

is too sweeping. Millions of people who are not millionaires desire to give their children the advantages of wealth, and this desire is one of the greatest incentives to accumulation. Provided they educate their children wisely, it is impossible to maintain that the gift of these advantages is necessarily injurious.

On this point Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Gladstone [a British statesman] had some debate; the latter contending that “the hereditary transmission of wealth and position, in conjunction with the calls of occupation and of responsibility, is a good and not an evil thing.” Of course, this is nothing but the old conflict between the ideals of democracy and aristocracy, and we need not restate it. . . .

Probably we shall see the experiment of confiscating large fortunes at the death of their owners tried on an increasing scale, together with progressive taxes on incomes.

3. Russell Conwell Deifies the Dollar (c. 1900)

The Reverend Russell H. Conwell was a remarkable Baptist preacher from Philadelphia who founded Temple University and had a large hand in establishing three hospitals. He delivered his famous lecture, “Acres of Diamonds,” more than six thousand times. The proceeds went toward the education of some ten thousand young men. His basic theme was that in seeking riches, people were likely to overlook the opportunities (the “acres of diamonds”) in their own backyards. Critics charged that Conwell was merely throwing the cloak of religion about the materialistic ideals of his time, especially since he combined philanthropy with dollar chasing. In the following excerpt from his famous lecture, what is his attitude toward the poor? How might one reconcile this brand of Christianity with the teachings of Christ, who said to the young man, “Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor” (Matthew 19:21)?

You have no right to be poor. It is your duty to be rich.

Oh, I know well that there are some things higher, sublimer than money! Ah, yes, there are some things sweeter, holier than gold! Yet I also know that there is not one of those things but is greatly enhanced by the use of money.

“Oh,” you will say, “Mr. Conwell, can you, as a Christian teacher, tell the young people to spend their lives making money?”

Yes, I do. Three times I say, I do, I do, I do. You ought to make money. Money is power. Think how much good you could do if you had money now. Money is power, and it ought to be in the hands of good men. It would be in the hands of good men if we comply with the Scripture teachings, where God promises prosperity to the righteous man. That means more than being a goody-good—it means the all-round righteous man. You should be a righteous man. If you were, you would be rich.

I need to guard myself right here. Because one of my theological students came to me once to labor with me, for heresy, inasmuch as I had said that money was power.

He said: “Mr. Conwell, I feel it my duty to tell you that the Scriptures say that money ‘is the root of all evil.’” . . .

³R. H. Conwell, *Acres of Diamonds* (1901), pp. 145–147, 151. Reprinted from *Modern Eloquence*.

So he read: “The *love* of money is the root of all evil.” Indeed it is. The *love* of money is the root of all evil. The love of money, rather than the *love* of the good it secures, is a dangerous evil in the community. The desire to get hold of money, and to hold on to it, “hugging the dollar until the eagle squeals,” is the root of all evil. But it is a grand ambition for men to have the desire to gain money, that they may use it for the benefit of their fellow men.

Young man! you may never have the opportunity to charge at the head of your nation’s troops on some Santiago’s heights.* Young woman! you may never be called on to go out in the seas like Grace Darling to save suffering humanity.† But every one of you can earn money honestly, and with that money you can fight the battles of peace; and the victories of peace are always grander than those of war. I say then to you that you ought to be rich. . . .

No man has a right to go into business and not make money. It is a crime to go into business and lose money, because it is a curse to the rest of the community. No man has a moral right to transact business unless he makes something out of it. He has also no right to transact business unless the man he deals with has an opportunity also to make something. Unless he lives and lets live, he is not an honest man in business. There are no exceptions to this great rule. . . .

It is cruel to slander the rich because they have been successful. It is a shame to “look down” upon the rich the way we do. They are not scoundrels because they have gotten money. They have blessed the world. They have gone into great enterprises that have enriched the nation and the nation has enriched them. It is all wrong for us to accuse a rich man of dishonesty simply because he secured money. Go through this city and your very best people are among your richest people. Owners of property are always the best citizens. It is all wrong to say they are not good.

