

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. 9—Whole No. 151

Chicago, Illinois, October, 1945

483

Price 5c a Copy

Labor-Management Peace Efforts

By Christ Jelset

Of all the problems that must be taken care of before "peace and prosperity" will be fully and permanently established is the settlement of the constantly recurring controversy between capital and labor. Both sides want peace, harmony and cooperation. Both sides want permanent prosperity. They want industrial and technological improvements, to benefit the nation and the world. They do not like strikes, picket-lines or injunctions.

With so much in common it should be easy to come to terms on details. Yet industrial strife is ~~ever recurring to mar~~ national well-being. Even the war for "national preservation" could not wholly subdue industrial conflict. Now returning peace is said to be endangered by the brewing hostility between capital and labor.

Wartime agencies which have functioned in labor disputes are now considered finished or about to be finished. New means must be provided to carry on during "reconversion" and into the era of peace. President Truman, in his message to Congress, after the surrender of Japan, made labor dispute settlements the number seven of his twenty-one point program. He said: "This is not the time for short-sighted management, to seize upon the chance to reduce wages and try to injure labor unions. Equally, it is not the time for labor leaders to shirk their responsibilities and permit wide-spread industrial strife."

To facilitate the carrying out of this responsibility, both by capital and labor, the President said: "I shall shortly convene a conference of representatives of organized labor and industry for the purpose of working out by agreement means to minimize labor disputes."

This conference has been called for November 5. Meanwhile a preliminary meeting has been held at which an agenda was drawn up, and where points of controversy were discussed. At this preliminary meeting, six public agencies were represented. These were the two main groups of organized labor, the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., the United States Chamber of Com-

merce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and two departments of the government, the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce. The government was represented by liberals who favor a "square deal" for labor. Paul Douglas, a former professor of economics at the University of Chicago, came from the Department of Labor, and Charles Symington of the Symington-Gould Co., represented the Department of Commerce. The Symington-Gould, by the way, is said to maintain an "ideal" labor-management relation.

At this meeting, representatives of business recommended the conference to adopt some clarified definitions from labor of what it means by "collective bargaining," "management-prerogatives," and of what assurance labor can offer that it will live up to agreements. They also want something dependable against jurisdictional disputes, and against rivalry between labor organizations.

The labor representatives want-

(Continued on page 2)

'Left of Center'

When President Truman submitted to Congress his 21-point post-war program on "full employment" etc., a conjecture arose as to the direction the President had moved. It wasn't long before the business interests of the nation proclaimed that Truman had gone "left of center." Newsweek Magazine of Sept. 17 stated that it was a "New, New Deal" and that, "the first reaction to this sweep of recommendations was that the President had definitely moved to the left. Much of the program was not new—it was a Rooseveltian inheritance. The financing of it, if enacted, would mean continued deficit spending for years to come. The cost would be enormous (the President himself admitted at a press conference shortly after the message was delivered that he had no idea of the program's cost.)"

Newsweek further stated that, "Mr. Truman had unquestionably concocted a program more palatable to the left wing than the right. But the real test was yet to come. Would the President make a real fight for it? If he did in the months ahead, then he would provide a true political measurement of himself."

The New York Times columnist,

Arthur Krock (Sept. 13), also critical of the President's program stated that he had thrown in his lot "with the spenders, anti-economizers, the New Dealers, the organized labor pressure squads and the social economists of whom Henry A. Wallace is the appointed spokesman." Krock deplored the fact that the President dismissed economy "in a pious generality" but offered no suggestions how the goal is to be attained; that the President said much "to encourage, and nothing to dissuade, those who talk of 60 million jobs as a normal state of employment and refer to a job as a 'right.'"

Krock further expressed his disappointment by saying that "Missouri friends represented Mr. Truman as a 'middle-of-the-road' man on all current political and economic issues—others said he spoke the fairest words for unhampered private enterprise and production—But his words crumbled under his proposals. And the 'middle-of-the-road' was way off to one side."

Notwithstanding the lamentations of the above defenders of private enterprise the question still arises: but has the President gone to the "left?" The answer is: no further than his predecessor, Roosevelt. Truman acted in the interest of preserving the capitalist system. As a matter of fact the United States today is confronted with a post-war economic crisis which for want of a less frightened term is called the "reconversion period." The huge production of which the national economy was capable during the war when

(Continued on page 2)

International Notes

Foreign Ministers Disagree

Many points of disagreement have arisen at the Big Five Conference of Foreign Ministers meeting in London. Few of these disagreements have been resolved. Most of the clashes have been between the British and Soviet representatives. In working out peace treaties for Finland and Rumania, Ernest Bevin, British Foreign Secretary, insisted that their future armies be limited in size and subject to United Nations surveillance. Molotov, Commissar of Foreign Affairs for the USSR, opposed. The American and British governments have maintained a hostile attitude towards the governments of Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary. The Soviet government has shown no evidence of weakening in support of same. Premier Groza of Rumania was recently feted in Moscow.

The Soviet government has also taken the offensive by criticizing the British-sponsored government of Greece. Then Molotov startled the capitalist world by asking for Soviet trusteeship over the former Italian possessions of Tripolitania and Eritrea. This brought cries of anguish from British imperialists. The London Daily Telegraph stated that this was as reasonable as for the British to ask for trusteeship over Inner Mongolia. Molotov may have had Rumania in mind rather than Inner Mongolia. He may have reminded the delegates that it was the Red Army, by engaging the bulk of Hitler's armies on the Eastern Front, that made it possible for relatively small British and American armies to drive the German and Italian armies out of North Africa. He may have reminded them of Win-

(Continued on page 7)

IN THIS ISSUE

LABOR-MANAGEMENT PEACE EFFORTS

By Christ Jelset

"LEFT OF CENTER"

By Al Wysocki

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

By Oliver Ritchie

HOME SCENE

By L. B.

THE GREAT WAR AND ITS OUTCOME

(Editorial)

By John Keracher

Labor-Management Peace Efforts

(Continued from page 1)

ed to know who could speak for management. The government representatives were willing to stay in the background and render assistance only when needed to bring about agreement.

On the whole, the preliminary work has been done in a way to indicate a will to success. If will and desire were the only factors involved, then the forthcoming conference should be able to go a long way in planning future labor-management peace. There are, however, other factors. Indeed there are factors over which no labor-management conference can wield any influence. Competition between business firms has not been abolished. Those firms who can produce the cheapest can sell the cheapest and still make enough profit to expand, and thus absorb more and more of the market. Firms that fall behind in the race of competition are forced to more vigorous, to more unscrupulous methods to keep from falling by the way-side of industrial advancement.

And what, in the final analysis, determines success in business competition? Cheapness of production, more product per dollar expended. It means not only improved means of production but less pay to labor per unit of product. Returns to business, i.e., profits, varies from less than nothing, or loss, sustained by some firms to the multi-millions raked in by others. Increased wages is said by labor to provide purchasing power for increased production. Thus, higher wages would be a means of creating more jobs and more permanent prosperity. But increased wages in all those places where profits are at the vanishing point would cause an increase in business failures. This would mean a more rapid loss of jobs in the backward industries. This would be a means of throwing business to the more advanced firms, but not of creating more jobs.

In the middle bracket firms, where profits are closer to average, an increase in wages would also mean a reduction in profits. This would necessitate economy measures, which means either increased production or curtailment of the labor force. The first of these would tend to over-production and subsequent shut-downs, the second to fewer jobs, not more.

