

THE SOCIALIST

Official Organ of The Workers Socialist Party of the U. S. A.

Vol. II, No. 4

NEW YORK, JULY, 1938

5 Cents

Is it Social Security?

WITHIN the last decade or so, the words "social security" have enjoyed wide-spread popularity, especially since the advent to political power of the Democratic Party, headed by Franklin D. Roosevelt. A large measure of that party's success in the 1932 and 1936 elections was due to the free use of the aforementioned words. Since attaining power, the Democratic Party has carried through various legislative acts, many of which, we have been told, have "social security" as their objective.

The Social Security Act of 1935, embraces not one reform, but an entire series of reforms. It attempts, (within the confines of one single act) to deal with several "social" problems, — the unemployed, the needy aged, the needy blind, and several other problems of a similar nature. This act sets up machinery by which the Federal government, working with the various State governments, expects to relieve the plight of those individuals included in the groups mentioned above.

The passage of the Social Security Act should make one fact obvious—that the representatives of capitalism have admitted by inference, that up to the present, "social security" has been denied to a large section of the community. Not alone by inference has this been admitted, but also by open statement. In a document entitled, *Why Social Security?* issued by the Social Security Board, the following is taken from a chapter entitled "Life Is Safer, But Living Less Secure":

While life became safer, the chance to earn a living became less secure. The growth of employment in basic industries began to slow up. Machines and improved methods made it possible to increase output without increasing the number of workers needed to produce it. Then, for the first time, one important field of work after another reached its peak in employment and began to decline—began to use a smaller number of workers.

This general statement is followed by examples in the basic industries.

Agriculture's share in the total employment of the Nation had been going down since 1870 but each census up through 1910 counted a larger number of agricultural workers. In the census of 1920 and the census of 1930 the number of workers was smaller. In 1930 there were 600,000 fewer farmers and farm workers than there had been 20 years before.

A similar change came in mining. Efficiency was growing. In 1930 two soft-coal miners could turn out as much as three had done in 1900. The peak in the census record of mine workers came in 1920. In the 10 years that followed, industrial activity was expanding, and new mine workers were needed for the gas wells and oil wells. But by 1930 the total number of miners had dropped by 100,000.

What had happened in the basic industries had happened also in other fields, as is pointed out by the following:

A man no longer had the same chance to continue through his working years in the occupation he had learned as a boy. The new openings in trade and the service occupations and professions often made specialized demands which workers from the older industries found it hard to meet. It was not likely to help a jobless miner, for example, to learn that more barbers were being employed.

This shift in occupations was particularly difficult for older men. From 1890 on, an increasing percentage of the men of 65 and over has been reported as unoccupied.

With the census of 1920 a more general change appeared. In that year and in 1930 the reports showed a drop in the percentage of all men and boys of 16 and over in gainful occupations. In spite of the increasing employment of girls and women, these reports found a decline in the proportions of all Americans of 16 and over in gainful occupations.

From the above, not only do we observe that "Social Security" has been denied to a large section of the community, but also, that this section of the community belongs to one particular group or class—the working class. Should objections be raised that this is an exaggeration, one need but examine the literature published by the Social Security Board. For instance, in a pamphlet entitled, *Unemployed Compensation under the Social Security Act*, the following appears:

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION is undertaken by the State to protect *working people* against the risk of losing their jobs. (*Italics ours*)

Similar statements occur frequently in other literature published by this government agency. Obviously, the capitalist class does not need such protective legislation. Its members have no jobs to risk losing.

We see, therefore, the Social Security Act is anything but *social*. It is a piece of *class legislation*, enacted by one class, the capitalist, for the supposed benefit of the *working class*.

We will now examine the claim that it is "Security." By security, we are of course referring to "economic" security. This is clearly stated by the Social Board in the following:

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT represents a major advance in the attainment of *economic security* for the individual and for his family. (*A Brief Explanation of The Social Security Act, Circular No. 1, page 1.*)

A more detailed explanation as to what is meant by "economic security" is given in the same pamphlet, which quotes the President, as saying, "Among our objectives I place the

security of the men, women, and children of the Nation first," and then continues:

He further said that security for the individual and for the family concerns itself with three factors—(1) decent homes to live in; (2) development of the natural resources of the country so as to afford the fullest opportunity to engage in productive work; and (3) safeguards against the major misfortunes of life.

