

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. XV, No. 5—Whole No. 158

Chicago, Illinois, May, 1946

483

Price 5c a Copy

United Nations Troubles -- Right and Left

By Christ Jelset

The League of Nations has been formally dissolved. Its assets were transferred to the new United Nations. Its trouble went the same way, without mention.

The League, it has been said, was foredoomed to failure because of America's isolationism, and because of lack of power. The U. N. has been strengthened in both aspects. The United States is a member, and the new organization is to be equipped with police power.

It must be remembered that the League failed to hold together the nations which became members. Germany and Italy were both full-fledged members, but did not receive what they considered adequate consideration. These member nations pulled out and attempted to achieve justice, as they saw it, by force of arms.

The feeble beginnings of the U. N. to settle international differences is already showing how difficult the problem really is. The amount of ink that has been spilt over the question of "Soviet aggression," east, west and south, proves conclusively that reliance upon the machinery of the new organization is lacking. It also shows that the conception of what is right or wrong in international policy differs with each nation. Thus it seems a virtue, an extension of the helping hand, for America or Great Britain to connive with the Feudal rulers of the Middle East, to obtain access to oil, or other natural resources, as well as airfields, banking institutions and business facilities generally, while it is stark aggression if the Soviet Union should attempt either to share in the scheme or to promote native opposition to it.

The difference between Soviet penetration and capitalist imperial expansion is not the only obstacle to U.N. success. The late war was fought, everyone was told, to crush fascism and to promote the rights of democratic liberty. Several countries continue to exist with fascist or semi-fascist forms of government. Argentina has been considered such a nation. It maintained friendly relations with Ger-

many in the days of Nazi aggression. It harbored German spies and gave support to the German submarine warfare. The Soviet Union looked upon Argentina as undesirable for membership in the U.N. America insisted upon invitation.

Everybody knows that Spain overthrew its democratic republic by bloody revolution. Nobody will claim that Franco's Spain is anything but a fascist state. Poland's new government on, friendly terms with the Soviet Union, brought charges to the U. N. that Spain was a threat to world peace, and that German scientists were secretly at work in Spain on atomic research, and on other military weapons. Some U. N. members were not interested. Britain, the U. S. A., and other nations were set against taking up the Spanish issue as strongly as they had been

(Continued on page 3)

This Post-War May Day And Its Significance

One year ago, World War II was just drawing to a close in Europe. It was still raging in Asia, where it continued until September, when the Japanese signed unconditional surrender on the battleship Missouri.

This May Day is of great significance to us. It is the first in the post-war period, the first in which overalls replace uniforms. We believe that it is timely to pause for retrospect, and to evaluate present trends. A year of "peace" in Europe has witnessed great changes. Even the largest capitalist empires surviving, those of Great Britain and France, have experienced a drastic political shakeup, and most of the other European nations have turned left politically, and the movement continues in that direction.

In most of the great cities of Europe there will be demonstrations, May Day parades, for labor is on the march. The workers are again in action, and with greater strength and confidence. Their political parties and industrial organizations have forged to the front. The power of the exploiting classes has been badly shaken, and in some countries shattered beyond recovery. Only in the United States and some South American countries have the propertied interests been strengthened.

In that relation, what was once the most advanced social and

(Continued on page 2)

On 'Pitiless Publicity'

One of the most insidious pieces of capitalist propaganda was an editorial written by David Lawrence in the United States News (April 5) entitled "Pitiless Publicity." He begins by stating that "many years ago Woodrow Wilson urged 'pitiless publicity' as the best cure for the evils of democracy." He compares that period in history with the present by pointing out that the UNO (United Nations Organization) is doing the same, i. e., exposing the evils of world affairs to debate and open discussion "whereby international crises can be fully understood if not solved."

He also stated that, "Democracy is at an advantage with pitiless publicity. Totalitarianism, such as that of Russia, is at a disadvantage against a free and uncontrolled press."

The whole burden of his article was that the Russian masses were kept from knowing by the Soviet government what had taken place in UNO Security Council meetings, namely that the Russian representative had

walked out. Lawrence in his article poses the question: "Was it because the Russian government did not want to tell the people about the serious and critical game being played by the Soviet dictatorship with the United States, a nation predisposed to be friendly with the Russian people and inclined to give them some of the economic help they so sorely need? Is this the way to improve the standard of living in Russia or will such a course deprive an already long-suffering populace of relief from their burdens?"

As we can judge by the above, the whole tone of his article is in line with the present anti-Soviet crusade now prevalent in the capitalist press. Just as in the past wherein Uncle Sam and John Bull were depicted as Solomon, the wise and just, this time the UNO is upheld to be that impartial tribunal of justice. Furthermore the capitalist press is priding itself on keeping the public informed with exactly what is taking place. But, one might ask, are these reports unbiased, that is, on the basis of pitiless publicity? How much can one believe what is fact and what fiction that appears in the columns of the capitalist press?

It is worth our time to subject Lawrence's article to some of that pitiless publicity that he extols. We will begin with his authority, Woodrow Wilson, that great idealist, and examine his record relative to Russia, and see if it bears up under impartial scrutiny. What does his record reveal. Namely this: as President

(Continued on page 2)

IN THIS ISSUE

UNITED NATIONS TROUBLES
By Christ Jelset

ON PITILESS PUBLICITY
By Al Wysocki

HOME SCENE
By L. B.

SCIENCE AND SUPERSTITION
TODAY
(Editorial)
By John Keracher

ON 'PITILESS PUBLICITY'

(Continued from page 1)

of the United States in 1918, he was responsible for launching an attack against the young, struggling Soviet Government under the pretense of being Russia's friend.

This so incensed the Soviet government that Chicherin, the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, sent Wilson a note of protest in October, 1918, which we quote in part as follows:

"You have promised, Mr. President, to help Russia to secure full and unhindered opportunity for the adoption by her of independent decision with regard to her own political development and her national policy. But in reality this assistance expressed itself in the fact that the Czechoslovakian troops and soon afterward your own troops and those of your allies attempted at Archangel, at Murmansk, in the Far East to force upon the Russian people the government of the oppressors, of those exploiting classes whose yoke the working men and peasants of Russia had already thrown off in October of last year. The revival of the counter-revolution, which had already been transformed into a corpse; attempts by means of violence to reestablish its bloody domination over the people of Russia—this is what the latter have experienced instead of help for unhindered expression of their will, which was promised to them, Mr. President, in your declarations." (Soviet Russia and Her Neighbors, by R. P. Arnot, Vanguard Press, appendix.)

Of course this note of protest by Chicherin was given very little if any publicity by the capitalist press at that time for the obvious reason that it would have exposed "the evils of democracy" too much for the comfort of the American ruling class. As a matter of fact the yellow bourgeois journals were filled with so much slander against the Soviet government that there was very little if any space left particularly for matters of an "impartial" nature. Then, as now, the American press was most assuredly "free and uncontrolled" in its attacks against the Soviet Union. "Democracy" was then indeed at an advantage with publicity pitiless toward Russia. "Kill the dirty bolsheviks" was the main theme. Today some of the capitalist journals don't dare openly come out with such vicious imprecations, but they do it through innuendo, which after all amounts to the same thing.

