

WHAT

IS

SOCIALISM

by

NEMMY

Sparks

price **15** cents

**WHAT
IS
SOCIALISM ?**

by Nemmy Sparks

COMMUNIST PARTY OF LOS ANGELES

Introduction

This pamphlet originated as a lecture on socialism. It has since been expanded for publication and is being published as part of the observance of the 100th anniversary of Marxism.

In November, 1847, the first Congress of the Communist League was held in London. The League was a workingmen's association, at first German, later international, whose leaders were Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. At the 1847 Congress of the League, Marx and Engels were commissioned to prepare a program for publication. The product of their work, published in 1848, was the *Communist Manifesto*.

The theory of scientific socialism, clearly and briefly stated in the *Manifesto*, was soon brought to the United States. In fact, the International Workingmen's Association (The "First International") which later replaced the Communist League as the center for the international socialist movement, had many sections in the United States during the years of 1864 to 1876. Moreover, in the last years of its existence, the international headquarters of the First International were located in New York City.

Thus the Centennial of Marxism is simultaneously an international observance and a commemoration of one hundred years of scientific socialism in the United States. It is with this in mind that the present pamphlet has been written and published.

The author is the Los Angeles County Chairman of the Communist Party.

STATE EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT
COMMUNIST PARTY OF CALIFORNIA

Published by
COMMUNIST PARTY OF LOS ANGELES
124 West 6th Street, Los Angeles 14, Calif.



CAPITALISM'S HIGHEST LAW

In the early—and worst—days of the last depression even President Hoover finally became convinced that it was not enough to repeat endlessly “prosperity is just around the corner,” and that something had to actually be done. As a result, when thousands and thousands of people were starving and being evicted from their homes, Hoover established the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and began giving millions and millions of dollars to the big capitalists and industrialists. A terrific outcry went up from the people but Hoover justified himself with the famous theory of “trickling down”—that according to the laws of capitalist economics, the only way the people could be helped was to give huge sums to the industrialists so that they would again be able to show a balance of profit in reopening their factories, hiring workers and paying them wages, and then the people would eat.

Of course it didn't work. Instead of improving, things got worse. But Hoover was correct that he was working fully in accordance with the basic law of capitalism; that is: that the existence of the people must be incidental to, and dependent upon, the making of profit by the capitalists.

WAS THE NEW DEAL "RED"?

That is why during all the years of the New Deal most of the big capitalists raised such a terrific howl about "government interference" with the basic laws of economics, for Roosevelt *did* actually give direct aid to the people. For this, he was called "Socialist!" "Communist!" etc. But Roosevelt didn't do this because he was against capitalism, or because he didn't agree with the basic laws of capitalist economy. Roosevelt intervened in the situation because he saw that the normal workings of capitalism would deepen and worsen the crisis until the point where the whole continued existence of capitalism in America would be endangered. For this reason, in order to preserve capitalism, Roosevelt and that section of the capitalist class which agreed with him proceeded through government intervention to make certain direct, temporary, modifications in the workings of the system, providing relief, work projects—such as WPA, etc., for the benefit of the masses of the people.

The WPA did tremendous jobs of construction. Playgrounds and swimming pools blossomed out in congested areas. New highways spanned the States. New public buildings arose, and the art and theater projects brought a flowering of culture among the people.

But as soon as the reactionaries saw that the unemployed workers really welcomed the chance to work, that public projects were successful, they began to raise a terrific protest against the government "competing with private enterprise," and forced limitations on the WPA until the point where they were able to characterize the typical WPA job as "leaf-raking," and finally abolish it altogether.

The same type of outraged protest was carried on in 1946 against the OPA by the big capitalists who didn't want the "government interference" of price control, and looked forward to the increased profits from speculation and inflation, ignoring the terrific new crisis that this is bringing on.

Does this mean that the capitalists object in principle and at all costs to any intervention in economics (or as they say

“in business”) by the State? By no means. On the contrary! As we saw in the case of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, they *demand* government intervention in the form of government aid *to themselves*—Big Business. And while the New Deal did give considerable direct aid to the people, the big monopolies were in there too, demanding and getting in one way or another from Congress and from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, billions of public funds “to help put Business on its feet.”

THE SQUEEZE!

We saw the same situation in the case of the last war. Despite the fact that this war was a progressive war to defend American democracy against the fascist axis, it was also necessary from the angle of American Big Business to insure domination over the rival imperialisms of Germany and Japan instead of becoming subjected to the axis powers. Yet American Big Business made terrific demands upon the government before it would even convert its plants to war production. Everybody remembers how in many cases the government had to practically pay for the building of plants and give them to the companies. On top of that it became an open scandal—a commonplace for columnists—about the huge excess prices that the trusts were charging the government for all materials, often with the direct connivance of elements in the War and Navy Departments.

Besides this the big monopolies got the benefit of enemy alien patents as well as the pooling of patents here in America—all for practically nothing—together with thousands and thousands of workers’ suggestions, improvements, and inventions for which the workers seldom got credit and almost never got any payment; as well as the increased profits resulting from the patriotic speed-up of the workers, while the wage rates were frozen despite a definite increase in prices that sifted through the price control agencies..

On top of that the monopolies insisted on the excess profits tax rebate for two years after the war, before they

would begin producing munitions so that the people could go out and give their lives to save this country from enslavement by the fascist axis. All this, the monopolies demanded from the Roosevelt administration before they would let America go to work producing munitions for its "War of Survival."

