

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. XV, No. 3—Whole No. 156

Chicago, Illinois, March, 1946

483

Price 5c a Copy

Faulty Social Engineering

By Christ Jelset

If a highway or railroad is to be extended across a river, a bridge is needed. The engineers are called upon to make plans. The ground must be tested for a solid foundation. Flood stages of the river must be known to prevent damming its free flow.

Once the length of the span is known, the suitable materials must be selected and the method of construction planned, in order that the bridge might have strength enough to carry both its own weight and the expected load. The engineers must be careful not to forget any of the problems connected with the job. They must use reliable testing methods or proceed upon previously tested grounds, with correct calculations. If they fail, even in one part, the bridge might soon prove to be the cause of a serious accident, or it might prove inadequate to carry the load.

In present day society, problems develop which call for solution. One need only to look at the great depressions which seem increasingly to deprive larger and larger sections of the population of a chance to acquire the necessities of life, to know that the problems go beyond the sphere of the individual. Or one might look at the wars, which also become more bloody and more devastating as civilization proceeds.

Without mentioning more, these two, depressions and wars, have become large enough and serious enough to warrant a search for remedies. People who set out to analyze such problems with a view to finding solutions might be called **social engineers**. Not a few people engage in this calling. Each new depression, and each new war, bring on the scene new swarms of volunteer advisers on what must be done.

Plans are evolved and put on paper. Some of the plans seem elaborate, others are short and simple. Some reach no further than the printed word or the "blue-print" stage. Others are adopted, in whole or in part, by nations and governments. Those that reach the testing ground of

actual application seem most often to be faulty.

The Federal Reserve System did not prevent panics and depressions. The League of Nations did not prevent wars. The new United Nations Organization is not subduing rival national interests. "Fact finding" is not bringing industrial peace. "Price control" is satisfying nobody.

Failure of applied schemes is only augmenting the flood of new remedies. One of the more recent plans brought to the surface insists upon its application by voluntary rather than by governmental coercion. Its author is Arthur A. Hood, Director of Dealer Relations, Johns-Manville Corporation, New York.

He calls his plan **Imperative Consumption**. He is as emphatic as any. This old world just must

(Continued on page 2)

Labor's Strike Weapon

On the numerous occasions when American "democracy" is the subject of criticism, those who spring to its defense are not only the capitalists but also not a few of its defenders can be found within the ranks of organized labor itself. The top officials of the labor unions boastfully proclaim that nowhere else in the world are workers as free as they are in the United States. In this "land of freedom" the workers have the "right to strike" and a right that has won legal recognition, they contend. This kind of reasoning is not confined to those above because the same sentiments are echoed by many rank and file members of the unions.

There is, of course, no denial of the fact that the "right of collective bargaining" and the "right to strike" have received "legal recognition." That this has not always been the case throughout the history of the

American labor movement, however, is not overly stressed by the defenders of American "democracy." What is emphasized by them is the contention that the American workers are fortunate to have a government that is solicitous of their welfare and moreover that quite a number of capitalists have become reasonable enough to accept labor unions as part of the American "way of life."

But the proof of how much rights anyone has can only be obtained by putting them into practice, and in regard to the right to strike one must admit that of late it has been considerably practiced, to say the least. With what results, one might ask, or in other words, how effective has been labor's strike weapon?

When looking over some of the recent strike settlements one finds the answer to that question. It is true that organized labor was able to wrest wage increases from the employers, but it is also a fact that labor received far less than its original demands. One must also take into account that some of these strikes, like the one at the General Motors, which is of approximately three months' duration, caused great hardship to the striking workers. Some may contend that the General Motors Corporation also suffered through loss of profits because of its closed factories. Be that

(Continued on page 2)

HOME SCENE

Developments on the Labor Front

Strikes continue to dominate the home scene, as the No. 1 problem. Industry after industry is hit, stoppages spread from city to city, creating virtual tie-ups in some. It has every semblance of general strike though developing by stages. Fact-finding has not met with the success officially anticipated. Though in isolated instances (Ford, Chrysler) agreements have been reached, and in others, as in rails, labor acquiesced to arbitration, lending greater promise of overall compromise between the contending parties, on the basis of an 18 per cent wage rise. Differences continue in full force.

Meanwhile, government's big stick is already swinging, here, as in the packinghouse strike, taking over operation, elsewhere using clubs, tear-gas and its full "power of coercion" against pickets.

The "impartial" courts are doing their little bit by issuing injunctions, restraining, not the employers but the workers from large-scale picketing (Jersey City, Electrical, Radio and Ma-

chine Workers, also the United Steel Workers, CIO, against Carnegie, Illinois Steel Corporation).

All this in the interest of the "public welfare" and in accordance with the best traditions of American justice. As though the striking workers were not part of the public.

Government repression is supplemented by the private thugger of the bosses. Two worker pickets have been victims of foul murder in the Illinois rail strike. Congress, the legal machinery of the business man's state, is on the job cooking up a nice little stew to gag labor. The Case bill, an anti-strike, anti-labor bill, is making "progress." To this date it has passed the House. This bill, should it become law, will embroil unions in all sorts of legal black tape, limitations, interpretations and punitive measures, in case of violations—which capital would forever be charging unions with—in effect would hamstring labor and weaken its strike weapon to the point of complete nullification.

Nor is industry relaxing on the

(Continued on page 3)

IN THIS ISSUE

FAULTY SOCIAL ENGINEERING

By Christ Jelset

LABOR'S STRIKE WEAPON

By Al Wysocki

HOME SCENE

By L. B.

GENERAL MOTORS STRIKE

By Lewis Williams

MARXISM TODAY (Editorial)

By John Keracher

LABOR'S STRIKE WEAPON

(Continued from page 1)

as it may, no one has yet recorded that any of its wealthy stockholders made visits to a pawnshop or lined up at relief agencies, in order to get the price of a meal.

Then also, the government that was supposed to be so solicitous, has proved to be anything but a help to the striking workers. Wherever it has intervened, the compromises achieved resulted in the workers taking much less than what they demanded. Even after such strike settlements, the workers' take-home pay was far below the average wage they received during the war period. The strike, therefore, as a defense of workers' rights revealed its limitations when put into practice.

We must bear in mind that the present strike waves broke out in a period wherein the numerical strength of organized labor is unsurpassed in American labor history. There are in round figures some 15 million workers who are members of such unions as the CIO, the AFL, the Railroad Brotherhoods, etc. The lack of unified action by these unions during the strikes was without doubt one of the main factors that prevented them from winning greater concessions from the capitalist owners of industry. The advocates of a "general strike" should take notice that here was a splendid opportunity for labor unions to unite on a common issue, but instead they muffed that opportunity by working at cross-purposes. We can cite many examples of how the unions blundered, however, one will suffice, that of the meat packers' strike where the A. F. of L. was the first to capitulate when the government announced its "seizure" of that industry.