This is not an argument against labor attempting to advance wages. It is a statement of economic fact showing that even if labor could enforce its demand for higher wages full employment and prosperity would not be the result.

Other economic forces are at work as well. In a capitalist society where incomes flow to owners of means of production, saving of money with a view to invest is a national virtue. To become an

owner of income yielding property, and to augment such ownership, is a duty of first importance to all who want to better their economic position in life. For the individual who is able to make his savings bring him an income, saving is a fine thing, but for the nation's population it means the building of additional productive plant, beyond the point where the products of such plants can be sold.

Periods of prosperity are just such periods where savings are put into productive plants, or into capital goods. Periods of panic or depressions are periods where huge quantities of such capital goods have been built up, but where the consumer goods market is unable to absorb the product and "frozen assets" becomes the name of such productive facilities.

Now for a look at the facts. During the four years of war, America's productive capacity was advanced by forty per cent, according to statistical estimates. At the same time, savings in money grew by about one hundred and fifty billion dollars (\$37,000,000,000 in 1944 alone). A small part of this belongs to the workers. Most of it belongs to men of wealth. Practically all of it is intended by the many owners to be invested in income-producing equipment. If a new consumer as large as World War II could be found the huge savings of today would soon be transformed into productive equipment, and prosperity would be assured. But such a market is nowhere in sight.

While labor unions are making strong demands for increased wages, both as a means to off-set the increase in the cost of living and also as a means of maintaining purchasing power for continuous industrial out-put, business is by no means ready to adopt a plan. Labor looks upon its demand for a thirty per cent wage increase as an absolute essential to approximate the national desire for prosperity and full employment. Business looks upon it and calls it "organized banditry." The Chicago Daily News speaks of this "organized banditry" and says: "Unless we can find a way to adjust our domestic differences along just and equitable lines, the United States of America will be in no position to help anyone and the inevitable result will be chaos."

No! In spite of the most ardent wish for domestic harmony in spite of the most elaborate plans for labor-management agreement and cooperation, strife is on the increase. As capital grows and expands beyond the limits of available markets its need for cheaper labor grows. As labor observes the growing difference between its productive power and its power of purchase it become more dissatisfied. Labor's demands for wages are countered by capital's insist-

'LEFT OF CENTER'

(Continued from page 1)

everybody was employed clearly pointed out that it would not be an easy matter to find enough peace time jobs for demobilized veterans and workers. Already, with the shutting down of the war industries, millions of workers were laid off. Those still remaining on the job do not hail with delight the return to the 40-hour work week because their take-home weekly pay had shrunk in many cases to half of what they formerly received. Furthermore, during the war, wage-rates had been frozen but not the cost of living, which kept rising. In an effort to keep their living standards from going lower workers have gone on strikes using organized pressure to enforce their demands for substantial increases in their daily or hourly rates of pay.

The plight of the unemployed is even worse. Hence the demand is made for an increase in unemployed compensation. Of course, the present administration has promised a job for every worker, once the reconversion to peace production takes place. But no one is in a position to know how long this will take. In the meantime workers must eat in order to live. The 25 dollars per week for a period of 26 weeks that Truman has recommended in his program as unemployed compensation is not such a sum of money that would put a worker on "easy street." Contrast this with the President's recommendation that the Congressman's salary be increased from \$10,000 per year to \$20,000 per year. This alone should give one an idea of how far to the "left" the President has gone. While there has been a lot of protest, in the interest of "economy," of how much an unemployed worker should receive, not a single Congressman has protested the recommended increase in his own salary. This, in brief, is the present economic condition of the nation as far as labor is concerned.

On the other hand, as far as the capitalist class is concerned, we see a different picture. The corpo-

ence upon more and cheaper production.

Without a doubt it will mean chaos, but the chaos will spring from the internal contradictions of the capitalist system, not from labor's effort to uphold its end of the controversy. But out of the chaos labor will rise to take over the management of society. By so doing labor will be in position to take over management of production and distribution. Then market difficulties will disappear. The whole product of industry will accrue to labor and be available for its individual and social needs. Then labor and management will cease to exist as conflicting economic units of society. The two functions will be part of the labor process and contribute to the well-being of all.

rations are sitting pretty and are well prepared to weather the stormy days ahead. The War Production Board has recently disclosed that their annual wartime profits were 350 per cent above 1939. They have accumulated—by exploiting labor—billions of dollars in profits and have set aside a sum of 20 billions of dollars to tide them over the reconversion period. Factories may shut down but the rich man will not go hungry only the worker will be affected.

The nation is now faced with a period similar to the first "hundred days" of the Roosevelt administration of 1933. That was the period of the Great Depression, the era of starvation in the midst of plenty. Driven by hunger, the masses turned to the "left," unemployed demonstrations occurred, likewise "bonus marches" of the veterans of World War I. Tired of waiting for "prosperity" to appear "around the corner" labor pressed upon the administration for relief. "Relief" came with the "left of center" Roosevelt administration whose first move was to save the banks through a "bank moratorium." Later a sop was thrown to the workers, doles to the hungry and for others WPA jobs. In spite of these hand-outs, the masses still suffered, if not from actual starvation, then from malnutrition. Prosperity did not return because the industrial stagnation lasted for years and ended only when the Second World Conflict ushered in a period of "war prosperity."

Roosevelt, at that time, was also accused by the capitalist class of abandoning the "middle-of-the-road policy." But one thing was very evident, the capitalist system was not hurt by the "New Deal" because it was given another breathing spell. It was also very evident that the New Deal did not create full employment for in 1940 even with the nation already producing war material, as the "arsenal of democracy," there were still 10 million unemployed. This jobless army was only liquidated after Pearl Harbor when conscription and war production took full effect.

America now, however, is faced with peace. What are the prospects for full employment? Can the Truman administration make good its promises? Wallace, the Secretary of Commerce, thinks it can and has even written a book on the subject entitled "Sixty Million Jobs." He points out, however, that full employment is only possible if the national production reaches 200 billion dollars per year. This was approximately the amount of national production in the war year of 1944. But during the war years the products were "consumed" at a rapid rate, particularly war materials, which were used up on the battle fronts. It was an era of production for destruction and the market only reached the saturation point when peace was declared.

(Continued on page 3)

'LEFT OF CENTER'

(Continued from page 2)

How does Wallace plan to match the consumptive capacity of the market during the war years in the period of peace production? Simply by having the government step in and regulate industry in such a manner that consumer capacity would be increased by a more equitable distribution of the wealth produced.

The Wallace "plan" may alarm some of the capitalists but they need not be for he states at the outset that the "Russian system of government is not for us." In fact he is as much a defender of private enterprise as any of his critics. He points out that "our democratic government has the definite responsibility of stimulating our free-enterprise system, not just in behalf of the general welfare, but also to keep free enterprise continuously a growing concern." Wallace levels his criticism against the corporations and cartels and champions the cause of the "little man" (small business and the farmers) whom he considers to be the "seed bed of American democratic free-enterprise." He further contends that "full employment will give the little fellow the chance he needs." He answers his critics who contend that planning would lead to a reduction in competition by stating that "The planning involved in drawing up a national full-employment budget would lead to more competition rather than less." What Wallace proposes is "competition through planning," (his own words.)

