

money, to be richer than our grandfathers were. Whether we are nobler, purer, or holier, is not to be considered. So far have we gone astray in the worship of Mammon that we have come to estimate all things by the money standard. A "successful man" means one who is accumulating money rapidly. The question "What is A. B. worth?" has no reference whatever to the value of A. B. to the community, or to the world; but simply means—how much property does A. B. own? Time was when aristocracy fought successfully against the money standard of value; when those who were base-born, or who led base lives, were not welcomed in the highest circles because of the length and weight of their purses. Time was when fame as an orator, poet, statesman or warrior erected a barrier against this money standard. But now it seems that Mammon has overcome all these, and that to-day he has no enemy to oppose him—except the Spirit of God.

It is well to know the nature of the disease, but it is better to know the cure. What, then, is the remedy? Just now, co-operation is proposed with a great blare of trumpets as the sovereign remedy for all the ills of capital and labor. The workman is to share the profits of the factory, on certain conditions. This is at best a compromise; it is not a remedy. It will tend to check strikes, and thus modify the symptoms, while the disease is left untouched to do its deadly work. So long as the root remains, the fruit is liable to appear. Co-operation may delay the catastrophe, but cannot prevent it. The workmen will share in the profits only so far as the employers are willing, and the limit is fixed by the interest of the owners and not by that of the workmen. Wages would soon be adjusted accordingly, and the practical outcome of the arrangement will be, that the owners insure themselves against strikes, the workmen collecting the premium. Co-operation may easily be made a means of oppressing workmen. The owners do not propose to surrender the control of the factory to the operators; and in a conflict of interests, the interest sacrificed will not be that of those who have control.

There are but three possible solutions to this so-called "labor problem." They are:

1st. The owners of the machinery may own their workmen. This is slavery, and is not to be thought of for a moment. Slavery has forever disappeared from this land. I mention it only because it is a possible solution of the problem before us.

2d. Destroy the machinery and return to the simple methods of our ancestors. There are no moral objections to this, as to slavery. Yet, it will not be seriously considered. It would involve the sacrifice of millions on millions of dollars and would scatter the inhabitants of our large cities. Before the days of machinery, as I stated above, there was no "labor problem," and to destroy the machinery would be to solve that problem effectually. But this age will never let its engines and factories go. Machinery has "come to stay"—let us take heed lest dynamite has come to stay, as well.