

Chapter 1 : From Chattel-slave to Wage-earner: History of Trade Unionism in Trinidad and Tobago by Ram

Ron RAMDIN is a widely-published historian. His books include "From Chattel Slave to Wage Earner" and "Paul Robeson: The Man and his Mission."

You can help Communedia by adding original content, and removing anarchist bias. African American wage workers picking cotton on a plantation in the South. However, it was gradually replaced by the more pragmatic term "wage work" towards the end of the 19th century, as labor organizations shifted their focus to raising wages. That is his misfortuneâ€¦ These menâ€¦ [have] the most terrible, the most imperious of masters, that is, need. Is that to be free? Some defenders of slavery, mainly from the Southern slave states argued that workers were "free but in name" the slaves of endless toil," and that their slaves were better off. Many abolitionists in the U. In The New York Times described the system of wage labor as "a system of slavery as absolute if not as degrading as that which lately prevailed at the South". And, in the value system of the community, those who resisted degradation were in the right. The individual proletarian, property as it were of the entire bourgeois class which buys his labor only when someone has need of it, has no secure existence. Since the chattel slave is property, his value to an owner is in some ways higher than that of a worker who may quit, be fired or replaced. For this reason, in times of recession, chattel slaves could not be fired like wage laborers. A "wage slave" could also be harmed at no or less cost. American chattel slaves in the 19th century had improved their standard of living from the 18th century [26]and, according to historians Fogel and Engerman plantation records show that slaves worked less, were better fed and whipped only occasionallyâ€¦their material conditions in the 19th century being "better than what was typically available to free urban laborers at the time". Similarly, various strategies and struggles adopted by wage laborers contributed to the creation of labor unions and welfare institutions, etc. Nevertheless, worldwide, work-related injuries and illnesses still kill at least 2. If a chattel slave refuses to work, a number of punishments are also available; from beatings to food deprivationâ€¦although economically rational slave owners practiced positive reinforcement to achieve best results and before losing their investment or even friendship by killing an expensive slave. Historically, the range of occupations and status positions held by chattel slaves has been nearly as broad as that held by free persons, indicating some similarities between chattel slavery and wage slavery as well. Arguably, wage slavery, like chattel slavery, does not stem from some immutable "human nature," but represents a "specific response to material and historical conditions" that "reproduce[s] the inhabitants, the social relationsâ€¦ the ideasâ€¦ [and] the social form of daily life. Similarities were blurred by the fact that proponents of wage labor won the American Civil War , in which they competed for legitimacy with defenders of chattel slavery. Both presented an over-positive assessment of their system, while denigrating the opponent. For example, the 19th century Lowell Mill Girls , who, without any knowledge of European radicalism, condemned the "degradation and subordination" of the newly emerging industrial system, and the "new spirit of the age: According to this narrative, any well-intentioned attempt to fundamentally change the status quo is naively utopian and will result in more oppressive conditions. Both did, in some sense create jobs and their investment entailed risk. Marginally, both chattel and wage slaves may become bosses; sometimes by working hard. It may be the "rags to riches" story which occasionally occurs in capitalism, or the "slave to master" story that occurred in places like colonial Brazil, where slaves could buy their own freedom and become business owners, self-employed, or slave owners themselves. Such arrangements were quite common in New World slavery as well, whether in the United States or Brazil. James made a famous argument that most of the techniques of human organization employed on factory workers during the industrial revolution were first developed on slave plantations. The concept seeks to point out how the only rights workers have are those they gain in the labor market. Workers face starvation when unable or unwilling to rent themselves to those who own the capital and means of production. Capitalists , landowners, or sometimes a state elite, own the means of production land, industry etc. This they do in exchange for wages. The 19th century economist Henry George argued that the market economy could be reformed by making land common property. In his view , people should own the productive results of their efforts, but that

everything found in nature, most importantly land, should belong equally to everyone in society. The notion that "[b]asic supply and demand theory would indicate that those economic theories which have utility to others would be provided by economists," entails that "[i]n a system with inequalities of wealth, effective demand is skewed in favor of the wealthy. But whoever imagines, upon this account, that masters rarely combine, is as ignorant of the world as of the subject. Masters are always and everywhere in a sort of tacit, but constant and uniform combination, not to raise the wages of labor above their actual rate." It is not, however, difficult to foresee which of the two parties must, upon all ordinary occasions, have the advantage in the dispute, and force the other into a compliance with their terms. Capitalism Wage slavery as a concept can be a general criticism of capitalism, defined as a condition in which a capitalist class a minority of the population controls all of the necessary non-human components of production capital, land, industry, etc. This sort of criticism is generally associated with socialist and anarchist criticisms of capitalism, and could conceivably be traced back to pre-capitalist figures like Gerrard Winstanley from the radical Christian Diggers movement in England, who wrote in his pamphlet, *The New Law of Righteousness*, that there "shall be no buying or selling, no fairs nor markets, but the whole earth shall be a common treasury for every man," and "there shall be none Lord over others, but every one shall be a Lord of himself. Criticism of capitalism on these grounds, however, might not always be connected to the belief that one should have freedom to work without a boss. To Marx and anarchist thinkers like Bakunin and Kropotkin their concept of wage slavery was as a class condition in place due to the existence of private property and the state. This class situation rested primarily on: Though stock ownership remains highly concentrated in capitalist societies, some workers complement their wage earnings with stock market investments. This can create a conflict of interest when stock profits require outsourcing of jobs or lowering of wages and other benefits. Fascist economic policies were widely accepted in the 20s and 30s and foreign especially US corporate investment in Italy and Germany increased after the fascist take over. Herman argue that U. Fascism has been perceived by some notable critics, like Buenaventura Durruti, to be a last resort weapon of the privileged to ensure the maintenance of wage slavery: No government fights fascism to destroy it. When the bourgeoisie sees that power is slipping out of its hands, it brings up fascism to hold onto their privileges. Without power the leader is inept. The possession of power inevitably leads to corruption" in spite of" good intentions " [Leadership means] power of initiative, this sense of responsibility, the self-respect which comes from expressed manhood, is taken from the men, and consolidated in the leader. Indeed such intelligence from his point of view, by breeding criticism and opposition, is an obstacle and causes confusion. The state of being, in his view, flourishes under a worker-managed workplace and economy, whereas self-ownership entails a materialistic notion of self, created to rationalize the lack of worker control that would allow for a state of being. Proponents of the view that modern forms of employment constitute wage slavery, even when workers appear to have a range of available alternatives, have attributed its perpetuation to a variety of social factors that maintain the hegemony of the employer class. It all starts in their home countries, often India or Bangladesh, where local recruitment agents promise them high salaries and generous overtime payments. However in most cases, it will take them the entire two-to-three year contract for them just to pay back that fee and break even. The resulting professional is an obedient thinker, an intellectual property whom employers can trust to experiment, theorize, innovate and create safely within the confines of an assigned ideology. Thomas Ferguson has postulated in his investment theory of party competition that the undemocratic nature of economic institutions under capitalism causes elections to become occasions when blocs of investors coalesce and compete to control the state. There are no rights of property, only rights to property that is, rights of persons with property, Abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison stated that the use of the term "wage slavery" in a time when chattel slavery was still common was an "abuse of language. It is considered neither an antagonistic nor abusive relationship, and carries no particular moral implications. From this perspective, the problem of poverty comes from an unequal distribution of income and can be addressed by government programs like social security and progressive taxation, and does not reflect a fundamental flaw in the capitalist system. Under this view, a person is not free unless he can sell himself, because if a person does not own themselves, they must be owned by either another individual or a group of individuals. The ability for anyone to consent to an activity or action would then be

