

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. XIV, No. 6—Whole No. 147

Chicago, June, 1945

483

Price 5c a Copy

Tariff Reduction and Full Employment

By Christ Jelset

While the big three, or big five, are moving cautiously in shaping their post-war course of cooperation, they do claim to be solving the most controversial problems. The San Francisco Conference is moving along towards finish, in early June. When adjournment is announced it will be claimed that human progress has been greatly advanced by the work of the delegates. It will be said that the groundwork has been laid for the power that is to prevent future wars. It will be claimed that almost complete agreement has been reached on most points. The various governments will be urged to ratify the plan, and the "United Nations" might thus be established.

The permanent nature of that union of nations might, however, prove to be an illusion. It is one thing for a group of aspiring delegates to draw up plans for an organization and quite a different matter when the many nations, with their controversial interests, begin to function in their new role.

It is easy to understand that the most costly and most brutal of all wars should create a strong desire for peace. What is so often forgotten is that the world, or the nations composing it, never act according to wish or plan. Nations usually act as best they can in their own economic interests, not with a view to the future, which is usually unknown, but in temporary solution of existing problems.

Under capitalism, nations have many problems which are contradictory. This holds true regarding external as well as internal problems. In fact the most outstanding of such problems are to be found in both fields.

A nation's population wants to live and, if possible, improve its standard of living. The good things of life must be wrested from the natural resources and wrought into articles of consumption and enjoyment. This is a necessary function in which all mankind engages, but the act is not

done cooperatively, either by the world or by single capitalist nations. In fact it is considered extremely wrong to even think of cooperative methods when it comes down to economic functions. The free enterprise system is in use, and it is considered the only worthwhile system. Under this system, as everyone knows, the good things are produced under the direction of private individuals. Tools of production and natural resources are the private property of individuals or of private organizations. The finished products, turned out with the help of wage labor, thus also become the property of these individual owners.

Before consumption can take place all such goods must be sold. At the market place the goods can only be distributed among owners of money or purchasing power. This "means of purchase" is available only in limited quantities to the masses of people who produce the goods, the wage workers. The private owners find themselves in competition for a chance to sell. In fact their very existence as pri-

(Continued on page 2)

America's Jobless Army

America celebrated with much rejoicing when it heard the news that one big job had been completed, namely, the defeat of Germany. But on May 8, President Truman put an official damper on this elation when he warned the American people not to relax because there still remained the "last battle" to be won—that of defeating Japan. He urged them to "work, work, work."

This was not the only somber note struck on "Victory Day." On that same day simultaneously with the celebrations taking place in Times Square and throughout the nation, New York's "PM" announced a "reconversion shock felt by Germany's collapse." Basing its statistics on the CIO Reconversion Committee's analysis it predicted that from 2 to 9 million American workers will become jobless within six months as a result of a 50 per cent cutback in war production to take place during that same period. It appears, therefore, that to millions of discharged war workers the President's advice of "work, work, work" will have little if any meaning.

America is in the stage of witnessing the formation of a "new"

army, one that needs no conscripting, namely, the army of the unemployed. Its numbers will be increased by recruits from Europe, approximately 2 million discharged soldiers, some of whom are already on their way here. These returning veterans are also worried how to put the President's advice into practice, for it appears that there will be no jobs awaiting them in the land of the free. Well may they exclaim, "This is it boys, reconversion is here."

Yes, this is it, for the War Manpower Commission has already put itself on record by announcing a relaxation of manpower controls. Henceforth millions of workers who have long been "frozen" in their jobs will now get a chance to thaw out, "free to seek employment" elsewhere, that is if they can find it. Even those "fortunate" ones still remaining on the job have cause to worry; they, too, will have some "leisure." The return to the 40-hour week means an end to time and one-half for overtime, a wage cut in the take-home pay. War "prosperity" is over and the nation is ready to settle down, but it would be more precise to say bog down.

Estimates as to the amount of jobless workers have also been made by the government through the Director of War Mobilization, which although not as "gloomy" as the CIO's figures, still point to some six and one-half million unemployed within the next

(Continued on page 2)

International Notes

The Soviets Speak at San Francisco

The voice of the Soviet Union at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco has disturbed the capitalist world. Although Soviet delegates were voted down in most instances, here is part of the record: Opposed the seating of the fascist government of Argentina; supported the request of the Provisional Government of Poland for a seat; proposed that full employment in all nations be incorporated as an objective of the security organization; proposed self-government and independence as an objective for all dependent peoples; supported the request of the International Trade Union Congress for consultative representation at the

San Francisco Conference. The leader of the Soviet delegation, Molotov, also had this to say about India: "We have at this conference an Indian delegation. But India is not an independent state. We all know that the time will come when the voice of an independent India will be heard."

Certain U. S. senators were very noisy in the opening days of the conference, over the necessity of asserting the sacredness of "human rights." These senators later became strangely silent.

Trusteeships

Marquis Childs, in the Chicago Times of May 8, quotes the late President Roosevelt as follows: "We are going to have to take

(Continued on page 3)

IN THIS ISSUE

TARIFF REDUCTION AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

By Christ Jelset

AMERICA'S JOBLESS ARMY

By Al Wysocki

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

By Oliver Ritchie

HOME SCENE

By L. B.

PROLETARIAN PARTY TWENTY-FIVE YEARS

(Editorial)

By John Keracher

AMERICA'S JOBLESS ARMY **TARIFF REDUCTION AND FULL EMPLOYMENT**

(Continued from page 1)
 twelve months. But the business men are even more "optimistic" as a recent issue of the Business Week states that there will be a "maximum unemployment of five million, which is not considered dangerous." In a quick rejoinder to that statement, the chairman of the CIO Reconversion Committee pointed out that it "may not seem dangerous to business men, but it is to labor," particularly when he bore in mind the remark of Sam Insull, the late utilities magnate, that "the best way to keep a contented working force is a long line at the employment window."

What is significant in relation to these estimates of America's growing jobless army is that they are predicated on the basis of Japan's still remaining in the war. A glance through most of the business periodicals reveals the fact that the American capitalist class is plenty worried and there is unanimity of opinion, namely, that Japan's sudden surrender would lead to precipitate demobilization of men and industry. On May 12 the Magazine of Wall Street in an article by A. T. Miller warns that there is "the risk of a transition market slump." It further declares that: "The peak of the wartime upswing in industrial production was passed by the end of 1943. It is absolutely certain — now that we are on a one-war basis—that by the end of this year production, national income and retail trade will have declined sharply from the current levels. It is certain that the defeat of Japan will be followed by further "transitional deflation" in employment, consumer income and business earnings—and this would be painfully severe if, as is possible, the Pacific war should terminate within, say, six to nine months."

The big problem, then, seems to be from the viewpoint of American business men: what are Japan's intentions, and, they view with great alarm the danger of a sudden surrender. This anxiety is best exposed in an item appearing in the "In the Wind" column of the Nation magazine (April 28) as follows: "The weekly market letter of Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, stockbrokers, for April 7 contained this optimistic note: 'If Japan should repudiate her conquests and meet Allied surrender terms sooner than our military believes, and mayhap this year, the American economy and its markets are then supposed to sustain a severe shock. Granting the Japanese are treacherous, and might suddenly throw in the sponge, we find it difficult to become depressed contemplating such a prospect.'"

