

# PROLETARIAN

# NEWS



OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE PROLETARIAN PARTY OF AMERICA 1545 LARRABEE ST. CHICAGO, ILL.

Vol. XIV, No. 2—Whole No. 143

CHICAGO, FEBRUARY, 1945

483

Price 5c a Copy

## Organized Labor and Post-War Planning

By Christ Jelset

The twelve to fourteen million workers, organized in the various labor unions of the nation, take no back seat when it comes to a consideration of post-war problems. Government agencies have been put to work gathering data and submit recommendations. Farm organizations are making proposals on how to keep agriculture, and with it the nation, on a healthy economic footing after the war. Business groups are surveying the field and submitting plans. Individual business firms are going ahead with their own post-war plans. Organized labor, through its officials and its periodicals, is outdoing all other economic groups in portraying the severity of the problem, making recommendations on how to meet them, and warning of the consequences if the job is not done right.

Needless to say, these different economic groups are not in agreement either on the severity of the problems or on the methods of meeting them. The government, with its sworn duty to protect all groups, will find it difficult to launch any program which would prove satisfactory to all. Business, particularly big business, with its economic strength growing from war profits, feels capable of handling post-war problems best if left alone. Labor, on the other hand, feeling its dependence upon jobs, insists that all groups must cooperate to avoid disaster. Labor feels sure that business in its selfish search for cheap production and a cash market will not begin to meet the problem.

During the fall of 1944 when the Allied armies were marching through France, and the fall of Germany began to look rather close, post-war planning started to take root. In late September the "Life" magazine came out with an editorial taking a strong stand for the leave-business-alone theory. Such a policy, said "Life," would create a "real boom" which in time would make such problems as balancing the Federal budget and reducing the

public debt "fairly easy." In the October issue of the American Federationist (official organ of A. F. of L.), one Boris Shiskin comes back at "Life" and proclaims that such a boom, even if it should get under way, would be followed by "the biggest and most devastating crash anyone has ever conceived."

Mr. Shiskin digs into facts and figures and brings out a picture of the job situation today. He tells of the number of jobs, of the jobs in the war industries, of how the products are being paid for. He gives figures on workers' income today, the prob-

(Continued on page 2)

## War and the Workers

The present global conflict known as World War No. 2 is now in its sixth year and no one knows how soon it will be over. Although it is wider in scope, involving more nations, nevertheless already at this stage it is revealing certain aspects and producing incidents similar to World War No. 1 (1914-18). Take, for example, the social turmoil manifesting itself in the "liberated nations." The capitalist and "liberal" press has devoted many pages in "explaining" the war and this social turmoil but has only tended to make confusion worse confounded. Not enlightening but deceiving the masses is the policy of the capitalist journals.

Lenin, one of the great Soviet leaders, rendered the masses a

great service by exposing the imperialist nature of World War No. 1, in more than one of his writings and lectures on the subject. In May, 1917, he delivered a lecture to the Russian workers which is now published in a pamphlet entitled "War and the Workers." In it he points out that alongside of the imperialistic conflict there is being waged a class war and that only those who have Marxian understanding can give a correct explanation of these conflicts.

He poses the question of what is the attitude of the Marxists in relation to war. He answers that Marxists are not absolutely opposed to all wars because they realize that some wars are progressive and some are reactionary, i. e., imperialistic. As an example of a progressive war he cites that of the French revolution of 1789 wherein a new social order, that of capitalism, waged a successful struggle against the old social order of feudalism.

He points out that people were apt to forget the fundamental question of the class character of the war (of 1914-18); why the war broke out; the classes that were waging it; the historical and historico-economic conditions that gave rise to it. In other words, classes were involved in all wars, even in the imperialist conflict of 1914-18. This is what he meant that by understanding

(Continued on page 2)

## International Notes

### Liberation of Poland

The Red Army, driving with blitzkrieg speed, in its great winter offensive has liberated many thousands square miles of territory and millions of Polish people from Nazi subjection. A Polish army of over 300,000 troops is co-operating with the Red Army in the struggle. The Nazi war machine is being shaken to its very roots. As Polish territory is liberated the Provisional Government of Poland takes over civil affairs and the innumerable problems of rehabilitation. Many more landed estates will now be available for distribution to the peasants and agricultural workers. The London Poles, still recognized by Britain and the U.S.A. as the government of Poland, have referred to the liberation of Polish territory as "conquest by the Red Army."

As areas are wrested from the Nazis, the Polish people along with Red Army engineers and railway workers immediately set to work repairing highways, railroads and bridges. Mills and mines also are set in motion as quickly as possible. Where the owners have fled, the workers take over management under government supervision. Train-

loads of equipment, material and supplies from the Soviet Union move up behind the Red Army. Shipments of food are sent to areas stripped by the Nazis. A picture in a recent Information Bulletin printed by the Soviet Embassy shows a trainload of Soviet flour on a siding in Praga, eastern suburb of Warsaw. This gives the lie to some stories that are being circulated.

In contrast to certain other governments, the Provisional Government of Poland is not afraid of their partisans. The Polish partisans are treated as heroes, not as criminals. They are not ordered to disarm. Quite the contrary they are re-equipped and become part of the regular army. That army now claims to have more tanks, guns and planes than did Poland of 1939.

Poland, lying on the direct line of march of the Red Army on its way to Berlin, stands to have her railroads, highways, bridges and much of her industry put in order almost overnight. Essentially, this is not a charitable undertaking of the Soviet government. In the main, it is part of the tremendous task of destroying the military might of Nazi Germany.

(Continued on page 2)

## IN THIS ISSUE

### ORGANIZED LABOR AND POST-WAR PLANNING

By Christ Jelset

### WAR AND THE WORKERS

By Al Wysocki

### INTERNATIONAL NOTES

By Oliver Ritchie

### HOME SCENE

By L. B.

### POWER POLITICS AND THE WAR

### WAGES AND THE WORKING DAY

(Editorial)

By John Keracher

## WAR AND THE WORKERS

(Continued from page 1)

the class character of the war, workers will be better able to understand in whose interest the war is being fought, i. e., which of the two classes, the exploiter or the exploited, have most to gain or lose.

Lenin states outright that the object of the Marxists is "to achieve the socialist system of society, which by abolishing the division of mankind into classes, by abolishing all exploitation of man by man, and of one nation by other nations, will inevitably abolish all possibility of war. In the war for this socialist system of society, however, we will inevitably meet a situation in which the class struggle in each nation may collide with a war, caused by this very class struggle, between different nations."

We see now more than ever how Lenin's words have been borne out, in view of what is now happening in such "liberated" nations as Greece, Belgium, France, etc. There the class struggle is definitely developing into a revolutionary struggle. British soldiers posing as liberators have been machine-gunning those whom they pretended they would liberate (in Greece). Greek workers are rebelling against their "liberators." British policy has a two-fold character, that of preserving the British empire and also that of preventing the spread of communism. The Greek masses have as yet not attempted to establish the socialist system of society, but they are moving too far to the left for the comfort of the British ruling class. Hence arises the necessity on the part of Great Britain to nip that "revolt" in the bud. There therefore arises the possibility, and not so remote, that the character of World War No. 2 will change from an imperialist war into a civil war.

