

The Preposterous Belief That “Wage Slavery” Has Anything to Do with Slavery

Written by Rudd-O.

DrMandible on Reddit is “against wage slavery”, and defines it as such:

A wage slave is somebody who *is compelled* to work in a job as a direct alternative to starvation.

Note *the open equivocation* in there, hidden in the italicized text. Oh yes, the passive voice can be used for tricking people to great effect. This phrasing is intentional: it is the *key* in selling the myth of “wage slavery” — this is a leading sophism towards the false conclusion that “entrepreneurs enslave their employees” (a common pernicious belief that many people seek to rationalize).

The standard argument for the idea of wage slavery goes something like this:

1. Slavery is *compelled labor*.
2. The employee working a shitty job *is compelled* to work that shitty job.
3. Thus, the employee working a shitty job is a wage slave.

This “wage slavery” argument is very convincing. It is potent because all human beings *already accept* premise #2: every one of us *is, indeed, compelled* to work (in *one* sense of the word) until one has enough wealth. The “thing” that compels people to work, *is reality*. *No one*, not even the *richest man*, can escape the fact that, if one just consumes and consumes resources without doing anything productive, one will eventually starve and die. This circumstance of reality applies to *everyone*.

To leverage this generally accepted fact into “wage slavery”, DrMandible relies on the ambiguity of the verb “to compel” to execute a masterful bait-and-switch. He expects you to *infer a hidden premise* that makes “is compelled” equivalent to “*entrepreneurs compel*”:

1. Slavery is *compelled labor*.
2. The employee working a shitty job *is compelled by reality* to work that shitty job.
3. **(Hidden sleight of hand premise)** “Your bodily needs compel you” is *the same* as “entrepreneurs compel you”.
4. Entrepreneurs compel the employee to work a shitty job.
5. Thus, the employee working a shitty job is a wage slave.

That false premise, in bold text, is the “rabbit-out-of-the-hat” dirty language trick that

proponents of “wage slavery” use, to try and pass a fact of reality as a shameful and reproachable attribute of the people they envy.

Of course, DrMandible takes great care *not* to state this implication explicitly — the trick *relies* on keeping this *hidden*, because once you make it *explicit*, it’s *beyond obvious* that the argument conflates two different meanings of “to compel”: a person having to work to avoid hunger (first meaning) is **entirely different** from a person having to work to avoid being brutalized, kidnapped or killed at the hands of another person (second meaning). They rely on the first meaning of “to compel” (to which we’re all subject), to deliberately elicit in other people the emotional response, mental imagery and moral revulsion that normal people associate with the *second* meaning of “to compel”: *actual slavery*. **It’s rank emotional manipulation.**

Formally stated, this is the *correct* argument without equivocations:

1. **Slavery** is *labor compelled by another person*.
2. The employee working a shitty job *is compelled, not by another person, but by reality* to work that shitty job.
3. Thus, the employee working a shitty job is **not a wage slave**.

So, for DrMandible to conclude that the entrepreneur paying a “shitty” wage is “enslaving” people or “compelling” them in any way, is **irrational**. It’s an attempt to blame undesirable facts of reality onto people he hates. And it’s a dishonest and low form of “argument” — a cheap sophism.

DrMandible continues to explain to us what makes wage slavery “wage slavery”:

The operative consideration is choice. [...] But when a person must choose between a job she hates (or even between several jobs she hates) or else starve

DrMandible, of course, presents us with a false choice. Let’s examine it.

Before the “wage slavemaster” makes an offer for a shitty job, the employee has these choices:

1. Living off of his own existing stuff.
2. Being self-employed.
3. Starting a business.
4. Starving to death.

5. Begging for help.
6. Foraging for food.
7. Hunting for food.
8. Going to a soup kitchen.
9. Going to a charitable organization

After the “wage slavemaster” has twirled his mustache, adjusted his monocle, and offered the employee a “shitty” job, this is the map of choices:

1. Living off of his own existing stuff.
2. Being self-employed.
3. Starting a business.
4. **Accepting the shitty job.**
5. Starving to death.
6. Begging for help.
7. Foraging for food.
8. Hunting for food.
9. Going to a soup kitchen.
10. Going to a charitable organization

I’m sure the list is incomplete, but I count *eight* choices versus *nine* choices.

This is *proof positive* that, contrary to the claim that an employee has *no choice* whatsoever, the actions of the “wage slavemaster” have actually **increased** choice for the employee.

OK, now we’ve covered the “operative consideration of *choice*”. Look at how DrMandible reaches the *illogical* conclusion that a person offering you a shitty job is somehow *decreasing* your choice. I suppose it’s easier for proponents of the “wage slavery” concept to continue believing that they are “victims”, than it is to get up off their asses and improve their own conditions. It’s a mystery of mysteries how a person can claim “more choices is fewer choices”... until you consider *laziness and envy*.

The trick explained above is used *over and over* by leftarchists in their doctrinal justifications. They routinely see aspects of reality, and then they *reinterpret* those facts to blame them on their “sworn enemies”. For example, when they say “property is violence”, they’re blaming the rightful owner of an object (who acquired it peacefully and without coercion) for the facts of reality that things are rivalrous, that they want to have the object, and that they can’t have it without working for it. Their whole ideology can be reduced to “mommy, my brother has more toys than I do, authorize me to steal some of his toys, and

I'll be happy".

Their irrational doctrine can always be refuted by iteratively clearing up concepts and going straight to the facts, because **it always comes down to fundamental denial of concrete, observable facts**. This is why they always fog, equivocate, attack and insist on remaining in the abstract, when they see you go for the concrete: *because they already know they are wrong*.

It's nothing new that they do this. A man emotionally determined to make logical and rational mistakes to justify his beliefs, will make them regardless of his stated commitment to justice, ethics or truth. This man will be capable of the worst manipulations in the service of his own "peace of mind", because he has already become a master at manipulating himself.

Originally published at Rudd-o.com.