

PROLETARIAN NEWS

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

A JOURNAL FOR THE WORKING CLASS

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

Vol. XIV, No. 12—Whole No. 153

Chicago, Illinois, December, 1945

483

Price 5c a Copy

Struggles Mount on The Labor Front

By Christ Jelset

Demobilization proceeds. Soldiers and sailors are coming home. Weapons of international warfare are put aside. Diplomats are given the job once more to "settle" international differences. Within nations, peace seems to move further away. Indonesia, China, India, Europe, all have their internal struggles.

In some of the places it is a struggle of economic groups and their political counterparts. In other parts, soldiers are rapidly being shifted from international fronts to battle-grounds at home. Order, harmony, tranquility, all deemed so essential to future peace are giving way to their opposites, disorder, disharmony and strife. It is all blamed on the war.

Millions were torn from their ordinary pursuits of life to take part in total war. Millions were torn from home surroundings. Millions were fitted into the war machines of the different nations. They were given new things to hate and fight, new promises to aim at and work for, and in a million of cases, a new source of livelihood, such as it was.

The "cease fire" order brought an end to the new ways without returning the old. A social vacuum was created which demands attention, while economic differences prevent peaceful solution. America, the most stable of all capitalist nations, cannot escape these post-war repercussions. The pre-war conditions of American economic life were not those of undisputed health. The Great Depression was said to be over, but ten million unemployed testified that something was wrong. The war put America to work. Twelve million of the nation's able-bodied men and women were put into uniforms. The rest, the old, the very young, and the crippled, doubled production. It was demonstrated that "America can produce."

During the war, America was to "sacrifice for the good cause." Complaints were many but not serious. A few shortages were annoying but not intolerable. Workers made more wages with their overtime "opportunities." Business

made enormous profits (double pre-war, even after taxes). U. S. bonds provided investment outlets for those who wanted to save.

Victory came. Government orders were cancelled right and left. "Reconversion" unemployment was on its way, even before V-J Day. Discharged war workers could still find jobs but with half of wartime pay. Those still employed faced loss of overtime and downgrading. In short, they faced wage-cuts. Now, returning soldiers begin to augment the ranks of those in need of jobs.

Two questions are forcing them—
(Continued on page 2)

Exploitation on the Farm

To get a bird's eye view of modern industrialized agriculture, that practised in California, Imperial County or "Imperial Valley" will serve the purpose. This county lies 150 miles east of Los Angeles, a desert area, and borders on Mexico. Farming is by irrigation from the Colorado River, by virtue of Boulder Dam. This area was practically uninhabited in 1900 and by 1930 had 440,000 acres of land under cultivation. Most land, today, is owned and operated by corporation "Growers shippers," or livestock ranchers. An idea on the degree of concentration can be seen from statements from the Senate Committee report on Education and Labor, Report No. 1150, part IV, dated October 19, 1942. This deals with

employer associations and collective bargaining in agriculture in the valley.

"In 1935 concentration of income was greater than land concentration with 10.5 per cent of all farms receiving 59 per cent of the income. These are farms with incomes of \$20,000 or more, with an average income per farm of \$56,000. In 1938 there were 90 holdings totaling 123,826 acres, which was an increase of 20 per cent over a 5-year period." "In 1935 and 1936, 51 growers operated 48,000 acres in vegetable and melon crops constituting 83 per cent of the total acreage. In 1936, 40 of these growers controlled 84 per cent of lettuce acreage, 13 growers controlled 85 per cent of the pea acreage, 20 growers controlled 68 per cent of the carrot acreage, 36 growers controlled 83 per cent of the cantaloup crop." * * * "Gross income of the county in 1936 was 22 million with vegetables and melons accounting for about half of same." * * * "The census figures for 1930 showed 68 per cent of farms in the county employing wage labor with a cash expenditure of \$7,569,942 for this labor."

During the war period, their labor supply taken by the Army and war plants, these farmers were concerned over an available supply of labor. Government agencies recruited Mexican nationals, mostly for California farms. This solution did not fit Imperial County due to Government specifica-

(Continued on page 2)

International Notes

The Struggle for Manchuria

The Red Army of the USSR is withdrawing from Manchuria in accordance with the terms of the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of Friendship and Alliance signed last August. The results of this withdrawal, however, are not in accordance with the plans of the Chungking regime. Wherever the Chinese Nationalist forces attempted to go into Manchuria they found their path blocked by hostile guerilla armies. When U. S. Marines were all prepared to land Nationalist troops in Manchuria's ports (as part of their job of disarming the Japanese) they found that the friendly Russians had left and that unfriendly Chinese had taken their place. At inland airports the withdrawing Red Army was quite agreeable that nationalist forces should land. However, in some places, when it became known that guerilla fighters were on the scene, plans were changed and the project cancelled.

To enter Manchuria by land has been no easy task for the Nationalists. First their troops, equipment and supplies had to be transported by water from southern ports to their beachhead in northern China. (Incidentally, this beachhead could not have been established without the aid of U. S. Marines.) After that their task was to break

through the Chinese Red Army's first line of defense along the ancient Chinese Wall. This proved rather easy. Now they are moving forward into Manchuria. Some resistance is being offered but the big battles lie ahead.

A number of questions are being asked regarding the Chinese situation. One of these questions is: "Where did the guerilla fighters, who have penetrated into every area of Manchuria, come from?" The obvious answer is that they did not penetrate from without but that they are part and parcel of the Manchurian workers and peasants. No doubt, aid is being sent from Yenan. Chu Teh, the noted military leader of the Chinese Red Army, is reported to be in charge of operations.

Question two: "What is the importance of Manchuria?" The answer is that Manchuria is industrialized. It was Japan's "Ruhr." Much of Japan's iron, steel, coal and chemicals came from this province. The country is criss-crossed with thousands of miles of railroad, telegraph and telephone lines. Electric power is highly developed. Manchuria was well on the way to becoming the heart of the Japanese empire. With that empire shattered this area now becomes a prize of very great importance.

(Continued on page 3)

IN THIS ISSUE

STRUGGLES MOUNT ON THE
LABOR FRONT
By Christ Jelset

EXPLOITATION ON THE
FARM

By Len Johnson

INTERNATIONAL NOTES
By Oliver Ritchie

HOME SCENE
By L. B.

TERMINOLOGICAL
CONFUSION
(Editorial)

By John Keracher

Exploitation on the Farm

(Continued from page 1)

tions for housing which the valley could not meet. Their housing consisted of occasional shade trees or shacks along the ditch banks. The workers still use the unfiltered water in the ditches. Since the growers considered it "impractical" to meet the "standards" they turned to the "wet" Mexicans as a solution. Recent estimates by growers state that 80 per cent of their laborers are "wet."

An employee of the Border Patrol stated that when growers needed more workers their "leader" simply phoned the patrol to "open the gates" and, of course, the patrol cooperated. After harvest the patrol rounded up the "wets" and sent them back. An A. F. of L. union official told of growers' methods of handling "wets," simply hire them at 60 cents and pay them off at 30 cents. Objections by the "wets" were rewarded by the Border patrol sending them home as trouble makers.

The valley vegetable and melon crops are harvested between January and June, which gives the California growers the desired position of being almost the only source of vegetables for the rest of the states. One U.S.D.A. valley official advised of market conditions for the small growers: "This handful of produce men sit in the El Centro Hotel and manipulate market transportation in such a way as to dictate crop prices which the small man will get. If a few crates are needed to complete their shipment they'll buy but otherwise he's out of luck. They arrange the marketing so that when prices are hitting peak their own crops are moved and when they are low they buy from the small grower. It's mostly been that way since the big growers came in here."

