

times more for American wages than the Chinese workmen receive."

A book I have, entitled "The Bargain Theory of Wages," says: "The figures substantiate the theory, that wages are higher in the Western States where living is relatively higher. The excess of city wages over those of the country is due chiefly to the excess in living expenses."

The following table is given of 160 towns of over 20,000 population.

Average yearly wage in dollars:			
Town	Men.	Women.	Children.
U. S. A.	498	276	141
Country	401	239	120

"Women," he says, "are mostly personal up-keepers, while men have dependents and therefor need more wages." If you read Engels' "Conditions of the Working Class in England," you will find the reason the Irish were disliked when they emigrated to England was because their potato standard of living was detrimental to the English laborer as the Irish cut him out of work, competing for lower wages.

A book entitled "Labor," published in 1882 says: "Natural wages are such as will reproduce labor. . . Labor is property and its value is determined by the cost of its reproduction." If we call the above "labor-power" it is a good Marxian definition.

Thorold Rogers, in his "Political Economy," pp. 65 and 178 says: "The food of a laborer has a powerful influence over that part of the rate of wages which is relative to his maintenance. If his customary food is costly, his wages will be proportionate."

"In England the staple food of the laborer has been wheat; in Scotland it is generally oatmeal; in Ireland it was, in great degree, is still, potatoes; in many parts of Europe rye or barley. That part of the rate of wages which is devoted to the personal subsistence of the laborer will be determined on the average, by the cost of that on which he principally subsists."

"Five or six centuries ago the wages in Ireland were as high as those in England. The substitution of the potato for oatmeal reduced their wages in Ireland."

In other words Rogers means in England the laborer had wheat wages, in Scotland oatmeal wages, and in Ireland potato wages. Any one who knows the old country concludes that is what Scotch "thrift" attained, i.e., lower wages in Scotland than in England, or, a low standard of living.

If we look at the total wealth of any country it runs 4 to 5 times what is paid in wages. Taking four times as an average it means the average wages is one fourth.

To illustrate, let us assume an 8 hours day of toil. The value of labor power would be reproduced in 2 hours. The workers do not put on their coat and go home. Oh no! They have bargained to sell labor-power for 8 hours. The other 6 hours then, is unpaid labor, or surplus value.

Here is the secret surplus value, discovered by Karl Marx, which the classic economists failed to explain. The reason was because the classic economists never were able to differentiate between labor and labor-power. Their value of labor was really the value of labor-power as it exists in the personality of the laborer, which is as different from its function, labor, as a machine is from the work it performs. Labor-power must not be confused with labor.

Labor is the realization of labor-power and its result embodied in the commodity produced, when labor-power is consumed. Labor is the act of consuming labor-power, the capitalist realizing its use value.

The capitalist receives the product of your labor, paying in return for its use the value of your labor-power; in other words, your means of subsistence, or slave's portion.

In "Capital," Marx says "Skilled labor counts only as simple, intensified, or rather as multiplied, simple labor, that in the creation of a surplus value

it does not in the least matter, whether the labor appropriated by the capitalist be simple, unskilled, of average quality, or more complicated, skilled labor. The labor of a higher and more complicated character than average labor is the expenditure of labor power of a more costly kind; labor-power that has cost more time and labor and which therefor has a higher value than unskilled or simple labor."

This reminds me of a discussion I had with a plasterer when he was very emphatic that his strong trade union organization was responsible for his high wages. It so happened that at that time the laborers had just as good a trade union, so I put the question: "If your trade union gives you the high wages, why have the laborers 20 cents an hour less, when their union is as strongly organized?" He replied: "It would not be fair, because we serve an apprenticeship." I answered: "Under your own argument it would be fair," and then I endeavored to explain it as a higher labor-power value. If labor took too long to reproduce its labor-power value, there would be no rich people because there would be no surplus.

There were no millionaires to speak of a century ago, because the worker labored the most of his time reproducing his own maintenance. Some may say that is the result of capital (machinery). That is true in a sense, but labor produces the machine, and labor, we have seen, is the only factor in production which reproduces not only the value of labor-power but a surplus, while the value of machinery and raw material is only transferred or transformed into the finished commodity. This we see when we come to deal with profits or, as Marx puts it, mystified surplus value. Money wages are so mystifying to the worker that he believes he is fully paid, and yet it is because he is the cheapest slave, that chattel slavery was abandoned.

