

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. IV.

APRIL 1900.

No. 2.

Doctrinal Theology.

CHRISTOLOGY.

(Continued.)

In and for the work of redemption, and in the manner and measure requisite for such work, Christ the God-man humiliated himself. The verb, ταπεινῶ, means *to lower, to humble*, the contrary being ὑψῶ, *to raise, to elevate, to exalt.*¹⁾ With the reflex pronoun, ταπεινοῦν signifies *to humble one's self*, to forego honor or high stations or prerogatives which one might rightfully claim or enjoy. Thus Paul says that he had "abased himself,"²⁾ when he had "preached the gospel of God freely," earning his livelihood with his own hands, and taking what other churches gave him, instead of taking and enjoying what he might have rightfully claimed at the hands of the Corinthians.³⁾ And such was the self-humiliation of Christ, *that, though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor;*⁴⁾ *that he, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being in fashion as a man, he humbled*

1) Matt. 23, 12. Luke 14, 11; 18, 14. Phil. 2, 8. 9.

2) ἐμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν, 2 Cor. 11, 7.

3) 2 Cor. 11, 5 ff.

4) 2 Cor. 8, 9.

Practical Theology.

THE PASTOR AND THE LABOR QUESTION.

(Concluded.)

The second fundamental principle which demands recognition in the theory and practice of the labor question is that of *charity*. There are not a few, especially among the laboring people, who object and say, "All we want is justice. Give us justice, and we have no need of charity." But this is another falsehood. God certainly knew better, and He has established the law of charity, *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself*, as a provision for the welfare, also the temporal welfare, of mankind. The interdependence of the members of society is such that charity is an indispensable requisite of a prosperous and enjoyable human community. God himself has made charity a factor of human happiness. Charity is all the more needful in a world of shortcomings and distress in all the various ways of life. The man who selfishly looks solely to his own interests and to the interests of others only inasmuch as his own interests are bound up and dependent upon theirs, is a standing menace and hindrance to the welfare of human society and of its members. By his selfishness he is disposed to look upon all whose interests may be or seem to be clashing with his own as his personal enemies, and to set all his energies against anything they may do to promote their own interests. And this is the animus that pervades the world of labor to-day. The laborer does not look upon his employer as a friend, but as an antagonist against whom he must be on his guard. When a scale of wages is to be prepared, the trade-union does not confer with the employers to learn or deliberate what the mutual interests of the parties may demand or permit. The Union fixes the scale, and it is submitted to the bosses for

acceptance. Refusal to accept the terms thus prescribed means war in the form of a strike or boycott. If arbitration is at all admitted, it is as between contending parties under threat of severer measures. The fellow laborer is considered a friend only while he sides with the Union. Let him go his own way and work at terms agreed upon between himself and the employer, and he is at once regarded as an enemy whose dismissal is demanded and enforced. The dealer or consumer who patronizes the employer with whom the Union is at war is likewise put down as an enemy and may risk being disciplined by a boycott. If the recalcitrant party is ruined by strike or boycott, or if the "scab" who is driven from the shop or building premises is reduced to starvation with his family, all the better; their example may deter others from defying the wrath of the Union. Let the consequence of a miners' strike be a coal famine, the closing down of factories employing thousands of other laboring men, distress in countless homes of the poor for want of fuel: what is all this and more to the strikers? They must see to their interests, let it cost others what it may. On the other hand, if employers think they can gain by taking the offensive, they declare a lockout regardless of the misery they may inflict upon the men and those who depend upon their labor. Employers or employees who may in other ways exercise benevolence to the needy and afflicted with willing hearts and open hands, when it comes to their struggles over the labor question will throw all charity to the winds and fight, simply and relentlessly fight while they can and only submit as to a prevailing enemy. Such is the spirit which actuates the parties to the labor problem of the present day. The acts of violence so often committed in connection with labor troubles are not merely incidental concomitants, but are outbreaks of the hostility which is at the bottom of the conflict of interests and constitutes the very soul of the industrial warfare of which strikes and boycotts and lockouts are merely the pitched battles of a permanent campaign.

