a bourgeois-democratic State, though they are willing to make compromises. And they call that *their* New Order! Hitler, Hirohito and Mussolini, and their jackal partners, demand despotic collectivism, or, as they also call it, the authoritarian and totalitarian State and no nonsense about democracy! They call that *their* New Order! The Marxists, representing the logical and true interests of the workers, demand self-government in industry by the workers, democratic industrial management and its logical climax, the Socialist Industrial Union Government, with its assurance of PLENTY FOR ALL, and therefore universal peace and consequent guarantees of freedom and happiness for all. And that *is*, or *will* be, the NEW ORDER!

Surely, the sane, normal person cannot remain blind to the fact that we cannot go back to the so-called good old times of “free enterprise.” Surely, the sane, decent and liberty-loving person perceives the barbarism, the impudence and utter imbecility of the Nazi-fascist formula. He must perceive that this so-called New Order is the same old despotic principle applied by the Pharaohs to the sweating, toiling children of Israel—the old theory of slavery, of economic serfdom. Surely there is nothing new in that. And, surely, the sane, decent, liberty-loving person (and particularly the workers) will recognize in Socialism *the* NEW ORDER—the only sound, the only decent, the only workable social program—the only program that will forever terminate

ARNOLD PETERSEN

war and social strife. Truly, *that* were a New Order, indeed!

Primitiveness of Axis “New Order.”

As I have said, those in the non-Marxian camps cannot agree as to the new-ness or old-ness of the particular brand of “new order” proclaimed by each. Hitler and his Axis partners are, of course, most vociferous of all, and no doubt many of the robot followers of Benito Messerino and Adolf Schicklgruber honestly believe that they have really got hold of something new in the way of a social order. The fraud of Hitler’s claim respecting a “new order” becomes transparent the moment it is subjected to the simplest test. We all remember that the chief elements in Schicklgruber’s “new order” are racial purity, Nordic stock, and social and ethical principles which he claims have not heretofore been observed anywhere. Schicklgruber himself is a living denial of racial purity. One look at his face is sufficient to convince anyone that here at least a dozen central, southern and eastern strains struggled in vain to produce a physiognomy that could become other than that of a mongrel, far removed from the mythical tall Anglo-Saxon he raves about. Moreover, his only two allies of importance are as swarthy and undersluno, as it is possible for any pair of “Nordics” to be!!

But this is, of course, the least important among the elements that prove the spuriousness of the “new order” claim. What are the other elements claimed as new? They are modern social organization, martial spirit, submission to a chosen “fuehrer.” As to modern social

organization, what the Nazi bandit and his Italian pal offer are instances of reverting to type—in structure, spirit and purpose theirs are feudalic institutions—feudo-industrial, to be sure, but feudalic in essence. What is new about them? They and their spirit, ethics and moral conceptions are as old as barbaric William the Conqueror and his fellow-marauders who laid Harold the Saxon by the heel—yet, lacking the redeeming characteristics which even those brutal founders of English feudalism possessed! The Hitler creed is force, ruthlessness, cruelty, vindictiveness, masochism, perverseness and fanaticism. What is new about these? They are as “new” as would be the phenomenon of witnessing Adolf and his gang suddenly growing tails and hoofs and what have we! New—yes, as new as Attila, Tamerlane, Genghis Khan and Rasputin!

And as for slavish, unthinking submission to a brutish master, surely that is almost as old as the hills. Even their so-called religion (if that is the name for it) they had to borrow from the pre-Christian Scandinavian mythology, even as the Christians borrowed theirs from the Jews. New? Yes, as “new” as the most, ancient Viking burial-mound in Denmark! And as for their Oriental ally—what new element do we find here? Nothing, except the production machine and the means and methods of destruction, all previously borrowed from Western capitalism. In all other respects Japan is still feudal—even primitively feudal, or pre-feudal, with a religion, or system of worship, which goes even farther back than Scandinavian mythology or primitive Christianity. Ancestor worship, or God-King, or God-Chief worship is among the most ancient of all, and only practised today among the most primitive tribes.

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

Indeed, Hirohito, Emperor of Japan, is in his own person as primitive in some of his habits and practices as the ancient sun-worshippers, though one may accord him the benefit of the doubt by supposing that he is also a good actor or clever faker. I am reminded here of one of those extraordinary manifestations which proves the hoariness of Hitler's Eastern partner and of his ruling clique. A few years ago (to be exact, it was at New Year's, 1938), when Hirohito's gorillas were raining death and horror on millions of innocent Chinese men, women and babies, the Imperial butcher-in-chief wrote a poem with this very slaughter in mind. He called it "Morning in the Shrine Garden," and it read:

"Peaceful is morning in the Shrine garden;
World conditions, it is hoped, also will be
peaceful!"

And for the forthcoming New Year observation the imperial monkey has selected for the annual poem theme the subject: "Clouds over mountain range"! The Associated Press solemnly reported that, upon hearing this, the Lord High Chief Custodian of "the poem bureau" was profoundly moved at the imperial profundity, deeply moved at "such a grand, sublime theme" in view of the "current extraordinary emergency." When this sort of thing is not mere clownishness or a circus stunt, it is primitiveness at its most primitive—as primitive almost as pig-worship in ancient Egypt! And these are elements, extraneous or not—these are elements supposedly representative of the "new order"-to-be!