—AND THE KNIFE!

Yet despite these enormous financial rewards, every variety of treason and aid and comfort to the enemy was carried on during the war by the big capitalists. Every one remembers how they continued to sell scrap iron to Japan—and at a time when everyone knew (and the capitalists better than anyone) that war between America and Japan was a practical certainty. Then after we were at war with the axis they continued to sell goods to Spain although they knew better than anyone that these goods were for Germany and were being trans-shipped to Germany.

Then we remember the SKF scandal: after our airforce sustained serious losses in bombing the Nazi ball-bearing factory at Schweinfurt, the Swedish affiliate of the American SKF ball-bearing company proceeded to supply the Nazis with ball-bearings from Sweden. There was a big scandal over this and Mr. William L. Batt, head of the SKF, who was a big shot in the War Production Board, came in for some criticism, but the SKF Corporation didn't stop sending ball-bearings to Germany.

Then of course, throughout the war the Hearst-Patterson-McCormick newspaper axis was going full blast justifying and defending the fascist enemy, day in and day out, and demanding that the war should be switched into a war against our ally, the Soviet Union. Then of course, everybody is familiar with the scandalous fact that the international cartels jointly controlled by Anglo-American and German capital (especially in the oil, chemical and metal industries) were not dissolved during the war but were only

temporarily suspended, while negotiations and business dealings for their future security went on through Switzerland and Portugal, etc.

IT'S NOT OVER YET!

With Roosevelt gone, and the administration no longer challenging the complete domination of the country's policies by the big monopolies, it is no wonder that, following the war, there was no denazification in the American and British zones of Germany; that the fascist dictators, Franco in Spain and Salazar in Portugal, are being maintained; that American and British policy has supported collaborationist elements throughout Eastern Europe against the new people's democracies; and that MacArthur is so studiously preserving intact the fascist military rule in Japan, while carefully manufacturing for it a pseudo-democratic uniform.

And now all those developments have come to full flower in the Truman doctrine. Under the slogan of a "world crusade against Communism," the big monopolies are attempting to put across their plans for "An American Century." Under "Communism" they include any system of democracy in any country in which the people have enough control to be able to reject the domination of American imperialism. And to accomplish this purpose, they naturally make friends with every anti-democratic, fascist force abroad. At the same time, the domestic phase of such a policy involves an attack against the people here at home in the USA—laws to cripple labor unions, to drive down the standard of living of the people; laws to outlaw the Communist Party; investigations and laws to establish thought control and stifle free speech and free press; and if they can get away with it, to actually establish fascism here in the United States.

It would be impossible to explain this scandalous situation if one did not know that fascism is a logical (though by no means inescapable) development of the capitalist system in its imperialist stage. Fascism is a system of govern-

ment for maintaining the capitalist profit system and their imperialist adventures by open, unlimited force when the big capitalists fear they can no longer do so if the people continue to enjoy democracy.

The military victory over the axis weakened imperialism and was a victory for the forces of people's democracy and socialism. Today American and British imperialisms are reverting to type, strengthening fascist forces abroad, and laying the foundations for a war against the new democracies and the socialist Soviet Union. The present situation shows as never before that capitalism in its imperialist stage breeds *war*, that capitalism in its imperialist stage breeds *fascism*. There can therefore be no *permanent* freedom from these dangers except by advancing from the system of capitalism to the system of socialism.

This does not mean that fascism and war cannot be averted unless we have socialism. On the contrary. The united resistance of the great majority of the people headed by the powerful organizations of labor can turn back the drive towards fascism and stave off the threat of war for a long time. But the possibility of fascism and war will still be inherent in the system.

CAPITALISM—AND YOUR DAILY LIFE

But it is not only these questions that have to be considered when we are trying to make an estimate of what capitalism does to the people, but also the *daily* toll of capitalism:

The fact that millions even in normal times are unable to get adequate food, and children grow up under-nourished; millions of families have no, or inadequate, medical care; if they get sick, they become permanently weakened or die.

—The slums that make life a nightmare and distort and cripple human beings and fill the prisons.

—The frustration of unemployment, drudgery, waste of painfully-acquired skill and intelligence; destruction of the idealism and eagerness of youth; prostitution and

degradation of women, and relegation of so-called "good" women to the kitchen.

- The horrors of race prejudice, discrimination and lynching.
- The bribery, corruption and pollution of civic life.
- The stifling and poisoning of culture and human thought; the creation of artists and writers who sing the praises of their own slavery and of the slavery of the people.

One could go on endlessly. All these and similar crimes are inevitable in a system where the highest law is profit.

Take for instance the question of the promises to the veterans. You remember the advertisements in all the



magazines during the war about keeping this country fit for the veteran to come home to, that nothing was too good for the veteran, etc.

Well, where is his home? The real estate interests find it is not profitable to build homes now. It is more profitable to double and triple and multiply by five times the price of homes, to restrict building, and to raise the rents for unlivable shacks.

Where is his job? The industrialists find it is not profitable to produce at capacity. They say "full employment is socialistic" and thereby admit that unemployment and insecurity are an essential feature of the capitalist system.

