

PROLETARIAN NEWS



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

A JOURNAL FOR THE WORKING CLASS

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE PROLETARIAN PARTY OF AMERICA

Vol. XXVII, No. 8, Whole No. 304

Chicago, Ill., August 1958



Price 10c a Copy

BACKING ANOTHER DARK HORSE

The Eisenhower doctrine (seems every president should have a doctrine these days) has backfired once again. This time the trouble is coming out of Lebanon. The U.S. Marines were sent there when the pro-West government of President Camille Chamoun found itself in a difficult situation, as most governments do when they lose support of their population.

However, Chamoun's plight is minor compared to the U.S. position. The Eisenhower Doctrine commits this country to support any pro-West government in the Middle East as being a "good" government, by force if necessary. This brilliant strategy was formed on the assumption that the only anti-West government would be a pro-Soviet government.

But now the U.S. State Department is faced with the horrible fact that opposition to Chamoun's government includes not only Nasser supporters but religious groups, personal rivals, various political factions, tribes with strong national feelings, etc. However much they might disagree with each other on the many issues confronting their small nation, they are opposed to the occupation of their country by the U.S. armed forces.

That they found this common bond in the moment of crisis makes it very difficult for Uncle Sam to decide what to do. If there ever was an internal affair to be settled by the people of Lebanon themselves, this is it. Trouble is, everyone knows that (except Eisenhower, Dulles, Wall Street and Co.), so here is the U.S. holding a wet paper bag again. One wonders if Uncle Sam is waiting to get that hint so frequently voiced by the exploited of the "underdeveloped" countries: "YANKS GO HOME."

It was just a small clique of political henchmen headed by President Chamoun of Lebanon whose call for help brought American marines ashore on the beaches near Beirut. Chamoun's term as President expires Sept. 24 and because the Lebanese constitution forbids a second term, he wanted to amend it so as to succeed himself for another six years as President. It was this that sparked the so-called civil war in Lebanon. It was a case of adding "insult to injury" in view of the many griev-

ances the masses were suffering from.

Not only are the masses opposed to Chamoun in the main, but also it was reported that the majority of the parliament of Lebanon was opposed to him, as we gather from the following report:

"Speaker Adel Asseyran, whose past record aligned him with the West, took the drastic step of calling a protest to President Eisenhower and to the U.N. Security Council. Another pro-Western leader, Emile Bustani, a member of the foreign affairs committee,

(Continued on page 2)

HOME SCENE

Multi-Millionaires in Politics

With the announcement of Nelson A. Rockefeller, grandson of the founder of the nation's first oil dynasty, as a candidate for Republican Party nomination for governor of New York state, the voters of the most populous state may have a choice for governor between two multi-millionaires. The incumbent governor of that state, W. Averell Harriman, Democrat, son of a famous railroad tycoon, is expected to run for reelection. Both men are up to their ears in ready cash and it should be a jingling campaign.

It is interesting to note, that of late, there has been a revival of gentlemen-of-means in politics: amongst the Republicans, Herter, Lodge, Saltonstall of Massachusetts and young Freylinghuysen of New Jersey, while amongst the Democrats, such as G. Mennon Williams, Jack Kennedy, Adlai Stevenson, Joseph S. Clark, William Fulbright and others have been drawn into the political arena.

Some of the founding fathers of the country, who played a prominent role in its formation, such as John Hancock, George Washington and Charles Carroll, were some of the wealthiest men in the colonies. The rich men of the new-found nation met in secret and drew up the U.S. Constitution. The first president-elect, Washington, was said to be the richest man of the country at that time, according to historian Charles Beard. For some time thereafter, the aristocracy of wealth took a prominent and direct part in politics.

But with the commencement of

MORALITY AND ITS BASIS

Every few years there take place investigations in Washington, D.C. which suggest scandal and cause political embarrassment to the existing administration. Under Harding in the 20's it was the Teapot Dome scandal; under Truman it was the General Vaughn affair; now under Eisenhower it is the Sherman Adams case.

The dirt unearthed is designed specifically for political reasons, with an eye to the coming elections. Such exposures are calculated to weaken the political and moral standing of the party that's in. Out of which the opposition

hopes and stands to cash in. Needless to add neither the Democratic or Republican party is free from scandalous episodes. Both are full of them, known and mostly unknown.

