

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. 11, Whole No. 307

Chicago, Ill., November 1958

618

Price 10c a Copy

A LOOK AROUND

THE STATIC CHURCH: The Catholic Church recently declared it saw a need for different classes in society. Pope Pius XII in a letter to a Catholic social week congress in Bari, Italy, reasoned that a class society is a "guarantee of an order that is not static, but dynamic."

This position is a direct attack on the basic concept of Marxism and its call for a classless society. We have not the space to reason out the whole difference in point of view in our "Look Around" but would like to make one observation in passing.

As hard as we have tried we can think of no other organization in the history of man with a background and point of view more static and resistant to change than the Roman Catholic Church. Proof of this lies in the fact that Socialism, a truly dynamic order (change, itself) has rejected the church as being unnecessary to the development of society and a hindrance to its growth.

CONTRADICTION IN TERMS: US Nobel prize winner, Harold C. Urey, well remembered as a defender of the Rosenbergs and a contributor to the development of the atomic bomb, has recently been quoted as saying it would be suicide for the US to take the lead in atomic disarmament.

His reason for this position is based upon an assumption that it is "more likely that there will be a war than that there will be no war."

It seems to us the learned professor from the University of California is somewhat confused as to what spells suicide for this country—or any country for that matter. As a member of the team which produced the first deadly weapons of destruction one would think Dr. Urey would settle for nothing less than total disarmament — that any other point of view would be suicide.

THE FIRST TO FEEL IT: Many a disillusioned mountain boy has returned to his native state in the South after losing jobs in the factories of the industrial North.

The recession of the past year has wiped out the need for many a job, especially in the auto industry. Reports from states like Kentucky indicate a critical shortage of jobs for those returning home—with little prospects for the future.

Added to the burden is the fact that many of these people stayed close to their job situations throughout the slow periods on empty promises of an up-turn just around the corner. Only after their money was completely gone did they decide to "go back home" with no nest egg to tide them over.

One report states many workers interviewed in Eastern Kentucky said they would like very much to return to work in the North "when the situation improves." They do not seem aware of the inroads automation has made upon their

(Continued on page 2)

LOGIC OF REVOLUTION

Revolutions are a social cataclysm which some seek to stop but can't; others would promote and equally fail. For they have a logic and law of their own irrespective of the will of men. The role of the participants is that of INFLUENCING the movement, one way or the other, but not to determine it.

This law (of revolution) is unlike that of man-made laws, such as connected with government and politics. It is more like that of nature, with this difference, viz., natural law acts in complete independence of man, whereas social law includes human will and inter-

vention. Beyond that, in both domains, that of nature and society, the law operates in objectivity, i.e., it is inherent in the contradictory processes of the movement itself.

That does not mean that such a law is to be understood as enjoying a supernatural, all powerful and overriding existence determining the course of phenomena from WITHOUT or above. Nor does it mean that it emanates from a divine or human consciousness. Rather does it mean that it is implicit in and INTERNALLY connected up with the functioning of things, which human consciousness comes to understand as both the cause and effect, simultaneously, of such phenomena.

Consider, for instance, the annoying experience of indigestion which generally results from overeating. It is an objective fact and can be labelled as an established principle or law. Yet it is not an absolute law. Its relativeness and limitations are at once apparent. It is relative since it cannot be applied rigidly to all alike. Individuals have varied consumptive capacities, some capable of eating enormously more than others before feeling overstuffed. Secondly, the law is limited, since indigestion can result from its opposite, hunger, aggravation, nervous tension, or poor quality food.

We must, then, understand any law, not as absolute, eternal and unchanging, but as relative, conditioned and limited. In the recognition of law we must permit of modification, broadening and correction to allow for changed conditions and new relations.

