

PROLETARIAN NEWS



WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE!
YOU HAVE NOTHING TO LOSE BUT
YOUR CHAINS! YOU HAVE A WORLD
TO GAIN! — Karl Marx

A JOURNAL FOR THE WORKING CLASS

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE PROLETARIAN PARTY OF AMERICA

Vol. XXVI, No. 12, Whole No. 297

Chicago, Ill., December 1957

Price 10c a Copy

A DISCORDANT NATO

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, better known by its initials as the NATO, is an alliance, or pact, of capitalist nations mainly of Western Europe, but it was brought into being by the American government during President Truman's administration for the purpose of "containing" and, or, "rolling back" communism. It was, and still is, a military alliance, and the man who played a foremost part in organizing it was America's top General at that time, Eisenhower; now the President of the United States.

The NATO has been held up as a model of "harmony," of co-operation of nations comprising the "free world" (that is, the capitalist world). Even lately, President Eisenhower, when visited by Queen Elizabeth and Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, praised the NATO, and urged that it be strengthened in answer to the Soviet Union's lead in the field of missiles and outer-space satellites. The burden of his talk was, that, now more than ever, the capitalist nations must stick together, for the "communist menace" has grown bigger than ever.

But, it might be asked, how much actual harmony is there in the NATO? The answer is: there is discord instead of harmony among the member nations of the NATO.

For example, there is the case of France who became furious at the United States and Great Britain for agreeing to provide Tunisia with arms. These two nations excused their action by pointing out that Tunisia was on the verge of accepting weapons from Egypt who is in the "Soviet orbit." The U.S. and Britain explained to France that they acted to keep Tunisia from falling under Soviet "influence."

But the French government was not easily mollified by such an explanation. It has been having trouble with Tunisia whom it charges with openly sympathizing with the Algerian rebels and providing them a sanctuary when they cross the frontier pursued by the French soldiers. (The French have an army estimated at approximately a half million soldiers in Algeria, but in spite of all their efforts have not succeeded in

crushing the native rebellions.)

The French fear that the weapons furnished by U.S. and Britain to Tunisia would be passed on by the latter to the Algerian rebels.

Tunisia denies all these charges of "aiding the Algerian rebels" and makes counter-charges against the French soldiers for deliberately violating the border adjoining Algeria when in "hot pursuit" of the rebels. It was not a long time ago that Tunisia herself was a colony dominated by France, but finally was "granted" independence after a number of rebellious attempts. She stated she wants arms to preserve her "dignity" as an independent nation.
(Continued on page 2)

Sputnik Over U.S.

Americans have a penchant for stars. They go big for baseball, football and other athletic "stars." They have their favorite movie and TV "stars." Now they gaze in wonderment at the Red Star as the Sputniks spin across the skies.

The reaction to the Soviet achievement was varied. Some, such as Rear Admiral Rawson Bennett, who said the Soviets merely succeeded in tossing a piece of iron into the air, belittled the accomplishment. While others, scientists and other learned leaders, took a more sober and serious view of that piece of iron tossed into the air and spinning around the earth in outer space. The implication of Sputnik's beeps was not lost on the world's population. President Eisenhower, too, was compelled to take notice.

The President addressed the nation on Nov. 7th, a week earlier than he had planned, to reassure this nation as well as its allies on America's military might. But he announced in his message, the appointment of Dr. James R. Killian, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, what the press described as the "Czar" in the missile field. The aim of course is to try to catch up with the Soviets in science, basic and applied.

The admission that America has a job now to catch up to the Soviets in science may come as a shock to most Americans who thought this nation was tops in that field. Haven't we gadgets, the products of science and technology that others, including Soviet

THE BUSINESS RECESSION

By now everyone knows that the boom of prosperity has been petering out and is giving way to a business recession. One sees the signs of it everywhere, especially on the faces of the business men; gloom has replaced the joy of the boom.

Even the workers are not happy. As jobholders many were conditioned to think that prosperity would last forever—and so would their jobs. But now comes the slump in business, and none of them are sure. As the story goes: "this should not have happened—but it did."

In fact it had to happen. It's all part of the "business cycle."

There is the high point, the boom (of prosperity) which lasts a number of years, and then comes the "bust," a recession, or a depression, and this too can last for quite a number of years. Or as an "old-timer" once put it: "first you have fat years, then you get the lean years, whether you like it or not." That's the way it is under capitalism. It cannot work any other way.

