

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. 11—Whole No. 164

Chicago, Illinois, November, 1946

483

Price 5c a Copy

Has It Been Too Good?

The reconversion period was presented as a difficult one. The changeover from war production would require time. Demobilization would bring the boys home again faster than they could be absorbed into peace-time occupations.

Shortages of consumer goods would linger on for quite a while. The pressure on prices would be great. Price trends would be upward in spite of ceilings, while unemployment would reach the eight million mark. A year and a half would be required before the post-war wonders of peace and plenty could be realized. Thus, in the main, ran official thinking at the close of World War II.

The eighteen months period since VE Day has about passed. It is fourteen months since Japan hoisted the white flag. The reconversion period is about over, and the long awaited period of peace and prosperity should be at hand. Now it is possible to look back at the former, while glimpses into the latter are being attempted.

The reconversion period, in the main, was not so severe as expected. Particularly did jobs become available faster than had been hoped for. What unemployment there was has been cushioned with unemployment insurance payments, and the number of unem-

ployed did not reach the predicted figures. It has been estimated that at no time during the period has unemployment exceeded two and one half millions.

Shortages of goods and rising prices have, on the other hand, been most annoying. Labor has received more than its share of abuse for having caused both, by its strikes and its slow-down on the production line. Labor has hurled back the charge against producers and dealers for holding goods off the market, in their "strikes" for higher prices. If anything has been proven it is that labor's pay envelopes have shrunk in relation to prices, that real wages have declined.

But now, when this annoying reconversion period is about over, it should be time for rejoicing. Shortages are finally beginning to disappear. Shoppers can once more afford to look around before buying. Store shelves are beginning to fill. Consumer durables (automobiles, sewing machines, etc.) are still short but coming rapidly. Housing remains the one bad feature.

This is one side of the picture. There is another, a darker side. As the goods reappear in the store windows, and on the shelves, cus-

(Continued on page 7)

HOME SCENE

Political Meat Ball

The top problem in the country today is that of meat. It is on everyone's tongue, but that is as far as it goes. Meat-consciousness has taken hold of the American people. They are beefing because of its absence from the table for the bulk of the population, the workers. Workers of heavy industry such as miners, have made it known that they could not continue to labor on a "grass diet." The Speakeasies of the 20's are being paralleled in the 40's with Meat-easies, and with similar results.

Like the prohibition issue, it has become a political football. Francis L. McElroy, New York Democratic State campaign manager, charged on Oct. 5th that: "The present meat famine is a direct result of a deliberate, malicious conspiracy to starve the voters into submis-

sion as part of the Republican campaign of 1948. The only way the reactionary Republican leadership and the controlling financial interests of this country can return to the robber baron period of the twenties is to create dissatisfaction among the people. Anxious to control Congress and hamstring the President, they have entered into a conspiracy with the producers, to starve them during the days before election, becloud the issues and hold the promise of meat when they elect a 'friendly' Congress.

"Here, in a land where our crops are bountiful, our herds multitudinous, we have a wretched, ruthless crew of unscrupulous Republican leaders deliberately employing the totalitarian technique of mass starvation to force people into subjection."

(Continued on page 6)

The Nazi War Criminals, Spawn of Capitalism

It was said that "justice triumphed" when Hermann Goering, Rudolph Hess, Joachim von Ribbentrop and sixteen other arch-conspirators of the Nazi regime were found guilty of war crimes and sentenced by the International Military Tribunal of the allied powers at Nuremberg, Germany, early in October. In all, twenty-two of the Nazi war criminals were on trial which lasted for a period of around ten months, giving the culprits an ample opportunity to make pleas in their own defense. The trial was also well documented with evidence, particularly of the atrocities, "crimes against humanity," committed by the German armies during World War II. The guilt of those on trial was established beyond the shadow of a doubt. The International Tribunal sentenced to death twelve of the Nazi war criminals and seven to varying sentences. But it also acquitted three of them, Hjalmar Schacht, Franz von Papen,

and Hans Fritzsche, who were judged not guilty. The acquittal of these three has shocked many, and in particular those who suffered most from the Nazi regime, who have voiced their opinion that all 22 of them should have been condemned to death.

The leniency displayed in these trials was criticized by the Soviet Union who dissented to the acquittal of Schacht, von Papen and Fritzsche, and also demanded that sentence of death be passed upon Hess instead of life imprisonment. The Soviet newspaper Izvestia declared:

"The role of these four prisoners in the crimes of the Hitlerite regime is sufficiently well known, it cannot be denied and it is impossible to forget. Nevertheless the majority of the Nuremberg judges, despite the Soviet representative's protest, found it possible to display amazing mildness to those four hardened criminals."

(Continued on page 2)

International Notes

Paris Peace Parley

On October 15, the Paris Peace Conference drew to a fruitless close after eleven weeks of bitter debate, charges and counter-charges. Twenty-one nations representatives met in July for the purpose of arranging the terms and conditions of peace for five former satellite states of Germany, namely, Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Italy and Romania. After much preparation and discussion by the foreign ministers relative to procedure, national boundaries, reparations, status of Trieste, etc., the main job of writing the peace was begun. By the time the first balloting took place the sharp cleavage between "East" and "West" was revealed.

The late lamented "Atlantic Charter of Four Freedoms" had proclaimed to the world the "great and noble" ideals for which the Allies had fought. Oppressed and subjugated peoples were to find their freedom and expression, the

right of self-determination was proclaimed, the world was to be a "paradise" in comparison.

To carry on a successful war against the Axis powers required unity of purpose and effort. These were agreed upon by the heads of state, Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin, and their satellite aids, at Teheran, Malta and Potsdam, in a series of conferences during the war.

With the great economic might of Britain, the U. S. and U. S. S. R. behind them, these plans were carried through to completion. War ceased and peace became the order of the day.

Before and after Potsdam, a change in personalities took place. Roosevelt died a "natural" death, Churchill a "political" death, only the Soviet representatives remaining the same. Much has been made of this change of men, but in reality, the underlying basic differences between the powers remained, as the conference revealed Attlee and

(Continued on page 2)

THE NAZI WAR CRIMINALS-- SPAWN OF CAPITALISM

(Continued from page 1)

Izvestia also criticized the International Tribunal's failure to condemn the Hitler Government and the German High Command as criminal organizations. It pointed out that it was in the German Government and High Command "that all the atrocities for which the Tribunal deemed it necessary to hang Goering . . . were conceived and accomplished."

Izvestia furthermore pointed out that the German Government and its High Command did not differ in essence from the Gestapo, SS, and SD, which were found guilty by the Tribunal. It declared that:

"The fact that the judges did not extend this verdict to the German Government and the German military command was without a doubt a serious error." (As quoted in New York Times, October 3.

From the extreme right in America there was also comment forth-coming as to the Nuremberg trials and decision. Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio in a speech at Kenyon College on October 5th called the death penalties "vengeance" rather than justice. He said that the sentences violated the *ex post-facto* principle in that they were assessed for acts which legally were not crimes at the time of commission. He expressed doubts as to the legal foundations of the Nuremberg trial and went the judges one better by even advocating greater leniency and in decrying the death sentences as "vengeance" he advocated life imprisonment by executive action, as in the case of Napoleon. It is very evident that the Nazi war criminals are not without their sympathizers here in America.

But the New York Times in its editorial of October 11th differs with Senator Taft's viewpoint by saying: "That it is justice, both moral and legal, is attested by the overwhelming approval of it by public opinion and the legal profession, not only among the victors but even among the vanquished themselves. Indeed, the three (Nazi) leaders whom the Tribunal freed as outside its strictly circumscribed jurisdiction are being prosecuted by the Germans themselves and are likely to join their surviving co-defendants in prison."