Does that disprove the validity of law or of a previously accepted one? Indeed not. Newton's theory of gravitation has not become invalid because present-day physics has reached out beyond it. It simply means that the Newtonian theory, as epoch-making as it was in its day, is currently conceived by modern science as too mechanical and inadequate to explain the problems posed by a world in constant flux with all its interrelations and alterations of forces. In search for answers to some of this fluidity science was forced to abandon some of the old accepted, mechanical (metaphysical) truths or laws. Unavoidably and unconsci-

(Continued on page 2)

HOME SCENE

"Massive Resistance"

Hard and sharp lines have been drawn between the segregationists and the Supreme Court rulings on school integration. In defiance of the Supreme Court's interpretation of the supreme law of the land, the U.S. Constitution, the Southern segregationists, the honorable Governors, Legislators, Jurists, notable laymen and their die-hard followers, are employing "massive resistance" to school integration. Segregated schools, or none, seems to be the practical result to date for the kiddies of the South. The demagogic politicians' watchword to the stupid fools who follow and support them could be: "It pays to be ignorant."

The leaders amongst the segregationists, notably the Governors of Virginia and Arkansas, attempting to evade school integration, have sought to sidetrack the issue as one between State and Federal rights. The Southern Governors claim that schooling is within the province of State rights. The invisible line between State and Federal rights and obligations is more fictional than fact. That issue was settled pretty near 100 years ago, in the Civil War. The omnipotent spread and interest of Northern industrialism, that is, capitalism, over the sectional drive of slavocracy of the South, was settled by the Civil War with victory for the capitalists of the nation. Whatever issue there is between State vs. Federal rights is mostly hogwash.

The racial demagogues have gone so far as to charge the Supreme Court as the handmaiden of the Communists. Even less firebrands, such as the Chief Justices

of State Supreme Courts, recently in convention, were critical of the highest Federal Court, for its bold decisions. However, it must be noted, that ever since its establishment, at the birth of this nation, the Supreme Court has been and is the greatest bulwark for U.S. capitalist property rights and interests. Its members are chosen, not primarily for their judicial training but for sound loyalty to the capitalist system. And they have proven themselves.

For pretty near a hundred years, the U.S. Constitution provided for equal treatment between Negroes and whites. During all those years the learned Jurists were color-blind. But now that the world is in flux or in a state of transition, the color question has become inflamed. The luxury of Negro discrimination is too costly. The higher international interests of the capitalist class calls for the leveling down of color barriers. The Supreme Court, cognizant of the higher material interest of the dominant section of the capitalist class, suddenly and abruptly jolted the nation with its school integration decision in 1954. Sectional capitalist class interests and their politicians are merely venting their opposition to the rising general social advancement, by attacking the Supreme Court and raising irrelevant State right issues.

Traditions and social backwardness dies hard, but die it will. Decadent social systems, the prerequisite for social backwardness and outworn traditions, too, must give way to social advancement. The

(Continued on page 4)

LOGIC OF REVOLUTION

(Continued from Page 1)

iously it has led to the employment, if not to the acceptance, of that much hated and feared—dialectic.

The question of revolution, its logic and necessity does not meet with general acceptance. And yet it has both. It is logical because it is necessary. And by necessity it is meant that it is inevitable. Old age necessarily leads to death. That means all that exists must inevitably perish or die. That is true of individuals. It is also true of social organisms. Nothing is eternally lasting or absolute. Everything is relative, has a time limit of existence. That is true of styles, musical hits, cars and televisions. Why is it then that a nation so geared to quick changes, always hailing something new and revolutionary from soap suds to headache pills formally considers a revolution in society so contrary to things? Why is it that in the same breath we are taught to revere the American Revolution of 1776, the great French Revolution and some other revolutions of the past, and exclude, frown upon the possibility and necessity of the future socialist revolution?

Historians and politicians interpret past revolutions as historically inevitable. They see in them justification and progress. Its leaders are to this day venerated as heroes—even tho in their day some were slave-holders, smugglers and to the opposition were plain "traitors." The socialist, proletarian revolution receives a contrary treatment. Here the historical sense of logic and inevitability is completely abandoned. The men who espouse it are dangerous and anti-social. It seems incongruous that the same law holds only in relation to the past but not to the future. The reason patently stems from self-interest, property motive.

Past revolutions brought the modern capitalist class into power, economic and political. They served this class handsomely. Hence their glorification. They were minority revolutions in the interest of a ruling class minority. The coming revolution is different. It would dispossess all propertied classes and elevate for the first time in written history the dispossessed, the majority of the people, to complete control of their social destinies. This is a majority revolution in the interest of the majority, with private property and exploitation of man by man forever abolished. The resistance to it from the seat of wealth is now clearly understandable since it would end all privilege. Hence the obstinate inadmissibility of its law and logic.

