

PROLETARIAN

NEWS



WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE!
YOU HAVE NOTHING TO LOSE BUT
YOUR CHAINS! YOU HAVE A WORLD
TO GAIN! — Karl Marx

A JOURNAL FOR THE WORKING CLASS

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE PROLETARIAN PARTY OF AMERICA 1545 LARRABEE ST. CHICAGO, ILL.

Vol. XV, No. 9—Whole No. 162

Chicago, Illinois, September, 1946

483

Price 5c a Copy

The Lunch Box and The Ballot Box

More than forty years ago Theodore Roosevelt suggested "the full dinner pail" in return for workers votes. It wasn't much of a bait but it caught some of the workers. The 1907 panic made even a few sandwiches from an old tin box, on a dirty factory-bench, an impossibility for many workers.

This year (1946) Congressional elections are the means through which Americans will give expression to their economic desires. This time it is not a regular capitalist class politician who brings out the old slogan of the "full dinner pail," but Walter Reuther, a top notcher in the labor union field.

The C.I.O. and the other large bodies of organized labor have been waging a seemingly losing battle for higher wages to offset rising prices. At present they are attempting to organize buyers' strikes as a means of reversing the price trend, and also at the same time to build political consciousness among the workers. Such political consciousness is, of course, confined to the old labor theory of electing "labor's friends." The old

Gompers' idea of labor "rewarding its friends and punishing its enemies" has been rejuvenated, as it were, by the Reuther proposal of "pointing out the relationship between the lunch box and the ballot box."

Theodore Roosevelt was a representative of big business and of its political expression, the Republican party. A high protective tariff and a "sound" monetary system were still of some importance to those who were as yet building the huge industrial empire. The farmer demands for lower tariffs, lower prices of manufactured goods, and "cheaper" money, as expressed by the Democratic party, were not in harmony with the best interests of big business. If Mr. Roosevelt could swing the election by the promise of an extra sandwich in the lunch box, it was good political strategy.

Reuther and the labor unions represent labor in its fight with capital. Here exists no reason for fooling anybody. We must take it that it is an honest demand.

Two questions suggest them—
(Continued on page 2)

International Notes

Poland

Despite all "ill wishers," such as the now discredited Polish refugee "government-in-exile" in London, conditions in Poland are "looking up." It is well known that the destruction of farms, factories, cities and towns was enormous.

After the Red Army drove the Wehrmacht off the soil of Poland and smashed it to pieces, the job of reconstruction was begun. A year and a half later reports reach us that crops are "good" and that this year's harvest is anticipated to be "excellent." Industries "are coming back very fast," but the rebuilding of cities, such as Warsaw, will take some time. Outside help is still needed. None other than an American Red Cross official so reports after being 18 months in that country.

When the British government refused to return the 10 million

dollars in Polish gold reserve, deposited in England, by failure to conclude the Anglo-Polish financial agreement, they tried thereby to influence, weaken and thwart the recent elections. Despite this move, the masses voted overwhelmingly in favor of the recent land reform program and nationalization of principal key industries. They also approved the new state boundaries and the establishing of a one-house parliament, eliminating the old reactionary senate chamber.

Elements of reaction are yet to be wiped out, such as the anti-Semitic outbreaks in Kielce and other places indicated. No ruling class has ever willingly given up its favored class position of exploiting the masses, whether on farms, mines or workshops. Polish ex-landlords and capitalists are no

(Continued on page 3)

Trends in the CIO

It is not uncommon for labor to be told by its so-called friends, such as liberal columnists, and other writers and speakers, that labor unions are all right if only those Reds and Communists were not allowed influence and places of leadership. Nor is it a secret that the C.I.O. has its Reuthers, Wolchaks, John Greens, and others, who oppose the actions of Communists, especially those of the "Communist" party.

In some cases this squabble was of a sectarian character, in which the anti-C. P. leaders were close to the Socialist party. And we have read articles in the Socialist party press that those dirty Reds (C.P.) should be barred by the union constitution from holding any important position.

This is not so surprising because the liberal friends of labor want unions that are loyal to capitalism. The labor leaders, many of whom, in their younger days, were in-

clined to fall under the spell of Social Democracy, still favor socialism, but sometime in the distant future, especially if it can be achieved without losing the so-called American democracy. Also, within the unions the enmity between the various left-wing groups has always been apparent.

However, it seems, the C. P., in its maneuvers within the unions, has run into new difficulties and is being pushed out of influence in the C.I.O. by people who have formerly been labeled members, or "fellow travelers." Joe Curran of the National Maritime Union is in a battle with them. George Addes, R. J. Thomas and Richard Leonard of the United Automobile Workers have announced that no member of the Communist party, Socialist party, Trotskyists, Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, or any outside group, shall be in policy making position within the union.

(Continued on page 2)

HOME SCENE

Congressional Boxscore

The 79th Congress adjourned on August 3rd, sine die. Like its predecessors, right back to the first, it faithfully and loyally carried the ball for the property owners. That is its setup, and that is where it shines.

Its last session opened and ended with rancidness. The Pearl Harbor inquiry perfumed its portals at the start, and the May scandal finished its laborious work.

In between these rumpuses it vented its rancor on labor. It enacted the Hobbs Bill which provides fines up to \$10,000 and up to 20 years imprisonment for anyone who "obstructs, delays or affects" interstate commerce, through robbery or extortion. (Don't be fooled by the wording of "robbery or extortion" for capital will do the judging on what is robbery or extortion.) This bill can definitely be used against strikes.

The Lea Bill, aimed at James C. Petrillo, musicians' head, calls for a year's imprisonment and \$1000 fine for anyone compelling broadcasters to hire more employees than what they consider essential.

Here, too, capital will determine how much labor is to be used.

In voting to return control of the United States Employment Service to the states, the amendment attached to this bill, bars payment of Federal salaries to employees belonging to unions who claim the right to strike against the Government. This, too, savors of anti-labor.

The "full" employment bill passed by Congress is a corker. The Government is committed to seek "maximum" employment. Ain't that a beaut?

The Minimum Wage Bill, to increase minimum pay under the Standard Fair Practices Act, from 40 to 65 cents now, and after two years to 75 cents on hour, was circumvented.

The Anti-Poll Tax, Anti-Lynch Law and FEPC dealing with discriminatory practices were all squashed by the "liberty-loving" gentlemen sitting in Congress.

Numerous other anti-labor measures were considered, but the only agreement amongst the legislators was their disagreements. All in all they saw to it that labor was

(Continued on page 2)

TRENDS IN THE CIO

(Continued from page 1)

They include most of those organizations, although it was directed mainly at the C. P. insofar as it was the only group within their union caucus. Morris Muster of the Furniture Workers Union said it was Communist (C. P.) dominated and has taken a large number of locals into the International Woodworkers of America, in order to escape domination.

Is this an organization drive to bring the C.I.O. completely under control of the top leadership and an entrenched bureaucracy? Not entirely. The "Communist" party has attempted to infiltrate and control policy in the C.I.O. During the war, when the "no strike" pledge was in effect, the program of the C. P. almost coincided with that of the C.I.O. officials, and was possibly a little more conservative. The official leadership, from Murray on down, found that there was a group that could be depended upon to promote their pro-war policies and their political support of the Democratic administration, a group with a left-wing reputation who individually could take the floor in union meetings and protect the union leadership from the more militant union members. The C. P. was in the lead of this conservation scavenger work. At times, during the war, it even became more reactionary than the top leadership, advocat-

ing such as piece work pay systems. This was even further than Murray could go.