There is no doubt that the corporations and cartels (big capital) will not be sold on the Wallace plan. Those who have a tight grip on the purse strings of the nation may not be versed in the science of economics but they know full well how they accumulate their millions. The multimillionaires have been faced with "trust-busters" before and always came out on top. It is not alone that the corporations were successful in using the government for the protection of their interests but also the very competitive process, that both they and Wallace are interested in preserving, has brought about the monopoly of wealth and industry into their hands. In the competitive process many small businesses were wiped out never to return; in fact today the bulk of American industry is controlled and owned by the big capitalists. And there it will remain as long as capitalism exists, Wallace notwithstanding.

The capitalist system can not be patched up and made to function for the "general welfare" of all. The small business men whom Wallace is so much concerned about are as individualistic in their outlook as their rival capitalists—big business: Both are exploiters of labor and do their utmost to profit through the sweat and toil of labor. In the cutthroat game of competition the small capitalist in time succumbs to the big capitalist.

And little business, in order to save itself from extinction as a fraction of the capitalist class, sets up a howl of protest against big capital. Wallace as champion of the cause of the little business man is doing the howling for them with the aim in mind of getting the support of the working class. He is therefore not revolutionary but reactionary for he is attempting to "roll back the wheel of history."

The "middle-of-the-road" men, together with the "left of centerists," are not only misleaders but also enemies as far as labor is concerned. In their efforts to preserve the capitalist system they will promise labor everything but one thing they won't promise and that is to get rid of the exploiters. After all that is all one can expect from capitalist politicians. Fooling the masses is an old game with them.

But the deception will last only as long as the working class is willing to put up with it. This much is certain: the capitalist system cannot provide security for the masses because its competitive and exploitive nature prevents it from providing every worker with a job at a decent standard of living. The solution to the problem of "full employment" can only be brought about by the vast majority—the working class—when it takes possession, under collective ownership of the entire wealth and industry of the nation. Of course, when labor does take this step it will have gone definitely to the left. Undoubtedly the defenders of capitalism, its political henchmen, etc., will vehemently protest and proclaim that will mean the abolition of capitalism; most assuredly, gentlemen, it will and with it an end to all its "blessings" such as wars, depressions and starvation in the midst of plenty.

Al Wysocki.

ATOMIC SCIENTISTS AND THE FRANKENSTEIN MONSTER

The atomic scientists have protested the misuse to which their brilliant discovery has been put. Dr. Samuel Ellison, one of them, said that all considered it a "great tragedy" that so important a discovery should be revealed under such circumstances; that they had hoped that by merely demonstrating the bomb on a unoccupied island or in Japanese home water, the war could have been ended." (Boston Globe, Aug. 8, 1945.)

He "also protested a situation in which the atomic scientists have become virtual prisoners. . . . He threatened that "if attempts are made to continue censorship and prevent free dissemination of scientific knowledge, the scientists would, in effect, go on strike. We will begin an elaborate study of the colors of butterflies." (Boston Globe, Aug. 8, 1945.)

Constructively, the scientists stressed the need for putting

Transition Headaches
The transition from war to peace is also a transition from heartaches to headaches and to millions of workers, wallet-aches.

The wild scramble for a favored spot on the post-war prosperity wagon has begun. Patriotic restraint and wartime unity is now giving way to open self interest. "Rugged individualism" is commencing to again assert itself. With the snapping of government red tape, priorities, rationing and such, the mad dash after peacetime prosperity rainbows commenced.

Blueprints for full employment of labor, lucrative earnings for capital, peace and good will are featured. The war cost \$300 billion. Surely if that much has been spent for war, why not for peace? But will it even be considered? Secretary of Commerce, Henry Wallace, offered a scheme for 60 million jobs. Something the workers are keenly interested in. How little confidence is placed in Wallace's vision is shown by the government's already formulated plan for public works projects totaling \$2,500,000,000 for the 12-month period. This would tend to indicate that the government is not looking forward to business furnishing full employment.

Senator McCarron advocates a 30-hour work-week for nearly 3,000,000 government employees with the same pay they are getting for 40 hours. A shorter work-week for all is now being advocated by the labor unions, with no reduction in pay, as a means to fuller employment. Certainly capital will not favor reduction of hours without clipping the pay envelopes.

The proposal to raise unemployment compensation payments to a nation-wide maximum of \$25 a week is further evidence that large scale unemployment, running into

HOME SCENE

millions, is here for the transition period at least. Even this meager proposal is meeting with stiff opposition, with the cry of state rights and federalization of unemployment insurance. (At this writing it has already met with its first defeat in the Senate Committee.)

The CED (Committee for Economic Development) program, to facilitate reemployment during reconversion, has received Wallace's endorsement. It favors:

1. "Speedy demobilization of servicemen in this country
2. "Speed in reconversion, with full cooperation of business.
3. "Elaborate provision for the support of unemployed workers." (Boston Globe, Aug. 27.)

Glaring generalities are offered for concrete problems. Enough said for them. Talk is cheap.

Dr. Emerson Schmidt, director of the economic research department of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, told a Senate committee hearing on the jobless pay bill that "a great boom is pending," and that American business and individuals owned \$194,000,000,000 in liquid assets last December, compared with \$66,000,000,000 in 1939. It is good to hear from the eminent economist. Now that "we are all rich" and prosperity is around the corner, workers need worry no longer.

Henry H. Heiman, executive manager of the National Association of Credit Men said that his organization is prepared to extend "the fullest cooperation in the field of commercial credit to all deserving applicants." Of course, that DESERVING APPLICANTS must have solid collateral shouldn't bother the workers any, should it?

Senator O'Mahoney, in urging the passage of the Full Employment Bill, made some pertinent remarks conveniently lost sight of. He said that the great depression following the last war had been broken "only by World War II" and asked if we were going to depend on another world war to cure

(Continued on page 7)

in their sociological investigation they would have drawn the logical conclusions about the bomb and its use without any disillusionment. For the atom bomb is merely carrying out its mission as a tool and creation of imperialist war and rivalry. Imperialism is ruthless and intensive to loss of human lives. Power and control of wealth is its sole aim.

Neither would they have any illusions about "freedom" and their real status in capitalist society. Marx and Engels writing in the Communist Manifesto in 1847 said, "The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honored and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage-laborer."

PROLETARIAN NEWS

A Journal for the Working Class

Decoted to the Education of Workers and
Their Struggle for Power

Published Monthly by the
Proletarian Party of America

Subscriptions—12 Issues for 50 Cents

Send All Subscriptions, Contributions, Etc., to

PROLETARIAN NEWS

1545 N. Larrabee Street, Chicago, Ill.

The Great War and Its Outcome

With Japan's capitulation a month ago, we think it is timely to comment upon its general trends and estimate the possible effects of World War II. It is fully admitted that it brought about devastation and suffering of the most intense sort, that it put all previous wars, even the most barbarous, into the shade for human brutality.

The victors, of course, place the full blame for the war and its atrocities upon the vanquished. The "war criminals" are all on one side, the losing side. However, there is a positive side to the great conflict. Just as in the Napoleonic wars, which brought about much suffering, there was a progressive aspect as they swept away much feudal rubbish, left over from the middle ages, so likewise this great imperialist slaughter-fest has swept away much capitalist rubbish, and the cleaning-up process may yet take on greater acceleration. Heads have fallen, and more will follow, and they are not all proletarian, although the poor, the most numerous class, always suffers most.

