

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 1545 LARRABEE ST. CHICAGO, ILL.

Vol. XIV, No. 4—Whole No. 145

Chicago, April, 1945

483

Price 5c a Copy

Imperialism Marches On!

By Christ Jelset

Empires have risen and empires have fallen but imperialism is not yet dead. Conquest and exploitation have been the twin pillars of imperialism. Wars of conquest have made possible the exploitation of subjugated peoples. Methods of exploitation have varied from time to time but in all cases the main benefits from imperialism have been the gathering into the hands of the imperialists the fruits of the labors of those subjugated.

Sometimes new empires have come to power through the conquest of older empires. Such wars have been called wars of liberation. The ancient Romans "liberated" many a colony from the Greek overlordship; but the "liberated" colonists were no more free under the Romans than they had been under the Greeks.

In more modern times, Spanish, Portuguese and Dutch colonies were "liberated" by Great Britain. Such "liberation" also proved to be very limited. New masters have known and applied methods of exploitation as exacting as the old ones.

Today a new nation has reached maturity and power, a nation which claims no imperialist designs. The United States of America has risen to a first place in the family of nations. It has the greatest productive power. It knows how to build a war machine, if necessary. It can fight two wars successfully at one time. It has built for itself the right to play a strong part at the coming peace negotiations.

The U. S. A. wants no colonies. It believes in the "four freedoms" and the "Atlantic Charter." It practices the "Good Neighbor Policy" in South America and wants to apply this policy to the whole world, yes, even to the present enemy nations, once these learn to behave as "good neighbors" should. The rays of a bright future seem already to throw light into a darkened world. Only one ominous shadow tends to mar the prospect. Will the rest of the nations fall in line? Thus far, the enemy nations do not see it the American way. Utter defeat and a period of military occupation will

be necessary to bring them to their senses.

It is with the members of the United Nations that the real test lies. In the future world of cooperation and good neighborliness the exact location of boundary lines should not be so important. Yet boundary lines are strongly disputed. The enormous stretch of the former French colonies should prove no cause for friction. With colonial exploitation brought to an end and cooperation for economic advancement taking its place the

(Continued on page 2)

'Revolution by Law'

The condition of the masses in the "liberated" nations of Europe is one of hunger. For example the New York Times, quoting a Reuters' news report (Feb. 12), states that, "About 30,000 cats have been eaten by hungry Parisians since the liberation. Acute food supply difficulties have produced something approaching a systematic cat hunt. One cat is worth six dollars—half for its meat and half for its fur." Also on March 1st, New York Times quotes a naval officer who, looking on the "bright" side of the picture, pointed out that the city dwellers still have bread and potatoes, that the "people don't look like skeletons. . . . But it is

very hard on children. They become mentally and physically weak. . . . The mortality rate among infants in January was the highest in recent history." The exigencies of war are said to be the cause for the suffering of the people.

There is unemployment in "liberated" France. In Paris alone it is estimated that 400,000 workers are pounding the pavements, looking for jobs. Those so "fortunate" as to have jobs find that they cannot exist on the wages they are getting. Recently, printers went on strike demanding an increase in wages and coal miners are refusing to dig coal because they say the food rations allotted to them are insufficient to maintain enough energy to complete their daily tasks.

It is this condition that has caused the masses of France to demand drastic reforms of the Provisional Government at whose head sits their one-time idol, General Charles DeGaulle. The demands being made are for nationalization of the basic industries of France and that labor be given a part in managing them. But in a speech to the Consultative Assembly, on March 2nd, DeGaulle refused to commit himself regarding the time or the extent of whatever further nationalization his government might adopt. He said to the Assembly that, "Changes of structure . . . provisional nationalization, must be accepted or rejected by a duly elected Parliament. . . ." Thus in these words he reminded the Assembly of its impotence and that it would have to

(Continued on page 2)

International Notes

China: Battlefield of Various Forces

China is coming more and more into the headlines of international affairs. Here, to a very large extent, the fate of Japan is to be settled. Besides the war against Japanese aggression, a state of civil war exists within the country.

Although vast in area, rich in natural resources and with a population estimated at over 450,000,000, China is often referred to as a giant with feet of clay. Over 80 per cent of her population live by tilling the soil. The political system is largely feudalistic. The bourgeois revolution, which began in 1911, was never fully completed. By 1927 extreme reaction had set in. The leaders of the revolution became fearful of their workers and peasants, who were getting out of hand. They patched up their differences, as best they could, with the war-lords and landlords and formed a national government upon this basis. To crush the "Red bandits" became objective number one. The revolutionary workers were driven from the cities only to become organizers of the revolting peasants.

Because of her backwardness and disunity, China has been for a long time a prey to foreign aggression. Many nations had their fingers in the pie of Chi-

nese exploitation. By 1932 China's next door neighbor, Japan, could no longer be satisfied with just a share. She took full possession of Manchuria, rich in iron and coal and other resources. This Chinese province with a population of over 35,000,000 fell to Japan like a ripe plum falling from a tree. At this time the U. S. A. gave China much sympathy but sold to Japan everything required to kill Chinese soldiers on the battlefield. Then at home Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, leader of the nationalist forces, still considered the campaign to wipe out the "Red bandits" as objective number one. He maintained that China could not oppose foreign imperialists until this objective was accomplished. General Chang Hsueh-Liang, young warlord of Manchuria, failing to get support, was forced to withdraw his armies to the west. Manchuria, now Manchukuo, became part of the Japanese empire.

Chiang Kai-shek's efforts to exterminate the "Red bandits" went on year after year but campaign after campaign failed to accomplish the desired objective. By 1936 the Communists had concentrated their forces into north-west China. Yenan, in the great bend of the Yellow River, became their capital. Slogans were an important weapon

(Continued on page 2)

IN THIS ISSUE

IMPERIALISM MARCHES ON!
By Christ Jelset

REVOLUTION BY LAW
By Al Wysocki

INTERNATIONAL NOTES
By Oliver Ritchie

HOME SCENE
By L. B.

THE SOVIET UNION AND
"SLAVE LABOR"
(Editorial)
By John Keracher

'Revolution by Law'

(Continued from page 1)

wait for a national election of a new parliament.

DeGaulle followed up his pronouncement with an admonition to the left elements in the Assembly by stating that, "The government considers as nefarious the exploitation of discontent. . . ." "The government asks everyone to measure his words and actions. It would be bad to cultivate an atmosphere of doubt, criticism, grumbling, . . . to destroy the union that government is trying its best to maintain. . . ." (Time Magazine, March 12.)

The Assembly gave his speech a cool, even hostile reception, because many of its members lean far to the left, representing the French Resistance groups from whom Gen. De Gaulle is drawing away. The resistance groups maintain that nationalization of the industries should take place now and so thoroughly that no parliament could undo it. They should have been forewarned, however, months ago, in the fall of last year, by the utterances of a member of De Gaulle's Provisional Government, i.e. the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, G. Bidault, who, in answer to the demands for drastic social transformation of French economy, declared that it must be orderly, that is "a revolution within the law."

By October of last year the French resistance groups were already exasperated by the vacillating policies of the Provisional Government, its slowness in nationalizing the industries and its reluctance in purging the government and the nation of all those who had collaborated with the Nazi army of occupation in its puppet Vichy government. True enough, some of the collaborators were brought to trial but the French resistance newspapers, angered by the government's vacillating policies, cried out: "Not enough." In Valence, meanwhile, resistance leaders, calling themselves the "Congress of Disillusioned Maquis Fighters" met and voted a resolution: "Let the government remember that . . . we represent the people and we will defend the interests of the people with ferocious tenacity."

