

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. 7—Whole No. 160

Chicago, Illinois, July, 1946

483

Price 5c a Copy

Motorcade Against The Current

On Saturday, June 22, three busses, carrying 99 delegates from various labor, consumer and civic organizations, left Chicago for Washington. Other cities are sending similar delegations. The purpose is a last minute attempt of putting organized mass pressure to work to save the Office of Price Administration.

The OPA, established as a war measure to hold prices within normal bounds during the period of war-created shortages, is to expire on July 1, unless extended by new legislation. It has long been felt that the continuing shortages of goods in so many lines will necessitate extension of price control for another year, if a much dreaded inflation is to be avoided.

Consumer demand for goods has also been strong. Producers have, as always, been eager to sell to the highest bidder. To

sell outside of the legal channels has become a growing practice. The black market has absorbed increasing quantities of goods. It is a natural trend. Rather than go hungry, people will look around for a seller who can furnish the article at a premium. So many are the ways in which eager buyers and equally eager sellers can get together and jointly violate price regulations that enforcement appears to be next to impossible. The point has been reached where not only the merchants who want to carry on their business legally are demanding abolition of price control, but where many consumers feel that absence of control would be no worse than the present black market.

Hence, the pressure upon Congress for dropping price control has grown, while the pressure to

(Continued on page 2)

How Strong is Labor?

In the recent strikes the American working class has demonstrated its organized might. The significant fact is that these strikes took place in the nation's basic industries, such as the automobile, steel, coal, railroads. Even the shipping industry was threatened with a strike which was averted at the last moment. Although it appears that the industrial turmoil has abated, nevertheless the labor picture is far from tranquil. Even the railroad strike which was presumed to be settled had its aftermath in the strike of the employees of the Hudson and Manhattan Railroad Company. The deadlock persisted between the company and the strikers over the road's refusal to pay the 18½ cent raise granted May 25 when President Truman broke the nationwide railroad strike. As a result more than 100,000 commuters had to find other means of transportation to cross the Hudson River to get into New York City. Throughout the nation, strikes, more or less local in character, still continue. They are like the rumbling of distant thunder, after labor's stormy bout with capital, an ominous indication that both are far from finished with each other.

Aside from the effect on the nation's economy, this industrial turmoil had its impact on the "public mind" and particularly on the government. In the halls of Congress, no less than in the

White House, it has given voice to the charge that the labor unions are too strong and hence, something must be done to curb their power. This has been echoed over the radio and through the columns of the press. Against this barrage of condemnation, the voice of labor rises in a desperate struggle, not defiant but querulous, still, withal, insistent that its side of the case be given a hearing. But not possessing Capital's facilities for disseminating information, Labor, the "giant," is almost inarticulate by comparison. Therefore, it is not surprising that the "dear public" (the most numerous of whom are the workers themselves) is now beginning to parrot the ideas of the capitalist class, namely, that labor unions are too strong and something must be done about it.

On the other hand, there is a section of the public known as the "liberals" who take the position that both capital and labor are too strong. These are the members of the so-called middle class, that intellectual efflorescence of the petty business class. Standing in the middle, between capital and labor, they survey the scene from their Olympian heights of intellectuality and pretend to be sympathetic toward labor. They take a critical attitude towards both capital and labor, in spite of their pretended

(Continued on page 2)

HOME SCENE

Atomic Jitters

Ever since Hiroshima the world has been afflicted by atomic jitters. Fear of universal destruction has crept into the hearts and minds of people, high, low, lay and scientific. Those now in possession of the know-how of the atomic bomb—the Anglo-U. S. imperialists—are using it for all it's worth, as an intimidating and political bargaining lever. Yet its full force is so frightful that its very possessors are literally scared stiff, lest ultimately they become victims of their own creation. Nor are they very sure that its secrets can for long remain theirs. For science is a universal development, where monopoly holds little sway. Under conditions of social, or natural, pressure, intensified study and research can accelerate scientific progress. It is this limitation in science—if one can term it so—that is worrying their imperialist souls. If, only this secret were forever theirs.

Meanwhile, all the weight of

the present atomic prospect is aimed, be it indirectly, primarily at the Soviet Union, since it cannot be assumed that the Soviet Union is asleep at the switch, having full knowledge of the dangers it is exposed to as long as this overwhelming power is in the exclusive hands of its questionable allies, the American and British capitalists.

Fear of retaliation if used, dread of the A-bomb acting as a boomerang, has given rise to considerable serious thought, how to overcome the contradiction of repercussion. Perhaps a compromise plan of some sort, acting so as to temporarily allay any progress on the part of the nations minus the A-bomb. If the Soviets can be talked into a temporary state of inertness, the upper hand of the imperialists will be maintained for the time being. The Baruch Atomic Report is probably of this general nature. The report, per se, is as abstract and utopian as it is lengthy.

(Continued on page 3)

International Notes

France

Old Marianne is very much in the news these days. The June 2 election results showed that the Catholic, Communist and Socialist parties were still the big three in French politics. Headlines in bourgeois papers proclaimed: REDS DEFEATED IN FRANCE. Upon closer observation we find that this "defeat" meant merely that the Communist Party had lost a couple of seats but had increased their popular vote by some 200,000. Their 5,188,715 votes represented 26½ per cent of the national total as compared

to 26 per cent seven months ago when they got more votes than anyone else. The M.R.P. (Catholic Party) increased its vote from 4,540,000 last October to 5,578,318 this election. The Socialist Party lost 400,000 votes, which in all probability went to the Catholic Party. While the foreign policies of the Catholic and Socialist parties are different they are not so far apart on the domestic issues. The strength of the Communist Party lies in its almost controlling influence in the Confederation of Labor.

(Continued on page 7)

HOW STRONG IS LABOR?

(Continued from page 1)

labor sympathies. However, in a showdown, they can always be depended upon to side with the upholders of "law and order," the capitalist class. By color, they have been designated as the "pinks," although yellow would be a more appropriate color.

One of these liberals, George Soule, sheds plenty of tears over labor in his article: "Are Unions Too Strong?" (The New Republic, June 17), but like a good father it does not restrain him from applying the rod to labor. In his article he is forced to admit the causes of the strikes, such as low wages and the high cost of living and the opposition of capital against the demands of labor to remedy this condition. He deplores the fact that collective bargaining machinery has broken down and that the strikes occurred. But whom does he blame for the strikes? He blames labor, particularly the coal miners and the railroad workers' unions. He states: "There is the small though important group which high-pressured the government to win more than other unions by threatening public calamity."

George Soule furthermore states that: "what really brought the kick-back from 'public opinion' were the coal and railroad strikes. In these cases union leadership must bear a heavy share of the blame."

From then on, Mr. Soule goes down the line on John L. Lewis, the UMW, and also the heads of the two railroad brotherhoods. The former he upbraids for his "power-grasping" and "political" motives. The railroad brotherhoods he takes to task for refusing to "accept arbitration" and to abide "by the results of a special presidential board of inquiry."

True, however, to his liberal soul, Mr. Soule also takes the government to task by saying that "repressive labor laws are not the answer, whatever may be at fault. They unite labor behind any leaders it may happen to have, good or bad, create a lasting grievance and prepare the way for trouble. Governmental regimentation of labor could not be achieved without a dictatorship."

