

SAMPLE
IF YOU LIKE THIS
SEND YOUR SUBSCRIPTION

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. XXIX, No. 1, Whole No. 314

Chicago, Ill., January, 1960

618

Price 10c a Copy

1960 — PEACE OR WAR?

Recently someone quipped in the press that the way things are going, the best life insurance risks in the nation are the seven astronauts. But whether "outer space" is such a safe place is also questionable in view of the development of radar controlled rapid missiles equipped with deadly nuclear war-heads. On one thing there is agreement, that seldom in the history of civilization has life been so insecure as now.

We have begun a new year. It is natural for people to wonder what it will bring. But no one can predict the future. However, by examining the past we could get a general idea of what might happen. We know this much: that most of the people living today have witnessed the two most destructive world wars in the history of the human race. These wars were caused by the Christian capitalist nations who, while spouting phrases about "good will" and the "brotherhood of man," were actually out to murder each other for the domination of the world, control of its markets, sources of raw material, and peoples to exploit for profit. Is this what we can expect in 1960?

No, this need not happen. Humanity can put an end to war. Who said this? It was an "atheistic" nation, the Soviet Union, who proposed total disarmament, and that nations should live in peaceful coexistence with each other.

However, this Soviet peaceful offer had hardly any mollifying effect upon the capitalists whose hatred of communism bursts out periodically in their press. For example, there was the angry retort against the Soviet Union recently in a U.S. magazine, headlined: "The Coming Choice For U.S.: FIGHT OR SURRENDER? Story of the Blackmail Behind the Threat of Nuclear War."

The "story" charged the Soviet Union of trying to "blackmail" the U.S. with the threat of a nuclear war. Actually it was cleverly contrived capitalist propaganda intended to make the people war-conscious and ready to die for dear old capitalism. It tried to reconcile them to the heavy losses of a nuclear war, that the U.S. could still survive even if its 50 largest population centers (including Chicago and New York City) were destroyed and sixty million people

killed. There would be "survivors" it stated. What a happy thought!

The "story" did not delve too deeply into whether the "survivors" would be delirious with joy at having been spared, only to be faced with another problem of survival: that of eking out an existence from a devastated country with the atmosphere, the soil, and themselves contaminated by the radioactive fall-out.

Actually, the capitalists are fearful of the growing strength of the working class world, the Soviet Union, Peoples China, East European nations; one-third of the world with approximately a billion people! Furthermore, the Soviet Union is well armed. Its rocket with powerful thrust was the first to hit the moon! Yet the Soviet Union wants peace. It is sincere; it suffered the greatest casualties of any other nation in both world wars.

The capitalists lament because they only have two-thirds of the world left for them to exploit for profit; and on this portion their grip is slipping, for it is torn with class strife against exploitation and colonial struggles against imperialism. Today the exploiters are rejoicing over their prosperity, but the revolutionary handwriting on the wall points to the future, the end of capitalism. Most of the capitalists know it. That is why some of them would prefer to see the whole world destroyed rather than see capitalism go out of business altogether.

Because capitalism is slipping, that is why the U.S. government in December sent its best frontman, President Eisenhower, as a "crusader for peace" (so-called) on the eleven nations tour, in an effort to "unite" what's left of the capitalist world. He talked "peace," but always recommended to the nations he visited that they arm themselves. Right from the beginning of his trip Eisenhower made it clear against whom they should arm by his crack about "a world sorely troubled by atheistic imperialism." This was a slanderous jab against the Soviet Union without naming it.

Eisenhower, while in India, paid lip service to peace but again attacked the Soviet Union when he hinted that India should arm itself because of "aggressive intentions

(Continued on page 2)

HAND-CUFFING LABOR

The 116-day steel strike, now suspended by President Eisenhower under the injunction-provisions of the Taft-Hartley law; the maritime unions, similarly hand-cuffed with legal entanglements; the prospect of a railroad strike around February, with built-in legal manacles to stop it; and recently the longest strike in the history of the rubber industry; the hundred-day stoppage in copper, lead and zinc; the protracted conflicts in other industries; all add up to the end of the relatively long period of "friendly, peaceful" coexistence between capital and labor.

A. H. Raskin, N.Y. Times, specialist on labor-management relations, on Nov. 29, 1959, wrote: "The steel companies and the United Steelworkers of America have become standard-bearers in what amounts to an outbreak of class warfare . . ."