In this writing we are not interested so much in the Sherman Adams case per se, its many details, pro and con, its moral aspect. That is a separate and contradictory treatment which is amply reported in the daily capitalist press for those who want to follow it.

An even more important matter is to discuss and try to understand the basis for this contradictory moral aspect, or the ethics of the matter. Our starting point, therefore, is morality in general, the stuff it is made of.

What is moral or immoral is very much debatable. There prevails little unanimity and much difference. What some consider right and just, others consider wrong and unjust.

Different nations have varying concepts and standards of morality, depending upon their state of social development and gradation. For instance, in modern so-called western civilized nations (capitalist), such as the U.S., Britain, Germany, France, etc. there obtains a moral standard that more or less coincides. In another category we might place the peoples of the Near East with a differing standard. In the third category there are peoples, say in Africa and other remote parts of the world who are completely backward, and who still hark back to a primitive, non-civilized way of life. Their morals are equally primitive, vastly differing from ours. Then there are the new nations of socialism with a brand new way of life and morality. Again, even within the nation, wherever there is private property and class composition, there exists a dual standard, (even though not formally recognized) one for the rich and another for the poor.

How do we explain these differences and variations? Some will contend, the others are all wrong and we are right. The proponents of western civilization (capitalist) will assert, "we represent the highest form of ethics desirable and possible, to which the rest have yet to evolve, because of their

On top of all the above internal political problems, the big wheels of industry and politics are face to face with continuous dangerous international problems. How to reconcile the rivalry and conflicting

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued on page 2)

MORALITY AND ITS BASIS

(Continued from Page 1)

backwardness." In their thinking morality is either more or less bound up with religion, namely, is of divine origin, absolute and eternally fixed; or else it is innate, inborn. In other words, humans are either born with a sense of good or evil within them. This point of view rejects the force of environment, the influence of the conditions of social life upon the individual and his behavior. It follows from this that the non-religious are completely incapable of a good moral life. It also fails to explain why so many people, professedly religious, fill the penitentiaries and generally indulge in practices that are even contrary to their own capitalist morals.

But it still fails to explain what is good and moral and what is not and WHY?

Let us proceed from a totally different premise which rejects both theses of divine and innate origin. It is that of the school of materialism. We are aware that some people have an abhorrence for the term "materialism." That is because they don't understand its real, philosophical connotation. To them, materialism is associated with the meaning of vulgar, selfish. That there is vulgarity, selfishness and greed, throughout the world, there is no denying. But where else can more be found to exist and practiced than among the God-fearing and loving capitalist businessmen?

Materialism in its scientific and philosophical sense simply means this:—that the material world and all its phenomena is the all-existing and fundamental reality. It is the origin and end of everything, including man and his ideas. From this standpoint, matter is primary, mind and morals, secondary. All human ideas, consciousness, have a worldly origin, are a reflection of the every-changing worldly process. Matter is in constant flux, so is man and his ideology ever changing, ever reflecting it. It is all a never ending evolutionary process.

It can reasonably be stated that morals or ethics are a HUMAN matter, a social institution. Inanimate matter certainly possesses none. But even in the animate kingdom, say among the highest types of animals, dogs, elephants, monkeys, there is little indication that they have the degree of social organization or are endowed with a conscience. To be sure they have consciousness, but even that in a low stage of development nowhere nearly approximating the human. The difference between animal and human consciousness is a QUALITATIVE one. With the former, consciousness or thinking is impulsive; the latter (human) is capable of reflecting, generalizing, formulating theories, inventing tools etc.

Consciousness is the faculty of thinking, of ideas. Conscience has

to do with a PARTICULAR kind of idea and feelings, what might be called a moral attitude, a reasoning of what is right and wrong, good and evil.

When it is said, that so-and-so has a conscience, or a guilty conscience, it is meant that that person has a definite sense, a conviction of right and wrong.

Morality, as a human institution in no way differs from other institutions, economic, political, philosophy, art, science. It varies and changes with the times and social conditions. It is determined as all other institutions by changes in the material conditions of life. It is determined largely by material need, individual as well as group. Naturally, individual need at times dictated an action contrary to the welfare of the group, be it a primitive tribe or the modern state or nation. In that event his morals or concept of it clashed with the existing and collective morality. Punishment was usually meted out accordingly. The point is that in either case the morality of the matter was determined by material circumstance and need, individual as well as social.