Where is his assurance of peace and democracy? The capitalists find that the maintenance of the profit system is more important; and so, less than two years after V-J Day they are already trying to orient our foreign policy toward a new war and restrict democracy, and if the veteran wants peace and democracy he has to throw himself into a new struggle for it on the home front.

CAPITALISM CAN'T PLAN

But they say "Capitalism works!" It does NOT work for the masses of the people! It no longer works for the development of society, and the classical example of this is the *periodic crisis*, or as it was politely called in America—the depression. This is not a recent phenomenon but has been a characteristic of capitalism since its origin. Nearly a hundred years ago Marx and Engels gave a description of the periodic (or cyclical) crisis that sounds just as modern today as it was when it was written in the "*Communist Manifesto*" in 1848:—

"It is enough to mention the commercial crises that by their periodical return put the existence of the entire bourgeoisie on its trial, each time more threateningly. In these crises a great part not only of the existing products, but also of the previously created productive forces, are periodically destroyed. In these crises there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity—the epidemic of over-production. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed. And why? Because there is too much civilization, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce."

(Marx — *Communist Manifesto* — Selected Works
Vol. I, Page 211.)

No one who lived through the years of the last "depression" will forget not only the destruction of food and manufactured goods while people starved and went in rags, but also the destruction of whole factories. I remember witnessing in 1932 the destruction of whole textile mills in New Bedford, Mass. The theory was that the price of cotton cloth wouldn't come up because too many mills were working. But even after most of the mills were shut down, then the theory was that the price still wouldn't come up because of the *threat* that if it did, some shut-down mills might *begin* working. And therefore, a number of mills had to be destroyed. And so we stood there and saw huge 12-inch driving shafts get thrown out of five-story windows to be broken up on iron plates below, while other workers pounded away with sledge hammers to destroy the building itself.

CAPITALISM DOESN'T WORK

The absurdity of the capitalist economic crises is nowhere better illustrated than in an oft-quoted little dialogue given again in Magil's pamphlet—"*Socialism—What's In It For You*":

"The story is told that the little son of a coal miner asked his mother: 'Why don't you light the fire? It's so cold!'

"'Because we have no coal. Your father is out of work, and we have no money to buy coal.'

"'But why is he out of work mother?'

"'Because there's too much coal.'"

The capitalist cyclical crisis is inescapable under capitalism. People are already awaiting the next depression, now called still more politely: "recession." It is an unavoidable accompaniment of the system of private profit and of the total absence of planning under capitalism. As Stalin pointed out in 1930 in his report to the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union:

"If capitalism could adapt production, not to the acquisition of the maximum of profits, but to the systematic improvement of the material position of the mass of the people, if it could employ its profits not in satisfying the whims of the parasitic classes, not in perfecting methods of exploitation, not in exporting capital, but in the systematic improvement of the material position of the workers and peasants, then there would be no crisis. But then, also, capitalism would not be capitalism. In order to abolish crises, capitalism must be abolished."

(Stalin: *Sixteenth Party Congress*—Page 12)

SOCIALISM PLANS!

Socialism is a *planned economy*. It is the ability of socialism to *plan* that calls forth from the capitalists the type of consternation and malice that was expressed by Churchill in his recommendation to the Soviet people to see their reflection in the habits and destiny of the white ants. If we were to go into the field of insect life, we could reply by telling the vengeful old war-monger who was so concerned in his Missouri speech about the welfare of the "little man," to see the reflection of himself and his system in certain species of spiders that devour their mate as soon as it has served their purpose and they have finished expressing their love for it.

When the Soviet Union embarked on its first five-year plan, the capitalist press first responded by laughter. The whole plan was "nonsense," and Stalin was merely whistling in the dark in the hope of keeping his regime going a little bit longer before the inevitable collapse. A little later, when they saw that the whole Soviet people was embarking on the plan with unprecedented enthusiasm, the great capitalist spokesmen began to argue seriously that such planning was impossible. A couple of years later when they saw the plan was actually reaching success they took up the tune—"What's all the excitement about? It doesn't mean so

much." And finally, when the completion of the five-year plan in four years created tremendous excitement throughout the entire world, the capitalist press blithely announced that capitalism could do it too! Does anyone remember Hoover's *ten-year plan* that was solemnly enunciated as an answer to Soviet planning in some important speech somewhere with accompanying fanfare on the front pages of the capitalist newspapers? I don't believe it was remembered for another ten days. Or does anyone remember Hitler's *four-year plan*—not to mention his *thousand-year plan*, because he was always planning for a thousand years of the existence of Nazism in his speeches? Capitalism can NOT plan.

OWNING YOUR OWN ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Socialism is a *planned system of economy where the means of production are owned by society as a whole*. Contrary to common misconceptions, socialism cannot be achieved by some attempt just to change the system of distribution in society.

Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific socialism, showed that the system of distribution of goods in society depends inescapably on the *system of production*. Socialist distribution can be attained only under the socialist system of production—where the means of production are owned by Society as a whole.

Socialism is, therefore, not a system of sharing-out.

"Any general share-out would mean in fact, not the creation of socialism, but the creation of tiny split-up economy, and millions of small proprietors. And of course from the small proprietors would grow medium ones, from the medium ones, big ones, and in short, capitalism would be created again, instead of the construction of socialism.

"We have already said that such a general division of property is impossible. How can a mine, or a steam-

ship, or a railroad depot, or a blast furnace be divided up? And even if it were possible, who wants such a division? The working class is not interested in general re-division of the means of production."

