

# 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. 10, Whole No. 306

Chicago, Ill., October 1958

Price 10c a Copy

## POLITICAL CREDO OF A LABOR ORGANIZER

To apologize for and distort the real relations between capital and labor is a frequent and effective practice of capitalist ideologists. This is not unexpected, and a disgusting enough procedure. It is doubly revolting, however, when it comes out of the mouths of "labor" men, so-called, especially from those with a socialist background. Walter Reuther, head of the automobile workers union, was once, in the turbulent depression 30's, of socialist conviction. It seems tho, that few can rise in influence in the trade-union movement and still retain their socialist faith. Success, and the monetary achievement that goes with it, has a way of going to men's heads, turning them upside down, causing them to forget what they once knew and believed in. Manifestly Reuther, too, succumbed to this mortal weakness. Concomitantly with the rise of his star he shed his socialist convictions, one by one, so that now he is a full-fledged member of the "bourgeois apologetic society."

It is the typical mark of an OPPORTUNIST to adjust his thinking, to abandon principle, in accordance with convenience as dictated by material, practical considerations.

Climbing to the top is no easy matter. Such a feat has its material compensations in wealth and prestige. It also means hobnobbing with labor's counterpart the big shots of industry. Brushing shoulders with them begets an intimate acquaintance as well as a sharing of their viewpoint. And before one knows, compromise grows on him and even their capitalistic attitudes. Mission accomplished. A labor opportunist and apologist is born. Principle and conviction is dead.

In reply to a recent charge that he is seeking to establish a labor political party Reuther came out with a categorical "no" and said: "The American labor movement is overwhelmingly committed to oppose the creation of a third party, or a labor party, and I share that point of view. In many European countries, there are such parties in power or about to take power. But those countries have different historic backgrounds than we in America. Their societies have been highly stratified in rigid class groups."

Let us now comb through Reuther's arguments and see if we can pin-point his oversights and circumventions. He sees CONTRASTS rather than RESEMBLANCE between Europe and the United States. Is that true or false?

A socialist would agree with the former (contrast) analysis but not with his latter (resemblance) observations. To take the first—contrast. Are there contrasts or differences? You bet, there are. The U.S., for one thing is wealthier, more highly industrially developed.

(Continued on page 2)

## HOME SCENE

### SOCIALISM and INTEGRATION

In democratic America, the land of freedom and equality, racial tension is mounting and sharpening. The conflict over school integration, the right to vote, acceptance of colored peoples in eating places reserved for whites only, housing and other civil rights, are focusing the areas of tension. Organized prejudice, organized ignorance are having a field day, but not without cost to U.S. prestige at home and abroad. America's pretense to democratic ideals, to freedom and equality principles is found wanting right in its own backyard.

We have contended right along, despite Supreme Court decisions, legislative enactments, and executive orders, that GENUINE equality between the races is impossible under capitalism. We reiterate that what you have under this setup is capitalist democracy, capitalist freedom, capitalist equality, which is class oriented. In practice it means, economically and politically, capitalist rule and working class subjugation. Racially, it spells inequality between the races. It can't be anything different under this system, for capitalism IS a divisive system. To expect capitalism to behave otherwise is pure fantasy.

Genuine equality between all peoples, that is, equality not only on paper but in everyday practices, in living reality, is possible only under socialism, in socialist or communist nations such as the Soviet Union. To the degree that they have discarded capitalist norms and advanced towards a classless society, to that extent it does show

## SOCIALISM, THE HOPE OF THE WORLD

Hope is an essential attribute to human existence. There's a saying: "where there is life there is hope" to which the converse might be added: and "where there is hope there is also life." The two thoughts are actually interconnected so that when a situation is declared hopeless it means we are done, licked.

We can see it at work in our daily existence. Most people look forward to something: either a better job, more schooling for their children; in general, towards a betterment in life. Some even cling to a dream of their "ship coming in

some day"; others look towards early retirement; most cling to a hazy, spiritual substitute in a world hereafter for their earthly disappointments.

