

Wages and the Working Day



By

JOHN KERACHER

Price Fifteen Cents



CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY

CHICAGO 10, ILLINOIS

Wages and the Working Day

BY

JOHN KERACHER

*Author of "Economics for Beginners,"
"How the Gods Were Made," Etc.*



CHICAGO

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY

1946

Wages and the
Working Day

COPYRIGHT, 1946

BY CHARLES H. KERR & Co.



PRINTED IN U.S.A.

FOREWORD

In presenting this pamphlet on "Wages and the Working Day" we believe it to be timely, in view of the wave of strikes that is sweeping the nation in this post-war period. The contents already appeared in the April, May and June, 1945 issues of "Proletarian News."

A greater knowledge of economic law, and the general trends that develop as a consequence of the wage-labor and capital relationship, will be helpful to those workers who will take the time to make such an investigation. This pamphlet was written with such intention, and in simple language with the hope it will reach large numbers of workers.

For those workers who are engaged in the struggle for higher standards of living, and for greater economic security, an understanding of the underlying economic laws of the present social system, capitalism, is indispensable. It will prevent the workers from falling into errors, from putting pressure at the wrong place or at the wrong time, and will aid them in taking advantage of the working of those economic laws, to move with them rather than against them. This knowledge is best acquired through the study of the science of political economy.

It is also important that labor should understand its limitations, even when well organized and united, so long as it seeks to solve its problems within the framework of the present social arrangement. It is imperative that labor should comprehend that in the long run its

struggles for higher wages and the shorter working day, cannot provide permanent security for them as a class, and that a higher former of struggle, which will carry them beyond those limitations, must be engaged in. This struggle must be for possession of the machinery of production if a permanent solution is sought.

The capital and labor relationships, now prevailing, can only, at best, and when most successful, bring temporary relief. The working of capitalist economic laws cause labor to continually fall back into the old rut, forcing the workers to go through with the struggle, through strikes and such, all over again. The workers are in the position, when entering into agreements with the employers (contracts), with capitalists, of playing against those in possession of loaded dice. In such a game, labor can only meet with defeat in the long run, but it will learn from such experiences the need for carrying the fight onto a higher plane, namely a political struggle for the mastery of the nation.

The workers are now the vast majority of the population. The machinery of production is now operated socially. The next step is social ownership. The alternative is submission to the present arrangement, the profit system, with wealth and well-being for the few and poverty and want for the many. If the contents of this pamphlet help the workers to a better understanding of their problems, and aids them in their struggle for a solution then it will have met the objective of its author.

WAGES AND THE WORKING DAY

The age-old question as to whether work is a "blessing" or a "curse" is still unsettled. That it is a necessity is recognized. Man, as such, has always worked. The forms under which his labor was applied, have been exceedingly varied. However, the general nature of the process has been summed up in the term, "the struggle for existence."

Without work, man would have perished from the face of the earth. Despite this simple fact many people have spent their lives without labor of any sort. This was possible only because others, willingly or unwillingly, worked for them.

When social progress had reached the stage where it was possible for people to produce more than was necessary to sustain them, this development was soon taken advantage of and *slavery* made its appearance in the world. Of course there were countless ages during which *slavery* was not possible, when all had to work or perish. *Slavery* could not exist because productivity was too low.

Slavery — A Progressive Development

No intelligent person would like to see the return of chattel *slavery*, when men took possession of their fellows and imposed upon them the status of property, forced them to work and enriched themselves from the labor of their victims. Yet, *slavery* was progressive, in fact one of the most progressive developments of all time. Without it, civilization would have been impossible.

Society as a whole benefited from *slavery*. It made a leisure class possible, with time for culture and achievements. It was pleasant for the ruling class. They enjoyed life more than it ever had been enjoyed before. They really lived. With the *slaves*, it was quite a different story. Most of them were little more than beasts of burden, and the older and wealthier the *slave civilization* became, the more ruthless was the treatment meted out to the *slaves*. Their abuses knew practically no limits. It was out of this that the thought arose that work was a "curse," imposed upon men by the "gods" as a punishment.

The story of Adam and Eve, driven from the garden for disobedience, and punished by being forced to work (a pure myth, as no single pair of human beings could have survived) could only have arisen in a *slave* society, where labor was a burden, a man-imposed "curse," where, to use Robert Burns' phrase, it was "man's inhumanity to man." To blame it on the "gods" was a good alibi for the ruling classes, the *slave owners*, who, themselves, succeeded very well in escaping the "curse."