Criticism of the Tribunal's acquittal of Schacht, von Papen and Fritzsche, was also quite bitter in the "liberal" American press, as for example in New York's PM (October 3rd) wherein Bernstein comments that: "Death to the fascists is impressive, but death to Fascism would have been much more so." He concludes by saying that "Somehow one feels let down by the verdict. From the very beginning, the interest in this trial has not been so much in the fate of the individual as it was in the fate of the principles. This trial has marked this much advance: inter-

national law can now require death to international murders. *But this trial has not proved that a respectable international gangster, whose weapon is not a gun, but money, power, and prestige, and who lets others do his work for him, is as guilty as he who pulls the trigger.*" (Emphasis, Bernstein's.)

Samuel Grafton, columnist for the New York Post (October 8th) offers us this tid-bit of information and comment on the Nuremberg trials. The one important defendant at Nuremberg who might conceivably have been found guilty of helping an aggressive conspiracy was Schacht, but Schacht was found innocent. Schacht was a banker; and Nuremberg, therefore, has failed to establish the principle that business people, bankers, and industrialists, etc., can be held as accountable as military figures for moral misjudgements. Perhaps it is a sign that ours is primarily a business culture rather than a military culture, that our prosecution of Nazis has not yet set up the doctrine that a manufacturer who helps in a conspiracy against the peace can be punished therefor; we seem rather less hesitant about putting moral burdens on the military than on trade."

It has been estimated that more than 2,000 Nazis and industrialists are in custody in the British and U. S. zones. But the new trials expected to be held in several parts of the U. S. zone are expected to bring only about 10 per cent of these before the "bar of justice." What effect the acquittal of Schacht will have on these trials we can deduce from the comment that appeared in World Report (October 15th) a weekly periodical published in Washington, D. C. which states as follows:

"The decision in the Nuremberg trial of top Nazis now holds out hope of freedom for 200 of the leading industrialists who geared Germany for war. These men have been held by the Allies as possible war criminals. But the Nuremberg verdict acquitting Dr. Hjalmer Schacht, former reichsbank President, of war guilt has prompted Allied prosecutors to review their cases against the industrialists."

It appears therefore that those German industrialists such as Alfred Krupp, wartime head of the munitions firm, together with most of the big capitalists of Germany stand a good chance of also being acquitted. For as World Report further remarks: "Schacht's acquittal was based primarily on the fact that he was not a member of the inner circle around Hitler. Neither were most of the industrialists in custody. The Tribunal recognized that a man in Schacht's position should have been able to discern the true significance of Hitler's rearmament program but held that rearmament is not in it-

International Notes

(Continued from page 1)

Bevin, Truman and Byrnes have capitalist class interests, in the main, just as efficiently as if they had been Churchill and Eden, Roosevelt and Hull.

Following World War I, only capitalist powers sat at the peace conference. All settlements were made upon the basis of a "capitalist peace." The new Soviet state only "lurked" in the background. Wars, as the "locomotives of history" bring great changes. Following World War II, the Soviet Union was no longer "lurking" in the shadows, she is in the "limelight," up at the "head" of the peace table. Paris has revealed that no longer can predatory, capitalist "giants" ride rough shod over all the nations and peoples of the earth. This time a voice was raised in behalf of the oppressed, the subjugated, the enslaved peoples of the world. Item after item, proposal after proposal had two sides to be presented to the delegates. Time after time the vote was 15 to 6. Imperialism and its "friends" lined up against Communism and its "friends." Seeds of future trouble were sown at Paris, reaction was "triumphant" on most issues. Natural aspirations were stifled, solution of problems, on a basis agreeable to the nations and groups involved, were denied. Witness the procedure against Yugoslavia and Trieste. Economic and financial interests are endeavouring to recover lost resources and markets, such as the oil of Romania, the markets of Central Europe, domination of the Danube and its adjacent trade and territory.

The political maneuverings at Paris are indicative of the main cause of differences. If the former landlords, capitalists and their henchman are to be denied their former wealth, power and influence it means less economic advantages for the capitalist class of the whole world. If property and business are lost behind the "iron curtain," there will be that much less opportunity for capitalist exploitation. But the other side, too, presents a picture. Steps have been taken, dividing up land, running the industries and carrying on daily affairs of daily life without the former "masters."

Time and again the votes of the "6" against the "15" revealed the necessitation for a furtherance of these plans and efforts by settling the questions before the body in the interests of the small nations involved. Also time and again the vote of the "15" against the "6" showed equal determination to frustrate development by turning back to old ways.

In the closing speech by Molotov, he pointed out that the "Western" representatives had repudi-

self a war crime."

It was an amazing decision, unique in history, that the Tribunal

(Continued on page 7)

ated previous agreements and had "steam-rolled" decisions through the conference. For example, the repudiation of the "Big Four" agreement on Trieste in favor of an "undemocratic" regime and the "ganging up" on the Danube settlement by states "not directly concerned."

In the final statement by Vandenburg he said: "The United States will leave it to history to judge its motives. . . ." Yes, history will judge that high and lofty ideals, put forward by a ruling class as a smoke screen to cover up their predatory interests and ambitions, cannot be reconciled with the basic facts of social and economic slavery.

The great contradiction of the present period of social development, namely, greater wealth for the ever narrowing few and greater misery and poverty for the many, cannot be reconciled, can only be resolved by continued struggle.

In the words of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, in "The Communist Manifesto," "The history of all hitherto existing society (that is, all written history), is the history of class struggles." Paris has shown that "East is east and west is west and never the twain shall meet," that is, the new world order now being born cannot develop and flower into fruition without continued struggle. Capitalism and Communism cannot be reconciled, joined together or live in peace, the one represents the old social relationships, private property with private ownership of the means of production and the products, the other, social ownership and controls of the means of life.

Argentina

President Juan Peron on October 21, announced a five year plan of industrialization with a goal of "the greatest possible degree of economic self-sufficiency for Argentina." (Chicago Sun.) The principle point of the plan calls for "intensification of state controls over every phase of Argentine economy." By 1951, with 1943 as a base, the plan hopes to increase "value of industrial production by 43.3 per cent; total wages and salaries by 52.8 per cent; number of persons employed by 34 per cent; the nations total horsepower capacity by 50 per cent." "A land policy calls for the subdivision of large estates and organization of small farmers in to producer cooperatives."

With this announcement Argentina enters the arena of economic struggle with the powers who have used her mainly as a source of raw materials, markets for surplus commodities and fields of investment and influence. Does she possess the necessary coal, iron, oil and the thousand and one other materials needed to accomplish her aims? If not, will she be able to enlist other South American coun-

Revolutionary Socialism

Broadly speaking there are two schools of thought regarding the achievement of a Socialist society.

Firstly, there is the group, and this is the largest in this country, who believe that Socialism will be achieved by a reform of the present system of society. By gradually removing the evils of present society by a series of reforms, they maintain that a Socialist society can be built. These people, known as Reformist Socialists, or Social Democrats, derive their ideas from the Fabian Society, a society which claimed such notabilities as Sidney and Beatrice Webb and G. B. Shaw as its founders. Similar ideas were propounded towards the end of the last century in Germany by Eduard Bernstein, and although his views were defeated at the time, the Social Democratic party of Germany found themselves accepting them later on. However, these socialists believe that by gradually reforming present society, we will proceed with the *inevitability of gradualness* towards Socialism.

The other school of thought is those who oppose these reformist ideas, saying that Socialism will not be achieved by mere reforms of present society, or merely by removing the evils of society. Socialism will not be achieved by the accepted constitutional methods which the reformists are trying to use. Socialism is an entirely different form of society, and can only be introduced when present society can no longer function. Socialism is not achieved with the "inevitability of gradualness"; it is not achieved by reform. Reform will only function within certain limits, but beyond these limits, society has to have a complete transformation and this can only be achieved by social revolution. This school of thought, known as Scientific Socialists, Revolutionary Socialist, or named after the founder of Scientific Socialism, Marx-

tries in trade alliances assuring her of supplies and outlets for finished goods? On these and many other questions depend the success of her ambitious plans.