Religion retains most of its hold on the human mind by nurturing the hope in the human breast that all the earthly sufferings and tribulations will find their compensations in a life after death that will measure up to what they've always sought here without success: peace, serenity, freedom and abundance. "Hope, faith and charity," is a terrifically powerful slogan. The impact and hold it has upon humanity is basically material, in the sense that it fills in a material vacuum, a substitute for what people desire and don't have. The Church in concert with the powers-that-be is conscious of the power of hope among the people and plays it for all it's worth. It virtually preys upon human ignorance and seeks its perpetuation.

This would indeed be a hopeless situation were it not for the facts of life which themselves have the faculty of establishing conditions, only in time to upset and negate them.

It is the contradictory nature of things, of existence, to negate itself. That which is eventually ceases to be, dies out and its opposite comes into being. Motion, flux is an attribute of all phenomena, material as well as spiritual or mental. Everything changes.

What bearing has this upon hope and a new society? It is this: just as the old contains and prepares the elements and conditions for the new; just as today grew out of, and is the continuation of yesterday, so tomorrow, the future, is the growth and the continuation of today. The process, growth, development, call it evolution, if you will, is an essential fact of life, of existence.

It hardly needs reiteration to say that capitalism, present-day social existence, is in a hopeless state as well as flux. It is beset by all sorts of conflicts, fears, hardships and human frustrations. The harder the little honest folk work, strive and plan, the less they seem compensated, their plans frustrated. The workman's job grows more insecure, in the face of technological development; the small business-

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued on page 2)

## SOCIALISM, THE HOPE OF THE WORLD

(Continued from Page 1)

man's footing is melting away like quicksand in the face of large-scale enterprise. It is hardly worth trying to advance or even hold on. Frustration is the result.

Nations and races are at each others throats, crises and wars a constant threat. Fear is everywhere. Again, it is a fearful, hopeless situation which is implicit in the capitalistic system from which there seems to be no way out.

Is there, then, no exit out of this social maze of contradictions? No and yes, depending upon how one sees the social picture. To those who hold that capitalism is the last word, the ne plus ultra in social development, beyond which lies just anarchy, chaos, to them the situation is indeed hopeless. All they can see is nuclear wars and human destruction; growing armaments, increased taxation and inflation and vast armies of unemployed. And nothing is to be done about it, for you "can't change things." This is a grim picture, of course. But there are others who can see a glimmering light appearing out of and thru the darkness.

This new society, socialism, is not a utopia or a dream. It presents a new hope to life because it is inevitable and real—not artificial. The course of events of history, capitalism's own development makes socialism both necessary and possible. Capitalism has laid the economic groundwork or foundation upon which only a socialist order, with its system of social relations, can smoothly function. Certainly capitalism cannot. It is showing it in every aspect that it is no longer able to harness the social forces it let loose. Only a society of socialism's grand magnitude can control those forces for the benefit of society.

Just as individual capital is today inadequate to launch and operate large projects and must

resort to the combined capital of many or to government, so even more the larger product—society—has gone beyond the capacity of private capital. It now calls for the efforts of the **WHOLE SOCIETY** to operate it.

By placing control in the hands of society as a whole, with the workers, the majority, in the lead, a new hope will have been established. And along with capitalism, its basic conflicts, fears and frustrations will go into the limbo of history.

To the many anxieties about socialism's materialism and totalitarianism, its anti-religious character, the cooked-up untruths that socialism will abolish the family and state, we will say: "have no fret," you haven't much to lose. Capitalism didn't do such a good job on many scores. Whatever it did do, it did so in accordance with the requirements of its system and its class interest. Socialism will necessarily, also, operate according to the requirements of the new social order. But the well-being of the **WHOLE PEOPLE** and not of any small segment of it is the primary essence of socialism. With that as a prerequisite the family, if anything, will become more cemented. Education, peaceful relations, economic security and prosperity for those who usefully toil can certainly be relied upon to determine the people's own attitude as to necessity of religion and a political force.

The point is that socialism once universally established, with its planned and peaceful economy can eliminate the need for some of the institutions now regarded as sacred and necessary. Because socialism can realize the hopes of the people in real life right here and now there will be little need to dream about intangibles.

