

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. XXVII, No. 7, Whole No. 303

Chicago, Ill., July 1958

Price 10c a Copy

THE OBSTINATE RECESSION

The year-old business recession obstinately hangs on. It refuses to get lost despite the exhortations to do so from high governmental leaders. In fact, its grip on the economy seems firmer. Unemployment is expected to reach six million when the school graduates enter the labor market this month.

This wipes out the "improvement in employment" of last month that occurred in the agricultural and construction fields. Workers, moreover, are still being laid off in the industrial sector of the economy. There is agreement among the "experts" that unemployment will not go below 5 million again this year, and that it could reach 7 million by next winter.

Differences of opinion are varied as to when an upturn will occur. No one looks forward to any immediate return of prosperity. Few will find comfort in the report of G. H. Moore of the National Bureau of Economic Research whose "opinion" is that prosperity will not return until some time in 1959 or early in 1960. He basis his opinion on the duration of previous post-war recessions. But this is far more severe than all the rest of them, and could last much longer than Mr. Moore expects.

Meanwhile the schisms of American capitalism are coming to the surface. Racial tension resulting from job competition is mounting. The old adage that Negroes are the last hired and the first fired is being borne out. The New York State Commission Against Discrimination reported that Negro unemployment is running more than twice the rate of white workers. Nationally, it is reported likewise, that one out of every seven Negro workers is unemployed in contrast to one out of fourteen among white workers.

There is an undercurrent of discontent among members of minority groups, older workers and women, who feel they are being discriminated against in job chances. The seeds of hatred within these various groups, latent during the period of full employment, are now sprouting in this recession climate.

Juvenile delinquency is bound to increase during the summer months when schools close and jobs to be had are scarcer.

The perennial struggle between big and small business is proving fatal to many of the small fellows. Bankruptcies are higher than in any period since the 1930's. Freedom to rise rings a hollow message.

Last, but not least, is the sharpening conflict between capital and labor. Here it is a bread and butter issue for the workers, a struggle for existence. It is this struggle between capital and labor, immediate and elementary over wages, working hours, and ultimately over the full control of the fruits

(Continued on page 2)

FRANCE TURNS TO THE RIGHT

The coming of Charles de Gaulle to power raised some misgivings as to the future of France. Already weeks prior to his assumption, when the so-called Algerian committees of public safety had been formed headed by a military-fascist clique calling for De Gaulle to take over, it became almost certain that the parliamentary Fourth Republic was done.

Internal strife, weakness, and vacillation plagued it. The right supported De Gaulle; the center vacillated, apparently lacking the full support of the armed forces, without which no government can

for long maintain itself.

The Communists, to the left, stood in solid opposition to De Gaulle, but lacked sufficient support from the proletariat to openly challenge him. This was demonstrated by the sporadic strike response. The Socialists, who together with the Communists could possibly have turned the tide, held the trump card but they failed to play it. They split over the issue, with almost one-half of the Socialist deputies going over bag and baggage to the support of the enemy (De Gaulle). Thus, true to their historic role they once again betrayed the proletariat, and helped to bury the Fourth Republic in the name of "saving" France.

Meanwhile, De Gaulle "rose in stature," appeared to stand above the classes, as his bourgeois supporters declared, "for the glory of France." He appealed to national unity walked right in, upon invitation, in the ostensible political vacuum, without hardly a struggle. The Republican bourgeois government virtually abdicated in his favor. It was obviously fully aware of its weakness and inability to cope with the deteriorated and challenging situation, happy to be relieved of its responsibilities. Thus, the traditional "man on horseback" became inevitable.

The immediate events that led up to the take-over was the disaffection in Algeria from May 13th onward when the so-called "rebel" (French) committees of public safety were formed with the military and fascist right-wingers in command defying constituted authority in Paris. Their demand was for a firmer policy towards the rebellious native Algerians (which the French army in over three and a half years of fighting had failed to subdue). They called for an end to the French Republic and for De Gaulle to take power. The movement soon spread to Corsica, an island off France. It also had its supporters in France proper. The nation was faced with civil war.