There are some people, however, in France who are opposed to the policies of the resistance groups. These are the handful of haute bourgeoisie, well fed and well dressed who did not fare badly under the German occupation even though they were contemptuous of the Nazis because the latter "destroyed beautiful things, got drunk, acted like swine." "The haute bourgeoisie simply "tolerated" them until the allies came. And now they would like to see things become "normal" again. They are of course, politically conscious and their greatest fear is of the spread of "communism." Hence their reliance on DeGaulle's Provisional Government.

But the French workers have also advanced politically and to that stage where "socialism" and "communism" are no longer dreaded words as far as they are concerned. The resistance groups spring directly from the working class elements, and most active against the Nazis and the collaborators were those of them who had achieved a great degree of class consciousness. In that struggle they had witnessed how thoroughly the French bourgeoisie had discredited itself. A classical example of the decadence of bourgeois nationalism was furnished them by the collaborator Louis Renault, owner of the largest automobile industry of France who, when arrested, only escaped the purges by committing suicide.

According to some capitalist journalists the present composition of the Consultative Assembly may undergo a change in the coming local elections that are to take place in April, May and June. The New York Times (March 15), states that, "Betting odds among political observers are that these local elections will show a swing to the right or towards the moderates. If so, this would support General De Gaulle's recent stand in refusing to fix any timetable for nationalizing additional industries, as the present Assembly has demanded." Thus they "foresee" the influence of socialist and communist delegation in this Assembly.

(Continued on page 3)

Imperialism Marches On!

(Continued from page 1)

mere technicality of possession should make no difference.

If free access to the natural resources of the world should be available to all, why have any disputes over shipping lanes or air routes? If freedom of trade is to promote the welfare of all, why bother about troublesome tariff barriers and import quotas? Can it be true that the U.S.A. alone is able to see the new road clearly while many of the other nations are as yet groping with ideas of former methods?

The first thing that needs clarification is this cooperative plan, this "Good Neighbor Policy." This American plan involves more than the glad handshake and the broad understanding of cultural differences. It involves economic cooperation. America will "help" the rest of the world. America will "help" to rebuild the war-devastated areas. America will "help" to improve and advance backward agricultural sections of the world. America will "help" to explore undeveloped mineral regions. It will "help" to build new industries. It will "help" to advance the standards of living in the whole world. America will do all this with its **surplus capital**. Idle dollars by the billion will be put to work. Now, when idle dollars are put to work, men are put to work as well. In fact, men have

to do all the work. What the dollars, and the owners of dollars, do is merely give permission to men to work and provide a minimum of food, clothing and shelter for them while they perform their assigned tasks. The products of such work, however, become the property, not of those who work but of those who supply the dollars.

Through this process it is just possible that South Americans or Chinamen or, in fact, inhabitants of most backward regions of the world, will be given more to eat than they ever had before. They will also be made to work and sweat more. They will be able to see their home surroundings transformed. They will see factories and smokestack, railroads and trains, roads, trucks and autos, office buildings and commercial establishments. Yes, they might even be able to see a few schoolhouses, where their children will learn the "dignity" of factory work and loyalty to the company; but they will also see "their" country transformed legally into the property of the American benefactors.

Meanwhile, if governmental friendly relations can be maintained, if huge supplies of new products can be sold, if the French, British, Dutch or other members of the United Nations can be kept on the sidelines and satisfied, and other IFS can be taken care of, the "helping" Americans will be able to realize that the main "help" will come to them in the form of profits.

Is it necessary to point out that this arrangement can mean nothing but continued and extended exploitation? Hardly! Rather, it becomes necessary to search out and examine what is new in this proposed arrangement? Instead of leaving foreign loans and foreign investments to private individuals and firms, the new plans call for governmental participation and regulation. It is the expression of the realization that private competition has become too keen for peaceful operation. It takes into account the experiences with private monopoly or cartel division of foreign business. It expresses the memory of business fluctuations and panics where private investments in foreign fields run the risk of being wiped out or seriously reduced through stoppages of production and sales. It takes account of the fact that in times of business slumps popular dissatisfaction and uprisings might put a stop to the servicing of foreign debts or foreign dividend payments. It is an extension of the New Deal theory of moratoriums.

RFC loans, at lower interest rates, production curtailments, etc., from the field of domestic

International Notes

of the Chinese Red Army in opposing the nationalist forces sent against them. With the Japanese pushing deeper and deeper into China such slogans as, "Chinese must not fight Chinese" and "Unite and fight the Japanese Invaders" were very effective. Entire armies, from top to bottom, revolted against the policies of the nationalist government. They made pacts with the Red Army to end civil war and to unite against the foreign invader.

In December, 1936, at Sianfu, Chiang Kai-shek was seized by Manchurian troops under Chang Hsueh-Liang. Other nationalist army leaders also insisted upon resistance to the Japanese. A communist delegation was sent from Yen-an to confer with Chiang. He was impressed with the necessity of waging war against Japanese aggression. The fact that his own armies in the north were in revolt against his policies could no longer be ignored. After being "detained" several days the much deflated Generalissimo was released. Since that time, at least officially, objective number one of the Nationalist government has been to wage war against Japan. However, large and comparatively well equipped armies have been used, and still are being used, to block-

ade the areas controlled by the Red Army. In spite of the blockade this army has carried on a successful defensive war against the Japanese. Besides this, their guerilla forces have taken over much of the rural areas behind the Japanese lines. More than eighty million Chinese are reported now under the control of the Yen-an government. In most of this area exploitation still exists but it is being controlled and reduced. To raise the economic condition of the mass of people is the first consideration of the Yen-an government.

Into this jig-saw situation the U. S. A. is to play an increasingly important role. Land communication with Chungking has been reopened via the Ledo-Burma road. An oil pipe-line is being pushed through over the same route. Air transport over "the hump" is increasing in volume. Then a more important event is imminent—the establishment of a bridge-head on the coast of China. To defeat Japan's armies is to be no easy task. All available forces will be required. For this reason the American government has used its influence in an endeavor to unite the opposing Chinese forces. This has apparently been a complete failure.

Oliver Ritchie.

(Continued on page 3)

'Revolution by Law'

(Continued from page 2)

bly on the decline.

There is, of course, that possibility. The "rightists" and "moderates," upholders of capitalism, are busy now trying to influence the electorate by such slogans as a "Return to legality." And we may point out also in this election like those that are about to take place in other "liberated" nations, food will no doubt be used as a "political weapon." The recent Lend-Lease agreement, arranged by the French Provisional government with the United States, is a powerful weapon that will strengthen its position in dealing with any situation it is confronted with. But it is also an indication that the French bourgeoisie cannot stand alone, its regime must be propped up by American dollars.

Regardless of the outcome of the local elections, the class struggle goes on and is not eliminated. French economy is at present in a chaotic condition due to the devastation of war and also plundering and sabotage by the Nazi armies during their retreat. Factories that were undamaged find it difficult to resume production. Lack of raw material and the deplorable condition of transportation are emphasized by even "political observers" as one of the main causes of the present plight of France. But even in the long run once the industry returns to "normal" to whom would the products be sold? The masses of France, that is the working class, are poverty-stricken. It is this aspect of the economic situation that is not overly emphasized by even the most astute of bourgeois political observers.

For a while the workers of France may be fooled into voting the "right" way even as here in "prosperous" America the workers were fooled by the dazzling promise of 60 million jobs after the war. But it will be difficult to fool all the French workers because, unlike America, at present millions of them are jobless. When one's stomach is empty, patience is a difficult quality to cultivate. Election promises, no matter how alluring, are a poor substitute for a good meal. Of course, there may be some food in France but the well stocked cellars of the bourgeoisie are not open to inspection by the workers.