In January of this year Hitler orated: "I am convinced that 1941 will be the crucial year of a great new order in

ARNOLD PETERSEN

Europe.” If Hitler is a good prophet, we may interpret this to mean that his “new order” is doomed, since the year 1941, is now practically ended, with Hitler and his fellow gangsters very much on the run—for the moment at least! However this may be, the so-called “new order” of Hitler & Co. has been amply demonstrated to be an order of a very ancient vintage, and a cruel and bitter draught as well.

Nothing New in “New Order” of Capitalist Democracies.

How stands it with the “new order” of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt? If we examine it in the light of the utterances of those proclaiming it, we shall find it to be also quite old, though obviously not so ancient nor so repulsive as the brand offered by the Axis gangsters. The “new order” as visualized by the capitalist democracies has perhaps been given clearest expression by Mr. Churchill. One of Mr. Churchill’s extremely friendly partisans has aptly summed up his creed, his idea of a “new order.” The immediate occasion for commenting on Mr. Churchill’s views was the Prime Minister’s address last June in which he pledged support to Soviet Russia in its struggle with Nazi Germany. Mr. Churchill’s partisan wrote:

“As the Prime Minister explained the other day when the subject of giving aid to Russia against Germany became a vital matter, he is now, and always has been, wholly against the Marxist philosophy [which, of course, is nothing new!—A.P.]. *He wants the future course of civilization to be steered between the extreme of blind, Tory reaction and the opposite extreme of that equally blind communistic revolution* [he really means *Marxist revolution*] which aims to establish public property in the capital equipment of the world [he means: social ownership of the socially produced and socially operated means of production]. He wants to move along a middle path between the impossible ideology [!] of the prevailing

system and the impractical notions of socialist utopianism [!].”

Well, Mr. Churchill does seem to be between the devil and the deep sea! However, this may fairly be said to represent also Mr. Roosevelt’s views on the future, or the “new,” order. The so-called “Atlantic Charter” signed by Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt last August at sea (one might say “Very much at sea!”) is a reaffirmation of the principles of the old ‘ capitalist order of society in which both gentlemen believe so ardently. Aside from the negative assurances, and the usual platitudes and claims of lofty purposes, the “Charter” is a declaration to the world to go back to do business at the same old stand—restoration of old boundaries, freedom of trade, regulation of labor and labor-standards, etc., etc. This “new order” is, in point of principle, as much like the capitalist system as it has operated heretofore, as one pea is like unto any other. Other representative capitalist spokesmen confirm this. Under-Secretary of State Sumner Welles delivered an important address before the National Foreign Trade convention which met in New York City on October 7, 1941, in which he made some Significant admissions from which I select the following:

“Trade [said Mr. Welles] the exchange of goods is inherently a matter of cooperation, but a glance at the past is enough to show that in the policies of nations this simple truism has been more often ignored than observed. Nations have more often than not undertaken economic discriminations and raised up trade barriers with complete disregard for the damaging effects on the trade and livelihood of other peoples, and, ironically enough, with similar disregard for the harmful resultant

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

effects upon their own export trade. They have considered foreign trade a cut-throat game in which each participant could only profit by taking undue advantage of his neighbor. Our own policy at times in the past has, as we all know, constituted no exception.

“After the last war, at a time when other countries were looking to us for help in their stupendous task of economic and social reconstruction, the United States, suddenly become the world’s greatest creditor nation and incomparably strong economically, struck heavy blows at their war-weakened, debt-burdened economic structures. The shock was heavy, morally as well as economically. The harmful effects of this policy on the trade, industry, and conditions of living of people of many other foreign countries were immediate. Our high-tariff policy reached out to virtually every corner of the earth, and brought poverty and despair to innumerable communities.

“But the effects on American importers, and on American industries dependent upon imports, were likewise immediate.”

The description of foreign trade as “a cut-throat game,” participated in by the United States, correctly describes the one outstanding cause of war. Coming from Mr. Welles, it is a damning indictment of capitalism. Let us note also carefully Mr. Welles’s accusation against the United States that it “struck heavy blows” at the war-weakened countries, and that our “high tariff policy reached out to virtually every corner of the earth, and brought poverty and despair to innumerable communities.” But these are virtually the charges brought against Hitlerism by the democracies! Are we, then, to understand Mr. Welles as saying in effect that

the destruction wrought by the armed forces of the Nazi gangsters had previously been matched by United States capitalism through economic warfare? There seems to be no doubt that that is exactly what Mr. Welles said!