When the war commenced, if we consider the Nazi invasion of Poland on Sept. 1, 1939, as the starting point, there were many more "great powers" than there are now. At the close of the conflict, if we take Sept. 1, 1945, as the approximate date, there are but three great powers left, and one of them, the Soviet Union, was not officially recognized as a great power at the war's commencement. Great Britain and the United States are the only other great powers.

In 1939, the great imperialist powers were France, Great Britain, the United States, Germany, Italy and Japan. Three of them are shattered and their territories occupied by their greater imperialist rivals. France is so badly crippled that it is doubtful if it will ever again become a great power among the world imperialists. Although not imperialist, the Soviet Union is now a first class world power. This tremendous change in the alignment of world powers will have far-reaching consequences.

Long before the outbreak of World War II, the Proletarian Party was proclaiming its inevitability, just as we today recognize, that with capitalist imperialist rivalry surviving, it is only a matter of time until it precipitates another world conflict, atomic bombs notwithstanding.

When the German imperialists made their onslaught upon Poland we drafted a "Proclamation to the Working Class" in which the Proletarian Party stated:

"When the Armistice was signed on November 11, 1918, and hostilities ceased in the great 'World War,' there were many people who believed that it would 'never happen again.' Now a 'Second World War' has been started which gives indications of being worse than the last one.

"To those who understand the nature of the present social order, the system of society called capitalism, the present war is no surprise, in fact the surprising thing is that it did not break out earlier.

"The Proletarian Party maintains that war is an inevitable product of capitalism, that it springs directly from the profit system. It also

contends that each succeeding major war, that which we call capitalist-imperialist war, will be more devastating than its predecessors.

"If the present world conflict lasts for years and kills and maims twice as many millions as that of 1914-1918, the ensuing peace, provided that the capitalist system remains, will be but the prelude to another and still greater 'World War' to follow. That is the nature of capitalism, its inevitable outcome.

"To end war forever, the system which brings it on, Capitalism, must be ended. The world's workers, and especially those within warring nations, must organize and bend all efforts to that end, the overthrow of the rich exploiters who are responsible for the mass-slaughter of modern imperialist wars."

The invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941 by imperialistic Germany, and the declaration of war by "democratic" America, in no way altered the general character of the great conflict. As far as the capitalist-imperialist powers were concerned, it was, and remained, an imperialist struggle, and an imperialist peace is in the making. An imperialist war can only bring such a peace.

The Soviet Union, being non-imperialist, fought a war of national defence. It resisted invasion. Its invaders being ruthless capitalist-imperialists, the nature of its struggle, therefore, was anti-imperialist. It was even more than that. It was a class war, a proletarian power, fighting capitalist-imperialist powers, Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and other capitalist satellites. It is true that the Soviet Union had imperialist allies, but it was not in reality fighting their battles, anymore than British and American imperialism were fighting for an extension of the Soviet system. Each were fighting for their own interests and their own form of society.

Only by understanding the real nature of the struggle which has officially ended, can we comprehend its outcome, and what will transpire in the immediate future can only be explained by recognizing the true aims of the nations engaged, especially the victorious powers.

So much has happened in the past few months that many pages could be written if we went into detail in relation to their import. We can but summarize, and stress the outstanding facts, such as the ascendancy of the Soviet Union as a world power, and the United States as finance-imperialist power number one.

Capitalist political leaders may "plan it that way" or plan it some other way, but social evolution does not unfold according to any political "blue-print." The irreconcilable conflict of interests within the capitalist world itself, has time and again caused the champions of "free enterprise" to fall foul of each other. Such was World War number two, and it brought about results which are far from satisfactory, even for the victorious imperialists of Britain and the United States. In downing their imperial rivals they have weakened the whole structure of world capitalism. The "cordon sanitoir" which the French imperialists built up following World War I, is gone, and France itself in on the brink.

The German bulwark against Soviet Russia has been destroyed, and likewise the Japanese bulwark against Soviet Siberia. The political trends within most of the capitalist nations, defeated and victorious alike, with perhaps the U. S. A. for the time being excepted, is toward the "left." France and Italy are in political turmoil. British imperialism finds itself with a Labor Government on its hands. True, it is not a socialist government, but behind it, and crowding upon it, is a potentially revolutionary class, the British proletariat, clamoring ever more insistently for a solution to its problems, a solution which can not be forthcoming within the structure of "free enterprise," the capitalist system.

Things are moving at a rapid rate. The plans of yesterday are being altered today, and social forces will demand that they be again altered tomorrow. Make-shift and compromises is the order of the day, postpone, delay and hope for tranquility. But in these there lies no solution. The flood-tide of capitalism is past, it is ebbing fast. Middle of the road men and measures may delay the overthrow of capitalism, but they cannot prevent the ultimate consummation of the historic mission of the proletariat, to overthrow the profit system, socialize the means of production and render society classless and warless. This can only be accomplished by the workers as a class, by the vast majority taking political power into their own hands.

John Keracher.

Frederick Engels

(November 1820—August 1895)

(Continued from last issue)

Engels had returned to the business world which he so much detested. Marx and his family had moved to London in the summer of 1849, when the French government informed them that they must leave Paris. They realized that while Marx would have the opportunity, in London, to devote his time to his theoretical work, that he and his family would also be faced with poverty, the common lot of most of Europe's revolutionary refugees who took shelter in the comparative safety of England in those days.

It had been agreed upon between the two men that one of them must spend his entire life in research and writing for the revolutionary movement. Marx was the one who undertook the task. He was the most suitable for the work, but he had a family to maintain. Therefore, Engels undertook to render all the financial aid possible to their joint enterprise. Back in Manchester, he worked with a will and sent all the cash he could spare, but his father still held the purse string.

The years of poverty and suffering the Marx family endured in London were also years of joy, according to the testimony of Wilhelm Liebknecht, who spent some years of exile in London. Engels visited them often. He contributed much to Marx's theoretical work, especially to his *Capital*, for which he provided industrial information, statistics and such, and after the death of Marx he edited the manuscript which compose volumes II and III of *Capital*.

However, it must not be imagined that Marx and Engels used their time exclusively for theoretical work. On the contrary, they were exceedingly active in practical organizational work.

When Engels first arrived in England he took steps to become acquainted with the leaders of the first political movement of the modern working class, the Chartists, and with some of them he maintained lasting friendship, especially George Julian Harney, the editor of *The Northern Star*, a paper for which Engels occasionally wrote.

From the time of the writing of the *Communist Manifesto* they saw the need for international cooperation of the vanguard organization of the workers of the different nations, but throughout the fifties, during the worst period of the reaction, they were just able to hold their contact and increase their influence with various groups in different countries.

It was not until the sixties that they were able to launch their great organizational project which was intended as a permanent fighting force for the world's workers. This was the International Workingmen's Association, now commonly called The First International. It was given its start at a public meeting held

in St. Martin's Hall, London, on September 28, 1864, but its form was not worked out until a year later, at its London Conference (first intended to be held at Brussels), September 25 to 29, 1865.

For some years there was developing much social unrest, labor was stirred by certain happenings. There was considerable reaction, especially in Britain, from the effects of the Crimean War, with its blunders and sufferings, and from the crisis which arose in the cotton industry due to its supply being shut off by the American Civil War.

These were the objective conditions when the International was launched. But what was expected of this organization did not fully materialize. It accomplished much but its permanency was killed by internal conflict between different factions which composed its ranks, chiefly the clashes between the petty-bourgeois ideas of the Anarchists and the proletarian concepts of the Marxists.