Does Mr. Lawrence imagine for one moment that the Russian masses have forgotten all this? Many of them have very long memories and very bitter ones at that because thousands of them had been slaughtered by British and American supported armies

of intervention that were hurled against them, during the Civil War days of 1918-20. But thanks to their Soviet dictatorship many of them survived. That is why the Soviet Union is now the most powerful nation in the world, only second to the United States. It is this fact that the ruling class of America finds so unsavory, hence their slanders against the Soviet government.

Mr. Lawrence, to the contrary, the Russian people have been and are well informed by their Soviet government about the "serious and critical game" (underhanded tricks is more to the point) played not by the Soviet envoys to the UNO but by the representatives of the "democracies," particularly the British and American. The Soviet people still remember how the Soviet Union was maligned by the "democracies" during the Soviet-Finnish war of 1939-1940. The capitalist press was then howling about how "poor little Finland" was being "abused" by the Russian bear. Today, of course, the bourgeois press is yelping about the fate of "poor little Iran," a country that the bourgeois democracies, particularly Britain, did not hesitate to use as an open door to launch an attack against the Soviets back in 1918-20. The fact is outstanding that Iran would have lost even its present semblance of independence and would have become virtually a colony of Great Britain were it not for the Soviet Union.

And as for the United States being a "nation predisposed to be friendly" to the Russian masses and its offer of economic aid, this also will not stand up under the glare of pitiless publicity. The Soviet people still remember the part played by Hoover's commission when a similar offer of food, etc., was made to them. It was made conditional that all those would eat who would turn against the Soviet government. The Russian workers and peasants refused to abide by such a condition, but preferred to remain loyal to their own Soviet government. The fact that thousands of them starved to death can only be attributed to the "evils of democracy," the British and American brand. This happened also during the Civil War period of 1918-20. It appears that at present a similar offer is being made them but the Russian people know full well how inclined the United States is in giving "them some of the economic aid they so sorely need." The Soviet people are not fish nor are they blind, for they can readily see the hook protruding through the bait.

It is common knowledge also that the American government refused to recognize the Soviet

(Continued on page 3)

THIS POST-WAR MAY DAY AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

(Continued from page 1)

political nation, the U. S. A., has now become the most backward. From the vanguard of political liberties it has become the rear-guard and defender of reaction, a bulwark against the political awakening of the world's workers. In the days of the Czars, Russia was the citadel of reaction, and the repressor of peoples. Now, Soviet Russia is the source from which arises inspiration for the downtrodden and backward peoples of the earth. It is what America once was.

Thus, as Frederick Engels once pointed out: "The irony of history turns everything upside down." And, America, the land which was the refuge of the persecuted and oppressed, now takes the lead as defender of decadent capitalism, the "free enterprise" knight in Wall Street's shining armor, the champion of immense wealth for the few and increasing poverty for the many.

America is now the world's number one empire. May Day here may again take on some of its pre-war virility, but it will be nothing in comparison to what it is in Europe where there will be general rejoicing and consciousness of the growing power of labor.

The war has done plenty to Europe. Its negative side was appalling, but it also reveals a positive side. If millions of poor people have died, most of them non-combatants and just victims of "free-enterprise," the profit-makers' war, they were not the only ones to be stricken. Many members of the ruling classes have bitten the dust, and especially in the defeated nations.

Large tracts of land, which they and their kind have held for centuries, have been divided among great numbers of poor people, whose kind have tilled the soil but never possessed it. Exploitation of the peasants has been greatly curtailed, and in a number of countries the struggle is in process for the complete socialization of all land. Large industries, mines and such, have been taken over by governments, some of which are only provisional administrations. In some cases, especially where the industries were set up by the Nazis, no compensation was made. In other cases, where owners had survived, and had not collaborated with the Nazis, which would be the exception, some measures of compensation have been arranged for the former owners. This situation reveals much confusion and obvious contradiction but despite political stumbling and mistakes it can be seen that the trend is steadily in the direction of complete socialization of the natural resources and the means of production.

This May Day witnesses a different alignment of nations, an aftermath of the great conflict. With the Soviet Union as its center, many nations are now moving in this new orbit. A number of others, such as Britain and France, seem to be torn between the two centers, which stem from Moscow on the one hand and Washington on the other. The governments of those latter nations look to America, but an increasing number of their people are looking toward the Soviet Union.

The Social Democratic leaders of Britain and France, now trying to get capitalism to operate smoothly, apparently prefer friendship with capitalist America, if the latter is not too exacting but large numbers of the working people have no faith in that policy, especially since it requests them to work harder and wait longer for a fuller life. This cleavage will widen and deepen as time goes by, because the Social Democratic policy will not bring improvement in the living standard of the workers. And, European labor cannot wait much longer. It will be forced to go a step further and take complete control of the nations, not simply try to run capitalism more efficiently.

A year is but a short time, but already the social forces are moving fast in the direction of political and economic centralization. The result of this will be that the working class will have state capitalism saddled upon them, unless they take complete political power into their own hands and abolish the class ownership of the means of production. That, of course, means proletarian revolution, and it will have to be achieved through the organization of a different state form, one which must work as the dictatorship of the proletariat.

May Day is not an ordinary holiday, granted by the exploiters

ON 'PITILESS PUBLICITY'

(Continued from page 2) government for a long time, it was well over a period of fifteen years before the Soviet Union received that official recognition. Nor was it granted willingly; it was granted during the years of the Big Depression in the 1930's when the American business men needed a market very badly and found that trade with Russia was very profitable to them.

Like all bourgeois journalists, Mr. Lawrence prates about "defending the United Nations Charter," that it's a "new slogan" and that the United States is ready to defend it to prevent a third world war even to the extent of using its military power. He concludes by pointing out that the "policy of complete disclosure of what is going on" cannot help but unite the "peace-loving" peoples to prevent war. "Moral force," he states, "is the greatest force the world has ever known and its principal instrument is 'pitiless publicity.'"

Everyone, however, remembers

the miserable failure of the now defunct League of Nations, the brain child of that famous moralizer, Woodrow Wilson. It did not and could not prevent a second world war for a very good reason that no bourgeois journalist dare publicize. What was the cause of World War 2? It was the direct result of economic rivalry among capitalist nations for control of the world market, the sources of raw materials, and colonies. We need not go deeply into the aspect of this question except to point out capitalist economy which is based on production for profit cannot survive unless it continually expands, i. e., has a market for its commodities and investment of capital. It is as plain as the nose on one's face that America and Britain had a monopoly on the world market before the war and still have to this day. Those less fortunate nations excluded from the market are bound to resent this restriction of "freedom of competition" and do their utmost

of labor in honor of one of their national heroes, a Washington or a Lincoln, nor is it to commemorate some event which paved the way for capitalist class rule, such as Bastille Day in France or Independence Day (fourth of July) in America.