Changes in the material conditions of life, produced by progress in the economic field is what constitutes human or social evolution. Where the production arts are primitive, the entire social organization, religion, art and morality are correspondingly primitive. The higher up we go, the more advanced the production technique, the more nearly it approximates and resembles modern capitalist institutions and ethics.

The economic base, the mode of production and appropriation, is where we seek and find the explanation for the morals and the contradictions between them. It is here that the answer is found in the conflicting concept of the feudal nobility with its "divine rights of kings" and the capitalistic concept of reign of reason.

Feudalism rested on the exploitation of peasants and serfs, on restricted competition in its guild-system. Capitalism exploits people differently, thru the "free" wage system and an open, free competitive market. What was right and useful (to the ruling class) under feudalism was wrong to rising capitalism. Earlier, under capitalism, monopolies and trusts were looked at askance; today they are morally accepted. Large corporation capital is so dominant today that the economy couldn't function without it. It is here to stay and is morally justified on the grounds of economic need.

We said above that material need was the basis for individual as well as group morality. That takes on a modification with the rise of private property and class divisions in society. Commencing with the civilization of old, such as Babylon, Egypt, Greece, Rome, etc. right down thru medieval

BACKING ANOTHER DARK HORSE

(Continued from page 1)

told the Associated Press in Beirut that he could count only 26 of the 66 members of Parliament who supported Chamoun's call for troops." (Chicago Sun-Times, July 18).

It is becoming ever more evident that Eisenhower's backing of such a "dark horse" as Chamoun was a political gamble that is not paying off so well. But in view of the Lebanese parliamentary opposition, which could result in them picking a "successor" for President other than Chamoun, it would put the Eisenhower administration on the proverbial spot, that is, in a position of ridicule throughout the world.

Thus the United States would become the laughing stock among all the nations, a most unenviable

position indeed! And for this, the American citizens could "thank" not only their Republican "leaders" but also their Democratic "leaders" (Senators and Representatives) who supported the Eisenhower, Dulles, Wall Street plan of an armed, direct, intervention of Lebanon.

Opposition to the U.S. intervention of Lebanon was voiced by Sweden and Japan, and quite a number of other members of the United Nations, who could not be considered "pro-Soviet."

In the British House of Commons opposition to Macmillan's intervention in Jordan (another backing of a "dark horse," King Hussein) developed, with 251 members, mainly laborites, voting against 314 conservative members who supported Macmillan. L.D.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from Page 1)

national material interests of the world capitalist powers would tax the wisdom of a Solomon, let alone a Dulles. Such capitalist rivalry has led to two World Wars within memory of adults. It also helped to spark the uprising of Russian, Chinese and other workers to establish their own rule and order—communism. Now the challenge of this new order, this new way of life, socialism or communism, to capitalism is beyond their political sagacity to fathom.

It is any wonder that the party hacks are being relegated to a back seat or at best to a town seat, while the scions of wealth reach out and contend for the mantle of political leadership? The Roose-

feudalism up to and including modern capitalism society has been divided into classes, masters and slaves, noblemen and serfs, capitalists and proletarians (wage-workers).

This class division gave rise to a dual morality, that of the ruling class, on the one hand, and the subject class on the other. Despite and within this duality there nevertheless existed a unity. This unity was superimposed upon the given society by the ruling class. In each case the dominant and official morality was that of the wealthy and influential. Whatever was and is in the material interest of the rich and dominant class carries the stamp of official morality. It is a CLASS morality. Unofficially, the exploited masses always felt differently, bore opposite attitudes on social matters, the right and wrong of things.

One can see how ruling class morality works contradictorily. It extols the commandment "thou shalt not steal." That concept is dictated by its property interest. It is calculated to reinforce morally the propertyless against appropriating or trespassing any of the rights of private property holders. But does that same moral principle apply the other way

velts, Harrimans, Achesons of the Democrats and Rockefellers, Herters, Lodges amongst the Republicans have a job on their hands to uphold and try to protect the rich capitalist system, which is so good to their class and breed. They are showing a personal interest in their political affairs. They are taking a direct step in the control of politics.

That should make it easier for the workers to understand the elementary facts of life. The Harrimans and Rockefellers are not of the workers' breed or class. The interest and welfare of the rich are in direct opposition to the workers. The advancement of labor rests with themselves and themselves only. L.B.

around? Indeed no! The capitalist ruling class is appropriating daily the fruits of another's labor. That's stealing, in effect. But capitalist class morality says no, that's not stealing, that's business. Those who invest capital have a right, (their own legalized moral right) to a return on their investment.