The General Council had its headquarters in London, and workers of various nationalities made up its membership. In July, 1876, the International Workingmen's Association was officially dissolved at Philadelphia. Its main office had been transferred to America with the object of preventing its falling into the hands of the Anarchist elements. It was partly the apathy of the working class, but mainly the internal quarrels which brought about its demise.

The First International, despite its shortcomings, had lasting and beneficial effects for the world's workers. It paved the way for others, which lasted longer and accomplished more, especially keeping alive the principle of international working class solidarity.

Engels, in a letter to Frederick Sorge, the secretary of the I. W. A., after it was moved to America, wrote: "For ten years, the International Workingmen's Association dominated European history in one of its aspects, that which looks to the future. It can be proud of its achievements. . . . I think that the next International, after Marx's writings have exercised their influence for a few years more, will be definitely communist." Engels, however, was wrong in his prognosis. The Second International brought into being in 1889, turned away from Marxism. It gave a certain amount of lip-service to it, but in the main it turned its back upon revolutionary communism and adopted capitalist-reformism, and "gradualism," and most of its sections reverted to nationalism upon the outbreak of World War I.

Beginning in 1852, Marx wrote articles for the *New York Tribune* for about ten years. For those articles he received payment, but not of a very remunerative sort. Without the aid of Engels his income would have been entirely inadequate, as it was he was continually in debt. Many of the *Tribune* articles, written at first by Marx in German, were translated into English by Engels and quite a number were written entirely by him when Marx was ill, or too busy with other work.

In addition to his cotton spinning business, he found time to carry on an extensive correspondence with active leaders of the revolutionary movement in several countries, and to respond to their many demands for advice. In that relation Engels wrote what was undoubtedly his greatest work. It was a request by his friends in Germany to reply to one Eugen Duhring, and entitled *Herr Eugen Duhring's Revolution in Science*, better known as the *Anti-Duhring*. In the late sixties, Duhring began to forge ahead as a writer on social questions. Then he announced his conversion to Socialism, but to his own conceptions of socialism. Being a scholar he was able to write voluminously and he won an extensive following among the German socialists, many of whom thought his ideas an advance from Marxism. Engels hated to undertake the work of

replying because it involved writing so much in order to follow Duhring into the many fields of knowledge, but once commenced, Engels did such a thorough job, that the reply to Duhring turned out to be an extensive treatise on modern socialism, that is, Marxism.

The *Anti-Duhring* has been translated into many languages, and countless volumes have been circulated. Next to Marx's *Capital*, it ranks as the greatest fundamental work on modern socialism. Three chapters taken from the work and published under the title *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, have met with a phenomenal circulation in many languages.

Engels says of his writing of *Anti-Duhring*: "I had to treat of all and every possible subject, from the concepts of time and space to bimetallism; from the eternity of matter and motion to the perishable nature of moral ideas; from Darwin's natural selection to the education of youth in a future society. Anyhow, the systematic comprehensiveness of my opponent gave me the opportunity of developing, in opposition to him, and in a more connected form than had previously been done, the views held by Marx and myself on this great variety of subjects. And that was the principle reason which made me undertake this otherwise ungrateful task."

He was, more or less, goaded into writing his great book. The pronounced drift away from what Marxism prevailed in the Social Democratic party of Germany, and his friends, knowing that he was most fitted for the work, gave him no rest. The work appeared in *Vorwärts* in installments, commencing in 1876. This effort, and subsequent ones, to put the German party upon a Marxian basis failed, but *Anti-Duhring* was what the name implied, it finished the influence of Duhring.

However, the great merit of his book is its complete explanation of the principles of modern socialism. It has had a tremendous influence upon countless numbers of students of Marxism throughout the whole world.

Toward the end of 1870, Engels, who had sold his interest in the cotton spinning business at Manchester, went to reside in London. Therefore, for the last thirteen years of Marx's life the friends were closer than ever, and they were continually visited by the leaders of the movement of the various countries of Europe who conferred at length upon the many political problems which confronted them, and sought to profit from their vast experience and profound theoretical knowledge.

After the death of Marx, the work of Engels was not lessened, if anything it increased, but being economically independent, and having great endurance, he worked with a will and accomplished far more than he actually realized. When speaking at the graveside of Marx he said: "His name and his work will endure throughout the ages," he probably did not realize that his name and work would endure along with that of Marx, because it is an integral part of that far reaching, world-shaking system of revolutionary thought and action, known the world over as Marxism.

In addition to the editing and preparing for publication of *Capital*, volumes II and III, Engels found time to write his "*Feuerbach* (1888), and his famous book on *The Origin of the Family; Private Property and the State*, which by most Marxians is considered next in importance to his *Anti-Duhring*. This splendid book is based upon the great ethnological discoveries of the American anthropologist, Lewis Henry Morgan, who in his most famous work *Ancient Society* (1877) had provided for the first time, as Engels expressed it, through his "finding in the sexual organizations of the North American Indian the key that opens all the unfathomable riddles of the most ancient Greek, Roman and German history. His book is not the work of a short day. For more than forty years he grappled with the subject, until he mastered it fully. Therefore his work

is one of the few epochal publications of our time."

Engels was generous in more respects than one. He never withheld credit from others, wherever it was due, although he was capable of a very healthy hatred for those who by their behaviour had earned it. In his preface to the first edition of his *Origin of the Family*, he gives Morgan credit for independently, although unconsciously, discovering the Materialist Conception of History. He writes: "It was no less a man than Karl Marx who had reserved to himself the privilege of displaying the results of Morgan's investigations in connection with his own materialist conception of history—which I might call ours within certain limits. He wished thus to elucidate the full meaning of this conception. For in America, Morgan had, in a manner, discovered anew the materialist conception of history, originated by Marx forty years ago."

The Origin of the Family is not only an excellent introduction to a direct study of Morgan's *Ancient Society*, its greater merit is its tracing of the rise of the State in the Greek and Roman civilizations, and among the Germans. His comments upon the modern state, especially in its capitalist, parliamentary form, has been exceedingly helpful to the working class in its approach to political action. Lenin in his polemical writing quoted from Engels' work continually. Engels writes: "The possessing class rules directly through universal suffrage. For as long as the oppressed class, in this case the proletariat, is not ripe for its economic emancipation, just so long will its majority regard the existing order of society as the only one possible, and form the tail, the extreme left wing, of the capitalist class. But the more the proletariat matures toward its self-emancipation, the more does it constitute itself as a separate class and elect its own representatives in place of the capitalists. Universal suffrage is the gauge of the maturity of the working class. It can and will never be anything else but that in the modern state. But that is sufficient. On the day when the thermometer of universal suffrage reaches its boiling point among the laborers, they as well as the capitalists will know what to do."

He concludes that, "We are now rapidly approaching a stage of evolution in production, in which the existence of classes has not only ceased to be a necessity, but becomes a positive fetter on production. Hence these classes must fall as inevitably as they arose. The state must irrevocably fall with them. The society that is to reorganize production on the basis of a free and equal association of producers, will transfer the machinery of the state where it will then belong; into the Museum of Antiquities by the side of the spinning wheel and the bronze axe."

As a writer, Engels had the ability to greatly simplify difficult questions and reduce them to concrete form. In his *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, he not only traces the history of socialism from its utopian to its scientific stage, but he explains in simple language what is usually regarded as incomprehensible philosophical questions.