Where does the United States, Britain and other economic rivals stand in relation to this move? David Laurence of the United States News has stated it this way, "Will the Fascist cancer in Argentina spread until it involves all Latin America and threatens us from the south?"

From a working class viewpoint one fact stands out. With the building of an industrialized nation, a class conscious proletariat is brought into being. When that nation expands her economy greater numbers of workers are brought into the class struggle, sharpening the differences and hastening the time when "the final conflict" becomes inevitable. Argentina will prove to be no exception.

Stanley Cederlund.

ists, is the one which I propose to deal with today.

My aim is to show you that Socialism will not be achieved with the inevitability of gradualness, but by social revolution. And in order to attempt to prove my point I will give you one or two analogies from natural science.

Firstly, let us imagine a beaker of water on a gas ring. As the gas gives heat to the water, the water gets hotter and hotter with the inevitability of gradualness. If the beaker contains 100 cc of water, then the temperature of the water will rise 1 degree Centigrade for every 100 calories of heat which it receives. And so on, with the inevitability of gradualness, the temperature is raised from 15 to 100 degrees Centigrade. But at 100 degrees Centigrade, the theory of the inevitability of gradualness ceases to function. The water finds that it can no longer exist as water and has to change into steam. In other words, we get a complete transformation of the water, because it cannot exist in the liquid state beyond a certain stage, and has to become a vapor. In other words, a revolution has taken place.

We could give innumerable examples of such transformations in science. How a solid is gradually heated and becomes a liquid which in turn gradually becomes hotter and hotter and becomes a gas. At a certain stage the solid or the liquid finds that it has to suffer a complete transformation. The theory of the inevitability of gradualness only works within certain limits and is not a rule for guidance on every occasion.

As one further example, let us take the classical one of an egg being hatched. Assuming the egg is fertile, the white of the egg, gradually assumes the form of a chicken in embryo. With the inevitability of gradualness, the chick grows, and as it grows, it eats up the yolk of the egg with the same inevitability of gradualness. And it becomes equally inevitable that a stage will arrive at which there will be no yolk left. And so the chick can no longer exist within the shell of the egg and therefore breaks the shell, thus performing a social revolution in its own life.

And so the working class movement will at some time have to recognize that under existing society it can no longer continue to gain reforms, but must break the shell of society and find its existence in a more advanced form of society, and like the chick enjoy a freedom which it never knew existed.

Now let us come down from the clouds, and relate this to political science, and in particular to revolutionary socialism. I have given you a few examples from the other sciences to show you that the inevitability of gradualness only works within certain limits, and how at a certain stage the gradual change ends and an abrupt change takes

place. I now propose to show how this also happens with regard to the structure of society.

First of all, two definitions. Economics. Economics is that science which deals with the production and distribution of wealth. Politics. Politics is the science of government. Since these two are very closely inter-related, it is necessary that we should be clear as to their meaning. We should also be clear as to their inter-relation. Since economics deals with the production and distribution of wealth, it is obvious that the manner in which the wealth in a given society is distributed (and produced, although this is not so obvious) will determine to a large extent the type of government which is in power.

Man has certain basic needs which must be satisfied. Firstly, he must be fed; secondly, he must be clothed, and thirdly, he must be housed. He must be able to provide for his family and at all times he endeavors not only to satisfy himself with bare necessities but to obtain comforts and even luxuries. But in order to provide these things he must work, using the raw materials which nature provides him. Primitive man made his needs direct from the products of nature; modern man still satisfies his needs from the products of nature but in a more roundabout manner. In whatever society man finds himself he therefore needs: (a) Products of nature, whether it be the bare earth to grow food on, a coal mine, or a stream to drive machinery with. He needs (b) his own labor, or that of others; and he needs (c) tools, or machinery.

The three prerequisites therefore for the production of wealth are raw materials, labor and tools, irrespective of what system of society is in operation.

What determines a society is not the tools which are used but the manner in which the three prerequisites (raw materials, tools and labor) are linked together and under what mode of production they are utilized. The character of any given society is determined by the economic mode of production.

For instance, under primitive communism, the raw materials and the tools were owned in common by the tribe and utilized in the interest of all members of the tribe, the labor not being paid for by wages, but by a share in the tribe's wealth.

Under chattel slavery, such as existed in Ancient Greece and Rome, a small class owned not only all the raw materials and the tools, but the slaves as well and society was run in the interests of this small class without any attempt at camouflage.

Under the system of feudalism, which prevailed throughout the Middle Ages, the land was owned by the Lords of the Manors, who compelled the serfs to work part of their time without wages, although the serfs owned their own tools.

And under the present system of capitalism, the raw materials and tools are owned by a small minority (the capitalists) who employ the rest of the community as servants, and make profits (or to be more exact, surplus value, which means rent, interest and profit) out of the labor of others in the same way as the lord of the manor and the slaveowner was able to utilize the labor of the serf and the slave for their own advantage.

How has society developed to its present stage? From primitive communism to modern capitalism? Has it been a gradual process? Has each year in the life of Man brought him one year nearer to the present peak of civilization? Or has it been like the other examples I have quoted; periods of gradualness, interspersed with sudden spurts? Has man's development been revolutionary or reformist?

I don't propose dealing with the transformation of society from primitive communism to chattel slavery because the written historical knowledge of this is not very great and is largely built on surmise; on the surmise that slaves were the captured prisoners of marauding tribes that swept on the primitive tribes living in communal settlements. Nor do I propose to deal with the development from slavery to feudalism. But we can learn from the development from feudalism to capitalism, because the history of this transition is one of revolution from the religious wars of the 16th century to the French Revolution of the 18th century and the various European revolutions of the 19th century.

Under the feudal system, the Lord of the Manor reigned supreme, except for a very limited subjection to the Crown. He owned the land and compelled the serfs to work on it; he, or stewards appointed by him, meted out justice; he could levy taxes on the burghers within the manor; he could levy an army from among his serfs and burghers to fight other barons or to fight the king.

Beside the Lord of the Manor, there were the serfs and the burghers were serfs who had been allowed to carry on a craft in which they were particularly well qualified, in a section of the manor fortified against foreign attack. This section was called the burgh, and hence its inhabitants burghers. As time went on, these burghers and their burghs became very strong, because of the privileged position they held.

At the same time the Lords of the Manor became weakened by conflicts with other lords and the king, and became more and more dependent upon the wealth which the burghers could provide. Therefore the burghers became more and more important, and found that the feudal system restricted their activities.

The feudal system gave the Lord of the Manor immense political power, which the bourgeoisie re-

(Continued on page 5)

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 Course of the Struggle

Everyone is conscious of a great social struggle going on, and that its international expression frequently centers in the peace conference, or other such deliberations of representatives of the great powers. The recent meeting at Paris, and its reconvening, in a somewhat different form, on this side of the Atlantic is in substance a sounding board of this social struggle.

Although the consciousness of the existence of this struggle and the recognition of its far-flung significance is quite general, there is extensive disagreement as to the substance of the conflict and what might be done in relation to it.

Writers have been referring to it as a struggle between the east and the west, between dictatorship and democracy, between totalitarianism and liberty, between regimentation and individual freedom, etc., etc. It is pictured as a spreading world contest between "two ways life," the British and American "democratic" way, and Soviet "dictatorship," and the implication is that each side draws other nations to its support, each has its satellites. Thus, instead of "one world," there are two, a good one and a bad one.

This approach to the matter, usually put forth as impartial, is not a sound approach at all. It is highly prejudiced, a capitalist analysis, in fact. In this propaganda, for that is what it amounts to, there is some truth, intermingled with much falsehood, and many half-truths, and someone has said of the latter that: "A half-truth is a lie and a half."

Not all of those engaged in this propaganda, this extolling of "western democracy" and its economic system of "free enterprise," are deliberately falsifying. Most of them actually see things that way. They have been trained from childhood to look at the world through "democratic" eyes. In other words the capitalist class point of view, purveyed to them through the school books, the press, radio, pulpit, etc. If a man could stand long enough on his head he would not know that he is looking at the world up-side down.