It is a day that the workers wrested from their capitalist exploiters, but it is not alone dedicated to rest or celebration. It is a day of militant demonstration of class solidarity, and a harbinger of the battle of freedom yet to be fought. It is also a day of retrospect, a check up on progress made upon losses and gains, and to close ranks and redouble efforts to unite all labor for the final conflict with the outworn parasitic system, with its depressions and devastating wars. Although militant, it is for peace. Although out of the past, it draws its inspiration from the future—"The workers have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win." Class solidarity and struggle is the keynote of May Day.

More workers will consciously participate this year than at any time in the past. More nations are closer to the final showdown. In most of the countries of Europe it is "later than it seems." Fascism, the last and most ruthless political form of "free enterprise" has been defeated in the Axis nations by its imperialist rivals, but within these "democratic" nations there is much regret because historic circumstances raised the Soviet Union to the position of a first class world power, and has resulted in a tremendous political advance of the proletarians and peasants, almost everywhere else. In the East, the teeming millions of down-trodden natives, exceedingly poor, and harshly exploited by native masters and imperialistic overlords, are awakening and asserting themselves.

A new wave of fascism, within the "democracies," disguised as a progressive movement, can be looked for. A measure of it is already in action. This is part of the general picture this post-war May Day. Capitalism is not through. It will not just sit idly by and watch its power and privilege gradually slip from its grasp.

Labor must be alert. The workers will do well to prepare for the worst. Organized labor must close its ranks and sink its insignificant differences in face of the common danger. It must not allow itself to be caught by traditional catch phrases, by national chauvinism, by race hatred and other booby traps which the ruling class and their hirelings so well know how to manipulate.

Close the Ranks; Face the Issue; the choice is plain—for capitalism, with its poverty, war and pestilence—or for Communism with peace and security from want. This issue, this choice, is the real meaning of May Day.

UNITED NATIONS TROUBLES RIGHT AND LEFT

(Continued from page 1)

for the handling of the Iranian question. In the American press it was reported that Franco had cleared himself by inviting "friendly" nations to send an investigation commission to Spain to ascertain the truth or falsity of the charges.

In most cases a criminal suspect will not be trusted to have his case investigated by his chosen friends. If the Soviet Union had suggested having the Iranian issue investigated by Soviet friends it would not have been received as a workable procedure.

The question of Spain is not so readily resolved by the American public as was that of the Soviet-

Iranian issue. The Soviet Union had troops in Iran after the agreed date for departure. That was wrong, period. Anything wrong done by America or Great Britain before their troops were withdrawn was not known. To all appearances, the Soviet Union was the sole wrong-doer, and no pressure could be too great to rectify that wrong.

Spain is well known to be a fascist state. There is at least the possibilities that escaped Germans are using that nation, both as a refuge and as a proving ground for new weapons. France, too, is alarmed about Spain. Why shouldn't something be done? This question will not subside so rapid-

(Continued on page 7)

to gain access to the world market. Economic rivalry of course has its "peaceful" aspects but in the course of time the less fortunate capitalist nations arm themselves and make a bid for the world market with open force. Germany made such a bid twice, that she did not succeed is beside the point. The fact remains that "moral force" failed in preventing both world wars. Nor will "moral force" succeed in preventing another world war as long as capitalist remains.

Mr. Lawrence would want us to believe that America would not hesitate to use her military might to preserve world peace, i. e., in defense of the United Nations Charter. There is no doubt that America would not hesitate to use her armed might but only to protect her economic interests and not from any altruistic reasons. American investments in Europe alone amount to well over four billions of dollars as of May, 1943, report of the U. S. Treasury (N. Y. Telegram World Almanac, 1946). In addition there are billions of dollars' worth of American investments throughout the rest of the world.

Now the Second World War has done something to Europe, very detrimental to capitalist investors. A little pitiless publicity on this aspect is in order. True enough, the biggest losers were the capitalists of Nazi Germany and its satellites. But likewise the investments of other capitalists such as American, British, French, etc., are also in jeopardy. Why? Because Europe is moving to the left, toward socialism. The workers of Europe who have rid themselves of fascist capitalist exploiters do not feel inclined to go back under the yoke of "democratic" capitalist exploiters. They show all the indications of being fed up with the evils of capitalist democracy. This movement to the left is taking on the character of land being divided up among the poor

peasants, and factories, etc., nationalized, all without respect to its former owners or investors. Without respect and without compensation to the capitalists, particularly in eastern Europe is this the case. It is very evident that the workers are finally discovering that they are the real producers of wealth, and are therefore in the first stages of taking over the whole works. The European workers are beginning to realize that only in this way will they achieve real democracy.

That the Soviet Union is sympathetic toward this movement to the left and puts no obstacles in its path is very obvious to the whole world. As a result Soviet prestige among the workers of Europe has gone up in direct proportion as American and British prestige has gone down. Is it any wonder, then, that the capitalist press is now frothing at the mouth at this development?

Then there is always the possibility that a similar development might occur in America. So far this has only manifested itself in the recent strike waves, American labor did not go beyond collective bargaining with the capitalist class. The American workers appeared to be contented in winning some concessions from capital without threatening its existence. Be that as it may, not a few workers have already learned that it is through exploitation of wage-labor that all profits are made. This knowledge is growing and as it gains headway, the American workers will learn the latest step of swinging to the left as their European brethren. When that happens the rule of the exploiters will be over, and as for the capitalists, if they want to eat, they will have to work for their living, become real producers instead of parasites.

And as for Mr. Lawrence, he also will be affected, he will have need for a pair of overalls, for his head-fixing days would then be over. Al Wysocki.

PROLETARIAN NEWS

A Journal for the Working Class

Devoted to the Education of Workers and
Their Struggle for Power

Published Monthly by the

Proletarian Party of America

Subscriptions—12 Issues for 50 Cents

Send All Subscriptions, Contributions, Etc., to

PROLETARIAN NEWS

1545 N. Larrabee Street, Chicago, Ill.

SCIENCE AND SUPERSTITION TODAY

It cannot be disputed that in recent years science has made gigantic strides. Just look at what was accomplished during the great war, and in preparation for it. Superstition, as a consequence, met with a corresponding setback, even if there were certain appearances to the contrary.

There has been increased activity on the part of religious institutions. They have participated to a greater extent in national and international affairs, but they are on the defensive.

Every forward step of science, every real increase in knowledge, causes the basis of superstition, the absence of knowledge (ignorance), to shrink. Religion has less ground upon which to stand and is, therefore, forced to yield more and more of its concrete claims, and rely upon wordy abstractions, vaguer, and vaguer generalities. Hazy humbug is often put forth in the name of advancement, new thought, modernism, etc. This is the last resort of organized and institutionalized superstition.

There was a time when the only "explanation" of the world and its ways was a supernatural one. It was to the effect that there exists outside of man and nature, a power above all nature, a supernatural power; a god or gods. The majority of people still believe something of that sort but they are less certain as to its power and its "location." In other words; there is a growing skepticism and, in many cases, complete indifference.