But here the question will arise, Was not selfishness a mainspring in all ages since the fall of man from his first estate? Why is it that labor troubles have become a feature of our age as distinguished from earlier periods of the history of the human race?

To answer this question intelligently, it will be necessary to place ourselves face to face with the industrial system now prevalent in modern civilized society as distinguished from earlier forms of industrial life.

The society of classical antiquity was largely monopolistic, inasmuch as a comparatively small part of the population of a territory, the aristocracy, held undisputed sway not only in political, but also in industrial life, while the great mass of laborers were slaves or serfs, or freemen considered little better than slaves or even beneath them. Manual labor and working for wages was looked upon as disgraceful among the Greeks and Romans, and Herodotus remarks that such was the case also among the Egyptians, Thracians, Scythians, Persians, Lydians, and nearly all the barbarian nations.¹⁾ The trades were largely in the hands of manufacturers, who carried on the various industries in extensive shops, in which they employed slave labor. Agriculture, too, was conducted on a large scale, the work being done by slaves or serfs for the land owners, most of whom never touched an implement. Commerce even, though carried on by wholesale dealers and speculators with their own and other people's money, and by ships manned with slaves, was looked upon as a sordid occupation. The laboring masses enjoyed protection in a measure to secure their subsistence. There were, f. e., laws to regulate the land owner's share of the crops raised on his plantations. But all the efforts of legislators to elevate the social and economic standing of the wageworker proved of no avail, and in spite of various measures for the prohibition of idle-

1) 2, 166. 167.

ness, and in view of the success of some who by thrift and talent succeeded in accumulating a competency which would raise them to a degree of respectability, the states had to deal with a growing proletariat of free subjects who, rather than to contaminate themselves with working for a living, would claim the means of subsistence at the doors of the aristocracy or at the expense of the state. What competition there was, naturally existed among the employers of labor rather than among laborers or between laborers and their employers.

The industrial institutions of the middle ages were also largely monopolistic. The mediaeval guilds were close corporations which held the exclusive right of exercising their respective handicrafts. The number of masters, journeymen, and apprentices was strictly limited by law with a view of maintaining a balance of supply and demand, and the measure and methods of production were regulated into minute detail by codes of rules and statutes. Competition was thus reduced to a minimum, and a fair living was permanently secured to all who were members of a craft in good standing. This system was extensively in force in recent centuries. An author of the first half of the eighteenth century¹⁾ defines these fraternities, *Collegium Opificum est trium plerumve personarum ejusdem conditionis, professionis, opificii, vel ordinis legitima Societas*, i. e., "A college of working men is a lawful society of three or more persons of the same condition, industrial profession, or order." He divides them into determinate and indeterminate sodalities. The former are those, *quae certum et stativum, tam Magistrorum quam Discipulorum numerum habent, vel etiam pro angustia loci ultra hominum memoriam certum et determinatum personarum numerum observarunt*, i. e., "which have a certain and stationary number of masters and disciples, or have, because of the smallness of the place, from

1) W. A. Schilling, de collegiis opificum, 1744.

time immemorial maintained a certain and fixed number of persons." As the legal basis of these "societies" the author points out the *Jus Civile*, the *Jura Saxonica*, the Saxon Police Regulations, local laws and customs. *Ex quibus facile colligitur*, he continues, *collegiorum societatem non ex privata conjunctione constare posse, sed summae majestatis Magistratus auctoritatem atque confirmationem insuper requiri*; i. e., "Whence it may be easily gathered that the fellowship of the guilds can not exist by private banding together, but requires the authority and confirmation of the supreme majesty of the government." In this way a legal monopoly was created. *Cum ergo*, says our author, *certa Collegia superiorum consensu constituentur, ex eo sequitur, quod aliis extra illud Collegium ejus artis exercitium exercere interdicitur, cum libertas opificiorum per Constitutionem Collegii restringatur*; i. e., "Hence, whereas certain sodalities are established with the consent of the superiors, it follows therefrom that others outside of that sodality are prohibited from the exercise of that trade, since the freedom of trades is restricted by the Constitution of the Sodality." Provision was also made for the peremptory settlement of difficulties arising between the masters and their employees. *Discipuli saepissime ex injustissimis postulationibus Magistris suis se opponunt et labores sibi demandatos negligunt. Sie stehen in dem Handwerck auf und begehren ihren Meistern, wenn ihnen nicht gewillfahret wird, nicht zu arbeiten. Hoc loco crudelius videretur omnes statim plecti, proinde consultius est, Duces potius et factionis capita seu Antesignanos carcere vel alio modo coercere, ad hoc, ut poena ad paucos, metus ad omnes perveniat. Reliqui vero saltem ad obedientiam Magistris suis praestandam serio admonentur, qui si in contumacia perseverent, poenis debitis ad id coercentur*; i. e., "The disciples very frequently set themselves against their masters with most unjust demands and neglect the work required of them. They strike in the trade and refuse to work for their masters if their