France, as a "world power" had already been weakened by many colonial defeats, for example: in Indo-China, Tunisia, Morocco, and the abortive Anglo-French fight with Egypt over the Suez Canal. All this had undermined her military morale, and world prestige.

(Continued on page 2)

HOME SCENE

Revolution vs. Reform

There was a time when the Fourth of July commemorated the birth of this nation. Today, and for some time past, that important national holiday is just the start of summer vacations. It could be that the leaders of the country are satisfied to let the overwhelming mass of people forget the significance of even the great American Revolution of 1776 which the Fourth of July symbolizes. The mere word "revolution" sends shudders of fear up the spines of the American ruling class. They haven't much stomach to even celebrate their own revolution; while not even the threat of an H-bomb war arouses the American masses, let alone a Fourth of July firecracker. Notwithstanding, it still is a good time to discuss the question of revolution vs. reform as a practical issue.

It was during the 1930's, when there was a tremendous amount of discontent among the American workers as a result of the Great Depression then, that the issue of revolution vs. reform was very much alive. The grand old Republican Party then as now failed to heed the economic storm gathering. They thought if they ignored the depression, it would leave by itself. The do-nothing section of the capitalist class were pushed aside and the do-something capitalists, represented by Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal Democrats, found themselves in control of the nation's destinies.

Roosevelt, and his shrewd henchmen, inaugurated a program of social reform to save capitalism. He upbraided those capitalists who

opposed his policies as shortsighted and as working against their own class interest. His rallying cry to them was: "reform if you would preserve."

The New Deal reforms hooked labor also to the chariot of capitalism. Pauperized labor succumbed to relief measures as a way out of its miseries. Food for the hungry mouths of workers and their families was urgent. The New Deal threw these a bone. Labor, by and large, didn't look beyond the bone of reform. Failing to clearly understand its class interests and the social mechanism that breeds poverty, labor was blindly trapped by the liberal wing of the capitalist class thru reforms. Reforms as such strengthen capitalism.

While much was made of the New Deal reforms as benefiting labor, there were still 10 million unemployed when the Second World War broke. It is generally recognized today, that it took that holocaust to lick the depression. And now once again we are entering a period of depression and growing discontent. The workers are still susceptible to reform handouts. And the capitalists thru their political parties may revise their policies to dampen the fires of revolt as they did in the thirties. Will another such depression lead to a Third World War? Can humanity survive an H-Bomb war? It is generally conceded that it would be suicidal for humanity to try it.

The solution lies beyond the patchwork of reforms. The answer and hope of the human race depends upon a complete reorganiza-

(Continued on page 4)

FRANCE TURNS TO THE RIGHT

(Continued from Page 1)

It was a drain on her youth and financial resources, for the wars were costly.

Taxation also was becoming ever more burdensome, causing much discontent at home. Above everything else, though once a great colonial world power, France was shrinking to a point inconsistent with its latest industrial progress as an imperialist capitalist nation. Already reduced to a third rate power there was danger of her sinking even lower.

The parliamentary government of France, called the Fourth Republic, was organized following the defeat of Hitler, with the end of the Second World War. It was such that more power rested with the National Assembly than the executive. The Assembly consisted of many parties including the extreme right, the Catholic center, and the Socialists and Communists on the left. The twenty-five Cabinets which came and went during these 13 years have been coalition cabinets. (Nevertheless, despite all these Cabinet "changes," the bourgeoisie retained control of the government, however much they disagreed among themselves.)

Thus the French constitution, with its existing arrangement of a weak executive, has been under fire, especially from the right, who contended that a revision is necessary with more power to the executive, in order to have a more "stable" government.

The new regime of De Gaulle has come in the midst of this crisis, in the name of the "unity of the nation" and restoration of "order." His entry was made in a "legal" and parliamentary manner. Not that he had any compunctions about the legality of the matter. He would have dispensed with the latter if he deemed it necessary.