In speaking of the First World War, Lenin remarks that many misinformed people believed that wars are simply a struggle between aggressors and non-aggressors, "as much as to say: People quarreled and then made up." Such explanations of war are a result of ignorance and prejudice, he points out, and warned the Russian workers against the danger inherent in such "explanations."

Quoting one of the most celebrated writers on the philosophy and history of war, viz., Clausewitz, who stated that: "War is a continuation of politics by other means," Lenin goes into a keen analysis of what he meant. Speaking of the French revolution of the 18th century Lenin pointed out that it was a continuation of the politics of the revolutionary class in France and that arrayed against the French, immediately after the revolution, were most all the counter-revolu-

tionary monarchies of Europe. The French revolutionary politics shook autocratic monarchistic semi-feudal Europe to its very foundations.

France, however, during the intervening period of over a hundred and twenty-five years, has been transformed into an imperialist nation, just as imperialistic as England, Germany and America. In spite of this change the capitalist newspapers are still trying to depict the World War of 1914-18 as a continuation of the wars of the Great French Revolution of 1792, Lenin explains, and even deceive the French masses by using some of the slogans of that period. What would Lenin have said were he living today! The French ruling class is still up to its old tricks of deception, ably, assisted of course, by its allies, England and America, who are representing World War No. 2 as "the war for liberation."

Here is how Lenin analyzed World War No. 1: "Today, however, we are confronted, first of all, by two groups of capitalist powers. We have before us all the great world capitalist powers—England, France, America, Germany—the politics of which for a number of decades consist-

(Continued on page 3)

## ORGANIZED LABOR AND POST-WAR PLANNING

(Continued from page 1)

able loss of jobs and of income when the war ends in Europe. He looks further, to the time when the war with Japan shall come to a close. He welcomes such an ending, but he warns that "turning back to prewar levels would spell disaster. If we return to the 1939, or prewar, level of production while present prices continue to prevail, we cannot escape unemployment reaching 20,000,000."

His analysis of the situation is so close to fact that it deserves more detailed quoting: The government is spending about \$70 billion a year for the purchase of war goods. It spends about \$20 billion to maintain the armed forces. Ending the war in Europe would curtail government buying by about 60 per cent, from \$70 billion to \$25 billion. Jobs in war industries number about 15,000,000; 9,000,000 of these would be discontinued. The armed forces would be reduced by about 2,000,000. There is at present about 1,000,000 unemployed. Thus to begin with there would be at least 11,000,000 unemployed. He follows a realistic method of reducing this figure. Some are too old and

want to retire, others are women who work only to help the war effort. They will retire also. This will reduce the number seeking jobs to about 9,500,000. Then he looks at reconversion possibilities. A good deal of civilian production has been going on during the war; but he sees an increase. He looks for the possibility of 1,700,000 continuing at their jobs in leather, foods, textiles, etc., the products being sent to the civilian market. He looks to the construction of civilian industry and machinery and finds no great shortages, perhaps about 400,000 jobs. There might be 500,000 jobs added producing for increased inventories. The transportation industries have shortages now but the curtailment of war transportation would make few new jobs available there. Durable consumer goods are in demand but here reconversion would take time, particularly partial reconversion, with the industry continuing reduced production for the war with Japan. With reconversion completed public purchasing power might already have been reduced. All in all he can find no job possibilities for from four to five million workers.

He also looks at what will happen to workers' income. At present the total wage bill is about \$80,000,000,000, a reduction of four to five million jobs would cut that income by about 12 per cent. Then there would be a tendency to cut out overtime and overtime pay. That would reduce total workers' income by another 12 per cent. Finally, there will be "downgrading." Workers in war industry will go back to retail trade, etc., or they will be put on new jobs for which the scale is lower. This will bring another reduction of about 15 per cent. A total reduction of 40 per cent in the wage bill would be a cut from the present \$80 billion to \$48 billion. Such a cut in workers' income would make workers hesitate about spending their war savings so freely. This curtailment in public purchasing power will have its effect upon the market for goods and therefore also upon the possibility of full employment. To this will be added, as soon as possible, the ending of the war with Japan and the prospect of "unemployment reaching 20,000,000."

And what is to be done about it? Mr. Shiskin has no answer. He says it is getting late "but not too late . . . for labor, business and government to agree and to act in concert and with speed to assure to all of us safe conduct through that treacherous no-man's land of industrial transition which lies just ahead."

This coming to agreement with business has long been the policy

(Continued on page 6)

## International Notes

(Continued from page 1)

### Hungary

The Nazis have been driven from most of Hungary and a Provisional Government has been set up in liberated territory. This new government has signed an armistice with the United Nations. The terms are similar to those agreed upon with Finland and Rumania. Hungary is to pay \$300,000,000 in goods as reparations over a period of six years. One-third of this goes to Yugoslavia and the balance to the Soviet Union. Hungary agrees to give up territory seized from her neighbors in recent years. She agrees to root out fascism within the country and to join in the struggle against Nazi Germany. The latter requirement was being fulfilled before the armistice was signed. Many Hungarian units and even entire regiments turned their weapons against the Nazis as the Red Army approached Budapest.

Little news is coming out of Hungary as yet. No doubt a similar process is taking place as in Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. Most of the bankers, the landlords and the big industrialists have fled. Fascists and Nazi collaborators found within the country will be brought to trial. The estates of the landlords will be appropriated for distribution to the peasants. In the industries, where the

former owners are not present, the workers will take over under government supervision. Most of the capitalists who remain in Hungary and out of jail will be the small shopkeepers. They will operate as before, at least for a while.

The Hungarian workers and peasants overthrew their exploiters in 1919 and set up a Soviet state headed by Bela Kun. Armies of intervention, however, crushed the revolution. Hungary soon may have a Soviet government once more. This time there will be no intervention. The friendly Red Army will see to that.

### Greece

Since the signing of an armistice between General Scobie and the ELAS comparative peace has been maintained in Greece. Papandreou and his cabinet have given way to the "Regency" of Archbishop Damaskinos with General Plastiris as Premier. However, there has been little or no change in policy. That the ELAS, military arm of the EAM (National Liberation Front) disarm remains the major demand. The British and their puppet government are in control of the Athens area. The rest of Greece is, evidently, largely controlled by the EAM.

Atrocities stories against the ELAS are being circulated. Sir

(Continued on page 6)

## WAR AND THE WORKERS

(Continued from page 2)

ed of unceasing economic rivalry for world supremacy, to strangle small nationalities, to secure threefold and tenfold profits for bank capital, which has enmeshed the whole world in the chains of its influence. These are the real politics of England and of Germany. I emphasize this. We must never tire of emphasizing this, because if we forget it we shall never understand anything about modern war, and we shall be helplessly in the power of any bourgeois writer who palms off fraudulent phrases." (War and the Workers.)

Particularly interesting and significant is Lenin's account of how Germany developed into a foremost financial and industrial power. True enough that development had for a while been retarded, but, in an effort to catch up, German industry developed at such a rapid pace that it soon became a menacing economic rival to England and France. Furthermore, as a fully developed nation, Germany arrived late on the scene when the world had already been monopolized and divided by such capitalist giants as England, France and America.