Not since the formation of the CIO and the sitdown strikes of the 1930's have capital and labor collisions been as sharp and protracted as now. Why? Basically and simply, the LABOR SHORTAGES of the wars and postwar periods are over. The recent development of automation appears certain now to guarantee LABOR SURPLUSES, by and large. Hence the changed attitude of capital toward labor. Capital can now afford to be more independent, more arrogant towards his "brother," labor.

It is being reported and substantiated by events that the capitalists aim to reassert their powers as bosses; to run their businesses as they see fit, without union interference. As Newsweek put it on Nov. 2, 1959: "if steel management could make its case, it might well set off a revolution in U.S. industry — impelling management everywhere to reassert the rights and prerogatives eroded away in a quarter century of labor negotiations." In other words, if the steel capitalists lick the workers, other industrialists will be encouraged to do the same and strip labor of the "gains" it achieved during the past 25 years.

They, the capitalists, are working as one toward that goal. The government, THEIR government, is supporting them, first, with a Taft-Hartley Act, lately with a Landrum-Griffin law; and when

Congress reconvenes in January, other measures are being readied, such as bringing the union under the anti-trust law, to hand-cuff labor.

Labor, too, is more united. The steel workers' fight is being recognized as a battle for all labor. However, the workers are economically weaker, a dependent class under this setup, politically blind to the realities that the government in Washington belongs to the upper class, plus traditionally loyal to the setup that keeps labor the "underdog" and the government the "watchdog" over labor — for the benefit of the capitalist class. Is it any wonder that labor stands befuddled? And that labor learns thru hard knocks?

One thing that is clear to labor and has served to unite the workers is the concerted attack by capital for a change in the work rules. While the capitalist propaganda machine harps on "featherbedding," the core of that controversy between capital and labor is age-old, over speed-up, work load, size of work crews and such. With automation rushing into the picture, the work rules controversy becomes increasingly important. How many jobs will be lost if U.S. Steel has a free hand to establish work rules without the consent of the union? One capitalist newspaper estimates a fifth, 100,000 workers out of 500,000 workers will be laid off. Should industry generally win that issue, how many millions will lose jobs?

The sharpening of the conflict between capital and labor threatens to go beyond traditional bounds of past compromises and "brotherly" feeling enjoyed by union leadership. George Meany, the president of AFL-CIO, has asked President Eisenhower to call a "summit" conference of leading capitalists and union leaders "to consider and develop guiding lines for just and harmonious labor-management relations." Such a conference cannot arrest the growth of the nation's labor force, due, to natural as well as social causes. Nor can it arrest the development of automation, inevitably throwing large numbers of workers out of jobs. The proposed conference cannot alter the condition that promotes and intensifies

(Continued on page 2)

HAND-CUFFING LABOR

(Continued from Page 1)
the struggle between the classes.

Of course, if such a conference is convened, a face-saving formula, a compromise by capital and union leaders may be effected. It is conceivable that union leaders in the name of "patriotism" and strengthening of the nation's defenses against so-called Soviet economic aggression would not contest capital's drive to automate industries, in return for "union security," that is, the so-called union shop and checkoff of union dues, plus a sop to the rank and file—retraining of displaced workers and the establishment of a committee to study the problem.

Such a "settlement" would undoubtedly favor capital, postpone the day of reckoning for union leadership and leave the rank and filers out in the cold, job seekers. The capitalists, and their govern-

ment down in Washington, are conscious of their class needs and interest. They will employ "soft" or hard devices to achieve their ends. The conservative union leadership tradition bound in support of capitalism finds itself unable to grapple with the crisis and unwilling to break with loyalty to that system that breeds such crises.

The plain workers are not the beneficiaries of the exploiting system. They have hungry mouths to feed. Job insecurity and economic want is their lot in life. The class struggle is real to them. They must become CONSCIOUS participants in it, CONSCIOUS of their destined goals to achieve beneficial results. To paraphrase an old saying: Beware of capitalists bearing gifts (laws and such) for the so-called benefit of labor. They may be gilded, but hand-cuffs nevertheless.

L.B.

OVERPOPULATION

The matter of population is important to every society, each coping and disposing of the problem in its own specific way. Procreation and multiplication of humans is a natural, biological process. But mouths must be fed. Food, clothing and shelter are necessary to survival. The degree of success or failure is determined in part by nature, its climate and changes, e.g. fertile lands, areas with ample meat and fish supply, tolerable climate, are a great help. But by far the greater factor is the character of the social organization.

