

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. 8—Whole No. 161

Chicago, Illinois, August, 1946

483

Price 5c a Copy

Wages and Labor Efficiency

The new, and rapid, advance in prices since the departure of OPA has again brought the wage question to the front. The post-victory wage advances of 18 and 19 per cent were granted reluctantly by many firms. It took bitter and long drawn out strikes to wrest even that advance from capital. In the thousands of places where labor was not organized, or where wage adjustments were made without strikes, the advances were often as low as five per cent.

Labor was certain that prices had advanced more, and that profits were high. The spokesmen of capital argued back that labor efficiency had declined and that profits were disappearing. They argued that absence of profits was preventing production, and augmented the scarcity of goods.

Both sides went to statistical agencies for proof of their contentions. Labor was bringing forth figures on the cost of living, showing that higher wages were necessary. It had statistics to show that profits were high, and that labor productivity had advanced so much during the war years that a 38 per cent wage ad-

vance would still leave capital with a margin of profit twice that of pre-war returns.

The argument proved nothing. Power proved everything. Capital, with the government firmly on its side, was the stronger. Capital was enjoying a seller's market and could advance prices regardless of OPA. Capital had enough say-so in government to do away with OPA, or to change its form to suit its needs.

Labor had no such power. Labor could strike, it is true, but not for long, and in not too great numbers. The "public" had to be protected. Labor's "friends," both in the White House and on Capitol Hill, said so.

Rapidly advancing prices and static wages cannot endure. Even the powers of capital are limited. The public, this time including labor, can go on a "buyers' strike." Such a strike is most effectively organized by capital, in spite of itself. By placing a limited amount of money in the worker's pay envelope, and advancing the prices of necessities, the quantity of goods sold for that money will of necessity shrink.

(Continued on page 2)

Europe: a Political Battleground

What is in store for three hundred million inhabitants of Europe? What of their political future? Can they look forward to peace and economic well being? Or will Europe again become a battleground like she has been for centuries past? These are some of the burning questions of the day that are uppermost in the minds of every serious thinking person.

From far off America, the continent of Europe appears to be in a condition of political chaos. Some say this was bound to happen, it's a direct result of World War II, that it's a political reflection of the devastated economy of Europe. It is, furthermore, maintained that sooner or later, once European economy is restored, chaos will give way to order and peace and the present political battles will subside.

On the other hand, there are some who vehemently declare that it's "Russian Totalitarianism"

that keeps Europe in a state of political jitters, that the Soviet Union is trying to impose its system upon an unwilling population, that if it could be restrained in some manner, then Europe would work out its own salvation.

Here we find two lines of reasoning on this subject, and numerous are the writers who blend the two together, namely that if America comes to the rescue of Europe, by helping to restore its economy, then Europe will be saved from communism.

What, however, is the real key to the understanding of the European problem? Will a restoration of its economy by America result in political tranquility? The answer to this latter question is a definite NO. For that which causes the present political unrest in Europe is the age old struggle between rich people and poor people, a struggle that America itself

(Continued on page 2)

HOME SCENE

The May Scandal

Hold your nose. The lid is off. The stink down in Washington, the nation's capitol, was too strong to hold down. It exploded with Congressman May on top of it all. The blow up started when the Senate's War Investigating Committee, headed by Senator James M. Mead of New York (formerly headed by Senator, now President Truman), stuck its nose into the affairs of the Cumberland Lumber Company of Kentucky, linked by Senate investigators to an Illinois "paper empire" of war contractors.

The "paper empire," connected with 16 munitions firms, handled a total of \$78,094,101 in war contracts. R. E. Schaffer, attached to the Chicago Division of the Government's General Accounting Office, told the investigating committee, as reported in the New York Times of July 7: ". . . That he was unable to locate any books or records of the Cumberland Lumber Company except a certificate of incorporation which the company took out in Delaware, an

option and deed involved in the purchase of timber land in Kentucky and some checks and fragmentary correspondence between the Illinois companies and the Kentucky Lumber Company. The deed was executed between the Cumberland Lumber Company and Mineral Development Corporation under which the Cumberland company acquired title to some 2,148 acres of Kentucky timber land for \$21,044.40, of which \$1,100 was in cash and the balance in notes.

"Irregularities" Reported

"Irregularities" in the book-keeping concerned with the relations of the metal products companies and the Cumberland Lumber Company, Mr. Schaffer said, prompted him to question accountants for the two metal companies but they were unable to shed any light on the transactions.

"The companies," he continued, "had advanced a total of \$48,634.07 to the lumber company for lumber but not a single board foot of the hundreds of thousands of feet of lumber they ordered for

(Continued on page 3)

International Notes

Europe

The eyes of the political world will be centered on Paris when the peace conference opens there July 29. The fate of the defeated Axis nations of Europe is supposed to be settled at this conference. After the meeting is over many of the points on the agenda will still remain unsettled. While some of the capitalist nations will disagree among themselves about some of the terms to be meted out to the vanquished, it will in substance be a contest between two old main contenders. This will be the clash between an old, worn, dying out social system, capitalism, and a new, vigorous, dynamic sovietism. The United States, the citadel of world capitalism and reaction, along with its satellites, will be in one corner. The Soviet Union and its

friends will be in the other. There will be compromise and working agreements on some points, but only time will settle others.

The Soviet Union has been accused of forcefully sovietizing the countries into which the Red Army has marched. Yet the fact remains that not one country in Eastern Europe is soviet today which was not soviet prior to Germany's invasion of the Soviet Union in June, 1941. It is not communist policy to force soviet governments on other nations. That must come from the workers within the nation itself. This policy is known as self-determination of peoples. Time is on the side of the soviets. Evolution works towards socialism.

One of the many knotty problems facing the powers at this

(Continued on page 7)

Europe: A Political Battleground

(Continued from page 1)

is beset with. This is the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working class and it is bound to have its political reflection as well. The class character of each nation, in fact of the whole world, is the real key to the understanding of its political make up.

In some respects the aftermath of World War II resembles that of World War I, for in 1918 there also ensued a period of economic chaos and political unrest. But even before, in 1917, this condition was most evident in Russia whose Czaristic regime had suffered severe reverses from Germany. A revolution broke out in March, 1917, the Czar was overthrown and a Provisional (Capitalist) government was established. Soviets of Workers, Soldiers and Peasants also appeared simultaneously and for a brief period supported the Provisional government which had promised them many reforms such as land, bread, etc. But the starving population cannot live on promises alone, particularly when they saw that the new ruling class, the capitalists and landlords, behind the facade of promises were trying to consolidate their political power and maintained an exploiting system by means of the Provisional government. The latter was therefore overthrown in November 1917, when the Soviets took power. Just preceding that period there were many political parties in Russia, but only one of them, the Bolshevik party, led by Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin, truly represented the aspirations of the masses, i.e. had the kind of a program toward which the starving millions could rally, get guidance and support from, in their struggles against the exploiters. So the Russian masses took quite a leap forward toward Communism, they abolished the exploitation of man by man and established the law *only those who work shall eat*. The Russian capitalists and landlords refused to abide by this will of the majority and for three years (1918-20) attempted by means of armies of intervention and support from "democratic" America, England, and France, to smash the Soviet government. That they did not succeed was only due to the courageous resistance of the Russian masses.

Working class revolts also occurred throughout the rest of Europe, particularly in such countries as Germany, Hungary, and in Italy where the workers actually siezed the factories, etc. But the wealthy ruling class was able to crush these revolts, thereby establishing "political tranquility" by force. The significant fact of the aftermath of World War I was that the class struggle came out in the open not only in Russia but in most of Europe. But only in Russia were the toiling masses successful in establishing and main-

taining a working class government. One of the main reasons was that the Russian capitalist class was not strong enough to smash this revolt, although they tried hard enough with the aid of British, American and French imperialism.