R.D.

## HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 1)

criminary policies. These liberals and organizations, while battling valiantly for a noble cause limit their activities to the effects of racial discord. They fail and will continue to be frustrated because they refuse to get at the cause of race conflict, which is bred in the capitalist swamp. These seek to stamp out this vile social disease without clearing the swamp. They are as effective as a fly-swatter at the edge of a swamp.

Capitalism is class rule and based on the exploitation of the working class, with "superior" and "inferior" layers in society. It may, from time to time, in its own interest, preach race harmony, but it can't practice what it preaches. Socialism or communism is predicated on the abolition of class rule and exploitation and the equality between peoples, no matter the color of their skin. The basis for racial peace is inherent under socialism just as the basis for racial discord is inherent in capitalism. Socialism alone can abolish the nightmare of racial conflict and establish the brotherhood of man.

### Unemployment and Automation

It is reported that business is on the upgrade once again but unemployment in the millions persists. Business forecasters see good business ahead but are pessimistic about putting the unemployed back to work. Some of the reasons for that seeming anomaly, better business and less rehiring, is given in some business publications. Daniel Bell in the July issue of Fortune magazine, writes, that business has tightened standards, planning better and greater mechanization (automation), with the result of improved output with less hands. He says as a result of the recession there may be a shakeout of several hundred thousands jobs in manufacture.

And Business Week, July 12th points out that: "The paradox of high unemployment in a period of improving business is one that seems likely to be characteristic of the coming year. It reflects both the increasing number of workers and the decided increase in output per worker."

Technological unemployment of labor is not a new phenomenon under capitalism, but the recent development of automation is new and underscores the problem. Labor saving (to capitalists) machines or labor displacing (to workers) gadgets, are as old as capitalism.

quo and the powers-that-be. They are all imperialist-minded with adequate war machines ever ready for greater conquests and extension of rule beyond their respective borders.

For Reuther to look away from the points of similarity is to disregard the history of American labor, its many class conflicts,

They are a mixed joy as readily seen. Early expanding capitalism, in due time, found jobs for some of the industrial displaced persons. But now, with contracting capitalism, a growing army of permanent unemployed is envisaged. Youthful capitalism expanded to the four corners of the globe; today, aging capitalism is shrinking in all corners with the rise and growth of its rival, communism.

One Detroit economist points out that more than 6-million cars could be built with some 200,000 fewer workers, due to automation. A similar condition obtains in other fields as automation spreads. A few years ago, a Chrysler executive said: "Automate or die." And big business is automating and smaller business is dying, as attested by business failures and bankruptcies which are up sharply in recent years. The inherent economic laws of capitalism decree no other course.

We are told that capitalism is flexible, that we could have automation and jobs to go with it—that is—we could have the cake and eat it too. The experience is contrary to such fanciful but misguided conceptions. The inexorable laws of the economy point to a growing disparity between the production forces and the capability of the market to absorb the commodities without a periodic glut. The merchandise must be sold at a profit to their owners, the capitalists, otherwise no sale. The market is shrinking absolutely and relatively. Absolutely in the sense that the whole earth has already been explored and is in fact contracting as communism expands and even invades the existing markets. Relatively, as automation throws workers out of jobs, diminishing purchasing power at home. That is the core of the fix the system finds itself.

It can't change fundamentally and still be capitalism. It must continue in that contradictory manner of operation, of expanding production forces against a contracting market, thereby producing depressions, international crises and a permanent army of unemployed. Automation is hastening, heightening and sharpening the contradictory mess of the outmoded system. Only the workers could change all that if they but take over the entire means of production and run it for the use and benefit of the whole people instead of as now for the privileged few.

L.B.

## POLITICAL CREDO OF A LABOR ORGANIZER

(Continued from Page 1)

ed. It reputedly possesses the highest living standards, highest rate of crime and heart failures, the greatest number and largest sized automobiles, the most backward labor movement and the largest number of labor misleaders. These are contrasts, of course, but not absolute ones. All the above-named differences are not one of a kind, but of degree. They are **RELATIVE**. For with the march of time its European capitalist counterparts are constantly making effort to catch up with the U.S. in wealth, productivity, and other matters. But the important oversight, conveniently made by Reuther, is in the **RESEMBLANCE** of things.