placed in the hands of a third party. This regression of ownership would transfer ad infinitum and leave no one with the ability to coordinate their own actions or those of anyone else. The conclusion is therefore that if under wage slavery, self-ownership is not legitimate, there is no right for anyone then to claim enslavement to wages in the first place. Employment contracts Some criticize wage slavery on strictly contractual grounds, e. David Ellerman and Carole Pateman , arguing that the employment contract is a legal fiction in that it treats human beings juridically as mere tools or inputs by abdicating responsibility and self-determination, which the critics argue are inalienable. The answer to the question of how property in the person can be contracted out is that no such procedure is possible. Labour power, capacities or services, cannot be separated from the person of the worker like pieces of property. The noted economist Paul Samuelson described this discrepancy. A man is not even free to sell himself; he must rent himself at a wage. I believe that it would.

Chapter 2 : Talk:Wage slavery/Archive 3 - Wikipedia

Add tags for "From chattel slave to wage earner: a history of trade unionism in Trinidad and Tobago". Be the first.

Virginia was a homemaker and Henry was the manager of a firm of cocoa merchants. They had five children besides Quintin: Lucy, Phillip, Juan, Patrick and Willie. Along with his brothers, Quintin was among a small number of young men in Trinidad whose families could afford to provide them with a secondary education. During their fifteen-year marriage, they had four children. He was opposed within the party by TLP leader A. When the United States established a naval base in the Chaguaramas area, they secretly organized the base workers and eventually won recognition as the bargaining agents for the base employees. They also organized many government workers. In addition, the agreement was a sign from the government to other employers that collective bargaining was to become a normal part of labour relations in Trinidad. In , he submitted a memorandum to the Franchise Committee in favour of universal adult suffrage. The casket containing his body was followed by a large procession through the streets of Port of Spain en route to Lapeyrouse cemetery. Once at the cemetery, people stood graveside and gave panegyrics in his honour. From Chattel Slave to Wage Earner: Social and Economic Studies. Through a Maze of Colour. Key Caribbean Publications Limited. The Transformation of the Caribbean Left. The Autobiography of Alfred H. University of the West Indies Press. Journal of West Indian Literature. The Politics of Communalism: The Agony of the Left in Trinidad and Tobago, Women, Labour and Politics in Trinidad and Tobago: Democracy and Development in the Caribbean. A History of Modern Trinidad, "Forty Years in the Steelbands, Cold War in a Hot Zone: A Sociological Reader 2 ed. Retrieved 22 March

Chapter 3 : Wage-Slavery and Republican Liberty

Thanks to technological progress, one can have material wealth as a wage slave in the modern world that was unimaginable to either the chattel or wage slaves of the past but one is less free now to engage in any social bonding to improve the soul of society or even for personal spiritual worth.

That is his misfortune! These men! [have] the most terrible, the most imperious of masters, that is, need. Is that to be free? Some defenders of slavery, mainly from the Southern slave states argued that workers were "free but in name" the slaves of endless toil," and that their slaves were better off. Many abolitionists in the U. In The New York Times described the system of wage labor as "a system of slavery as absolute if not as degrading as that which lately prevailed at the South". And, in the value system of the community, those who resisted degradation were in the right. The individual proletarian, property as it were of the entire bourgeois class which buys his labor only when someone has need of it, has no secure existence. African American wage workers picking cotton on a plantation in the South. American financier Jay Gould. After hiring strikebreakers, he said "I can hire one-half of the working class to kill the other half. For this reason, in times of recession, chattel slaves could not be fired like wage laborers. A "wage slave" could also be harmed at no or less cost. Similarly, various strategies and struggles adopted by wage laborers contributed to the creation of labor unions and welfare institutions, etc. If a chattel slave refuses to work, a number of punishments are also available; from beatings to food deprivation" although economically rational slave owners practiced positive reinforcement to achieve best results and before losing their investment or even friendship by killing an expensive slave. Historically, the range of occupations and status positions held by chattel slaves has been nearly as broad as that held by free persons, indicating some similarities between chattel slavery and wage slavery as well. Arguably, wage slavery, like chattel slavery, does not stem from some immutable "human nature," but represents a "specific response to material and historical conditions" that "reproduce[s] the inhabitants, the social relations, the ideas, [and] the social form of daily life. For example, the 19th century Lowell Mill Girls , who, without any knowledge of European radicalism, condemned the "degradation and subordination" of the newly emerging industrial system, and the "new spirit of the age: According to this narrative, any well-intentioned attempt to fundamentally change the status quo is naively utopian and will result in more oppressive conditions. Both did, in some sense create jobs and their investment entailed risk. Marginally, both chattel and wage slaves may become bosses; sometimes by working hard. It may be the "rags to riches" story which occasionally occurs in capitalism, or the "slave to master" story that occurred in places like colonial Brazil, where slaves could buy their own freedom and become business owners, self-employed, or slave owners themselves. Such arrangements were quite common in New World slavery as well, whether in the United States or Brazil. James made a famous argument that most of the techniques of human organization employed on factory workers during the industrial revolution were first developed on slave plantations. Proponents of the view that modern forms of employment constitute wage slavery, even when workers appear to have a range of available alternatives, have attributed its perpetuation to a variety of social factors that maintain the hegemony of the employer class. It all starts in their home countries, often India or Bangladesh, where local recruitment agents promise them high salaries and generous overtime payments. However in most cases, it will take them the entire two-to-three year contract for them just to pay back that fee and break even. The resulting professional is an obedient thinker, an intellectual property whom employers can trust to experiment, theorize, innovate and create safely within the confines of an assigned ideology. The concept seeks to point out how the only rights workers have are those they gain in the labor market. Workers face starvation when unable or unwilling to rent themselves to those who own the capital and means of production. Capitalists , landowners, or sometimes a state elite, own the means of production land, industry etc and gain profit or power simply from granting permission to use them. This they do in exchange for wages. The 19th century economist Henry George argued that the market economy could be reformed by making land common property. In his view , people should own the productive results of their efforts, but that everything found in nature, most importantly land, should belong equally to everyone in society. The notion that "[b]asic supply

