this correct theory, it would seek to use its organized strength to wrest as much of this surplus value from the capitalists as it possibly can under this system.

But no, the public interest (read capitalism) demands that workers subordinate their own interests to those of society (read again: capitalism) as a whole. In other words, capitalism demands the workers subordinate themselves to capitalism. Is it no wonder that we stated at the beginning of this article that the escalator clause, and the thinking which still pursues it, demonstrates that workers are thinking along capitalist lines, and greatly and urgently show the need for socialist education?

TRUMAN GOING "SOCIALIST"?

President Truman, in his State of the Union message on January 5, asked Congress, among other things, to enact legislation "To authorize an immediate study of the adequacy of production facilities for materials in critically short supply, such as steel; and if found necessary to authorize government loans for the expansion of production facilities to relieve such shortages, and furthermore, to authorize the construction of such facilities directly, if action by private industry fails to meet our needs."

Immediately, a hoot and a holler went up from the capitalist press. The Detroit Times called it "state socialism." "Truman's Side is the Left Side" read the headline of an editorial in the Detroit News, January 6, which stated that Truman is "Still working the left side of the street."

But it was left to Blair Moody, the News Washington Bureau Ace, to reach the high point in this burlesque on socialism. For that is precisely what it is. Moody, who is not a writer without influence, writes that if the U. S. government goes into the steel industry this would be "the longest step toward socialism a President ever laid before Congress," and would "move state ownership into the heart of American industry."

Moody credits this plan for the government to go into the steel industry as inspired by Walter Reuther. Whoever was the author of the plan, we would like to ask the question, Does this mean socialism? Of course not. What Moody is talking about is the system of state capitalism which exists in Russia in its entire economy, or in England in one-fifth of its economy. Here in these countries, and in other countries where the government has taken over industry, the workers still work for a wage, the industries are operated on a profit-loss basis, and in addition, the workers in their wage demands are met by the armed forces of the ENTIRE state (as witness the last French coal strike.)

Of course, the plan of the capitalist press and its hired writers is very clear to the knowing socialist. Any attempt to intervene in the private affairs of the capitalists is slandered as "socialism." The worker, being propagandized successfully against the "evils of socialism", therefore protests against the government going into the steel business.

However, if the government ever enters the steel industry, it will be for one or two, or both, of these purposes. First, to expand the capitalist economy, or to provide the necessary steel in advent of a war. The workers in these plants would be under civil service, would have their wages set for them, and like all government workers, would be prevented from striking. The profits from these plants would go to the holders of US bonds, floated for this purpose. And this is called "socialism."

No, socialism is anything but this form of state capitalism, where the state operates the industry for the benefit of bondholders. Rather, socialism is a society without wages, and without profits, where industry is democratically run and managed for the benefit of all society.

C. FREDERICK

* * *

(The editors invite readers of the WS to submit any questions dealings with economics, and insofar as it is possible, the questions and answers will be published in Economic Notes in Review.)

Who . . . Me ?

YES! ME!

I've just learned something. Had a shock. Got to think it over. Hurts my vanity. I'm working class! That's what they tell me. These socialists. Me! A white collar job. A good job. Nice house out of town. All the comforts. Working class!

I know different. I'm middle class. Of course. That's what I thought. It seems plain. There's the rich and the poor. I'm neither. So I'm the middle. That's logic. I'm half way up. H'm, or half way down. Gravitation. Easier going down.

Reminds me. The old song. "Once I built a railroad." "Buddy can you spare a dime." Things like that did happen. Might happen again. To me!

Suppose the socialists are right. They say I'm working class. But what does that mean? I work for my living. But so do some rich. Well — hardly! Some do work, true. But do they depend on that work. For their living. No! That's the socialist argument. Do I depend on my work? Well — yes. True, I've got some investments. Yields a dollar a week. Could I live on that? Silly! Could I? No!

Of course! I get a salary. Not a wage. Monthly. Not weekly. That settles it. I'm middle class! Well, hardly an argument. Some get more than me. And weekly. So that's out.

Then what makes me middle class? Just the feeling I suppose. Good education. The way one walks. And talks. But that's nonsense. That puts me in one group. Of good talkers. And walkers. But then I'm a skilled engineer. Academic qualifications. And so on. That puts me in another group. Of skilled engineers. And so on.

So we come back to the socialist point. That I work for a living. For a wage. Sorry, salary. Am dependent on a wage. For my living. And that puts me in the other group. Of those who work for a living. And dependent on that work for a living.

Then the other class is the capitalist class. That's what they call them. They are usually rich. But are never dependent on work. For their living. They work for pleasure. And interest. When they do.

So. I must face the fact. I am working class. So what? Why should I worry? I'm still alright. Let *them* worry. They are poor. They may have cause for worry. Not me. I'm not middle class. Alright. But I'm middle income. And that's security.

But. Is it? Security? Terrible thought. What would I do? If something happened. "Buddy, can you spare a dime?" That song. It haunts me. Savings. How much? Could last out six months. At a pinch. But what a pinch!

I get good money. But I can't save Much. Why can't I save? I spend up to my income. Almost. Have to, I suppose. Middle class standards. Keeping up with the Joneses. Middle class nonsense.

Can I insure? Against insecurity? No. YES! Socialism. The best insurance. That's what they say. But how? Why security then? And not now? By what magic? What is socialism? 57 varieties. Sorry, Mr. Heinz! Justice? Liberty? Freedom? Punk! Just words.

But then. Why insecurity? I'm secure. Yet I feel insecure. "Once I built a railroad." Damn that song. "Buddy can you spare a dime?"

Socialism means security. That's what they say. Socialism means common ownership. Of the means of production and distribution. Not very clear. But what's this? A world without money. Production for use. Free distribution. That's plain. I can see that. What does that imply? No money. Free distribution. Right.

That means no wages. Or salaries. Or buying and selling. No middle class. Sorry. No middle income group. No trade. Or commerce. Right. That means no profits or dividends. No rents. NO RENTS! That means no property. No private property! No ownership. That's common ownership. I get it now. Good!

But factories? Machines? Mines?