

## THE STRIKE: WAR OR FESTIVAL?

Paris. The Place de Grève<sup>1</sup> is teeming with the city's idle seeking relief from their boredom. Street-singers, story-tellers and showmen are encircled by groups of people in varying moods—some sullen, others eager, some distracted, others attentive. Sweets vendors, mercers and lampoonists attract customers by their words and gestures. A little apart from the crowd, men with grave faces seem to be waiting for something: they are the unemployed, keeping an eye out for a possible hirer. On some days a drumroll precedes several men-at-arms escorting a condemned man and his executioner to the place of execution; the festive atmosphere turns suddenly somber, the crowd becomes silent. If scattered jeers and taunts are heard, more often than not it is just to relieve the tension.

The Place de Grève gave its name to the French word for strike, *grève*. And perhaps something still remains of the liveliness of that gathering-place in today's strikes. The Spanish word for strike, *huelga*, is near to *juerga*, Spanish for amusement or diversion. The English "strike," the German *streik*, the Italian *sciopero*, all connote fighting, an exchange of blows. The words themselves thus suggest that a strike may be both militant and festive.

<sup>1</sup> The Place de l'Hôtel de Ville now occupies the site of the Place de Grève. Translated by Jeanne Ferguson.

## *The Strike: War or Festival?*

### WHAT IS A STRIKE?

In the larger sense a strike is the expression of conflict born of tensions between workers and the structure within which they work. This expression is multiform: a complete inventory would be impossible, but some of its aspects may be given. In the narrowest sense of the term, a strike is the cessation of work by employees who insist upon satisfaction of demands unobtainable by any other means. This definition naturally implies that there is employer as well as employee. It would be difficult to imagine a strike in a self-run cooperative. The word "employer" must also be understood in a broad sense. In nationalized enterprises or in the civil service, the employer is the State. Theoretically, therefore, strikes are not confined to the capitalistic system, since they may occur in different types of political systems.

In broad outline, a strike is one phase of a dispute: a precise demand (or a vague discontent crystallized into a precise demand on an easily-stated point, such as a raise in pay, where the discontent is expressed in monetary terms) is refused by the employer, here used in the broad sense of the term. A strike may then force a negotiation and it will generally end there: thus the formula, negotiation—strike—negotiation. But a strike may also be called when the employer refuses the initial negotiation or when the distance between employer and employee is so great that a bargaining agent is hard to find. Then the strike becomes an appeal to the highest echelons to show that the problem is acute enough for the employees to have recourse to it.

Here, the notion of a strike can be extended to others than salaried employees, such as doctors or tradesmen, who do not always have precise motives for striking but in general wish to express a profound discontent. This kind of strike is an appeal to the government and to the public, to attract attention.

Before turning to a discussion of strikes in the Western world, we would like to explain why we limit ourselves to that area. Strikes do, in fact, exist elsewhere, in the developing countries and in socialist countries, but they take a different form.

In socialist countries, with State capitalism, the State directly controls the means of production. The strike, a means of pressure used by workers on those who direct them, becomes rebellion against the State. It is thus a matter of extreme gravity and usually corresponds to an acute political crisis which is resolved either by crushing the strike movement or by a political shakeup and perhaps a partial satisfaction of the workers' demands. Such strikes are necessarily rare. What little information is available as to their cause and development, and the uncertainty as to how much of the cause is purely economic, does not facilitate analysis. Carried to the limit, the strike becomes a crime or an uprising and disappears.

In a country governed by its citizens a strike is unimaginable. The majority opinion would impose either a continuation of work or a change in management. There, too, work stoppage corresponds only to political exigency: politics take precedence over the economy.

The work stoppages of the Chinese cultural revolution were due to the need of the masses to transmit a revolutionary message which was more important than the realization of economic goals. The message was, in fact, the reconciliation of the workers and their work structure: no longer to work for a proprietor but for themselves, not as individuals but as components of the people.

The determining force of doctrine in China, the influence of the party cadres in Eastern Europe and collective or State pressure tend to make impossible any conflict between the individual and his necessity to work. Or at least these render the expression of this conflict impossible by enclosing the individual in a framework of logical argument, flawlessly constructed, so that his rebellion would contradict his own logic and therefore his reasoning.

Could we call "strike" the reluctance to work which leads to absenteeism, carelessness, indifference to quality, underproduction, which are found in one or another of the socialist countries and which could be interpreted as a latent form of the strike, a rejection of the imposed order?