The labor process, the degree of technical organization, the tools that man has acquired and applied in transforming raw nature to his needs, is even more fundamental and deterministic. The difference between primitive and modern societies, the dependence of the former and relative independence of the latter, lies exactly in their difference in technology. Simple implements and limited know-how of nature gives a small yield. Advanced and complex technique, greater understanding of nature's forces produces abundance, even overabundance.

Earlier societies were more subject to famine, drought, disease and climatic catastrophes. Entire population segments were often decimated, in part due to lack of the protection of science, medicine, sanitation, etc., in greater part due to plain hunger. They were economies of scarcity. Their primitive forms of labor seldom produced surpluses of things. It was a veritable struggle for existence.

Modern society, on the other hand, with a high productive power and technique, a great knowledge of science and ways of combatting disease, makes man more independent of nature. This is an economy of plenty, more than enough for everyone. No one actually need be in want for things

today. Theoretically, no one need go hungry. Talk and concern about overpopulation is an anomaly. Yet millions are starving in one part of the world while storage houses are bulging and rotting in another. Moreover even in the advanced nations themselves, the mass of the population leads a needy existence. This is a contradiction that needs an explanation. It is simple to understand the plight of the primitives whose conditions of scarcity prevailed and everyone suffered alike. Modern civilization is different. Scarcity prevails in the midst of overabundance and overproduction. Workers starve, are out of jobs because too much has been produced. The rich gorge themselves while the poor pinch their bellies. The workers, the producers, always suffer from scarcity, the owners, the capitalists, suffer, if we can call it that, from overabundance.

What is the meaning of overpopulation? In relation to what? In relation to the means of subsistence. During the middle of the 19th century, Malthus advanced his theory of overpopulation. He claimed that at the rate population was growing it was outrunning the means of subsistence, or food supply. Population, he contended was increasing geometrically while food increased arithmetically. Consequently there was a natural basis for war, disease and starvation, to eliminate the surplus people.

Adapting this basic standpoint, attributing the blame to NATURE, others have been preaching birth control, justifying war and depressions as a means of curbing population growth. Meanwhile birth control has been practiced with or without official or church sanction. We have had many major wars and depressions in which millions of humans have perished. And yet the general trend is up-

(Continued from page 1)

ward. The plight of overpopulation and its effects is with us. Why? In the first place it is not true that the means of subsistence proceeds in arithmetical ration. What with modern chemistry and production technique productivity has reached unheard of heights. Science is always finding new methods, substitutions and synthetics. The old scares about coal mines running out found its answer in oil. The latter, too, may soon be superseded by atomic energy. What then is the meaning of natural resources drying up when science is constantly one jump ahead of it. The progress of scientific research is unlimited. It is not here where our problem lies. It is in society, in its social relations.

Consider for a moment, two nations with the largest populations in the world, China and India. Both these countries suffered from an alien philosophy backed by military might," and that "weakness in arms invites aggression or subversion or externally manipulated revolution." The latter remark was a barb aimed at Peoples China also who at present has a border quarrel with India. The capitalist press was elated over the "mass turnout" that greeted Eisenhower, the "prince of peace," in New Delhi, India. But it leaked out in the press itself that Nehru's India has over 7 million workers unemployed and 8 million "legal" beggars. That's a total of 15 million paupers. But there must be many more of them than is acknowledged. Even most of those who still work for a living get only a starvation pittance. It wasn't just for the "love of Ike" that many of them lined the streets in greeting; they looked forward to having their empty bellies filled, knowing that the U.S. is overflowing with products, particularly wheat. However, Wall Street's U.S. government does not feed the hungry unless they render unconditional "loyalty" to it. Whether India will agree to that, time will tell.

Eisenhower wound up his tour by visiting Spain and its dictator, General Francisco Franco (the bosom pal of the late fascist dictators, Hitler and Mussolini, who helped him, Franco, to butcher the workers and smash the legal Spanish democratic-bourgeois government of 1936). Speaking of the \$350,000,000 chain of U.S. armed bases in Spain, dictator Franco expressed admiration for "the task" to which the President is "dedicated." With great joy, President Eisenhower embraced dictator Franco twice, and reached the heights of exaggeration and insinuation against the Soviet Union when he declared that neither Spain nor the United States "seeks to exploit other people; neither plots aggression against any neigh-

bor near or far; neither is impelled by an atheistic philosophy to degrade human beings into economic tools of the state."