Indeed, he observes that in this very economic warfare carried on by United States capitalism against the rest of the world, the Nazi and fascist gangsters found their excuse and opportunity for commencing their assault on the social fabric and the nations of the world. Asserting that the United States “helped to set in motion a whirlpool of trade-restricting measures and devices, preferences and discriminations, which quickly sucked world trade down to such low levels that standards of living everywhere were dangerously reduced,” which, he added, forced foreign countries (meaning specifically Germany) “to cut their economic cloth accordingly,” and compelling them to resort to retaliatory tariff restrictions, and to resort to “primitive barter,” etc., etc., Mr. Welles continued: “Obviously the totalitarian governments . . . seized avidly on the opportunity so afforded to *undertake political pressure* through the exercise of this form of commercial policy.” And after warning that “the period following the present war will be fully as critical for us as is the present crisis [happy prospect, indeed!],” he reaffirms his faith in the very principles which inevitably produced the particular practices that he had otherwise condemned! The competition in the open market, and all that thereby hangs, which fatedly produced the “present crisis,” is hailed by him as the basis and cornerstone of the postwar “new order”! Again we ask, as we asked in connection with the Nazi-fascist “new order”: “What is new about it?”

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

Mr. Walter Lippmann, plutogogue par excellence, is quite specific about his idea of the “new order.” Last August (August 2, 1940 he wrote in his column:

“We may say, quite soberly and without indulging in any flight of fancy, that the new American economic defense board, together with the British and Allied equivalents, constitute the nucleus of the organization of the post-war world.”

Another cheerful prospect that—and, again, what is new about it?

Old Order Gone to Seed Called “New Order.”

Early this month a group of plutocrats assembled at the palatial Hotel Waldorf-Astoria in New York under the aegis of the National Association of Manufacturers. A new president of the association was elected, one William P. Witherow, who painted a gloomy picture of the “new order” that is to emerge after the war. Denouncing, of course, the sane plan for a truly New Order, proposed by Marxists, he finds the prospect not so good for capitalism. Proposing a half dozen measures (which may be summed up as preventing waste, increasing production, and increased taxation for those in the lower brackets), he declares that if these prove not successful, it will be necessary to resort to “a system of rationing and price control for all commodities, wages, rent and services,” lest the inflation “gobble-uns” get us! And he adds: “To be successful over a long period it would require very close to complete dictatorship.”

Very close *to*? Why, the very system of rationing of prices, etc., previously outlined by Mr. Witherow, is nothing short of regulatory totalitarianism, i.e., the economic element in fascist dictatorship!

Mr. Alfred Sloan, Jr., of General Motors, on the same occasion warned his fellow-plutocrats that “Free Enterprise is at stake”—that is, that the capitalist robber system is in danger. He warned that more than 35 per cent of American business men believed that the future promised “a semi-socialized form of society with little opportunity for the profit system.” And revealing

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

frankly that the Nazi and fascist aggressors did not constitute the real problem, or greatest menace, to American capitalism, he added pointedly:

“We shall be able to deal effectively with physical aggression. But can we deal equally effectively with forces that are attacking our way of living [he means “our” way of exploiting the workers!] in a more subtle way? There is little doubt that these dangers exist, that there are far too many among us who look upon the present emergency as a ‘heaven-sent’ opportunity to alter, or at least importantly to reorganize, the American system of free enterprise.”

And he sums up his rather gloomy regurgitations by expressing the naive hope that it may be possible to “rebuild a foundation of confidence in the minds of men in the long term future.” Which is Mr. Sloan’s way of saying that he gives up—that the problem is “mutch 2 mutch” for him, as Artemus Ward would say!

Needless to say, Henry Ford also had to offer his views on a subject so close to his heart, although in the interview he gave on his 78th birthday he was altogether too vague and general. Mr. Ford’s idea of a new order is a “federated world” which (if he has his way) will be conspicuous by the absence of his pet aversions which, in the order of the degree of Mr. Ford’s feelings respecting them, are—

| | |
|--------------|----------|
| Socialism | Politics |
| Labor Unions | Bankers |
| and War. | |

Mr. Ford mentions only two of these pet aversions in the interview, “Politics and War.” On the basis of these aversions, and remembering Mr. Ford’s emphasis on a

universal currency, a universal market, and a universal economy, and his known admiration for the Nazi system coupled with his flirtings with anti-Semitism, it is not difficult to deduce that Mr. Ford's preference as to a "new order" is the corporate State a la fascism, a preference also shared by Mr. Myron C. Taylor, the ambassador extraordinary of President Roosevelt to the Vatican, and of United States Steel Trust fame. At any rate, Mr. Ford is as gloomy concerning the future outlook for mankind as is his colleague, Mr. Sloan, unless *his* plan is adopted. For, as his interviewer reported him, Mr. Ford is convinced that unless his "world federation" is established, "the present war would be only a dress rehearsal for another and more terrible conflict."

Yet another cheerful Cassandra—and all these gentlemen supposedly constituting our very best minds!

Finally, on the question of the "new order," we may briefly review one or two specimens from the brigade of columnists and special feature writers. Mr. Raymond Clapper of the Scripps-Howard syndicate some time ago wrote: "We say goodbye now to the land we have known. Like lovers about to be separated by a long journey, we sit in this hour of mellow twilight, thinking fondly of the past, wondering." Mr. Clapper may well wonder! "Regimented people. Regimented trade," he moans, and concludes on this nostalgic note: "so ends our reverie in the twilight, over the dear, dead days!"