Lenin states that: "The old division was based on the fact that for several hundreds of years England had crushed her competitors. Her former competitor was Holland, which had ruled over the whole world; her former competitor was France, who waged a war for supremacy for about a hundred years. By means of prolonged wars England, on the basis of her economic power, of her merchant capital, established her unchallenged rule over the whole world. A new robber appeared. In 1871 a new capitalist power arose, which developed ever so much faster than England. This is a fundamental fact. You will not find a single book on economic history that does not admit this indisputable fact—Germany's more rapid development. This rapid development of German capitalism was the development of a young and strong robber, who came before the league of European powers and said: 'You ruined Holland, you defeated France, you have taken half the world — please give us our share.' What is 'our share'? How can it be determined in the capitalist world, in the world of banks? In that world strength is determined by the number of banks; there, strength is determined in the way it was defined in an organ of the American billionaires with purely American frankness and cynicism. It was put this way: 'In Europe war is going on for world supremacy. For world supremacy two things are needed: dollars and banks. We have the dollars; we will create the banks

and rule the world.' This is what a leading newspaper of the American billionaires said. I must say that this cynical American phrase, uttered by a swell-head and arrogant billionaire, contains a thousand times more truth than the thousands of articles written by bourgeois liars who claim that this war is a war for some sort of national interests, national problems, and other obvious lies of the same sort, which throw all history overboard and take a single example, for instance, the fact that the German robber attacked Belgium."

Lenin further points out that the First World War was a "continuation of the politics of annexation, that is, conquest, capitalist robbery, on both sides, on the part of both groups engaged in the war. Hence it is clear that the question as to which of these two robbers first drew the knife has no significance for us whatever."

In regard to America's role in world "politics" during that conflict, Lenin has this to say: "As regards America's entry into the war I will say the following. It is argued that in America there is democracy, that there is a 'White House' there. I say: slavery was abolished half a century ago. The war over slavery ended in 1865. Since then billionaires have sprung up. They hold the whole of America in their financial grip, are preparing to strangle Mexico, and will inevitably go to war with Japan over the partition of the Pacific."

How prophetic are Lenin's words! Today America is already at war with the young robber in the Orient. For Japan, just as Germany, arrived late on the scene as a fully developed capitalist power. Well may Lenin add that just as in the case of Germany, this robber from the Pacific has also challenged the big robbers and said: Let us have a new division! You want to stick to what you've got? You think you are stronger? Let us match our strength.

And so today—in the "year of our Lord" 1945 the world again is wallowing in another blood-bath far greater in dimensions than the first world war. How would Lenin have characterized this present world conflict? He would, without hesitation, have defined it as another imperialist war, a continuation of the politics of "peaceful" economic rivalry by other means, that is, by forceful, violent methods. In other words, the robbers are trying to despoil each other of their ill-gotten gains, a case of international highjacking or banditry.

Yet the present conflict is different from the first in this respect, namely, that an honest nation, the Soviet Union, is also involved in it. She was attacked

## HOME SCENE

### Dies Resurrected

The 79th Congress opened with a bang. The notorious Committee on Un-American Activities, better known as the Dies Committee, whose term expired with the close of the 78th Congress was set up anew as a permanent standing committee with greater authority and wider range. The new committee of nine, "to stand guard for America," can "sit and act" any time and everywhere, issue subpoenas for persons and things as it sees fit. The field is wide open, anything and everything could be subject for investigation.

Rep. Charles M. LaFollette (R., Ind.) in needling the new committee offered these for investigation: "The stealing of elections, the maintenance of monopolies, the discrimination against economic opportunities of citizens because of race, creed, or color, and the maintenance of the poll-tax are just some of the un-American activities which the supporters of the amendment might first attempt to eliminate through the existing standing committee and legislative practices before starting out on another witch hunt."

The defeat of three of its former stalwarts, Joe Starnes (D., Ala.), John M. Costello (D., Cal.) and Fred E. Busby (R., Ill.) and the withdrawal of Martin Dies from the congressional race, plus the defeat of several arch reactionaries of both major parties at the last elections, were supposed to seal the death of reaction and make way for liberalism

and sanity.

The liberals were sure surprised and shocked. Wasn't the defeat of the Dies gang at the polls indicative of their repudiation? The mandate of the people was overruled. How naive! Capitalist politics are pretty messy and don't always follow the polls, particularly when it concerns labor.

The Dies Committee was set up, ostensibly, to investigate un-American activities. However, one of its pet targets was the New Deal. It was a tool of the anti-New Dealers, Republicans and Democrats alike. It pictured many liberals as "Red" in so far as they were connected with the Roosevelt Administration. It tried to smear the administration with red paint. It hounded and frightened some innocent "souls." It tried to picture the country on the brink of disaster, because of the "radicals." It attributed "plots" and "schemes" to class conscious workers. It saw red in the CIO. In fact, whenever labor stepped forward it saw the machinations of "Reds."

On the other hand, it was full of praise for the "patriotic" organizations, many of whom were subsequently found to be in cahoots with the Nazis and Japan. Dies, himself, spoke on the platform of some of these "outfits."

The new committee, whatever its composition, if not anti-administration, will almost surely be anti-labor. Labor baiting has be-

(Continued on page 7)

by one of the robbers (Germany) and so is fighting not only a war of defense but also to preserve the only socialist system the workers have yet achieved.

The Soviet Union is at present allied with her former enemies, those imperialist nations that did their utmost to destroy the Soviet socialist system by sending into Russia armies of intervention in 1918-20. It is an alliance unique in world history. How long will it last? There are very few who will dare predict that it will be permanent. One glance at the past history of international relations and politics provides us with the answer. The present alliance therefore is only a temporary and an involuntary affair.

Already, and for some time, within both England and America, the capitalist press is full of slanderous attacks against the Soviet Union. Particularly now with the Red Armies getting closer to Berlin, speculation is rife as to what will happen if Germany is overrun by the "red menace." Apprehension is mounting in bourgeois circles as to the fate of the capitalist class in Germany. There is apprehension not only in regard to Germany but also the whole of Europe. An-

other conference of the "big three" is in order. Churchill, the British King's Prime Minister, is getting impatient and has some time ago remarked, "It's time we three met again."

No conference, however, can bring permanent peace to Europe and in fact the whole world, as long as economic rivalry exists. Perhaps many European workers are beginning to perceive this. Perhaps many of them are beginning to realize that the Soviets have got something in their nation that is good, a socialist system. But what place is there for capitalism when the socialist system is established. No place at all unless of course, the European workers have reserved one for it, and that is (to paraphrase Engels) in the Museum of Antiquities by the side of the spinning wheel and the bronze axe.

For imperialism, as Lenin often emphasized, is not only the final stage of capitalism but also "the eve of the proletarian social revolution." Let the ruling classes tremble at a communistic revolution (as Marx stated in 1848), the proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

Al Wysocki.

# PROLETARIAN NEWS

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

Published Monthly by the  
 Proletarian Party of America  
 Subscriptions—12 Issues for 50 Cents  
 Send All Subscriptions, Contributions, Etc., to  
**PROLETARIAN NEWS**  
 1545 N. Larrabee St., Chicago, Ill.

## POWER POLITICS AND THE WAR

The term "power politics" has been much in vogue of late and it carries the implication, especially on the part of liberals and some "socialist" writers, that it is inherently wrong, a wicked business. Like most other matters which are approached abstractly, such as the terms "good" or "bad," without asking the question: "good or bad for what?" much confusion inevitably results.

"Power politics" are good for the powers who can use them effectively, and bad for those whom they are used against. The great powers of the earth, such as Britain, America and the Soviet Union, use "power politics," and so would all small "democratic" nations if they had sufficient strength.