While in Europe, Eisenhower had a meeting in Paris with the "big four," De Gaulle, Britain's Macmillan, and Adenauer of West Germany. But the old "unity" is lacking. Eisenhower got a cool reception from De Gaulle who refuses to commit the French armed force to the NATO. Most of it is in Algeria fighting the native rebels. Furthermore, De Gaulle prefers French control over the NATO rather than American.

What is splitting the NATO even more is the economic rivalry between the blocs of West European nations, the "six" headed by France allied with West Germany against the "seven" headed by Great Britain. Tariff walls have been erected between these two groups, and also to exclude U.S. products. We see how "free competition" has turned into its opposite: monopolistic, cut-throat competition, the basic cause of modern world wars. Can a "summit" meeting solve this problem? It is not likely.

Need more be said? Yes, for further enlightenment we recommend the reading of the reprint in this issue of that fundamental editorial, "Capitalism's Inherent Crises," written by our own most able Marxist and historian, John Karcher, just before he died two years ago on Jan. 11, 1958. In addition to it being a fitting commemoration, it is essential to our own understanding of the kind of world we live in.

In conclusion we can only emphasize that it is indeed high time that the American workers woke up to their revolutionary historical mission of getting rid of capitalism altogether. The preservation of the human race itself demands that this must be done. Speed the day!

Al Wysocki.

ward. The plight of overpopulation and its effects is with us. Why?

In the first place it is not true that the means of subsistence proceeds in arithmetical ration. What with modern chemistry and production technique productivity has reached unheard of heights. Science is always finding new methods, substitutions and synthetics. The old scares about coal mines running out found its answer in oil. The latter, too, may soon be superseded by atomic energy. What then is the meaning of natural resources drying up when science is constantly one jump ahead of it. The progress of scientific research is unlimited. It is not here where our problem lies. It is in society, in its social relations.

Consider for a moment, two nations with the largest populations in the world, China and India. Both these countries suffered from

overpopulation and its deleterious effect. Indian and the other Asiatic nations still do. What has reversed the situation in China?

Prior to 1949, China was a dependent nation, dominated and split up by several imperialist powers. Its peoples were exploited by foreign capitalists, its economy kept from developing beyond its semi-feudal state. Production was low, living conditions brutal. With the communist revolution in 1949 the foreign and native exploiters were kicked out, landlordism and capitalism abolished. In ten years, China, thru its socialized, non-profit economy has released new social powers which is transforming it from a backyard, vegetating nation of scarcity to a modern leading power. Its agriculture and industry, is growing at a rapid pace. Science is being applied and labor becoming really productive.

(Continued on Page 4)

PROLETARIAN NEWS

A Journal for the Working Class

Devoted to the Education of Workers and
Their Struggle for Power

Published 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

Capitalism's Inherent Crises

It is now quite obvious that capitalism is heading for a serious crisis, or, more accurately, a series of crises. Whether such crises will bring on "the final conflict" we would not make so bold as to predict. However, the workers of the western world, the vast majority in such countries as Britain and America, sooner or later, will be forced to take matters into their own hands, or endure the privation and suffering which capitalism has in store for them.

The vast preparations for "all-out war," with its promise of total destruction, should convey to the consciousness of the vast majority of people that drifting toward "the brink," without an effort to stem the tide which threatens to engulf mankind, is a policy almost equivalent to self-destruction, to collective suicide.

The so-called statesmen of capitalism are certainly aware of the danger, but they are utterly bankrupt when it comes to finding a solution. That is why they alternate between pleading and threatening, while the problem remains and, if anything, becomes more menacing.

The military-minded element in the nation can only yell for more armaments. "It is a sound investment," they say, "because it insures peace." That ancient delusion was trotted out before both World Wars, but to no avail. Armaments never have prevented the coming of war. They may delay it, and, under certain conditions, actually hasten it.

The peace elements within the community, —church leaders, small business people, and such—especially those who feel the pinch of taxation, favor curtailment of armaments, and peace negotiations. However, neither the pacifists nor militarists can prevent a clash of forces, if the economic pressure of business rivalry is strong enough.