In no other work can we find so clear an explanation of the difference between idealism and materialism, between the metaphysical and dialectic approach to common everyday matters such as liberty, justice, reason, etc. For those seeking a simple explanation of the materialist conception of history, his chapter three is unsurpassed, and likewise for an understanding of the difference between socialism and state capitalism.

His introduction to an edition printed in April, 1892, is an excellent outline of materialist thought, what he calls historical materialism.

(To be continued)

Proletarian Dictatorship

One hears a great deal of late years about dictators in "general" and democracy in general. The trouble with most of this talk is that it's too general—so general, in fact, that it misrepresents things in general.

A few years ago we heard that all dictators were bad, Stalin included. Since Russia entered the war "on our side," and has so masterfully disposed of the invincibility of the invincibles, Stalin has been more recently described as a good dictator—in some respects. Of course "Russia is turning capitalist," especially when the bourgeoisie want to "explain" why some phases of Soviet economy are making progress.

Not only are the bourgeoisie misleading, but some leftist folks also claim Joe is a dictator who hovers above the Communist Party in Russia. Just how and where he "hovers" is not quite clear—but he's "up there" dictating to the party.

These "leftists" may not be spreading this confusion deliberately, nevertheless it is confusion. They conceive of a democracy in the abstract. Such democracy does not and never will exist. Democracy under capitalism is relative, that is related to capitalism only. The worker has the democratic right to be exploited and the capitalist the democratic right to do the exploiting.

Under socialism exploitation ceases to exist. The question of most importance, which many workers do not understand, is the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin speaks of this in his "Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky." On page 15 he says: "The fundamental question that Kautsky touches upon in his pamphlet is the question of the **root content of the proletarian revolution, namely, the dictatorship of the proletariat.**"

"This is a question that is of great importance to all countries, especially the advanced ones. One may say without fear of contradiction that this is the **most important problem of the proletarian class struggle.**"

Lenin further states: "Dictatorship of the proletariat is the question of the relation between the proletarian state and bourgeois rule, between proletarian democracy and bourgeois democracy."

Like so many "Marxists" of today, "Kautsky," according to Lenin, "made rapid progress in the art of being a Marxist in words and a lackey of the bourgeoisie in deed," and to quote further from this same book ("Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky") Lenin further remarks: "Marx and Engels, in their letters as well as their published works, repeatedly spoke about the dictatorship of the pro-

letariat, both before and after the Paris Commune. Kautsky cannot but know that the formula dictatorship of the proletariat is but a more historically concrete and more scientifically exact formulation of the proletariat's task to smash the bourgeois state machine, about which Marx and Engels, in summing up the experiences of the revolution and still more of 1871, spoke for **forty years** between 1852 and 1891."

When one speaks of democracy one should add, says Lenin, "For what class?" We here in America have democracy — capitalist class democracy, and what we need for the benefit of the majority (the workers) is working class democracy. This is where many "socialists" fall down. They lack Marxian understanding.

Let us suppose that the American workers finally learn by experience that capitalism cannot function as the administrator of economic democracy for the majority, the workers. Furthermore, supposing they vote for a change in the economic system—from a capitalist planless economy to a socialist planned economy. We are told that the majority's voice is final. Under this assumption the workers have, through their ballot, demanded that the means of production be owned collectively. According to this conception of democracy, "the rule of the majority," the capitalists would just turn over their industries and accept the political mandate of the people. Do American workers believe that the capitalists will hand over their capital, the means of production, to the government? According to certain naive "socialists" the capitalists are supposed to do just that.

The capitalist class, with their armed "influence, the State, certainly have not set any historic precedent in that direction. Just the opposite has been the case.

For further details one can observe what happened in the Paris Commune, the Russian Revolution, or the actions of the exploiting class of Germany and Italy, prior to and during the present war.

Suppose that the bourgeoisie refuse, as history indicates they will, to allow the means of production, capital, to be collectivized. Just what is the next step for the workers to take? The question now is whether the will of the minority, which has always been the law, will continue to assert itself and continue its rule of exploitation, mass misery and war. (Only two World Wars within twenty-five years.) Within their state machinery, the capitalist class, regardless of the will of the majority, will hold on to their capital, the means of production. They will defy the will of the majority and set up their dictatorship, and rule openly and ruthlessly. This method of capitalist rule is now called fascism, and it is not peculiar to Germany, Italy and Japan. The only chance for the working class to get rid of capitalism is to conquer political power. The capitalists hold the state machinery and will use it "legally" or otherwise, to maintain possession of the means of production and the natural resources.

Once fascism is installed it is too late for the workers to act. They will find themselves and their organizations smashed and repressed. Only by setting up their own political structure, and liquidating that of the capitalists, will the workers, the vast majority, be able to enforce their will and socialize the means of production. This state machinery of the workers, in France called Commune, in Russia called Soviet, is the widest form of democracy which history records. It is not a nominal democracy, but a real one, embracing within its structure, not intermittently every few years, but continually, day after day, the vast majority of the population, the proletariat. The

functioning of this state structure is the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, whose objective is to complete elimination of capitalism and its political institutions.

To quote Marx: "When the workers substitute their revolutionary dictatorship for the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie—in order to break down the resistance of the bourgeoisie, the workers invest the State with a revolutionary and transitory form." And Engels writes: "The party (which has led the revolution) is necessarily compelled to maintain its rule by means of that fear which its arms inspire in the reactionaries. If the Paris Commune had not employed the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie would it have maintained itself more than 24 hours? Are we not on the contrary justified in blaming the Commune for having employed its authority too little?" * * * "As long as the proletariat still needs the State, it needs it not in the interest of freedom, but for the purpose of crushing its antagonists; and as soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom then the State as such ceases to exist."

We believe, not without evidence, that the capitalist class of America will only respect the will of the majority so long as the majority "wills" to be ruled by capital. And, only incidentally of course, it is the "will" of the exploiters. Let the workers "will" by taking complete political power, then the exploiters will "will" that a state of emergency exists and that it is necessary to maintain law and order (for the capitalists) and start a counter-revolution.

When a social system breaks down, and its government ceases to function and take care of the basic needs of the majority, it is time to get a new government. To borrow an illustration from Arthur Lewis's "Evolution, Social and Organic" (page 148): "When the brain of an animal is wrecked the animal dies; it has no choice. But when the brain of a society fails to represent the interests of the mass of the people who compose that society, or when the social brain (government) runs amuck and invites disaster, society may take its choice, it may elect to die—or it may get a new brain."

Proletarian dictatorship is simply installing the will of the majority of the members of present day society. It is the "new brain" of the new society coming into being. This new brain, the "Soviet" form, the Proletarian Dictatorship, is only possible when the majority of the members of society, **wills, supports and takes active part in the revolution.** In short, it is the beginning of real democracy which has shaken off the illusions of bourgeois, capitalist, democracy with its rule and exploitation of the many by the few.

Len Johnson.

FREE SUBSCRIPTION!

With the purchase of any of the following books, one year's free subscription will be given to PROLETARIAN NEWS.

THINKING: ITS HISTORY AND SCIENCE, by Fred Casey \$1.25

SOCIALISM AND PHILOSOPHY, by Antonio Labriola \$1.25

THE EVOLUTION OF WAR, by Emanuel Kanter Cloth, \$1.00

THE POVERTY OF PHILOSOPHY, by Karl Marx Cloth, \$1.50

1545 Larrabee Street, Chicago, Illinois.

You will find here enclosed \$..... Send me a copy of.....
.....and one year's subscription to the
PROLETARIAN NEWS.