and demand theory would indicate that those economic theories which have utility to others would be provided by economists," entails that "[i]n a system with inequalities of wealth, effective demand is skewed in favor of the wealthy. But whoever imagines, upon this account, that masters rarely combine, is as ignorant of the world as of the subject. Masters are always and everywhere in a sort of tacit, but constant and uniform combination, not to raise the wages of labor above their actual rate." It is not, however, difficult to foresee which of the two parties must, upon all ordinary occasions, have the advantage in the dispute, and force the other into a compliance with their terms. Capitalism Wage slavery as a concept can be a general criticism of capitalism, defined as a condition in which a capitalist class a minority of the population controls all of the necessary non-human components of production capital, land, industry, etc. This sort of criticism is generally associated with socialist and anarchist criticisms of capitalism, and could conceivably be traced back to pre-capitalist figures like Gerrard Winstanley from the radical Christian Diggers movement in England, who wrote in his pamphlet, *The New Law of Righteousness*, that there "shall be no buying or selling, no fairs nor markets, but the whole earth shall be a common treasury for every man," and "there shall be none Lord over others, but every one shall be a Lord of himself. Cicero wrote in 44 BC that "vulgar are the means of livelihood of all hired workmen whom we pay for mere manual labour, not for artistic skill; for in their case the very wage they receive is a pledge of their slavery. Criticism of capitalism on these grounds, however, might not always be connected to the belief that one should have freedom to work without a boss. To Marx and anarchist thinkers like Bakunin and Kropotkin their concept of wage slavery was as a class condition in place due to the existence of private property and the state. This class situation rested primarily on the existence of property not intended for active use, the concentration of ownership in few hands, the lack of direct access by workers to the means of production and consumption goods the perpetuation of a reserve army of unemployed workers. Though stock ownership remains highly concentrated in capitalist societies, some workers complement their wage earnings with stock market investments. This can create a conflict of interest when stock profits require outsourcing of jobs or lowering of wages and other benefits. Fascist economic policies were widely accepted in the 20s and 30s and foreign especially US corporate investment in Italy and Germany increased after the fascist take over. Herman argue that U. Fascism has been perceived by some notable critics, like Buenaventura Durruti, to be a last resort weapon of the privileged to ensure the maintenance of wage slavery: No government fights fascism to destroy it. When the bourgeoisie sees that power is slipping out of its hands, it brings up fascism to hold onto their privileges. Without power the leader is inept. The possession of power inevitably leads to corruption in spite of good intentions [Leadership means] power of initiative, this sense of responsibility, the self-respect which comes from expressed manhood, is taken from the men, and consolidated in the leader. Indeed such intelligence from his point of view, by breeding criticism and opposition, is an obstacle and causes confusion. The state of being, in his view, flourishes under a worker-managed workplace and economy, whereas self-ownership entails a materialistic notion of self, created to rationalize the lack of worker control that would allow for a state of being. David Ellerman and Carole Pateman, arguing that the employment contract is a legal fiction in that it treats human beings juridically as mere tools or inputs by abdicating responsibility and self-determination, which the critics argue are inalienable. The answer to the question of how property in the person can be contracted out is that no such procedure is possible. Labour power, capacities or services, cannot be separated from the person of the worker like pieces of property. The noted economist Paul Samuelson described this discrepancy. A man is not even free to sell himself; he must rent himself at a wage. I believe that it would.

Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer - no Kindle device required.

There may be various agreements and stipulations for conditions the employer wishes to impose but unless the employer is reselling the employees labor to a third party, there is more often than not no Employment contract and what would be in its place is an implicit network of commercial and common law and the specific laws of various jurisdictions. The very fact of a contract implies a relation between legal equals and is normally absent in my experience for the range of phenomena which the article title covers. There is a commonality between it and the subject matter of this article wrt language and the understanding of social and economic phenomena. Unfortunately these fora are critically limited by the intellectual stature of the interlocutors. It also reveals the shift of "wage slavery" from meaning all wage work, to "low wages", i. Here are a few quotes you may find interesting: This path, however, also has implications for movement continuance. Once the KOL was no longer able to present a comprehensive ideological and cultural alternative to the trade union movement, there was little incentive for movement members to continue their allegiance. Without an organization to carry its host ideology, wage slavery no longer referred to a real alternative of wage freedom, nor did it articulate concrete strategy by which it could be achieved. It did not happen because they were being beaten about the head by capitalists and industrialists. Of course, you should avoid synthesis and jumping to conclusions not actually stated in the sources. It is a general term It is a popular culture term. There are certain rules that we must live by on wikipedia, otherwise this project would never work. Those rules include, presenting facts not opinions , keeping language and presentation neutral and balanced. Not including original research or synthesis , and only presenting arguments that have already been made elsewhere, and that can be sourced to a reliable source. Also, we should try to be polite to each other, and not use sockpuppets to argue on our behalf. This is essentially what you are doing here from the other side of the political spectrum. Please, lets try to avoid another edit war. No one makes any changes to the article unless we have consensus. First presenting here on the talk page suggested changes together with appropriate cited sources. Lastly, I suggest patience and restraint. That fact is, no one is going to read this page and go out and start a revolution no matter what it says. Turning, or trying to turn the article into what can only be termed a propaganda forum of original research Coming back here to reinstate deleted material that has been shown to be against consensus and non neutral over and over does not accomplish the goals of presenting well rounded and balanced information. So there you are, pointing your finger at me, accusing me of bias, when you were the one coming to false conclusions based on your biased preconceptions. Back in the day you used words such as "preposterous". The essay PROVES that that was one of the main uses of the term as opposed to the "peonage" which you apparently fabricated. Now, if you choose to ignore the very essay you originally quoted because it goes against your pre-conceived notions, well, so be it, use your power and cartel relationship with skip to marginalize me, but everyone here, including yourself, will know you have no intellectual integrity. Tell me and try to prove which of the 5 changes you believe to be "synthesis" as skip claims. I backed every single change with substantial evidence and I tried hard to not include anything that could be labeled "synthesis". After all this, amazingly, skip then calls me a "sockpuppet". More controversially, others point to the similarities between owning and employing a person , and extend the term to cover a wide range of employment relationships in a hierarchical social environment with limited aspects of wage job-related choices e. The change is due to the information I found in the VERY footnote that LK had placed at the end of the lead paragraph, which indeed explained the reasons for the change from "wage slavery" to "wage work" and revealed the important identification of low wages with "wage slavery". As I mentioned, I nor anyone else has found evidence for "peonage" hence the lack of a footnote. This resulted in "neoslavery Is anyone denying that their "newly found status as wage laborers allowed" for these new abuses? For example, using diagnostic criteria from the DSM-IV; Robert Hare , a University of British Columbia Psychology Professor and FBI consultant, provides a detailed analysis comparing the legal person embodied in the modern, profit-driven