From the foregoing we get an insight of the state of mind of the capitalist class. Hysteria is a mild term in describing it. There

is no doubt about it but that a post-war collapse is not just a mere specter that can be pooh-poohed away but it's an actual possibility. Neither the government nor big business is prepared to cope with the economic chaos that would immediately follow Japan's surrender. For America has created an industrial Frankenstein during the war years. The United States News (May 4) stated that industry's output rate in 1945 had reached 236 per cent of the 1935-39 average. How to control this output in a profitable manner during the peace times is now the problem confronting the capitalist class. The transition from war production to peace production is in itself one problem that will be difficult to solve in an orderly manner. A preview of what is likely to happen was furnished the nation as early as last year, in spring, when some 13,000 workers of the Brewster Aircraft Co. staged a "stay-in" strike in protest of being laid off as a result of the cut-backs that took place then.

Already such large plants as the Ford-operated Willow Run bomber plant at Detroit, Michigan, which was built at a cost of approximately \$100,000,000 are now scheduled for the scrap heap. Many thousands have been laid off and the shutdown of that one plant alone, it is estimated, will affect several hundred thousand workers in the related industries. Union spokesmen are demanding to know why these government-built plants can't be converted to producing peace commodities, such as bathtubs, pre-fabricated homes or tractors, etc. Ford himself provided the answer by saying that the plant had served its purpose, its cost being no greater than a large battleship and therefore it was expendable. Evidently the workers who operated the factory are also "expendable" now that their services are no longer required.

As unemployment increases, no doubt the demand will also become more insistent as to what the present administration intends to do in carrying out its promise of 60 million jobs for the post-war period. Workers have yet to learn that the capitalist class will promise them everything but to get off their backs. For promises cost them nothing but serve the useful purpose of deceiving the masses. It's time the workers quit being deceived.

There is this ironical aspect about the whole situation: during the war, in addition to the billions of dollars in profits accumulated by the wealthy owners of industry, they have also amassed a reserve fund up to 20 billion dollars to tide them over the reconversion period. As for the working class it is very obvious that they have very little

(Continued from page 1)
 vate owners and sellers, i. e., as capitalists, depends upon their ability to sell. Competition for markets and for the more abundant sources of raw materials becomes the life and death struggle of the capitalists.

Being men of property, and of business, the capitalists wield the strongest influence upon national affairs. They, in the main, decide what their nation's domestic as well as foreign policies are to be. Being in economic conflict with each other, they are unable to establish national policies suitable to all. They either must make compromises or fight it out, and let the stronger side have its way. This latter course means war.

Today, when the desire for peace is stronger than ever, the tendency to be willing to compromise, economic conflicts are also stronger than ever. But just as a leading capitalist, or leading capitalist firm, is unwilling to compromise his leading position, for fear of being ultimately driven from the field, so leading capitalist nations will make compromises only within the safe margin of remaining in the lead.

How far can a leading capitalist nation go in compromising its position? That, too, becomes a controversial question among groups with conflicting economic interests. It is now pretty generally agreed that if permanent peace is to prevail, there must be economic security and advancement, in most sections of the world. What can the U. S. A. contribute toward such general world economic advancement? Much, it is claimed. America can make donations to relieve some of the most acute sufferings from

"reserves," the wages were never adequate to catch up with the high cost of living. It therefore looks like millions of workers will have to get back on "relief" (and as someone remarked, it's anything but relief).

After all is said and done, the capitalist system cannot function in any other way than it does. It creates extreme wealth for some, i. e., the handful of parasitic multi-millionaires. On the other hand, it creates extreme poverty and unemployment for the vast majority, the working class. It is time the workers woke up to this most obvious fact. America's industrial machine will only function for the benefit of all when the workers take collective ownership of it. In order to do this the capitalist system will have to be abolished by the organized might of the working class. This, then, is the solution to the problem of unemployment and poverty; there is no other.

Al Wysocki.

war devastation. America can advance capital to rehabilitate devastated areas. It can provide capital for economic improvement in backward sections of the world. It can adopt policies that will facilitate the free flow of world trade.

Already there is a working organization in the field to handle the first of these undertakings. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration has been supplied with funds and some equipment for handling relief. Americans might not like to go on short rations just to take care of suffering elsewhere, but at least something will be done in this respect.

When it comes to providing capital for the rebuilding of war-devastated areas, and also for industrialization of backward sections, America will be most willing. This is not to be given away. It is to be loaned or invested. Capitalists are not only willing, they are most anxious to do such things on a large scale — provided it can be done with safety. Loans and investments are "safe" when the projects into which they are put are able to turn out the goods or services intended, and further, **when such goods and services can be sold.**

It is here that the problem starts to become knotty. Before World War II got under way, America had ample productive equipment, a fairly abundant supply of raw materials, and plenty of skilled hands to turn out the products. Attempts were made, through "pump priming," N. R. A.'s and other means, to create sufficient "purchasing power," to move the products through the various markets. Prolonged mass unemployment gave ample evidence of the inadequacy of such measures. Bitter criticism of the New Deal gave evidence that the plans adopted were not universally accepted. Government purchase of war equipment solved the problem for a time, and in a way, but now peace is wanted and "permanent peace" at that.

Now more goods can and **must** be produced than ever before. How is it to be sold? The answer is in process of being formulated: More freedom for the flow of world trade.

To sell much and buy little was the good old way of accumulating funds. Now this method is proving itself a means of stagnation. Too many want to sell. Not enough want to purchase. To have full prosperity, and full employment, in America, much must be sold abroad. To be able to receive payment for such goods, and also to maintain prosperity as well as friendly rela-

(Continued on page 7)

HOME SCENE

Partial Reconversion

With the defeat of the Nazis, "half the war over," the reconversion plans were transformed from the realm of theory to practice. The government made known, in a general way, its policy of reconversion. The daily press headlined the end of the curfew and the lifting of the ban on horse racing, which by the way will not relieve the meat shortage. However, urgent questions have arisen that both capital and labor will face, and search for answers.

PRODUCTION: Fred Vinson, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, "the president on the home front," made known that with a "one-front war," war production will be cut 10 to 15 per cent within three months and to two-thirds of the present level by the end of 12 months, at which point it is proposed to stay until V-J Day. War production itself will undergo a change, with the change of war scenery and as a result of experiences. The tools will be "acclimated" to the new environment.

The Willow Run, B-24 plant, outside Detroit, is scheduled shortly to close down entirely, throwing 140,000 workers out of jobs. On May 4th the plant received the Army-Navy "E" for excellence in production, only to be followed by "B" for bums rush out, in their pay envelopes.

"Will-Not-Run" cost the government \$96,450,000 to build and equip; \$26,000,000 for housing project and \$20,000,000 for the highway connecting it from Detroit. And what a highway, with a dead end.

Many of the one-industry towns, which prospered so recently, will take on the characteristics of the "good old days," ghost towns.