Here we witness to the full the squirming of a liberal "soul." On the one hand he fears a capitalist dictatorship, for under it the liberals would also be regimented, and on the other hand he fears the unity of labor and it is bad in his eyes whether it be under good leadership or bad. What then does he offer for a solution?

Namely this, to quote his concluding words: "Voluntary submission (by labor and capital) to a minimum of fair social discipline is the price, in an industrialized world, of liberty."

Such a solution might sound fine to those who live in their ivory towers of "erudition." But to those who live in a world of reality (the workers) it is no solution. Labor has been doing plenty of submitting, through being exploited at the point of production by capital. Thus, the workers have been submitting to the "social discipline" imposed upon them by the ruling class. Discipline cannot be applied to anyone unless it comes from some authority. In this case it is the capitalist class that is the authority and it imposes its social discipline through not only direct but also when the need arises, through its political instrument, the government, or as it is called, in Marxian terminology, the State.

Did this need of using the government, or State, arise? It certainly did. And how well the capitalist class made use of it was amply shown in the recent strikes, particularly in the railroad strikes and, even no less so, in the threat of a strike in the shipping industry. But if the government is the political instrument of capital, why then did the labor unions appeal to it, it might be asked? The fact of the matter is that many workers are still under the illusion that the government is an impartial arbitrator or to use the Hegelian phrase "the image and reality of reason." In the strikes above mentioned it demonstrated how "reasonable" it was to the workers. Its "impartiality" took the form of coercion, of threatening to use its real power, its armed forces, the Army and Navy, against the striking workers, to force them into submission. But in so revealing itself, its real nature was exposed, as Marx had long ago pointed out, as "the public power of coercion." Thus by such a demonstration the capitalist government had saved the Marxists a lot of hard work in educating the workers. As a result many more workers are now saying: "The government is not on our side, but **is on the side of capital.**"

The State is a product of the struggle between classes who have opposing economic interests. The government rises directly out of this class struggle and represents that class which has ownership and control of the economy of the nation. Any school boy could quickly provide the answer of who owns the industries of America. He would simply reply, why of course, the rich people. And the rich are not the workers but the millionaires and billionaires of America. It's a wealthy minority, and comprises less than 15 per cent of the population. How then can a handful of rich parasites hold on to their possessions, and continue to exploit the vast majority who

(Continued from page 7)

MOTORCADE AGAINST THE CURRENT

(Continued from page 1)

retain, or rather bring back such control, has diminished. Meanwhile, Congress has been working on the basis of satisfying those who are able to press their demands the strongest. Bills have finally emerged in both Houses for retaining the OPA, but with new provisions allowing many price increases, and with methods of working out allowable increases so complicated that enforcement would be all but impossible.

It is not expected that a last minute conference between the two Houses will be able to make a workable law out of these unworkable bills. A veto by the President would mean the end of price control unless a new law should be passed. The last week of the present setup is too short a time for such action, and the present setup, even if retained, is not serving its purpose. The motorcade might be sponsored with the best of intentions, but its effects are not likely to be great.

Meanwhile the situation is calling to attention many problems. First of all, the uncertainty about continued price control is causing many producers, including the farmers, to hold their goods off the market, pending the outcome.

More seriously, the present and expected price advances are bringing back into focus speculation about the future stability of the whole economic setup. Production is gradually getting into stride. Shortages are great. Purchasing power is also great. It looks pretty good on the surface. Shortages are an inconvenience, but it is upon shortages that free enterprise thrives.

There are a few who cannot refrain from looking a little deeper. They scan available purchasing power and compare it to existing shortages. They find discrepancies, not so much in amount, but in distribution. It is **not the same people** who possess purchasing power and who suffer from shortages.

On the side of shortages they scan the reports of various public and private agencies and find that "America is a needy nation." They have added it up and find that 2,700,000 new homes are necessary right now as a minimum, industry needs a billion dollars' worth of new plants and stores, the farmers need \$350,000,000 worth of farm buildings, 15,000,000 new cars and 3,000,000 new trucks and busses are needed to meet transportation needs, 40,000,000 new suits of clothing would no more than fill existing demand, stockings, underwear, linen, all are needed by everybody. Existing homes need things; 8,409,984 U. S. homes have no electricity, 18,151,126 homes have no private baths.

11,724,148 homes have no running water, 9,364,548 homes of "the free and the brave" have no refrigeration. Oh yes, we mustn't forget, we are short of meat and bread and other items of food as well.

And do we have purchasing power? Yes. Americans have a high weekly and yearly income. The U. S. Department of Commerce reports that total national income, which was down to \$49 billions in 1934, had climbed to \$149 billions in 1943. Only estimates are available for 1944 and 1945, but they all agree that for two years total income approached the \$200 billion a year mark. As this total income is broken up in amounts going to the different sections of the population, the same report shows that total wages and salaries in private industry rose from \$30 billion in 1934 to \$112 billion in 1943. This part also went higher the following years. Government spending for war was the cause of the major portion of this increase.

They also have savings, \$81 billion in liquid funds are on deposit in banks or in cashable government bonds. This vast sum added to the prevailing income should provide the necessary purchasing power for some time to come. But here appears a discrepancy. In most cases those who need bathtubs, running water and other things, are not the ones who have the savings.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has taken samples of a cross-section of the country and from these, bring out the following estimates: The top 10 per cent of U. S. families—those with savings above \$3,400—hold 60 per cent of the total, or \$48 billion. The second 10 per cent—those who hold between \$1,800 and \$3,400—have 17 per cent of the total, or \$13.7 billion. The middle 50 per cent—those with savings of from \$50 to \$1,800—have a total of \$18.6 billion, or 23 per cent. The bottom 30 per cent—with savings of less than \$50—hold a negligible amount. In fact, only the 6 per cent have savings, the remaining 24 per cent have none.

By lumping the first two groups we find that 20 per cent of the population hold \$62 billion in savings, or 77 per cent of the total. These people also have ample incomes. They are not short of bathtubs or anything else. From their yearly incomes they are not likely to put additional sums into savings except where they see opportunities for profitable investments. The 30 per cent at the bottom with little or no savings are also those with lowest incomes. But they are the very ones with the most crying

(Continued on page 5)

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 1)

It is widely discussed with varied reactions. Those who praise it do so with reserve, recognizing that the whole plan of putting atomic energy in the hands of a United Nations Authority hinges upon full international cooperation among the United Nations themselves. That is, of course, a most difficult premise, as sufficient friction always exists among them. The burden of responsibility is mainly placed upon the shoulders of the Soviet Union, taking for granted British and U. S. willingness and cooperation. Then there are individuals, such as Max Eastman and William Randolph Hearst, who consider it most dangerous to trust the Soviet Union with knowledge of the Atomic Bomb process. All in all, it is a pretentious plan to the extent of visualizing the ultimate elimination of war altogether. How? It is not explained, at least the need for peace is posited. Nor is its practical working out of immediate moment, since it would in all probability take a considerable period of time.

Whatever the intentions of this report are we cannot rest there. A Marxian analysis must encompass the practical considerations. Were Mr. Baruch's intentions the noblest, that still would not make them workable. The question would still be: "Can such a proposed plan work under the existing circumstances of international strife?" The experiences of both World Wars point to the impossibility of controlling weapons, much less of abolishing war altogether. The League of Nations once had such lofty aims, and the many peace treaties failed to prevent war. Why? Because imperialist rivalry is an overriding force that shatters all declarations and commitments. Capitalist imperialism begets and thrives on competition and antagonisms. These flow through its veins. Grandiose peace suggestions raise especial suspicion when they emanate from the thieves, lair. Talk is cheap, but who can, in the light of the past few decades, take them at their word. The chances are a hundred to one that the very proposers of peace and control will be the first to violate their own commitments — always under the screen of self-defense.