In the vast Third World the strike exists in all possible

forms. In countries having a relatively high standard of living, strikes in the Western sense of the word may or may not occur, depending on whether the economy is capitalist rather than socialist and whether political power is democratic rather than authoritarian. In the most disadvantaged countries strikes involve only a small fraction of the population: economies which are for the most part rural or nomad have few salaried employees. The misery of the unskilled urban worker is such that he grasps at any rare opportunity to earn a living. In order to strike, he would need at least some kind of status, to be part of some structure, to have something to lose, to have some weight on the economy and the State. The same could be said of the peasants or nomads who live in subsistence economies: a strike would make no sense to them. On the other hand, in addition to State administrative structures, modern industry may exist in certain underdeveloped countries. But without exception the strike is not an effective weapon when strikers have little protection: it is too tempting to dip into the unemployed labor reserve to replace the workers who are out. However, when the political system permits, highly skilled workers may decide to strike, because such workmen are rare, and their very skill permits them to block production.

Certain general strikes also take a political turn and are actually a form of revolt, or indeed revolution, when they are used by high official or administrative functionaries and when these carry along with them the entire salaried population, swollen by the unemployed who find in these mass demonstrations an opportunity to show their numbers.

These remarks permit a better understanding of why what we want to say about strikes applies mainly to Western countries. A certain amount of political tolerance is necessary. The law, and sometimes the constitution, makes provisions for and regulates strikes, fixing their norms and limits. Strikes are legal and accepted by all. Even when the regulations are not respected (striking without prior notice) or laws are broken (sequestration, appropriation of stocks or tools), legal action rarely follows. On the contrary, complex and thorough regulations permit working to rule strikes which block the functioning of the more rulebound

administrations (customs, for example). At the same time, this kind of strike reveals the arbitrariness of government organizations which insist upon equality before the law: in order that the largest possible number of individual cases be covered, the rules are so numerous that it is no longer possible to apply them to the letter. The spirit alone remains and interpretation is left to the discretion of those who interpret the rules.

There must also be a general consensus, an awakening—often slow, very slow—to an awareness of the hardships in working and living conditions and remuneration endured by some workers. The immigrant workers' strikes, the strikes of those who do the "dirty work," are often viewed as justified. More conclusively, the shutdown of certain factories brings with it conflicts in which justice seems to be on the side of the laid-off workers. Hunger strikes, slow attempts at suicide, serve to draw the public's attention to a particular problem, which is often the result of conflict between law and charity. In contrast to these, the strike of the Air France pilots seems unjustified. And public opinion does not err there: it approves the strikes it deems just and condemns the others, total approval or total condemnation being, of course, a matter of degree.

Finally, a distinction may be made between strikes according to whether they affect public or administrative services, State monopolies or private enterprises. In the case of private enterprise, a further distinction must be made between wage earners' strikes and those of the "independents" (doctors and tradesmen, for example). The development of the strike, the strikers' concept of it and the public's concept, clearly differ from one case to another. A strike by employees of a private company retains its human dimension for a longer time. The strikers' interlocutor has power and is directly affected by the outcome of the strike. Furthermore, the dispute is limited to two parties, the employer and the employees. In the case of public services, one of the parties, the State, though represented by men, is a much more abstract entity. In addition, there is a third party to the conflict: the public which must suffer the consequences of the strike.

"A strike is only a last resort, an extreme means of protest and demand... a strike is thus always, in a way, a breaking-off,

### *The Strike: War or Festival?*

the sign of a breakdown in communication... inversely, it is itself a means of communication.”<sup>2</sup>

“I don’t think you can imagine the indescribable joy and sense of deliverance the strikers’ movement brought me. Whatever the consequences, they cannot erase the joy and fraternity of those wonderful days nor the relief the workers felt to see their dominators yield for once.”<sup>3</sup>

These two quotations serve rather well to illustrate the two partial definitions that can be given for strike: the institutional aspect and the “happening,” the warlike aspect and the festive, the legal aspect and the revolutionary. No strike can be limited to just one of these definitions: each component is more or less present in all strikes. Because of existing legislative structures, no strike is completely free of the institutional aspect. Likewise, since a strike is a conflict, there is always the revolutionary aspect, in the sense of defiance of established order. We will attempt to describe what makes a strike at times akin to a conflict and at other times akin to a festive occasion, keeping in mind that this is a schematic coverage, and that no strike is completely contained in either aspect but is a blend of the elements of both. During its evolution a strike may pass from one to the other of the general patterns just as the conditions of the moment place it more in one than in the other.

