Of course, other economies are also suggested. Thus the labourer is advised to discard his pipe, to walk to his work instead of riding, to shun the dance-hall, to listen to the music-hall. These very social reforms, be it remarked, would oppose toil and rancour all attempt to open the museums, etc., on Sunday.

Such, then, are the means whereby these philanthropists would set the example, the labourers will have to follow. They skillfully ignore the fact that the stoppage of the liquor-trade, the tobacco-trade and others which contribute to the small ray of sunshine that occasionally brightens a labourer's life, or to the thousands more talked about the already bursting ranks of the unemployed. But we will not consider that point. We will suppose that, by some miraculous means, every operative in the country economises £10 annually on his present expenditure. That is, we suppose it affects the cost of living.

Now it is evident that however severe competition for employment may be, it has its limits. No man will work for a wage with which no consideration of self-respect, even a subsistence, will suffice to meet the existence (with women, for obvious reasons, one can be different). Male labour-reputation never descends below one degree above starvation-point, for if it did so, the labourer were literally starved on the spot. It would soon be physically impossible to perform a day's work. All mine and factory owners and other large employers of labour, therefore, calculate the remuneration they will give, taking as a basis the needs of the labourer. We will call starvation-point $x$, and the point above that $z$.

Now we will imagine A and B competing with one another for a certain office only yielding sufficient employment for one. A and B are considered useful and useful labourers. Which of them is the nonce is dependent upon his securing the vacancy. It is clear then that the employer who has the vacancy to offer can only lower the rate of wages below that of A and B, or go without work. If A and B, without other means, could not maintain themselves at such a wage, and would both refuse the post. But if A has a private income of £10, he can afford to and will compete with B down to $z - 10$, which will be to the detriment of A.

It is this illustration that we have now to apply on the large scale. Through unlimited competition, labour-wages (I am speaking generally, as it is unnecessary to name the class-unions) may now be considered as having sunk to $x$, i.e., the minimum at which a working-man can subsist without denying himself one or more of what are considered the necessities of life, and which may include (for we are speaking of men and not of animals) not only bare dry bread, but beer, tobacco and recreation. But if all the workers agree to resign such recreation, such beer, such tobacco, they simply shift the points $x$ and $z$, and are permitted, in other words, comparatively, to remain as they exactly as before, and the extra £10 which pseudo-economists speak of, instead of going to buy the wretched labourers more bread and more meat, would go into the pockets of their outside exploiters without ever reaching them at all.

Of course we know the majority or even any considerable number of working men would not be so senseless as to adopt the theory of operative extravagance but individual workmen with the, under the circumstances, stupid trust in their "superiors," which characterises their class, have already been and are enfranchised, and such men, by lowering their own standard of life, force their fellows, by the law of competition, to do the same. It is not our object to enfranchise the workers upon how little we are able to live; any more than it is his to submit the books of his business to the inspection of his trade-rival. It is in order to make them understand and appreciate the value of their toil, that we inculcate upon them the necessity of maintaining their own wages. And if they can set their faces against the example of the middle-class "wisdom" and divide the dividends. Let the operative prepare before he agrees to still further diminish the small savings that existence yet retains for him. Let him frequent the "revolutionary" as much as possible, let him be straddled in the capitalist wilderness, let him modern himself as much as his scanty means allow, and forget occasionally, for an hour or two, that he is but the impersonal and degraded tool of a heartless and no less degraded taskmaster.
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