corporation to that of a clinically diagnosed psychopath. His findings corroborate typical psychopathic behavior such as superficiality, callous unconcern for the feelings of others, incapacity to maintain enduring relationships, diffusion of responsibility, emphasis on short-term goals, predatory egotism, reckless disregard for the safety of others, deceitfulness: Read the first change in the post above to see what the 2 main uses of "wage slavery" are. More controversially, others point to the similarities between owning and employing a person, and extend the term to cover a wide range of employment relationships in a hierarchical social environment with limited aspects of wage job-related choices e. People can be banned from Wikipedia for rudeness. Also, we would all appreciate it if you could indent your replies. It makes for easier reading. As for your question, I read the article you posted as footnote from wage slaves to wage workers and it documents precisely what I quote i. I am indebted to you for finding that essay. I must say that this article has benefited the most when people with different points of view had vigorous exchanges. You are welcome to read the whole text "from wage slaves to wage workers" but I think the quotations I showed you earlier encapsulate the text for the purposes needed. Now, if by the controversiality of the former meaning of "wage slavery", is meant a lack of consensus, it suffices to say that many mainstream economics do not believe the employer-employee relationship in capitalism is exploitative. Also how is it that this user has two accounts? Both of which are like tag teaming alternatives to blocking periods? Accusing two editors as desperate as him and I is actually a little comical. He is a mainstream economist while I am a heterodox influenced one. We have one thing in common though. We appreciate neutral unbiased information. As long as a subject is notable, it is going to get covered in Wikipedia. By leading information as you have done to a general pov A reader can think for themselves if presented good information. Leading a reader is obvious That IS my right. If you think I made more than 3 reverts in 24 hours prove it. We know what you did yesterday, when, to evade the suspension from violation of the 3 revert-rule, you contacted LK to request a third from him--a sockpuppet action in effect. So you better look in the mirror. Secondly, what I meant is that the additions that I made were a considerable amount of work, so when I get someone like you dismissing them right away after calling me "communist agitrop" I do not appreciate it. As for your complaints of bias, and "pov I challenge you to find a single unverifiable, non-factual statement. Plus you are tiring everyone here by repeating yourself. So either discuss each fact, or quit making dime-a-dozen general statements. It would be just as easy for me to say "by leading information as you have done to a general pov We have tried to give friendly advice. Presenting information only in the light of a pov does everyone a disservice. The article is already loaded with refs Any one reading the article previously probably thought it a piece of propaganda more than an encyclopedia entry. Wage slave is a general term More than that is making the article into someones idea of an essay on a different or different subjects. If that is the lazy accusatory attitude you want to maintain I suggest you leave this discussion and this article and give space to those who want participate in improving the article and correcting inaccuracies and factual errors. Anything less would be a disservice to the people who want to learn from wikipedia. Anarchism leftist politics etc Probably the current material can be trimmed back in that regard further. Some uses of the term refer to various forms of unfree labour , such as peonage. This controversial latter use points to the similarities between owning and employing a person , and extends the term to cover a wide range of employment relationships in a hierarchical social environment with a limited set of job-related choices e. I deleted the last comment added as the section was calling a specific editor out after asking the poster not to do so and was pretty much an attack post. Can everyone try to respect the other side and work to improve the article? It takes both sides to do so, and I feel all parties including me can do better. Recently I have tried to remove some aspects that rely on interpretations or o. The article still needs streamlining and copy editing for clarity and probably more close inspection looking to make for more neutral presentation. Also it would be nice to have more modern thinking aspects as to the last 10 or 20 years in the article. It is probably over-weight yet with to narrow a perspective as to political aspects, mostly leading round in the same direction, though obviously the socialist, anarchist, information is valuable. Also notice that pointing at evidence of retaliation IS wikipedia policy. These huge deletions are always made by skip after heated discussions. Pointing this out is not an "attack" against skip, anymore than saying "George W. Bush invaded Iraq" is an attack on George W. Anthropologist David Graeber has noted that, historically, the first wage labor

contracts we know about—whether in ancient Greece or Rome, or in the Malay or Swahili city states in the Indian ocean—were in fact contracts for the rental of chattel slaves usually the owner would receive a share of the money, and the slave, another, with which to maintain his or her living expenses. Such arrangements were quite common in New World slavery as well, whether in the United States or Brazil. James made a famous argument that most of the techniques of human organization employed on factory workers during the industrial revolution were first developed on slave plantations. Some critics of capitalism argue that wage slavery is present in all capitalist societies, even the richest ones. This has to do with two factors: The higher wages received by some workers in industrialized countries do not eliminate the authoritarianism critics perceive in capitalist institutions — just as the improving material conditions of chattel slaves in the American south did not eliminate the institution of chattel slavery. If Labor is treated as commodity, just like food or healthcare, the lack of democratic control of industry means that workers do not have a say over decisions in proportion to how much they are affected by those decisions.

Chapter 5 : Chattel Slavery | Fight Slavery Now!

Based on historical data, a wage earner in the north at the time when slavery was still practiced legally stood a pretty good chance of starving, could be deprived of his or her home, and in many cases, his or her life had less value than that of a slave in the south.