Internationally, the great nations cannot function otherwise than through "power politics." They do not use altruistic methods. They cannot afford to. They would be stupid if they tried. There is much altruism expressed, of course, but that is a cloak. It is propaganda. It helps to soothe the discontented masses, and deceive them into giving their support to men and measures that are not beneficial. In fact, most often, really injurious.

The spokesmen of great nations may talk, for instance, about "good neighbor" policies, and about "democracy and fair play" between nations, but each nation is trying to convince all the others that they would do well to behave that way, but they all, individually, practice "power politics." In other words those who have power make use of it.

In the world, today, we see a new type of "power politics," because it is only recently that the Soviet Union has been able to play that role, but for entirely different purposes than that of the other great powers. A vast army, or navy, or both are essential to the application of "power politics." The small nations of the earth, like Portugal, Finland, Belgium, or certain south and central American republics, may have the same desires, but not the necessary forces to enter the circle of "power politics." That is the main reason why they usually remain peaceful, "neutral" nations.

The British are among the oldest power politicians in the modern world, and they know all the moves on the board. They are imperialist, and have been for a long time, but as modern finance-capitalist imperialists they are nowise different from the American, Japanese, Germans or other highly developed industrial and financial powers. Their interest in world affairs cannot work by any other method than that of "power politics." To rave and denounce it and expect those great powers to behave otherwise does not make sense. To understand "power politics" is much more important than mere denunciation.

The competition of the great nations in the world market, the struggles for control of sea lanes, world trade and sources of raw materials, spheres of investment, etc., forces even the strongest nations to deliberately enter into alliances and agreements which are continually being renewed and amended, or abandoned, according to prevailing circum-

stances. - The purpose of this phase of "power politics" is to checkmate other rival groups of powers and hold the upper hand over business competitors.

Even the most powerful nations do not stand alone. It is too risky. They offer concessions of some sort to other nations for their support, sometimes naval and military protection, to keep those nations from being dominated by rival imperialists. The stronger nations force themselves upon the smaller, usually in the guise of friendship "good neighbor," etc.

The relationship of the powerful U. S. A. to the nations of south or central America is an example of the application of this method. For instance, what becomes of the "rights of small nations" to the south when naval vessels, in such numbers and of such size as to be able to practically blast such nations out of existence, sail up and down their coast lines at will? What chance has a small nation to resist a territorial or economic demand when confronted with such power. Survival is only possible by submission to such demands?

When the naval craft of Britain, America, France or Japan could sail at will up the Yangtze River, what became of the sovereignty of China? If the naval vessels of other powers could sail up the Mississippi or Hudson uninvited, what would American independence and sovereignty amount to?

"Power politics" is not a cause but an effect of modern giant capitalist nations. That they enter into agreements with each other and frequently give and take of what does not belong to them, is but part of the international capitalist way of life. Great Britain and France agreeing with Nazi Germany that it could take possession of Czechoslovakia, in Chamberlain's time, was a typical example of applied "power politics," or America's landing of armed forces in Central American countries, such as Nicaragua, and the dictating of political settlements for such small and helpless nations.

In the present great conflict "power politics" have been used more than ever. Despite all idealistic phrases, and nice talk about Atlantic Charters with "four freedoms" and such, it is just the same old method. It is protective coloring, which goes with the dividing of the spoils, or dividing of the world into spheres of influence in which spoils can later be collected, whether it is on battleships in the Atlantic, or at remote places such as Cairo or Teheran or Moscow. These are not meetings of people who are seeking to give something away, but just the reverse, people who are seeking to gain, to appropriate, and who, however unwilling, have to concede certain things to their rivals in return for a hands-off policy in some other direction.

In the present mad scramble the old feudal precept holds good: "Sufficeth it the simple plan. Let him take who has the power and let him hold who can." The Axis powers, had they been victorious, would have divided the world among themselves, ruthlessly and thoroughly.

The United Nations, in possession of the best parts of the world, are fighting with all the strength at their command to retain those choice holdings, and of course to add to them, while proclaiming that they don't want a thing, and also to put their rival imperialists in a position where they will not again, for many years to come, be able to challenge the world supremacy of the "democracies."

The Soviet Union is also engaged in "power politics," and if it were not, it would be lacking in intelligence. To liberals (petty bour-

geois idealists) this policy is wicked, immoral, etc. The lack of understanding of class society and the nature of finance-imperialism is the cause of their indiscriminate lumping together of the U. S. S. R. and the other great nations in the field of "power politics."

Britain and America, as the world's greatest finance-capitalist powers, are not only fighting to save and to strengthen their empires, but to strengthen, if possible, the economic basis upon which capitalism rests. The Soviet Union, whose aim is not only to clear its territory of the invading Nazi capitalism, but to strengthen the collectivist economic basis upon which the U. S. S. R. rests, and in addition to shatter and destroy the foundation upon which Nazi capitalism stands.

Its capitalist associates know this very well, but if it is allowable that they carry on toward their objectives, then it is allowable that the U. S. S. R. seeks its goal also. This is not because Britain and American finance imperialists approve of Soviet aims, but because historic circumstances forced them into alliance with the very negation of their own social system. The capitalist class holds as sacred the system that yields to them their vast wealth through the exploitation of labor. The Soviet system is the implacable enemy of the profit system, with it the exploitation of labor is impermissible.

The meetings of the top leaders of the United Nations cannot disregard those conflicting objectives, neither can they dictate to the opposing economic systems that their objectives be abandoned. Confronted with such powerful enemies, they had to agree to fight side by side regardless of their ultimate conflicting objectives.

Lend-lease to the U. S. S. R., for instance, was not for love, or the saving of the Soviet system, but for fear of a Nazi triumph and its consequences. Loyalty to the United Nations agreements on the part of the U. S. S. R. is not for love of British and American capitalism, but for fear of Nazi militarism, and the possibility of a compromise with German finance-capitalism, as certain individuals in Britain and America would like.

The destruction of Germany as a military power will be more beneficial to the Soviet Union than to either Britain or America. It will leave the U. S. S. R. as the strongest land power in Europe. British and American finance-capitalists are happy about the defeat of their powerful rival, Nazi finance-capitalism, but they don't relish the tremendous Soviet ascendancy and its ultimate consequences.

All of eastern Europe may go Soviet, or some of those nations, even if they remain upon a class basis, will be forced to look to the U. S. S. R. and concede much in that direction. From a working class point of view, what is wrong with that? Only an ignorant worker, or a sentimental liberal, could object to such a development.

That the Soviet administrators have had to concede much to their co-partners in this war, and involuntarily strengthen British and American imperialism, must be recognized. But it is equally true that the British and American capitalist imperialists had to concede much to proletarian "power politics," and an all-around strengthening of the Soviet power.

Capitalism, in its irreconcilable and unavoidable world conflict, and its internal divisions, has weakened its whole structure and aided, however unwillingly, the proletarian world revolution.

Total war has brought what amounts to total conscription of all forces. It has thrown all the resources of the nations into the melt-

# Wages and the Working Day

The age-old question as to whether work is a "blessing" or a "curse" is still unsettled. That it is a necessity is recognized. Man, as such, has always worked. His forms of labor, however, have been exceedingly varied. Their substance has been summed up in the term "the struggle for existence." Without work, man would have perished from the face of the earth. Despite these simple facts many people have spent their lives without labor of any sort. This was possible only because others, willingly or unwillingly, worked for them.