Should something concrete follow, and some compromised form of a United Nations Atomic Authority be established, it will only encourage more espionage, conning, secret preparations and circumventions. The inherent discrepancies within the capitalist world, and between the two different social systems, capitalism and communism, condemn in advance this proposed United Nations Authority to a mere scrap of paper, behind which the most sinister machinations will thrive.

Get in Line

The American people are feeling the pinch of scarcities. That is the order of the day. Lines everywhere and all kinds: butter, nylons, sugar—and now bread. This is really a new low. For bread is the barest necessity, the "staff of life." Lack of bread, at different periods, has put entire populations into motion, causing revolutions. Hunger was a major cause in the Russian Revolution of 1917. It was also the cry in the famous French Revolution, during which the queen, Marie Antoinette, when told that the people were clamoring for bread, was said to have retorted: "Let them eat cake."

Americans can understand this scarcity of bread in France or Russia, or in present day post-war Europe. But here, in abundant and prosperous America, that can't be. It is an anachronism. The Administration's only explanation is the emergency need and sacrifice to save starving Europe and Asia.

To many this explanation is hardly satisfying. Some have the feeling that shipments abroad don't account for all of it. Others, more individualistic, gripe that our own needs come first, before anyone else's.

The anti-administration forces place the responsibility for this crisis entirely upon the bungling policies of Washington, OPA and general mismanagement. They point to the black market, where all commodities seem plentiful, and in part this criticism seems valid. Meanwhile, confusion and exasperation are rampant. Congressional pressure, in response to individual property demand, is in process of bearing down on the OPA. Despite administration opposition the future of the OPA is hanging in the balance. It has failed in its objective to regulate distribution or curb inflation. The law of capitalist operation will not allow itself to be strait-jacketed by legal procedure.

Circulation of commodities seems disrupted and production is retarded. Anarchy reigns everywhere. The individual interest is in conflict with the public interest. Anarchy is an integral part of the planless system of capitalist economy. Production for profit, private property is the cause.

Should the OPA be in due time abolished, anarchy and disorder will still continue. Perhaps more goods will come out on top of the counters; perhaps production will even be stimulated some. But new forms of anarchy will arise, such as greater disproportion between existing wages and a higher cost of living. The existing commodity lines might, in time, disappear, only to give way to new ones, welfare and unemployed lines. Lines, scarcities in

(Continued on page 6)

BITS AND SKITS

U. S. Fascism

Eugene Tarb, Soviet historian, in a recent article in "Red Star," says that Fascism is on the march in the U. S., seeking to crush workers and to impose a "Pax Americana," similar to Hitler's dream of a Pax Germania.

* * *

Time and Space

A jet-plane in air show now flies from New York to Albany in 16 minutes and 20 seconds. Thirty-six years ago, in 1910, Glen Curtis covered the same distance in 2 hours and 46 minutes. The time has been cut down to one-tenth. This is progress. The relative nature of space and time is incontrovertible.

* * *

Why Not?

Hirohito is not to be tried as a war criminal, declared Joseph Keenan, chief prosecutor for the U. S. in the Japanese war-crimes trial. Hirohito is only "a figurehead and a fraud perpetrated on the Japanese people."

Did anyone ever seriously believe that this man-god imperialist, and one of the wealthiest exploiters in all Japan, would be brought to "justice"?

In modern industrialism, top criminals seldom get the axe themselves. Paid lieutenants usually take the rap for the big boss. It would be a mistake, indeed, to try the emperor, not because he is "a figurehead and a fraud," but because of the need to perpetuate this "fraud" upon the Japanese people. Our Wall Street rulers know the value of similar frauds perpetrated against the American people.

* * *

Bilbo "Democracy"

In a broadcast speech, Herr Bilbo warned Mississippians that the white people were sleeping on a volcano, and "it is up to the red-blooded men to do something about it. The white men of this state have a right to resort to any means at their command to stop it." (N. Y. Times, June 23.)

And, "such means" were democratically applied, was charged in an affidavit by Etoy Fletcher, a Negro veteran of the Army. While he was attempting to register for the July primaries, he claims he was seized and flogged with a heavy wire cable and threatened with death if he made another attempt to register.

* * *

K. of C. Justice

In an article, fully half a page, in the New York Times of June 23, the Knights of Columbus (K. of C.), a Catholic fraternal organization, came out with a sharp criticism of the manner in which the United Nations handled the Franco case. It accused it of being "a court which did not even ask for testimony on behalf of the accused . . . which afforded the defendant nation no opportunity whatever to contradict

or disprove the allegations made against it . . . that such travesty upon justice and fair play should be perpetuated in our own soil . . . in the very shadow of the Statue of Liberty . . . and with the abject connivance of our own government . . . is a particularly shameful spectacle to millions of American men and women, as it is to decent men and women all over the world."

It called the sub-committee's investigation a Communist-inspired case against Spain.

"Why, if the sub-committee was honestly seeking the truth, did it permit itself the wholly gratuitous and completely unwarranted statement that 'there are two rival Spanish governments in existence' when every member of the sub-committee knows there is only one lawful Spanish government today . . . that that government has ruled Spain wisely and well for seven years or more." . . . "Is the sub-committee trying to delude us into thinking that such recognition should be extended to the former rulers of Spain who fled that country before the righteous wrath of its people, hid out for years in Mexico, recently moved in on France, and now seeks to again impose their ruthless Red rule upon the Spanish people through the connivance and cooperation of other nations?"

It winds up its appeal to people to let the President know that he is expected to lead in the fight for fair play and fair dealings in the United Nations. So the K. of C. calls for justice. But what kind of justice? Fascist justice—justice to the landlord reactionaries who have perpetrated the most inhuman crimes against the democratic and labor elements of Spain, many of whom are still lingering in Franco's death dungeons.

The K. of C. is pleading for fair play for Franco. Shall we say, for instance, the same kind of fair play he's administering to Spain's common people, whom the K. of C. indiscriminately calls Reds?

The K. of C. is very conveniently oblivious (perhaps more correctly, approvingly) to that black chapter of Spain's Civil War, when Franco's fascist victory was guaranteed through the direct material aid from the German Nazis and Italian Fascists. It is also a matter of record that Franco's Blue Division had fought along with the Nazis against the Soviet Union, and that Spain's war neutrality made it possible for her to serve as a convenient base through which much war material and supplies found their way into Germany. Franco's unity with Hitler and his anti-democratic stand are too well known to even discuss.

That "that government (i. e.,

(Continued on page 6)

PROLETARIAN NEWS

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

Published Monthly by the
Proletarian Party of America
Subscriptions—12 Issues for 50 Cents

Send All Subscriptions, Contributions, Etc., to
PROLETARIAN NEWS
1545 N. Larrabee Street, Chicago, Ill.

Is Russia Trying to Conquer the World?

In all nations where a minority class rules, deception is a necessary weapon in their approach to most social questions. Recently the American press and radio have launched a virulent campaign against the Soviet Union. However, it is being done in a deceptive manner. This anti-Soviet campaign must not take the appearance of aggression. It must be represented as defensive, as something that is aimed against aggression, to check it.