The cut in war production will mean a partial release of men and material for production of civilian goods. Raw materials hitherto unobtainable and prohibited consumer goods will now, in a limited way, make their appearance. The slogan of the industrial captains will no doubt be: "Git their fustest with the mostest." The scramble is about to commence. Victory will go to the speediest and strongest. "Little fellows, make way, don't clog the highways; this is a race of giants. Steer clear or you'll get crushed."

PRICES: "Cost-Plus," which characterizes war production, is to prevail for the starting point in the renewal of civilian "lizzies," etc. The OPA will permit manufacturers to add higher labor and material costs to their 1941 prices. But this conveniently ignores the cost-reducing factors of improved and increased labor productivity and organization, and with the demand still outstripping the sup-

ply, the reduced selling expenses.

Donald Montgomery, chairman of the CIO Cost of Living Committee, in opposition to increasing prices said: "I refer to the suppressed steel report prepared by the OPA Research Department which showed that although average hourly earnings in the steel industry had increased 46 per cent from prewar to 1943, the actual labor costs per unit had gone down by 8 per cent, due to technical improvements and higher volume of output." The "generosity" of capital is now in the clear. What is true of steel most likely holds for its "feathered friends." High prices for what it sells; low prices for what it buys, including labor power.

TAXES: While the government financial experts report on the one hand "the need for revenue" until Japan is defeated, they also favor tax relief for the "poor" rich. Morgenthau and those congressional committees under whose authority tax measures are sprung, favor the speed-up of refunds to corporations, to improve the cash position of business during reconversion. The Treasury Department now holds 10 per cent post-war credit under the excess profits tax.

These gentry also favor exemption from excess profits tax, beginning next year, of the present \$10,000 to \$25,000 incomes.

Why, those "poor fellows" don't know where their next meal is coming from, according to the latest report of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Commission report shows: "that all corporations in the United States—except banks and insurance companies—increased their holdings of cash and government securities by \$30,000,000,000 from 1939 to September, 1944.

"As a result, the net working capital (current assets less current liabilities) of the corporations increased during the same period by \$20,000,000,000—an increase of 83 per cent since 1939.

This gain of \$20,000,000,000 in net working capital, all represented by cash and government securities, is sufficient to enable corporations to pay themselves—without turning a wheel—their net prewar profit after taxes for six years. (The average used is \$3,300,000,000 based on the years 1936-39.)

"Of the \$40,000,000,000 profits after taxes which corporations amassed from 1940 through 1944, they have paid out about \$20,000,000,000 in dividends and retained the remaining \$20,000,000,000—just equal to the increased working capital." (PM, April 8, 1945.)

That isn't all; how about the various reserves set up as insurance against falling business and prices, deductible most likely

(Continued on page 6)

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

(Continued from page 1)

some positive steps or find ourselves pushed out completely. Some time ago I worked out a form of trusteeship for French Indo-China. You know, that colony was governed very badly. For every dollar the French put in, they took 10 dollars out. Those little people had a culture of their own, Cambodia and the Cambodian kings. But they were badly treated.

"Now, my idea is for a trusteeship to administer Indo-China. I put this up to Chiang Kai-shek and he was strong for it. The idea is to have one Chinese trustee, one Philippine trustee, one French trustee, a British trustee and perhaps an American trustee."

The opening sentence quoted appears to state very clearly the position of the U. S. government on the matter. It is a case of pushing in or being pushed out in the struggle over the division of the spoils. For the French to put in one dollar and take out ten is very bad. However, if American financiers had the same privilege, then everything would be all right. The British don't favor such trusteeships. If such a system were applied to "French" Indo-China the demand might arise to apply this to British Burma, Malaya and the Dutch East Indies. In the latter case, this might work out very well for the Americans but not so well for the British.

Soviet delegates at San Francisco proposed that all dependent peoples be promised ultimate self-government and independence. British and American representatives don't like the terminology. The "self-government" part is all right but not the "independence." Evidently they want to see that such people set up the right kind of "self-government." The British, for instance, are quite willing to promise Burma self-government provided it is "self-government" within the British empire.

60 Million Workers Represented at Oakland

The delegates to the International Trade Union Congress met in Oakland, just across a narrow stretch of water from the United Nations Conference at San Francisco. The I. T. U. C. represented some sixty million organized workers in various parts of the world. In setting up the charter for this new organization a general committee of 45 and an administrative body of 13 were agreed upon. Representation in the administrative body was arranged as follows: Two each for the British (T. U. C.), the French (C. G. T.), the Latin (C.T.A.L.), and three for the Soviet trade unions. (The latter represented some 27 million organized workers.) The I. T. U. C. is to meet in Paris in September when

other trade union bodies are expected to be represented.

The I. T. U. congress in Oakland was a contrast to the United Nations Conference. At San Francisco it was evident that there was a conflict of interests between nations or between groups of nations. Representatives were well aware that anything tending to strengthen a competitor would weaken their own relative position. The charter resulting from this conference could be nothing more than a compromise, on paper, of the conflicting interests of the participants. At Oakland, however, the interests of all participants were fundamentally the same. If the trade unions in one nation are strengthened this has a beneficial effect on the trade unions in all nations. The organization resulting from this congress represents progress. The aim now should be to bring the trade unions of every nation into the I. T. U. C.

Socialism an Issue in Canadian Elections

A national election campaign of considerable significance is taking place in Canada. The election is to be held in early June. Over 900 candidates of various parties are seeking 245 seats in the Canadian house of commons. In recent years a new political party, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (C.C.F.) has come to the front to challenge the two old parties, the Conservatives and the Liberals. The C.C.F., as its name implies, is looking to socialism as a solution to social problems. C.C.F. spokesmen maintain that capitalism cannot solve the problems confronting the Canadian people and that socialism is the way out. The new party has gained considerable strength in several provinces. In Saskatchewan, the great wheat-growing province, the C.C.F. was voted into office in 1944. Its elected representatives immediately became involved in bitter controversy with the federal government in Ottawa over financial matters. In Ontario (next to Quebec the most populous province in Canada) the C.C.F. has some 30 out of 90 legislative seats. Here a hot provincial campaign is taking place, with elections to be held one week prior to the national election.

The question of the merits or demerits of socialism as opposed to "free enterprise" has come in for bitter debate in the labor unions. The Canadian Congress of Labor, which has affiliations with the C.I.O., is supporting the C.C.F., while the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada, which has affiliations with the AFL, is maintaining the old stand of "nonpartisanship." The leadership of the latter is no doubt largely anti-C.C.F., while the rank and file is divided.

(Continued on page 7)

PROLETARIAN NEWS

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

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

Proletarian Party 25 Years Old

A quarter of a century has passed since the Proletarian Party was organized. Its first convention was held in Detroit, June 27 and 28, 1920. Those who brought the Party into being had, in the previous year, played an important part in organizing the Communist Party, September, 1919.