The "People's Revolution"

The struggle against the Nazi invaders has been called the "people's revolution" against tyranny, in France as well as elsewhere. But the French workers are beginning to realize that their struggle against tyranny is not yet over for they have yet to "settle matters with their own bourgeoisie." This struggle is only a continuation of the class struggle that has existed since the French bourgeoisie came to power. Its the struggle between capital and labor, one

that goes on in all capitalist nations, "democratic" or dictatorial.

In spite of all attempts made by the ruling class to keep this struggle within "legal" channels there are times when it bursts out into open. Then the struggle takes on a political, in fact, a revolutionary character. And this is NOT a "revolution within the law" but in spite of and against the legal restrictions imposed upon it. The bourgeoisie itself would not have been victorious in its revolution against feudalism without bursting asunder the feudal legal relations. The capitalist class is notorious in its disrespect of the "law." France is richly endowed with historical examples of such revolutionary struggles.

France also is rich in historical examples of proletarian revolutionary struggles against their exploiters. We can give one of the best examples viz. the Paris Commune of 1871. It happened at the time the Prussian armies, in the days of Bismarck, had overrun France and were laying siege to Paris. The "collaborationists" were Thiers and others who headed the bourgeoisie, and under the pretence of "defense" of the nation betrayed it to the Prussian general.

The workers of Paris, however, fought against that betrayal. On March 18, 1871, "Paris arose to the thunderburst of 'Vive la Commune.'" It was with that outcry that the workers hurled their challenge to their exploiters and betrayers. As Karl Marx further points out in his "Civil War In France," the address of the General Council of the International Workingmen's Association:

"The proletarians of Paris amid the failures and treasons of the ruling class, have understood that the hour has struck for them to save the situation by taking into their own hands the direction of public affairs. . . . They have understood that it is their imperious duty and their absolute right to render themselves master of their own destinies, by seizing upon the governmental power."

But, as Marx further stressed in his analysis of the Paris Commune, "The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes." And this the Communards of Paris soon discovered and therefore acted accordingly. What did they do? They established rule from below, that is their own political power, a working-class form of government.

Marx in his letter to Kugelmann, April 12, 1871, stated that: ". . . If you look at the last chapter of my Eighteenth Brumaire, you will see that I declared the next attempt of the French revolution to be: not merely to hand over, from one hand to another, the bureaucratic and military machine, as has occurred hitherto, but to shatter it (Marx's italics, the

(Continued on page 6)

HOME SCENE

Behind the Strike Situation

The No-Strike Pledge which handcuffed labor since the U. S. entered into the war, received its first official jolt from the Textile Workers Union. Its executive board announced that "it had released 100,000 members in 53 mills" from the pledge.

Emil Rieve, union president, made known that the union had been "deluged by requests for walk-outs in telegrams by the bushel."

The many "wild cat strikes" which have been occurring in various industries from time to time are certainly indicative of a strong feeling among labor. The union leaders as a whole have used every device to thwart interference with the No-Strike Pledge and, to date, have in the main succeeded. Yet the rising tide of rank and file grievance is developing towards a breaking point, as shown by the action of the Textile Workers Union.

That strikes do not originate from the workers' lack of patriotism, as some labor haters charge, is demonstrated by the workers response in production, sweating plenty, long and bitter hours at backbreaking jobs, to turn out the machines of destruction; by its financial sacrifices in bond purchases and taxation; and above all, by the millions of its brothers it has yielded to the moloch of war, many of whom are never to return.

Nor do strikes emanate from selfishness and greed on the part of labor. Whenever it struck for higher wages, it was forced to do so because of the disproportionate rise in the cost of living. Thus in demanding wage increases, it was attempting to maintain its wage standard. What appears to be selfishness and greed is a pure and simple defense of its economic interest. Whatever charges of selfishness and greed exist must be properly placed in the camp of the employers, as verified by their own governmental agencies.

Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, testifying before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, showed that the textile industry is the picture of health. The Bankhead Amendment to the stabilization act of 1942, brought \$100,000,000 annual price boost to the textile manufacturers.

Bowles continued: "These price increases, were given to industries which demonstrably did not need them. It is now known that, at the time when the first of the increase were approved, the earnings of cotton textile mills were at the rate of about \$315,000,000 a year.

"This is more than five times their adjusted peacetime average. . . ." It is pretty obvious that the textile owners are interwoven with the government, and rightly so since the government in Washington is there to protect the "American Way," the profit system.

Again, "Chester A. Bowles, OPA Administrator has revealed that department store profits in 1943 soared to \$593,800,000, in contrast with an annual average of \$51,800,000 in the peacetime period from 1936-39. This is an increase of 1046 per cent." (PM—March 1, 1945.)

Contrast the above profit (capitalist greed) with labor's "selfishness" as reported in PM: "The Bureau of Labor Statistics have issued a report on wages in department and clothing stores showing that hourly rates of pay in these establishments in 1943 ranged from 39 cents an hour for women bundle wrappers and stock girls to \$1.18—including commissions—for furniture salesmen," or with the five cents an hour increase (from 50 to 55 cents) as tentatively granted by the WLB to the textile workers. We leave it to the reader to judge where the charge of greed and selfishness belongs.

The cause of these strikes lies (1) in the need for wage increases to offset the ascending cost of living; (2) workers reaction to inhuman rate of speedup of production which, under the camouflage of the war effort, is resulting in tremendous war fortunes piling up. The millionaires of World War I are outclassed by the billionaires of World War II.

Increased pay means less profits, and greater profits usually means lower wages. Speedup means more in the coffers of capital. These are the fundamental grievances of labor, making for strikes. No political law made in Washington to outlaw strikes can prevail for long. The economic laws will not be downed and assert themselves in time.

Substandard wages is the rule of capital. The workers are perfectly justified, in or out of war, in fighting for their economic rights. For in not doing so they are yielding to capital, rendering it all the stronger.

* * *

Harvard Professor Says Science Restrained by State and Religion

Speaking at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Professor Kirtley F. Mather of Harvard University said: "There are institutions in our land, even states within our nation, in which the scientist is still definitely limited in research as well as teaching by 'no trespass' signs erected in the name of religion." Professor Mather also said: "There have been attempts by politicians to control the social scientists in the United States. The teachers oath legislation was the first step toward enslavement of scientists to a political hierarchy.

"Economic groups have attempted to restrict the freedom of scientists, especially in the social sciences, pressures which create in the teaching staff of state universities,

(Continued on page 6)

PROLETARIAN NEWS

A Journal for the Working Class
**Devoted to the Education of Workers and
 Their Struggle for Power**

Published Monthly by the
 Proletarian Party of America
 Subscriptions—12 Issues for 50 Cents
 Send All Subscriptions, Contributions, Etc., to
PROLETARIAN NEWS
 1545 N. Larrabee St., Chicago, Ill.

The Soviet Union and 'Slave Labor'

The term "slave labor" has been much in vogue of late. It has been applied mainly to Germany's ruthless handling of large numbers of people in those countries which its imperialist armies had overrun. French and Belgian workers in large numbers were taken into Germany and forced to work under the direction of Nazi overseers. Poles, Russians and others have been treated in like manner.

The triumphant capitalist-imperialists of Naziland added to the regimentation and exploitation of their own workers a still more ruthless exploitation of peoples of the conquered territories. In other words, the capitalists of Germany, in addition to exploiting their own wage-slaves, went in for intensive exploitation of the wage-slaves of most of the countries of Europe, during the time of their occupation.