The Soviet Union is being branded as the new post-war aggressor. Now that the Axis powers have been smashed, the Soviet Union has been promoted to the position of "public enemy number one." And what is the charge leveled at it? That the Soviet Union is trying to conquer the world, that it is promoting a world-wide conspiracy to overrun all nations and impose its economic and political system upon them. This campaign has spread to Britain, too, but there it is meeting with more opposition than in America.

It is difficult for the leaders of capitalist nations to conceive of the U. S. S. R. having any other intentions, because all capitalist nations, even those much weaker than the Soviet Union, believe such a goal to be most desirable. The British with their great empire have come closer to it than any other nation.

An analysis of this charge against the Soviet Union is timely because it is furnishing the basis for agitation for a Third World War, with the U. S. S. R. as the aggressor power, the one which is obstructing world peace. Of course, the democratic capitalist nations, particularly Britain and the United States, are represented as seeking only peace and general well-being, while the U. S. S. R. with its vast Red Army is deliberately promoting trouble and preventing the coming of a "just and lasting peace." It is a good line. It is good bait for suckers, but workers who bite will get the hook which it contains.

Capitalism can only survive by expansion. The greater nations, in competition with each other, must absorb or dominate the lesser. They must openly annex them to their empires, or covertly control them by means of the money bag, through finance imperialism. The latter approach is the modern way, but it has to be backed by military or naval power, or both. It is less than a year since the close of the great conflict, but the "peace-loving nations" are reorganizing and expanding their forces in harmony with the experiences of the great war.

The United States, posing as the world's foremost peace-loving democracy, is revamping its peacetime conscription upon a basis of military training for all single men between the ages of nineteen and forty-four. Britain has armies scattered throughout Europe, Africa and Asia, and they are not there for their health.

Irreconcilable Differences

Before the outbreak of World War II, all capitalist nations were hostile to the Soviet

Union, although some could not afford to be outspoken. However, within the circle of capitalist nations themselves, there was an irreconcilable quarrel over territory, trade routes, sources of raw materials, and spheres of capitalist investment. This division within the ranks of the capitalist imperialist powers kept them from being able to unite against the U. S. S. R. They certainly tried hard enough. The nearest they came to success in that direction was the pact of Munich, when the premiers of Britain and France discovered that Hitler and Mussolini were perfectly reasonable fellows; when Chamberlain proclaimed: "Peace in our time."

Western capitalist imperialism, menaced by the rising tide of Italian, German and Japanese imperialism, believed that war was imminent, and aimed at them, as the greatest holders of the world's wealth and resources. The "aggressor nations" had claimed that it was Soviet Communism they were ready to fight. British and French imperialism decided to take them at their word, and give them a free hand to strike at the U. S. S. R., but it did not work out that way.

The great war commenced among the imperialist powers themselves. The non-imperialist power, the Soviet Union, was able to remain neutral for nearly two years, and it must be remembered that the Soviet Union was invaded. It had lived up to its non-aggression pact with Nazi Germany, but the latter thought itself strong enough to fight the U. S. S. R. as well.

The strength of the Axis imperialism, with France already hors de combat, and only the North Sea and English Channel preventing the Nazis from sweeping into London as they did into Paris, causing British war lords to be badly scared. Churchill was quick to hail the Soviet Union as "our ally." Six months later, when the bombs of Japan fell upon Pearl Harbor, the Yankee imperialists were ready and willing to send all the weapons they could spare to the Soviet Union, so that they could be hurled at America's imperialist enemies. Every Soviet soldier who fell might thus be saving the life of an American or a Britisher.

But the scene has changed, and Britain's imperialist stage-manager, Mr. Churchill, in his Missouri speech, called for concerted action, on the part of Anglo-American imperialism, to stop the dark deeds that are being enacted back of the Soviet "iron curtain" that shuts off imperialism's access to eastern Europe. Rich people (Mr. Churchill's kind) are being stripped of their land monopolies. Large numbers of poor people are being given land for the first time. Large industries, mines and such, are being taken over by pro-worker and pro-peasant governments, and the Red armies in those occupied regions are not raising a hand to stop it. Such wickedness is not at all in harmony with "free enterprise" and the British and American way of life.

Now the nation which made the greatest sacrifices on the side of the United Nations is being singled out for all the venom which American imperialism, and its radio and press flunkies, can pour out. The majority of the American people, mostly workers, can be fooled by this propaganda if they are not on guard against it. They can be convinced by the power of the press and radio, that the Soviet Union actually plans to impose itself and its system upon all other nations.

If people who hear this charge would but stop to think it out, they would realize how false it is. More than a year has gone by since "cease fire" in Europe, and the Red Army, powerful enough to force Soviet governments upon occupied countries, has not done so. There is a good reason for this.

Outside of U. S. S. R. borders, Soviet governments do not exist. Why is this the case?

Some revolutionaries, the "left-sick" variety, have accused the Soviet leaders with betraying the revolution, with preventing the workers of eastern Europe from conquering political power. There is no evidence whatever to substantiate such a charge, nor, on the other hand, have they launched the Soviet system from without by force of arms.

"The proletariat of each country must first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie" was the teaching of Marx and Engels. The Soviet Marxists know that as well as anyone. They know that if the workers, even where the Red Army is in occupation, are not ready to bring about a revolutionary change of their own volition, if they are not ready to conquer political supremacy, then the Red Army cannot, and will not, do it for them. Social revolution cannot be imposed upon a country from without. It must come from within.

Then, why are the erstwhile "allies" of the Soviet Union so stirred up? They are simply reverting to form. They have always regarded the Soviet Union as the greatest threat to capitalist imperialism. And now, with German Nazi imperialism, as a barrier to the Soviets removed, the democratic imperialists fear Soviet influence within the borders of their own fields of plunder. If the workers of the U. S. S. R. can do so well, then the workers of Britain and America might get the notion that they can do as well, or better. That is dangerous.

If the workers of the countries of eastern Europe should move any further to the "left" politically, they will be practically establishing new Soviet nations. This is an internal transformation that is in process, not something forced upon those nations. The Red army does not occupy France nor Britain, yet the trend in both of those countries is to the "left," much the same as in eastern Europe. In fact, those western European nations have moved further to the left, nearer to the Soviet system, than some of the countries of eastern Europe, where the Soviet armies occupy. The Churchills and their kind have been relegated by the workers to a political backseat. That does not mean socialism in any of those countries, but mainly state capitalism. Further steps must be taken. The workers cannot stand still in this process. If they try to, what progress they have made will be wrested from them by the capitalist imperialists. Complete and exclusive political power, in fact proletarian dictatorship is the next step to be taken. Only by that means can the working class expropriate the capitalists and socialize the industries.

Does not the Soviet Union want to see a Soviet World? Certainly it does, just as all capitalist imperialists want to see their system encompass the world. But, there is a great difference. Capitalist imperialists must seek to conquer the world, or as large a share of it as possible. Capitalism is based upon exploitation of labor through profit, interest and rent. Communism abolishes exploitation entirely, but it must do so within each nation. The methods of capitalist imperialism being conquest, subjugation and exploitation, it must expand. It pays. It enriches the capitalists of the conquering nations. In addition to the exploitation of their workers at home, they are enabled to exploit millions of workers in other lands, either directly, or indirectly by forcing the native ruling classes to give up a share of what they exploit from their workers. Japan is in that situation now.

