

PROLETARIAN NEWS



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

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

Vol. XIV, No. 1—Whole No. 142

CHICAGO, JANUARY, 1945

483

Price 5c a Copy

SOVIET SCIENCE

By Christ Jelset

For twenty-five years, from its inception in 1917 to its invasion in 1941, the whole Soviet system was ridiculed and belittled by the moulders of public opinion in all capitalist countries. Its form of government was bureaucratic; its economic development was stifled; its cultural and moral concepts were perverted; its science was harnessed to the dictates of one man; it was one colossal failure. The Nazi invasion and the subsequent Soviet successes on the fields of battle has changed the methods of dealing with Soviet affairs. On the military field the Soviet Union has become England's and America's most powerful ally in their struggle against Nazi Germany. A nation that can muster the power to defeat, in battle after battle, the most powerful armies yet known cannot easily be belittled. Its striking power becomes known to the whole world. Naturally, interest is aroused as to the nature of that power and the methods of its building. Consequently, information is gathered and distributed. Books appear on many phases of Soviet life. Newspapers and magazines devote space to news and comment on Russian methods and activities. The more conservative type strive to find shortcomings by comparison with the "best ever," the American or British ways of life. The liberal section goes further in praising Soviet achievements. Some will go to great length eulogizing the more outstanding feats in production, in education, in health protection, and other cooperative undertakings. Some of the latter will even go as far as to advocate adoption of Soviet methods.

This "new" information cannot help but serve to break down formerly built up prejudices toward the Soviet Union. It is nevertheless falling far short of giving a real description of the subject. It is also, at least in one respect, exceedingly misleading. All Soviet achievements have their very foundation in the proletarian revolution. They cannot be adopted or applied in capitalist nations except where the workers rid themselves of capitalism and exploitation and thus

lay the foundation for their own achievements like the workers and peasants of Russia did in 1917. This, of course, is left out of all news from Russia.

One example of how Soviet achievements are eulogized and at the same time perverted and minimized will make this point clear. We shall pick one of the best. An article in the December 1944 issue of "Free World," on the subject of "Soviet Science and Humanism," by a Russian scholar, Boris Alexandrovich Keller, gives a fine description of the development of science in the Soviet Union and points out that "Soviet science serves people not as a result of external pressure but voluntarily." He says: "It (Continued on page 2)

Big Business and the State Department

On December 19 the "liberal" daily, PM, of New York City, headlined the contest being waged by "progressives" on the Senate floor as a "fight to save F. D. R. from State Department blunder." In fact, ever since the appointment of the "millionaires team" to the U. S. Department of State the columns of the PM have been full of smearing criticism. It began with the appointment of assistants to Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State, who himself had chosen the men to serve under him with the approval of President Roosevelt. As a matter of fact, Stettinius has quite a millionaire's background himself. Before he took up "statesmanship" he served as

chairman of the executive board of the U. S. Steel Corp. He picked for his undersecretaries the former ambassador to Japan, Joseph C. Grew, Nelson Rockefeller, Will Clayton, James C. Dunn, Brig. General Holmes and Archibald MacLeish. With the exception of MacLeish, who is considered a "liberal," all the rest of them have been bitterly opposed by those who term themselves progressive. Stettinius himself was subjected to a scathing criticism on December 1 when he took office. Senator Langer in a long speech charged that Wall Street influence would enter the State Department with Stettinius, and accused him of having delayed the national defense program in 1940 in the interest of steel and aluminum monopolies.

The "progressives and liberals" are furious that Roosevelt has given them such a big let-down by appointing such reactionaries to cabinet positions. They are angry not on the score that the President had gone in for appeasing big business for the sake of "unity," but that he had gone too far in that respect. The Liberal Party which polled 320,000 votes in supporting F. D. R. for President is now demanding that he withdraw these six appointees to chief positions in the State Department.

(Continued on page 2)

International Notes

Civil War in Greece

On Sunday, December 3, a forbidden demonstration, called by the EAM (National Liberation Front) got under way in Athens. The demonstration was in protest against the order to the Greek partisans to disarm and disband. When the demonstrators, composed of men, women and children, refused to disperse, Premier Papandreou's police opened fire, killing some 15 and wounding 150 more. This cold-blooded killing was the spark which fanned the smouldering civil war into open flame and drew the attention of the entire world.

Back of Premier Papandreou were the British under General Scobie. Papandreou also had the support of the fascist elements in Greece. Richard Mowrer, after spending a week in Athens, reported from Rome that, "Fascists, known to have fought alongside the Germans against Greek resistance groups, today are fighting against their old enemies of German-occupation days. The only difference is that Fascists, pro-Nazi when the Germans were in Athens, today carry the banner of the monarchy." (Chicago Daily News, December 21.) However, were it not for British

troops, Premier Papandreou's tenure of office (and perhaps his tenure of life) would have been short. The British had tanks, artillery and planes, which they proceeded to use. The EAM charged the British with the killing of women, children and the aged and of being more ruthless than the "German barbarian conquerors."

The British actions in Greece brought international repercussions. British labor protested against the role being played by British troops. Churchill was forced to defend himself and his cabinet in the House of Commons. He referred to the Greek partisans as "bands of gangsters armed with deadly weapons." He made the issue a test case for his continued tenure in office. Although in the voting he won by a considerable majority this did not indicate the feeling on the Greek question. Rather, it expressed a desire that he should remain in office till Germany was defeated. Some, however, felt that Churchill should go now. H. G. Wells, the historian, referred to Churchill as the "would-be British Fuehrer" and warned that, "If we do not end Winston, Winston

(Continued on page 2)

IN THIS ISSUE

SOVIET SCIENCE
By Christ Jelset

BIG BUSINESS AND THE
STATE DEPARTMENT
By Al Wysocki

INTERNATIONAL NOTES
By Oliver Ritchie

HOME SCENE
By L. B.

VETERAN EMPLOYMENT
CONFUSED BY EMPLOYERS
By A. Hart

CHURCHILL AND THE
LIBERALS
(Editorial)
By John Keracher

BIG BUSINESS AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT

(Continued from page 1)

At this writing the six appointees around whom the controversy is raging are being examined in regard to their qualifications and must be first approved by the Senate before they can take office, as is the regular procedure in such cases. PM, in an editorial by I. F. Stone, December 14, writes: "Two days of hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have only served to confirm our distrust of the men chosen to run the State Department. With the exception of Archibald MacLeish, whose spirited defense of the Spanish Republic provided the hearings with their one lonely inspiring moment, this supposed reorganization leaves the department to a greater degree than ever the one branch of our Government which is the private preserve of the upper crust of society, the relatives, retainers, and spokesmen of America's wealthiest and most powerful families. We decline to fool ourselves into believing that a department so constituted can provide us with a democratic foreign policy. We venture to say that had Dewey been elected the composition of the State Department would hardly have differed from that which is now before the Senate."

From the foregoing PM editorial analysis one might jump at the conclusion that PM is the "champion of the underdog," but in the very next sentence PM itself disabuses us of any such notions when it states: "We fully recognize the need for a State Department that would bring conservative and international business spokesmen into coalition with progressives for the establishment of a stable world order. But this is far from being such a coalition." (Emphasis ours.)