In another column written a few weeks later, Mr. Clapper, resignedly and in a matter-of-fact way, observed that "we," that is, the United States, "are operating not under a three-headed form of government but under a Presidential government," which seems to

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

be Mr. Clapper's way of saying that a one-man dictatorship has already been established.

Still later Mr. Clapper returned to the charge. In his column of a week or so ago he took up for consideration the so-called "Union Now" plan, promoted by one Clarence Streit, who belongs to the Luce-Dorothy Thompson clique of incipient imperialists. The Streit plan is a slightly veiled imperialism, with Great Britain and the United States in supposedly peaceful partnership. Optimistically Mr. Clapper says: "We all know what we want." All right, suppose we do, but do we all want the same thing? It is obvious that we do not. At any rate, Mr. Clapper's idea of the "new order" amounts, in effect, to the old League of Nations' *proposed* "new order," with no change in principle, however the incidentals may be shuffled. For the "new order" of Mr. Clapper requires, in his own words, "military and economic power behind it," in order to make it stay put at all. Nothing new about that, is there? And, like Mr. Ford, he forecasts dire things if *his* "new order" is not adopted. For, he says, "unless we do this [i.e., adopt his idea] victory will only mark the rise of new apprehension and preparation for more war."

Cheerful and pleasant prospects, aren't they?

Crusty General Hugh ("Old Ironpants") Johnson bemoaned the fact a few months ago that the country was being driven into war, cautiously suggesting (by way of asking a question) that "our President has gathered to himself so many of the powers of government that no wish of the people can stop him," thus confirming the diagnosis of his colleague, Mr. Clapper. Johnson also agrees that this is a war of capitalism for, he says, "Economic causes are responsible for most wars," adding

that the slogan “freedom of the seas” (which he denounces as false) “fooled us into one war; now it is fooling us into another.”

The vociferous, volatile and always unpredictable Dorothy Thompson has had so many brainstorms both over the old and the new order that it would be quite impossible, and hardly profitable, to follow her. Last spring, however, she committed herself fulsomely and ardently to the visualized “new order” by Henry Luce, editor of *Time* and other profitable publications. Mr. Luce called *his* new order “The American Century,” and it was hailed by Miss Thompson as a “call to destiny.” Now, when anybody begins to talk about “our destiny,” or “our manifest destiny,” watch out—there is bound to be a budding or full-blown imperialist behind the phrase. At any rate, the dream of these two super-Americans, *their* idea of the new order, is, briefly, to raise America, i.e., American interests, to play the dominant role in the world, much as the Nazi butcher dreams of making his chosen people the supreme and dominant race and power in the world. As Miss Thompson explains it: “To Americanize enough of the world so that we shall have a climate and environment favorable to our growth is indeed a call to destiny.” It will clearly take more than one or two world wars to carry out Miss Thompson’s ambitious plan! As the editor of *The Nation* facetiously observed at the time:

“The Luce-Thompson brand of imperialism should be investigated by the Federal Trade Commission and a cease-and-desist order issued before the public mind is poisoned. This program is magnanimous and benevolent, it is large and awe-inspiring. It is also smug, self-righteous, superior, and fatuously lacking in a decent

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

regard for the susceptibilities of the rest of mankind. These particular qualities are the typical stigmata of the Anglo-Saxon in his role as imperialist.”

Miss Thompson obviously bears watching. Meanwhile, *her* “new order” is as old as the others and the theories and principles underlying it as exploded or threadbare.

Feudalism, Resurgent as “New Order.”

There is one element that has a program as definite as that of the Marxian De Leonist. That is the Ultramontane machine, the Roman Catholic hierarchy. This element definitely and unmistakably represents retrogressive. revolution in its most hideous and sinister form. However carefully it may be kept under cover in the United States, it is implicit in every utterance on the subject of post-war reconstruction. It is explicit in Leo XIII’s famous (or infamous, if you will) encyclical on, “The Condition of the Working Classes,” the *Rerum Novarum*, issued in 1891. In Leo’s celebrated opus we find outlined the perfect feudo-industrial State with the usual Ultramontane (politico-catholic) beatitudes: “Laboring and suffering must exist”; “Class must help class”; “the poor must accept their lot”; “the master must be kind to the poor”; “private property is sacred”; “the living wage,” that is, the slave’s allowance; “respect for authority”; “government derives its power from God”—i.e., from the Church—all perfect ingredients of the slave State. And there are, of course, to be found the usual falsehoods and slanders about Socialism and the Socialists.

The Roman Catholic hierarchy, however, is working feverishly to sell the capitalist rulers the program of Leo XIII which, as I intimated before, lends itself perfectly to the purposes and structure of the corporate State, or industrial feudalism. The criminal assault on Republican Spain, aided and abetted, if not instigated,

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

by the Vatican and the Ultramontane machine generally, fully reveals the hand of these reactionary medieval conspirators. More recently Marshal Petain has demonstrated his devotion to Ultramontanism and fascism alike by his promulgation of what he has called the “authoritative hierarchical social state,” or the society with fixed social stratifications, where only the “Elite” would vote. The Associated Press described it revealingly on August 21, 1941, as follows:

“PETAIN ORDERS REVIVAL OF MEDIEVAL PROVINCES

“Autonomous Local Regimes to Exercise
Full, Authority

“Vichy, Aug. 20 (AP)—Chief of State Marshal Henri Petain definitely ordered today reorganization of France along medieval provincial lines. He instructed the National Council, charged with the reorganization, to create virtually autonomous provincial regimes, ruled by governors, whose authority and prestige would be incontestable.