The Day's Work

There has always been a limit to the *working day*, even in *slave* society. This limit was nature-imposed. Human beings can just do a certain amount, then they must eat, rest and sleep, if their life of labor is to continue. Of course there have been times when *slaves* were worked to death, but that was not general. Killing "the goose

that lays the golden eggs" could not be the rule, but the exception. Live *slaves* were profitable, dead ones produced no wealth. Only where *slaves* were very plentiful, and exceedingly cheap, were they sometimes worked to death.

A sick *slave*, or a half-starved one could not produce much. For men to labor, they must be fed and otherwise cared for. Therefore, the *day's work*, through all forms of human *slavery*, all forms of exploitation, divided itself "naturally" into the *necessary labor time*, and the *surplus labor time*. This division is still with us. The former, the *necessary labor time*, has, through improved processes of production, been greatly shortened, and the latter, *surplus labor time*, as a consequence, relatively lengthened.

In any system of exploitation the first consideration must of necessity be the feeding and housing of the exploited. It is just the same as in the case of an intelligent farmer who sees to it that his horses are well fed and comfortably stabled if he is to get the best results from their labors. In some of the western states they have a saying: "Feed your horse and he will carry you further, but ride him, cowboy, ride him!"

Feeding and caring for the workers was an unavoidable expense, even under *slavery*. Many people are inclined to think that the *slave* received nothing for his labor, and that he had to give his entire time without remuneration. That is not true. As the *slaves* had to eat, rest and sleep, a portion of their *working day* was taken up with producing the equivalent of what their

masters could not withhold. Part of the working time of the *slaves* had to be used in producing the means of sustaining themselves. Thus, part of the *slave's working day*, be it short or long, was *necessary* for the maintenance of the *slave* himself. That is the part which has been called the *necessary labor time*. The hours which the *slave* worked beyond that period each day have been called the *surplus labor time*.

This division of the working time prevails in all forms of class society, in every form of exploitation of man by man. Under feudalism, the *serf* was allowed so many days of each year to produce for his own requirements and of his family. In some cases he worked certain hours of the day, or certain days of the week, for himself, and the other hours, or days, his *surplus labor time*, he had to serve his feudal master, and produce for his wants. In any case, no matter how the working time was divided, part was for the *serf* and his dependents, the rest of the time he worked for his master and received for it no equivalent.

Capitalist Exploitation

Under the present system of production, the division of the *working day* into *necessary* and *surplus labor time* is not so obvious because of the wage system, which tends to obscure it.

Today, the "free" worker receives a wage for his whole day's work. He is not usually paid for a part of the *working day*, but for the whole of it. He enters into a

contract, or agreement, with the employer and he receives, on an average, the full payment agreed upon. Sometimes he gets even more than has been promised. Other times he may be cheated. But, on an average, wages are the full payment for *labor power*. And, yet, the capitalist who buys the worker's *labor power* at its full value makes plenty of profit, and from the only source which it can possibly arise, the labor of the worker.

Wages

Just as an average banker doesn't understand money, the average wage worker does not understand wages. Most bankers know how to get money and how to keep it, but still they cannot explain its "mystery." The worker may fight like a tiger to get an increase in wages, and he may know how to spend his income wisely, but the real nature of wages, as such, he generally does not comprehend, and may not even suspect.

It is quite impossible to understand the real character of wages without recognizing their connection with the *working day*. The proletarian, the modern wage worker, is a peculiar historical product. He differs from all other workers in history. He is not allowed certain days of the week to work for himself and certain days to give to his master, as was the case with the feudal serf. In fact, on the average, he owns no tools of production and no place of his own in which to work. Nor is the proletarian the personal property of a master, with unrestricted control over his life and labor, as in the case of the *slave*.

The wage worker is in a different position. At the termination of a stipulated time, he carries home his pay envelope, what he now refers to as his "take-home wages" (withholding tax, etc., deducted). We will assume that he has been working steady, engaged in production, not for himself of course, but for the buyer of his labor-power, his employer. However, he is not doing that for his health, nor because he likes work, or loves his boss. His purpose is to get enough pay to purchase food, shelter and clothing for himself and those depending upon him. In other words he tries to obtain a standard of living as high as possible.