Now the situation has changed. The war has ended. The leaders don't need the C. P. to uphold "no strike" pledges, etc. During the first post-war year, long and costly strikes have been carried on, and there is an official shift in the attitude toward Soviet Russia. True, the workers have won raises, but increased living costs have left them in no better position than before. Even the semblance of protection that the O.P.A. offered has vanished. So the C.I.O. leadership has found that C.P. support is a detriment to them. Many workers remember the group that helped to sell them the "no strike" pledge during the war, and advocated piece-work and speed-up.

Of course, the official leadership has not started open red-baiting as yet, but the implication is plain and strong. No Reds—especially the pseudo-Reds, like the C. P., will come to leadership in the C.I.O., unless they do so by winning mass support from the membership. They will not be able to capture the C.I.O. by conniving, and doing odd jobs for the top officials, as the C. P. has been trying right along to do.

A working class political party should work with the masses of union members and not with the leaders.

Lewis Williams.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 1)

kept in its place, with capital enjoying the green light in this civilized game of skinning labor, with full legal and holy blessings. And what a game! Sine die.

* * *

Rising Cost of Living

Food prices are of prime interest to a working class family. For this item alone absorbs the greatest portion of the breadwinner's wages. That, in the main, explains the heated controversy that raged over the OPA.

Before the OPA was allowed to lapse, June 30, 1946, it was the contention of business generally that if controls were abolished there would be plenty of merchandise and, in time, the "natural" law of supply and demand would take care of prices, to the satisfaction and favor of the consumers. Moreover, it would do away with the black market. Congress, in its endeavor to untie this knotty economic problem, substantially adhered to the voice of business.

But on August 9th, "The Government reported today that the nation's housewives paid 13.8 per cent more for food July 15 than they did a month earlier.

"The Bureau of Labor Statistics said the increase was the greatest one-month jump in United States' history.

"Here is a breakdown of the

Bureau of Labor Statistics's report on price increases on specific products:

"Meat—led the movement with a 30 per cent rise as prices of livestock in primary markets rose 20 per cent.

"Chickens—up 9 per cent.

"Fresh and canned fish—up 7 per cent.

"Dairy products—butter up 32 per cent and milk 15 per cent.

"Cereals and bakery goods—increases 3 per cent primarily because flour went up 9:6 per cent.

"Eggs — advanced, seasonally, by 9 per cent.

"Fresh and canned fruits and vegetables—up almost 3 per cent.

"Fats and oils—rose 14 per cent as lard prices jumped 24 per cent and oleomargarine and other shortenings rose 2 to 4 per cent." (Boston Globe, Aug. 10.)

It is obvious from the above statistics, even for so short a period, that prices practically approximated black market prices, so that both the black and the regular markets virtually coincided, with under the counter sales becoming no longer necessary. Shortages turned to their opposite — abundance, and all that was necessary was the cash. That appears to be the present state of affairs at this writing, Aug. 19.

In the meantime a OPA Decon-

(Continued on page 6)

Lunch Box and the Ballot Box

(Continued from page 1)

selves at this point. (1) Considering the enormous advancement made in recent times in labor productivity, is an extra sandwich in the lunch box all that workers should aim at? And (2) Is the old remedy of "rewarding friends and punishing enemies" the best weapons? The first question has economic implication. The second is political.

Both fields deserve a more thorough investigation than labor unions and their leaders have thus far been willing to conduct. An understanding of both becomes more urgent as time passes and as labor's reward for work dwindles in comparison to production output.

It has now been fully demonstrated that the nation can take twelve million of its most able-bodied men and women out of production and put them in uniforms, and with the remainder double production. This happens in war time when the government steps in to purchase more than half the products.

With most of the 12 million servicemen and women returned to civilian life it should be possible, not only to maintain this high level of production, but to increase it. Such productive ability should, in peace-time, show itself in consumer satisfaction. Nobody denies that labor forms a large section of the consuming public. This first year of peace has demonstrated that for this section, consumption is being curtailed through the growing difference between the slow rise in wages and the rapid advance in prices.

Thus far, the excuse has been that the war-created scarcities sends everybody bidding for the, as yet, limited quantities of goods. Real enjoyment is to come when goods once more become abundant. Then prices will adjust themselves to demand, and abundance will be available for all. There are flaws in this line of reasoning. Whenever a line of production fills up, the first act is not price-cutting but production curtailment. Such curtailment creates unemployment and shrinkage in labor purchasing power. Not *enjoyment* but *want* will flow as a consequence of a restocked consumer goods market.

Statistical analysis of productive achievement to date, of war savings, of individual income, all point in the same direction. Labor is desperately in need of housing. Returning veterans can find no shelter. The building industry is in full swing. Old records, established in the twenties, are being broken, both as to employment and expenditure in the building industry. But more than half of the buildings are factories, commercial housing or places of amusement, race tracks, etc. War savings go into this latter kind. People with any amount of savings have good living quarters. They

are building with a view to future profits. Workers with poor, or no, living quarters have little or no savings. Their wages are not big enough to pay for new housing. Labor's housing needs are serious. Labor's "friends" in the government are making plans for housing. But money, building materials, and labor, go to a less essential but more lucrative field.

It is, of course, nice to have jobs and wages regardless of how little the wages will buy, we are told. At present many workers have jobs, producing for the foreign market. At the present rate the yearly shipment of goods to foreign countries stands at 8.2 billion. Imports are at a rate of \$385 million. That provides a huge favorable balance of trade for business but not much to buy for the workers. It also raises the question of how long such a situation can be kept up. At present American loans take care of payments. Loans however, are supposed to stop at some time, and repayment to start. That would suggest a future need for imports greater than exports. Would any economist, or even a politician, suggest that when such a time arrives labor will be getting an increase in the good things of life. To us it suggests loss of jobs.

To all appearance labor is enjoying its post-war wonders right now so many jobs are in existence. But labor is not satisfied even with this. It is reported that by May of this year, when most of the strikes had been settled, that weekly earning of workers were down almost eight per cent from the previous year. Prices at that time had risen by three per cent in as many months. After that came July without price control. Basic commodities went up by 25 per cent, and the cost of living rose 5½ per cent with promise of more advances to follow.

These figures are usually not overstated. The "New Republic" for August 26 quotes an OPA economist as saying that "recent price increases would add \$150 million a year to prices of durable goods." The magazine points out that with the price advance on cars alone the extra cost would amount to \$300 million on 3 million cars. While weekly wages tend to stay put, or decline, and the prices soar "because of shortages." Reports on manufacturers' stocks on hand show increases. At the end of June, such inventories were quoted at \$17.2 billion, up 200 million for the month.

Nathan Robertson, a former PM Washington reporter, now writing for the "New Republic" is worried about the situation. He tells his readers that at the present rate the yearly output of goods is worth \$185 billion. Payments to individuals amount to \$160 billion. These individuals save about \$20 billion. Corporations are saving another

(Continued on page 7)

For Those Who Toil

The U.S. Census Bureau revealed that national employment reached an all-time peak in July of 60,730,000 employed (including 2,600,000 in the armed services). Thus the 60 million job goal set by Secretary of Commerce, H. A. Wallace, has been passed.

The Census Bureau also stated that despite reports of "labor shortages" in some lines of employment, like the cotton textile industries, there were 2,270,000 unemployed throughout the nation. It also indicated that these unemployed were having a hard time finding jobs.

Some sober reflections on these figures will cause many to wonder what became of that wave of "prosperity" foretold by Secretary Wallace and others that would be the consequence of having reached the 60 million job goal. One glance at the overall picture is enough proof that "prosperity for all" has not been achieved even in spite of this record of peace-time employment.

Of course, there has been plenty of prosperity for those who own the industries, the capitalist class, who have reaped the harvest (but not through their own labor), billions of dollars went into their coffers. But for those who toil, the millions who comprise the working class of the nation, "prosperity" is still a dream.

~~No sooner had labor achieved~~ wage increases, through the recent strikes and organized pressure, then it found its wages increases nullified by the rise in the cost of living. Even its attempts at consumer's or "buyer's strikes" have had very little effect in reducing living costs. It appears that labor is back where it started from.