All capitalist nations, regardless of size, location and historical background have similar composition and function. Their composition is their class division, capital

and labor, exploiters and exploited. They all, alike, possess a state power, popularly called government, the purpose of which is to protect the interests of private property and its holders. It is the real political power for the safeguard of economic interests. They all as one possess political parties, representative of the different and distinct economic and class social segments. Whether one capitalist nation is a republic and another a modified monarchy makes little difference. The variation does not negate the capitalist essence which underline their sameness.

In their function the resemblance is even more marked. Wealth is in all of them amassed thru exploiting labor. Class conflict and social strife, generally, characterizes all alike, in which the state power is definitely committed to the defense of the status

including the history of his own auto-workers. Little does he realize what's in store for his own union, the effects that capitalist automation is bound to bear upon the skill and wellbeing of auto workers, which in time may displace even more workers than technological development of the

(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

## THE THREAT OF WAR

The "cold war" between capitalism (led by the U.S.) and communism (led by the U.S.S.R.) is actually a phase of the class struggle on an international scale. Periodically it gets very "hot," that is, comes out into the open. Last month the two antagonists became so inflamed over the Chinese question that it threatened to break out into a conflict of world-wide proportions. The press commented that even if a compromise of some sort was worked out, that at best it could be only a truce and not a permanent solution.

### The U.N. Debate

War threats filled the debate in the United Nations General Assembly over the fate of the offshore islands of China, especially when America's "brink of war" and "massive retaliation" expert, Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles spoke. He said, in effect, that if Communist (Peoples) China attempted to "conquer" the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu, as a step toward the conquest of the Pescadores Islands and Formosa (Taiwan), then the United States would directly intervene and war would come.

But the Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, denouncing the American armed intervention, stated that if Peoples China is attacked then the Soviet Union will come to her aid. He demanded immediate withdrawal of the American forces from the area, and declared that, "More and more evident becomes the simple truth that there cannot be a stable peace in the Far East until American armed forces are withdrawn fully and for all time from the Chinese island of Taiwan (Formosa) and from the Taiwan Strait."

### Eisenhower vs Khrushchev

There has also been plenty of acrimonious exchange, diplomatically and thru correspondence, between President Eisenhower and the Soviet Premier Khrushchev over the Chinese question. Letters and notes between them passed so furiously that it was a problem for the press to keep track of them.

Very early on this issue, Soviet Premier Khrushchev warned Eisenhower by declaring that, "An attack on the Peoples Republic of China . . . is an attack on the Soviet Union." Khrushchev further stated that, "all we want to do is to call your attention to the situation which no one would be able to get out of, neither you or we, should a war break out in the Far East." Khrushchev suggested a negotiated settlement.

What the Soviet Union desires most is to preserve peace, yet at the same time defend the interests of her ally, Peoples Republic China.

In rebuttal, Eisenhower's reply was his beligerent "no appeasement" radio-TV speech of Sept. 12th in which he committed the U.S. to intervention by force in the so-called "defense of Quemoy." It was received with great rejoicing by Chiang Kai-shek (the head of the Nationalist forces on those islands including Formosa) who wants to invade Peoples China.

But within the American nation it was received with mixed feelings, and even with open criticism by those few who dared brave any investigation from the "f.b.i." that might subsequently occur to ascertain whether they have any "communist leanings." For example:

the Chicago Daily News publisher editorially condemned the Eisenhower-Dulles "brink of war" policy, as "gigantic folly" and "monumental madness" and that the island of Quemoy is "not worth one American life." (Is he under investigation now?)

The sharpest attack on the President came from Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat of Oregon, who declared, "The U.S. is being dragged into a war through the back door by a dictator, a Chinese war lord who was driven off the mainland of China." This was in reference, of course, to Chiang Kai-shek, and to his being booted out of China by the October 1949 Revolution.