The Social Security Act is concerned with the third of these objectives — "safeguards against misfortunes which cannot be wholly eliminated in this man-made world of ours."

Such a form of security is no security at all. It does not, on its own admission guarantee to the members of society the opportunity to enjoy the necessities of life all the time, but only at such times that they are confronted by the "major misfortunes of life." From this we are left to assume that there are times when the working class are free from these "major misfortunes"; that during these periods they are enjoying economic security. Need we point out that such a condition has never existed, nor can it exist under our present social system.

The reason for this lies in the fact that the means for producing wealth are in the hands of a small minority of society, leaving the vast majority propertyless and at the mercy of the small minority. Senator Robert F. Wagner, an ardent advocate of "social security," bears witness to the above claim. During his advocacy of the Labor Relations Act, another much vaunted piece of "social" legislation, he pointed out the following facts in regard to the distribution of wealth in the United States.

... If we had succeeded in providing the *minimum* requirements of health and decency for every deserving person in the United States, we might have said that the maldistribution of income was a fair price to pay for our industrial efficiency. But we know that we suffered from the *prevalence of poverty in a land of plenty*. In 1929, 6,000,000 families, or 21 percent of our total population, had incomes of less than \$1,000 per year. About 12,000,000 families, or more than 42 per cent of the total, earned less than \$1,500 yearly. Sixteen million families, or 60 percent of the people, had annual incomes below the \$2,000 per year necessary for the basic requirements of health and decency. And nearly 20,000,000 families, constituting 71 percent of all America, received less than \$2,500 a year. *At the same time, in the highest income bracket, one-tenth of one percent of the families in the United States were earning as much as the 42 percent at the bottom.* (Congressional Record, p. 7566 May, 1935.) (*Italics ours*)

The Social Security Act does not, and cannot alter this property relationship. The status of both classes is in no way altered. The capitalist class continues as the owners of the means of wealth production, while the working class continues being propertyless. All talk of "security" under such a condition is mere mockery. Furthermore, none of the provisions of the Social Security Act provide the recipients of its benefits with social security even during the time they are confronted by the "major misfortunes of life." For instance, in the case of the unemployed who are by far the largest group covered by the Social Security Act, the benefits they will get must be less than their or-

dinary income from wages. To quote another government source:

... They are not equal to the worker's regular pay, but they will usually tide him over until he can get back to work. (*Unemployment Compensation under the Social Security Act. Circular No. 2, p. 1*)

In light of the above statement made by Senator Wagner, as to the economic condition of the working class in prosperous 1929, when the bulk of the working class was employed, yet living below the "minimum requirements of health and decency," how much lower must they be living now, trying to get by on the limited benefits of the Social Security Act. Should we be accused of making incorrect generalizations, we will quote from the same circular as above, which under the heading of "*Benefits*" states the following:

In all but a few of the State laws, benefits to unemployed workers amount to *half the pay they have been receiving*, up to a maximum benefit of \$15 a week; That is, a worker earning \$20 a week would receive a benefit payment of \$10 a week; earning \$30 a week, he would receive \$15; but if he earns \$35 or \$40 he could receive no more than \$15 a week in benefits. The District of Columbia law provides for payments equal to 40 percent of the worker's pay plus 10 percent for a dependent husband or wife, plus 5 percent for each dependent relative, up to 65 percent of his wages, provided the benefit payment is not more than \$15 a week in all.

In many of the States benefits may not be less than \$5, or three-fourths of full-time weekly wages, whichever is less. But in some States the minimum payment is as much as \$7 and \$7.50. On the other hand, some States fix no minimum.

However, irrespective of the amounts given to the unemployed in the different States, there are definite limitations as to the periods in which benefit may be obtained. From the same source quoted above we learn:

The number of weeks during which an unemployed worker may receive benefits is limited in two ways. In all States there is a flat limit to the total number of weeks during which benefits are payable in any one year. Usually this maximum is 15 weeks, but it runs, in the different States, from 12, 13, 14, and 16 weeks, up to 18 and 20 weeks a year. Some of the States extend the time if the employee has been employed longer than the preceding two years.

Space does not permit us to deal with other limitations of the act, such as the question of "Qualifications." We must refer the reader to the literature already quoted.

There are those who may claim that it is better to have this act than no act at all, and that to the unemployed worker, or the worker too old to obtain a job, any relief is better than none at all. Those who argue along such lines lose sight of the fact that our masters, the capitalists, have always been compelled to provide some form of relief for the enslaved working class whom they cannot use in the process of wealth exploitation. These workers, including the unemployed and destitute, the sick and the lame, the aged and the young, have always been taken care of in some fashion or another. Prior to 1929, when unemployment

(Continued on Page 8)

The Futility of Reform

PART IV.

The Reformer's Role

THE reformers and their organizations are not only useless in solving the workers' problems, but what is worse, a dangerous obstacle to the solution. Not attacking the problem at its roots, they divert the attention of many workers from the cause and hence the solution. Dealing with effects they cannot hope to eradicate the cause and they become, in part, responsible for the perpetuation of the system which produces the problems. The sincerity of the reformer in many cases may be readily granted, but sincerity was never the criterion of correctness, and in this case the facts show too well that this sincerity is misdirected. The reformer is also a nuisance because he kindles the false hope in the workers' minds that it is possible to get "something now." In either case he spreads confusion that hampers the work of the social revolutionists.

The reformer asks for no scientific examination of the causes he espouses. On the contrary, he must support every political, economic and social illusion of the electorate. He must shun independent thinking that leads away from the beaten track; he must follow the crowd. As a rule the reformer is of the type that is more articulate than the vast majority of the working class and so he engages in "spell-binding" and demagoguery. He becomes the self-appointed "spokesman" and "leader." His glibness of tongue soon leads workers who are unfamiliar with a scientific approach to most questions, to look up to him and accept him as an authority. Like all leaders, he can exist only with blind followers. In most cases it is the "blind leading the blind." Thus the reformer helps to discourage independent thinking in the working class.

Were the reformer to encourage independent or scientific thinking in his followers, the hollowness of his claims and the issues he has espoused would soon become apparent. The followers would soon cease to follow. Gone would be the condition that permits the existence of the opportunists who take advantage of the political ignorance of the working class to feather their own nests.

A further effect of the unscientific approach of reformism to the problems of the working class is the variety of ideas offered as solutions. This conglomeration of ideas explains the existence of the many parties and groups which make up the so-called working class movement. Not based on any scientific unity of ideas, the movement remains what it is, a continuous series of splits and schisms.

Furthermore, the membership of reformist organizations is as unstable as quicksand. An individual who joins an organization because it supports a particular reform or group of reforms often loses interest once the reforms are put into effect. At other times he can be persuaded to go off in pursuit of some other reform. In this sort of activity we see the continual switching of support from one reformist political party to another.

Reforms Do Not Lead To Socialism

The so-called working class movement has in its ranks many who claim to be Socialists and who admit that reforms are useless as a solution of workers' problems. Nevertheless, they offer programs of reforms on the ground that by enlisting the support of non-Socialist workers for these non-Socialist programs, the interest of these workers can later be diverted into Socialist channels. It is contented that it is necessary to get into the struggle of the workers in order to get their support. This particular method, known as "radicalizing the masses," is especially popular among the so-called Socialist parties. They claim that the advocacy of these measures attracts the attention and sympathy of workers who could not otherwise be reached; and that once these workers have been "won over" by reforms, they can be used to capture political power for the purpose of social revolution.

The history and experience of such movements and parties throughout the world, for over half a century, is positive evidence to the contrary. The organizations, which have operated on these lines, instead of radicalizing the masses, have succeeded only in increasing the confusion already existing. The result achieved by the Communist Party in the 1936 Presidential elections is a good illustration of this contention.

Capitalism produces more and more problems for the working class as it develops. The "radicalizing reformers" have been kept busy pandering to the desires, and gaining the support of, workers interested in reforms. Any alleged working class party that gets political office on this basis can do nothing to establish Socialism, for the people who put it into office want reforms and not Socialism. Any move of the "leaders" beyond the desires of their reform-seeking followers can result only in a loss of their "leadership." The case of the Bonus Marchers of 1932 is an example. The leader of this movement stated:

But none of the people who suggested other plans or third party platforms realized that the minute that objectives other than the Bonus were held before the men at this time, the unity of desire which made a third party or an economic reform program seem possible would vanish.

The men of the B.E.F. were agreed on one thing: they wanted their Bonus. But there was no other objective which could have held all the men. I did broaden the objective of the B.E.F. eventually to include "The Bonus and a Job," but further than that I could not go and would not go if the B.E.F. were to be held as a unit in Washington.—W. W. Waters, Commander of the Bonus Army, *The Bonus Army*, p. 144 (*Italics ours*).

These men were interested primarily in a specific reform measure which effected them, as a section of the working class. The general condition of the working class had little or no concern for them. Appeals along this line were coldly received. In fact they were opposed, as is shown by the treatment dealt the Communists which is discussed else-

where in the same book. On occasion, the Communists were brutally expelled from the Bonus Army's ranks. In the face of such experience, not only is the "need for leadership" to Socialism denied, but also its possibility. The "leader" cannot outstrip his followers.

To claim that it is easier for the workers to understand the methods of reform than that of Socialism is likewise incorrect. Visualizing the complicated effects of reforms such as Social Credit, Cheap Money, or the Townsend Plan, is far more difficult than understanding the principles of Socialism.

Socialism—The Only Solution

The fact that many reform organizations such as the Socialist Party of America, the Social Democratic Party of Germany, etc., have styled themselves Socialist, has led many workers to believe that Socialism and social reform are the same thing and that the programs of these parties have something to do with Socialism. The failure of these reform organizations to alleviate the conditions of the working class, after they had obtained power, has caused many others to believe that Socialism has failed. This has re-

dounded to the advantage of the capitalist class through such organizations as the Nazis in Germany, whose strength to a great extent was built up by those workers who had been disappointed in the other reform parties.

The history of the working class holds no basis for the hope that by following every reform to the ground, it will finally discover that capitalism cannot be reformed for the benefit of the working class, and so turn to revolution as the only way out. The long history of the reform movement has shown that in this process many workers become tired, disappointed and poor material for further struggle for political power for economic freedom.

The Workers Socialist Party, therefore, suggests to those workers who have been deluded by the "possibilities for something now" and have engaged in such activity, to pause in their futile struggle; to take stock of the efforts of themselves and of so many others in the past; to heed the lesson of reformist activity—its uselessness and danger. Once they have learned this lesson, their place must be in the Workers Socialist Party which has one program, one immediate demand, one purpose—the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

—S. F.

Marx On Historical Materialism

"... In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material powers of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society—the real foundation, on which rise legal and political superstructures and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations within which they had been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production these relations turn into their fetters. Then comes the period of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations the distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic—in short ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight

it out. Just as our opinion of an individual is not based on what he thinks of himself, so can we not judge of such a period of transformation by its own consciousness; on the contrary, this consciousness must rather be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces, for which there is room in it, have been developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society. Therefore, mankind always takes up only such problems as it can solve; since, looking at the matter more closely, we will always find that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions necessary for its solution already exist or are at least in the process of formation. In broad outlines we can designate the Asiatic, the ancient, the feudal, and the modern bourgeois methods of production as so many epochs in the progress of the economic formation of society. The bourgeois relations of production are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production—antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonism, but of one arising from conditions surrounding the life of individuals in society; at the same time the productive forces developing in the womb of bourgeois society create the material conditions for the solution of that antagonism. This social formation constitutes, therefore, the closing chapter of the prehistoric stage of human society." (From the Introduction to *The Critique of Political Economy*.)

THE SOCIALIST

Published By

The Workers Socialist Party of the U. S. A.

5 Sylvan Place, New York, N. Y.

All communications, subscriptions and articles
should be directed to the Editorial Committee.

Five Cents per Copy

Subscription: 12 Issues, 60c

Bundle Rates on Application

Vol. II, No. 4



July, 1938

War and Peace

ONCE again the country is being asked to support a large rearmament program. President Roosevelt in a message to Congress has asked for an appropriation of an estimated billion dollars to bring the naval and military forces to a standard compatible with the "conditions of unrest prevailing in the world today." These forces are to be used for "defence and security" he stated, and, in common with the heads of governments in other parts of the world who have embarked on the same kind of program, he proclaimed his country's peaceful intentions. No doubt support will be forthcoming from a populace who have lost faith in other methods for maintaining peace, such as the League of Nations, and which has forgotten that "arming for defence" did not "keep us out of war" in 1917.

Despite the pious proclamations of Wilson and the overwhelming support given to him by those who did not want to fight, we entered the war when the interests of the owning class dictated the need for it. It is this same interest that today finds the need for a larger naval and military force. The state of unrest that now prevails in the world is in essence the same as has always existed under capitalism, although tending to become more intensified as this system develops. This unrest is a product of the antagonisms that arise between the owning classes of the various nations in their competitive struggle for power and advantage. As long as an owning class is allowed to control government, the armed forces will be built up and utilized, no matter what excuses may be offered.

If there is a desire for peace on the part of the American people, who in the main are workers, they will have to learn that there can be no peace as long as the private ownership of property provides the cause which lead to war. To put it another way, as the economic system known as capitalism, is the cause of modern wars, it naturally follows that peace is only possible when the working class recognizes the necessity for its abolition and the establishment of Socialism. This is the historic mission of the modern proletariat.

Military Economics

ALMOST every day we are told by the press about the preparations that are being made for a future war. The Sunday Supplements feature super battleships, super-

submarines, super-airplanes, and other super-super-paraphernalia of war. Civilians are shown making ready for the coming slaughter, even to the point of full-dress rehearsals. Together with all this the war strategists are given space to elaborate upon their tragic lore. Opinion is followed by counter-opinion. The subject of the latest debate centers around the question of the military effectiveness of air raids on cities behind the lines. Such tactics, naturally, involve the killing and wounding of non-combatants, including women and children. It is indeed a gloomy picture of the future.

Through the gloom, however, a ray of light and hope appears. A dispatch from Washington, D.C. informs us:

America's military airplanes, in the event of war, will not bomb civilians.

It seems that "humanitarianism" is not lost entirely to the world. Our brothers and sisters across the seas can now put their gas-masks in camphor and turn their bomb-proof dug-outs into wine-cellars. No longer need they fear that the "hand across the seas" is clutching a bomb.

But hold a moment! We haven't finished reading the entire dispatch. "Humanitarianism," it now appears, has nothing at all to do with the above decision of the military experts. As we read on, our ray of hope dwindles to a mere pin-point.

... Strategists of the general staff and the air corps have so decided, not for humanitarian reasons but because their study of tactics and results in China, in Spain and in Ethiopia indicates the game is not worth the candle.

Can these gentlemen mean that war is the "game" that is not worth the candle? Of course not as their very studies indicate. The dispatch, as it continues, gives the real answer.

During the past three years there has been enough fighting going on in the world for the student of aerial tactics to draw certain conclusions. Tacticians here and at the various air corps stations of importance have been following, as best they can, the successes and failures of military airplanes, the survey being conducted with the professional's detachment from the question of rights and wrongs involved. The tacticians are interested only in knowing what the airplane can do as a military weapon.

The general conclusion has been reached that the bombings of civilian populations, such as have been prevalent in the three wars of the past three years, *produce no military advantage comparable to their cost to the attacker. (Italics ours)*

The Socialist Party of Great Britain publishes the following pamphlets. They should be read by all workers.

Socialism

A clear explanation of the subject in simple language.
48 Pages - - - - - 10 Cents

War and The Working Class

The Socialist analysis of the causes of Modern War.
36 Pages - - - - - 10 Cents

The Loyalist Program

THIS July will mark the second year of the Civil War in Spain. During this two year period, thousands of lives have been lost, and additional thousands have been maimed and wounded on both sides. Needless to say, most of the killed and wounded were farmers or peasants, or members of the working class.

All sorts of interpretations have been made as to the aims and purposes of the conflict. These, however, can be reduced to the broad general view, that the struggle is essentially one between those who advocate Democracy, (Loyalists) and those who are the proponents of Fascism, (Insurgents.) Tons of printed matter have been turned out espousing one side or the other. Either side has its supporters all over the world. The main line-up of the supporters outside of Spain is, for the Insurgents, the Catholic Church and its followers, plus a sprinkling of conservative elements; and for the Loyalists, the liberal and radical element, particularly the Communist Party, and their affiliates and offshoots.

The real cause of the Loyalists, (or Government) has never really been obscured, despite the fact that individuals, or groups, might have a variety of reasons for aiding or favoring, either side. On April 30th, in Barcelona, the Spanish Government's war program was drafted by a Ministerial Council. "Intended as a Spanish declaration of independence, it was addressed to Spaniards and to the world so that the Loyalists' aims and ideals should be known in this critical period." (*The New York Times*, May 1, 1938).

The *Times* then stated that Premier Juan Negrin called all Spanish and foreign newspaper men to his residence and read the declaration to them, which contained thirteen points, in the presence of other Ministers.

The declaration is such an important historical document that we print it in full.

1. To assure the absolute independence and complete integrity of Spain.
2. Liberation of our territory from the foreign military forces that have invaded it.
3. To establish a People's Republic represented by a vigorous government that rests on the principles of pure democracy.
4. The republic's juridical and social structure will be the work of the national will freely expressed through the means of a plebiscite, which will take place as soon as the struggle ends and will be carried out with full guarantee and without restrictions or limitations, and with the assurance that all those participating will be protected against all possible reprisals.
5. Respect for regional liberties without impairing Spanish unity.
6. The Spanish government will guarantee citizens full rights of civil and social life and liberty of conscience and will assure the free exercise of creeds and religious practices.
7. The State will guarantee legally and legitimately acquired property within the limits imposed by supreme national

interests. ***It will encourage the development of small property, will guarantee family patrimony and will encourage all means that will lead to the economic, moral and racial improvement of the producing classes. The property and legitimate interests of foreigners who have not aided the rebellion will be respected, and the government will examine, with a view to indemnifying, harm involuntarily caused in the course of the war.

8. Profound agrarian reform that will liquidate the old aristocratic, semi-feudal proprietorship.
9. The State will guarantee the rights of the worker through an advanced social legislation in accord with the specific necessities of Spanish life and economy.
10. The cultural, physical and moral betterment of the race will be a primordial and basic pre-occupation of the State.
11. The Spanish Army, at the service of the nation, will be free from all tendency to a hegemony of politics, and the people will be brought to see in it a sure instrument for the defense of its liberty.
12. The Spanish Government re-affirms its constitutional doctrine of renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy.
13. Full amnesty for all Spaniards who desire to cooperate in the immense labor of reconstruction and aggrandizement of Spain.

From the above declaration it should be clear that, if the Loyalists win, the reorganization of Spanish society, along definitely Capitalistic lines will take place. A Loyalist victory would mark the bloody culmination of decades of social conflict in Spain, in keeping with the historical development of the productive forces. This is the basic reason why Socialists want to see the Loyalists victorious, aside from the fact, that Socialists deplore the spectacle of workers and peasants slaughtering one another in the interest of the growing capitalist class in Spain (and foreign capitalists).

During the course of capitalist development in Spain, many workers and peasants or farmers, may be better off, for a short time, at least, than they were. At the same time, the new society will soon produce the class relations, and attendant social effects of this development on the growing working class in Spain.

This may seem like a cold-blooded and detached attitude, to many emotional and wish-thinking radicals and liberals. But we cannot alter reality by sympathetic words and demonstrations. The working class in predominantly capitalist countries can change their own miserable conditions by organizing to abolish capitalism and establish Socialism in their respective countries. When they have accomplished this, they will then be in a position to help the oppressed classes in more backward countries, such as Spain, China, India and Africa.

—B.C.

THE WESTERN SOCIALIST

Official Monthly Organ of the
Socialist Party of Canada

Obtainable at 5 cents a copy from all our Locals

FROM THE PRESS

A Republican Looks At The Communist Party

THE opinion, as expressed by some people that the Communist Party is a force for revolution, has never been shared by the Socialist. That Party's pre-occupation with everything and anything, except revolution, has been the basis for our view. Each new "party line" strengthens this view. We now find that we are not alone in our analysis of the Communist Party's position regarding revolution. The view below, however, comes from a source entirely remote from that of the Socialist. It is from an avowed supporter of capitalism. Mrs. Betty Patterson, new president of the Young Women's Organization of the Women's National Republican Party, has the following to say of the Communist Party.

We study both sides of questions we take up, and invite outside speakers. When we studied Communism, . . . we got a member of the party to speak to us.

She stayed to lunch and we argued with her until 3 in the afternoon. Some of our members—they're mostly finishing school girls who never went to college—*were a little shocked to learn that the aims and the ideals of the Communists were the same as ours.* Only the methods differed. (*New York Post*, May 5, 1938) (*Italics ours*)

The Communists And The Small Business Man

We do not know just what the young lady told these young Republicans, but we are safe in assuming that it was the "Party Line" for 1938, which same "Party Line" is conspicuous by its absence of a "class line." No longer does the class-struggle, according to the Communists, consist of the working class versus the capitalist class, — but the working class plus a section of the capitalist class against the "big" capitalists, i.e., the bankers, etc. How else then, can the following be explained?

Small businessmen, are you losing the battle to keep your head above water? Have the banks refused you small loans—that mean life and death to your business? Support the President's proposal—It means loans and purchasing power; it means more customers and more business!

Incidentally, the above is taken from a leaflet recently issued by the New York State Committee of the Communist Party, entitled: *Back the President's Job and Recovery Program*. This after so many lengthy articles by the Communist theoreticians to prove that "Recovery" was an impossibility under the capitalist system.

The Catholic Church In Spain

THE traditional role of religion, that of the defender of the status quo, has long been known to the student of history. This role has been shared by all religious groups. Outstanding, however, has been the Catholic Church. Once again, this time in strife-torn Spain, does this religious denomination share the stage with the forces of reaction.

As the largest owner of the land in Spain, besides other important economic interests, it has up to quite recently enjoyed the political and social domination of Spanish society. Small wonder, then, that we find its forces on the side of the Insurgents and that the following was reported in the *New York Times* of May 17, 1938.

VATICAN CITY, May 16.—The uncertainty hitherto existing regarding the precise status of relations between the Holy See and Nationalist (Insurgent) Spain was removed today when an exchange of duly accredited permanent diplomatic representatives was decided upon.

The above *formal* recognition of the Franco forces, is but a continuation of the *informal* support given by the Catholic Church since the outbreak of hostilities. An example of such support, wherein the priesthood utilizes its hold over some of the Spanish people, is given in the following:

In a Fascist newspaper of November 13, 1937, appeared the following item. The paper is named *The Graceta del Norte* of Burgos. 'The Provincial Commission for the collection of scrap, requests all the priests of the towns and villages to remind their parishioners who may not have read the notices in the Press, that they are bound by patriotism and by honesty to hand in all empty cartridge cases and other scrap as all such material is the property of the State.' (*The Churchman*, January 15, 1938).



PARTY ACTIVITIES

Local New York

Regular Business Meetings—1st & 3rd Thursdays of Each Month.

Local Boston

Sunday:—Open Air Meeting. Boston Common Mall. Every Sunday from 2 P. M. to 6 P. M.—Forum at Local Headquarters, 12 Hayward Place, every Sunday at 8 P. M.