That capital is not completely blind to the plight of labor is also very evident. To the protests of the toilers it has an answer. Labor is told to be patient, to wait until supply catches up with demand and then prices will come down, "return to normal." How soon this will happen, no one has yet foretold. In the meantime, the workers must be patient, even though the rise in the living costs amounts to a reduction in their living standards. As it was a privilege for the workers to sacrifice for the war effort, so, now, it should be a privilege for them to sacrifice in the interests of "reconversion." This then is capital's answer to labor's protests.

We note that the Census Bureau reveals more than 2 million jobless in spite of the high level of employment and "labor shortages." This sounds almost like a contradiction. What it did not state, however, is the fact that "labor shortages" exist mainly in those industries where wage scales are very low. Jobless workers are reluctant to hire out at wages that are hardly any more than what they receive in unemployment compensation. Here, too, capital is not

only asking but also exerting all kinds of pressure to force labor to make this sacrifice.

The struggle for jobs and job security is not as keen as it was before World War II but already it is manifesting itself. During the war not a few "unemployables" could readily get a job. Now "management" is more particular, youth is preferred to old age. Again the streets of the city's slums are replenishing themselves and quite a number of the jobless are solving their "housing shortage" by sleeping in hallways, park benches, etc. America also has its refugees, human floaters cast off by the capitalist system.

There are many who still continue to dream, who insist that all this is but a temporary condition. Their line of "reasoning" is: give capital a chance, to see what it can do. That once the competitive system has free reign we will be on our way. Few are the ones who take time to reflect that capitalism has been "free" and what is now occurring is the only way in which it can function. The highest point in peacetime employment and production has been reached and yet it results in millions of workers remaining impoverished. This fact should awaken those who are still entranced with capitalism.

Over the heads of those who toil in the workshops of the nation hangs the threat of another depression. The questions are already posed: how soon will it be when again the warehouses will be bulging with the products of the factories and the market saturated with them? What if the supply of commodities not only catches up with the demand by *exceeds* demand? What then, Mr. Capitalist, will you do?

To these questions capital dares not give a straightforward answer except to pooh! pooh the idea of another depression, that this time it can be avoided. Strange as it may seem, however, here and there one comes across a business man who admits that "business cycles" of boom and depression are unavoidable and at best panics can only be "alleviated." So even among some of the ablest defenders of capitalism there is no agreement on vital problems.

But one thing the workers *do know*: what Mr. Capitalist does when a depression occurs. He closes his factories and discharges workers. He hangs up the "no help wanted" sign at the factory gates. If some workers are fortunate enough to have jobs during a depression period then its on a part-time basis at reduced wages. Laying off and wage-cutting has always been the policy of capital during such periods. The whole history of capitalism is proof that this is an inevitable occurrence. The depression of the 1930's is a classical example of this.

No one can foretell the exact time a depression will occur but

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

(Continued from page 1)

different in this respect than any other.

For the first time in Poland's turbulent history her Slav peoples have the opportunity of developing, nationally and collectively, toward that goal of economic security desired by all the world's workers. Her neighboring states to the north, east and south are now friends instead of enemies. To the west in Eastern Germany, development is occurring on the same basis as her own. The possibility of Poland again being used as a link in a new "cordon sanitaire" against the Soviet Union appears remote. The workers and peasants have a powerful friend in the Soviet Union and neighboring states and all indications point to a successful "working out of their own emancipation."

Greece

The scheduled plebiscite on September 1st, to determine whether or not the Greeks wish to return George II as King and all monarchical, feudal trappings, takes on the appearance of a farce. Contrary to those solemn declarations "hatched" at the beginning of the 2nd World War, known as the "Atlantic Charter," the masses of Greece are not to have the opportunity of exercising their "right" to the "four freedoms."

A recent dispatch states that the United States has declined to observe the plebiscite. A United Press report from London stated that "the British government was understood to be accepting an invitation by Greece to join in *supervising* the forthcoming plebiscite." (Our emphasis.) What kind of "supervision?" With British Tommies, tanks and guns! It appears so. Who extended this invitation? The masses of half starved, weakened, displaced workers! Of course not. As in all satellite countries of British imperialism, it was the owners of land and industry; "owners" in the sense of playing "second fiddle" to the English interests who have heavily invested in Greek enterprises.

Lest we forget, this British government is in the hands of "socialist" labor leaders, those who have proposed to bring socialism into being in England (piece meal, of

this much is certain: *it is inevitable*. It is due to the fact that the enormous productive forces of the nation have reached the stage where they are beyond the control of the capitalist class.

What is the solution some one might ask? There is only one. The toilers of the nation must abolish the profit system by taking collective ownership of the entire industry and produce for use instead of for profit. If those who toil want to rid themselves of poverty, exploitation, and oppression then they must rid themselves of the capitalist system.

Al Wysocki.

course).

Leland Stowe, well known reporter, puts the question of why the U. S. government has declined the invitation of helping to observe the Greek plebiscite, while displaying such great concern over "free" elections in Poland and Rumania. He asks, "Since the U. S. government proclaims itself a champion of free and democratic elections, why does it not insist on a fair and honest plebiscite in Greece? Why does it toady to the British? If we (meaning the U. S. government) are sincerely opposed to puppet governments, why do we tacitly support the puppet government forced on the Greeks by British tanks and bayonets?" Further, "Do we demand political freedom only in countries under Soviet influence and defend monarchy, reaction and terrorism when practiced by England and her puppet regime?" We hold no brief for Leland Stowe's lack of understanding and knowledge of who this "we" consists of, yet at the same time it indicates how rotten the Greek situation really is.

Once before, in 1926, the Greeks expressed themselves by deposing their king, but reactionary elements proved stronger and fascist reaction triumphed.

Greece, with her age-old traditions of "democracy," in the year 1946 finds herself "enjoying" the "blessings" of capitalist, imperialist "democracy." Democracy in the abstract proves very illusive. Sooner or later, the proletariat comes to the realization that democracy for them can only be attained by proletarian control of the nations economy. The economic base is the spring from which all political forms arise.

Only when the exploiting, ruling minority class, the owners of the means of production have been replaced by social ownership and control, the vast majority of workers, can democracy for them be attained. Greece is no exception.

YUGOSLAVIA:

During the latter part of August the bourgeois press screamed long and loudly about the terrible Yugoslavs who shot down American flyers over Yugoslav territory. How dare these "ignorant" mountaineers challenge the right of American imperialism to go into their territory and map and photograph their fortifications. Sovereignty was not involved said the bourgeois press, just a few flyers losing their way in bad weather. The fact that American aircraft had been seen 50 kilometers inside Yugoslav territory and that these flights had occurred often was lightly passed over by the bourgeois press. A Turkish army captain was one of the men captured along with the Americans in one of the downed aircraft. No doubt he was merely going along for the joyride. The Americans are well known for their generosity.

Marshall Tito, the head of the Yugoslav government was painted

(Continued on page 7)

PROLETARIAN NEWS

A Journal for the Working Class
Devoted to the Education of Workers and
Their Struggle for Power

Published Monthly by the
Proletarian Party of America
Subscriptions—12 Issues for 50 Cents
Send All Subscriptions, Contributions, Etc., to
PROLETARIAN NEWS
1545 N. Larrabee Street, Chicago, Ill.

The Pursuit of Peace

In war-time there is always much talk of peace. But, as the British used to say: "In time of peace prepare for war." And that is just what is going on at present, with America well in the lead. It is the nations which were recently allied that are planning and preparing for the next war. The defeated nations, for the present, are too badly shattered to even think about preparing.

