forms of raw materials — minerals, oil, etc. — that the expanding industries needed. To hold, or to gain such resources it was necessary to wage war. Therefore to defend or extend their exploitation, the capitalists of each country had to finance research on weapons of war. Radio, Radar, Meteorology, and Aviation are but a few of the fields of knowledge, that have been developed rapidly in this century for war purposes. Harry Harper, a journalist who has followed aviation from its earliest days with the Wright brothers, quotes the following striking examples of inventions that merely collected cobwebs until war made them necessary.

> "The jet propulsion of aeroplanes hung fire until war demands gave Sir Frank Whittle his chance. As far back as 1907, at the first model aeroplane competition in England, I watched a little machine fly through the air driven by rocket propulsion. But it was not until Hitler ordered the spending of many millions on experimental work that the dread V-2 rocket went soaring skyward." (Page 154. Daily Mail Year Book, 1952. England.)

Besides research and development directly for war purposes, "pure and useless" scientific research must also be financed, because every government is aware that if anything is discovered that can be of military use, specialists must be available to apply these techniques for war purposes. A striking example of this was provided by atomic science in the last war. Between the two major wars, atomic physics was the province of pure scientists, searching for knowledge for its own sake, and not a bit interested as to whether their work was in any way useful. War brought the realities of capitalism, and found a use for atomic physics; it became, in the shape of the Atomic Bomb, one of the most deadly weapons ever invented.

These are but a few examples and many more could be given.

We have seen that in capitalist society science is not used mainly to make life happier, in fact in many cases just the reverse. Many inventions that could eliminate toil and tedious work remain unused, while more and more terrible weapons of war are eagerly developed to the utmost. Even when new labor saving devices are introduced it is done slowly and reluctanctly, for as Lilley points out.

> "If the equipment of the U. S. A. were everywhere brought up to the highest technical standards available in the inter-war years, . . . with the present working day, production could be multiplied six-fold." (Page 181. Men, Machines and History.)

SOCIALISM

Alongside this reluctance to raise the standards of the working class, we find no hesitation to produce the Hydrogen or Hell Bomb, to protect the profits of the capitalist class. Such is capitalism; it does not produce golden eggs, but rotten ones!

We need a society where war and poverty cannot exist, a class-less socialist society.

In a socialist society people will cooperate to produce useful things designed to be elegant. Work will be arranged so that it is interesting and enjoyable, while dull, tedious toil will be eliminated as much as is technically possible. Today photo cells, automatically controlled machinery, and a host of other devices are available, that could be used to do this. In such a society, with no banks, police, or ticket punchers, men and women will not spend their lives worrying where the money is coming from for the next meal, or to buy a coat to replace their threadbare one. There will be no money. Such worries will be gone for ever. The world is rich and the people will feast on it. Then the creative and inventive spirit will flourish. New inventions will be developed to benefit all mankind, not to be shelved by monopolies while people die from lack of the bare essentials of life.

ROBERT

OPULENT AMERICA

It is nothing new to be reminded of how fortunate we are. Ours was a glorious heritage, born in liberty, and nurtured in the freedom of the democratic tradition. Our economists tell us that the wealth of the United States amounts to so many billions of dollars that one would require the mathematical genius of an Einstein to really appreciate how wealthy we are.

In a cave underneath Fort Knox, three-quarters of the world's gold supply is playing possum from circulation, but still remaining a grim depositary of social value. The figures denoting our industrial and commercial standing were never so imposing as they are now. Our crops of corn, wheat, cotton, and tobacco, are steadily ascending to unprecedented heights, and are readily translated into advancing prices on the markets of the world. All in all, we are a peculiarly favored people, with every indication of closer affinity with the Great Architect of all that is. Yes, this is the story as related through the medium of press, pulpit, radio, television, and grapevine. Yet, there is evidence that we do not respond in such measure as might be expected to such favorable stimuli. We do not seem to possess that poise and peace of mind that should logically follow in the wake of such lavish advantages.

Everywhere we look, there are ample signs of strife and contention pervading the ranks of those who toil. Big as the take-home pay appears in the light of dollars and cents, it is continuously dwindling in relation to the prices marked on the commodities the workers must have in order to exist. Millions of tradesmen, and unskilled laborers, obviously unaware of the heavenly beatitudes we have attained in the realms of industry and finance, are threatening to remove their labor power from the market until something to alleviate the situation has been accomplished. Social discontent is apparent in all directions.

How, then, can we reconcile these opposing attitudes on social conditions? Boundless wealth, a plethora of oil, steel, grain, wool, cotton and leather, on one side, and poverty, trouble, and strike action, on the other. There must surely be some method by which we can unravel the mystery, and explain it all. The Socialist claims that there is. He asserts that the class division existing in human society, making possible a monopoly of wealth on one hand, and a monopoly of work on the other, accounts for this unseemly social mess.

Even the Government representing, as it always does, big business, occasionally reveals that the data compiled shows inequality in the distribution of the things produced. The Census Bureau, in the month of December, 1951, reported that the top fifth of the U. S. population gets nearly half of the national income, while the bottom fifth gets only 3 per cent. This was certified by those who analyze the information gathered by the 1950 census.

Breaking down the distribution of incomes into fifths, which seems to be the prevailing fashion, financially as well as liquidly, the report shows:

highest fifth — 47 per cent; second highest fifth — 24 per cent; third highest fifth — 17 percent; fourth highest fifth — 9 percent; and the poorest fifth — 3 per cent.

The outfit releasing this report hastens to assure us that they didn't take account of the fact that a much bigger percentage of the big incomes is reclaimed in income taxes than is the case with small incomes. They do not have to high pressure this information. Backward, as we happen to be in perceiving the fine points of financial logistics, we can readily concede that more income taxes could very well be extracted