Communism does not, and cannot, work that way. Moreover, the workers of each nation must themselves establish communism. Workers of other lands cannot do it for them.

If they don't do it for themselves, communism will never be established.

That the Soviet Union would aid and stand by the workers anywhere they try to set up their own rule (just like American capitalism is helping Chinese capitalism now) goes without saying. It is a realization of this which is back of the "hate Russia" campaign. That is what all the stink is about.

Imperialist armies, in the name of democracy, freedom, etc., will not hesitate to smash a workers' revolution. A Red army would not stop such a revolution. The rich exploiters of the world's workers know this. That is what Mr. Churchill and the British money lords, and all their big Wall Street cousins are yelling about. They fear the spread of communism throughout the world. Indeed, the leftward trend in Europe, mild and all as it is in most cases, has them in a panic. They would like to drum up a holy war against the

Soviet Union, in the name of saving Christian civilization (but in reality to protect their plunder racket). By that means they believe they could stave off Communism for another fifty years or more.

It is they who have already conquered most of the world. The British and American empires now dominate more than half of the world's surface, all of its oceans and most of its sky. There is only one power strong enough to challenge this monopoly—the Soviet Union, with its expanding influence and its millions of working class allies in every land.

If the millionaire exploiters of the victorious nations can only unite, and if they can rally the remnants of Fascism in western Europe (Germany and Spain, for instance), and Nationalist China, and if they can use the hostility of the Social Democrats and other Soviet haters, all may not yet be lost.

Every parasitic institution, from the Holy Roman Catholic Church to the Holy Rollers, from every racketeer and gangster of the underworld to their political friends of the city halls, all parasites, large and small, will rally to the defense of capitalism in its last stand, its Ragnarok.

While the Soviet Union cannot, and would not, conquer the world, the fundamental principle underlying the U. S. S. R., socialized industry and freedom from capitalist exploitation, will sweep the world.

Ever increasing numbers of workers throughout the world are preparing for the final conflict. The workers of each nation will "settle matters with their own bourgeoisie." This is the only form of world conquest now possible, a freeing of the world from all conquerors and exploiters of its people.

John Keracher.

MOTORCADE AGAINST THE CURRENT

(Continued from page 2)

needs. In this group, we will find many of the nation's hardest workers. They work in factories, fields, mines and forests, where work is hard and pay is low. They can produce much, but as consumers they fall down. Their wages limit their consuming ability. The in-between group, the 50 per cent who hold the 23 per cent of the savings, no doubt will be using some of it to satisfy their wants. But here, too, it is possible that a great many look to their savings as a means of investment. They would like to buy shares of stock in the nation's productive equipment. Some

would like to buy farms or additions to the ones they have. Others would like to start an independent business or expand the ones they have. In short, many of these people can be seen as potential expanders of the nation's productive equipment without much question as to who shall be the ultimate consumer of the increased production.

There is at present speculation as to what most of the people with substantial savings will do. Will they try to buy into shares of stock in prevailing equipment? Or will they go in for the building of new additions? In the first case they would bid up

prices on the stock market and cause inflation in the price structure of existing equipment. In the second case they would contribute to an industrial building boom with the future prospect of stagnation from lack of markets for the goods which the increased productive equipment would be capable of turning out. It is most likely that both fields of investment will be used, and the upswing will be general. This, however, will by no means prevent that dreaded thing, the crash, which has always followed industrial boom.

U. S. News for June 22 has this to say on the subject: "Depression, likely to follow the present surge of buying once the pent-up demand for goods is filled, may come more quickly than has been

indicated."

Many a capitalist sees this economic reality at work. All he can do is to try and safeguard his business by an ample supply of liquid cash, by not going into debt too deeply, and, most of all, trying to get his share while the going is good. He can do nothing either as an individual or in conjunction with his class to change the course.

Labor, too, sees the trend. Organized labor has, since long before V-J Day, warned about the approaching crises. It has formulated the theory that workers' income, wages, must be advanced so that consumer purchasing power should keep pace with productive advancement. Labor has tried to put its theory into

(Continued on page 8)

THE PROLETARIAN PARTY Its Principles and Program

(Continued from last issue.)

Capitalist school "education" and inculcated prejudices make the organized labor movement victims of deceit and betrayal on the political field. Their top-lofty, high paid officials, many of whom have grown rich and arrogant, are but the henchmen of Wall Street's capitalist imperialism. Their scheme is to keep the workers looking to the political parties of big business for legislation favorable to the working class. Therefore, no real progress is made, just palliatives and promises which leave the workers as bad off, or worse, than before.

It is time that organized labor broke with its ancient policy of supporting "good" enemies against bad enemies. Political "friends" of labor within the Republican and Democratic parties are supported and "enemies" are opposed on election days. By this "practical" maneuver the organized workers are led into the political sheep pens of Wall Street. The longer the workers stick to this outworn political course, the longer will they be pushed around and left "holding the bag" by the very system which they help to uphold.

While recognizing those political shortcomings of organized labor, the Proletarian Party has given, and will continue to give, unstinting support to the workers in their day to day struggle with the employing class for better conditions of employment, more wages and shorter hours.

The workers, as yet, do not understand that with their present weapons and plans of battle they are foredoomed to defeat, but they will learn as a consequence of those defeats. Stricken to the ground they will rise again stronger than before. Capitalism will force them to organize politically, as it has done in most other countries, and it will force their political action into revolutionary channels, because the workers, as a class, so long as the profit system remains, cannot rise with the progress of industry but only fall.

What Will a Workers' Revolution Achieve?

With the overthrow of capitalism and the introduction of a new social system, a classless society, there would be tremendous changes and almost unlimited possibilities for advancing the welfare of all.

While we cannot give details in advance of this development, the approximate results would be as follows: (1) The abolition of poverty. (2) The abolition of the mass murder known as war. (3) Tremendous expansion of production through the removal of the obstruction of profit making, the workers having the opportunity of consuming the bulk of what they produce. (4) The disappearance of panics and unemployment, as in the event of overproduction the people would simply cut working hours, or take a holiday until consumption overtook production, at least until the surplus was greatly reduced. (5) The elimination of the costs of armies and navies (a burden now met by the capitalists out of surplus values exploited from the workers). (6) Enormous reduction in crime through the removal of its main cause, poverty, and consequently a reduction or elimination of police, judges, jailers, and other prison expenditure. (7) Reduction in general waste, such as competitive advertising and other non-essentials.

Life Abundant

With the tremendous saving that could be effected by abolishing all the above non-essential costs and the elimination of the rich parasites, i. e., the present generation of capitalists, who waste so much without producing anything useful, the people could have just as much as they desired to produce, within the limitations of the degree of existing productivity.

Consumption, now on a starvation minimum for the toiling masses, many of whom are often not even permitted to produce, could be extended to great proportions, permitting the use of so much which the wages of present day workers make impossible of attainment.

The former parasites (when able-bodied and mentally fit) would have to work for their own living, and likewise their army of servants (flunkies, butlers and other retainers) would be transferred to useful labor and thus cut down further on the working hours of all.

Having outlined above the principles and practices of the Proletarian Party and set forth what the objective of the Party is, we hereby urge all working men and women who are in agreement with us to become dues paying members, to join the ranks of the Proletarian Party.

(Adopted by the Proletarian Party at its National Convention, at Chicago, May 30, 31 and June 1, 1946.)

