

# 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. 12—Whole No. 165

Chicago, Illinois, December, 1946

483

Price 5c a Copy

## The New National Freedom The 'Almost Hateful' Peace

Literally, millions of people have read the "Atlantic Charter." That document, wrought from the minds of leading statesmen of two rival nations in the face of common danger, became the rallying point around which millions were urged on to support their nation's war efforts. It became the formula under which "unconditional surrender" was forced upon the enemy nations. The "four freedoms" became the goal of victory and of post-war achievements.

National self-determination and independence were vital parts of the "Atlantic Charter," except for the British possessions, which Mr. Churchill was not ready to let go.

Post-war events are now unraveling a process through which the "Charter" proclamations seem to come to fruition. America stands out as the number one champion of colonial independence. The Philippines were promised "full" independence on schedule. Others seem to need more coercion, but they are coming along.

The British stood by the Dutch in Indonesia for a while. Perhaps the "Charter" had momen-

tarily been put aside. Pressure, at home and abroad, together with growth of the spirit of independence among the Indonesians, have forced the British to take on the role of mediators rather than repressors. The Dutch seem willing to compromise, but limits are definite. The outlying islands, with little or no native uprising, must remain Dutch. And, more important, **law and order and property** must be respected. In short, the Dutch are now willing to go along on political liberation, provided **dependable guarantees for property rights** can be established.

The French Empire, ruling over 4,600,000 square miles of overseas territory, inhabited by 71 million people, is torn by the demands for independence, for national freedom. France, no more than Holland, was ready to give full support to the "Atlantic Charter" proclamations. Racial and national feelings reached the boiling point, uprisings in Indo-China as well as in North Africa, are causing France to take notice. Sure, France now sees the beauties of the "Atlantic Char-

(Continued on page 3)

The question uppermost in the minds of many is: Can the United Nations maintain peace? When one reflects upon the deliberations of that world assemblage of nations (the U. N., now in session in New York), there is no assurance that it can. So far no peace treaties have been signed even though more than a year has passed since the defeat of the enemy, the Axis powers. One must bear in mind that it is the victorious nations who are attempting to write the peace. The defeated nations have nothing to say about this matter, for they have unconditionally surrendered. It would seem, therefore, that peace treaties should not be difficult to consummate. The disputes, however, that have arisen among the "peace-loving" nations, together with the postponement of decisions on every major issue, is proof of the fact that the U. N. is nothing but a debating society, a "world forum" with

no actual power. To those who expected more from this body, the U. N. is a bitter disappointment. To others who understand its make-up, what motivates its delegates to engage in time-consuming polemical debates, etc., it is not a disappointment, but rather an intensely interesting experiment in world history that is not without its enlightening features. Furthermore, one must remember that the U. N. cannot "write the peace," it can only make recommendations, because the final decisions rest in the hands of the Big Three, namely: America, Britain, and the Soviet Union.

True enough, ostensibly the U. N. was formed to bring permanent peace, an organization to protect the rights of nations against "aggressors." So far, however, within its deliberations, it has only been successful in protecting the "right" of dis-

(Continued on page 2)

## HOME SCENE

### The Republican Victory and Labor

In the midst of a weary post-war world, while many European nations are swinging markedly to the left, in the direction of Socialism, with Communist and Socialist parties scoring strong parliamentary gains, American politics is still oscillating well within the traditional orbit of the old parties of capital, i. e., between the Democrats and Republicans. Though the Republican sweep is generally regarded as expressive of a desired change, its limited nature must not be overlooked. It is more apparent than real. The content of the Republican program, and its contemplated changes, has substantially the same class or economic interest at heart as the Democrats. Basically both parties stand for the

profit system. They differ as to method of its preservation. The Democrats had already come to realize, back in 1932, that if capitalist economy is to function and survive social crisis, a certain amount of government aid or interference is a must, whereas the Republicans have adhered, more or less, to the old economic philosophy of laissez-faire where capital is allowed freedom of action, with little or no government control.

Fourteen years ago the Republican Party similarly went down on an economic issue. It was the depression of 1929 that was responsible for the change over to the Democrats and the New Deal. There followed much government tinkering, but it was not until war orders began flowing

(Continued on page 6)

### Elections in Europe

In contrast to the recent elections in the United States, where one political party of capitalism replaced another, the European elections showed strong leftward trends. Working class parties, especially those proposing to abolish capitalism, have made substantial gains, and in some cases more liberal forms of capitalist democracy have been brought about.

Though the economic base, capitalism, still remains in those countries, nevertheless the part played by working class parties is a tremendous advance over their role prior to World War II. In one country after another, since the close of the war, the political consciousness of the workers has been awakened and strengthened. Their ballots at the polls show the rise in "heat" on the political "thermometer." A resumé of these elections reveals their historical significance.

### France

Weakened economically, so-

cially and politically, by ten years of war, treason, class struggle and finally capitulation to the Germans, France went through terrible ordeals of mass hunger, starvation and general suffering. After the liberation from the Nazis a provisional government was set up, with General Charles de Gaulle at its head. Reconstruction of economic and social life was begun, and in its wake came the need for a new constitution, and political leaders to be selected by the citizens of France and what remained of the empire.

Covering a period of thirteen months, from October, 1945 through November, 1946, eight major elections were held. Two of these, in May and October, 1946, were for the purpose of voting on the new constitution. The first rejected the proposed constitution as being too "leftist." The second approved the basis law for the "Fourth Republic" on more "liberal" lines. The

(Continued on page 2)

## The 'Almost Hateful' Peace

(Continued from page 1)

reement of its member nations. On this score it has been quite successful and can now boastfully proclaim: we have agreed to disagree. The wrangling that has taken place within the U. N. has given birth to a cynicism, that "peace is an extension of war by others means" (a parody on Clausewitz's "War is a continuation of politics by other means").

In the face of all this, one may well ask: what is the cause of the disputes occurring within the United Nations? The American press has a ready answer and proclaims it is caused by the "obstructionist" policies of the Soviet delegation and by Russian "imperialistic" designs upon the world. That it is not as simple as all that, however, can be aduced from former Secretary of Commerce, H. Wallace, who was fired from his job as secretary by President Truman for daring to criticize America's foreign policy. (For further details, see October issue of Proletarian News, article on "Saved — One American Foreign Policy.")

An even more thorough exposé of America's imperialistic motives was given by Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov, in his speech to the general assembly of the U. N. on October 29, in New York City. He made a plea to the allied nations to stick together in order to prevent the rise of "new claimants to world domination."

Molotov stated that, "We know that there are quite a number of methods by which the stronger powers can exercise pressure on other states. It is well known that squadrons of warships and military planes appear, sometimes in the seas and in places where they were absent before, whenever this is considered essential for achieving the greatest possible success in diplomatic negotiations. It is well known, too, that dollars and pounds sterling are not always restricted to home consumption, especially when it is necessary to resort to 'dollar diplomacy,' if only, say, for the purpose of securing due respect for 'dollar diplomacy.' Now, as we know, people also write about 'atomic diplomacy.'"

That Molotov was referring to America and Britain is very obvious, even though he did not directly name them. One can but recall that when the dispute over the port of Trieste was waxing hot, then American planes violated frontier regulations by flying over Jugoslavia. On the other hand, when the Soviet Union and Turkey were in the midst of negotiations for joint control of the Dardanelles (the passage to the Black Sea) then American and British warships made their appearance in the immediate vicin-

ity. The American excuse that it was making a "courtesy call" upon Turkey deceived no one, least of all the Soviet Union. As for "dollar diplomacy," it is common knowledge how, together with "pound sterling," it is doing yeoman service for American and British imperialism in their attempts to prop up reactionary regimes not only in Europe (e. g., Greece), but also throughout the rest of the world, as e. g., China, Indonesia, etc.

More to the point was Molotov's characterization of the question of the atomic bomb which, as he declared, "now plays such an important part in political calculations of certain circles."

"As we know, there are two different plans regarding the use of atomic energy, I have in mind the plan of the United States of America on the one hand and the plan of the Soviet Union on the other."

"The American plan, the so-called 'Baruch plan,' unfortunately is afflicted by a certain degree of selfishness. It is based on the desire to secure for the United States the monopolistic possession of the atomic bomb. At the same time, it calls for the earliest possible establishment of control over the production of atomic energy in all countries, giving to this control an appearance of international character, but in fact, attempting to protect in a veiled form the monopolistic position of the U. S. in this field."

Molotov, furthermore, pointed out that this American plan is afflicted by certain illusions, namely the one that a single country can maintain a monopolistic position in the field of atomic energy. He said, "Science and scientists cannot be put in a box and kept under lock and key." Another illusion, Molotov pointed out, was in regard to its use; for it is common knowledge that it is the civilian population of cities who would suffer the most from the destructive nature of atomic bombs in future wars. He stated that, "Justified resentment may gain possession of honest people in all countries and the enthusiasm about the decisive effect of the atomic bomb in a future war may entail political consequences which will mean the greatest disillusionment above all to the authors of those plans."

What did Molotov mean by the above statement? Couched as it is in diplomatic language its meaning is unmistakable, namely, that the mere thought of suffering of the people in the event of an atomic war might cause them to precipitate a world protest with dire consequences to the warmongers.

(Continued on page 7)

## International Notes

(Continued from page 1)

vote showed approximately 9,000,000 for and 8,000,000 against, with over 7,000,000 abstaining. Support went to three major parties, about 53 per cent of the vote, and for the opposition, or "rightists" supporters of De Gaulle, and others, approximately 47 per cent.

In October, 1945, the major parties, according to voting strength, were as follows: The Socialist Party, Popular Republican Party (M. R. P.), and the Communist Party, with Radical Socialists, and others, trailing. By November, 1946, events had brought about a change in their standing. The Communist Party has now emerged as the strongest in France, about 30 per cent of the votes. The M. R. P. is in second place and the Socialist Party is third.

In the November 1st elections, for 618 members of the first assembly of the Fourth Republic, to hold office for five years, the Communist Party won 180 seats, the M. R. P. won 162 and the Socialist Party 101 seats. The Radical Socialist Party had 59 and other parties varying amounts.

Maurice Thorez, Communist Party leader, has called upon the 5,000,000 followers to join in a popular front of "United Republican Majority" to form a "government of the 'left' consisting of Communists, Socialists, Radical-Socialists and 5,000,000 members of the General Confederation of Labor (C. G. T.). This represents a departure from the old policy of joining coalitions with non-"leftist" groups, the pure and simple capitalist parties.

The test will come in forming a government under the new constitution. Will the "left" parties achieve control of the state machinery? If so, will they be able to administer the affairs of the nation so as to strengthen the proletariat, instead of using the state in the interest of "France's 400 families" who now own the mines, mills and factories? Or will the parties of the "right," the M. R. P. and others, gather enough strength to prevent this?

### Bulgaria

As a result of the victory at the polls on October 27th, the "Fatherland Front" group of political parties has called upon the leader of the Communist Party, Georgi Dimitrov, to head a new Bulgarian government.

Ninety-five per cent of Bulgaria's registered voters cast ballots in the election, showing to the world that it was democratic to an unprecedented degree. The Soviet Union is the only other nation that has 95 per cent, or better, of their registered voters go to the polls at election time.

Out of the total vote, the

"Fatherland Front" won 364 of the 465 assembly seats. Out of 364 seats, the Communist Party got 277. This gave them approximately 60 per cent of the seats in the assembly.

The first duty of the assembly will be to write a new constitution, acceptable to the nation. Land reforms will, no doubt, be among its principal provisions. Being predominantly an agrarian country, Bulgaria has shown that the developing social revolution can be enhanced and furthered by agricultural workers and peasants.

In the election, two party lists were put forward in opposition to the "Fatherland Front" parties, namely, the Bulgarian Democrats (bourgeois and intellectual elements) and the coalition of the Agrarian and Social Democratic parties. If the Bulgarians had been entirely backward, as some would have us believe, they failed to show it in the test at the polls. Quite the contrary, the workers on the farms and in the cities have discussed the problems of land reform and socialization for many years. Marxism has been the key to theoretical discussion and now the guide to action. On the whole, now that the vestiges of feudalism have been greatly liquidated (the nobles, landlords and their retainers fleeing with the Nazis) the "Bulgarian Slavs," brothers of the "Russian Slavs," are showing their desire for agrarian "blessings" that the October, 1917 Bolshevik Revolution brought the Russians, Ukrainians and others. The world's proletariat is strengthened by this development in Bulgaria and points the way for agrarian peoples everywhere.

### Italy

In the elections held on November 10, the residents of Rome, Genoa, Milan, Turin, Naples and Florence participated in their first municipal elections since the rise of Fascism a quarter of a century ago. The results of these elections were a blow to the Christian Democratic Party of Premier Alcide de Gasperi, victors in the June 2 National Constitutional Assembly elections. The best the Christian Democratic Party could do in the six cities was second place. The parties of the left won by substantial majorities.

In Florence, the victorious "Reds" hoisted the "Red Flag of Labor" on the historic Palazzo Vecchio and other buildings of the city. In Rome, the Communists, Socialists and other "leftists" carrying scores of red flags and torches marched up famous and ancient Capoline Hill to the City Hall for a victory celebration. In Naples, the stronghold

(Continued on page 8)

## The New National Freedom

(Continued from page 1)

ter" promises. Surely, independence and freedom are worthy causes. Surely, France wants to see those aspirations grow and spread, but it must be orderly. It must be dignified by ability for self-government, by ability to preserve **law and order and property**.

France, the mother country, is itself going through a reorientation of its institutions. Freedom-loving Frenchmen have difficulty in agreeing among themselves upon questions of property and property rights. The rich and the poor do not think alike. Exploiters and exploited are trying hard to smooth out their differences. At present, the French have framed and adopted a new constitution. The document is likely to be no permanent basis of law. Sooner or later it is more likely to be broken by one or the other of the contending economic interests.

For the time being, this new constitution also gives recognition to the unstable conditions prevailing throughout the empire. It makes attempts at rectification. It does it quickly and easily. It does it with a phrase: "**France Overseas.**" The brown Indo-Chinese, or the darker peoples of the African colonies, are no longer colonial peoples. They are all Frenchmen, with "equality of rights and duties, without distinction of race or religion."

This document further provides: "The French Union is composed of nations and peoples placing in common, or co-ordinating, their resources and their efforts to develop their civilization, to increase their well-being and to assure their security." But the Overseas "Frenchmen" also had to be reminded that, as yet, they were not exactly on a par with their more advanced fellow countrymen in the mother nation. "Faithful to her traditional mission, France proposes to guide the peoples for whom she has assumed responsibility toward freedom to govern themselves and democratically to manage their own affairs."

Now, that seems to be something else again. The colonial traditions of France do not seem to be much to proclaim faithfulness toward in this new move of conferring "national independence." The most ruthless exploitation of natural resources, and of native populations, with almost no thought for even the rudiments of education, health measures, or other native needs, has for long been the known colonial policy of France. To promote those natives to the status of "Frenchmen" but to retain them in their traditional bondage as men and women might not be such a sweet morsel to take. Yet, it holds temporary

possibilities. A few natives might be promoted to governmental positions. A few might acquire property rights—all in return for more faithful service to their French masters. And, some may be rewarded for energetic participation in educating the native masses to be proud of their national heritage of freedom and independence, and in rendering more faithful service in the mines and plantations, so that the sum total of the new freedom can show itself in more millionaires, more industrial giants, and more hard-working wage slaves.

Great Britain, exempted, by Mr. Churchill, from Atlantic Charter provisions, finds herself confronted by the independence movement.

The British Empire is the largest in the world. It stretches into every continent. Its territories measure over 13 million square miles. Its population numbers over 558 million. Since 1776, when the American colonies broke away from her motherly care, Great Britain has developed and followed the method of compromise. Section after section of the empire has been allowed to shed the name of colony and to become a "free" member of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa have all enjoyed dominion status for some time. Many other possessions, including India with her almost 400 million people, are in various stages of colonial dependence. Where dissatisfaction reaches a high enough pitch, the mother nation is ready with concessions. More freedom, more independence, more self-government is what Great Britain now "stands for." But, again, the extent of the new freedom granted must be measured by the native willingness and capacity for maintaining **law and order and property**.

### A Common Purpose

Is it possible to find a common aim in all these varied measures of proclaimed extension of national freedom? We think it is. We think it can be found in the American proclamation of Philippine independence. We think the same intent and purpose can be found in the Dutch, the French and the British proclamations.

Philippine independence might seem to have been granted willingly, while the rest are given reluctantly and under pressure. This might spring from the fact that colonial rule was never a major part of the U. S. Government. In fact, the American "public" has never been fully imbued by the necessity for colonial expansion.

On the other hand, the grant of Philippine independence clear-

ly shows that the Americans were not ready to give anything away. Apart from the military bases retained, American citizens are to enjoy equal rights with Filipinos, to own property and conduct business. Where the Americans have most of the money, and the Filipinos next to none, it can be calculated who are to own most of the property and the business.

We are also now told, over the radio and in newspapers, that the Filipinos who are taking responsible parts in the new government are asking American churches to send missionaries as "character builders." And they explain what that job consists of. Filipino tenants and land workers had been left on the land when the landlords fled from the Japanese invasion. With victory, the landlords are returning. The land workers have learned how to get along without landlords and express their desire to continue thus. This is very bad from a landlord's view, be he Filipino or American. A landlord's conception of freedom always includes the right to have an income from his real estate. American missionaries, the Philippines government and both nations' landowners must work hand in hand to uphold this noble property right

It is this right, the right to own land and other property, the right to run such property with the help of native labor, and in such a way that rent, interest and profit, accrue to the owners. That right must be preserved under any and all forms of granted freedoms. Self-governing primitive peoples could not be made to understand how such rights could be enjoyed or why they should be shared with foreigners. Only after a measure of "civilization" has been imposed, through a period of colonial servitude, are the top section of any backward people prepared to appreciate and support this noble form of western freedom.

The new national freedom movement is receiving one more powerful stimulant. The old form of colonial exploitation, the carrying off of raw materials and yields of natural resources for the home industries is no longer sufficient to satisfy profit-hungry capitalists. Capital accumulates and needs more room for expansion. Export of capital from all of the imperial mother nations has become a capitalist necessity.

Export of capital means building of modern industries in more and more of the backward nations of the world. This means taking the colonial mine and land workers into new industrial plants. For this, education is needed. Education and colonial slavery do not quite go so well hand in hand. Education and freedom go together. But the concept of freedom must be closely guarded, through the

educational process. The American type of freedom is ideal. Any person should be free to select his own government representative. He should be free to go into business, to buy and sell, to sign a contract, to own property and run it his own way. In short, capitalist freedom is in demand. The fact that, under such form of freedom, 90 per cent of the population gets reduced to dependence upon a job which they do not own must not be mentioned.

America has become the number one nation in the business of exporting capital. America needs a growing portion of this export business for prosperity and full employment. So America stands ready to help. America will help with loans—at interest. America will help the colonial liberation movement, help to guide it into "sane" channels, help by giving scholarships to students from Asia or Africa.

America will help by sending teachers and missionaries. The U. S. A. will be generous with its help, and generous in allowing an equal distribution of the hoped for results—dividends on exported capital. Of course, it must be understood that such equality is upon a percentage basis. If America exports billions and other nations only millions, the results must be as 100 to 1. That is capitalist equality. That is equitable returns for generosity.

Such is the nature of the new freedom movement. It is not as ideal as originally represented, but it is progressive. Mass production will spread to larger sections of the world. Later, when mass production stagnates for lack of markets, when unemployment, caused by over-production, becomes widespread, the freedom movement will take on new forms and become more dangerous to present day freedom lovers.

It is this trend of the freedom movement that is so strenuously guarded against now. This trend will not be killed. At most, it will be temporarily subdued. In due time it will revive and the masses will march to victory. The movement for more freedom to exploit now will generate the greater movement for freedom from exploitation. The national freedom movement will precipitate the movement for human freedom.

Christ Jelset.

"All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air."

—From Communist Manifesto.

## 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.

### U. S. Capitalism's War on Labor

The most obvious fact of this post-war period is the tremendous political changes now going on in so many countries. While those political changes vary in degree and intensity, it is plain to see that they are all of one general sort, namely, a struggle on the part of the broad masses of working people to gain control of the nations, and, on the other hand, a vigorous resistance to that change on the part of the owning classes. It is in substance a conflict between an old social order that is dying and a new social system that is in the process of birth.

This world situation is having its effect upon the minds of the American people. However, they do not all react in the same manner. An increasing number of workers, although, as yet, only a minority, see and favor the change. A small number, especially the rich, bitterly oppose it. The vast majority are indifferent. The capitalists, in general, are alarmed, but they are far from being united upon a plan for combatting the menace to their "liberties," their freedom to enrich themselves from the social labors of the working population.

Some leading capitalists, such as William Randolph Hearst, Colonel Robert McCormick and other multi-millionaires who have the facilities for reaching the public, are engaged in a vigorous anti-working class campaign. Of course they seek to disguise their anti-labor, pro-capital exhortations as a noble, disinterested movement on their part. They are only interested in the defense of other people's liberties, of democracy, the "American way of life," etc., but on all issues where the workers' and capitalists' interests come to a deadlock, such as the present coal miners' dispute with their employers, labor is always represented as being in the wrong, or as extremely foolish in allowing itself to be led into evil ways by self-seeking men, allowing themselves to be dragged into "un-American" activities, and playing into the hands of foreign enemies of American democracy, etc. It is never the employers that are to blame for labor disputes, but just the workers or the leaders of their organizations.

Editorials, cartoons, and broadcasts galore depict the vicious labor leaders dragging the poor unsophisticated workers into trouble, against their "own best interests," and causing them to lose millions of dollars in wages (not a word about profits). Quite often this capitalist class propaganda represents industrial disputes, especially strikes in a major industry, as the result of some deep-laid plot, brought on by the machinations of people who are carrying out secret instructions from Moscow.

It is a "good line," first class bait, if the suckers bite. It is a stone aimed at two birds. First, to divert the minds of workers from the real issues in the strike. Second, to stir up hatred for the Soviet Union, the greatest threat to capitalist class privileges in the world today. A very large number of American workers, because of their early training,

and the propaganda incessantly hurled at them from all quarters, sometimes cleverly disguised, are frequently caught in capitalism's propaganda net. This is especially true when national or race prejudice are appealed to, when it is represented to the workers that some enemy from outside of the country is trying to make use of them.

The stirring up of national chauvinism is an old trick, all ruling classes have made use of it. Nothing blinds a patriotic worker more than waving the national flag in his face. The intelligent worker should be on guard against it, especially when it is dragged into a dispute between themselves and the employing class.

Big business, the large capitalist concerns (steel, coal, oil, tractors, tanks, battleships, planes, etc.) made enormous profits during the war. This was partly due to the nature of the weapons which could only be produced by giant industry, capable of mass production, and partly due to the high prices paid by the government. Enormous numbers of workers were exploited, during long hours, and steadily, over a period of years. Very little labor time was lost.

It is true workers earned more, because they lost no time and worked long hours. Their money wages, as a whole, were higher, but the purchasing power of their wages steadily fell, and to a greater degree than the increases granted, or forced by strikes or threats of strikes.

Since the close of hostilities, and the reduction of hours, the return to a more normal working day, less money wages are now being taken home by the workers, and the purchasing power has fallen still further and faster than before, and the end is not in sight. In other words, real wages, the workers' living standard, is becoming less from day to day.

Big business is drunk with power, and is applying pressure, both directly through its ownership of industry, and indirectly through the control of government, to force organized labor to its knees. Labor's gains of the war years, mostly sweated out of its own hide, are to be nullified and the workers thrust back into their pre-war status of day-to-day dependence upon the job in order to live. Organized labor's strength and its collective action is to be destroyed or substantially curbed.

The battle of capital against labor on the home front is just part of the general fight of world capital to stem the tide of working class political progress which we have here already referred to. In daily newspapers, such as the Chicago Daily Tribune, the battle is in full swing. In the Tribune there recently appeared a whole page, attacking the Soviet Union. It was placed there by the Hearst newspapers, and headed "Red Fascism." It consisted of an article by W. R. Hearst which that gent had broadcast as a speech in January, 1935.

This article, nearly seven years old, contains many ancient charges against the Soviet Union which have long been refuted and by historical development rendered senseless, yet its old platitudes are still being purveyed to a large circle of readers. It is true that the average newspaper reader is not of very high mental caliber, but surely not of such low mentality as the reprinting of Hearst's diatribe would imply.

He starts off by giving a dictionary definition of the word proletariat as "the lowest order of citizenship in ancient Rome." Then he tells that "this class obtained by force and violence, complete control of the powers of government" in 1917 in Russia. No comparison is drawn between the proletariat,

and the peasantry for that matter, of the 20th century and the proletarians of ancient Rome. But such a little matter of that sort does not make much difference to the mentality of a William Randolph Hearst, nor those who swallow his bait.

He proceeds to tell of how at the time of writing (1935) there was in the Soviet Union "evidence of rising revolution against the new regime." After a lengthy recording of all the evils which the capitalist world was then throwing at the Soviet system, he portrays the U. S. S. R. as a hopeless mess of starved and demoralized workers, and he brings his tirade to a close by asking: "Well, citizens of free America, do we want the cruel class rule of the proletariat in our country? \* \* \* "Do our farmers want to be starved to death to support a Red Army, a blood-stained army which will murder them?" To him, the first working class government of the modern world is a "government by the mob, government by ignorance and avarice, government by tyranny and terrorism," etc.

Since Hearst made that talk in 1935 (one wonders why it is reprinted in 1946), the Soviet nation of "starving slaves," the national system described by him as "Red Fascism," fought a savage foe, German "Black Fascism" (Mr. Hearst's "free enterprise" friends), and laid down more young lives in the process than were lost from all other causes in the previous half century. This was done in alliance with American and British capitalism, involuntarily it is true, but had it not been for the sacrifices of "Stalin's starving slaves" millions of American and British boys now living would be dead.

Had the Black Nazis defeated the Red Army and conquered the Soviet Union (probably that is what Hearst and his kind wanted to happen) it is practically certain that the conquest of Britain would have followed. Then what would have happened to America? The answer is anyone's guess. But, supposing that America could have, in the long run, defeated the Nazis and the Japanese alone (only supposing, of course), how many millions more American boys would have had to lay down their lives?

Do the Soviet haters, those who shout "Red Fascism," ever give a thought to that point, or do they value American lives so little, or is it a case of being so blinded by hatred of the classless system instituted by the people of the U. S. S. R., and fear that the same might arise here and take away their class privileges, that they go quite mad and cease to be able to think?

We are not charging that there is a secret center from which orders to the press and radio are sent out, but there is a surprising uniformity to the line of slander and the "theoretical" arguments aimed at the Soviet Union. This is undoubtedly due to the uniformly mechanical outlook of the bourgeois mind.

One of the present aspects of the anti-working class campaign is that new laws should be enacted to curb organized labor. This idea is being extensively propagandized. What the capitalists please to call the "closed shop" is to be the excuse for launching anti-labor laws. In reality the closed shop is only when the capitalists lay off the workers and send them home because they cannot be profitably exploited. A union shop does not exclude non-union men, so long as they do not scab on other workers. The non-union man is the potential unionist. The rat, or inside anti-union worker, is a different matter.

His actions may arise from sheer stupidity, or he may be a paid agent of the employers. In either case union men are justified in making things hot for such an individual,

regardless of all the fine talk about the "American way of life," and the rights of the individual to work when and where he pleases, and that the wages he accepts is his own individual affair, etc., etc. John D. Rockefeller, the elder, used to bewail the interference with the individual worker's personal liberty, and his God-given rights, and assert that labor's heritage of individual freedom should be protected from outside interference, no one should tell him what wages he should work for.

We are going to hear much more about calling a halt to the "tyranny of organized labor," about its defiance of the employers and resistance to government mandates. Behind this smokescreen, the capitalists are trying to force labor down to a lower standard.

"Had enough?" was the political slogan used by the Republicans against the Democratic administration in the recent election. It is certainly high time that the working class as a whole begin to ask itself if it has "had enough" of capitalist politics (Democratic and Republican alike) and launched out, as the great majority it is, to take over the powers of government, and the nation and the fullness thereof.

Have not the workers had enough of professional politicians? Is it not time that carpenters, bricklayers, miners, railroaders, truck drivers and other useful people took a hand in the nation's affairs and elected their own kind to Congress? Is it not time that the lackeys of Wall Street were sent about their business? Labor certainly could not make a greater mess than the last quarter of a century has witnessed. On the general principle of the "greatest good for the greatest number," labor would be justified in making a clean sweep of the political incubus.

Capitalism in America is riding high, it is arrogant and self-willed. It is taking the fight to labor, and if the workers don't fight back intelligently, and systematically, both on the union field and on the political, they are going to find themselves and their dependents reduced to the standard of living which the European workers are now in revolt against.

A showdown is approaching, a situation is developing wherein the workers will either have to "hang together" or "hang separately." The Proletarian Party proclaims that labor's unavoidable daily battles with the employers over wages and working condi-

tions, no matter how successful at times, still leaves labor at the thin end of the horn, and it is not long until the "gains" have vanished and the strikes have to be fought all over again.

Hasn't labor "had enough" of that sort of performance? Is it not time that the American workers realized that a final solution is possible only through the abolition of capitalist class ownership of the industries. Collective ownership, the socialization of the means of production, for the benefit of all instead of the enrichment of the few, is what labor must strive for. It is a simple solution, yet there is no other. It is the solution that history has decreed.

The Proletarian Party takes its stand upon that solution. Capitalism has outlived its usefulness, but it will continue to linger and work still greater harm, until the workers, as a class, organize and conquer political power. Toward this goal the Proletarian Party is organizing and educating those who have vision enough to see its inevitability. Readers of Proletarian News who are convinced of the soundness of our program are hereby invited to join our ranks, to become members of the Proletarian Party.

John Keracher.

## Bits and Skits

It is said that **any** American boy can grow up to be President. Of this we no longer have any doubt.

\* \* \*

District 1, United Steelworkers (CIO), adopted a resolution asking international officers to take steps to prohibit communists from holding office in their union. Such action is right up the alley of the steel bosses, and deserving only of lackeys. The progressive workers will fight such discriminatory and undemocratic practices. It is not the communists who are the enemies of labor: Capital is its enemy, and its exploiter. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, wants "no damn communists meddling in our affairs," yet he sees no reason to protest against the damn Republicans, damn Democrats, damn Catholics, or any other damn prejudice that may be around.

\* \* \*

**How to win friends and influence people:** Mrs. Veronica Dingle, author of "Personality Unlimited," and "Hold Your Man," recently told Boston businessmen that "Lipstick can make America secure against Communism" (Boston Globe, Oct. 16, 1946). Lipstick may be a means of winning boy friends, but as a means of securing the nation against Communism it may backfire, for contact with it generally results in a red impression.

\* \* \*

Selfishness and greed is said to be inherent in human nature. The fallacy of this is proved by the many instances of mutual aid and sacrifice. Man is either good or bad, depending upon conditions. Further, good and bad, themselves, are a relative thing; what is good for one may be bad for another. What is good at one time is bad at another. Selfishness is a product of

human society. In a competitive order, with private property prevailing, each business man is on his own, is in competition against the rest of the business world. So he must look out, not for his competitor but for himself. Equally true is it with the worker, who is in continuous competition for a job against other workers. His survival and that of his family depends upon the job.

The profit system begets greed; the wage system begets selfishness. Each must look out for himself in this dog-eat-dog society of capitalism. A cooperative socialist system will establish conditions where such qualities will become an anachronism. Human nature changes along with human society. The nature of the social soil determines the quality of the social product.

\* \* \*

A Reverend A. Powell Davies recently exploded with indignation from the pulpit of his Unitarian Church, in Washington, over a picture of two admirals grinning over an angel-food cake, in the mushroom shape of an atomic explosion. He called it "utterly loathsome."

"If I had the authority of a priest of the Middle Ages, I would call down the wrath of God upon such an obscenity," he told his congregation.

One of the admirals present at the party where the atomic cake was cut commented that the pastor "probably just doesn't understand the situation."

And the well-meaning pastor probably doesn't. For if he did and had the courage he would raise less cain about the cake and more about capitalist society that gives birth to atomic bombs of which the cake is but a cynical expression.

"Faith is indispensable to man but not in what others believe but in what they know."—Dietzgen.

\* \* \*

That our planet, as all planets, is the result of an evolutionary process is now an accepted scientific matter. As far back as the 18th century the great philosopher Kant first formulated his nebular hypothesis, according to which the sun and all the planets developed out of a rotating nebulous mass. His theory, said Engels: "half a century later was established mathematically by Laplace, and half a century after that the spectroscope proved the existence in space of such incandescent masses of gas in various stages of condensation."—From "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific."

Additional modern proof is furnished as recently reported in the press, by Dr. Wendell Latimer, dean of the College of Chemistry, who says: "support for the theory was found in a study of chemical reactions at about 5000 degrees absolute, the temperature of the sun's surface and probable temperature at which the earth and the planets were formed."—N. Y. Times.

Many still lack the courage to break with the traditional and specious belief in supernatural creation, but the courageous and thinking mind finds greater satisfaction in the natural and factual explanation furnished by science.

\* \* \*

Henry Wallace, former Secretary of Commerce, in a recent speech before McAlester College students, labelled Winston Churchill as the world's "great red baiter."

Two additional points that he scored are worth noting. First, that "Americans express horror at Soviet criticism of the U.S.A.

But for every inch of criticism appearing in the Soviet newspaper Pravda, there were at least a thousand inches of criticism of the Soviet Union appearing in the U. S. newspapers." Secondly, that "the U. S. A. had more to fear from the threat of a military dictatorship than from the threat of Communism in a time of depression." He added, "that in the late 1932 and 1933 military men in the U. S. A. were talking of a military dictatorship in case President Roosevelt had proved a weak leader." — PM, October 31.

Here we have an admission by an outstanding capitalist spokesman as to the preponderance of the so-called free press propaganda and its influence over the mass mind. American workers are a thousand times more opinionated than Soviet workers.

His second comment corroborates once again that democracy is not an impartial and ideal institution, but a form of class rule, that of the capitalists. This class has shown in other countries, and in history, readiness to junk democratic procedure whenever emergency social conditions arose. It can, and will, do so here in America, too. That such resort was even contemplated (and Wallace was in the know) should put workers on the alert. For behind the democratic facade stands economic privilege, bent upon maintaining its wealth and power, no matter by what means, deception, ruthlessness or both.

R. Daniels.

"Though not in substance, yet in form, the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie."

—From Communist Manifesto.

# HOME SCENE

(Continued from page 1)

in, and American itself entered the war, that economic activity set in. For a few years, prosperity reigned. But now that the carnage is over, and with it war-prosperity, elements of coming crisis are again visible on the horizon. Only a couple of months ago the stock market sagged badly. More recently the cotton market broke. At the close of the war the nation was left with a debt running into hundreds of billions of dollars. The war effort has made exceedingly high demands upon capital, cutting into its profits; the extremely costly armament preparations that U. S. imperialism now finds necessary, in its attempted stabilization of world capitalism; inflation, price control, food and material shortages, a thriving black market and above all major strikes in heavy industry and transportation that crippled production, all these economic factors together have irritated substantial sections of the business elements clamoring for a change.

It is obvious that the Republican "landslide" was a reaction against the existing Democratic Administration's inability to keep social and economic forces in check. Crisis in politics is a reflex of economic disorder. Whatever party is in power is made to assume the blame for such confusion and difficulties, though it must be stressed that neither party, Republican nor Democratic, can do more than tinker with a problem that is inherent in the economics of the situation.

A year of mounting prices, shortages and strikes has made it possible for the Republicans to capitalize strongly on growing anti-labor sentiment. CIO's PAC support of the Democrats also played very strongly into their hands. The communist issue, too, was adroitly dragged in to stigmatize the administration. Confusion and disunity on the part of labor became so much grist to the Republican mill. For labor has not yet learned the necessary lesson of embarking upon a political role of its own in defense of its own economic interests. It is still chasing capitalist rainbows, supporting now the elephant, now the jackass, little realizing that its so-called "friends" in both parties are only election-time friends who are sure to kick it in the teeth when crucial class issues arise. With the election of the Republicans, the drift seems more in the direction of the right and reaction, a trend already noticeable in the present Truman Administration. The get-tough policy on the foreign field is likely to be duplicated on the domestic front as well. Already the election showed several states adopting

anti-labor legislation. Should economic conditions deteriorate as they well might, the Republican Party notwithstanding, an extension of the labor-curbing process might follow, unless labor disavows once and for all, the policy of begging political favors from its class enemy, or any of its henchmen, and adopts an outright class policy of its own in independent political action.

The coming months and years will see American labor either completely shackled and regimented or else adopting a policy of fight and class struggle. It will learn that it must become self-reliant if it is not to be transformed into cringing wage-slaves, licking the hand that slaps it down. The Republicans, flushed with victory, might attempt a program of tax reduction and other economies, so as to enhance the profit margin. They might seek to limit government interference in capital's economic affairs, only to find a rude awakening one fine day with economic and social complications, with class struggles too vast and far beyond the capacity of laissez-faire capitalism and individual capitalists to handle. This is the era of imperialism, of growing state capitalism, worldwide revolutionary struggles, growing economic crises. The old ways with the free market are gone. This is the day of monopolies. The old ways of solving national depressions through market expansion are done. This is the era of world crisis with the world's markets narrowing. At this stage, one-sixth of the world is Socialist and more is on the way. These are some of the problems that the Republican Party, in taking political control, must face.

The workers on their part must in due time come to recognize that the basic economic and social problems of job security, prosperity and peace, are beyond the capacity of either the old parties of capital. That is, not because they don't want to, but because they can't. The profit element in the economic order, for which they both stand, prohibits its own consummation.

\* \* \*

## News Poll

Prior to the recent elections, the New York Daily News ran a poll to determine the political trend. Such polls are presumed to be impartial, and objective, covering a cross-section of the population. But ballots marked for Mead were found in a Bronx sewer.

How impartial this one was has been disclosed in affidavit by one of its canvassers, Edward Pyman, who on the second day of his canvassing was fired because of his "general attitude." "My attitude," said Pyman,

"had been that I objected to anti-semitism and that I thought the poll was deliberately unfair."

His affidavit said: "There is no check on the number of blank ballots a canvasser takes out.

"There is no check on the number he brings back in comparison with the number he takes out.

"He is not supervised, so he is free to destroy ballots if he sees fit.

"If too many ballots are returned (the poll in each district is allegedly one per cent of that district's actual vote in 1942, the previous off-year election) the excess ballots are destroyed.

"He saw his superiors destroy the excess ballots, and virtually always they were Mead ballots.

"In some cases a crew chief moved to known Republican sectors when a sampling elsewhere in a given district turned up 'too many votes for Mead.'" (P.M.)

His story included instances of class discrimination. "To my knowledge," said Pyman, "when one particular crew came into a wealthy district, the men were specifically ordered not to bother with maids or butlers or other servants." (P.M.)

This and other polls (Gallup, Fortune, etc.) are not a genuine reflection of public opinion. Rather is their function to influence the people's thinking. To enlightened workers this will occasion on surprise. The press is an organ of the moneyed class for deceiving the mass. Its ability to lie and distort has become a "fine art."

\* \* \*

## Rogge's Dismissal

The dismissal of Rogge as Assistant Attorney General should focus attention again on the fascist issue. Many will remember Rogge as the prosecuting attorney, in the sedition case of a couple of years ago, against 65 American fascists, which was strangely dropped. His ousting by Tom Clark, Attorney General, followed because "he had wilfully violated' department regulations by quoting from a department report on a mission which Mr. Rogge made to Europe last spring." (N. Y. Times, October 27.)

It appears that Rogge had documented data, linking German high fascists and their American counterparts who are still at large and operating. Rogge claims that it was his intention to bring these to light, before the American public. For this he was declared to be talking out of turn and given the ax. Which brings the question to mind: What about these fascist seditionists? Why weren't they prosecuted to a finish? Or are they being preserved, supported and protected by labor-hating reactionaries, for possible future fascist eventualities within democratic America? Could be. Judging by the general lenient policy towards the Nazi reactionaries in

the U. S. zone in Germany, one can understand why anyone genuinely opposed to fascism would be purged. These same capitalist reactionaries who formulate such foreign policy are determining things political at home. Such will hesitate little about adopting concentration camp tactics for their own recalcitrant labor and liberal elements.

\* \* \*

## Productivity

Business leaders, since the close of the war, have repeatedly, almost daily, reminded the nation that greater productivity is the key to lick inflation, and introduce permanent prosperity for all. It is well to make a mental note of this formula for permanent prosperity, for future recollections.

Business leaders have attributed the reconversion pains to labor. Charging that labor is staging a "slow-down" movement; that it is less efficient than in pre-war, and that, in fact, productivity has declined. These charges by business have been particularly vehement when labor demands increased wages to meet the rising cost of living.

Figures and statements, from both the government and business sources, belie the popular press reports on declining productivity. Both the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Federal Reserve Board report a rise in production, per man-hour, in 1945 over 1944 and still further increase for 1946 over 1945, based on early figures of 1946. And the U. S. News predicts, on the basis of the present trend, an increase in productivity in the first half of 1947, to a peak about 25 per cent above the 1939 level.

Down on the farm, where life is supposedly characterized as slow, the story of productivity is markedly on the upswing. From 1939 through 1945, farm production increased 12 per cent, with 8.4 per cent less help. Output per worker rose over 20 per cent over prewar years.

The U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics, in its report on "Changes in Farming in War and Peace," says: "Acceleration during the war of the long-time downward trend in farm employment, coupled with marked wartime increases in farm production, resulted in record levels of production per farm worker. . . . Increases in production per worker in agriculture matched those of industrial workers during the war."

And who has benefited from this increased productivity? Ask the ordinary worker, and if he doesn't tell you he's worse off, the most he'll admit is that he's no better off. The profiteers may cry about lessened production, but the records show another story.

Director of War Mobilization

## THE AFL SEES RED

We expect the newspapers who cater to their master's voice, the well paying advertisers, to be against reds and the insidious influence (insidious to them) of Moscow. We know that whatever the recent AFL convention legislated for the benefit of the worker would not receive much newspaper space. We have a "free press." The rich owners of the press are free to print the news they wish to print.

However, we do read that the recent AFL convention lashed at the CIO because, according to them, that organization is part of a Communist plot to destroy "free" America. They charge that Russia was endeavoring to establish a Communist dictatorship in America; and that the World Federation of Trade Unions is a Communist Front organization; and further on we read, in pronouncements from the same convention, that the State Department is honey-combed with Reds who have filched secret papers and sent photostatic copies to Moscow.

These statements must be confusing to many workers who have acquired a smattering of class consciousness; and who have begun to doubt whether the problems of the working class could ever be solved under our present social system. They may well ask if the AFL leaders aren't talking against their own interests. Isn't it against their interests to bar so-called Communists from membership?

The answer is an emphatic "no." The AFL leadership is protecting its own interests in acting thus.

These same leaders who meet from year to year, in swank hotels in Chicago, New York or San Francisco, or overlooking the sands of Miami, to ponder the "workers' problems" are putting up a vigorous fight to save America from the Red menace, which would also put an end to their jobs. It is inconceivable that Green, Woll, Hutcherson and company will look on labor's problems as other than battles across conference tables, battling for hourly rates, closed shop and dues check off.

They have never attempted mass leadership nor have they ever tried to improve the conditions of the great masses of workers, but have always pleaded for their own special groups. It is also true that portions of the AFL are an exception to these statements but they are not the main body of the AFL. Ideas of communism and socialism, of working class unity and solidarity on a national and international scale are dangerous indeed to the AFL hierarchy. If such ideas could permeate the AFL, they would also include a new leadership who would not be interested in maintaining the status quo, from which the old leadership wrests its rich livelihood.

Lenin pointed out in "Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder" how old line trade unionists would resist any change from capitalism to socialism. However, their resistance will not stop progress. The problems confronting the workers today, new and severe depressions in the making, will not stop the rank and file from taking

(Continued from page 6)  
and Reconversion, in his report to the President, October 1, 1946, stated that: "Business profits, after taxes, are at the highest point in history." The record of \$9.9 billion in 1943 is in "danger" of being passed. A glance at the various trade and financial magazines corroborate the government view. In the food product companies, for example, the National City Bank reported, in its August Letter, that profits in the first half of this year were 51.6 per cent higher than in like period of last year.

Then, in the final analysis, greater productivity means intensified exploitation of labor. The benefits to the capitalist are increased profits. What's more, it is a fall in relative wages. The difference between wages and profits is markedly in favor of capital. That is not all, for the harder the worker labors, the closer he gets to the undertaker. Increased production benefits one class, and one class only, under capitalism—the profit-takers.

While it is true that through increased production, ultimately, prices will drop, it is a blessing in "disguise." As experience has borne out, increased production

also means, in time, the creation of surplus marketable products. The need for an expanding market, to absorb the greater production, carries with it the specter of depression with its mass unemployment, the temporary solution for which the capitalists found only in war. It is hell for the workers, either way, under the profit system.

\* \* \*

### Labor and the High Cost of Living

Rising food prices have cancelled out whatever wage gains organized labor achieved last year. Food prices now, according to official estimates, are 90 per cent above August, 1939 and over 25 per cent ahead of last year's level.

The removal of price control on everything except sugar, rice and rent, immediately following the November elections, is bound to have its effect on the commodity market. Price fluctuations are expected, but, so far, they have been mainly in one direction—UP. Food alone, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics, accounts for 40.8 per cent of the middle-income consumer dollar. As for the low-income section of the population, the laboring

## The 'Almost Hateful' Peace

(Continued from page 2)

Molotov also made this admonition, "Lastly, it should not be forgotten that atomic bombs used by one side may be opposed by atomic bombs and something else from the other side, and then the obvious collapse of all present-day calculations of certain conceited but short-witted people will become all too apparent."

Molotov then presented to the U. N. the Soviet Union's proposal for the adoption of an international convention which would prohibit the manufacture and use of atomic bombs for military purposes as well as other weapons of mass destruction. What he proposed was—disarmament. Toward this end he pledged the Soviet Union's co-operation.

Molotov also warned the U. N. delegates against the "militant atomists," as for example Baruch, who in a speech to the College of the City of New York, on October 12, stated that "Peace seems beautiful during the sav-

action; and Green and company will be unable to prevent the workers from coming to grips with the exploiters. Red baiting will please the capitalists but it will not solve the workers problems. Class conscious workers will still struggle within the AFL, and the problems of inflation and depression will increase their numbers. The need for labor unity will increase and no amount of name calling will bar it indefinitely.

Lewis Williams

agery of war but it becomes almost hateful when war is over."

What did Baruch mean by that statement? Molotov explained that it's the kind of philosophy that is connected with far-reaching plans for the use of the atomic bomb, increasing armaments, etc. That this "militant philosophy can find its continuation only in the preparation of new aggression which has been so unanimously condemned by the United Nations."

The Soviet Minister, Molotov, also pointed out that further in Baruch's speech, he was not sparing in expressing his love of "freedom." But that Baruch's concept of freedom is of the kind that only the "lucky ones" can enjoy the benefits of life not only in times of prosperity and peace but also in times of war. Molotov pointed out that Baruch's sentiments are alien to the people who sweat in heavy daily toils and who at the cost of their lives defend the freedom and future of their native country.

How does one analyze all the foregoing, particularly when another question obtrudes itself, namely, will the nations disarm? The press of America provides one with an answer. It characterized Molotov's speech as "bellicose." One could expect that for, after all, the newspapers in America are, in the main, owned and controlled by the capitalist class. Another answer was provided by Austin, the American

(Continued on page 8)

mass, the food item certainly represents a higher percentage. The worker's effort to get a square meal will force him to take action. For labor has something to sell, his capacity and energy to work. Pleading for lower food prices will get labor nowhere. He can't determine the prices of someone else's commodity. But demanding, and getting higher wages is the only effective way to offset the increased cost of living.

To delay obtaining wage increases now would be tantamount to accepting a cut in real wages. For the relation of the money wage to its buying power is the thing that counts. In reality, for labor to effect wage increases now would not, in substance, be a raise at all, but only an approximate balance to the increase in cost of necessities which has already taken place. Labor is advised to be patient, for "prices are bound to come down." The advice is free and cheap. It is the master's voice. Meanwhile, capital is reaping the harvest of higher prices. When the downward tendency sets in, wages, as well as other commodity prices, will be on the toboggan slide.

The miners' efforts, for adjustment of their wages to the higher cost of living, have been widely described by the daily press as the opening of the second round of strikes. It is contended that labor's first round, last year, netted 18½ per cent for all workers, which is not altogether true.

According to the same B. L. S. only one-fifth of the wage earners have received an increase of at least 18½ cents an hour since V-J Day.

That the rate of pay is the same for the vast majority of workers since V-J Day for:

"48.4 per cent of those working in wholesale establishments.

"63.6 per cent of those employed by the retail trade.

"67.9 per cent of those working for hotels, banks and similar service institutions." (PM, October 21.)

It is self-evident from the above that most workers have already felt the drive made by capital to lower the living standards in this post-war period. It is both a challenge and a threat to all American labor. Labor must answer this challenge with vigorous resistance.

L. B.

## The 'Almost Hateful' Peace

(Continued from page 7)  
representative to the U. N., who, in reply to the Soviet proposal for disarmament, made it clear that America would not disarm unless other nations do. It all boils down to this: that America has no intention of disarming and will only go to the extent of paying lip service to it. America can try its best to assure the world that she will never use the atomic bomb again but the memory of what had happened to the Japanese people in Nagasaki and Hiroshima still lingers on.

The United Nations Organization, like its predecessor, the League of Nations, is powerless to prevent war. It is at best an experiment foredoomed to failure. It might succeed in imposing limitations on armaments, but that too would not prevent war, as past history has proven.

To prevent future wars from arising one would have to eliminate the cause of war. International conflicts spring directly from the capitalist system itself. It springs from the economic rivalry between capitalist nations for control of world markets, the sources of raw materials, and the "right" of exploiting millions of propertyless peoples. To protect their holdings and wealth and to accumulate more capital, the capitalist nations have need of armaments.

To bring permanent peace, the capitalist system would have to be abolished. This could only be accomplished by the working class, who would have to collectivize, i. e., socialize industry and wealth, thereby replacing competition with co-operation. That the capitalist ruling class fear such a social transformation is very evident by their diatribes against communism. Be that as it may, the rich exploiters of labor have long ago demonstrated their incapacity to rule society, they cannot prevent wars any more than they can the periodical crises of overproduction which render millions of workers jobless, which creates the paradox of starvation in the midst of plenty. Only those who suffer, who sweat and toil, and in times of war do the bleeding can bring about a social system that will not only make life secure but a life worth living. It is the laboring class that holds the future in its hands if it would only bestir itself. The social revolution is long overdue, and until it takes place the atomic bomb will continue to hang heavy over the heads of all, like that famed sword of Damocles.

Al Wysocki.

Subscribe to  
**PROLETARIAN NEWS**  
50c for 12 ISSUES

## INTERNATIONAL NOTES

(Continued from page 2)  
of "Monarchists," the "Ticket of Vesuvius" — combination of Communists, Socialists and other left groups—were first, "Monarchists" second "Common Man" third; "Liberals" (Conservatives) fourth, and fifth, the "Christian Democrats."

The results will have a beneficial bearing upon the parliamentary elections next spring. The overtures being made by various working class groups for a "united program" to be presented to the nation may see the victory over Premier Gasperi and the Christian Democratic Party. Granted such a possibility it will nullify the strength of the C.D.P., probably forcing them openly into the camp of Reaction.

Regardless, the victories of the workers' parties must ring loud upon the ears of Reaction and its servant, the Vatican. Sharper becomes the cleavage between "Right" and "Left" so that when the day arrives that the American and British (oppressive) occupation troops leave Italian soil, the opportunity will again present itself to "smash the bourgeois state machinery and set up the "dictatorship of the proletariat." This would atone for the error of the 1920's when the workers of Italy took over the industries of the north, but failed to take into account the "state," the powerful weapon of the bourgeoisie. If Marxist understanding

has gained the ascendancy in the thoughts and actions of the workers, this "mistake" will not be repeated.

### Romania

In spite of four United States notes, and also British notes of protest, the Romanian people held their parliamentary elections on November 19th. Out of an official count of 7,968,794 registered votes (women are included and voted for the first time in Romania), 6,823,928 cast their ballots. This is approximately 85 per cent of the total qualified voters. The "opposition parties" received several hundred thousand votes and won 66 out of 414 seats in the new parliament. In itself this is a refutation of the charge that the elections were not "democratic." The peaceful manner in which they were held seems to bear out the Interior Minister's declaration that "opposition parties were free to conduct their campaigns and propaganda and that the press was free." (Associated Press report.) On the whole it bears out the contention that all the notes of protest were as Premier Petru Groza's government charged, attempts at "interference in her internal and sovereign affairs." (A. P. report.) Had the elections been otherwise than free and democratic, a greater "outburst" would have been forthcoming from all quarters.

The results of the voting showed the following official results: Government Bloc (National Democratic Front coalition of six parties, including Communists, Socialists, Petru Groza's Ploughman's Front, Foreign Minister George Tatarescu's Dissident Liberals) 338 seats, plus 10 independents endorsed by the government; opposition parties 66 seats, divided between National Peasants 32, Hungarian Popular Union 29, and other minor parties 5. The breakdown of the seats won by the "Big Four" of the bloc proves very interesting: Socialists first with 78 seats; Dissident Liberals second, 72; Ploughman's Front third, 71; Communists fourth, 70.

Opening the first session of this newly elected "Leftist Parliament" on December 1, King Michael announced the first step in the government program, namely, **nationalization** of the Romanian National Bank (national in name but privately owned). Stability of finance is urgently needed in liquidating the consequences of the war and for a program of reconstruction. With the working class parties taking a larger part in government, participation by the workers in operation and management of industry and agrarian land reform point the way to this change in the nation's economy.

In summing up the results of the many elections held in Europe since the close of the war, both in "front" of, as well as "behind" the "Iron Curtain" of the "Churchills," one fact stands out in bold relief. More and more are the workers entering the arena of "Political Action." This is a natural trend.

Historically, the proletariat has become conditioned to act in this manner. Private ownership of the means of production served well in economic development, but long since has become obsolete in performing "the greatest good for the greatest number." The very opposite is true, "greater poverty for the greatest number, greater wealth for the few." Capitalism cannot provide anything else. These are the teachings of Marxism drawn from the social processes and historic development. These teachings do not stop with recording the "past," but point the way for the "future."

Workers of America! Cannot we learn these lessons and become conditioned and aware of the need for revolutionary political action? The answer is yes. Economically and socially we, the workers have produced the basis for abundance, that which remains is an awakening of political consciousness. Our duty to our class demands that each one who becomes aware of this need "do his bit." Will you join us in the work?

Stanley Cederlund.

## GET A BOOK FREE

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

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO, by Marx and Engels.....	10c
WAGE-LABOR AND CAPITAL, by Karl Marx.....	15c
MARXISM AND DARWINISM, by Anton Pannekoek.....	15c
CLASS STRUGGLES IN AMERICA, by A. M. Simons.....	15c
CRIME, ITS CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES, by John Keracher.....	15c
ECONOMICS FOR BEGINNERS, by John Keracher.....	10c
THE HEAD-FIXIN GINDUSTRY, by John Keracher.....	15c
PRODUCERS AND PARASITES, by John Keracher.....	10c
PROLETARIAN LESSONS, by John Keracher.....	25c
HOW THE GODS WERE MADE, by John Keracher.....	15c
WHY UNEMPLOYMENT, by John Keracher.....	10c

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

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

Subscriber's name .....

Address .....