The Money Wage

The cash which the worker takes home, when he receives his pay, has been called the *nominal wage*, or wage in name, twenty dollars, forty dollars, or such. Let us call it the *money wage*. But the worker is too sane just to want money to look at. He earns it with the idea of spending it, and generally he is forced to do so. The cost of living for him and his family compels him to spend his *money wage* on the necessities of life, plus some small luxuries.

The Real Wage

What, therefore, the modern worker toils for it not money, but what the money will buy. That which is thus obtained has been called the *real wage*. Without consideration of the cost of necessities, wages, as such,

cannot be properly understood. A high *money wage* which would purchase but little, might be a very low *real wage*. If a worker receives, say, 20 per cent increase in his "*money wage*, and, if in the meantime the "cost of living" had advanced 30 per cent, his *real wage* would actually have fallen. His standard of living would be lowered.

The battle to maintain, or increase, *real wages*, to maintain living standards(the main function of a labor union), is a constant and terrific struggle for the workers. It is a battle which the workers must carry on. They cannot afford to relax or be off-guard, no matter how well organized or how "great" their temporary gains may be. This necessary, this unavoidable struggle, nevertheless, leaves labor at a disadvantage, in the long run, because of the nature of the present social set-up.

Under the present system of "private enterprise," capitalism, the workers as a class cannot rise, but only sink, economically. The capitalist system works that way and it will not work any other way. Competition for jobs, especially over a long period, reduces the workers to a starvation minimum. For the workers, in the long run, the "natural" wage is the minimum wage.

The Relative Wage

While the worker's main concern is with what he is actually going to receive in return for his services, it is important for him to understand what has been called the *relative wage*, or in other words, the amount of actual

value he receives in *relation* to the *value he produces*. If the worker produces new *values* to the amount of one hundred dollars, and he receives a wage whose *value* is twenty dollars, his *relative wage* then is but one-fifth of the *value* he has added by his labor.

This margin between the *value* the worker receives (his wages), and the *value* he produces, has been called *surplus value*. Under the wage system, the former (wages) represents that part of the *working day* which we previously mentioned, the *necessary labor time*, the latter, the *surplus value*, is that which is produced during the remainder of the working day, during the *surplus labor time*.

Unless all these simple facts, and some others besides, are taken into consideration, it is impossible to fully comprehend the nature of the *wage system*.

Labor Power

The wage system is, in effect, a sale and purchase affair. The average worker, in order to live, must sell the only marketable thing he possesses, his labor power. In other words, it is his power to perform physical and mental work. The purchaser of labor power, the employer, has for his purpose the making of profit. This result he achieves by paying, on an average, the full value of labor power, and by selling the products of labor at their value, a much higher value.

It is this difference between the two values (the value of labor power and the value of the products of labor)

which enriches the exploiters of wage workers. This *surplus value* is the source from which all profits, no matter how divided, arise under the prevailing mode of production.

Not all payments for services are wages. An individual house painter, plumber, or a doctor, may be paid for services but they are not wage workers. They are more like the independent producers of pre-capitalist days who produced and sold commodities rather than worked for wages. Their numbers tend to decline as capitalism advances. Painters or plumbers who may be employed by building contractors are wage workers, and they produce *surplus values* for their employers. A doctor who works full time for a hospital, public or private, is a wage worker. And, in like manner, a nurse so employed, is an exploited wage worker. They may call themselves salaried ladies and gentlemen, but they are exploited *wage slaves* just the same.

The *surplus values* appropriated by the capitalists have a tendency to increase in ratio. This increase of the *surplus* is achieved in a number of ways. It can be done by prolonging the *working day*, so that the *surplus labor time* will be longer, or it can be brought about by increasing the tempo of production without increasing hours. Of course it can also be done by reducing wages, while retaining the same output, or by all three, reduced wages, lengthened *working day* and increased speed of production.

More efficient machinery enables the workers to turn out more products per hour. In some cases where the

working day has actually been shortened, the *surplus* has been greatly increased by the use of improved machinery, or by speeding up production, and sometimes by both, improved machinery and greater speed simultaneously.