The defeated nations are no threat to the victorious powers, but the latter are a threat to each other, and they are quite aware of it. Yet, they do not want war. This is as true of the United States as it is of the Soviet Union, but their interests are so divergent, and the rivalries of capitalist imperialism have not been eliminated, they but face each other in a different alignment.

The peace palaver at Paris, as is the case with all such gatherings under capitalism, is but a maneuvering of the powers concerned to strengthen their position, by alliances, secret and open, which in the event of war will give them the greatest advantage. And, the smaller nations, in the role of satellites, are there to make the best of a bad job and pick up what favors are available in return for their services.

The Axis powers, the "aggressor nations," prior to World War II, had proclaimed as their main objective the elimination of Communism. By that they meant that the Soviet Union was the chief enemy. And, undoubtedly it was one of their objectives, but that was not the whole truth. As capitalist imperialist powers, which they were, their main aim was to defeat their most powerful imperialist rivals, Britain and America who were standing athwart the chief sea routes to the world markets and in possession of the choicest sources of the world's raw materials, etc.

The great capitalist imperialist powers fell foul of each other, and World War II commenced with the Soviet Union on the sidelines. The number one aim of the German, Italian and Japanese finance imperialists did not succeed. It is true that practically all of Europe was overrun, but not the British Isles. Then the Soviet Union was attacked, and indeed very violently. A few months after Russia was invaded, America was involved by Japan's blow at Pearl Harbor.

Historical circumstances caused the world's most powerful imperialists, Britain and the U. S. A., challenged as they never had been before, to ally themselves with the greatest anti-imperialist power the world has ever seen, the Soviet Union. Neither side to this strange alliance picked this course, but in desperate situations one cannot be too particular in the choice of friends. Mr. Churchill proclaimed, at the time Nazi Germany invaded: "The Soviet Union is our ally," but the wily old imperialist had no more confidence in lasting unity than the Soviet leaders had in him, and British imperialism in general. Neither could the U. S. S. R., fighting for its very existence, afford to be too choosy about its friends.

The British imperialists hoped that the Red Army would be able to hold out, but had little confidence that it could. They were not alone in that respect. All the "experts" guessed wrong, and likewise many "democratic" socialists. The Soviet Union proved to be a first

class military power. The British, however, were looking to America, a nation more to their liking, an imperialist power like themselves. It was during the period between the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union and the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor that Mr. Churchill held his famous rendezvous with Mr. Roosevelt off the coast of Newfoundland, where the so-called Atlantic Charter was cooked up as a sort of gilded curtain, behind which the real purpose of the meeting, and its actual transactions, could be hidden from that great shallow-thinking mass, commonly called the public.

The British empire was saved by two great powers, the two greatest left in the world today, the Soviet Union and the United States. The former contributed most in human lives, the latter most in war materials. The saving of British imperialism was involuntary on the part of the U.S.S.R., but the United States, and especially leaders like Roosevelt, knew that as on imperialist power they could not afford to let British imperialism fall, for if the U. S. were to be the only great capitalist power left, it would not be so healthy for it.

Because of its tremendous productive capacity, America became the greatest source of war supplies for the United Nations. Its publicists began to refer to it as the "arsenal of democracy." However, both Britain and the Soviet Union produced tremendously, and if the latter had not done so it would have been defeated long before the U. S. was ready to ship large and effective quantities.

More than a year of the post-war period has now passed, and peace is not yet officially made, in fact the Conference at Paris is just engaging in preliminary bouts before the main battle for peace is fought. There are those who claim that it is all in vain, and that peace is impossible so long as the Soviet Union dominates the countries it occupies, but they are inclined to overlook the fact American and British forces also occupy certain countries, such as Greece, Italy, and the western sections of Germany, Austria, etc., not to mention America's occupation of Japan, part of Korea, and armed forces in "liberated" China.

The Soviet's Red Army is occupying a number of countries of eastern Europe, but they are not, as is the case with American forces, thousands of miles away from the homeland.

Through the American press and over the radio an intense hate-Russia campaign is in full swing, and it did not commence with the shooting down of American army planes over Yugoslavia. However, that and the American notes which followed, have furnished excuse for whipping up the anti-Soviet hate to a high pitch.

Ever since Mr. Churchill's "iron curtain" speech in Missouri with Mr. Truman by his side, this warmongering campaign has been gaining momentum. We are not contending that war with the Soviet Union is imminent, or even aimed at, but an intense diplomatic struggle is on at the "Peace" table. It is a scramble for place and power, for "peacing out the pieces." The Hitlerite weapon of "war of nerves" has become a "democratic" method.

The American capitalists know that there is much sympathy for the Soviet Union existing among the American workers, and it is even stronger with the British workers. Therefore, steps must be taken to kill that sentiment, and it can be promoted easier on this side of the Atlantic.

The British workers know that the Soviet Union bore the brunt of the struggle against the Nazi. They were closer to the heart of the fight than the Americans. No bombs fell upon American cities. That makes it difficult for the British capitalists to promote a hate-Russia campaign as easy as it can be done here. There are other reasons. The British workers are politically conscious.

That is not true of the American workers. Politically, they are almost unconscious.

A "Labor" government is in office in Britain. While it serves capitalist imperialism well, it cannot promote a campaign of hostility to the Soviet Union. But American imperialism, now the spearhead of world reaction, understands its vanguard role and is rising to the occasion.

Behind the wrangling at Paris is the aim of British imperialism, with the powerful backing of Uncle Sam, to take a stronger hold upon the whole Mediterranean basin and to keep the Soviet Union shut up behind the Dardanelles. Britain and France have long used Turkey as their gatekeeper of the eastern Mediterranean, but now France is weak, with practically no navy (and the Italian navy no longer exists) but American naval craft, side by side with British, police the Mediterranean. Britannia used to "rule the waves" but now it is Columbia that is playing that role, with Britain as junior partner, and the Mediterranean has become a Yankee-British sea.

The Soviet Union's apparent belligerence at Paris is a resistance to this powerful British-American combination. It refuses to be treated as a step-child of the United Nations, or as a poor relation, accepting such crumbs as the masters of the new western block seek to dole out. It is far stronger than the old Czaristic empire ever was, and it can't be pushed around any longer by France and Britain. That is why American imperialism is taking a hand.

Even before real peace plans have been worked out, certain powerful elements in this country are shouting "Red imperialism" and asserting that war with the Soviets is inevitable, and perhaps it is best that it should not be delayed too long. Of course this is not the official position of the American government. As we have already stated neither Russia nor America wants war, and the former will not make the mistake of forcing the issue. However, it knows it is being confronted by a powerful combination of capitalist imperialist strength, and it cannot be otherwise in the present circumstances.

The irreconcilability of capitalist imperialism, the basis of which is the exploitation of labor for profit, with the Soviet system which has abolished the exploitation of labor, and is, therefore, anti-imperialist, is fully recognized by both sides. However, because of the magnitude of Soviet strength and communist forces throughout the world, the British and American ruling classes are not ready to rush into another World War, as it might only hasten their downfall.

Limiting the range of the U.S.S.R., strengthening their own, is the present aim of Britain and America. And, they are hoping against hope that some formula can be worked out to hold the rest of the world (their imperialist world of "free enterprise," where a small number of people become rotten-rich, and the great masses in time of depression rot in poverty, or are blasted to bits in time of war) upon its old foundation, with profit, interest and rent as usual.

The two systems move further and further apart. They are like two different worlds, the old and the new. Capitalism is the going system. Communism is the coming world system. Peace is impossible, except in the form of a truce, between now and the next conflict. The pursuit of peace is like "the pursuit of happiness," which the schoolboy said means "try and get it." Short as was the "peace" period between World War I and World War II the indications point to this "peace" period being even shorter. Yet, universal peace is possible, provided that the cause of war is abolished, through the abolition of the exploitation of one class by another. The way to a warless world is through the establishment of a classless world.