“His letter told the committee that the head of each province ‘will be a governor, a high personality representing the Chief of State.’ The provincial council, he said, will be a simple advisory body, and ‘in no case a political assembly.’”

The old clericalist manikin has, dared to point to Franco’s Ultramontane Spain as an ideal to be imitated or improved upon, for, in a speech delivered August 12, 1941, he warned his subjects (who were once free French men and women) that if they did not accept his reactionary plan, then “she [France] would see open up before her the abyss in which Spain of 1936 just missed being swallowed and from which she was saved only by faith, youth and sacrifice.” By “faith” Petain no doubt means the Vatican plotter, and by “youth” we are

probably to understand him to refer to “der schoene Adolf” (Hitler); and “sacrifice” we are no doubt to identify with him who sacrificed Italian manhood on the altar of Italian imperialism, “Bandito Benito” (Mussolini)! At any rate, the senile and servile instrument of Nazi gangsterism at Vichy has made unmistakably clear that his “new” order is the oldest of all—the rule of medievalism, feudo-industrial, under the supreme rulership of one man who (like the “sun-king”) can proclaim: “The State—’tis I!”

And he has made it further clear that this “Society of the Elite” will be under the general “spiritual” tutelage of theocratic Romanism, with no toleration of democratic nonsense. In his radio speech to his, subjects, the senescent “supreme ruler” made that last point abundantly clear: “Certainly,” he said, “our parliamentary democracy is dead, but it never had more than a few traits in common with the democracy of the United States.” That ought to please, the Dorothy Thompsons, who in early summer of 1940, raved about “glorious France,” about our “martyred sister democracy,” etc., etc.

And, incidentally, the Vichy tool of the Vatican and of the Nazi beast has decided to put an end to the class struggle—“Petain Expects to Put End to Class Struggle,”—is the way the headline reads in the New York *Herald Tribune* of September 23, 1941. The doddering old theocrat might also try to control the tides, forbid lightning and prevent earthquakes while he is about it! He would have just as much success. For the class struggle can only be abolished when Petainism and its brood of evil are abolished.

Stalinist “New Order” Looks Backward.

Soviet Russia, with or without the admixture of Stalinism, will, of course, be a powerful factor in determining the new order, that is, if the Axis powers are defeated, and Soviet Russia's integrity is preserved. That subject, however, is too vast for this occasion. Referring specifically to Stalinism, it may be said that its performance (apart from the heroic struggle of the Soviet army and the Russian toilers) is according to expectations. Machiavellian and unscrupulous as ever, the Stalinists everywhere now act, speak and write in direct contradiction to all that they did, said and wrote a few months ago. Among the sickening acts of hypocrisy of the Stalinists is their pretended concern for the welfare of religion and for the supposedly faithful worshippers. The *New York Times* of October 7 reported the suppression of so-called anti-religious, or Atheist, publications in Moscow. It is made clear that this was done to placate Russia's “democratic” allies, especially the United States. This action, among others, resulted in the amazing spectacle of the Archbishop of Canterbury pontificating on the “wonderful” religious development in Soviet Russia. A London despatch to the *New York Times* of October 6 states:

“Asserting that there were signs of more religious toleration in the Soviet Union, the Archbishop of Canterbury predicted today as an outcome of the war a ‘new Russia’ and a revival of the Russian people's ‘deep, ineradicable sense of religion.’”

Emphasizing his belief that “it was Britain’s battle as well as their own the Russians were fighting,” the Archbishop (as reported in direct quotation by the *New York Times* of October 7) concluded:

“And who can tell what the effect may be upon the ordering of the post-war world of closer relations between, on the one hand, *a new Russia*, united by afflictions and emancipated from errors of the past, and, on the other, the British Commonwealth and the United States.” (Italics mine.)

As we see, a “new order” is predicted for Russia also. And, far from denying such reports, Stalin and his boys and girls industriously encourage them. Anna Louise Strong, quondam S.P. columnist, in recent years the Pollyanna reporter of Stalinism to America, wrote in Seldes’s *In Fact*, October 27 issue, on “the facts about religion in Russia.” Among these “facts” we find this delicious tidbit:

“Today Young Communists [wrote Miss Strong] are not allowed even to scoff at their parents’ religion, and officials have been deposed for over-taxing or otherwise annoying groups of believers.”

This, I submit, is “religious toleration” a la Ultramontaniam, with a vengeance!

A “toleration” of religion (or of anything else) that suppresses the right of dissent or unfavorable comment is precisely the sort of toleration favored by church bodies everywhere having vested interests, and, above all, by Roman Catholicism.