Now we must ask ourselves the question: what if it was possible for the labor unions to unite for a general strike, would they be able to achieve their aims? What the results would be no one can forecast. But this much is certain: the unions would be in a better position to wring greater concessions from the employers; however, on the other hand, they would be confronted with the solid opposition of the capitalist class. The past history of labor reveals that when general strikes were attempted the industrial arena looked like a battlefield of organized labor against organized capital. It also revealed that those who were mauled and defeated in those past struggles were not the capitalists but the striking workers.

But this time, say the advocates of a general strike, we would not submit, we would be so strongly organized that we would starve the capitalists into submission. We would paralyze industry, transportation, commerce, etc.

This is a fine sentiment, of course, but far from sound reasoning. We must point out that the capitalist class would not be sitting idle waiting with folded arms to be starved into submission.

One should never forget that the capitalist class owns the industry, and all that is produced in it. That, of course, includes the food industry as well. The products and the means of production are the private property of the capitalists. Their right to hold private property is legally guaranteed them by a political institution, the government. They would then call upon this government to protect their "rights."

Would the government give them that protection? It certainly would. As a matter of fact in the entire history of industrial strife, the government has always played a very significant role — and always on the side of the capitalist class. One glance at a strike-bound factory today should be sufficient proof of that. The government is present there and not merely the voice over the radio from the White House or Congress. That is merely the facade. The real government is present at a strike in the shape of well armed policemen or militia. Nor is it neutral or solicitous about the welfare of the workers, because when any shooting or clubbing occurs it is always the strikers who are its most numerous victims.

Therefore, in the case of a general strike, if the workers would not submit, the real government, the police, militia, and even federal troops if necessary would be used against them. Not only would the armed forces of the government "protect" private property but would also force the workers back on the job at the point of a bayonet. This government or State, as Marx termed it, is "the public power of coercion." No, the capitalist class would not submit to starvation.

This seems rather a dark picture for labor. One must admit it's anything but pleasant. Someone might then remark: if strikes have such limitations, then what is the use of workers resorting to them? The answer to that is that the workers cannot avoid striking. When real wages fall so low that the workers cannot buy sufficient food, shelter, and clothing to insure their well-being, then they automatically respond with demands for wage increases. Of course they are willing to settle the matter peacefully through negotiations with the capitalists, but when their demands are rebuffed, as a last resort they strike. American labor history is replete with such strikes. During the year of 1877 so low were the wages that something in the nature of a general strike occurred, workers went on

(Continued on page 3)

FAULTY SOCIAL ENGINEERING

(Continued from page 1)

adopt his suggestions or it will be too bad. **Imperative Consumption** is a new system of salesmanship. The nation has achieved mass production, so we must have mass distribution. It is as simple as that. Let us have a look at this wonder-worker.

Mr. Hood sees some new factors in this post-war period. These must be reckoned with if trouble is to be avoided. He listed ten such factors. Briefly, they are: 1. The new peace is not peace. We have democracy and totalitarianism. 2. People have become used to full employment and demand its continuation. 3. The large public debt, which might grow still larger. 4. Inflation dangers from the large amounts of private savings. 5. People have a new understanding of the penalty of depression. During the 1930's \$500 billion dollars worth of production was lost through idleness. 6. The government has made a new declaration of human rights, the right to full employment at useful work. 7. The totality of our interdependence. No one can now barter his own products for those of another. 8. The significance of nuclear fission. The world must achieve cooperation, or face self-destruction. 9. Annihilation of distance. No spot on earth is more than 42 hours' travel from any other spot. 10. The world-wide swing to the left. The revolt of the masses.

These factors are not illusions of Mr. Hood. They are real, present, and have a bearing on social trends. They need to be taken into consideration. This planner thinks that people are quite reasonable in their demands. What people want are such things as job opportunity, reasonable security, a rising standard of living, material and cultural, a fair division of the joint product of capital, labor and management, and they want to be treated decently, and in turn treat others decently. By following his plan, such reasonable desires should be easily provided, he thinks.

He does see obstacles in the way. Here are the main ones.

1. People are still thinking in terms of periodic depressions. 2. The volume of goods that must be sold. During the war years American production reached 247 per cent of the pre-war, on a tonnage basis. For full employment that much, at least, must be produced yearly in peace time. 3. The government is no longer the big customer. 4. The old way was to build up inventories. This must be prevented. 5. The consumers are fickle. Sometimes they buy, sometimes they don't. 6. We are facing increasing consumption and shrinking gross margins. The war years, with shortages of

goods, tended to break down sales organizations. 8. There is warfare on the home front, too much of the "versus" complex. 9. There is not enough understanding of how the economy works. 10. There is too much interference in business by the government.

Well, there is just one way to go about it. The goods, the result of increased productive ability, must be sold. "Technology has advanced to the point where the only road to freedom is the selling road," says this "social engineer." And the selling method must be changed.

It used to be where no sales pressure was necessary, where good products would be sought by the consumer. Later "dynamic selling" had to be adopted. Now, this high-pressure sales method no longer suffices. People must be re-educated to understand how production and consumption must proceed evenly. The whole population must learn to cooperate. The prevailing "versus" complex, with capital versus labor, dealer versus manufacturer, producer versus consumer, race versus race, religion versus religion, must be stopped. We must learn to understand our interdependence and make it work to our mutual benefit. In short we must adopt **Imperative Consumption**. We must acquire the spirit of cooperation.

Has this "social engineer" taken all the factors into consideration? Has he given them all their due weight? What about the "fair and equitable" division of the products between capital, labor, and management? Have they achieved this understanding of fairness at Johns-Manville, where a long drawn out strike is still unsettled? Who is going to teach who how much to save and how much to spend of their income? Does he think private business can ever be taught to abandon competition and adopt cooperation without creating monopoly? The Christian religion has taught the doctrine of "love thy neighbor" for nearly two thousand years. And the Christian nations have fought most of the wars — mostly with each other.

No! Mr. Hood, like so many other reformers, has called attention to some serious world, and domestic problems. He has failed to find the basic cause of such problems and thus he has failed to find a workable solution.

That part of the population which is interested in a fair return for capital and management usually has its own opinion of what is fair, usually all that is produced above a minimum wage to the workers. Being independent and "free" individuals, each of them has to look out for his own interest. In competition with

(Continued on page 8)

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 1)

propaganda front. Full page ads, decidedly class opinionated, are fired daily at the reading public. Expense is out of the question in slanting public opinion the "right" way.

Despite all these powerful forces, political, economic and propaganda, labor's spirit seems firmly bent on the necessary wage increases to meet the high cost of living.

And what if, in time, a modified wage increase, say 18 per cent, is granted and strikes subside? Will there be permanent peace between labor and capital? Will labor enjoy security in employment? No. For a time production will be resumed in full force, industry will be speeded up, market demands met, only to be overtaken and crash! Overproduction and unemployment will again stalk the land. Labor must press, unflinchingly, for all it gets now while conditions yet favor it, and always be cognizant of the temporary nature of such benefits. Permanent peace is a dream. Capital and labor relations can be compromised for a short period. But, with changed conditions, the struggle will break out anew. (As we go to press word comes of a settlement of the steel strike and others.)