Even the majority of scientists are still in the grip of some form of superstition. Religious people know this and make use of the fact. However, it is not in their own field of science that they hold on to mysticism. There they abandon superstition. But, in a general way, in relation to the world as a whole, many scientists fall back upon the spooks. This is because the average scientist is lacking in knowledge (ignorant), is in fact unscientific in relation to social laws and social affairs generally. He does not understand his social relation to his kind. In the field of history or economics, politics, and the thought process itself, he is either ignorant or highly misinformed. He may be quite scientific, even brilliant in relation to certain material phenomena. In chemistry, geology, astronomy, physics, etc., the scientist is sound, but in social matters he is in a fog and therefore, is obliged to return to the crude "explanations" of our primitive forebears.

To those foggy-minded scientists, the world in general is being directed by a god or a vague abstraction which they call the "higher intelligence." Natural laws, which they exclusively rely upon in their respective branches of science, they abandon in relation to the social field, the field of human affairs, and they fall back upon the supernatural, that there is a "non-material" something, somewhere, somehow, making the works go round.

However, despite this attitude of the scientists, wonderful progress has been made by science in general. Every gain it makes is a loss for superstition. Throughout the world there is arising greater understanding of natural phenomena. The light of science has penetrated into the darkest corners of the earth. Backward peoples have seen and heard doings which they formerly believed to be the exclu-

sive province of the gods. They have heard the voices of men, traveling through space for great distances. They have seen good things made to grow where "god" could not grow grass. These actions of men like themselves have caused them to lose their fear of the fetish, or god, which they formerly called upon for aid.

A native of a primitive community had seen water being purified or turned into ice. He remarked that the "white man's power to do that in a hot climate was greater than that of god who could only do it in a cold climate." We are now living in an age when all sorts of "impossible" things have become possible. Everyday doings, many of which are taken as a matter of course, if men had attempted a few centuries back would have resulted in them being burned at the stake as agents of the "evil one," as doers of "black magic." In this respect, children are now more enlightened than many of the best educated people were a century ago.

Institutionalized religion, after fighting science, tooth and claw, finally was forced to accept its reality, but has sought to evade its results, and where possible to adapt it to its reactionary purposes.

Back of organized religion are the rich, and they need religion, not merely as a solace, to sooth their consciousness of their parasitic lives, but also to befuddle the broad masses and convince them that private property is sacred and should be respected and that hard work and poverty are heaven-imposed virtues, intended exclusively for the working class. Some of the higher paid ministers, the "educated" ones, can make a "brilliant" defense of such humbug.

Not only the preachers, but also the scientists, on the pay roll of the rich, are used to "explain" that science and religion are quite compatible. Science is for the field of the knowable and religion for the field which cannot be understood, is their line. Very plausible, but false nevertheless. Of course, they mean the field which *they* don't understand, or don't want to understand and, moreover, are interested in trying to keep others from understanding.

However, many scientists are honest enough but quite ignorant of the social process. The social sciences are beyond their comprehension. Some even deny the existence of social science, claiming that social phenomena can never be understood and all that is available, so far, in that field are only opinions. They do not see that social evolution is at work. They do not see that the disintegration of the old social order is progressive, a necessary process, paving the way for a newer and higher social order. Thus, some of those who have brought about great changes in certain fields resist all change in the social field. There they are not men of science and progress, but men of superstition and reaction. A few scientists, of course, have accepted the inevitable revolutionary changes now in the making, changes which will put the great masses of common useful people into control of nations.

Superstition is by no means confined to an "explanation" of the workings of nature. It also grips people in relation to the thought process, the nature of the human brain itself. The idealists, and on social questions many good scientists are only empty-headed idealists, regard the source of ideas as a supreme mystery. Even the institutions which employ them, and in which they are actively engaged are also a mystery to them, especially as to their origin and their real function. In this state of confusion on social matters the idealists have to fall back upon their old abstractions, such as "justice," freedom," "right," etc., or to their favorite "all-wise providence," as an "explanation" of what is happening in the world of human affairs. That is why they are de-

fenders of the social status quo, which of course leaves the rich on top of the social heap, and the poor on the bottom.

The main reason for this behavior of the scientists is understandable. Many of them are born into the exploiting class. Their relatives and friends live from the toil and sweat of others, from profit, interest and rent. To them, this is a "natural" state of affairs. The poor are stupid and incapable of running things. The rich are wise and, therefore, run things the only way they can be run, etc. Other scientists, who may have a working class background, are the products of the capitalist class educational system. They are in the grip of prevailing opinions and social traditions, which are basically the opinions of the rich, the ruling class.

Paul Lafargue points out how it is that the ruling class, the capitalists, cannot free themselves from superstition. In his "Social and Philosophical Studies" he says: "The problem of the belief in God on the part of the bourgeoisie can not be approached without an exact notion of the role played by this class in society.

"The social role of the modern bourgeoisie is not to produce wealth, but it is to have it produced by wage workers, to seize upon it and distribute it among its members after having left to its manual and intellectual producers just enough for their nourishment and reproduction.

"The wealth taken away from the laborers forms the booty of the bourgeois class." * * * "The social mission of grasping the wealth produced by the wage workers makes of the bourgeoisie a parasitic class; its members do not contribute to the creation of wealth, with the exception of a few whose number is constantly diminishing, and the labor which they furnish does not correspond to the portion of wealth which falls to them.

"If Christianity, after having been in the first centuries the religion of the mendicant crowds whom the state and the wealthy supported by daily distributions of food, has become that of the bourgeoisie, the parasitic class par-excellence, it is because parasitism is the essence of Christianity.

"Jesus in his sermon on the mount explained its character in a masterly fashion: it is there that he formulates the 'Our Father,' the prayer which every believer must address to God to ask him for his 'daily bread' instead of asking him for work; and in order that no Christian worthy of the name may be tempted to resort to work for obtaining the necessities of life, the Christ adds, 'Consider the birds of the air, they sow not neither do they reap, and your Heavenly Father feedeth them * * * take no thought therefore and do not say, tomorrow what shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewithal shall we be clothed. * * * Your Heavenly Father knoweth that you have need of all these things.' The Heavenly Father of the bourgeoisie is the class of manual and intellectual wage workers; this is the God who provides for all its needs."

The same author points out why the workers tend to be irreligious. "Indifference in religious matters, the most serious symptom of irreligion, to quote Lamennais, is inborn in the modern working class. While the political movements of the bourgeoisie may have taken on a religious or anti-religious form, no inclination can be seen in the Proletariat of the great industries in Europe and America toward elaborating a new religion to replace Christianity, or any desire to reform it." And further he says: "Machine production, which makes the capitalist religious, tends on the contrary to make the proletariat irreligious." * * * "The machine, in spite of its miraculous power and productiveness, has no mystery for him. The laborer in the electric works, who has but to turn a crank on a dial to send miles of motive power to tramways or

Tradition as an Obstacle to Progress

By Robert Daniels

(Continued from April Issue)

But the mode of production does not remain static. Problems of scarcity, drought, famine, dangers from fierce animals, overpopulation, climatic changes, forces man to move about, search, improvise, discover and invent new methods for protection and preservation. Inevitably they come into clash with the conventional methods and traditions. A struggle ensues between the old conservatives and the innovators. The traditionalists fight and resist innovation. "It can't be done," they say, "it's dangerous, suicide, unreliable, contrary to all experience and tradition." They resist, disparage and ridicule the new, and chastise youth for its recklessness. But youth defies tradition, is risky and courageous. It tries the new methods, applies the new discoveries and establishes a higher form of preservation even to the complete destruction of traditional modes, which often are carried over in the new social form, only to completely lose its hold, though stubbornly.

