

# 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. 7—Whole No. 148

Chicago, July, 1945

483

Price 5c a Copy

## Reconversion in Europe

By Christ Jelset

Europe is in its second month of peace. Things begin to shape up. Problems assert themselves. Trends in economic and political thinking start to formulate. Confusion grows, and news gatherers labor in bewilderment.

War devastation was serious in many places, but far from total. Large areas have their farms, their houses and their factories, in almost complete preservation. There were millions of uprooted population, refugees, prisoners of war, and workers for the Nazi war machine. These are rapidly being started on their return journey, back to their home lands. Surface appearances indicate that the worst should be over soon.

Other factors indicate a more stubborn resistance to the return of normalcy. There is lack of vigor behind reconversion. The farms and factories, all of which were busy and enjoying a measure of prosperity, both in Germany and in German-occupied nations, are now, for the most part, idle.

It is reported that Czechoslovakian factories, but slightly touched by bombings, now stand ready to produce for "whatever customers will place big orders." To "stand ready" is one thing, to operate and produce is something else. The farmers of Normandy, prosperous under German occupation, are so completely without a market that they are starting to cause trouble to their "liberators." Belgian and French factories are specifically named in reports, and we are told that they operate at from thirty to fifty per cent of capacity, with half of their curtailed turn-out going to the Allied armies to recondition equipment being sent to the Pacific war theater. Thus, even present deliveries face further curtailment.

The black market is absorbing most of the scant products available, and prices prohibit purchase by anyone except the wealthy. Rations of food and clothing are being cut drastically to make the scanty supply go around. Germans who fled from the Russian invaders are now said to regret their westward journeys and are looking for chances to return. As Curt

Riess reports from Magdeburg for the NEA service: "The Germans, it may surprise you to learn, prefer Russian occupation to Allied rule." . . . "The Russian army, beyond a doubt, is more active in reconstruction work than ours." Mr. Riess gives particular credit to the Russian occupation methods. The Russians fraternize with the German population. They have opened theaters and movies and have arranged for concerts, "all of which we have not done so far." The broadcasting stations (four of them) have good programs, have all the appearance of being run by Germans, do not mention German war guilt, only the Nazis are guilty. It is stressed that "Germany won't starve." An important factor seems to be that rations have already been increased under Russian occupation, while they have been reduced under American and British supervision.

Yet it becomes plain that not all are satisfied with the Russian system. One report mentions an American woman who had become a British subject through marriage, and who found herself in Russia. (Continued on page 2)

## Machines Displace Farm Workers

Although many are aware of the accelerated pace in the development and use of machinery in industry, due to the impetus provided by World War 2, not all as yet fully realize the degree to which modern farming has likewise become mechanized. As in the factories of the nation, so on the farms this mechanization has brought about two most important effects, namely, a tremendous increase in output and the displacement of manual workers by the machine.

As to output, on June 1, the Department of Agriculture indicated for 1945 the largest wheat crop for the United States ever produced, approximately 1,085,000,000 bushels. It also indicated above average production in oats, hay, potatoes and many fruits, despite a frost damage that affected some fruits. It is a comforting thought to the nation that there will be a great surplus of farm grown food. There will, therefore, be no need for anyone to go hungry, what with the country overflowing with "bread and honey," so we will be told, as we have been

time and again. But such reassurance will have little effect in relieving the anxiety as to the future of those workers who have become displaced from their jobs by the machine.

One must bear in mind that this tremendous output of farm products has occurred during the war years when there was an acute labor shortage. Ladd Haystead, writing the Farm Column in the June issue of Fortune, gives us a preview of what is in store for many farm workers. He states that:

"The greatest emigration from the farm in history has occurred in the last four years. From four million to seven million farm people are estimated to have gone to the armed forces, war industry and non-war urban jobs. Some of them were not needed on the farm but were the oversupply of labor resulting from the back-to-the-farm movement of the depression decade. Others were needed, but perhaps they won't be in the future. Despite labor shortages, farm production in wartime is estimated to have gone fully one-third above the average for the last of the thirties."

He further points out that this year the U. S. Department of Agriculture estimates that farmers would buy a billion dollars worth of equipment (farm machinery) if they could get it; but the more conservative in the farm equip-

(Continued on page 2)

## International Notes

### Inside Poland

Polish news continues to make the headlines. The Big Three are reported to have agreed regarding the formation of a new Polish government. Evidently the provisional government, which has been in operation in Poland since the Nazis were driven out, was recognized as the basic core of the new set-up. The "16 Poles" have been tried and those found guilty given jail sentences, ranging from 4 months to ten years. The testimony they gave exposed fully the reactionary role of the London emigrees.

While these events have held the spotlight, developments of much greater significance have been taking place within Poland. The Provisional Government, supported by the workers and peasants, has been acting. Here are excerpts from a very informative article in the

June 5th issue of Information Bulletin, Embassy of USSR: "It is already possible to enumerate some of the fruits of the immense work performed in so extremely short a time. As a consequence of this work the danger of economic disaster and wholesale unemployment has already been completely removed. Democratic Poland is already on the threshold of normal organization of its economic life on a new basis.

"An overwhelming majority of the industrial plants have been reopened. All textile mills, nearly all coal mines, and most of the iron and steel, chemical and metal-working plants, are operating. Thanks to the Soviet Union, the textile industry has all the cotton it needs. . . . The locomotive works in Chrzanow, the largest in Poland, (Continued on page 3)

### IN THIS ISSUE

RECONVERSION IN EUROPE  
By Christ Jelset

MACHINES DISPLACE FARM  
WORKERS  
By Al Wysocki

INTERNATIONAL NOTES  
By Oliver Ritchie  
HOME SCENE  
By L. B.

AMERICAN LABOR GETS  
POLITICAL PAY-OFF  
(Editorial)  
By John Keracher

# Reconversion in Europe

(Continued from page 1)

sian occupied Germany. She had stored away about a year's supply of food, but was forced to surrender everything in return for a ration card no better than the average. Such "outrages" do not occur under British and American rule.

The magazine "Business Week," for June 16, has an article entitled: "France: Europe's Tinder Box," in which one of its staff editors analyzes the European situation, with France as the central theme. This writer, after mentioning the fact that much of Europe's industrial equipment was not destroyed by the war, lists "four fears" which tend to "undermine the will of liberated western Europe to shape its own recovery vigorously." These "fears" are, (1) Dread of domestic economic crisis next winter; (2) Uncertainty over what is to happen to Germany; (3) Domestic political instability, and, (4) Doubts about the future security of western Europe.

Under "fear" 1, are listed such facts as that coal production is operating at no more than half of normal, that there is not enough electric power being produced to supply the demand even of the much curtailed industrial usage, that factories are operating at as low as thirty per cent of capacity, and that the demand for a large part of this limited output comes from the Allied armies, and is therefore temporary.

Under "fear" 2 are mentioned such factors as that the German Ruhr with its heavy coal and steel production was essential to western Europe's production, and besides, that "the great metropolitan centers in western Germany provided a market outlet." British industry is optimistic about capturing markets formerly held by the Germans, but "almost no industrialist in the small countries west of the Rhine views such an outlook with anything but alarm."