terms are not granted. In such cases it would seem rather cruel that all should be punished at once; it is better policy to coerce by imprisonment or otherwise the leaders and heads or bannerbearers of the faction, so that the punishment may come upon the few, the fear upon all. 'The rest are only to be earnestly admonished to render obedience to their masters; but if they remain obstinate, they are coerced by the punishment they deserve.'

This mediaeval system of industrial organization was swept away by a series of social movements and concomitant theories. In France, the liberalistic policy laid out by Quesnay, Gournay and others, and converted into practice chiefly by Turgot, did away with commercial and industrial barriers, trades guilds and market privileges, and introduced freedom of commerce, freedom of trade, freedom of movement, in short, *free competition*. In the same year in which Turgot was, under the stress of monopolistic opposition, dismissed by the king, 1776, Adam Smith, a Scotchman who had studied theology and philosophy and lectured on belles lettres, logic and moral philosophy at Edinburg and Glasgow, published the ripe fruit of his personal intercourse with the French physiocrats and ten years of application to his subject. This work *on the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, one of the most influential books ever written, opens with the words:—

“The annual labor of every nation is the fund which originally supplies it with all the necessities or conveniences of life which it annually consumes, and which consist always either in the immediate produce of that labor, or in what is purchased with that produce from other nations. According, therefore, as this produce, or what is purchased with it, bears a greater or smaller proportion to the number of those who are to consume it, the nation will be better or worse supplied with all the necessities and conveniences for which it has occasion.”¹⁾

1) Works of Adam Smith, vol. II, p. 1.

While Smith and the Physiocrats agree in the principle of free competition, they differ as to the sources of wealth, the Physiocrats holding that all wealth is derived from nature, and Smith maintaining that labor is the creator of all wealth. From this principle, Smith argues that, since every man is the best judge of his own interests, the production of wealth will be most effectively promoted by the greatest freedom of industrial pursuits. According to this theory the organization of industrial life was reconstructed in England and on the continent, until the monopolistic barriers had mostly disappeared and free competition had taken their place.

For a time it seemed that the true highway of prosperity had really been discovered. The wealth of nations was marvelously increased in the new industrial era, and all might have gone well if it had not been for several grievous mistakes which clamored for correction. In the first place, labor persistently refused to be the creator of all wealth. No amount of labor could create coal out of nothing; access to the coal beds in the earth was indispensable, and the mines were not in possession of the laborers. Labor, to be most highly productive, was in need of capital, and capital was largely in other hands than those of the laborers. At the same time it became apparent that if the laborers were the best judges of their own interests, the possessors of land and capital considered themselves the best judges of theirs, and that free competition, to be really free, must work, and actually worked, both ways. Adam Smith himself was by no means blind to this, and even in his great fundamental work he had said, "What are the common wages of labor, depends everywhere upon the contract usually made between those two parties, whose interests are by no means the same. The workmen desire to get as much, the masters to give as little as possible. The former are disposed to combine in order to raise, the latter in order to lower the wages of labor. It is not, however, difficult to foresee which of the

two parties must, upon all ordinary occasions, have the advantage in the dispute, and force the other into a compliance with their terms." ¹⁾

In these words, Adam Smith was the prophet of the Industrialism of which he was the chief apostle and evangelist. He foresees "two parties" in "dispute," the one party endeavoring to "force" the other into "compliance with their terms." This was inevitably the outcome of a system based upon and actuated by a fundamental sin, the sin of selfishness whereby man makes his own interests the standard of his actions and conduct. And when this fundamental sin is wedded to a fundamental falsehood as that of labor being the creator of all wealth, what will the offspring be? Thus what was planned as wholesome competition has developed into a contest of conflicting interests, a war of contending parties.