There were various grower organizations, mostly organized to insure an unlimited source of "Honest diligent" labor and secure reductions in freight rates.

One of their trade journals, the "Western Grower and Shipper," described the farm unit of the west as follows: "They are practicing the oft expressed theory of industrial farming, for the western vegetable grower-shipper is an industrial farmer. His activity is comparable with that of any industrial enterprise. Farming hundreds and even thousands of acres, he affects economics in production through large scale farming which is based largely on power operation." From this same journal: "Over a period of 20 years this tremendous business has changed very materially in its various phases of production. At its inception the small farm owner, the Japanese tenant and many unorganized small groups were the producers of these products. Today a rough estimate shows that approximately 75 per cent of the California and Arizona acreage is farmed by large grower-shipper

organizations, many firms operating as high as 30,000 to 35,000 acres." (Dec., 1929, page 16.)

The Western Grovers Protective Association was formed in 1926. According to the above Senate report, its sponsors were big outfits like the American Fruit Growers, which acted as "guide." The platform was very explicit:

"1. Cooperation with orderly labor groups confined to rank and file honest industrious workmen, without radical and communistic affiliations.

"2. Support of legislation to our industry's welfare and unceasing opposition to political law making of obstructive character.

"3. 100 per cent cooperation to Government agencies executing their duties beneficial to the industry.

"4. Consideration of transportation costs and freight rates.

"5. Supply useful information through Association official publications pertaining to crop and market conditions, legislation, transportation developments in cultivation and labor matters."

Notice the "support everything to our interest" and "unceasing opposition" to everything otherwise.

Workers made efforts to organize but the Association resisted with everything legal or illegal in their power. The following quotations will show how much respect the capitalist class has for law and order not to their interest. The brazen attitude of law enforcing officials of the County shows how capitalist class "democracy" works under cover except in this valley they didn't "cover up." The County officials biased attitude reached up to that dignified administrator of "justice," his honor, the judge himself. Quotations are from the above Senate committee report from Union and Grower officials. General Glassford, Federal mediator for strikes occurring in the valley between 1933 and 1935 made the following report (page 453.) "After two months of observation and investigation in the valley, it is my conviction that a group of growers have exploited a "communist" hysteria for the advancement of their own interests, that they have welcomed labor agitation, which they could brand as 'red,' as a means of sustaining supremacy by mob rule, thereby preserving what is so essential to their profits—cheap labor. That they have succeeded in drawing into their conspiracy certain county officials who have become the principal tools of their machine. It was my first endeavor to correct the situation by argument and persuasion. This failing to curb illegal assaults, intimidations and unfair convictions, it became necessary to take the decided stand against the continuance of these deplorable conditions."

The following incidents occurred when workers tried to hold meet-

(Continued on page 6)

STRUGGLES MOUNT ON THE LABOR FRONT

(Continued from page 1)

selves to the front. For the workers, with or without jobs, the question is one of immediate necessity; is it going to be necessary to take a serious reduction in living standards, just when sacrificing for the war effort has come to an end?

For those who look to the welfare of the nation as a whole, the question becomes a theoretical one, what must be done to provide full employment and permanent prosperity? To the first question, labor's own answer is an emphatic NO. Labor, through its unions, says that the ending of the war, together with the new improvements in productive methods, should result in an improved standard of living for the workers.

This improvement, labor says, must come through higher wages. Business takes the opposite stand. Business, in the main, insists that reconversion is a difficult period, that wages should not be advanced before peacetime production is fully under way, and increased profits give assurance that wage increases can be carried. Business also insists that wartime control of prices should be abandoned, that the higher profits resulting from increased prices would stimulate production and bring about that "natural equilibrium" of prices and demand which is claimed to be the real foundation for permanent improvement in the living standards of the workers.

Both sides insist that they are right. Neither is willing to yield. Efforts at compromise and settlement have been many, but to little avail. Many smaller strikes have occurred and minor settlements have been made, usually on the basis of a small increase in pay (ten to fifteen per cent, instead of the thirty per cent demanded by labor). Now, one of the larger unions has made good its strike threat against a major company.

The United Automobile Workers are on strike against the General Motors Corporation and 200,000 men are out in a show of strength against one of America's most powerful corporations. The government has stepped in to ask both sides to send representatives to Washington, with a view to affect reconciliation. At present, the workers have accepted the invitation from Washington, and it is expected that the company will do likewise shortly.

Whatever the settlement, one can be sure that the General Motors Company will not be required to jeopardize its profit position. If the company cannot see fit to grant a small wage increase on the basis of present prices, the government's OPA will be made to yield on prices. Meanwhile it is not certain whether the workers in steel, and other mass-production industries, can be made to wait for the settlement in General Motors, or if more large scale walk-outs will

take place immediately. A few things, however, seem fairly certain, the workers will be made to compromise on their demands for a thirty per cent wage increase, and what they do get will not provide that extra purchasing power, so essential to continue full production.

Relative to the public question of what must be done for full employment and permanent prosperity, a great variety of answers are forthcoming. All who attempt to provide such answers base their argument upon "economic factors," but they all seem to be capable of leaving out factors not suitable to their argument.

Aside from the conflicting answers coming directly from representatives of labor unions, and of business organizations, there are answers from public educators, "economists" and government officials. "These "public" men, or many of them, will insist upon a three way split in the economic makeup of the population. They see the workers holding out for higher wages, the employers insisting upon more profits, and the consumers demanding lower prices. This latter group, the consumers, is the most important to some. Lower prices, they say, will not only benefit the consumers. Lower prices will benefit everybody. The workers are consumers and would benefit from lower prices even more than higher wages. The producers would also benefit. They would be able to sell more. What they would lose in profit on each item sold they would gain on the mass. In fact, they say, mass production is here, but mass production cannot operate if it is not tied up with low prices and mass consumption.

As an example of this line of reasoning can be mentioned, one E. A. Crause, writing on "Pillars of Prosperity" in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal. He says: "Our enormous productivity can be utilized only to the extent that income is so distributed to producers and consumers as to maintain a balance between demand and supply in the various markets, and that those who receive the income are encouraged to spend or invest it." This encouragement, by the way, had to be provided through low prices. His whole "moral" seems to be, to workers: "don't ask for higher wages. To producers: "don't ask for higher prices." "Lower prices will help all."

There might be a great deal of logic in such arguments, but in real life people do not adopt policies because they are logical. Economic policies become logical or acceptable only to the extent that they promote one's economic interest. Labor and capital might, for a time, make a truce or a working agreement, but no per-

(Continued on page 3)

STRUGGLES MOUNT ON THE LABOR FRONT

(Continued from page 2)

manent "good for all" policy.

Higher wages are "good" for labor but hurt profits. Lower wages, if they do not reduce the speed of production, increases profits. In the struggle between these two economic interests, certain economic laws dictate the limits to which either side can go. On the matter of prices and consumer interests, economic laws again fix trends, not in conformity with public interests but in conformity to the factors which combine to provide the laws.

An understanding of these economic factors will make possible an understanding of the trend of present day society. Such understanding will remove all questions of economic social behavior from the field of morality to the field of science. It will remove problems of economic improvements from the field of moral behavior to that of economic necessity.

Any student of economic trends, who is willing to take all factors into consideration, will be able to discover that prices of goods tend to fall only as the same goods are being produced with less labor employed. It is not an understanding on the part of the producers that lower prices would benefit society which brings down prices. It is the glutted markets, and the ability of the most advanced producers to undersell the rest, which affects the downward trend.