Capitalist defenders and representatives have no compunctions about the means employed when it comes to saving their "established order." When they speak about "order" and "national unity," they actually mean capitalist order and capitalist unity. In their eyes any other kind of order and unity constitutes the opposite: anarchy.

In calling in De Gaulle the French bourgeoisie literally sealed its parliamentary doom, put an end to its Republic, declared it bankrupt. Its parliament was given a 6 months "vacation" (which can be extended, if need be). Even if it returns, it could only act as a rubber stamp to the "man on the horse," De Gaulle.

French history is replete with Napoleonic dictators who emerge in periods of crises and revolution to save the day for the ruling class and establish iron-heel order. This function has now fallen to General De Gaulle, a military man, a "hero" of the French Resistance Movement against the Hitler Dictatorship and occupation of France during the 1940's of the Second

World War days. It's the irony of history, that in spite of all the attempts of De Gaulle's friends to refute any charges that he is attempting to establish a dictatorship, the fact remains that he is a right-winger with fascist tendencies, alien to the hopes and aspirations of the common people.

It is well to repeat that the ease with which De Gaulle took over was made possible not alone by the abject capitulation of the "democratic" bourgeoisie, but also by the almost complete and traitorous class collaboration of the French socialists, Mollet and Auriol, and others.

In view of this, the Communists felt they were not sufficiently strong to come out alone in open opposition. It was very evident that the French proletariat as a whole was not ready for a final showdown.

For the moment it would seem like a victory for the French capitalists. From now on they will be centralizing their power, throwing their weight around more freely, exerting pressure on non-cooperating elements.

Notwithstanding all the promises of De Gaulle to uphold the French Republic, France may find itself in the midst of a growing dictatorship with a fascist coloration. It cannot be assumed that fascism as a political form of capitalism passed away with Hitler and Mussolini. Remnants of fascism are still present in many capitalist countries, Germany, Italy, France, and even in America.

Wherever capitalism exists, and as long as it exists, there will be present seeds and a basis for fascism, which is the forcible and open subjugation of the proletariat and suppression of all forms of democratic institutions and expressions.

But whether or not DeGaulle will find it necessary to resort to open dictatorship, and whether he can also achieve such, will depend largely on the French proletariat. DeGaulle is said to have a sense of history." The same must be said of the French proletariat who also have a "sense of history," this from an opposite, i.e. a class standpoint.

French history brings to light a rich background of the militancy of its proletariat. De Gaulle certainly will not gloss over the period of the Reign of Terror following the Great French Revolution of 1789; the June Insurrection of 1848; the Paris Commune of 1871 when the proletariat held political power for over two months. And more recently the magnificent role of the French workers in the Resistance movement against the German occupation during the Second World War days, this especially cannot be forgotten. All these significant historical events might possibly convince De Gaulle to a policy of caution, lest in his effort to allay civil war he stirs it up and thereby sharpens the class

THE OBSTINATE RECESSION

(Continued from page 1)

of labor (wealth produced), that will determine the shape of things to come.

The current obstinate recession is the result of the inherent contradictions of capitalism, the incompatibility between social production and private appropriation; the anarchy in capitalist production. It is the economic crisis of overproduction, which could develop into a depression of the first magnitude.

This would cause more suffering to the American workers who, although caught in the present economic mess, appear to be resigned to it. Most of them refuse to see the only solution, socialism, whereby to free themselves permanently from the system that exploits them, capitalism, with its depressions and wars.

struggle.

There is above all the matter of Algeria. Its population is about 10 million, of which, the vast majority, 9 million are natives, Moslems. The remainder, a minority, of 1 million comprise the French "settlers" who through the years had monopolized virtually all the fertile land of Algeria. The May 13th "uprising" was sparked by the fear of these "settlers" lest the French government come to terms with the Algerian native nationalists who have been fighting for three and a half years to win independence.

Algeria has been a French colony for many years. Its resources and people have been mercilessly exploited, as all colonial peoples throughout history have been in the interest of foreign property investors. Much natural riches is contained there, even though most of the area is desert country. Lately, oil regions have been discovered and exploited, which the French ruling class won't let go for it needs oil badly for its own industries at home.