So far it's not yet a deep depression. But no one is happy over business conditions today, for here is what they reveal according to one of the latest reports, to wit:

"Signs of a leveling-off, if not an actual downturn in the economy, have been read in increased unemployment stemming from cut-backs in defense spending; a disappointing increase in fall business; a further decline in freight car loadings and a stock market decline in recent weeks that has sent prices to mid-1955 levels." (N.Y. Times, Nov. 17)

That sounds like a clinical report of an ailing person. But what is the actual disease, and what is the cause of it? When the Soviet Union launched its first Sputnik up into outer space (Oct. 4th) and immediately afterward the stock market took a plunge (a steep dive) some wanted to blame the Russians for it. However, the business men in Wall Street themselves pointed out that the Russians were not to blame because business was already sick long before the first Sputnik's flight.

Actually the ailment, or "social disease," that the U.S. economy is suffering from is an old one, that of glut, or overproduction. Too much has been produced, more than can be sold on the market at a profit. By September this tremendous surplus of commodities had already reflected itself in more than \$54 billions of "manufacturers inventories" (a Dept. of Commerce term). This took the form of many kinds of products, such as textiles, leather goods, TV sets and radios, washing machines, refrigerators, furniture, autos, and even jet planes. Added to this are the farm products, the millions of bushels of wheat, and the millions of bales of cotton, etc.

Unemployment

With unsold goods "on the shelves" and cramming the ware-

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued on page 2)

HOME SCENE

Russia, have not even dreamed of? Yes. The tail-fins on American autos, door-handles to open the refrigerator either way, and other gadgets too numerous to mention, product of expensive research in brains, energy, time, money and materials; all to please the consumer taste and above all corporate business and PROFITS.

Basic research in science that may not have a dollar mark to it was not strongly encouraged. In fact some of those scientists so engaged were classified as "egg-heads," "queers," and were suspect as subversives. They were pushed around and smeared by job seeking politicians. While over in the Soviet Union the scientists enjoy the prestige and comforts of life that conform to that profession, here the baseball "star" shines — there, the scientists are in the limelight.

Since Sputnik involves rocketry, and rocket development bears on military security, the nation's politicians are nosily stirring. The Democrats, on the defensive on racial integration, are now attacking the Republicans on security matters. They are charging the President with lack of leadership and the Republicans with penny-pinching on the budget. That is capitalist politics.

However, the message of Sputnik's beeps from outer space, constitutes a challenge to the capitalist system. It heralds the advancement of Soviet science and application. The possibility of

THE BUSINESS RECESSION

(Continued from Page 1)

houses, it was inevitable that there would be curtailment in production in most of the industries of the nation. Hard hit has been the most basic industry of them all, the steel industry, which is now producing far below its capacity, approximately at 77 per cent. This is understandable in view of the fact, that, because of decreased production in the rest of the industries, there is less demand for steel than formerly.

But decreased or curtailed production has hit the workers directly. Many thousands of them have lost their jobs. The capitalist statisticians (and also the government) are reluctant to release the actual figures as to the amount of unemployment. However, most of them predict more lay-offs, as we gather from the following report of the N.Y. Times (Nov. 17th):

"It is now considered likely that unemployment this winter will reach 4,000,000, compared with a peak of 3,200,000 last winter."

The above is a conservative estimate. Some predict there will be at least 5 million unemployed before the winter is over. But the most gloomy are the views of some jobless workers who in effect "predict" that the speed with which they were thrown out on the street makes it problematical if any workers will still be holding their jobs around Christmas time. In short, it is "anybody's guess," as to how many will be unemployed this winter, but all are agreed there will be a lot more jobless than at present.

The plight of the jobless worker is anything but enviable. He is suffering from a severe reduction in that so-called "great American standard of living." Even the unemployment compensation he collects does not "compensate" for his loss of wages. Stretch it all he can, he still finds it impossible to catch up with the high cost of living.

Bitter must be the reflections of the unemployed when they read in the press that there is "too much" produced. And yet, they, the jobless, do not get enough of these good things produced! What does it matter to them if there is too much bread in the nation? If they lack the price of a loaf of bread they simply do not eat. Of course, it might be remarked that none of these jobless are in a starving condition. However, prolonged unemployment may yet reduce them to such straits.

Nor could they resort to beggary, should that occur, for then they would be committing a "crime," to quote Anatole France (a famous French writer): "The law in its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread."