Hoping for peace but preparing for war is as old as capitalism. This contradictory position is the outcome of the inherent contradictions within capitalism. International business competition is the cause of modern wars. And, so long as the struggle for the world market, and spheres of economic investment remains, so long will the war danger be with us. Both World Wars were brought on by this capitalist imperialist rivalry. This rivalry is as strong as ever. However, there is a new retarding factor, namely, fear of the workers world, fear of the U.S.S.R. and the nations allied with it. Much of the world has already been lost to capitalism. The fear of losing the rest makes the imperialist shudder and is driving them to desperation.

The burden of armaments, by itself, will not bring capitalism to its knees, but it will be a contributing cause. France, already, is groaning under the load, and Britain is feeling the strain on its economic resources. Their adventure in Egypt, a year ago, cost Britain fully a billion dollars and France approximately half that sum, and the continual strain of the Algerian war has brought French imperialism to the breaking point. At this time (December 15th), the western imperialists are meeting at Paris to try to bolster their broken ranks.

NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) —whose military set-up was organized under

Eisenhower's direction — has, more or less, fallen apart. America, alone, is holding up its end of the load, and hoping that West Germany will be able to take over a larger share of the burden, so as to replace forces withdrawn by France and Britain. Thus, there is a serious crisis in west Europe, within NATO.

Capitalist "unity" cannot free itself from its own imperialist rivalry. The relentless economic war now going on, the battle of competition—which is in full swing within the circle of the "free enterprise" nations themselves—is dividing their ranks. Britain is feeling the weight of West Germany's competitive drive in the world market. Japan is capturing an increasing share of the world's textile trade. Even in shipbuilding — recognized as one of Britain's top industries—Japan took first place in 1956.

In addition to the strenuous struggle amongst the imperialists themselves, the Soviet Union has penetrated, with its modern products, into countries once exclusively supplied by the western imperialists. It has loaned money to certain nations and invested in their economy. It has supplied some of them with considerable quantities of modern armaments. Consequently, America — "the arsenal of democracy" — finds itself confronted competitively by the new democratic arsenal. The Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and other workers' nations, have been supplying countries in the Middle East and in Asia with a wide variety of armaments and industrial equipment. This development also has contributed to the general world crisis now building up to confront the western capitalist imperialists.

There is a limit to the capacity of western capitalism, and to the endurance of its all-too-patient wage-slaves, whose bended backs are now carrying a tremendous burden. "It is the last straw which breaks the camel's back," and the western working class camel has about reached the exploitable limit.

A new crisis is building up, with new problems crowding in upon top of the old ones. Strikes are breaking out in Britain and America and joblessness is on the increase. Inflation has reduced real-wages, whether planned that way or not, and the workers are resentful. The intensity of production, too, is so great that there is demand for fewer hours of toil. Hence, internal economic crises.

In eastern nations — India, Indonesia and others—the political drift is still left-wards. Those nations are transforming their economy, and, in so doing, they are looking less to the west for aid and more to Peoples China and the Soviet Union, and the countries of eastern Europe. Some of them have taken advantage of the competition between the two blocks of nations, and have taken assistance from both.

"Competitive coexistence" is not exactly new. It long has prevailed among the capitalist nations themselves. However, it now has a new implication, namely a competitive struggle between the allied working class nations, with their non-profit economy at home, and the capitalist nations with their profit motive economy.

The Soviet Union, Peoples' China and other working class nations have definitely become a force in the world market. Of course they also are a part of that market. Not only do they do business with each other, but their products now penetrate into those sections of the world market which the western imperialists have regarded as their exclusive field.

This competition, however, works both ways. West Germany, for instance, is taking an increasing share of business with Peoples' China, and other countries allied with the Soviet Union. Britain, Japan and other capitalist nations also operate within the economic sphere of the workers' nations.

As commodities exchange at their value, this international trade is to their mutual advantage, and that will prevail so long as business in general expands. If the world market shrinks, or the volume of products increases beyond its capacity to absorb them, the competitive struggle will become fierce, and, as the world market has its limitations, the crisis of overproduction will ultimately manifest itself.

The new economic system, where a non-productive exploiting class no longer exists, is certain to out-compete the capitalist nations, where a large portion of the produced wealth is appropriated by the ruling class. A terrific crisis could arise out of just that sort of situation. This is not dissociated from the armaments struggle. They go together.