This contest was immensely sharpened and intensified by a change in the methods of industrial production which neither Adam Smith nor any one else had foreseen and taken into consideration, the extensive introduction of labor saving machinery. This affected the condition of laboring men in various ways, most of which do not immediately concern us here. But one of the features of this new order of things is that, while formerly the weaver and the shoemaker and many others worked with their own tools and implements and capital and labor were largely in the same hands, the cost of a modern manufacturing plant with its expensive machinery vastly exceeds the means of by far the greater number of laboring men, few of whom also possess the talent, training and experience for conducting an industrial enterprise on a large scale, and, consequently, the capital and labor engaged in modern manufacturing industries are, as a rule, in different hands. One party, the employer, furnishes, holds and controls the capital; the

1) Works, vol. II, pp. 99 f.

other party, comprising the employees, furnishes the greater part of the manual labor requisite to render capital productive. And while these parties are interdependent upon each other, they are at the same time competing parties, competing for their respective shares in the product, which is the joint product of concurrent causes. While the two parties have, or ought to have, a common interest in the production of wealth, they have conflicting interests as regards the distribution of the wealth produced. The share which goes to the employee as wages cannot at the same time remain the property of the employer, and that part which the employer retains for himself cannot at the same time pass over to the employee. Under the mediaeval system as regulated by law and custom, the distribution was not subject to a conflict between the parties, but to the established rule. But free competition on the principle that every man is the best judge of his own interests leaves the parties to settle the question between themselves, each looking to his own interest and endeavoring to wrest from the other as much as he can. This is one of the motives which leads employees to band together as individuals with a common party interest against the other party, that of employers. Says Trant, "Not only, then, is a union able to bring about a rise in wages sooner than would otherwise be the case, but it is also able to wrest from the masters a larger share of the profits than they would concede to a request unsupported by the power to enforce it."¹) And, on the other hand, it is not entirely without foundation in fact when the same author, speaking of the policy of employers, though in too sweeping a way, says, "Their chief advice to the masters is, 'Be kind to your men;' and to the men, 'Trust to the generosity of your employers.' The men, unfortunately, have had a bitter experience of the generosity from which they are told to expect such great blessings. . . . It is in-

1) Trade Unions, p. 76.

deed foolish to maintain that masters would give the full wages to which men are entitled unless they were forced to do so. As a matter of fact they have never done so.”¹⁾ Here we have, again, the animus that pervades the industrial classes or parties of to-day. If charity prevailed, the distribution of the emoluments of production would be reached by way of amicable agreement adjusted to the circumstances of the case, and free competition would afford both parties the advantage of free scope for considerate adjustment. But it is not in depraved human nature to be charitable. Natural man is selfish, and free competition in the pursuit of his own interests signifies to him unrestricted license to fight every one whose interests clash with his own. And now labor is or considers itself in competition, free competition with capital for the share it claims in the output of industry. What share? In 1875 the Massachusetts Labor Reform Convention adopted the resolution:—“We affirm, as a fundamental principle, that labor, the creator of all wealth, is entitled to all it creates.” The right to the whole produce is what labor to-day claims in its competition with capital. And this is only consistent with the views of the liberal school of political economy which inaugurated the system of free competition. Chapter VIII of Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* begins, “The produce of labor constitutes the natural recompense or wages of labor.”²⁾ Capital itself, according to Smith, is only the accumulated product of labor. Hence the animosity with which the competition between employees and employers is conducted. Trade unions are conceived and announced as consociations of laboring men for the protection and defense of Labor against the greed and selfishness of Capital³⁾ and the wrongs

1) Ibid. pp. 76 f.

2) Smith, Works, vol. II, p. 96.