Name

Address

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 3)

the depression that follows wars. He called it "naive" to think that pent up war savings would create the purchasing power to keep the economy going. Citing figures, he estimated that the average family making less than \$2,000 a year had only \$750 of savings; that most of the war savings are in the hands of the upper brackets. Continuing, he recalled that in 1940, at the height of production in America, there were 9,000,000 unemployed. That full employment now would take 12,000,000 more jobs than in 1940.

Senator Murray too had his "in-nings." He said: "We have in this country, a small but vocal minority who are against the Full Employment Bill because they are against full employment. For example, one businessman who objects to the bill has written us that 'private capitalism needs a floating pool of unemployed.'"

"The New York State Commerce Commission has approved a report which maintains that depressions are the price we pay for freedom.

"To some big corporations, I have found periods of widespread unemployment are actually welcome, because they provide opportunities to squeeze out or buy out smaller competitors. . . ."

Senators O'Mahoney, Murray and all liberals are against the excesses of capitalism. They favor a planned economy, a "just" capitalism. But "you can't eat the cake and have it." You can't have capitalism without it continually throwing up its excesses. Profits are begotten through the exploitation of labor. Exploited labor produces surpluses of commodities which eventually leads to overproduction, unemployment and crisis.

* * *

A Bit of Reminiscing

Looking back a couple of years we came across some unfinished business—the trial against the seditionists. We recollect the red tape and generally farcical manner in which it was conducted; the effective strategy of the defense in postponing and obstructing. The death of the presiding judge Eicher further facilitated matters for the tried fascists. Now the case stands tabled, likely for good.

At the time of the height of the trial, we reported in the Proletarian News, the lack of seriousness of the prosecution of those fascists. We even indicated the possibility of their preservation for their future reactionary usefulness.

The case is now as dead as its presiding judge. These reactionists are on the loose, free to spread their fascist hate propaganda.

This is but one instance that significantly projects the lukewarm attitude of capitalist democracy towards confirmed fascists.

* * *

The Church and Politics

Communists are often reproached for their critical attitude toward

religion. "Religion is one's own private matter, it is contended, and should be left alone and out of politics."

The truth is that religion is a social matter. Were we to leave it alone, it doesn't follow that it leaves us alone. It's nose is forever in politics, with decided property class leanings, taking a whack at communism on every available occasion.

In Boston, the Catholic church has lately announced its intention of establishing a Labor Center, the avowed purpose of which will be—not to fight capitalist injustice—but to combat Communist influence among labor.

By its own acts and intents it affirms (1) that religion is not a private but a social matter; (2) that it is pro-capital, in defense of private property and its institutions.

By announcing its determination to take the offensive against communism it more than justifies our contention that it is a defense institution of the rich. It's connection with class politics is undeniable.

* * *

South Carolinian Democracy

Strongly protesting the recently scheduled Bulgarian elections, which have since been called off, Secretary of State Byrnes (of South Carolina) emphasized that they must be held "under conditions which will allow and insure the participation therein, free from fear of force and intimidation, of all democratic elements."

One commentator, Lowell Mellet, writing in the Boston Globe, brings out the contradiction quite well. He says: "If this doesn't baffle the Bulgars it surely will confuse some South Carolinians, where 'democratic elements' as the poor whites, and the Negroes, have never been allowed to participate enough to meet the Secretary of State's prescription. (Of the democratic elements old enough to vote in South Carolina, 10 per cent voted in the last election, whereas in non-poll tax states, the average was 63 per cent)."

It would seem, off hand, that "people living in glass houses should not be casting stones." But they do.

Class society precludes democracy for "all alike." It is either democracy for the rich, with restrictions for the mass—as in Byrnes' South Carolina—or it is democracy for the mass, and less of it for the upper classes, especially the fascist collaborators—as was likely contemplated in Bulgaria. Byrnes is loyal to South Carolinian democracy.

* * *

What Price Government Publicity?

To the misinformed in America, most people of other lands are dupes of their government propaganda, suckers and easily taken in. But here in America we are free from government propaganda, independent and think for our-

selves. Here the government is the servant of the people. We the people order the government around. That sounds very patriotic and has a July 4th ring. How does it square with the facts?

"What each department or agency spends for publicity is one of the most closely guarded secrets of government," says Sen. Harry F. Byrd, chairman of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures which already has affected some \$3,000,000,000 in economies. "We've attempted to make a study and tried for months and months to get figures, buried in a maze of fancy titles and vague items."

The Budget Bureau after two years study, showed, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, the following, as reported in the July issue of the "Nation's Business": "The survey showed 2,895 federal employees devoting all their time and 31,618 giving part of their time, or a total of 8,433½ man-years, for publicity. The cost was \$27,769,940, of which \$19,463,470 was for salaries. Among costs not included was "penalty" mail, an expense of \$19,717,348 to the Post Office Department. The Bureau specified that 38 chatty house organs cost the taxpayers \$310,153, and that two-thirds of the other publications, costing \$13,751,797, were not required by law."

"An estimate of \$300,000,000

spent in 1944, is not too far away," added Rep. John Taber, of the House Appropriations Committee.

As late as 1889, the entire cost of government, including debt services, was less than that, according to the Budget Bureau.

The author in "Nation's Business," believes among other things the objective of the government's expensive blah is: "To train the people in obedience to officialdom by converting public opinion to the official viewpoints on domestic and international issues."

Further he stated: "Willing to undertake even more, the experts recently offered a program for controlling thought in liberated lands. Under their plan, publicity experts and psychologists in uniform will tell those people what has been happening in the outside world. Similar filtering of news is planned for China, the Philippines, Japan and even India. These same successors to Herr Goebels' organization would also decide what the American public should hear about the countries for which their sons fought and died."

Senator Taft lends support to that view when he declared in the Senate: "Newspapers report that celgymen have been brought to Washington by the Treasury Department to be indoctrinated for

(Continued on page 8)

International Notes

(Continued from page 1)

ston Churchill's statement that it was the Red Army which tore the guts out of the Nazi war machine. Molotov's suggestion may also have been a gentle hint that the Soviet Union has won a voice in the affairs of Tangiers which lies on the African side of the straits of Gibraltar.

In most of these controversies the British foreign secretary has had the support of Secretary of State Byrnes. The British and Americans may have, and do have their own quarrels but in controversies with the Soviet Union they can be depended upon to act as one. However, even on this basis these allies are at a great disadvantage. The problems within the capitalist controlled world continue to grow. In Italy starvation and chaos threatens to bring revolution in the months ahead. Greece remains a powder keg. In France the masses are demanding relief from their misery and are moving leftward. DeGaulle may be ousted in the coming elections. In that case he and his supporters, the capitalist class of France, may decide to throw off the cloak of democracy and try to remain in power by force of arms. Even in England dissatisfaction is rife. Already, returning veterans are saying: "Hell, these are not the men we elected!" In China, Chiang Kai-shek must be supported and American troops are to be quartered indefinitely in a number of Chinese cities. In Korea, the Amer-

ican military governor has stated that American occupation may be required for as long as fifteen years before the Koreans are "qualified to govern the country." All of these countries remain a constant threat to those who wish to maintain "free enterprise."