"Fear" 3 (political instability), the writer claims "must haunt Washington and London as well as the Europeans themselves." He says "Few people who have felt the pulse of Paris since V-E Day, watched the bitter political battle over the king of Belgium, or noted the prolonged cabinet crisis in Holland, believe that the course ahead will be a smooth one." Already governments have gone in for nationalization. France has nationalized the coal mines, etc. So far nationalization is not bad. The owners have been protected with assured income from government bonds. But if these nationalized mines should "fail to provide enough coal next winter, labor will undoubtedly attempt to snatch full control. And then what happens to mines may be applied to other key industries. The prospect alone is enough to prevent aggressive expansion programs."

The black market in France, the

attempts made by the government, apparently without success to curtail it, and the disappearance of goods from the legitimate market aggravates the situation. Finally, when General de Gaulle plunged into foreign affairs in order to gain time to straighten out domestic troubles, his schemes became complete failures. DeGaulle "has been rebuffed in the French occupation of Italian territory and in his demand that Franco be removed in Spain." He was also forced to capitulate on the Syrian issue.

"Fear" number 4, springs from "fear" number 3. Post-war planners, according to this commentator, want France "to be the western European anchor of a post-war security system." But the western powers want to key France and western Europe to "familiar democratic capitalist economies." It now becomes clear that "all of eastern Europe is being oriented into the Soviet sphere." He adds that "first hand observations in France during the month since V-E Day raise great doubts that any such confidence (in preserving capitalist economy) is warranted unless it is the intention of Britain and the United States to take a far more positive stand in supporting the French economy, and, as an automatic result bolstering the less radical leadership of the country." It is too early to say, but "the next two years will almost certainly determine which role France is destined to play."

The foregoing are but samples of what is reported from Europe. It all raises the big question, why? Why are the Russians more capable of handling occupation? Why can food production and distribution improve from the start under Soviet rule and grow worse under British and American directions? Why does friendship for the Soviet increased in the east and hatred for the occupiers grow in the west? Why the idle factories? Why the "fears" in the west? Why the anxiety about the future of "familiar economy"? Does it all spring from the scrupulous efficiency and "imperialist policies" of the Russians on the one hand and the democratic leave-things-alone policies of the Allies on the other?

It all seems to bring certain factors to the surface, factors which go against the grain of all protectors and promoters of "familiar capitalist economies." The capitalist economy with all its boasted efficiency stands helpless when it comes to produce and distribute goods among a poverty-stricken population. This, with one exception, if an outside market is available for the surplus products of that economy, then the poor can be taken care of, with jobs, wages and food. Lacking such an outside market, capitalism becomes beset with "fears." Send well financed orders to the mines and fac-

(Continued on page 7)

# Machines Displace Farm Workers

(Continued from page 1)

ment industry believe that estimate is too big even for the best post-war year — if farm prices don't hold up. But he states: "Whatever the total sum to be spent on equipment, it seems fairly evident that machines already in use, plus the refined post-war models, plus new inventions now in the "woodshed" stage, will permit a greater farm production than we have yet seen with fewer people on the farm than the wartime low."

He mentions in his Farm Column some of the modern equipment now used in farming. That Dr. L. S. Adams, the inventor of airplane mail pickups, has developed a peacetime use for war transport planes and at the same time a method for the quick and inexpensive planting of large acreages. Adams claims he can plant 20,000 acres per hour with his airplane seeder-pellant disseminator. Rice has been sown successfully from the airplanes, but most other attempts at aerial seeding have failed because the seeds were too light and if not blown away, were easily destroyed by animals or weather. Dr. Adams thought up a mechanical way to simulate and magnify that "humble" function that bird and animal droppings play in natural seeding.

Noting that nature's way was effective because animals' droppings provided weight, protection and fertilizing elements to give the seed high germinability and a good start in life, Adams' experiments duplicated this by providing the seed with a clay or adobe coating which would give the seed weight and protection and yet would dissolve easily in moist soil once it penetrated the ground. He even invented a machine that would turn out 30,000 seed pellets per minute, with the protective coat containing the necessary fertilizing elements.

Thus by means of airplane seeding overgrazed land can be replanted, and blighted areas reforested. Range land seeding by plane reduces the present cost of \$3.20 per acre to one-half that sum. Thus it is planned to recover large areas of land at a low cost. California alone has as much as 93 million acres of semi-desert and overgrazed land in need of reclaiming. By means of airplane seeding, reforestation costs, it is claimed can be reduced from 15 dollars for hand seeding to 3½ dollars per acre airplane seeding. This our Farm Columnist stated will provide jobs for returning veterans, but he failed to state what the hand seeders will do for a living. Apparently they are destined to "go to seed."

The sowing of wheat or grain in blocks of 500 or more acres is also profitable, reducing the cost from the present 95c to 75c per

acre by means of the airplane. A great future is in store for the "lucky" pilot who gets the job, but here also unemployment is the outlook for many displaced hand sowers. There is an adage, a Biblical one, of "as ye sow, so shall ye reap," but the benefits (profits) derived will not go to the pilots but to those who own the farms — providing also that they can dispose of the product on a market that bids fair to soon become glutted once these streamlined methods of farming take full effect. It is this latter aspect also that Haystead, the Farm Columnist, did not dare fully explore.

In justice to him, however, he did provide us with a wealth of material in regard to some of the effects of machine development on the farm. He admits that "machines instead of people" are being used and gives us some examples. There is the Gaudin row crop loader which aids in harvesting lettuce, potatoes, onions, carrots and sugar beets and does with 14 men the same amount of work that takes 72 hand laborers.

Even the humble spinach is gathered in by the Harris and the Thompson-Sage spinach and canning pea harvesters, reducing field costs almost 90 per cent, cannery labor on spinach, another 40 per cent and raises the spinach recovery in the cannery about 30 per cent above that of the hand-cut variety. Haystead remarks that: "The complete mechanization of the sugar beet industry probably will displace some tens of thousands of migrant laborers who heretofore have worked the fields. Segmented seed, mechanical chopping, lifting, shaking, and loading by machine makes this possible."

Hay-making has also become mechanized, whereas before the war it received little attention in that respect. For the post-war period, our Farm Columnist points out, there will be one-man hay balers, forage crop harvesters, bale loaders, buck rakes for long hay handling, hay crushers and mow curing for long, chopped, or baled hay. With these modern means four men can do the work formerly done by 27 men.

The one-man, all-crop combine, the self-propelled grain harvester, and corn pickers, shredders, and huskers all show large savings in manpower. Haystead further states that "the one-man operation means that one man with machines can farm alone a larger acreage than he used to do with several hired hands plus seasonal help. As finger-tip control for hydraulic lifts becomes common in the future, fairly young children or women can operate the machine."

What about the prospects of the returning veteran getting a  
(Continued on page 3)

## Machines Displace Farm Workers

(Continued from page 2)

job on the farm? We will let the reader judge for himself by what Haystead has to say, to wit: "It is often estimated that about 600,000 farmers want to retire; that a million and a half veterans and war workers many of whom never farmed before, want to farm. If the retiring farmers are replaced with war-trained, mechanically minded youngsters with more machine 'know-how' as well as physical endurance, this shift alone might fulfill all our consumptive needs without considering the six or seven million farm workers who left farms for the armed services or wartime city jobs. Even if another million people could be accommodated on the farm, **there would still be around five million who would have to find jobs** in industry, the city service trades, or else go back to the land to produce an even worse rural unemployment than before the war." (Emphasis mine, A. W.)