Such has been the relation of tradition to progress in early pre-class times until we reach classical antiquity with its property and class divisions. Here, as later, during feudalism tradition is the reflex of the particular mode of social existence with this special characteristic—it becomes class-tainted. It is no longer a question of preservation of the community as a whole, but the preservation of a special class, the dominant class. Tradition becomes rooted in the material conditions of CLASS rule. It becomes an organized bulwark against any attempts at social change and innovation, labeling such as forces of destruction. But the dynamic forces of production proceed and come into contradiction with the existing order of things. Disintegration and dissolution lead to a struggle between the old and the new. Newly developed classes ride upon the crest of the new production forces to a higher social order over the bodies of the traditional defunct and decayed one.

This is no less true of capitalism than of the previous class societies. Though it has hacked to pieces past traditions, has broken down the walls of seclusion and backwardness the world over in the process of opening up the world market; though it has found it necessary to extend scientific

knowledge beyond the dream of all previous history, it, too, because of its class nature must seek to preserve, must yield to tradition, become conservative, create eternal traditions of its own, capitalist traditions. This explains its compromise with its traditional enemy the church. Not that it needs it any longer to "explain" the mysteries of nature. That science is doing most completely. The capitalist rulers find in religion a useful (to them) moral force for social control over the working people, lest this *puer robustus sed malitiosus* (robust but bad boy) becomes uncontrollable. The tradition of religious belief is an asset to capital by way of preserving order and social harmony. Not even science under capitalism for that matter has escaped completely the traditional force or clinging to accepted theories. Historical screen presentations, such as "Louis Pasteur," a few years back, give the average worker an idea of the stumbling blocks some of our austere scientists societies can put in the way of new scientific theories.

This analysis brings us to the modern American traditions of 1776. Capitalism has thoroughly profaned and exposed the remote traditions as so much hoax and superstition. Thanks to modern science, industry and enlightenment, we no longer believe in wizards, witches, medicine men, or black cats. We now regard the fetish and ancient cults, animal and human sacrifice to appease the god-spirits, as so much ignorance and backwardness. But what has it done but replace those by newer, modern and more abstract fetishes and prejudices? Or by mass human sacrifice before the god, Mammon? No differently than its predecessors it, too, seeks to idealize, and establish its traditions, once non-traditional and revolutionary, as eternal and sacred for all time. Every day, and on special holiday occasions, Americans are reminded to guard these ideals as their sacred heritage, to preserve them as their natural right forever.

When we examine these noble traditions of 1776, of free government, liberty and equality for all, freedom of speech, of press, conscience and religion, we find they are far too abstract or general. In their concrete expression they simmer down to the freedom of free

enterprise and for free enterprise. To the workers these freedoms and their guarantees are meaningless because of their limited and unequal economic condition. Formally they have equal rights, but practically the capitalists enjoy the privileges. At every step, in political, economic and educational matters workers find their freedom of action restricted and repressed by the superior power of privilege. And why? Because there cannot be any genuine equality between the rich and poor. Those who have, control the press, schools, the jobs, factories, wealth and the government. The rich and powerful have the priority and free access to all things. All others must come, hat in hand, and accept what little freedom the political agents of the rich see fit to grant them. Whenever workers protest infringements upon what they conceive are their hereditary democratic rights they are shouted down as subversive elements.

The entire history of American capitalism, the struggle between capital and labor, shows conclusively that its traditions are class traditions, rooted in the material conditions of free enterprise and the domination of capital over labor. What little value there could at one time be attached to the traditional "equality of opportunity" in the earlier days of America has now definitely no basis. With the development of modern large-scale corporations, industry and finance a worker has as much chance to enter the business world successfully as the "sinner to go to heaven." For him "making good," as an individual is a lost art and a fetish which makes him a victim of a delusion. This blinds his perspective of the real forces at work and his own mode of activity. He is chasing the will o' the wisp, looking to the dead past for his inspiration, when he should be looking to the future.

What are these forces? Those same economic or production forces which have underpinned all social movement, creating and up-setting social systems, are now working towards another turning point in history. Capitalism through its own inner laws of competition has now fallen into a state of crisis when it can no longer manage its production machinery. Its mass production is too much for private enterprise to handle without periodical anarchy

and widespread unemployment. Wars of extermination are the only means now of bringing prosperity. The new forces of social production are now fettered by capitalist private appropriation. To release this force from its fetters, social or collective appropriation must be established.

From here on no property class can carry progress forward. That task is the historical mission of labor, the producers themselves. Labor now stands as the non-traditional, revolutionary class fighting for the new against the old, for progress against tradition and preservation. In this effort it must break with all forms of tradition and prejudice, with whatever forces, religious or otherwise, which seek to stay social advance and change. Rather than look to the traditions of Washington, Lincoln and Jefferson—the heroes of the capitalist revolution—it must look for guidance to its own great thinkers, Marx, Engels, Lenin, the traditions of class struggle and science. In place of the reactionary policy "no politics in unions" it must adopt working class political action; in place of capitalist radicalism which keeps labor divided fighting against one another it must weld its ranks into one united whole.

Social change and progress, higher production, greater economic security, class struggle and science must become its watchwords. The old must not be allowed to dominate the present and future, but must be made to give way to them. The capitalist class will naturally fight, with all means, to preserve their traditions and the system that's good to them. The workers in the interest of their own preservation must relegate them to history, advance society another notch to the next stage of social evolution—socialism.

The past has its place in history, in the museum of antiquities. Whatever positive, useful and beautiful, industry, science, art music and literature can be carried over but not in the traditional sense of a *ne plus ultra* beyond which there is no progress. Improvement, addition and modification, extension in knowledge is implicit in social advance. Tradition by looking backward, by seeking to preserve and eternalize the "good" old-fashioned ways, is a retarding force and as Marx said, "The traditions of all past generations weigh like an alp upon the brain of the living."

That alp must be removed.

light to the lamps of a city, has but to say, like the God of Genesis, 'Let there be light,' and there is light. Never sorcery more fantastic was imagined, yet for him this sorcery is a simple and natural thing. He would be greatly surprised if one were to come and tell him that a certain God might, if he chose, stop the machines and extinguish the lights when the electricity had been turned on; he would reply that this anarchistic God would be simply a misplaced gearing or a broken wire, and that it would be very easy for him to seek and to

find this disturbing God. The practice of the modern workshop teaches the wage worker scientific determinism, without his needing to pass through the theoretical study of the sciences."

These rather lengthy quotations from Lafargue are given because they so well describe why the capitalists, and their intellectual servants, the professors, preachers, journalists and politicians, are still in the grip of superstition (more than one kind), while the "uneducated" workers have freed themselves of it, or just

disregard it.

Since Lafargue's time tremendous scientific progress has been made, forcing superstition to shift its ground and disguise its dogmas, but it dies hard. It is fighting for dear life, but will undoubtedly survive, even if badly mauled and mutilated in the struggle, until the economic and social foundation from which it draws sustenance, the parasitic capitalist system, is overthrown by the class historically destined to play that role, the modern wage workers, the proletariat. John Keracher.