Europe today, is also on "the eve of the proletarian social revolution." World War II has only accelerated the pace. During the war, the capitalists ruling class within each European nation thoroughly exposed themselves, namely that their economic and class interests were paramount, above everything else, even above loyalty to their own nations. It was not very difficult for Nazi Germany to find willing "collaborators" or "Quislings."

On the other hand those capitalists who opposed Nazi Germany fled their country but, with forethoughts, taking their money bags with them and whatever else of value that could be quickly transported. Factories and land they had to leave behind them for such wealth cannot be compressed into a suitcase. They went to London, Washington, etc., and formed "governments in exile" and "committees of liberation." And from such safe places they shed crocodile tears over the fate of the peoples of their respective nations whom they had deserted in the hour of their greatest need.

As the war dragged on, the misery and exploitation of the masses became so extreme that resistance movements developed within Europe. These were well on their way so that toward the close of the war in some sections of Europe, Yugoslavia, in particular, the toiling masses had gone so far as to take matters into their own hands. With Germany's defeat, this move to the left gained such headway that in practically the whole of Europe, the workers are well to the front. This took the political form of setting up Provisional governments with the "left" elements, socialist and communist parties well to the fore.

But here is where history provides one with a variation. Back in 1917 the British and American ruling class supported the Provisional government of Russia, even with the "socialist" Kerensky at its head. But now, in 1946, one's ears are dinned with the hue and outcry against the present Provisional governments of Europe, particularly against those in eastern Europe, "behind the iron curtain." Why, one must ask the question?

The answer is clear. The Russian Provisional government (Kerensky) of 1917 was dominated by the Russian capitalist class and was also the willing catspaw of British, French and American imperialism. Therefore it was a "stable" government in the eyes of the capitalist class.

The present Provisional govern-

(Continued on page 8)

Wages and Labor Efficiency

(Continued from page 1)

Soon such workers will feel the pinch of hunger, their clothes will become shabbier, their rents will not be paid, they will be evicted, labor efficiency will decline, profits will be affected, labor unrest will be augmented.

The spokesmen of capital know something about this trend and they are afraid of it. They develop theories and "learned" arguments about the situation. Capital, in the main, is faultless. Labor is the culprit. It is proven by "facts and figures," and they reach "sound" conclusions. "The welfare of the American worker now is to depend on how well he works," is the conclusion reached by the "United States News."

The London "Economist," a bit more alarmed over the situation, seems to know what is needed to step-up labor efficiency. It proclaims: "Provided that no one is unemployed for more than a short time, an unemployment ratio of 5 per cent is not only supportable but absolutely necessary to provide mobility and elasticity in the economy. Full employment, in fact, will not work without a million unemployed." In short, a few unemployed outside of each factory, to spur on those on the inside, is the **absolute necessary** condition for an improving national economy.

Let us get back to America and the "facts and figures" which "prove" the situation here. The records kept by the Bureau of Labor Statistics are quoted to show that for 32 soft good industries, "which did not greatly alter their output during wartime," the situation is this: Between 1939 and 1945, output for each hour of work increased by 6.5 per cent. Pay for each hour of work jumped 54.5 per cent. Living costs advanced to around 29 per cent.

Thus, real earnings per hour advanced "almost" 20 per cent, after adjustment to increases in the cost of living.

It is taken to be obvious that this cannot go on. Only 6.5 per cent improvement in production and a whole 20 per cent increase in real wages. To be sure, such a trend must eat into profits. There can be no doubt that the B. L. S. figures are correct, but were they used correctly? Why pick the industries that "did not greatly alter their output during the war"? Most industries did alter output a great deal.

"The United States News," which quotes and uses these figures, quotes something else on another page, where it deals with advancing prices. Here it is found that the B. L. S., by using August 1939 as the base period, and listing prices then as —100, by June 28th, this year, the general index had reached 199.4 and by July 11th it stood at 233.1, or a price advance on the whole

list of commodities amounting to 133.1 per cent. On foodstuffs the advance was 189.6 per cent, and on farm products 202.4 per cent. The price advances on clothing and rents are not given, but it makes one wonder about the accuracy of a cost-of-living advance of only 29 per cent, when the whole price structure went up by 133.1 per cent and the price of food had advanced by 202.4 per cent.

Looking at the long-term trend, it is found that between 1914 and 1945 workers' hourly wages advanced by 318 per cent. Living costs, over the same period, advanced by 79 per cent. Thus, workers were very much better off during the latter period. The reason for this being possible was that labor productivity had also advanced. In fact, output per hour of labor was close to 250 per cent greater in 1945 than it had been in 1914.

Here is "proof" that labor is rewarded for its efficiency. The same "proof," also, makes it plain that when labor efficiency falls off, or slows down, wages cannot advance except prices are at the same time increased. During the war years, labor efficiency advanced but little, 6.5 per cent. Wages advanced much more, 54.5 per cent. To be clamoring for more wages now would only send prices still higher, unless labor efficiency was equally advanced. In short, the enormous profits piled up by the companies, both during the war as well as after victory, must be ignored. The books should not be looked into, and, particularly, the method of bookkeeping should not be questioned. Yet in their eagerness to prove how wrong labor is, the spokesmen of capital let out truths which sometimes say a great deal.

After showing how badly workers did during and after both World Wars One and Two, we are told about how well they did between the war years. From 1920 to 1939, worker productivity advanced by 107 per cent. Wages did not advance during this period. In fact, wages declined sharply in 1920-1922 and did not again reach the 1920 level before 1939. Thus the labor cost entering into the unit of factory output declined by 49 per cent.

It now appears that this period was an ideal one, with real wages steadily advancing. As a matter of fact, it is not hard to remember that the actual trend was a little different. During the twenties, when jobs were available, the cost of living did not decline. The lower prices came in the depression years of the thirties, when most workers were either unemployed or on part-time jobs. By dividing this 20 year period into two 10 year periods, it is found

(Continued on page 3)

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 1)

shell boxes and other uses had ever been delivered." Mr. Schaffer said he had unearthed a letter and order written to the Cumberland Company by the Batavia Metal Products, Inc., but apparently never mailed.

"Attached to the letter was an order for 493,000 board feet of lumber 'meeting Government specifications' for use as boxes for shells. No lumber was ever delivered on the order, he said, although delivery dates running through March, April and May of 1944 were carefully specified.

"The Batavia Company, according to Mr. Schaffer's records, 'had advanced a total of \$15,477.60 in checks ranging from \$1,500 to \$5,000 each. All of the checks were deposited by Mr. May as president of the lumber company.

"Mr. Schaffer called the attention of the committee to 'a curious thing,' the repayment of \$23,000 of the \$33,000 advanced by the Erie Company to Cumberland within 24 hours after Mr. Schaffer started an examination of the Erie's books. He said that repayment of all but \$100,000 of the advances was recorded in the company's books on April 23 last, the day after examination of the books started.

"Mr. Schaffer produced a sheet from the books of the Erie Com-

pany showing entries dated Nov. 30, 1943, in which 30,000 was charged to advances on material, while to the personal accounts of Henry and Murray Garsson were credited \$5,000 each, and \$20,000 was credited to 'notes receivable.' Notes had been executed to the company by the two Garssons for \$10,000 each, the witness said. These entries he added, were made at the insistence of the firm's accountants who desired to 'reclassify' advances made to Cumberland Lumber.

"The witness added that purchase orders for several hundred thousand board feet of lumber were issued to the lumber company of October 29, 1943, several months after the advances were made. The orders called for storage of the lumber by Cumberland until Erie was ready to receive the shipment. No shipments ever were made, Mr. Schaffer said."