From the foregoing we can, therefore, see that the prospects of getting a job on the farm are very slim indeed. Of course there are some workers who still live in hope that once the reconversion period is over and the nation goes back to "normalcy," things somehow will adjust themselves, and jobs again will become plentiful. To them we can only say that the development and use of machinery goes on apace and does not wait for any reconversion or adjustment period.

Haystead, himself, seems to be aware of this for he remarks that:

"Some argue that the presence of surplus labor will slow up or stop the trend toward mechanization. The bare fact is that during the worst depression, with the greatest unemployment in our history, the one-man combine and the one-man hay baler arrived. The number of tractors increased tremendously. Rubberization, not only of the tractors but other farm tools, went from scratch to high percentages (95.5 per cent of all tractors made in 1941 were on rubber). In short, in spite of labor availability, technological displacement on the farm speeded up."

From the foregoing, Haystead, we can see, is quite a realist, for facts are indisputable. Now we wonder what solution, if any, this "realist" has to offer for this technological farm unemployment. He, as well as anyone, can see that the consuming capacity of jobless workers is very low indeed, and it's not from lack of appetites that these workers are inclined to eat less food. For the purchasing power of a worker is dependent on a steady job and a pay envelope, and once he is laid off he finds himself more

or less penniless and a poor customer as far as the market is concerned.

Haystead offers no solution for this problem. He points out that, "farmers seem bent on sharing the savings that mechanization brought to industry whether it creates farm unemployment or not."

Nor does Haystead mean by the foregoing that "sharing" of the savings is with the unemployed. Hoarding would be a more proper term for him to use.

He concludes his Farm Column with these remarks: "Despite assurances that prices will be held up, some farmers with long memories know that the one sure way to move surpluses is to bring prices down to levels at which the lower income classes in cities can buy. That not all farmers admit this is shown by the constant demand for price protection, but enough believe it to create a market for more machines to reduce operating costs and free the owners from dependence on hired labor. This circumstance adds new weight to the problem of providing post-war jobs in business, industry, and service trades."

In appraising his conclusions we can see at a glance that the farmers, and undoubtedly with Mr. Haystead, are sitting on the horns of a dilemma. It resolves itself into this: if prices of farm products come down that means less profit for the farmers and none of them relish such a prospect. If that should happen those farmers still operating would have to reduce operating costs, "free the owners from dependence on hired labor" by introduction of more or new machinery. In that event, thereby, landing in a similar position they were in before, namely, creating more unemployment, destroying their own market for themselves because jobless workers, no matter how low or how high the prices, are poor prospects as far as customers are concerned.

On the other hand, if prices are maintained at a high level there is a tendency for the market to become glutted with the farm products for lack of buyers, particularly when the labor market is also glutted with surplus labor, the unemployed. However, some of the farmers might find some consolation in this: that sooner or later, due to the unwritten law of competition, supply and demand, rather than through any man-made legislation, prices are bound to come down. In that event they will land on the other horn of the dilemma, aforementioned. Let us sight another indisputable fact, namely, that prices of commodities during the depression years were the lowest in the history of the nation but this had no effect

## International Notes

(Continued from page 1)

is working normally, and in addition to repairing the rolling stock, has begun to produce new locomotives.

"The government, as we know, took over large-scale industry, but it was also obliged to extend its administration to a vast number of small and medium enterprises owing to the absence of their owners. From the very first, the Provisional Government has declared that private initiative and private capital would be allowed and encouraged in medium and small industry. . . .

"Literally on the day following the ejection of the invaders, when the sound of guns had not yet ceased, the Provisional Government proceeded to carry out the primary point in its program, namely, the abolition of the landed estates and the apportionment of the land to the peasants. . . . Some 4,300,000 hectares were confiscated from the big landowners. . . . All creameries, mills, distilleries, sugar refineries, brick kilns, potteries and other industrial plants which belonged to the landed estates have been turned over to the Peasants' Mutual Aid Society. . . .

"The peasant masses have become convinced that the policy of the Provisional Government aims at promoting the prosperity of the countryside. . . . Never before has Poland known such mass parties as the Stonnictwo Ludowe, The Polish Socialist Party, and the Polish Workers Party. Masses flocked into the trade unions. . . . Over 100,000 persons took part in the May Day demonstrations in Warsaw, 200,000 in Lodz, and 300,000 in Cracow. . . ."

The Big Three may agree that

in creating a market. Unemployed workers found it difficult to purchase farm products even at such low prices.

The market for farm products as well as industrial products was created by the demands made upon it by World War 2. And now we are about to go into the peace period which many business men view with great alarm, for it means a reduction in the consuming capacity of the market, thereby causing a reduction in profit making.

Is there a solution to this problem of periodical overproduction and its resultant unemployment and poverty for the masses? There is. But one will not find the solution in Farm Columns appearing in capitalist periodicals, however "brilliant" their analysis may be of some of the contradictions of the profit system. First of all, we must point out that those who, in the main, profited through mechanized farming were not the farm laborers or the poor sharecroppers and tenant farmers but the big capitalist landowners, the millionaire gen-

eral Polish "moderates" be included in the reorganization of the Provisional Government. If so, will this change the course of events within Poland? We think not. Nothing less than military intervention could stop it and the Red Army of the Soviet Union stands in the way of any such action. The Polish landlords can say "goodbye forever" to their great estates, and to the rich incomes extracted from the toil of the peasants. The big capitalists, and the smaller ones who fled with the Nazis, can say "goodbye" to their industries and to the profit wrung from the industrial workers. The lease on life of remaining private enterprise can be cut short when it gets in the way of progress. The Polish masses are far on the road to a genuine form of democracy—a workers and peasants democracy—a Soviet Poland.

### Election in Britain

For the first time in ten years there is to be a national election in Britain. This means that none under 31 years of age has ever before voted in such an election. There are two major parties—the Tory Party, headed by Prime Minister Churchill, and the Labour Party, headed by Clement Atlee. The Tories are out to consolidate "free enterprise" and the status quo, while the labourites see "Socialism" as the final goal. In spite of this, there is no radical difference in the platforms proposed. Both give full support to the war against Japan. Both propose many reforms to guarantee peace-time prosperity. The Tories see these reforms as a means of strengthening "free enterprise," while the labourites still labor under the de-

(Continued on page 7)

try who seldom get their hands dirty with the soil. The same is true of the wealthy owners of industry who never get grease on their hands but due to the labor of the industrial workers the profits come rolling in just the same.

The solution, therefore, is clear cut for both the industry and the land and that is collective ownership with production for use for the whole people instead of for the benefit of a handful of parasitic millionaires. Socialization of the entire economy of the nation would certainly mean the end of the profit system, but, at the same time, it would guarantee a market with a great consumptive capacity, because then the real producers, i. e., the industrial workers and farm laborers, would have full employment, and, thereby, the opportunity to consume their product. This can only be achieved by the organized effort of the vast majority, the working class, when it takes the next step in human progress by abolishing the capitalist system.

Al Wysocki.

## PROLETARIAN NEWS

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

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

### American Labor Gets Political Pay-Off

For many years the American labor movement has been pursuing a political policy which borders upon lunacy. Certain candidates of the political parties of big business, the Republicans and Democrats, have been singled out by the executives of the labor movement and recommended to the membership for their support at the elections.

Those who are thus selected for labor's vote are supposed to be "friends of labor." They are usually professional politicians who are said to have a good "labor record." They have pursued a policy in the past which was supposed to be beneficial to organized labor, or they have voted in the legislative bodies against measures which were obviously harmful to labor. Support is withheld from candidates who have an unfriendly record. The pro-labor candidates are usually in constituencies where labor unions are strong. It is "practical politics" to cater to union voters.