(Marxist Study Course: *The Ultimate Aim*—P. 16.)

SOCIALISM IS NOT POVERTY

Above all *socialism is not a system of poverty*. It is necessary to stress this fact because even certain supporters of American-Soviet friendship thought they would allay capitalist fears of the socialist system in Russia by spreading the idea that socialism is all right in the Soviet Union because the tsarist peasant never had anything anyway, and therefore the "uniform poverty" of socialism is an improvement for the Russian masses who have never had a chance to learn the glorious standard of living of capitalism. Winston Churchill has also referred to the socialist system as a system for "sharing the poverty." That this idea is totally false can be shown by a quotation from Stalin:

"Some people think that socialism can be consolidated by a certain equalization of people's material conditions, based on a poor man's standard of living. That is not true. That is a petty-bourgeois conception of socialism. In point of fact, socialism can succeed only on the basis of a high productivity of labor, higher than under capitalism, on the basis of an abundance of products and of articles of consumption of all kinds, on the basis of a prosperous and cultured life for all members of society."

(Stalin: *Leninism*—Page 367.)

"TO EACH ACCORDING TO HIS WORK"

Nor does socialism mean equality of income for all. It is important to stress this fact because the capitalist press, perennially discovering the same thing year after year, every so often announces as some exclusive discovery by a foreign

correspondent that there are wide differences in income in the Soviet Union and therefore this shows that the Soviet claim to socialism is untrue, or that the Soviet system is gradually moving away from socialism back to capitalism. Equality of income under socialism was never envisaged by Marx for the reasons that he gives in the *Critique of the Gotha Program*:

“What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as it has *developed* on its own foundations, but on the contrary, as it *emerges* from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it emerges.”

(Marx—*Critique of the Gotha Programme*—Selected Works, Vol. II, Page 563.)

Nor was it envisaged by Lenin who, in the following passage from *The State and Revolution* shows which advances *can* be accomplished under socialism, and which advances (equality of income) can *not* be accomplished under socialism:

“Hence, the first phase of communism cannot produce justice and equality; differences, and unjust differences, in wealth still exist, but the *exploitation* of man by man will have become impossible, because it will be impossible to seize the *means of production*: the factories, machines, land, etc., as private property. In smashing Lassalle’s petty-bourgeois, confused phrases about ‘equality’ and ‘justice’ *in general*, Marx shows the *course of development* of communist society, which, at first, is compelled to abolish *only* the ‘injustice’ of the means of production having been seized by private individuals, and which *cannot* at once abolish the other injustice of the distribution of articles of consumption

'according to the amount of work performed' (and not according to needs)."

(Lenin—*The State and Revolution*—Selected Works
—Vol. VII, Page 85.)

WHO OWNS WHAT UNDER SOCIALISM?

We have the tremendous advantage over the people of thirty years ago that we do not have to discuss socialism solely in theory, but that there exists a living example of socialism *in practice* in the Soviet Union. To understand and give the people the full benefit of that example, we also have to clarify some misconceptions that are deliberately and calculatedly spread by the capitalist press. The socialist state for example, which has the role of protecting the achievements of socialism against fascist, capitalist reaction, is not some cold cruel materialist instrument riding rough-shod over the individual, but is instead the instrument of the people themselves. To quote from article 1 of the Soviet Constitution; "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a socialist state of workers and peasants."



And Article 3 makes it plain: "In the U.S.S.R. all power belongs to the working people of town and country as represented by the Soviets of Working People's Deputies." This is *democracy* in the highest sense.

Article 4 clearly explains that the economic system of the Soviet Union is *Socialism*: "The socialist system of economy and the socialist ownership of the means and instruments of production firmly established as a result of the abolition of the capitalist system of economy, the abrogation of private ownership of the means and instruments of production and the abolition of the exploitation of man by man, constitute the economic foundation of the U.S.S.R."

Who owns the means of production? To quote article 6:

"The land, its natural deposits, waters, forests, mills, factories, mines, rail, water and air transport, banks, post, telegraph and telephones, large state-organized agricultural enterprises (state farms, machine and tractor stations and the like) as well as municipal enterprises and the bulk of the dwelling houses in the cities and industrial localities, are state property, that is, belong to the whole people."

Another frequent slander about socialism in the Soviet Union is that there is no private property, and therefore the government can come into your home and make you share your toothbrush or take away your favorite neck-tie or something like that. Article 10 shows plainly the broad rights of citizens to private property, even including inheritance:

"The right of citizens to personal ownership of their incomes from work and of their savings, of their dwelling houses and subsidiary household economy, their household furniture and utensils and articles of personal use and convenience, as well as the right of inheritance of personal property of citizens, is protected by law."

The only things that can not be privately owned are *Society's means of production*.

THE PEOPLE'S RIGHTS UNDER SOCIALISM

What is the status of labor, and what are the principles of the Soviet Union? Article 12 says:

"In the U. S. S. R. work is a duty and a matter of honor for every able-bodied citizen, in accordance with the principle: 'He who does not work, neither shall he eat.' The principle applied in the U. S. S. R. is that of socialism: 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his work.'"

Besides these articles that describe and guarantee the socialist system in the Soviet Union, the constitution contains various articles guaranteeing civil rights, common to all democracies. But in addition the Soviet Constitution contains a series of rights that have never yet appeared in any other constitution.