John Keracher.

Marxism and Darwinism

Nathan Weiser rendered the English-speaking workers a great service when, almost 40 years ago, he translated Anton Pannekoek's classic work, "Marxism and Darwinism." It is the purpose of this article to present the essence of Pannekoek's pamphlet in brief form.

Before the advent of modern science it was generally assumed that all existing animals had been independently created by God, and that no changes ever took place in the various species. When Linne, the Swedish botanist, set up a system of classification of animals, grave doubts arose concerning the validity of the theory of independent creation and invariability of species.

Into Linne's system of divisions, classes, orders, families, species, etc., each animal fitted neatly. From this wonderful fact only two inferences were possible, either God had created living forms in harmony with Linne's system of classification or all living animals are the result of evolutionary development.

It was Charles Darwin who succeeded in demonstrating how existing animals could change into new types, and that new species actually had arisen. He started out with the accepted fact parents transmit their qualities to their young. But the offsprings are not identically like their parents, nor are they entirely like each other. Offspring always differ, both from the parents and from each other, in various details. This fact of *variation* is the starting point of Darwin's great discovery. A new species can develop, only when the divergence from the central type becomes great enough and through generations of development, a new animal appears with distinctively different characteristics, and often with but slight resemblance to its progenitors.

What causes divergence to become greater and greater? Lamarck said it was due to the usage of certain organs. In other words, men got strong legs from running, giraffs got long necks by stretching, by reaching up to eat tree leaves, etc. This contention left many things unaccounted for, such as how certain animals acquired their protective coloring, etc. Darwin did not accept Lamarck's explanation of the cause of evolution. He observed that the breeders of animals obtained certain desired types by preserving and pairing those who showed the tendencies that they desired to obtain, while destroying or not permitting the breeding of undesired types. The varieties of domestic animals, thus produced, quite frequently differed more from the central type than did wild kinds.

The question next arose with Darwin, since there is no will in nature, producing new species artificially as the animal breeder does, what process in nature brings about the same results. This led

him to his great discovery, *Natural selection*. As a naturalist, Darwin was familiar with the intense *struggle for existence* that all living things wage in order to survive.

Thomas Malthus, an English clergyman and economist, had stirred up much controversy at the beginning of last century with his book, "An Essay on the Principle of Population" wherein he contended that living things tended to increase in number faster than the food supply, and that the same was true of the human, and that something should be done to limit the increase of population. While reading this work, Darwin recognized its truth in relation to the enormous number of living things brought into existence, yet only a limited number reached maturity and survived. Something was at work in nature, preventing the over-production of living things.

In a changing environment, only those living forms which could change to conform to the changed environment could survive, and reproduce their kind, while those killed off in the struggle, the less fit, naturally did not reproduce. Thus new types gradually arose, new species. Thus the giraffs *born* with longer necks, and other favorable characteristics, had a better chance of surviving than those, handicapped in the opposite direction.

As Darwin discovered the cause of animal development, so Marx discovered the cause of social development. Marx, unlike Darwin, did not have to prove that such a development was taking place, for it was obvious that society had undergone many changes both qualitatively and quantitatively. He noted the peculiar feature of all written history, viz., class struggles, and pondered the question of their explanation. He found that the basis for all class struggles lies in the process of production. This process itself is ever changing. The tools with which man work are constantly being improved.

Feudalism lasted for many centuries. It was based upon the ownership of land, upon which the aristocracy exploited serfs. As an agricultural society it changed very slowly. Its tools were primitive, but there arose within its structure merchants and handicraftsmen. Following the discovery of America and the tremendous expansion of the world market, new methods of production, with new tools, had to be found. Manufacturers, capitalists, made their appearance and handicraftsmen were transformed into wage workers.

The development of tools is the wellspring of social development. Changes in the process of production lead to changes in the class composition of society. The capitalist system is therefore not permanent but must yield eventually to a higher form of society, in ac-

cordance with changes in the process of production. Thus, Marxism, like Darwinism, is a positive science applying, as it does, an evolutionary theory to society.

Marxism is of interest to the workers because it serves them as a weapon in their struggles against the capitalists. Marxism does away with the vague dreaming about a better world and reveals that such a world is not only possible but inevitable, and indicates the path that the workers must follow to attain it.

Darwinism was eagerly accepted and used by the capitalists in their struggle against the feudal nobility. It was a weapon used against the "divine right" of kings. It was wielded with especial vigor in Germany. But it was only wielded until the working class began to use it in their bid for power. Since the arrival on the world scene of the proletarian movement, the capitalists have both renounced and distorted Dar-

win, as suited their aims. Once in power, the capitalists pervert science and make use of religion and mysticism.

Darwinism was also made use of by Socialist thinkers, as it corroborates, although in a different field, their long-held theory of the continuous development of things.

Some scientists, such as Haeckel, attempted to use Darwinism against Socialism, arguing that the former theory proved that inequality is natural and inevitable, and the socialist dream of equality was impossible. Haeckel further said, that the socialist desire to bring an end to competition could never be realized for Darwin had proven this to be impossible because of the struggle for existence. The capitalist system is a "natural" social system. Spencer, too, held this view. He contended, in addition, that the struggle for existence was a most beneficial thing as it weeded out the weak and un-

(Continued on page 7)

BITS AND SKITS

Theodore Bilbo, Senator from Mississippi, admitted over the radio, membership in the KKK, No. 40, which bears his name. But added: "I attended one meeting and have not attended it since, because I was not in sympathy with some things in it." Could it be that even the race-hating, labor-bating KKK is too "progressive" for this diminutive specimen of "The Man"?

* * *

Sickness has saved many a dilemma, even going back to school days. Too bad the "venerable" Congressman May from Kentucky, had to develop this "sudden" heart condition, just when things were really getting hot and interesting! But not all people are fools—without imagination.

* * *

Damn those hides! That now makes another shortage to investigate. Shoe plants are reported to be closing down for lack of material. Shoe workers are forced to loaf. The manufacturers can't take it out of the workers' hides unless hides are obtained. No skins, no skinning.

* * *

The Australian government is planning to import 200,000 German girls to equalize its present disproportion of men over women. A population increase is visualized from its present 7,000,000 to over 20,000,000 within a few years. From "on high" (or Valhalla) the spirit of Hitler may shudder with violent paroxysm at this "cruel" violation of the "pure" Nordic Aryan madchen. Circumstances alter races.

* * *

Louis Bromfield, novelist and farmer, told a gathering of farmers, at the 38th annual meeting of the Vegetable Grovers Association of America, that the food supply of the world is waning while the population increases. He main-

tained that the Malthusian theory, with population increasing at a faster rate than the food supply, is coming true, and he appealed for increased production to offset the difference.

It is doubtful whether any farmers who have lived through the painful experience of the Great Depression will take this worn-out Malthusian nonsense seriously. During the 30's, there was no lack of production in relation to population. In fact there was overproduction. Goods were certainly abundant and cheap, yet there were, relatively, not enough buyers or consumers with the necessary cash to buy. The population was ready to consume but unable to pay. Under capitalism increased production, and overproduction, is the source of depression and want. It brings foreclosures on mortgages and ruin to the very producers. As an analyst Bromfield makes a good farmer.

* * *

Black market operators must look at Belgium, where such transactions are not regarded with green envy, as immoral or even illegal. A story is told about a Belgium woman who walking into a bakery shop for some pastry, laid down some points. The proprietress drew herself up haughtily "we accept no points here," she announced. "I'll have you understand we don't run that kind of place. We use only the best black market ingredients in our pastries." And after all, doesn't the end justify the means, especially if the pastry is delicious?

* * *

The aim of socialism is not to abolish all individual differences and inequalities. What it does propose to put an end to is *Social* inequalities or class privilege, whereby one class, the capitalists, live at the expense of another class, the workers.