Periodicity Of Economic Crises

Capitalism is a system based on private ownership of the means of production (industry) and the ex-

ploitation of wage-labor. It is also based on competition between capitalists for control of the market wherein to sell their commodities at a profit. It's a buying and selling society, and nothing is produced unless it can be sold at a profit.

So long as buyers (customers or consumers) can be found for their commodities, the capitalists are happy, because profits come rolling in. Workers are also contented, in the main, because of steady employment and receiving wages. Such a period is known as "prosperity."

But, as we have seen, "prosperity" does not endure for all time. It comes to an end as soon as the economic crisis of overproduction makes its appearance. That's also an indication that the market has reached its saturation point.

The most numerous customers or consumers (but not the wealthiest) are the workers. However their purchasing power is limited by their wages, and that in turn is but a small fraction of the value of the total amount produced. Hence the capitalists have a huge surplus of commodities on their hands. These rich, idle parasites cannot consume it all, no matter how much they riot in ease and luxury; there still is a tremendous amount left over.

Much of this surplus is used—or set aside in the form of capital—for the expansion of industry. But comes the time when the industry reaches its limit of further expansion, where it would be "throwing money away" to build factories and plants that would not be used. Again a large surplus is left over.

The government through the method of taxation appropriates some of this surplus. The approximate 72 billions of dollars for the "federal budget" is mainly obtained through taxation. More than half of that, around 38 billions of dollars, is being spent for the armed forces of the nation, so-called "defense program." The big capitalists benefit (profit) through the latter, by supplying the government with the armament material, such as planes, tanks, guns, battleships, and lately, rockets or missiles.

In fact, up to this time, the main prop of "prosperity" has been this government "defense spending." However, the recent "cut-backs" by the government, resulting in less planes produced, for example, brought about lay-offs in the aircraft industries. This only aggravated the present business recession.

Some of the capitalists recognize that the economic crisis is an inherent part of their system, as the "business cycle" (aforementioned) or, and, the "boom and bust period." One of them, Leonard Smith, a top official of the U.S. Rubber Co. was reported to have said: "This is one of those modern

(Continued on page 4)

A DISCORDANT NATO

(Continued from page 1)

dent nation. (Tunisia has a small "army" of 6,000 soldiers, equipped with only 3,000 rifles, according to the N.Y. Times report, Nov. 17th. It's a small country also, with a population of less than 4 million.)

This French-Tunisian-Algerian problem will continue to aggravate the dissension in the NATO in spite of all the American and British efforts to placate the French.

Some More NATO Troubles

There are other troubles also that will tend to create more discord in the NATO. Even the old problems that have been "solved," like the Suez affair, tended to weaken the Western alliance. The United States not only failed to support its imperial allies, the British and French, at that time, but intervened ostensibly if not actually in favor of Egypt. That the U.S. action was motivated by concern over American oil interests in Arabia, and fear of Soviet intervention, did not excuse her in the eyes of Britain and France, who are still smarting from resentment over that "let-down."

The conflicting economic interests of the members of the NATO are back of all their troubles because they are capitalist nations, in competition with each other for control of the world market.

For an example we cite the so-called "miracle" of Germany's rapid economic recovery (thanks to American dollar aid) to the extent that German exports are again pushing British and French products out of the world market. This is regarded not only with envy but with hatred by the British and French capitalists for it hits them there where it hurts the hardest: right in their pockets.

But the biggest trouble overshadowing all others is the rise of the Soviet Union to the status of the strongest armed power in the world due to its "miraculous"

achievement in the field of missiles (rocketry). The capitalist world heretofore regarded with hatred and fear the "expansion of Soviet communism," that is, they decried and denounced the East European working class democracies as "satellites" of the Soviet Union. But now the Soviets had added to their "string of satellites" this year (Oct. 4th and Nov. 3rd) by launching two more, but in the outer space, Sputniks, No. 1 and 2. This feat of rocketry has actually stricken the capitalist nations with terror, from which they are still reeling and far from recovered.

The recent pronouncements of the Soviet Union were to the effect that in the event of another world conflict all the American bases, particularly those in Europe would be vulnerable, and the nations harboring them would be the first to be devastated. Furthermore, they declared, such a war would spread to America and that capitalism would be destroyed. Realistically the Soviet Union spokesmen pointed out that their nation also would suffer.