D. The Rise of the New South

1. Henry Grady Issues a Challenge (1889)

The industrialized South—the new South—was slow to rise from the ashes of civil conflict. A kind of inferiority complex settled over the area. Henry W. Grady, eloquent editor of the Atlanta Constitution, did more than anyone else to break the spell. With Irish wit he preached the need for diversified crops, a readjustment of the freed slaves, the encouragement of manufacturing, and the development of local resources. In demand as a speaker, he broadcast his message widely and with demonstrable effect. The South of the 1880s was experiencing a marvelous economic boom, and new industries were spreading like its own honeysuckle. Following is a selection

*Santiago de Cuba was the site of a decisive U.S. victory over Spanish forces in the Spanish-American War of 1898.

†Grace Darling was the daughter of a British lighthouse keeper who heroically helped her father rescue passengers from a shipwreck in 1838.

‡Joel C. Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady* (New York: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1890), pp. 204–205. Shortly after delivering this speech, Grady contracted pneumonia and died.

from a speech in Boston in which Grady contrasted the broken-down South of Reconstruction days with the new industrialized South. What major lesson must this passage have impressed upon his northern listeners?

I attended a funeral once in Pickens county in my state [Georgia]. A funeral is not usually a cheerful object to me unless I could select the subject. I think I could, perhaps, without going a hundred miles from here, find the material for one or two cheerful funerals. Still, this funeral was peculiarly sad. It was a poor “one-gallus” fellow, whose breeches struck him under the armpits and hit him at the other end about the knee—he didn’t believe in décolleté clothes.

They buried him in the midst of a marble quarry—they cut through solid marble to make his grave—and yet a little tombstone they put above him was from Vermont. They buried him in the heart of a pine forest, and yet the pine coffin was imported from Cincinnati. They buried him within the touch of an iron mine, and yet the nails in his coffin and the iron in the shovel that dug his grave were imported from Pittsburgh. They buried him by the side of the best sheep-grazing country on earth, and yet the wool in the coffin bands and the coffin bands themselves were brought from the North. The South didn’t furnish a thing on earth for that funeral but the corpse and the hole in the ground.

There they put him away and the cloths rattled down on his coffin, and they buried him in a New York coat and a Boston pair of shoes and a pair of breeches from Chicago and a shirt from Cincinnati, leaving him nothing to carry into the next world with him to remind him of the country in which he lived, and for which he fought for four years, but the chill of blood in his veins and the marrow in his bones.

Now we have improved on that. We have got the biggest marble-cutting establishment on earth within a hundred yards of that grave. We have got a half-dozen woolen mills right around it, and iron mines, and iron furnaces, and iron factories. We are coming to meet you. We are going to take a noble revenge, as my friend Mr. Carnegie said last night, by invading every inch of your territory with iron, as you invaded ours [in the Civil War] twenty-nine years ago.

2. A Yankee Visits the New South (1887)

New England-born Charles Dudley Warner—lecturer, newspaper editor, essayist, and novelist—shone as one of the literary lights of the post-Civil War years. World traveler and humorist, he collaborated with his friend and neighbor Mark Twain in writing a satirical novel that gave a name to an era, The Gilded Age (1873). He revisited the South, after a two-year absence, on an extensive six-week tour. The result was the charming magazine article from which the following selection is excerpted. What is most remarkable about the industrial flowering of the South, and who or what was primarily responsible for it?

When we come to the New Industrial South, the change is marvelous. . . . Instead of a South devoted to agriculture and politics, we find a South wide awake to

business, excited and even astonished at the development of its own immense resources in metals, marbles, coal, timber, fertilizers, eagerly laying lines of communication, rapidly opening mines, building furnaces, foundries, and all sorts of shops for utilizing the native riches.