But the Algerian natives have awakened from their slumber and like the rest of the colonial world are in a state of ferment. They are revolting against the oppression of the French imperialists. They have organized a movement of national liberation, fighting for national independence, so courageously that their guerrilla detachments have pinned down the many times more numerous force of around 500,000 French soldiers.

This native Algerian rebellion against the French is no ordinary, sporadic flareup, but a movement deeply rooted in a maturing consciousness of these peoples that only through complete independence can they preserve their national life.

Immediately following his assumption of power, De Gaulle flew to Algeria. He tried to win the good graces of the Algerian natives by his hypocritical praises of them. He promised to give them "equal rights," with integration

Another world war as a capitalist "solution" to the economic crisis is not completely ruled out even though it holds the possibility of human extinction. To be sure, capitalism "righted" its system following the two world wars, but not without losing much of its "skin," such as Russia in 1917, and more lately, China in 1949. The exploiters still lament this.

In their cut-throat competition for control of the world market there is always the danger that the capitalist nations might precipitate another world conflict and far more devastating than World War Two which followed the Great Depression of the 1930's. This should convince all workers that only by complete abolition of capitalism can an era of real peace and security be ushered in.

L.B.

and an election sometime in the near future. His speeches were deliberately vague, and it was obvious that he did not want to draw the strong opposition of any of the groups involved in the Algerian struggle. What he tried to do is to work out a compromise.

However, it is doubtful whether the natives will swallow De Gaulle's sugar-coated pills. Already the native Algerian committee of liberation threw his whole proposition back into his teeth. It isn't integration that they want, but complete independence, they replied. But independence is not what De Gaulle was delegated to confer. His mission is to uphold French imperialist rule.

But how? That is precisely the problem facing him. He will try conciliation, offer some formal rights and minor concessions, anything, so long as the essential power and wealth remains the property of the French investors. But should those methods fail him, it is a foregone conclusion that he would not hesitate to use his full dictatorial power to crush the native resistance movement. All of which would only lead to an ever greater intensification of the colonial struggle.

This episode is of great importance to the future of France. It has also great bearing upon the many world complications of which it is a part. French imperialism does not stand by itself. Even though it is in competition with other imperial powers (e.g. U.S. and Britain) yet it is a part of their general pattern and actually tied in with its imperial organization, the NATO. A defeat for French imperialism would be scoring a blow at the entire imperialist body.

By the same token the colonial liberation movement of the Algerian natives for independence although an entity consisting of individual parts is also of worldwide significance. It is tied in with the whole struggle for freedom from imperial domination. As we

(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

A WORLD PROBLEM

The main problem confronting the big nations of the world today is the question of maintaining peaceful relations with each other. Human survival itself depends upon the solution of this problem, hence all other questions are insignificant by comparison.

This period of civilization has been termed "the atomic age," ever since the American armed forces dropped the first atomic bombs upon an "enemy nation," Japan, toward the close of the war in 1945. It has not been forgotten that up to that time no explosive of such devastating effect had ever been used. And it is still remembered, especially by the survivors at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, that the most numerous victims of that atomic-bombing were the working people of those cities.

Since then, 13 years have intervened, and the many-times more powerful "hydrogen bomb" has been produced and tested. In addition, the rocket or "missile" has been improved to such an extent, and "thrust," that earth satellites have been pushed into space. It was Russia who launched the first satellite, and lately her third and heaviest "Sputnik" of them all.

It is said that civilization has now passed the "atomic age," and has entered the "nuclear-missile" or the "Sputnik" era. Military "experts" today talk in terms of "push-button" war, that nations could be destroyed within a few minutes through "missile-carried nuclear war-heads." They claim that survivors of the blast and fire, would be destroyed thru the radio-activity of the atmosphere, the "fall-out"; that all organic life could be destroyed. That's a terrible future, one must admit; in fact some one remarked in grim humor that it's no future at all for the human race.