To sum up: the capitalist nations comprising NATO are afflicted with all kinds of fears which the N.Y. Times (Nov. 17) enumerates as follows:

"First, the fear that American bases in allied countries will now become magnets for Russian missiles. Second, the fear that the U.S. may disregard the interests of the allies in exercising its exclusive control over the use of American atomic weapons. Third, the fear that the vulnerability of America itself to Russian missiles may scare the U.S. out of the fight if the Russians attack some peripheral allied point such as West Berlin."

These fears may yet cause NATO to completely disintegrate. To capitalism this would be a calamity — but to the working class world it would be the best thing that could happen. A.W.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 1)

scientific advancement under communism surpassing capitalist achievement in that field is no longer a question—it is here for everyone to see and hear in Sputnik. Applied science in industry invariably follows. Economic supremacy of communism over capitalism seals the doom of the profit system.

Management Racketeering

When the Senate committee investigating improper practices in the labor and management field spotlighted labor leaders in its hearings, it received full and glaring coverage in the press, radio and TV. Now that corrupt leaders of business are on the stand, their misdoings are buried on the inside pages of the press and lightly

passed over by the other mediums. Such reporting indicates class prejudice, or that the improper practices in the management field is considered shrewd business. Have your pick? Both, as a matter of fact, would be correct.

However, it was brought out during the hearings, that one, Nathan Shefferman, head of the "Labor Relations Associates" was consulted by over 300 firms, on how to avoid establishing legitimate labor relations. A Sears Roebuck vice-president confessed before the Senate Committee that Shefferman's methods were "inexcusable, unnecessary and disgraceful." But, we may add here, not unsuccessful. For Shefferman's despicable tactics did pay off for business. The legitimate unions

(Continued on page 4)

PROLETARIAN NEWS

A Journal for the Working Class
Devoted to the Education of Workers and
Their Struggle for Power
Published Monthly by the
Proletarian Party of America
Subscriptions—12 issues for \$1.00
Send All Subscriptions, Contributions, Etc., to
PROLETARIAN NEWS
333 W. North Avenue, Chicago 10, Illinois

"THE RIGHT TO WORK"

One of the first results of the Industrial Revolution—the transition from hand-tools to machinery—was the industrial crisis, with its mass unemployment. As a consequence, in the early part of last century, the workers of western Europe, especially Great Britain, raised an outcry for the "Right to Work."

What those jobless workers meant by that slogan was the right to a job, or job-security. Mass unemployment was a new experience for them. They, and their families, were hungry. Therefore, they regarded "The Right to Work" as a legitimate demand.

Through no fault of their own, but simply as a result of industrial progress, those willing workers were displaced by machinery. Many were in the streets, their belongings in the pawnshops. Starvation and black despair was their lot. For a large section of the working class these were the first fruits of the "new golden-age of machinery."

In the early Nineteenth Century the workers were not organized. Labor unions were practically non-existent. The workers were entirely at the mercy of the employers. "Combinations," as unions were then called, were illegal. Men went to prison for attempting to organize them. They were "subversives," guilty of conspiracy against the general welfare. A prolonged, bloody struggle was necessary to bring into being even the mildest form of Trade Unions.

The Chartists, the first political movement of the British workers, put forth many demands, and engaged in militant demonstrations to have them recognized. Many of its leaders went to prison. Among its demands were the "right to vote," education for their children, a "free press," and the right to organize labor unions.

In time, labor unions were legalized, but that did not provide the Right to Work. That "right" belonged to the employers, and still does. They alone have the final say as to who will work, and who will not. Under capitalism, job-security, the right to work, can never be attained by the workers. The industries—and the jobs—belong to the employers. The workers may talk about "my job," but they really have no job. The jobs and the machinery of production are owned by the capitalists. They employ workers so long as they obey orders.

Capitalism is not a uniform system which operates smoothly. It has its ups-and-downs, its periods of prosperity and depression. In general, the capitalists don't like unemployment because they cannot make profits from jobless workers. The productivity of their employed workers is the source of their wealth. Nevertheless, their system brings on unemployment. This is due to a number of causes, the chief of which is **overproduction**, and the **shrinking of the world market**. Sometimes, both happen simultaneously. Then larger numbers of workers are dismissed from "their jobs."

The demand for "the right to work" was one of labor's first inadequate reactions to its displacement by machinery, altho it was not so ruthless as was the destruction of factories and machinery of the earlier period—the Luddite Movement.