Now what are the facts? Is it beyond the range of ordinary minds to comprehend them? We think not, and we here present our explanation of what is really going on in the world today.

First of all, the struggle is not between east and west, or south and north, or any other direction. It has no definite location, and is not confined to certain sections of the world. Its theatre of operations is the world in general. True, it is not of uniform development, but it is world-wide nevertheless. Its roots go just as deep in the western "democracies" as in the eastern parts of the world. Its basis exists in all the countries of the Americas, most of Asia, Europe and much of Africa.

It is an unceasing conflict between two world-wide classes, between those who own the means of controlling human life, the mills, mines, factories, land, etc., and those who can live only by selling their services to those owners. The whole conflict arises from this unabridgeable gap between those two classes. It is the war of capital and labor.

Consequently, workers in New York, Chicago or San Francisco, are just as deeply involved (although many are unconscious of it) as are the workers of Japan, China, Germany or Italy. However, between the different nations there is considerable variation in the degree of economic and political development, and also in the degree of class consciousness which accompanies that development.

Just as the nations are not uniform in their development, so, too, are the struggles within each nation full of differences. Lenin called this "the law of uneven social development." For instance, some of the newer nations are highly advanced economically, while nations which have been civilized for thousands of years are still backward in that respect. Compare, for instance, the economic development of the United States with that of China. On the other hand, some ancient civilizations, such as Japan, were able to make sudden and extensive development compared to newer nations, such as South American republics, or the Soviet Union compared with Mexico.

This uneven development also exists in politics. In this respect, some of the less advanced countries have a politically awakened working class, and labor leaders are also political leaders. It is not because the American workers lack brains that they are still hanging on to the tail-end of capitalist politics, and begging the governmental representatives of their class enemy to do something for them, while their British brothers have built a powerful political party, independent of the employing class.

This contrast is the result of certain historic development. American labor, taken over a long period, has had better living conditions, on the average, than have had workers in other capitalist countries. Thus, they tend to be less inclined to make the break with capitalist politics, which conditions compelled workers in other countries to make. American workers can still be deceived by promises of capitalist political parties, just as the workers of all other countries were until comparatively recently.

The workers of America are still following the old policy of trying to select "good men" within capitalist owned and controlled parties. For example, we see the Political Action Committee of the CIO which played quite a role in the election of Roosevelt and Truman when the late Sidney Hillman was its chief leader, is still following a similar course, supporting the left-wing of capitalist politics, with the so-called Communist party as its rearguard.

Jack Kroll, the present boss of the PAC, and an Ohio leader in the CIO, writes as follows: "We must be practical. The question of a third party is not the issue in 1946. The issue this year is the election of a progressive Congress."

So long as working people are willing to follow the "practical" Krolls, independent working class political action will not be an "issue in 1946," nor in 1966. There will always be the "issue" of "the election of a progressive Congress." If the working people don't step out and take political action for their own class interests, labor fakery will be telling them a hundred years from now "this is not the year, we must be practical and wait." In other words, still keep on supporting capitalism.

While that is approximately the political plight of American labor, the European situation is much more advanced. In Britain, France, Germany and other countries the workers have moved to the left, and the trend continues in that direction. Of Britain's labor government, now over a year in office, it can be said, at best, that it is a break away from the old and openly avowed capitalist parties, the Tories and Liberals, and in practice it is showing the workers that they must move still further to the left, in fact take political power

into their own hands, exclusively.

At the Trade Union Congress, recently meeting in Southampton, there was vigorous criticism of the government's foreign policy, and while Attlee, Bevin and company got a vote of confidence, forty per cent of the vote was in opposition. The labor government's tendency to turn its back upon the Soviet Union and embrace American imperialism was vigorously condemned. From this and other actions of the British workers it is obvious that large numbers are pro-Soviet or, at least, more friendly toward the U.S.S.R. than toward the U.S.A.

At the same gathering, the Spanish government of Franco was condemned by an overwhelming vote. In the course of the struggle, the British labor government will split wide open over this issue. The right wing of labor will continue to look toward America and the left toward the Soviet Union.

However, the Labor party's foreign policy will not alone divide its ranks. Its home policies will also fail to solve the problems facing the vast majority of workers, such as housing and health measures and the general conditions of poverty that press so heavily upon the British working class.

The failure of reformism, the more state capitalism is installed by the government, will be the means of awakening increasing numbers of workers to the realization that "gradualism" is not rendering society classless, but may even be strengthening capitalism, and leaving the workers in the same economic plight.

In Germany, working class parties dominate the scene. In the western sections, where the American and British forces occupy, the Social Democrats are in the lead (including Berlin). In the eastern section, which is occupied by Soviet forces, the Socialist Unity Party (pro-Soviet) has a substantial majority.

The social conflict in France is vigorous and almost anything can happen there. General DeGaulle, bourgeois France's would-be saviour, is openly advocating a strong, repressive anti-working class government. Recently he made a plea to the electorate to repudiate the proposed Constitution, but in the referendum vote taken the Constitution carried, although the opposition vote showed great strength. The division between left and right political forces seems to be very close. On November 10th another national election will be held, for a permanent administration. The parties of the left, the Communists and Socialists, are just as badly divided as those of the right.

The issue, in the main, will be whether the left coalition government will continue to administer France's state machinery or be replaced by a right coalition. The DeGaulleists will work for the election of the latter. Meantime, the problems of labor remain unsolved and civil conflict threatens. The franc keeps falling and living costs rising.

The countries of eastern Europe, especially Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia are gradually nationalizing all industry and land. Greece and Italy are still in turmoil and open civil war threatens, despite the presence of British and American troops.

A feature of prevailing development is the possibility of complete socialization being carried out in a number of countries under their existing administrations, because they are dominated by the proletariat and peasantry, and their governments are similar in function to Soviets. This possibility is due to the presence of Soviet troops and the absence of capitalist and landlord armed forces to prevent such a consumation. The "uneven law of development," in some cases, is presenting a surface appearance of utter confusion, but underneath a process of revolutionary transformation is at work which the capitalist world in general will never be able to undo.

John Keracher.

Revolutionary Socialism

(Continued from page 3)

sented. The feudal system was essentially a system of internal production, the ideal manor being considered as one which was entirely self-sufficient. This aspect of feudalism was against the interest of the bourgeoisie, which depended for its wealth to a large extent on trade with other manors. And most important, the feudal system tied the peasant to the land, and the bourgeoisie wanted the peasants to be free to work for them.

Therefore the bourgeoisie found itself in opposition to the feudal system. We find an antagonism of interest between the feudal lords and the bourgeoisie, manifesting itself in a class struggle.

The economic transfer from feudalism to capitalism was working with the inevitability of gradualness. The political transformation was not so smooth.

"The great international centre of feudalism was the Roman Catholic Church. It united the whole of feudalised Western Europe, in spite of all internal wars, into one grand political system, opposed as much to the schismatic Greeks as to the Mohammedian countries. It surrounded feudal institutions with the halo of divine consecration. It had organised its own hierarchy on the feudal model, and lastly, it was itself by far the most powerful feudal lord, holding, as it did, fully one-third of the soil of the Catholic world. Before profane feudalism could be successfully attacked in each country and in detail, this, its sacred central organisation, had to be destroyed." (Introduction to "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific" — Engels). The first manifestation of the capitalist revolution was in the Protestant reformation.

In some countries we find the interests of the bourgeoisie coinciding with that of the King. As early as the 12th century Henry I granted a charter to the City of London. In the 16th century, support for Martin Luther and the Reformation came from German princes. And in Britain, Henry VIII, who was a more astute politician than he is given credit for, used the support of the bourgeoisie to attack the power of the Roman Catholic Church.

