



Starvation Proof

If the workers were robbed alike (of equally as much) the robbery could not be hidden and the robbers would soon be discovered. But unfortunately, it would seem, no two men are robbed alike, (especially, or those doing piece work). Nevertheless, all workers are robbed of a certain portion of their product; to make life more bearable for a few public spirited parasites.

Very naturally those of the workers who are robbed of less (than the others) appreciate the favor done them by the robbers, and many of them are in favor of permitting the robbers to ply their trade as long as they remain considerate towards the few better paid slaves. They count it a privilege to be robbed of only a part of their labor, and rejoice in accordance * * * and flatter themselves that they are important, more so than the poor devil who is relieved of every comfort, pleasure and luxury; but their non-importance is established by the fact they have won no strike in a "dog's age" and by the fact they invariably take what is given them by the employer. The employer is really liberal with the men according to their ideas on such matters and consequently they make a contract with the boss agreeing to not strike or ask for more wages during the life of the contract, no matter what happens. Strange as this seems, that men will agree to stand for a series of robberies practiced on themselves between two certain dates, and insist on the right to renew said agreement (to become robbed) next year. Nevertheless it is true that a few of the working class do enter into an agreement with the men who profit by exploiting labor. Naturally these men are very useful to the "interests" and it is not often the employers reduce their wages.

But it happens occasionally, as a part of a general deflation, that these men receive a cut in wages (the unkindest cut of all) and then these men go on strike!

* * *

Let us watch their strike: At all times there are 1½ to 3 million unemployed men alternating with other "owners of jobs," on the jobs. The strike starts: These men are good fighters. They fight hard as any cat protecting its young. But soon the meagre resources are spent, hunger sets in, and a question rises * * * Do these men get together, admit they are licked, and settle the strike? No, they are too good fighters to do that.

* * *

They call on all labor to respect their strike, stay off their job and then they step out and take labors' job. By this time unemployed labor is wondering, "How do they do it." How can they strike and work at one time?

* * *

They have called on labor to protect their job. This proves that their "skill" doesn't protect them. Their skill doesn't bring them the "better pay" which they point to as proof of their skill. It would be more reasonable to think that the "now jobless" laborer's ability to live without visible means of support is cause of better pay to the skillful striker. Almost, but not quite. Let it be noted here that there are skilled men who receive sufficient wages, when they work, to carry them through a bonafide workless strike, and that they do have power to raise their wages. But they seldom strike because their wages already cover their expenses, the cost of living being adjusted or based on the needs of workers below him on the wage scale. Thus is a division created in labors ranks.

* * *

It being to the interest of the employing class to foster a condition of division among the working class, it almost seems reasonable to think the skilled man gets better pay for functioning as a "division." A divided working class being helpless before a united employing class, a helpless working class being subject to small pay, it would almost seem that the skilled man is in favor of permitting the robbery of the big majority to continue, so long as he is robbed of less, if any; he receiving certain benefits through the wonderfully adjusted "cost of living."

* * *

It would almost seem (when I say seem, I mean it looks that way) that the skilled man doesn't belong to the working class. When he is organized he is a craftsman—a trade unionist—a trader—and signs contracts acknowledging the rights of employers to do business on his skill for a year or two at a time without interference, regardless of what happens and when the mounting cost of living, (when common labor raises his wages) threatens to deny him food, clothing and shelter, his contract binding him, he finds relief in "conciliation," overtime, bonus and special dispensation, all of which come out of the bosses own pockets, which is well, (if not right in method).

* * *

He doesn't believe in the one big union but believes "a great good" will come out of a litter of small craft unions properly "amalgamated." (He needs education). The only way to educate him is to take his job (there is nothing difficult about it). Let there be an epidemic of boomers on the starvation-proof jobs.

* * *

Sorry I can't start or finish this article. I, too, am an ex-Mechanic, and I'm for the O. B. U.—T-Bone Shim.