When the communists proclaim that in the socialist revolution the workers will confiscate all major private industries and transform them to collective and social ownership, the capitalist let out a hysterical howl, "it is anarchy, immoral!" But when these same gentlemen walked into other peoples' countries, seized their territories, by force, chicanery and bribery, that was not confiscation or immoral, no! That was the "white man's burden," it was his (the capitalist) "moral" duty to civilize those backward peoples, save them from ignorance. There was no material interest, of greed and selfishness involved there! No. It was a moral obligation. That's how class morals work. When the factory owners shut a plant down to teach the workers a lesson in behavior, to starve them into submission, that's all right. But it's flouting proper behavior when workers

(Continued on page 4)

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 \$1.00
Send All Subscriptions, Contributions, Etc., to
PROLETARIAN NEWS
333 W. North Avenue, Chicago 10, Illinois

Ike's Mid-East Police Action

Not so long ago President Eisenhower was proclaimed by his admirers as being the great leader who brought peace to the nation by ending the Korean War. For this, they said, he would be long remembered in history.

But times have changed since then, and some say, the man also. This time, by ordering direct intervention, that is, the sending of an armed force into Lebanon (the U.S. Marines on July 15th), Eisenhower may go down in history as the President who started a bigger war than his predecessor, Truman. Already the armed intervention is being called "Ike's Mid-East Police Action."

It is remarkable how quickly President Eisenhower carried out the orders of Wall Street, for, in effect, that's what it amounts to. He not only bypassed the United Nations, but, dictatorially, the U.S. Congress itself. **There was no vote at all taken on the issue.**

It was reported in the press that only twenty-two Senators and Representatives were called to the White House to hear the President announce his decision to intervene by force. When one of them posed the question whether the U.S. might become involved in an authentic civil war in Lebanon, Eisenhower was reported to have replied impatiently that the revolts were "Moscow inspired." When two of the Democratic Senators questioned whether the Eisenhower Doctrine was applicable, Dulles was reported to have retorted that "international communism had inspired the revolt in Lebanon."

In spite of the smell of oil about the whole issue, it was apparent that the Senators and Representatives swallowed the glib tales about the "communist bogeyman" dished out to them by Eisenhower, Dulles and Co. But it is not to be wondered; it's a steady diet they have been fed with right along, and for that matter, so has the whole nation.

Eisenhower also broadcast similar tales to the U.S. armed forces in Lebanon. He said to the thousands of marines stationed there: "You are helping the Lebanese to remain free. You are there at their invitation—as friends—to preserve for them the same freedoms that we have here at home." (It is not known whether any of the marines replied that they had heard that one before.)

Oil Politics

Encouraged by the American armed intervention in Lebanon, the British, by now much alarmed over possible loss of their oil interests, sent their troops to Jordan to prop up the tottering regime of King Hussein which stood in danger of being liquidated like that of his cousin, King Faisal, in Iraq.

American interests, such as Standard Oil of New Jersey, have also many millions of dollars worth of investments in oil wells and refineries in the Middle East (in Iraq, Saudi-Arabia, etc.).

This fact has been given quite a bit of publicity in the press, lately; possibly because it's so obvious, that there is no need to suppress or conceal it. Furthermore, "foreign investments" are an accepted "business way of life."

But to foster the pretense that the U.S. Marines were sent to the Lebanese to "preserve their freedoms" was too much for some of the American journalists and editors to stomach.

One of them, John S. Knight, in his editorial

in the Chicago Daily News (July 19) entitled "We're Again Risking War for Unattainable Goals," in an angry retort declared as follows:

"The presence of British troops in Jordan reinforces the view that while we may profess the noblest of intentions about preserving the independence and integrity of pro-Western nations in the Middle East, we really mean to save the oil fields for the West."

Mr. Knight poses some very important questions towards the conclusion of his editorial, to wit:

"Even in the event that we are able to avoid war, will anything have been settled permanently by our intervention?"

"Will the presence of American and British troops in the Middle East diminish the growing nationalism or retard the ambitions of the Arab world?"

Mr. Knight declared that the answers to these questions are "fairly obvious" to him, but they "are not the conclusions being reached by the President, Mr. Dulles and the leaders of our two major political parties."