All new *values* are added by human labor. Only the producers create *value*. Because it has been noticed that workers using machinery can produce more than those using hand tools, or using improved machines as against old types, some people have concluded that machinery adds *value*, that machines actually produce. This, of course, is an illusion. No shovel ever dug a hole, not even a steam-shovel. A worker is always necessary. No hammer ever drove a nail. No saw ever cut wood. Tools or machines simply make it possible for the workers to produce more, or less, according to the usefulness of those appliances.

A few years ago, a new expression of vulgar economy arose, to proclaim that machinery produced ninety per cent of the wealth, and that the workers only produced ten per cent. If that were true, the employers would be quite happy to dispense with the ten per cent, and get rid of the workers producing it. They would save themselves a lot of conflict. However, the employers are not so stupid as that organization of proclaimed "scientists," who are unable to comprehend that not a wheel would turn in the modern world without a worker to start it, feed it, stop it, and remove the product.

The Struggle for the Shorter Day

The struggle for a shorter *working day* is an historic one. The ten-hour day when legally attained in Great Britain a hundred years ago, was considered a tremendous advance for labor. It was bitterly opposed. Many employers proclaimed that Britain would be ruined.

The eight-hour day, a much more recent achievement, was also a great victory, and a universal six-hour day is long overdue. However, while recognizing the many sacrifices made by the working class in those great struggles for the shorter *working day*, we have to recognize a still more vital factor in the reduction of the length of the *working day*, namely the increased speed of production.

The tempo of modern industry could not permit the 12 to 16 hours which prevailed a century ago, nor even the ten hours average of fifty years ago. There is just a certain amount of energy in the worker and when that is used up, the prolonging of the hours beyond that period, as a general practice, is not profitable for the employers. An exhausted worker is not a good producer. An energetic one, contented with his job, is like the "contented cow" which gives more and better milk.

Long hours, if persisted in, reduce the workers' strength, impair his efficiency, so that a half-dead worker drags himself to the factory, if he is able to go at all. The wiser employers have long since learned that stretching the *working day* to a point where it impairs the worker's efficiency does not pay. Some employers, of course, have

not learned that and never will. Their immediate advantage is all they can see. Consequently they continually strive to increase the speed of production, to prolong the working hours and "chisel" upon the workers in various ways.

Through organized labor action, the workers can checkmate the employers to a considerable extent, although the latter, being in possession of the means of production, have most of the advantages on their side. The labor movement has to continually resist the many maneuvers of the employers and their lackeys who strive to increase the volume of production, without a corresponding increase in wage payments.

If the workers did not systematically fight back, their living standards, bad and all as they are, would be still worse. Their share of the *working day*, the *necessary labor time*, would be further infringed upon. In other words, if the workers as a class did not resist, their wages would be cut to the starvation point.

"Good" Wages

Since wages of any sort imply exploitation, which is a polite name for robbery, and all exploitation, from a worker's point of view, is bad, it follows that *all wages are bad*. Yet, workers carelessly use the term "good wages," but there really is no such thing. There are bad wages, and worse wages, but no good wages. To an understanding worker, the wage system itself is an evil thing. He continually fights against it and proclaims its

final abolition as the starting point for the solution of his problems.

Nature never brought one class into being for the purpose of working all their lives just for the comfort and enrichment of another class. This is one thing which cannot be charged up to nature. It is a man-imposed condition, a social arrangement, which, whatever its past merits have been, is now cruel and stupid, especially since famine from scarcity is practically unknown. Yet, famine from oversupply, with its accompanying unemployment, is an outstanding characteristic of the prevailing social system. To fight prolonged and devastating wars over the disposal of those supplies, while the producers thereof, the workers, should be using it themselves, is just as stupid, especially on the part of the workers who acquiesce in this arrangement.

Increased Ratio of Exploitation

Many workers, knowing that their class has been exploited for such a long time, have come to regard it as a nature-imposed condition, as something that is inevitable. They also believe that the former systems of exploitation, *slavery* for instance, were the worst. That workers in the past were exploited the most. "Don't we have a shorter work week than our fathers had, and is not our toil lighter than theirs was? Are we not much better off?" they ask.

Here, too, there is much illusion. Here, again, workers are caught by surface appearances. They have not even a suspicion that they are the worst exploited workers

in all history. Why is this the case? It is not because they are more ignorant than past generations of workers. This is because they do not understand the real nature of the prevailing social relations, because they, as yet, fail to comprehend the relationship of *wages and the working day*, especially the *relative wage*.