Over the past half-century, the answer to this seemingly simple question has changed continuously. In the s and s it usually denoted male breadwinners who earned a living in agriculture, industry, mining, or transport. In the s and s objections from feminists instigated a fundamental revision that broadened the focus beyond the male head of the household to include the wife and children. Occupational groups that tended to be overlooked in the past, such as domestic servants and prostitutes, started to receive serious consideration. The chronological and geographic scope of the research expanded as well. Labour historians became interested in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, and took a closer look at pre-industrial wage earners. Our overall perspective on the working class has undergone a paradigmatic revolution. The signs indicate that this first transition is merely a harbinger of a second one. However broadly labour historians have interpreted their discipline thus far, their main interest has always been free workers and their families. Sociologists, anthropologists, and historians studying the capitalist periphery had observed decades ago that the distinctions between free wage-earners and some other subordinate groups were very fine indeed. In the early s, V. The distinctions between free, self-employed, unfree, and sub-proletarian workers are also challenged by Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker in their book *The Many-Headed Hydra*. These authors deal less with the periphery of capitalism than with relations between the core region emerging in the 17th and 18th centuries Britain and its colonies across the Atlantic in North America and the Caribbean. They consider the members of the underclass, whose labour made nascent capitalism possible. Reviews have appeared in journals and newspapers such as *The Washington Post*; it has also led to discussions such as in the *New York Review of Books*. Part of the reason why the book achieves such a strong impact is undoubtedly that it is very well written and covers enthralling subjects, such as pirates, mutinies, and conspiracies. Their romanticized descriptions do not, however, conceal that beneath the narrative of rebelliousness and bloody repression, there lies subject matter that is immensely important for labour history as a discipline. Linebaugh and Rediker transform our perspective entirely. *The Many-Headed Hydra* is a history of British capitalism in the North Atlantic region from about to the early 19th century. The chief concern was to find people who provided their labour under economic or physical coercion. Linebaugh and Rediker refer to the entire motley crew of labouring poor as proletarian, regardless of their specific legal status. Linebaugh and Rediker, 2003, and 1999 At some points deference prevailed and at others rebelliousness, like an undulation of acquiescence and resistance. The authors identify four general periods in the history of capitalism. The first began in the early decades of the 17th century, when the foundations of British capitalism were established with the enclosures and other expropriation practices. The system spread through trade and colonization across the Atlantic Ocean. This trend coincided with the bloody emergence of the Atlantic proletariat in its many manifestations as servants, sailors, and slaves. The English Revolution ushered in a second period, in which the new proletariat began to agitate, as is clear both from radical-plebeian movements and from the rise of a buccaneering culture and colonial rebellions. The third period ranges from the s until the mid-18th century. This consolidation, however, met with several challenges from below, that climaxed in a conspiracy in New York in which the participants were Irish and Hispanic, and in which Africans from the Gold Coast played a crucial role. The fourth and final period roughly begins from onward, and protest was once again the central element. That year a cycle of revolts began in the Caribbean and continued for nearly two decades. In the American Revolution began as well. Linebaugh and Rediker, Voluntary and forced migration and the permanent mobility of the seafarers ensured continuous circulation of revolutionary ideas. Their immediate reaction was brutal repression and terror. On the one hand, the social composition of the proletariat was changed after each wave of protest. Linebaugh and Rediker regard the recent uprising in Haiti as the only conceivable reason for this sudden reversal. Like all good books, however, *The Many-Headed Hydra* has

considerably more to offer than this summary suggests. As I mentioned, I am primarily interested in its more general methodological and theoretical implications for labour historiography. The book provides convincing evidence that the labouring poor across the Atlantic exchanged radical ideas, and that slaves and free workers joined forces on many occasions. This revelation is of lasting merit. But Linebaugh and Rediker appear to be far more presumptive. They call for a comprehensive revision of current theory on working-class formation. The working class comprises everybody who performs dependent labour under capitalism, which includes slaves, wage-earners, indentured labourers, and other workers. Labour historians, therefore, need to perceive their task in far broader terms than they have generally done thus far and should study all dependent workers from the 16th century to the present. Linebaugh and Rediker do not truly substantiate their position. *The Many-Headed Hydra* is strong on narratives but considerably weaker in its theoretical analysis. In fact, the only reasons the authors mention for regarding waged and non-waged workers as members of the same class is their close collaboration in various struggles. Such coalitions are obviously not the only ground, though, since a great deal depends on whether the shared interests that underlie them are temporary or permanent. The lack of analysis based on class theory is the main shortcoming of *The Many-Headed Hydra*. Linebaugh and Rediker do not argue that class analysis is superfluous; rather, they do not perform it adequately. This idea appears not only in liberal theory but also in the work of authors such as Marx. Several authors have argued that unfree labour is fundamentally compatible with capitalist relations. This conclusion is in fact rather obvious. Why does this have to be the case? Why can labour not be sold by a party other than the bearer? What prevents the person who provides labour his or her own or that of somebody else from offering packages combining the labour with labour means? And why can a slave not perform wage labour for his master at the estate of some third party? Asking these questions brings us very close to the idea that slaves, wage-labourers, share-croppers, and others are in fact an internally differentiated proletariat. After all, in his extensive study elaborating on the work of Robert Miles and others, Moulrier Boutang supplies arguments supporting the position that bonded labour is essential for capitalism to function, both in the past and nowadays. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, who have also been inspired by Moulrier Boutang, summarize a substantial portion of his theory as follows: Slavery and servitude can be perfectly compatible with capitalist production, as mechanisms that limit the mobility of the labor force and block its movements. Slavery, servitude, and all the other guises of the coercive organization of labor “from coolieism in the Pacific and peonage in Latin America to apartheid in South Africa” are all essential elements internal to the process of capitalist development. Capitalists would always have a certain choice how they wished to mobilize labour-power. And bonded labour would under many circumstances remain an alternative. If this conclusion is justified, then labour historians will indeed be expected to expand their field of research considerably. Linebaugh and Rediker write: First, the transcontinental proletariat is neither limited to the North Atlantic nor to regions where English is spoken. The multi-ethnic world of the sailors included Spanish, French, and Dutch fleets as well. Second, the concealed history obviously did not cease around Modest and ambitious in scope, *The Many-Headed Hydra* is a fascinating contribution to a new way of thought. Similar definitions were applied by non-Marxists as well. The review incorrectly suggests that *The Many-Headed Hydra* is primarily about slavery. Readers of this journal have been familiar with some of the themes for a long time. Research in *Critical Marxist Theory* forthcoming. A System of Sociology; London, Linebaugh and Rediker, Of course, Linebaugh dealt with this theme previously in *The London Hanged. The Debate Continues* Berne Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy. Harmondsworth, Van Royen, Jaap R. Bruijn, and Jan Lucassen, eds. Baltimore and London; and Herman Ketting Jr. *Historical Variations in the Use of Unfree Labor*, c. Historical Anomaly or Political Strategy?

A slave. Chattel slavery is what most people have in mind when they think of the kind of slavery that existed in the United States before the Civil War, and that.