He deplores the policy of the past, that of buying "friends in the Middle East with our (American) dollars," that it has proved to be a "failure," and this was "indicated by the violent revolution in Iraq—a country helped substantially by the United States and Great Britain and long considered a powerful friend of the West."

Mr. Knight ends his editorial with these ominous words:

"Having embarked upon another perilous adventure, Mr. Eisenhower will need all of his fabulous luck to pull us through with a whole skin."

The Tax Burden

The fear of another world war is not the only reason why Mr. Knight is opposed to the U.S. armed intervention in the Middle East. There is the tax burden which is bound to become heavier the more involved that the U.S. becomes in Eisenhower's "perilous adventure."

Mr. Knight would have to pay his share of the increased taxes to the government, without any recompense to him. It so happens he has no investments abroad that need "protection" such as Standard Oil's. Mr. Knight's "business holdings," mainly connected with newspaper publishing, are within the United States, at "home." So it's natural for him to criticize and condemn Eisenhower's (that is, Wall Street's) policy toward the Middle-East. Mr. Knight actually represents a considerable section of the capitalists that have been more or less lumped together under the term of "isolationists."

Nevertheless, many workers would be inclined to sympathize with Mr. Knight on the score of increased taxes, even though "Ike's Mid-East Police Action" might result in a return of prosperity with jobs for the unemployed, albeit profits for the big capitalists. The government is already chiseling on the wages of the workers through the "income tax" to a considerable extent, thus reducing their "take-home pay." And there is even less recompense for them than for Mr. Knight.

Workers do not own any "businesses," either at home or abroad. In fact, they do not even own "their" jobs, for which they do not get any "protection" at all from the government; as the unemployed can testify, who at present number well over 5 million workers.

During the period of war and post-war prosperity (the 1940's and '50's) the workers had steady jobs in the main. But when slack times came, as in the present business recession, many of them were laid off. Neither the government nor the labor unions could prevent unemployment, such being the nature of the "free-enterprise system," capitalism.

This is something that Mr. Eisenhower failed

to tell the U.S. Marines when he said they have been sent "to preserve" for the Lebanese the "same freedoms that we have here at home."

What kind of "freedoms" do we have "at home"? They are as follows: Freedom for the capitalists to profit through the exploitation of wage-labor. Freedom for the capitalist employers to hire whom they please, and fire the workers at will when they have already used them up and can no longer profitably exploit them. As we can see, it is actually capitalist freedom.

As for the workers, it was summed up by one of the jobless: "I am a free American ex-laborer, that is, free of my job, and if I don't get another one soon, and exhaust my unemployment compensation, I will be free to starve."

Cause of Arab Revolts

What is the actual cause of the revolts that occurred in Lebanon and in Iraq? Is rebellion an inherent characteristic of the Arabian people, as some would imply?

We will answer that at once. Rebellion is no more, or less, inherent in the Arabians than it is in any other people, including the American. The real cause of the revolts there is mainly economic and political. As a matter of fact, the toiling masses have been subjected for many centuries to exploitation by foreign powers and native exploiters. This is the "fuel" that feeds the revolts, including the "aggressive nationalism" of President Nasser of Egypt. The masses are stirring and the native rulers must do something.

British, French and American imperial capitalists, in their greed for profit, had monopolized the main resources of the Middle East, particularly oil. And having geared European industry to the use of this oil, they are now in the sorry plight of coming to terms (less profitable to them than in the past) with this "aggressive nationalism" of the Arabian countries.

The British and French imperialists had already experienced severe "losses"; to cite one of the latest, that of the Suez Canal, taken over by Egypt. They still feel angry, not only at the Egyptians but also at the U. S. for having stymied their attempt (invasion) to retrieve that loss.

Now the British and French are ironically gleeful, at seeing their ally, the U.S., attempting the same in the case of Lebanon, the imperial invasion by the U.S. Marines.

It was not only the "rebels" who were against the occupation of their country (Lebanon) by the U.S. Marines, but also around two-thirds, a majority, of the Lebanese parliament were against President Chamoun's call for the troops. In fact, Chamoun is regarded by the masses of his own nation as just a stooge of the imperial powers, Britain, France and the United States.

The move against the imperialists in Iraq physically eliminated the so-called "pro-Western" regime of King Faisal. In its place a "rebel" government is now functioning. It is not communist, but nationalist, similar to Nasser's regime in Egypt. It was this Iraq revolt that precipitated "Ike's Mid-East Police Action."