The main reason for launching the Proletarian Party was the recognition of the need for a sound party of Marxism, a revolutionary, not a reform party. The Communist Party had turned out to be a party of confusion, an incurable mess, communist in name only. History has demonstrated the soundness of Proletarian Party judgment in relation to the now self-liquidated C.P., the leadership of which has openly joined hands with American capitalist-imperialism, and proclaiming that the profit system is worthy of working class support.

Down through the years, the Proletarian Party has adhered to the principles upon which it was organized, a sound communist basis which has required no fundamental changes in its "line." It has consistently proclaimed that only through the political overthrow of the capitalists as a class, by the workers as a class, can the exploitation of labor with its attendant evils be abolished. It has ever proclaimed that the conquest of political power can only be attained by the proletariat through the organization of a new state structure, that the ready-made state machinery of capitalism will not make it possible for the workers to reach their goal, the socialization of the entire means of production.

The work of the Proletarian Party has not been spectacular, but it has been consistent. Like other working class organizations it has had its difficulties. It has seen growth and setbacks. It has had to eliminate opportunism, and various types of reformism and adventurism which have from time to time crept into its ranks. The first break in its unity came as a result of the Great Depression which commenced in 1929. During the severity, and the excitement, of the first years of the depression, a group within our ranks sought to swerve the Party from its course and go in for more spectacular methods. They wanted to introduce capitalist reforms into the Party program, and rally larger numbers by the promise of gaining "something now" for the workers. They also believed then (1931) that the Depression was more than a cyclical breakdown, that it was the "death crisis" of American capitalism.

The Party refused at its convention in June, 1931, to endorse the ideas of this group, whereupon they sought by misrepresentation, and the publishing of an unauthorized opposition bulletin and sending individuals to the locals, to stir up factional strife. This resulted in the expulsion of the leaders of the group. They took a number of the members along with them and for a few years carried on a separate organization, with the result that they became victims of their own impatience and their own methods. Divisions arose

within their ranks and their organization expired in a miserable fit of the blues.

Two other breaks, of less severity, came later in the Party ranks. Following the Party Convention of 1933, a group resigned and launched a bitter attack upon the Party and its principles. This group from the start was too confused and divided to hold together as a unit. It split up in a number of directions. Some joined the Socialist Party. Others joined the Communist Party and later, even the Democratic Party. The Trotskyists and the Lovestone group (now out of existence) collected a few of them.

The third, and last, break in Party ranks came following our Convention of 1937. It was the result of the Party's refusal to "repudiate the Communist International." While the Proletarian Party never was affiliated with the now defunct C.I., it endorsed the principles upon which that International was founded, and while it never thought that the C.I. was free from errors, it saw no reason for repudiation.

Lurking behind the proposed repudiation was something else, namely, strong anti-Soviet opinions which they openly expressed after they were out of the Party, and which was one of the causes for this group also breaking up. Our San Francisco local, being the center of the split, together with some support in other parts of the country, tried for a time to carry on a loose organization, but it fell apart and totally disappeared. Most of the individuals who took part in those splits have given up all efforts at organized working class political action.

Those internal conflicts, although in part due to insufficient discipline, were mainly unavoidable. They were a real test upon the Party's stability. They were costly but they helped to solidify our ranks. They brought about greater unity of purpose and a more thorough theoretical understanding of our membership. Today, the Proletarian Party is the soundest Marxian Party in America. It is the only party based upon the Communism of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

When the Communist International was dissolved in May, 1943, we wrote: "The Third International is dead. It has finally succumbed to this imperialist war, just as the Second International collapsed during World War I. Had the Communist International been smashed by the onslaught of capitalist war, had it gone down fighting, it would have been unfortunate but creditable. "Unconditional surrender" to British and American imperialism, to opportunism and national chauvinism, into which most of its sections were already sunk, is an inglorious exit indeed." * * * "The Proletarian Party was never affiliated with the Communist International, although from its inception in 1920 it endorsed the C.I. as the best International that the world's workers had yet produced, and it subscribed to the program and form of revolutionary struggle which that program proclaimed, namely, the conquest of power by the proletariat through a Soviet form of government and the administration of that power by Proletarian Dictatorship." * * *

"For there to be a Marxian party, its individual members must be, in the main, Marxists. A Communist party must have not only a Communist program, it must practice Communist policies as well. Its purpose is to fight the capitalist system with the object of overthrowing it. Its field of operations is within the country where it exists. The Communist Manifesto plainly makes this assertion: "The Proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie." Had there been a sufficient number of genuine Communist parties

within the C.I., that is, real Marxian parties, its dissolution could not have taken place."

To those who are not familiar with the existing parties which speak in the name of the working class, the differences which divide the ranks of working class political actionists may seem to be without rhyme or reason. However, they are the result not of an avowedly different objective but of a different conception as to how the Proletarian Revolution can be achieved.

In the ranks of the Proletarian Party there are no language divisions, such as exist within the Socialist and Socialist-Labor parties, although workers of all nationalities are within our ranks. Nor does the Proletarian Party pin its faith to bourgeois legality and proclaim that the U. S. Constitution guarantees the right of revolution, and that through the existing state machinery, even with a majority vote (a very desirable procedure), the working class can take over and socialize the means of production.

The Proletarian Party has no anti-Soviet or anti-Stalin phobia, as is the case with the Socialist Party, the Socialist-Labor Party and various parties and groups of Trotskyists, and the I.W.W.

From the inception of World War II, the Proletarian Party has proclaimed it to be an imperialist conflict, not a "people's war" or a "war for the liberation of small nations." We have consistently contended that with the exception of the Soviet Union, which fought to repel invasion and defend a workers' republic, this war is a struggle amongst the big capitalist imperialist powers and their satellites. We further contend that a people's peace cannot emerge from an imperialist war, and that any "peace" which leaves the capitalist class in possession of the means of production, can be but a truce between wars, no matter what terminology may be used, nor in what idealistic phrases the "peace" treaty may be written.

During the 25 years of our Party's existence there have been many social changes. There have been capitalist business booms and capitalist crises and depressions, and last of all, capitalist imperialism's great worldwide war, with its mass slaughter, not only of those in uniform, but of old men and women and innocent children, in the bombing from the skies of great centers of population.

We have seen the rise of capitalism's most ruthless political methods under Fascism (or Nazism) and we have seen working class parties and groups become pro-capitalist in their fight against this ruthless form of capitalist administration, supporting the "lesser evil" of capitalist state power and capitalist militarism.

The Proletarian Party has consistently contended that Fascism or Nazism, are not peculiar to Italy and Germany but that they have roots in all capitalist nations, and would be used just as openly and ruthlessly if the ruling capitalist classes deem it necessary. Fighting against capitalism, in all of its forms, has ever been the policy of the Proletarian Party.

Unlike those parties which proclaim that "religion is a private matter," meaning thereby that no stand should be taken against the inculcation of superstition, the Proletarian Party has proclaimed that "religion is a social phenomenon, to be explained in the light of the materialist conception of history."

During the first 10 years of our Party's existence, capitalism, in the main, was expanding. There were vast profits for the capitalists, and "steady jobs" (regular exploitation) for the workers. During the second 10 years, depression prevailed, with mass unemployment and much hardship for the workers.