Under the headline: “Stalin Invoked God’s Aid for United States at Kremlin Dinner for Officials,” *New York Times* correspondent Wallace Carroll, on November 19, reported that Joseph Stalin, proposing a toast to

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

President Roosevelt, said: “May God help him in his task,” to which all the Stalin robots in the United States no doubt reverently added: “Amen!”

Most of you, I suppose, read the statement released to the American press the other day (December 13) by Maxim Litvinoff, new Soviet Ambassador to the United States. This statement, in its general as well as specific language, is indistinguishable from those issued from time to time by other “statesmen.” Among other things, Mr. Litvinoff completely abandons the Marxist position of seeking explanations for social phenomena in economics and the materialist conception of history. The war, said Mr. Litvinoff in effect, is caused by the devil whose current name happens to be Adolf Hitler. As Mr. Litvinoff put it:

“After all, it is Hitler who is the chief culprit in all the present wars, the inspirer and moving spirit of the whole gang, *and the destruction of Hitler would mean the end of them all.*” (Italics mine.)

Note that Mr. Litvinoff specifically says “Hitler,” not “Hitlerism.” Far more realistic was an American industrialist, the president of the General Electric Company, Mr. C.E. Wilson, who earlier this year made the following interesting statement in connection with his idea of a “new order”:

“Recognition of the revolutionary character of this world conflict will also lead to a fuller realization of the fact that Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler, and the Japanese army leaders are but symbols of this movement.

“This realistic point of view [continues Mr. Wilson] also leads to the sad conclusion that should these symbols meet the disaster or the death so widely and so earnestly wished upon them, this [retrogressive]

revolutionary movement, most probably, would suffer no more than a temporary confusion, while substitute symbols were being elevated to leadership.” (New York *Times*, January 30, 1941.)

It is, indeed, a startling commentary on the Stalinist understanding and conception of social and economic forces that one of its chief official representatives should be talking like a Calvin Coolidge, while a representative of the American plutocracy talks realistically and virtually in Marxist terminology!

*

The American Stalinists have again nearly “died at the cross-roads,” like the chameleon which vainly tried to cross a Scotch plaid. It seems certain that, if once again they have to reverse completely the present line, they must surely perish, or cause a substantial increase in the population of the country’s insane asylums! The unsavory Foster has assumed the burden of explaining to the robots why the Communist party is now denying all that it affirmed a few months ago, and vice versa, and he is really making a magnificent jesuitical job of it. It must cost him “sweat, blood and tears” to do this, to borrow a phrase from Zig-Zag Foster’s British ally. The language of these cheap swindlers is in the best approved jingoistic style, vying in their efforts with the most fervent dollar patriots. In the *Daily Worker*, of December 9, the old zig-zagging chameleon rhapsodizes: “This is a just war.” A few months ago Foster denounced the war as a struggle between imperialist gangsters! And he brazenly urges “the strongest possible collaboration among all classes. . . .” Down with the

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

class struggle! Long live class collaboration!* Thus chants the unscrupulous and unprincipled Foster. But thundering down the decades come the words of Marx and Engels in crushing rebuke of the swindlers and charlatans who are leading the workers to the shambles, sacrificing them on the altar of plutocratic imperialism:

“As for ourselves,” wrote the founders of Socialism sixty-two years ago, “in view of our whole past there is only one path open to us. For almost forty years we have stressed the class struggle as the immediate driving force of history, and in particular the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat as the great lever of the modern social revolution; it is therefore impossible for us to cooperate with people who wish to expunge this class struggle from the movement. When

* In nauseating fulsomeness, in language worthy the cheapest “patriotic” ward heeler, the Communist party has since repeatedly declared its “complete loyalty” to “the American scheme of life”—that is to say, the exploitation of the workers, “schemed” by the capitalist class of the United States. As a typical example of this toadying to capitalist exploiters and politicians, as an exhibition of class collaboration typical of the rest, the case of the Communist party of Colorado may be cited, as reported in the *Daily Worker* of January 3, 1942. Replying to the Communist party’s “pledge of complete loyalty” previously received by him, Governor Ralph L. Carr, of Colorado, made the following “grateful, acknowledgment in his letter to the chairman and secretary of the Communist party of Colorado:

“It is gratifying to receive your letter of Dec. 15, announcing the loyal intentions and ideas of the Communist party of Colorado.

“I don’t understand everything I hear, and I want to say that this is the most gratifying thing which has come from your people in several years’ experience. I had been led to believe that you were not loyal to our country or to our American scheme of life. Your expression of fealty in a time such as this goes far toward dissipating that idea.

“On behalf of the people of Colorado, I want to voice our very deep appreciation for this expression, and you may convey these ideas to all of your people.

“Yours very truly,
(Signed) “RALPH L. CARR,
“Governor of Colorado”

This is a document for the record. Let it be preserved and well remembered—A.P.

the International was formed we expressly formulated the battle-cry: the emancipation of the working class must be achieved by the working class itself.”

As if to underscore his contempt of Marx and Engels, the little Stalinist Zig-Zagger continues: “Our [party] line expresses the patriotic interests of *the whole people*.” The interests of a “whole people” in a class-ruled society, as Marx somewhere observes, are ever the interests of its ruling class. From which it follows that Fuehrer Foster’s statement should have read: “Our party line expresses the ‘paytriotic’ interests of American capitalism and the whole plutocracy.”! Which is precisely what it does!

