

livelihood in any other way. The employer should be in a certain sense the father of all his employes. He holds a power in his hands and has the right to wield it justly. He should make the interests of his employes his own interests, and pay them as liberally as his own circumstances and their services will permit. The employe, on the other hand, should consider the interests of the employer as affecting his own, and should endeavor to advance them as he would his own affairs.

The employe cannot justly complain because his employer receives his hundreds in a day while he can earn only his dollar, nor yet because his master lives in a mansion while he lives in a cot. All men cannot live in palaces like Dives and fair sumptuously every day, for agriculture, art and science will not support such wide-spread luxury. Some men must be contented with a little, if others are to have abundance. Neither do I believe, as some pseudo-philosophers have maintained as a matter of justice, that property should be more equalized than it is now. If property were equalized, some branches of business would suffer for want of a sufficiently centralized money power. In feudal times a community without a chief would have been short lived, because power by becoming scattered would have become ineffective. The same is true to a certain extent today. A dozen men might perhaps do business with the same capital as one man, but the effect would be about the same as though a dozen commanders-in-chief were at the head of an army, while the employes of the dozen men would be less carefully looked after than as though they were in the employ of one man.

So I think that the relation between labor and capital is just about as it *can* be, if it is not always just as it *should* be, and like society itself, it must be self adjusting and can be brought under rules and regulations only in a limited degree.

But there is a tendency among American people to cry equality of wealth and

social position, as well as equality of rights and privileges. We have said so often that "all men are created equal" that we begin to half believe the bombastic assertion, and to live up to the doctrine.

The employe too often thinks himself on an equality with his employer, and would dictate his terms rather than be dictated to. We have seen this increasing tendency illustrated on a large scale in the late strikes of railroad employes and other working men. It is nonsense to suppose that all men are created equal, either intellectually or socially, and that feeling of independence so characteristic of the American, like the liberty and free constitutions which he enjoys, has its serious disadvantages as well as its advantages. It greatly injures that sort of family feeling which unites master and servant in countries where wealth and power are centralized and kept intact by the right of primogeniture. In this country the motto for action is, "Every man must look out for himself." Whether poor man, sick man or beggar, he must earn his daily bread or starve, as there is no proprietor for whom his father and his grand-father before him have labored, to look after him with any sort of paternal care. The man of business bustles past him with his head erect, as much as to say "I've made my mark in the world by my own efforts, go thou and do likewise," and is rather disposed to sneer at the man in straightened circumstances than to pity or help him. What is the result of such a feeling in society? It is just this: Our men of wealth and position become selfish and between them and their employes there springs up a sort of antagonism. The one class want all the work they can get out of men for the least amount of money, and the other class want all the money they can get for the least amount of work. The man who is unfortunate, must, like everybody else, look out for himself, and, as Shakespeare says:

"If he fall in, good night, or sink or swim."

URIEL.