Article 118, *the right to work*:

"Citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to work, that is, are guaranteed the right to employment and payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality."

More and more Americans are beginning to see that without *the right to work*—without "full employment"—all talk about prosperity, about high standards of living, can prove to be a bitter illusion indeed. They have not forgotten the last depression with its bitter humiliation, its starvation and misery for millions of skilled workers and highly-educated professionals, and they have a deadly fear of another depression which our present system is showing no sign of being able to avoid.

WHAT COULD AMERICA DO WITH SOCIALISM?

With our huge modern factories, our mechanically skilled youth and the American natural turn for inventiveness, we have the greatest productive plant and work-force in the world. But our economic system condemns them to the most wasteful unplanned usage, and to periods of wide-

spread idleness. To be free from the spectre of unemployment and to be able to make proper use of the tremendous working talent of the American people would result in an enormous increase of production of every kind of necessity and luxury enriching the life of the whole population. Why can't we have the *right to work* in America today under capitalism? Because capitalism can't provide it, and because capitalism needs its reserve army of unemployed so that it can keep down the wages of the workers and hold over their heads the threat of unemployment to dampen their struggle.

Article 119:

"Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to rest and leisure.

"The right to rest and leisure is ensured by the reduction of the working day to seven hours for the overwhelming majority of the workers, the institution of annual vacations with full pay for workers and employees and the provision of a wide network of sanatoria, rest homes and clubs for the accommodation of the working people."

Imagine how our working people in America who work in many industries at such a rate that they are "too old at forty," could make use of that right with our huge, wonderful country, our national parks, our facilities for travel, the tremendous love of sports and athletics among the American people, and the widespread and growing love of music, art and every form of culture. Why can't we have the right to rest and leisure under capitalism? Because this would not give capitalism its full opportunity to squeeze the greatest possible profits out of its workers. Because capitalism can keep its workers in operation on thousands of dangerous, unhealthy, and incredibly exhausting jobs, only through the constant menace of imminent starvation and misery if the worker quits his job.

Article 120:

"Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to mainte-

nance in old age and also in case of sickness or loss of capacity to work."

For a dozen years now, America has seen a succession of Townsend Plans, Ham-and-Eggs plans and what not, that have enlisted hundreds of thousands in the hope of securing a decent and dignified life in old age free from dependence upon others. Why can't we have this right under capitalism? For one thing because under capitalism, life insurance is one of the biggest profit-making private monopolies. To quote from a little pamphlet "*Is Socialism the Answer?*":

"Throughout the period between the first world war and the second, millions of people in Canada and the United States must have read this widely published advertisement:

'THE FUTURE

'What happens to 100 Average Men of 25 Upon Reaching the Age of 65?

'Only one will be wealthy;

'Four will be well-to-do and able to enjoy comfort and recreation;

'Five will be working for a living, with no prospects of relief from drudgery;

'Thirty-five will have died, in many cases leaving families enduring hardships;

'Fifty-five will be dependent upon friends or relatives or charity.'

"These figures were worked out from insurance tables by the National City Bank of New York, the richest bank in the country. . . .

"Could there be penned by any critic of capitalism an indictment more damning than that?"

(Irwine: "*Is Socialism the Answer?*"—Page 21.)

Article 121:

"Citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to education."

Our country probably has more schools, more universities and a greater expenditure on educational buildings than any other country. Yet as the statistics of the Draft Boards again showed, a large percentage of Americans grow up illiterate. Many elementary schools provide nothing but the barest essentials of education and bury thousands of talents that could contribute tremendously towards society if further developed; with the exception of a few colleges in the largest cities and state universities which are nominally free (but actually closed to most students whose families cannot support them), college education must be bought like any other commodity. And besides all this, reactionary forces not only thoroughly distort the content of education, and fight and penalize any teaching that takes any issue with capitalism, but they force public education to fight continually for its very existence.



Why don't the people have the *right* to education in America today? Because capitalism is unable to solve the contradiction between manual and mental labor. In order to assure itself of an adequate labor supply for the industries it restricts education, at the same time that it wastes and fails to use even the number of people who are educated for highly-skilled and professional work. But more important, capitalism recognizes that universal higher education in itself is dangerous to its continued existence. The broader and

higher the education of the masses, the greater the probability that they will question the necessity of capitalism and learn how to change it.

Article 122:

“Women in the U. S. S. R. are accorded equal rights with men in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life.”

During the war we had a glimpse here in America of the tremendous advantage to the country of equal rights for women, especially their equal right to work. The whole country became conscious of the new freedom enjoyed by the women, the greater respect for the women as participants in the great national war effort, and the more healthy friendliness between men and women. But now that the war is over, women are being discharged from the factories and capitalism is reverting to its normal condition of denying equal rights to women. Capitalism finds this necessary in order to maintain a division among the people through sex chauvinism, to maintain its high-powered sex industry in the movies, in the pulp magazines, prostitution, etc., and to keep women for specialized cheap labor.

Article 123:

“Equality of rights of citizens of the U. S. S. R., irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life, is an indefeasible law.”

“Any direct or indirect limitation of these rights, or, conversely, any establishment of direct or indirect privileges for citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any propagation of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, shall be punished by law.”