The average worker sees clearly enough what he receives for his services, but he does not see the tremendous increase of the *surplus* which he and his fellows produce during the *surplus labor time*, and which they leave in the hands of their exploiters.

Before the invention of machinery the greater part of the *working day* was the *necessary labor time*. It took the workers, with hand tools, much longer to produce the equivalent of their wages. Only during the shorter part of the *working day* were they producing *surplus value* for their employers.

By the middle of last century, by about 1850, after the machine system of production in Britain was about seventy-five years old, the British industrialists were able to boast that they only had to pay the workers in wages about half of the new values produced each day. Half of the new values added by the workers using machinery could be retained by the capitalists. Thus, at that time, about half was *necessary labor time*, when the workers were producing values equivalent to their wages, and half was *surplus labor time*, during which the workers were producing *surplus values* (the source of all profits) for their employers.

From then until now in Britain, and also in other countries, all improvements in the productive process have but lengthened that part of the *working day* in which *surplus values* are produced for the employers and shortened the part of the *working day* in which the workers are producing for themselves, producing values equivalent to their wages.

Value of Labor Power

The modern proletarian, the wage worker, is not a commodity. He cannot be bought or sold, as a chattel *slave* was, but his *labor power* is a commodity and he is obliged to sell it in order to live. His physical and mental services he sells to the employing class. The wage he receives is the price of his *labor power*. It is measured off by the clock at so much per hour, or by the product if he is a piece-worker.

The value of *labor power* is determined in the same way as that of any other commodity, namely by the socially necessary labor which enters into its production, or reproduction. But how does that work out? It is the amount of socially necessary labor required to produce the food, shelter, clothing, etc., that the worker and his family require, which determines the value of his *labor power*.

If, on an average, it takes three hours of socially necessary labor to produce values equal to that consumed daily by the worker and his family, then his wages would be equal to three hours of his labor time, but if he works nine hours, then six of those hours are *surplus labor time*

during which he is producing values for his employer.

The employer may be quite a humane individual, but from a business point of view, the worker is just an instrument of labor. To the average employer, the worker is but *labor power* in overalls, and after buying that commodity from the worker, the business man is the owner of it and makes use of it for his own purpose, the direct object of which is profit making. The worker, having sold his *labor power*, is no longer the owner and director of it.

The wages which the worker receives for his *labor power*, during the time he is expending it, are necessary to restore it so that he can again sell it. This restoration (the reproduction of *labor power*), the result of his meals and rest, plus clothing and other necessities, of course includes the expenditure of his whole family. His wife may cook the meals and do the washing and repairing of the family's clothes. She may do the shopping and other necessary work which enters into the reproduction of the worker's *labor power*. His wages have to be sufficient to cover these expenses, plus the raising of a fresh supply of young *labor power* for the future labor market, otherwise the supply of human *labor power* would run out.

Mr. and Mrs. Proletarian, and the young Proletarians, have all to be supported, hence all that enters into the value of the worker's *labor power*. The value of his *labor power* is not determined by what he produces, but by what he and his family must consume.

The price of *labor power*, as is true of other commodi-

ties, rises and falls, but this fluctuation is around the value of the *labor power*. This fluctuation results mainly from demand and supply. If there are more jobs than workers, wages rise. If there are more workers than jobs, wages fall, but not so low that it would be just as well for the worker to starve without working as to starve and work as well.

Labor power, being a living thing, cannot be sold and delivered without the worker delivering himself to the employer. Thus, the worker, indirectly, sells himself by installments. *Labor power* has other characteristics. It is the only commodity purchased by the employer which, when applied, produces values greater than its own value. The social labors of the workers is the only source from which profit arises, no matter how it may ultimately be divided between the different types of capitalists.

Even if we assume that the standard of living in modern nations, such as the U. S. A., trends in an upward direction, the working people are so efficient, and machinery so improved, that they can produce greater quantities of wealth for the capitalists than any *slaves* in history have ever done for their masters.

This is the real source of the great fortunes of today. They are the outcome of the great productive capacity of the modern workers, the result of the process which is known as *social production*. However, it has not enriched the workers who do the producing, but has made millionaires and multi-millionaires of the capitalists, who don't produce but own the means of production.