It is like the discovery of a new world. When the Northerner finds great foundries in Virginia using only (with slight exceptions) the products of Virginia iron and coal mines; when he finds Alabama and Tennessee making iron so good and so cheap that it finds ready market in Pennsylvania, and foundries multiplying near the great furnaces for supplying Northern markets; when he finds cotton mills running to full capacity on grades of cheap cottons universally in demand throughout the South and Southwest; when he finds small industries, such as paper box factories and wooden bucket and tub factories, sending all they can make into the North and widely over the West; when he sees the loads of most beautiful marbles shipped North; when he learns that some of the largest and most important engines and mill machinery were made in Southern shops; when he finds in Richmond a “pole locomotive,” made to run on logs laid end to end, and drag out from Michigan forests and Southern swamps lumber hitherto inaccessible; when he sees worn-out highlands in Georgia and Carolina bear more cotton than ever before by help of a fertilizer the base of which is the cotton seed itself (worth more as a fertilizer than it was before the oil was extracted from it); when he sees a multitude of small shops giving employment to men, women, and children who never had any work of that sort to do before; and when he sees Roanoke iron cast in Richmond into car irons, and returned to a car factory in Roanoke which last year sold three hundred cars to the New York and New England Railroad—he begins to open his eyes.

The South is manufacturing a great variety of things needed in the house, on the farm, and in the shops, for home consumption, and already sends to the North and West several manufactured products. With iron, coal, timber contiguous and easily obtained, the amount sent out is certain to increase as the labor becomes more skillful. The most striking industrial development today is in iron, coal, lumber, and marbles; the more encouraging for the self-sustaining life of the Southern people is the multiplication of small industries in nearly every city I visited.

When I have been asked what impressed me most in this hasty tour, I have always said that the most notable thing was that everybody was at work. In many cities this was literally true: every man, woman, and child was actively employed, and in most there were fewer idlers than in many Northern towns. There are, of course, slow places, antiquated methods, easygoing ways, a-hundred-years-behind-the-time make-shifts, but the spirit in all the centers, and leavening the whole country, is work. Perhaps the greatest revolution of all in Southern sentiment is in regard to the dignity of labor. Labor is honorable, made so by the example of the best in the land. There are, no doubt, fossils or Bourbons, sitting in the midst of the ruins of their estates, martyrs to an ancient pride; but usually the leaders in business and enterprise bear names well known in politics and society. The nonsense that it is beneath the dignity of any man or woman to work for a living is pretty much eliminated from the Southern mind. It still remains true that the purely American type is prevalent in the South, but in all the cities the business signboards show that the enterprising Hebrew is increasingly prominent as merchant and trader, and he is

It cannot be too strongly impressed upon the public mind that the South, to use a comprehensible phrase, “has joined the procession.” Its mind is turned to the development of its resources, to business, to enterprise, to education, to economic problems; it is marching with the North in the same purpose of wealth by industry. It is true that the railways, mines, and furnaces could not have been without enormous investments of Northern capital, but I was continually surprised to find so many and important local industries the result solely of home capital, made and saved since the war.

3. Life in a Southern Mill (1910)

From Charles Dickens's England to the modern-day Third World, the onset of industrialization has repeatedly wrenched people out of traditional habits of life and forced harsh accommodation to the cruel discipline of the factory floor. The rapidly industrializing late-nineteenth-century South was no exception, as the following excerpt from a congressional investigation illustrates. What were the hardest conditions of life in the southern textile mills? Were there any distinctively southern aspects to these mill workers' plight?

In many mill villages the mill whistles blow at 4.30 or 5 A.M. to awaken the inhabitants, and in winter employees begin work in the mills before daybreak and they work until after nightfall.

When a mill is operated longer than its nominal working schedule, the machinery is started before the announced time of beginning work in the morning and at noon, and, in some cases, continues to run later than the announced time of stopping work at noon and in the evening. Mill managers, when questioned as to this practice, said that employees are not required to work before or after the announced scheduled time. In reality, however, employees are required to be at their machines whenever the machines are running. Otherwise the work gets in bad condition, and in the case of weavers dockage is made for imperfections, which are liable to occur when the weaver is not attending the looms.

The practice of requiring employees to begin before the announced beginning time and to work after the announced stopping time is called by them “stealing time.” . . .

Taking the 28 North Carolina mills which employed women or children at night, all together, the children working by day in all these mills were 25.32 per cent of all the day employees there, and the 437 children working by night in all these mills were 26.29 per cent of all the night workers. . . .