To adopt this equality of rights in America would mean to wipe out the greatest blot on our civilization—the discrimination against the Negro with its frequent end in legal

or illegal lynching; to wipe out anti-Semitism; to free the Negro, the Jew and the foreign-born from being pushed around and driven; to bring about the full utilization as contributors to our material and cultural wealth, of the national cultures of the Negro, the Jew, and the national minorities. But we do not have to enlarge here on the fact that capitalism finds a useful role for race hatred as a weapon of divisiveness and reaction.



Would it be possible to achieve socialism in America? Would it be possible to achieve the necessary standard of living?

In the year 1934 the United States Government appointed a committee to investigate the capacity of American industry and agriculture to produce goods and services. The report of this committee was published under the title of *"The Chart of Plenty"* (National Survey of Potential Product Capacity) by the Viking Press in 1935. *It found that every family of four persons could provide itself with an income of \$4,000 a year, at 1929 prices, if America's productive resources were used to the full and their product equally divided among all families.*

That was the year 1934. But everybody knows that during the war there was such a tremendous increase of productivity that the capitalists themselves were astonished. So that this figure of \$4,000 a year could certainly be tremen-

dously increased if not doubled. (Not to mention the fact that prices today are much higher even than 1929.)

CAPITALISM, SOCIALISM, AND ATOMIC ENERGY

And now on top of all this comes atomic energy. It is impossible to grasp yet any conception of the actual effect of this discovery upon methods of production since atomic energy is a force that can be understood only on an astronomical scale. It is the process through which the stars have been giving out immense quantities of light and heat for billions of years and will continue to do so for billions more.

Clearly such a terrific world-wide force can be fully useable only on a world-wide scale—that is, under socialism. The United States' proposal in the Acheson-Lillienthal report for an "International Atomic Development Authority" to own and operate all fissionable materials and atomic plants in the world is really a recognition of this fact, while at the same time it expresses the fantastic hope of imprisoning this super-socialized form of production within the clutches of the Wall Street imperialists who dominate our government and hope to dominate the world.

Since atomic energy increases a hundredfold the basic contradiction of capitalism that Engels characterized in the classic phrase, "The mode of production is in revolt against the mode of exchange"; since it obviously holds within itself the possibility of vitiating the system of private enterprise that is based on restricted ownership and restricted use, we should not be surprised to see that American capitalism is attempting to suppress not only its utilization in industry, but even *any further study* of its utilization.

This is of course similar to the previous practices of capitalism, increasingly throughout its existence, to suppress inventions as long as possible in order to safeguard its existing investments in processes and equipment and material that might become obsolete. There are thousands of smaller examples of useful and valuable inventions that

were developed during the war that are still being kept from the market under the pretense of military secrecy, or with no explanation at all. Now—on a huge scale—the capitalists are trying to deal with atomic energy in the same way.

But of course, the danger of atomic energy under capitalism is infinitely greater than any of these previous considerations, for the fact is that we are now face to face with the danger of capitalism physically destroying the entire world through the use of atomic energy as a military weapon. Just as atomic energy is inherently a symbol of the necessity of socialism, so this danger that the world faces from the atomic bomb is a sign that the social organization of humanity has lagged dangerously behind the tremendous new developments of the productive forces and of the physical sciences.

HOW CAN WE ATTAIN SOCIALISM?

How then can we attain socialism? Socialism can be attained through, first and foremost, winning the *majority* of the people to the realization that it is impossible to continue indefinitely with capitalism; that capitalism cannot produce anything but an endless succession of crises, reaction and war, or even the destruction of the world; that socialism is a possible and fully desirable system thoroughly proved in practice. But the majority of the people will not be convinced of these facts only by words or by observation of other countries. They will be convinced only through *their own experience*—in the struggle to maintain and improve their conditions, against the increasing economic oppression of the capitalist system; to preserve and extend their democratic rights against the growing fascist encroachments by Wall Street; to prevent the devilish insanity of a third world war.

Socialism is not just a wish-fulfillment. As long as it was merely some desirable dream in men's minds, it remained merely a utopia. But Marx and Engels showed that socialism is not only a *desirable* system but that it is the *necessary outcome* of the entire historical process through

which humanity has been moving since its origin. They showed that socialism is the natural goal of the *industrial working class* which was first brought into being and attains its essential characteristics under the capitalist system, through the actual conditions of its daily life and work. Marx and Engels further showed that the *struggle* of the workers against the conditions imposed upon them by capitalism, when carried on under the leadership of a working-class political party conscious of the ultimate aim of socialism, and in alliance with the other exploited sections of the people, is the essential process through which socialism can be brought about. It is the *daily struggle* that leads to the ultimate victory. As Marx and Engels described it in the "*Communist Manifesto*":

"Now and then the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The real fruit of their battle lies not in the immediate result, but in the ever-expanding union of the workers."

Marx: *Communist Manifesto*, Selected Works, Vol. I, Page 215.)

This is a truth that is now being impressed on millions of workers who had thought that their gains under the Wagner Act and the New Deal represented something permanent written into the fabric of American society. The passage of the Taft-Hartley Act has now shown these millions that no gains are permanent under capitalism except insofar as they can maintain them through their organized strength—on both the political and the economic fields.