What PM is indignant about is the fact that its petty bourgeois liberals have been ignored by Roosevelt and big business in the choice of officials to head the U. S. Department of State. But as is the case in a quarrel between little robbers and big robbers, the truth will out, and in this instance PM has unearthed many facts especially as to the character of the "millionaires team" in the State Department and whose interests these gentry represent. For example, it states that: "It is extraordinary that Rockefeller, a member of the Standard Oil family, should appear before a Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a nominee for Assistant Secretary of State without once being asked about Standard Oil's long pre-war relations with I. G. Farben (a German concern), relations which hamstrung our own defense preparations."

In regard to Joseph Clark Grew, the nominee for Under-

secretary of State, PM states: "His rationalizations for opposing (when Ambassador to Japan) an embargo on scrap and oil shipments to Japan do not impress us; they are on all fours with the similar explanations for Munich. His reports from Tokyo helped to preserve the illusion that the Emperor and better class elements in Japan — you know the *really nice people* — were being dragged unwillingly into aggression by the military. His feeling that we may want to keep the Emperor in power after the war fills us with dismay. It is not one to which Japanese anti-fascist and militant working class elements (there are some) can appeal for the building of a democratic Japan. We do not relish Hirohito as a Japanese Badoglio, and we

(Continued on page 3)

International Notes

(Continued from page 1)

will end us." Others warned that the British campaign in Greece might lead to mutiny in the British army. Then, from the new U. S. Secretary of State, Edward Stettinius Jr., came a statement which appeared to be a blow below the belt to Churchill. Stettinius stated, in part, that, "We expect the Italians to work out their problems of government along democratic lines without influence from outside. This policy would apply to an even more pronounced degree with regards to governments of the United Nations in their liberated territories." Later he affirmed that this policy also applied to Greece.

Just why big-business-man Stettinius should propound such a policy at this time is not entirely clear. For one thing we can be quite sure that it is not because of any burning interest in promoting the cause of democracy in Europe or anywhere else. When we examine a few facts the statement appears rather hypocritical. In Italy the U. S., along with Britain, has been sitting on the lid for many months. In Belgium, as Churchill was quick to point out, the order to the Belgium partisans to disarm came from General Eisenhower's headquarters. Then in Greece, American "neutrality" in practice is neutrality in favor of the British. American supplies, both military and civilian, are going to the British and to the Papandristis, not to those who support the EAM.

Washington, looking forward to post-war business, no doubt desires to build as much goodwill as possible in Europe. If that is done at the expense of the British, well, it really is too bad. However, the British have held out against U. S. interests in the

Soviet Science

(Continued from page 1)

is science for the people at large. It is fighting for the happiness and welfare, not of an insignificant handful of usurpers who have placed themselves above the people, but for a better future for all, be they workmen, farmers, or intellectuals." He continues: "It is aiming all of its efforts toward improving the economic and cultural status of the people, toward the consolidation and perfection of a free, democratic system in its country, a country where all racial groups enjoy equality, and in friendly cooperation are working out richer patterns for their lives."

To prove the broad and all-inclusiveness of Soviet science the writer quotes from the 1944 report of the Academy of Science of the U. S. S. R., where it is stated that their work includes

"study of problems of organizing the country's resources, the creation of improved engineering and other designs for the final defeat of the Nazis, research on the scientific-technical questions bearing on the rehabilitation of the economy of the regions ruined by the German invaders, as well as on general theoretical problems of physics, chemistry, biology and other branches of science, problems of super-high and low temperature, of bodies, of atomic particles, of increasing harvest yields, of anti-epidemic measures, of the history of folklore, and a variety of others."

He tells of how scientific processes have been adopted in the remotest regions of the vast Soviet Union. He mentions Ashkabad, capital of Turkmania, over 3000 miles from Moscow. The people here speak Turkmanian, they bring in their cotton on caravans of camels as well as on trucks; but the great solar energy of the region is now being used scientifically for both houses and kitchens. He continues: "But they are the same Soviet people, imbued with the same hatred toward the enemy, and with the same democratic humanism which characterizes all Soviet people." He speaks of how Soviet science attracts youth from all sections of the country and from all groups of people. He stresses, time and again, how science works with and for the people as a whole. He says: "Humanism in Soviet science also means that it gladly welcomes the younger generation, and fights against the tendency to become a monopoly of high priests in ivory towers. It is constantly replenishing the ranks of its workers from all sources and from the creative powers of people irrespective of race, nationality, sex, origin and social or economic status."

He illustrates the progressive character of Soviet science. He mentions that, "Michvain, Lvsenko, Tsvtsin and other Soviet Darwinists accomplished something humane in the highest degree, when they courageously rejected many of the outmoded conceptions of formal genetics which were retarding the progress of biological and agricultural science, and on the basis of Darwinism and mass experiment worked out a new theory of development of vegetable life. The practical application of this theory gave us increased power to control the growth of plants and will thus increase the crop yields of Soviet agriculture."

The whole article is worth reading. It is a fine description of the growth and spread, as well as of the achievements of Soviet science. Hidden away in one paragraph on "New Aircraft" is even a hint that the writer knows

various conferences on post-war plans. Then, too, Churchill in dealing with European affairs has shown a tendency to ignore his American ally.

Just what the outcome of the struggle in Greece will be no one knows. Churchill is in a very tough spot. Evidently he is much concerned over the British lifeline through the Mediterranean to India and the Far East. Greece is an important outpost along that line. If he fails to establish British influence there he will have failed in his duties to British imperialism. If he goes forward with what evidently must be a major military campaign it may lead to serious political consequences. The U. S. government may come to the rescue as a peace maker. More talk about "democracy" from the big-business puritans in Washington, along with some promises and white lies to the people of Greece, might pay better dividends than British bayonets, bullets and bombs.

The Curzon Line

Prime Minister Churchill's announcement in the House of Commons that the Curzon Line must be accepted as Poland's eastern boundary brought another storm of weeping and wailing from Soviet-hating commentators and columnists. All the old, worn-out charges which have been hurled at the Soviet government in regards to Poland were revived: In 1939 Stalin made an alliance with Hitler and received half of Poland in the deal; Soviet imperialism; renunciation of the Atlantic Charter; seizure of Polish territory, etc., etc. Some of the wailers excused the Soviets on the basis of their need of strategic borders. Then a new slan-

(Continued on page 3)

(Continued on page 5)

BIG BUSINESS AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT

(Continued from page 2)

see little which qualifies Grew to be undersecretary in a supposedly rejuvenated and reorganized State Department. He didn't do too well in that job in Calvin Coolidge's day. We don't see what fits him into Franklin D. Roosevelt's."

Well, well, so PM doesn't see "what fits" Grew into FDR's but it's a sure thing that Wall Street sees. Grew has been one of the most able and loyal servants of American finance capital and now he is not only being rewarded but also his "talents" are going to be utilized by the finance capitalists.

We now come to PM's critical but also factual analysis of Will Clayton, another one of Wall Street's choices for Assistant Secretary of State. PM states that, "When you take all of Clayton's abilities and gifts what do they boil down to? He is a shrewd cotton trader, who hates Agricultural Adjustment Administration and labor legislation, who wants cheap cotton and cheap labor, and embodies this in a revival of mid-19th century laissez faire notions—the same notions that were once held by British manufacturers who similarly wanted cheap corn and cheap labor."

