

and children, and the direct and indirect loss to the community must be very great.

The great wealth of the comparatively few individuals who control the coal mines puts them beyond the influence of the inconvenience resulting from a rise in the price of coal, and enables them to contemplate a long cessation of profits with considerable equanimity. The strike does not impair their capital and they can afford the loss of dividends. Conceding to these people all the wisdom which their prominence in the business world implies, and also their due share of appreciation of social conditions, it may be well doubted if they are the best judges of what the welfare of the state demands. They are separated by a wide gulf from the toiling masses, who form the immense majority of the population and who, if they choose to assert themselves unitedly, must in the long run win. The conditions prevailing in the United States to-day are not so greatly dissimilar to those which existed in Imperial Rome, out of which grew slave rebellions with all their attendant horrors. A not unlike condition of things gave rise to the French Revolution. Too close a parallel must not be drawn, because the civilizations of the Third, the Eighteenth and Twentieth Centuries are divergent in many ways; but human nature remains the same in all ages and just as the patrician class in Rome, and the nobility in France failed to appreciate the strength of the movement among the working classes, so it is no reflection upon the intelligence of the great capitalists of the United States to suggest that they may not be able to grasp the consequences of the movements with which they are confronted.

Fortunately there is in the United States what Rome scarcely knew and what France possessed only to a limited extent, a vast body of people who are neither wage earners nor capitalists. If this element of the community chooses to assert itself it can give laws to the others. These are the people whose opinions really constitute public opinion, that tremendous force against which in self-governing countries nothing can stand. It is upon this class that the safety of the nation may depend.

A dangerous feature of the industrial situation in the United States is found in the very large number of people employed in coal mining and other purely manual trades, who are not in close touch with what we call the Anglo-Saxon system of government. They are representatives of the Slavic and other races from Central Europe and they have not been taught either by tradition or experience to trust to the effect of peaceful agitation to secure the recognition of their rights. Of themselves they are not sufficiently numerous to bring about revolutionary conditions, but when the American-born workman makes common cause with them, they become very formidable indeed. History shows that danger

lurks in friction between the extremes of the community. The average American workingman may have very little sympathy with the filthy and ignorant immigrant from, say, Bulgaria; but if he thinks the latter is being imposed upon by his employers, he is hardly to be blamed if he determines to take sides with him. Smaller causes than the oppression of a few foreign workmen, even though they may smell evilly and live huddled together in cabins hardly fit for animals, have before now ranged society into hostile camps.

Under these circumstances it seems wise to take into the most serious consideration the whole labour question and provide if possible something that will do away with strikes or at least provide for their prompt settlement. The whole community has rights in the premises which must be respected. Capitalists may object to having their business affairs in any way regulated by persons not directly concerned in them, but it is upon such persons that they must rely for the protection of those interests. The owner of a great industrial plant feels that he has a right to the assistance of the courts and the military arm of the state to protect his property at all times and against all influences that might destroy it. This being the case, he ought in a spirit of reciprocity to be willing to permit the state to have a voice in the settlement of disputes with his employees. On the other hand, employees look to the state for their protection, and this being the case, they ought in all fairness to be ready to submit to state control. If neither party is willing to make this submission, then the only course open to the rest of the community is to take the matter in hand and apply such remedies as may to them seem advisable.

An objection made to compulsory arbitration is that, while workingmen would be compelled by public opinion to accept the decision of the court of arbitration, there can be no means devised whereby they can be compelled to comply with such decision in good faith. That is, it is said, that while a workman might feel compelled to go to work for a smaller wage than he felt he was entitled to, no means can be invented whereby he can be compelled to do as much work for the lower wage than he would for the higher one. No possible means can be devised to meet such a contingency as this, and it is a question if there is really any valid reason for contemplating it. There is no means whereby a man can be compelled to do a good day's work for any wage, no matter how large. Experience does not warrant any fear that loss would ensue by reason of workmen "loafing on their jobs," because an arbitration court decided against them. The right to discharge incompetent or lazy workmen must always be reserved to the employer. If the labour unions attempt to assert any control in this respect they ought to be given to understand that