3) It may be proper to explain that when speaking of *Labor* and *Capital* personified, we accommodate ourselves to the modern *usus loquendi*, according to which *Labor* stands for the employees of the industrial *entrepreneur*, who manages and controls the capital invested in the industrial enter-

inflicted upon the former by the latter. The Preamble of the Constitution of the Iron Molders' Union of North America adopted in 1886 opened with the quotation:—

"Labor has no protection—the weak are devoured by the strong. All wealth and all power center in the hands of the few, and the many are their victims and their bondsmen." The Preamble further says:—

"WEALTH IS POWER,¹⁾ and practical experience teaches us that it is a power but too often used to oppress and degrade the daily laborer. Year after year the capital of the country becomes more concentrated in the hands of a few; and in proportion as the wealth of the country becomes more centralized, its power increases, and the laboring classes are impoverished. It therefore becomes us, as men who have to battle with the stern realities of life, to look this matter fairly in the face. There is no dodging the question; let every man give it a fair, full and candid consideration, and then act according to his honest convictions. *What position are we, the mechanics of America to hold in society?*²⁾ Are we to receive an equivalent for our labor sufficient to maintain us in comparative independence and respectability, to procure the means with which to educate our children, and to qualify them to play their part in the world's drama, or must we be forced to bow the suppliant knee to wealth, and earn, by unprofitable toil, a life too void of solace to confirm the very chains that bind us to our doom?"

prise, provides the materials and means of production and disposes of the produce to the dealer or consumer, and is, in this relation, known as *Capital*. The *entrepreneur*, or captain of industry, may or may not be the owner of the values invested; he may work wholly or in part with other people's capital. In the distribution of the produce, the part which goes to Labor is *wages*, the part which goes to the owners of the values invested is *interest* or *rent*, and that part which is retained by the *entrepreneur* as such is his *profit*.

1) Capitals of the original.

2) Italics of the original.

“IN UNION THERE IS STRENGTH,¹⁾ and in the formation of an organization embracing every molder in North America, a Union founded upon a basis as broad as the land in which we live, lies our only hope. Single handed, we can accomplish nothing; but united, there is no power of wrong we may not openly defy.”

The same spirit of defiance directed against wrongs inflicted by Wealth or Capital upon Labor is manifest throughout the labor movement of our day. Two more illustrations may serve to exemplify the genus. The Preamble of the Constitution adopted by the Cigar Makers' International Union of America in 1885 says:—

“Labor has no protection—the weak are devoured by the strong. All wealth and power center in the hands of the few, and the many are their victims and bondsmen. In all countries and at all times capital has been used to monopolize particular branches of business until the vast and various industrial pursuits of the world are rapidly coming under the immediate control of a comparatively small portion of mankind, tending if not checked by the toiling millions, to enslave or impoverish them.

“Labor is the creator of all wealth, and as such the laborer is entitled to a remuneration sufficient to enable himself and family to enjoy more of the leisure that rightfully belongs to him, more social advantages, more of the benefits, privileges and emoluments of the world; in a word, all those rights and privileges necessary to make him capable of enjoying, appreciating, defending and perpetuating the blessings of modern civilization. Past experience teaches us that labor has so far been unable to arrest the encroachments of capital, neither has it been able to obtain justice from the law-making power. This is due to a lack of practical organization and unity of action. ‘In union there is strength.’ Organization and united action are the only means

1) Capitals of the original.

by which the laboring classes can gain any advantages for themselves. Good and strong labor organizations are enabled to defend and preserve the interests of the working people."

The Bricklayers' and Masons' International Union of America, in the Preamble of its Constitution adopted in 1893, says:—

"At no period of the world's history has the necessity of combination on the part of labor become so apparent to every thinking mind as at the present time; and, perhaps in no country have the working classes been so forgetful of their own interest as in this great Republic; all other questions seem to attract the attention of the Workingman more than that which is most vital to his existence.

"Whereas, Capital has assumed to itself the right to own and control labor for the accomplishment of its own greedy and selfish ends, regardless of the laws of Nature and Nature's God; and

"Whereas, Experience has demonstrated the utility of concentrated efforts in arriving at specific ends, and it is an evident fact that, if the dignity of labor is to be preserved, it must be done by our united action; and

"Whereas, Believing the truth of the following maxims, that they who would be free themselves must strike the blow, that in Union there is strength, and self-preservation is the first law of nature," etc.