When social progress had reached the stage where it was possible for people to produce more than was necessary to sustain them, this development was soon taken advantage of, and slavery made its appearance in the world. Of course there were countless ages in which slavery was not possible, when all had to work or perish. Slavery could not exist because productivity was too low.

## Slavery — A Progressive Development

No intelligent person would like to see the return of chattel slavery, when men took possession of their fellows and imposed upon them the status of property, forced them to work and enriched themselves from the labor of their victims. Yet, slavery was progressive, in fact one of the most progressive developments of all time. Without it, civilization would have been impossible.

Society as a whole benefited from slavery. It made a leisure class possible, with time for culture and achievements. It was pleasant for the ruling class. They enjoyed life more than it ever had been enjoyed before. They really lived. With the slaves, it was quite a different story. Most of them were little more than beasts of burden, and the older and wealthier the slave civilizations became the more ruthless was the treatment meted out to the slaves. Its abuses knew practically no limits.

It was out of this that the thought arose that work was a "curse" imposed upon man by the gods as a punishment. The story

of Adam and Eve, driven from the garden for disobedience, and punished by being forced to work (a pure myth as no single pair of human beings could have survived) could only have arisen in a slave society where labor was a burden, a man-imposed "curse" where, to use Robert Burns' phrase, it was "man's inhumanity to man." To blame it on the gods was a good alibi for the ruling classes, the slave owners who themselves succeeded very well in escaping the "curse."

## The Day's Work

There has always been a limit to the **working day**, even in slave society. This limit was nature-imposed. Human beings can do just so much, then they must eat, rest and sleep, if their life of labor is to continue. Of course there have been times when slaves were worked to death, but that was not general. Killing "the goose that lays the golden eggs" could not be the rule, but the exception. Live slaves were profitable, dead ones produced no wealth. Only where slaves were very plentiful, and exceedingly cheap, were they sometimes worked to death.

A sick slave, or a half-starved one, could not produce much. For men to labor they must be fed and otherwise cared for. Therefore, the day's work, through all forms of human slavery, all forms of exploitation, divided itself "naturally" into the **necessary labor time**, and the **surplus labor time**. That division is still with us. The former, the necessary labor time, has, through improved processes of production, been greatly shortened, and the latter, surplus labor time, as a consequence, relatively lengthened.

In any system of exploitation the first consideration must of necessity be the feeding and housing of the exploited. It is just the same as in the case of an intelligent farmer who sees to it that his horses are well fed and comfortably stabled if he is to get the best results from their labors. In some of the western states they have a saying: "Feed your horse and he will carry you further, but ride him, cowboy, ride him." Feeding and caring

for the workers was an unavoidable expense even under slavery. Many people are inclined to think that the slave received nothing for his labor, that he had to give his entire working time without remuneration. That is not true. As the slaves had to eat, rest and sleep, a portion of their working day was taken up with producing the equivalent of what their masters could not withhold. Thus, part of the slave's working day, be it short or long, was **necessary** for the maintenance of the slave himself. That is the part which has been called the **necessary labor time**. The hours which the slave worked beyond that period each day has been called the **surplus labor time**.

This division of the working time prevails in all forms of class society, in every form of exploitation of man by man. Under feudalism, the serf was allowed so many days of each year to produce for his own requirements and that of his family. In some cases he worked certain hours of the day, or days of the week, for himself and the other hours, or days, his **surplus labor time**, he produced for his feudal master. In any case, no matter how the working time was divided, part of it was for himself and his dependents, the rest of the time he worked for his master and received for it no equivalent.

## Capitalist Exploitation

Under the present system of production, the division of the **working day** into **necessary** and **surplus** labor time is not so obvious because of the wage system, which tends to obscure it.

Today, the "free" worker receives a wage for his whole day's work. He is not paid for a part of the day but the whole of it. He enters into a contract, or agreement, with the employer and he receives, on an average, the full payment agreed upon. Sometimes he gets even more than has been promised. Other times he may be gouged. But, on the average, wages is the full payment for **labor power**. Yet the capitalist who buys the worker's labor power at its full value makes plenty of profit, and from the only source from which it can possibly arise, the labor of the worker.

## Wages

Just as the average banker

does not understand money, the average wage worker does not understand wages. The bankers may know how to get money, and may know how to keep it, but still they cannot explain its "mystery." The worker may fight like a tiger to get an increase in wages, and he may know how to spend his wages wisely, but the real nature of wages as such he does not comprehend, and may not even suspect.

It is quite impossible to understand the real character of wages without recognizing their connection with the **working day**. The proletarian, the modern wage worker, is a peculiar historical product. He differs from all other workers in history. He is not allowed certain days of the week to work for himself, and certain days to give to his master, as did the feudal serf. In fact, on the average, he owns no tools of production, and no place of his own in which to work. Nor is the proletarian the personal property of a master who has unrestricted control over his life and labor, as was the case with the slave.

The wage worker is in a different position. At the termination of a stipulated time, he carries home his pay envelope, his "take-home wages" (withholding tax, etc., deducted). Daily he has been going to the job we will say, and engaging in production, not for himself of course, but for the buyer of his labor-power, his employer. However, he is not doing that for his health, nor because he likes work or loves his boss. His purpose is to get enough pay to purchase food, shelter and clothing for himself and those depending upon him. In other words, he tries to earn as high a standard of living as possible.

## The Money Wage

The cash which the worker takes home in his pay envelope has been called the **nominal wage**, or wage in name, twenty dollars, forty dollars, or such. Let us call it the **money wage**. But the worker is too sane just to want money to look at. He earns it with the idea of spending it, and on the average he is forced to do so. The cost of living for him and his family compels him to spend his **money wage**

(Continued on page 7)

ing pot of war, and such a war. There is no backing down. Such a course is an impossibility. The contest must run its full course. The temple of capitalism is being shattered from within. Total war will bring the total destruction of capitalism in a number of nations, and the tremendous weakening of others. The "power politics" of capitalism will bring about a vastly weakened capitalist world. Soviet "power politics," that is proletarian power politics, will bring a vastly strengthened workers' world. The only question now is: how far down will capitalism go and how far upwards will go the struggle for the universal triumph of the world's workers? More power to Soviet "power politics."

John Keracher.

## 'NOTHING CAN STOP RED SURGE'

The Moscow Radio has told the Germans that "the Red Army is surging toward Berlin, sweeping away all obstacles in its path." The "red surge" has been plaguing capitalists and capitalist nations ever since 1917, when the workers of Russia first established their Soviet system. Blood was shed to blot out the "red menace" in the first years of the Bolshevik Revolution.

From intervention the capitalists turned to propaganda to stop its spread to new territory. For a long time they almost succeeded. They convinced not only themselves, but also many workers, that Communism was a failure. For a time they were hoping that Ger-

man Nazism would clear the "Scourge of Sovietism" from the face of the earth. They were disappointed again. Capitalist rivalry prevented joint action. The war among the capitalist nations together with Soviet strength brought a new defeat to capitalist desires. Now the forward Surge of the Red Army tells the world not only that the Soviet System will live, but also that it is more than likely to spread.