R. Daniels.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 2)

control Board has been set up to gradually liquidate the presently revived OPA. Confusion reigns for the ambiguity of the law and the lawmakers have only added fire to the flaming price structure.

With or without the OPA, the cost of living has gone beyond the workers' wage capacity. To "hold the line" or run amuck without a line, that is a dilemma for free-enterprise. But labor is hooked either way. First it is exploited thoroughly in industry, only to be dry cleaned later by the merchants and landlords. Labor has no control over prices of other commodities, but workers certainly can and should make demands for higher wages.

* * *

World War III Preparations

Even though World War II ended in August of 1945, the United States government has NOT yet officially proclaimed its end. What's more, the rulers of America are getting ready NOW for World War III.

Get a look at this:

Exhibit A. "Kenneth C. Royall, Under-Secretary of War, said today that the Government was starting 'immediately' to build up a \$2,100,000,000 war reserve stockpile of the 'critical materials we would need first in an emergency.' "President Truman made available a \$100,000,000 down payment in signing a deficiency appropriation bill this week. Mr. Royall told a reporter that the Treasury's procurement division was expected to start letting contracts soon, acting as agent for the armed services.

"Mr. Royall is the War Department member of the Army and Navy Munitions Board."

Exhibit B. "In an attempt to keep close contact with industrial and business developments and to train officers for duties which are concerned with industrial mobilization and procurement planning, the recently established Industrial College of the Armed Forces will initiate in September an intensive ten-month course for specially selected officers, it was learned yesterday.

"The objectives of the school, which is under the direction of Brig. Gen. Donald Armstrong, include: Evaluation of the economic war potential of the United States and foreign nations; study and analysis of the current industrial mobilization plan, and other studies which may be useful to the procurement agencies, it was explained.

"Part of the course is designed to orient the officers in the broad aspects of world political, economic and power patterns. The greater part will be concerned with detailed studies into such general subjects as raw material resources, purchase policies, production controls, organization and administration of both production and procurement agencies and manpower

and population as it affects production effort." (N. Y. Times—Aug. 11.)

Men and material, not forgetting the piling up of atom bombs and the draft, are being readied right here and now in peace-loving America for another holocaust. This, while the World War II Peace Conference is in session.

The price in war dead is quite well known. Atomic war will exact a higher price. Homo-sapiens of America—Wake up!

General Corruption

The Senate War Investigating Committee started something when it pried into government wartime spending. Congressman May and Coffee weren't the only black sheep in the Washington pasture. Army officers in general and General Brehon Somervell, wartime commander of the Army Service Forces, in particular, seem to be tarred with the same brush, or, to put it politely, irregularities.

Senator Magnuson, Dem. Washington, on the Senate floor said that General Somervell "squandered practically \$300,000,000 of American money with supreme arrogance." The Senator's experience in dealing with the General in connection with the Alaskan Highway and Canol Oil projects were mentioned as the basis for his charges. The Senator continued "that so much secrecy was thrown around the latter (Canol Oil projects) that members of Congress could 'hardly ask questions about it.'" (Boston Globe, Aug. 1.)

Testifying before the investigating committee, Comptroller General Lindsay Warren, cited "fraternization" between Army officers and contractors and contract loopholes which cost the nation "untold millions."

"From my seat, it has looked as if everybody and his brother were out to get the government during the lush war years," he told the investigating committee.

The Comptroller General, in his testimony: "Reported Army officers accepting lucrative jobs from war producers whose government contracts they helped to draft and settle while in the service and denounced the practice as 'damnable.'"

"Declared acceptance by 'some' high government officials of entertainment, including cocktail parties, hotel bills and travel expenses, from contractors was 'the rule rather than the exception. (Our emphasis.)"

"What incentive remains to exercise the American genius for efficiency when the most far-fetched and extravagant outlays are reimbursed, dollar for dollar, upon the unchecked approval of a friendly or downright sociable contracting officer?" asked Warren. (Boston Globe—July 30.)

We, too, ask the reader to consider this: What else could be expected from a "damnable" robber system but brazen corruption, graft and other such "smart"

transactions? Is not profit, robbery? Legal robbery of the working man?

* * *

GI Political Action

Athens, Tennessee (population 6700) took the nation, last month, by surprise as its ex-GI's took over the political administration by storm. It was a veritable little revolution accompanied by resistance and force. The breaking point was reached when after arresting numerous veterans, the entrenched political machine resorted to high handed methods in counting the votes by removing the ballot boxes to the county jail. There Sheriff Mansfield and 75 deputies, fortified themselves, defying the angry crowd, ordering them to disperse. But instead the GI's went for their guns and after considerable shooting and some dynamiting, surrender was forced upon the deputies and the old political machine was counted out.

This certainly is political action, and how. But, what are its objectives? That is important to know. For if it is only an alignment of veterans versus civilians, there certainly is danger in such a division. It could eventually lead to a semi-military dictatorship. Or if its aim is merely the elimination of an entrenched, corrupt political machine (and we certainly are for that) it falls short of its goal. It will displace one machine only to develop another. Machines and machine politics are capitalist institutions. Machine politics are inherent in capitalist politics and cannot escape its influence.

Veterans, like their brethren in overalls must recognize the class division in society and it is along this line, the class, that they should orientate their politics. The only kind of political action that the Proletarian Party can regard as socially progressive and to the benefit of all who labor is that of working class political action. Such action will not limit itself to the mere ousting of local politicians. It will dig deeper into the economic roots upon which the political game rests.

* * *

Democratic Lynching

As we record our burning condemnation of the recent "lynching party" in Monroe, Georgia, in which 4 negroes, 2 young men and their wives (one an ex-GI) were the lynch-victims of race hate, our memories go back only a few years. It was during the war crisis when an all-out effort and sacrifice was called for. "We must all rally unstintingly, regardless of race or color in defense of our common liberties against fascist racist oppression."

The Negro people, who though the worst sufferers from southern "hospitality" and persecution for generations long, had, too, answered "democracy's" call. Their sons fought and bled equally, and side by side, with the whites. The parents, men and women, worked hard and long. Many have entered industry for the first time, this not without opposition from somebigoted white workers. Legislation

was even sponsored (FEPC) to facilitate this much needed source of labor-power. Work in modern factories, and increased income, have brought many Negroes, for the first time, into the cities and closer to the white living quarters, causing repeated resentment, friction and even riots.

It was inevitable, as a result of rising income, economic participation and opportunity, that a greater sense of independence and social equalitarianism should grow. But this development was watched avidly and with a resentful suspicion by the white-chauvinist element. It was a temporary emergency that was not to be endured for long, they felt. Reaction was to follow. "The Negro was getting too bold," they said, "soon he would be running America." "He must be put in kept in his place."

And it is happening. In class-divided, race-divided America, it could not be otherwise. No sooner was the war over than the status quo ante was reinaugurated. Negroes are barred from voting, at the risk of their lives. The Bilbos, Talmadges and the Ku Kluxers are furiously entrenching, to uphold, in the name of Americanism, white supremacy.

The minutest incident provides occasion for a lynch-fest. The local authorities are usually in cahoots with the hate-crazed mob and are conveniently indifferent. Appeal to the Federal authorities brings the usual *promise* of investigation. And there it remains until another incident occurs.

The Monroe foul-murder is not on isolated case. It is a link in an endless chain of race-persecution, in no way different than that of the "Nazi beast." Race-victimization is just as brutal, whether it is perpetrated by Democrats and Christians or by fascists. The hypocrisy even adds salt to the wounds when these same elements talk about democracy and liberty for all, subscribe to the Christian principle of "brotherhood of man," while committing these acts of social crime.