Social Production

The average worker, so far as his hours and pay are concerned, has a fair understanding of what the working day is, but the half-hidden complex factors and social relationships, which we here seek to explain, are, for him, as yet, a mystery. In other words, the general character of modern production, *social production*, is not comprehended by the workers, and consequently its inevitable outcome has yet to be learned.

When we speak of *social production* we simply mean that no individual any longer produces things by himself. It now requires the co-operation of thousands of workers, all doing some small part which fits into the whole. That is all that is meant by *social production*. It is no longer individual production. This has come about slowly and rather imperceptibly, but the significance of this development, if once understood by the workers, will change their whole outlook upon social questions which continually arise in the wide and continuous struggle between capital and labor.

Social production, thousands of workers often cooperating under the same roof, and industry in general being more interdependent, is the chief characteristic of present day production. It is *collective production but individual appropriation*. The products do not belong to the workers who produce them but to the owners of the means of production, the capitalists.

Social production was not invented. It evolved spontaneously. It is the outcome of industrial evolution, but

the effects of this change have great significance. It has brought large numbers of workers together, under the same roof. It has reduced the vast majority to the position of mere machine tenders, doing a small part in the industrial process, however necessary and efficient that part may be. Their congregation around the machines, and their common needs, taught them to organize into unions, although some have not yet learned that lesson.

Some have grasped the relationship of politics to industry, that the main purpose of political power is to insure and protect private ownership of the machines, the means of *social production*. *Social production* has also had its effects upon the owners. It has rendered them unnecessary. They don't even have to manage, or keep books, or do anything whatever in connection with the process of *social production*. All posts in a modern plant, from the floor-sweeper to the general manager, can be carried on by hired "hands" and hired "heads." The only function left for the modern capitalist is to collect his profit. In fact, it is collected for him.

Thus, *social production* has rendered the capitalist entirely parasitic. He can be miles away from his nearest factory or mill, doing nothing whatever in connection with the process, and yet may have an income greater than all his employees put together.

Private ownership of the machinery of *social production* is now a travesty. It is the root of all social problems, poverty, slums, depressions, crime and war. *The logical sequence to social production is social ownership*

of the means of production. That is the answer to all the major social problems of today.

In the handicraft period, the artisan owned the tools with which he worked and also the workshop. He owned what he produced. There was no question about that. He took the products to the market. But the modern worker does not own the machinery with which he works, nor the industrial plant. The owners of these, although not usually taking part in production, appropriates the products. They send those products of *social labor* to the market and collect the prices which they bring.

Included in the prices obtained are the costs of the materials used, wear and tear on the means of production and the outlay for wages, plus, of course, the *surplus value* over and above those outlays. Part of those receipts are reinvested in more materials and more labor power so as to procure more *surplus values* (profits) from the *social labors* of the workers.

Wages, as we have previously shown, imply exploitation. Because of this fact, some people contend that the producers of the Soviet Union, where industry is already socialized, receiving periodical payments for their maintenance, are, therefore, exploited wage workers, proletarians. But where there are no *surplus values* there are no proletarians. For there to be *surplus values* there must be capitalists appropriating them. *Surplus value* is the historic form of exploitation which characterizes that social relationship we call capitalism.

As the workers of the U. S. S. R. produce all values,

and only consume a portion thereof, there are, consequently, "surpluses." In other words, more is produced than is immediately consumed. Those "surpluses" are used by the workers as a whole, through their Soviet State, not by an exploiting class of property owners.

For many years, much of this "surplus" produced by the Soviet workers went into the expansion of industry and, unfortunately, into heavy military expenditures. This latter was the consequence of the rest of the world remaining capitalistic, and imperialistic. The Soviet people knew that, soon or late, some capitalist power, or powers, would strike at and invade the Soviet Union, as Nazi Germany finally did.

Some open, and some covert, enemies of the U. S. S. R. claim that a new exploiting class has arisen there. They pretend to see in the officials of the Soviet system, and the variations in incomes, a new exploiting class. Yet, it is admitted that this new "class" does not own the means of production, that the means of production is socialized, that no one there can start in business, as in America, for instance, and hire and exploit wage workers for profit.

This seeing in the disparity of income, a new form of exploitation, and claiming that the Soviet officialdom is a new ruling and exploiting class, is a stupid mental distortion. It is the result of lack of dialectical reasoning and historical knowledge, a lack of Marxian balance on the part of those claiming to be socialists, and confusion or deliberate falsification on the part of spokesmen of capitalism.