The major parties, the Democrats and Republicans, are parties of the business class. They are financed and controlled by the capitalists. The labor unions, leaders and rank-and-file alike, are quite aware of this simple fact. These powerful parties were never organized by the workers. They are not controlled by the organized, or unorganized workers. In fact, the contradictory union teaching is that "labor should stay out of politics." They have a slogan to that effect, "No politics in the union." The slogan has been one thing, the practice has been something else again.

That certain advantages have been gained by the practice of supporting "labor's friends" in the elections, some small concessions, is true enough, otherwise the whole flimsy scheme would collapse. But what is usually overlooked is the fact that while some palliatives are handed out, the employers as a class are making greater inroads upon labor's economic status, and its supposedly inviolate political rights. In other words, labor's losses far exceed its gains, both economically and politically. What would one think of a hoisting apparatus, which for every foot a load is raised lets it fall two feet? Practical people, in possession of their mental faculties, would soon abandon such a hoisting contrivance.

The political apparatus of America, as well as of other capitalist nations, is designed to raise the political and social status of the wealthy owners of industry, and to protect their increasing wealth, which flows from mere ownership of the means of production. That government does this effectively can be clearly demonstrated by the results, namely, the growing capitalist monopoly over the natural resources, and all means of production and transportation. With this also goes greater regimentation of the people by the state apparatus, in the interest of the business class.

This class of exploiters of labor also owns and dominates all institutions of mind control, such as the press, the radio, movies, etc.

The present social arrangement, styled by its beneficiaries "free enterprise," "the American way," etc., cannot raise one class economically, and politically, without lowering the other. The actual and relative aspects of this can be demonstrated by simply observing the vast numbers of propertyless people on the one hand, and the decreasing number of capitalists, in possession of an increasing volume of wealth on the other. The constantly expanding productivity of social labor enriches the non-producing owners and still further impoverishes the workers who do the producing.

If we will take the trouble to observe the working of this system of "free enterprise" over a period of years, we will see that industrial progress moves forward with giant strides, and we will note that during that time an increasing number, both actual and relative to the population as a whole, become dependent upon a job in order to live. This class, the modern proletarians (wage workers), being without the means of production (propertyless), must sell their labor power to the capitalists, the owners of the means of production, in order to obtain for themselves and their families, the means of subsistence.

Vast numbers of workers are now employed, working together, producing collectively, great quantities of commodities. But they do not own their products, they are not their commodities. They belong to the capitalists. Though produced socially, they are appropriated individually by the non-producing capitalists, simply because they own the means of production and the natural resources, in fact, own America.

The exploiters of labor, the capitalists, own and control the nation, including the Democratic and Republican parties. Under these circumstances, for labor to look to the political parties of their employers for redress of grievances it is like lambs looking to wolves for protection. If a man handed a whip to his deadliest enemy, and then systematically took steps to try prevent his enemy from whipping him too severely, he would be regarded as lacking in intelligence, yet that is just what organized labor does. It hands the political whip to its class enemy at election time, and then struggles against the consequences of its own folly.

Some thoroughgoing examples of this political futility can be observed in the recent actions of the American government. The prevailing administration is in the hands of the Democrats. That party in the last election received more support from organized labor than any party in the whole history of American politics. So much was this the case that labor leaders, as well as fake communists, have claimed credit for the political victory of the Democrats.

Very soon after the election, the "friends of labor" showed their utter contempt for the servile, fawning labor lackeys who worked for their election. The State Department, a very important institution at this time, was reorganized with Edward R. Stettinius Jr. taking Mr. Hull's post as Secretary of State, with a number of under-secretaries of like type. So representative of big business were this whole group of appointees that they were immediately referred to as "The Millionaires Team." Labor constitutes the overwhelming majority of the American people, but it was only capital, the big Wall Street boys in fact, who were considered fit to handle America's foreign affairs, by labor's newly elected "friends." Not one was chosen from the ranks of labor, not even for a minor position. What a pay-off!

Not long before the death of Mr. Roosevelt

he let it be known that he favored some sort of labor conscription. The idea of big business men in that relation is about as follows: "Since young men can be conscripted for war on distant battlefields, it should be possible to conscript labor on the home front and make them work, like soldiers, under discipline." Such an arrangement would be a body-blow at organized labor, and it might even assure larger profits to the capitalists. It certainly would put a crimp in the labor unions. But, meantime, Germany has collapsed, and there is more likely to be a manpower surplus, rather than a shortage. For the time being, at least, the labor conscription idea has been shelved.

Another scheme is now on foot, peacetime conscription. Those advocating the plan propose to give military training to the whole youth of the nation, and start them off at an early age. Just in the interest of peace, of course. A nice political reward from the friends of labor" in appreciation of its loyal support. Not only are politicians raising the issue, but some of the generals, who at present are popular heroes, seem to have been won to the cause of peacetime military training for American youth.

With the "aggressor nations" now defeated or, as in the case of Japan, on the way out, the menace of war from rival imperialism is practically nil. Then, why the sudden demand for peacetime military training? Is it some foreign foe that the legislators, and their multi-millionaire masters, fear or is it labor and class war on the home front they have in mind?

The truck drivers of Chicago, not too well organized, not as united as they should be, have been pushed around by their employers who are making plenty of money through the industrial war boom. They demanded an increase in wages and a shortening of the work week. The War Labor Board, it seems, granted an increase of \$4.08 a week, and some minor concessions, but short of what the men had asked for. Approximately 10,000 of them stayed away from their jobs. The government has stepped into the dispute. Over 10,000 soldiers were sent into the city, not to take over the trucking business, but to operate the trucks or to guard workers who are willing to drive them. The contention is, of course, that the men, not the employers, are interfering with the war effort.

Soldiers are housed in a number of schools, and encamped on the lake front. They can be seen riding through the city streets on the trucks, delivering merchandise of all sorts. On the side of the trucks are large white posters with red lettering, which reads: "Warning. This truck is being operated by the United States Government by order of the President under the War Labor Disputes Act. Interference with government operation of this truck is punishable by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment of not more than one year or both."

The strike is as good as broken, by the "political friends of labor." Undoubtedly, many of Chicago's truck drivers voted for the present administration, which is now using military force and defeating the drivers in their efforts to obtain better living conditions. What a pay-off!

We could give many other examples of the outcome of labor's folly in supporting the political parties of its exploiters, instead of taking independent working class political action through a party of its own. What is wrong with sending working men to Congress? Are they not doing the work of America? Are they not the majority of the people? Or must workers be content to be represented by shyster lawyers, professional

politicians, or those born with a gold spoon in their mouth?

We think it is high time that the workers of America woke up to the fact their political immaturity, their political trust in the representatives of big business, is getting them nowhere, and that all they can ever expect is a "pay-off" such as some we here have described.

The solution of labor's problems lies through political action, revolutionary political action, by itself as a class. More concessions will be wrung from the capitalists when labor is intelligent enough to send its representatives into the U. S. Congress. However, concessions, however desirable, will still leave the rich parasites in possession and control of America. The real solution to labor's problems is through the collective ownership of the natural resources and the means of production, and transportation, which is part of production.

The Proletarian Party proclaims that the historic role of the modern working class, the Proletarians, is the complete conquest of political power as the necessary step to the transformation of America from the private property of rich parasites to the collective possession of the whole American people, for the good and welfare of all.