How inequality of wealth destroys liberty Edward Bellamy "Nevertheless," said the doctor, "I have stated only half the reason the judges would give wherefore they could not, by returning your wealth, permit the impairment of our collective economic system and the beginnings of economic inequality in the nation. There is another great and equal right of all men which, though strictly included under the right of life, is by generous minds set even above it: If it were attempted to kidnap a citizen and reduce him by force to slavery, the state would interfere, but not otherwise. Nevertheless, it was true in your day of liberty and personal independence, as of life, that the perils to which they were chiefly exposed were not from force or violence, but resulted from economic causes, the necessary consequences of inequalities of wealth. Because the state absolutely ignored this side, which was incomparably the largest side of the liberty question, its pretense of defending the liberties of citizens was as gross a mockery as that of guaranteeing their lives. Nay, it was a yet more absolute mockery and on a far vaster scale. That is to say, they accepted servitude to the possessing class and became their serfs on condition of receiving the means of subsistence. Although multitudes were always perishing from lack of subsistence, yet it was not the deliberate policy of the possessing class that they should do so. The rich had no use for dead men; on the other hand, they had endless use for human beings as servants, not only to produce more wealth, but as the instruments of their pleasure and luxury. The rich had no power to compel the poor to be their servants. They only took such as came voluntarily to ask to be taken into service, and even begged to be, with tears. Surely a service so sought after could scarcely be called compulsory. Was it because the poor so loved the rich? The distinction between forced service and such service as that would seem quite imperceptible to us. If a man may be said to do voluntarily that which only the pressure of bitter necessity compels him to elect to do, there has never been any such thing as slavery, for all the acts of a slave are at the last the acceptance of a less evil for fear of a worse. Suppose, Julian, you or a few of you owned the main water supply, or food supply, clothing supply, land supply, or main industrial opportunities in a community and could maintain your ownership, that fact alone would make the rest of the people your slaves, would it not, and that, too, without any direct compulsion on your part whatever? What hypocrisy could have been so brazen as that pretense when, as a matter of fact, every contract made between the capitalist who had bread and could keep it and the laborer who must have it or die would have been declared void, if fairly judged, even under your laws as a contract made under duress of hunger, cold, and nakedness, nothing less than the threat of death! If you own the things men must have, you own the men who must have them. In that sense we are all under compulsory servitude to Nature. That is the whole difference between slavery and freedom. To-day no man serves another, but all the common good in which we equally share. That is a hard word. Let us look at the question. Slavery exists where there is a compulsory using of men by other men for the benefit of the users. I think we are quite agreed that the poor man in your day worked for the rich only because his necessities compelled him to. That compulsion varied in force according to the degree of want the worker was in. Those who had a little economic means would only render the lighter kinds of service on more or less easy and honorable conditions, while those who had less means or no means at all would do anything on any terms however painful or degrading. With the mass of the workers the compulsion of necessity was of the sharpest kind. The chattel slave had the choice between working for his master and the lash. The wage-earner chose between laboring for an employer or starving. In the older, cruder forms of slavery the masters had to be watching constantly to prevent the escape of their slaves, and were troubled with the charge of providing for them. Your system was more convenient, in that it made Nature your taskmaster, and depended on her to keep your servants to the task. The slave received subsistence--clothing and shelter--and the wage-earner who could get more than these out of his wages was rarely fortunate. The rate of wages, except in new countries and under special conditions and for skilled workers, kept at about the subsistence point, quite as often dropping below as rising above. The main difference was that the master expended the

subsistence wage of the chattel slave for him while the earner expended it for himself. This was better for the worker in some ways; in others less desirable, for the master out of self-interest usually saw that the chattel, children had enough; while the employer, having no stake in the life or health of the wage-earner, did not concern himself as to whether he lived or died. There were never any slave quarters so vile as the tenement houses of the city slums where the wage-earners were housed. In all save temporarily fortunate countries with sparse population the laborer would have been glad indeed to exchange the right to leave his employer for a guarantee that he would not be discharged by him. Was it not so? He could by merit rise out of his condition and become himself an employer, a rich man. The freedmen in ancient Rome rose to places of importance and power quite as frequently as did the born proletarian of Europe or America get out of his condition. The prospect of rising as a motive to reconcile the wage-earner or the poor man in general to his subjection, what did it amount to? No true man should wish to rise save to raise others with him. If here and there the anger of the chattel slave owner made him forget his self-restraint so far as to cripple or maim his slaves, yet such cases were on the whole rare, and such masters were held to an account by public opinion if not by law; but under the wage system the employer had no motive of self-restraint to spare life or limb of his employees, and he escaped responsibility by the fact of the consent and even eagerness of the needy people to undertake the most perilous and painful tasks for the sake of bread. We read that in the United States every year at least two hundred thousand men, women, and children were done to death or maimed in the performance of their industrial duties, nearly forty thousand alone in the single branch of the steam railroad service. No estimate seems to have ever been attempted of the many times greater number who perished more indirectly through the injurious effects of bad industrial conditions. What chattel-slave system ever made a record of such wastefulness of human life, as that? How was it in this respect under the rule of the rich? We read in our histories that great armies of women in your day were forced by poverty to make a business of submitting their bodies to those who had the means of furnishing them a little bread. The books say that these armies amounted in your great cities to bodies of thirty or forty thousand women. Tales come down to us of the magnitude of the maiden tribute levied upon the poorer classes for the gratification of the lusts of those who could pay, which the annals of antiquity could scarcely match for horror. Am I saying too much, Julian? They were, as we might say, too near the eyes to be seen aright. You are far enough away from the facts now to begin to see them clearly and to realize their significance. As you shall continue to occupy this modern view point, you will more and more completely come to see with us that the most revolting aspect of the human condition before the great Revolution was not the suffering from physical privation or even the outright starvation of multitudes which directly resulted from the unequal distribution of wealth, but the indirect effect of that inequality to reduce almost the total human race to a state of degrading bondage to their fellows. As it seems to us, the offense of the old order against liberty was even greater than the offense to life; and even if it were conceivable that it could have satisfied the right of life by guaranteeing abundance to all, it must just the same have been destroyed, for, although the collective administration of the economic system had been unnecessary to guarantee life, there could be no such thing as liberty so long as by the effect of inequalities of wealth and the private control of the means of production the opportunity of men to obtain the means of subsistence depended on the will of other men.

Chapter 7 : Slaves vs. Wage Earners? | Yahoo Answers

Primitive communism, chattel slavery, serf slavery, and wage slavery were necessary stepping-stones in the evolution of society. View in context It can be argued that slavery became wage slavery in the satanic mills and factories of the 'Great' British Empire.