HOME SCENE

National Headaches

A monthly review of the nations' condition must include three major problems baffling to the Administration.

The housing shortage is one, still a troublesome child plaguing the Washington master minds. To date all we've had is lots of talk, reminding one of Mark Twain's humorous observation on the weather, "about which everyone talks but no one does anything."

The Administration takes shelter in promises of 2,700,000 homes to veterans in 1947, pending Congressional endorsement. Congress, in its turn, takes refuge in investigations.

Meanwhile pertinent opinions are crowding in from different sources as to the cause of the shortage. "A spot check by the Federal Savings Loan Insurance Corporation in Washington area concludes that out of 46 houses sold, 29 had changed hands within five days at price increases averaging 21 per cent. A house bought a year ago for \$4000 was resold for \$8000." (N. Y. Times, March 31).

A survey made by a housing agency reports that the selling price of houses has gone up nationally 65.1 per cent since 1940.

Douglas Whitlock, representing the Producer Council, Inc., which in turn represents 80 concerns manufacturing building materials and equipment and 20 national trade associations in that field, argued before a Congressional Committee on Housing that: "Low-priced standard grades of certain building materials are not being produced because of unprofitable price ceilings." He continued: "The way to the housing shortage and reduce home prices was to grant 'judicious increases in the ceiling prices.'" (N. Y. Times, March 31st).

At the same hearing, Joseph T. King, counsel for the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, said, "that price adjustments would produce all the building materials needed and would result in lower-cost housing." (N. Y. Times, March 31).

These testimonies would indicate that prices and profits are the bottleneck that the Administration must first break through before any concrete progress in housing may be expected. But how is that to be accomplished? This brings us at once to the heart of problem No. 2—OPA.

A bitter wrangle is now raging in Congress over it. Since the OPA with its price restrictions affects not only building materials and rents but many commodities, food, textiles, etc., it is contended by business interests, N. A. M. and trade organizations that the OPA is basically responsible for much of the current shortages. There's no in-

centive to production, they claim, where allowance is not made for a "fair" profit. On the other hand, consumer and labor organizations interested in low-priced goods rally quickly for the retention of OPA.

Already OPA was dealt a severe jolt when the House passed a resolution limiting OPA's power. What fate holds out for it in the Senate, we don't yet know. But the free enterprise element seems determined and bent upon OPA's liquidation.

While price ceilings are playing havoc upon the circulation of commodities, many of which have almost completely disappeared from the legitimate market. Butter, nylons, building materials and others, too numerous to mention, are almost exclusively circulating in the black market, where the operators are making lush profits.

Butter brings in as high as \$1.00 per pound, nylons 100 per cent over ceiling. Inflation (high prices) is flourishing, though illegally, in contradiction to all OPA's attempts to stem it.

Consumers complain to the point of exasperation—but what about it? Business doesn't recognize human needs other than its own, call it greed, selfishness or what have you.

This threefold problem is an integrated and knotty one. The forces that seek to resolve it are equally bad. What a dilemma!

* * *

Industrial Casualties

The Labor Department reported that in the last three months of 1945, 550 workers were killed and 5,200 were permanently disabled in manufacturing plants. This was an increase over the third quarter of 1945. In addition the total number of accidents from nearly 11,000 manufacturing plants was about 111,000, which was 17,000 less than in the third quarter and 42,000 less than in the 1944 quarter.

These figures would indicate that the overall annual number is alarming, running into tens of thousands dead, and hundreds of thousands, perhaps million, disabled. It is certain that the casualties from industry are a close runnerup to that of war.

The Department attributed the increase in part to reconversion, the shifting of labor to new jobs and the return of veterans. All of which is true.

There is one other factor, the most important, which is generally omitted for reasons of convenience. That is inadequate safety measures. It is known among workers that the lack of essential safety devices is mostly responsible for fatal accidents, as for instance in mines. And why don't the owners provide such safety precautions? Expense is the answer. Devices cost money and cut into profits, this is where

the delicate equation of profits versus human values comes into the picture. Employers deplore accidents, but do little to prevent them.

Labor pays dearly in lives for enduring the profit system.

* * *

Red Threat

Ray T. Miller, of Cleveland, counsel for the Brotherhood of Railroad Locomotive Engineers and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, warned the railroad bosses via a Presidential fact-finding board, that failure to meet the demands for wage increase and working rule changes now would encourage "communist influences" in the labor movement.

That may sound like a good argument but will have little effect upon the capitalists. The railroad magnates are too practical to be intimidated into paying higher wages by a threat of communism. They know their onions too well, chiefly guided in their everyday relations with labor by their immediate material interest, which is profit. That is why they favor lower wages.

Certainly they are concerned with the threat of communism, but what could they do about it? Their very profit system, the economic class relations between capital and labor are the very forces that condition communism.

Miller and his type are misleading the workers and splitting the ranks by raising the red scare. Communists are workers no different than others, with this exception that they not only struggle for the immediate improvement of working conditions within capitalism but for the higher interests of putting an end to exploitation. In that sense the communists are but the advanced section of labor.

* * *

Problems of John Barleycorn

The Government order limiting grain for alcoholic beverages will have a sobering effect upon the "faithfuls" of John Barleycorn, relative to shortages. If previously some shortages were taken with a grain of liquor that may now be out in time. If previously food shortages were palatably swallowed through abundant liquid food that taste may soon vanish. It may be tough enough sledding with food scarcities, but until now it was at least merry for the thirsty. But with the liquor freeze, life is sure to be miserably drier.

Those who, more or less, survived on a liquid diet won't easily take to solids without squirming. The patrons of sourdough are very apt to revive the bootleg days. And they are no negligible number. It is estimated that there are 45 million drinkers consuming to the tune of seven billion dollars annually. That has a lot of influence in more than one way. Not only on the lay member of the venerable order of John Barleycorn but especially

on the business hierarchy. The business may be all wet but the greenbacks in the cash drawer are not. We may yet witness a partial return to the booming 20's.

* * *

Gagged Science

Scientists have learned a whole lot about the atom. They are now learning a thing or two about the "free" nature of our social system, the conditions under which they are working. And they are learning it the hard way through their own experience. Some of them engaged in atomic research have in the past protested against their virtual imprisonment while in the process of their activities. Recently several of the younger scientists have decided to publish some material on the subject of the atom and found that no recognized publisher dared to do so without it first going through the official censorship. Freedom of the press! Freedom of expression! There ain't no such thing, they found out to their great dismay. Well, what about the freedom of science? Certainly it is free as long as it willingly serves freely the special interests of U. S. capitalism. That and no more.

* * *

Making Good

One sub-master in a Boston school works as a bellhop in his spare time at a large hotel. He pretty nearly dropped a tray containing a pitcher of ice-water and some glasses when he answered a call to a room when one of the party was a member of the School Committee.

Another teacher is employed as a uniformed doorman at a hotel. Still another works as night clerk in a hotel.

Such teachers should know now from their own bitter experience how to lecture their students on the art of making good.