The exploitation of labor by capital is not a German monopoly. The profit system was already there when the Nazi machine took over the political control of the nation. The German capitalist-imperialists, however, were enabled through Nazi methods to greatly intensify the exploitation of their workers. To increase the surplus values, to have more to expend upon militarism and their imperialist adventure, the German capitalists gave free rein to the Nazi political machine, and in return the Nazis served their financial supporters well by breaking all working class resistance to unlimited exploitation.

These scavengers of German capitalism smashed all working class political parties and labor organizations, and thus aided the owners of industry to lengthen hours and shorten wages. The Hitlerites also carried on an intensive propaganda, the substance of which was an appeal for sacrifice now in the interest of the greater Germany of the future. Going without butter, and with less bread, was commenced much earlier in Germany than in Britain and the U. S. A., and without a doubt it has gone much further in its rationing and regimentation.

German capitalism sought to overthrow its greater rival imperialists. It succeeded in smashing the French empire, and might have done the same to the British empire, had it not made the mistake of tangling up with the Soviet Union and the overwhelming forces of the Red Army. In its desperation German capitalism resorted to more ruthless exploitation of labor, especially of non-German workers, than its capitalist rivals, such as Great Britain and France, although those nations also have instituted similar methods, if less intense.

With the entry of America into the war, the victories in North Africa and western Europe, and the rolling of the Red Army to the suburbs of Berlin, victory for the United Nations is in sight, and speculation is rife as to how Germany should be handled after defeat. It is obvious that the occupation of Germany is not intended for the benefit of

the German people, either workers or capitalists. Its object is to take control while indemnity is being extracted, to compensate the capitalist of the British and American empires for their losses, and to compensate the people of the Soviet Union for their losses.

The British and American imperialists will take their payments in gold or other valuables, if available. Where this form of payment is not available or is insufficient they will support and direct German capitalist industry, so as to be able to collect the larger share of the profits, to compensate for the losses inflicted by the German war machine.

This, of course, means a continuation of the exploitation of German labor, right on the spot, in the industries of Germany, which will remain in the hands of their present owners. The German workers will get but a bare existence, but that is all they have been getting anyway. It will make no real difference to them. Instead of the German capitalists taking all the profits extracted from the social labors of the German workers, a large portion of the profit will be collected by the capitalists of Britain and America. The smaller share of the profits will be left in the hands of the German "private enterprisers," the Krupps, Stinneses, and others of their class. This will be represented as nice "free labor," not "slave labor."

To our way of thinking all workers who are exploited are "slave" laborers, but this capitalist exploitation of German workers under British and American direction will not be called "slave labor," because the German workers will continue to be skinned at home in the good old "free enterprise" way. If some of them should be taken to England or America to work in industry, or to rebuild devastated cities, that will be called "slave labor."

The Soviet Union will occupy part of Germany, perhaps the larger part. There, the workers will be exploited, provided that capitalism prevails, by the same class which is exploiting them now, and to about the same extent, but a share of the product will be taken from its owners, the capitalists, perhaps the greater share. The workers, as a class, would get no less, they might actually get more, than at present. Their exploiters, the German capitalists, would get much less, the largest share of their profits would be taken as indemnity by the Soviet Union.

It has been suggested that perhaps large numbers of Germans may be taken into the Soviet Union to produce in Soviet factories, and to help rebuild devastated Soviet cities. This "slave labor" would be producing for the U. S. S. R., a workers' country, instead of for the millionaires of capitalist Germany. From the workers' point of view, what is wrong with such an arrangement?

From a capitalist standpoint, the Soviet Union using large numbers of Germans to rebuild Soviet cities, that would be bad. That would be "slave labor," even if those workers received a higher standard and better working conditions than the workers remaining in those parts of Germany where production would be carried on in the interest of British, American and German millionaires.

If all the people in Germany could be made to work for, say the next 20 years, for the U. S. S. R., instead of giving their lives for the rebuilding of German capitalist-imperialism, we would not see any reason for American workers, especially so-called socialists and progressives to yell about it. Of course we would very much prefer to see Germany as a whole pass into the hands of the German workers, and the exploitation of

labor by capital come to an end there.

If the U. S. S. R., in its settlement with German capitalists, lays down terms as a means of partial payment, that Germany send into the Soviet Union, say ten millions of its people to rebuild what the Nazi armies destroyed, and in addition that while they are there the German government has to pay those workers, that will not bring back the Soviet dead, but it will be a penalty upon German capitalist-imperialism, not merely in relation to its past behavior but that will be ten million people that German capitalism will not be able to exploit or to use for the rebuilding of its imperialism.

The Soviet Union will not be injured by the coming of German "slave labor." Competition for jobs will not exist. Such an arrangement in Britain and America, where all transactions have to pass through the bottleneck of the profit system, would throw home labor out of work and add to the army of unemployed.

As the Soviet Union produces without profit there is no vast national debt, such as in America, which "We owe to ourselves" (the American capitalists), as Mr. Roosevelt puts it. As the rebuilding of the U.S.S.R. will also be carried on without profit, without the enrichment of parasites, there will be no limit to the number of people who can be put to work. Unemployment will be unknown. Even if the U. S. S. R. has Germany deliver vast quantities of tools and machines as part payment, that will not throw Soviet workers out of employment, but on the contrary will help to greatly extend employment.

Reparations in kind, machinery and goods in general, if taken by America and Britain, will but add to the burden of unemployment, because of the competitive character of the profit system, the "free enterprise," which Churchill and Roosevelt so stoutly defend. Those who squawk the loudest about "slave labor" abroad are usually defenders of "free" slave labor at home. With them it is all right as long as labor is skinned democratically.

The defenders of "free enterprise," conservatives and liberals alike, cannot understand or do not want to understand that the profit system has brought the world to its present plight. The various methods of exploitation are but different forms of slave labor. The "free" American worker, for instance, because of his productive capacity, because of the amount of value he produces in relation to his wages, is one of the most exploited workers in the world, probably the most thoroughly skinned wage slave in all history. To become aware of this simple fact is a real forward step, a necessary one if American labor is to play a worth-while role in world-wide changes which are now in the making.

Is it not high time that American workers began to understand the nature of capitalist exploitation? Is it not time that they realized that the way in which they are exploited is but a different form of capitalist slave labor? And, is it not time that they took steps to abolish the exploitation of man by man in all of its forms?

This is the way into a better world, to prosperity and permanent peace. Only the workers as a class can bring this about, and only by first conquering complete political power and using it to socialize the industries and the natural resources of the nation for the good of all.

John Keracher.

Wages and the Working Day Imperialism Marches On!

(Continued from last issue)

The Value of Labor Power

The modern proletarian, the wage worker, is not a commodity. He cannot be bought and sold as a chattel slave was, but his labor power is a commodity and he is obliged to sell it in order to live. His physical and mental services he sells to the employing class. The wage he receives is the price of his labor power. It is measured off by the clock at so much per hour, or by the product if he is a piece-worker.

The value of labor power is determined in the same way as any other commodity, namely by the socially necessary labor which enters into its production, or reproduction. But how does that work out? It is the amount of socially necessary labor required to produce the food, shelter and clothing, etc., which not only he consumes but also his wife and family, which determines the value of his labor power.

If, on an average, it takes three hours of socially necessary labor to produce values equal to that consumed daily by the worker and his family, then his wages are equal to three hours of his labor time, and if he works nine hours, six of those hours are *surplus labor time* in which he is producing values for his employer.

The employer may be quite a humane individual, but from a business point of view the worker is but an instrument of labor. To the average employer the worker is but labor power in overalls, and after buying that commodity from the workers, he is the owner of it and makes use of it for his own purpose, the direct object of which is profit making. The worker, having sold his labor power, is no longer the owner and director of that power.