PM continues by emphasizing that: "His work-a-day record as revealed in past PM stories about the Associated Farmers, his associations with Jesse Jones, his cotton barter negotiations with the Nazi, his opposition to government purchase contracts designed to create better working conditions in Latin America, all add up to a pretty typical reactionary score."

"They wanted Brown Shirts in Germany and Black Shirts in Italy for the same reason that Clayton's cotton company wanted the Associated Farmers in California — to smash labor unions and to hold down wages."

As for Dunn and Holmes, the other two choices of Wall Street for the State Department, PM points out that because of their unfriendly attitude toward anti-fascists, the resistance movements and democratic elements generally, "the confirmation of those two, Dunn and Holmes, would be a calamity."

PM put up a valiant struggle together with such "progressives" as Pepper in the Senate but to no avail. As we go to press, PM reports (Dec. 10) that the group of "progressive" Senators led by Pepper had an interview with Roosevelt in protest against the appointment of the "millionaires team" to the State Department. The President, however, told the group that he wanted the nominations approved and if they were not, in this closing session

(of the Senate), he would send the same group back to the next Congress in January. As a result of his decision a vote was taken in the Senate, "the millionaires team" was approved by a substantial majority. And so American finance capital added another link to its long chain of political victories and will enjoy its Christmas holiday with greater relish than ever before. Who said there is no Santa Claus? Just ask the boys in Wall Street. They would answer, "Sure we have one, he sits in the White House."

PM in its December 20 issue remarks that it's not sorry that it waged a fight against the new State Department appointments even though it lost the battle. "The most encouraging aspect * * * was how much was achieved with so little support. The disappointing aspect was the failure of labor organizations to take an active part in the fight. Notably conspicuous by its absence was the CIO-PAC and the NCPAC. * * * Their political usefulness will be sharply limited if confined to re-electing the President."

We might point out to the PM that its own "political usefulness" was "sharply limited" in November when it gave Roosevelt its unqualified support in electing him for the fourth term as President. As for the labor movement, the CIO and its Political Action Committee, they are still being dazzled by the prospect of 60 million jobs promised them in the post-war period by the "Santa Claus" who sits in the White House.

But regardless of who is in the White House, the government is controlled by the dominant class in power, namely the capitalist class. The wealth and industry of the nation is centralized and concentrated in the hands of a powerful minority, the "money kings" of America. This centralized ownership of the economy of the nation is bound to have its reflection in centralized political control. In plain words those who exploit the masses are the rulers of society. "Government of, for, and by the people" reveals itself as the government of a small but powerful section of the population, that is, the wealthy minority.

It is this lesson that many "liberals" as well as workers have yet to learn. Until such a time the masses will continue to be deceived and exploited. But when the awakening comes, real democracy based on majority rule can only be brought about by those who are most numerous, that is, the working class. The liberals cannot be trusted because of their willingness to "cooperate" with the "conservative and

Veteran Employment Confused by Employers

A steady job in the post-war world is a prime concern of every worker, whether he is at present a "home front" employee or serving at the "war front." There is no clear, concrete evidence that there will be jobs for all, much less, a guarantee of same. Even the most optimistic post-war plan so far offered, namely, the National Resources Planning Board report, expects and makes allowance for considerable permanent unemployment. The working class is constantly confronted with this nightmare of economic insecurity. The Selective Training and Service Act, as passed and amended by Congress, provides that men and women honorably discharged from the armed forces, and who are physically able to return to former employment, shall be returned if it is possible for their former employer to rehire them.

Despite the uncertainty of jobs the home front workers are making plans through their unions to give the war veterans a considerable degree of advantage in obtaining and holding jobs in the post war era. The UAW-CIO veterans department has drawn

up and presented to all major employers a model contract clause covering rehiring of veterans. This clause would restore to a veteran returning to his former job the seniority dating from the beginning of his first employment on that job. If the veteran applying for a job had not been in the employ of the firm at the time of his entry into the armed service, he would be allowed seniority amounting to the period of time which he served in the forces. Further, under the guidance of a veterans committee, which the union wants established, the corporation would undertake a training program for disabled veterans so as to place them on jobs that are agreeable to them.

The Packard Motor Car Co. was the first major employer to agree, at least in part, to this union proposal. In a recent layoff of 5000 workers at Packard, approximately 500 veterans, though not former employees of the company, were kept on the job because of their fellow workers allowing them seniority equal to time spent in the armed forces.

(Continued on page 7)

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

(Continued from page 2)

der is now heard, viz.: Stalin advocates that Poland be compensated for loss of territory to the Soviet Union with German territory in the west and north.

Once again we wish to set the record straight. The area involved in the dispute and held by Poland prior to 1939 was held by right of conquest only. It was seized by Poland, with the aid of other imperialistic nations, France in particular, in the war of 1920-21 against the Soviet Union. The inhabitants were and still are mostly Ukrainians and

international business spokesmen."

In spite of the present political backwardness of the workers, the fact still remains that their historical mission awaits them. A few more examples of Wall Street manipulations of the government like the present one is very helpful in educating the masses as to who their real enemies are. Once the masses see through the sham of capitalist democracy they will move closer to their historical mission, that of abolishing the capitalist system and instituting their own working class form of government. It is only then that deception and exploitation will be brought to an end and democracy will have a real meaning to the masses. Speed the day! —Al Wysocki.

Byelorussians. Capitalistic sources have estimated that the Poles make up only 15 per cent of the population. In 1939 the Soviet government did not enter into an alliance with Hitler Germany. They did sign a peace pact. The Red Army did occupy the area in 1939, not by any deal with the Nazis but in spite of the Nazis. Later, Hitler used this incident as one of his main arguments for invasion of the Soviet Union.

After the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 the people of the area involved decided in favor of the Soviet system. Then in 1939, when the Red Army came, thus heading off Nazi occupation, the populace voted by more than 90 per cent in favor of reuniting with their Ukrainian and Byelorussian comrades. In view of these facts is it any wonder that the Soviet government considers this area to be Soviet soil? For them there is no Polish-Soviet boundary problem. If the Soviet Union favors Poland acquiring land that is now Germany this is not "in compensation for loss of territory in the east." Poland requires no compensation for loss of Ukrainian and Byelorussian soil. (New readers of the Proletarian News who wish more information on this subject should get the February, 1944 issue and read the article, "Polish-Russian Dispute" by Al Wysocki. Many more details are given there.)

Oliver Ritchie.

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 St., Chicago, Ill.

Churchill and the Liberals

We have consistently contended that this war is in substance a conflict between two different alliances of capitalist imperialism. We are living in that period of capitalist development when the great bankers are the political bosses of modern nations, the stage which Lenin classified as "finance imperialism."

The multi-millionaire industrialists and financiers have become rotten-rich through the exploitation of their home populations. They have found themselves with so much cash capital on hand that they were not able to use it all in the further plundering of their workers at home. Therefore, they have invested large amounts of it abroad, so as to share, to an ever greater extent, in the exploitation of millions of workers of other lands.

Germany, Italy and Japan came late into this field. They found that the older imperialists had control of the best sea routes and ports, and that they had first choice of the world's raw materials, best spheres of investment, etc. The newer imperialists had to submit to this situation, and be satisfied with a secondary role, an ever more difficult one, or become competitive "aggressors," fighting their finance-imperialist rivals in a world-wide economic conflict. They chose to follow an "aggressive" course, and if the old forms of capitalist international competition were ruthless, they were obliged to become more ruthless.