This depression brought about certain changes in the political methods of the American capitalists, not for the benefit of the workers but to strengthen and stabilize their political control of the nation. Toward the end of that decade came the great spontaneous sit-down strikes, with the rise of the CIO, and the general expansion of organized labor.

During the past five years, the Great Imperialist War has brought about still greater changes. Large numbers of workers have been drawn from the industries (and from the jobless army) into the armed forces of the nation. National production has increased in volume, and industry in general has expanded to an extent never before known. Most of this expansion was for the purposes of war. The vast army of unemployed, many millions, was absorbed by the armed forces and by this expansion of industry. War prosperity, "production for destruction," has for the time being, stimulated American capitalism, and in many cases caused workers to forget the depression of the "hungry thirties," because they are enjoying the "prosperity" of the "bloody forties."

War, the Proletarian Party contends, is the outcome of economic rivalry between the capitalists of the various nations, especially the larger imperialist ones, seeking to expand their hold upon the world market, or to control sources of raw materials and spheres of capitalist investment, and that, consequently, as long as such a system remains, wars will break out and no league or treaty or "understanding" can prevent the recurrence of such conflicts as the present war. The only assurance of peace is to abolish the cause of war, namely, the class ownership of the means of life. When industry is socialized, when profit is taken out of production, there will be no incentive for war.

In the daily struggle of the workers against capitalist encroachment upon their standard of living, we urge that all workers participate in the activities of the labor unions, that in such a struggle there should be no political truce with the class enemy, that the workers should not abandon their economic weapons upon the plea of national emergency (capitalist emergency) but fight at all times for higher wages and shorter hours.

The Proletarian Party believes that the experience gained from such struggles will be conducive to the solidarity of the workers as a class and that they are in a measure preliminary battles leading to the final struggle for working class supremacy.

During the years of its existence the membership of the Proletarian Party has played a strong role in union activities, and it has sought to carry the message of Marxism to the rank and file and has striven to raise the objective of the conflict beyond mere redress of grievances and toward the struggle for possession of the means of production.

Educational methods to raise the theoretical level of the Party membership are undertaken as part of the process of raising the revolutionary concepts of the working class in general. Study classes, in which members of the Party and supporters get together, to read and discuss fundamental economic, philosophical, historical and political principles have been a feature of Proletarian Party work.

Our Party, without being caught in the meshes and illusions of bourgeois political action, nevertheless, sees the need for class-conscious workers making use of the franchise at elections and selecting from their own ranks, working class candidates for political office. If the Proletarian Party has not entered into election campaigns more

it has simply been because of the conviction that American workers are not yet ready to break with the political parties of capitalism, the Republican and Democratic parties, which have the masses still fooled with their propaganda and "education."

The P.P. sees much value in election campaigns, and in working class participation in legislative bodies, mainly as a means of enlightening the workers and of helping to bring the class issue to a head. Its main difference, however, is understanding of the limitations of political elections as well as their value. It does not tell the workers that they can vote capitalism out or buy it out, as do certain existing parties. It does not tell the workers to support one capitalist party, as a "lesser evil" against another. Nor does it contend that a smart party leadership can take power, with the support of an ignorant working class, or, on the other hand, that the workers must be all well informed socialists. It does contend that the workers as a class must understand the historic goal and consciously participate in the overthrow of capitalism.

The history of the past 25 years has, in the main, vindicated the soundness of the Proletarian Party's policies, both in relation to American capitalist development and in relation to foreign affairs, the present great war, and the role of the Soviet Union. Unlike opponents of the Soviet system or the assailants of the Soviet administrators, who prophesied the downfall of the soviet officialdom as soon as war would be made upon the U. S. S. R., the Proletarian Party proclaimed that the contrary would be the case, that the greatest amount of national solidarity would ensue, and that the Axis armies would fail to conquer the Red Army of the U. S. S. R.

The Proletarian Party asserts that those who now use a new slander, namely, that the Red Army, having won the war on the eastern front, working class interests are being betrayed by the Soviet leadership, Stalin and others, selling out to British and American capitalism, are equally wrong as they have been on other charges they have made in the past.

When the "Communist" Party of America was liquidated, and its members individually urged to join a political association for the support of the candidates of the Democratic Party, we wrote: "The Proletarian Party was not at all surprised by this new twist in the old class collaborationist line of the "Communist" Party's performances. It is the logical outcome of its "practical politics" and its choice of alleged "lesser evils" of capitalism. This committing of hara-kiri is a belated act. It should have been done long ago. If it really goes through with this noble act, this self-destruction, it can then be said that it has at last been of service to the workers. For many years now it has injured more than it has aided the forward march of the American working class." * * * Its "practical politics" led it back to the totally discredited practice of the social-democratic parties of the Second International. Now it plans to outdo its former rottenness, by calling upon the workers to abandon all efforts at independent working class action, and join with it in the support of American capitalism. * * * "Earl Browder, the general secretary of the party of liquidation, is reported in the press to have stated that: "Capitalism and socialism have begun to find a way to peaceful co-existence and collaboration in the same world," and also that "the American people are so ill-prepared, subjectively, for any deep-going change in the direction of socialism that post-war plans with such an aim would not unite the nation, but would further divide it."

Thus, unity with the capitalist class became the official policy, and, at this writing still is, of the remnants of the former "Communist" Party, now the "Communist Political Association."

As the Proletarian Party's principles and practices have been the most in harmony with actual developments, what can be said of the future course of events, and the problems now confronting the American workers? Can the capitalists readjust their economic system, so as to employ the masses of wage workers? Can they guarantee 60,000,000 jobs, and pay more than starvation wages? We contend that they can no more fulfill such promises, than they did their former promises of "prosperity," such as "a chicken for every pot," or their promise "that men would not be sent to fight on foreign soil."

With the war ended in Europe there will be a curtailment of production, and a jobless army will make its appearance, composed of discharged war workers, and returned servicemen who are unable to obtain employment, and further, it is obvious, that if the war in Asia is ended soon, America will be confronted with a jobless army as large, or larger, than that of the depression years. Do American workers want to return to that state of affairs, or will they take a hand in the solution of their own problems?

The standard of living for the workers (not the capitalists) will fall still lower. Rationing of necessities, and civil regimentation in general, will be expanded, and a further concentration of wealth into still fewer hands will follow.

However, not all the millions of servicemen will be returned to civil life. A large and permanent imperialist army will be maintained, and huge naval and air forces, for America's increasing role of world policeman, together with its chief ally, Great Britain, hitherto the world's policeman number one. In the name of "the new world order," or "international good-will," we can be sure that America's "democratic" imperialism will maintain a large military force, just for "the maintenance of peace." In the "liberated" nations the Yankee Doughboys may be given the job to defend the property of the rich and clamp down upon the starving poor, if the latter make raids upon the private stocks of foodstuffs.

The Proletarian Party calls upon all workers who now see this trend of events to rally and resist this strengthening of the exploiters, the capitalist imperialists, at the expense of defeated imperialists and at the expense of their own workers.