John Keracher.

## European Peace and Pacific War

"This war is just half won," said an American general, upon returning from Europe. Apparently he meant that the European phase of World War II was ended, but the Asiatic phase had yet to be fought out.

At this stage, between the close of European hostilities and the transporting of the vast forces necessary for an all-out attack upon the Japanese, it is timely for thinking workers to take stock of things. It is time to evaluate the outcome of the struggle in Europe, and to visualize possible outcomes in the Pacific. After all, it is mostly working people who have to shed their "blood, sweat and tears."

The average worker does not fully understand this war, but he knows that it is not just being fought to make the world a better place for him and his kind to live in. He knows that there is plenty of room for improved conditions everywhere, but he is not simple enough to believe that improved conditions will spring automatically from "victory." He knows that if worth-while changes are made, they can only be brought about by the people of the countries involved, after the close of hostilities.

With Germany's unconditional surrender, the war in Europe was officially ended. As a result, the servicemen will be mainly concerned with getting back home as soon as possible. However, it is obvious that a great many will not be able to return immediately, and many will be sent direct to Asia without a furlough in the U. S. A.

Meanwhile, what will be the role of the American soldiers in the European nations? It will be a policeman's role, chiefly, under military administrations. By present indications those administrations will strive to restore social stability, prop up the outmoded monarchies, the rich landlords, bankers and industrialists, and feed and ride herd on the hungry masses.

Certain things have happened in a number of European countries which will have far-reaching consequences. Many of the large landlords and rich industrialists, especially those of eastern Europe, have fled from their home lands. Many who supported the Nazis

and fought against the United Nations have been killed or taken prisoner. Some of them, no doubt, have been taken care of by a firing squad, or placed in the category of "war criminals" by their captors. Others, likely the larger numbers, have fled from regions occupied by the Soviet armies, for fear of being charged with "war crimes." The capitalists and landlords would flee mostly in a western direction, in the belief that Britain and America, as capitalist nations, would be more likely to favor them.

It is true that there is a lack of news reaching America from the nations of eastern Europe, but certain information does filter through, which indicates that governments of a composite character have been set up, pending, in most cases, regular national elections. These are made up of all anti-Nazi parties, and particularly those friendly to the Soviet Union.

Already, we read, that changes favorable to the workers and peasants have been brought about. Large estates have been divided into many farms, and turned over to the peasants. Industries, where not destroyed, are being directed by those temporary administrations, producing chiefly necessities. Some writers tell that this development has proceeded a long way. All this, of course, is far from pleasing to the former owners of the land and industries.

In western Europe, even where United Nations' armed forces are stationed, social and political turmoil prevails. The king of Belgium, for instance, is striving to regain his throne but a large section of the population is opposed to his return. Open civil war threatens. The situation in Spain becomes more precarious daily. The cooperation which the Franco government gave to the Axis during the war is now recoiling upon it. More and more voices are being raised, demanding that Britain and America requidiate the existing Spanish government.

In Norway and Denmark, the return to peace seems to have been relatively free from social strife. Poland, on the other hand, is the scene of internal class conflicts. The British Tories hoped to see their landlord friends, the Polish "Government" in exile, or the "London Poles," as they are sometimes called, returned to power in Poland. But, recent developments, the exposure of their anti-Soviet activities, and the conviction of some of their representatives in the trials at Moscow, have reacted upon the "London Poles," so much so that the British and American governments may have to abandon their support of the absentee landlords' "government."

The governments in the liberated countries east of the Elbe cannot function for long in their present composition. They must either operate exclusively for the landlords and capitalists or go further to the "left" and operate exclusively for the workers and peasants.

The Communist Party of Germany which was crushed by the Nazis in 1933, and which has been underground, has now taken on an open legal form in Berlin, but it has proclaimed that it will make no attempt to launch a Soviet government, as it holds the opinion that the German workers are not ready for such a change. Undoubtedly, some time will elapse before the German workers recover from the crushing effects of Nazism. The Soviet Union, at this time, seems to be mainly interested in eliminating all Nazi elements and supporting such governments as are friendly and seeking to promote a measure of general welfare.

The thing that is obvious in the whole situation is that capitalist militarism in its imperialist rivalry has destroyed much of the

foundation on which capitalism resten in Europe. Within a number of nations there is little opportunity for the reconstruction of capitalism on an independent basis. With the aid of Britain and America some of the countries of Europe, particularly in the west, may be restored, but they are unlikely to advance funds for such work in the regions occupied by the Red armies. What restoration is directed by the U. S. S. R. will not be in the interest of landlords or industrial capitalists.

In France and Italy, reaction has fought hard to maintain its hold, but political developments trend further toward the left. However, these countries are still on a capitalist basis, although it is likely that some of the larger industries and mines may be nationalized, but unless the workers as a class take political power into their own hands the introduction of socialism will be impossible.

Great Britain is in the midst of a national election. The Tories (Conservative Party) are taking full advantage of victory over the Axis. Their stalwart, Churchill, is being trotted out as the heroic savior of Britain. The Tories, who had the majority in the ten-year-old administration, hope to ride back to power on Churchill's coattail, with the national flag flying and all the rest of the patriotic palaver, which conservative forces everywhere are so capable of using.

That Churchill and his friends fear the possibility of a Labor Party victory is demonstrated by his having to enter the campaign so vigorously and resort to old electioneering tricks and scaremongering about the disaster which would arise from a "socialist" victory. If the Labor Party of Britain had a more vigorous program, if it was less vague its candidates could make a stronger appeal to the electorate. As it is, Churchill and his friends are likely to slide back into office, and the Labor Party will have to be content with its new role, official opposition, after so many years of political collaboration, although it may have a substantial increase in Parliament.

As for the war in the East, which at first many people believed would be comparatively easy for British and American naval and military might, it is very obvious that the heavy fighting has yet to come. Three and a half years have passed since the Japanese smashed at Pearl Harbor, and while American forces have performed prodigious feats, they are still along way from victory, in fact they are fighting mainly on the fringes of Japan's vast empire. The large armies, the manpower of Japan, is mainly upon the continent of Asia, in China. It looks now like it will take all the strength that Britain and America can muster, together with Chinese armies, to drive the Japs out of China, back into their little islands.

Unconditional surrender is still the objective. If Japan has no alternative than objective surrender or a fight to a finish, a sort of national suicide, she is likely to choose the latter course and fight to the bitter end just as Nazi Germany did.

There are some Americans in high places who are hoping for an arrangement of some sort, through the Japanese trusts, or the Emperor, or both, whereby a "liberal" administration would be permitted to take over Japan proper, eliminating the militarists, and in cooperation with British and American imperialism help to restore the old "open door" policy in China and Asia in general. There are other prominent representatives of "free enterprise," both in Britain and America, who believe that, since the struggle has gone so far, it is better to fight it out as it was done in Europe.

(Continued on page 6)

# HOME SCENE

## S-380 the SOS

S-380, the proposed "Full Employment" bill, sponsored by Senators Wagner, Murray, O'Mahoney and Thomas of Utah, is the SOS for labor. The enactment of this bill into law would make full employment a responsibility of the federal government and a national policy. It would set up a planning agency in an attempt to square consumption with production. An estimate of market needs and what it takes in production and employment to fulfill the market during the fiscal year would be outlined by the President to Congress for action. Should private enterprise fail to measure up to the budget and additional legislative stimulants also fall short, the difference would then be balanced by public works with the good old "moral-building" shovels.