#### THE STRIKE AS WAR

Western Europe, Japan (since World War II) and the United States (since Korea) have not been engaged in an armed conflict which would threaten their survival. If we include Korea and not Viet Nam, it is because of the former’s importance with regard to the number of men involved and the unanimous accord of the national conscience on that occasion. As the years pass, the Western world, to which we limit ourselves for the moment, does not anticipate, whether rightly or wrongly, an armed conflict on its own soil which would endanger its existence, its ideology or its way of life.

<sup>2</sup> *Rapport Sudreau*, p. 188.

<sup>3</sup> Simone Weil, *La Condition Ouvrière*, p. 215.

The polemics surrounding the armed forces, defense, alliances, are of little interest to anyone except specialists or those directly concerned. The public at large is unaware of these problems or is indifferent to them. On the other hand, conflicts arising from work, polemics concerning capitalism, economic questions, have become of primary interest to the public, because these are problems directly affecting each member of society.

Even before the crisis of 1973-74, the economic view of life took precedence over the ideological and religious aspects which underlie thinking and are reinterpreted in the light of reflections on economy. The tensions born of war are transferred to the world of labor. They lose in intensity because of the plurality and nature of the new objectives; they gain because of their immediacy and because of personal involvement, which is not just physical but also ideological. An individual cannot exclude himself from a war, through it may be repugnant to him, whereas he may have his own opinions on economic affairs, hold to them and act accordingly. Normally channeled by State structures, these tensions are weakened by the satisfactions that come with a rise in the standard of living: labor unions also concentrate, contain and organize these dispersed latent forces.

Whenever the tensions, whatever their origin, become too strong, conflict ensues. And conflict, in the Western countries today, usually takes the form of strikes.

Even when economic motives play a more or less preponderant role in the outbreak of wars, mobilization is speedily justified in a more noble way. Economic motives are immediately disguised as ideological motives. The energy consumed and the unlimited waste always make modern war economically nonsensical, as has been observed by Auguste Comte, for whom war no longer had a function in industrialized societies.

Certain aspects of strikes could lead to the same conclusion. Strikes are expensive, more so for the employees than for their employers. However, modern war could not reach such paroxysms were it not that desire for power and the force of ideology sweep away every obstacle, beginning with the immediate welfare of the people involved.

On the contrary, the first objective of a strike is an immediate improvement, especially material, for even working con-

### *The Strike: War or Festival?*

ditions can in the end be translated into economic terms. But as soon as there is conflict, there is recourse to pressure, and this has its price. A strike is a conflict which breaks out after other means have been employed for reconciling the different points of view (conciliation, discussion, etc.). The announcement of a strike is made like a declaration of war. It often happens that before the actual strike is called, a warning strike will show the determination of the employees to support the negotiations in progress, in much the same way as there may be a show of military strength before the outbreak of an armed conflict.

When a strike becomes inevitable, and before it is actually called, a war chest may be established, usually made up of contributions to the labor unions. But the workers and their families may also prepare themselves for a strike by putting money aside not only for the family's living expenses but also for the battle: film showings, delegates' traveling expenses. A veritable budget is set up to get ready to support the action.

Strikes and wars are conflicts in which the stakes are new gains or the recognition of rights, beginning with the right to exist. There are both offensive and defensive strikes. These stakes must be sufficiently understood by the involved parties that they will be ready to sacrifice an immediate gain for a better future one. In the present synopsis, the strike-as-war, the objective is always defined: like the ultimatum which triggers off hostilities, a list of demands precisely states the objectives of the strike. Both wars and strikes are governed by rules, though they may often be broken. The parties limit the scope of the operation, and some weapons are kept in abeyance. Limited wars have precise aims: this may also be true of a purely economic strike called to gain a determined advantage, a strike based on a reformist ideology which does not envisage the destruction of the enemy. On the other hand, the revolutionary strike, which is a stage in the overthrow of capitalism, is kin to an all-out war demanding unconditional surrender.

Within this pattern, a strike calls for a strengthening of the strikers' discipline. The hierarchy, usually of the labor union, sees its authority increase. Its decisions are not questioned, secret balloting is forbidden, unanimous agreement is sought and a



strike leader ends up being the sole decision maker, a sort of general surrounded by his staff.

This discipline is reinforced when there is repression of the strikers' demonstrations by the police or when some workers do not join the strike and confrontation occurs between the non-strikers who want to enter the plant and those (the picketers) who try to keep them out. The picketers thus are similar to men on guard duty, sentinels posted at the gates to enforce orders.

