

### A NEW FACTOR OF SOLIDARITY

When we say that the world has become smaller, we don't think merely that an airplane can now transport us the same distance in a day as a ship would years ago in a week; that devices of modern technique cuts down the distance of space. The different parts of the world have come closer together as a consequence of similar interests, be they economical, political or social. In former times, the unity of different countries came about as a result of political force. Victorious wars seemed necessary in order that a broader unity of states would be achieved. We could not refer to this as voluntary unity. The unity survived as long as there was the central force of authority. This means of establishing unity became of little importance in the last century. Our times ushered in another idea, which does not rely on force but on co-operation, motivated by common interests. The first attempt to implement the new idea, which took the form of the League of Nations, was not so successful. But we may ask: What enterprise of such a large scale as this organization was ever known to succeed in the first attempt?

The policy of the United Nations is worthy of grave consideration because it fits into the evolution of human society. It is important because it evolved as a natural development supplanting the policy of achieving unity by force. It is not really an olive branch grafted on an old pine tree. We notice that the world of today has the tendency to capitalize on all the opportunities which the modern civilization offers it. The romantic will regret that variety is disappearing among nations and uniformity is appearing. When we speak of uniformity we don't mean only that the natives of Africa play football with such vigor and zeal as we, or that somewhere in Java boys who wait for the cowboy films wear the same cowboy suits as their pals in Texas. The uniformity we have in mind is not so superficial. It does not mean merely that people start to wear the same style of shoes, but that they begin to realize their common interests. The interests of today's human society are interdependent. The grain crops of Argentina reflect on the market at Amsterdam; all peoples are concerned about the incidents on the north border of Burma. With these common interests comes a certain solidarity of interests.



In America the connection between the producer and consumer is readily understood. The producer needs the consumer and the former has to try to influence and activate the latter. This results in a demand for higher wages to allow increased buying power with the consequence of increased demand and therefore higher production. We can see a similar tendency on the international level. After the end of World War II, there was organized the UNRRA, which helped with success to overcome the immediate needs of the war countries. Its motive was not exactly philanthropic. It was rather the feeling of solidarity, the feeling that the well-being of the world could only be the result of the well-being of all countries. Was not the Marshall Plan perhaps the best example of how this idea is spreading? This changing attitude would seem to mark the end of the old imperialism. Whereas it used to be regarded as a good policy to keep our enemy under the water as long as possible, today America is giving millions of dollars to help the conquered enemy rehabilitate. And this again is not a philanthropic idea but simply the feeling that the best insurance of well-being of one country is the common well-being. Also, the same applies with regard to the assisting of backward countries—to help them so they can learn modern technical methods which contribute to the betterment of their lot. People begin to realize that it would be inconsiderate for people in India to be starving when agriculture could be modernized so that better production would result.

This same tendency is evident in Europe as well. The time when boats sailed from Dutch, English or Spanish ports for foreign lands and returned with cargoes on which the sweat and blood of native was expended is long since passed. Today these vessels only serve for common and just exchange of products. This international exploitation has passed and is as unpopular as slavery. It is just not to be tolerated in today's world. Therefore what is going on behind the Iron Curtain is anachronism. Freight cars which bear the products of the Eastern countries to the "homeland" have a striking similarity to those vessels of the sturdy, sea-roving merchants of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This practice of Russia is backward and primitive. For such a system there is no place in our modern human society. Tanks and guns can only stop the march of armies. But not even the most perfect war weapon has succeeded in stopping, even for a second, the march of time.

—Kristina Moysiyakha '53.