

then meant and use it with that meaning and so it has been handed down to other strikers? I do not think that the medical term "scale an incrustation over a sore, &c.," has become obsolete among either medical men or people who have not many words in their vocabulary to enable them to avoid its use. Look at the combination "scab-faced" in the evidence. Take the word "scabbed" abounding with scabs, hence mean "paltry, vile, worthless." One would think that all the equivalents for this word given in the dictionaries were now inapplicable and its use by writers like Shakespeare and Swift had become obsolete since strikes came in; that the word had become deodorized; that the only meaning now was a pleasant equivalent for a non-striker "a non-union man."

It is true modern writers avoid some of the words which were used by such men as Burns and Shakespeare; they do not wish to leave an unpleasant association in the mind of the reader. But I think some of them are still current on the back streets. The word "scab" has not, I think, improved. In modern times as well as formerly there have been those who, at least, when they were in the majority, have used an appellation expressive of derision or hatred to express their opinion of another race or class or sect in order to make them feel uncomfortable. Sometimes it has been one word; sometimes another. The effect has been to cause quarrels and avoidance, going around some other way and even going to another country to live. Whatever that word may have been in the mouth of the mob which applied it, the word "scab" in the mouth of the strikers, addressed to the non-strikers is not far behind any of them. I wish that the non-strikers were philosophers and would regard it as a pleasant term that is unavoidable if you wish to distinguish between two classes. Perhaps one ought not to reverse a judgment which decides that. If it would only bind the parties carrying on or opposing a strike it would be useful. But I think I have to identify myself with the New York Court which thought the word was opprobrious, and when written was libellous per se. However dictionaries and decided cases are poor when compared with this evidence which I have quoted.

It appears that Giles, on the witness stand, in cross-examination, said that he expected to be called a scab, that he was what was known as a scab, and that is made use of.