The strike leader's position changes, on the other hand, when the strike is over, much as a commander-in-chief relinquishes his position to civil authorities after a war. Indeed, for a strike to break out there must be a broad consensus of opinion among the potential strikers. On the other hand, as the strike goes on, lassitude leads to defections. The leaders must then take a tougher stand to galvanize their men, complicating the concluding negotiations, or they must back down on their demands so that the strike may end.

During the last twenty years the average length of strikes has become shorter in terms of strike days per number of workers. This may be due to the fact that a long strike is difficult to end and that, more efficiently managed, a strike today appears to be more a show of strength than a struggle.

Left behind by their followers or deserted by them, strike leaders find themselves alone, and they often have as much difficulty in obtaining satisfaction of the strikers' demands as they have in getting their constituents to agree on the results obtained. These difficulties arise from the rapid changes in the state of mind of the strikers. The outbreak of a strike is accompanied by a hostility toward the employer which may go as far as hate.

These strong feelings, aside from the fact that they may bring with them not only verbal but physical violence, lead to a straining of energies and a die-hard attitude. A "striker's asceticism" often appears, affecting also the strikers' families, who endure hardship and lend support, since they, too, are concerned in the outcome of the struggle.

The foregoing synopsis is especially applicable to strikes occurring in the weaker sectors of the economy where, looming beyond the demands for immediate salary adjustments is despair over an uncertain future, dimly perceived and insecure because

### *The Strike: War or Festival?*

the industry or activity in question no longer corresponds to the inevitable needs of future years, or at least is seen in that light (miners', textile or clothing workers' strikes). The employers, themselves paralyzed by tradition on one hand and unable to project long-range growth for their enterprises on the other, become so much the more severe.

#### THE STRIKE AS A FESTIVE OCCASION

One may ask with Serge Bosc<sup>4</sup> "if the forms of expression seen in some disputes really reflect the stated objective, if they do not rather signal another dimension of the strike, a somewhat symbolic dimension, a strike as an interruption of routine and relatively free of demands. In which case, the type of organization would be split between a functional purpose and a game which is an end in itself—strike for strike's sake." It is this festive aspect which we find present in many of today's strikes, to the point where a more up-to-date pattern could be that of the strike as substitute for a festive occasion.

In any society living according to a given order, daily pressures impose sacrifices which must be made, willingly or not. In all times and in all countries daily routine has been upset by a holiday, a festival. Saturnalia, *fête des fous*, carnival, official or spontaneous holidays, the daily monotony is forgotten, anxiety for the future disappears, in favor of the immediate satisfaction of appetites: hierarchy is set aside. Aïd Kebir, in Islam, remains this outburst of joy which is expressed in the eating of the sacrificial sheep, bolted down in a few days even though and especially because there is little meat to be had the rest of the year. And the Aïd is still celebrated, because religious sentiment in Islam is still strong, whereas in the Christian West religious or patriotic holidays are disappearing due to indifference toward religion and lukewarm patriotism. These holidays have become occasions for spending without counting the cost, even though the rest of the year may have to be lived in austerity. And yet today's way of life, on the one hand, and a high degree of tension

<sup>4</sup> *Démocratie et consensus dans les grèves*, Editions du Seuil.

on the other, have greatly diminished the liberating effects of a true festive occasion.

The way we live today is a principal cause: the individual's withdrawal into himself or at best into a family circle reduced to a couple with small children—the rest of the clan is scattered, working-age children have left the family domicile and gone far off to find work, grandparents are separated from their descendants. Population growth and rapid urbanization have led to the proliferation of dormitory cities from which people try to escape for vacations or even for weekends. Television has become a permanent fixture and the most common means of distraction. All these are factors opposed to the opportunities for festivity as they were known to earlier generations. For an occasion to be festive, the participants must live and work together in a limited space so that they can get to know each other well. Their relationships must be so well defined that they cannot be threatened by the fête, so that no one may fear that things will not return to the way they were before the fête. There must be an insouciance that comes only with frequent contact, familiarity and friendship.

The gap between the everyday and a rather unfocused ideal of an earthly paradise increases tensions and takes away the carefree attitude which is essential to a festive occasion. Festivity appears ridiculous: there is no longer any faith in it, in spite of multiple efforts to create one. A church fair is primarily to raise money for the church, not to honor a saint. Even some political conventions, though they come nearest to the old liberating idea of a festivity, are mainly to show solidarity and proclaim hope. They are no longer the freeing from all restraint, the ignoring of the present, in an almost infantile outpouring of joy. Perhaps this is because today's man is too mature, and only youth can be forgetful. May, 1968, in France, is an illustration.