In the present stage of the revolutionary process, full communism is not possible. Disparity of income, based upon differences in productive capacity, must yet prevail. And incomes of officials, the services of whom are considered by the Soviet people to be valuable, are also upon the same basis. Full communism, in this relation, is usually visualized upon the principle of, "From each, according to his ability, to each, according to his needs."

This certainly would not be "equality," in the common use of the term, because the "needs" of those with great ability to produce, or otherwise serve, might be no more, or even less, than that of a very poor producer, or contributor, to the social whole. This disparity, in the opposite direction, could give rise to the charge of special privilege and a new "exploiting class," the less efficient exploiting the more efficient, etc. Of course it would be a distortion, just as all claims that classes are determined by disparity of income is a distortion. If that were true, then there would be many capitalist classes, and many working class, in each capitalist nation now.

A correct understanding of capitalist exploitation, which the rule of the proletariat abolishes, can be best arrived at when we comprehend the characteristic of *wages*, and of the *working day*, the relationship of the *necessary labor time* to the *surplus labor time*, and, consequently, the class relationships which arise therefrom.

Organized labor would be able to fight more effectively if its membership understood WAGES and their relation to the WORKING DAY.

History of The Supreme Court of the United States

By William Howard Taft

of what a century the Supreme Court of the United States
has followed and in what manner it has developed its
functions. It is a history of the growth and development
of the Court as an institution and as a body of men
and as a part of the government. The book is a history
of the development of the Court as an institution
and as a part of the government. It is a history
of the growth and development of the Court as
an institution and as a part of the government.

The Supreme Court of the United States is a
body of nine Justices, one Chief Justice and
eight Associate Justices. It is the highest
court in the United States and has the power
to review the decisions of the lower courts
and to declare laws unconstitutional. The
Court is composed of Justices who are
appointed by the President and confirmed by
the Senate. The Justices serve for life, but
may be removed by impeachment and
conviction by the House of Representatives.

CHARLES C. THOMAS & COMPANY
CO-OPERATIVE PUBLISHERS CHICAGO

History of The Supreme Court of the United States

By Gustavus Myers

For over a century the Supreme Court of the United States has towered aloft in omnipotent sway over all other institutions. Absolute and final, its decrees have gone deep into the history of the nation and have had their mighty effect upon the wars of the classes. This book is a comprehensive history of the development of capitalist resources, power and tactics, and of the great and continuing conflict of classes. It reveals the true sources of the primitive accumulation of wealth which, beginning with the appropriation of land and the dispossession of the workers, has extended to the elaborate forms of capitalistic power existing today.

Palpably, a dominant class must have some supreme institution through which it can express its consecutive demands and enforce its will. In the United States the one all-potent institution automatically responding to these demands and enforcing them has been the Supreme Court. Vested with absolute and unappealable power, it has been able, with a marvelously adaptable flexibility, to transmute that will not merely into law but into action. This History of the Supreme Court, being a narrative of the deeds of the chief bulwark of capitalism, constitutes at the same time the best history of the United States that has yet appeared. One large volume, 823 pages. \$2.50.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
CO-OPERATIVE PUBLISHERS, CHICAGO

The Ancient Lowly

A History of the Ancient Working People From the Earliest Times to the Adoption of Christianity by Constantine.

By C. Osborne Ward. Cloth, two volumes, 690 and 716 pages. Each \$2.50. Either volume sold separately.

Before written history began, society was already divided into exploiting and exploited classes, master and slave, lord and subject, ruler and ruled. And from the first the ruling class has written the histories, written them in accordance with its own interests and from its own point of view.

To arrive at the real story of the life of the oppressed classes in ancient times was a task of almost incredible difficulties. To this work Osborne Ward gave a lifetime of diligent research, and his discoveries are embodied in the two volumes entitled *The Ancient Lowly*. He has gathered together into a connected narrative practically everything pertaining to his subject in the published literature of Greece and Rome, including in his inquiry many rare works only to be consulted in the great European libraries. But he did not stop here. Many of the most important records of the ancient labor unions are preserved only in the form of stone tablets that have withstood the destructive forces of the centuries, and the author traveled on foot many hundreds of miles around the Mediterranean Sea, deciphering these inscriptions.

