

against liquor, sin, and unionism. In the midst of the 1893 panic about one-third of the labor force was laid off and the rest took wage cuts ranging from 25 to 33 per cent. A committee of the men met with Pullman to seek rent cuts and restoration of the wage cuts, but to no avail. Debs tried to moderate the actions of the workers, but when three of their leaders were discharged they struck.

A month and a half later railroad unionists throughout the country refused to handle Pullman cars, cutting off the sleepers and sidetracking them. The employers, through their General Managers' Association, responded with discharges and the ensuing strike paralyzed a large amount of railroad traffic throughout the nation. Before it was over the Association had deputized 3,600 men, who, in the words of a federal commission that investigated the matter, were "armed and paid by the employers and acted in the double capacity of railroad employees and United States officers." Two thousand railroad cars were wrecked, \$50 to \$100 million in property destroyed, a general strike was called in Chicago, scores of injunctions were issued, and 10,000 federal troops were mobilized by President Cleveland to break the strike.

A decade later, in 1903-1904, another American depression interrupted the steady spiral upward. In its wake, another radical force came into being, the picturesque Industrial Workers of the World, or, as they were popularly known, the Wobblies.

IV

Inexorably, however, the lure of radicalism was being dimmed. Capitalism's development was uneven and the division of its bounty far from just, but from decade to decade it stabilized at an ever higher plateau. In the wake of phenomenal progress it was able to yield important benefits to the workingman. Beginning with 1886, it spawned a new type of unionism—simple, bread-and-butter unionism—a unionism that eventually separated itself from socialism. Such a development could occur in the United States because, compared to Europe, there was far more resiliency in the American economy, far more possibilities of appeasing the laborer, particularly the skilled laborer. Poverty remained—and remains—a blight on the national conscience. Franklin Roosevelt could talk in the 1930's of the one-third of the nation that was ill-fed, ill-housed and ill-clothed, and even after World War II, at the height of the economic swing, four of every ten families were living on standards below what the United States Department of Labor considered minimal—\$75 to \$80 a week. Yet, it is undeniable, despite depression and setback, the system stabilized to the point where it could grant considerable concessions to sizable groups. It opened safety valves and deflected the laborer's horizons from panaceas to simple demands for "more"—more wages, more leisure, more security. A conjunction of interests between segments of the employing class and segments of the laboring class encouraged and solidified the new unionism. As usual, this conjuncture resulted not from the connivings of any unionists or the philosophical meanderings of any groups of employers. On the contrary, it emerged naturally from the "give" in American capitalism. The piling up of wealth released the tensions between the