The Soviet Premier Khrushchev answered Eisenhower's Sept. 12th letter and warned him that the U.S. troops faced "expulsion" from Taiwan (Formosa), and the surrounding seas, by the Chinese Communists unless they withdraw "now"; that an attack on Peoples China would mean "certain death" to American sons and a world war. He also pointed out that neither the Soviet Union nor Peoples China was "frightened" by what they considered as "atomic blackmail" from the U.S. Khrushchev also revealed the "only true source of tension" which was, "that the United States has seized inalienable Chinese territory—Taiwan (Formosa) and a number of other islands; keeps under the protection of its guns the Chiang Kai-shek clique, thrown out by the Chinese people, and encouraged its sallies and provocations against Peoples China."

He further declared that the U.S. once "recognized China's sovereignty over those islands in the Cairo Declaration of 1943. It was reaffirmed in the Potsdam Declaration of 1945 which was signed by the United States and some other great powers. Khrushchev pointed out that the islands have not ceased to be Chinese territories after the victory of the People's Revolution which established a government representing the entire Chinese people and which "guides itself by the ideas of communism." He declared that, "To deny this is to interfere in the internal affairs of other peoples and to arrogate to oneself some police functions." What Khrushchev attempted was to convince President Eisenhower that Peoples China has a legal and historical right to the ownership of the islands.

However, the United States is in the reactionary and ridiculous position of recognizing only the Chiang Kai-shek clique on the island of Formosa as the "legitimate" or "nationalist" government of China. This is in direct contrast to England and France who are more realistic and have given their recognition to the Communist government of Peoples China.

Khrushchev's letter must have hit a sore spot in President Eisenhower who returned it in anger declaring it to be "abusive," etc. This was very childish behavior, not befitting a man holding such an important office. It was an insulting gesture to the Soviet Union.

### High Cost of U.S. Intervention

In terms of returns on the U.S. government investment in the support of the Chiang Kai-shek clique as a "bulwark against communism" it has been a dead loss to the American government. The cost of that intervention, to preserve the Chiang Kai-shek reactionary, semi-feudal, capitalist regime on the mainland of China, in post-war years from 1945 to 1949 while he was trying to crush the revolutionary uprising of the Chinese masses, amounted to the huge sum of upwards of 6 billion dollars in American aid, mainly in guns, tanks, planes, etc. The American taxpayers groaned, and quite a number of American capitalists bemoaned: "And we had lost China anyway—all that money thrown down a rathole!"

During World War Two, before 1945, there was some justification in supporting the Chiang

Kai-shek regime in the common struggle against Japan. However, there was much corruption in Chiang's regime; many of his bureaucrats lining their own pockets with American aid dollars, and some actually collaborating with the enemy, Japan.

But with the war coming to an end in 1945, the internal conflict, the civil war, in China was resumed. It was a revolutionary struggle of the poverty-stricken workers and peasants against all their oppressors and exploiters, native as well as foreign (the imperialists). In spite of all the billions of dollars in American aid, mainly in arms for Chiang's counter-revolutionary forces, the Chinese masses were able by October 1949 to rid themselves of that "running dog of American imperialism," Chiang Kai-shek. The Chinese Red Army of Liberation captured all of his (American) weapons, together with millions of his soldiers, most of whom were glad to surrender rather than fight their own countrymen. So, the many billions of dollars worth of American aid did not exactly go down a "rathole." It was the American government itself that armed the Chinese revolutionists against Chiang; although it did not plan it that way!

Since Chiang Kai-shek was pushed off the mainland of China (in spite of American support) is there any assurance that he can hold on to Formosa? None at all, if he has to depend upon his own efforts. To keep him there has cost the American government (or rather the U.S. taxpayers) over a billion dollars so far, and "there is no end in sight" as to future costs as some press commentators put it. But the cost of aiding him in an attempted invasion of China would be tremendous, not alone in dollars but human lives as well. It could result in complete destruction of the United States itself, in the event it precipitated a world-wide conflict.

