

alone that they may live in luxury, but that they may have power and control.

They are afflicted with the sacred thirst for gold to extremes of intemperance, drunk with it. Take for example the answer of a well-known millionaire magnate, when asked by the Court if he thought ten dollars a week was enough for a longshoreman. He said, "Yes! if that is all he can get and he took it!" Or again the reply of the President of a sugar refinery in the United States in 1900, when asked—"Is it ethically justifiable to make consumers pay dividends on an over capitalization of twenty million dollars?" answered—"It is fair to get all you can consistent with the business proposition. I don't care two cents for your ethics. I don't know enough about them to apply them." These are pirates who scorn equity and consider that laws can be made, or at least rendered inoperative, by money.

When such irresponsible forces combine what chance had a lone worker struggling for sufficient pay, for permanent employment, for decent surroundings and normal hours. The need of united effort to curb injustice called into being groups of various industrial workers, who, as they became more educated and wary, banded together in unions to bargain collectively.

When they locked horns with the captains of industry, and conciliation and arbitration failing, the strike, the sympathetic strike, the lock-out, the boycott, black-listing and picketing became serious matters for the consumer, public attention was drawn to the operations of frenzied finance. And in the fight thus staged public opinion favored labor.

The labor movement in this stage was but an economic one, although labor interests became more and more issues in elections and trust-breaking became in time a political slogan. Statesmen with true democratic instincts essayed to tackle and shackle the octopus by legislation abolishing underselling, watering of stock, and interlocking directorates. Conditions of factory life were investigated by commissioners, and a general house-cleaning was in order.

The general understanding was that capital, the savings of labor, was a necessary factor in the production of wealth, that there were good capitalists, but that the abuse of money power should be curbed. Labor's attitude in respect to capital was that of the moderate, not of the prohibitionist.

But a small faction in a distinct political movement, basing its program on the theories of Marx and Engels, proposed the elimination of capital, and the transfer of the ownership of the means of production and distribution to the people, i.e., to the State. The policy of these socialists was to capture the labor unions by boosting radicals to office in order to control. They inaugurated a propaganda to convey the impression that the horrible examples of perverted capitalists were typical of all. The grievances of the wage earner were so magnified and reiterated in the press and on the platform that the indifferent worker, like the sick man who read the almanac, began to feel that he had all the diseases from anemia to hydrophobia, economically speaking. And the patent red medicine was prescribed "Expropriate the expropriators."

Sober fathers of families with little homes and savings in the bank knew that they too were capitalists of a kind, and they questioned the practicability of a system which tended to destroy initiative and industry, and seemed merely to change the handling of capital from private to political control, to substitute bureaucracy for plutocracy.