The Negro workers, and these constitute the bulk of their people, must face the truth, once and for all, as to the social cause of their plight. It is the economic system, capitalism, that is responsible for it. Race discrimination is that bastard-child of class divided society, democratic or fascist. As long as capital exploits labor, both white and Negro, property will take precedence over human values, the rich over the poor. The emancipation of the Negro is just as much, and even more, the responsibility and task of the White workers. The latter, too must realize that as long as the Negro is discriminated against, he, too, remains the object of economic poverty. Together they must march against the system that exploits both. Abolish private property and exploitation and the race problem will be over. Together the nation's producers and useful citizens can live in harmonious relationship.

L.B.

MARXISM AND DARWINISM

(Continued from page 5)

fit. He attacked socialism saying that such a system would bring about the deterioration of the human race through the abolition of this natural struggle and the preservation of the weak and unfit.

Neither Haeckel's nor Spencer's arguments can stand up under scientific scrutiny. No valid comparison can be made between a social organism and an animal body. Men do not differ like cells or organs, but only in capacities. Furthermore, in capitalist society the most fit do not survive: *for it is the possession of capital and not personal fitness that determines who shall survive and who perish.* As Pannekoek so aptly remarks, "When the small capitalists perish, they do not perish as men but as capitalists; they are not weeded out from among the living but from the bourgeoisie." Capitalist competition is altogether different from the animal struggle for existence. The workers are the ones who perish as people, but not in the competitive struggle. They do not compete with the capitalists but only sell their labor power to them. They are not poor and wretched because they lost the race but because they are underpaid.

The two theories are distinct. Darwinism applies to animal development, and Marxism applies to the development of man and society.

The laws of animal development simply cannot apply to the capitalist system. The previously mentioned attempts to make them apply represent efforts to show the capitalist system as both permanent and natural. Marxism teaches us that no social system is permanent, and indeed, is natural only under specific conditions. Marxism teaches us that capitalism is doomed to be permanently and naturally liquidated.

Man, like some animals, is a social being. Among animals who live socially in herds, or groups, the struggle for existence takes on a different form than is the case among the rapacious animals who lead isolated lives. *The struggle is against nature and not one's fellows!* It is a cooperative, group struggle among social animals, against the forces outside the group. It is "one for all, and all for one." Strong and weak alike survive, as a result of united effort. The motive of self-preservation becomes subordinate to the motive of group-preservation. The origin of this motive is, of course, external necessity. They must hang together or hang separately. The group in which the social instincts are most strongly developed is the group with the greatest chances for survival.

So the claim that it is natural for the weak to perish (Haeckel, Spencer, *et al.*) is belied by nature itself among the animals that live socially, such as deers, most apes, etc. The strong protect the weak. As a result the whole group grows

stronger. It is the individualist in certain branches of the animal world that is most apt to perish, not the collectivist!

Man differs from *all* other animals in that he possesses language, higher reason, and self-made tools. The qualitative differences between man and the animals in these three departments are so tremendous that no valid comparison between them is possible. Animals, for instance, cannot name objects or activities; nor can they reason abstractly; nor can they create tools with a specific aim. It is only in living socially, be it noted, that man can develop these special abilities. The isolated individual could have no language, nor could his tools be preserved and improved by a subsequent generation. Knowledge is not innate, but acquired. These special peculiarities of man are all closely connected and have their basis in living socially. One is impossible without the other. It was undoubtedly through the use of a stick or club, later developed into crude tools that our ape-like progenitors became men. Of course, as man develops, his language, reason and tools, become ever more complex, but the important fact is that without *labor* (the application of self-made tools in procuring the means of subsistence) man could never have reached his present high stage of evolution.

Pannekoek calls tools the "artificial organs of men." It is the hand in conjunction with the tool that has enabled man to adapt himself to any environment. Every animal, on the other hand, is restricted, as a result of its structure, to a definite environment outside of which it cannot exist. The essence of Marxism, like that of Darwinism, is also associated with struggle. Its starting point is the recognition of the fact that property society is divided into classes and that those classes, by historic circumstances, are forced to battle to the death. This is the class struggle. Marx did not discover this. It was known before his time. But he did discover its real character, that society moves forward by the process of class struggle, and when the old ruling class has outlived its historic usefulness its political supremacy is overthrown by the new class which social evolution has ripened for the task.

Today, this struggle is worldwide. The worker sees his kind increasing in numbers while the parasitic owning class decreases and more and more he comes to realize that it is by association with his fellows, and political class action to gain possession of the means of production, that will solve his problems. Therefore, he consciously struggles for the socialization of the means of production, abolition of the profit system and the introduction of a system of production for use.

Lewis R. Schultz.

International Notes

(Continued from page 3)

as the big bad wolf. One of the bourgeois prostitute writers tried to draw an analogy between Tito and Goering. The difference between Tito and Goering is the difference between day and night. Tito is a true internationalist (he speaks seven languages) who has spent all his life fighting for the working class. Goering has spent all of his life fighting for German imperialism.

The Soviet Union was brought into the picture. Yugoslavia and Tito are just puppets of the Kremlin continued the prostitute press. The Yugoslav republic is not a soviet state. There are strong bourgeois elements within the country that would like to bring it back to its former reactionary condition before the war. Only outside intervention will bring these elements back to power. The Yugoslav working class is well organized and on its way towards complete power.

PALESTINE:

At the present time this hot spot

is a big headache to British imperialism. How to keep the nationalist Arabs and bourgeois Jews contended and still maintain his dominant position in this very strategic locale is John Bull's problem. This is an entrance to the rich oil fields of the near east. No modern nation can maintain its position without this most important strategic material.

For centuries the Arabs have cultivated this land. It is only within the last few decades that the Jews really became interested. Zionism, a movement to make Palestine a Jewish state, is a bourgeois movement dominated by rich Jews. World War II and the persecution of the Jews in Europe has accelerated this movement. The Zionists would like to make Palestine a modern agricultural and industrial nation with the exploitation of Jew by Jew. The rich Arab landowners are fighting this. The only solution is the overthrow of both the Jewish and Arab exploiters by the poor Jews and poor Arabs. C. B. and S. C.

The Lunch Box and the Ballot Box

(Continued from page 2)

\$15 billion a year. These savings (\$35 billion) each year are causing a lot of goods to be left unsold.

Business expansion and new housing, financed by credit, use up about \$17 billion of these savings. Building up of inventories, or putting goods on the shelves, take another \$4 billion. Foreign loans take about \$5 billion. This cuts into the savings, but does not use them up. Besides, it is not to be expected that the \$9 billion for inventories and foreign loans can be continued indefinitely. It is not expected that the \$17 billion used for business and housing can be continued. The highest former figure was \$15.6 billion in 1929, and that was too much. In 1939 such use of savings amounted to \$9 billion. "Either we slide into a depression that may make 1929 look like a picnic or we take action to forestall it," says Mr. Roberston.

It is this kind of action that organized labor needs to take. Organized labor wants more of its products for itself, both to get more enjoyment out of life and also to save the nation from further depressions, a real noble task.

And this is to be done by continuing to put labor's "friends" into political office.

Labor has put some "friends" into office before. What became of them? Were labor's demands during last winter and spring outrageous? Why did not labor's "friends" stand by labor in time of need? If those political "friends" could not be relied upon what assurance is there that those elected this coming November will be true to the bitter end?

Now when Congressional wages have been advanced it should not be hard to find Congressional candidates who will agree to an additional sandwich in the lunchbox. Such candidates, if elected, will be sworn in to uphold the Constitution, to protect property, to serve the public. These after election promises are more likely to be kept. And these, strangely enough, do not coincide with labor's demands, be they ever so "reasonable." Sooner or later, labor will have to adopt more manly demands. Labor itself will also have to provide the means of obtaining what it seeks.