New slanders, new accusations, will be broadcast that the Soviet Union is adopting imperialistic tactics. Nothing of the kind. Economic chaos in devastated Europe will be the promoter of Sovietism today, as it was in Russia in 1917, and nobody will have the power to stop it.

C. J.

## ORGANIZED LABOR AND POST-WAR PLANNING

(Continued from page 2)

of organized labor. It has never come to fruition. Business does not see the problem the way labor does. Labor looks to shorter hours to create jobs. It looks to higher wages to create purchasing power. The demand for the six-hour day and the five-day week was unanimously adopted by resolution of the 64th convention of the A. F. of L. meeting in New Orleans last November. That convention also proclaimed that labor's purchasing power was \$11 billion short of meeting the supply of the market after the war, and that wage increases would have to take care of this discrepancy.

Organized labor is complaining bitterly that throughout its agreement not to strike during the war, the government agencies have allowed prices to advance much more than wages. Business is just as bitterly complaining that labor has had the better of the deal, that in spite of huge wage increases labor often went on strike in clear violation of its sacred pledge. Labor is much more correct in its contention, but labor seems completely to fail to understand that if it is impossible to hold business to its pledge during a period when the produce moves directly into war consumption at huge profits, it will be even more difficult to hold business to any such pledge when the profits of war production are gone.

Some men in business see, in part at least, the problem ahead. They want the government to lend a helping hand. Some want the government to promote foreign trade, to provide credit facilities for sale of industrial equipment to lesser developed nations. Some want the government to help also on the domestic field. They want a huge road building program, rivers and harbors developments, hydro-electric power, slum-clearing, etc. A section of official Washington voices this demand. Sections of organized labor see in such undertakings a furtherance of labor's cause and give it their hearty support. On the whole the C.I.O. unions stress this part of the program as the most essential, while they also advocate the short hours and higher pay policy. More conservative business feels that for the future, just as much as in the past, business will do best when the whole nation's production is left in its hands. This section of business has a strong voice in the public press. It speaks to small business and warns against the high cost and consequent high taxes of a huge public works program. It speaks against government bureaus with regulation of business and labor alike. It lumps labor and so-called left-

wing government official demands together and warns against their danger. The Wall Street Journal has linked the different demands into a connected program, and Ralph Robey summarizes it under nine points in the Jan. 15th issue of Newsweek. Besides the already mentioned demands for higher pay for workers and a public works program this summary includes a demand for the establishment of a National Production Council which is to be an over-all planning agency with power to control the entire national economy. Under this agency is proposed to be established a sub-council for each industry composed of representatives from labor, management and the government. Production schedules are to be set at levels to provide "full employment." No one could go into business in any particular field unless the council found he was needed. Prices and wages are to be fixed for a year at the time to avoid undue hardships to anyone. If someone should attempt to enter business against the wishes of the council it would be considered "anti-social" and it would be a case for the police.

Mr. Robey thinks the men behind the program know what they want and that they will introduce it piecemeal in Congress in order to secure passage. He thinks it will be introduced under the name of "industrial democracy" or "planned economy." When the full program has been adopted it will be the same, he thinks, as was in effect in Italy, and was known as "Fascism." "And today," he concludes, "in Germany it goes under the name of 'Nazism.'" The program might just as well have been sneered at under the name of "Communism." It is neither one nor the other of these. Nor will it be adopted.

Sections of organized labor might indorse such a program. The whole might of organized labor might be mustered in its support. Sections of the capitalists might give it lip service. Parts of it might be adopted by the government and made part of the national policy. But the main implication, that the vast productivity of labor can be turned to labor's benefit, will fall short of adoption as long as private business or private property is considered entitled to profit on investments. The thing that is most cherished about free enterprise by the capitalists is that it provides them with an income from profits. Profits do not spring from purchasing power created through the payment of wages but through the sale of a surplus, a surplus, by the way, created by the workers over and above

(Continued on page 8)

## INTERNATIONAL NOTES

(Continued from page 2)

Walter Citrine and other British trade union delegates have looked over the field of battle. They have been "horrified" by ELAS atrocities. "Sir Walter saw chains on bodies, manacled together and shot at close quarters. Some were knifed. . . ." How simply terrible! Civilized executioners would be more refined.

Churchill has added another epithet by referring to the EAM movement as Trotskyism. He liked this term better than Greek communism because, he stated, "It has the advantage of being equally hated in Russia." We have some doubts, however, that the EAM movement is "equally hated in Russia." News magazine, Time, January 29, reports that, "The Russian-controlled Sofia radio . . . broadcast an appeal to ELAS to try its hostages as 'war criminals,' enemies of the people of Athens. It also launched a drive for an autonomous Macedonia (which might include Greece's No. 2 port of Salonika), with a capital at Skoplje — which is in Yugoslavia." Other reports indicate that the Bulgars and the Yugoslavs are giving support to the EAM. The Soviet government is not likely to make an issue of British intervention in Greece so long as Nazi Germany remains undefeated.

### UNRRA Difficulties

The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) is having difficulties in arranging distribution of food, clothing and other relief supplies to the ravaged nations of Europe. The Yugoslav government, headed by Marshal Tito, refused to allow UNRRA officials to enter the country. Now arrangements have been made for the United States and Britain, with UNRRA aid, to bring relief supplies and Yugoslav authorities will administer them.

UNRRA officials are reported to be worried because the Soviet Union has made no requests to the organization for aid. It is also reported that, "Soviet Russia still owes \$1,300,000 to the 1944 administrative fund of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. The Russians are holding up payment pending a study 'as to the use of the Russian contribution,' it was learned today." (Chicago Daily News, Jan. 11). The Soviet Union, as one of the invaded countries, was not called upon to contribute to the \$2,500,000,000 operating fund, but paid, during 1944, \$200,000 to the administrative fund.

Poland has received no aid from UNRRA. The Soviet government is charged with being tardy in granting UNRRA requests for passports and transportation facilities. There may be

some truth to this. UNRRA personnel assigned to Poland would, in all likelihood, be emissaries of the London Poles and more interested in trying to repudiate the Soviets and the Polish Provisional Government than in distributing food and clothing to the destitute. Then, too, UNRRA relief would perhaps be merely a drop in the bucket compared to the shipments of supplies going to Poland from the Soviet Union.

UNRRA is supposed to be an international charitable organization. However, nobody now tries to deny that UNRRA's goods and services have a price and that they are being used as a political weapon. This has been most clearly demonstrated in Greece. There, UNRRA supplies and services went to those who submitted to British subjection. UNRRA had nothing to give to the hungry, ragged and sick in areas controlled by the EAM. It is reported that this was a major factor in causing some elements to break away from the EAM movement. However, in others it would doubtless create greater hatred and increased resistance to all exploiters and oppressors.

### "True Democracy"

Crocodile tears, flowing from the Vatican telling of the necessity of ending this "dreadful war," have increased in volume. Pope Pius XII, one of the chief spokesmen for the rich exploiters of the world and ace head fixer, is much alarmed. In his Xmas message, broadcast to the world, he spoke much about "true democracy." He divided society into two elements. Said he, "The people and a shapeless multitude (or as it is called, 'the masses') are two distinct concepts." He warned that, "the masses . . . are the capital enemy of 'true democracy.'" He exclaimed, "What a spectacle is that of a democratic state left to the whims of the masses: (giving) free rein to a man's impulses and appetites . . . respect for tradition . . . disappears." The Pope's democratic state would be a state in which "the people" (as distinct from the masses) would have "the power to command with real and effective authority." It is in line with British and American democracy at work in Italy, Belgium and Greece.