* * *

Bulls, Bears and Hogs

Happy days are here again! To be sure, the strikes are a dark cloud over an otherwise bright blue sky, which is in the process of breaking up and is passing away. The halcyon days of the booming '20's are very much in evidence on the stock exchange. Voluminous trading and feverish activity, reminiscent of 1929, once again prevails. Many common stocks which previously have failed to better their 1929 top prices, have succeeded in the present bullish wave. Industrials, railroads and utilities, the three major stock groups, are reaching new high levels. Liquors, too, are showing a spirited rise. Merrily we roll along.

Prosperity is written all over the smoke-filled air. Speculation is rife. "Bulls and bears make money but hogs don't" is now the predominant atmosphere of the exchange. There is a virtual stampede to get on the prosperity bandwagon with the hope of getting rich quick. Fearing overcrowding, and lest they ride for a fall, Marriner S. Eccles, chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, obtained presidential support to put the stock purchasing on a cash basis. On February 15, 1945, the 40 per cent requirement was boosted to 50 per cent; on June 15, 1945 to 75 per cent and as of January 17, 1946, to 100 per cent. Will that stem the tide of buying? As one broker put it: "There's too much cash

around." When the percentage was boosted previously, the bulls and bears were stalled temporarily but soon regained their poise. So, too, have they since the 100 per cent announcement.

The stock market is not just a gambling racket as so many think. It exists, primarily, to facilitate the transfer of capital from one industry, or individual, to another. Like a thermometer, it registers the health of business. Sometimes belatedly and not to the decimal point, but it is generally a fair indicator in the long run. Take the 1929 crash. Business began to slump around the early part of August and the stock market crashed in the latter days of October. The stock market could no longer hold back or hide the pressure of economic forces. It had to give way, and how it did!

The present bullish trend is based, primarily, on the favorable profit position of business. Further, the outlook is even brighter to some, for they feel that the OPA's attempt to "hold the line" will give way or bend, as evidenced by price increases for steel and other commodities, enhancing earning possibilities.

But all good things come to an end. The productive forces will not be too long in saturating the commodity market. It will backfire again as it did in 1929, and the stock market with its 100 per cent cash on the barrel will be sure to follow in its wake.

* * *

Reminder to the Farmers

With planting time about to begin, the immediate prospect, at least, appears pretty favorable to the farmers, that is the owners. During the war, appetites were unsatiated. The farmers just couldn't keep up with the consumptive needs. Increased purchasing power brought business sunshine to the countryside. But now the ending of the war brings back memories, and sorrowful ones, of the aftermath of World War I. Then the farmers continued to raise more than the market was able to absorb. Will experience repeat itself?

Secretary of Agriculture Anderson has recommended continued high production goals for 1946, calling for 356 million acres of crops, the acreage actually planted last year. In announcing the goal, Anderson explained the need for high productivity. Domestic and foreign demand continues to be high. The war has devastated large farm areas and it will take time for restoration. Further, a better balance between soil-depleting and soil-conserving crops is visualized. So the farmers are officially assured of a prosperous 1946. But what after 1946? No farm expert will dare risk his neck about 1947 and thereafter. He knows better.

LABOR'S STRIKE WEAPON

(Continued from page 2)

strike then, announcing that it were better to starve in idleness than add to hunger and privation the added pain of labor. It is through strike action that the workers attempted to force the wealthy owners of industry to grant them something better than starvation wages. In the city of Pittsburgh so enraged were the workers that they drove the militia out of the city. This conflict took on the nature of class warfare in the open. The workers armed themselves with weapons taken from the hardware stores of Pittsburgh. Pitched battles were fought with casualties on both sides, the most numerous victims, of course, were the workers. Although they succeeded in defeating the militia, the victory of the workers was only temporary. The government sent in federal troops and restored "law and order," the capitalist variety. The strikes of the 1870's were smashed, union leaders were arrested, convicted, to serve long sentences in jail.

About the best that can be said of strike action is that it teaches many workers some valuable lessons. One thing they soon learn, namely, that the government is not on their side. It is the government of, for and by the capitalist class. In other words it does not protect or defend the interests of all the people but only a small section of the people, i. e., the wealthy ruling minority. "Democracy", as far as the vast majority, the working class, is concerned, becomes a sham, for the government always acts dictatorially when strikes occur.

Karl Marx, who had analyzed the nature of the wages system in his brilliant work, "Value, Price and Profit," sates that: "the very development of modern industry must progressively turn the scale in favor of the capitalist against the working man, and that, consequently, the general tendency of capitalist production is not to raise, but to sink the average standard of wages . . ."

He further points out, "Such being the tendency of things in this system, is this saying that

In the meantime, land prices continue to rise. The Department of Agriculture predicted on February 3, 1946 that land prices in the U. S. would be 10 per cent higher this spring than last and may reach the boom year of 1919. It estimated that land prices would be 65 per cent higher this spring than for the five-year average of 1935-39.

The "back to the soil" urge among war veterans, and others, thinking of a quiet life, the expansion of acreage by farmers, plus speculation, are the ingredients helping to jack up land prices. It is a sellers' paradise.

(Continued on page 6)

the working class ought to renounce their resistance against the encroachments of capital, and abandon their attempts at making the best of the occasional chances for their temporary improvement? If they did, they would be degraded to one level mass of broken wretches past salvation."

The above needs little explanation, for it is self-evident that if the workers want to prevent themselves from being reduced to worse wage-slavery then they must resort to strike action whenever the occasion demands it.

But as Marx emphasizes it: "At the same time, and quite apart from the general servitude involved in the wages system, the working class ought not to exaggerate to themselves the ultimate working of these every-day struggles. They ought not to forget that they are fighting with effects, but not with the causes of those effects; that they are retarding the downward movement, but not changing its direction; that they are applying palliatives, not curing the malady. They ought, therefore, not to be exclusively absorbed in these unavoidable guerrilla fights incessantly springing up from the never-ceasing encroachments of capital or changes in the market."

What Marx particularly stresses is that instead of the conservative motto of "A fair day's wage for a fair day's work," the workers should inscribe on their banner the revolutionary watchword: "**Abolition of the wages system!**"

By doing that, i. e., by abolishing the wages system (capitalism) the workers would eliminate the cause of their exploitation. How would this be done? It could only be accomplished through a higher form of organization than labor unions. It would have to be done through working class political action that has for its aim the collective ownership of industry by the vast majority. The workers would have to take ownership of the entire means of production, the mines, mills, factories, land, banks, etc., and operate them for the benefit of the whole people instead of for the profit of a handful of parasitic millionaires. Furthermore, the working class would have to establish their own working class form of government to make this possible.

The Proletarian Party is such an organization, that has for its aim the abolition of capitalism. To those workers who see the necessity of getting rid of exploitation we make this appeal: Join with us, you have nothing to lose but your chains of exploitation. Become members and let's speed the day when wage-slavery shall be banished from this earth.

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 Street, Chicago, Ill.

Marxism Today

Less than a year has passed since the British electorate voted overwhelmingly for the candidates of the Labor Party, for what many thought to be a Socialist party. Therefore, Britain now has a "labor" government. Its leaders have proclaimed themselves to be "democratic" socialists.