In only 2 establishments investigated did the night force work more than 5 nights a week. In each of these mills, both of which were in North Carolina, an additional half day's work on Saturday was demanded, and this demand caused much dissatisfaction. In 1 of these 2 establishments the night shift worked 11 hours and 15 minutes nightly from Monday to Friday, inclusive, and on Saturday resumed at noon and worked until 6.15 in the evening, making a total of 62 hours and 30 minutes a

³Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage-Earners in the United States, U.S. Congress, 61st Cong., 2d Sess., 1908, p. 10.

week. In the other mill the night shift worked 11 hours and 30 minutes nightly, from Monday to Friday, inclusive, and on Saturday resumed at 3 P.M. and worked until 10 P.M., making a total of 64 hours and 30 minutes. Other mills which had had such a schedule had discontinued the Saturday work for its night workers, because of the dissatisfaction which such a time-table caused. . . .

In interviewing cotton-mill operatives, women expressed more dissatisfaction with night work than children did. Many of the latter claimed that they much preferred to work at night. Spinners asserted that the “work runs better at night,” because the increased moisture in the air keeps the threads from breaking so frequently. In consequence the young spinners received less reproof from the overseers.

Then, with the exception of 2 mills in North Carolina the night shifts worked only 5 nights a week, from Monday to Friday, inclusive. This means that three full days were given for rest, Saturday, Sunday, and Monday. If the children should sleep on Saturday, as they ought to do, but rarely do, they would see that they have very little more spare time than the day workers—only the one night, Saturday, which they surely need for recuperation after their sixty hours' work at night. Mothers complain that the children who work at night are nervous.

In visiting families of cotton-mill operatives who worked at night, night workers were often found sitting drowsily before a scant fire between 9 and 11 o'clock in the morning. They had begun work the night before at 6, had quit at 6 A.M., and at 11 o'clock they had had no sleep. Usually they arose at 4 or 5 in the afternoon and again took their seats before the fire, too weary and sluggish to think of a walk in the open air. Even when they went to bed early in the morning, sleep was not continuous throughout the day, nor could it be sound sleep. In the small houses, with thin wood partitions, every sound in the house can be heard by the night worker, even though he may sleep in a separate room. Moreover, night workers often sleep in the same room occupied by the nonworkers during the day. The nonworkers frequently include children and the room can not be kept quiet.

In cases where both the mother and father worked at night, the mother nearly always did her housework, including her washing and ironing. This means that on one day at least the mother went from 18 to 24 hours without sleeping. One woman, who gave as her reason for working at night that she could take care of her home, garden, cow, and boy during the day, was found at 11 in the morning hanging up her clothes. She had had no sleep during the preceding 24 hours.

Shocking abuses in connection with night work were found in two small mills in North Carolina, where night employees frequently worked in the daytime in addition to their regular night work, and where day employees frequently worked at night after a full day's work. These cases are not cited here as typical, but they are given to show the extremes to which unregulated labor of women and children can go in the absence of legal regulation or of efficient means of enforcement, and to show the callous disregard of every consideration for a child wage-earner that can be shown by his employer and his natural protector alike.

In one of these mills the day shift worked 66 hours per week and the night shift 60 hours. Owing to a scarcity of help, day workers were frequently requested to return to the mill immediately after supper and work until midnight, and frequently

to request day workers to come and work half of the night. Some employees usually declined to do overtime work. Others worked alternate nights as a regular custom.

Ordinarily this overtime work was paid for at the time it was performed and there was no record to show its extent. In the case of one family, however, the names of workers were entered on both the day roll and the night roll and this record showed that 4 children, 2 boys, doffers, one 10 and one 15 years old, and 2 girls, spinners, one 11 and one 13, and also a youth 17 years old, all members of the same family, had been paid for 78 to 84 hours of work per week. They had worked this number of hours, less a little time for supper and breakfast, on days when extra work was done. It was found that during a considerable part of the eight months that this family had been at this mill these children had worked two or three half nights each week, in addition to day work. After working from 6 A.M. to 6 P.M., with 35 minutes for dinner, they had returned to the mill, usually every other night, immediately after supper and worked until midnight, when they went home for four or five hours of sleep before beginning the next day's work; or, they had been aroused at midnight and sent to the mill for the second half of the night, where they remained until 6 o'clock the following afternoon, except when eating breakfast and dinner. In either case, they were on duty for a working day of 17 hours, with no rest period save for meals. Those who worked the second half of the night went home for a hurried breakfast just before 6 A.M. The mill stopped only 35 minutes out of the 24 hours, from 12 M. to 12.35 P.M. On one or two occasions two younger children of the same family, one a girl spinner and spooler-helper 7 years old, and the other a male doffer, reported 10 years old but apparently 8, had worked half of the night in addition to day work.