It is but consistent that organizations avowedly formed for such reasons and purposes should treat those who hold the control of capital as their natural and irreconcilable enemies, against whom they must stand arrayed on the basis of "the first law of nature," in the performance of solemn duties toward their families and fellow laborers, in defense of their sacred rights against those who would enslave and otherwise wrong them "for the accomplishment of their greedy and selfish ends, regardless of the laws of Nature and Nature's God." The more consistently organizations

so planned and constituted adhere to and execute their purpose of antagonizing the power of Capital as the oppressor of Labor, the creator of all wealth, the more will their methods and measures, considered as necessary means to their ends, appear justified in the eyes of their members. And yet it is evident that the trend and scope of Trade-Unionism as it is exhibited in the official utterances above quoted, and strikes and boycotts as coercive measures, while in full keeping with one another, are thoroughly and radically immoral, utterly disregarding every principle of charity, the fundamental duty underlying all the legitimate relations between man and man. Even if all the claims of Labor against Capital were just, it would be immoral for the claimants to say to the other party: "Give us what we demand, or we will damage or ruin you." No man is free to be plaintiff, judge, and executioner at the same time concerning matters at issue between himself and another man. No man may arrogate to himself the right of taking the law in his own hands, where there are powers ordained of God to administer law and justice. It has been said that a man may work when he pleases and for whom he pleases, and with considerable limitation this may be conceded. But when a man or a hundred men quit work and keep others from work for the purpose of damaging the employer and thereby coercing him into compliance with their demands, they are *pro tanto* anarchists, even when their claims are in themselves just and ought to be granted. And no strike is considered expedient which does not coerce by taking the opponent at a disadvantage and threatening or inflicting damage to forego which the recalcitrant party is apt to yield. Of course, this is not free competition; for freedom is not license to benefit one's self by harming everybody else, and where coercion begins, free competition is at an end. In free competition every competitor must respect the rights of all other competitors, and my right must cease where my neighbor's right begins. But it is no man's right to force

his will upon any other man. Duress is not a right, but a wrong. God alone and those who act under divine authority may subject my will to theirs and enforce their rulings in spite of what I may will, say, or do. Within the province of free competition it is proper that the best should prevail because it is best, but not that the strongest should prevail because it is strongest. Free competition as such must be determined by right, not by might.

But not by right alone. Right and justice go a great way toward regulating the common affairs of men; but they do not go all the way. Human law and human justice and its administration are, as all things human, imperfect in various ways. Many complications of human affairs are utterly beyond human analysis and adequate adjudication. It is impossible to determine what share of the wealth produced by a multitude of concurrent agencies and causes should fall to an individual workman as his share in proportion to what he has contributed toward the complicated process of its production. It is utterly impossible to state in dollars and cents how much of a year's profit in a great shoe factory is due to the labor of the employees, how much to the management of the employer, and how much to a score or a hundred of other concurrent causes, as the labor and management in other shoe factories, the labor and management of so many tanneries, the amount of cattle raised in this country and abroad, the amount of corn reaped in two hemispheres, the severity of the winter and the amount of rain in the summer, the rates of shipment by land and water, the hundreds of causes which determine the price of coal, changes of fashion, the political outlook, the money market and the innumerable causes by which it is affected, the introduction of new machinery, *et cetera*. How much did John Jones in the packing room and Annie Sloan at one of the stitching machines contribute toward the year's profit of the factory, which cannot even be precisely computed because of the wear and tear of the plant, and what would

be the just recompense of John Jones and Annie Sloan? The whole produce? Perhaps not. For Anderson, the teamster, and Miss Miller, the typewriter girl, want their shares. What shares? Can they tell? Can the Union tell? Can anybody tell?