The "right to work" agitation, while quite legitimate, had certain incongruities, especially

considering that period of the long working-day, with low pay. It irritated the brilliant Frenchman, Paul Lafargue (son-in-law of Karl Marx), who expressed criticism in his pamphlet: "The Right To Be Lazy" (right to leisure). Lafargue contended that what the workers should have demanded was less work and the right to enjoy leisure and a larger share of the fruits of their labor.

Prior to the advent of mass labor-unions, and labor-legislation, the working-day was exceedingly long. There was practically no limit to the hours the workers put in, apart from human endurance. Men, women and children worked twelve to sixteen hours, or longer, daily. Conditions became so appalling that they brought on a public outcry and legislation to checkmate the evil.

The legalizing of the **Ten-hours work-day** brought a heart-rending wail from the employing class. "We will be ruined," they cried. But, no such thing happened. They reorganized their factories with more advanced machinery. Consequently, they made larger profits than they ever had in the longer work-day.

In that desirable change—the shorter working-day—the labor unions played a strong role. However, it was the machinery which played the greater part in shortening the hours of labor. It was similar in relation to child-labor. The employers resisted legislation to cope with the evil. It was not altruism that actuated the employers in ceasing to exploit child-labor. When machines were invented, which, with one operator, could turn out more products than several hundred pairs of little hands, child-labor became unprofitable.

The **Eight-hours day**, also bitterly contested by capitalism, ultimately was established. It turned out to be even more profitable than the **Ten-hours day**. Intensive exploitation, through machinery run at high speed, took every ounce of energy out of the operators in eight hours, through the "belt-system" (the moving work-bench) and such. As a matter of fact, industry today has reached the stage where a still shorter day is in order, six-hours, for instance. When a worker's industrial capacity can be extracted in six hours, it does not pay to work him longer.

In recent times, the American capitalists have revived the ancient cry for "The Right to Work." However, they are not actuated by any fellow-feeling for working people. They have other fish to fry. It is **the right to work the workers** they are concerned about. The "Right to work laws," now being enacted in this country, and already passed in some eighteen states, are something entirely different from the early demands of the European workers for job-security.

Those new laws are designed to hamstring organized labor, to aid strike-breaking and to revoke the gains of the labor unions. With the capitalists, the "right to work" is a catch phrase, a pretense that they are doing something for the working people, while it is their own interests they are concerned about. About the only advantage the workers have is the potential power of their vast numbers. It is this power the capitalists fear, and they will do everything they possibly can to obstruct and nullify the aims of organized labor.

To win public support for their strait-jacket laws, they have always pretended that it is simply an extension of "democratic liberties" they are interested in. The elder John D. Rockefeller, in his time, posed as an advocate of "individual liberty." He let it be known that his opposition to labor unions was because they interfered with the freedom of the individual worker in the sale of his services to the highest bidder, also, of course, the lowest bidder. The first Henry Ford, too, believed in individual freedom for workers. He did not think that

workers should organize and have something to say about wages and working conditions. The earlier industrialists, such as Carnegie, Pullman, the McCormicks, were all champions of "the freedom of the individual." If workers were shot down in strikes, it was for their own good, just to keep them from organizing and losing their personal liberty. Many industrial battles were fought, and many lives lost to overcome the stubborn resistance of those lovers of liberty.

Today, big business, faced with millions of organized workers, has resorted to different methods. It "recognizes" organized labor and negotiates with it more effectively. It ties it up with contracts covering periods of years, so as to assure a steady tempo of production, and a larger volume of profit than former generations of capitalists thought possible.

But, to keep the unions "in their place," the capitalists make use of their political power. That is the aim of those "Right to work" laws. Capitalist politicians, and anti-unionists in general, are taking advantage of the present outcry against corruption in the labor movement. The title of the law, too, is a deception. It fools many people, for who is not in favor of workers having the right to earn a living? However, that is not the aim of their generous interest in workers' "rights." The objective is to nullify some of labor's hard won gains and to erect barriers to its further advance.

"The American Institute of Public Opinion" claims, after a coast-to-coast survey on the "Right to work" issue, that 63 percent of the general public would vote for a "right to work" law and that 33 percent of union labor would so vote.

Not all capitalists want the law. Some of the larger concerns believe in leaving well enough alone. Still, capitalism's fear of the inherent power that resides in the ranks of the working class continually plagues the capitalist class as a whole. This is especially true when those exploiters see what the workers have been able to do in certain countries.