In those countries in which the crown was too strongly tied to feudalism and the church, the bourgeoisie overthrew the monarchy and established republics as in Holland and France.

In Britain the Tudors were astute enough to realize the growing power of the bourgeoisie, and thus cooperated with them in return for monetary support. The feudal barons had been considerably weakened by the War of the Roses, and a new type of baron was beginning to develop; one whose interests were more in line with those of the bourgeoisie than with the feudal system. The bourgeoisie supported the crown in its strug-

gle against the Roman Catholic church and bestowed the monarchy with divine rights. The Tudors were therefore autocrats relying for support on the rising bourgeoisie.

But it was inevitable that a stage would arrive when the bourgeoisie no longer needed the services of the crown, when in fact, the power of the crown was as dangerous to them, as was the power of the feudal barons. When Charles I tried to rule without the aid of parliament, a showdown was inevitable; the King was beheaded, and a republic under Cromwell established. After Cromwell's death, the monarchy was restored, but the Stuart dynasty only lasted 28 years, before James II was compelled to abdicate, and make room for William of Orange, who would not attempt to assert his authority. And so to this day the monarchy is powerless, a survival of feudal times with none of the power of the feudal kings. It serves well British capitalism.

And the final stage in the triumph of the British bourgeoisie was the passing of the Reform Act of 1832, and the Repeal of the Corn Laws. The former enabled it to have a bigger say in the government, and the latter ensured that its wage-slaves would be able to live more cheaply and require less wages. A victory for the industrialists over the landowners.

In similar manner could we trace the development of capitalism in all the other European countries. It has not been a gradual process—less so on the continent; it has been a process in which periods of gradualness have alternated with periods of revolution, the periods of revolution being turning points in the history of social relations.

This, in spite of the fact that in many countries the old feudal aristocracy has been able to compromise and collaborate with the new capitalist class. In Britain, the aristocracy became "the first bourgeois of the kingdom," by cooperating with the merchants in turning the peasants off the land. They sought indirectly to profit by the industrial development; and to maintain their privileged position by supporting the industrialists, or becoming industrialists themselves. Many of the industrialists today are able to trace their ancestry back to feudal days. Nevertheless in spite of this compromise, the transition to capitalism has been a revolutionary one.

What lessons can we learn from the capitalist revolution?

1. The transfer from feudalism to capitalism was achieved by a struggle between the feudal aristocracy and the new bourgeoisie. It was a result of this class struggle and not due to the brilliant thinking of Rousseau and the other thinkers, to the generalship of Cromwell or Napoleon, or the moral fervor of its propagandists, religious or otherwise. Socialism too,

will only be achieved by class struggle; by the overthrow of the capitalist ruling class and the eventual conquest of power by the working class. Only when the working class has sufficient confidence not only to elect a Labour government, but to take over industry as they did in Russia, will Socialism be achieved.

2. It is less likely that Socialism will be achieved by gradual means than by revolutionary means. Socialism means the abolition of all classes and all privileges, and therefore there is no room for compromise.

3. In the same way as the bourgeoisie had to destroy the instruments of feudal rule, and create their own instruments of government, so too has the working class to destroy existing bourgeois institutions and create their own method of rule. In Russia, Soviets were developed as the form of Socialist government, and these serve as models for us to study, copy and perhaps improve upon.

4. A political revolution only takes place when the economic conditions of society are ripe for change. Thus the Socialist revolution can only take place when the economic conditions are mature, as they are now, and when the working class is sufficiently conscious of its historic role.

5. The struggle of the bourgeoisie took many and varied forms. It took place at different places and at different times. But its aim was always the same; the conquest of political power by the bourgeoisie. It was only successful when the bourgeoisie were capable of, and had sufficient confidence to take power. So too, with the Socialist revolution. It has taken, and will continue to take, many forms. In Russia, in 1917, it overthrew Czarism. In Germany, it attempted to overthrow the newly established Weimar republic. In Britain it manifested itself in the strikes of 1921 and 1926, and has not been canalised into parliamentary channels. But neither of these methods alone will be successful; Socialism is a complete transformation of society and can only be achieved by an all-out attack on the capitalist system.

6. In the same way as capitalism led to the end of provincialism and the beginning of nationalism, so too will Socialism mean the end of nationalism and the beginning of internationalism. Nationalism at the present moment is a deterrent to progress; it means that goods which can be produced more cheaply in America are not allowed to be imported here, because we as a country have got to show a favorable trade balance. Nationalism at its worst, leads inevitably to war. Under Socialism we shall have, at first, a world federation of Socialists Soviets.

And finally, in the same way as capitalism found itself in opposition to the Roman Catholic church, Socialism now finds itself in opposition to all organized religion. Socialism takes on the communal

way of life, equality, and comradeship. We ask men and women to be Socialists not in order to gain a place in heaven in some after-life, but in order to help in the greatest cause of all, the emancipation of mankind. In the same way as we climb a mountain not only for the view at the top but for the actual climb, so too are we in the Socialist movement not only because of our eventual achievement, but for the struggle itself—we would not be happy otherwise. We believe furthermore that man is master of his own destiny, and not ruled by any supernatural god, who is given credit for all the good things which we enjoy, but not for the bad. We revolutionary socialists are not dry-as-dust economists. We believe sincerely in humanity. As a new moral code, I recommend to you the words of Rosa Luxemburg, who was murdered by German militarists of the Social Democratic administration in 1919:

"Determined revolutionary activity coupled with a deep feeling for humanity, that alone is the real essence of Socialism. A world must be overturned, but every tear that flows and might have been stench-ed is an accusation; and a man hurrying to a great deed who knocks down a child out of carelessness commits a crime."

Revolutionary determination plus a deep feeling for humanity. Men and women possessing these two qualities are urgently needed by society to day.

Ken Eaton
Wakefield, Yorks,
England.

BITS AND SKITS

Statistics show an alarming increase in divorces during 1945 nearly 1 out of every 3 marriages breaking up. The church may frown upon divorces or remarriages but social conditions decree otherwise. The present instability of the family is a reflection of the instability of the existing order.

* * *

While we are on statistics, make a note of this: crime has increased 13 per cent in the first six months of 1946. The corresponding months in 1945 registered an 8.4 per cent increase over 1944. The tendency is an upward one, with rural areas hit harder than urban. Roberies lead the parade.

* * *

According to a popular encyclopedia the human flea is not uncommon in the South. Most Americans are familiar with the species *Senatoris Bilbo*, which is, unfortunately, a long way from being extinct.

* * *

The U. S. Census Bureau says that 27 million Americans who left home during the war are not going to stay put in the years to come. "Conditions indicate the development of a large nomadic population for some time to come." Change, mobility are everywhere. How about capitalism—isn't it time that this too were changed?

Daniels and Schultz

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 1)

Carrol Reece, Republican National Chairman, in answer to a proposal by John W. McCormack, Democrat, House Majority Leader, to suspend price controls for 60 days, said: "He (McCormack) merely wants to suspend them in an effort to kid the voters into believing that the problem has been solved and still leave the way open for a resumption of unrestrained bureaucratic government after election." Adding, further, that McCormack's proposal was a "cheap political trick."

It is evident from the remarks of both the Republicans and Democrats that they are anxious to use this meaty issue to their own advantage. That's their game. But what are the facts of the matter?

From McCormack we learn that there are 88 million cattle on the hoof in the country, 15 million above normal. Gov. Tobin of Massachusetts announced on Sept. 30th that State Police and Public Health inspectors had found that there was, as the result of the first day's investigation into the supplies in 41 meat storage plants in the state, 6 million pounds of meat in the Quincy Market Cold Storage and Warehouse Company in Boston. Further investigation showed 195,564 pounds of meat in three Springfield cold storage plants. The above disclosures are the result of surface inspection and only in one state, don't forget. That it is widespread throughout the country is common knowledge, and can be easily ascertained by a thorough checkup. Chairman Roy L. Thompson of the Price Control Board said as much when he predicted the current meat shortage would last "some time" and attributed withholding as the primary reason.