The Pope's Xmas message was an appeal to the exploiters not only to make peace with fascism but to adopt fascist methods in order to subdue "the whims of the masses." He does this under the guise of appealing for "true democracy."

Oliver Ritchie.

Subscribe to  
PROLETARIAN NEWS  
Subscription Rate  
50c for 12 ISSUES

# HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 3)

come the fashion with many congressmen.

## Montgomery Ward Again, or Yet

Sewell Avery, head of the company, continues to tangle with the administration in Washington. A running battle, for two years, has yielded no decision.

Avery charges that the government's actions are unconstitutional and a violation of liberty. The government, through the WLB and Roosevelt, charges that the policies of Avery interfere with the war effort by endangering the continuation of the no-strike pledge, the wartime structure of labor relations and the stabilization program.

While the conflict is on, with or without seizure of the Montgomery Ward's properties by the U. S. Army, profits continue to flow into the coffers of the company. The suggestion to confiscate the profits, during Army management, was coolly received and ignored.

The government's fear of disturbing the wartime labor structure and policies led to the seizures. Sewell Avery, rugged individualist, as he no doubt is, will likely be obliged to submit. The old school of laissez-faire capitalism dies hard, but die it does.

## Two to One

The Roosevelt Administration has often been charged with being partial to labor, and is even referred to at times as a labor government.

The WLB records belie the charge with the disclosure that: "In deciding some 12,000 disputes, the public members of the Board voted more often with industry members than they did with labor members." (PM, Jan. 4, 1945.)

Any labor board composed by equal representation of capital, labor and the "public," means 2 to 1 in favor of capital. Who is this "impartial" member of the public? He is generally a representative of capital, or at least attached to capital in thought or deed, or he just wouldn't get on the Board. Two strikes before labor swings, then one whiff and he is counted out.

## MOR(e)ALE

"—Americans spent more than \$7,000,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1944—a new record.

"In actual quantity, they drank:

"1. More liquor than in 1943, but not as much as in 1942.

"2. More beer than in any previous year.

"3. Slightly less wine than in 1943.

"Those estimates were made by the Commerce Department and announced today.

"The \$7,000,000,000 is roughly \$1,000,000,000 greater than the amount spent in 1943, and nearly \$2,000,000,000 above

1942, when \$5,200,000,000 was laid down for drinks." (Boston Globe, Jan. 17, 1945.)

It is gratifying to learn that the New Deal wasn't a complete failure. It is stimulating to feel that at last our "spiritual needs" are in good hands.

## Manpower Muddle

The labor power, now more popularly known as the "manpower problem," has permanently plagued capital. Surplus of labor during peace and shortages during wars, it is always sticking out like a "sore thumb." The turmoil now going on over that issue only emphasizes the muddle.

A year ago, on Jan. 10, 1944, President Roosevelt proposed a universal service act, hinged with qualifications. A "realistic tax law," renegotiation of war contracts, a cost-of-food law and a stabilization statute, were also proposed. These proposals were conveniently shelved by both the President and Congress, for 1944 was an election year.

Now that the votes have been counted, it is safe to trot out a national service act. This time without the "hinges," a straight compulsory labor draft. While nothing on that score has been passed to this writing (Jan. 17) it is almost certain that something of that nature, affecting some portion of the workers, will be enacted before long.

In the meantime anti-labor spokesmen, in and out of Congress, are having "their innings."

William M. Colmer (D., Miss.) introduced a bill in the House that would set up "a third branch of the Service—a supply force." This bill, if passed, would induct into the Army, 4Fs, strikers, strike agitators and "willful absentees" from jobs. These would be made available for war plants, private contractors or any job deemed necessary to the war effort at Army pay and conditions. Another bill, proposed by Sam M. Russell (D., Tex.) would extend the standard work week from 40 to 48 hours, cutting down overtime wages now paid for by industry.

The Administration is finding the problem riddled with perplexities and unsolvable contradictions.

To limit compulsion to 4Fs raises the cry of discrimination. Many of that classification are denied employment as poor insurance risks.

To make the act of compulsion universal for men between 18-45 ushers in problems of application. A skilled man from the east coast laid off on account of cutbacks, is needed on the west coast. Who will pay transportation costs for him and his family? How long will he be needed in the new location? How about transportation back to the east coast when the need has been fulfilled? Is

he to be shifted to a lower paying job? These and many other questions arise for answers.

Some opponents of the national labor draft contend there isn't any shortage but an inefficient distribution of labor. They point to discrimination against negroes, women and 4Fs. Lack of housing facilities, sometimes necessitating driving as much as 50 or more miles to the job, low pay rates, bad management, workers sent home for lack of material.

Planlessness is inherent in the system of private enterprise. Each industrialist makes plans for his own factory. "Each for himself, the devil with the others." How to keep the devils from one another's throat and then how to synchronize the devils with the "evil" plans of government, a devil of a time is had in the fleecing of labor.

## The Race Problem

Quite an embarrassing situation is created by the increasing growth of race intolerance. Incidents and riots occur at this time of war emergency when urgent appeals are constantly broadcast for more and greater cooperation behind the war effort. In the midst of a supposed all-out fight against the evil forces of Nazi hate and intolerance, the appeal is contradicted and to an extent nullified by internal dissension. This condition is causing no little alarm to serious observers who sense danger. For

instance, the Christian Science Monitor editorially observes: "The respectable and sober voices which continue to warn of post-war 'hate movements' should bring home to every American the bald fact that while the nation is waging a major war against the fires of intolerance elsewhere there are glowing embers within its own borders which are a long way from being stamped out." (Jan. 5, 1945.)

Referring back to "a wave of intolerance" that "swept over America after the last war" it continues "there is every reason to guard against its recurrence, not because history repeats itself automatically, but because the same forces are at work and on an even larger scale."

Prying into the cause of this race tension it says: "But a great war causes tremendous social dislocations: millions drawn from their homes and accustomed work into the armed forces; more millions in wartime jobs in strange cities and towns. When hostilities cease there will be an equally great moving and milling about as the nation readjusts to peaceful pursuits."

"Even with 'normal' prosperity there will be competition for the old jobs and preferred jobs, and the ones who win out may often be of a color, culture, or church which compounds the loser's disappointment. If much unemploy-

(Continued on page 8)

# Wages and the Working Day

(Continued from page 5)  
on the necessities of life, plus some small luxuries.

## The Real Wage

What the modern worker, therefore, toils for is not money, but what the money will buy. That has been called the **real wage**. Without consideration of the cost of necessities, wages as such cannot be properly understood. A high **money wage** which would purchase but little might be a very low **real wage**. If a worker receives, say, 20 per cent increase in his **money wage**, and the "cost of living" had in the meantime risen 30 per cent, his **real wage** would actually have fallen. His standard of living would be lowered.

The battle to maintain, or increase, **real wages**, to maintain living standards (the main function of a labor union) is a constant and terrific struggle for the workers. It is a battle which the workers must carry on, no matter how well organized or how "great" their temporary gains may be. This necessary and unavoidable fight in the long run leaves labor at a disadvantage, because of the nature of the present social setup. Under the system of private enterprise, capitalism, the workers as a class cannot rise, but only sink, economically. The capitalist system works that way and it will not work other-

wise. Competition for jobs, especially over a long period, reduces the workers to the starvation minimum. For the workers the average wage, in the long run, the "natural" wage, is the minimum wage.