Representative Andrew J. May, Democrat of Kentucky, and chairman of the powerful House Military Affairs Committee, hotly denied that he had profited from any connections with the Illinois industrial chain. "Several hours later, L. W. Fields of Whitesburg, Ky., testified before the Senate committee that he and May had discussed formation of the company, that May had said, 'We would draw nice salaries,' and that

the Congressman repeatedly ignored his pleas for his promised stock in the concern.

"Another witness, A. C. Brown of Whitesburg, testified he also considered May to be the owner of the lumber tract." (Boston Globe, July 8.)

"Four instances in which Rep. Andrew J. May, chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, went to bat with the War Department in behalf of the Illinois munitions combine, headed by Henry M. Garsson, now charged with profiteering, were read into the record at yesterday's session of the Senate War Investigating Committee. (Pm, July 10.)

Further efforts were revealed by PM of July 11 to squelch the affair, by involving others and particular the President. "Sen. James M. Mead (D., N. Y.), chairman of the Senate Investigating Committee, said yesterday he would ask the Justice Dept. to investigate possible 'perjury' by Henry Paynter, the public relations man who on Tuesday denied sending a telegram charging that President Truman and members of the committee were involved in war contract scandals.

"The telegram was sent to the Washington Post over Paynter's signature. Two members of the Post staff, the Post city editor and a rewrite man testified yesterday that they discussed the telegram with Paynter last Saturday and that he 'did not disavow' sending it."

Sufficient evidence has already been advanced, showing the corruption and filth of the business economy and its protector, the government. After every war, some of the dirty side of "honest" business is exposed in its naked ugliness. Graft, profit, and war go hand in hand. Corruption and graft are nothing new or surprising under capitalism. The influence of property upon government is a every day occurrence.

But wars bring to focus the hypocrisy of ruling class patriotism. On the one hand they exact with an idealism and piety all out sacrifices from labor while they and their scavengers loyally turn these sacrifices into gold. The May scandal is typical of this corruption of capitalist politics and business.

* * *

Totalitarianism and Curtains

Everywhere we turn we sense a growing feeling of skeptical criticism, bordering on outright hostility, towards the Soviet Union. At each point of disagreement over world matters, blame is placed upon those "impossible, enigmatic and power-seeking Russians," who never seem fully to grasp our "democratic" spirit of conciliation. The terms Red Fascism and Red Imperialism are much used. Only a year ago we called the Russians our "valiant ally;" now they are the "forgotten ally." Together, the press, radio, pulpit and school are stirring up antagonism. The old staid charges of totalitarianism, one man, one party rule, with freedom of

though and action curbed, are being revived and assiduously plied. And new ones are being added. There is the "Iron Curtain" which obstructs "truth-seeking" journalists, and other democratic souls, from freely peering into Russia's affairs, as if these property-befogged, bought and paid for, souls could ever recognize the truth and tell it!

A couple of correspondents, one representing the Christian Science Monitor, and Atkinson of the N. Y. Times, have already been told by the Soviets to get out for sending misrepresenting and calumniating reports.

U. S. Attorney General Clark recently came out with a home blast at the Soviet Union, labelling it as totalitarian, not any different than fascist totalitarian. Said Clark, "We know full well what Communism and Fascism practice, sometimes one taking the cloak for the other. . . . I am told that in the councils of many labor unions, wherein deliberations are screened from the public, identical tactics, staged with acute parliamentary skill, are used to disconcert and disrupt proceedings in the hope that Communists or Fascists, or both—for I see no DIFFERENCE in them—may achieve final power."

In the New York schools, recently a controversy raged over the textbook material used in classes on Russian history. It was charged by a teacher named Jaffe, a liberal, that the viewpoint taught, lumps together Soviet and fascist totalitarianism indiscriminately, that such teachings were not conducive to friendly and peaceful relations.

What's behind all this propaganda, misrepresentation and outright villification both at home and abroad? The war's end brought defeat to German, Italian and Japanese imperialism. These nations have been eliminated as competitors among the world powers. But a new world force has now emerged, which in one sense is even more dangerous to U.S.-British imperialism. It is the Soviet Union. This country, with its socialist system based upon worker rule, champions everywhere the cause of the oppressed and represents to them a source of strength, guidance and friendly influence. To the extent that Soviet influence grows, that of western capitalism wanes.

The present violent outburst and savage foamings against the Soviet Union are a manifestation of capitalism's fear, instability and reaction.

Is it totalitarianism in the Soviet Union? The Soviet leaders, themselves, never denied that. They openly proclaimed the existence of a dictatorship. But what kind? The dictatorship of the proletariat. Moreover, it is always added that this dictatorship does not exclude democracy at all, but on the contrary includes democracy—but for the working class, the majority alone. This dictatorship is therefore a democracy at

(Continued on page 6)

that one was good for business, the other was bad. For labor, they were both bad.

The apologizers of capitalism always seem to find the "present" full of trouble, most of it caused by labor. In the "past," when wages were lower and efficiency was higher, things were just fine. If they could use a little less prejudice and little more analytical insight, they would find laws operating within the capitalist system. They would find that these laws assert themselves in spite of theorizing. They would find that real wages cannot always advance together with the advancement in labor efficiency. They would also find that relative wages, that is, wages as compared with output, **never** advances with labor efficiency, but, on the contrary, moves in the opposite direction. Labor efficiency is advanced by the improvement of the means of production, by better machines and processes.

Such improvements are installed by capitalists as a means of improving their competitive position. Such improvements must, of necessity, be labor saving. To be labor saving to the capitalist, every new device must help turn out more goods at less cost, i. e., less labor cost. In the long run, such improvements will drive prices down, but, first, they will cause unemployment by discharging labor. Unemployment, then, becomes a new cause for labor efficiency, but hardly a

cause for higher wages.

The economic laws governing capitalist production decree also another trend. Once it is understood that the introduction of labor saving methods is a necessity, enforced by competition, it also becomes plain that the benefits accruing are but temporary. As more of the competitors introduce the newer methods, and goods increase on the market, prices are forced down to where they correspond to new costs.

The larger investments in machinery and raw materials helps to turn out more goods per worker employed, but the necessitated lower prices drive profits down per unit of output. This lower unit of profit, now having to be spread over a larger investment, causes the rate of profit to shrink. Capital sees, and feels, the lower cash returns on dollars invested, and it blames labor. Labor sees the greater output of goods, which its wages cannot buy. It sees an injustice and demands higher wages.

The conflict is augmented, and will continue to be augmented until the contradiction becomes unbearable. Then the conflict cannot be settled by compromise, nor by labor yielding to the demands of capital. The cause of the conflict must be attacked and removed. Capitalism, as a system of production, must go. This will be labor's own remedy. Capital will go down fighting it.

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.

Political Parties and Their Purpose

The State, or Government, came into being when society divided into economic classes. Its main purpose is to uphold and defend the interests, the economic status, of the property owning classes against those of the propertyless. With the birth and growth of slavery, the State became a necessity. Armed force has ever been the substance of its power, and that, no less in the democratic republic as in the absolute monarchy.

The State existed for thousands of years before political parties made their appearance. Political parties represent classes, and frequently divisions within a class. They have no power within themselves. The power resides in the State. It is the object of political parties to hold, or to obtain, control of that power. In other words, the political party in office administers the power of the State, but, of course, in the interest of that class which it exists to serve.

In earlier times, political parties made no attempt to hide their class character because then only people with property could participate in politics. The majority of the people had practically no political rights, and they did not consider they were entitled to such rights because they had been taught that they were of an inferior class.