Moreover, it was just in those countries that the toiling masses were the most awakened politically, that is, outside of the Soviet Union. Repression, in this case, like charity, began at home. The Italian, Japanese and German workers were brutally suppressed by their capitalist masters. However, that proved to be but a means to an end, to eliminate all opposition within those nations and to confront their rival imperialists with a united force. The entire regimentation of those nations made it possible for them to wage "total war."

The "democracies" had to confront this new method and fight the greatest war of their lives to hold their world supremacy. Britain and France, partly because of fear of the Soviet Union, at first tried appeasement of the newer "aggressor" finance imperialists. During that period a few influential men in Britain and France denounced the policy of "appeasement." They saw clearly that the issue could not be compromised but must be fought to a finish, with victory for one side or the other.

Outstanding among those who assailed the appeasement policy was Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty. When British imperialism's cheap appeasement policy nearly brought it to disaster, this militant conservative, in politics, and ultra imperialist, Churchill, was called upon by his fellow imperialists to head the British government. As Prime Minister, he proclaimed the policy of "unconditional surrender" for the Nazis.

Anyone acquainted with Churchill's history, and that of his Tory colleagues, could not be surprised at his blunt announcements, time and again, that his prime concern was for the maintenance of British imperialism. However, he was hailed as the right man to lead in Britain's fight, not only by conservatives like himself but by liberals of all kind throughout the world.

Even the British labor leaders, who at best are but muddle-headed, timid liberals, proclaimed and praised him and drifted along with Tory imperialism. They, and American liberals, such as those who write for "The Nation" and the "New Republic," extolled his "blood and tears" speeches and hitched their hopes to this wheel-horse of Britain's imperialist chariot.

But now, when the "fascist danger" is not so dangerous, when it is obvious that the newer "aggressive" imperialists are not going to defeat the nice "democratic" imperialists, the liberals are again beginning to "strut their stuff." They now point out, correctly enough, the reactionary behaviour of British imperialism in certain of the "liberated" nations of Europe, particularly in Greece, where British soldiers have been given the job of shooting down the ELAS (Greek Patriots who by force of arms helped to drive out the Nazis), because they refuse to be disarmed by the government forces chosen by Britain to dominate Greece in the interest of the old property owning class.

The "New Republic" (December 18th) calls it "The Churchill Tragedy," and says: "One can well imagine the feelings of men like C. R. Atlee, Ernest Bevin, Herbert Morrison and other labor members of the government at being forced to support, if only by their silence, such deeds as these." The "New Republic" is worried about the "feelings" of those famous misleaders of labor. As a matter of fact they are little different to Churchill himself. They also are British imperialists, and pro-Tory laborites. They are not "FORCED to support * * * such deeds as these." They are right in agreement with any action which has for its purpose the upholding of British imperialism.

Mr. Churchill, and his liberal-labor associates are behaving true to form. Both are equally afraid of the working class taking power in Greece. That is why they support the disarming of the EAM, after it sacrificed so much fighting against the Nazi rivals of British imperialism. When the British working class becomes aware of its true economic and political interests it will sweep away the Churchills and their class, and along with them all labor and liberal lackeys of British imperialism.

The "New Republic" sums up with these remarks: "The world today stands at the crossroads. Mr. Churchill's path leads to power politics, imperialism, spheres of influence and more and more war. The other path leads to democracy, peace and freedom." "Leads to" is really funny, just as if Britain had not long ago arrived at "power politics, imperialism, spheres of influence," etc. Do they think that Roosevelt's path leads to anything different?

In its December 25th issue, the same periodical points out certain undeniable facts in relation to the plight of the people in some of the "liberated" nations. It says, "Italy, for all practical purposes, is without a government, while riots in Sicily approach the status of Civil War. Fighting in Greece is indirectly affecting all of Europe. Throughout the world, people are asking themselves whether the moral purpose of the Allies in the war is rotting away and whether in fact that moral purpose ever existed; and are answering in the negative the question whether the prospect of preventing a third world war can reasonably be called bright." * * * "Churchill talks about democracy, but in so far as he is sincere, his democracy is limited in the extreme."

As staunch supporters of the warring "democracies" (British and American imperialism) the liberals of the "New Republic" have done their bit in holding the masses in line with the "democratic" imperialists, but things have happened which are a little more rotten than the "liberals" approve of, and they want to wash their hands of their share of the responsibility and blame it all on Churchill. They say: "He is such a passionate Tory and capitalist (a brilliant discovery, but are they not also capitalist) that he is unable to see any differ-

ence among people of the left, and he is cruelly unfair to all of them. His idolatry for royalty and for authoritarianism led him, before war-time discretion closed his lips, into glowing words of friendship for Franco and Mussolini and bitter words of hatred for Soviet Russia. As well expect an African witch doctor to perform a delicate surgical operation as to expect such a man to take the lead in creating a better new world."

The "better new world" hoax of the soothsayers of the democracies is beginning to expose itself, to show its true colors, and the Liberals are vexed. And they apparently do not understand the British labor leaders, and believe that a labor government would act very differently. Here is what they say: "Despite the disgraceful timidity on this occasion (failure to oppose the Churchill policy in relation to Greece) of the Labor Party, it remains true that a Labor government representative of the rising tide of liberal sentiment in Great Britain could work an instantaneous and far-reaching improvement in British foreign policy," and as the Tory character of the American State Department is now so obvious they wail: "Such a development in American foreign policy will never be achieved by men of the caliber of the five of the six new nominees of the State Department."

Who nominated those Wall Street gents and who worked for the election of the administration that selected and supported them? Mr. Roosevelt made it plain to a group of liberals who protested the nominations, that if the Senate failed to ratify the nominees that he would send back to the Senate in the new year the same names. The Senate endorsed the "Millionaire team."

Liberals in politics always act like true conservatives, because they are supporters of a social system which can only become more and more bureaucratic, more and more centralized in the hands of the rich, and when reaction sits in the political saddle, they yell against the outcome of their own political handiwork.

Liberals are a political expression of early capitalism, when there were many small business people and few multi-millionaires. They are an echo of the dead past, a stage of capitalism, the pre-monopoly period, which is gone for ever. Like all who look to the past for inspiration they can only meet with defeat and disappointment. The elements of the solution of the social problems do not lie in the past but in the present and the future, and it is the class of the future, the useful productive working class, which is called upon by historic circumstances to carry society forward. They alone, as a class, can create "a better new world."

The liberals, as supporters of capitalism, chose a political course which to them, as to the leaders of American labor, including former proclaimed communists and socialists, which seemed to be the "lesser evil," only to find themselves confronted with the same results which would have been brought about had they supported the most reactionary Republicans.

Of course, they do not like the Wall Street boys who have been hand-picked for the State Department, but they share the blame. By supporting the Roosevelt ticket they helped to put them there. They should not alone be sorry for the British labor leaders. They should also be sorry for themselves and their empty political program which leads to nothing but reaction. Those who support capitalism should not complain of its fruits, especially in its present stage of finance imperialism. All who support the Republican or Democratic parties today are the supporters of imperialism, no matter how much they may pretend to be against it.