The father of this family was apparently an active, hard-working man. He expressed the opinion that night work in addition to day work was rather hard on the children, but said that he was trying to get money to buy a home. He also said that as the children were in two sets, part his and part his wife's, he must be careful not to show any favor to either portion of the family. No member of this family could read or write. . . .

E. Labor in Industrial America

I. In Praise of Mechanization (1897)

As capitalists competed for markets and profits, they pushed their workers ever harder. Factory laborers came to dread the "speedup"—the order to produce more goods in less time. The already screeching din of the shop floor then whined to an even higher pitch, as machines were made to run faster—and more dangerously. Some observers claimed that the peculiarly profit-hungry and competitive U.S. business environment rendered the conditions of labor in the United States particularly intolerable. Yet new workers by the millions fled the farms of both America and Europe to seek work tending the rattling industrial machines. In the following

¹E. Levasseur, "The Concentration of Industry, and Machinery in the United States," *Annals of the Ameri-*

comments by a French economist who visited the United States near the end of the nineteenth century, how does he appraise the overall impact of mechanization? Is he convincing? What differences does he see between work conditions in Europe and those in the United States? What does he identify as the principal complaints of U.S. workers? Does he consider them justified?

"The pay here is good, but the labor is hard," said an Alsatian blacksmith employed in a large factory. I could verify nearly everywhere the truth of this remark, for I have seen such activity both in the small industry, where the tailors in the sweating-shops in New York worked with feverish rapidity, and in the great industry, where the butchers of the Armour packing house prepared 5800 hogs a day, where the cotton weavers tended as many as eight looms, or where the rolling-mill in Chicago turned out 1000 tons of rails in a day. Everywhere the machine goes very rapidly, and it commands; the workman has to follow. . . .

In the Senate inquiry of 1883, upon education and labor, a weaver of Fall River, who had been a member of the Massachusetts Legislature, and who was then secretary of the Weavers' Union, said that he had worked seventeen years in England, and that conditions were much better than in America. The manufacturers there were not so desirous as they are here of working their men like horses or slaves; they do not work with the extraordinary rapidity which is customary at Fall River. In England, one man manages a pair of looms with two assistants; one between the looms and the other behind. In America, the manufacturer, with one or two exceptions, will not hear of that, and whatever the number of spindles they do not wish that a man shall have more than one assistant. The spindle is turned more rapidly; the laborers have more to do and for each loom Fall River produces more. . . .

The manufacturers judge that the movement [to mechanize] has been advantageous to workmen, as sellers of labor, because the level of salaries has been raised, as consumers of products, because they purchase more with the same sum, and as laborers, because their task has become less onerous, the machine doing nearly everything which requires great strength; the workman, instead of bringing his muscles into play, has become an inspector, using his intelligence. He is told that his specialized labor is degrading because monotonous. Is it more monotonous to overlook with the eye for ten hours several automatic looms, and to attach, from time to time, one thread to another with the finger, than to push for fourteen hours against the breast the arm of a hand-loom, pressing at the same time the pedals with the feet?

In proportion as the machines require more room, the ceilings become higher, the workshops larger, the hygienic conditions better. From a sanitary standpoint, there is no comparison between the large factory to-day and the hut of the peasant, or the tenement of the sweating system. The improvement of machinery and the growing power of industrial establishments, have diminished the price of a great number of goods, and this is one of the most laudable forward movements of industry whose object is to satisfy, as well as possible, the needs of man.

The laboring classes do not share this optimism. They reproach the machine with exhausting the physical powers of the laborer; but this can only apply to a very small number of cases, to those where the workman is at the same time the motive power,