The Soviet Union denounced the U.S.-British armed intervention in the Middle East and warned that the world is now "on the brink of catastrophe," and demanded an immediate "summit" meeting, of the heads of the Soviet Union, the U.S., Britain, France, India, and the U.N. secretary-general "to take measures to curb the starting military conflict." Whether such a meeting will put an end to the U.S.-British imperial invasion of the Middle East no one dares to predict.

Al Wysocki

IMPRUDENT WASHINGTON D.C.

Sherman Adams, Presidential assistant, said to be the second most powerful man in Washington next to the President himself, who exercises Presidential powers, particularly since Eisenhower's illnesses, admitted "imprudence" before a Congressional Committee, investigating the handshaking Bernard Goldfine, a textile tycoon. The prudent President Eisenhower, whose supporting cast are expected to be as "clean as a hound's tooth," who has in the past threatened to throw out any officeholder guilty of unethical practices, also admitted the "imprudence" of Adams, but said: "I need him."

When the Democrats were in control in Washington, imprudently sporting around in mink coats and such, they were charged with corruption by the Republicans. Now the tables have been turned, as the Republicans sport their vicuna coats, with the Democrats shouting corruption against their political adversary. When the Republicans are caught with the "goods" they admit "imprudence," not corruption, nothing like that! When their political twin-brother, the Democrats, are caught in the act, then it is sure to be corruption, in their eyes. The same is true about the Democrats. They may

admit from time to time acts of indiscretion but never, never, corruption practices. The fact of the matter is: that political corruption is the accepted thing, not at all shocking to the American people. Should a capitalist politician be found to be untouchable, "a square," that would be shocking to the man on the street.

The bizarre antics in the investigation of the Adams-Goldfine affair, such as stolen papers and hidden microphones, may sidetrack some viewers; however, the disclosures already reveal valuable lessons, to wit:

1. The relation between business and government is close. The government in Washington was founded by the PROPERTY OWNING CLASS of the nation. The powerful merchant class of the colonial period were succeeded by the growing industrialists of the last century, who were in turn succeeded by the banking capitalists of this era. But they are all of the propertied element, different sections, but capitalist to the core. These were organized and have control of the affairs of government ever since. The institution and officeholders of government are essentially the instrument and servant of the dominant class in the country—under capitalism—

the rich capitalist class.

That there is an intimate relationship between Goldfine and Adams is nothing to be wondered at. Why not? Goldfine, or any other capitalist for that matter, uses or needs Adams or some other politician for some deal, fair or foul. "Business is business," as the saying goes; the dollar is green in any circumstances. The government and its officeholders stands to uphold the rule of the capitalist class and to facilitate their business. The ethics in the jungle struggle of capitalism is unimportant, as long as you have it (wealth).

We mentioned above the role of the government to uphold the rule of the capitalist class. That is its most important function. That is very obvious when the working class finds itself in strike action against the capitalist class. The government and its enforcement arm, the police, are generally aligned against labor. It is the laborer who gets clubbed.

2. Modern Capitalism: "The government that governs the least governs the best" was the ideal state in early capitalism. Business was young and growing, simple; so too was government, small and its rules and regulations simple. Today, business is monopolized, complex in nature, with worldwide interests, old with compli-

resolution calling for an end of all nuclear weapons testing. At their annual reunion they also urged the U.S. to take militant leadership in an effort to end war tensions and halt the "mad, bankrupting arms race."

It's like a refreshing breeze to hear of a Veterans Organization, no matter of what vintage, or size, taking a position that did not reflect unflinching support of whatever the most reactionary political leaders stand for.

BIG BROTHER AGAIN? Another report of the U.S. capital pouring into the promised land of Australia. New York and California investors are pumping millions of dollars into building projects "down-under." One of the projects is a \$21,600,000 group of apartments in Melbourne—said to be the largest single apartment de-

veloped problems. So, its instrument, the government, is giant size, with all kinds of laws and regulations governing all sorts of relations, attempting to solve all kinds of complications. The affairs of businessmen with government and the reverse, are more closely interwoven than ever before. The early ideal state is dead. Businessmen and government officials are in intimate contact. The opportunity for imprudence, favors, corruption, etc. are greater than ever. When the lid blows off, such as in the Adams-Goldfine affair, we get a glimpse and only a glimpse of the "virtuous lady," capitalism.