And as the Stalinists more and more brazenly embrace the philosophy and program of the plutocracy, so the Stalinist literature and newspapers more and more adopt the language and assume the appearance of the literature and the press of the plutocracy. The *Daily Worker*, for example, except for the poorer make-up and inferior literary quality, is in all essentials indistinguishable from the *New York Times*. And so forth. What a godsend to all the phonies, the “revolutionary” racketeers, and specifically the Anarcho-Stalinists, that they can play on the sunny side of the street *this* war! How comfortable it is for them to be with the ruling class majority, and to be able to shout patriotic phrases, to join generally all the patrioteers (not to mention the profiteers) in their enthusiasm for the world conflict and its bloody accompaniments! How resplendently their yellow streaks glow, how faithfully their cowardly hearts tick in unison with those of the Fords, the du Ponts, the Girdlers, the Peglers and the Hearsts! Foster, we recall, was an eager and efficient

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

war-bond salesman in 1917; he should prove an even better one now!

Socialism, the Only NEW ORDER.

And thus, engulfed in the most destructive war of all time, caught in the mighty maelstrom of conflicting interests and clashing ideas and ideals, men—wise men and fools—debate the issues of the all-transcending and all-embracing struggle, and attempt to project the future which appears to each group as the reflected image of their hopes, fears, prejudices and, above all, of their present material interests. They have all protested that they did not wish war, and with but few exceptions we may believe them, for they are in the grip of forces beyond their control. Daniel De Leon once emphasized that though capitalism means war, that although wars under capitalism are as inevitable as malaria in the poisonous swamp, yet capitalists, generally, love war no better than the rest of us. “Not all capitalists love war,” said De Leon. “Indeed,” he continued, “it may be said that those who love war are a cruder set. War, for war’s sake, is not loved by the capitalist. Where war is at all loved by him it is loved as a means to an end—profits. If profits can be obtained in equal volume without war his choice would balance even in the scale. If, however, profits can be obtained in larger volume without war, peace becomes the capitalist’s decided choice.”

*

And so the debate rages as to the sort of “new order” that shall emerge after the war, but, as we have seen, every plan suggested, except the plan and program proposed by the Socialist Labor Party, is a mere variant

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

of the old order, including the occasional talk of reviving Woodrow Wilson's bourgeois-liberal dream, the League of Nations, or an international police force, which is what in effect such a league would be. I am reminded here of Mr. Dooley's comments at the time the so-called Peace Court was instituted at The Hague. That was in the "dear dead days" when Kaiser Wilhelm and King Edward were sparring for position prior to the first world war. Mr. Dooley expressed the hope that the Peace Court would be a sort of detention prison "where they'd sind th' internaytional dhrunks an' disordhlies, an' where ye cud go Anny day an' see Willum Hohenzollern cooperin' a bar'l, and me frind Joe Chamberlain peggin' shoes. . . . I want to see th' day whin just as Bill Hohenzollern an' Edward [of England] meets on th' corner an' prepares a raid on a laundhry a big polisman will step out iv a dure an' say: 'I want ye, Bill, an' ye might as well come along quiet.' " "But," concluded Mr. Dooley ruefully, "I suppose it wud be just th' same as it is now in rale life." And when his friend asked him "How come?" Mr. Dooley replied: "All th' biggest crooks wud get on the [internaytional] polis force!"

And Mr. Dooley's reply, I think it must be admitted, covers a great deal of real territory! For, leagues or no leagues, one capitalist group will trust another just about as much as an Al Capone would trust a Dillinger!

However, we are in the steadily deepening shadows of the war, and at the parting of the ways. *This is Goetterdaemmerung*, the twilight of the gods; this is *Ragnaroeek*, the occasion when the present settles its accounts with the past, and makes its compact with the future. This is the historic moment when civilization totters on the brink of destruction, and the fate of

generations to come hangs in the balance. This is an hour to sober the flightiest mentalities, this is the hour for steadying the wavering hand, and for strengthening a hundredfold the strong, the clear-visioned, the purposeful and the determined. This is the zero-point when all the past may become a minus, or all the future a potent and glorious plus.

This is the time for hard thinking, for soul-searching, and for planning as only thoughtful and informed men and women can plan. It is time to take counsel together as never before. For if for the moment the voice of reason may be muted, or silenced altogether, this will not be for long. After a little while men will again begin to ask the ever-persistent "Why?" and presently the moment arrives when the answer and the explanation must be given. The Socialist Labor Party has the answer—the *only* answer that can satisfy the demands of this momentous historic hour, the only answer that fulfills the needs and requirements of mankind—the only substantiality that will fill the empty void in the lives of the men and women of this generation, the gold that alone can redeem the pledge of the past. And when we of the Socialist Labor Party speak of the new order, we mean the NEW ORDER.