S-380 is the SOS that mass unemployment is on its way. The War Manpower Commission reported on June 2 that the country's unemployment rolls have increased some with the shift toward a one-front war. Estimates of the size, and time, vary among officials but there seems to be no variance about its coming. About one-half of the 200 billion dollar industrial output in 1944 was government war expenditures. What will come along to take up the slack in government expenditures with only a one-front war? Where will the avalanche of orders come from with the total ending of war?

S-380 is the SOS of the fear of the terrible depression ahead. To square consumption with production with statistics and as a national policy is one thing, it is something else in life. Mass production needs mass consumption. If the worker received all he produces there would be nothing left for profits, nothing left for capital and that would mean the end of free enterprise. That isn't the plan of S-380. Plainly, the mass of people, the workers, cannot buy if they are not getting wages and they won't get wages if they are not at work. If they are at work and getting wages, they will produce a surplus, from whence profits come. If surpluses cannot be marketed and the potential profits turned into cash, of what use is there in producing more merchandise? To talk of increasing employment and hence greater production is like pouring oil to put out a fire. Full employment is impossible under peaceful conditions of capitalism.

S-380 is the SOS, perhaps the forerunner, for regimentation of labor and attempted planned economy. The strait-jacket for labor may be fitted, but for how long before it bursts? As for capital, will it make for love and peace between competitors, big and small business, manufacturers and farmers, trusts and indi-

vidual entrepreneurs, national and international business? Can capital be limited to a central plan for any length of time, and gather steam before that very government plan turns for external expansion, and meets with economic collision, resulting in wars, such as the present one?

S-380 is the SOS of another snare for labor. Business cannot furnish jobs and peace at the same time. The way to fulfill employment, with peace, is S for Socialism, 60 masters of America vs. 60 million jobs.

\* \* \*

## "A Man Is Known by the Company He Keeps"

President Truman has invited ex-President Hoover, and "also rans," Alf Landon and Tom Dewey, to White House conferences. These gentlemen are no strangers to each other. They think and speak alike as members and spokesmen of the capitalist class.

Such conferences should answer the "puzzled" people, in particular, labor, as to where the new President stands on the controversial issues of the day. Whatever the topic of discussion at these conferences, whatever the differences between the President and the Republican opposition, it is one of method and not of goal. They have their "eye on the ball" at all times, the preservation of property rights.

Labor too must keep its "eye on the ball" and organize for the interest of the propertyless. Too long has labor been guided by rich men's reasoning.

\* \* \*

## Cabinet Shakeup

Attorney General Biddle, Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, and Labor Secretary Perkins have been replaced by new appointments from President Truman. A favorite capitalist political method in meeting difficulties and rewarding friends.

Will the new Secretary of Agriculture square the supply of food with the demand? Will the new Labor Secretary forestall the rise in unemployment? We think not, on both counts.

If the shortage of food is due to a greater demand than supply, then it will take more than a government order by the Secretary of Agriculture to alter the law of supply and demand. Nor can he, or other agencies concerned, wipe out the black market in food. The "black" trade is only an extension of the "regular" trade and both "white" and "black" merchants are interested in profits. The question is not, "How did you make your money?" but "Have you got it and how much?"

The new Labor Secretary, Lewis B. Schwellenback, while not from the ranks of labor, is hailed as a progressive and friend of labor. Well, "a friend in need is

a friend indeed" is an old adage. It is also a traditional custom among the ranks of labor to seek for friends, only to meet with disappointment after a while. The growing "pains" of labor cry out for a solution. Unemployment, reduced wages are critical problems, not to be solved by mere change in personnel. A "friend" can offer sympathy, can make a modest offering, a few extra crumbs in this case, but cannot support labor's need for a final solution.

Labor alone can solve its prob-

## EUROPEAN PEACE AND PACIFIC WAR

(Continued from page 5)

There are those among the rich exploiters of American labor who continually bewail the enormous costs in men and money which this devastating war has brought about. The unconditional surrender policy, the fight to a finish in Asia as in Europe, they see as playing directly into the hands of the Soviet Union. The only ones who will benefit, argues in effect, the Chicago Tribune, are the "Red Russians." The former isolationists, now turned appeasers, fear the general weakening of capitalist imperialism and the relative increase in the strength of the Soviet Union.

Some of those wailing people have been suggesting that a war against the U. S. S. R., before it is too late, would be best, but so far, they are in a hopeless minority. The leaders of the United Nations, whatever they may ultimately do, see no other practical policy than cooperation with the Soviet Union, and they hope that further awakening of the world's workers can be checkmated. This latter policy finds its embodiment in the San Francisco Charter.

Meantime it is hoped that the working classes can be pushed back or held in line for further capitalist exploitation. We think it is already too late for successful application of what really underlies the San Francisco plan. A new and powerful alignment of nations is on the way. It is in the making, with the Soviet Union as its core. The nations of eastern Europe, including the Baltic and Balkan states, for the most part will be allied with the U. S. S. R.

The social revolution does not come about according to plan, but it is obvious that it is well on the way. It has forces in all nations, the modern proletarians, who are destined to play a most revolutionary role, hold the future in their hands. The top-lofty leaders of the bourgeois world can plan and plan. They can make their proposals, but social forces, and particularly the world's workers, will make the final disposal.

John Keracher.

lems. It has worked hard. It must begin to think hard, in line with its own economic interest, to really solve the problems confronting it. The line will have to be drawn between "friends" (capitalists) and "relatives" (class brothers).

\* \* \*

## Raise Your Sights—Steer Left

War profits for 1944 were high, as disclosed by a recent report of the OPA Research Division. The report showed that: "The 1120 leading industrial corporations included in the study showed profits of \$3,164,000,000 during the first half of 1944, which was 213 per cent above their six-month profit average during the peacetime years 1936-1939.

"The steel industry did even better than that. During the first half of 1944 it earned, before taxes, \$405,598,000, which was 251.5 per cent above its peacetime average." (PM, May 22, 1945.)

With the cut in war production, resulting from the end of the European war, wartime profit making will be cut in volume. And even should peacetime profit making not measure up to wartime profits, the smokestack barons have "made hay while the sun shone." Capital didn't "miss the boat." Sailing ballasted with gold, the storm ahead may be severe for U. S. capital but not necessarily disastrous.

But for labor, after having most generously provided its employers with billions of handsome profits, what can it boast of for itself? The black clouds of unemployment are already gathering, the promise of 60 million jobs notwithstanding. The course ahead will become clear only by steering leftward.

\* \* \*

## Rats on the Menu

From 23,000 to 25,000 cartons of muskrats were shipped into Massachusetts from Hammond, La., and sold for 39c a pound as rabbit meat. The government is now prosecuting the case.

The meat situation has manifestly deteriorated, as also the business class, which will go to any length to make a dollar. But, then, why get excited? Don't they say: "What you don't know won't hurt you"?

\* \* \*

## A Two-Way Release

The 17,000 Army plane cut-back, the largest single armament slash since V-E Day, is estimated by officials to reduce the war bill by 3½ billion dollars, release 450,000 war workers, release vital metals, steel, aluminum, electric motors for certain civilian goods.

If the release of essential materials is calculated to help industry "over the hump," the release of war workers is certain to put labor "over in the dump."