With the rise of modern capitalism, especially after the industrial revolution and production through machinery, it became necessary for the capitalist owners of that machinery to have their workers taught to read and write. With the elimination of illiteracy there arose a measure of political consciousness on the part of the workers. This was dangerous for the property owning classes. This awakening expressed itself quite frequently in mass demonstrations and riots. The workers protested against the inequalities and class privileges they observed around them. They demanded the right to vote and to organize into trade unions. The Chartist movement in Great Britain was probably the most militant expression of this development.

The most far-seeing elements of the ruling classes realized that something had to be done. They knew that the enfranchisement of the masses, giving them the right to vote and the right to organize, was quite dangerous but they also knew that it could not long be postponed. The next best thing to be done was to control the mass-mind, to channelize it along the lines of "law and order," which, in practice, meant respect for the property rights of the class that exploited them. Into the minds of the workers were systematically inculcated the ideas which the rich and powerful desired them to accept.

Institutions were available for this purpose. The schools, churches, newspapers and periodicals were the vehicles through which this noble work of "moulding the mass-mind" was carried out. The "educated" workers were thus highly misinformed on history, politics, economics, etc. They were led into taking sides in their masters' political quarrels. In most countries the broad masses are still en-

gaged in this political performance.

In recent years, the movies and the radio have augmented this "intellectual" enervation, so that in each succeeding election the workers take sides on political issues which are of no real concern to them, issues which, in fact, are mostly detrimental to them individually and collectively. This, of course, is only possible because of the mental mess the workers are in.

Workers taking sides on capitalist political issues is not by any means confined to the United States. In the British Isles, for instance, the main parties for years were openly the defenders of capitalism, the Conservative and the Liberal parties, just as in America, since Civil War days, the two main parties have been the Republicans and the Democrats. In Britain, as in the U. S. A., the workers, decade after decade, gave their support to first the one and then the other of those two parties, as they were caught by political appearances or promises.

The parliamentary form of government is of such design that its outward appearance lends itself to the deception that its policies are determined by the electorate, the majority of whom are working people. However, upon closer observation, it can be seen that this is not the case at all. In Britain they have a two house system, and until just recently the main strength lay in the non-elected body, the hereditary House of Lords. It is only since the beginning of this century that the House of Commons became the dominant body. The monarchy, a feudalistic hangover, has no real power and must conform, as does the parliament, to the needs of the owners of the British Isles, the capitalist class.

Americans smile at the naivete of the British people in putting up with that ancient political structure, without comprehending the true significance of their own "House of Lords," the U. S. Senate, the nature of the Presidential veto, and the absolute power of their own nine kings, the U. S. Supreme Court, an appointive body which the masses of the people have nothing to say about.

Fooling and Ruling

The few cannot enrich themselves at the expense of the many without either establishing an open dictatorship or a highly organized and efficient system of deception. The latter is the best, it is the smoothest and easiest for "the powers that be." Democracy is the term it uses, but in a class dominated society democracy is only another name for deception.

The State is the "public power of coercion" but if the masses are quiescent, or submissive, why bother to apply the coercion. No muzzle is needed for sheep. Historic distortions, patriotic palaver, ancient traditions and humbug of all sorts are made use of by "publicists" and "educators" to hold the masses in a mental fog.

Brooks Atkinson, a bourgeois writer for "New York Times," is the author of an article appearing in "Life," July 22, 1946, on "Soviet Russia 1946" in which he asserts: "The familiar dictatorship of the proletariat is actually the dictatorship of the thirteen members of the Politburo of the Communist Party" * * * "the first socialist state in the world has not released the workers from slavery but has reduced them to totalitarian slavery that includes the mind as well as the back." * * * "Whether the Soviet Government and the Communist party, which are virtually identical, are promoting," etc., etc.

It can be seen from the above excerpts that Mr. Atkinson is utterly confused on the nature and function, not only of political parties but of the political power itself, the State. He says: "The Soviet Government and

the Communist party are virtually identical." And, as the Politburo (consisting of 13 members) is the highest body of the Communist party, which is just another name for the Soviet Government, therefore, the Politburo, which "dictates" to the Communist party (which in practice is the Soviet Government), therefore, "the familiar dictatorship of the proletariat (over 200 million people in the Soviet Union) "is actually the dictatorship of the thirteen members of the Politburo of the Communist Party."

Mr. Atkinson could have carried his "brilliant reasoning" a step or two further. He might have shown, by the same "scientific" analysis, that one man, say Joseph Stalin, enforces his iron will upon the other members of the Politburo, and thus, the "dictatorship of the proletariat" could be further reduced from 13 to one man. And, if someone "dictated" to him, say his wife, then the Soviet Government, which is identical with the Communist party, and identical with the Politburo, then by the same Atkinsonian logic it would simply be the dictatorship of Mrs. Joseph Stalin they have, instead of a government, in the U. S. S. R.

This bright boy of the "New York Times" tells us that the people of the Soviet Union are still slaves, but in addition to their backs, their minds are now also enslaved. We don't know much about Mr. Atkinson's back, but it is quite obvious that his mind is wearing someone's chains.

Of course, it is the "inalienable right" of any "free-born" American journalist to make an ass of himself in print, upon any subject he wishes to write upon and can find a publisher for. But, if Mr. Atkinson's logic were applied to America, then we would have to see the "government of the people," not merely as it really is—a "government of the rich, and for the rich"—but a dictatorship" (we beg pardon) a "democracy" of Mr. Truman's cabinet (his Politburo), which is identical with the Democratic party, and identical with the U. S. Government. In fact, from that point of view, there would be no government at all in America, just a "democracy" of Harry and his boys.

One of the apparently unanswerable charges against the Soviet Union is that only one party exists—the Communist Party. It is not so different here as appearances would indicate. If every American supported, say, the Republican party, then there would be but one party, just because no one wanted any other. The people of the Soviet Union don't seem to be worried about the fact that there is but one party. It is the opponents of the Soviet system in the capitalist nations that are worried.

It has been said that a Russian was asked about the one party system and replied: "If we had two parties that offered us the same thing, then we would have one too many. And if we had two, and one of them was seeking to give us what we did not want, we would know enough to abolish it."

If we look under the surface appearances of American politics we will find that a one party system prevails here too—the Party of Capitalism—which has two main wings—the Republicans and the Democrats. They both stand for the same social system. This left wing and right wing of Wall Street's politics assail each other, and call the candidates on each side the vilest names, during elections, but afterwards they seem to work together quite well. Quite frequently, when they divide over issues in Congress, so many Republicans and Democrats line up together and vote Yes, and so many Republicans and Democrats line up and vote No. In practice it is one party of capitalism.

But parties represent class interests, even where there is much confusion, and in countries where the working class has developed considerable political strength, capitalist parties which have bitterly fought each other for years over the question of which is the best way to administer capitalism, have been able to merge into one party, to more effectively resist the political ascendancy of the workers.

However, political parties are not governments, and never can be. The State is a power outside of parties, which can, and do, administer that power, but cannot replace it. And, if a party cannot take the place of the State, then its leading executives cannot do so, be they 13 or 30.

The parties of capitalism can use the existing state machinery, with their property based constitutions, and so can social democratic parties, such as the British Labor Party, now in office, especially if they are simply reforming capitalism. They can introduce state capitalism that way, i.e. capitalist state ownership of certain industries. But they cannot use the existing state machinery to abolish the capitalist system. The property-based constitution stands in the way. In order to eliminate the profit system entirely, the workers, the vast majority, must construct a new state form. Such a government must be organized from below and embrace within its structure the vast majority of the

proletarians, the wage workers. It is through such a state structure that the workers accomplish their revolution and apply their political power. The Soviet government is of that order.