THE COMMUNISTS' STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM

The fact that the Communists know that the struggle of the working class has a long-range goal, that the Communists are conscious of this goal of socialism and seek to make the workers conscious of it, is used by the red-baiters to argue that the Communists are therefore not really interested, as are ordinary trade unionists, for example, in the daily im-

provement of the economic conditions and democratic rights of the people.

But this is obvious nonsense. Communist workers have the same economic needs as other workers. Far from the struggle for immediate improvements being incompatible with the struggle for socialism, it is *inseparable* from it. The only thing incompatible with socialism is the struggle for individual improvements *for oneself at the expense of the others*. But this is also the ABC of honest trade unionism. That is why the Communist Party leads in the struggle for immediate improvements in conditions as well as in educating the people for socialism.

Each nation will come to socialism in its own way. Already some of the new democracies of Europe are moving toward socialism, but in a way different from that taken by the people of Russia. As a result of the recent history of Poland in the war of liberation against Nazi Germany, when loyalty and patriotism were no longer merely a question of Congressional oratory or newspaper editorials, but when the core of the old Polish ruling class showed their character as Quislings while the workers became the backbone of the resistance, Vice Premier Gomulka of Poland recently declared:

“On the basis of unity of action of both workers’ parties, with close cooperation with other democratic parties, the Polish Workers’ Party has established the conception of the Polish way of development toward socialism. This conception is significant because it does not include the necessity of a violent, revolutionary political upheaval in the development of Poland and eliminates the necessity of a dictatorship of the proletariat as a form of government.”

(*Political Affairs*, April 1947. Page 328.)

So too, when the American people become convinced of the necessity of Socialism, they will move towards it along lines that have a natural basis in our American history, our

American tradition and national character, the concrete situation facing the country at the time, etc., and will hardly duplicate the experience of any other nation.

There is not a single important country in Europe or Asia today, in any way subject to control by its own people, that attempts any more to uphold unbridled capitalist economy—what American capitalists call “free enterprise.” The new democracies of Eastern Europe are definitely in various ways and degrees on the road to socialism. And even in conservative England, the Labor Government has been forced to nationalize the Bank of England and the coal industry in slight deference to its official commitment to socialism. Only in America does so-called “free enterprise” remain holy in word and deed.

IS SOCIALISM UN-AMERICAN?

Is there anything un-American in all this? Of course not. The Constitution of the United States does not commit the nation to any particular economic system. Americans have always fought for a higher level of freedom and progress. It was for this that our forefathers fought in the American Revolution against Britain. It was for this that the nation under Lincoln fought the four bitter years against the Southern slave-owners who conspired to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, third President of the United States and the man who more than any other developed the ideology of American democracy, expected changes in our system. He wrote:

“Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind and as . . . new discoveries are made, new truths discovered . . . institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors.”

Abraham Lincoln saw the menace to democracy involved in the domination of capital over labor. Thus in his first message to Congress December 3, 1861, he wrote:

"It is not needed nor fitting here that a general argument should be made in favor of popular institutions. But there is one point with its connections, not so hackneyed as most others, to which I ask a brief attention. It is the effort to place capital on an equal footing with, if not above, labor, in the structure of government. . . . Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could not have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much higher consideration."

And, warning the middle classes of domination by capital, he said:

"No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty. . . . Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess, and which if surrendered will surely be used to shut the door of advancement for such as they, and fix new disabilities and burdens upon them until all their liberty shall be lost."

His basic approach to the question of production and distribution in society, Lincoln stated in 1847 as follows:

"Inasmuch as most good things have been produced by labor, it follows that all such things belong of right to those whose labor has produced them. But it has so happened, in all the ages of the world, that some have labored and others have without labor enjoyed a large portion of the fruits. This is wrong and should not continue. To secure to such laborer the whole product of labor, as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any government."

And on the future development of our country, Lincoln gave this solemn warning:

"I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me, and causes me to tremble for the safety of my

country. As a result of war, corporations have been enthroned, and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudice of the people until all the wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the republic destroyed."

These words could have been written today in description of the present reactionary course of Big Business, with its red-baiting hysteria, and its Taft-Hartley Act. And just as clearly does Lincoln's long-range thinking in the previous passage point in the general direction of socialism.

Americans, always questioning and experimenting in the search for freedom, founded utopian socialist colonies early in the 19th Century. The first prominent Communist (Marxist Socialist) in the U. S., Joseph Weydemeyer, was commissioned by President Lincoln as a Colonel in the U. S. Army and fought through the Civil War.

Does it show that the Communists who lead the struggle for socialism are un-American because they are under such savage attack by the reactionaries, that many ordinary people are led to join in? By no means! The Abolitionists suffered the same attacks during the years before the Civil War when the slave owners seemed in unshakable control of the U. S. Government. But slavery was nevertheless abolished by the will of the American people.

THE RECORD OF THE COMMUNISTS

The American working class movement for socialism was strong long before the Russian Revolution of 1917. It has had a long list of martyrs who died that the struggle might be carried on: the Haymarket martyrs framed-up and hanged in Chicago in 1886 with the last shout of Albert Parsons, "Let the voice of the people be heard!" ringing on in the country's ears. Joe Hill, organizer and writer of workers' songs, framed-up and shot in Salt Lake City. Tom Mooney, whose incredible persistence in the struggle against his frame-up for 22 long years served as a standing exposure

of capitalist justice. Joe York, Communist youth leader, shot down with three other Communists by machine-gun fire while leading a hunger march of unemployed at the gates of the Ford plant in Detroit; Dave Doran and many others killed in the ranks of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade that went to fight the fascist axis in Spain; and numbers of others.