Sometimes the spirit that animated those festivals of long ago can be found in strikes: some characteristics common to both can be enumerated.

In certain cases a strike may "upset the order and the normal

<sup>5</sup> M. Durand and Y. Harff, *Les Grèves*, Editions du Seuil.

### *The Strike: War or Festival?*

play of roles and powers... the workers' actions may be violent or playful, oriented more to the expression of the conflict than to its final outcome. Thus wildcat strikes... have been called irrational... the strike as a festive occasion, the strike as a 'vacation' from existing social relationships, the strike as group solidarity of the workers in a rediscovered community spirit, the strike as collective liberty." <sup>5</sup>

We have quoted here authors who see both reality and supra-reality in strikes. As we have said, the two aspects may coexist, but one or the other will be the most in evidence. Often one element is absent. This is true of most limited strikes, crucial stages in negotiation, whereas a strike which is the result of a vague unrest occurs because it is empty of demanding content and the objective is difficult to concretize.

As far as strikes that are most closely related to the strike-as-festive occasion are concerned, we think they may be recognized by an evolution of more recent development which is completely different from that of the strike-as-war. This kind of strike breaks out in the rank and file, with no precise motive, without unanimous agreement on goals, but with a strong desire for change, a feeling of being fed-up (as in France in May, 1968), a latent discontent, demands which cannot be expressed in exact terms (the employer's behavior, the attitude of supervisors, the nature and organization of work). The purely economic objective, well defined, explodes into a utopian desire to overthrow the established order, to construct a new society. What is at stake becomes so important that it can no longer be contained and goes beyond any existing ideology. Hostility and hate are no longer directed against the employers. They are forgotten. Hate gives way to a superb indifference which denies the adversary's very existence. Less revolutionary than anarchic, this kind of strike breaks away from established structures, beginning with those of the labor unions, and these latter have trouble keeping in step and recuperating these energies in order to channel them. There is no longer a leader, there are spokesmen, and in the end everyone speaks and gives his opinion. Motions, if any are made, are debated at length. Everyone participates, imaginations run wild. This is noted in the themes of strike songs: making fun of the adversary, ridiculing him, deflating his im-

days are no longer punctuated by strident bells and wailing sirens separating working hours from off-work hours. One lives a strike 24 hours out of 24: strike duty, picketing, demonstrating, discussing, while the strikers' wives prepare food and drink for the picketers on duty day and night, take care of the children and encourage the strikers. The plant is occupied, the workers finally can make themselves at home in areas that have been off-limits, they go from one department to another, sitting in the employer's chair. They act out a farcical and exaggerated portrait of the employer. It is half game, half overcome fear, to show that distances have been abolished. At its extreme, the game is pushed to the limits, when there is forcible detention: "The detained personnel—employer, director, staff—lose all power to command. On the contrary, they must obey, they must ask for what they want... they are powerless and must take on the attributes of the workers... inversely, the strikers act the part of the employer, temporarily. Symbolically, they sit in his chair, smoke his cigars, drink his whiskey, use his telephone, while dictating memos to his secretary."<sup>6</sup> The game thus resembles a psychodrama, revealing work relationships, releasing built-up tensions. This may apply to both parties to the conflict, since the holding of hostages is rarely followed by legal action. No more time-clocks, no more off-limit areas, no more surveillance by foremen: all taboos are broken.

There is practically no exception to the rule that no damage is done to tools or machines. In fact, they are kept in working order, ready for use. When outside elements seek to enter the factory, they are almost always kept out: they are not part of the brotherhood created by mutual suffering even though they may be sympathetic.

Strikers protect their tools not only from possible deterioration but from indiscretion or espionage. This has been quite evident where sit-in strikes have occurred in the automobile industry: the new models under study were hidden, and no-one profited from the situation to reveal secret information about them. This is one of the characteristics of a festivity: it is exclusive, outsiders who don't know the secret language or code can only

<sup>6</sup> Pierre Dubois, *La séquestration*, Editions de Seuil.

