**Japan and hence authorized by this country's occupation authorities.**

The Japanese trade with China in 1950 was about six times the previous year's volume. . . .

Great Britain's direct trade with China is much less than that of this country, about one-third as large.

Most of this trade with China was, of course, in so-called non-strategic items, although it is hard to differentiate between "strategic" and "non-strategic" in these days of total economic war.

Through Hong Kong, on the other hand, have flowed goods whose military usefulness could not be questioned — vehicles, machinery, chemicals, steel sheets, scrap steel and angle-bars.

**However, we seem to have been equally as lax as the British in this respect, for we have been shipping Hong Kong more goods than they in recent months — $107,000,000 worth last year, compared to British shipments of $70,000,000.**

Of these British shipments, $36,000,000 were in machinery; chemicals and vehicles. In these categories shipments were about $20,000,000 from the United States.

Hong Kong of course, is nothing but a trading center, and to profess surprise at seeing goods shipped there turn up later in Chinese hands is nothing if not naive...

The truth, of course, is that it is almost impossible to stop trading with another nation, short of naval blockade, which, in international law, is considered an act of war.

JOHN HARRIMAN
Financial Editor, "Boston Globe"

May 14, 1951.

## On Religious Broadcasts

■ Cont. from page 11

(5) That Heaven, Hell and Purgotory are IDEAS too, and nothing else.

Happily, Heaven — with its paraphernalia of golden gates, pearly staircases, hallelujah choruses, angels, saints, and ruling class of spiritual kings, cardinals and bloated capitalists — is just a palace of dreams.

(6) That there is no future life in cloudland, or anywhere else, after death. Nature and the atomic bomb permitting, the human species is immortal only in the sense that it survives the death of the individual. But there is no immortality, or eternal life in a celestial paradise.

(7) That prayer — to an IDEA, to a god who is simply a product of the intellect, — is a futile business, a waste of time.

(8) That the purpose of present-day religions, is to induce the propertyless international working class to accept, without protest, a life of poverty, misery and economic insecurity — and the prospect of untimely death in imperialistic wars — for the promise of a happy hereafter.

(9) That the great SIN in existing capitalist society — which the clergy never mention — is not dancing, or smoking, or necking in the park, or downing a pot of beer but private ownership (by a master, capitalist class) of the means and instruments of producing wealth and the consequent poverty of the propertyless.

(10) That Church and State are buttresses, defenders and expressions of modern industrial capitalism.

(11) That since there's nothing for you, fellow workers, but the fustiness and the silence of the tomb forever and ever when you are dead, it's time (while you are alive) to do your utmost to make this world a better place to live in.

What can you do? Refuse to be driven crazy by the drivel of professional psalm-snivellers and bible-bangers. Enjoy yourselves to the full, but for humanity's sake — and your own — strive for the abolition of capitalism, with its wage-slavery, class rule, bloody wars and suffering. To get rid of effects, you must get rid of the causes. Have done with useless reforms. Let your goal be SOCIALISM — the COMMON ownership of the means of living, and the democratic distribution of wealth for the benefit of society as a whole.

TOILER



# Toynbee vs. History

An expert in any scientific area is an interesting person. We like to watch him and see what he does. In some branches of science he is more than just interesting. He is instructive, and supplies us with strange but reliable data concerning his special duty.

In chemistry and physics the expert is a dependable guide to correct understanding. He deals with atoms and molecules, with gases, liquids, and solids. He separates their component parts or synthesizes them into a harmonious aggregate with care and precision. His work is necessary and useful from a social standpoint.

In the realm of history we would surely expect that something similar in the way of social value would result from the labors of the expert. The subject is susceptible to scientific analysis. It constitutes a dimension of thought that has its genesis in the most primitive tribes, and its termination in modern civilized society. This awareness of our relationship to the past, present, and future status of the human race is the plan and purpose of the human story.

Yet, regardless of what we might expect, it must be conceded that the results have not been commensurate with the expectations. Even the expert whose conclusions we examine in this essay has supplied us with all too little light on an all too dark subject.

Professor Arnold S. Toynbee, Director of England's Royal Institute of International Affairs, assumed a big task, and promised big returns when he attempted to unify the collected data concerning the story of peoples in all ages and areas, discovering features common to all of them, and formulating a theory of universal application to explain their movement and meaning.

The promise was big but the fulfillment disappointingly small. Toynbee, in several instances, leads us to conclude that he has discovered a dynamic factor capable of making sense out of historical development, only to lose sight of what he was going to do, and end up in another circle. Sometimes he seems to be on the verge of supplying proof that both individuals and societies are extensions of each other, and act and react in such a way as to indicate that there is a rational dialectical movement in the historical process. But again we are let down. The great man emerges once more as the most potent factor.

Instead of collecting the available historical data, and developing a theory out of the material at hand, Toynbee reverses the process, formulating his theory and then arranging ancient societies to make them fit the theory. It would be inconceivable to find a professor of chemistry or physics foolish enough to attempt such procedure.

In his approach to the study of civilized societies, Toynbee relies heavily on what had already been done in ethnology and anthropology. Much had been accomplished in those fields. Morgan in the past century, and Briffault in the present having given us valuable data to explain not only how primitive peoples lived, but also the reasons for social growth.

Toynbee accepts the classical anthropologists, who do their utmost to avoid factors that make for change. This attitude prevents understanding. It is all very nice to know the cultural patterns of society in the time of the early Greeks and Egyptians or, on our own side, in the Aztec, Mayan, and Inca civilizations. But such a study provides no basis for connecting links between those social systems and our own without finding a common dynamic factor that applied to all.

That the process of transition was through "Apparentation — Affiliation" is of course a theory, and as such it may be successfully twisted into performing the service of revealing the changing aspects of ancient cultures. But how does it function