The wages the worker receives for his labor power, during the time he is expending it, are necessary to restore it so that he can again expend it. This restoration (the production of labor power), the result of his meals and rest, plus clothing and other necessities, includes the expenditures of the whole family. His wife may cook the meals and do the washing and repairing of the family's clothes. She may do the shopping and other necessary work which enters into reproduction of the worker's labor power. His wages have to be sufficient to cover these expenses, plus the raising of a fresh supply of young labor power for the future labor market, otherwise the supply of human labor power would run out. Mr. and Mrs. Proletarian, and the young Proletarians, have all to be supported, hence all that enters into the value of the workers labor power. The value of his labor power is not determined by what he produces but by what he and his family must consume.

The price of labor power, as is true of other commodities, rises and falls, but this fluctuation is around the value of the labor power. This results mainly from demand and supply. If there are more jobs available than workers then wages rise, but within certain limitations. If there are more workers than jobs, wages fall, but not so low that it would be just as well for the workers to starve without working as to starve and work as well.

Labor power, being a living thing, cannot be sold and delivered without the worker delivering himself to the employer. Thus, the worker indirectly sells himself by installments. Labor power has other characteristics. It is the only commodity purchased by the employer which, when applied, produces values greater than its own value. The social labors of the workers is the only source from which profit arises, no matter how it may ultimately be divided between the different types of capitalists.

Even if we assume that the standard of living in modern nations, such as the U. S. A. trends in an upward direction, the working people are so efficient, and machinery so improved, that they can produce greater quantities of wealth for the capitalists than any slaves in history have ever done for their masters.

This is the real source of the great fortunes of today. It is the outcome of the great productive capacity of the modern workers, the result of the process which is known as *social production*. However, it has not enriched the workers who do the producing, but it has made millionaires, and multimillionaires of the capitalists who don't produce, but who own the means of production.

Social Production

The average worker, as far as his hours and pay are concerned, has a fair understanding of what the working day is, but the half-hidden complex factors, and social relationships, which we here have sought to explain, are for him, as yet, a mystery. In other words, the general character of modern production, *social production*, is not comprehended by the workers, and consequently its inevitable outcome has yet to be learned.

When we speak of *social production* we simply mean that no individual any longer produces things by himself. It now requires the cooperation of thousands of workers, all doing some small part which fits into the whole. That is all that is meant by *social production*. It is no longer individual production. This has come about slowly and rather imperceptibly, but the significance of this development, if once understood by the workers, will change their whole outlook upon social questions which continually arise in the wide and continuous struggle between cap-

(Continued from page 2)

business, to that of the international. It is another step in the direction of state capitalism.

There is also something more in the plans which can be said to be new. American proposals seem to be the more liberal, seem to recognize the rights of other nations to participate. They want to maintain a measure of competitive freedom. Take America's proposal to the Civil Aviation Conference at Chicago Nov.-Dec., 1944): "These rights of transit and commerce should be available to all nations, permitting equal opportunity and reasonable competition."

In reality, this idea is neither new or is it the expression of the "fair" and "liberal" mind. Early in the Seventeenth Century a Portuguese galleon was captured by a Dutch vessel and hauled before a Dutch prize court. The question to be decided was: Had the Portuguese the right to close off great areas of the Pacific Ocean and to bar others from those seas? The lawyer, Hugo Gratius, for the Dutch Company, wrote what later became considered the greatest argument for the "freedom of the seas."

John Seldon of Great Britain, for the defense, wrote the argument for "the closed sea." The lawyers' arguments settled nothing, but after 200 years of business development, and many wars, the British had come around to the endorsement of the "freedom of the seas" idea. It wasn't just a mental process. In the early Seventeenth Century the Dutch felt themselves capable of competing and the previously established rights of the Portuguese stood in their way.

In the early Nineteenth Century the British were not only capable of competing with the world, but had actual control of so much of the earth's land surface, including three mile shore line limits, that they had no fear of competition on the high seas. Today, American productive machinery, including aviation, is at a stage of development where fear of competition is much reduced, but where European land possessions are a serious hindrance to American business expansion.

Thus we see that the American

ital and labor.

Social production, thousands of workers cooperating under the same roof, and industry in general being more interdependent, is the chief characteristic of present day production. It is collective production, but individual appropriation. The products do not belong to the workers who produce them but to the owners of the means of production, the capitalists.

(To be continued)

plan for freedom and cooperation is in line with the present stage of world capitalist development, and particularly with the needs of American surplus capital.

The plan does not, nor could it be made to, void the economic laws of capitalist development. The economic fact that surplus value, created by labor for capital, must continuously be invested in capital expansion, if production is to continue, is still at work. The further economic fact that markets for the products of capitalist production do not grow at the same rate as production, but at a much slower rate, is still the law.

Thus the continuous growth of surplus capital is augmented with every new expansion of capital. This holds true as much in regard to capital expansion into new territories as it does regarding its invasion of new fields of production. It also holds true in the general field of technical improvement. The most liberal of post-war plans formulated by capitalist nations can be nothing but plans for capital expansion. On the international field this means imperialist expansion.

The new military machine which has been built for the present war is now considered a permanent necessity. The U. S. A. wants no colonies. It wants to subjugate no foreign people. It does want far-flung naval and air bases. It wants to keep watch over other nations' behavior. The worst of all misbehavior on the part of any foreign nation will be a too rapid expansion of its capital. America is not only willing to "help" the most. It insists upon the right to "help" the most. And the "help" must bring returns on dollars invested. The percentage might be lowered but the bulk returns must be augmented. Again, this is in line with the economic laws of the concentration and expansion of capital. Imperialism, marches on.

But the plans might not carry through to fruition. The economic chaos that will prevail in war-torn Europe and Asia, when the bombs cease to drop, might be too much for capitalism to overcome. A workers' system of government, with cooperative production and distribution to workers only, might be the line chosen in many sections. This would be a serious blow to all investors of capital. It would be considered bad taste indeed to have their proffered "help" rejected. But that very rejection will be the means of ending wars and preparations for wars. It will be the means of allowing consumption of goods to keep march with productive ability. It will be the means of getting along without capitalist "help." It will be the termination of capitalism.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 3)

such as of Texas, fear of dismissal if they announce conclusions repugnant to members of boards of trustees or regents." (Boston Globe—March 7, 1945.)

Three very fine observations were made by Professor Mather: (1) that it is "economic groups" that attempt to restrict the freedom of scientists; (2) especially in the social sciences; (3) fear of dismissal as a form of economic pressure.

This is exactly how our "free" educational system works in practice, which like the rest of the American institutions are "freely" controlled by the capitalist class, sometimes called "economic pressure groups."

That social science should come in for greater restriction than natural science is to be expected of an economic class which is ready to exploit to the full that phase of science (natural) indispensable in their accumulation of wealth. They are equally ready to repress, distort and restrict that other phase of science (social) which of necessity would have to inquire into the method by which wealth is accumulated. In other words, how capital becomes fat through legalized theft and deception must remain a secret. An admission coming from the mouth of one of its own idealogists adds strongly to the indictment against the existing capitalist order. Its economic interest acts as the restrictive force. Society must first rid itself of economic privilege before science can become free. This notwithstanding existing popular notions on "freedom."

* * *

On the Race Front

Equality of sacrifice on the battlefield is one thing—Equality at home is quite another. An entire Negro battalion, approximately 1000 men, veterans of 21 months of South Pacific service, have recently gone on a hunger strike at Port Hueneme, California, in protest against an act of discrimination. It appears that some white enlisted men have been added to their battalion where they were eventually to be elevated to chief petty officers. The Negroes, because of their training and overseas experience, felt qualified for these ratings.