* * *

Arbitration—Southern Style

Governor of Virginia, William M. Tuck's method of arbitration in the threatened strike of 1800 workers of the Virginia Electric and Power Company should be an "eye opener" to those boys who went across, purportedly to fight against the system of slave labor.

It is reported about 1000 draft notices on members of the International Brotherhood of Electric Workers, A. F. L., were served with members of the Virginia State Guard serving the papers. The N. Y. Times reports that in many cases the draft notices "were accepted with joking and laughter" and in "a few instances of workers tearing up the notices" soon found the joke on them.

The Governor is sworn in to "take care that the law be faithfully executed." Further, as Governor, the state constitution makes him commander-in-chief of the State's armed forces with

(Continued on page 7)

UNITED NATIONS TROUBLES -- RIGHT AND LEFT

(Continued from page 3)

ly. Various answers are forthcoming. The Spanish people are proud and might resent outside interference, even though they desire a change of government. Such interference might turn them to support of Franco rather than against him. Pressure on Franco from the outside might lead to civil war again, while with patience and non-interference there might be a peaceful solution.

The most straight-forward answer heard, thus far, came from Mr. Vandercook, one of the radio commentators. He said that there is a great doubt if the Spanish people are capable of establishing a democracy such as we know it. The struggle against Franco in Spain might be a struggle, not so much between fascism and democracy as between fascism and communism. Confronted with that situation, it became a question which of the two very undesirable forms we should prefer. And, he added, that as much as we hate fascism we still hate communism more.

There is no doubt that, as far as British and American policy is expressed in international relations, the fear of communism and its spreading is greater than the fear of fascism. For the workers of these countries, however, it is of importance to keep in mind that fascism is capitalism's last stand against workers' rule. When the economic system of capitalism breaks down to the point where the exploited masses cannot be supplied with jobs, and a means of livelihood, these latter will band together for a solution of their own. Fascism then becomes the answer of capitalism. To a capitalist it is much more desirable that the workers should willingly submit to exploitation; but let that willing submission show signs of collapsing, and suppression, fascism, becomes a desirable form.

It is not only the question of Argentine and Spain that is disturbing the U. N. and world tranquility. Now, when the Soviet forces have pulled out of Manchuria that country is in the throes of civil war. General Marshall is back in China to attempt a new bringing together of the contending forces. Commentators have said that Marshall's bringing about the first truce was a minor miracle. If he can do so the second time it will be a major miracle. We may add that even if he succeeds it will still be a truce, and no lasting peace.

In Europe, Portugal is a fascist as Spain. Portugal was doing business with both sides during the war, thus posing as a real neutral. Many, however, were the reports of Portuguese officials support and wish for German victory. Portugal is but a small nation and could be no possible threat to peace, but it joins with Spain and,

as such, could be used as an important base if other sections should develop in the same direction. It is reported that Oliver Salazar, the dictator of Portugal, once he saw the turn of the war, became interested in promoting new friendship with Britain, that he allowed political organizations to form. These rapidly became so popular that martial law had to be declared, and government controlled elections held to reestablish the regular order of things.

We have heard much of the turning to the left, both in Britain and in France. So far, the British "Labor" government has done nothing to really alarm the capitalist class. But we are also told, from different sources, that the British workers are becoming impatient with the government policy, both domestic and foreign.

In France, things are much more unsettled. The three groups having about equal political strength are the Communists, the Socialists, and the Christian Democrats. Thus far, these have pulled along on a basis of truce but are drifting apart. They all are proposing reforms, but the Communists are more definite for labor. The Christian Democrats, under church leadership, want to preserve capitalism, while the Socialists are splitting up, some going with the Communists, the rest supporting the Christian Democrats. The draft of the new constitution is said to have been adopted by joint support of the Communists and most of the Socialists, while the Christian Democrats opposed it.

Meanwhile, France, like the rest of Europe, is drifting in the economic sense. The nation is said to be short of coal to the extent of twenty-five million tons. It has no petroleum to speak of. Its hold on Irak and Syria is not the strongest, while its industries have been slipping behind other nations. The national budget is running in the red, at the rate of 300 billion francs yearly. Commentators will insist that Frenchmen are still individualists who believe in the free enterprise system, but, as one has it, "they have a great desire to eat."

In all of Europe, Germany appears to be the most alarming to the capitalist way of thinking. The London Observer is now quoted as saying: "Another year like the last, another few steps in the course we began at Potsdam and we shall find ourselves faced by a united, Communist, hostile, vindictive Germany, closely linked to a suspicious and perhaps unfriendly Russia."

The British are reported to have invited Karl Schumacher, head of the Social Democratic Party in the British zone of occupation in Germany, to come to England for a discussion with the Labor government officials. A

HOME SCENE

(Continued on page 7)

power to "embody the militia and enforce the execution of laws."

Arbitration with a pointed gun at the worker's back are shades of Hitlerism. Apparently, fascism is not a local infection. Fascist methods are being adopted in the State made famous by Patrick Henry of "Give me liberty or give me death" fame.

* * *

Retooling Boom

While the country is engaged with palpable and immediate eye-catching problems of reconversion, a silent undercurrent, though less spectacular, yet more revolutionary in effect, is proceeding under our very noses.

Reports are current about a boom in the machine-tool industry. Well, what's the alarm? Aren't we assured that booms provide more employment and prosperity? Well, let us see. Metal plants are expected to withdraw 300,000 machine tools from operation in the period from 1945 to 1949. Those withdrawn are to be replaced by the latest and best equipment in order to cut production costs as an offset, they say, to rising labor costs.

It is obvious from this report that the capitalists are meeting the movement for wage increases with practical measures of their own. They are not taking it lying down. This retooling process arising out of business competition, where each capitalist tries

to undersell his competitor by means of lower production costs and prices, acts simultaneously to offset lowered profits through increased production output and a more thorough exploitation of labor.

Lest anyone conclude that the recent wage increases forced upon business through strikes are directly responsible for the introduction of new machinery and technique, we should emphasize that this process is the inevitable resultant of the economic laws of capitalism itself. What the rise in wages has done is merely to accelerate this movement already in motion.

But what is the net effect of new mechanical equipment? By cutting production costs they cheapen commodities in general, especially those entering into the worker's consumption. Eventually that leads to a lowering of the value of the worker's commodity labor-power, his wages. That portion of the working day necessary to reproduce labor's living needs becomes reduced, leaving more of the working day in which he keeps on working for capital, creating profits. Profits are thus increased by reducing necessary labor-time, leaving a greater amount as unpaid labor.

Further, new modern equipment is labor-saving, which means also labor displacing. Fewer workers can turn out more

(Continued on page 8)

resolution was passed in the British parliament urging the government to help the Social Democratic Party.

Times have changed. Once it was that Social Democrats were considered dangerous to capitalism. Now they seem to have become necessary for its preservation.

More trouble to capitalism's smooth sailing is the growing colonial unrest. India wants its release from British rule. Indonesia is fighting for independence. French Indo-China is stirring. Within each of these sections are internal conflict and stirrings by the exploited masses.