When it comes to wages, workers want more, employers want to pay less. The amount of workers seeking jobs as a means of making a living, compared to the amount of jobs offered by the employers, determines the trend in wages. More workers than jobs, and wages go down. More jobs than workers, and wages go up. Workers, however, must have enough wages to maintain themselves and families in such strength and health that they can continue to work, and send young workers to the jobs as the older ones fall away. Thus, wages, in the main, become fixed by the cost of living, or as Marx said, by the value of labor power.

As labor productivity is improved by the employers, in competition with each other for the market, providing technical improvements, such improvements, instead of accruing to labor tend to reduce the number of jobs on the one hand, and reduce the cost of living on the other. Thus, a longer portion of the working day can be used to produce profits for the employers and a shorter and shorter portion goes to the workers in the form of wages.

These growing surpluses, accruing to the employers, are largely wasted in various ways. They employ more and more cunning methods of salesmanship. Advertising and sales organizations multiply and expand. They adopt "good

neighbor" policies toward foreign nations in order to promote sales, and they achieve international ill-will, and a demand for preparedness. On the farms of the nation, technological improvements help each farmer in competition with his neighbors. The increased production resulting tends to glut the market and reduce all the "backward" farmers to increased poverty and economic insecurity.

This trend did not come out of the war. It was here before the war and led to its outbreak. This trend was not brought to an end by the war. On the contrary it was augmented. It is not a breakdown of the moral fiber which causes the growing uneasiness within the many capitalist nations. It is the coming to a head of economic contradictions within the prevailing economic system.

Whether the struggle takes the form of uprisings against foreign exploitation, as in Indonesia, or political instability, as in Europe, or as a mere economic struggle, as in America, the cause, in the main, is the same.

Some of the remedies offered will be tried, others will be compromised or rejected. All will fail in the long run. The struggles, however, will not be in vain. Through such struggles the workers and oppressed masses will learn to combine their strength for a final struggle with the real trouble within the economic system, one which dictates on the one hand increased production and on the other decreased consumption for the masses.

The final outcome will not be higher wages and profits, as are promised today, but abolition of the profit system. Such a solution will be opposed to the last by all profitmakers and their supporters. It will be condemned in all countries as foreign, dictatorial, immoral, brutal and unworkable. It will be adopted by the masses when no other outlet seems possible. And it will bring an end to the economic troubles that now beset mankind.

"The essential condition for the existence, and for the sway of the bourgeois class, is the formation and augmentation of capital; the condition for capital is wage-labor. Wage-labor rests exclusively on competition between the laborers. The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the laborers, due to competition, by their revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeois produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeois therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable."

International Notes

(Continued from page 1)

If Chiang Kai-shek is to win this prize he must have large scale support from the U.S.A. If such large scale support is not given, Manchuria almost certainly will become the heart of the "Red" region of China.

Another question: "Why doesn't the USSR aid the Chinese Communists?" Perhaps, by maintaining their policy of nonintervention the Soviets are giving the best kind of aid. The peoples of all nations are being given the best possible demonstration of the functioning of the foreign policies of two opposing economic and political systems. This demonstration is producing effect. Labor unions in America are going on record opposing intervention in China. American flyers in China have protested to their commanding officers the nature of some of their missions. Millions of Chinese who have learned to hate all foreigners can see that the Soviet Union does not wish to meddle in China's domestic affairs. They are being weaned away from support of the reactionary regime headed by Chiang Kai-shek. The Soviet policy of nonintervention has nonplussed the capitalists of America and is creating division within their ranks. Soviet support to the Chinese Communists would tend to nullify these trends and would give the voice of reaction a strong propaganda weapon.

* * *

Political Crisis in Italy

Feruccio Parri, premier of the coalition government formed last June, has been forced to resign. The right-wing parties withdrew from the cabinet when Parri refused to "broaden his cabinet" by the inclusion of more right-wing supporters. The government was formed with the stipulation that it must continue to have the support of all the six parties which entered into the coalition. Hence, when the right-wing parties withdrew Parri's resignation followed as a matter of course. Parri is head of the Actionist Party and was a leader of the partisan movement in Northern Italy.

An article in the Chicago Sun, November 24, by John M. Mecklin, gives an excellent analysis of the Italian political situation on the eve of Parri's resignation. Here are excerpts from that article:

"Led by the influential Liberal Party, a temporary coalition of every shade of conservative, pro-monarchist and fascist-tainted opinion in Italy is trying to destroy the fine balance of power within the five-month-old coalition government of Premier Ferruccio Parri and to grab leadership for itself. . . .

"In the face of this situation the American and British embassies and the Allied Control Commission are saying officially that their policy is not to meddle in Italian internal policies and their silence

is unquestionably being interpreted by rightists as a green light to go ahead.

"Either by design or as a result of the ignorance and prejudice of military officials against the left, Allied activities in Italy for months have had the appearance of attempting to torpedo the Parri coalition. The signs are so numerous that many leftists are charging just that. For example: the Allies are the only possible source of arms, ammunition, vehicles, even uniforms and food, for immediate expansion of the Italian police force, so urgently needed to put down widespread crime and brigandage. . . .

"One of the first American businessmen allowed to visit Italy was Amadea P. Giannini, president of the Bank of America. . . . 'Winter is near,' he said, 'and bread is lacking. If you do not have a strong government, you will not be able to avoid disturbances, for the repression of which your 60,000 carabinieri will not be sufficient without the aid of Allied forces in Italy.'"

The action of the conservative parties, in forcing Parri to resign, brought immediate protests from the Italian masses. Tens of thousands demonstrated in Rome. Some carried banners reading, "Out with the House of Savoy" and "Down with the Monarchists." All workers in Milan quit work for 15 minutes and there are threats of a general strike to cover all of Northern Italy. The pot is boiling. The question is: "Can the British and American military forces hold the lid down while fascism is re-established in Italy?"

* * *

Austria

Long before the war the city of Vienna was administered by the Social Democrats, and that party had some support throughout Austria in general, but the nation as a whole was never controlled by the Socialists. In the thirties it looked like they might win in a national election, but fascism and other forms of reaction prepared for an open struggle.

In 1934 the capitalists and landlords used the Heimwehr, their armed forces, to blast the workers in their homes in Vienna because they felt their control of Austria was becoming insecure. Later, between the native fascist and the German Nazis who took over the country by force, the political parties and labor unions of the workers were abolished or driven "underground."

With the war at an end, and Austria "liberated," and occupied by armed forces of four nations, a national election was permitted. The outcome of this election was closely watched because most of the European countries which have had elections recently have moved strongly toward the "left." Now the election is over, its out-

(Continued on page 6)

PROLETARIAN NEWS

A Journal for the Working Class

Devoted to the Education of Workers and
Their Struggle for Power

Published Monthly by the

Proletarian Party of America

Subscriptions—12 Issues for 50 Cents

Send All Subscriptions, Contributions, Etc., to

PROLETARIAN NEWS

1545 N. Larrabee Street, Chicago, Ill.

TERMINOLOGICAL CONFUSION

Sociological terms are very much abused at present, even among those who have spent a lifetime in dealing with social questions. A few years ago a tremendous number of articles and books appeared dealing with "democracy," and some very queer interpretations came forth.

Some were loud in their praise of existing forms of democracy, except that of the Soviet Union. To them that was but a dictatorship, and, therefore, no kind of a democracy. On the other hand, some Soviet admirers claimed that it is the only true democracy, that democracy in other countries does not exist, or it is just a fake, etc.

Most of this confusion of terms arose from failure to recognize the class nature of society, and consequently, the class nature of democracy, and of course, the class nature of *Dictatorship* as well.

In America, England, France, and other nations, we see democracy at work, but it is capitalist class democracy. The Soviet government was a proletarian class democracy. It was a *dictatorship of the proletariat* against the capitalists, the aristocracy, and the rich property owning peasants (the Kulaks).

Since society within the Soviet Union is now classless the bourgeoisie, aristocracy and Kulaks having been expropriated as classes through the complete socialization of the means of production and the natural resources, dictatorship within the U.S.S.R. has withered away. The population is no longer peasant or proletarian, because the abolition of exploiting classes also eliminates exploited classes as such. That is what is meant by Marx and Engels when they state in the Communist Manifesto: "If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by force of circumstances, to organize itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms, and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class."

We are aware of the fact that, since all democracies in the past have been class democracies, it is difficult to conceive of a classless democracy. Yet, that term is not unfitting in relation to the U. S. S. R. The population now belongs to no class. They are a free people, a classless democracy. This does not mean that we consider their administration as perfect, as faultless, but just the best, the most advanced, that the world has yet produced.

Democracy in the abstract, which many people visualize, never existed and never can exist. Democracy is not a state of mind. It is a political form, and the same is true of dictatorship. Those who see either as a mental condition, especially if they see it as the expression of the will of an individual, have no real understanding of social phenomena.

What is true in relation to democracy, and dictatorship, is also true of other sociological terms. Look at what the followers of Hitler

did with the term "socialism." They used it for the very opposite, extreme nationalistic capitalist-imperialism. Naziism, as a term, is an adaption of "National Socialism." Now, was it any sort of socialism? Many at first thought that it was, but it would be difficult now, in view of its record, to find any worker who thinks it was socialism. The Nazi state took over much of the industry, but what sort of state was it? It was a capitalist state, a highly centralized and dictatorial one. It was a state of the "free enterprisers," the same class that owns and runs America, Britain and other nations, the capitalists.

What, therefore, existed in Nazi Germany was STATE CAPITALISM, not socialism. The capitalist class of Germany was greatly enriched by the war, and if *their* armies had not been defeated, they would have become the world's richest and most powerful CAPITALIST IMPERIALISTS. The functioning of their state was BOURGEOIS DICTATORSHIP, a dictatorship over the working class and all opposing elements. The Soviet Union also was a proclaimed dictatorship, a DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT, but with their society now classless, it is no longer a dictatorship, although yet a strong and highly centralized state, because of the possibility of capitalist imperialist aggression against it.

In the U. S. S. R. all industry and natural resources have been socialized. There are no capitalists. Therefore, it is STATE SOCIALISM, in fact a very high form of it, bordering upon COMMUNISM.

To those who are capable of using the analytical method of dialectical materialism it is not difficult to comprehend what is going on in the world, but to those who use idealism, or metaphysical abstract reasoning, confusion and error are inevitable. For instance, there are people who can see quite clearly that the sort of thing which the British Labor government is introducing is *not* Socialism, but on the contrary, STATE CAPITALISM, yet in the Soviet Union, where there are no capitalists, these people claim it is also STATE CAPITALISM, the same as in Britain.

In Britain the government is "buying" out the Bank of England, but not all banks are being nationalized. In Russia, the workers and peasants took over the whole banking system at the time they took political power. In Britain, the land, and the minerals under the land, are privately owned. In the Soviet Union the land and the natural resources were socialized at the outset. No payment was made for the resources or banks. Yet, many, even at this late date, cannot see the difference between the Soviet Union and Great Britain, cannot distinguish *State Socialism* from *State Capitalism*.

To sum up this distinction, we would say that *State Capitalism* is government controlled industry where the capitalists are the state power, and *State Socialism* is government owned and controlled industry where the workers are the state power.

Someone has said: "In the dark all cats are grey," and to those who are in the dark on social questions, it is to be expected that they will fail to distinguish one social form from another. To them democracy is democracy and dictatorship is dictatorship, they never vary, there is no class content recognized, except in practice. Quite often those who shout the loudest for democracy and against all dictatorship, have a way of promptly dropping democracy and resorting to out and out dictatorship when it suits their purpose. In theory they are against it but in practice they are for it.

Freedom and Justice

There is probably no other country in the world where so many people are deluded by political and social terms, where so many are

fooled by forms. A famous man once said: "Those who have illusions have need of disillusionment." The working people here, the vast majority of the population, are certainly in the grip of illusions.

A popular illusion is that *all* people here enjoy "freedom and justice," or that if people are poor it is their own fault, and if some people are rich it just goes to prove that this is a "land of opportunity" that some are wise enough to cash in on, while others neglect their chances and remain poor because they lack ambition, are too slow, too lazy, etc., etc.

This is the "land of the free." Quite true, in a limited sense. Some have always enjoyed freedom. They are the property owners, the "well-to-do." Even that latter term is a prejudiced one, just as is its opposite the "never do well." The property owners, especially the rich, are free to play, or rest, to go to warm regions in the winter time and to cool places in the hot weather. They are free to choose a nice dwelling place, good food and nice clothes, and they are free in many other ways. This is certainly a land of capitalist class freedom.

With the vast majority freedom is very restricted, quite limited, and for many it does not in reality exist. To them it is a meaningless term. The workers in general are not free to live where they wish, to eat what they desire (or even require), nor are they free to dress well. They are limited to a "choice" of poor houses, poor clothing and poor food. They are "free" to move from one poor neighborhood to another. They are "free" to leave one employer, but not free to leave the employing class. They must sell their services in order to live, especially if they have dependents. There is not much "freedom" in that. A big family and a small income usually leaves little freedom of choice. Very often the bare necessities of life are all that are available, even when people work hard and are thrifty.

In times of distress, when there are not enough jobs to go around, when there is much unemployment, then many are just "free" to starve, and as "free sovereign citizens" if they don't like to starve in one community they are at "liberty" to go starve in some other place. For the rich Americans, freedom is real. For millions of workers it is an illusion, a mirage, nothing more.

"Justice," too, is of a class character. It is not absolute, unchangable and equitable, even when it is formulated into laws which are applied to all in general. What is just for one class can be very unjust for another. What is just today may be unjust tomorrow. All laws have an economic basis, even those which seem on the surface to be impartial.

In a class society, such as that of present day America, laws are made by, and in the interest of the property owners. It is capitalist class justice. Theoretically it is for all citizens alike, but when applied to the propertyless, the workers, then "justice" becomes a mere empty shell, because the substance upon which it is founded, property, is not there.

For instance, a judge on the bench must administer the law to all alike. If two men are arrested for the same offence, say, violating some traffic law, the "justice" may fine them alike, perhaps ten dollars and costs. One of the "guilty" may be a rich man who only laughs at the small penalty, but the other may be poor and to him the law's "equitability" is a real hardship. He may not be able to meet it and have to take the alternative of a few days in jail, or part with his last dollar to retain his "liberty."

When a rich man dies, the law provides certain protection for his relatives in relation to the disposal of his property. The same law applies to rich and poor alike, but when a poor worker dies, his relatives find themselves outside of the law's provisions because there is no

property to divide.

We could give countless examples of the working of "justice," equitable in theory, but for the vast majority, meaningless in practice.

The terminology in common use is very deceptive, or rather those who use it, for lack of understanding of social relationships, deceive themselves into believing that they are participants in certain social rights, while their poverty has shut them outside of those rights entirely. How ridiculous it is, for instance, for some fellow to be boasting about "America's (meaning capitalists) great wealth," and the great number of fine automobiles on the highways, while he may not own as much as a wheelbarrow, or some worker going into a mental whirl over the vast amount of gold stored away in Kentucky, while he does not know where his next meal is coming from, yet he speaks with enthusiasm about "our gold supply."

It is important for workers to learn to use social terms correctly, but more important still to comprehend their real significance, to understand the substance behind these terms, and for whom they are applied. When we speak of Communism, Socialism, or State Capitalism and State Socialism, or Freedom, Justice, Rights, etc., it behooves us to comprehend their real social significance, and to be able to apply those terms correctly, when dealing with social questions from the standpoint of the working class. We must never forget our class lines, or historic development. The correct and careful use of terminology, especially in the working class movement, will eliminate a great deal of the prevailing confusion and, thereby, facilitate a higher theoretical grasp and sounder approach to the many problems now arising to confront the workers in their revolutionary struggle for emancipation from the yoke of capitalism.

John Keracher.

Patriotic Labor's Reward

With "production for destruction" greatly curtailed or shut off, and an ample supply of labor in sight, the industrial giants are throwing down the gauntlet at labor's feet. Their government will be called upon to do its stuff, and it can be counted upon to hear its master's voice.

The capitalists, the owners of the industries and the purchasers of labor-power, seem to think that there is "no time like the present time" to put labor in its place and reward it for its loyalty to the skin game of "free enterprise" and its political vassals of Washington, D. C. For a "job well done" on the home front, backing up the boys on the capitalist-imperialist battle front, organized labor is going to have the privilege of helping to pay the war debt through a reduced standard of living.

It's an old story. Labor never seems to learn from past experiences. It is now due to be pushed around once more by its kind exploiters and its pretended political friends.

In the clash of business rivalries which periodically rend national politics, and cause one group of exploiters of labor to confront its rival group, by making use of the Republican Party while the other group uses the Democrats, labor always allows itself to be dragged in. The class character of those two major parties is so well known that it is nothing short of tragic that organized labor, and the working class in general, lets itself be taken for a ride by the Wall Street owned elephant and jackass.

Some workers go along with the Republican Party, believing that it will do most for labor, or do it the least harm, but of late years the vast majority of the working class has sup-

ported the Democratic Party. During World War I, it happened that the Democrats were running the capitalist state machinery, and again when World War II broke out. The working class, with the greatest number of votes, was, in the main, responsible for the election of the Democrats. Some of their top-lofty "leaders," such as Sidney Hillman, claimed to have turned the political trick for the Democratic Party and its great man, F. D. R. Many workers believed that the Democratic Party was on the side of labor. Others who knew that both major parties are owned and controlled by big business, deliberately chose what they foolishly considered to be the lesser of the two evils, and besides winning the war, the defeat of the fascist nations was to them imperative.

But, long before the war, back in the days of WPA shovels, and governmental soup for the jobless, labor had already climbed upon the "friendliest" political garbage-wagon of capitalism, the Democratic Party.

With the outbreak of hostilities, organized labor reindorsed the Democratic administration and their unfailing "friend" Franklin D. Roosevelt. In the last Presidential election, labor supported Roosevelt and Truman to the utmost. Its leaders gave the administration the famous (or infamous) no-strike pledge. It fell for the blarney of "price ceilings" on necessities (an utter impossibility for anyone to maintain). It accepted "frozen" wages. It toiled, sweated and bled for Wall Street's government, and its capitalist-imperialist war.

Now that American imperialism has downed some of its great capitalist rival nations, and can again breath freely and feel safe, it considers that the time is ripe for labor to receive a reward for its loyalty, and it is going to get it and get it good.

Certain circumstances now favor labor, but other circumstances favor capital, and the latter holds the whip-handle. Capital owns the industries which labor must have access to in order to live. It *owns* and directs the government with its law-making machinery, and its armed forces to administer the laws.

Labor has the present advantage of capital requiring its productive services to supply a depleted market. It has considerable funds in its treasuries, and the workers have savings from the war years.

The whole issue is simple and easy to understand. Capital has reduced hours, something which labor usually desires, but the hourly rate of pay is such that the take-home wages will not provide as good a standard of living as before the war. With the wages "frozen" and the cost of living going skyward labor claims to need an increase of thirty per cent in order to maintain its old standard. Labor claims that it is only resisting an effort to lower its standard. Capital is prepared to resist labor's demands. In practice, if labor submitted to the new wage rates, it would have to draw upon its hard earned war-time savings to maintain its standard.

The first phase of this great fight is the showdown between the United Auto Workers Union and the General Motors Corporation. The strike is on and is very complete. President Truman has asked the Auto Workers to return to work and give the government time to play around with a so-called fact-finding commission, and that the steel workers, who have voted to strike, refrain from doing so and go along with his proposal.

Meantime the Congress is getting ready to consider an anti-strike law, to pass legislation making strikes illegal, unless the government after a "fact-finding" investigation permits labor to go on with its strike. This is all to the advantage of the capitalist, who in the meantime would have labor producing on the old terms.

Practically all labor leaders have denounced this proposal. They see in it a further shackling of labor by legal chains favorable to capital. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, denounces the proposal and charges the Democratic administration, of which he has been a staunch supporter, as scheming to "weaken and ultimately destroy labor union organizations."

The workers are here being given a vigorous example of whose government it is. They vote their class enemies, and their lackeys into political office, and then go "hat-in-hand" to beg for considerations, and they usually get treated as beggars deserve.

Labor is so ashamed of its own class that it will not vote for workers, its own kind. If it was not so stupid it would send into Congress political representatives of its own. It would send miners, railroaders, steel workers, carpenters, plumbers and all other types of workers. The poorest types would, in fact, be better for labor than the best capitalists, or the corporation lawyers and professional politicians that labor votes for now. The historic course which the working class has followed in practically all countries has been to support politically the left-wing of capitalist politics until it has been forced by the capitalists to set up its own political parties. This was the experience of the British labor unions. Up to the year 1906 the British workers supported the Liberal Party (almost now defunct), but in that year, those within the labor movement who favored independent political action got control of the Trade Union Congress and put that body on record favoring a Labor Party and running its own candidates for Parliament.

Soon the Labor Party became one of the major parties of British politics. It is now the party in office, with a very large working majority. On two previous occasions the Labor Party administered the state machinery, but this is the first time it has had a clear majority and is not obliged to depend upon Liberal support to stay in office.

We have pointed out in these columns the shortcomings of the Labor Party's program. If American labor follows that course as it probably will in time, it is likely to have just as weak a policy as the British. We do not think that labor's problems can be solved by trying to reform capitalism or getting through a capitalist congress certain favorable "labor legislation." It will still leave the workers in the same general economic position, producing wealth for the capitalist class and wages, just enough to live on, for itself. Yet, we realize that organized labor is liable to proceed in that way, and in spite of the inadequacy of such a program we would consider it a great forward step for the working class, to break politically with the old out and out parties of capitalism. Apparently there is no other way for labor to learn than by the process of "trial and error."

Labor has been running its head against the stonewall of capitalism so long that it might feel very uncomfortable if it quit doing it. Even if it finally learns the lesson of independent political action and launches its own political party it will most likely adopt similar policies to those of the British Labor Party and go through the errors which that party is now entering into. On the other hand, American labor may avoid much of that error by learning from the mistakes of British labor, as the British workers themselves are bound to learn.

It is high time that American labor stepped out politically for itself. The workers of practically every other country are ahead in that respect. Until it learns this simple lesson it can expect to get no better treatment than what it now faces at the hands of capitalism's elected representatives.

John Keracher.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

(Continued from page 3)

come has been hailed by the reactionary press of America, especially the anti-Soviet periodicals, as a triumph for "free enterprise" and a smashing defeat for "Communism."

The truth of the matter is that Communism has never been very strong in Austria, and while the Communist Party made a little headway, the outcome is not a "triumph" for capitalism, as the bourgeois press is claiming. The Social Democrats received well over forty per cent of the vote and will have some 76 representatives in the national parliament out of 165 members which comprise that body. The Communist Party is said to have received no more than ten per cent of the votes cast, and will have 3 to 5 representatives.

Approximately 85 seats were won by the right wing elements, old pro-Fascist forces, and the Catholic rural elements. This will give them a small margin over the socialists and communists, but certainly not a strong majority.

With Austria occupied, and the general confusion resulting from that and the war, it is surprising that the parties of the left were able to make so good a showing, especially in the zones occupied by British, French and American troops. Vienna and eastern Austria is occupied by the Soviet forces. The charge was being made that force would be applied in favor of the Communist Party, but to judge by the outcome the charge falls by the wayside. On the whole the Austrian election is not a "triumph" for the property interests, as it has been proclaimed.

* * *

Socialists Save DeGaulle

In the recently elected National Assembly of France the Communist Party won the highest number of seats. However, when they asked for one out of three key posts in the cabinet (foreign affairs, war or interior) DeGaulle objected and threatened to resign his premiership. This situation forced the representatives of the Socialist Party to make a choice. They could join with the Communist Party to form a left-wing government or they could support DeGaulle and the Popular Republican Party. They chose the latter course. This is likely to prove to have been an unhappy choice for the Socialist Party. DeGaulle and the Popular Republican Party are more concerned with the problem of upholding the system of "free enterprise" than in solving the problems facing the French masses.

Responsibility for the continued misery and privation of the French masses in the months ahead will lie largely at the door of the Socialist Party. The Communist Party, as the opposition party, doubtless will gain increasing support.

Oliver Ritche.

Exploitation on the Farm

(Continued from page 2)

ings, which the growers didn't think were necessary. "The day after the strike was called a workers meeting was called at El Centro. A caravan en route to this meeting was broken up by city, county and state peace officers with the aid of tear gas bombs" * * * "Four days later a meeting of several hundred Mexican workers was broken up by the Brawley chief of police, deputy sheriff and state highway police officers."

Mr. Heald, county district attorney testified before the above Senate committee: "When the chief of police went to the hall to arrest 4 people for whom he had warrants he was hit on the head with a piece of pipe about 3 feet long and knocked unconscious." Mr. Heald further stated: "They finally got him out of there and then he called the sheriff and he went up there and then they demanded—now there were about 500 people inside the building and on the outside there were a large group of Filipinos, Mexicans, Whites, Hindus, Japanese and all were milling around this building. And the sheriff and the chief of police went to the door and demanded that they disperse—asked them to disperse. They refused to do so and shoved the officials out and shut the door and then is when they threw the gas bomb inside." Later 3 people were arrested and convicted on charges of riot and "unlawful assembly."

The American Civil Liberties Union tried to hold a meeting a few days later for the strikers.

"Owing to the extensive use of machinery and to division of labor, the work of the proletarians has lost all individual character, and, consequently, all charm for the workman. He becomes an appendage of the machine, and it is only the most simple, most monotonous, and most easily acquired knack that is required of him. Hence, the cost of production of a workman is restricted, almost entirely, to the means of subsistence that he requires for his maintenance, and for the propagation of his race. But the price of a commodity, and also of labor, is equal to its cost of production. In proportion, therefore, as the repulsiveness of the work increases, the wage decreases. Nay more, in proportion as the use of machinery and division of labor increases, in the same proportion the burden of toil also increases, whether by prolongation of the working hours, by increase of the work enacted in a given time, or by increased speed of the machinery, etc."

Communist Manifesto.

Subscribe to
PROLETARIAN NEWS
50c for 12 ISSUES

The sheriff and chief of police refused permission, and an injunction secured from a Federal district court was served on these "gentlemen." * * * "On the evening of the meeting Al Wirin, a Los Angeles attorney, acting as chairman for the meeting was abducted from a local hotel in Brawley by a large mob, threatened, carried 20 miles into the desert, allowed to walk back to town without shoes or clothing, and escorted out of the county, only when he signed a statement that he would never again come back."

"During the period of January 9 to January 22, 1934, 11 women and 75 men were arrested on such charges as 'disturbing the peace,' 'vagrancy,' 'trespassing' and 'resisting arrest' and bailed fixed up to \$1800 each."

The district attorney stated the following in an interview with the Senate committee. This shows the traditional bourgeois "law and order" respect:

"I don't know whether the growers had a legal right to evict the strikers or not, but the logic of the situation was all in their favor. Maybe legally they should have been given 30 days notice. This talk of serving 3-day notices is all wrong. I think the sheriff's logic was good, that the shelter, fuel, lights and water furnished to the pickers by the growers is part of their pay for picking. So if they refuse to pick, they shouldn't get this pay any more than money. The sheriff and I told the growers not to worry about pickers' rights anyway. The growers had all the logic on their side. If it isn't the law it ought to be."

The union called a strike during the pea harvest and organized a traveling picket line of about 100 cars. They called nearly all of the workers out on strike after a few days of this type of activity. Mr. Nice, indigent commissioner, described how the growers took care of this "outrageous" situation. Mr. Nice: "The matter got to a point where these people were taking the law into their own hands. So the sheriff decided to put a stop to it. He deputized 125 citizens—I among them—and we went out and stopped it. We stopped their traveling goon squad on a Sunday morning near the ranch of Mr. Robert Ware who is now our sheriff. The sheriff arrested 7 or 8 of the ringleaders and threw them in jail. The next morning 75 per cent of the workers were in the field."

The report stated that an Anti-Communist organization was formed in March of 1934, with 2 county officials providing the leadership. Mr. Nice, the indigent commissioner, was the "commander." Mr. Osborne, a member of the County board of supervisors, was the secretary. Mr. Osborne testifying before the committee stated the main purpose of the organization was related to labor disturbances. "We had to figure

out a lot of things because there was no precedent. Now strikes—Are they permissible?"

The valley situation was described by an official of the Southern Pacific Railroad in a memorandum dated May 28, 1934, as follows: "The situation is being handled in the valley by a local committee with very little if any expense and funds that were raised are being used to obtain direct results in the hiring of guards, under-cover men, that are keeping down a agitation and strikes."

These incidents had the support of the press, with one exception. A local editor explains in the following quotation why the press couldn't swallow this one. He wrote the leader of the growers in July of 1934. "With the exception of the Besig incident the Chronicle gave loyal backing to the program of the vigilantes as well as to the growers. I denounced the Besig affair as a bad blunder and it seems events have borne me out."

* * * "Without the support of public opinion the vigilantes would not have gotten to first base." * * * "It is generally believed the vigilantes and the growers were working in cooperation."

Mr. Osborne was asked to comment on the above statement. His reply: "There really were no vigilantes in that sense of the word. We rather object to the term because that wasn't the situation."

In February, 1935, a strike was called by the union and 2 union men were killed. The report reads. "The Grand Jury returned a no bill against the two defendants who had been identified as firing the shots."

The Grovers Association records: "The strike culminated in the death of two of the strikers in their attempt to wreck one of the packing sheds in El Centro. This immediately brought the strike to a close and Imperial Valley has had no trouble since."

The union representative reported: "Their deaths arose as a result of the unrestrained deputizing and arming of strikebreakers."

His honor, the Superior Court Judge, Mr. Thompson, still in office in the valley, stated in a letter in March of 1936, dealing with grower-labor troubles: "Although as you probably know, for some time there has been a 'subrosa' organization in this county which has been more than successful so far as our local situation is concerned. Still there is a real necessity for a 'united front' organization for the purpose of bringing all organizations under one head."

In a 1936 cotton strike in the valley 30 clergymen from Fresno, California, gave moral support to the strikers. The growers accused the clergy of lining up with agitators and the following reply by the "spiritual" gentlemen will clarify their position in connection with class lines. "When the same officials state 30 Protestant, Catholic and Jewish clergymen, well known to thousands of people in

(Continued on page 7)

HOME SCENE

Hanky-Panky

The American Iron and Steel Institute, whose company members employ 95 per cent of the workers in the steel industry, including its component parts, have taken to the press with full page advertisements, to explain with "facts" and figures, why they cannot raise wages without price increases.

To accept their story at face value is enough to move the sentimental "free enterprisers" to tears. These public "benefactors" to be really humanitarian should pass around free handkerchiefs with such a tearful tale. The nerve of the steel workers to ask for an increase in pay! Why, they must all be communists! Why, why, they must believe in confiscation!

The hanky-panky bookkeeping of the steel industry, disclosed by PM, as analyzed by Government statisticians, shows us a steel with a different colored ink.

"... Published reports of U. S. Steel, for profits, after taxes, in thousands of dollars. The average for 1936-39 was \$44,732. For 1941, \$116,171; for 1943, \$62,632; and for 1944 it was \$60,791.

"But analysis by the Government's statisticians shows that U. S. Steel's real profits, after taxes, last year were not just one-third higher than before the war, but they were more than three times what they were in the 1936-39 period. Here are the figures: Average for 1936-39 was \$45,098; for 1941, \$157,160; for 1943, \$148,538; and for 1944 it was \$157,094."

The difference of a mere \$223,564,000 in hidden profits is concealed, as shown in the detail report, in reserves of various kinds, deductible and respected by the rich man's government in Washington.

U. S. Steel has no monopoly on hanky-panky. Most all the stealers are acquainted with the art.

Bethlehem Steel's reported profit, after taxes, in thousands of dollars. 1936-39 average:

Avrg.	1941	1943	1944
\$18,902	\$34,458	\$32,125	\$36,168

Thus, according to the corporation's own reports, it has done no better than to double its profits after taxes, compared with the prewar period.

"But analysis by Government statisticians has revealed that Bethlehem's real profits for these years were:

Avrg.	1941	1943	1944
\$19,269	\$53,872	\$73,420	\$67,926

"Instead of only doubling its profits after taxes, the big steel corporation has actually more than trebled them, and in one year almost quadrupled them."

Republic Steel, Crucible Steel and Rustless Iron and Steel are shown in PM to be up to the same hanky-panky. It is no accident.

Yes, even "good, honest, legitimate" profits is robbery, stemming from unpaid labor of the workers. The "honest" and hanky-panky free-booters are Siamese twins.

* * *

Wages and Profits

The efforts of the Government to establish a semblance of economic order during this post-war period is meeting with considerable difficulty.

Industry wants higher prices, naturally. It is accused in instances of being on a "sit-down," refusing to produce until prices are jacked up.

Workers, on the other hand, demand higher wages, a better price for their labor power, to offset the cut in take-home pay. These demands are resisted by management.

Figures are cited by both management and labor to prove their case. But no matter what the figures show, labor knows and feels

EXPOSURE

"What did you tell that man just now?"

"I told him to hurry."

"What right have you to tell him to hurry?"

"I pay him to hurry."

"How much do you pay him?"

"Four dollars a day."

"Where do you get the money to pay him?"

"I sell products."

"Who makes the products?"

"He does."

"How many products does he make in a day?"

"Ten dollars worth."

"Then, instead of you paying him, he pays you six dollars a day to stand around and tell him to hurry."

"Well, but I own the machines."

"How did you get the machines?"

"I sold products and bought them."

"Who made the products?"

"Shut up! He might hear you."

Mrs. Meyer.

that its pay is smaller with the cut from 52 hours to 40 hours, with the cost of living as at present. No amount of arguments can change that one iota.

Amidst the tittle-tattle of Government spokesmen, John W. Snyder, director of reconversion, released a report, prepared by Government economists, indicating that corporation earnings in 1946 would reach \$6.3 billions, after taxes. Not bad! On the basis of that report, he is suggesting that wages be boosted 24 per cent, at present price level. With this boost, the report estimated, the average factory worker will still be short changed 10 per cent in purchasing power, as compared with the year 1941.

One would naturally think the profiteers, who are the gainers in this bargain, relatively speaking, would be agreeable. But "no soap" is their answer to such suggestions. They wash their hands clean of any such considerations.

When labor union leaders confront the industrialists with statistics, proving that wages can be hiked with prevailing prices, and profits still very substantial, the capitalists answer in effect, "It is none of your d— business about our prices and profits."

Before industry in general was converted on a war basis, profit restrictions were lifted and labor handcuffed. It made for almost unrestricted war profiteering. Now, with reconversion, industry is favored with lower taxation, elimination of overtime payments, down-grading of wage classifications, and improved etchinque, and more, an ever growing supply of laboring power. That is what makes capital more cocky. Cocky, for they know that labor will be searching for jobs. The competition for jobs amongst the workers usually has the tendency to lower wages. The capitalists now feel that they are more firmly in the "driver's seat."

What is the argument of the industrialists against wage increases? (1) An increase of wages at this time would endanger, if not eliminate profits. (2) A rise in wages would automatically reflect itself in an increase of commodity prices, this increased burden would have to be borne by the consuming public generally, including labor. The latter argument is advanced with the intention of weakening labor's case in its own eyes as well as causing alarm to the "public."

As a matter of economic fact, the prices of commodities have nothing to do with and are not determined by wages. They are regulated by the law of supply and demand. Assuming that wages are retained at the present level, it does not necessarily follow that commodity prices will remain equally stationary. If the demand for merchandise is greater than the supply, as at present, granting that government price controls are lifted, or modified, price tags are certain to show an increase, re-

gardless of wage level. What's more, wages can go down, as is reported in many cases now, and yet prices go up. Conversely, wages can rise because of special circumstances, organization, etc. and if the supply of goods is greater than the demand, price tags will register a decrease.

This is to show that wages and prices have no bearing one upon the other. That management is falsifying economic laws with obvious intention of confusing the workers for the special interest of capital. Previously we here stated that wages are the price of labor power. The price of this commodity, like any other, is regulated by the law of supply and demands. But the law of supply and demand only explains the prices of goods on the basis of fluctuation around a given center. What is it? It is value.

Groceries, clothing and a roof over one's head have a price tag, not only because they have a use value, but because something useful and necessary goes into these things before they take on shape and taste. It takes work to make clothes, houses and even food. Labor is that common something that all commodities possess and which gives value to commodities of life are measured. It is the amount of socially useful work put into marketable things that determines their value. For instance, a diamond ring has a higher price than a week's living expenses of a worker because it takes more labor to produce it. Mind you, while food, clothing and shelter are absolute necessities and have greater utility than the diamond ring, whose only use is that of an ornament, yet the market value of the diamond ring is vastly greater. Why? because it embodies more labor. Labor is therefore the only real determinate of the value of all commodities around which prices swing. Prices are the money form of value. Wages are the price or money form of the value of labor power. The value of labor power is determined by the cost of the necessities of life.