Commodore William M. Quigley, commander of the advance base depot at Port Hueneme was reported to have said: "I knew them and admired them at Tulagi and Guadalcanal. However, they have no basis whatsoever for complaint, since there has been absolutely no color line and no discrimination against members of the battalion by its own officers or by the naval base."

Quite naturally they were "admired" at Tulagi and Guadalcanal, but what about California? The dual standard of imperialist-democracy should be obvious.

In the meantime effort is made by advocates of race equality to force open the doors of Catholic colleges to educationally qualified Negroes. Religious people may preach lots about the virtues of "tolerance and love" for one's neighbor, and that "we are all alike God's children," but what do they practice? — intolerance, bigotry, humiliation of man by man. Their sermons are just so much double-talk, hypocrisy and plain humbug.

When we think of "fair Harvard" most people are prone to do so with a certain degree of reverence and even awe. But Harvard is not so "fair." It, too, is guilty of discriminatory practices, of course not in a cheap way. For whatever Harvard does is done in a lofty "gentlemanly" manner.

At a Massachusetts legislative hearing on an anti-discrimination bill, Dr. Albert S. Coolidge, professor of chemistry cited a case where there existed a gentleman's agreement" between Harvard University and a chemical concern of Delaware which donated a scholarship. The understanding was that it would not be given to a Jew.

Said the professor: "We know perfectly well that names ending in 'berg' and 'stein' have to be skipped by the board in the selection of students for the scholarship."

According to Dr. Coolidge the scholarship was about to be presented to a Jewish student, "unquestionably of superior intelligence" when "someone said, 'Hold on a minute; what is his name?' and then it was stated that, due to a gentleman's agreement, it would be impossible to delegate the scholarship to this particular man."

Such is the composition of "fairness" of this oldest and "greatest" American educational institution! Such is its fair play! Such is its merit system! A true 'gentleman's agreement'! What hypocritical philanthropy! And these have the audacity to criticize the Nazis! These American racists should look into the Nazi mirror for a reflection of themselves.

* * *

The Little Man With the Big Idea

The story of the "little man" is quite a painful one. Frequent attempts are made by business doctors to ease painful condition. It is supposed to act as a moral lift. How much real good such "lifts" do is of course doubtful. For, like the weather, everyone talks about it, but no one can do anything about it.

One such moral builder is Eric Johnston, enterprising young president of the National Chamber of Commerce. In the March issue of Nation's Business, he has an article entitled, "Make Way for the Little Man with Big Ideas." He is not too specific as to who is to "make way." As a statistician and realist, he reveals a phenomenal casualty list for small business. 1,000,000 of them since Pearl Har-

'Revolution by Law'

(Continued from page 3)

original word is *zerbrechen*); and this is the preliminary condition of any real people's revolution on the continent. This, too, is what our heroic Parisian comrades have attempted. What elasticity, what historic initiative, what capacity for sacrifice in these Parisians. After six months of starvation and ruin, more as a result of inner betrayal than of the external enemy, they rise beneath Prussian bayonets, as if war between France and Germany never existed and the enemy were not yet standing before the gates of Paris. History has no similar example of similar greatness. . . ."

What did this "real people's revolution" accomplish? It established the first working class form of government which lasted for two and a half months. To insure its rule, as Marx points out, one of the first decrees of the Commune was the suppression of the standing army and the substitution of the armed people. This was particularly essential after the attempt of the bourgeoisie on March 18th to disarm the Parisian workers. Failing in that attempt the bourgeois government fled to Versailles, where Thiers, that "monstrous gnome," plotted with the Prussian Bismarck to suppress the Commune. The Commune paid a heavy price in being so "magnanimous" in allowing the bourgeoisie to escape. For eventually it was suppressed with a ferocity and atrocities committed by the French bourgeoisie that have only been equalled and surpassed in recent history by the atrocities committed by the German Nazis in this present world conflict.

During the rule of the Paris Commune, the capitalist class did their utmost to prejudice the world against it. They denounced it as "mob rule" and "banditry." But Karl Marx furnishes us with the facts and states that: "The Commune was formed of the municipal councillors, chosen by universal suffrage in various wards of the town, responsible and revocable at short terms. The majority of its members were naturally working men, or acknowledged representatives of the working class. The Commune was to be a working, not a parliamentary body, executive and legislative at the same time. Instead of continuing to be the agent of the central government, the police was at once stripped of its political attributes, and turned into the responsible and at all times revocable agent of

the Commune. So were the officials of all other branches of the administration. From the members of the Commune downwards, the public service had to be done at *workmen's wages*. The vested interests and the representation allowances of the high dignitaries of State disappeared along with the high dignitaries themselves. Public functions ceased to be the private property of the tools of the central government. Not only municipal administration, but the whole initiative hitherto exercised by the State was laid into the hands of the Commune."

F, Engels also furnishes us with an insight of some of the social measures taken by the Commune and states that: "On the 16th of April, the Commune issued an order for a statistical account of all factories and workshops which had been closed by the employers, and for the elaboration of plans for their utilization by and for account of the workmen hitherto engaged in them, who were to be formed into cooperative societies for the purpose, and further, for the amalgamation of these societies into one great cooperative organization."

In fact this example of a working class government in actual operation was deemed so significant and noteworthy that Lenin, a great Soviet leader, in his Letter to the Workers of Europe and America (Jan. 1919), states that: "A parliamentary bourgeois republic strangles and crushes the independent upbuilding of all state life from top to bottom. The opposite is true about the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The latter reproduces the type of state that was being evolved by the Paris Commune and that Marx called the 'political form at last discovered under which to work out the economic emancipation of labor.'"

The Paris Commune was "the embryo of the Soviet power" that Soviet power which enabled the Russian workers to take possession, not just of one city alone, but of one-sixth of the world's surface. And so, today, in their struggles against their exploiters, it would be well for the French workers (in fact the world's workers) to remember the Paris Commune (and its more fully developed form, the Soviet), to draw inspiration from it and learn the historical lessons from this first "experiment" of a workers' government.

Al Wysocki.

bor, have made their exit. As a moralist and dreamer, he contradicts himself by glorifying this "as a land of opportunity" still. We cannot disagree with Johnston that this undoubtedly "is a land of opportunity"—only not for everybody. Big capital is certainly enjoying ample opportunity, but the same cannot be said for labor which is most thoroughly exploit-

ed, nor for its less fortunate business brethren whose businesses are gradually falling into good sound hands. Johnston consolingly suggests to the little man with the big idea, ambition and skill "to find someone with money who is looking for interest." A very fine suggestion. But where is that someone with money? And can any-

(Continued on page 7)

Yalta and Its Labor Critics

The Yalta Conference brought out the critics of the Soviet Union in full force. Not only the outright reactionary capitalist spokesmen, McCormicks, Wheelers and other bourgeois haters of the Soviet form of government, but also spokesmen of some working class parties, speaking in the name of Socialism; for instance, the Socialist Labor Party, the Trotskyites and others. If we can at all excuse the former critics, or at least explain their reaction on grounds of pure economic class interests, the same cannot be said for the latter. For "Socialist" organizations speaking in the name of labor and especially Marxism should know better or else become the object of severe criticism themselves.

Let us take the S. L. P., since its criticism of Yalta and the Soviet is typical of the rest in its main outline. In the Weekly People, its party organ, February 24, it expatiates in a quite lengthy article, "Rulers Cheer Yalta Concord," how "Stalin carried home the bacon from the Crimean meeting—and the whole Allied-capitalist world (excepting the London Poles) is cheering itself hoarse!"