A movable article of personal property. Any article of tangible property other than land, buildings, and other things annexed to land. Chattel slavery is what most people have in mind when they think of the kind of slavery that existed in the United States before the Civil War, and that existed legally throughout many parts of the world as far back as recorded history. Shamefully, this exact kind of slavery still exists today, mostly in the East African countries of Mauritania and Sudan. While this practice is probably the least prevalent of the contemporary forms of slavery, still many thousands of people are so enslaved. Chattel slavery in Mauritania and Sudan is quite gruesome. These two countries divide the African and Arab cultures. A person can become the property of another for life, bought, traded, inherited or acquired as a gift. Girls as young as ten are being captured on raids of villages. To prevent escape they are branded like cattle with hot metal objects. Female genital mutilation and castration are frequently imposed punishments. Republic of the Sudan This war torn country has seen unending civil strife in recent decades, including the genocide in Darfur. In Sudan, slavery is making a comeback as the result of a war waged over the past twelve years by the Muslim north against the Christians and Animists in the south. Government-armed Arab militias are known to kill the men and enslave the women and children as personal property or to march them north to be auctioned off and sold. Anti-Slavery International reports that there is probably no village in the north without kidnapped black slaves. Gasper Biro, a special UN human rights monitor, has reported that the price of slavery has changed over time. In , a woman or child could be bought from the Dinka tribe – an exceedingly tall and proud pastoral people of the Nile, could be bought for ninety dollars. Although the national government has repeatedly banned the practice, most recently in , many human rights group see this as mere window-dressing with little enforcement effort. The number of slaves in the country is not known exactly, and estimates range widely. At least 90, darker-skinned Africans still live as the property of the Muslim Berber communities. This percentage of slaves is the highest in the world. These slaves are chattel. They are used for house or farm labor, for sex, and for breeding. They may be exchanged for camels, trucks, guns, or money. Children of chattel slaves remain the property of their master. Fatma Mint Mamodou, Mauritania Fatma Mint Mamodou was born a slave, just as everyone in her family had for generations been born into slavery. This state is not remarkable to her. Not much is remarkable to her. Is that what you mean by rape? She gave birth to her own son in a field with the goats. He would immediately become the property of her master, just as she had.

Chapter 8 : Wage slavery - Wikipedia

Serfs, slaves, or wage earners? The legal status of labour in Russia from a comparative perspective, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century Alessandro Stanziani.*

Megan Erickson In a recent interview, historian Quentin Skinner had the following to say about Karl Marx and the republican theory of liberty. I am very struck by the extent to which Marx deploys, in his own way, a neo-Roman political vocabulary. He talks about wage slaves, and he talks about the dictatorship of the proletariat. He insists that, if you are free only to sell your labour, then you are not free at all. He stigmatises capitalism as a form of servitude. These are all recognizably neo-Roman moral commitments. It is not just Marx or even primarily Marx who believed that the neo-roman theory of freedom leads directly to a critique of wage-slavery. As early as the late 1780s, urban workers seized on the inherited republicanism of the American Revolution and applied it to the wage-labor relationship. Their only chance of leading a decent life was if some employer would give them a job. Though formally free, these workers were nonetheless economically dependent and thus unfree. That is why they saw themselves as denied their rightful republican liberty, and why wage-labor merited the name slavery. Skidmore made the comparison with classical slavery the most explicit: For he, in all countries is a slave, who must work more for another than that other must work for him. It does not matter how this state of things is brought about; whether the sword of victory hew down the liberty of the captive, and thus compel him to labor for his conqueror, or whether the sword of want extort our consent, as it were, to a voluntary slavery, through a denial to us of the materials of nature. The critique of wage-slavery in the name of republican liberty could hardly be clearer. Given their analysis of wage-labor, these artisan republicans were inexorably led to radical conclusions about the conditions that could restore workers their full independence. And it was to be distributed not just in the form of land, but cooperative control over factories and other implements. There is an important historical connection between these radical artisans and Marx. As Maximilien Rubel and Lewis Feuer have shown, just at the time that Marx turned from Hegelian philosophy to political economy, in 1842, he began to read comparative political history. He was particularly interested in the American republic, and read three main sources: Beaumont, Tocqueville, and a less well-known Englishman, Thomas Hamilton. Hamilton was a former colonel who wrote his own, very popular observation of his time traveling in the United States called *Men and Manners in America*, published in 1827. Unbeknownst to Marx, he was copying a copy. Marx never knew these labor republicans by name, nor any of their primary writings, but it is clear from his notebooks that their ideas and political self-organization contributed to his early thinking, especially at the moment at which he was formulating his view of workers as the universal class. It is there that Marx makes the famous distinction between political and human emancipation, arguing that the American republic shows us most clearly the distinction between the two. In the United States, the republican critique of wage-labor went into abeyance for a time after the 1820s, or more appropriately, it was absorbed into the agrarian socialism of the National Reform Association—a tale masterfully told by the historian Mark Lause in *Young America: Land, Labor and Republican Community*. The Knights used the republican concept of liberty to assert the universal interests of labor and to argue for the transformation of American society. They were self-conscious appeals to the republican theory. In fact, the labor republicans not only drew on the republican theory but further developed it in light of the new dynamics of industrial capitalism. They noted that there were two interconnected forms of dependence. One was the general or structural dependence of the wage-laborer on employers, defined by the fact that the monopoly of control over productive property by some left the rest dependent upon those owners for their livelihoods. As Skinner has shown in his book on Hobbes, it is precisely this conflation of voluntaristic action and freedom that modern republicans have always rejected, and which their enemies, like Hobbes, have regularly defended. After all, the contract was an agreement of obedience in exchange for wages. Indeed, even if the wages were fairly high, the point of the contract was to become subject to the will of a specific owner or his manager. It is no accident that it would feature so heavily in labor republican arguments about domination in the workplace. Only when the class differences between owners and workers were removed could republican liberty be truly

universalized. It would, at once, remove the structural and personal dependence of workers. Here was a series of arguments that flowed naturally from the principles of the American Revolution.

Chapter 9 : Quintin O'Connor - Wikipedia

The presence of chattel slaves in the empire was related to territorial expansion, and to commercial relations with the Caucasus and the Ottoman Empire. Russian forms of bondage are compared to those in other situations, such as indentured service in the West, debt servitude in India, and Islamic slavery.