As the fledgling bird casts away the shell which first protected and sheltered it, but presently entrammeled it, and threatened to stifle it, so we propose to cast away entirely the shell of the old capitalist society (protective and necessary as it once was), in order that our New Order may emerge untrammeled, able to move and normally to exercise its organs and faculties. There can be no compromise with the past, for that way lie darkness and death.

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW

And what *is* our New Order? It is a commonwealth of integrated industry, wherein the necessary work is done by the able-bodied, banded together as useful workers in the commonly owned, integrated industries; where work has largely become play, and the workshop a cheerful and airy laboratory; where hours of labor have been reduced to the minimum of a few per day, and less than half the present annual labor days; where the fruits of our productive play shall enable all to enjoy plenty, with none suffering want who wish to do a proportionate share of the collective efforts; where the sick, the very young and the aged shall be cared for—and none of these things out of “sweet charity,” but out of human and humane regard for the sick, out of enlightened selfishness and love for the very young, and out of that gratitude and reverence which the aged shall have earned after a lifetime of useful endeavor.

It is that New Order wherein internecine strife shall have become at most an evil memory, and even that eventually to be wiped from the mind of the race. Our New Order is the commonwealth wherein men and women labor together without strain and in complete harmony and good fellowship, organized in Industrial Unions, each shop or union constituting the electoral unit whence all power will flow, controllingly and without sundering, to all the parts of the commonwealth, even to the topmost unit in our New Order, the Industrial Union Republic of Labor. The commonwealth wherein there is no master and hence no slave, but where all are partners in that grand enterprise called Life—social and industrial life and individual life, in dignity and self-respect, and mutual regard and forbearance.

ARNOLD PETERSEN

And this, comrades and friends, is no idle or utopian dream, for the elements of which it shall consist lie about us, all within easy reach, needing but our enlightened and sustained efforts to effect coalescence and integration. And when the wreckers of the old order shall have completed their destructive work—as complete it some day they will and must—we, the builders, the workers, shall resume and bring the construction of the New Order to a glorious finish. And to the workers we say, in the words of Walt Whitman:

“You shall no longer take things
at second or third hand,
nor look through the eyes of the dead,
nor feed on the spectres in books.”

Yes, even as the seasons change, winter at length yielding to spring, so the winter of man’s existence on this planet shall at long last yield to the spring and summer of the gentler, the higher social life. “The old order changeth, yielding to the new,” said the poet Tennyson. And that new order, *our* New Order, is Socialism, the only hope of humanity, the solvent of all our social and economic problems. For Socialism, in the immortal and inspiring words of Daniel De Leon—

“Socialism, with the light it casts around and within man, alone can cope with these problems. Like the sea that takes up in its bosom and dissolves the innumerable elements poured into it from innumerable rivers, to Socialism is the task reserved of solving one and all the problems that have come floating down the streams of time, and that have kept man in internecine strife with man.”

POSTLUDE.

Dark and dismal as the immediate future must appear to most of us, there are rays of hope and encouragement aplenty. We know that it is impossible to go back to the *status quo*. That leaves but two alternatives: Slavery, economic serfdom, for the masses under a system of absolutism—call it fascism, Nazism, or industrial feudalism, it is all one. The other alternative is Socialism, and freedom in affluence for all. That we may lapse into industrial feudalism is not impossible. And in saying this we speak soberly. But, on the other hand, whenever in the past the world slipped back into a darker and more cruel period, there was always a sound reason for it: The fact of scarcity in the things needed to sustain and develop a civilized existence with equal opportunities for all to enjoy the good life. *This is an irrefutable fact, and a fact of basic importance.* Neither in natural nor in social evolution do things happen capriciously, nor in a way that for any considerable length of time is contrary to the logic of things—contrary to the nature of things themselves. *This we know.* In society, as in nature, things have a way of seeking their own level, irresistibly and with overwhelming force, whatever may be the current and transitory obstacles. Moreover, man is no longer without conscious direction in social evolution. Man can, and generally *does*, take evolution by the hand and says: Along thy normal course I follow thee; and though there be artificial forces seeking to deflect thy course into byways, or backwards, I shall resist and follow thee

whithersoever thou leadest!

All history attests that thus are the processes of history worked out. The glory that was Greece, and the grandeur that was 'Rome, did not perish because of the evil designs of wicked and selfish men. They perished because the economic basis was lacking to push society further along those particular lines. The promise of the French Revolution was not violated because there arose fanatic dreamers on the one hand, or a Napoleonic man on horseback on the other hand. That promise was not fulfilled because as yet the material possibilities for the abundant life were absent. *We face no such situation today.* To imagine such an aftermath to the present social ferment and (as yet) incipient revolutionary upheavals, one has to imagine that mankind will perversely shut its eyes forever to palpable facts; that deliberately the mass of humanity will choose slavery and poverty, *and go out of its way energetically to frustrate the designs of social evolution.* Granted that sometimes it does seem as if that is precisely what humanity does, we know better, of course. Whatever momentary conquests the forces of reaction, the apostles of darkness, may make, they are of such a nature that they cannot possibly for long, not to say permanently, be consolidated. They bear within them the seeds of disintegration even if the workers should at first fail to organize and take over the management and direction of social and economic affairs.—*Arnold Petersen.*