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 3)
the midst of plenty, are a strictly capitalist phenomenon. Poverty stems from riches.

KKK

An offscouring of the post-war is the rebirth of the Ku Klux Klan. This white chauvinist, anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic and anti-Labor organization is gearing itself, once again, to "ridin' high and wide," sowing seeds of race and sectional hate. Recently it has reorganized in Georgia, holding a number of meetings. Many people regard this outfit as extremely reactionary and un-American.

Yet the House Committee on un-American activities found it expedient **NOT** to conduct any probe of the KKK, for the present, because "there was not enough evidence to warrant such." Why not? Isn't there enough historical evidence connected with its acts of terror in the past, its corruption, beatings and killings, to warrant investigating? What about the black chapter in the Klan's history of the post-war 20s? Or the earlier terroristic acts against the "emancipated" Negroes following the Civil War?

But it is naive to expect action on the part of an investigating committee; an offspring of that notorious red-baiting Dies Committee, itself anti-labor, to probe a brother anti-labor group. Indeed that is not the purpose of its existence. Un-Americanism, in its eyes, is anything which stands opposed to capitalism. The labor movement must be kept from growing stronger. Unity must be prevented. Hate, bias, supremacy, division between White and Negro is **MUST** for the maintenance of the capitalist order. That is the credo of the KKK order. That is also the credo of the un-American Activities Committee. Capitalism and all its stands for is to both, Americanism.

* * *

Supreme Court Row

The "iron curtain" around the Supreme Court was pierced by a hot blast, on June 10, from Associate Justice Robert H. Jackson, presently on leave as America's Chief Prosecutor at the Nuernberg Trial of War Criminals. Justice Jackson categorically charged one of his colleagues on the bench, Justice Black, with action undermining the "honor" of the Court.

Precisely, the controversy over the Jewell Ridge Coal decision, better known as the portal-to-portal pay case, in which the United Mine workers won, is the surface cause of the dispute. The miners were represented by Black's former law partner, Crampton Harris. The decision was rendered over 13 months ago. It was one of the Supreme Court's famous "five to four"

votes in favor of the mine workers. The timing of Jackson's long shot is ascribed, by some, to his failure to receive the appointment of Chief Justice of the Court.

Because Crampton Harris was a former law partner of Justice Black (partnership severed over 20 years ago) in the opinion of Jackson, the participation of Black in the rendering of the decision was not in conformity with traditional judicial policy. That policy being that whenever a case is brought before the Court where one of its members is an interested party, directly or remotely, that justice does not participate. The reputation of the Court "for nonpartisan and unbiased decision" must be safeguarded.

Jackson appears to be defending the integrity and impartiality of the Court. One would, therefore, gather that the policy of disinterested judgment is an established one which Black has violated. Is that so? No! Many cases can be cited such as the Black affair.

For instance, former Chief Justice Stone wasn't questioned when he sat in on a case involving the North American Co., whose legal business was handled by a law firm with which Stone was formerly connected.

Former Justice Roberts sat in on cases involving the American Tel. & Tel., in which firm he is a director.

Jackson, himself, sat in on cases in which his former Assistant Solicitor General, Fahy, participated, one of which was the very controversial case, the Jewell Ridge Coal.

All these instances indicate that other justices, too, have been "guilty" of similar practice.

But, then, this is a technicality that unavoidably springs from class society. No justice, however pure and honorable, can escape the effects of his environment, in which business is the dominant element.

Not elected, but appointed through the Presidency, these men have no responsibility to, nor connection with, the electorate, but are put there by special and influential business interests for their loyalty and reliability in upholding the inviolability of property.

In defending the sacredness of private property, and delivering the majority decision in the case of Ames vs. Union Pacific Company, on Nov. 12, 1894, Justice Brewer stated as follows: "He may have made his fortune by dealing in slaves, as a lobbyist, or in any other way obnoxious to public condemnation; but, if he has acquired the legal title to his property, he is **PROTECTED IN ITS POSSESSION**, and cannot be disturbed until the receipt of the actual cash value." (Emphasis

mine.)

From John Jay, the first Chief Justice, to the present, all, without exception, represented the propertied classes. They are selected, not because of their knowledge of law, but with certain anticipation that they would interpret the law favorably to those interests who sponsored their appointment.

John Jay largely represented the landholders when they were the important section of the ruling class; Chief Justice Taney represented Southern slaveocracy when they had a foothold in the nation; Chief Justice Waite, when the railroads were the driving force; Chief Justices Fuller and White, during the period of growth of large corporations; Hughes was a public utilities servant, and so on, down the line.

While appointments have generally followed the line of party patronage, exceptions have been known to take place. President Truman, a Democrat, recently appointed Burton, a Republican. Former President Taft, Republican, appointed as Chief Justice, a Democrat, White. Despite the crossing of party lines, the class affiliation has always remained true to capital.

Beneath the immediate issue, between Jackson and Black, is the greater division between a "liberal" and conservative bloc. On the "liberal" side are Justices Black, Murphy, Douglas, Rutledge and Reed; on the conservative are Jackson, Frankfurter and the rest. The "liberal" bloc is the more flexible, more in line with government regulation, yet within the framework of property interests.

The conservative members are generally the free-enterprisers, the staid followers of what has been. They look to the past, always to a precedent.

In his day, John Marshall, the "father" of the Court, who reigned for 34 years, was such a conservative. In delivering the decision on the "Antelope" case he said: "Slavery, then, had its origin in force, but as the world has agreed that it is a legitimate result of force, the state of things which is thus produced by general consent, cannot be pronounced unlawful."

Wage workers, too, have had the "law books" thrown at them. For didn't the Supreme Court legalize the "kidnapping" of union leaders Haywood, Moyer and Pettibone? In the Danbury Hatters' Case, was not the Sherman anti-trust law used, and sanctioned by the Court, against labor? Many more such cases, especially against labor, could be cited, throughout the history of that body.

The present conflict within the Court should dispel the halo that has for so long surrounded its members, and the institution. As capitalism's appointees, they are tried and true savants of property interests. They are usually

former corporation lawyers, and at least one corruption lawyer has landed on the bench. That was Justice James Wilson, on the first Court list, who died a fugitive from justice.

As far as the workers are concerned, the inner squabbles of the Supreme Court are of little consequence to them. They must understand that this pretended impartiality is but a mere sham. In practice the Court is connected, by a thousand and one threads, with business. Laws are, basically, in support of property. They are made, and interpreted, in the interest of the exploiting class.

L. B.

Bits and Skits

(Continued from page 3)

Franco's Fascist government) has ruled "**wisely and well**," no one can dispute. But wisely and well for whom? By what standards? By that of the large landed estate holders, that of the Pope and the K. of C. Franco's was a political system of violence, modeled after the Hitler pattern, intimidating and brutalizing the Spanish masses into a state of slave acquiescence. This is the "wise" government that the K. of C. is defending.

It objects to the U. N. Sub-Committee's recognition that there are "two rival Spanish governments in existence." Yet, the whole world knows that the Catholic hierarchy openly supported, with all its religious and political might, the Polish government in exile in London, while a real provisional Polish government was functioning right on Polish soil.

Why the difference in attitude? It is simply because the Polish provisional government was a democratic people's choice, opposed to the rich landlords and capitalists.