We print below a serious and highly informative study of an important phase of the class struggle in the United States. For example, in our opinion, the causes for the revival of slavery are treated too sketchily and one-sidedly; the same applies to the elucidation of the reasons why cotton planting expanded in slave form rather than as wage labor. Nor are the concrete conditions under which the Civil War developed treated adequately. Regrettable is the omission of all reference to the clash between slave agriculture and small farming which played an important role in the course of events at the time. We hope that the publication of this article will lead to a closer study and further discussion and illumination of the contributions already made by the author. It has also been said that slavery was on its way out in America after the Revolution but received a new lease on life in from the invention of the cotton gin. These two statements suggest an inconsistency. They raise the question "if free labor is more efficient, why did the cotton gin revive the system of slave labor? And if slavery had an upsurge in , why did it disappear in ? An attempt to answer these questions reveals a thread of economic development running from to , unbroken by the Civil War. Slavery imposed burdens upon the masters. Most of the slave states had laws requiring slaveowners to furnish their slaves with adequate food and clothing and to care for the aged and crippled. Penalties were also imposed on anyone who injured the slave of another whether through overwork or beating. Some states fixed maximum hours of work. Obligations of slaveowners applied equally to overseers and to sheriffs who detained or hired out fugitive slaves. Here are some of these laws. Obligation of master to slave unless otherwise indicated. Code Ormond Bagby and Goldthwaite, Secs. As the Civil War approached, the slave laws in several Southern states became more and more severe. North Carolina Acts , p. Carolina Stats, at Large. II "adequate clothing; ibid. XXII "adequate food and clothing for runaway slaves held by sheriff; ibid. XXII "adequate food; ibid. XLIV "hour day. Carolina Stats, at Large, Vol. XIII "white servants "adequate food and lodging, not to be overworked or beaten excessively; Sec. XIX "support sick servants; Sec. XXII "clothing at end of servitude; ibid. XXV "support of sick servant; Sec. XXVI "clothing at end of term. V "adequate food, clothing and lodging; Acts of the Assembly, now [] in force in the colony of Virginia p. V "adequate food, clothing and lodging; Sec. XV, maintain during sickness. Acts of the Assembly, now [] in force in the colony of Virginia "p. The South Carolina and Georgia maximum work-day of 15 and 16 hours respectively seem fantastically long, but industrial capitalism denied the principle of limitation altogether see below in text ; and British industry in the Nineteenth Century maintained much longer working hours. Compare Marx, Capital, Ch. Toward the end of the season, after reduction from double to single shift, the remaining single shift was sometimes worked 23 hours out of Obviously, these laws were maximum hour, minimum, wage and pension laws adapted to a system of chattel slavery. After slavery was abolished, all such laws were held unconstitutional when aimed at employers of wage labor. The capitalist would submit to no shackles such as a slaveowning society had imposed upon its members. But after the depression of , this very same type of legislation reappears on the capitalist scene: These facts and others mentioned hereafter provide a clue to the causes for the spurt which slavery took in and for its disappearance in They also show that the same causes continued to operate uninterruptedly and ushered in a new phase of American capitalism after We shall first analyze the respective characteristics of wage labor and slavery which gave slavery its second wind in Then we shall show how these same characteristics brought the downfall in not only of the slave system but of the social obligations imposed by law upon the master toward the slave. On the one hand, there is the competition of work by independent proprietors with that of slaves; on the other, the competition of wage labor and slave labor. Settlement of the continent involved only the first of these phases. Farms were originally cultivated by independent peasant proprietors. Since there were not enough wage laborers either in America or Europe to supply hands for large plantations, slaves were imported

to furnish employee labor where such was needed. Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, p. Since the early competition was between independent, farm proprietors and slaveowning planters, it follows that the slaveowners were the first large-scale employers in United States history. In the Southern colonies slave labor proved more efficient than the work of independent proprietors for two chief reasons, both springing from the nature of the regional crops. The Northern colonies were found suited to cereal crops [1] ; the Southern to sugar, rice, tobacco, and cotton Ibid. On the one hand the cotton could be cultivated more efficiently over large than over small areas. On the other, the concentration of field hands per acre for cotton and allied crops kept down the expense of supervision. Wheat or corn required one laborer per each twenty acres; tobacco and cotton one laborer for every two or three acres Ibid. Under slavery the Northern crops would require almost as many overseers as slaves and the expense of supervision would tend to wipe out any gain from large-scale operations. With the Southern crops that was not so. Under these circumstances, the independent peasant proprietor in the Southern colonies could not compete with the slaveowner when the English colonies were first settled. But in and after there was a different problem. The industrial revolution brought industries, particularly to the Northern colonies. These were not operated solely by their owners. They required labor, which was supplied by immigration from Europe. In the South, too, there was a pool of free labor never surpassed in numbers by the slave population Cairnes, op. Olmsted, *Seaboard Slave States*, p. The responsibility of the employer of free labor is at an end when he has paid the covenanted wages. Two of these considerations are clearly beside the point. Similarly, saying that slaves can do only simple tasks, and that wage labor is needed for complicated work would, if true [4] , furnish no reason why slave labor should surpass wage labor for simple work. One alleged disadvantage of slave labor is often cited: Analysis will show that two of the reasons mentioned constitute real advantages of wage labor over slave labor: You can extract more work out of the laborer by hope of reward than by fear of punishment; the wage laborer is paid only if, as and when he works, while the slave involves an overall capital investment. A third advantage is that the means of discipline used against wage earners are much less costly than those used against slaves. The suggested disadvantage of slavery "that it hinders diversified agriculture" puts the cart before the horse. The fact is that slave labor tends to flourish when agriculture is limited to one crop. This phenomenon dovetails with the respective modes of enforcing discipline on wage and slave labor. In order to demonstrate these propositions, it is necessary to examine the concrete workings of the two systems. Under the wage system the employer hires the laborer only if, as and when he needs him. But this merely negative freedom from responsibility is pyramided into an affirmative asset. VI, VII ; in modern parlance, they are geared to the cost of living. This means that, by hypothesis, the laborer has no surplus, and every layoff carries with it the threat of starvation. Thus the wage system has the beauty of furnishing a means of discipline which costs the employer nothing and which is actually an offshoot of his initial freedom from responsibility. Formerly, docking wages was also used as punishment, but at present it is generally prohibited for infractions other than failing to report for work. Docking not only cost the employer nothing but brought him additional profit. Moreover, the wage system has still another spur which costs the employer just as little as coercion. As against this, the slaveowner must first of all support the slave throughout life, whether working or not. All three "the patrols, the overseer and the lash" cost money. The overseer perhaps has his counterpart in the foreman. But quasi-military patrols and corporal punishment were costs without parallel under the wage system. Discipline becomes an item of expense. The spur of self-advancement falls away. The greater efficiency of the wage system thus rests on a specific and tangible basis. A few quotations point up this view. The novelist Celine [6] observes, regarding the quasi slavery in French West Africa. The cudgel ultimately tires the person who wields it, whereas the hope of becoming rich and powerful with which the whites are burdened, costs nothing, absolutely nothing. Even its individual consumption is, within certain limits, a mere factor in the process of production. Celine reports the same phenomenon with the opposite editorial slant: The natives hardly work at all, except when beaten. They retain that much self-respect.