The road which will lead to "democracy, peace and freedom" is not that of capitalist liberalism. It is a different road entirely. It is a revolutionary one. The modern proletariat, the wage workers, alone are capable of carrying

America From 1492 to 1942

(Continued from last issue)

When we started to write this series of articles on American history we did not think it would take so long. It is now the end of 1944, and during the past three years, since the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor and America entered this great war, so much has happened, and we are still so close to these events, that it is difficult to comprehend their relative significance in American history as a whole.

Many books will be written about this extraordinary period, but whatever their viewpoint, whoever they may blame, we wish to assert that to us this war was inevitable, just as the next great conflict will be, if the "private enterprise" system, with its production for profits, prevails.

We see this war, not as a conflict between "good and evil," or between dictatorship and democracy, but as a struggle to repartition the world amongst the great imperialist powers.

Fascism or Naziism is only an extremely hard-fisted application of capitalist state power. Both Fascism and Democracy have their roots in capitalist soil. The one can merge into the other without much difficulty. Primarily, they are dedicated to the upholding of the profit system, to the exploitation of the proletariat by the capitalist class.

The forms of government did not cause the war. It was the outcome of capitalist rivalry over world markets and trade routes, over sources of raw materials and spheres of capitalist investment. There were no Fascist states in 1914, nor a Soviet State for that matter, but the same sort of war world today were as democratic broke out. If every nation in the as the United States, and upon the same economic basis, that of capitalism, imperialistic war would break out just the same, because the cause for it would be present.

In the event of the "peace-loving democratic powers" defeating their imperialist rivals, the financiers and great industrialists, will seek to monopolize their advantages and completely shut off or heavily handicap their defeated business rivals. However, they will leave

the social system which brought on the war intact. Their peace plans, no matter how well handled, can only bring an interlude, a truce between World War II and World War III. Therefore, those who are fighting this war for the purpose of maintaining capitalism, no matter how "democratic," are not fighting to end war as such, but, consciously or otherwise, are fighting to prepare the groundwork for the next conflict. Only if the broad masses, the world's exploited workers, assert themselves as a class and become the controlling power in society can wars be brought to an end and world-wide peace prevail.

So far, American labor, organized and unorganized alike, except for a comparatively small number, such as the members of the Proletarian Party and its supporters, are upholding the system that periodically brings on such wars and in peace times, great depressions.

American workers have exactly the same problem as the workers of all other capitalist nations, poverty amidst plenty, unemployment and war. These can only be removed by the American workers themselves, in cooperation with the workers of all other countries.

The main lesson to be drawn from a close study of American history is its *class character*. All great events, such as the wars which America has engaged in, have been spurred on by class interests. The passing of the years has seen the population grow from a few millions in the time of Washington to more than 130 millions of people in the time of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and that which has most characterized this long period has been the tremendous increase in real wealth in the hands of an ever decreasing minority and the extraordinary expansion of poverty and economic dependence for the vast millions of ordinary Americans, the wage workers of today.

We realize that these articles are but sketchy, most of them hurriedly written, but we contend that the viewpoint set forth is true, that America has ever been, as it is now, a nation and a government of the rich, by the rich and for the

SOVIET SCIENCE

(Continued from page 2)

something about the cause of the success of Soviet science. He says: "It was on the basis of progressive social science with its correct interpretation of the course of historical processes, that the founders and leaders of the Soviet state, Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin, determinedly combatting superficial social theories, were able to make so great a contribution to the ends of humanism, by creating the prerequisites for a full development of the abilities and talents of the peoples of the U. S. S. R. in peace and also in the crisis of war."

Here we find, rather elusively and far from clear, the only statement referring to the cause of

rich, and furthermore, it will continue to be that, with less democracy, fewer civil liberties for the common masses, unless that vast majority, the modern proletariat, those who live by labor of hand and head, who draw wages or "salaries," organize and act on their own behalf, just as the propertied interests have done in the past. By their organized might, the majority of the people, the American proletariat, must conquer political supremacy and take America out of the hands of the small class of rich parasites who have it as their private possession, and place it in the hands of the whole people, so that its vast resources and prolific productivity can be used for the benefit of all the people. THE END.

NOTE

During the appearance of these articles on American history many readers have suggested that they be printed in book form. That may ultimately be done if we can find the time to revise, rewrite and round out the material, so as to present it in a more complete and connected manner. It was not intended to present all phases of American history. Many important matters had to be left out entirely. Still we believe that this outline of American history, and its viewpoint, the overriding class interests, was worthwhile to present to the readers of the Proletarian News.

the success of Soviet science. Many other writers on the subject leave this out entirely. The reasons are not hard to find, but they are extremely important. First of all, most writers who work for capitalist publications do not know the fundamental cause for Soviet successes be it in science or any other field of endeavor. Second, if they did know and did write about it, their material would be rejected. Even the above mentioned Russian writer is not free to say all he knows on the subject. The Soviet Union at war is very much in need of British and American help to crush the Nazi invaders. In like manner the latter countries are in need of Soviet help. The need for mutual help makes it necessary to hold in abeyance, as much as possible, any controversial subject. Nothing is more feared by capitalists than the spreading of information of Soviet economic and political structure and function. Such knowledge among exploited wage-workers would stimulate an interest in the abolition of capitalism.

But Soviet science, its growth and success, rests precisely in the Soviet economic and political setup. True, science in capitalist nations is also growing with leaps and bounds today. New discoveries in almost every field of science are unearthed and put to use. New thousands of the nation's young men and women are learning scientific processes as they never learned them before. This whole stimulation to science and scientific development is brought on by the war. Capitalism, the former promoter of science (Continued on page 6)

"All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air."

—The Communist Manifesto.

society forward. As yet, unfortunately, the American workers, too, have faith in capitalism and its Wall Street leadership. America's labor leaders are no better, probably worse, than the British. In the recent Presidential election they made well organized efforts to deliver the labor vote to the left wing of capitalist politics, the Democratic Party. Hillman, Murray and company simply carried out, in a newer form, the old Gompers' policy of rewarding political "friends" and opposing enemies within the ranks of capitalist politics. It was not independent working class political action but part of capitalist political action. American labor, too, is responsible for the sort of men who have been selected to lead the State Department, and responsible for its foreign policies.

The workers have followed a policy of capitalist liberalism. They are deluded just as much as other liberals. The CIO did not engage in working class political action at all. It still puts its faith in the "progressive" politics of its class enemies. It will meet with no better results in the long run than the regular liberals have met with. Before the workers make substantial progress toward a solution of their age-old problems they will have to break completely with the political parties of Wall Street. The Democratic Party, even if it throws some concessions to labor, is there to serve big business, not to serve the working class. It is there to fool and rule labor and uphold the profit system.

Churchill of England and Roosevelt of America represent the exploitation of labor by

capital. They are political leaders of labor's class enemies. They know what they are doing but the workers do not.

The American workers, as yet, are unaware of their revolutionary historic role, the conquest of political power, the socialization of the means of production, and the ending of the profit system which is the real cause of poverty and war.

If the workers really understood the causes of their poverty and the causes of depressions and war they would surely not then support a system that brings such suffering upon them. It is lack of knowledge of the nature of the present social arrangements that is responsible for the workers supporting their exploiters and their political policies.

John Keracher.