Perhaps the most startling of his conclusions is that Christianity was originally a movement of organized labor. The persecution of the early Christians is shown to have arisen from the age-long class struggle between exploiters and exploited. And the most dangerous thing about the book from the capitalist view-point is that the author does not merely make assertions; he proves them.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY

CENTENARY EDITION

The Positive Outcome of Philosophy

By Josef Dietzgen

One of the best books we have ever published is THE POSITIVE OUTCOME OF PHILOSOPHY. We have sold many thousands of Josef Dietzgen's books, and readers everywhere have testified to their educational value and to the enjoyment and enlightenment they obtained from the study of Dietzgen.

December 9th, 1928, was the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Josef Dietzgen. To commemorate the event we published, with the kind assistance of his son, Eugen Dietzgen, a new translation of THE POSITIVE OUTCOME OF PHILOSOPHY. This new translation from the original German is by W. W. Craik, an Englishman, resident of Hamburg.

Good as our former edition was, we do not hesitate to assert that this translation is immensely superior. It is in clear and expressive English, which simplifies the study. Craik has certainly done his work well.

To those who have formerly read the philosophy of Josef Dietzgen, it is not necessary to comment upon its merits, but to those who have not yet participated in this pleasure we wish to give here a brief outline of its content.

It deals with the nature and substance of thinking. It strips the human mind of the mysticism that is usually attached to it, and shows the functioning of the brain as a perfectly natural process. Just as Karl Marx and Frederick Engels traced history and economics along evolutionary lines, to the logical conclusion that a new social order is inevitable, so Josef Dietzgen traced the evolution of human thought, as expressed through philosophy, to its positive outcome. He shows that the natural sciences have taken over every branch of the old-time philosophy, leaving only the thinking process itself to be explained. This latter he accomplishes in a masterly fashion in his chapter on "The Nature of Human Brain-Work."

The Centenary Edition of THE POSITIVE OUTCOME OF PHILOSOPHY is handsomely bound in maroon cloth with gold stamping and contains a portrait of its famous author. Price \$2.00, postage paid.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY

The Origin of the Family

PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE STATE

By Frederick Engels

The book on which are based all subsequent works on property and the State written by Socialists and Communists. What is the State? How did it arise? Does it represent all the people? Will it ever disappear? What is its function? When did Private Property arise? And how? Has the institution of the Family changed and evolved? Just now all over the world socialists, anarchists, syndicalists and communists are divided upon the subject of the State, its origin, its function and its future. Which group are you in, and do you know why? This book explains these vital questions for you. Cloth, 217 pages, 75 cents.

Socialism

UTOPIAN AND SCIENTIFIC

By Frederick Engels

When may we expect a proletarian revolution? Can we plan to have it at a certain time? Can we carry a revolution by propaganda? Does it depend on what we desire? We all want tickets to the New Society of the Workers. How can we know how near we are historically? Engels gives us the signs in this book. They never fail. When we understand them we can know how to use social and economic forces to carry us forward to the New Day. Cloth, 60 cents; paper, 25 cents.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
CO-OPERATIVE PUBLISHERS, CHICAGO

ANTI-DÜHRING

[[*Herr Eugene Dühring's*
Revolution in Science]]

By Frederick Engels

*Also contains "The Mark" and the author's introduction
to "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific"*

Part I treats with Philosophy, giving the most comprehensive statement of Marx and Engels with regard to this question than anywhere else in their published writings. Part II is, in effect, an outline and introduction to the three volumes of *Capital*, along with interesting discussion on the force theory and warfare and militarism. Part III explains the basis of modern socialism in its entire range of program, strategy and tactics.

Anti-Dühring is the only work compressing into one volume the Marxian world-outlook in its relation to the various fields of knowledge and science and the society of the future. Engels says of this work: "I had to treat of all and every possible subject, from the concepts of time and space to bimetallicism; from the eternity of matter and motion to the perishable nature of moral ideas; from Darwin's natural selection to the education of youth in a future society. Anyhow, the systematic comprehensiveness of my opponent gave me the opportunity of developing, in opposition to him, and in a more connected form than had previously been done, the views held by Marx and myself on this great variety of subjects. And that was the principal reason which made me undertake this otherwise ungrateful task."

Price, postpaid, \$2.00

Write for complete list

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY

