one considers the money that has been made in the production of safes, vaults and other equipment for burglar prevention such as barbed wire fences and police paraphernalia, how can one believe that "crime does not pay?" Consider the extra profits made by newspapers and the host of successful publications of books and magazines on the subject. Crime definitely **does** pay and it would be a crime for the capitalists if everyone was to become honest. They are confronted with an impossible task as it is to use up the enormous surplus of the good things of life. Were the wealth they spend on crime detection and punishment to be diverted to other channels such as consumer goods they would have even greater unsaleable surpluses. The implications of a crimeless capitalism are indeed staggering.

All this, however, is neither here nor there. The capitalists do not like the idea of having their hard-earned (?) money stolen from them by people who use unorthodox methods. Stealing and even murder is alright provided it is done at the command of the ruling class. They are prepared to force millions of their citizens to learn and apply the most scientific methods of robbery, sabotage and annihilation during wartime. This is patriotic, but the students who survive are all expected to forget this training in between wars. Unfortunately for them this is not possible.

The methods used by the Capone gang were in many ways reminiscent of World War I. Al Capone himself was a graduate of the U. S. Army in that venture, where he was instructed on the effective use of machine guns. It can only be expected that the Commando type of training in World War II will lead to bigger and better executed jobs than Capone ever dreamed of. The men who held up Brinks, Inc. were said to have worn sailor pea-jackets and to have tied their victims with navy-type knots. Whether or not this means they received their basic training in the U. S. Navy, the chances are that some of them at least learned the racket during and in the last great war.

Organized crime has become in our times a highly organized and efficient business. It is seized upon by many a worker as a means of "beating the system." Socialists however see it as a very unsatisfactory alternative to a life of toil in the service of capitalism. The chances of staying alive and on the outside are not too many. The individual members of a gang are if anything less free from restrictions from their leaders than are the workers in a factory. As in other endeavors it is of course possible for the individual to strike out for himself, but here he has no organization to afford him protection and is in an even more precarious position.

We do not wish to sermonize against a life of crime. As socialists we regard capitalist wealth in general as (legally) stolen to begin with. As socialists however, we know of a much better way to beat the system. We have no respect for capitalist property but our way is not that of the hi-jacker which solves no problems. Socialists are not out to steal the capitalists' property, rather our aim is the abolition of their right to own private property. In other words, socialism will mean the expropriation by the working class of the whole of capitalist property and its conversion into assets, commonly owned and democratically controlled by all society.

Realizing as we do the extent of Brink's Mr. Allen's hatred of crime and criminals we urge him and his fellow capitalists to examine the principles of socialism and join our organization so they can help us wipe out the root of the evil — capitalism. Realizing further, however, that this act of class renunciation is highly improbable, to make the understatement of the half century, we likewise urge our fellow workers not to wait for such an eventuality and do the job themselves.

HARMO

THE NEXT 100 YEARS

For the past fifteen years the Brookings Institute in Washington, D. C. has been issuing a series of books dealing in general with the relationship between the distribution of national income and economic progress.

Controlling Factors in Economic Development (1949) is the fifth and latest in this series. The author, Dr. Harold Moulton, explains the title by stating that the book deals "with the factors which impede and restrict, and those which generate and promote, economic development." The work is parcelled into two divisions, the first of which, under the heading "Looking Backwards" sketches the progress of the last one hundred years. The author concludes that economic progress — as measured in terms of the increase in output per man per hour — was as great in the century between 1830 and 1930 as it was in the entire pre-1830 period.

The classical economists and John Stuart Mill are severely taken to task for adhering to the law of diminishing returns (decreasing agricultural yield and increasing population), and thus discounting the idea of further economic advance. This criticism of these "dismal" economists is indeed a sound one, against which we do not wish to argue. However, when Dr. Moulton includes Karl Marx as one of the economists holding "even more rigidly" to the iron law of wages, this is a distortion which promotes our interest and ire at the same time.

Marx is accused by the author of stating that labor would receive little more than the bare minimum necessary for existence, and of not conceiving that the standard of living of the working class would rise progressively with technological advance.

To students of Marxian economics this latter charge sounds even too ridiculous to answer. However, since an actual increase in the standard of living — in terms of real wages — since the time of Marx has been placed alongside of this theory of the "increasing misery of the working class" in an attempt to refute Marxian economics completely, it would be well to take time for a reply. To put it into popular language, Marx is misrepresented as writing that if a worker in 1850 had two pair of shoes to his name, in 1900 he would have one pair, and in 1950 he would have to hop about on the one shoe he owned. (The law of decreasing foot apparel.)

MARX A SCIENTIST

In the first place, Marx as a scientist in both history and economics, was concerned with the basic forms and basic developments. The momentary fluctuations of the economy in his time concerned him, but did not deter him from settling forth long-range remarks about the development of capitalism. Once we understand this, we can resolve this so-called contradiction.

When Marx asserted that the workers at all times receive barely enough for their existence, what they need to produce and reproduce their labor power, he was underlining two facts. First, that the workers as a class never receive sufficient in wages to declare their independence from the capitalists, and second, that whatever the worker produces above the means for his existence, goes to the capitalist in the form of surplus value or profit.

Marx also stated that the worker's standard of living depended on the historical, cultural, and economic development of the country in which he lived, so that as the capitalist economy expanded (in the past), more and varied goods came within the "necessities" which the worker needed for his existence. Added to this is the fact that capitalism must