

PROLETARIAN

NEWS



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

A JOURNAL FOR THE WORKING CLASS

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

Vol. XV, No. 6—Whole No. 159

Chicago, Illinois, June, 1946

483

Price 5c a Copy

Labor's Reward for Loyalty

American labor, organized and unorganized, is receiving its reward for loyalty. The nation's war was represented to be everybody's war. The attack upon Pearl Harbor was too dastardly and fiendish to allow any impartial and thorough investigation into the intricate economic rivalries which had led to the break in peace relations.

Labor did not oppose the draft but submitted as "good Americans." Labor went further, it signed the "no strike" pledge in return for a promise that the prevailing price structure should be retained. The promise was not kept. Prices started to advance. Workers could feel the pinch. Their wages would buy less and less. The newspapers and radio commentators did not say much on the subject. Perhaps they did not notice it. Labor did. The demand for more wages, to offset rising prices, grew by the week.

Unauthorized strikes began to occur. It was terrible! The strikes were promoted by Hitler and Hirohito, was the charge. Striking workers were "committing acts of treason," and "public opinion" had really been aroused, according to the press. Finally, the discrepancy between static wages and rising prices became so obvious that something had to be done. Production was actually slowed by strikes and workers' resentment. The famous "Little Steel" formula was adopted. The workers were granted a fifteen per cent wage increase to provide more equality with the now prevailing price structure. And now, the lid was to be on tight against all price advancements. Even restaurants had to post their menu prices as of a certain date.

Labor was not satisfied. The 15 per cent advance did not measure up to the price boosts. But labor took it, as a further expression of its loyalty. The lid on prices was again pushed off. Inferior quality goods, smaller portions, as in restaurants, and other chiseling methods, served to reduce wage purchasing power, in spite of ceilings. Once more the workers had to voice their resentment. Again a few "unauthorized" strikes occurred. By the tone of the press and radio it sounded like the whole labor force had folded its arms and that labor's own kin on the battlefields were left exposed to the enemy guns without equipment.

When the war ended, and the smoke of battle had lifted a bit, it was revealed that the workers had been on strike to the tune of three-tenths of one per cent of the working time. The whole time

(Continued on page 2)

Food as a Political Weapon

The aftermath of World War II reveals that 400 million people are faced with starvation in Europe and Asia unless aid is brought to them quickly. Aware of the fact that they would be faced with the problem of feeding starving millions, the United Nations as early as 1943 set up the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (known as the UNRRA) composed of some 48 nations. The UNRRA is an international relief agency whose purpose is to procure food and other essentials for the nations in distress. It is financed by contributions from its member nations, which, as of Jan. 1st, totaled more than \$1,700,000,000. America, of course, is the major contributor toward this fund.

But the problem of feeding the famine-stricken victims of the war has taken on colossal proportions. UNRRA reports that there is not enough food, particularly wheat, to take care of the hungry millions. It reports that hungry nations will require 20 million tons of wheat before the end of July to hold the line against starvation. The maximum available, however, falls far short of that calculation because, of visible supplies, there is only between 11 and 12 million tons of wheat. So that even if 12 million tons of wheat are rushed to the famine stricken areas, nevertheless it will prove far insufficient. As a result millions of people are doomed to starvation.

America had promised to contribute 6 million tons of wheat but has fallen short of meeting this goal. Other contributing nations like Canada, Australia and Argentina, it is reported, have substantially met their commitments. In an effort to spur on the people of the United States to greater effort, President Truman announced a 25 per cent cut in flour production so that wheat can be sent abroad. To encourage the farmers to bring their stored up wheat to the market a 30 cents a bushel bonus was offered them by the government. But in spite of all these measures, gloomy prophecies are being made that they are far inadequate, that nothing short of strict rationing will solve the problem of feeding the starving.

All these efforts, so far made, to come to the rescue of the famine stricken, appear to take on a "humanitarian" aspect. But in an article appearing in the New York Times (April 28), on Europe's food crisis, its London correspondent, Mallory Browne, frankly points out that humanitarian reasons are coupled with the intent of halting radicalism. This is what he has to say:

"Viewed from London, the present grave food crisis has two connected yet completely different aspects. One is immediate and humanitarian. It is the problem of tiding certain countries of Europe and Asia over the acute hunger period of the next ninety days.

"The second is less urgent and more political. It is the question of whether Europe can be helped by food and other forms of economic assistance to choose the way of Western democracy or whether under the pressure of hunger, despair and propaganda, many peoples of the European continent will throw their lot with Russian communism."

We note by the above that what Mallory Browne wishes to imply is that unless the European people are fed they will turn away from "Western democracy" and take to "Russian communism." His candor is quite refreshing except when it comes to defining "Western democracy," although later in his article he defines it as governments like in Britain and the U. S. What he does not state (but should have,

(Continued on page 2)

HOME SCENE

The Miners' Strike

Old "King Coal" is a merry old soul—but he's not so merry when things are kicking up. Right now the country is in the grip of a coal strike. That's nothing new in that industry. The coal mine regions have ever been a strike-torn area. No industry has had tougher labor-capital battles. Working conditions have always been bad, safety regulations inadequate, pay low, much workers' blood has been spilled. The miners have felt the crack of the government club over their heads more than once, generally augmented by boss-hired private thugs and spies.

Upon expiration of the present contract, the mine union served notice of demand for higher wages, improved safety regulations and royalty or a tax of 10 cents on every ton of coal mined to provide for a health and welfare fund for needy miners and their families.

The latter demand drew the particular ire of "King Coal." Preposterous! That's a challenge, a direct encroachment from the outside into the sacred right of property! To yield on this point would be, from the operators' view, yielding part ownership to the commodity coal which legally is solely their property. Since

the workers have no financial stake in the mines, since they own no part of the production equipment or property, on the very face of it, they have no legal claim upon any part of the commodity-coal they produce. All objects of labor belong by "right" to the property owners. Workers are entitled to wages, and no more. Such, no doubt, are the thoughts that flitted through the minds of the coal operators.

Are, then, the miners justified in this property encroaching demand? Why, certainly. Whether Lewis is conscious of it or not, this demand contains some revolutionary kernel, in that the workers feel justified in laying claim, or taxing, part of the prod-

(Continued on page 3)

Food as a Political Weapon

(Continued from page 1)

if he was really frank) is that such governments are capitalist democracies which are based on private ownership of the means of life. Like many other writers for capitalist newspapers, Mr. Browne shuns the use of the word capitalist. No doubt, because to him and those who profit by the sweat and toil of the masses it has an odious connotation.

In his article, he further points out that the British government is fully aware of the urgent need of feeding the hungry millions of Europe and therefore has taken steps accordingly — reduced the two-pound loaf of bread to one and three quarters in England—in order to divert grain from its own meagre stocks to feed the distressed on the continent. This in spite of the fact that the British people have been for six years on strict rations, we are expected to believe that they take these fresh cuts without murmuring. Moreover he states that, “The long-term political implications of the food crisis, on the contrary are not plain to the general public in Britain. But they are obvious to the government in Whitehall which is seriously concerned and far from optimistic over the outlook.”

Here we discover that the British government is concerned like other capitalist nations lest Europe turns to communism, hence it couples its “humanitarianism” with the purpose of combatting communism. Mr. Browne does not tell us, however, how long the British workers will continue to make sacrifices for and to sanction such a noble undertaking without murmuring against it.

What he does say is that, “The United States and Britain plainly have a common interest in acting jointly to prevent the countries of western Europe, the Mediterranean and the Pacific from going communist, whether from hunger or a combination of that and other causes. But to obtain a common policy in practice is not easy.”

He, furthermore, stresses the fact that Britain is not in as favorable a circumstance as America when it comes to feeding the starving. For Britain has always been a food importing nation while the United States is on the contrary a producer and exporter. When it comes to the problem of which starving nations should be fed first, Britain takes the attitude that India is most important while the United States feels that India is a British burden as far as food is concerned.

Nevertheless, the United States and England have a common policy in regard to Europe, particularly Germany and those countries along the “iron curtain,” along the belt of Soviet occupied regions. Mallory Browne deplores the fact that Russian influence has spread as a result of taking good care in feeding the Germans in their zone just as they have done elsewhere

behind the iron curtain.” He attributes the growth of Soviet influence to effective propaganda in making certain those fed know who their benefactors are. He says, “One fact that is beginning to be appreciated in London is that, politically speaking, it is no use feeding the Germans unless they know it,” and that lately the British and Americans have also resorted to propaganda, through the press and over the radio, informing the Germans, in their respective zones, who feeds them.

In his summary of his article, Mr. Browne states, “And so the struggle, half humanitarian, half political, and not without some mixture of commercial motives as well, goes on. Britain and the United States are doing, if not their best at least a great deal to help the hungry peoples of other countries and at the same time to encourage them to follow the ways of the west rather than the communism of Moscow.”

Yes, “Western democracy” has a big problem on its hands. This is best summed up by some of the daily cartoons appearing in the press, such as the one of a picture of a cadaver or skeleton garbed in a feminine cloak called “World Starvation, Sowing the Seeds of World Revolution.” Yet what has “western,” i.e. capitalist democracy to offer to the masses? Both in Great Britain, and America itself, one finds that the workers are not satisfied with it. For even in America we find millions of workers not eating as they should in a nation that boasts of being a “land of plenty and prosperity.” The recent strikes are proof of that, they are struggles to obtain something better than just a bare existence.

In spite of all the efforts of capitalist writers, such as Mr. Browne, to paint capitalist democracy as the system par excellence, nevertheless its imperialistic and exploitive nature sticks out like a sore thumb. It does not require much knowledge to perceive that the greed for profit, which motivates the capitalist class, who are the rulers of all nations based on a system of private ownership, is the main cause of wars, poverty and starvation. In the Great Depression of the 1930's in America, millions were starving in the midst of plenty. Food was withheld from the masses and was only doled out to them in dribbles when they threatened to rebel. At the present time when striking workers appeal for relief to government agencies, food is denied them. Is it any wonder that the American government uses food as a political weapon in its foreign policy when it did not hesitate to use it in its domestic policy! And that fact is applicable to all capitalist nations.

If hunger is driving the European and Asiatic masses to communism, it's because they are beginning to realize that capitalism has nothing to offer them but a lifetime of wage-slavery and poverty. They are beginning to real-

Labor's Reward for Loyalty

(Continued from page 1)

lost by the strikes during the war years amounted to less than one-half day for all the workers.

Victory was complete. Post-war promises of a fuller life could now be put into practice. How did it work? Lay-offs of war production workers by the thousands was the first result. Then followed abolition of overtime for those left on peacetime production. Normal week-time pay would not meet the cost of living.

The condition for the “no strike” pledge had passed, and the workers' needs were greater than ever. The companies, on the other hand, had stuffed their coffers with billions of dollars in war profits. Wartime taxes were high, but net profits, after taxes, were reported to be at least double the best of peacetime returns. The strike weapon had to be put to use, as a life necessity. Many companies were holding out. They could afford to. The strikes were settled on a compromise basis. The thirty per cent increases demanded were reduced to 15 or 18 per cent in settlement.

Some of the strikes dragged on for long periods. The General Motors strike lasted 113 days. It was hard on the workers. It was easier on the companies who had provisions for excess profits tax returns. Thus, General Motors was able to report an 18 million dollar increase in net profits for 1945 over 1944. This in spite of early war contract terminations and the complete shutdown by the strike from the middle of November.

The first strikes slowed the reconversion efforts, helped to prolong the period of consumer goods shortages, but caused no drastic economic collapse. Then came the coal strike, and finally the railroads tieup. Supplies of coal on hand made possible a period of waiting, without too serious consequences. The rail strike meant an immediate serious disruption of the nation's transportation. Waiting would be disastrous. The trains had to be started, and quickly. What could be done? The wages and additional consideration the men wanted seemed modest enough.

The government, run by labor's “friends,” could tell the companies to comply with the demands. Did they do so? On the contrary, Mr. Truman went on the radio, accused the rail union officials of entire responsibility and pleaded with the men to defy their union officials and go back to their tasks.

Thinking that they would not comply, he went before Congress with demands for drastic strike curbing authority, including power to draft the strikers into the Army and subject them to court-martial if they should refuse to obey. An overwhelming majority of labor's “friends” in Congress applauded the request and were willing to comply.

In the House, 306 members voted for his submitted bill, to 13 against it. In the Senate, the support was almost as great. But in that body, debate is seldom shut off and any minority has the power to postpone, if not to block, passage of bills.

The Senate, knowing it could not rush through the bill, passed the previously debated Case Bill, containing drastic and permanent strike curbs. This bill had already been passed by the House, but was considered too drastic. The Senate version differed from the House bill and had to be adopted in conference. This bill is now awaiting the President's approval or veto. Meanwhile, the President's proposed bill has also been passed by the Senate in amended form, by a vote of 61 to 19. The Army induction clause was removed, but “strike against the government” was declared illegal and the invocation of the injunction and other penalties provided. This bill is now held up in conference until it is known what the President will do with the Case Bill. It is now history that the rail unions decided to go back to work on the basis of the compromise offer, before the President spoke to Congress, and that the emergency thus had passed. It is not yet clear whether this was known to the President before he started his talk, or if the notice he received in the middle of his speech was his first information. In any case, Mr. Truman was angry at the two Railroad Brotherhood chiefs and, no doubt, would have liked to see them punished by court-martial.

The legislation that will finally be adopted will be an attempt to curb labor union power. Its effects will be to make criminals of union officials, but not merely that, it will make lawbreakers of all

ize that only by taking under common ownership the entire resources of their respective countries, such as the land, the means of production, etc., can they put an end to their starving condition. Do what the capitalist nations will to decry this as “Russian Totalitarianism” the fact remains that

the World Revolution has gained so much momentum, that in time it will sweep all opposition aside. It is only after the capitalist system is completely abolished that real humanitarianism will be possible and food no longer be used as a political weapon.

Al Wysocki.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 1)

uct which they alone have produced. In due time, they should raise the full-revolutionary demand, even over the head of the conservative Lewis, of complete access and control over property and the product of their labor.

The strike continued for nearly four weeks, commencing to affect other industries depending upon coal as a source of energy and power, notably the railroads (where a similar strike has been postponed for five days, following their taking over by the government). The railroads immediately announced schedule reductions. The nation has been worked up into a state of alarm. "Public opinion" was mobilized by radio and press, as usual, not against the mine operators for resisting demands, but against the mine workers for making them. John L. Lewis has been given a thorough "raking over the coals" as a union czar and dictator for his "complete callousness for the public welfare." Anti-labor legislation was already getting into swing as a sort of a Damocles sword to frighten labor into giving in. During all this time the UMW held firm and Lewis maintained his well-known stubbornness.

Then suddenly it was announced that, after a talk with President Truman, Lewis had ordered the miners back to work for a twelve day period, pending negotiations. This can be construed as the first break of the strike, an opening wedge, with the possibility of further widening the breach into the miners' unity and determination. Simultaneously it was reported that Lewis also had agreed to abandon his royalty demand in favor

of a substitute tax on the total payroll. At this writing (May 19) one week before the deadline (May 25) negotiations are getting nowhere. The government may be forced to take over the operation of the mines and break the strike. In that event it will again show its true color, as the catspaw for big business.

Nor does the liberal eye-wash about "nationalization of the mines" mean any substantial change for workers. In such event, the government would merely function OPENLY as the official exploiter, agent and collector, turning over the profits to their "rightful" owners.

The miners should fight hard and stubbornly. They should persist in their demands unyieldingly, no matter who runs the mines, private operators or its agent—the government. The net result is the same. One thing is certain, the miners, themselves, don't own nor run the mines—yet. Until then they must realize that whatever immediate pay increases or safety regulations they need will not benevolently come by themselves, without struggle. They must further awaken to the stubborn facts that, granted even a complete union victory in the present strike they still have no complete guarantee against the curse of unemployment, nor genuine protection of their health. To attain this desirable and necessary goal, King Coal will have to be completely dethroned.

* * *

The rhapsodies sung of American philanthropy as measured by performance, are in the process of sounding a hollow note. Thirty-two metric tones of rice

(Continued on page 6)

The Labor Unions

The Workers' Weapon Against Exploitation

Karl Marx, the foremost working class leader and thinker, had long ago stated that: "The trade union is the cradle of the labor movement," for working people naturally turn first to that which effects their daily life, and they combine first with their fellows of the trade. This fact is so significant that the Proletarian Party regards the organized labor movement as the most important section of the American proletariat.

When we examine the American labor movement today we discover that there are approximately 15 million organized workers, a record achievement, heretofore unsurpassed in American labor history. They comprise such unions as the American Federation of Labor with 7 million members and the Congress of Industrial Organizations (C. I. O.) with 6 million members, and the remainder of approximately two million in such unions as the railroad Brotherhoods and other independent organizations. This tremendous growth is looked upon with just pride by labor but it is tempered with the fact that it is still but a small fraction compared to the unorganized workers who comprise some 35 to 40 millions. The Proletarian Party, therefore, urges the unorganized to join the ranks of, and to support the unions and it points out to them that only through organized action can the workers wage a successful struggle against their exploiters.

Aware of the necessity of increasing their membership, both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. are now engaged in an intensive campaign to organize the un-

ganized, particularly the workers in the southern states whose living standards are far below that of the workers of the north. Both these major unions have set a goal of enrolling one million members each to their respective organizations. This is a commendable effort because by increasing its membership organized labor will be in a better position to resist the encroachments of capital.

There is, however, an aspect of this picture which is not commendable and that is that both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. are rival organizations. Instead of co-operating with each other they are engaged in a bitter rivalry, although this is more the fault of the top leadership than the membership, still it results in raiding each other union membership in jurisdictional disputes, etc. This is a deplorable condition which the Proletarian Party not only criticizes but for which it also holds the leadership of both organizations responsible. The Proletarian Party calls upon the rank and file membership of these opposing unions to force their leadership to accede to the needs of the working class and to immediately settle this internecine war within the ranks of labor. The two groups must come into one, which will vigorously prosecute organization of the unorganized in all fields of production, and along lines which will adequately protect the interest of craft and industrial workers alike, as members of one class. We point out, however, the superiority of the industrial form of organization for most workers

(Continued on page 5)

union members who do not go back to the job upon government and company worked out agreements. It will do more. It will make clear to the workers where the government stands in any labor-management controversy. It shows that the companies must be asked to compromise with labor's demands, but also that labor must be compelled to accept the voluntary offers. It reveals clearly that wealth has first call upon government protection and that labor gets the push-about.

The methods pursued by Washington reveals that Republican and Democratic party lines are meaningless. It shows that "friends" of labor will turn against labor. It should convey the understanding that labor's own political action will be necessary, not to select "friends," but to put itself in power. Yes, it should do more. It should cause labor to take up a serious investigation of the whole economic setup, and its relation to government and politics.

If this is done it will be found that private enterprise through its stages of development, decrees a decreasing part of the products of labor to be labor's reward. It will be found that every new device, every improved method of production, can be installed only if it saves labor or increases production with the same labor.

It will be found that this gain to capital does not always, or for long, bring about more profits but more waste and expense. Rail transportation might be flourishing, both in profits and high wages, when it is alone in the field. In competition with trucks, automobiles, and air transportation, it might mean poverty for all concerned, while at the same time ton-mile cost of transportation may have been greatly reduced.

Coal, standing alone as the nation's fuel, might do well. In competition with natural gas, oil and hydro-electric power, it brings problems that free enterprise cannot solve. An automobile factory,

running full time, might provide both profit and wages. If that same factory is expanded to the point that it supplies the market in half of running time, profits will disappear and workers will be close to the starvation point. It is the same in all fields. It is a condition that cannot be changed or improved. It grows worse with every expansion of capital. It necessitates the pressure for foreign markets, and, hence, wars.

So, in its relation to government, free enterprise means private property in the means of production. The present form of government was instituted to protect people in their property rights. The fact that, gradually, 90 per cent of the people have become propertyless, and the other 10 per cent hold title to all, merely means that the 10 per cent gets the prior protection where property relations are involved. Wage controversies are always involving property rights, because property in the means of production is as nothing if profits decline or disappear.

These lessons will be learned, mostly the hard way, through experience. But the hard way is asserting itself, at times in rising prices and static wages, at other times in falling wages, partial layoffs and unemployment. It asserts itself always in the government standing firmly for the rights of property.

Labor will learn in time, if not from this lesson, that even a political party of labor could not make brothers out of capital and labor. It will be brought home in America, as it is now being brought home in Europe, that free enterprise—capitalism—cannot be made to feed the masses. Among the working class, the movement is under way for the building of the forces which will do away with free enterprise. This movement is growing. You, the reader of these lines, should investigate and align yourself where you rightly belong.

Christ Jelset.

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.

THE PROLETARIAN PARTY

Its Principles and Program

For more than a quarter of a century, the PROLETARIAN PARTY OF AMERICA has consistently set forth its revolutionary principles for the consideration of the whole working class. Its starting point on all social questions, during peace or war, during prosperous periods or depressions, is that which will best serve the economic interests and political advancement of the working class as a whole.

The Proletarian Party contends that the greater war, the unceasing conflict between the employing class and the working class, cannot be compromised, cannot be modified with the passing of time, but only intensified and sharpened. It contends that this war between capital and labor can only be fought to a finish, that the only consistent and practical slogan for the workers against their exploiters, the industrial and financial capitalists, is "unconditional surrender."

There is no middle-ground. Contrary to official teaching, capital and labor are not brothers, but deadly enemies. The struggle of the classes, rich against poor, is a historic fact. It is not the product of the rich hating the poor or the latter hating the rich. Hatred is there sure enough, but it is not the cause. It is the result of the division of society into classes, possessors and non-possessors.

Revolutionary Political Action

While the objective of the class struggle is economic, the retention of the means of production, the mills, mines, railroads, etc., by the capitalists, and the fight for possession of those means of production by the proletarians, the modern wage workers, the form which the struggle takes is **political**. This, too, is a historic fact, existing objectively outside of the minds of men.

When Karl Marx and Frederick Engels wrote into the **Communist Manifesto**, of 1848, that: "All class struggles are political struggles," they meant just exactly what they said. The institution which decrees that the class struggle is **political** was founded originally by, and in the interest of, the property owning classes. It is the **State**, or what is commonly called government.

In all present day phases of the struggle between capital and labor, between the workers and their exploiters, the **State** takes its stand on the side of capital, even when it tries, or pretends, to be impartial. That is what it exists for. It is the "public power of coercion." Its constitutions are founded upon property rights. Its purpose is the protection of those with property, especially property in the means of production. Those without property, the modern working class, the vast majority, may grasp at its substance, but they only get its shadow.

Political action which has for its objective the overthrow of the profit system, the taking possession of the means of production by the vast majority, in the interests of the vast majority, is **Revolutionary Political Action**.

Ever since its inception, in 1920, the Proletarian Party of America has consistently adhered to the fundamental principles of Marxian communism.

The objective of this party is to arouse the working people of America to a realization of the historic role they are called upon to play, namely, their self-emancipation from the yoke of capitalist exploitation. To this end, the Proletarian Party proclaims that the starting point of all intelligent class action is the recognition of the class character of present day society, recognition of the fact that it is divided into two great camps, rich exploiters and exploited workers.

The wealth of America is produced **socially**. Enormous numbers of workers cooperate in the productive process. This is **social production**. But, while the wealth is produced **collectively** it is appropriated **individually**, by the individual capitalists.

This result springs from the fact that the members of one class, the capitalists, own the means of production, the mills, mines, railroads, etc., and also own the natural resources of the nation, while the members of the other class, the proletarians (wage workers), have no ownership in the means of production.

Sellers of Labor Power

If the workers would live, and provide for their dependents, they are obliged to sell, for wages, the only thing they possess, namely, their labor power, their mental and physical power to produce. But,

the wage system of payment is like charity, "it covers a multitude of sins." Under the cloak of wage payments there lurks a legal system of plunder, politely called "the exploitation of labor." It is the source of all profit, interest and rent. From this source alone, from the toil and sweat of social labor, arises the great fortunes of millionaires and multi-millionaires.

The chief problems of today cannot be solved within the structure of the prevailing social order, within the profit system. The basic problem, of course, is the "exploitation of labor." In other words, the workers produce wealth, the value of which is vastly in excess of the value of their wages, and, as we have previously pointed out, the abolition of this exploitation can be achieved only by revolutionary political action.

Organized Action

The working people, the vast majority of the population, must organize for the purpose of taking political power into their own hands, and establishing a new form of government through which they can direct the nation in the interest of all, instead of it being directed, as at present, in the interest of the capitalist class alone.

For this purpose, a political party is of prime importance. Hence, the Proletarian Party, which asserts that the collective ownership of the means of production, and the natural resources of the nation, is the only possible solution to the great problems of today, such as war, unemployment, mass starvation, ignorance, slums, disease and crime. The achievement of permanent peace, adequate housing, health and general security, can never be attained so long as pro-

Proletarian Party Convention

The Tenth National Convention of the Proletarian Party of America was held in Proletarian Hall, Chicago, on May 30, 31 and June 1. There were delegates from many parts of the country. They represented locals from Boston and New York on the east, to Los Angeles on the west.

This convention was one of the most effective yet held by the Proletarian Party during the 26 years of its existence. It was marked by harmony and hard work. The delegates took their tasks seriously and crowded as much effort into the three days as normally would have taken a week.

Following the convention, a social was held on Saturday evening, June 1. The hall was filled to its capacity, and a lively time was enjoyed by all present, many of whom were there for the first time, which was also true of a number of the delegates. Good food and good fellowship, with much fun, lent life to the evening. A short speech explaining the aims of the Party was made by the National Secretary Comrade John Keracher.

The work of the convention was mainly taken up with planning for Party expansion, but time was found for the writing of theses on various phases of the class struggle, into which was incorporated current aspects thereof. The characteristics of this post-war period, with its growing conflicts, both at home and abroad, were stressed. Some of these theses appear in this issue, and others will be published in the July issue.

Special committees are to be elected in the Party locals to carry out the convention's decisions. These committees will have definite tasks, such as membership drives and fund raising. The latter to be used for sending additional organizers into places where there are prospects for strengthening existing locals and commen-

cing new ones. Methods for fund raising will be combined with other activities such as the holding of picnics, socials, and other fraternal affairs.

On the matter of fund raising for Party expansion it was decided to solicit assistance from non-members and friends of the Party, the number of whom have been increasing of late. Readers of *Proletarian News*, and Party members-at-large, where no locals as yet exist, are especially urged to lend a hand.

The reports of delegates at the convention showed clearly that a substantial advance had been made in contacting increasing numbers. New headquarters have been established in New York City at 1947 Broadway, where classes are conducted. Lectures are held each Wednesday at 8 p. m. at Labor Temple on Fourteenth Street and Second Avenue. Local Boston has recently established a permanent headquarters at 158 Broadway.

Sometime was devoted to consideration of enlarging and improving *Proletarian News*. It was decided that additional funds would be raised for that purpose, but it was felt that much will depend upon an increase in circulation, plans for which were worked out. A subscription drive is being launched and readers of *Proletarian News* are hereby invited to cooperate. Their prompt aid will be appreciated. Send in subscriptions for your friends. Send names and addresses of progressive minded people. Cash contributions to the *Proletarian News* Press Fund are also solicited. To all who read this we are appealing. Only thru the fullest cooperation of readers and friends of the Party can we make our paper bigger and better. There certainly is a demand for this change. Some want the paper to appear more frequently. therefore, we need your help, just as you need *Proletarian News* and the message it conveys.

duction has to pass through the bottle-neck of the profit system, which leaves the bulk of the wealth in the hands of rich parasites.

As long as capitalism remains, these problems will remain. Nay, more, they will increase in volume and viciousness. Strikes will take on greater magnitude and severity. They will become more and more political in character. More frequently will the government be forced to intervene to save capitalism, to keep it from collapse. Those struggles of labor against capital will take on the form of struggles against the government, which is, of course, the highest organized form of capitalist repression and coercion of the workers. The recent action of Congress in overwhelmingly supporting President Truman, and his proposed law to conscript into the army all who strike against a government controlled industry, is emphatic proof of this trend.

Post-War Problems

As a result of the war, American capitalist imperialism has greatly expanded. It is now the dominant imperialism of the world and, as a consequence, the armed forces of the State will be maintained upon a vastly increased scale. The role of chief of police to the world, formerly Great Britain's role, has been taken over in the name of democracy by the United States. "Bearing the white man's burden," as the British imperialists used to hypocritically call it, and which meant carrying off everything of value that wasn't nailed down, now becomes the international mission of the Wall Street imperialists.

Large numbers of young men and women will be taken from their homes and sent to remote parts of the earth to police and protect the investments of the American finance capitalists, the great banking institutions, industrial monopolies, and if necessary, to lay down their lives in defense of those investments.

If the masses of the American people wish capitalism to continue, or think that there is nothing that can be done about it, then they will have to put up with its effects. If they want to remain in poverty, if they are satisfied with insecurity, if that is the inheritance they wish to pass on to their children, just to be wealth producers for another class all the days of their lives, then they can be sure that it will continue, especially with their support of the political parties of capitalism, the Democratic and Republican parties.

However, should the workers come to comprehend that by the power of their numbers (the only force they really have), they can, through organized action, alter this state of affairs, then independent political action is the first step to take.

Capitalism does not fear an ignorant mob, no matter how large or violent, but numerical strength, enlightened and organized, that is a different matter. That means real power, the only sort that will be effective. The difference between an army and a mob is a matter of organization.

The ruling class today has everything on its side, except numbers. All established institutions are at its disposal—the press, the radio, the schools, universities and churches. All are openly or covertly, in the service of the rich and against the working class. "Public education" is capitalist education. The "public press" is the capitalist press. Its propaganda is in the interest of the property owners. Some of it is openly anti-labor. Some of it pretends to be friendly to labor, provided that the workers are satisfied with the present social arrangement, or want but slight improvements.

Those who preach class peace, whether through the press or the pulpit, mean peace with poverty, the continuation of slums or at best, improved slums. The professional charity mongers are staunch defenders of the system which makes their "charity" necessary.

Those who look to the rich exploiters, their government and political parties, for justice, will get capitalist justice and no other. The workers, the vast majority, must establish their own justice. The first step is to break with the political traditions of the past, and the second is to build a powerful political party of the working class, upon principles, and with policies, such as those of the Proletarian Party.

The Proletarian Party has consistently asserted that capitalism with its profit, interest and rent, for one class, and starvation wages for the workers, has outlived its historical usefulness, that the time is now here for its entire abolition.

Reforming the present social order will not bring advantages to the workers. Each "improvement" which emanates from Congress, is overtaken and nullified by new breakdowns, by further inroads upon the living standards of the working class. Problems, under capitalism, arise faster than they can be remedied.

The Labor Movement

What is commonly called the Labor Movement, namely, labor unions of all sorts, has grown enormously in the last decade. Millions of workers are now organized on the economic field, but they are still unorganized politically. They do not trust the employing class in relation to their jobs and conditions of employment, but they have complete confidence in the political representatives of that class, the Republicans and Democrats.

(Continued in next month's issue)

THE LABOR UNIONS

The Workers' Weapon Against Exploitation

(Continued from page 3)

and urge a campaign of education to hasten the complete adoption of this form.

The record growth of the American labor unions within the past decade calls for a searching analysis as to the causes of this phenomenal increase. This is all the more necessary because the official leaders of the unions have taken the credit for this improvement by advancing the notion that it was due to their "wise leadership" and the social legislation (New Deal) of the late President Roosevelt. What we point out, however, is that America, is like any other capitalist country, wherein the wealth of the nation including its means of production is owned by a wealthy minority, the capitalist class. Private ownership and production for profit dominates the economy of the nation. The vast majority, i.e. the working class are without property, the only thing they have is their ability to work, their laboring power. In order to live the workers must sell their labor-power, in return for which they receive a wage. The employers of labor, on the other hand, do their utmost to keep wages down, knowing full well that the less they pay in wages, the more they get in profits. The exploited workers struggle against such condition. Marx stated in 1848 (Communist Manifesto) that: "The proletariat goes through various stages of development. With its birth begins its struggle with the bourgeoisie. At first the contest is carried on by individual laborers, then by the work people of a factory, then by the operatives of one trade, in one locality, against the individual bourgeois who directly exploits them." He also points out that the workers, realizing that, as individuals, they are powerless against the onslaught of capital, thereupon "begin to form combinations (trade unions) against the bourgeoisie; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations, etc." This, of course, is the elementary aspect of the class struggle between capital and labor.

Many workers remember that during the Great Depression period of the 1930's wages had sunk so low that they were below the bare level of existence. By 1935, millions of workers "rebelled" against this oppressive condition and the "revolts" took the form of mass organization into the labor unions. It was during that year that the C. I. O. was born, at first a committee and later it became a "congress" of industrial organizations. Not even the short-sighted and reactionary attempts of some of the A. F. of L. officials could stem this avalanche of union organization. In making

this analysis we do not underestimate the efforts made on the part of union-conscious and class conscious workers in getting others to join. What we do stress, however, is the basic fact that it is the enroachment of capital on the living standards of labor that causes the workers to organize. If workers did not organize and resist capital, they would be reduced to a worse form of wage-slavery than they are now experiencing.

Although the American labor unions have reached a record quantitative development yet qualitatively they have many shortcomings. The structural form of both organizations could stand much improvement. Craftism still prevails within the A. F. of L., although lately spurred on by the growth of its rival the C. I. O., it has also gone in for organizing workers in the industrial form. The former is still an "affiliation" of unions, while the latter is still a "congress" both lacking in that centralized unity which is so essential in maintaining a solidified front against capital. This is evidenced particularly in strike action, where one often finds one union scabbing while the other is striking.

The qualitative shortcomings of the unions was particularly revealed in the reactionary and opportunistic role of its top "leadership" during the period of World War II. The Proletarian Party, at its 1943 convention, condemned such betrayal of working class interests and stated that:

"When World War II broke out, instead of this leadership taking a militant position of pointing out to the union members that this war is imperialistic and, therefore, harmful to the cause of labor, they took steps to tie the unions more firmly to the capitalist war-chariot by going in for 'no-strike' pledges, and thus depriving the unions of their main weapon, which is the workers' greatest reliance in their struggle against capital. In the interests of 'war unity' they have gone into the conflict in the support of capital, some favoring incentive wage schemes to speed up the workers, favoring long hours of labor, the buying of war bonds, etc."

What was the condition of American labor when war ended in 1945? One found that, as a result of wages being "frozen" during the war (but not the cost of living which went sky high), the workers standard of living had gone down. Thousands of workers were laid off. Others were transferred to less remunerative jobs, and the shortening of the work week brought with it a resultant cut in weekly wages. This was capital's reward to lab-

(Continued on page 8)

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 3)

were shipped during the week ending April 29, where the average weekly shipping requirements of UNRRA called for 13,900 tons. According to government reports, there are 5,500,000 long tons in the storage bins of America's great wheat states, more than twice as much as the United States needs for reserves. The deficit for April is reported to be 418,000 tons, and, since January, 881,000 tons. Acting Secretary of State Acheson told a press conference that the export deficit, for the first week in May alone, would have been sufficient to meet the minimum weekly ration for 71,500,000 Europeans.

The discrepancies between shipments and requirements, led F. H. LaGuardia, Director General of UNRRA, to burst out that: "From now on UNRRA is dealing in realities. I am taking figures only of actual shipments. Availabilities, future commitments, hopes, statistics, quantities, are no good to hungry people. I intend to make public actual shipments and to consider only actual shipments. This is a pretty dark picture for the moment." (N. Y. Times, May 5.)

In the meantime, while the supine administrators debate, starvation stalks in Europe. Leo Jay Margolin, associate director of public information in charge of UNRRA's European offices, who recently returned from four and a half months in Europe, interviewed in Boston, reported that 75 per cent of Europe's population is suffering from malnutrition. He said that: "People who are suffering from malnutrition will die in one month to a year. If we don't get food to them, we will be signing their death warrant." (Boston Globe, May 6.)

Warning the U. S., Dr. W. Y. Elliott of Harvard University, told members of the Massachusetts Cooperative Bank League that unless the U. S. "continues to give relief to Germany at the rate of several hundred million dollars a year out of American taxpayers' money, we shall doom Germany to joining up with Russia as an alternative to starvation.

"This country needs a definite policy to counteract Russian policy in Europe and the Far East by creating strong economic systems in Western Europe." (Boston Globe, April 23.)

It is self-evident that millions, literally tens of millions, of bushels of grain of all kinds is on hand and could be shipped, if the "What's in it for me?" attitude could be abandoned by both the farm profit takers and the government. In 1939, wheat prices averaged 57.1 cents a bushel, compared with \$1.45 in 1946. In April, the government,

in an effort to lure some grain from the storage bins, offered the farmers a bonus of 30 cents a bushel. The response has been negligible, owing to the government's counteracting promise of higher ceiling prices for meat, and the fact that there is more profit in feeding the grain to high priced live stock than accepting a bonus for grain for human consumption. The milling of wheat for bread, which, true enough, may be the "staff of life," BUT profit is the staff of life of capitalism.

The Government, on the other hand, is more than likely using the food more as a political weapon than for humanitarian motives, as hinted by the "educator," Dr. Elliott. To feed friendly countries pays "dividends." To withhold, or threaten to withhold, may be an effective club to unyielding political recalcitrants. Meanwhile, statistics, paper promises, are fed the HUNGRY.

* * *

How Much We Read

A nation-wide survey of the amount and kind of reading done by the American public, covering the first six months of 1945, was reported before a gathering of 150 members of the book manufacturers' institute at their recent annual convention in Atlantic City.

Here are a few facts, as reported in the N. Y. Times of May 4:

Ninety-five per cent of the people read the bible; but "Forever Amber," a love novel, is a close runner-up, with 84 per cent; "A Tree Grows in Brooklyn" was a good third, with 57 per cent; and of those who read the bible, a large percentage read but a few verses.

Seventy per cent of all books published are read by 21 per cent of the people. More active readers borrow books than those who buy them, with the former group outnumbering the purchasers 57 per cent to 31 per cent.

As for the active readers' taste: fiction accounts for 58 per cent of all books read and 37 per cent non-fiction. The most popular books are of the adventure type, which accounts for 17 per cent. Other favorites are war books, 15 per cent; religion, 14 per cent; mystery, 10 per cent; social problems, 15 per cent; humor, 8 per cent; poetry, 2 per cent.

As to age, youth between the ages of 15 to 19 read more than any other group. Women read more than men, 53 per cent against 46 per cent. Fifty-two per cent of readers buy books ranging in price from \$1 to \$3; only 12 per cent pay more than \$3.00.

Here is other data on what the American people do with their leisure time: 59 per cent is spent

listening to the radio; 21 per cent reading newspapers; 11 per cent of the time in the movies and 8 per cent reading books.

Having no other similar and earlier data we are unable to make any comparative analysis to determine the trend. However, it is probably safe to make the following deductions:

(1) That book reading is not an essential activity, or acquired art, in our daily life, standing at the foot of the list with only 8 per cent in the use of our leisure time.

(2) That radio is a tremendous and potent force, with the overwhelming figure of 59 per cent.

(3) That the bulk of the reading done is inclined rather to the lighter and fictional side of life; history and social problems, with the respective allotment of 15 per cent, though leading religion by 1 per cent.

(4) That the adult population reads less than youth.

In accounting for the relatively little reading done by Americans, as also their heavy leaning towards fiction, we believe emphasis should be put first upon the stress and strain of our general manner of living, and that of the workers in particular. The incessant struggle to make ends meet, the strain of industry with its mass production and speed-up, the fast pace in commercial enterprise and lack of sufficient leisure, all these leave the worker a very fatigued man, barely able at times to drag himself home. In seeking relaxation, he turns to the easiest and most entertaining form, to which radio has the answer.

The humdrum, noisy and monotonous machines in the factory, his drab, day-in-and-day-out drudgery and toil, his dreams and hopes for something new, interesting, thrilling and adventurous, are blasted by his dependence upon the job and the limitations set by its miserable yield. Unable to ever fulfill these desires of his in the concrete real conditions of life, he seeks an outlet, or escape, in the unrealistic and grossly exaggerated movies. Here he pipe-dreams away for a couple of hours in an imaginary ideal world. Fiction books fill that void for like reason.

Leisure is the one requisite element necessary to reading and study. That, the workers have too little of. It would seem that their whole life and strength is wrapped up and consumed by this urge to work, which they cannot escape and for which they are so poorly rewarded. Wonder it is, sometimes, that even that much is read.

An important unreported phase on books is as to their social quality. Too few, as yet, realize that the bulk of the material published has a class slant which unconsciously grows into and becomes part of the public thought-equipment. Little do the many

suspect that the main theme, the morals drawn, the social values stressed, the heroes and heroines with their successes and failures, are permeated through and through by capitalist motivation. Though now and then a book gains recognition which does bring out some of the "dirt," exposes some of the wrongs and prejudices of prevailing society, this is a rare phenomenon, in the main capitalist ideology prevails.

Writers and books are assiduously eyed, carefully censored by the publishers, critics, etc. Such writers are usually encouraged, advertised and made popular, who can interestingly, and entertainingly, surround and capture the reader's mind in the service of capital.

Someone once said: "Reading maketh the man." But that is not all. How much we read is one thing, the kind of stuff we read is another. That difference is important to draw. Workers, particularly, must learn to separate the chaff from the wheat, factual material from tripe, the distorted and imaginary from the real.

In addition, today, we have, in the labor movement, a rich and growing literature which stresses the real nature of things, both as to posing the problem and the solution. This literature is factual and scientific. It is high time that workers ceased to depend for information upon the class-colored sory-books of capitalism. These may salve their wounds for the moment, numb their feelings, but workers should have had enough of this sort of stuff. From their own experiences, they should realize the need for serious reading and more serious thinking—in behalf of their own class needs. Increased reading of Marxian books would certainly serve as a gauge of their growing social alertness.

* * *

How Not to Organize Southern Labor

Both the AFL and CIO have simultaneously launched a campaign for the organization of Southern labor. This is a long overdue need for unionization to wrest that segment of workers, both white and colored, from the terrible conditions of southern "slavery" and mental backwardness. As such this attempt deserves all the encouragement and support labor can muster, but certainly not in the manner it is already taking form.

The AFL got off on the wrong foot. It is making a bid to the Southern employers, by opening up an offensive against the CIO, linking up the latter with Communism. It would appear that the pattern is taking on the character more of red-baiting and labor-splitting than the logically expected appeal to all labor to organize for its economic interest. The underlying AFL strat-

(Continued on page 7)

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 6)

egy seems to be aimed to convince, or goad, the employers by frightening them from the "Communist" CIO to the safe, conservative and truly American form of organization, the AFL.

In his opening address, President Green of the AFL viciously assailed, not the employers but the CIO. He emphasized that the AFL is opposed to race bias, but on this point the facts belied his statement. For in this very conference, as the N. Y. Times reported, attempt was made to segregate approximately 200 Negro delegates by seating them in a separate part of the hall. Though strong opposition forced abandonment of this color-seating policy, it must, nevertheless, have left a sour taste in those delegates' mouths.

The CIO, in its turn, met at Atlantic City, where President Murray very elastically advised the CIO that while it must guard carefully against communist infiltration, it is not to engage in any purges and witch-hunts.

The jockeying for favorable position by both labor organizations in their mutual attempt to obtain hegemony over Southern labor is bound to bear limited fruit. Disunited action and mutual smear-campaigning will play into the hands of the employers, who will quickly take advantage of the rift. The effect upon the workers themselves will be a negative one.

Especially is that true of the AFL communist-smear campaign, which sounds like employer inspired or, in any event, works to their interest. The influence of communists in either labor organization is yet lamentably small, though it might well be that there are more progressive labor forces in the CIO.

The campaign objective of the AFL to organize and unite Southern labor is, in practice, counteracted by its reactionary tactics of splitting and disunity. Its appeal to "Americanism," and to the employers, can only lead to compromise and temporizing with the Southern bosses.

Rank and file labor everywhere, both in the AFL and the CIO, must adopt a more critical attitude towards its leaders. They must force a demand for greater labor unity and action. Organizational progress can proceed, only after abandonment of internecine labor warfare and smear. The exertion of labor's forces must be directed, not at one another, but against labor's enemy—capital.

* * *

Alcatraz

For a fortnight, strikes, shortages and international peace difficulties, were blacked out by the "Battle of Alcatraz." Heavy-typed front page headlines and vengeful editorials only served (if

that is necessary) to dramatize the growing crime problem and the failure to effectively cope with it, let alone solve it. Previously reported prisoners' strikes in different sections of the country were only a foretaste of the battle on the "Rock."

The 12-acre Isle of Alcatraz has been Federal property since 1850. Fortified and made a disciplinary prison for Army offenders in 1859, it has served since 1934 as an impregnable prison for "incurables." While other federal penitentiaries at least make a pretense of rehabilitating their "boarders," that is out of the question at Alcatraz. Here the inmates are mere animals in a human zoo, caged and deprived of any hopes. "Branded" for life as incurable social outcasts, they are haunted and spotted by the armed guards, like a prey by a hunter. The latest scientific devices, including the "electric eye" to detect the presence of metals on prisoners, is employed to make the "Rock" escape-proof.

As an impregnable fortress, its record is tops, for no one is known to have ever escaped to tell the tale. The famous Oklahoma robbers, Ralph Roe and Theodore Cole, vanished from Alcatraz in December of 1937 and were never found. They were believed to have perished in the deadly rip-tide that sweeps from the isle to the mainland.

In this recent attempted flight from behind bars, the reported ringleaders, Coy, Cretzer and Hubbard were found dead after the smoke cleared. On the side of "law and order," were two killed and fourteen wounded in the 36-hour siege. U. S. Marines, modern military equipment, including bazookas, mortars and gas bombs were called upon to exact unconditional surrender.

That particular episode has ended. Has the infection been removed or even arrested? These questions have racked the brains of prison reformers, no little, with scant results for their efforts. The black-clothed prison reformers plea is for more religion. But seemingly crime increases concomitantly and in spite of every religious effort. This reminds the writer of an experience related by a prison reformer some time back who upon inspecting a prison in a New England state, queried the jailkeeper, if there were any atheists within the compound. Whereup the jailer indignantly retorted, "that all his boys are good religious people attending the prison chapel every blessed Sunday." Not a very good recommendation for religion as a crime deterrent.

Nor are any other suggested panaceas by good-hearted prison reformers for a more humane treatment towards the inmates any more effective. The flood-

(Continued on page 8)

Two Questions Answered

1. Isn't it probable that Marxism, like Catholicism, can become a dogma, dangerous and a hindrance to social progress?

2. Marxists claim to work towards establishing greater economic security. Isn't it possible that such security might be acquired at the sacrifice of freedom?

In answering the first question, attention must be drawn to the essential difference between Marxism and Catholicism. Unlike Catholicism, Marxism is not a dogma, but a science, a social science. Wherein, then, does dogma, or faith, and science differ? In method, or approach. Dogma is based upon preconception, or acceptance, on belief, pure and simple. It admits no questions for any natural proof or analysis. It renounces experience and is contrary to it.

Religious dogma is absolute truth, based upon divine revelation, recognizing no change. Any deviation is a sinful departure from the holy truth, or God. In its very nature, dogma stands opposed to change. It is in contradiction to social evolution and a barrier to it, defending always the fast-frozen past and established present. It fosters and perpetuates superstition, is an enemy of science and social innovation.

Science, both natural as well as social, stands squarely upon facts, experience or sense perceptions. Nothing is taken for granted, everything must pass the test of analysis and investigation. If with dogma, reasoning is apriori, with science it is posteriori. It seeks, not an absolute truth or a supernatural cause, but a relative truth, a phenomenal cause within the natural world. Experience, reality, is both the source as well as the check or proof of the correctness of ideas. New experience, new data, give rise to changed ideas and theories. From time to time, science corrects, amplifies and even negates previous theories. It is obvious that only science, which recognizes the objectivity of change, can be in line with the necessity of change and progress. It is implicit in its very ideology, or method of reasoning.

Social science, Marxism, like natural science, is not speculative but analytical. Its socialist critique and program have neither faith nor any moral concepts of an unjust capitalism as its premise. The Marxian conception of social relations stems from an analysis of the inner workings of capitalism and its contradictions, the evolution of these inevitably producing the material conditions for such social change. The cause for socialism is not sought in the minds of men, but in the womb of capitalist society.

Marxism is a science of revolution, dogma is a belief in revelation. Its method of reasoning does not lead to searching for an absolute truth or ideal state. Communism is not the end of social evolution but a stage of it. Its ob-

ject is relative truth, in harmony with the progressive development of society. Marxism is a changing science and a science of social change. It rejects permanency or the eternity of anything, in nature, society, or ideas, including itself, insisting always on the fluid nature of all things. Its dialectical character prohibits it from ever logically to deteriorate into a fixed dogma of absoluteness.

In answer to the second question: "Will economic security be bought at the expense of a restriction in freedom?" Undoubtedly, it will. Security for the great masses automatically involves a restriction for some, the select few. It implies a loss of freedom for the capitalist minority to exploit and rob the many as of old. It also carries with it a loss of that freedom to restore conditions of capitalist exploitation through counter-revolution.

Security and freedom must not be regarded abstractly. They must be treated in a concrete way, as of class society. We don't live in a social vacuum, but in society with definite forms of organization. Today it is known as capitalism. Here, economic security is enjoyed by the propertied class, the capitalist minority. Freedom inevitably goes with it. Those who have are naturally more free to do things, go places, than those who haven't. But such freedom and security originates out of exploitation of the working class, i. e., at the expense of insecurity and limitation of freedom for the masses of the workers. Riches and poverty are inter-dependent, so also are freedom and slavery.

What does socialism do? It reverses that process. It establishes, through the abolition of private ownership of property, greater economic security for the producers, the workers. In doing so it makes materially possible to this class greater freedom of movement, or social freedom. What kind of freedom?—The freedom to-exploit workers for their individual enrichment?—Such freedom the social revolution definitely restricts. This is a class relation.

It must be added, too, in this connection, that in the course of time, when socialism has advanced to its full and complete form, i. e., in the higher stage of communism, security and freedom both will have lost their class character completely. It then becomes a general privilege enjoyed equally by everyone. In the first stage of communism, however, with remnants of capitalism still extant, greater security for the growing number makes a relative restriction of freedom imperative, for those desiring to return to exploitation. That is in the interest of a greater freedom for the majority, the working class. Such is the relation between security and freedom.