Economic law rules capitalist production. It decrees a diminishing return to labor in comparison to every productive advancement. This should be very clear. If a capitalist anywhere should install a new machine which did not reduce his labor cost per unit of output, he would be forced to look upon such an investment as a wrong move. His competitor would get a laugh out of it, and take a long step ahead.

Government, under capitalism, must provide protection for production. The relief that labor seeks cannot come from such a government. There is a very close connection between labor's political action and its economic status, but that status does not stand any show of improvement under the prevailing form of political action. Not an extra morsel in the lunch box from labor's "friends," but the whole product of labor, through labor's own decision, will be the required change in labor's political activity.

Christ Jelset.

A Few Words About the UNO

To understand the troubles the United Nations are having in coming to some kind of agreement on their fundamental foreign relations, one must understand the economic motive of each nation as practiced at home; and must realize the desire of each nation to spread its motive to other nations.

Economic systems of all nations are composed of individual units of activity of many kinds—production and services—all depending upon each other to a certain extent. And all units are composed of managers, planners, and workers, those who give and those who obey orders. All those are perfectly natural. No other way would be efficient.

In all the United Nations, except Russia, all units of activity are privately owned, which ownership is backed up by the proper governments, and run for private profits; the "workers" are known as employees and receive "wages" for their labor; they own no part of the unit in which they labor; the income of a unit belongs to the "owners." But in Russia practically all units are owned and run by the workers thereof, and for their special benefit; there are no employees in the usual sense of that word, no "wages"; the income of all units belongs to the workers.

One must stop right here and think what the difference is, and means, in the two kinds of economic systems. For instance, the Ford automobile works, a unit of production, is owned by the Ford family. It has its managers, planners, and its 500,000 workers. The employees receive wages for their labor. They own no part of the works. Its income belongs to the family of Fords. The incomes of the 500,000 workers are not much more than what the Fords please to give them, at most about the average that auto capitalists must pay. And naturally they will not give them any more than they have to, for the more they pay the less they will have for themselves. Right there, appears the great antagonism between owners and workers of a private unit of activity.

The economic interests of workers and capitalists are just the opposite. They are enemies. That is perfectly natural! Neither side will ever be satisfied with its share, the income of the workers, or the profits of the employers. They will always be quarreling. No possible chance for continued peace. Under capitalism the struggle must and does go on.

But in Soviet Russia, almost the opposite economic conditions prevail. If works similar to Ford's exist in Russia, the 500,000 workers have the power to choose their managers, planners, and such from among themselves, and they obey the orders of those whom they place in authority. They are not employees, not "wage" workers in the ordinary sense. The income

from all industry belongs to the community as a whole, not to private capitalists, as in "free enterprise" countries. There are no antagonism, no divided economic interests, no class that produces and another class that appropriates. And, that is communism.

The one great difference in a unit of activity located here in the United States and one located in Russia, and the one causing most of our troubles, is the difference in the division of the income of that unit. Everything else is similar. The income of the Fords is fabulous; that of an employee, infinitesimal, in comparison. In Russia the income of a unit of activity is more nearly divided up equally between those engaged therein. But what difference there is, is the result of the workers themselves; they decide what that difference shall be.

The governments of all the United Nations, except Russia, and especially England and the United States, represent the "owners" of their units of activity. Most members of those governments are the owners of some unit of activity or other, and from which they draw fabulous incomes. The working people have no representatives; they have nothing to say as to the relations between nations, or between units of activity. The "owners" run everything! In Russia the government represents the workers of their units of activity. The members of its government

are chosen by the workers, and from their own class. In fact there is no "owner" class! The working people run everything! In Russia the workers have no fear of their government; but they do have fear of the other governments, especially, those of England and the United States. In the two latter the owners of the units of activity have no fear of their governments, but they do have fear of the government of Russia. In other words, the workers of Russia fear the "owners" of other nations; in those other nations the owners fear the workers of Russia; for after all a government of a nation is only the power of the ruling class thereof. And that ruling class is going to rule for its own special benefit.

So, one can see as much difference between the motive of Russians' actions and the motives of the other United Nations' as there is in the economic conditions of the "owners" and "workers" of the units of activity of England and the United States. Russia is thinking of the welfare of the workers, the other United Nations, that of the capitalists, the owners of all their units of activity.

No intelligent man outside of the U.N.O. ever expects harmony between the United Nations. The difference in their fundamental economic principles is too glaring. Both sides to that difference are in deadly earnest. Arguments mean nothing to the opposite side. Each side sees the other's motive. The delegates are no fools. It is as clear as the noonday sun that Russia's arguments favor the work-

ing class of the world; the other United Nations', that of the capitalist class, the owners of the units of activity. And both sides are "hopeless bigots"; each expects the other side to give in—to see the light.

Nothing but force will ever create the appearance of harmony among the capitalist nations, and sooner or later that means WAR! Peace is hopeless! Figure it out for yourself.

H. M. Harnden.

ECHOES OF HITLER

On August 9 President Truman gave an interview to a group of youthful students studying government today. This group was sponsored by the American Legion. Among some of the things he told them about the American republic was his belief that it is "good for a thousand years." Less than ten years ago Adolf Hitler said that the third reich would last a thousand years. How long will Truman's prophecy last?

The next day, August 10, Undersecretary of War Kenneth C. Royall said that the government was starting to "immediately" build a \$2,100,000,000 war reserve stockpile of "critical materials we would need first in an emergency."

This government proclaims its interest in peace but prepares for war in the immediate future after having just finished one. What are some of the problems confronting the American workers today. Everybody knows about the housing shortage. Here are some other pressing problems. Forty-three per cent of America's homes lack private bath or shower. "This means approximately 18,000,000 families do not have what is considered a basic necessity of American good living. In addition there are 14,000,000 homes which are without flush toilets facilities; surveys show that 9,800,000 homes have only three rooms or less." * * * "31 per cent of America's homes lack running water." * * * "10,700,000 dwelling units are not equipped with modern plumbing facilities. Over 9,000,000 homes in U. S. have no refrigeration; 19,800,000 homes do not have the warmth and comfort of a central heating system." * * * 21 per cent of America's homes lack electricity." (Kearney & Trecker Corp., Milwaukee, Wis.) Imagine one-fifth of all homes lacking this most essential of necessities.

Less than a decade ago there were over 10,000,000 workers unemployed. The building trades workers were about the hardest hit. They were able and willing to work. There was plenty of material to remedy the above situation. What was the bottleneck? PROFITS. Nothing moves unless somebody makes a profit. Shortage of the above necessities will last while the capitalist system lasts.

C. B.

GET A BOOK FREE

If you send Fifty Cents for a year's subscription to PROLETARIAN NEWS (1545 Larrabee Street, Chicago, Ill.) you can have any one of the following books free, \$1.00 for a two years' subscription entitles you to pamphlets to the value of 35 cents. Postage paid.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO, by Marx and Engels.....	10c
WAGE-LABOR AND CAPITAL, by Karl Marx.....	15c
MARXISM AND DARWINISM, by Anton Pannekoek.....	15c
CLASS STRUGGLES IN AMERICA, by A. M. Simons.....	15c
CRIME, ITS CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES, by John Keracher.....	15c
ECONOMICS FOR BEGINNERS, by John Keracher.....	10c
THE HEAD-FIXIN GINDUSTRY, by John Keracher.....	15c
PRODUCERS AND PARASITES, by John Keracher.....	10c
PROLETARIAN LESSONS, by John Keracher.....	25c
HOW THE GODS WERE MADE, by John Keracher.....	15c
WHY UNEMPLOYMENT, by John Keracher.....	10c

Send me PROLETARIAN NEWS for a period of, for which I here enclose \$.....

Also send the book (or books) which I have marked.

Subscriber's name

Address

Subscribe to
PROLETARIAN NEWS