that capitalism is at the root of them. Someday will go on fighting for what we know to be not satisfied with it, and that's why we are not only here in our own country but all over difficult for millions upon millions of people, representing what socialism is, the SLP and every attack and effort to destroy us by mis- ism and the social evils it creates.

We have failed to convince a majority of work- ers to monopolize and undermine what is overcoming the antidemocratic election laws cre- ated by capitalism. We have also failed to overcome the antidemocratic election laws cre- ated by the Democratic and Republican politi- cians to monopolize and undermine what is supposed to be a ‘free ballot’. We have failed to protect the public airwaves from being monopolized by a shrinking number of huge capital- ist corporations, and therefore failed to prevent those monopolies from muzzling free speech and using the public airwaves to convince people that capitalism is good for them. We have experienced lots of failures; but even our fail- ures point up the truth of our criticisms of cap- italism and the social evils it creates.

As to our successes: We would have to say that it is our survival in such a hostile atmos- phere, for despite everything the capitalist class, its professors and politicians have tried to do to stifle the SLP we have survived and defended the fundamental principles of the labor and socialist movement for more than a century. Through thick and thin, and despite every attack and effort to destroy us by mis- representing what socialism is, the SLP and its official newspaper, The People, continue to educate workers about the class struggle, about the antisocial character of the profit system, about how capitalism creates the conditions that inevitably lead to poverty and unemploy- ment, imperialism and war, and all the other social evils that make life so difficult for millions upon millions of people, not only here in our own country but all over the world.

We are gratified by that success, but we are not satisfied with it, and that’s why we will go on fighting for what we know to be right and decent. Someday capitalism will force the working class to wake up to those social evils and to the inescapable conclusion that capitalism is at the root of them. Someday
Free Trade & Steel

I received an inquiry about the SLP from a steelworker in Oklahoma. He found us on the Web but didn’t download The People or anything else. He wanted additional information and said he had been a Socialist for a long time. He asked me if I knew what had happened in the steel industry, attributing the layoffs and bankruptcies to free trade agreements and, by implication, NAFTA. He asked me if we were Marxist and I told him we were, and gave him a very brief description of the SLP and what our goal was.

B.B. via email

Reply—“Steelworker” is wrong about free trade agreements being at the bottom of the steel industry’s woes. Overcapacity relative to markets is the immediate cause, and that, obviously, is rooted in the “market system” itself. Trade agreements are like levees and dikes. They are used to keep water out or to let it in, but they have nothing to do with how much water there is in the stream or how high it might rise. Steel is plentiful, hence it is cheap. As a result, the American product cannot compete on the global market and domestic markets are being flooded with the foreign product.

Steel capitalists complain about cheap foreign products being “dumped” on the market. That got them a sympathetic hearing with the Bush administration, which imposed some sort of barrier against foreign steel in March. But the number of politicians concerned more with the interests of the capitalists who consume steel than with those who produce it—almost certainly a majority—may have over-ridden that soon. In April, for example, the following item appeared on the Web:

STEEL IMPORTS FOR MARCH 2003 INCREASED 31 PERCENT FROM FEBRUARY 2003

“April 29, 2003

“Nearly released preliminary government figures covering steel imports for the month of March show that steel imports increased 31 percent from February 2003 levels.”

That’s enough to show that domestic consumers of foreign-produced steel like the American product. In a class by itself...

INCREASED 31 PERCENT FROM FEBRUARY 2003

by W. L. R. via email

Reply—E. B. is right. The working class has made a career of concealing the fact of the destruction of capitalism, not its continuation. And Steelworker is wrong about free trade agreements being at the bottom of the steel industry’s woes. Overcapacity relative to markets is the immediate cause, and that, obviously, is rooted in the “market system” itself. Trade agreements are like levees and dikes. They are used to keep water out or to let it in, but they have nothing to do with how much water there is in the stream or how high it might rise. Steel is plentiful, hence it is cheap. As a result, the American product cannot compete on the global market and domestic markets are being flooded with the foreign product.

Steel capitalists complain about cheap foreign products being “dumped” on the market. That got them a sympathetic hearing with the Bush administration, which imposed some sort of barrier against foreign steel in March. But the number of politicians concerned more with the interests of the capitalists who consume steel than with those who produce it—almost certainly a majority—may have over-ridden that soon. In April, for example, the following item appeared on the Web:

STEEL IMPORTS FOR MARCH 2003 INCREASED 31 PERCENT FROM FEBRUARY 2003

“April 29, 2003

“Nearly released preliminary government figures covering steel imports for the month of March show that steel imports increased 31 percent from February 2003 levels.”

That’s enough to show that domestic consumers of foreign-produced steel like the American product.

And over the weekend this item showed up on the Net:

“Saturday, May 3, 2003 at 09:00 JST

“GENEVA—A World Trade Organization (WTO) panel probing complaints from European Union, Japan and six other countries on steel import curbs imposed by the United States has issued a final ruling that the U.S. move, in force since March last year, violates WTO trade rules, trade sources said Friday.

“The sources said the WTO dispute settlement panel sent a final report on its findings to the parties involved in the dispute on Friday, setting the stage for another round of adjudication at the WTO Appellate Body. The panel’s decision, however, is likely to stand as the WTO Appellate Body rarely overturns the basic conclusions reached by a dispute settlement panel. (Kyodo News)”

This shows that the “flood waters” are beating against the U.S. “levee.” How this will play itself out remains to be seen, particularly when the interests of the steel industry are weighed against the export interests of other capitalists who need access to E.U., Japanese and other markets.
Joblessness Stalks North Texas Workers

By B.B.

Unemployment continues to grow in the Dallas-Fort Worth area, where 105,000 jobs have been lost over the past three years. The only significant sign of the economy hiring these away is the so-called defense industry, where science, technology and human labor are squandered wholesale.

The technology sector continues to founder, with massive job losses affecting between 30,000–40,000 workers. American Airlines, after cutting 3,000 workers from its payroll in the last year, plans to hand out pink slips to another 7,100 unionized workers. Despite the airline's bankruptcy ploy and the subsequent concessions wrung from the three unions "covering" employees, pilots and mechanics, their employment remains tenuous.

The largest 100 companies in the Dallas-Fort Worth area currently employ 428,740 workers, according to the Dallas Morning News. That number suggests a loss of almost 5,000 jobs over the year.

Dallas-based Greyhound Lines cut 200 employees, and the expectation is for more layoffs to come. "People just aren't traveling as much as they used to," a spokesperson declared. "We are not getting hit to the extent the airlines are, but we are still feeling the bruises of Sept. 11."

Notwithstanding all this, Jeff Kaye, who heads a local job recruiting firm, expressed restrained optimism. "So you aren't traveling as much as they used to," a spokesperson stated. "What little savings unemployed workers have, if any, quickly vanish in two months, much less four. In the interim what happens to sustenance for the family, or to car and mortgage payments?"

The answer is hinted by the "good news": Anonymous "experts" speculate that the current business slump is ending and that jobs will emerge at the end of the year, a mere six months away. Cheery news indeed! How is this to come about we may ask?

One partial exception from the general economic slump is in the "defense" industry. Fort Worth-based Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Co., for example, is hiring because it got the government contracts for the F-35 "Joint Strike Fighter."

"Thus far, the Defense Department has committed $22.9 billion for the construction of 22 F-35s," the May issue of Popular Mechanics reported. "The Air Force and Marines will each get five flying aircraft, the Navy four. The remaining eight will be nonflying versions for various testing programs. The Pentagon estimates it will eventually need as many as 3,000 F-35s, at a total cost of $200 billion...."

No wonder, then, that Lockheed Martin has hired 3,400 workers over the past year, bringing their wage slave count to 15,400. Considering the massive losses in science, technology and the military equipment, weaponry and ammunition expended in that debacle, replenishment could well be part of the economic "stimulus" President Bush hopes will enhance his chances for reelection in next year's presidential election campaign. That type of economic stimulus for North Texas, and possibly for the whole nation, only underlines the destructive and antisocial character of capitalism.

Unemployment is inherent in capitalism. The system's contradictions make full employment impossible even when the stimulus is war or the preparation for war, Marx and Engels succinctly summed up the underlying cause in the Communist Manifesto: "For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of the revolts of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production...."

Large cooperative bodies of workers socially operate those modern productive forces, but they are massively destroyed by the small class of industrial autocrats. This is one of the fundamental contradictions of the system. That contradiction between social or collective production and private ownership can only be eliminated by bringing the means of production and distribution under democratic social control and collective ownership by society.
It is said that Nero fiddled while Rome burned in 46 A.D. The Bush administration, defending the material interests of big coal, oil and auto capital and other segments of the capitalist class, is doing even worse while the crisis of global warming continues to gather intensity.

Incredibly, though some scientists are reportedly wondering if our planet isn’t approaching a global warming “meltdown,” the Bush administration is still trying to deny that the crisis even exists. It recently proved exactly how far it would go to continue denying the crisis.

At press time, the release of an Environmental Protection Agency report on the state of the environment was imminent. Documents leaked to The New York Times showed that, as the British publication The Guardian put it on June 28, before okaying its publication “White House officials...cut details about the sudden increase in global warming over the past decade compared with the past 1,000 years and inserted information from a report that questions this conclusion...which was partly financed by the American Petroleum Institute.”

One memo circulated to a staff within the agency in April said the report “no longer accurately represents scientific consensus on climate change.”

The People is no arbiter of scientific validity. Neither is the Socialist Labor Party. But when even the bureaucracy of the misnamed Environmental Protection Agency acknowledges publicly that “scientific consensus on climate change” is that the crisis exists and that auto and industrial emissions are at least partly to blame, it is no doubt beyond time that...

The EPA has since its establishment proven that it is primarily a...dow dressing—an underfunded, toothless agency intended to promote the “idea” that something is being done about the massive rape of our environment and poisoning of our air, water and land by the profit mongers of “free enterprise.”

“The environment and poisoning of our air, water and land by the profit mongers of “free enterprise.” The service it provides in so doing is that of fending off demands that more must be done—or even more to the point, demands that an economy that routinely produces such poisoning should...be scrapped altogether.

In 2002, the EPA finally suggested, much to the chagrin of Bush, that “human activity” might be at least partly responsible for the phenomenon. This year the administration is apparently taking no chances, editing out any passages it thinks offensive to the interests of its capitalist benefactors before the report is published.

Denying the problem or its cause at this late date should mark this administration for exactly what it is—the unabashed and criminal toady of those who wish to continue raping and poisoning the environment for profit no matter what it means for the future of the planet.

According to The Guardian, “Up to six degrees of warming is now predicted for the next 100 years by United Nations scientists from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), if nothing is done about emissions of greenhouse gases, principally carbon dioxide, the chief cause of global warming.”

But even in England recently reported that their studies of the Permian geological period “show that six degrees of global warming was enough to wipe out 95 percent of the species which were alive on Earth...250 million years ago.”

Species diversity did not reach what it was before the cataclysm for another 100 million years.

Some scientists now worry that rising temperatures may cause a “runaway greenhouse effect” that cannot be stopped. In this worst-case scenario, the polar ice caps and even Arctic tundra melt, oxidizing organic matter previously frozen in the ice, and releasing vast amounts of carbon dioxide and another greenhouse gas, methane.

Industrial and other emissions of greenhouse gases are not being significantly cut because emission controls diminish profits. Take away the profit motive in capitalist production and replace it with socialist production for human needs and wants and such controls become not only possible, but desirable.

While capitalism reigns on Earth, the chance exists that the prevailing wage is about 12¢ a day. The industry is...unimportant, because the absence of coal makes it impossible to carry...tories would migrate thither.

For individuals, socialism means an end to economic insecurity and exploitation. It means workers cease to be commodities bought and sold on the labor market and forced to work as appendages to tools owned by someone else. It means a chance to develop all individual capacities and potentials within a free community of free men.

Socialism does not mean government or state ownership. It does not mean a state economic organization. Socialism means production to satisfy human needs, not, as under capitalism, for sale and profit. Socialism means democratic control and management of all productive and distributive services by the workers through a democratic government based on their nationwide economic organization.

Under socialism, all authority will originate from the workers, integrally united in Socialist Industrial Unions. In each workplace, the rank and file will participate directly in formulating and implementing all plans necessary for efficient operations.

Besides electing all necessary shop officers, the workers will also elect representatives to a local and national council of their industry or service—and to a central congress representing all the industries and services. This all-industrial congress will plan and coordinate production in all areas of the economy. All persons elected to any post in the socialist government, from the lowest to the highest level, will be directly accountable to the rank and file. They will be subject to removal at any time that a majority of those who elected them decide it is necessary.

Such a system would make possible the fullest democracy and freedom. It would be a society based on the most primary freedom—economic freedom.

For individuals, socialism means an end to economic insecurity and exploitation. It means workers cease to be commodities bought and sold on the labor market and forced to work as appendages to tools owned by someone else. It means a chance to develop all individual capacities and potentials within a free community of free individuals.

Socialism does not mean government or state ownership. It does not mean a state bureaucracy as in the former Soviet Union or China, with the working class organized into a new bureaucratic class. It means a classless society with the working class as the sole governing force. To win the struggle for socialist freedom requires enormous efforts of organization and educational work. It requires building a political party of socialism to contest the power of the capitalist class on the political field and to educate the masses to...
HOW DO YOU DIFFER FROM THE COMMUNIST PARTY, THE SOCIALIST PARTY, THE WORKERS’ PARTY OF PRACTICAL SOCIALISTS, OR THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST OCCUPATION? BLIV101380...

REPLY—SENT WHAT’S THE DIFFERENCE?

Fair enough. Most of the explanation was very excellent and just what I asked for and I thank you for that. At the same time, I am still having a hard time differentiating between you and the ISO. You both seem to say the same thing.

BLIV101380...

REPLY—THANK YOU FOR YOUR E-MAIL...WE THINK YOU COULD HAVE MADE OUR JOB EASIER IF YOU HAD EXPLAINED WHAT THE ISO HAS TO SAY THAT MADE IT DIFFICULT FOR YOU TO DISTINGUISH IT FROM THE SLP. A VISIT TO THE ISO’S WEB SITE TOOK US TO “WHERE WE STAND,” AND FROM THAT SEVERAL POINTS OF DIFFERENCE CAME OUT.

The ISO supports “trade unions,” and presumably trade unionism. The SLP advocates industrial unionism. Trade unions organize by trade or occupation, whereas industrial unions organize workers by industries, thereby unifying them regardless of occupation. The difference is important, because how the working class organizes on the economic field will be decisive in determining how the struggle for socialism will be conducted and how the new society will be organized. In addition, while the ISO sees “trade unions as essential to the fight for workers’ economic and political rights” (under capitalism, we assume), it fails to identify any role for these economic organizations of the working class in carrying out the change from capitalism to socialism.

The SLP believes that if the working class cannot be organized economically it cannot be organized at all. What is it, after all, that defines and distinguishes the working class from all other classes? It is the class relationship to the means of production and distribution? The economic organization of the working class is essential to any movement for socialism. Without that organization socialism would be impossible to achieve.

This omission is not an accidental oversight. It is deliberate and flows out of the Leninist (and Trotskyist) premise that workers cannot rise above “trade union consciousness.” In other words, in the Leninist-Trotskyist scheme of things the working class is incapable of achieving class consciousness. Accordingly, it must be led to socialism by a political party. Marx rejected this idea before Lenin came up with it, and for that matter so did the SLP.

The ISO says, “The structures of the present government—the Congress, the army, the police and the judiciary—cannot be taken over and used by the working class.” It says that these structures of the government “are designed to protect the ruling class against the working class.” This statement presupposes “an entirely different kind of state—a workers’ state based on councils of workers’ delegates and a workers’ militia.”

The ISO’s presupposition that the political state itself, not simply the different forms it might take or structures it might adopt, is an instrument of class rule and must be abolished. The political state is based on territory, on geographic demarcations—cities, counties, states, nations—whereas socialism is based on industrial demarcations.

“A workers’ state” composed of “workers’ councils” is a contradiction in terms. Workers are not workers because of where they live—in this city or in that state—but because of their working. Councils of workers drawn from Pittsburgh or Los Angeles, Pennsylvania or California, would not be a difference in kind from a Congress of what lawyers, or even much of a difference in form. The difference between a capitalist state and a “workers’ state” is one of semantics only. At best it posits a state in which workers or their representatives would substitute for capitalists and their representatives in conducting an institution that promotes classes one ruling over the other. There need for an instrument to oppress a ruled class. A society divided into classes is not socialism, and a society without classes has no need of the state itself. In place of these structures it proposes a different kind of state—an entirely different kind of state—a workers’ state based on councils of workers’ delegates and services. It is deliberate and flows out of the Leninist (and Trotskyist) theory of a “vanguard party” to lead the working class to socialism. Indeed, no political party can lead the workers to socialism. Working class must make a conscious decision to organize themselves to achieve the socialist goal.

Socialism, as Marx said, must be the class-conscious act of the working class itself. The role of the party now, as the SLP sees it, is to stimulate class-consciousness and to urge the working class to organize itself into industrial unions capable of taking control of the industries and services and operating them on a socialist basis. A political party without the economic organization of the working class to back it up cannot achieve socialism, or anything else, unless it is to stir the workers up and to leave them defenseless in face of the police and military power of the state. Even the largest political party, one that achieved an overwhelming majority of popular support at the polls or otherwise, would not have the power to enforce the will of that majority.

No ruling class abandons its power meekly steps aside just because a majority of people say that they will. That requires force. What force does the ISO’s “revolutionary socialist party...political leadership and [political] organization” offer to oppose the overwhelming majority of popular support at the polls or otherwise? If it is to have the power to enforce the will of that majority.

The ISO is right where it says, “Although workers create society’s wealth, they have no control over its production and distribution.” It is right where it says, “A socialist state can only be built when workers collectively seize control of that wealth and democratically plan its production and distribution according to human needs.” But the ISO is wrong where it says, “The SLP propose that the workers organize themselves to “collectively seize control of that wealth and democratically plan its production and distribution according to human needs.” That is precisely the question Socialist Industrial Unionism addresses, and answers, but which the ISO ignores.

We hope this helps you to recognize some of the differences between the SLP and ISO.
ger at Iran and North Korea, the two countries he included with Iraq in his “axis of evil” speech to Congress last year. WMDs top the list of rea-
sons he gave for invading Iraq.

The president and his aides claimed Iraq had WMDs in abundance, but none have been found since. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld insist such weapons are buried somewhere beneath Iraq's abundance of desert sand and are sure to be found, critics are saying that the administration was either badly informed or that it deliberately manufactured an excuse to justify the war. Even Congress—the same Congress that renounced its responsibilities under the Constitution to give Mr. Bush the go-ahead to do as he pleases—has begun looking into the possibil-
ity that he deliberately misled the country or that he was himself misled by faulty intelligence. Re-
gardless, President Bush is now rattling his saber in the direction of Iran and North Korea.

There are nearly 22,000 known nuclear weapon
s in the world today, according to the Center for Defense Information. Most are in the hands of the United States, Russia, France and the United Kingdom (40,000), with the balance scattered among five or six other countries.

The CDD’s nuclear weapons count assumes that Israel has about 200 such weapons, but it lists nothing for Iran or North Korea. North Korea has boasted its ability to create nuclear weapons and Iran either has or soon will have the same capacity.

Even once a nuclear weapon is too many, of course, but why should the world concern itself with what Iran or North Korea might develop, or with the threat posed by India and Pakistan when their nuclear stockpiles are minuscule compared to those of the U.S. and Russia? The answers given most often are that the U.S. can be trusted, that it is imperialist and imperialist rules dictate, that it represents democracy and freedom, and that what Americans want above all else is to be liked. If the answers sound silly and self-deceiving, so be it because they are.

Capitalism is anything but benign, and while it may seek to hide its rapacity behind a paternalist-
istic smile it subscribes to the Leo Darroch the-
ory that “nice guys finish last” in the competitive world. And if anything the world of globalized capitalism is becoming increasingly competitive. Indeed, on June 18, after the International Atomic Energy Agency released a report on growth of Iran’s nuclear industry and its concerns that Iran may be on the verge of producing nuclear weapons, President Bush said: “The inter-
national community must come together to make it clear to Iran that we will not tolerate construc-
tion of a nuclear weapon.” What the president for-
got to add, however, is that the United States has exemp-
ted itself from any such restriction. Indeed, it has been widely reported that the U.S. is giving ser-
ous thought to developing so-called low yield nuclear weapons for strategic purposes. As Popular Science reported in June:

“Two options for the new nuclear arsenal are under consideration. Both are based on the idea that a nuclear weapon directed at the earth would unleash powerful shock waves that, like an earthquake, would rip apart even solid rock, shredding their way to the most deeply embedded en-
emy. One choice is to upgrade an existing ato-
mic bomb, such as the B-111...”

“The other possible choice is more radical: to design an entirely new weapon called a mini-
nuke...While the idea has been around for sev-
eral decades, the mini-nuke got a boost in the first Defense Department analysis of U.S. nuclear capacities in 10 years....”

first Defense Department analysis of U.S. nuclear weapons for strategic purposes. As

popular science

it has been widely reported that the U.S. is giving itself from any such restriction. Indeed, while the idea has been around for sever-
decades, the mini-nuke got a boost in the first Defense Department analysis of U.S. nuclear capacities in 10 years....
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As the historian Eric Hobswan expressed dismay that “U.S. pol-
icy weakens all the alternative arrangements, for-
mal and informal, for keeping order,” as if Amer-
ican capitalism was not primarily interested in maintaining its dominant position within those “arrangements,” or without them if necessary.

In Hobswan’s opinion, Bush’s existing inter-
national policy is not a particularly rational one
for U.S. imperial interests—and certainly not for the interests of U.S. capitalism. Hence the divi-
sions of opinion within the U.S. government.

There is plenty here that betrays the sad naiveté we referred to at the outset. Nonetheless, it is sufficient to give all thinking people some-
thing to mull over. It suggests that American cap-
talism is losing its grip as the world’s dominant economic power, and it is determined to save itself or to take us all down with it. That may not appear “rational” to those who may think that capitalism cares about being rational. What cap-
talism needs is markets and sources of raw ma-
erials. What it needs is strategic advantage to maintain its access to these things indispensable to its survival. What is not rational is to believe anything else.

To repeat: The greatest threat to the world to-day is neither environmental destruction nor nuclear proliferation. These can be stopped, reversed and eliminated, but only if society is reconstituted on an entirely new and (wellest ay) rational foundation—socialism.

This is my contribution of $______ for the Daniel De Leon Sesquicentennial Fund, which will help support the SLF’s official journal. (Please make check/money order payable to the Socialist Labor Party or to take us all down with it. That may not appear “rational” to those who may think that capitalism cares about being rational. What cap-
talism needs is markets and sources of raw ma-
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capitalism will wake workers up to the fact that socialism is the only solution to those problems. The SLP will be here and ready for them when they do.

Well, we hope that the SLP will be here. We are working on this realidad, but it is. But nothing is certain in this uncertain world of capitalism, and work as we may we know that our efforts alone are not enough. We need the help of every one who understands the program and principles of the SLP, including their financial help.

The SLP is still struggling to overcome a financial crisis that our readers and supporters have been combating for many months. Publishers and members of The People. The evidence of how successful that struggle has been to now. But we are far from being out of the woods. Please use the coupon on page 6 to show that you are still in the fight.
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Constitution, they did not invoke God to make things work. They set up a system of laws that they considered best suited for the times. And they wisely established an amendment clause, not thinking their work would last for all time, thus providing the basis for a peaceful and legal transition to a new system. Workers need to assert their right to do so and emulate the Founders in regarding religion as a private, not a political, concern.
Slavery in Brazil

It will come as a shock to many to learn that slavery is still being widely practiced in one of the countries of the Americas despite the fact that it was abolished by that country in 1888. Although Brazil was tardy in joining the anti-slavery league set up in the Western Hemisphere, its abolition of that social blight in 1888 has proven to be no hindrance to the capitalists within its borders who have found ready means, right down to today, to flout a law that interferes with their profits.

Owners of mines, ranches and logging operations have continued to profit by luring poor, uneducated laborers, carefully guarded by hired gunmen. The workers, without adequate means to pay for their upkeep, food and housing, become victims of ongoing debts that they cannot repay.

Reporters Larry Rohter noted a report by the Roman Catholic Church in Brazil that "at any given moment at least 25,000 Brazilian workers are held in debt slavery, at any given moment at least 25,000..."

Eduardo Vernandas, the federal prosecutor who currently has a number of ranchers under prosecution for slavery, said that "Slavery remains a severe social and economic problem in this country, the result of pitiful people without food or land being duped by false promises and of government policies that help or not make the eradication of servitude a priority." (The New York Times, March 14)

"...if the Founders intended to found a Christian nation, they kept their intent secret.

Religion is referred to elsewhere in the Constitution. In Article VI it is written that “no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any office or public Trust under the United States.” When the Constitution was written, almost if not all, states in Europe had established religions. Those who did not belong to the established church were subject to numerous political disabilities, from outright persecution to being barred from any position in government—from presumably a man to a king. The framers of the Constitution said this was not to happen in the United States. Officeholders and government employees could hold any faith or none, and it was none of the government’s business.

The better known First Amendment provides that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...” Lake the no-religious-test provision, this established political neutrality in respect to religion. The government is neither to foster religion nor discourage it; the government is to leave religion alone and allow people to practice religion as they, not the government, see fit. Likewise, religion should leave government alone and not urge the adoption of policies justifiable only on the basis of religious tenets. Why did the Founders so act? One answer is provided by James Madison, who is considered the Father of the Constitution and shepherded the Bill of Rights through the First Congress. He wrote: “Ecclesiastical establishments tend to great ignorance and corruption, all of which facilitate the execution of mischiefous projects.”

"...if the Founders intended to found a Christian nation, they kept their intent secret.

By and large, using the word “God” is a religious utterance. The absence of “God” in the Constitution, along with Article VI and the First Amendment, indicates the Founders intended to keep God out of politics. Unfortunately, the erosion of this laudable principle began almost at once. Washington added “so help me God” to his oath of office although those words are not in the Constitution. “In God We Trust” first appeared on currency in 1984. It had been suggested in 1861 when many thought the Union could not trust in its armies to defeat the Confederate traitors. The words appeared off and on until 1955, when Congress mandated they be placed on all currency. Congress added “under God” to the Pledge of Allegiance in 1954 and adopted “In God We Trust” as the official U.S. motto in 1956.

In other words, “God” crept into official political utterances in times of uncertainty and distress—at the beginning of the Republic when it was uncertain such an undertaking could succeed, during the Civil War and during the Cold War. U.S. Rep. Calvin Dooley (D-Calif.) states that the ruling that the words “under God” are unconstitutional “comes at a particularly bad time. Our nation needs to band together around a common set of values and beliefs now more than ever.”

Marc’s famous youthful observation on religion needs to be quoted in context: “Religious distress is as it were a drop from the fuller’s beam, and not that of their workers.

Brazil’s new president, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, who was a former labor leader, has now determined to seek a constitutional amendment that would permit the government to seize slave-employing businesses and all their assets and award them to the former enslaved workers.

President da Silva knows that in the past the errant capitalists could bribe officials from the lowest inspector or cop all the way up the political ladder to mayors and members of Congress. Perhaps he can get his new law through Congress, despite the fact that the money that once greased the hands of the capitalists will undoubtedly be gushing forth to them again from greedy capitalists who do not want government or anyone else interfering with their business interests.

Even if the law does go into effect, there predictably will be a struggle in the future between a well-meaning president and the capitalist interests that will be seeking their own benefit and not that of their workers.

It is 184 years since that there would still be slave labor anywhere in a supposedly advanced country just emphasizes the criminal nature of capitalism. Its unending and insatiable drive for profits continue to take precedence over any impulse toward humanitarianism on the part of a beneficent political leader.

The Pledge and the Founders

By Paul D. Laurence

The constitutionality of the words “under God” in the Pledge of Allegiance is headed to the Supreme Court. It is remarkable there is any controversy for the U.S. Constitution is clear. Its sole reference to a god occurs in Article VII, viz., “in the year of our Lord,” that is, in the date. An alternative date, “and of the Independence of the United States of America,” is provided. In short, if the Founders intended to found a Christian nation, they kept their intent secret.

Religion is referred to elsewhere in the Constitution. In Article VI it is written that “no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any office or public Trust under the United States.” When the Constitution was written, almost if not all, states in Europe had established religions. Those who did not belong to the established church were subject to numerous political disabilities, from outright persecution to being barred from any position in government—from a man to a king. The framers of the Constitution said this was not to happen in the United States. Officeholders and government employees could hold any faith or none, and it was none of the government’s business.

The better known First Amendment provides that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...” Like the no-religious-test provision, this established political neutrality in respect to religion. The government is neither to foster religion nor discourage it; the government is to leave religion alone and allow people to practice religion as they, not the government, see fit. Likewise, religion should leave government alone and not urge the adoption of policies justifiable only on the basis of religious tenets. Why did the Founders so act? One answer is provided by James Madison, who is considered the Father of the Constitution and shepherded the Bill of Rights through the First Congress. He wrote: “Ecclesiastical establishments tend to great ignorance and corruption, all of which facilitate the execution of mischievous projects.”

By and large, using the word “God” is a religious utterance. The absence of “God” in the Constitution, along with Article VI and the First Amendment, indicates the Founders intended to keep God out of politics. Unfortunately, the erosion of this laudable principle began almost at once. Washington added “so help me God” to his oath of office although those words are not in the Constitution. “In God We Trust” first appeared on currency in 1984. It had been suggested in 1861 when many thought the Union could not trust in its armies to defeat the Confederate traitors. The words appeared off and on until 1955, when Congress mandated they be placed on all currency. Congress added “under God” to the Pledge of Allegiance in 1954 and adopted “In God We Trust” as the official U.S. motto in 1956.

In other words, “God” crept into official political utterances in times of uncertainty and distress—at the beginning of the Republic when it was uncertain such an undertaking could succeed, during the Civil War and during the Cold War. U.S. Rep. Calvin Dooley (D-Calif.) states that the ruling that the words “under God” are unconstitutional “comes at a particularly bad time. Our nation needs to band together around a common set of values and beliefs now more than ever.”

Marc’s famous youthful observation on religion needs to be quoted in context: “Religious distress is as it were a drop from the fuller’s beam, and not that of their workers.

Brazil’s new president, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, who was a former labor leader, has now determined to seek a constitutional amendment that would permit the government to seize slave-employing businesses and all their assets and award them to the former enslaved workers.

President da Silva knows that in the past the errant capitalists could bribe officials from the lowest inspector or cop all the way up the political ladder to mayors and members of Congress. Perhaps he can get his new law through Congress, despite the fact that the money that once greased the hands of the capitalists will undoubtedly be gushing forth to them again from greedy capitalists who do not want government or anyone else interfering with their business interests.

Even if the law does go into effect, there predictably will be a struggle in the future between a well-meaning president and the capitalist interests that will be seeking their own benefit and not that of their workers.

It is 184 years since that there would still be slave labor anywhere in a supposedly advanced country just emphasizes the criminal nature of capitalism. Its unending and insatiable drive for profits continue to take precedence over any impulse toward humanitarianism on the part of a beneficent political leader.
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