Already we have seen some of its actions. The "Labor" government has been obliged to take a stand upon a number of issues, and what do we find? On foreign policy, that government is doing its best to preserve the empire and all that it stands for. On home affairs, its chief concern seems to revolve around the restoration of the export trade, with profits as usual.

Where it has taken steps to nationalize industry, beginning with the Bank of England, it has been careful to plan so that the capitalist stockholders will receive as large returns annually upon their investments as they received when the Conservative government administered national affairs, and to postpone the actual buying out of the stockholders to a later date, and upon an optional basis.

This is indicative of what "democratic" socialism can do for the maintenance of capitalism, and the exploitation of labor in the same old way. It is in the nature of things, that whatever party takes over the administration of the capitalist state it must administer it in a capitalist way. It will not work any other way. And this is especially true when the nation taken over is the center of an empire. It will be little different in France, although the "Communist" party there is the largest, although not holding a majority like the British Labor Party does.

Britain's "democratic" socialists, in control of the capitalist state machinery, had to work out a long-range policy on world affairs. It had to make a choice of powerful friends. Weak ones would not be helpful. One great power is in the hands of the workers, the Soviet Union. Exploitation of labor for profit has been abolished there. Private ownership of the industries and land no longer exists. Another great power, the United States, is based upon the very opposite, upon private ownership of the industries and the natural resource, and consequently the exploitation of labor by the capitalist class, the Rockefellers, Fords, DuPonts, and their kind.

Did Britain's "socialist" government decide to cooperate with the workers' government of the U. S. S. R. and seek to strengthen socialism in a general way? No, it decided to cooperate with the world's strongest capitalist state, and, in league therewith, to checkmate and set back the Soviet system and Soviet influence, whenever and wherever possible. In other words, Britain's "democratic" socialists have, so far, demonstrated that their practices are, in the main, no different to those of the Tories, namely, defense of business interests at home and imperialist interests abroad.

The subjugated colonial peoples are being as ruthlessly suppressed under the Attlee "socialist" government, as under the Churchill Tory administration of the empire.

There are a number of reasons for the behavior of the British Labor government, and they are mainly to be found in the sort of thing that such a party is. The leaders are British nationalists and imperialists. Their plan is to buy out the capitalists, and pay them with their own money. It won't work. The capitalists are not that dumb. They are making a start with some of the major industries which are being nationalized (not socialized). That is State Capitalism. The State is nominally the owner, but the capitalists are actually the owners. The exploitation of labor for profit goes on as before. Pauperism increases in extent and intensity. That is not the way to Socialism.

Meanwhile, throughout the world, and especially in eastern Europe, there is another great process at work. The war left a number of nations in ruins and great masses suffering. Their masters led them into the slaughter and now can neither provide them with work or food. In such countries there is no enthusiasm for going back, for restoring the old order of things or the old ruling classes. It is true that what is left of the old ruling classes are trying to hold on to their ancient privileges, but they are confronted with increasing numbers striving to establish a new social order. This struggle is in the open in a number of countries. Land has been taken from the aristocrats and turned over to the poor. Industries have been taken over by the national administrations, which are, in some cases, but provisional governments. Everywhere, increasing numbers are striving to end exploitation. They may not be clear as to the best political form for action, but they are after the substance. Those who are consciously fighting for a new social order are looking in the direction of the Soviet Union. Those trying to reestablish the old are looking to "democratic" America and "socialist" Britain.

Class War

It is quite in harmony with Marxism, the starting point of which is the recognition of the existence of class war and the active participation therein on the working class side, to take advantage of the international divisions of the capitalist world. In fact, that is one of the main characteristics of applied Marxism today. Marxism is not a dogma, but a guide to action.

In 1938 the great fear among class conscious workers was that capitalism might be sufficiently united to make war exclusively upon the Soviet Union, with all the main nations taking part, or the Axis powers alone fighting the U. S. S. R., while the other imperialist and capitalist nations stood on the sidelines. That did not happen because the capitalist powers were too divided among themselves, and later, when the "democratic" powers saw what the Axis was capable of, they were not so anxious that the Soviets, with their great Red Army, be overthrown because it would be just a matter of time until the Axis armies in full force would be attacking the British and Americans as well.

It was this split in the capitalist world, between the democratic powers and the Axis, skillfully taken advantage of by the Soviet Union, which saw World War II commenced while the U. S. S. R. stood on the side lines. However, not wasting its time but using every day of it in further preparation for defense. That extra time, nearly two years, plus the irreconcilable character of the inter-imperialist conflict, saved the U. S. S. R. from having to fight alone and be defeated.

There were people, even in working class ranks, who yelled against the Soviet Union for making the non-aggression pact with Nazi Germany. Some contended that their social systems were but two variations of the same

thing, because they were both political dictatorships. The Nazis knew different. They knew that their most deadly enemy was the Soviet Union. Their non-aggression pact was but a temporary arrangement, so that German imperialism might avoid a two-front war.

The success of German military might, against its capitalist rivals, in a way, proved its undoing. They felt strong enough by the middle of 1941 to make war on the Soviet Union as well. That proved to be a fatal mistake for German imperialism. Less than six months later, Japan's blasting of Pearl Harbor put America into the war against the Axis, thus sealing the fate of the "aggressor" nations and assuring victory for the "peace-loving" imperialists.

A Marxian analysis of the war reveals that its substance was not a struggle between Democracy and Fascism at all. Basically it was a struggle between rival alignments of capitalist imperialists. The Axis imperialists—Germany, Italy and Japan—united to fight their rival imperialists, aligned against them as the "democracies."

Propaganda was wielded effectively on both sides, to hold their people in line for the struggle. Of course, we here are more familiar with the propaganda of the United Nations, which was to this effect, that "peace-loving nations were fighting to defend themselves from the attack of war-making powers, the fascist aggressors." It was a good line with which to fool the unthinking masses.

If the Soviet Union is guided by Marxists, which in the main it is, then the leaders of U. S. S. R. knew that it was an international imperialist conflict, and in the beginning of the conflict that fact was stressed. But something happened. After nearly two years, the Axis powers suddenly invaded the Soviet Union. The same day, the main leader of British imperialism, Winston Churchill, announced that "the Soviet Union is our ally." Would it have been intelligent, or in keeping with Marxian strategy, if the Soviet government had replied: "We will not accept such an alliance with Britain, because it is engaged in an imperialist war, and we are opposed to all imperialism."

Such a stand would have been very stupid, as indeed would have been the Soviet Union's action two years earlier if it had refused to enter into the non-aggression pact with imperialist Germany. During the war years the Soviet Union could not carry on a proclaimed policy of fighting to destroy Axis capitalism and imperialism, especially after America, another great capitalist-imperialist power, was also an ally.

The propaganda of the Soviet Union was to the effect that they were fighting, not to destroy the German nation, but to root out the beastly Nazis, and to let the German people then determine the sort of government they wanted. All that was correct enough and it was wisdom not to stress the fact that they were also fighting to destroy capitalist imperialism. Its leaders knew that if Germany was defeated, not only would the Nazi party be finished but German imperialism and capitalism would be badly shattered, but to keep thrusting that fact under the noses of the British Tories, or Wall Street's cash-conscious owners of America, would have been foolish indeed.

The Soviet Union is a non-imperialist power, in fact it is anti-imperialist by its very nature. Exploitation of labor for profit by property owning classes has been abolished. The exploitation of labor is the very basis of imperialism. It is upon that foundation that America rests, and also Britain, despite its

"Labor" government.

Many people look upon territorial expansion as synonymous with imperialism. This is not necessarily the case. Of course, where the basis of the nation expanding is the exploitation of labor, the profit system, then territorial expansion is imperialistic, whether the nation is as small as Holland or as large as the U. S. A. But, where exploitation is abolished, where the profit system no longer exists, the expansion of territory is not imperialistic, in fact it is in substance anti-imperialistic. It takes away from the capitalist world, territory upon which labor would be exploited by capitalist imperialism.

The struggle in northern Iran has been represented by bourgeois journalists as imperialistic on the part of the Soviet Union. Even if it could be shown that the U. S. S. R. is the aggressor, is it not a fact that certain capitalist-imperialist nations would only be too willing to step in there to exploit labor in the oil region around the shore of the Caspian, if they had the opportunity?

We think the sovereignty of Iran should not be infringed, but at present it is far from being a sovereign state. The old Russian and British empires dominated Iran for a long time. British and American capital stand ready now to exploit the whole of Iran's mineral resources if given an opportunity. Whatever part the U. S. S. R. is able to keep imperialist nations out of is in harmony with working class interests in general.

Marxism today is quite different in its application than in the past. Its basis in the greater part of the world is still the class struggle. There the workers have to take the initiative, they have to be on the offensive against their exploiters, but in the Soviet Union, a very large section of the world, that stage has been passed. There the workers have no longer to fight an exploiting class. In the Soviet Union the basis for Marxian action is the conservation and defense of the gains of the proletarian revolution. National defense against the aggression of capitalism is, and must be, the role of the U. S. S. R. Its foreign policy must be aimed at weakening imperialism. It supports all subjugated peoples in their struggles to break the yoke of imperialism. Therefore, the Soviet Union, in harmony with applied Marxism, is today the bulwark of anti-imperialism, and not a new type of imperialism as the capitalists (and capitalist minded workers) continually try to brand it.

Another aspect of present-day Marxism arises as a result of the Soviet people living for so long in the post-revolutionary stage. More than half of all that vast population has been born since 1917, and a very large section of those living then were young people and children.

While the Soviet educational system has laid great stress upon the teachings of Karl Marx, and widely circulated the Marxian writings of Lenin and others, there is one thing it could not impart to its population, namely, the actual experiences which arise for workers actively engaged in the class struggle.

The strikes and other conflicts which workers in capitalist countries engage in gives them certain experiences which can be obtained in no other way. Those who engage in strikes find themselves confronted by police, and armed forces in general. Often they are shot down in the name of law and order, carted off to jail, or starved into submission. Only a minority of the Soviet people are old enough to have had such experiences, and with the passing of time a different ideology is bound to arise, something very different in many respects to the ideology of

exploited wage workers.

The starting point today for the vast population of the U. S. S. R. is the conservation of what has been attained. The workers of the capitalist world are not on the defensive, but on the offensive. They are confronted by exploiters and the exploiters' state power. The Soviet Union, and its preservation, is still of utmost importance to the proletarian world struggle, but the leadership for such a struggle cannot be drawn from the U. S. S. R. However much that has been the case in the past, the changed conditions make it more and more imperative that the workers of the capitalist section of the world depend upon themselves.

One of the great weaknesses of the Communist movement throughout the world has been its tendency to look to the U. S. S. R. for guidance instead of learning to do their own thinking. Drawing inspiration from the great Soviet revolution, and taking pride in its achievements is all very well, but looking there exclusively for Marxian guidance will only result disastrously for the revolutionary workers who long ago were told by Marx and Engels that "the Proletariat of each country must settle matters with its own bourgeoisie." A self-reliant and well-informed Marxian party is indispensable to the vanguard of the proletarian revolution everywhere. The Russian revolution was not guided from London or New York. The Bolshevik party developed its own revolutionary strategy. We can learn much from their experiences, but we will meet with failure, not with success, within the ranks of the working class party developed in the U. S. A. So far, the Proletarian Party is the only one which has actually made systematic efforts to convey Marxian knowledge, in its fullest form, to its rank and file membership.

Here we must redouble our efforts in that relation. We must fight against all opportunism and betrayal, whether it is deliberate or the result of ignorance of Marxism. One of the greatest weaknesses of working class political action in the U. S. is the continual reversion to class collaboration. Alliances are made with capitalist parties, chiefly with the Democratic party, and that is regarded as practical politics. Certain individuals, outstanding servants of capitalism, such as Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman and Henry Wallace are.

These men are represented by American labor leaders, and some who speak politically in the name of the working class, as friends of labor and the workers, sometimes in the name of Marxism, are called upon to work and vote for their election.

This policy is not Marxian, it is anti-Marxian. It does not advance the workers politically, no matter what its immediate advantages appear to be. It betrays and sets back the independent political action of the workers, and sells them out to the political dominance of their exploiters.

Marxism proclaims that "every class struggle is a political struggle" and it asserts that only through revolutionary political action can the workers solve their problems, and that through the overthrow of the capitalist system.

Capitalism takes advantage of every division. A self-reliant and well-informed Marxian revolutionary movement of the workers is justified in doing the same, namely, taking advantage of the many divisions within the capitalist world.

At present there are many nations of subjugated peoples that are trying to break the yoke of imperialism. There is rebellion against British imperialism in Egypt, India and elsewhere. The Indonesians are in re-

bellion against Dutch imperialism and in fact, the East in general is in a state of turmoil. Daily we read of demonstrations, of riots and shootings in which people are killed and wounded. It is the natives who get the worst of it, not because they lack numbers, but because they lack modern weapons.

While most of those struggles are purely nationalist in character, there is a section that goes beyond mere national independence and fights against their native exploiters as well.

At this late stage of capitalism, where there is evidence on all sides of its disintegration, those struggles for national independence carry with them strong revolutionary working class trends. Under these circumstances it is good Marxian strategy to support those movements for national independence. First, it is a blow at imperialism, and thus a weakening of capitalism. Second, it may gather impetus and draw large forces of workers and peasants into the conflict, with their own independent political demands, such as the division of the land and industrial reforms which both native and foreign exploiters refuse to concede. Such struggles, especially now, tend to move to the "left," far beyond mere independent government, and for working class control of land and industry.

Marxism, while it has its specific goal, the entire socialization of industry and the natural resources, nevertheless supports the struggles of all subjugated, repressed and exploited peoples.

The Soviet Union is now recognized by most of those independence movements as their true friend, and sections of those movements are ready to go all the way and rid their territories of all exploiters, native and foreign alike.