SOVIET SCIENCE

(Continued from page 5)

ence, can no longer stimulate scientific development in time of peace. Science is not a thing in itself. It is part of a nation's economy. Under capitalism new scientific processes are in demand only when the results of such processes can be turned into cash, or more correctly, into capital by the capitalists. Once the productive machine begins to stand idle for lack of markets, science experiences the same stagnating effects. In the thirties, e. g., when America was enjoying peace and depression, many a young man with scientific training stood in the bread lines. His scientific advancement might have brought him close to a new and important discovery; but his knowledge gave him no increase in relief rations.

In the Soviet Union, where the good things of life are produced directly to satisfy the needs of the producers, every new scientific discovery contributes, directly or indirectly, to the nation's productive ability and thus to the population's well being. Soviet science thus, from the very nature of things, stimulates its own growth. No new discovery can for long remain in the laboratory stage. If it increases output, if it stimulates production, if it contributes to health; in short, if it has human advantages it can be put to use in practice where it will reveal its advantages, as well as its shortcomings, and where the mass of workers stand ready to suggest improvement.

The Soviet economy has done more than freeing natural science from the shackles of capitalism. On an even grander scale it has freed social science from those shackles. Because of the need of capitalism to continue in practice what it denies in theory, namely, the differentiation of the people into economic categories or classes, social science can be nothing but a jumble of dogmas and contradictions. The non-existence of human equality must be explained in a hundred ways; but scientific research must not be applied. The fundamental discoveries of working class social science, the Marxian discoveries, must be ridiculed and denied. Natural human traits, selfishness and mutual aid, are given supernatural origins. Moral and ethical codes are set up to preach on Sundays and to violate the rest of the week.

What are these fundamental discoveries of social science, these theories upon which the Soviet Union is built, but which are so vehemently rejected by the capitalist class? They are, first of all, the materialist conception of history. This is but a branch of the all-inclusive science called dialectical materialism. This is the theory that life is but a natural unfolding and that man has nothing in his makeup that is over, above,

or from the outside of nature. This theory makes it necessary to search for man's behavior in his own structure and in the environment in which he lives. If it is found that man acts differently and thinks differently in the different parts of the world and in different historic periods it is not because the Gods gave out different inspirations but simply that the natural environment was different. When it is found that man's urgent endeavor is to sustain life and make life more endurable or more pleasant, it follows naturally that man's thoughts, acts and behavior are influenced the most by such endeavors. This brings to the forefront a study of man's means and methods of sustaining life. The scientific answer to such a study is the materialist conception of history or historical materialism.

This study reveals that man has gone through a long evolutionary process. It reveals that for a long time man lived in the jungle very much like other animals. It reveals that he gradually learned to make use of tools and weapons. He learned to make such tools and weapons. He began to learn to make use of natural forces, wind, water, steam, electricity, gas. As he added to his tool shed and his store of knowledge he improved upon life. At the same time and as a consequence he changed his social organizations, his methods of worship, his form of government. At one time in this forward march it became possible to add slavery as a means of enriching one's life. It goes without saying that this new institution helped only the slave owners, not the slaves. Thus social inequality grew out of an evolutionary process in man's upward march and was not a curse or a blessing brought on by devils or gods. Once social inequality was established it brought on wars. Wars of conquest and wars for liberation became part of man's activity.

Social inequality has taken many forms and has changed from time to time. It was once in the form of chattel slavery. At another period it was feudalism with the exploitation of feudal serfs and land workers by feudal land owners. Today it is capitalism with the exploitation of wage workers. The change from one to another of these forms did not come down from heaven nor from a higher human wisdom. Each form rested upon an economic foundation, the prevailing method and means of production. Each was overthrown in bloody revolution by the owners and representatives of a more advanced method of production. This unfolding of historical development is the theory of the class struggle. It is a part of social science but not acceptable to any privileged class. Following this social theory we now stand confronted with capitalism. This system proclaims social equality but in

(Continued on page 8)

HOME SCENE

Little Steel—Big Steal

The policy of the steel industry, like that of all business, is to pay as little as it can for what it buys, including labor, and to sell its own products for as high as the market will bring.

War time regulations make for some restrictions. In such times, no less than in peace, labor is "gypped," even more so, as evidenced by the WLB decision of November 25, 1944, on the steel case.

The WLB set aside the steel union demand for a 17c an hour increase, but did grant second night-shift workers an increase of 4c and the third-shift workers an advance of 6c an hour. This was after about a year of deliberation, and after the Cost of Living Committee, named by the President, reported an increase in the cost of living since January, 1941, of between 29 per cent and 30 per cent, a very conservative figure.

Even W. H. Davis, WLB chairman, himself, is reported to have said that the above decision "does not even bend" the Little Steel Formula, which limits pay increases to 15 per cent above the January, 1941, level. Obviously the steel workers didn't put on enough heat to bend or break the steel formula.

This is one side of the coin (labor). Now let us take a look at the other side (capital). Here we find the picture much different. The OPA special report showed that: "The profit position of the industry is extremely favorable, with 1943 profits before taxes equal to 3.7 times the average profits of the base period 1936-39, and constituting a rate of return equal to 17 per cent of invested capital, 3.5 times the average rate of return in 1936-39." (PM.)

In terms of dollars, PM reported, as disclosed by this OPA report, that: "Jones & Laughlin profits were placed at \$33,612,000 in 1943, almost 10 times the pre-war average. Bethlehem profits reported at \$184,825,000, or more than six times the \$30,323,000 prewar average." Not bad, eh! "Our" industries are making progress, whatever that might mean in the steel worker's pay envelope.

That isn't all. The steel capitalists aren't satisfied with 370 per cent profit and, so, they are asking for an additional 10 per cent on the prices of steel products, claiming that labor costs have increased. Here is what the OPA report has to say on labor costs: "Since 1939 output per man hour has increased more than average hourly earnings. Consequently, labor costs are currently 4 per cent below 1939 levels and 8½ per cent below the average level for 1935-39." (PM.)

The report went on to show

that the U. S. Steel Corp., with the proposed 10 per cent price increase granted, could cut production to 26 per cent of capacity and break even; that with 50 per cent production of capacity it could make \$164,000,000, or two and a half times its prewar average; and would haul in \$369,000,000, or 6 times prewar levels with production running 75 per cent capacity.

Little Steel for labor. Big Steal for capital. That is the formula and meaning of free enterprise or capitalism.

* * *

Who Owns America?

Our average American is still in the habit of thinking and talking in terms of "we" and "our" country. He feels that there is equal opportunity for all who have initiative, rich and poor alike.

These concepts are a traditional carry-over from the days of rugged individualism of early capitalism. But alas! Rugged individualism has passed on with the development of modern large scale industry and monopolistic control.

Benjamin C. Marsh, executive secretary of the People's Lobby, in arguing against subsidy for business to peace production, pointed out:

"The result of concentration of war orders in a few great corporations aspiring to be the Government of the United States, and through international cartels, a World Government, has been to give 16 non-financial enterprises 50 per cent more assets than all the corporations the Government owns.

"In 1941 there were 32 concerns with total assets over \$1,000,000,000, 38 in 1942, and 41 in 1943.