In 1741 David Hume wrote: "From the experience of our planters, slavery is as little advantageous to the master as to the slave, where hired servants can be procured. A man is obliged to feed and clothe his slave, and he does no more for his servant. The price of the first purchase is therefor a loss to him, not to mention that the fear of punishment will never draw so much labor from a slave as the dread of being turned off and not getting another service, will from a free man."

John Adams in U. S. A. Congress, 1776, said: "It was of no consequence by what name you called your people, whether by that of a free man or of slaves. That in some countries the laboring man was called a free man, in other countries they were called slaves. But the difference was only imaginary. What mattered it whether a landlord, employing ten laborers on his farm, gives them annually as much as will buy the necessaries of life, or gives them those necessities at short hand."

James Ellsworth, a member of the convention to formulate a constitution for the Republic, held at Philadelphia 1787, said: "As population grows poor laborers will become so plentiful as to make slaves useless."

Adam Smith wrote: "Though the wear and tear of a free servant be generally at the expense of his master it generally costs him much less than that of a slave. The fund destined for refunding or repairing a slave is commonly managed by the master, but is performed by the freeman himself. It appears, accordingly, that the work done by a freeman comes cheaper in the end than that of a slave."

In "The Evolution of Industry in the United States," by Carroll D. Wright, 1895, the author says Dr. Franklin wrote an essay which pointed out that the labor of slaves here in America can never be as cheap as the labor of the free working men of Britain.

On page 151 is a table I copied and enlarged on cloth to hang in the class room, which is a very telling, concrete fact as to why slave labor was dear. I use many charts, because it is then easier for the class to grasp than by using only abstract illustrations.

If it is possible, Mr. Editor, print it in the "Clarion" as follows:

"Capital necessary to grow cotton; with slave and with free labor."

	Free.	Slave.
100 acres land at \$20 an acre.....	\$2,000	\$2,000
Value of cattle, horses and farming tools	2,000	2,000
Food, clothing of farmer free labor, horses, cattle, feed	1,000
Food clothing, farmer slave, food horses and cattle, doctors bills for slaves	1,000
Ten slaves value \$1,500 each	15,000
Wages of free labor	1,000
Total investments	\$6,000	\$20,000

We see that free labor means to the capitalist a saving of \$14,000, or the freedom to use this to exploit more wage slaves.

We saw in our history lessons that Engels said: "Slavery was a great step forward from killing their captives." Lester Ward says: "How did man learn to work; did the needs of existence teach him self denial? to tone down his wild unsettled nature and discipline his mind and body to toil? "Not at all" "It is safe to say if left to these influences, man would never have learned to labor. It required some other influence far more imperative and coercive. In a word, nothing short of slavery could ever have accomplished this. This was the social mission of human slavery, to convert mere activity into true labor."

Yet we hear today you cannot change human nature.

In conclusion of the discussion of this lesson let me point out that there are three values in connection with labor-power.

1st exchange value, which is the maintenance of the laborer.

2nd Its use value to the capitalist.

3rd That Labor-power is not only a source of value but reproduces a surplus value, the production of which is due, as we have seen, to labor-power being utilised beyond the time necessary to reproduce its own value.

Remember. Labor is labor-power in action, and that its action is extended beyond the time of reproducing labor-power's value, the food, clothing, and shelter of the workers, or, in other words, maintenance, which is called wages.

This extended time is surplus labor, which creates surplus value, or, in other words, Rent, Interest and Profit.

Next Lesson: Wages; Relative, Nominal and Real.

RIVALS IN REAL ESTATE

(Continued from page 2)

ain is entirely against the United States. No military base on any of them could be used against any important nation but the United States. No military or naval base on any of them could be used by the United States against England.

Why, then, should England decline to assign them to us in part payment of her debt incurred in obtaining ten times their area of new land in other sections of the world? The situation is remindful of the story of the monkey with hand trapped in the jar, because he would not open his fist to drop the nuts inside the jar which he had seized."

We haven't heard yet what Mr. McKenna said in reply to this, but no doubt it's all contained in his dictionary of swear words.

**Socialist Party of Canada
PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**

STAR THEATRE, 300 Block, Main Street

April 16th W. A. Pritchard
April 23rd T. O'Connor
April 30th J. D. Harrington

AT NORTH VANCOUVER.

126-2nd Street West.

April 16th C. Stephenson
April 23rd R. Kirk
April 30th S. Earp

All meetings at 8 p.m.

Questions. Discussion.