In view of this, what are the prospects of permanent peace in this world? Let us examine.

Two World Rivals

The two most powerful nations in the world today are the United States and the Soviet Union. They are rivals, each representing a social system opposed to the other, i.e. capitalism versus communism. It is not surprising that they do not love each other.

In fact, the U.S. capitalist ruling class hated the Soviet Union so intensely that it tried to destroy the then young Soviet government when it sent an American army of intervention into Siberia at the end of the First World War. Together with Britain and France it precipitated that Civil War in Russia (1919-1921) by supporting counter-revolutionary Czarist, Russian generals and their murderous cohorts. They devastated the best part of Russia, and butchered many thousands of Russian working people. They caused a famine in the country which took the lives of millions more through starvation.

The real rulers of America, the multi-millionaires and billionaires, a small but powerful clique of idle rich parasites, known as "Wall Street," still hate the Russian workers, and would like to see the Soviet Union destroyed today. That is the aim of all the imperial capitalists.

But it is too late. Soviet Power has increased many-fold, and some say that even as a "nu-

clear-missile" armed power it is more than a match for the United States. Likewise, its army and airforce has no equal in the world.

It also has a well developed, and most modern, industry. A recent visit to Russia by an American millionaire, Ryerson, head of the Inland Steel Co., revealed that Russia was well advanced, in some respects even more so than the U.S., in steel-making processes. Ryerson was reported to have said that Russia by 1970 will surpass the United States in steel production, and be in a position to export steel to this country.

A well-developed steel industry is the foundation of all modern nations. That is how they gauge their strength. The Soviet Union has that, and the workers with "know-how" and energy to operate it—and most enthusiastically because they own it; like the rest of the industries under collective ownership, i.e. socialized.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union has loyal allies, Peoples China with the biggest working population in the world, the East European Democracies; so that put together there are approximately one billion people devoted to the Soviet, that is, the socialist or communist way of life.

Such tremendous working class power, reinforced by the armed might of the Soviet Union, is virtually invincible, or, at least, it cannot be easily destroyed.

The remarkable thing about these workers of the Soviet world is that they are not belligerent but want to live in peace with the rest of the world.

Recent Peace Proposals

For some time the Soviet Union has been proposing a "summit meeting," that is, a conference of the heads of the government of the U.S., Britain and France for the purpose of discussing the question of disarmament, and establishing better peaceful relations between the nations. Of course, Britain and France are willing to discuss the matter of "peaceful co-existence" with the Soviet Union, knowing how all three of them had suffered during the two world wars. (They still remember they were "allies" then.)

But the U.S. is still reluctant, and it is charged that its Secretary of State, Dulles, is "dragging his feet" on the question of a "summit meeting." Actually, however, it is well known that it is the upper part of his body, his head, which is overloaded with reactionary ideas representing the views of Wall Street, that impedes his progress toward the "summit."

What does Wall Street propose, that is, what "concessions" does it demand from the Soviet Union? It went "whole hog," it wants a restoration of capitalism in all of East Europe, including Poland and East Germany.

Wall Street, through its mouth-piece, Dulles, is demanding that "free elections" (U.S. style) be held throughout the whole of East Europe, and with which to "unite" East Germany with West Germany. What it is proposing for those countries is the kind of system (capitalism) and political set-up, (either "mink-coat" Democrats, or "vicuna-coat" Republicans) that the American masses are afflicted with.

Naturally, the Soviet Union considered the Wall Street proposal an insult, especially to the East European countries, whom it points out already have governments of their own, the rule of the majority, the working class.

In rebuttal, the Soviet Union made the proposal that a real step toward peace would be for the American government to dismantle its armed bases surrounding the Soviet frontier. It also requested that tests of nuclear weapons (atomic and hydrogen bombs) be suspended; a step that the Soviet government had already taken.

It was finally agreed by the nations concerned to hold a preliminary meeting, that of scientists and technicians, on July 1st, to discuss ways of inspecting, should stoppage of nuclear tests take place. Whether this meeting will eventually lead to "summit" talks on world peace remains to be seen. In the meanwhile, however, the world is far from peaceful as we note.