If anything is to be deplored and criticized on the part of the U. N. Sub-Committee, it is lack of action. Its stand was wishy-washy, reminiscent, in a manner, of the non-intervention policy during the Spanish Civil War. Appeasement of Fascism is an aid to it.

Rank and file Catholics should recognize in this K. of C. appeal on behalf of reaction, that it is synonymous with reaction itself. The interests of the hierarchy of the Church, as of its defense organizations, are not identical with the interests of the mass of Catholics. Those who seek "justice" for Fascist hangmen, and their governments, are themselves Fascist-minded. For "birds of a feather flock together."

R. Daniels.

In Shanghai, there were huge anti-American demonstrations and crowds paraded through the city's streets with placards urging the Marines to "go home" and assailing "dollar diplomacy."—Chicago Sun, Sunday, June 30.

HOW STRONG IS LABOR?

(Continued from page 2)
comprise approximately 85 per cent of the population? The answer is axiomatic, the ownership of the means of production by the capitalist is upheld and maintained by its political power—the State. The latter is, therefore, also the instrument by means of which capital maintains the exploitation of labor.

But to be exploited, that is to work for wages, is a very painful condition, particularly when wages fall below the bare level of subsistence. Even in the most "favorable" of conditions, as in periods of so-called prosperity, workers are exploited, for the harder they work the more profits they produce for the capitalist class. Thus the workers make demands for wage increases upon the owners of industry, knowing full well that is the only way to keep up their standard of living. But the capitalist class is notorious in not being inclined to share its wealth with those who produced it. Here we find opposing economic interests in the day to day aspect of the class struggle. It often breaks out into strikes, capital and labor collide, and the former is compelled, at times, to call upon the "mediator"—the government—to "moderate" the force of these collisions. History has given us plenty of examples of such struggles and whenever any heads were broken, as a result of such collisions, it was mainly those of the workers. The police, at every strike-bound plant, are not there to protect the striking workers, but are the means by which capital maintains both its economic and political supremacy over labor.

Some of the liberals, of course, recognize the existence of the class struggle. But the liberals, who are nothing else but a section of the capitalist class—the petty bourgeoisie — attempt to "correct" Marx (as Lenin had pointed out) by making it appear that the State is an organ for the **reconciliation** of classes. Lenin emphatically points out, citing Engels as an authority, that the State is a product of the **irreconcilability** of class antagonisms. And recent events have certainly added further proof of this Marxian contention when the government came out and threatened the striking workers, particularly the railroad workers, with its armed force. A peculiar form of "reconciliation," to say the least. A parallel could be drawn from "romantic" novels — a shotgun marriage.

But we still have to answer the question: "How strong is labor?" Labor's might lies in its numerical strength and the fact that it is the only productive force in society. Without the collective efforts of labor, the machinery of production would be paralyzed.

This, the strikers have amply demonstrated. The capitalist class, however, although in the minority, was able by the use of its political institution—the State—to force labor back to work and start the wheels of industry in motion again. What a dirty trick the bosses played on us, some workers may exclaim. True enough, it's not the first time nor will it be the last. Nevertheless, what has happened is not without its lessons.

Already sentiment is rising in the ranks of the labor unions for completely breaking with the capitalist political parties, the Democratic and Republican. Most of the so-called friends of labor in Congress have thoroughly exposed themselves. Sentiment is growing daily for a labor party. Some of the top leaders, however, are trying to stifle this sentiment by apologizing for President Truman's actions in the railroad strike, saying he was "ill advised" and did he not veto that reactionary Case bill, etc. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the Truman administration will not be able to live down its "ill advised action." Organized labor is gropingly, haltingly, but forced inexorably by conditions engendered within the capitalist system itself, and it will be forced to strike out for real independent working class political action. How soon this will materialize is a conjecture but it is inevitable.

The road to workers' freedom from exploitation and class oppression should now be more discernible to greater numbers. It lies through the conquest of political power that has for its aim the collective ownership of the entire wealth of the nation, its natural resources and its means of production. However, this cannot be achieved by reforming capitalism, because the profit system has long ago outlived its usefulness. Furthermore, the capitalist class will do its utmost to hold on to its economic supremacy. The workers must establish their own political supremacy, by means of a working class movement, in order to overthrow the rule of the exploiting class. Only by a complete social change will labor be able to bring an end to poverty and usher in a new social order with abundance for all. This, too, is inevitable, but only when it is accomplished can labor really call itself strong!

Al Wysocki.

Don't Misunderstand Mr. Bevin

Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin of Britain, speaking before the Labor Party Conference recently, said: "The agitation of the U. S. and particularly New York for 100,000 Jews to be put in Palestine—and I hope it will not be misunderstood in America if

International Notes

(Continued from page 1)

The three top parties have again formed a coalition. Of the 24 cabinet posts, only two are in the hands of independents. The other 22 are divided as follows: Catholics 9, Communists 7, Socialists 6. This setup represents the third provisional regime since the liberation from the Nazis. Prior to World War 2, the "fall" of French governments was a common thing. Judging from present events these falls are likely to occur quite often before a stable regime will be set up. The workers are strong enough to prevent the capitalist class from setting up their dictatorship, but not strong enough for the time being to set up their own proletarian dictatorship. This situation may prevail for some time with the resultant turmoil coming from this equal division of forces.

Italy

On June 2 another monarchy was discarded into the ashcan of history. By a vote of approximately 12 to 10 million, the Italians decided that they had had enough of that hangover from feudal times. Traditions die hard. On June 11 a pro-monarchist demonstration of some 10,000 people tried to burn the six-story building belonging to the Communist Party of Naples. The police fought the crowd for several hours. The Communists barricaded themselves in their building and fought back. The building was saved. These monarchist demonstrators were merely doing the bidding of the big landowners of the south who fear land reforms may take their property away. The industrial north where the bulk of the country's industry is located voted for the republic, while the agrarian south voted for the monarchy.

While the bourgeois press generally hailed the victory of the republic they also sighed a breath of relief at the showing of the leftist parties. Of the 556 seats in the Italian Constituent Assembly, the Communists captured 107 and the Socialists 116. Together they represent 40 per cent of the electorate. The winner was the Christian Democratic Party with 207 seats. Some thirty

I say it with the purest of motives—was because they did not want too many of them in New York."

In truth, who can question in the least the purity of motive of this "labor-imperialist," who, like Churchill, is not out to liquidate the British Empire but to save it? His remark might have suggested anti-semitism. But anti-semitism is a modern by-product of imperialism. And whoever understands imperialism, particularly the British kind, can certainly not misunderstand Mr. Bevin.

R. Daniels.

parties are represented in the new assembly. Fascism is not dead in Italy. It is openly represented by the Uomo Qualunque (Common Man) Party. This organization, headed by the fascist playwright, Guglielmo Giannini, captured 30 seats and is the fifth largest party. In some quarters, Giannini is referred to as the new Duce. He was a member of the Fascist Party from 1941 until the fall of Mussolini. His newspaper is said to have a circulation of 800,000, which is more than the combined coverage of Rome's 23 dailies. In all probability his financial support is coming from the same group that supported Mussolini.

The food situation in Italy is still acute. The daily bread ration has been reduced to 200 grams. Food riots had continued to increase even prior to this reduction. There is no immediate relief of this situation in sight. The clothing situation has been greatly alleviated by bundles coming from America, from friends and relatives. Robberies are common things. Large, well organized gangs sometimes engage in pitched battles with police and get away with their loot. In Sicily, kidnapings of rich industrialists and landowners is a big business. Ransoms of over \$50,000 have been paid for the release of these men.