"On December 21, 1943, 16 of these giants had total assets of \$31,325,000,000, compared with the \$20,438,500,000 assets of the 44 Government corporations which cause Senator Byrd and his associates such acute anguish. The top seven concerns and their assets are:

"American Telephone & Telegraph Co., \$6,313,000,000; Pennsylvania Railroad, \$2,812,000,000; Standard Oil Co. (N. J.), \$2,328,000,000; Southern Pacific System, \$2,237,000,000; U.S. Steel Corp., \$2,106,000,000; New York Central Railroad, \$2,102,000,000; General Motors Corp., \$2,265,000,000.

"The other nine are: Atchinson, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad, Union Pacific Railroad, Consolidated Edison Co. (N. Y.), Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Commonwealth & Southern System, E. I. duPont de Nemours, Bethlehem Steel Corp., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. and Ford Motor Co.

"The assets of these 16 concerns increased in the four war

(Continued on page 7)

VETERAN EMPLOYMENT CONFUSED BY EMPLOYERS

(Continued from page 3)

This meant that about 500 non-veteran workers gave up their jobs in favor of the veterans.

Several large corporations have offered veterans employment plans which contain clauses clearly showing a desire to create confusion and enmity between veteran and non-veteran workers. The employers are constantly seeking ways and means by which to break the solidarity of organized labor. They deal in cold profits and their sympathy and concern about the veteran is but a cloak to hide the real purpose of their scheme.

General Motors and Chrysler Corp. recently proposed that veterans not previously employed by them be permitted to use as seniority the time they served in the armed forces as far back as May 1, 1940. This would permit these employers to lay off any, or all, of their non-veteran employees hired since May 1, 1940, and to employ veterans in their place. The union does not want this type of seniority to apply earlier than January 1, 1941. The farther back the veteran seniority can be applied, the deeper can the seniority of an entire working force be disrupted. These corporations also propose a very complicated system of overall plant-wide seniority for veterans given special job training. While the unions want special opportunities of training, especially for the handicapped veterans who are unable to perform their previous jobs, they also want to avoid wholesale displacements of workers in a department or entire industry.

Seniority is one of the main foundation stones in a labor union. It protects employees against employer discrimination, because of labor union activity or the laying off of workers and hiring new ones. Seniority removes from the hand of the employer one of his most effective weapons in opposing the workers and keeping their unions weak and impotent.

No surprise then that at this time the employers are preparing to use the sympathy of the home front workers for the veterans, to force onto them various schemes aimed at weakening a most vital part of their union structure. Regardless of the best intentions and plans of the unions to assist the veterans, the employers will constantly provoke disputes over the interpretation of the agreement on this subject. This has been the case in many instances of deliberate misinterpretation, or outright employer violation of contract stipulations during this war. The Freuhauf Truck-Trailer builders of Detroit is one such recent example where the employer by deliberate and repeated violations of the union's contract pro-

voked four plant-wide strikes within six weeks.

This veterans' issue promises to bring no end of trouble. The employers will trample on labor and use the veteran as a shield when the non-veteran worker resists. It will be that old game of "divide and conquer." If the veterans allow themselves to be used for this purpose, it will mean the lowering of wages and conditions of labor for the entire working class.

The fathers, brothers and sisters of veterans must also have employment. The ex-soldier, after being told that he fought for a better world in which to live and work, will certainly not be satisfied with seeing the unions weakened or destroyed with unemployment and being used by the bribe of a job to work against his own interests and that of his class.

Authoritative spokesmen of the capitalist class acknowledge that unemployment cannot be avoided. The National Association of Manufacturers expects ten million unemployed to be a normal condition for post-war America. Unemployment is a natural product of the capitalist economic system. It cannot be legislated out of existence or removed by directives. It is only in war time, with millions in uniform, that the surplus labor supply can be absorbed. Unemployment will again spread over this country, bringing in its train misery, destitution and degradation for the class that produces in abundance all the things of life, but get so little in return. That will be the problem facing the entire working class.

It is not a question of who will get what jobs there are, but rather, the abolition of the system of exploitation and substitute it with an economic and social system based on production for use, instead of for profits. Then and then only will the fear of unemployment be banished from the earth.

A. Hart.

"Modern industry has converted the little workshop of the patriarchal master into the great factory of the industrial capitalist. Masses of laborers, crowded into the factory, are organized like soldiers. As privates of the industrial army they are placed under the command of a perfect hierarchy of officers and sergeants. Not only are they the slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois State, they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the over-looker, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself. The more openly this despotism proclaims gain to be its end and aim, the more petty, the more hateful and the more embittering it is."

—The Communist Manifesto.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 6)

years from 1939 to 1943 by \$5,239,000,000 — that is 20.2 per cent or one-fifth.

"On December 31, 1940 (the last available data) the total assets of the 403 corporations having over \$100,000,000 assets were \$153,711,500,000, an increase in one year of \$9,506,700,000, or 6.6 per cent.

"The assets of these corporations amounted to 48 per cent—nearly half of the total assets of the 413,716 corporations reporting, and included:

"Cash, \$21,165,400,000;

"Government obligations, \$19,414,100,000;

"Other investments, \$50,408,400,000;

"Capital assets (less reserves), \$41,131,100,000;

"Other assets, \$2,575,300,000.

"In 1940 these 403 corporations had surplus reserves and surplus and undivided profits of \$23,400,200,000.

"Their net profit was \$2,823,500,000 and some of them have doubled their net profit, above taxes, in the war years since 1940."

Where once business was conducted in thousands of dollars and the small man with little capital and lots of initiative had half a chance to work his way up with the general growth of the country, today industry is operated on a huge scale requiring investments of millions and billions of dollars, thus completely blacking out the little fellow with inadequate funds. The concentration of wealth is and will continue into fewer and richer hands. So, too, will the displacement of the many small business men. Initiative now lies with the big business, and none other. All protesting, bellyaching, or dreaming of the return of the "good old days" will not avail. Big business now rules the roost with the control of America definitely in its hands.

As for labor, non-owners of wealth, it never could lay real claim to ownership in America. Labor's lot has been toil and produce for the rich of America. It will only be when the country, with its vast wealth, becomes the common property of all its producers, that the worker will be able to say and with justification, "This is my America."

* * *

Freedom of the Press

At a recent meeting of American newspaper editors in Washington, fears were voiced lest control of the press, now justified by the war emergency, be carried over into the post-war. Already the tendency, it has been noted, is to establish political as well as military censorship.

To us in the labor movement, this trend is of no surprise, since we have never recognized the press as free and unbiased in dis-

persing its news and opinions.

An industry, privately owned and operated as a profit-making proposition, it takes its proper place alongside other industries to which it gives expression. Though it seeks as wide a circulation as possible among the reading public, it looks towards business advertisers for its source of financial support. In the final analysis it is this element that is catered to. It is they, too, who determine the method and policies of the press.

There are, of course, a variety of sections among the capitalists, large and small enterprises, bankers, industrialists, merchants, farmers, exporters and importers, those whose interests are local or national, and others whose investments take them abroad. The economic interests of these groups is variously affected by given political and economic governmental policies. In like manner the press also is divided into large and small. It gives expression to specific sectional property interests. It is this diversified opinion as regards the special group interests that gives it the appearance of being a free press. Free, however, only in relation to property. Freedom, but within the capitalist class.