If two-thirds of the States pass a "Right to work" law, it could thereby become a federal law, but whether or not that happens is in the lap of the future. However, the reactionaries may overplay their hand. They may actually stir the workers to a realization of their political capacity, and push them forward toward their historic goal: the conquest of political supremacy as a class.

So long as organized labor holds exclusively to economic action, the capitalists will sit firmly in the political saddle and make such laws. This shortcoming was well summed up by Karl Marx in his "Value, Price and Profit," where he wrote: "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 cause 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 guerilla fights incessantly springing up from the never-ceasing encroachments of capital or changes in the market. They ought to understand that, with all the miseries it imposes upon them, the present system simultaneously engenders the **material conditions** and the **social forms** necessary for an economical reconstruction of society. Instead of the conservative motto 'A fair day's wages for a fair day's work!', they ought to inscribe on their banner the **revolutionary watchword, the abolition of the wages system.**"

In this summation, Marx was advising the workers to use both weapons—the economic and the political—as that is the way to victory.

John Keracher

THUMBNAILED

TO WHAT PURPOSE? "If we want science teachers brilliant enough to train top-notch scientists, we cannot expect them to be stupid enough to work for small salaries." So stated Dr. Lynn M. Bartlett, state superintendent of public schools in Michigan while addressing the Mich. Educational Association last month.

Thus another voice was added to the ever increasing barrage of criticism regarding America's school system. Dr. Bartlett made it clear he is in no way advocating a school system such as exists in the USSR but at the same time called for many of the characteristics contained in that system. Of major importance to him was a better standing for professors both financially and prestige-wise. He also called for greater public financing of the higher schools to avoid turning away students who are qualified but cannot afford to attend.

Although this type of criticism is not new among educators it has reached a boiling point since Russia's obvious advances in the sciences. The question is, what to do about it? In the first place, we wonder if it is possible to automatically double, for instance, the salaries of present teachers just to give them more prestige without at the same time asking whether they are qualified (because of what is admittedly inferior training) or worth it. On the other hand, if higher salaries are offered to new comers as an inducement, what will the already experienced teachers say to that? It would appear the situation is at an impasse.

Incidentally, we are constantly surprised to find most criticism to be leveled at the higher schools with little interest in what is happening at the lower grade levels. It is a basic fact that no matter how high the standards at top levels, one can expect only or-

inary results from an ordinary foundation in education. The American concept of education does a great job of turning out technicians and well trained drones but does little to develop creative minded individuals. The educational system deserves little credit for those who do develop creative tendencies.

We shall close these remarks with the words of a college friend who commented, "So what if we did have the best school system in the world, which we haven't. You still have real brains turned loose to do what? To make as much money as they can no matter what the job, or come up with some hair brained gadget that will make someone else lots of money. If there's no money in it who wants it? Sputnik would be a great thing if they could sell advertising space on the side of it. Only trouble is, who would buy advertising space so high up nobody could read it. Too bad, too, that could help pay for it, and save the tax payers some money."

PEEPING TOM: The US has been operating a "peeping tom" radar station near Samsun in Turkey for some two years now. The object of their affection has been the USSR's main missile testing center at Krasny Yar, on the Volga, 1000 miles to the North. This information was reported by Aviation Week magazine last month along with some bitter comments on the subject. The editorial was quoted as saying, "news of this operation can be obtained in Athen's cafes, Pentagon corridors, Los Angeles cocktail parties and professional society gatherings."

It seems the only ones in the US who were unaware of Russia's rapid progress in missile development was the general public.

In view of the fact that detailed

information and data was being gathered and transmitted daily on Russia's progress in missiles testing for two years, it is little wonder President Eisenhower was not "surprised" at the announcement of a new fellow traveler in the skies.

But then again, what can the leaders of a dying and decaying social order do but stand by and watch the new "world" go flying by (at 18,000 miles an hour)!

GENERAL ALARM: There are so many satellite rumors orbiting around our heads lately we find it difficult to make any sensible statements regarding America's artificial "race" with her, as yet, non-existent artificial moon. We did, however, run across an interesting comment from one of France's leading aviation experts. In disclosing information that the US has a "sky-spy-eye" satellite with built-in radar for reconnaissance purposes in the planning

stage he warned the Western nations they had better put their brains (unscrambled, of course) together or face the chance that "Russia can win the peace without ever having to make war."

