

as to draw out its capabilities to the full extent. Like Condorcet, too, while dealing perturbation all around him, Mr. Mill is imperturbable, and might be described as he was, as "*un mouton enragé—un volcan couvert de neige.*"

There is a curious playing at cross-purposes between the recent economical champions of the claims of labor to rank as something else than labor, and to receive as its reward something that shall not be called wages, and the practical assertors for their class, so far as combined in Trades' Unions, of the simpler claim of a maximum of wage for a minimum of work. The former (we borrow the words of Mr. Mill) "cannot think that the working classes will be permanently contented with the condition of laboring for wages as their ultimate state. They may be willing to pass through the class of servants in their way to that of employers, but not to remain in it all their lives." On the other hand, the whole action of the latter—the Trades' Unionists—tacitly assumes for all who enter their combinations (and rightly assumes in the great majority of cases) the position of life-long wage-receivers. If Unionism is an authentic expression of the views and wishes of the more stirring section of the working classes, it is an expression contradictory of the views and wishes which the school of political economists, headed by Mr. Mill, think those classes must entertain.

Never did a pair of poor correlative terms become the subject of such unreasoning or wrong-reasoning animosity as those of *Labor for Wages*. In the novel vocabulary of national and international labor-leagues, work for wages by manual laborers in the employ of capitalists is denounced as a badge of slavery, and political economists who swear by Mr. Mill are taking up the same strain in milder language. Whereas the only man who works *not* for wages, as M. Edmond About justly observes, is *the slave*. Labor for wages—for pay received as the equivalent of work done—as the same lively and acute writer says with perfect truth—is the general rule of service, public or private, in the whole social hierarchy; and the one class incited by some who should know better, to revolt against that

rule as a special injustice and indignity to itself, is precisely the class whose simple manual service comes most distinctly under it.

If wage-receiving labor, according to the new doctrine, is the slave, wage-paying capital (according to the same doctrine) is the tyrant of the modern organization of industry. Here, again, that doctrine is precisely the reverse of truth. Everywhere, and at all times, capital is labor's most submissive "help" or servant. Everywhere, and at all time, the advances of capital are at the service of the effective worker; and to give proof of possession of the qualities of the effective worker is to command the power of the purse. The tyranny of capital is only true in the sense that, by laws as old as the world, those must obey who have not qualities to command; those must be soldiers who are not fit to be officers in the army of industry. Mr. Mill has said that "the laborer needs only capital, not capitalists." Like most smart sayings of the social-revolutionary sort, this is quite beside the mark. What laborers need, speaking generally, is neither capital nor capitalists, so much as the qualities which inspire confidence in capitalists, or even confidence in each other. Capital is always, at least as eagerly as labor, in quest of employment; and, so far from tyrannizing over labor, is always willing to serve it at the lowest living wages, if only coupled with security. It is that security which the ordinary manual laborer is unable to afford. He must look somewhere above him, not so much for capital as for guarantee and guidance. Somebody must be found, whom the capitalist, not himself employing his capital, can feel himself morally safe in trusting with funds to employ profitably in his stead. That somebody is not the hand-worker, but the head-worker—the "captain of industry" in the now well-worn Carlylian phrase. He it is who can alone afford a moral guarantee to the capitalist, that the funds entrusted to him shall be employed with a discretion ensuring their replacement with a profit. And everywhere the man who can be trusted with capital is the man whom capital helps to wealth. Working men may organize trades-unions against him, abuse