We quote: "Stalin won his demands—a slice of Polish territory, recognition of the Lublin government, abscission of eastern Germany, German reparations loot, a voting procedure in the projected world organization council that practically rules out the use of that body in any future anti-Soviet coalition — and the capitalists rejoice!"

"Is this a contradiction? It is a contradiction only to those who persist in their political naivete concerning Stalinist Russia, and who, notwithstanding the evidence, still regard Russia as a 'worker's republic.' But to those who perceive the true state of affairs, and grasp the pregnant fact that Russia represents, not Socialism, but bureaucratic Stateism, the contradiction is easily resolved. For it was give and take at Yalta, and what Stalin gave means far more to the international capitalist plunderbund than a few thousand miles of Polish territory or the enslavement of German workers as "reparations" for the crimes of their Nazi-capitalist masters. It means Stalin's cooperation in crushing the incipient European revolution. It means that Russia's might and prestige are at the disposal of international capitalism in its aim to prolong class rule. It means that the rulers of the U. S. S. R. have given final and convincing proof of their repudiation of Socialism. Neither Jesuitic pretexts nor Marxist pretensions can any longer obscure the fact. Stalin & Co. have deliberately thrown the workers of the world to the capitalist wolves."

Let us analyze the above quotation: "Stalin carried home the bacon . . . and the whole Allied capitalist world (excepting the London Poles) is cheering itself hoarse!"

Is that statement true? Is it true that the reactionary, landlord, fascistic London Polish Government in exile has been abandoned by the whole capitalist class as a body, that it has no friends amongst it? The incontrovertible facts of history are that up to very recently both the U. S. State Department and the British as well have officially given support not to the Soviet recognized Lublin Polish Provisional Government but to the London Polish Government in exile. It is an incontrovertible fact that a sizeable section of the capitalists as represented by the Hearsts, Howards, McCormicks, Wheelers, Dies, Rankins and others have been and are the friends of the reactionary, landlord London Poles. It is also incontrovertible that the London Poles have neither been abandoned by their "friends" in the labor movement, the S. L. P., Trotskyites and others. The "poor" London exiled Poles (representative of the rich landlord and Polish capitalist interests) haven't been completely abandoned to the "Stalinist" bear!

Next "Stalin" won his demands . . . and the capitalists rejoice!" Is it a contradiction? The S. L. P. proceeds to reconcile the contradiction through the explanation that Russia is not a Socialist state at all, that "Russia represents not Socialism, but bureaucratic Stateism." Thus it says, "the contradiction is easily resolved." But it is easier said than done. A contradiction might be "easily" resolved through statement, but not so "easily" resolved in history which precedes theory and takes precedence over mere **statement**. It is the S. L. P. itself that is in a contradiction and an unpalatable one, sharing company with the fascist Polish element and other fascist elements. It is not the politically naive who "still regard Russia as a workers' republic" who fall into the contradiction. It is the S. L. P. itself with its politically distorted concept of "Stalinist Russia" which fell into its own created contradiction and seems unable to "easily" resolve it. And what is this S. L. P. creation of "bureaucratic Stateism" without class or economic connections? Is it a "pure" thing in itself, a Kantian concept? Or is it a living political institution existing in relation to, within and as a result of class society? The Marxian concept (and the S.L.P. representing itself of course as Marxian, will even give lip service to it) is that the State had its origin in private property and class society. It continues to ex-

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 6)
one convince him that financing small business is more profitable, and sounder than investing in stocks and bonds?

Sentiments look pretty on paper. "Big business should give the little man a start, for it is the very backbone of our country," is an old contention, but the point is that the darned thing don't work that way. Business is competitive. As such, it practices little mutual aid. They are all philanthropic fair-minded financiers until some one asks, "Who will be the first to help?" Then silence.

About the same time another leading figure, a Wall Street financier, Ferdinand Eberstadt is also much concerned about the little man's well being. He, too, presents some painful statistics. In the year

1942 alone 307,000 small businesses folded up. As a financier he glorifies little, and talks cold turkey: "The opportunity for small or new enterprises to get capital is practically non-existent, and as for credit, the situation is not a great deal better, with no improvement in prospect."

To Eberstadt the problem is purely local, hence the solution is also local. It is the responsibility of the local community to come to the aid of local merchants and business plus some, only some, additional assistance from the government. In effect, what Eberstadt is suggesting is that the poor little fellow go "home" to mama.

What is the real condition of the little man with the big idea. He's like the fellow with a champagne appetite and a beer pocketbook.

L. B.

ist in varying forms as long as private property and class society exist or any remnants of it, internally within a given country, or externally within the system as a whole; that only when all of society has become classless is there a basis for a stateless society and not until then. In the light of this concept, in the light of a still predominant capitalism as a world system can Marxism speak of "Stateism" without specifying the economic class which this state represents? We press the question: "What class is in power in Russia, is it the capitalist class with a private property economy? Or is it the working class with a socialized economy? And to the Trotskyites, too, who prattle about a "nationalized economy" we ask: a nationalized economy, but what kind? Is it socialist, working class or capitalist nationalized economy? Lenin on the question of democracy always asked what kind of democracy, bourgeois or proletarian working class democracy? To speak of the state or democracy in the abstract without concrete, specific allusion as to what kind of a state, a working class or capitalist, is dealing in bourgeois democratic generalizations and not Marxian analysis. Even in relation to bureaucracy (both Lenin and Stalin never denied the existence and unavoidability of bureaucracy) as a traditional and political hangover from capitalism the overcoming of which is a process under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. We must pose the question, what kind of a bureaucracy, capitalist or proletarian, and in the interest of what class is it wielded?

The Weekly People charges Stalin with selling out, "it was give and take at Yalta, and what Stalin gave means far more to the international capitalist plunderbund than a few thousand miles of Polish territory or the enslavement of German workers as "reparations" for the crimes of

their Nazi capitalist masters. It means Stalin's cooperation in crushing the incipient European revolution. It means that Russia's might and prestige are at the disposal of international capitalism in its aim to prolong class rule. It means that the rulers of the U. S. S. R. have given final and convincing proof of their repudiation of socialism."

It then goes on to cite concrete records of Stalinist "liberation." "Russian arms have now 'liberated' five Eastern European nations, each of which simmers with unrest and revolt. And how have the agents of Joseph Stalin coped with this situation? Have they encouraged the workers to organize and prepare themselves to take the control of affairs in their own hands? Have they, in line with 'the fundamental duty of all Socialists,' as enunciated by Lenin, revealed to the masses the existence of a revolutionary situation, 'awakened 'the revolutionary consciousness and revolutionary determination of the proletariat,' helped the workers 'to pass to revolutionary actions,' and guided them in the creation of organs capable of seizing the political and economic control of their country?"

"The answer," the Weekly People continues, "is of course that they have done none of these."

Are we to actually believe that the S. L. P. has at long last come to accept the dictatorship of the proletariat? For what else did Lenin, whom it conveniently refers to as an authority, teach but "that the creation of organs capable of seizing political and economic control of the country" cannot be done except through the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat? But we are not naive. We are fully aware that it is not beneath the 'high' principled S. P. P.-ites to use Lenin when it is convenient for them to do so, a matter quite different from understanding and accepting Lenin. But the S.L.P.

(Continued on page 8)

Yalta and Its Labor Critics

(Continued from page 7)
plays with fire (to itself) when it even suggests the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, whatever its intentions are.