R. Daniels.

THE LABOR UNIONS

The Workers' Weapon Against Exploitation

(Continued from page 5)
or for its sacrifice for the war effort!

It is to the credit of the rank and file members of the unions that they did not take this lying down. A wave of strikes broke out. This should have convinced the top "leadership" that between capital and labor there is no identity of interests. But it did not. Instead, the union officials engaged in class collaboration, through "labor - management" committees, and some, by making appeals to the government. What was the result? In most cases where strike settlements were achieved, the workers had to take far less than their original demands. On numerous occasions wherein the strikes reached a critical condition, the government either "seized" the factories or else the workers were coerced, i.e. beaten, by the strong arm of the law—the police. In taking over the factories, the government acted in the interest of the capitalist class, as its edict is: "You can't strike against the government." Thus the economic supremacy of capital is upheld by its political institutions — the government or state. The latter therefore is the political instrument by means of which capital maintains its exploitation of labor. Those who attempt to build up faith in the state as an "impartial agency" are actually contributing to the betrayal of working class interests.

The political bankruptcy of the present official leadership of the American labor unions is also very evident in other respect. Both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. have always used the cry of "no politics in the labor unions," that is, when it comes to red-baiting or assailing working class political parties. But in practice the union officials support the capitalist parties — the Democratic and Republican — by pursuing the policy of "rewarding labor's friends and punishing its enemies." Of course, the C.I.O. has organized "Political Action Committees" but it differs very little from A. F. of L. policies of lining up votes for capitalist politicians who pretend to be in favor of labor. Seldom have the unions put forth a worker as a candidate, and none of them have yet come forth for real independent working class political action. The Proletarian Party, at all times, points out to the workers the necessity of independent working class political action, by breaking completely with the capitalist political parties.

The Proletarian Party points out to the rank and file members of the unions that the policy of "red baiting," employed by the reactionary leadership, is detrimental to organized labor because it stifles progressive action

and union legislation, calculated to preserve the democratic control of their organization by the members. This democratic control is very essential, if continued success in combatting speed-up and wage-cutting is to be assured. Complete rank and file control of the unions is the main objective, and the only protection against racketeering and reactionary leadership.

On the other hand, the Proletarian Party does not condone control of the unions by any political or ideological minority for it results in disruption of the organization because of ideological differences. Strict adherence to working class democracy and eternal vigilance to prevent autocracy by a minority is the price of success.

Proletarian Party members, however, do not confine themselves exclusively to the task of exposing the "labor lieutenants of the capitalist class" but do their utmost in carrying on regular union work, while stressing working class education within the unions. The main goal is to raise the level of understanding of the union members, to teach them class consciousness. The facts of labor history are brought to their attention, emphasizing the fundamental fact that from the very beginning of capitalism, the exploiters of the working class have always combined against labor, that in the final analysis the best friend of labor is labor.

The fundamental principles of working class economics are made available by Proletarian Party members to their fellow union members. They point out that the source of the capitalist's wealth is through the exploitation of wage-labor. That the capitalist by buying a worker's labor power at its value—by payment of wages—extracts greater value out of it, i.e. **surplus value**, from which all profits are obtained, and that there is no community of interests between the employer — whose profits demand low wages and high prices—and the worker whose needs require high wages and low prices.

Economic fallacies advanced by reactionary union officials are also exposed by Proletarian Party members. The one, for example, that the capitalist by increasing wages will also profit by it, that a market will be created for his products because the workers will be able to buy back more of what is produced with their increased wages. If that were a solution, then the capitalist class would not oppose demands for increased wages. As a matter of fact, competition—and production for profit—compels the employers to keep wages down to the minimum, to de-

A Papal Dualism

In a recent broadcast to Portuguese Catholics celebrating a religious event, Pope Pius blessed them for their "neutrality" in the most destructive war history has ever seen. However, he said, "an implacable force is now attacking the Catholic faith, and Catholics cannot be NEUTRAL in that

crease wages. On the other hand, modern industry is now so highly developed that more is produced than the home market can absorb. As a result, periodical crises occur—the crises of overproduction, more familiarly known as panics or depressions. When this happens, millions of workers are laid off, just as in the Great Depression of the 30's, wherein a peak of 17 million jobless was reached. A general policy of wage-cutting was resorted to by the capitalist class during that period, thus subjecting the working class to greater poverty and misery.

But even during periods of so-called prosperity, machinery supplants skilled workers with unskilled, men by women, adults by children and where it is perfected or improved and replaced by more powerful machines, it discards the workers—technological unemployment occurs. Today, in the midst of "post-war prosperity," there are approximately 4 million jobless. Karl Marx likened the competition among the capitalists to "an industrial war of capitalists with one another, that its battles are won less by means of enlisting than of discharging its industrial recruits. The generals or capitalists, vie with one another as to who can dispense with the greatest number of soldiers."

The Proletarian Party furthermore points out that the struggle between capital and labor is a class struggle and that as long as the capitalists remain in possession of the means of production that long will they rule and rob the workers at the point of production. The Proletarian Party, therefore, stresses the necessity of organized labor taking over, under collective ownership, the entire means of production, i. e., the land, mines, mills, factories, railroads, etc., and producing for use, for the benefit of the whole people instead of for the profit of a rich minority.

The Proletarian Party does not hesitate to set forth the solution for the problem of exploitation. It boldly proclaims the Marxian slogan that, instead of the labor unions asking for "a fair day's wages for a fair day's work," that they should "inscribe on their banner the revolutionary watchword: **'Abolition of the wages system!'**"

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

fight."

That this Pope is a most practical man employing every bit of materialistic reasoning ought to become apparent to the most dogmatic believers. His thinking here partakes little of the supernatural and theological. It is a departure from the abstract, eternal, or fast-frozen concept. He talked more like a practical realist, and not out of this world either. He is right in the thick of it, with a recognition of the relative nature of things.

Neutrality is not an absolute category, true under all conditions. It may have been necessary, from the Pope's viewpoint, to act neutral in Fascism's case, but certainly not in relation to Communism. What else, then, is the Pope doing but using the very materialistic philosophy he so dreadfully abhors? But forgiveness is human. And so we can forgive this partisan Pope for this intellectual sin, especially where his material interests are at stake. For is not self preservation the first law of life? The Catholic hierarchy is intelligent enough to know that its spiritual strength may be derived from "the Almighty," but that its REAL NOURISHMENT comes from private property. Exploitation of the body (labor) is the real foundation for the Church's exploitation of the soul. No wonder, then, that the Church views Communism, the movement to abolish private property, with such bitter hate and alarm. Indeed it would shut off the Pope's source of economic life and power. In all fairness, can anyone blame him for trying so hard to hold on?

R. Daniels.

Home Scene

(Continued from page 7)
tide in and the trickle out are evidence of their impotence. Crime marches on. For it is deeply rooted in a propertied system, itself resting upon theft, the legal robbing of the working class in the production process. That over 90 per cent of crime are violations against property is only so because the vast majority of the population are propertyless. Attempts by the "crooks" to alienate property, lands them in the "big house." The workers build the jails, they also, in the main, fill them. The chief crime such workers commit is that they try to solve the propertied question in their own individual manner. When workers learn the futility of this avenue of escape from poverty, they will turn to the more effective approach of organization and united efforts. Collectively, the workers, by abolishing private property with its legality, will also eliminate the main prop of crime itself.

L. B.