The Constituent Assembly which convenes June 24 will have these and many other problems to contend with. They will elect a president or head of government to head this transitory government which may last less than a year. The present cabinet will resign and a new one will be appointed by the president. In all probability it will be a coalition government as no one party is strong enough to take responsibility of control. The Socialist Party has rejected the plea of fusion with the Communist Party, but has agreed to cooperate with the Communists "for working class objectives." The Communist Party, as part of its tactics, is denying that it is opposed to Catholicism, or even private property. Recently in their newspaper, *Unita*, was headlined: "In Russia Private Property Is More Stable and Widespread Than in Any Other Country." This is outright opportunism or ignorance. Private property as understood by the Marxist is that which is used by man to exploit man, that is, the exploitation of the worker by the capitalist because of the latter's ownership of the means of production. Ownership of anything for personal use such as an automobile, house, clothes, etc., is not private property. No man can exploit his fellow man in the Soviet Union, but he can own as many personal things as he is capable of earning through his work.

C. B.

Labor Party

The traditional political action of the American workers since the 1880's has been that of "rewarding labor's friends and punishing its enemies." This is the policy of voting for and supporting candidates of capitalist parties who promise to work for reforms favorable to labor and to oppose those candidates who are against labor. The A. F. of L. has always adhered to this political line, and it is also the official political policy of the CIO. In fact, the latter organization has perfected an elaborate machine to better carry out this policy, the Political Action Committee.

Selecting candidates of capitalist parties for support or condemnation has been the main political expression of the American labor unions, it is true, but has not always been the only policy. On various occasions, from the beginning of the 19th century until recent times, local, and sometimes national, labor political organizations have come into the field, separate and apart from the political parties of capitalism. These were made up and supported entirely by workers, with a program designed to conform to the needs of the working class. Sometimes the "abolition of capitalism" has been emphasized as their ultimate aim. The outstanding examples were the early local parties of working men, as for example, the Workingmen's Party of 1830.

These were genuine expressions of American labor as distinct from several attempts at the formation of a labor party from the top like the Farmer-Labor Party of 1923, etc.

As American capitalism advanced, reforms were instituted, drawing the teeth of the young labor parties, stealing their thunder, as it were. The parties of capitalism—Republican and Democratic—have been peculiarly flexible. In this relation, the political palliatives of the New Deal outdid even the best of the European Social-Democratic or "Labor" parties.

Of late years, capitalism in the United States has reached the stage where reforms are becoming more and more impossible, making it necessary for the capitalist government to cut down on the expensive welfare schemes and even to dispense with much pretense at "democracy." More of the real governing is invested in selected people, appointed on boards and commissions by the President or Congress, without regard for democratic procedure. This was particularly evidenced during World War II, wherein we witnessed the creation of such agencies as the War Labor Board, the OPA, etc.

The social legislation of the New Deal during the depression

years of the 1930's and the seeming success of the "reward and punish" policy strengthened this idea, but the recent actions of President Truman and his administration (who got the support of the AFL and the CIO during the election period) has been a blow, giving voice to some sentiment for independent political action as distinct from the old capitalist parties. This sentiment, of late, is not only crystallizing at the top of the organized labor movement but at the bottom as well, wherein it has manifested itself much earlier.

The Proletarian Party points out and stresses that: "The political action of the working class is determined by the economic needs of that class. And since the economic needs of the proletariat must ultimately lead to a struggle for the conquest of the economic resources, the machinery of production and the products, it follows that proletarian political action must of necessity be revolutionary. While capitalism, like any other social system, rests upon an economic foundation, its ownership is upheld and maintained by political power." (Proletarian Lessons, J. Keracher, p. 16.)

We further declare that a genuine "Labor party" can only spring from the organized section of the American working class. We know full well that the majority of workers have not yet seen the necessity of revolutionary political action; therefore, any expression of independent working class political action is bound to be more or less reformistic in character. But if it should result in a third party, i. e., a labor party, it would be a step forward because it would mean—in spite of its reformistic character—a complete break with the capitalist parties such as the Democratic and Republican.

The workers of Great Britain have gone to the left through the British Labor Party, which is far in advance of the American workers. But the reforms advocated by the British Labor Party have not abolished the exploitation of labor by capital, proving further the need for revolutionary political action. This is all the more necessary when one takes under consideration the fact that the colonial peoples are also kept under subjection through Britain's imperial policies, continued by its "labor imperialists"—the Atlees and Bevins. We warn the American labor movement not to make a similar blunder, but to resolutely go forward toward complete expropriation of the capitalist class.

The Proletarian Party sees much value in election campaigns, and in working-class participation in legislative bodies, mainly, however, as a means of

enlightening the workers and thereby bringing the class issue to a head. It, moreover, clearly understands the limitations of elections, as well as their value. Therefore, it does not seek to create illusions in the minds of the workers that capitalism can be voted out or bought out, as do certain existing parties.

The struggle for the possession of the machinery of production and its products is a revolutionary political struggle. The capitalists will do their utmost to maintain their economic supremacy for it insures them a life of ease and luxury. In this struggle history has revealed that the exploiters of labor do not hesitate to make use of their "public power of coercion"—the government or State — against the working class. The road to the emancipation of labor is through the conquest of political power, by the workers setting up their own **State machinery — a working-class dictatorship against their exploiters.**

The Proletarian Party contends that the workers, as a class, must understand their historic role, and must recognize the insufficiency of reforms and consciously participate in independent revolutionary political action which has for its objective the abolition of the capitalist system. It urges all workers who have come to this realization to become members of the Proletarian Party, in order to speed the day when the exploiting profit system — with its poverty for the masses and slaughterfests known as

MOTORCADE AGAINST THE CURRENT

(Continued from page 5)
practice by demanding wage boosts. The capitalists did not see eye to eye with labor. They resisted all substantial wage increases. Strikes brought a few advantages but also the excuse for more price advances.

The present new wave of price advances will put labor back further than it was before the strikes got under way. It makes little difference who blames who for being the cause. The trend is undeniably here. The free enterprise system is capable of producing if customers are at hand. If the government steps in and buys about one-half of total production machinery can be kept running. A substantial curtailment of such buying will soon put a crimp in production.

A motorcade to Washington could be ten times as long as the present one. It could give the authorities ample time to work on the problem. But it could not for long stem the trend of capitalist production. This trend is regulated by economic law and not by political maneuvering, not by mere striking at effects. Try again!

C. Jelset.

World Wars — shall be forever banished from this earth.

(Adopted by the Proletarian Party at its National Convention at Chicago, May 30, 31 and June 1, 1946.)

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.....15c
- MARXISM AND DARWINISM, by Anton Pannekoek.....15c
- CLASS STRUGGLES IN AMERICA, by A. M. Simons.....15c
- CRIME, ITS CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES,
by John Keracher.....15c
- ECONOMICS FOR BEGINNERS, by John Keracher.....10c
- THE HEAD-FIXIN GINDUSTRY, by John Keracher.....15c
- PRODUCERS AND PARASITES, by John Keracher.....10c
- PROLETARIAN LESSONS, by John Keracher.....25c
- HOW THE GODS WERE MADE, by John Keracher.....15c
- WHY UNEMPLOYMENT, by John Keracher.....10c

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 _____