

it is to place him. He belongs to the intellectual demi-monde of late nineteenth-century European liberalism. He is one of those 'clever devils' whose advent the Duke of Wellington, with his acidulated eighteenth-century commonsense, foretold. Stalin, it is clear, represents something more permanent, as old as the Arabian Nights and as modern as Tammany Hall. Behind that enigmatic face the Caliph of all the Faithful and the party boss of the Age of the Common Man have joined forces to destroy the 'rotten West' and the Latin tradition, and to enforce the undisputed empire of a Third Rome which owes nothing to Constantine. Not that he has anything essentially different to offer what is left of Europe. In a decaying culture the new masters come first from the provinces and then from the outer lands on the periphery. The Caucasian, as might have been expected, has proved more forcible than the 'clever devil' with his West Russian, Hebrew background.

That pickaxe was the inevitable conclusion; but to Trotsky it seems to have come as a surprise. And it is this which gives its ultimate and fascinating interest to Trotsky's book.

T. CHARLES EDWARDS

LA RUSSIE SOVIETIQUE. (Editions Univers, Lille; frs. 260.)

The full title of this 'cahier de culture comparée pour un humanisme sans frontières' is *La Russie Soviétique à la recherche de l'homme nouveau*, and short of a long article it can hardly be reviewed otherwise than by giving a brief note of its contents. Soviet literature, theatre, cinema, painting and education are examined, with all the apparatus of *dossiers*, documentation and bibliography, and all the thoroughness, that we now expect from contemporary French popular research (Cinema, for example, is looked at under the headings *Climat, Technique et orientation, Mystique*). There is an essay on the 'fundamental problem', i.e. the philosophy of the new man, a 'profile' of Arthur Koestler, book reviews, and illustrations (some of them poorly reproduced). The index of Russian authors cited runs to nearly 150 names.

Over-simplified views of the U.S.S.R., whether *pro* or *con*, are as dangerous as they are widespread. Such works as this *cahier* undermine such simplifications among the more lettered. It is written by various hands, notably by the professor of French literature at the Catholic University of Lille, Bernard Amoudru.

D. A.

FORCED LABOUR IN SOVIET RUSSIA. By David J. Dallin and Boris I. Micholaevsky. (Hollis & Carter; 25s.)

The existence of an efficient, highly developed and widely spread system of slavery in Russia has long been a matter of common knowledge to students of politics. So far as the man in the street is concerned it is only comparatively recently that any knowledge

of the matter has come his way. The publication of this book presumably marks the moment when this state of affairs will come to an end. The truth, or at any rate the main facts, about the Russian labour camps cannot now be hidden. As the *Manchester Guardian* put it in a leading article: 'Yet the total impression is so convincing that an impartial reader is forced to conclude that if only half is true it still remains a damning account of an inhuman system'.

The book is divided into fourteen chapters and into two parts. Part I deals with the Corrective Labour Camps, Eye-Witnesses' Reports, Milder Forms of Forced Labour, The Number of Camps and Prisoners. The Essence for Forced Labour and the Arctic Camps. Part II traces the origin and development of the system up to the present day. There are some admirable maps and diagrams and a good bibliography.

The book should be read in conjunction with Pius XI's *Divini Redemptoris* and also with Dostoïeffsky's famous novel *The House of the Dead*: these will give perspective and balance. It must be emphasised that we in Western Europe are in no position to read this book at our intellectual and moral ease. Marxian Communism originated and was incubated not in Tartary and Siberia but in the brutal and self-confident commercialism of nineteenth century industrialism. This is a book which no student of contemporary politics can afford to leave unread.

T. CHARLES EDWARDS

PROPRIETE ET COMMUNAUTES. By Lebret and others. 2nd Edition. (Editions Economie et Humanisme, Paris; 200 fr.)

Slowly and gingerly, in the footsteps of the Jarrow hunger-marchers or through the more learned pages of the Barlow Report, the idea of stable communities has been creeping back into favour over the last fifteen or twenty years. The policy of driving workers from Wales or Scotland to the shapeless new towns of the south, though still acceptable to an occasional liberal economist, is for practical purposes as dead as Queen Anne. The herding of two-fifths of the population into million-cities where everything conspires (outside the slums) to discourage family life and the growth of social roots is today universally condemned. And the Town and Country Planning Act has recently marked one more stage on the road back to community and civilisation.

But, while stability for the community is coming back in this way, stability for the individual family within the community—the stability of the family not merely assured of a stable living, but planted in its own house or on its own corner of land and among its own neighbours—has actually tended to diminish. The housing experts talk of mobility from house to house within a district as the size of a family alters. The planning legislators have done their worst to turn freeholders into a disappearing race and to plant in Crawley