(Continued on page 7)

# Reconversion in Europe

(Continued from page 2)

tories of western Europe and production will get on the way. "Fears" will disappear, and recovery will be on its way. True, even then, the poor will have to produce much and receive little in comparison. Such a situation might cause minor labor troubles, even strikes with wage readjustments, but nothing to be "feared." With that outside market missing, the profit motive disappears, and the boasted efficiency system breaks down. The most cunning of reporters cannot completely conceal this fact.

Why, i.e., should British business be optimistic about capturing former German held markets? Why should western European business fear the loss of German markets? Even the much boasted "prosperity" period when war devastated industries are to be rebuilt can not materialize when there are no prospects of a future outside market.

The Russians are not hog-tied to this "familiar" economy. To them, land and the natural resources are not forever tied to legal concepts of private ownership. To the Russians, natural resources, tools of production, and willing hands are the three essentials of production. To them the market is supplied by the producers. If under their occupation, Poles, Roumanians or Germans are willing to go upon the land and into the factories to produce needed goods, would-be private owners are not permitted to stand in the way. Of course such private owners feel grossly outraged. They condemn Russian influence as contaminating to local moral concepts. To them it looks like the end of their lives of leisure and, so, it must be the end of civilization.

The Russians stand to gain from such a course. They are working in their own self-interests. By making it possible for the masses in the occupied territory to become self-supporting to the extent that the respective natural resources and local skill permit they create friendship instead of the formerly fostered hostility. Thus they create more security against future invasions. They do not establish a colonial policy. They do not make profit from the new system of production rapidly getting started under their supervision. The Russians don't look upon profit-making with the eyes of capitalists.

It is not hard to understand why the success of Russian occupation methods are being looked upon with suspicion. Behind every suggestion of Soviet "imperialistic aims" is a good selfish American or British capitalist interest. It becomes plain as day why demands grow for a more vigorous policy in curtailing "left tendencies" in western Europe. It is not merely the strong belief in the principles of private property and of "free enterprise," nor is it the desire to protect their capitalist friends in

their zones of occupation that promotes it. The British and American capitalists have "fears" too. If capitalism should be abandoned in Europe, both east and west, if the cooperative system of production should be adopted and the masses be able to produce abundantly for all it would stimulate left tendencies within the western powers themselves.

Post-war unemployment and poverty in the midst of plenty have not been removed from the "familiar economy" of these nations. A successful solution of these problems in continental Europe would surely stimulate the demand for their abolition also here. The capitalist nations are acting in their own self-interest as surely as is the Soviet Union. There is one difference, however, where the workers rule there is room for no other economic class. The interest of the nation is the interest of all. Where capitalism prevails, the interest of the few, the capitalists, are promoted to that of national interests, and the masses are left "holding the bag." Economic development, stimulated by war, is driving the workers more and more to act independently in their own self-interest. If they succeed in Europe today they will not become "the slaves of Russia." They will become the masters of their own destiny. And they will be giving a new and powerful lesson to the workers in the rest of the capitalist world of how the economic problems can be solved. It was not the intention of the imperialist nations, when they entered World War II, to promote Communism but such seems to be the inevitable result.

## Home Scene

(Continued from page 6)

### The Press and Public Opinion

A recent survey of the World News Freedom Committee in behalf of the American Society of Newspaper Editors has been reported in digest form in the N. Y. Times, June 11, 1945. It is the report of three American newspaper editorial figures (Wilbur Forrest, assistant editor of the N. Y. Herald Tribune; Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution; Dean Carl W. Ackerman of the Graduate School of Journalism of Columbia University), who from January to April traveled 40,000 miles around the world, to test and discuss freedom of the press, and of communications, in the post-war world.

"This is the first time recorded by history," says the N. Y. Times, "that such a mission was undertaken, its main objective being a pledge in the peace treaties '\* \* \* of governments not to censor news at the source; not to use the press as an instrument of national policy, and to permit a free flow of news in and out of

# INTERNATIONAL NOTES

(Continued from page 3)

clusion that their reforms would be a step towards Socialism.

In campaigning, Churchill gives credit to the Tories for every alleged good which came out of the Tory-Labour war government. Criticism by labor representatives of him, or his Tory followers, is met with the caustic remark: "They ought to know, they were a part of the government for a long time." The Tories appear to be telling more truths about the path towards Socialism than the Labourites. They attack the Labour Party for having as chairman Prof. Harold Laski, a man who is not in Parliament. "Time and Tide," a Tory paper, states that this situation, "Is jarringly out of key with the workings of the English parliamentary system." The same paper proclaims that: "The totalitarian state (referring to the socialist state), is the antithesis of all we mean by the parliamentary system in Great Britain." In thus trying to scare the British working class the Tories are doing the socialist movement a great favor by hammering home this fundamental Marxian concept that the parliamentary state is the very antithesis of the socialist state.

The British workers appear to have learned very little from the horrors of war. This is no doubt largely because they have eaten regularly, if not well, during the war years. Soon they will receive another lesson—the horrors of capitalist peace. Reforms, initiated by the Tories or by the Laborites, will not stave off another economic collapse. Beveridge plans, or improved Beveridge plans, will not stave off mass hunger and misery. Sooner or later economic conditions will force the British workers into revolutionary political action.

### Syrian Flareup

The flareup in Syria and Lebanon is somewhat reminiscent of the Chicago gang-wars of the rip-roaring prohibition days. The gangs were on peace terms, at times, until one gang felt powerful enough to invade the territory of another. Sometimes two gangs would join to route a competitor, then divide between themselves the captured whiskey trade. In Syria, it is also a liquid which is at the bottom of the struggles. Oil, the "black gold" of the Middle East, is the

signatory countries."

"The three editorial travelers say they did not find much press freedom under wartime conditions.

"They got many pledges from government leaders for post-war, some of them described as 'lip service,' and discovered in editors of most nations a real desire for more freedom of the press than most nations have heretofore enjoyed or permitted.

"Also, for the first time in history, three American journalists

(Continued on page 8)

bone of contention. The high officials of the British and American oil companies are the big bosses behind the scenes. The time had come to step on a little competitor who was attempting to make a come-back. The big bosses had stooges out in front, talking about "Independence for Syria" and about "threats to the communication lines to the Far East." A powerful British army was moved into position at the proper time. This army came as a "harbinger of independence" for the Levant! If the donkeys of Lebanon (the four-legged ones) could have understood the situation they would have sat on their haunches, thrown their heads in the air and he-hawed in utter abandon. The three million Syrians who straddle communication lines to the oil fields of the Middle East may have their "independence" if they support the right gang.

### Franco the "Democrat"

General Francisco Franco, the fascist dictator of Spain, is doing his best to appear as a democrat. He states that he is planning municipal, then provincial, then national elections. He also suggests the return of the monarchy. He recently stated: "With the exception of relatively short periods in our history, our government has been traditionally a monarchy. . . . We have already decided upon the creation of a council of the realm which, whenever the necessity arises, would decide the problem of succession as regard the throne." Franco and his fascist followers no doubt could make good use of a monarchy. It could make the Spanish government appear respectable again. Certain governments who directly or indirectly helped Franco to power, including the British and American governments, could recognize the monarchy and thereby save face. It would be welcomed in particular by the British imperialists who have large interests in Spain and who fear the consequences of Franco being unseated.