What gives sense to capitalist production is that labor not only reproduces the value of labor power in the form of wages, but values over and above that. That is pocketed by the capitalists as profits. The difference between what labor produces and what he gets, is the bone of contention. For this reason if the manufacturers have to pay more in wages, profits will be less, never at the vanishing point.

Capital is fully cognizant of that and fights bitterly to keep wages down. Labor, on its part, is fully justified in resisting the pressure from capital. This struggle will continue as long as labor submits to an exploiting system. The attempt of the manufacturers to discourage and defeat wage increases through a price-rise scare is but a camouflage for the real issue— and

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from page 6)

Fresno, have lined up with professional agitators they only make themselves ridiculous. It is an old trick to call anybody who makes a dignified reasonable protest a radical agitator. But in this case the trick does not work. *What we did state was that employers who underpay their workers make a fertile field for radicalism that we want to stop.*

We have tried to show the "unofficial" connection between the "democratic process" and the capitalist class. While on the surface all appears "fair" and "impartial" the class pattern is the same whether in an "outside factory" or an inside one.

With modern technological development "smoked out" by the war the future for the farm workers lies in their forming strong employee organizations and helping the industrial workers get rid of the obnoxious weed of capitalism.

Len Johnson.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 7)

that is one between wages and profits.

* * *

Loafers!

The anomaly of jobs going begging, and growing unemployment, seems like confusion confounded. But why? Here is an official answer.

"The United States Employment Service, in a survey of three cities described as typical, said today that if job seekers accepted available work 'they would receive a cut in take-home pay averaging from 34 to 49 per cent for men, and from 49 to 53 per cent for women.'" (Boston Post, November 13, 1945.)

Fine greetings to home coming veterans! Is this the reward "for a job well done?"

This IS the reward for labor's loyalty to the no-strike pledge, for accepting formulas, ostensible for the welfare of the nation, but actually for the capitalists.

But now the REAL owners of the nation, the owners of banks, industries and such, will point their finger at veterans and workers, who refuse such underpaid jobs, as loafers.

* * *

Universal Military Training

The smell of gunpowder still hovers in the air. World War II only just ended. The return of servicemen to civil pursuits was anxiously awaited by men in uniform, and their friends. The "job well done" was complete this time, so we were told. The hopes of peace rode high, only to again return to uneasiness with the clamor for universal military training. military training for what? Directed against whom? For the benefit of what class?

The advocacy of military training is self-evident of the fallacy of lasting peace, with or without atom bombs. The proponents of conscription argue that it will frighten any possible "bad man" of tomorrow who tries to disturb the peace. It didn't in Europe, where drafted armies were national policies. It is further contended that it would strengthen the U. S. foreign policy in forthcoming peace conferences. An element of truth is contained in that argument, for the "peacing out the pieces" is determined in the main by the power to back it up.

Something bigger, and of a more permanent nature than the immediate peace conferences, must be in the minds of the masters of American policy to favor and embark on jaeacetime universal training.

Arthur Krock in the New York Times of Nov. 18, wrote that the unspoken arguments, seldom used in favor of military training, one of which is officially never mentioned may weigh the scales in its favor.

"The two arguments that have been little stressed in the preli-

inary encounters, but are influencing some members of Congress who are having great difficulty in making up their minds are these:

"Universal military training will improve the physical standards now prevailing among the youth of the United States, and possibly even increase mental alertness. And it will serve to instill a sense of discipline and duty among the young people of a country that may arrest a lack of this among their elders which many social students believe they have discovered in rapidly increasing measure.

The argument that is never offered explicitly is this:

"The post-war world is a hard world in which a nation will have influence in proportion to its latent strength to carry out its international policies. These policies in the United States are aimed at peace and non-aggression. There is some reason to doubt that Soviet Russia's policies are traveling toward the some goal, even if that is their objective.

"The only way the United States can assure that it is to become and stay strong enough to discourage the contrary course of any nation. An essential basis of that strength is a youth which is trained to arms and discipline."

Krock is letting the "cat out of

the bag" as to the real motives behind this proposed move. What are they? An insurance against anticipated internal disorder as also against international strife, pointing his bourgeois finger at Socialist Russia. To many it may come as a shock, that even peace loving America does not look forward to enduring peace at home or abroad.

Organized force is proposed for the maintenance of order and power. The social order of the privileged rich, the owners of industries and banks seems fearful of the future at home, looking to military conscription as a safeguard.

The threat of spreading communism is haunting Wall Street imperialism. Big business seeks to throttle the advance of social progress everywhere, by imposing its reactionary will, by force, if necessary.

The already existing "headfixing" agencies are to be augmented with a military discipline, to check unrest rapidly increasing "among their elders." What an awe inspiring spectacle for peace.

* * *

The A-Bomb—A Lever for Peace or War?

The controversy over what to do with the atomic bomb brings into view what's back of the minds of our rulers as to objective, as well as the growing disunity, within the United Nations. The latter has been strongly emphasized by

the recent one-sided conference from which the Soviet Union was excluded, Britain, Canada and the United States alone participating.

Suspicion may justifiably be entertained by the Soviet Union that the Western powers aim to hold this secret weapon, in "sacred trust," as a military and political club directed against none other but itself. For how else should such exclusion be explained?

Despite all admonition by scientists that the atomic secret cannot for long remain exclusively "ours," a warning which the Soviet Foreign Minister, Molotov, took occasion to confirm in his Russian Revolution anniversary speech, the aggressive boys of imperialism aim to make the most of it for as long as they have the lead. The only sure guarantee of peace, they hold, lies through power and force. Strange talk for a "democratic" nation!

But such actions have in the past been the surest guarantee for armament races, eventually exploding into open war. For whatever happens from now on, as is sure to happen, U. S. imperialism and its conferees must bear responsibility. Power, armament competition and preparedness breeds its counterpart. The Soviet Union cannot but interpret this as a ganging up process against her, calling for increased vigilance and preparedness, since no nation is now safe without equivalent power.

The atom bomb, itself the product of conflict, is now becoming a lever for future conflicts. The logic that it is intended to discourage any new aggressor means only this: that U. S. imperialism is now making a bid for absolute and uncontested control, itself becoming the world's worst aggressor. Far from serving the cause of peace, it can become a source of universal distrust.

It should become clear that the A-Bomb, brandished around by the money-crazed and irresponsible capitalists, is a menace to any social move forward. A class so maniacally addicted to its property privilege, will just as soon reduce the whole world to ruins rather than release its class grip upon things.

Whatever speculation there is about putting atomic energy to constructive industrial uses is so much wishful thinking. The system of production and exchange for profit prevents the absorption of the current production output, leave alone greatly increasing it. To do so will only mean more overproduction and depression. Capitalism can expand little more productively without serious consequences. Any expansion is now tied up with destruction, war.

To achieve atomic control, to transform the atom from destruction to construction, the whole people, i.e. the producing class, must take over social affairs. From a threat to universal existence, atomic energy could become a source of greater abundance and security for everybody.

L. B.

GET A BOOK FREE

If you send Fifty Cents for a year's subscription to PROLETARIAN NEWS (1545 Larrabee Street, Chicago, Ill.) you can have any one of the following books free, \$1.00 for a two years' subscription entitles you to pamphlets to the value of 35 cents. Postage paid.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO, by Marx and Engels.....	10c
WAGE-LABOR AND CAPITAL, by Karl Marx.....	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