The best form of resistance is to join in the struggle to put an end to capitalism entirely. Of course, that means political action. That is our purpose of existing as a party.

Membership in the Proletarian Party is open to all workers who desire to help in the struggle to abolish capitalism. If you want to save capitalism, if you want to patch it up, if you have faith in its promises of better times in the future, with 60,000,000 jobs, then there is no room for you in our ranks, but if you now realize that the solution to your problem lies in the abolition of the profit system through the workers taking possession of the means of production, the mills, mines, factories, etc., then your place is in our ranks. The Proletarian Party needs you. You need the Proletarian Party. Become an active member. Join the ranks.

John Keracher.

The number on wrapper opposite your name shows the last issue for which you have paid.

This issue is No. 147. Remit early. Postage stamps are acceptable.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 3)

from income taxes, and other such loopholes which "talented" tax consultants scent. Capital is sure taken care of, in and out of Washington.

LABOR: It was announced that war production factories will remain on a 48-hour week. Other industries will taper off to the 40-hour week. The answer as to what will happen to the workers' pay envelope, with the loss of overtime and even short of 40-hour work week, is obvious. With a larger supply of manpower, rates, too, will be affected adversely, even if government boards proclaim to the contrary. Ceilings have been enforced rigidly; how solid the floor?

Fred Vinson, "assistant president," calculates a net unemployment of 2,500,000 at the end of the 12-month period.

Business Week predicts 5,000,000.

Boris Shiskin, AFL's chief economist, says 4,000,000.

Ted Silvay, chief of the CIO Reconversion Committee, estimates it will run between 3 and 9 million at the end of 6 months, depending upon the depth of the cutback and size of military inventories.

One thing stands out — the unanimous agreement that unemployment is on its way.

Anxiety over the fate of fathers, sons and brothers, during wartime, is now to be overtaken by the additional anxiety of joblessness. What about the wartime prosperity labor has been enjoying, the big "fat" pay envelopes, which should tide the workers over the "bumps"? The Treasury Department reported that of more than 67,000,000 people filing tax returns last year, 49,000,000 earned less than \$2000 a year, and after taxes \$1300. What a reserve labor can pile up from that! Always on edge, the worker lives between hopes of peace and fear of its joblessness.

* * *

Black Market Babies

The black market seems to penetrate every phase of the "American Way" of life. How low it has sunk can be gauged from the following. Miss Doris Margolis, speaking at a meeting of the Hampden County Children's Aid Association, described a flourishing black market in babies for adoption in Massachusetts. Some couples were paying as high as \$2000 for babies to adopt. "Some physicians make a business of providing illegitimate babies to childless couples at exorbitant prices, she added." (Boston Globe, May 18, 1945.)

It's a dirty business, but "business is business" under the profit system.

* * *

A Lesson in Press Freedom

While theoretically the press is supposed to be impartial, ac-

tual experience proves the opposite. This time it was the employees of R. H. Macy Co., New York department store, who got a lesson in elementary social science. It was during a recent labor dispute that the union decided to buy advertising space in some New York papers to present its side of the dispute with the department store. This was turned down, the reason given was lack of space. The union no doubt felt chagrined.

It's about time that labor unions learned something about social relations and press "freedom." What else can be expected in a class society where the press, like all means of production, is privately owned and controlled? Is it not logical that a business economy should give priority to its propertied advertisers, the Macys and others and tell its side of the story only?

When trade unions have recognized this basic truth they will have gone a long way towards power and freedom. The capitalist "free" press can rave all it wants about the Soviet "controlled" press and absence of freedom, but the fact still remains that it is Soviet labor which controls it and the anti-labor forces that lack the freedom. Power and freedom go together. The class that has the power enjoys the freedom.

* * *

On the Race Front

In a previous issue we alluded to discriminatory practices in Catholic colleges. We now wish to add that dogmatic Catholicism is not alone in this guilt. Some goings-on within the camp of "enlightened" Protestantism are not less unworthy.

For instance, the recent case of Dr. Edward J. Sparling, who reportedly was ousted from the presidency of the Central YMCA College of Chicago because he defended Montgomery Ward strikers. Now, here's an educator who sinned against his masters on two counts — race and class. When he was removed from his post he said "At the base of the racial discrimination fight was Newton Farr, real estate operator and defender of restricted covenants, who initiated the demand to know the number of Negroes in the college at the November, 1944, board meeting.

"At the same meeting another director asked for the number of Jewish students in the college, which question I ignored.

"When demand by complete board action was made on me to reveal these figures, I said that I would have to resign if they were used in discrimination against any student because of race or creed.

"I was rebuked by the then chairman of the board, Francis M. Knight, vice-president of the Continental Illinois National

Wages and the Working Day

(Concluded from last issue)

Some open, and covert, enemies of the Soviet system claim that a new exploiting class has arisen in the Soviet Union. They see in the officials of the U.S.S.R., and the variations in incomes, a new exploiting class. Yet, it is admitted that this new "class" does not own the means of production, that the means of production is socialized, and that no one there can start in business, as in America, for instance, and hire and exploit wage workers for profit.

Bank and Trust Co., because, as a private citizen, I spoke before the workers during the April, 1944, Montgomery Ward strike.

"I was further rebuked for allowing my name to be used on a citizens' committee handbill condemning Montgomery Ward & Co. for its refusal to obey the directive of the War Labor Board.

"Protest on these scores also came from the YMCA, aside from the college board, which receives contributions from the mail-order house." (PM, April 20.)

It should be noted that one director, Farr, is a real estate operator, the other, Knight, is vice-president of a bank. Both are members of the propertied class. We can well appreciate the position of the YMCA in the Montgomery Ward strike when it receives contributions from that house. How can it possibly be impartial, let alone favor the strikers?

* * *

About the same time we read in the press that in Wilmington, Delaware, a study of the school system by a Committee of Education revealed the following condition. "Religious and social intolerance on the part of pupils, teachers and principals exists in the school system.

"An unfriendly attitude toward minority groups and toward new pupils exists among the pupils.

"Some pupils and some teachers have a 'great misconception' and 'false information' on minority groups and believe these groups are 'biologically inferior.'

Derogatory remarks have been made by pupils and teachers because of absence of Jewish children on their religious holidays.

"There is a tendency on part of some teachers to designate certain unfavorable traits of character as typical of certain minority groups." (PM, April 22, 1945.)

Such conditions are an indictment against the institution of religion and the capitalist educational system. They preach brotherhood of man and practice intolerance towards men; they teach democracy and practice its opposite. Those pinning all hopes for race understanding upon our religious and educational institu-

This seeing in the disparity of income a new form of exploitation and seeing in the Soviet officials a new ruling and exploiting class, is a stupid mental distortion. It is the result of lack of dialectical reasoning, and historic knowledge, a lack of Markian balance, on the part of those claiming to be socialists, and confusion or deliberate falsification on the part of spokesmen of capitalism.

In the present stage of the revolutionary process, full com-

(Continued on page 7)

tions are fully misguided. For these institutions themselves need purging from prejudices.