It is one thing for capitalists and their supporters to speak of a new era of world peace and prosperity, and quite a different thing to achieve it. As they fail in this latter aspect their talk becomes obnoxious to the ears of the masses. Their attempts at joint action may become more serious but their success will be less likely. They are, first of all, unable to take joint action with the Soviet Union. Their capitalist interests stand in the way of such procedure. They are also unable to take any consistent joint action against the interests of the Soviet Union. Their own economic rivalry prevents that. In like manner, any joint action

by capitalist nations outside of the Soviet Union will also be impossible because of capitalist rivalry.

How far could Germany, Japan or Italy be helped to reestablish their industries before they would again become rivals on the world markets? How long can such nations be policed without stirring new troubles at home, in recruiting or drafting members for the armed forces of occupation, and collecting taxes for their upkeep, and in the occupied nations as well, when the economic functions of the nations are not providing food for the masses.

The present new alarms over hunger, the spread of Communist aspirations everywhere are but new signs of the general trend. No wonder there is eagerness to discredit the Soviet Union. No wonder there is lack of interest in taking action against fascist nations. It all springs from the same source: alarm over the spread of communist and mass activity against hunger and exploitation, on the one hand, and inability to improve the economic situation with anything better than the bitter bread of charity, and too small portions even of that, on the other. The world is on the move, but not through U. N. channels.

MARXISM AND LIBERALISM

By Lewis R. Schultz

Liberals are usually nice, sincere people. They are champions of human rights, and are against those who "push other people around." At the same time they consider the present social system the best of all possible systems, for all its defects. They shudder at revolutionary changes. True, they sometimes whisper of socialism as the next logical step in human progress, but they shrink from any practical activity in bringing it about. Why is this?

The liberal ideology, like any other, has an economic foundation which must not be overlooked. The small-capitalist, "middle class" economic status is the fountainhead of liberalism. The "middle class" has a small stake in capitalism and is always striving, albeit futilely, to acquire a greater stake. As a factor it is growing smaller year by year, as thousands of small businesses fold up and their masters are relegated to the ever-growing ranks of the working class. Torn between the hope of becoming a big capitalist and the fear of being wiped out of business, Mr. "Middle Class" is bound to have, as a rule, a way of thinking that is confused and vacillating. His confused thinking merely reflects his confused condition of life.

It is well to mention here that the conservative or reactionary ideology is the logical one for those whose stake in capitalism is greatest. The wealthy capitalist (the unbrotherly big brother of the small capitalist) whose economic status is the most favorable in society cannot help wishing to conserve the system which guarantees his lush, parasitic mode of life. On the other hand, the wage laborer whose economic status is the least favorable in society must, if he is really conscious of his status, wish to abolish altogether the system which is the cause of his miserable, slavish existence.

American liberals, like John Hyde Preston, Max Lerner, Henry Wallace, Arthur Schlessinger Jr. et al. are ever the targets of the conservatives. Poor, blameless humanitarians that they are, they are kicked around by those whom they actually help the most. For, despite the fact that the liberals vacillate as a general rule, history reveals that they always support big capital against the worker. Theodore Roosevelt, famous for his liberalism as well as the "big stick," frequently used the latter against striking workers. A liberal is merely a proponent of the extension of freedom (as he may define it at any time) within the status quo: he is never a proponent of the abolition of capitalism.

The above-named Preston recently wrote in "PM": "The only alternatives to injustice are com-

promise and revolution, and it is the strength of our democracy that, save for the tragic exception of 1861, compromise has worked—and worked so well that it created our tradition of liberalism."

This is liberalism in all its glory. Liberals, and Preston is typical, prate of "injustice," "liberty," "democracy," etc., as if these concepts were absolute in meaning and fixed for all eternity. But the concepts are relative in meaning and change as society changes. Theodore Roosevelt, doubtless, thought that justice was being served every time a police billy cracked a worker's skull, but the worker's conception of the act was exactly opposite. Capitalist justice is usually injustice to the worker. Capitalist freedom means slavery for the worker. Capitalist democracy means dictatorship to the worker. Thus, these concepts have a class character which cannot be understood by liberals who love to compromise and to shun reality.

Preston sees nothing save tragedy in something like the Civil War. He does not see that under certain circumstances compromise is impossible. No compromise was possible, for instance, between chattel slavery in the South and industrial capitalism in the North. The two an-

tagonistic economic systems could not exist side by side. But to the liberal half a slave is better than one. Liberals wish to improve the conditions of slavery without abolishing it; and their attitude toward wage-slavery is no different than their attitude was toward chattel-slavery.

Arthur M. Schlessinger Jr., in his book "The Age of Jackson," says: "The object of liberalism has never been to destroy capitalism, as conservatism invariably claims—only to keep the capitalists from destroying it." Here we have the simple truth. The liberal, at bottom, is but a reactionary. Many workers are continually being deceived by these people who seem at times to be so militant, so progressive.

To liberals all governments appear the same, in the sense that any government can, in some mysterious manner, be brought by pressure of public opinion to bring an end to poverty, unemployment, and war. Liberals support whatever regime is in power, for it is not their nature to be revolutionary. They are always critical, but they stop at criticism. They are not scientific in their approach to anything. They make no distinctions between working-class governments (in the Soviet Union) and capitalist-class governments (in England, America, etc.). Government, to the liberals, is something that has arisen as a result of the

will of a majority of the people. To the Marxist, on the contrary, all governments have a class character. Any government that ever existed was and is the instrument of coercion. Under capitalism, the government is the instrument of coercion of the capitalist class, and it is the working class which is coerced and oppressed. Furthermore, a capitalist government, unlike a working-class government, cannot help being the government of a few over the many.

The essence of liberalism is reformism. This reformism emphasizes moral principles (and present-day, hypocritical capitalistic morals at that) over scientific analysis. But what lies at the basis of present-day morality except the system of exploitation of man by man? The morals of our day are the camouflage of the dog-eat-dog way of life. Brotherly love is impossible so long as cash is the sole nexus between man and man.

The Marxist, unlike the liberal, cannot compromise with capitalism. It is not primarily on moral grounds that he assails this system, but rather on scientific grounds. To be sure, from the standpoint of the class-conscious worker capitalism is truly evil and immoral, but of more importance is the fact that Marx and his successors have proven scientifically that capitalism does not work in the interests of the majority.

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

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 7)

goods in a given time. Workers can expect a growth in employment. Competition for jobs becomes keener with a consequent further reduction in wages.

Machinery is not intended to lighten labor's burden; it is a capitalist lever for greater profits, a lever whereby labor's gains are nullified in the process. Is that an argument against workers striving for higher wages, however temporary such gains may be? No. We merely should be clear, that labor's gains under capitalism can never be permanently secured.

But this also has its effects upon the machine owners and their economy in general. Improved tools increase the output of goods which in due time outrun the market capacity. Overproduction follows. Factories shut down. The workers walk the streets hungry because they have produced too much. Crises set in. Such are the ultimate results of machine development under capitalism.

Though, immediately, retooling may net bigger profits to business, though the workers may even retain some of the benefits of increased wages for awhile, in time the effect takes its toll first upon the workers, then upon the system as a whole.

L. B.