*The Strike: War or Festival?*

portance by pointing up his moral or physical defects. His faults are exposed, to show that there is no need to fear him, he is not dangerous. Formality in relationships is done away with: in France, the chant "Charlot, des sous!" was addressed to General de Gaulle himself. The adversary is put on equal footing. At the same time, all the discontent of the time is explicitly summed up in "des sous." These songs also extol the mobilization and unification of all workers, as if total participation were the goal, not just for action but also for the festivity to take place: you can be happy only if you are all together, everybody playing the game, with no long faces, no holding back, no false enthusiasm.

Though there may be no voluntary or involuntary transgression of legality, it is completely forgotten. Regulations and laws are set aside. Because of this, there is more solidarity, ties are strengthened, unwritten rules are accepted without being precisely formulated. However, whereas in the strike-as-war this is a forced solidarity, in the strike-as-festivity solidarity comes about spontaneously, freely and naturally. Preoccupation with material gain, though it may be present, is relegated to the background. There may not even be a negotiation: one gets along as well as one can, with no thought for the morrow. And then, abruptly, the party is over. You wake up, you go back to work, but possibly something has changed, there is hope for a better future, barely glimpsed.

"Independently of the grievances, this strike is in itself a joy. A pure joy. An unadulterated joy." (Simone Weil).

But for joy to exist, everyone concerned must have a sense of well-being. How can this state exist in a world where work is endured rather than accepted, where the structure is only an accumulation of constraints in a complex world, in which the rules are determined by the complexity itself, rules of which the origin and for which the reason are no longer understood? Even the necessity to work is no longer always understood, in view of the differences in the ways of life which lead to the thought that those who are the best off know nothing of the toil, sweat, monotony and fatigue of the worker.

Thus a strike-as-festivity is the rejection, the forgetting of all that renders work toilsome: there is no longer a schedule,

be spectators, whether or not they are in sympathy. On the other hand, though the workers protect their tools and machines, they do not respect the factory's finished products. The workers consider such products the fruit of their toil and their own personal property: they therefore feel free to use them in support of their struggle. This squandering may take the form of selling the products at a low price, or at a price which seems low because the middleman's profit and taxes on the products have been eliminated. This could resemble waste, but waste is inherent in a festive occasion. When the objective of a strike is unclear, time, energy, money, nothing, in short, counts as much as continuing as long as possible this period of freedom from constraint.

It may happen that a strike turns into a genuine fair: there are improvised dances in the factory yards, stands sell not only the factory's products but also whatever is brought in by the strikers and their sympathizers to support the strike. There is singing, dancing, drinking, cardplaying, eating, arguing, forgetting: a complete secularization of the workplace. When the strike ends, because all things come to an end, the memory of those hours of joy and liberty remains, although the piper must be paid: no paycheck for the lost work days, fatigue from the long, exciting days and from nights on picket duty, fatigue also from working overtime to catch up on production and earn extra money to make up for what was lost during the strike.

This pattern is not found in all its details in reality, but a number of conflicts approach it, especially when there is the threat of a factory shutdown, for example. On that occasion the ties formed at work are extended to unite the entire community: everybody is concerned. This is especially true in small towns and in small and medium-sized industries, where there is not the scattering of the population over sizeable distances which impedes frequent contacts among people.

#### POSSIBLE EVOLUTION

From these few remarks on the different aspects of the strike, it is possible to project the future of conflicts in a capitalist society. In proportion as development, rise in the standard of

*The Strike: War or Festival?*

living and improved working conditions continue at a sufficient rate, the tensions born of the ideal of an easier life, without constraint, remote, can only grow, bringing with them outbreaks of the strike-as-festivity, and this all the more easily since rising living standards, savings, social services, security for the future, will be considered as certain. While hope remains, we feel free to enjoy ourselves, we can forget about the future, because it holds no real problem for us.

On the contrary, if the crises are not fully solved, if the future is closed, if the promised land fades in the distance, strikes-as-war, the fruit of despair, will be the most numerous. A world in crisis is an immobile world, where any gain is at the expense of an opponent. Conflict requires discipline as well as a structure which gives form and direction. A progressing world is a world in motion, where everything is possible, where advantage is no longer wrested from an opponent but is a result of progress itself.

It is not our purpose to suggest which way we are headed, toward the persistence of crisis or toward recovery of progress. But it is certain that the only enduring conquests are those over nature or those over ourselves, never those made at the expense of others. May we hope that, as the Place de Grève has become the Place de l'Hôtel de Ville, a place for encounters and ideas between the representative of the city and the administration which manages it, the evolution of conflict will tend more toward understanding between parties than to a worsening of the conflict.