* * *

The FEPC is nothing but the equal right of all workers to be thoroughly exploited. Not the most ideal right for workers to strive for. And yet even that is not fully granted within capitalist democracy. It took a war with meteoric destructiveness and almost inhuman requirements to see the need for at least formulating such a bill. The conditions for it are to be sought less in the minds of "our" great Washington statesmen and their regard for fair play than in the critical manpower shortage. It is not that job discrimination was not right, but that greater production output called for all hands on deck, regardless of color or nationality. The common interest of the American ruling class as a whole, the need for its winning the war, would seem to indicate the need for their adoption of FEPC. And yet it is meeting with opposition, contradicted by two forces, (1) the special interests of the individual capitalist, (2) tradition.

Propertied classes are very individualistic and tradition-bound, always looking backward for their inspiration, as it were. This is especially true of the reactionary sons of the South, still carrying on in the spirit of pre-Civil War slaveocracy. Right now these Southern reactionaries are campaigning hard for congressional filibuster to defeat the FEPC.

Meanwhile the war has already entered its second phase. The production peak has already been passed. The period of cutbacks and unemployment is here. Were the FEPC adopted nationally right now it is doubtful whether it would have much meaning left in practice. Unemployment by its nature does not harbor the elements of discrimination. Jobless workers all starve alike. As such it acts as a leveling force in breaking down the antagonism begotten by the capitalist mode of production. In their misery and suffering the workers of every shade and color become united in opposition to the economic system that oppresses them.

L. B.

TARIFF REDUCTION AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

(Continued from page 2)

tions in other nations, America must also buy much from abroad. International monetary agreements have been perfected to facilitate the use of national currencies on the world market. The Bretton Woods agreements might lack technical perfections, they might have compromised America's economic self-interest, but they stand to serve a noble world purpose and **must** be adopted.

Bretton Woods, however, is not enough. One of the old barriers to world trade, the protective tariff, must be revised. What was built to give protection to the idea of selling much and buying little will not function under the new demand, where buying seems to be as essential as selling.

No controversial economic problem is better known to the American public than that covered by the tariff issue. As early as 1792, the U.S. Congress passed the first tariff law for the specified protection of American industry, as against the importation of foreign manufactures. As early did Southern cotton and tobacco plantation owners, and New England shipping interests, start condemning it, as a means of throwing money to the wealthy, Jeffersonian democracy was not for long able to retard tariff protection. In 1824 and 1828 new tariff laws were passed, giving increased protection to American manufacturers. By 1832, South Carolina passed its ordinance on nullification, declaring the tariff measure unconstitutional and, therefore, not binding, and also that secession from the Union would be its course of action. From 1832 to 1860 there were many attempts, and some measures of success, on the part of the Southern free traders to reduce the tariff. When at that time the manufacturers of the North assumed national power with the Republican Party and Lincoln, the South was ready to secede, and the Civil War was on, the main cause being the tariff issue. The North won but the tariff issue was not settled. Grover Cleveland and William McKinley are names connected with protracted tariff fights.

In fact almost every administration has been pledged to revise the tariff, upward or downward, in compliance with the winning side of the election. Always there has been enough of the opposition left in office to prevent a complete change. Throughout its whole history the tariff conflict has rested upon something more concrete than theoretical differences. In the main, those who produce for the foreign market, like the cotton growers, want free trade. They

wanted foreign goods shipped in duty free in return for what they sold. Those who produced for the home market, like the manufacturers, wanted foreign competition excluded.

The economic pattern has changed but it has not done away with the controversy. The manufacturers, many of them, have advanced technologically to the point where they are not only able to compete with foreign firms but also where they need a foreign market for a growing part of the product, if they are to provide "full employment," both for their capital and their workers. They also realize that if they are to sell much abroad, return importations must be facilitated or payments cannot be collected. Now, what can America take in return payment for its growing exports? A Eugene Rastow, in a recent issue of the *Yale Review*, gives the answer: "Foreign trade is a way of not increasing the total of employment but of promoting the most productive use of resources. It permits us to keep our men making cars, tools and business machines, for the world market, while we import gloves, use foreign ships, and buy our sugar and bauxite and rubber abroad." Of course, this short list is only a sample of what must be done. It is enough to show what is wanted.

This "most productive use of resources" sounds quite logical if it was merely the problem of increasing total world production. As things are, will this provide mass purchasing power? Can the glove makers who lose their jobs be better taken care of in the machine industries? Besides, foreign nations have various systems of protecting their home industries. They must be persuaded to abandon such protection in favor of more importation from America. If America was in need of protection while building its industrial plant, what logic would show that other nations will prosper by abandoning theirs?

At present, it so happens that America has developed a very efficient method of production of transportation equipment, ships, airplanes, etc. Why abandon such skill and ability, to foreign nations? No! The question is not settled.

Meanwhile, the old method of revising the tariff has been changed. When the New Deal came into office, to do something about the depression, increased foreign trade was considered to be one of the means. Congressional revision of the tariff laws was thought to be too slow. President Roosevelt asked for, and got, in 1934 the Trade Agree-

International Notes

(Continued from page 3)

M. J. Coldwell, C.C.F. leader, has been a delegate at San Francisco. He took issue with Premier McKenzie King, also a delegate, over Argentina. Coldwell maintained that the Argentine government should release its political prisoners before being admitted to the conference.

The C.C.F. is not appealing to the Canadian people on a Marxian platform. Rather, it is a platform containing many paragraphs of proposed reforms. They apparently expect to reform capitalism out of existence. Their manifesto states: "The C.C.F. seeks a mandate in this election to put this program into effect during its first term in office. At the end of that term, it will place its record of achievement before the people and ask for a new mandate for a further advance toward the Cooperative Commonwealth." This is not a Marxian outlook. However, the strength shown by the C.C.F. movement in Canada indicates that a large section of the Canadian public, mostly workers and poor farmers, are looking towards socialism as the way out. They must learn by experience

ments Act. This act allowed the administration to enter into trade agreements with other nations, and to reduce prevailing tariff schedules as much as fifty per cent. The act ran for three years and was renewed several times.

Now the Daughton Bill before Congress stipulates a new extension of the act, and also provides for a new fifty per cent reduction below prevailing rates. During the period since 1934, some 1200 items out of about 3000 on the protective list have been sub-

(Continued on page 8)

Wages and the Working Day

(Continued from page 6)

munism is not possible. Disparity of income, based upon differences in productive capacity, must yet prevail. And incomes of officials, the services of whom are considered by the Soviet people to be valuable, are also upon the same basis. Full communism, in this relation, is usually visualized upon the principle of "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

This certainly would not be "equality" in the common use of the term, because the "needs" of those with great ability to produce, or otherwise serve, might be no more, or even less, than that of a very poor producer or contributor to the social whole. This disparity, in the opposite direction, could give rise to the charge of special privilege and a

that such a goal cannot be reached by reform and gradualism.

Stalin on Poland

On May 19, Marshal Stalin made a statement to the press on the arrest of the 16 Poles and on the question of the reorganization of the Polish government. Here are excerpts from that letter: "These gentlemen (the 16 Poles) were arrested in accordance with a law similar to the British defense of the realm act. . . . It is untrue that the arrested Poles were invited for negotiations with the Soviet authorities.