But with all the name-calling and blame-throwing were getting nowhere. A near meat famine was at hand, as the country hit a new rock bottom, about the second weekend in October, when it was suddenly announced that the President was going to address the nation, Monday, October 14.

Mr. Truman spoke, announcing the removal of price-control on meat. This amounted to unconditional surrender to the profiteers. The effect of this action was twofold, economic and political. In the economic sense, it was to relieve the hunger of the nation, and also its pocketbook. Certain profit-mad business people are now relieved of any restrictions. That this revival may be of short duration, leading to other complexities, soaring prices, reduced real wages, strikes, etc., seems out of consideration for the moment.

The Administration, confronted by an immediate crisis, has chosen to settle with the immediate cause leaving other problems to be dealt with as they appear. It is a short-sighted policy, nonetheless, the only feasible one under the existing disorder.

Politically, it would appear that Truman's action has stolen much of the Republican thunder. It was a dead certainty that meat was to be their chief issue against the Democrats. But now—what? And even though the Republicans may still have the horse-laugh on the Democrats, our memories can go back to the late 20's. Then it was the Republicans who promised a "chicken in every pot." They were chided then by the Democrats and there was "more truth than poultry" to their criticism. To the workers, both the Democrats or Republicans, are parties of "promises."

President Truman exaggerated the role politics played in the food crisis. In his speech he said: "The real blame, however, lies at the door of the reckless group of selfish men (meaning the Republicans) who, in the hope of gaining political advantage have encouraged sellers to gamble on the destruction of price control." (N. Y. Times, Oct. 15.)

We cannot agree that capitalists (and Republicans are not the only capitalists for there are plenty of capitalist Democrats) are selfish for political reasons, primarily. Where goods were withheld it was for economic reasons, higher prices, and thus, larger profits.

Meat, to the owners of cattle, means just one thing—PROFITS. It's utility to the worker is, for those owners, of little consequence. This is their class outlook. The workers, too, must see the meat question, in fact the entire economic question, in the light of their own class interests. From meat consciousness they must advance to class consciousness.

* * *

Pleasure-Bent

Along with meat consciousness, a pleasure craze has seized the nation. The movies and stage shows are jammed to the rafters. Sport-festivals report record breaking throngs. From the lowly joint to the swanky dives, business is spilling over. About every conceivable pleasure-catering business is enjoying a prosperity never before dreamed of. It would appear that almost all Americans are on one helluva joy ride.

First, we want to make it clear that we are not "kill-joys." We are not opposed to the principle of having pleasure, and a "good time." In fact we don't think the workers have enough of genuine pleasure. Still it is necessary to understand the wherefore of the present wild orgy, for as the saying goes: "Those who dance must pay the fiddler."

After a war, particularly such as the last one, it was natural and expected that there would be a "let-down." The war exacted a heavy toll in lives. All human energies were geared to the war machine. Good times were "verboten." Money was being coined,

(Continued on page 8)

THE 'TOOL OWNERS UNION'

Lewis R. Schultz

The Boston Daily Globe of September 26, carried a full-page advertisement, paid for by the newly-organized Tool Owners Union. Its founder and its national headquarters are located in historic Lexington, Massachusetts. T.O.U., while still small, hopes eventually to sweep the country with its ideas. T. O. U.'s avowed purpose is to get action from the incoming Congress on the pressing problems of "strikes, shortages and inflation," by seeing to it that only those candidates are elected who accept its principles. (We shall examine these principles.) A Congress must be elected "that will restore the balance in this country." T. O. U.'s members and friends are urged to send copies of the organization's questionnaire to candidates for public office to ascertain their fitness to serve. "Good men," say they, "will welcome a chance to answer. . . ." Sample questions:

"Do you consider it the duty of government to prevent the use of threats and violence against any worker who desires to work?"

"Do you consider it the duty of government to break up labor-union monopoly as well as business monopoly?"

"Good men," T. O. U. points out, ". . . are able to answer 'yes' to these and eight other similar questions. Most workers will immediately recognize the anti-labor character of such questions, but many will unfortunately be duped by the apparently well-meant indictment of "violence," and "monopoly." To discover just how lacking in well-meaning toward the working-people the promulgators of such queries are, however, it is necessary to learn something more about them.

"Today's forgotten man," the ad announces, "is the tool owner." There are fifty million tool owners (just think, 50,000,000!) in America. You are a "tool owner" if you are: "retired and living on your savings;" "living on annuities and insurance;" "a farmer, a small business or professional man;" "a life insurance owner;" "a savings bank depositor"; or "an owner of corporate securities." Yes, it says, there are 50 million of us, and "only a tiny handful of us are 'rich'." The ad appeals to this vast reservoir for members. Small fry may become "regular members" for only \$1.00 per year, while there are other "classes of membership up to "subscribing members who must pay \$100.00 per year.

The mildewed and fallacious argument that anyone who owns a share of stock or is insured, is a capitalist, appears here in ill-disguised form. The fact that industries are run by a comparatively few wealthy men who own most of the shares in these industries and therefore own them, is ignored. Furthermore, a share is merely an I. O. U. held by the purchaser in a gamble that he will

later on be able to convert it into cash on the future success of the enterprise in which he has invested.

T. O. U. comes rather more to its point in a little paragraph which reads:

"In plain words, there is NO way to take arbitrarily from us 50 million thrifty people our savings and give them to others without changing this free country into a regimented, communistic state."

Thus we find that it is fear of communism which has inspired the founder of the Tool Owners Union. This is evidently a blast, at the same time, at those who advocate the tossing of an occasional crumb at the hungry workers lest they seize the whole cake.

The problems of the tool owners (the *real* ones, not the alleged 50 million) are no problems of ours: But it is edifying to find that a movement has arisen which does not disdain to remove its mask sufficiently to reveal that what it really offers the workers is more thorough-going exploitation by the class it speaks for. If only the unions could be smashed! If only the government would crush the working-class movement and pave the way for the return to an unchallenged "free enterprise!" But let us scrutinize the "Principles for Action" of this crusading organization.

After reminding us that without tools the worker couldn't produce very much, T. O. U. argues that the tools of production originate, are renewed and added to through thrift and self-denial of 50 million individuals. Now just what are these tools of production (properly called means of production)? They are the mills, the mines, the factories, etc. And they did not originate through the thrift and self-denial of anybody, but rather, down to the last brick and machine part, through the labor of the working-people. T.O.U. does not care to discuss economic theory. At the outset they declare: "This is not the time for talking, passing resolutions and debating fine points (sic!) of economic dogma." Yet they proceed to fill a whole newspaper page with their own talk and dogma! The reader is supposed to drink it all down just as though it were some scientifically prescribed medicine that will do him good. That the means of production are owned, not by the working people, but by the capitalist class; that this ownership results from ". . . nothing else than the historic process of divorcing the producers from the means of production" (Marx), i.e., from theft; and that the renewal of and adding to the means of production (properly called accumulation) existed under previous economic systems without the good offices of the "thrifty and self-denying"—is subject-matter which T. O. U. does not care to discuss!

What is this thrift of the capi-
(Continued on page 7)

talist? This self-denial? Nassau Wm. Senior, an English Economist who discovered that the capitalist made his profit in the last hour of a twelve-hour day, announced in 1836 the discovery of a new word for capital. It was the word "abstinence." He admitted that the savage did not practise abstinence but simply produced things, labored. He contended that (in some mysterious way) the more society progressed, the more abstinence was necessary. Marx observed that this abstinence was on the part of "those who ply the industry of appropriating the fruits of others' industry." (CAPITAL, Vol. I, Kerr ed., p. 654). He added: "If the corn is not all eaten, but part of it also sown—abstinence of the capitalist!"