While a party is not in itself political power, it is the means of gaining control thereof, but in the interest of some class. Therefore, a party is of great importance for the modern working class, especially if it is sound, and has for its objective the conquest of political power by the workers as a class. This is the purpose for which the Proletarian Party exists. To those who agree with its principles and program, we say: "Join the Ranks."

John Keracher.

BITS AND SKITS

Cardinal Hlond, primate of Poland, as much as justified the anti-semitic atrocities, in which forty-odd Jews were foully murdered, when he said the pogrom was "to a great degree due to Jews who today occupy leading positions in Poland's government and endeavor to introduce a governmental structure that a majority of the people do not desire."

Typical fascist talk, this is. The late unlamented Feuhrer's ravings were of the same vein; against the Bolshevik Jews who were responsible for Germany's economic ruin. Nor is Hlond an exception. The Church everywhere is playing a role of apologizing for fascist reaction. And when it is proposed by one of the leading Polish Jews to take this matter to the Pope himself, for redress, it displays a naivete that is preposterous. Anyone with the least smattering of knowledge of the Church's hierarchial set up, and ideology, knows how wasted such efforts are. The branch is little removed from the trunk.

The evolution of Senator Wheeler from his one-time liberalism to his present day isolationism and pro-fascist line is an instructive development that should serve as a warning to all liberals.

A liberal is a vague sort of an individual, unstable and vacillating. In the face of conflicting class interests and ideologies he attempts the impossible, i.e. reconciliation. Hopping around unanchored from one reform to another finds him apt material for the one big fascist reform. From reformism to fascism is just a step. That is why class-conscious workers must keep close watch on the liberal reformers, who are sympathetic to the labor movement one day and damn it the next.

Reports to the effect of American soldiers in Japan conducting themselves in a manner most undemocratic, approaching vandalism, is very disconcerting to the military officialdom. The attitude is described as one of super-racism and complete disregard for the most elementary rights of the Japanese people.

"To the victor belong the spoils" is taken too literally by many, creating a disturbing state of affairs. This sure is no way to teach,

through example, the Japanese in the art of American democracy. The task of establishing even a minimum of respect for a nation of people who only a year ago were "Little monkey men" is a difficult process. This error can only be corrected by a knowledge of the truth of this war. That truth cannot come from the imperialistic militarists on either side.

Churchill is not only a great word - artist but a perservering and versatile personality. Several months ago, in his Fulton, Mo., speech, he urged an Anglo-U. S. military alliance against the U. S. S. R. That didn't fully go over. So a determined Tory makes another speech in Paris on Bastille Day. Here he called for a European coalition between Britain and France. He didn't say flatly against whom, but the implication is there.

The Catholic Church is always denouncing totalitarianism, not the Spanish kind, but the Russian. If only it could look into the mirror and see the totalitarian reflection of its own hierarchial self! And what a dictatorship it is!

During vacation time you have a chance to think—for a change. Why not change over from Capital's "kept" press to Labor's "free" press. Read the Proletarian News. Subscribe to it. It's different, thought-provoking.

A university archeologist is a man who can tell you more about how people lived ten thousand years ago than he can tell about how people are living today.

The king of Italy is a guy who lives in Portugal.

One of these days, the Pope of Rome may have to roam.

A hundred million dollars in reparations will go to the Soviet Union from the property owners of Italy. Some of it will be in the form of munitions which the Italian government had on hand at the close of the war. Some of it will be in the form of Italian capitalist investments in the Balkan states.

It is said that Big Business is pleased with the policies of Pres-

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

Land Reform in Eastern Germany

Recent reports indicate that large scale land reform has been carried out in the Soviet zone of occupation in Germany. The development will probably continue, but, meantime, let us examine what has been accomplished, so as to better understand the trend and what is likely to happen in the future.

According to a recent article in "Life," 3,750,000 acres of land (in eastern Germany only) was parceled out and given to 281,000 families. This averages 13½ acres per family. Not much of a "farm" for each, but, historically, this is the culmination of many long years of "hungering" for a plot of land to call their own.

A more recent report shows even greater results. Out of a total of 6,800,000 acres under control of central administrative bodies, the following division has been made: 4,560,500 acres to small farmers, small tenants, landless laborers, new settlers (local peoples and those from the east), 478,750 acres for pasture and meadow lands, 139,750 acres for new settlers coming from Poland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, etc., 367,000 acres for cultivation by city dwellers in the zone, 1,014,750 acres to be used as model farms, utilizing large scale farming methods, and the balance of approximately 238,750 acres to be held in reserve by central administrations (figures quoted from "Germany Today," July 7, 1946).

ident Truman, and that it wants him again in 1948. It is also claimed that the formula for putting him over is already worked out. An arch-reactionary will be run on the Republican ticket, one they can use if he should slip in, a Taft, or one still further to the right. It must be someone who stinks in labor's nostrils. To keep the stinker from being elected, Labor will again choose the "lesser evil" and rally for Truman. Thus, in any case, Big Business will have its man in office and it can sit back upon its money bags and chuckle at the chuckle-heads. Ain't democracy grand?

R. Daniels.

The aim of the administration is to cultivate land on a large scale and develop crops suitable for a base for future German agriculture. At first glance a contradiction is apparent. If large scale agriculture is desired, why parcel out land in small plots? Some of the reasons are that available machinery and equipment allows only for farming small sections of land, each "land hungry" farmer or peasant is being given that for which they voted, food crops are needed as soon as possible and last, but most important, experience gained from social practice is needed before the masses of small, individualistic farmers are ready for collectivized, large scale mechanized farming.

To use modern equipment, such as tractors, combines, etc., fences will have to come down, resources will have to be pooled, committees for planning the plowing, care and harvesting, will have to be organized. Equipment will have to be procured from tractor and agricultural implement factories, not yet producing these items. In short, economic, social and political conditions will have to be favorable before that future German agriculture can be realized.

The contradiction, so apparent at the outset, becomes resolved, and through this process, a new and higher form of agricultural economy emerges. We have but to review and learn from the experience of the poor peasantry of "Old Russia," who became transformed under the social relationships of a quarter of a century of the U. S. S. R.

Marxism teaches and develops the principle that once the land has been taken over by the masses, the next step is by way of education, instruction, comparison, examples, etc., to reach the end desired, namely, socialized agriculture.

Are the peoples of eastern Germany as "bad off" as the capitalist press would have us believe? We think not and hasten to add that great changes are in the process of realization, not only in eastern Germany but elsewhere "behind the Iron Curtain."

(Continued on page 8)

HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 3)
the same time. That may sound queer and illogical to capitalist thinking which understands democracy only in the western sense, that is, as synonymous with the right to own private property and exploit labor. But the Soviet workers, who enjoy the rights and benefits from the new type of Soviet or Socialist democracy, something they never enjoyed before, know, full well, who feels the force of dictatorship, and who benefits from it.

Totalitarianism has a class connection, is wielded by one class against another. To think that the individual in the U.S.S.R. exists for the state is incorrect. Conversely, the state exists for the people, that is, the working people. The nature of all states is that they exist and function as a political force in the interest of a given ruling class; in western democracies for the capitalists, in socialism for the workers. To lump together, without differentiation, all totalitarianism is to be guilty of lack of scientific procedure. Scientific classification combines both differentiation and generalization.

All this talk about the Iron Curtain is so much bourgeois chagrin over its inability to infiltrate Soviet territory and "democratically" carry on its underground connivings.

But there are all sorts of curtains. For the western democracies, too, have their variety of curtains, which might be called the "curtain of deception." Workers are given a false sense of values, filled with various notions and prejudices. By means of illusions they are forever kept in a blind alley, never quite able to see their way through this curtain and deception.