While competitive armaments, and the war danger, may be the over-shadowing issue in the present crisis, its economic roots lie in the world battle for business, plus the now conscious conflict between the two economic systems, the profit and non-profit economy.

If the classless economy forces capitalism to cut prices to the bone, and taxation for armaments increases, the profiteers, in their desperation, may throw discretion to the wind and let loose an atomic war of destruction.

As the capitalist world shrinks, and the workers world expands, a stage will ultimately be reached where the balance of power will pass to the new non-profit economy. It is at this turning point that a life or death crisis would face capitalism. Under such circumstances, will the rich rulers of capitalism submit to historic inevitability, or will they seek to turn back the evolutionary tide?

While the answer to this question lies in the future, it is most unlikely that those rich exploiters, the multi-millionaires, will let this happen without letting loose the "dogs of war."

There is quite a number of rich American parasites, and some in high political places (not to mention those of Britain and other nations), who would sooner see the extermination of the human race than their loss of class status and privileges. They may be few in number, but they are a dangerous minority as they have tremendous power within the capitalist bloc of nations. It would be a wise move on the part of the workers of western capitalism, the immense majority of the population, to take immediate steps to prevent such an outcome.

For a long time, American public opinion has been built up to the effect that the Soviet Union is preparing to strike at America. This is given as a reason for the building of bases all around the U.S.S.R. American journalists are now asking, in view of Russia's known air strength, if it is wise to wait for "a Pearl Harbor?" We are of the opinion that the U.S.S.R. will not provide a "Pearl Harbor" because time is on the side of the new world, and for the old world of capitalism it is running out. It is high time that the American workers organized politically to take the nation into their own hands.

John Keracher

(A reprint from Jan., 1958, issue)

The above is a reprint of the editorial published two years ago. We think it is just as timely today, and a fitting commemoration of its writer, John Keracher, who died in his 78th year on January 11th, 1958.

NOTICE TO OUR READERS

We regret that we had to skip the December issue for lack of funds. However, we are thankful to those readers who responded to our letter of appeal for funds and contributed towards getting out this issue of the Proletarian News.

OVERPOPULATION

(Continued from page 2)

Its standard of living, tho not yet at what is aimed at, is steadily rising. There is no talk of overpopulation or starvation. Everyone is working. There are no reports of any desire to emigrate, except possibly political non-conformists. This phenomenal progress is not due to any natural change. The Chinese are substantially what they were except that there has been a decided SOCIAL change in their mode of living and outlook. Its economy has been revolutionized. The productive powers have been released from the fetters of imperialism which kept it down in colonial chains. From now on China can breathe, work, live and progress. It need have no fear of being overpopulated. In fact, the larger its population, the greater its laboring force, the more its economic output. With more modern means of production there is bound to be more consumption goods or means of subsistence. The latter depends upon the former.

India and other backward countries are still directly and indirect-

ly in the grip of foreign capital. They are still class divided and controled. Their economies cannot lift themselves out of conditions of scarcity, cannot complete the transformation from low production to higher. This can only be accomplished thru a social revolution with the ruling classes, native and foreign, both, eliminated from the picture. Hence overpopulation is their lot for the duration of class existence. It is that even to an extent in advanced capitalist nations.

As Marx says in Capital, Vol. I, pp. 692-693: "The laboring population therefore produces, along with accumulation of capital produced by it, the means by which itself is made relatively superfluous, is turned into a relative surplus population; and it does this to an always increasing extent. This is a law of population peculiar to the capitalist mode of production; and in fact every special historic mode of production has its own special laws of population, historically valid within its

limits alone. An abstract law of population exists for plants and animals only, and only insofar as man has not interfered with them."

This surplus population, or industrial reserve army, as Marx calls it, is both the cause and effect of capitalist accumulation. Capital needs to have a surplus labor force for new industry opening up. It also begets it, creates such thru its processes of mechanization and especially during periods of economic depressions. Hence capitalism is never free from surplus population. There is always a standing army of unemployed even in periods of prosperity. Naturally, the nations hardest hit are the backward ones, in Asia and Africa.

How does it affect the advanced countries, the U.S. for instance? President Eisenhower, when approached about supplying U.S. aid and information on birth control to backward countries, stated, in effect, that it is a private matter. Notwithstanding his stand, which could have been taken with an eye to pacify the Catholic Church, birth control and any other aid is far more than a private matter.