## The Relative Wage

While the worker's main concern is with what he is actually going to receive in return for his services, it is important for him to understand what has been called the **relative wage**, or in other words, the amount of actual **value** he receives in **relation** to the **value** he produces. If the **value** of his wage is twenty and he has produced a **value** of one **hundred**, his **relative wage** is but one-fifth of the **value** he has added by his labor.

This margin between the **value** the worker receives (his wages) and the **value** he produces, has been called **surplus value**. Under the wage system, the former (wages) represents that part of the working day which we previously mentioned, the **necessary labor time**, the latter, the **surplus value**, is that which is produced during the rest of the working day, the **surplus labor time**.

Unless all these facts, and some others besides, are taken into consideration, it is quite impossible to fully comprehend the nature of the **wage system**.

(To be continued)

## HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 7) ment follows, the tensions will tend to be greater."

Coming from the pen of a Christian Scientist this is quite a materialistic admission. Precisely, that's where we must seek and also find the cause for intolerance, not in biologic differences, nor in cultural distinctions, but in the economic conditions of society itself. It is the "competition for the old and preferred jobs" and the anguish and disappointment accruing to the loser when there aren't enough jobs to go around. That leads to rivalry, jealousy, then hatred. If unemployment follows, as no doubt it will, sooner or later, tension is certain to follow.

But job competition and unemployment are part of our economic system of private enterprise. Logically therefore it is the social system itself which generates those conditions, making for race hate and intolerance in and out of war.

In climaxing its analysis, leading up to the solution, it strays from its objective materialist cause and reverts to its usual idealistic, mind over matter stuff: "Intolerance, being illogical, does not yield to mere logical manipulation of factors. Uncertainty, fear, and ignorance lie at its root, and only that which can lift thinking and attitudes above them can be ultimately effective." Education, enlightenment and religion is offered as the great hope to block these hate movements.

In offering a "spiritual" solution for a real, material problem it is just burying one's head, ostrich-like, and refusing to face the living facts that underlie uncertainty, fear and ignorance. It is only by recognizing that it is economic uncertainty, and fear of joblessness, and ignorance as to why there can't be enough

"The state, then, is by no means a power forced on society from outside; neither is it the 'realization of the ethical idea,' 'the image and the realization of reason,' as Hegel maintains. It is simply a product of society at a certain stage of evolution. It is the confession that this society has become hopelessly divided against itself, has entangled itself in irreconcilable contradictions which it is powerless to banish. In order that these contradictions, these classes with conflicting economic interests, may not annihilate themselves and society in a useless struggle, a power becomes necessary that stands apparently above society and has the function of keeping down the conflicts and maintaining 'order.' And this power, the outgrowth of society, but assuming supremacy over it and becoming more and more divorced from it, is the state."—Engels, "The Origin of the Family."

jobs under capitalism to go around for everybody, that turns people of different color and culture against one another rather than against the social order that causes it.

It is not lifting our thinking and attitude above reality or away from it that we need. On the contrary we must cease gazing up to the sky and into the abstract, we must bring our thinking down to the concrete, the actual conditions of reality. Herein our only hope lies. The race problem is a socio-economic problem. L. B.

## WAR IS HELL, BUT DIVIDENDS ARE HIGH

Companies listed on the New York Stock Exchange were able to increase dividend payments in 1944 by 7.3 per cent compared to 1943. This was because of sharp production increases, the report states.

The largest increase was in the automotive group. General Motors provided a \$44,000,000 increase in its payments, or a \$1 per share boost on its 44,000,000 shares outstanding. The chemical group was next with an \$18,000,000 advance in its income distribution.

"All European countries have already reached an equal stage in the development of capitalism, all of them have yielded all that capitalism can give. Capitalism has already reached its highest form, it is already exporting, not commodities, but capital. It begins to feel cramped in its national shell, and there is a struggle now for the last free remnants on the globe. While the national wars of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries signified the beginning of capitalism, the imperialist wars indicate its end."

Lenin—"The Imperialist War."

"Imperialism is a state of capitalism, when, having fulfilled all that is possible for it, capitalism makes a turn towards decay. This is a different epoch, not in the consciousness of the Socialists, but in social relations as they exist. The struggle is going on for the distribution of the remaining pieces of territory. This is the last historic task for capitalism. How long this epoch will last, we cannot say. There may be several such wars. We must, however, understand clearly that those wars are not the same as wars conducted earlier, and that, accordingly, the tasks confronting the Socialists are also different."

Lenin—"The Imperialist War."

## ORGANIZED LABOR AND POST-WAR PLANNING

(Continued from page 6)

the power of their wages to buy. Any concern who goes into business and who sells only to his own workers, and only to the extent that the wages he is paying them will buy back the products will find that he is up against a problem. If he pays high enough wages he can sell the products provided his workers did all the work from the natural resources to the finished product; but in that case he receives no profits. He receives no more for the products than he paid to have them made. If he paid less the workers will not be able to buy all. He will have a surplus but will not be able to sell it. It would do him no good to use this surplus to build more plant unless he could also hire more workers to use the new additions, and then it would only increase the unsaleable surplus. A nation, or a world, of capitalists are in a similar position when they try to sell the products of industry to the workers. Their profits will come only from the sale of the surplus which the workers cannot buy with their wages. There is one difference, however. A single capitalist might arrange the production of the surplus in such a way as to make it fit his own consumption. The whole section of capitalists, being in competition with each other for the total market, must ever improve their method of production in order to be able to continue as capitalists. Those who fail to improve will fall by the wayside as incompetents. Cheaper production brings success to the capitalists who are able to introduce it, but that very process reduces labor's ability to buy in comparison to their growing ability to produce.

The need for a market outside that furnished by the workers increases with every improvement in production methods. At the same time the improved production methods drive more and more independent producers out of the field. Thus while the need for the market grows the existing market actually shrinks in comparison.

Organized labor is quite able to see the effect of this trend in the growing productivity of the nation and in the shrinking ability of the people to buy the products. Thus far it has failed to understand the nature of this trend. It insists upon agreement and cooperation where economic law dictates strife. It hopes for improvement where the actual trend is in the opposite direction. This unabateable trend will go on until labor learns that it must strike out in its own behalf, not for agreement and cooperation from the capitalists, but for the abolition of the profit system.

## 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.

WAGE-LABOR AND CAPITAL, by Karl Marx.....	10c
MARXISM AND DARWINISM, by Anton Pannekoek.....	10c
CLASS STRUGGLES IN AMERICA, by A. M. Simons.....	10c
CRIME, ITS CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES, by John Keracher.....	10c
ECONOMICS FOR BEGINNERS, by John Keracher.....	10c
THE HEAD-FIXING INDUSTRY, by John Keracher.....	10c
PRODUCERS AND PARASITES, by John Keracher.....	10c
PROLETARIAN LESSONS, by John Keracher.....	15c
HOW THE GODS WERE MADE, by John Keracher.....	15c
WHY UNEMPLOYMENT, by John Keracher.....	5c

Send me PROLETARIAN NEWS for a period of ....., for which I here enclose \$.....

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

Subscriber's name .....

Address .....