And in America's war of survival against the Fascist Axis scores of Communists were killed in the war out of the 15,000 who served in the U. S. armed services, not counting those in the merchant marine.

The Communists led the fight for unemployment insurance and relief for the unemployed; for industrial unionism and organization of the basic industries. They broke down the tyranny of the company towns, won innumerable free speech fights and were the first to bring modern industrial unionism to the South. They wrested the nine Negro Scottsboro boys from legal lynching in Alabama and fought for full equality for the Negro people. They fought for defense of the Spanish and Chinese peoples against the attacks of the Fascist Axis; and against the attempts of the Nazis, aided by powerful Wall Street interests, to establish a Fifth Column in the United States. All these struggles were led by the Communists long before these issues were generally accepted, and thousands of Communists were savagely beaten up by police and served terms in jail to gain these advances for the American people.

With such a tradition and such a record in the service of the American people, Communists can appeal with confidence to the verdict of the people and the verdict of the future against the slanders and attacks of the un-American Committee, and the sneers of the time-servers and the outright hirelings of the trusts.

Many people looking at the tremendous contradictions and conflicts of the world of today wonder "How will it all end?" Leading scientists write under pen-names stories

predicting the atomic destruction of the world. But what is needed is a system of organization of society suited to the enormous powers wielded by Modern Man. That system is *socialism!*

SOCIALISM—ITS PLACE IN HISTORY

The achievement of socialism is the crowning development of the entire previous process of human history. As Engels described it in "*Socialism Utopian and Scientific*":

"Anarchy in social production is replaced by systematic, definite organization. The struggle for individual existence disappears. Then for the first time, Man, in a certain sense, is finally marked off from the rest of the animal kingdom, and emerges from mere animal conditions of existence into real human ones. The whole sphere of the conditions of life which environ Man, and which have hitherto ruled Man, now comes under the dominion and control of Man, who for the first time becomes the real conscious lord of Nature, because he has now become master of his own social organization. The laws of his own social action, hitherto standing face to face with Man as laws of Nature foreign to, and dominating him, will then be used with full understanding, and so mastered by him. Man's own social organization, hitherto confronting him as a necessity imposed by Nature and history, now becomes the result of his own free action. The extraneous objective forces that have hitherto governed history, pass under the control of Man himself. Only from that time will Man himself, more and more consciously, make his own history—only from that time will the social causes set in movement by him have, in the main and in a constantly growing measure, the results intended by him. It is the ascent of man from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom."

(Engels: *Socialism, Utopian & Scientific*, Page 134.)

MORE ABOUT SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

What You Should Know About the Communists.....	3c
Is Communism Un-American? Nine Questions Answered	5c
The Path of Negro Liberation, by Benjamin J. Davis.....	5c
Woman's Place in the Fight for a Better World, E.G. Flynn	5c
The Communist Manifesto, Marx & Engels.....	10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, Frederick Engels.....	10c
Socialism: What's In It for You, A. B. Magil.....	10c
Marxism vs. Liberalism, An Interview J. Stalin and H. G. Wells.....	10c
The State, V. I. Lenin.....	10c
What Price Profits? Max Weiss.....	15c
Theory and Practice of the Communist Party.....	15c
Science and Religion, Marcel Cachin.....	15c
The Nature of Capitalism, Anna Rochester.....	35c
The New Europe, William Z. Foster.....	35c
The Soviet Power, Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury	60c
Why Work for Nothing? Herman Schendel.....	60c

Available from

PROGRESSIVE BOOK SHOP

1806 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles 5, California

INTERNATIONAL BOOK STORE

1400 Market Street, San Francisco 2, California

SEND FOR FREE CATALOGUE

Free Eugene Dennis!

Eugene Dennis, General Secretary of the Communist Party, was one of the first to challenge the un-constitutional existence and practices of the Thomas Un-American Committee. As a result, he has been convicted of contempt of Congress and sentenced to one year in jail.

The experience of trade unionists, artists, writers, scientists and film people with the "thought control" procedure of the Committee, clearly indicates it is the center of a conspiracy to subvert the Constitution and violate the Bill of Rights.



EUGENE
DENNIS

Dennis' appeal claims that there is no place in our American democracy for this "Un-American" Committee because:

- 1: Congress is forbidden to enact any law prescribing what people may say or think. (1st amendment of the U. S. Constitution.) Further, the Committee has become an illegal police authority, blacklisting a million Americans.
- 2: John E. Rankin, member of the Committee, does not lawfully hold membership in the House according to the 14th amendment. "*. . . when the right to vote . . . is denied to any of the inhabitants . . . or in any way abridged . . . the basis of representation therein shall be reduced . . .*" It cannot be assumed that in November, 1946, 95 per cent of Mississippi's electorate voluntarily refrained from voting.

The Dennis case is the fight for free trade unions, a free screen, free schools, free press, free speech and freedom from Fascism.

Do this right now:

- A. Write to Attorney-General Tom Clark telling him you believe Eugene Dennis is not guilty of contempt of Congress and that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is guilty of violation of the Constitution.
- B. Write your congressman urging him to abolish the "Un-American" Committee.