The U.S. is involved in all areas of the world. Anything of a social nature, and certainly the existence of population is that, affects them and every nation.

Backward peoples these days no longer accept their lot and die quietly. Those nations are going thru a period of revolt. They want to improve their lot, raise their living standards, not only to survive but prosper. They see others around them, like Russia, China, who are blazing the trail. It is natural to assume that in order to ameliorate their condition they will choose the path that is proving itself. The enlightened element among the capitalists no doubt recognize this danger and will exert some sort of pressure to relieve the situation. But there are limits beyond which capital cannot go in eliminating a condition that is much their own making.

Both the problem and the concern over it is bound to be with us for as long as capitalism prevails. Its solution as well as other major social ills will come only with the abolition of class rule. Socialism provides the answer.

R. Daniels.

A LOOK AROUND

OTHER SIDE OF THE MOUNTAIN: Stories filtering back from the "top of the world" tell us of Tibetan refugees crowding into neighboring countries looking strange in appearance and confused in mind.

They are generally herded into a place called Misamari, India, where a large refugee camp has been set up to accommodate the situation. Although the camp is reported to treat them well, the Tibetans find it hard to get used to the hot dry climate of the plains—to say nothing of the lack of activity or purpose. This drives them to complete boredom. As a result they eagerly accept offers of jobs in mountain areas when extended to them.

In one case about 4,000 Tibetans have been transplanted into Sik-

kim (a neighbor to Tibet) for the purpose of building roads. For this they are paid the grand sum of 2 rupees a day (roughly 42 cents) from the Indian Government. The women do not fare so well; they receive only 1½ rupees for their efforts.

According to A. T. Steele, in an article to the Detroit News, the Tibetans are very happy building roads all day—even the hundreds of Buddhists monks who have never done a day's labor in their lives are "cheerfully hauling dirt, carrying rocks and wielding pick and shovel."

We suspect, however, that Tibetan refugees are not unlike their own kind the world over. The big disillusionment follows close on the heels of their retreat to the "promised land." In the case of

the Tibetans we are reminded of the old nursery rhyme which goes something like this:

The bear went over the mountain,
The bear went over the mountain
to see what he could see,
And what do you think he saw,
And what do you think he saw?
He saw the other side of the
mountain,
And that was all he saw.

BACKFIRE: Once in a while a situation comes to the surface just long enough for the international character of capitalism to be plainly seen. In this particular case it concerns Canadian oil interests and their relationship with U.S. private capital.

About two years ago the Royal Commission on Energy began a study which led them to dig up the fact that Canadian oil wells were producing at only 47 percent of capacity. As a result of the study, Canadian oil companies, almost all of which are U.S. and European controlled, are being asked to find markets for additional Canadian oil output. This decision was based on the fact that Canada is now spending \$300,000,000 annually for the importation of foreign oil while its own domestic wells are operating at less than half capacity.

Although it is true that expanding Canadian economy can absorb some increased production it is felt the bulk of increased output will have to replace present imports from the U.S. or go into the world market competitively. Since U.S. oil production is running about 70% of capacity it is feared there would be some "objections" from domestic producers if Canadian imports to the U.S. should rise. (It's a little like being in

competition with yourself). The other problem arises when suggestions are made to cut other imports to the U.S. market in order to make room for Canadian oil. We can imagine the howls of Venezuela, for example, and the other American controlled wells throughout the world.

At any rate, the ultimatum from the Canadian government to produce more crude oil for domestic requirements and increase export volumes seems to indicate the game is up for those foreign investors in Canadian oil who hoped by controlling the oil companies they could keep domestic production down and their own more lucrative imports up. But like the man says: you can't win them all!

THE AUTOMATED CONSUMER: Consume, consume, consume, or our economy will surely fail . . . that is the cry of the marketing men as they beat their drums up and down the land shouting, singing, even pleading with the great buying public to consume the gross national output. If we do not, surpluses will arise and we will all be out of jobs because of an oversupply of "just about everything."

And so we are persuaded and those of us who can afford to (and many who can't) roll up our sleeves and start eating away at the vast productive process (a good 40% to 50% of which is unnecessary to our well-being) in obedient reply to the persuasive drone of the ad-makers whether we want to or not.

In this way, we are told, our wonderful capitalist system will be saved for another year, or maybe a month . . . well at least another day!
L.D.

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.....