"As far as the question of the reorganization of the Polish provisional government itself is concerned, it can only be solved on the basis of the Crimea decisions because no deviations from these decisions can be permitted. . . . I think the Polish question can be solved . . . if in the reconstruction of the Polish provisional government the latter is recognized as the basic core of the future Polish government of national unity."

The British and American representatives on the Polish commission which was set up at Yalta have refused to accept the provisional government as the basic core upon which to build. We quote from the "Report of the Crimean Conference" as follows: "The Provisional Government which is now functioning in Poland should therefore be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad."

Who is it that is trying to circumvent commitments made at Yalta? Is it the Soviet officials or is it the British and Americans? The wording of the Crimean Report appears to indict the latter.

Oliver Ritchie.

new "exploiting class," the less efficient exploiting the more efficient, etc. Of course it would be a distortion, just as all claims that classes are determined by disparity of income is a distortion. If that were true there would be many capitalist classes and many working classes in each modern nation now.

A correct understanding of capitalist exploitation, which the rule of the proletariat abolishes, can best be arrived at when we comprehend the characteristics of wages, and of the working day, the relationship of the *necessary labor time* to the *surplus labor time*, and the class relationships which arise therefrom. Organized labor would be able to fight more effectively if its membership understood Wages and the Working Day.

J. K.

Snarls on the 'Communist' Assn. Line (or Is It A Washout?)

When the "Communist" Party of America voluntarily dissolved itself and created a "Political Association" for its membership, an unofficial section of the Democratic Party, it did so in the name of Marxism. Some of the most reactionary maneuvers, some of the most open betrayals of working class interests, as Lenin pointed out in his time, were carried out in the name of Marxism.

When the C.P. cast its new line into the troubled waters of American politics, comical and all as it may seem, some of its members proclaimed that Earl Browder had made a "fundamental contribution to Marxism." Whooping it up for the candidates of the Democratic Party, the political administration of American capitalist imperialism, was a strange application of Marxism. Some of the blind following made wry faces, but they went along with the line and even indicated that it was just a smart game that was being played to fool their political associates, the big boys of Wall Street.

Now comes a French critic, Jacques Duclos, secretary of the Communist Party of France, who takes to task the class-collaborationist line of his American colleagues. He says: "Earl Browder drew from the Teheran Conference decisions, erroneous conclusions, in no wise flowing from a Marxist analysis of the situation. Earl Browder made himself the protagonist of a false concept of the ways of social evolution in general, and in the first place, the social evolution of the U.S.A." Thus, it appears, the secretary of the C.P. of France does not think that Browder made a "fundamental contribution to Marxism," but just the reverse.

Says Duclos: "The course applied under Browder's leadership ended in practice in the liquidation of the independent political party of the working class in the U.S." The French C.P. secretary does not approve of this liquidation of the American party, but it was a logical conclusion to a line that had been followed for years. In place of covert support of American capitalism, it was open support, admitted approval of the virtues of American capitalism. Should not a good word be said for honesty, if it pops up once in a while? Is it not a fact that the Communist Party of France could profit thereby? If it has not carried its policy of class collaboration to the point of dissolving the party it should, or else quit collaborating.

However, if the French pot calls the American kettle, the latter, no doubt, will be forced to a theoretical defense of the line or change it again, a small matter when viewed in the light of past performances. But the French-

man does not recognize Browder's "fundamental contribution" as Marxism at all. He says: "Despite declarations regarding recognition of the principles of Marxism, one is witnessing a notorious revision of Marxism on the part of Browder and his supporters."

Revision of Marxism is not a new performance. It has been served up in many forms in the past, the most famous of which was that of the German, Eduard Bernstein, and probably the most infamous form now is that of Browder's revision. Marxian revisionism is not Marxism at all. In substance it is anti-Marxian, as Lenin has so ably pointed out. When Jacques Duclos says: "one is witnessing a notorious revision of Marxism on the part of Browder and his supporters," he is politely saying that they are not Marxians at all. He is hardly in a position to tell the whole truth, however, that the "C.P.A." is not now and never was a Marxian organization. In the past they did, occasionally, theorize correctly about Marxism but in practice they were always non-Marxian or anti-Marxian.

An organization which for more than a quarter of a century has been practicing social demo-

cratic opportunism, and plain capitalist political opportunism, is not likely at this late date to unsnarl its line of confusion. It is too chronic a disease for any remedy. The French physician, who diagnoses the disease rather well, is unfortunately in the position where even Browder and his blind-boys could say "physician, heal thyself."

Capitalist press comment indicates that a change in the C.P.A. line may be on the agenda. They quote Browder as "welcoming" the criticism of the French C.P. secretary and saying: "Discussions among Communists * * * always lead to clarity, to agreement, and to unity of purpose and action." Now, ain't that nice? It will be no trouble at all, just as easy as picking up an elephant.

The American "Communists" had been proclaiming that with just a little effort, just a little better understanding, capitalism could be gotten along with to the benefit of the working class, not only during this war but in the post-war period as well. In fighting German fascism they were supporting American monopoly capital. Duclos reminds them that: "It is scarcely necessary to recall that the material bases for fascism reside in the trusts, and the great objective of this war, the annihilation of fascism, can only be obtained to the extent in which the forces of democracy and progress do not shut

their eyes to the economic and political circumstances which engendered fascism."

We do not agree that the objective of this war is simply the "annihilation of fascism," however desirable that might be, but we know that Duclos is right when he accuses his American friends with having "shut their eyes to the economic and political circumstances which engendered fascism." In other words, their political opportunism led them to support the very basis of that which they were supposed to be fighting against.

We don't think that the criticism of the French C.P. secretary will have very much effect upon what is left of the liquidationists, but it may enlighten many workers who still believe that the "C.P.A." is capable of leading American labor in a revolutionary direction. To land where they have, after more than a quarter of a century, is proof enough for any normal person, that they are hopelessly reactionary and incurably confused.

J. K.

TARIFF REDUCTION AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

(Continued from page 7)

ject to reductions. Of these some 500 received the full fifty per cent cut authorized. It shows that even the New Dealers were not ready to go all the way permitted by the act. Perhaps they found other nations unwilling to reciprocate.

The new Daughton Bill might become law. The Magazine of Wall Street proclaims, in a recent issue, "Today the tariff program is to become the keystone of our post-war foreign trade policy, and mainly on this policy, it appears, rests the success or failure of any world plan to avoid issues—both economic and political—that have in the past so frequently poisoned international relations."

This Wall Street "keystone" seems rather limited, considering the immensity of the problem. The proclaiming of a new tariff revision as the saviour of mankind from future wars, as well as from economic hardships, rather shows how poverty stricken the capitalist class has become in its efforts to preserve its out-lived economic system. A new structure will be needed before any "keystones" of consequence can be put in.

"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. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up without the superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air.

—The Communist Manifesto.

GET A BOOK FREE

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

- THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO, by Marx and Engels.....10c
- WAGE-LABOR AND CAPITAL, by Karl Marx.....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