Marxism is not an outmoded system of thought, as bourgeois professional "educators" and bourgeois journalists assert. It is not an outworn movement but one which has already achieved much for the world's workers, and is destined to achieve far more. Leading exploiters of labor, the world over, know this. They hate and fear Marxism. The main institutions of the bourgeois world, the parasites who fatten upon a parasitic system, like the Church, for instance, are up in arms against Marxism. The anti-Communist movement, Fascist in character (although sometimes denying it) is working overtime in all capitalist nations, America not excepted. In a number of European countries Catholic Action is in the open. It is one of the main rallying forces of reaction. At present, it is working through certain political parties. Its object is to uphold the rich and powerful and to promote humility and obedience amongst the poor.

In countries, such as Great Britain, the capitalists, while not supporting labor politics, are trimming their sails to the social storm and working with "democratic socialism" as a last resort, to head off the proletarian revolution, to divert it into the less harmful channel of state capitalism, under which profit, interest and rent will prevail as usual. Marxism they will not work with but against, because they know that with the victory of Marxism, in other words, the proletarian revolution, their parasitic rule, with its vast wealth on the one hand and its appalling poverty on the other, will come to an end. Marxism, today, is still the mightiest weapon wielded by the world's workers in their struggle for a classless and warless world of peace and plenty. Its famous slogan is as potent as ever for the workers of the capitalist world—"Workers of the World, Unite."

John Keracher.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 3)

But what will happen when the home market becomes glutted? With the postwar purchasing power already commencing to dwindle, and will shrink more when **full unemployment** sets in? That in a period when foreign demands have slackened? Then the land bubble is sure to burst. Then the high priced paradise will turn to its opposite. The cycle of prosperity and crisis is inevitable under capitalism for agriculture as for industry. There is no escape within its walls.

* * *

Science Notes

Scientific developments are making front page news. Most everyone is familiar with the discoveries of radar, atomic bomb and engineering feats. Now we read about more scientific progress made in aeronautics, where a jet plane made a record flight from Long Beach, California, to La Guardia Field, New York City, a distance of 2,470 miles, in 4 hours and 13 minutes, an average speed of 584 miles an hour. The Army reports a push-button plane which, through automatic devices, can take off and make landings without hardly any human interception.

The General Electric has announced that its physicists have produced, for the first time, meson, one of the chief constituents of cosmic rays. This discovery is expected to enhance the knowledge of nuclear forces and open a much wider field for atomic energy.

Science would deservedly occupy first place in the hearts of mankind were it constructively and peaceably bent. That it is twisted for selfish and destructive purposes, demonstrates, contrary to popular belief and pious platitudes, that science and scientists are influenced by economic and class environment.

That is more true of capitalism with its heroes crowned with gold than any previous social system? What's in it? Those are the searching questions influencing men's minds. All sentimental and passionate searching for the abstract good and welfare is considered as a waste of time. Idealists are considered just crackpots.

The capitalists have little use for pure research for its own sake. Its support is gained only when science is **concretely** put to the probing of nature's secrets with a view of enriching the capitalists.

The evolution of pure and applied science has gone hand in hand with the development of capitalism. The opening of the world market, expansion of commodity production and exchange, the growth of commerce and communication, all these brought need for more knowledge of things. Science was a necessary

factor for the expansion of the production forces and grew progressively along with them.

It has gone a long way in harnessing nature's forces in the interest of capital, only to find itself harnessed by the latter. Scientists are forced to serve their masters and are dollar marked.

That they are now applying themselves to the development of destructive forces is a reflection of the declining period of the system. Capitalism is no longer able to expand the constructive or productive forces. Its science, and scientists are now busily engaged in inventing new and deadly instruments of destruction in the hope of saving the bankrupt order.

* * *

Filibuster and the FEPC

The filibuster in the esteemed Senate against the Fair Employment Practices Act is a practical demonstration of democracy in action.

But by the very strength of its opposition it puts a question mark against its so cherished ideals. By its own commitment it gives the lie to its avowed claims, exposing to public view that grand illusion "that American democracy rests on equality and freedom for everyone irrespective of race, color or creed." Its abstract theory is contradicted by its concrete practice; formal declarations of equality negated by flagrant inequalities on all sides; pious Sunday sermons on tolerance by daily indulgence in intolerance.

Elements of both parties, Democrats and Republicans, have lined up solidly against what they consider a threat to American traditions of freedom. "FEPC will curb the freedom of the individual to hire, a fundamental condition for free enterprise," is the charge of these reactionaries.

The liberals, in defense of FEPC, resort to the same traditional harp: "Racism is against the principles of our government and tradition."

It is obvious that an abstract fetish of "freedom" and "equality" is here appealed to when concrete issues are at stake. Tradition is a relative matter. An economic order based upon privilege for the few and grind for the many cannot by its very nature practice equality for all. What you have is capitalist class equality. Freedom to hire includes, of course, freedom of discrimination. The latter is an attribute of the former. Discrimination because of religion, color, race or nationality rests basically upon the basic discrimination or division into classes, and the ruling class fans and fosters these divisions to its own advantage.

FEPC, this abortive child of World War II, were it even to be adopted, would but scratch the surface of this social fester, limiting itself, as it proposes, to but

The Individual and History

By Lewis R. Schultz

Marxists are often accused of ascribing no importance to the individual in the making of history, and of explaining societal development solely on the basis of economic laws. The accusation is without any merit at all, and it is worthwhile to defend Marxism against it only because of its persistence in so many circles.

There have been two extreme theories held on the question of the role of the individual in history, and the Marxist theory should never be confused with either of them. One theory contends that history is the result of the thoughts and deeds of certain individuals. According to this view, the "mob" is composed entirely of zeros, and only the heroes count. People with this theory would say that if there was Nazism (state capitalism) in Germany, it was because Hitler and a few others willed it. They would say that Hitler and Co. devised Nazism, descended from their lofty heights to persuade the population that this system was meet and proper for Germany. Substitute Roosevelt and the New Deal, Mussolini and Fascism, etc., and you have many examples of this type of thinking. The other theory, just as extreme, contends that the individual is of no importance in history at all. History, it asserts, is the result of the operation of certain laws of social development. Some would conceive of these laws as "divine" in origin, while others would affirm their materialistic (e. g., economic) origin. In either event, this extremist theory reduces human history to the operation of immutable mechanical laws, over which the individual has no control.

Each of the two theories contains some truth, but how much? Let us examine the first-mentioned theory. It suffers from two defects: (1) it ignores the importance of the mass of mankind in the making of history, and (2) it asserts the complete freedom of will of the few individuals to whom it does ascribe importance in history. The first defect was admirably revealed by the events of the French Revolution of 1789 (a capitalist revolution) and the Russian Revolution of 1917 (a working class revolution), neither of which

one aspect of the problem, namely, the job.

The heated battle over this point should be added proof to thinking workers of the class nature of democracy; secondly that discrimination is an integral part of "free enterprise;" thirdly, that freedom from discrimination can only follow freedom from free enterprise.

L. B.

could have succeeded had it not been for the activity of great masses of the people. But it is the second defect that is more serious, because it recognizes no force in history save men. Does man make his own history? Yes, but "... he does not make it out of whole cloth; he does not make it out of conditions chosen by himself, but out of such as he finds close at hand." (Karl Marx in "The Eighteenth Brumaire," p. 9.) Here lies the crux of the problem. Thus we see that man, socially and individually, is limited in this business of making history. But Marx does not merely assert this, he adduces proof for the assertion. What are these "conditions" that he refers to?