But even here, in proportion as dominant control of industry is concentrated in the hands of a few monopolists, so, too, in the press. Power and control is centralized in the hands of a few extremely wealthy publishers. The widest read newspapers and magazines are owned by them, as also the highly-paid editors and columnists. It is the big fellows, the Hearsts, Wallaces, Luces, and such who dispense the news as they see fit. The sphere of press freedom has thus been considerably narrowed down. Under the impact of an ailing society the government has been forced to step into an already much controlled picture and add more restrictive regulations.

To labor, such "freedom" has never had much meaning. It can only be as effective as the economic power it represents. And since labor possesses no economic wealth, modern publishing houses and machine equipment, means for gathering information, access to business advertisers, etc., in the very nature of things its power of expression is limited. "Freedom of the press," for labor is, and ever has been under capitalism, a very much restricted "freedom."

In concrete issues, strikes and other social struggles, the labor viewpoint seldom sees print. Public opinion is the business man's opinion. This is freely, all too freely, dished out in steering the thoughts of millions of Americans into safe channels. This right of freedom, though enjoyed

(Continued on page 8)

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 7)

by labor, is tolerated only as long as it is conciliatory and carries little influence. In time, when this influence reaches out to the wide mass and its ideology turns militant, the true nature of "freedom of the press" will, no doubt, assert itself in the form of open suppression.

The workers must first attain economic power, collectively, before this freedom can have for them any meaning.

The whole question boils down to this, viz.: that there is no freedom of the press for everybody, capital and labor alike. In class society all freedom is class freedom, either capitalist or proletarian.

* * *

Labor Conventions

The CIO and AFL had their conventions simultaneously during the latter part of November, the former at Chicago, the latter at New Orleans.

Numerically both organizations have progressed with a membership of six millions or more for each. This, along with Lewis' Miners' Union and the Railroad Brotherhoods, gives us a total of 13 to 14 million organized workers. While still a minority of the total working class, it is nonetheless a considerable force, capable of substantial influence upon the life of American labor.

Economically and politically they have not fared quite so well. Despite war prosperity, by their own contention, 60 per cent of all the workers receive less than enough to meet the Department of Labor's subsistence level. While we are not ready to put all the blame upon organized labor, since the unorganized majority bears even greater responsibility for that condition, still the trade unions are a party to that guilt. Their lack of militancy, readiness to compromise with capital, political conservatism, internal disunity and in some cases corrupt leadership, all these have been negative factors tending to check labor's progress. After three years toleration of the Little Steel Formula, which seriously hampered wage increases proportional to living cost rise, both organizations still seek to modify or nullify the formula through appeals to the very governmental agencies that inaugurated it; both conventions saw fit to reaffirm their no-strike pledge for the duration, trading away their only effective weapon of defense—the strike — for an abstract justice through capitalist government procedure. Such faith is truly transcendental!

In this respect rank and file workers showed more practical wisdom and less gullibility. They defended their economic demands through strikes, much to the dismay, and in spite of, their leaders.

Politically neither organization has shown readiness to take an independent labor stand. They still hang on to the apron strings of the two major parties of capital, whose "benevolent" protection they seek. Even the CIO, flushed from the recent victory of Roosevelt and the role PAC played in his election, does not see any other future for it except to look to "progressives in either party." How much "progressivism" can be expected from Roosevelt is already indicated in part by his choice of personnel for the State Department. Progressives of the Wall Street stripe, Stettinius of the Steel Trust, Clayton, the cotton king, Rockefeller of Standard Oil, and other members of big business.

On the question of race discrimination, the CIO took a commendable stand with a strong resolution condemning it, while the AFL, itself guilty of Jim Crowism within some of its affiliates, failed to break with its past policy of reaction. The AFL again unyieldingly adhered to its traditional conservatism by turning down the invitation of the British trade unions to an international labor conference to be held in London next February. The presence of a Soviet trade union delegation was the cause

for its declination. It would indeed constitute a descension and a discomfort for capitalist-minded labor politicians of the Green, Woll or Tobin type to sit side by side with class-conscious representatives of the Soviet workers. The AFL is more alert to the chauvinistic interests of the American bankers and industrialists than to the needs of international labor.

The declaration of both conventions for the necessity of providing 60 million jobs in the post-war are labor prototypes of the capitalist party conventions. Instead of an objective analysis of economic conditions and trends, the revolution in production technique making for a tremendously increased labor output, reduction in necessary skill and eventual displacement of jobs, instead of considering the post-war disparity between production and consumption they express the pious wish that 60 million jobs will be available. How? Not a word is said. Except that they must be created. But that in itself is quite a job, for which we already have some valuable precedent. Public works projects and pump priming create jobs but not for long. They are an artificial stimulant, not-profitable, and constitute a drain upon capitalism. Real jobs are regarded as such only when they are profit-creating. And these must arise from

the normal process of capitalist production with a distribution outlet. But such an outlet cannot be visualized in the post-war particularly after the destroyed areas have been restored. But such an evaluation of the economic forces cannot but face the prospects of terrible economic crisis and labor suffering.

All in all, much of a progressive nature cannot be recorded for either convention. Basically they both endorse the system of free enterprise (capitalism) which rests on the exploitation of the worker. While they constitute an advance over the completely unorganized section of American labor in that collective bargaining is an improved defense of labor's elementary economic interests, they still remain completely oblivious to his higher economic interest. Such call for a complete change in the economic order. This can be brought about only through independent working class political action. The process of development is seemingly slow. But change it will.

L. B.

Soviet Science

(Continued from page 6)

practice unfolds its most flagrant opposite. It creates abundance and want. It makes millionaires and paupers. It can only live upon an expanding market. Thus it creates wars for capital expansion or stagnation and depression with mass unemployment and mass misery.

The unfolding of the workings of capitalism with its intricate machinery of exploitation through the extraction of surplus value from the labor of wage workers becomes the work of another branch of social science, i.e. political economy. This science is also rejected by the capitalists. It reveals not only the method of mass exploitation but also the course of capital development from small scale to large scale and finally toward monopoly and stagnation. It reveals also that as this stage is being reached the wage workers, the sufferers from exploitation, have become not only capable of doing all the work necessary to production, including managing, but also that they have become the vast majority of the population. It thus reveals that the wage workers have the means as well as the strength to take power into their own hands and establish production for their own use.

This briefly is the social science theory upon which the Soviet system was built and upon which it is growing. Thus we see why it is possible for science to expand as it does in the Soviet Union. We also see how it would be impossible to copy Soviet methods in other nations without first doing away with the economic system which today stifles science. We also see here why nobody but the workers can afford to tell the whole truth about Soviet achievements.

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.

- WAGE-LABOR AND CAPITAL, by Karl Marx.....10c
- MARXISM AND DARWINISM, by Anton Pannekoek.....10c
- CLASS STRUGGLES IN AMERICA, by A. M. Simons.....10c
- CRIME, ITS CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES,
by John Keracher.....10c
- ECONOMICS FOR BEGINNERS, by John Keracher.....10c
- THE HEAD-FIXING INDUSTRY, by John Keracher.....10c
- PRODUCERS AND PARASITES, by John Keracher.....10c
- PROLETARIAN LESSONS, by John Keracher.....15c
- HOW THE GODS WERE MADE, by John Keracher.....15c
- WHY UNEMPLOYMENT, by John Keracher..... 5c

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