Lebanon's "Civil War"

Lebanon is a small nation in the Middle East, alongside the Mediterranean Sea, much smaller than its neighbor, Syria, bordering on its north and east frontier. The population of Lebanon is 1,500,000, mainly Arabian, but divided into two religious groups, Christians and Moslems.

According to press reports most of the Christian Arabs, including the Lebanese President, Chamoun, are "pro-Western." On the other hand, the Moslem Arabs are anti-Western, or anti-imperialists and "pro-Nasser."

But it's not a religious conflict in spite of the alleged division. It is actually a political struggle, and was precipitated when President Chamoun attempted to succeed himself as President for another term by either amending the constitution or ignoring it entirely. An open rebellion against his regime took place, and spread to Beirut, the capital city.

President Chamoun has charged that President Nasser of the United Arab Republic (Egypt and Syria) has been "actively backing" the Moslem rebels in Lebanon.

Although sympathizing with the rebels, President Nasser has denied the charges.

The United States is threatening to intervene; Secretary of State Dulles openly admitting that U.S. armed forces may go to Lebanon in spite of warnings from the Soviet Union against such intervention.

What we are witnessing in Lebanon is the rise of Arab nationalism against the American and British imperial control of the nations in the Middle East.

The American imperialists are trying to "justify" U.S. intervention in Lebanon, for two "reasons": 1st, The oil pipe lines need "protection;" 2nd, It's in line with the "Eisenhower Doctrine" to send troops when such nations, like Lebanon (whose President Chamoun is "pro-Western" and tied up with that deal) request it.

The British imperialists have shown willingness to "loan" some of their troops (under a U.N. label, of course) from their armed base on the nearby island of Cyprus, where they are on a hot seat themselves as a result of the recent fracas between the Greek and Turkish inhabitants of that island.

One sure thing, if American-British intervention occurs in Lebanon, it would inflame the Arabian world that much more.

The Soviet Union has already protested such proposed intervention indicating that she could not stand by indifferent to what happens in Lebanon.

Is World Peace Possible?

The question of world peace is a thorny one, and we note that wherever capitalism prevails, there is trouble. Recently a big nation like France, mainly because of its unsuccessful efforts to crush the Algerian native movement for national liberation, had to abolish its parliamentary Republic, and call in a "paternal autocrat," De Gaulle, to take over.

We are in this period of human, social development, what with the weapons of war having become so terribly destructive, that it leaves the workers no other alternative but to eventually abolish the cause of war, capitalism, entirely throughout the world. Only then will peace be possible.

Al Wysocki

A LOOK AROUND

SOUTH OF THE BORDER: The South American country of Chile finds itself in much the same economic straits as so many of her neighbors in recent days. As any intelligent school boy studying geography can tell you, Chile's principal export products are copper, cobalt, zinc, manganese and other important metals. He can also confirm the fact that the United States is the main customer of these products. But, he might not, on the other hand, be able to tell you why our esteemed Vice President was so ill received on his recent visit to South America, although it's plain to see.

When the world market is glutted with vital metals it is a simple question in the mind of any American as to who shall mine the small trickle of replacement metals needed for the U.S. economy. The answer is: the U.S. mines, of course. But what about our good friends to the South?

They can spit on the U.S. representatives, and cast stones at every "northerner" they see, but it will not change the facts of commercial life. Up go the tariffs on imports of foreign products to the U.S. (with official apologies all

around) and down goes the market for the "good friends" to the South.

We wonder how long our fellow Americans on the continent to the south will be able to sustain themselves when they find that all their eggs in the U.S. basket are not hatching out.

Many drastic changes will have to take place in their economy if they hope to continue to grow as self-respecting nations.

Achieving their independence by lifting the yoke of U.S. imperialism from off their necks is the first step toward self-respect and security for all the South American countries.