### Can Wars Be Abolished?

An attempt has been made to negotiate a peaceful settlement by a conference held in Warsaw, Poland, between diplomats speaking for the U.S. and Peoples China. Suggested plans were aired for a "cease fire," and neutralizing the offshore islands of China. So far, at this writing, nothing definite has been decided. Whether, or not, something in the nature of a Korean "truce" will be arrived at remains to be seen. This much is certain: if the present hostilities continue, the conflict will spread. But even if a "truce" is arranged and agreed upon, there is no guarantee that some day it will not be violated by Chiang Kai-shek. As the Marxian saying goes: "no ruling class gives up without a struggle," and Chiang has never given up hope that some day he will "get back China."

But that is not the only reason that the threat of war will continue to afflict the peoples of the world. This is because the world today is divided socially and politically into two parts: one-third is the communist section which is growing, and two-thirds is the capitalist section but which is shrinking.

Capitalist imperialism (American, British and French, especially) is in a most disadvantageous position as compared to the past. Today there is less room for capitalist expansion, and the struggle for the portion (two-thirds) that's still left to the imperialists becomes most keen. To make matters worse for them they have to contend with the colonial uprisings, as Algeria, Iraq, etc. All of these factors make for a most troubled world.

Wars will only be abolished by getting rid of the system that breeds them: capitalism. This would require a social revolution by the exploited masses against their exploiters within each capitalist nation. This is the only way to end wars and bring permanent world peace.

Al Wysocki

## POLITICAL CREDO OF A LABOR ORGANIZER

(Continued from page 2)

past has. He must be blind not to recognize the international aspect of capitalism. The U.S. is not an isolated entity. Its interests and investments are everywhere, so, too, its armed forces. The competitive nature of capitalism is such that its own industry is intensely and directly affected by automobile competition from Europe and elsewhere. Under these conditions for him to deny the resemblance of capitalism is either outright ignorance or conscious distortion.

He mentions that "our society has been in a state of flux." Well, you wouldn't know it by the static opinion he expresses. Certainly the American economy has been in a state of flux. Does that mean the European countries have not, even if not the same pace? And if it is in a state of flux, what does that prove? Precisely what the contentions of socialism are, what Reuther knew in the 30's, namely that the productive forces under capitalism are getting too big for its shoes, that it is laying the economic and social groundwork for socialism, making a new social order inevitable.

But Reuther draws another conclusion, that in contrast to Europe's developing rigid class relations American fluid development permitted workers to move from their social status and into the ranks of capital. That's not a lie. However, it has happened in few instances. It has happened to Reuther, we suppose. Still that doesn't disprove the existence of classes in America. The general numerical increase of the labor force in America shows there are more falling into the ranks of the working class than escaping from it. The fluidity and the movement in and out of it is certainly no contradiction of its existence.

The growth and entrenchment of monopoly capital in industry and agriculture, both, if anything, makes for more stratified class groups, right here in America,

Reuther, notwithstanding. This is a definite trend which, too, is part of the fluidity of American society. Incidentally, this may have a tendency to, at least, partially resolve the following contradiction:—that the political consciousness of American labor is low as compared to the U.S. high economic development. Conversely, in Europe with a less high industrial development the proletariat is more politically advanced. It is to be expected that with time and the economic effects as set into motion by existing social forces the proletariat in America will increase in its militancy and political understanding.

It is Reuther's contention that American labor does not need a political party of its own; that its interests can be satisfied thru the existing capitalist parties. All we need is more "integrity" and "political responsibility," he holds. Certainly, we need that and more of it. But what does that prove? That capital will use that integrity and responsibility to labor's benefit? Is that what they, the capitalists, are in business for? Is that what labor's history proves? Or is it greater profits that motivates them in their relations? And how does Mr. Reuther propose that capital will get what it's after except out of the hides of the workers, his own auto workers included?

By the same token, if "integrity" and "responsibility" is the criterion, then might it not be equally logical to disband the labor unions (economic class organizations) and rely on the economic bargaining, upon the integrity and responsibility, of General Motors, Ford, Chrysler and the rest?