To recapitulate, revolutions have their logic and necessity. Not the logic of reasonableness, nor of morality but that of necessity, the kind of necessity that means inevitability.

Just as lack of water and food

begets thirst and hunger, one phenomenon following upon the other, so too, the existence of certain social forces, their opposition and conflict, i.e., their contradiction one to the other, keep developing in their slow, evolutionary manner until they reach their boiling or saturation point—then a sudden change or revolution.

The two types or modes of change, quantitative and qualitative are evolution and revolution, they are internally integrated, one always leading to the other. Consider the simple process of boiling water. It keeps getting hotter and hotter until it reaches the boiling point. Up until that moment it was still water, just a QUANTITATIVE alteration in its temperature. But the moment it reached a certain stage of heat it suddenly changes its quality from liquid to gas or steam. This is a QUALITATIVE change, a revolution, if you will, within a given phenomenon of nature. Equally so with society. The ruling classes keep riding and exploiting the people—whether the latter is aware of it or not—this process keeps mounting and widening. The class that suffers most from under the pressure keeps groaning and grumbling until finally life gets too difficult to endure matters longer—and social change becomes in order—the revolution.

Such is the history and logic of the French Revolution, the American Revolution and others. Whatever the slogans coined, in their ideological content they were nothing more than material class interest, dominantly economic. If we consider the facts of the American Revolution it was the commercial and industrial interests of the early Colonists that carried the ball, sparked the rebellion against the English crown. Economic freedom, to carry on trade and industry and amass wealth on their own without any curbs or cutting in from the outside was what motivated their cry for independence.

The logic of the present or coming revolution lies well within the internal conditions and forces of modern capitalism. This system of private enterprise has built up an enormous production machine which periodically gets clogged up, resulting in overproduction, unemployment, hardship and wars. Its inability to function smoothly without crises, to provide even that limited economic security as provided by the wages-system must eventually lead to a social impasse, class conflict and revolution.

The Russian Revolution of November 1917 was such a social cataclysm. At first the capitalist powers united in their efforts to squelch it by military force. Unsuccessful, they resorted to other means, blockade and isolation, vilification, economic and political pressures. What was at first regarded as a political putsch, pulled off by Lenin, Trotsky and the Bol-

A LOOK AROUND

(Continued from page 1)

jobs, to say nothing of the new market conditions returning to a more "normal" state (as some economists have indicated). And of course this "normal" state of affairs has to include a vast number of permanently unemployed workers of which the above mentioned group is a part.

The security and well-being of permanent employment is one luxury the capitalist system cannot brag about. Only under socialism and a planned economy can this most vital of all human desires be fulfilled.

LITTLE NOTED HISTORICAL FIRST: We recently noted a three line story in the newspaper devoted to reporting the fact that Red China has test-flown its first all Chinese-built seaplane.

Perhaps to the editors of the capitalist press the news is only worthy of three lines of their valuable space. But to those of us who have followed the tremendous progress of that country in recent years the news of such a seemingly minor event will some day backfire on the smug American mind.

Sputnik did it for the USSR. China's day will also come to give further proof of the fact that only under socialism is it possible to advance a nation's economy for the good of that nation. Capitalism must always work against advancement of her neighbors because they are potential competitors on the world market. On the other hand Socialist countries can only become stronger collectively as they become more highly industrialized. It is easy to see from this simple statement there is only one road open to many backward nations. That road is Socialism.

WHO'S TO PAY—AND HOW? As Karl Marx so often pointed out in his writings, under the superstructure of culture and ideas in a given society lies the economic foundation which determines those ideas. We can see this fact coming to the surface in the southern dispute over school segregation.

sheviki later came to be tolerated as an experiment which was sooner or later bound to fail. But all such thinking lacked foundation. That revolution was deeper in content than a few leaders. Revolutionists can't promote or make resolutions unless and not until the objective conditions, economic and political for such a change become ripe and call for it. Moreover the class that is to benefit from such a social change must be fed up with the old order and be willing and ready to struggle for the change.

Were such conditions then extant? Indeed they were. The Russian masses, workers and peasants, the majority, could no longer endure the exploitation and oppression of the rulers; they were defeated in war, landless and hungry. The slogan, "peace, bread and

The die-hard segregationists who, up until now, have taken the full brunt of social, moral and legal attacks are now going to have to take a new look at the economic problems facing them. The areas in the South fighting integration need new school facilities for expanding populations just as badly as any other part of the country. However, school districts are having trouble in finding bankers, insurance companies and municipal bond buyers who are willing to invest good money into what is currently a bad (or unstable) risk. Investors whose only principle is a sound and safe return on their investment can see the possibilities of defaults by taxpayers when they are asked to pay for public buildings, un-used while paying for private schools, too. Or worse still, when tax revenue declines as fewer and fewer taxpayers are willing to invest in public school projects especially with the social atmosphere as it is.

The result is the drying up of bond markets for financing school expansion. This means prohibitive tuition rates to finance private construction due to the fact that private institutions cannot pledge future tax dollars for building expansion and improvements. Of course, the parents have a choice . . . they can allow crowded classrooms with little hope of expansion . . . they can muddle through depreciating equipment, inadequate facilities and the threat of losing teachers unwilling to teach under such conditions over an extended period of time.

When the chips are down we feel few of our southern citizens will be so highbrow about an historically outmoded principle as school segregation if the alternative to holding against history is a run-down and inadequate school system. As in so many times past, economics will once again decide whether the people of the South can "afford" to hold one idea over another.

L.D.

land," were not empty words. They fitted the dire need of the masses which were willing to fight to correct and eliminate that condition. What the Bolshevik party with Lenin at the head was able and did was to provide leadership, encouragement and socialist direction. The point is there was logic and necessity to that revolution which was implicit in the internal situation without which any call to action would have been of no avail. Its kernel was the deteriorated economic and political situation which the Russian capitalists and landowners could not resolve.

Revolutions are many-sided. We hear about technological, scientific, intellectual and political revolutions. None but the last named evokes fear. There is reason. Yet as a matter of fact it is the revolu-

(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

COMMUNISM vs. CAPITALISM

Communism has grown to such great proportions that it constitutes a serious challenge to what's left of capitalism. As a result the world today is socially and politically divided into two parts: one-third is the communist section, which is ever getting stronger; while the remainder, or two-thirds, is the capitalist section, which is ever getting weaker.

The present conflict between these two opposing systems, the "cold war" so-called, as we pointed out before, is actually a phase of the class struggle on an international scale. Its final outcome will decide who shall be the victor.

However, in view of the great strides of communism during the first half of this century, it is possible that the present young generation may yet live to see the end of capitalism altogether, and communism triumphant throughout the whole world.

This, of course, will mean sad news to the capitalist class, especially to the multi-millionaires and billionaires, that handful of rich parasites who at present are profiting through their system of exploitation. They are fear-struck and are doing their utmost in their fury to preserve capitalism even to the extent of threatening to precipitate a third world war with the nuclear and missile weapons.

But social evolution cannot be stopped, it is inexorable and goes forward. That which gives it greater impetus is revolution from below, from the exploited masses, toward the goal of a higher, classless society, toward ending completely the exploitation of man by man.

The Origin of Communism

It might be asked: what is the cause of communism, i.e., how does it originate? The answer to this question must be sought in the historical development of the previous system, capitalism. It might seem strange to those who hear it for the first time, but nevertheless it is the truth, it is capitalism itself that gives birth to communism. Karl Marx long ago pointed out in his writing that within the womb of the old social system, a new one grows, and finally is born.

No social system operates in a vacuum. Just as capitalism emerged from feudalism, so communism in its turn emerges from capitalism. Marx described this revolutionary process by stating that "force is the midwife" of the old system pregnant with the new.

As compared to feudalism, capitalism was once a progressive society and played the role of creating a modern industry, and a class to operate it, the modern wage-workers, the proletarians.

These wage workers do not own any means of production. They are called proletarians because they do not possess any property from which they could derive an income to live on. All they possess is their ability to work, that is, their labor power (as Marx put it). In order to live they must sell their labor power to the capitalist class who own the means of production.

In return the workers receive a wage. But their labor power produces a surplus value far greater than the wages. It is this surplus value that the capitalist appropriates, out of which enormous profits are accumulated. Capitalism is therefore a system based directly on

profiting through the exploitation of wage-labor.

It is obvious that capitalists do not provide jobs for the workers out of humanitarian reasons. In paying the worker wages, the capitalists know that a worker must receive enough to subsist upon or else his usefulness to the exploiter would come to an end. But no worker is "overpaid," because the capitalists keep the wages down to the lowest level possible.

In prosperous times, with industry at full production, most workers have steady jobs and earn enough on the average to support themselves and their families. But in slack times, especially when the economic crisis of over-production appears (like the current "business recession"), millions of workers are laid off from their jobs. Unemployment reduces many of them to poverty.

It is this condition of economic insecurity that breeds discontent among the workers, and, in the course of time, compels them to organize and rebel against their exploiters who have caused their misery.

It is in this way that a communist revolutionary movement is born. It is the direct product of the class struggle between the capitalists and wage workers, between the exploiters and the exploited.

The Russian Revolution

Forty-one years ago the class struggle became so intense in Russia that on November 7th, 1917 its proletariat allied with the poor peasantry revolted against their exploiters, aristocratic as well as capitalist. Fully one-sixth of the world (a vast area more than twice the size of the U.S.) was ripped out of capitalist-imperial control and was placed under the collective ownership of the toiling masses of Russia.

An American writer, sympathetically and realistically described that revolutionary uprising as the "ten days that shook the world." In truth, the capitalist world was shaken up plenty; to this day it has not gotten over that shock. Quite a number of capitalists are still shaking from fright. And, oh, how they hate the Russians for that! And, no wonder!

The Russian revolution ushered in the first stage of communism, and brought in a new type of government—a Socialist Soviet State—the dictatorship of the proletariat, the political rule of the immense majority, the working people. It expropriated the capitalist class of its property, i.e., the means of production, and in time converted the mills, factories, banks, railroads, mines and land into the socialized property of the whole people, thereby ending the exploitation of man by man.

This new Soviet State established and enforced the rule that only those who work shall eat, that is, that all able-bodied persons must perform useful labor. Thus the revolutionary broom swept clean the nation of all idle parasites. This did not go so well with the capitalists who prefer to do their eating without working, to have others (workers) produce their living for them.

But it went well with the toiling masses of Russia who knew that if everyone worked there would be increased productivity and in time a higher standard of living with a reduction in working hours. This would result in more leisure for the whole population, to be spent in recreation and education thereby raising the cultural level of the nation.

History reveals that the Russian revolution came during the First World War (1914-1918), that imperial struggle of the capitalist world powers, Britain, France, Czarist Russia (and later America) as against Germany, Austria-Hungary and Turkey, for the domination of the world, its markets, sources of raw material, and for peoples to exploit. Within the first year of that war Czarist Russia suffered serious defeats from the superior German armies, and Russian

losses were tremendous, reckoned at 3,800,000 for the first ten months of that war. This constituted a drain not only of Russian manpower but also the resources of the nation which was very backward industrially as compared to Germany.

As casualties mounted (total Russian losses were estimated as high as 8 millions) the stage was reached when endurance snapped. A war-weary, poverty-stricken population could stand only so much, and raised the demand for "peace, bread and land."

The capitalist "Provisional Government," that was established in March 1917 following the overthrow of the Czar, in order to carry out its commitments to its allies, Britain and France, made the fatal error of asking the war-weary, starving Russian masses to be "patient," to continue the war.

It is a matter of history now, how the exploited masses turned to the Bolshevik Party led by Lenin, who had pointed out to them right along that the only way they could get "peace, bread, land, and liberty," was by the overthrow of their exploiters, the bourgeoisie, and taking the nation into their own hands, under collective ownership. The slogan was raised, "All Power To The Soviets," and on November 7th, 1917 Russia came under the rule of the working class.

So intense was the hatred of the major capitalist powers, Britain, U.S. and France, against the Russian revolutionists that they attempted to destroy the then young Soviet government by direct armed intervention. By their support of the counter-revolutionary Czarist Russian generals and their murderous cohorts a civil war was precipitated (1918-20) which devastated the best part of Russia and caused a famine resulting in the death of many hundreds of thousands of Russian people.

Soviet Power Today

Soviet Power survived not only that reactionary foreign military intervention but more lately the attack and invasion of Nazi-Germany during the Second World War (1939-45). In spite of the tremendous losses in human lives, and destruction of industry, Soviet Power recovered and grew stronger than ever, so today it is a World Power second to none.

Furthermore it no longer stands alone, it has powerful allies, e.g., Peoples China which through its revolution of October 1949 brought in another sixth of the world, and a nation with the biggest population on this planet earth, all under the rule of the working class.

The countries of Eastern Europe also "went working class," that is, got rid of their exploiters. In this respect they received much help from the Soviet Union, towards the close of the war in liquidating those tainted with the Nazi brush, and in the post-war years much economic aid.

United is the working class world. Soviet Power is strong from the scientific and military standpoint also. It was the first nation to hurl a satellite, Sputnik, into outer-space. But the real source of its strength should be no mystery to anyone. What Karl Marx had said of the Paris Commune of 1871 is even more true of Soviet Power today. "Its true secret was this. It was essentially a working class government." (A product of the class struggle.) "The political form at last discovered under which to work out the economic emancipation of labor."

Communism cannot be destroyed. This is beginning to dawn upon some capitalists who realize they have no alternative but to try to "peacefully coexist" with it. Others, whose hatred blinds them to the social forces at play, should ponder the words of Marx: "What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable."

Al Wysocki

LOGIC OF REVOLUTION

(Continued from page 2)

tion in technology that gives rise, lays the groundwork for all the others to follow.

Economic possession, the satisfaction of man's primary needs are closest to his stomach, hence his heart. They provide the mainstay for human existence, no matter what the form society takes. As such technology and its changes provides the basis for the motor power in history. In it are contained the elements and reasons for class interest and struggles. Technology under capitalism has now reached its apogee. From now on no further technological progress is possible without incurring increasing hardships on the populace at large, without precipitating one crisis after another. There

is but one way out—social revolution.

What is meant by a proletarian revolution? It simply means a complete social reconstruction, a fundamental change, a brand-new economic and class relationship, economically, politically and culturally. It means the proletariat assuming political power in the name of and for the benefit of all society. It means the turning over of the industries, transportation and communications into collective instead of private ownership.

Does this transformation have to be accompanied by violence or can it be accomplished in a peaceful manner? That depends upon the logic of revolution, how the relation of class forces is stacked up, both national and international; that depends more upon the nature

and extent of the ruling opposition. It would be foolhardy for the workers to employ force where none is necessary. That is, assume that the capitalists realizing the logic of events and social necessity recognize that their social jig is up and reasonably yield to the inevitable, certainly under those circumstances a relatively peaceful approach is envisaged. On the other hand, the proletariat would be discreet in being prepared to deal firmly with an opposition whose entire history is itself marked by violence. The workers in assuming political power must establish their own form of state—the dictatorship of the proletariat—in order to ensure the successful transition to a completely classless society—communism.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the last form of state. With the passing of time, when the

bourgeoisie is no longer considered as having any power to attempt to stage a comeback, and class opposition to social construction is no longer a possibility, class distinction dies out and along with it the state—for lack of any function.

The state is nothing else but an organ of class domination. If there are no classes to dominate, such an institution, in the political sense, becomes an anachronism.

The socialist revolution is the last political revolution. From here on revolutions in society will still play a role, but not in a class sense. Social change compatible with technological development will still go on. There will no longer be any class battles over them. This will occur in complete harmony with the interest of society as a whole as well as with full consciousness of its consequences.

R. Daniels

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 1)

capitalist system thruout the world, U.S. included, is now a "has-been," decadent and ready for the social scrapheap. "Massive resistance" in both cases, against racial equality and its basis, the breeding swamp, capitalism, is doomed.

Foreign Policy

Controversy over foreign policy, particularly during an international crisis, such as at present in the Far East, becomes heated. "Sen. Wayne Morse (D-Ore.) said meanwhile President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles should be impeached if they continue their present course with regard to Quemoy." (Boston Globe — Sept. 27)

Speaking of Dulles, Morse added: "This evil man, bent on war, must be checked if our nation's glorious record of never having been an aggressor nation is to be preserved."

While John Foster Dulles, a religious lay leader, proudly admits

treading the brink of war as the art of diplomacy, the basis for foreign policy lies deeper than the inner recesses of the mind of Foster Dulles or any other madcap. To subscribe to the theory that foreign policy is the choice of conduct between good and evil, between men of good will and those with evil intentions, is to have learned nothing from recent history with its two bloody wars, within memory of most adults. In World War One, Kaiser Bill was pictured as the villain. After that holocaust, Americans said: "never again," they wouldn't be caught suckers again. Later (in World War Two) Hitler, the fascist beast, proved that labor has a short memory and could be taken again and again. That war was adjudged to be between good and evil and the masses succumbed to that "evil" theory of diplomacy.

To be sure there are "evil geniuses" in the diplomatic ring. Any madcap able and willing to plunge the world into such bloodbaths as we have witnessed, for sordid gains, sacrificing even their own

loved ones, must be crazy, but that doesn't explain the conduct of foreign policy.

The basis for foreign policy commences right at home with its own ground rules. Given the present setup, capitalism, the foreign policy track is definitely laid down, no matter what party (the Republicans or Democrats) is in office. These parties are foresworn to defend and protect propertied interests no matter where it leads and what it entails.

In brief, capitalism divides the people at home between workers and capitalists and divides the world between propertied rivals. The capitalists exploit labor at home and exploited labor produces surpluses beyond the domestic capabilities to absorb such. Expansion beyond national boundaries becomes a vital necessity for operation. "Export or die" cried Hitler. Intrigue, holy alliances, military bases, legal and illegal spying and such, are the paraphernalia of diplomacy. And war is the extension of diplomacy by other means as one statesman put it.

General Smedley Butler in his book, "War Is A Racket," put it bluntly as follows: "I spent thirty-

three years and four months as a member of our country's most agile military force—the Marine Corps—and during that period I spent most of my time being a high-class muscle man for Big Business. In short, I was a racketeer for capitalism. . . . The record of racketeering is long. I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers in 1909-12. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for American sugar interests in 1916. In China in 1927 I helped to see that Standard Oil went its way unmolested."

Marine General Butler's own experience and first-hand report, disposes of Sen. Morse's claim and others, too, that of "our nation's glorious record of never having been an aggressor nation."

The conservative Barron's Financial Weekly (May 20, 1940) puts it succinctly, relative to business and war: "War represents international trade competition at an explosive stage."

That is capitalism. Its foreign policy is to safeguard and extend its interests. That is basic. It may be subtle at one time, violent another, but it all goes to make capitalist foreign policy. L.B.

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.....

Election Campaign Promises

In the recent so-called free elections in the United States it was most evident that the two capitalist parties, Republican and Democratic, had the monopoly of the ballot between them. Especially was this so in the state of New York where the two multi-millionaires, Harriman (Dem.) and Rockefeller (Rep.) were "rival" candidates for governor. Capital could not lose with such a powerful combination—and did not.

Now we realize the truth of the Marxian definition of all capitalist elections, namely, that the workers are asked "to decide once every few years which member of the ruling class is to repress and oppress the people through parliament—this is the real essence of bourgeois parliamentarism" (as

quoted from Lenin's "State and Revolution").

The elections also revealed glaringly that in spite of the mudslinging of each other, the Republicans and the Democrats defended capitalism to the utmost, both trying to outdo each other by condemning communism.

Oh, of course, they expressed their "sympathy" for American labor and made glowing promises to the workers, "a revival of prosperity, with jobs for all," etc. These two capitalist political parties "discoursed sweet music" to the poor man (to use a Tolstoyan phrase) and promised to do almost anything for him, "anything but get off his back."

Yes, the elections are over—but not the exploitation of labor, for capital is still in the saddle.

A.W.