The Weekly People is day-dreaming when it confounds a revolting situation with the European resistance movements. These resistance movements are anti-fascist movements and not proletarian movements, although revolutionaries and proletarians participate in them and are often in the forefront. Resistance movements, to be sure, contain revolutionary possibilities. Before these movements can become genuine proletarian movements the proletariat must win the lead, must raise for its definite objective the complete abolition of capitalism. None of these movements have to date raised the banner of Socialist revolution. The most that can be said is that these movements are pregnant with the seed of revolution. To expect the Soviet Union under these conditions to raise that banner for them is tantamount to importing the revolution from without. If that is what the S. L. P. means, why doesn't it say so? Assuming such a hypothetical case, is it not like the S. L. P. to denounce the Soviets as "interventionists" and anti-democratic for forcing revolution from without?

Ironically enough, a few days following the S. L. P. blast at Russia for coddling the Rumanian reactionary, Radescu, for torpedoing the Greek ELAS from within; Moscow came out with a denunciation of Radescu as a fascist collaborator. When the Rumanian National Democratic Front ousted Radescu, what did the powerful Red Army do? Did it drown the Rumanian masses in blood as the S. L. P. inferred? History gave the answer to that lie, Radescu sought and found sanctuary not with the Red Army, where he might have lost his head, but with the British foreign legation.

In relation to Greece, where the British imperialists are fighting the ELAS, even here Moscow, too, strongly denounced Plastiras as a tool of imperialism and as anti-democratic. In the eyes of the S. L. P. the Soviets are damned if they do and damned if they don't.

On Poland the S. L. P. insists that the Lublin Government is a Moscow puppet. Could it be that the S. L. P. prefers the other alternative: the London Government in Exile, that puppet of British imperialism? In viewing the politics the S. L. P. overlooks and strongly minimizes an economic reform of tremendous social significance, the splitting up of the big landed estates in Poland, giving the land to the peasants. Isn't such a real democratic step in harmony with the S. L. P. concept of democracy?

Who else but a genuine democratic government is capable of instituting such a change? Certainly the Polish Government in Exile is not.

On the "Free German Committee" the Weekly People has again the problem all worked out a priori. We are not yet ready to conclude what its role, if any, will be. We'll leave that to the S. L. P. infallibles who seem to have all the answers ready beforehand, preconceived. However, here, too, we must warn them against historical irony as in the case of Radescu.

The question on "forced" German labor is worth analyzing. It is an important question. The Soviets insist that as part of the reparations, German workers are to contribute labor to help in the rebuilding that which they tore down or burned. Well, what's wrong with that? The S. L. P. considers it obnoxious to hold the German workers responsible for the crimes of their Nazi-capitalist masters. It's one thing to play upon labor sympathy, it's another to give it a socialist analysis. While it is true that the Nazi Party and the German capitalists were the perpetrators of the war and the crime against the Soviets, is it not true equally that the German workers supported these perpetrators, and inhumanly participated and executed these crimes and destruction? And if the Nazi leading war criminals, political and economic, are to pay with their lives is it exacting to force at least partial material restitution upon the German workers? Socialists do not adhere to the "free will" theory in relation to crime. But neither do we accept the "no-will" theory either, i. e. that men are mechanically the offspring of their environment, with the will playing no role whatsoever. Such is mechanical materialism and not dialectical materialism. Dialectical materialism holds that men's will and consciousness plays a definite, important (even though not the primary one) role in shaping and altering economic and political conditions. That is why we have revolutionary movements, that is why we have resistance movements. The German workers are guilty of offering little if any resistance to the Nazi criminals, yielding to the Nazi will. Through their lack of wilful opposition they put themselves into the unfortunate position of mechanically supporting Nazi crimes. It is the S. L. P.'s incorrect premise that is the basic error from which all its contradictions flow. Did it recognize the Soviet Union as a workers' Socialist State all would be resolved.

Even this "forced German labor" would then be justified in the interests of Socialism. One

must never forget the objective and the class essence of things. The S. L. P., just as it lumps loosely together all dictatorships and democracies without discerning the class differences (since it sees the common features but not the differences—dialectics is the recognition of both), so too with forced labor. If socialist labor forces capitalist labor it does not and cannot do so with the object of exploitation and repression but into its opposite, to build and help rebuild a non-exploiting system. In helping to rebuild the physical structure of socialism in the Soviet Union, German labor will thereby strengthen world socialism, the German as well.

What should be the attitude of labor of one country towards another? The unity of their international interest is the basis. Have the Russian workers attempted that? Precisely that. In the first phase of the war, Lazovsky, who was then in charge of propaganda, kept repeatedly appealing to the German soldiers to fraternize, to cease fighting and destroying. But the German soldiers, except in few isolated instances, were deaf to the pleas; they preferred the Hitler road, to destroy and enslave the Russian proletariat, to destroy socialism. This stubbornness of the Germans forced the Russians to change their policy. They were forced to become unyielding to all German participants in this Nazi venture, regardless of their class origin. The German workers had proved that they have forgotten all labor history, whatever socialist training and background they had. As long as they insisted on supporting their German capitalist masters they must be made to bear the full responsibility for their own actions and that of their masters with which they associated themselves. This is not a case of a struggle between two capitalist nations but one between an imperialist (Germany) and a socialist (Russia).

On the other hand, should the German workers in the course of defeat yet break with their German national oppressors, the character of forced labor will automatically lose that nature. In the first place the German workers will of their own accord come to regard it as its international duty to help their Russian fellow workers in rebuilding, in which case it will be a form of self-discipline; secondly, it is just as likely that the process will be reversed, i. e., the Russian workers reciprocating where necessary, in which case this aid, or labor if you wish to call it such, will be mutual.

The S. L. P. and other such parties see "forced labor" through the eyes of capitalist ideology and not Marxian, bound

by capitalist nationalism and preference for it. The Marxist, not bound by the bourgeois shibboleth of "free" labor (for labor is never free under capitalism), will always prefer labor even under the form of "forced labor" for another country, if it is socialist as the Soviet Union is, in preference to its own national "free" capitalist labor. The internationalism of labor is greater than the nationalism of capital. But the S. L. P. seemingly prefers "benevolent" labor for German capitalism to "malevolent" labor for Soviet Socialism.

In the last analysis all labor under capitalism partakes of the general character of slave labor; conversely all labor under socialism, even the so-called forced labor, partakes of the character of free labor. This is a contradiction the S. L. P. metaphysicians will not so "easily" reconcile. It must first free itself from the petit-bourgeois concept of "free" labor and stop talking in abstract terms with no class content.

While the Russian Marxists are engaged in working out concrete historical problems the S. L. P. turns away from reality, indulging in all sorts of capitalist metaphysical abstractions and quixotic visions.

The Proletarian Party does not claim to know all that took place at Yalta. We do not see in Yalta the panacea for the world's ills. No conference or agreements under capitalist conditions can bring permanent peace and harmony. The economic and class contradictions within it preclude that, definitely. Nor do we think that the Russians are unaware of these matters. It is probable that the Soviets did make, inadvertently, some concessions, but certainly not without having wrung some definite concessions from British and American imperialism. Again we are certain of this: that whatever concessions have been made by the Soviets were not as a result of abandonment of the proletariat, of socialist principle and objective. Only such as unavoidably flowed from the existing relation of forces, between a yet predominantly capitalist world and an already strongly established socialist nation. Such concessions are no more to be termed a betrayal of socialism than the concession that Churchill and Roosevelt made can be termed a betrayal on their part of capitalism.

The Proletarian Party regards such parties who are openly hostile to the Soviet Union and others who half-heartedly support it while slapping it back-handedly as enemies of labor and socialism. While giving lip service to socialism in the abstract they are anti-socialist in practice and should be labeled as enemies within the ranks of labor. Inadvertently they line up with the outright haters of labor and distorters of Marxism.

R. Daniels.