The situation within those countries under Soviet influence is quite different. There, the peasants are busy on *their* land and workers are busy in factories, mines or rehabilitation work. There, the fetters of private property, if they stand in the way of progress, are rudely brushed aside. Such countries are rapidly overcoming the chaos resulting from war and incidentally are becoming a bulwark to the Soviet Union.

The Atomic Bomb

Recommendations were recently made that control of the know-how of atomic power should be retained by the War Department. This brought biting criticism from some of the scientists who worked on the production of the atomic bomb. They branded these recommendations as "the most reactionary proposals in American history." Says Newsweek, Sept. 21: "They are convinced Russia not only can duplicate the bomb but probably can improve our methods in from two to five years and that Russia will quickly forge ahead of the U. S. in development of atomic power for industrial use if the War Department is allowed to control this phase of development in peacetime."

Oliver Ritchie.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 7)

pulpit appeals to bring pressure on Congress in behalf of the controversial Bretton Woods proposals." He continued, "The War Department, on April 26, brought some 40 leaders of women's organizations to Washington from different parts of the United States. They were spirited into the Pentagon Building to hear talks on compulsory military service. They were warned not to disclose that they had been in the Army building, or who had talked to them or to identify the War Department in any way but to go home and spread the 'only true story' of the military plans. I contend that performance was not only a misuse of government funds but underhand and un-American."

The official critics, Senators Taft, Byrd, Tabor, and the author in "Nation's Business," as well as other businessmen and their spokesmen are concerned largely from the point of view of economy. Government expenditures and waste spell higher taxes for them.

Our concern is not at all with the expenditures as with the reasons for such expenditures. The objective is to formulate a public opinion, so as to coincide with the interests of the ruling class and the government that is representative of it in Washington. In this lies the essence of subsidized publicity. No ruling class can for long maintain its economic and political prerogatives without sufficient ideological control over the masses. Class opinion must therefore be made to appear as public opinion. Official government publicity and all public (capitalist) information and educational agencies are dedicated to the task of controlling public opinion.

* * *

Equal Class Representation

In the Boston Globe of July 22, 1945, appeared a breakdown in the composition of the U. S. Congress as follows: "Lawyers predominate in Congress and our Legislature. An official survey of the House shows that there are in the present House 241 lawyers; 47 members are from the business and manufacturing field, 25 were former educators, 24 are real estate and insurance men. There are 23 editors, 15 farmers, 10 bankers 7 doctors, 6 municipal officers, 4 former congressional secretaries, 4 who list themselves as legislators, 3 dentists, 3 accountants, 3 investment bankers, 2 authors, 2 druggists, 2 social welfare workers, 2 union officials, and 2 ministers. There is a former actress, an analyst, an architect, a merchandise broker, a civil engineer, a director of international relations, a chemist, a secret service officer, a veterinarian, and one listed as a *workingman*." (My emphasis.)

"In the Senate, there are 62 lawyers, 10 each from business or manufacturing and from the editorial field; 3 farmers, 2 former congressional secretaries, 2 legis-

lators, 2 educators, and 2 bankers. Also an admiral, a dentist, and a radio performer."

Note the "equal" representation that the workers have in Congress. Two union officials and one lonely workingman as against 432 Representatives in the House and 96 in the Senate for capital. What class equality! What democracy!

* * *

A Foretaste of Things to Come

Secretary of Labor Schwellessbach made known, on July 23, that the weekly pay check of the average worker in manufacturing industries was cut 2.3 per cent to \$46.03 from April to May and he worked 44.1 hours, a 2.2 per cent reduction in time. He reported a slash in all major heavy goods industries and in all but two non-durable goods manufacturing groups, attributing it in part to the observance of V-E Day.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics just previously reported that an upward trend in wages nationally had leveled off, to such an extent that pay rates rose only 1.6 per cent between October, 1944 and April, 1945, in urban manufacturing industries. This is but a foretaste of things to come. What will V-J Day bring?

* * *

Crime

Crime is on the increase, according to the Public Administrative

Clearing House of Chicago, police protection cost urban dwellers 19 cents more per person in 1944 than in 1943. Making a per capita expenditure of \$4.76 in 994 cities. Several months ago, the Wickersham committee, estimated the crime bill to be \$15,000,000,000 annually. The FBI is quoted as estimating it to now reach as high as \$20,000,000,000 annually. And that ain't hay!

It is quite a chunk to part with, even for the wealthy multi-millionaires of America. It represents about the equivalent of the total wage bill of the American workers annually. To lay out billions for wages and realize a profitable return is good business, but to set aside money for protection, and lose billions notwithstanding is "bad business," and a source of worry to the capitalists. And what is more exasperating is to see the dip into their treasury by crime go deeper and deeper.

In the July issue of the "Nation's Business," on the "Cost of Bad Boys" by John Carlyle, the author writes: "The FBI publishes a report twice a year on the prevalence of crime in the United States. It shows that each year 1,393,655 major crimes are reported to local police in this country. That is at the rate of 158 an hour. Other major crimes are not reported, for a variety of reasons. The figures quoted are from authorities in only 1,078 towns and cities with a population of 62,726,936. Some com-

munities did not report in 1944. The crimes in rural areas are dealt with under another heading. An agent of the FBI said: "We think that when a boy has been institutionalized he is lost."

To be institutionalized is to be marked for the house of detention, house of correction, workhouse or whatever other designated "school" and, if bright, to be later graduated from the penitentiary, the highest of crime institutions.

Religious, educational and Boy Scout organizations and training have not been able to prevent the prevalence and growth of crime. If the aftermath of World War I is any criterion, crime is bound to increase, particularly if men and women are involuntarily idle.

"Bigger and better jails," cry out the muscle minded gentlemen. There are 3,156 jails in America. Let the gentlemen in "Nation's Business" describe the hell holes.

"Most of the jails of this country are disease-infected, bug-infested, dirt-encrusted horrors. The evidence for that sweeping charge is provided by the Federal Bureau of Prisons. . . . "In some jails trusties beat the prisoners at will with clubs which appear to be shortened baseball bats, or in some instances with rubber truncheons.

"In some jails, garbage from the day's meals is thrown into the corners of the halls. Floors are covered with encrusted slime. There are no bathing facilities. Toilets are stopped up and filth runs out on the floor. Blankets are literally glazed, so long it is since they have been washed.

"Even if a prisoner is guilty as charged, no community has the moral right to feed him on greasy water and stale bread served in unwashed tin pans. Sometimes the pans are thrust through slits at the foot of the door. Unless the prisoner hurries the bugs will overrun his day's meal. Bedbugs, lice, cockroaches and rats are common-places."

Miss Nina Kinsella, executive assistant to James V. Bennett, director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, says: "There are no good jails in the United States."

The description of the treatment of criminals, yes even criminal, in this enlightened age is an indictment of capitalism. Progress in money making, stagnation and even retrogression in the handling of crime. And why?

The capitalists and their lackeys deal with effects. The punishment must be equal to the crime. "Criminals are born that way and must be punished," they assert. Yet with the severity of punishment there is simultaneously an increase of crime. "It grows on what it feeds," is an old saying, and that is applicable to crime. Accumulation of wealth is itself begotten by exploitation, which, in substance, is robbery of the workers. Private property and exploitation are the cause of crime. It is inherent in the capitalist system. Crime goes with the profit motive and in fact the profit system is a crime of the worst sort.

L. B.

GET A BOOK FREE

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

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