Monday:—Open-Air Meeting. Talbot and Blue Hill Avenues, Dorchester. Every Monday from 8 P. M. to 11 P. M.

Tuesday:—Marxian Study Class. "The Gotha Programme" and "Current Events" at 1163 Blue Hill Avenue, (Morton Theatre Building, Room 11). Every Tuesday at 8 P. M.

Wednesday:—Speakers Class for members only. At 198 Walnut Avenue, Roxbury. Every Wednesday at 8 P. M.

Thursday:—Study Class. "Anti-Duehring" and "News Events." At Local Headquarters, 12 Hayward Place, every Thursday at 8 P. M.

Friday:—Business Meeting of Local. At Local Headquarters.

Saturday:—Youth Movement. Study Class. "The Communist Manifesto" and "Current News Events." Meets at Otisfield Hall, 17 Otisfield Street, Roxbury. Every Saturday night at 8 P. M.

Local Los Angeles

Information regarding activities can be obtained from the Local Secretary.

All the above activities are free and all those who wish to attend are always welcome.

Is It Social Security?

(Continued from Page 2)

was relatively small, in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 or so, wages were, in many fields, a little higher and jobs were easier to get. The unemployed could, in many cases, get help from County funds or members of their own families, or from private charitable organizations. In addition, the local poor-house, soup-line or orphanage existed to relieve the most destitute. But since then, unemployment and poverty have increased to such an extent, that the existing agencies proved powerless to deal with the situation. When in 1932 and 1933, unemployment reached the variously estimated figures of between 13,500,000 and 17,500,000, it became apparent that it was a social problem, which had to be dealt with by the Federal and State governments.

"Social Security" is today, essentially a problem of the capitalist class. It is, in fact, a realization on the part of many of them that they must do something to take care of the millions of workers and their families whom they cannot exploit for profit. The question for the capitalists is, how to take care of this problem efficiently, which means in reality, how cheaply? The present party in power, the Democratic Party, has used this issue to pose as the guardian angels of the working class, and have sought to monopolize the role. However, the Republican Party also recognizes the problem. As the critics of the Democratic Party, their criticism leans most to the methods used in giving relief, not to the need for some form of relief or another. In short, all the political parties are agreed that something must be done to relieve the unemployed. Their difference on this question is mainly, how shall it be done and how much shall it cost. The Democratic Party defends itself from its critics by pointing out that they too are interested in keeping the cost of relief down. Dealing with allowances for the aged under the Social Security Act, we are informed:

Giving allowances has been cheaper as well as more humane than caring for old people in poorhouses. *Why Social Security?* p. 22.

Or the following regarding aid for the sick and disabled, to be found on page 19 of the same pamphlet:

... More recently we realized that it is public economy as well as kindness to make sure that other disabled people get care, since often they can recover enough to earn a living for themselves. *It is cheaper to cure them than to care for them for years in institutions. (Italics ours)*

For the working class there can be only one way in which they can obtain social security. That way lies, not in depending upon any form of legislation that may be passed under our present social system, because such legislation leaves untouched the status of the classes, or the basis out of which that status arises. The Socialist has pointed the way out for many years. It is contained in the Object of the Workers Socialist Party:

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

—S. F.

The Workers Socialist Party Its Object and Declaration of Principles

OBJECT: The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

The Workers Socialist Party holds:—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railroads, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labor alone all wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organize consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation for the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE WORKERS SOCIALIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labor or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the workers of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labor, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those who agree with the above principles and who desire membership in the Party, should apply to the Secretary of the nearest Local.

Party Directory

National Office and Local New York, 5 Sylvan Place, New York, N. Y.

Boston Local, C. Rothstein, Sec'y, 12 Hayward Place, (off 600 Washington Street), Boston, Mass.

Los Angeles Local, H. Dyer, Sec'y, 330 W. Covina Blvd., Baldwin Park, Calif.

Indispensable!

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Published Monthly by

The Socialist Party of Great Britain

Obtainable at 5 cents a copy from all our Locals