This gloomy prospect was voiced by none other than Gen. Pierre Gallois, lately resigned from the French air force and formerly with Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE). He is now enjoying a position with a French aircraft company developing new type fighters for NATO. Aside from the fact the General would be out of a job if such an unhappy state as permanent peace were to become a reality, we suspect he also knows the whole Western world would come tumbling down if its economy could no longer rely on war and all the waste it requires to keep the factories humming under capitalism.

L.D.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from Page 2)

were routed in many instances and phony or company unions resulted.

Labor is familiar with the "back-to-work-movements," "right to work" clamor and other such tactics and stratagems employed by bosses and their henchmen. It also has experienced capital's more violent reaction to unions such as the Memorial Day massacre in Chicago, 1937, when some 10 workers were killed. Labor's history is replete with capital's opposition, both the barbaric and civilized (corrupt) kind.

The class lines are crystal clear, in the open fight, as in strikes.

They are not so clear, blurred, in modern times, by high sounding organizations like the one Shefferman headed. Misleaders of labor have a field day in such a social atmosphere. The rank and file unionists are deceived and capital goes on its merry way profitwise.

Both, "honest" capitalists as well as the scheming corrupt kind, are exploiters of labor, the "good" as well as the "bad." Both kind are in business to make money thru the exploitation process. The system corrupts some more than others. But the system itself is corrupt and a robber one. The solution lies in getting rid of the capitalist system not in seeking for angels amongst the capitalists.

L.B.

THE BUSINESS RECESSION

(Continued from page 2)

recessions where no one feels much pain. I am convinced that it's not going to be very deep." (It is evident that he did not ask the unemployed worker whether he "feels" much pain.)

Another defender of capitalism, and apologists for it, Wm. M. Martin, Jr., head of the Federal Reserve, was also quoted by the press, as follows:

"If you think that any time a decline reaches a certain point, we can just step in and stop it, you have misunderstood the workings of our entire system. Declines have to occur from time to time . . ."

He further stated that "losses" must be taken "occasionally," that, "this is a loss as well as a profit economy." (Emphasis, ours.)

Mr. Martin perhaps is unaware that his contention is an acknowledgment of the periodicity of the economic crises, a fact that the Marxian school of thought have been trying to impress upon the workers right along. The history of capitalism has furnished rich proof that the economic crises are inevitable, as witness the Big Depres-

sion of the 1930's which followed the "unparalleled" prosperous period that came to an end—and a bang—with the stock market crash in 1929. That Big Depression lasted for around ten years, and it was only the Second World War (1939-45) that brought back prosperity.

The postwar period of prosperity was a long one, approximately 12 years, (so far). However, it was punctured by "business recessions" similar to the present one. There was a "recession" in 1949-50 before the Korean war, and then one after it in 1953, and still another recession in 1955-56. And just as in wars, so in recessions or depressions, those who suffer most are the workers, the vast majority of the nation. In times of war, the capitalist class use millions of workers as cannon fodder, and millions more at all times as factory fodder.

It is time the workers got rid of the system (capitalism) that exploits them and only brings them insecurity. Collective, social ownership of the means of production is the only solution.

Al Wysocki

GET A BOOK FREE

If you send One Dollar for a year's subscription to the PROLETARIAN NEWS (333 W. North Avenue, Chicago, Ill.) you can have any one of the following books free. \$2.00 for a two years' subscription entitles you to pamphlets to the value of 50 cents. Postage paid.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO, by Marx and Engels.....	25c
WAGE-LABOR AND CAPITAL, by Karl Marx.....	25c
MONEY AND MONEY REFORMS, by Christ Jelset.....	25c
CRIME, ITS CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES, by John Keracher.....	15c
HOW THE GODS WERE MADE, by John Keracher.....	25c
WAGES AND THE WORKING DAY, by John Keracher.....	15c
ECONOMICS FOR BEGINNERS, by John Keracher.....	10c
PRODUCERS AND PARASITES, by John Keracher.....	10c
WHY UNEMPLOYMENT, by John Keracher.....	10c
FREDERICK ENGELS, by John Keracher.....	25c
THE HEAD-FIXING INDUSTRY by John Keracher.....	30c

Send me PROLETARIAN NEWS for a period of.....

....., for which I here enclose \$.....

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

Subscriber's Name

Address

City..... Zone..... State.....