It should be clear that Reuther's line is clearly a trap for labor and if carried to its logical conclusion would leave labor completely at the mercy of the employers. The class lines are real. They are real economically. They should be equally so, politically. No organi-

## A LOOK AROUND

**WRONG PURPOSE:** We see by the newspapers where President Eisenhower vetoed a bill authorizing construction of an atomic powered ice breaker, costing some \$60 million.

His reasons were simple. He said it was an unnecessary expenditure in a period when the government was trying to save some money.

Senator Magnuson (D-Wash.) one of the sponsors of the bill, was disappointed because he felt such a ship would be competition for the Russian atomic ice-breaker in conquest of the arctic.

Had the senator included a provision in the bill for some big guns and rocket launchers abroad the ice-breaker the chances for its passage would have been much better.

**TO PAY THE PIPER:** The French have just paid a high price for their reckless adventure of 1956 when they joined their comrade in crime, Great Britain to invade Egypt at the Suez. The damages came to some \$57,000,000 to be paid to Egypt in currency, credits, manufactured goods and services. When this is added to the cost of staging the invasion plus the fact that nothing was left but defeat after the smoke cleared we must all agree the move can be counted as one of France's greater mistakes.

**MORE FIRES TO PUT OUT:** The Canadian Government recently asked the US State Department if a Canadian subsidiary of an American Company could sell some wood pulp to Communist China. The US Treasury Dept. issued the license under a new agreement hatched up when President Eisenhower visited Ottawa last July.

It's easy to see from this type of thing why South American countries rejected US proposals to in-

crease private investments in their countries instead of government loans. They have long since learned the strangle hold Uncle Sam can get on their economy through private US companies with subsidiary organizations in foreign countries. Canadians are learning it too. As a matter of fact their long and loud cries were finally heard in Washington, which prompted the hasty visit of the President and the Sec. of State to Canada on the double last July. It got results, too.

We see by reports in the Journal of Commerce that the British Columbia market in Canada is going to enjoy the importation of bananas from Red China as part of the above mentioned trade agreement. We are wondering how long it will be before the American Fruit Co. in Central America will protest cuts into her North American banana markets. However, in the true spirit of American free enterprise, "Lets not try to solve that problem 'till we come to it', we have trouble enough as it is."

**THANKFUL?** The US Agriculture Department reports a record-breaking crop of wheat, corn and other crops this year. Trouble is people don't really know whether this is good or bad. There was a period in American history when a bumper harvest was a time of rejoicing. Thanksgiving grew out of the idea that the more foods produced, the greater the thanks.

Today the thanks have turned into woes as the capitalist manipulators try to figure ways and means for disposing of farm surpluses without upsetting "the fine balance between supply and demand." (Translated, this means—how can we keep the price up?)

Mother Nature has a habit of not paying much attention to farm legislation designed to out guess her. L.D.

zation, economic, political or even cultural can satisfy conflicting class interests alike. The Manufacturers Associations, Chambers of Commerce and Bankers Groups are capitalist outfits, as the trade-unions represent the economic interests of labor. The Democratic and Republican parties are the political mouthpieces for business interests. They can be nothing more. To the extent that they speak in behalf of all the people it is but a pretense and a snare. No organization can serve two masters with two separate and opposite economic interests. For labor to seek redress thru the political camp of its traditional enemy is fantasy, far from wisdom and the true facts of life.

By indulging in apologetics for capitalism and its political setup

Reuther demonstrated his complete renegacy, loyalty to the men of capitalism. Labor's future lies not in the direction as outlined by Reuther but in the opposite direction. Labor needs to break with capitalist politics, with capitalist thinking in general. Socialism is on the march. Labor is its banner bearer. To it belongs the future, where peace, happiness and security will cease to be mere words but a practical reality.

American labor needs not only a political expression of its own. It needs more—to think and to eventually go completely beyond the confines of capitalism as a whole—to fight for a brand-new society where industry will be owned and operated by the many who labor—in the interest of all society and not just for a few rich. R. Daniels

## 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.....

**SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION-BOOK FREE OFFER: For \$3 for a three-year subscription (or three-year renewal) we offer all the books free in the adjoining literature box. Send you remittance to Proletarian News, 333 W. North Ave., Chicago 10.**