We can readily see what this abstinence (self-denial) of the "tool-owner" (capitalist) amounts to. He denies himself the pleasure of paying more than a subsistence wage to his workers. He denies himself the pleasure of improving the working conditions of his employees. He denies himself, finally, the pleasure of working. In the name of humanity let us release him from his martyrdom!

Accumulation, which took place under other economic systems too, results in capitalist society, from the setting aside by the capitalists of a portion of the profits for new machinery, new buildings, etc.

A man is a tool-owner, to use the word that T. O. U. substitutes for capitalist, if he owns a means of production and derives his income from the exploitation of others. A man who is exploited, on the other hand, derives his income from the sale of his labour-power to the tool-owner. There are, at most, a few million tool-owners, and of these a negligibly small segment owns and controls the means of production in America.

No rights are fundamental: not even the right to exploit labor. Rights are *class* rights, and exist only so long as the class which enunciates them rules supreme. "Divine right" disappeared with feudalism, and was not for a moment considered "fundamental" by the capitalists whose system triumphed over the old. The "bargaining" referred to is the transaction that takes place when the propertyless worker offers his labor-power for sale to the capitalist for a wage. Evidently, T. O. U. feels that the capitalist hasn't emerged from these transactions as well off as

he should! But we must forgive them for impulses which are innate, "The directing motive, the end and aim of capitalist production, is to extract the greatest possible amount of surplus-value, and consequently to exploit labor-power to the greatest possible extent." (Marx, CAPITAL, Vol I, Kerr. ed., p. 363). The thought is cherished that if the unions can be destroyed, the worker can be skinned more effectively. The workingman, in this clever phraseology, is a "tool user!" It is assumed, too, that he has fundamental rights, while in actuality, under capitalism he has no rights whatsoever, fundamental or other. Capital, to whom all the rights belong, loves to delude the workers with stories about their "freedom, dignity, equality, etc."

Each "Principal For Action" is prefaced by an imposing "Whereas—" as though to lend legality (and thus, correctness, truth) to it. The next principle stated betrays the violation by the government of the aforementioned fundamental rights of the tool-owners and charges discrimination. They, poor tool-owners, are unorganized, while the tool users are favored by the government for the purpose of attracting political support.

What chance has unorganized capital against organized labor? What T. O. U. means but doesn't say, is that their government, the capitalists' government must get tougher with labor. They are, however, not unduly subtle, and the intelligent worker will not be deceived by such nonsense.

The last principle advanced charges the government with undermining the rights of the tool owners "to receive payments for the use and renewal of tools . . ." More profits are demanded. Thus it is resolved that the 50 million tool-owners shall organize and take appropriate action to achieve their ends.

This is not all there is to the new Tool Owners Union, from which more may be heard.

Let us all become tool owners. And let the existing tool owners become tool users for a change! For that purpose we have organized the Proletarian Party. As for a union of the *present-day* tool owners (not the 50 million, figments of Rucker's imagination, but a mere dribble), it is superfluous: They have already such a union in the National Association of Manufacturers.

THE NAZI WAR CRIMINALS -- SPAWN OF CAPITALISM

(Continued from page 2)

rendered. But no less unique than Schacht's own plea of "innocence" based on the contention that he was not able "to discern the true significance of Hitler's rearmament program." As a matter of fact one can judge how "innocent" he was by one fact alone, namely this: that during the pre-war period, the Nazi regime was carrying on such intensive preparations for war, that the German workers

were exploited mercilessly in the factories of the German industrialists, so much so that numbers of them voiced their protests, demanding more food, etc. How did the German ruling class answer them? Their reply was "Guns instead of butter."

The German bankers and industrialists are even more guilty than Hitler and his cohorts. Why? Because it was the German capitalist class who supported Nazism,

HAS IT BEEN TOO GOOD?

(Continued from page 1)

tomers begin to hold back, to look for price-cuts, for bargains, for sales. Producers are getting jittery. They want to unload before prices drop. Merchants are becoming cautious and place smaller orders. Instead of trying to build up their stocks in expectation of higher prices, they now want to keep stocks low, in expectation of a drop. It has not, as yet, become general. It is only beginning in a few lines but nobody seems to know how fast it will spread.

For months there has been reporting on the growth of industrial inventories, that is, on the building up of supplies of raw materials by the manufacturers. On October 23rd, the Wall Street Journal reported: "A flood of cloth is on its way to the textile-starved American public. Propelling it is a cotton price tumble of some \$25 a bale in less than ten days." It further reports that New York's Worth Street, "in the past six days has seen the highest selling spree since before the war."

Other items, besides cotton and cotton cloth, are reported to be past the peak in the price move. Corn was down from \$2.04 to \$1.84. Butter was down from 87 cents to 79 cents. After price con-

trol was removed from meat, chickens lost 14 cents and turkeys dropped 10 cents in two days. The United States News of October 25 reports: "Inventories of many items are at high levels. . . . At textile mills, for example, they are forty per cent above a year ago." And, further: "Millions of dollars' worth of ('construction') contracts were cancelled."

Is there anything dark or gloomy about such reports? Are we not all glad to see goods available at lower prices? It has one drawback. Prices, generally, do not start the downward trend until supplies reach the bursting point. The first small price cuts will not stimulate sales. They will stimulate caution among buyers who will be looking for bigger cuts.

Meanwhile, inventories continue to grow until production curtailment is necessitated. But production curtailment is not brought about by telling the workers to take it easy. It is connected with lay-offs and shut-downs. It creates unemployment. The wonderful 60 million jobs that America is now enjoying is sustained by shortages and high prices.

When producers learn that their
(Continued on page 8)

who brought it into existence, it was their creature. When we reflect on the period before 1933, how the German workers were moving to the left, towards socialism, and how the capitalists were trying to stem that tide, what repressive measures they used, etc., then we get a real picture of how "innocent" the money lords of Germany are.

The German capitalist class supported Nazism, it was their last resort in order to maintain their rule as the exploiters of the German workers. And once Nazism was established, the world was shocked at the brutalities committed by the German ruling class. Working class organizations were smashed, its leaders either executed or tortured in the concentration camps. One might add also, a significant fact, that this brutal Nazi regime also got plenty of support from abroad. There were many American and British dollars that went to the support of the Hitlerites. Furthermore, not a few American and British capitalists openly voiced their approval of the Nazi dictatorship. So the Nazis are not only the creation of the German capitalist class, they are also the spawn of capitalism in general.

There is no intention on the part of America and Britain to indict the German capitalist class. Because if all the capitalists of Germany who supported Hitler were condemned that would mean the end of German capitalism. The German working class then would have no obstacle in their road to the left—toward communism. Neither Britain, America, nor the rest

of the capitalist nations relish such a prospect. Hence it becomes part of British-American policy to prop up, save what they can of German capitalism; a similar policy they are pursuing throughout the rest of the world. It is only from this point of view that one can correctly appraise the significance of the acquittal of the German banker, Schacht.

It is said that the International Tribunal set a precedent at Nuremberg by its decision of "aggressive wars" being a "crime against the peace." That this henceforth will act as a deterrent to any future threats against peace. To say the least, this is a naive conception because wars cannot be abolished by decrees.

To abolish wars, capitalism itself would have to be abolished. But to overthrow the capitalist system would require a social revolution within each capitalist nation. One can, however, visualize, arising out of such an event, a working class international tribunal that would put capitalism on trial. It would have plenty evidence against the capitalist system, viz., its greatest crime of exploitation of man by man; the greed for profit which motivates the capitalists of each nation to engage in a ruthless struggle for the world market, source of raw materials, and spheres of influence, which results in world wars.

The working class international tribunal would then bring in its verdict: Capitalism is guilty! And the punishment: Consignment to the grave! Only then could one say that *justice has triumphed*.

Al Wysocki.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 6)

especially by business. Peace with joy was anxiously awaited. The war ended and celebrations commenced. And now there appears no let-up to the let-down. All appear to be pleasure-bent.