3. Capitalism and corruption: The motive, the aim of business is profits. Profits are made thru the exploitation of labor. The difference between what labor gets, wages, and what it produces is the source of profits. That is legalized robbery. However, in their thirst for profits, the capitalists have and do engage in unethical and illegal practices, such as misleading labels, adulteration of goods and conniving with politicians for business gain in one form or another. The nature of capitalism is to get something for little or next to nothing, hence corruption goes hand in hand with the system. That is inherent and can only be eradicated with the end of the exploiting, corrupt system. L.B.

velopment in the world.

We like to keep our readers informed on such matters in order to prepare them for future discussions they might have to make about the intentions of any U.S. support of Australia. If and when the Australian working class gets fed up with their system of "free" economy and demands a change we can be sure Uncle Sam will be right there to fight for that "free" economy. That is, the "freedom" to invest and to exploit the people of Australia under whatever reactionary government is necessary. So when the U.S. fleet is called upon to sail "close in" around Australia in the event of trouble with the friendly government you will remember those apartment buildings and wonder if the intentions are honorable. It's been happening almost everywhere else in the world, why not Australia? L.D.

A LOOK AROUND

BRITAIN'S CYPRUS PROBLEM: If the British have their way the Greeks and Turks on the island of Cyprus are going to join in a "partnership" with their benevolent Colonial rulers whether they like it or not.

Greek Prime Minister Constantine Karamoulis said, in rejecting the plan for a seven year partnership, he hoped the British would and could come up with something more satisfactory to solve the crisis now, not seven years from now.

Sharing of sovereignty of the crown colony with Greece and Turkey after seven years of joint administration apparently left the

Greeks and Turks cold and unhappy. However, the British let it be known they intend to go ahead with the plans anyway as the only means of preventing "dreadful catastrophe." Sir Hugh Foot, governor of the crown colony said Britain would not be deterred by "violence, opposition or temporary setback." Seems to us the above statement spells "dreadful catastrophe" anyway you look at it—at least for the British rulers.

A DIM LIGHT: A flicker of hope appeared in the press recently when it was reported the 329th Field Artillery Veterans Association of World War I adopted a

GET A BOOK FREE

If you send One Dollar for a year's subscription to the PROLETARIAN NEWS (333 W. North Avenue, Chicago, Ill.) you can have any one of the following books free. \$2.00 for a two years' subscription entitles you to pamphlets to the value of 50 cents. Postage paid.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO, by Marx and Engels.....	25c
WAGE-LABOR AND CAPITAL, by Karl Marx.....	25c
MONEY AND MONEY REFORMS, by Christ Jelset.....	25c
CRIME, ITS CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES, by John Keracher.....	15c
HOW THE GODS WERE MADE, by John Keracher.....	25c
WAGES AND THE WORKING DAY, by John Keracher.....	15c
ECONOMICS FOR BEGINNERS, by John Keracher.....	10c
PRODUCERS AND PARASITES, by John Keracher.....	10c
WHY UNEMPLOYMENT, by John Keracher.....	10c
FREDERICK ENGELS, by John Keracher.....	25c
THE HEAD-FIXING INDUSTRY by John Keracher.....	30c

Send me PROLETARIAN NEWS for a period of.....

....., for which I here enclose \$.....

Also send me the book (or books) which I have marked.....

Subscriber's Name.....

Address.....

City..... Zone..... State.....

MORALITY AND ITS BASIS

(Continued from page 2)

strike at a propitious time tying business up in a knot.

So it is with killing and war. Killing is immoral except when it is done on a large and business scale and pays off. When the economic interests of any capitalist nation or nations suggest war as a means of acquiring what they are after, mass-killing becomes morally justified under diverse slogans and pretexts, self-defense or in defense of freedom and democracy, or protecting some "poor" little defenseless democratic nation etc.

The workers also have a class morality, proletarian morality. Its

content is also a material one. That which corresponds and advances the material interests of the workers as a class is moral. If it clashes with the official capitalist morality, it is not of their own choosing. Its inevitability stems from the class and economic division in society and inherent in it.

We will say with Engels that "A really human morality standing above class antagonisms and the memory thereof, will first be possible in a stage of society in which class antagonisms have been surmounted and, in practical life, also forgotten." (Anti-Duhring, page 94) R. Daniels