In the "Communist Manifesto" (Marx and Engels) it is stated that "In every historical epoch the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which it is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch" (p. 7). The extent of an individual's influence on history (and even its possibility), therefore, depends upon the state of the productive forces. The capitalist mode of production necessarily divides society into classes (worker and capitalist). If a man is an exploited worker his influence on history will be far different than if he is an exploiting capitalist. Capitalism, which is evolved out of the previous economic system, feudalism, did not evolve automatically, by its own self-government; but it prescribed the limits of individuals' activity by the degree of its development at any given time. Hitler and the Nazis, for instance, could not have caused Germany to revert to a feudal economy, even if they had wished to. All of their activity was limited by the framework of a capitalist mode of production, and that in its "moribund, dying stage," of imperialism.

There is now no need to consider the theory that the individual is of no importance in history. It is plain that it represents the antithesis of the other theory that the individual is all-important, and that the truth lies in a synthesis which contains something of each theory.

2 New Pamphlets

"WAGES AND THE WORKING DAY"

By John Keracher
Price 15 Cents

"FREDERICK ENGELS"

By John Keracher
Price 25 Cents

GENERAL MOTORS STRIKE

The General Motors Strike creates a new record in American labor history as to its length and the number of people involved during that length of time. Over 175,000 auto workers went on strike, to which should be added may thousands of GM workers who were laid off when the strike was called. They, too, are on strike.

Their union, the UAW-CIO, has always been noted for its turbulent history. Its very vocal rank and file and its, sometimes, total disregard of official leadership. The members had been chafing at the no-strike pledge during the war and it was not uncommon to hear the remark, "As soon as the war is over, we'll shut her down," not realizing that reconversion itself would shut the plants down for a time. Management's provocative attitude in refusing to settle minor grievances added fuel to the fire, and all signs pointed to major post-war strikes in the auto industry.

The UAW-CIO was the first union to announce cancellation of the no-strike pledge after VJ Day. Its International Executive Board met in Flint, Michigan, early in September, 1945 and laid down a policy of 30 per cent wage increase; and announced the one-at-a-time policy; namely, that negotiations would begin immediately with the big three, General Motors, Ford and Chrysler, and strikes would be called in one corporation at a time to enforce the demands. The other companies would work and have the jump on a competitor. By November 21, 1945, the General Motors strike was called and the one-at-a-time policy was in effect.

The strike has been longer than expected by anyone involved. A number of factors arose which upset the strategy. First, there was a lack of coordination among the various unions in the CIO. The Oil Workers went on strike last fall for a 30 per cent raise and were settling for 18 per cent shortly after the GM strike began.

Second, the Steel Workers threatened to strike and did strike and have settled for 18½ per cent. There was no pressure on GM to settle while the steel strike was on or impending because it upset the one-at-a-time strategy. General Motor's competitors would not get steel, either, and would gain no advantage in the market.

Third, there is the question of timing in the GM strike itself. Certainly, Reuther, who directs the GM department, and the other officers knew a steel strike was impending and that their strategy could not work until it was settled. Steel, being a more basic industry, should have led the fight. CIO policy should have

been so integrated that the other CIO unions would then follow up with their demands.

There are possible explanations for this lack of coordination in the CIO. One is the personal ambitions of some of its leaders. Each wanting to become the savior of the American working class and the head of CIO itself, and jealous of anyone intent on doing an honest job. This makes coordination of union campaigns impossible because some autonomy would have to be surrendered by the various internationals. Another explanation, and a more plausible one, is that the rank and file having been clamoring for strikes during the war caused their leaders to justify their demands as soon as thought practical.

General Motors as a corporation headed the capitalist drive to wring concessions from their government. They were aided by the steel companies and industry generally. Price control is not suitable to them and they want it repealed or modified in their favor. They have met some success in this direction.

Industry, generally, is opposed to raising wages; however, if raises must be granted they want some guarantee that such demands will not be repeated in the future. Industry has now been assured this by the President, who has set up a wage stabilization board similar to the War Labor Board, with orders that wage increases granted now must suffice the workers for at least one year.

In the meantime, Ford and Chrysler, seeing the handwriting on the wall and being satisfied with the arrangements their Government have made, have agreed to the compromise wage demands. So has most of the steel industry. Through Government intervention a formula was devised whereby the workers in American industry, if they show enough determination, will receive a wage increase of around 18c per hour.

The GM strike still continued after these settlements because there were other gains the company wanted to make. Even after conceding most of the wage demands, they wanted guarantees of better production, of company security, they opposed union security and wanted to throw out some contractual gains the union had made.

The General Motor's workers are carrying on a magnificent fight, but are due to find that their wage raises have not solved their economic problems. In another depression they should learn that an economic fight alone is not the solution, as the length of the strike is beginning to teach them now that there is more to this strike than economic

THAT ROAD TO ROME

Shortly after the termination of hostilities in Europe a prominent American statesman trotted off for a visit to the Pope at Rome. The reason for the visit was not divulged, nor were the American people informed as to the nature of the subjects discussed. Even so staunch a supporter of isolationism, Americanism and keep-out-of-Europe-ism as the Chicago Tribune failed to comment on the secret consultations between an avowed servant of American democracy and the dictatorial head of world Catholicism. From this it seems fairly obvious that capitalist reactionaries and liberals alike were in favor, not only of a closer relationship between Washington and Rome, but also parties to a conspiracy of silence as to the nature and purpose of such a relationship.

Since then things have progressed. Rome has promoted several of its American church officials to high posts in that foreign capital, ostensibly for the purpose of keeping the Vatican well informed on American affairs, and well financed. All this without a single vote having been cast by the sovereign people of the United States. Small wonder that the eminent Cardinal Stritch, in a recent broadcast to the United States, declared: "We must not fail to recognize a bogus democracy of our times which, in its substance, is a crushing, tyrannical imperialism." Not content with that, the Cardinal again asserted that "the church forms and fashions man for right social action." In view of the Cardinal's attitude and the fact that both Mussolini and Franco were formed and fashioned by the Church, and the right social ends served by them was the destruction of democracy in their respective countries, we must assume that the destruction of democracy everywhere is the probable objective of this ancient axis of which Rome is the hub. The Cardinal's statements and the action of Washington's statesmen in promoting a closer relationship with the dictatorial power of the Catholic Church is especially significant in view of the South American situation.

American capital is frantically attempting to extend its control to the overwhelmingly Catholic nations of South America, but is meeting with considerable opposition from native capital which

issues. The strike has been forced into the political arena with the Government taking part and forcing the workers to accept a compromise. They must learn that they, too, must fight in the political arena. They must think in terms of working class political action.

Lewis Williams.

does not relish the prospect of competing with American mass production methods in the exploitation of the natural and human resources of the region. As is usual during the long period of capitalist emergence from a semi-feudal social system, the Catholic Church is found on the side of the remnants of the feudal aristocrats and against the rising capitalist class, and past history indicates that neither the church nor the feudal aristocracy is above making common cause with a foreign power at the expense of capitalism in their own nations. The emergence of South American capitalism from semi-feudal conditions has been accompanied by its share of conflict between these two factions, and now that Wall Street has entered the picture as the foreign power, some interesting results may be expected.