There is one boast which Franco makes which no doubt is based on facts. He boasts that Spain's economic condition has greatly improved in the years since the civil war ended. However, this prosperity was not created by Franco's administration. Rather, it was the result of the tremendous markets created by the world war. Franco took advantage of this situation in a very democratic way. He dealt with the Axis powers and with the democracies. He sold to the highest bidder. Now, however, the situation is changed and some of his best customers are gone. Now he must cater instead of being catered to. To sell the surplus products wrung from the exploitation of Spanish workers will not be so easy now. The problems confronting the entire capitalist world with the advent of "peace" will also face Franco and his fascist gang.

Oliver Ritchie.

# HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 7)

invaded Moscow and achieved, with top Soviet newspaper editors and government press controllers, a full and frank mutual survey of their different problems and conceptions."

The sought for objective contains three points: (1) a pledge of governments not to censor news at the source; (2) not to use the press as an instrument of national policy; (3) to permit a free flow of news in and out of signatory countries.

At first glance it would appear that realization of such objectives would indeed bring a genuine condition of freedom of the press. But would it? This brings us at once to the crux of the question: what is a free press?

For instance, the majority of the people in America are under the impression (or illusion as we see it) that their American press is a free press. The Soviet people, on the other hand, hold that their press (which to Americans appears as a controlled one-party affair) is free. Now, which one of the two is the true expression of freedom? It is obvious that they are different.

To see the press as it really is, we must abandon dabbling in generalities and abstractions about freedom in general, and get down to earth. For this talk about a free, impartial press, expressing public opinion, is so much wishful thinking, as though society were a homogeneous mass of humanity, with a single interest. The press functions in a most differentiated world, split up into divergent classes and groups, capital and labor, big and small business, strong, imperialist nations and subjugated weak nations, a capitalist and socialist world. Now the economic and political interests of these different social strata are at variance.

What's good to the powerful and entrenched privileged interests is of necessity bad for the underprivileged, and vice versa. Such is the iron law of class society that no institution can serve alike both master and slave. Neither can the press escape the inexorability of this law. Information and news which would enlighten, encourage, arouse and spur on the underprivileged would not serve too well the groups that live off investments.

Further, publication of news is in itself a huge and privately owned industry, the owners living off dividends, with capital and labor difficulties of their own, yet partake of the general problems of the capitalists as a whole. Hence its (press) viewpoint is theirs, and that of their class. Newspapermen who work for the press know from first-hand experience what this "freedom" amounts to. They are free to express themselves, provided they

do not deviate from the editorial policy, which in a manner acts as a form of censorship or limitation upon freedom of expression. And who establishes the editorial policy? As in all industries, the owner of the establishment is the boss. And who-soever transgresses the will of the boss, finds himself a truly free man—free from the job. Thus, for instance, the editors ("office boys," as Brenden Bracken, Minister of Information of the United Kingdom, called them) of the Hearst press are reactionary, isolationist, pro-fascist, labor baiters and Soviet-haters, because they are reflecting the outlook of their multi-millionaire boss, Hearst. The same holds, in the main, for the rest.

A leading American daily, the N. Y. Times, carries a caption: "All the news that's fit to print." And its "office boys" sing the praises of their "lord of the press." But what about the news that is not "fit" to print, the real story of the conditions of workers in America, their life and struggle, and those of the little men the world over? How much of that is "fit" to see print, and how much is deleted, distorted and doctored up? How much of the workers' case and grievances is presented as compared

with the owners' side of the story?

Public opinion in capitalist society can't be anything else but capitalist opinion catering to the needs and expressing the interests of the propertied class.

The Soviet press, too, is a class press, only that of another class, the workers. It speaks candidly for the underprivileged masses of the world, making no bones about it; no pretenses to impartiality. In this respect it has no need for the hypocrisy employed by the capitalist press. It openly asserts that it limits its democracy to the workers, expressing the interests, not of the whole public or people, but the vast majority of them. Its partisanship, therefore, permits of more actual "freedom of expression" than the capitalist pretended non-partisanship. Paradoxically, the controlled one-party press of the Soviets is more free than the nominally non-party, or multi-party, press under capitalism, which in practice is controlled through its economic power and influence.

We have asserted in the previous issue that power and freedom go together. Whoever has the economic power (access to the means of publication, publishing houses, presses, paper, etc.) has the freedom to say things. In property society the capitalists have that power and use it to mould "public opinion,"

coinciding with their own, or what they think it "fit" to be. Wherever the proletariat assumes public power, as in the Soviet Union, it takes over the control (power and access to the means of information), using it to its own class advantage. There, too, "public opinion" is class opinion, with this difference, viz., that the working class constituting the majority element, there the class and the public more nearly coincides. Therefore, where in the former (capitalism), public opinion is **minority** class opinion, in the latter (Socialism), it is **majority** public opinion, **majority** class opinion.

If labor can be more candid in its press it is because its interests demand revealing the objective facts and truth, whereas capital must resort to yellow journalism and distortion of the facts. Thieves are forced to lie.

The shouting for "press freedom" comes loudest from the liberal press which speaks for small business. Its relatively small press influence stands in the same ratio as its limited capital compared to large corporation capital. The big power trusts in the field of the press are the dominating factor as in the rest of industry and finance. The small publishers are forced to eat out of its hands. Their griping is a reflection of this economic disproportion, which is unavoidable in class society.

The three-point objective loses much of its meaning judged from a class viewpoint. (1) If the government does not censor the news at the source, that certainly will not preclude the censoring of that news or tampering with it, which amounts to the same thing, in the editorial room. (2) If the press is not used **officially** as an instrument of national policy, that will not in the least affect its readiness in the main to defend **unofficially** the national policy of the government. For the national policy is a class policy, the policy of that class of which the press is a mouthpiece. (3) A free flow of news, in and out of signatory countries, will, not, of itself, make for a presentation of the facts without any class bias.

To clear-thinking workers, the question of the press and its "freedom" is plain. They do not look for fairness from capitalist class sources. Every class has its independent medium of expression. Capital certainly has its. The workers must have theirs, to freely express capitalist conditions for what they really are, enlighten labor in its daily problems, guide it in its strikes and larger social struggles, pointing the path to its ultimate freedom. The Proletarian News is such a press.

L. B.

## GET A BOOK FREE

If you send Fifty Cents for a year's subscription to PROLETARIAN NEWS (1545 Larrabee Street, Chicago, Ill.) you can have any one of the following books free, \$1.00 for a two years' subscription entitles you to pamphlets to the value of 35 cents. Postage paid.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO, by Marx and Engels.....	10c
WAGE-LABOR AND CAPITAL, by Karl Marx.....	10c
MARXISM AND DARWINISM, by Anton Pannekoek.....	10c
CLASS STRUGGLES IN AMERICA, by A. M. Simons.....	10c
CRIME, ITS CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES, by John Keracher.....	10c
ECONOMICS FOR BEGINNERS, by John Keracher.....	10c
THE HEAD-FIXING INDUSTRY, by John Keracher.....	10c
PRODUCERS AND PARASITES, by John Keracher.....	10c
PROLETARIAN LESSONS, by John Keracher.....	15c
HOW THE GODS WERE MADE, by John Keracher.....	15c
WHY UNEMPLOYMENT, by John Keracher.....	5c

Send me PROLETARIAN NEWS for a period of ....., for which I here enclose \$.....

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

Subscriber's name .....

Address .....

Subscribe to  
**PROLETARIAN NEWS**  
50c for 12 ISSUES