American workers need not worry too much about the Soviet Iron Curtain. We had better first commence looking into our own backyard and see what's going on behind our own curtain, or it might well be "curtains" for us.

Bikini

It would seem that the much touted Bikini Atom test didn't fully click. Somehow the bomb failed to destroy on as a vast a scale as expected. Many of the craft remained afloat, as also some of the animal life brought for experimentation.

The object of the test was several fold:

(1) To promote the general knowledge of atomic energy and destructibility.

(2) To concretely test its effect upon naval craft and sea power.

(3) Politically, as a show of force.

The deduction to be made is that sea power is still a force to be reckoned with in war.

As for political effect, it would appear to have been disappointing. Non-the-less, public opinion must not be disarmed by this relatively unsuccessful event. Other experi-

ments are sure to follow, in fact already reported scheduled, for America is not what could be called exactly on a peace footing. It is more in a transitional, or preparatory, stage towards another war in which the A-Bomb is banked on to play a decisive role.

Imperialism is the violent and decadent stage of capitalism in which all its forces are in collision and flying at each other. Its death pangs are symptomatic in all its effort to maintain itself beyond its natural conditions of existence. Violence is its earmark. The Atomic bomb, the most destructive weapon yet concocted by man, is a fitting creation of an exploiting system which, rather than give way to a new social order, would bring the whole of humanity to ruin.

The test at Bikini, as all subsequent tests, are manifestations of the destructive nature of a doomed social system. Workers must be vigilant. These experiments are the forerunners of bombs to fly.

The talk of "armed peace" as the greatest guarantee of freedom and democracy is so much dust in our eyes.

"Independents"

Secretary of Commerce Wallace reported the sharpest rise in business mergers in over 15 years, a "trend closely resembling the corporate concentration that occurred following World War I."

In the last five years, more than 1000 mergers have been reported in the manufacturing industry alone. Every single day, three former independent manufacturing firms are swallowed up by big business, according to Rep. Estes Kefauver of Tenn.

This trend is everywhere in the business field, in food, drugs, textiles, iron and steel, machinery and liquor.

General Foods, the biggest of the specialty food companies, is reported to have acquired a poultry dressing plant, a flavor manufacturing company, a processor of citrus fruits and other allied food companies.

In the drug line, the American Home Products alone swallowed up 31 of the 52 companies losing their independence between 1940 and 1945.

The Senate Small Business Committee reported an estimated million out of 23,800,000 spindles have changed hands during the first two months of 1946 alone in the former highly-competitive textile industry.

The eight largest corporations in the iron and steel and machinery industries have sucked in 35 smaller companies.

The big four in the liquor field, the National Distillers, Schenley, Seagram and Hiram Walker, reached their present size through "spirited" mergers.

Despite the Clayton Anti-Trust Act, which supposedly was enacted to arrest the development of monopolies, big business has found

ways and means to get around the law and fatten up.

The sale of a corporation's physical assets to another corporation is one way of circumventing the Clayton Anti-Trust Act.

The contracting for the total output of a manufacturer by a large chain in the distribution field is another method which tends to limit competition through subordination.

The scarcities of supplies helped to stimulate mergers, causing companies to buy up their suppliers.

Still another factor lending itself for monopoly growth is the sale of government plants. Only the big companies with sufficient capital can take over the gigantic units.

The statement by Wallace that the present "trend closely resembling the corporate concentration that occurred following World War I" is, if anything, an understatement. Then they were millionaire corporation—today their wealth is counted in billions.

There is no going back to smallness, the trend is in the opposite direction. Small business is proclaimed to be the backbone of free enterprise and the essence of independence. But the "little fellow," according to the above facts, is fast losing the solidity of his cherished independence. His existence is becoming ever more precarious. Those of them who are still in the ring are barely hanging on to the ropes.

The issue is becoming clearer. Shall the industries and means of wealth production be owned, controlled and enjoyed by the handful of billionaires or be taken over by the numerous, the proletarians and toilers generally, in the interest of all?

Why the British Loan

The biggest loan in the history of mankind of one nation to another at one time was granted to Britain by America. The lump sum of \$3,750,000,000 received Congressional approval. While there was some opposition from both branches of Congress, the proponents of the loan carried the day and gave their reasons for the action.

Speaker Rayburn in the windup of the debate said: "I do not want Western Europe, England, and all the rest pushed toward an ideology that I despise." He continued, "I fear if we do not cooperate with our great natural ally that is what will happen." He was roundly applauded by his fellow members upon conclusion of his speech.

Rep. Jesse P. Wolcott of Michigan, ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee, whose views on financial matters carry considerable weight amongst the Republican, pitched in as follows: "After V-E Day it became apparent that three spheres were developing in the world, around Russia, the United States and Great Britain. The probability has been created that at any time there may be a coalition of any two of these. We determine today for years to come whether

the British will go along with us or with the Soviet Union.

"That is to me fundamental thinking which transcends dollar and cents considerations. The real question is can we afford not to make this loan?"

Rep. Ralph W. Gwinn, New York Republican, was more open and blunt. He said: "War has been declared on Western civilization and we must recognize it. In that sense and that sense alone can this British loan be justified. Certainly it cannot be justified on the grounds of a sound financial deal. Repayment is possible, but not likely. We must face the fact that we cannot afford not to make this loan. We must make every sacrifice to maintain our freedoms and security against a Russian-controlled world."

From the mouths of official spokesmen, both Democratic and Republican, internationalists and isolationists, it becomes crystal clear that the "collateral" envisaged for this huge sum of money is two-fold: fear of Communism and stabilization of capitalism. Not their love of God or Britain but fear of the devil, or Communism, that motivated this deal.

Learn Economics

To the popular mass, knowledge comes less from books and more from experience. This is called "learning the hard way." But it also drives home the lessons of reality so much more thorough and convincing. Workers are not economists nor philosophers. They have neither time nor the training for that kind of thing.

The existing production arrangement works out most satisfactorily to the employing class. They get the profits from the laborers' efforts; and the workers get wages, enabling them just about to get by.

Profits turn into riches and riches beget pleasure and leisure. It is this leisure time that is a must for intellectual endeavor. Those made wealthy through labor's efforts, utilize their special economic and political vantage position, as also that leisure, to control and dispense such economic and political wisdom as is considered sound and safe for their own economic well-being. The real picture about economic conditions, the relations and laws of capitalist production are carefully slanted and distorted, leaving the workers in a state of confusion as to what is and why.

But unfortunately for master-class ideology it must buck up against the experience of the workers. It is here that it is tested and exposed. For instance, it is our opinion that a good many workers are now shedding some elements of master-class economic philosophy that has been part of their mental equipment over the years and, perhaps, for the first time, in their lives, are learning some real economic facts about the free-enterprise system. The recent OPA, the black market, and the present inflationary price trend,

(Continued on page 7)

International Notes

(Continued from page 1)

meeting will be that of Trieste. It has been suggested that the port be internationalized. This will not be satisfactory to either the Italians or Yugoslavs. Both claim the port as rightfully theirs. While the population of the city of Trieste itself is mostly Italian, the area around it is, in the main, Yugoslav. This problem will be settled only after both of the countries are in the hands of the workers. Only then will national differences and boundary lines disappear.

South America

The ousting of the Villarreal regime in Bolivia was the changing of one bourgeois clique for another. The president was killed and hung, a la Mussolini style. Is it possible that this method of getting rid of bourgeois dictators is becoming a fad? As the Spaniards would say, quien sabe? For a revolt that is commonly referred to as a palace revolution this one was rather bloody, with 1000 killed and 2000 wounded. These are heavy casualties, when one considers that this country has a population of only 3,000,000. The new regime has promised civil liberties and "democratic" elections. Organized workers (mostly unions) helped the new regime come to power.