The Catholic Church stands to gain much more in both influence and power if the sort of democracy which a normally developing capitalism requires never arises, and if the semi-feudal overlords can be assured of full church support and the financial aid of American capital supported by American arms, then Wall Street should have clear sailing in the task of effecting a very profitable penetration and exploitation of all natural and human resources of the South American countries. The church will probably receive its cut in the form of generous donations for schools, hospitals and universities, under strict church control, while helpful public officials can be taken care of in ways that are as varied as they are profitable. The workers will receive industrial training, fitting them for the tasks required, performed by the church and the new financial masters without becoming contaminated by the ideas of a "bogus democracy" which sometimes proves both embarrassing and expensive for capitalism when workers "mistake it" for the real thing. A few years may well see a repetition in South America, of such actions as took place in Mexico in the years '34 to '36; actions which frightened both Wall Street and Father Coughlin out of seven years' growth. Industrial growth, even under severely restricted conditions, has a terrific educational effect upon workers and must, as a matter of course, eventually produce reactions which remove the very restrictions imposed to keep them in line. This shotgun wedding between Wall Street and Mother Church will probably provide some blissful moments for both—but we envy neither when their hybrid offspring, a class-conscious, industrial working class, and a broken, disillusioned "middle class" start kicking things around.

A. N.

LEWIS AND THE COAL MINERS FAULTY SOCIAL ENGINEERING

If John L. Lewis, on his return to the American Federation of Labor, has conceived the idea that he can bring about the dismantling of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and take it, limb by limb, into the AFL, he will only demonstrate that such is a false conception, and that he does not understand the why and wherefore of the organized labor movement.

Unions of the working class, are, primarily, a protest against the methods adopted by our present order of society in the unequal distribution of the wealth of the nation, of that which is produced by labor. Unions come to life of necessity, and each union will play its part in the fulfillment of its obligation to that necessity.

Once this necessity has been eradicated through the reorganization of society, so that wealth is no longer a private monopoly, the necessity for the union will disappear. The union will become obsolete. In other words, remove the cause and the effect will disappear of its own accord.

The AFL, from a working class point of view, is an ultra-conservative organization. The mentality of its leadership lost it the opportunity of organizing the masses of workers in many of the basic industries. Its affiliated unions were permitted, and encouraged, to charge exorbitant initiation fees, and in some instances bar from membership those who dared to have political views of their own. It has been mainly interested in the welfare of the skilled workers. At no time since its inception has it made a real effort to organize the great mass of common laborers in the United States. That is why the AFL has always stood high in the esteem of certain large employers, and some employers' associations.

When Lewis withdrew the Mine Workers out of the AFL no one would ever have dreamed that he would return, after the things he said about the AFL. Many people will wonder how John can do the things he does. However, it is not strange when one understands that he deposed 85 per cent of the duly elected district and sub-district officers, and installed provisional officers in their places, and for years has deprived the rank and file members a voice or vote in certain affairs of their union. The Mine Workers, by the very nature of their work, have always been militant, and if the day ever comes that gives them the opportunity to break the shackles that he has forged upon them, with his unlimited appointive power, they will soon consign him to the hall of forgotten men.

Those in the AFL who cherish the idea that the CIO will be consumed by the AFL should keep in mind that once the child is de-

livered from its parent it cannot return to from whence it came. When the chairs were assembled for the representatives of craft organizations in the blue council room of the American Federation of Labor, it was not intended that seats would be provided for the representatives of industrial organizations, and there has never been any vacant chairs preserved in that chamber for such representation.

The working class in America in its progressive development of organized labor has arrived at the stage of industrial unionism and since this form of organization recognizes that all classes of workers need protection, it is bound to go forward until it obtains its final objective.

The Progressive Mine Workers in Illinois who succeeded in severing relations with the United Mine Workers in 1929 were barred from the AFL because they were a dual union, after Lewis took the miners out of the Federation the Progressive Miners of Illinois were invited into the AFL. Now that the Mine Workers have returned to the AFL and the Prodigal Son John has returned home to those whom he slandered, he will be on hand when the curtains are finally wrung down. The Progressive Mine Workers of District No. 1

(Continued from page 2)

his fellow capitalist, he is usually forced, by threat of economic extinction, to take all he can get. His income, in the main, must be used for business expansion and improvement, or he will fall behind in the race.

If some capitalists really should take Mr. Hood's advice to heart, and give more consideration to others, they would soon find themselves going down hill. They would find that others would be the gainers and they the losers. Such being the economic law under which capitalism works, there is small chance that people will "learn" to do differently. Why are people fickle, buying at times and refusing to do so at other times? The capitalists, and the would-be capitalists, spend their money freely when they see opportunity for profit making. They "invest" rather than spend it. After a long war, or a long period of depression, when consumer goods are scarce, increased profitable production is possible. When anybody with money will buy raw materials, hire labor and produce goods.

of Illinois have voted unanimously to withdraw from the AFL "to save their democratic principles."

Joseph Tumulty.

Much of such goods will be in the form of production equipment, buildings, machinery, raw materials, etc. After a period, consumer demand is taken care of. Production equipment has been greatly enlarged for the very time when consumer demand begins to slow down. Inventories pile up in the consumer goods field. Soon industrial shut-downs become necessary. Unemployment grows, and consumer demand is further curtailed. Firms who made big profits, ready for spending and investment when operating at capacity, find that part time operation brings small profits and little money for spending.

With production equipment now more than ample to take care of consumer demand, there is no longer the incentive for investment. Those who still make money will save it for a more "opportune" time. They stop "spending." Their fickleness has a cause that cannot easily be talked away.

The warfare on the home front, the "versus" complex, has its cause as firmly rooted in the economic structure. Labor is constantly producing more goods at a faster pace, and it wants a share. Capital is facing diminishing net returns, because of its enlarged equipment and the comparatively smaller market.

The world-wide swing to the left is nothing but the reaction of the world's workers and producers against the shackles of capitalist production. In fact, none of the "obstacles" to "Imperative Consumption" can be brushed away by new mental attitudes. These mental attitudes spring from very material causes. The "social engineer" will have to take a lesson from the construction engineer. He will have to look for and find the material causes of social troubles before such troubles can be removed. Not "Imperative Consumption" but social distribution is the remedy.

But social distribution cannot proceed from private ownership of the means of production. That private ownership, "free enterprise," as it is now called, is the basic cause of present day social troubles. This, all reformers want to preserve. Thus, they all waste their time, as well as that of their followers, by their continuous bringing forth of the old idea of a changed mentality, as the essential to social harmony.

Not a fair return to each of the conflicting groups in society, but the whole proceeds of production to the producers, and the doing away with the cause of the conflict, will continue to be the aim of the world's workers until such time as victory for the cause is achieved. Until such time, social ills will not diminish but grow, and this in spite of the most earnest efforts of all reformers.

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