There are many people throughout the world who have already learned this lesson and are well on the road to building a new world under socialism. Judging by the tremendous shock U.S. diplomacy received on Vice President Nixon's trip (in fact, unprecedented in American history) the time is not far off when the so called "independent" countries of Central and South America will follow suit.

SAME TUNE, NEW WORDS: We assume our readers will be expecting a comment about the

Dr. Edward Teller, father of the American H-Bomb, one of the top nuclear scientists employed by the Government, favors continued nuclear bomb testing. Like a true politician of small stature, he argues for further testing in the name of national security. In a recent debate with Dr. Pauling, he stated: "We must avoid war under all circumstances, except, in my opinion, one: when the freedom of human beings is at stake." Dr. Teller and some others of like-mind argue that the risk involved in radioactive pollution is small compared to the dangers from natural and medical radiation.

Dr. Pauling, a vigorous opponent of nuclear bomb testing, an eminent scientist, said in his debate with Dr. Teller that: "... according to the best estimates of gene-

ticists, all of whom agree, fifteen thousand children are sacrificed for every large bomb tested that produces stratospheric radioactivity that slowly descends to the ground, gets into the grass, gets into the food of cattle, gets into the milk, and then gets into the bones of children."

There is no argument amongst the scientists that nuclear bomb testing is contaminating food, air, water and soil. Dr. Teller seems to think it is inconsequential, so far. Dr. Pauling sees the danger as immediate to thousands with each explosion. It would seem that rather than take a chance that Dr. Teller may be wrong, the tests be halted. But the U.S. leaders' thinking on "freedom"—that is, capitalist freedom—decree the tests to continue on the grounds of "security," namely, their security as a privileged class.

THE MOST, BUT NOT ENOUGH: A friend recently pointed out that the U.S. had the distinction of being able to boast of more beds reserved for the insane than any other country in the world. This, he said, indicated a remarkable social awareness on the part of the American public and authorities to the seriousness of the problem.

But, we say, it also can indicate that capitalism is driving a lot of people crazy in the "good old

U.S.A."

When he was reminded of reports revealing a shortage of beds for many of those suffering from mental illness, to say nothing of inadequate personnel and funds, he did admit that it was not the type of thing one should recommend broadcasting on the Voice of America.

A GOOD QUESTION: Bob Hope, the well known comedian, said he found the Russians could laugh too. Dan A. Manason, former president of the Detroit Tennis Club, said he found tremendous interest in athletics in Russia with full governmental support of sports programs.

W. K. Kelsey, well known columnist, wonders why we could not have closer relations with the people of the Soviet Union as a means of diminishing suspicion that the people of one country want to bring about the collapse of the other? That's a good question, which demands an answer.

However, we suspect that Wall Street would not want this because it could lead to demands for peaceful co-existence. Then what would happen to that vast war machine that props up the U.S. economy and so "gainfully" (?) employs millions of workers?

L.D.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from Page 1)

tion of society upon a collectivist and socialist basis. That is revolution—a fundamental social change, which can only be brought about through revolutionary political action by the immense majority, the working class.

Polluted Capitalism

The international controversy over nuclear bomb testing is or should be of direct and immediate concern to everyone. World scientists of repute are unanimous in agreement that radioactive fallout is dangerous to human existence. The disagreement amongst some of these nuclear scientists is over the mere question of quantity — over how much the human race can stand with safety to itself.

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.....

FRANCE TURNS TO THE RIGHT

(Continued from page 2)

note, not only does the whole Arab world (Tunisia, Morocco, Egypt, etc.) sympathize with the Algerian natives' aspirations for independence, but also the working class world (the Soviet Union, Peoples China, etc.).

France's move to the right may appear, for the moment, to have closed the ranks of the French bourgeoisie so that it could proceed with its business tasks with greater determination, less opposition, and hopes of success. But it

remains to be seen how far it will go unhampered and whether it can overcome the several obstacles facing it.

This much is certain: the French ruling class has yet to face its own working class at home who are far from docile as past history has revealed. Worsening economic conditions could cause the French proletariat to move again toward a Marxian revolutionary solution, that is, to "first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie."

R. Daniels