When Great Britain was the nation with the most investments in South America and America was her nearest competitor, these

two were usually behind revolts occurring in any of those countries. The regime ousted was usually one favorable to the capitalists of one or the other nations. The recent war forced John Bull to liquidate most of his investments in South America (still considerable British capital in Argentina) leaving the field wide open for Uncle Sam.

There is a new trend in South America. This is nationalism. Native capital would like to oust all foreign capital. Getting rid of Uncle Sam will be a very tough proposition. Argentina, the wealthiest of the nations of South America, has taken the leadership in trying to organize the rest of the nations in this fight.

The Far East

The country with the world's largest population makes the front pages almost daily. Scandals involving UNRRA food and supplies was one of the main items. It has been revealed that less than 1 per cent of relief supplies given China by UNRRA has gone into communist held regions of China. The reactionary, nationalist Kuomintang government saw to it that these sections of China with the "wrong ideas" got nothing. Meanwhile, grafting nationalist Chinese are getting rich selling this stuff on the black market.

The most important thing going on in China today is the clash between the communist and

nationalist troops. Accurate information on the progress of this fight is not available. Reports seem to indicate that the communists are holding their own despite the superiority in equipment of the nationalists. American planes given to the government forces by the United States give the nationalists a very great advantage over the communists who have no air force. General Marshall of the United States has spent many months trying to patch up this quarrel between the communists and nationalists. A China that is continually fighting is not a safe place for American investments. If America is sincere in its desire for peace in China and is supposed to be neutral in this factional fight, why does it continue to send material to the government forces? Can General Marshall have come to the conclusion that the only way to bring peace to China is to wipe out the communist forces? What are the American marines still doing in China?

JAPAN:

Contrary to popular belief, the Japanese workers have demonstrated since the end of the war that they can act just as intelligently (if not more so) as the workers of the western nations. In some of the strikes they pulled off they took over the plants, ran them and gave themselves the increases they had demanded. Can the American workers match this intelligence? After this had occurred a number of times, that great defender of democracy, General McArthur, put a stop to

it. This was a crime against private property, which in the eyes of the capitalist always takes precedence over human rights. The capitalist class of Japan were terrible people during the war. But that is over now. McArthur and the Japanese capitalists are now fellow exploiters and must stick together. Of course the Japanese capitalists have made some sacrifices. Emperor Hirohito, Japan's largest landholder and one of its wealthiest men, recently gave up 3,946 of his servants. He now has to get along with only 4,758. Of this latter number only 808 are police and the rest take care of his properties or act as flunkies of one sort or another.

Last month, the Soviet member of the Allied Council for Japan submitted a 22-point proposal for labor legislation. They were mild proposals calling for such things as a 48-hour week, two weeks' vacation with pay, unemployment allowances and annuities for the aged. This was immediately attacked as communistic by the American chairman of the Council, George Atcheson, Jr. In this controversy, the British delegate backed the Soviet suggestions. After looking the Soviet proposals over he said, "It seems to be quite a conservative document. I think it unfortunate when an Allied Council member puts forward a proposal for the protection and social welfare of Japanese workers that such proposals is automatically stigmatized as Communist propaganda."

C. B.

are responsible for that. While tediously standing in those long lines for food and such, they have had plenty of time to think. Appeals to patriotism and to common sense didn't work. Warnings of the pitfalls of inflation failed. But no sooner was the OPA set aside than lo and behold—a miracle! Phenomenally, shortages disappeared overnight and plenty of everything, butter and beef, milk and honey were flowing across those business counters. A regular price-fest. Some commodities have broken records dating back to before World War I.

Dun and Bradstreet's "Index on 30 basic commodities; up from 200.12 to 229.46. The index assigns 1932 prices a value of 100 points. Other sources from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and National Fertilizer Association reveal similar price rises." (PM July 16.)

To even the humblest, this experience showed that the black market was a resultant of OPA's restrictions, and at least for a great part, if not for most, these shortages were a purely cash matter; business men holding out for higher prices and profits.

That profit is the quintessence of "our" free enterprise economy, or American way of life, is now dawning upon the brain of many an individual.

But how about human needs? What about the official economic teachings that "consumption is the aim of production?" That is just one of those master-class lies that doesn't hold water. For people did suffer for lack of things, were prevented from consuming things produced and available because greater profits were visualized through withholding them. Money-making took definite precedence over human needs.

OPA's defeat brought home economic lesson No. 2, viz. that over-all centralized planning in a free, competitive system is impossible without causing severe dislocations. Certainly it profoundly disturbed the individual commodity owners whose money-making opportunities were thereby frustrated. By clamoring for the restoration of the "natural" law of supply and demand as the only solution to the economic problem, they doubtless meant their own economic angle-profit. Business pressure from the American Manufacturers Association and Chamber of Commerce forced governmental response and the OPA was counted out.

The immediate effect was as expected, a general rise in prices, despite official warnings to "hold the line." In some instances commodity prices have already reached, as mentioned above, the

highest records for many years. Meanwhile, Congress is hesitant and confused. What to do now? The proponents of the OPA, the government-control elements, are fighting for OPA's restoration. Bills are proposed for some sort of limited price regulation with definite decision still pending. The effects of this debacle upon the workers is equivalent to a cut in their wages. Whatever wage increases were recently gained through strikes are in effect being erased. Apprehension is felt that this state of affairs will cause a renewal of strikes. Indeed, that is the only logical course for the workers to adopt. Proportional wage demands should be made in ratio to the rising cost of living. The unions, in advocating organized consumer actions, are leading the workers into a blind ally, dissipating their energies in relatively useless efforts. The workers are in no position to appreciably affect price trends except in isolated cases, by either political pressure or refusal to buy the goods. First of all, the American workers don't, as yet, constitute an independent political force. Secondly, the failure of the OPA, sponsored politically by the ruling group itself, has demonstrated in practice that legal pressure cannot stem the trend of economic current. The workers best and only recourse to

pressure lies in their REFUSAL to work unless granted increases in the price of their own and only commodity—labor power. It is on the job, in production, where they are exploited. It is there, too, where they are organized and where the fight must be carried on.

Should they be slow in realizing this fact it will be another bitter lesson for them to learn. To fight for OPA's reinstatement is not labor's problem. OPA is a capitalist institution, inaugurated for the stabilization of capitalism and not for the amelioration of labor's lot. And labor has no stake in capitalist stabilization. The valuable lesson of it all is that free enterprise, because of its profit incentive is unable to establish "normal" economic functioning—equilibrium between production and consumption. Scarcity in the midst of plenty is an anachronism that cannot be justified for long.

This messy condition should help the workers to understand the general workings and contradictions of American capitalism. As this self-destructive economic process continues, the people's faith in capitalism as the only possible and best of all social systems should become shaken. The next step is to look with free and open mind into other and new directions.

L. B.

Europe: A Political Battleground

(Continued from page 2)

ments of Europe, however, are too far to the left, too much working class in character for the capitalist class to stomach. These "leftist" governments furthermore have gone in for such "socialistic" measures as nationalization of industries, dividing up of the landed estates, and in fact, particularly in eastern Europe, without compensation to their former—capitalist—owners. It is not because of their "provisional" character, implying temporary, but because these governments have trampled on the sacred rights of private property, that they are condemned by the capitalist class as "unstable," and "undemocratic."

And, then, that which goes against the grain of British and American capitalism is that most of these provisional governments of Europe are friendly toward Russia. Hence the charge that they are dominated by the Soviet Union, that they are police states.

There is a saying that: to every action there is a reaction or in evolutionary terms, every cause has its effect. The European workers are reacting against their former exploiters, against the collaborators and Quislings; against those capitalists who had fled the country with their money bags. Furthermore, factories and land are essentials in the production of food, etc., and a hungry population cannot be blamed for putting the means of production to use without regard for the "property rights" of the former owners.

But, on the other hand, there is also a reaction to this development on the part of the capitalists, even within Europe itself. Poland is a good example of this and will also provide one with the answer of: How far to the left is its Provisional government? This government has not abolished private ownership of property although it has gone in for the nationalization of some of the basic industries and has also divided up some of the large estates giving land to the poorer peasantry. Yet one of the largest of land holders is a very reactionary institution, the Catholic Church, which during the Nazi occupation was despoiled of its holdings and only got its land back through the present Provisional government. Even in spite of such consideration, the Catholic Church is in opposition to the Provisional Government, and in the recent anti-semitic pogroms, one of its priests, Cardinal Hlond, said the outburst at Kielce was not racial but was partly "due to Jews who occupy leading positions in Poland's government and endeavor to introduce a governmental structure which a majority of the people do not desire." In the Kielce pogrom of July 4 forty-one Jews were brutally assassinated. It is to the credit of the Provisional Government that it moved quickly in arresting twelve of the murderers, nine of whom were tried, condemned, and executed for the mur-

ders while the other culprits received jail terms. Cardinal Hlond's reply was in response to the Polish government's request that the Catholic Church issue a statement condemning anti-semitism in Poland. The Catholic Church owns 1,900 estates or 1,976,860 acres in Poland. (New York Times, July 16.) It is very evident that the Catholic Church is more concerned about its temporal (material) interests than it is about spiritual matters.

An indication of the "leftist" strength in the Polish government was revealed in the recent elections for a single chambered parliament, 60 per cent of the vote was claimed by the two left parties, the Workers (Communist) Party, the Polish Socialist Party, and the non-opposition Center parties. On the other hand the opposition is led by Deputy Premier S. Mikolajczk's Polish Peasant Party, which together with underground and fascist influences comprise 40 per cent. The fascist underground in Poland is very active against the Provisional Government and is financed by dispossessed landowners and militarists, resorting to terror and is responsible for the murder of more than 2,000 Polish citizens. Jews are not the only victims but Polish political functionaries as well. Quite a number of Russian soldiers have also been waylaid by fascist bands and murdered. The anti-semitic pogroms and even the election demonstrates that reaction in Poland is still very strong.

Yet, even in spite of the capitalist reaction, the Polish masses indicated clearly their determination to go forward, to the "left," when 8,895,105 voted yes, that is in favor of the nationalization of industry and agrarian reform decree, as against the 2,634,446 who voted no on the same question.

Capitalist reaction throughout the whole of Europe is attempting to stage a come-back, in some places openly and in others covertly. In Greece it operates openly for there it gets the support of British imperialism. With the aid of the latter it has succeeded in driving the left elements underground. The present government of Greece is a semi-fascist dictatorship that has been set up and is still maintained with the aid of British tanks and tommy-guns and the pound sterling.

In the other parts of Europe the fascist, capitalist elements dare not operate so openly but do it covertly. Politically they support the "lesser of evils" as in Poland, wherein they are backing Mikolajczk's Polish Peasant Party, so in France they back the MRP, and in Italy and elsewhere, the Christian Democratic party receives their support.

In Germany, only in the Soviet occupied zone have the left parties come to the front, the Socialist and Communist parties have fused, and now play a leading role in the political and economic administra-

tion of that section of Germany. This was only possible due to the thorough purging of the Nazi elements by the Soviet armies of occupation.

Just the opposite is the case in those sections of Germany under the administration of the British and American authorities. To safeguard "property rights" Nazi industrialists, bankers, and officials received the protection of Great Britain and America. Thus the exploiters of the workers of Germany are permitted to remain in power. Yet even here the working class parties and trade unions are coming to life again, in spite of the opposition they get from both the German capitalist elements and the American and British authorities.

Of all nations of Europe, the one closest in resemblance to a Soviet form of government is that of Yugoslavia. Its provisional government, headed by Tito, has nationalized practically all the basic industries and has divided up the landed estates among the poor peasantry. The latter have combined their small holdings in most sections of the country into cooperative farming, a collectivization bearing a close resemblance to that of the Soviet Union. The constitution of the government of Yugoslavia has been adopted by the vast majority, and one of its clauses outrightly states that "the soil belongs to those who till it."

Yugoslavia has eliminated most of the reactionary elements, through the years of Partisan warfare, and has just about completed the job by recently sentencing to death the arch-reactionary Mikhailovitch and some of his henchmen. That the capitalist class throughout the world is shedding tears over his fate is only an indication that they are aware of their class interests and also of their hatred of the working class.

In Czechoslovakia, the working class are also well to the front. The Communist party there is the strongest, numerically and politically, and hold key posts in government. The Premier, K. Gottwald, is a Communist. The people of Czechoslovakia are very friendly toward the Soviet Union and remember that it was the Red Army that helped most in liberating their country. The Czechs also remember how their nation was sold down the river by Great Britain and France, via the Munich pact in 1938. Capitalist reaction has little chance in gaining headway in Czechoslovakia. Agrarian reforms and nationalization of industry has also been instituted by its coalition government, even though all "property rights" have not yet been abolished in Czechoslovakia.

So far the working class of Europe is trying to achieve emancipation from exploitation within the framework of bourgeois "provisional" governments. In other words they are trying to utilize the "existing state machinery for their own purposes." But it is very evident that the capitalist class will not give up without a

struggle. That is why today, more than ever before, Europe is a political battleground. Sooner or later the European working class will discover that they will have to go further to the left in order to eliminate all reactionary opposition. This will only be possible when they take complete political control, not through "the existing state machinery" but through a Soviet, i. e., a working class form of government.

The question of whether this transition toward the first stage of communism, generally called socialism, will be peaceful, will be determined both by the strength of the working class, and the amount of opposition from the capitalist class, European and British-American. Be that as it may, the proletarian social revolution is imminent in Europe and is bound to take place in spite of all opposition.

Al Wysocki.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

(Continued from page 5)

Ruler of the Seas

"Britannia Rules the Waves" was for a long time England's proud claim. No longer can John Bull so proclaim. With the end of World War No. 2, a new "Ruler of the Waves" has emerged on the scene.

Recent figures given out by the U. S. Maritime Commission show the following: Total of all merchant vessels of the world, engaged in ocean trade in 1939, 7,900; at the close of the war in 1945, 10,200. The British Empire had, in 1939, 2,900, or approximately 36 per cent of the total number of ships. The U. S. had 1,400, or approximately 18 per cent — about one-half the British total.

But 1945 shows a different story. The U. S. had 5,500 of the merchant ships, or approximately 54 per cent of the world's total of 10,200. The British, through losses by sinkings and obsolescence, plus their inability to replenish her losses during the war, had but 2,300, or approximately 24 per cent. This means that the U. S. now has nearly 2½ times that of England.

Nor is this all. Not only has the U. S. merchant fleet increased in numbers and tonnage to greater than that of England, but the naval strength has increased as well. In other words, the armed force is there to "back up" the merchant shipping.

In this period of "Great Imperialists," he who has the productive plants, sources of raw materials, markets for outlet of surplus products, spheres of investment and influence, needs the "best" and "mostest" to get there "firstest."

Thus, through an historical-economic process of development, "Britannia Rules the Waves" becomes transformed and relegated to a secondary position and from the change emerges, "Columbia Rules the Waves." S. C.