The peace brought joy, but also problems. Foremost are the threats of a new war with atomic bombs, and the strife and struggle over wages, prices and shortages. The continual turmoil, and being "on edge," has led to mass escapism—"to get away from it all"—diversion. Drink, sports and other amusements are serving as shock absorbers. Some of it (sports) is impressively played up, to absorb and divert the aggressiveness and restlessness along safe channels for the business world.

Of course, we favor pleasure, but as a form of recreation and diversion from the usual productive activity. "For all work and no play makes Jack a dull boy." Sports and such can be an aid to the rounding out of the day. But when pleasure becomes an obsession, a primary thing in itself, a means of escape from reality, because of fear or inability to face the music, then it becomes one-sided and illusory, with a big head the morning after, the problem still staring one in the face.

The general reason for the pleasure crave, under capitalism, is the reaction to the constant grind, and the ever so little pleasure, bound up with the workers economic existence. When work ceases to be monotonous and a means to enrich the bosses, when it becomes a means of enriching the lives of the toilers themselves, with economic security and well-being, then pleasure will become real and on a healthy foundation. It will become an essential part of life and not an escape from life.

* * *

A Lesson for Teachers

The shortages and understaffing of schools is in no small sense due to the low compensation paid to teachers. It may be surprising to some, but teachers, too, have to live, and are affected by the high cost of living.

It is widely known, and admitted, that they are among the most underpaid section of the working class. Whether they are conscious of it or not they are wage-workers. Excuses are always found, such as lack of sufficient city appropriations, taxes already being too high, an empty city treasury, etc.

Teachers often have to work at other jobs, in addition to their school jobs, to make ends meet. Considering the many years effort and cost of training for this work, their wages are often much below the value of their labor power.

In contrast with the organized skilled industrial workers, they are not nearly as well off. And this is mainly due to lack of organization. Despite all their stored-up book knowledge, there's one little truth

they have overlooked, viz., in organization there is strength.

It will do them lots of good to get away from the worn out, and empty theory of class peace, and individualism in employer-employee relations, and try the proven method of experience, collective class action. They might surprise themselves how much book-taught people can learn from life.

* * *

Socialist Traitors

Statements issued by leaders of the Socialist party, Thomas and Fleischman, and Algernon Lee of the Social Democratic Federation, in which they each assailed Henry Wallace for espousing a policy of appeasement towards Russia's "totalitarian dictatorship," affirms their flunkeism to the capitalists.

"Mr. Lee declared that Mr. Wallace, in taking the position that he was 'neither anti-British nor pro-Russian' was virtually saying that we should be neutral in the battle between the opponents of communism and those seeking to Sovietize the world, and that the United States should not align itself with the forces of democracy, including Britain." (N. Y. Times, Sept. 15.)

Lee, and the Social Democratic Federation, no doubt, like to refer to themselves as old time Socialists and pro-labor. They couldn't therefore, think of being "neutral" in this class struggle between the proponents and opponents of Communism! A socialist has to take sides, they say. And they do. But with whom? With the capitalist democracies, the opponents of Communism and Socialism, the enemy of the working class.

The Thomas-Fleischman statement says: "It is a shock to Socialists that he (meaning Wallace) who demanded that we should go to war with Hitler for the defense of justice in eastern Europe, should now be content to leave so much of Europe and Asia to the tender mercies of a dictatorship which practices the same sort of tyranny." (N. Y. Times, Sept. 21.)

But how much more shocking is it that men, parading under the cloak of socialism, have not yet, after all these years of working class struggles, learned the class nature of both democracy and dictatorship, and to distinguish between capitalist and proletarian democracy, as also between capitalist and proletarian dictatorship.

How much more shocking is it that these social reformers and appeasers of capitalism renounce class struggle and revolution and rally to the support of the forces of imperialism and counter-revolution.

We are not defending Wallace's standpoint. It is an openly liberal capitalist standpoint, attempting to reconcile opposites, to keep them from flying at each other. But when socialist claimants attack Wallace's "appeasement" they deserve castigation as anti-labor

HAS IT BEEN TOO GOOD?

(Continued from page 7)

wares begin to move slowly they have not much choice but to curtail production. It is not a pleasant thing to do, but such is free enterprise. Then it becomes a job for the "public" and for government to find out what is wrong and make recommendations for corrective measures. Such recommendations usually are not followed. It was recommended that prices should be held in line, so as to prevent inflation and an upset economy. It was not heeded, Higher prices were too attractive.

Labor was advised not to demand higher wages, it would only increase prices. Labor found wages lagging behind other price advances and asked for more. Strikes were cautioned against. They would slow production and prolong the period of scarcity. It was to no avail. Labor has argued that higher wages were essential to maintain high purchasing power, and a ready market for sustained production. Employers were not convinced.

As Congressional elections roll around, political groups accuse each other of causing past troubles and of bringing about conditions which will result in more trouble in the near future. Republicans are now hopeful of many victories. They might gain control of the next Congress, but their victory will do nothing to sustain full employment once the market is filled with goods. On the other hand, an over filled market will do little to satisfy the wants of the many who, for lack of jobs or incomes, are unable to buy.

The situation is shaping up very much like it did after World War I. It was a busy period, with full employment, but with shortages and rising prices for about two years. Then came the 1921 panic. Farm prices were the first to break. Next came shut-downs in other raw materials fields, coal and iron mines, etc. Unemployment brought on the drive for "back to normalcy," or for wholesale wage-cutting. Then, as now, the housing shortage had not been removed. Gradually the "prosperity" period got under way, resting mainly on the building boom. And, finally, when the building market had been flooded, the "Great Depression" got under way. It had been "too good to last," we were told.

The old slogan is brought out again. It hasn't become general as yet but we shall hear it more and more from now on. "It was too good to last." "Wages were too high." "Workers loafed on the job," "this drove prices out of reach for the public," etc., etc. Perhaps it will be "back to sanity," this time, rather than normalcy. Things are done on a big-war mongers.

They belong with the Hearsts, McCormicks, Bilbos and the rest of the reactionary gang of Soviet haters.

L. B.

ger scale now-a-days.

Such a development should warrant a more serious searching for causes and remedies. If a nation can only take care of its population when a war is on, or for a short time after, when serious shortages of goods prevail, that should indicate a lack of proper planning.

Is it possible that America, the richest nation in the world, will just sit down and wait for something to turn up? We do not think so. America's millions of unemployed showed great patience in the 1930's, but at least, they demanded a "new deal." True, the war prosperity has created new hopes in "free enterprise," in the "American way," but the speedy return of unemployment will be likely to show less patience.

"America's ability to produce" will be remembered. Labor, patient as it is, will not take the blame for coming hardships. The powerful labor unions will resist wage-cutting more strenuously than they fought for wage advancements; but they will have little power against unemployment. As labor's standards gets further reduced, because of new technological advancements and increased productive ability, workers, in growing numbers, will take up the search for a remedy.

Sooner, or later, labor will be forced to look into the Marxian explanation of economic development. Sooner, or later, the workers will discover that the now highly respected free enterprise system is giving them the smaller end of production output. When they do they will raise new demands and organize to obtain them. They will not for long accept the verdict that "it has been too good" under war-created scarcities and high prices. They will insist that peace should bring abundance for them, and not just for the warehouses, They will organize as a class, and they will march to victory.

Christ Jelset.

Death of DeMuth

Comrade Ralph DeMuth of Niles, Michigan, was born 50 years ago at White House, Ohio. He joined the Proletarian Party in 1922 and was active in western Michigan for many years, and was instrumental in organizing Party locals at Niles, Benton Harbor, South Bend and Elkhart.

Funeral service was held at Niles on Wednesday, October 16th. Comrade John Keracher, National Secretary of the Proletarian Party, addressed the relatives, comrades and friends who had gathered to pay their respects to the memory of one who had been active in the struggle for proletarian emancipation.

Comrade DeMuth is survived by his widow, two sons and two daughters. As a loyal party member he will be missed from our ranks.