Here again, apparently, free competition comes to the rescue. If Anderson were the only teamster and Miss Miller the only typewriter girl to be had, they might dictate their terms. But now they have competitors, other men and women who are able and willing to perform the same work, and as they too are free to offer their services, and the employers are free to accept them, the wages question is easily settled. The employers will engage the competitors who will give them the best service for the least wages. If free competition pure and simple is to prevail, then the employer will dismiss Anderson and Miss Miller and employ others in their places, if others will give them the same service for lower wages. But Anderson has a wife and six children to care for, and Miss Miller is the only support of an invalid mother and a consumptive brother. Charitable consideration would, of course, recommend that they be retained in their positions even at higher wages than those for which their competitors, a single man and an unencumbered girl, would be willing to fill their places. The same charitable considerations might have induced these competitors to stand back and even refuse to take the places of the needy incumbents of the positions they might otherwise have sought to obtain or accepted if they had been offered. It is a pleasure to say that instances of such generous use of the privilege of free competition are not entirely unheard of. Individual employers and even so-called soulless corporations are known thus to discriminate, even at a sacrifice of services or wages, in favor of employees whom charitable regards recommend for continued employment. As a rule, however, competition works the other way. Employers will engage Labor at the lowest terms obtainable, and Labor will

compete with Labor regardless of the condition of those whom competition crowds to where they can no longer keep the wolf from their door. Not the laborer, the person, with his human personality, his individual wants and duties, but labor, the thing, is in the market, which is regulated by the law of supply and demand. Where and when the supply is scanty and the demand is high, the price is correspondingly high. Where the supply is plentiful and the demand is small, the price is proportionally low. And where there is no demand, the supply is wanted at no price at all. In these respects, the labor market is as any other market. Here, as elsewhere, neither supply nor demand is a fixed quantity, but both are variable and fluctuating. There is no uniform standard by which they may be gauged. Even the minimum rate at which the laborer can work, the means of bare subsistence, the wage rate to which, according to what has been termed the "iron wage law," free competition must ultimately reduce the laborer, is not a fixed, invariable quantity. For one man requires more food than another; on what an Irishman will starve may suffice to fatten a Chinaman. And as "subsistence" includes the support of the laborer's family, it does not signify the same to a father of seven children and to a single man. Subsistence means more in winter, when fuel and warm clothing are requisite, than in summer, when both are of little account. Here, again, there would be a wide field for charitable adjustment in the economy of free competition, providing from the produce of industrial pursuits under the blessing of God not only the necessities, but also a fair allowance of comfort, for all the members of an industrial community. But such a condition of things will and can never obtain under a system of free competition in a selfish world, even with the best administration of human justice within the reach of deteriorated human nature.

To sum up: what might have been *a priori* concluded, has been *a posteriori* amply demonstrated, that an indus-

trial system of free competition in this world of sin and selfishness is and must be a failure. Not, indeed, a failure in every respect; for free competition is very apt to work as a powerful stimulus for energetic exertion of the faculties and powers of body and mind, and may engender, as it has undoubtedly done, vastly increased activity in the various pursuits of industrial life. But a failure as far as the true temporal happiness of human society and its members is concerned. "The modern man," says Prof. Ely, "like the modern trotter, has been developed in the race-course. Every one must be active and alert or suffer loss. Progress in technical processes has been rapid, and the formation of new enterprises has been encouraged. . . . When we come to speak of the disadvantages of the modern system of freedom, that is to say, of competition, it occurs to us that the moral atmosphere of the race-course is not a wholesome one. Competition tends to force the level of economic life down to the moral standard of the worst men who can sustain themselves in the business community."¹)

All this is by no means of recent discovery. On the contrary, the world is, and has been for many years, full of those who exert their utmost endeavors to put down this very thing, once preached as a gospel of social salvation by wise men and hailed with shouts of joy by other wise men and ignorant multitudes, free competition. Trade Unions, Communism, Socialism, Trusts, Monopolism in a hundred forms, are so many physicians endeavoring, each in his way, to cure society of this organic disease, free competition, and the long catalogue of evils resulting therefrom.

Trade Unions, as has been shown, are, in one way, conceived and operated as means of more successful competition with Capital for the share of Labor in the distribution of the produce of industry. But Labor has learned by experience that, while this competition is *free* competi-

1) Introd. to Pol. Econ., p. 83.

tion, Capital is as free to employ whom it pleases as Labor is to work for whom it pleases, and that, if the labor market is a free market, Capital must be as free to purchase labor as cheap as it can, if Labor is free to sell its services as high as it can. And Labor, furthermore, learned by experience, that, while Capital and Labor are interdependent as far as production is concerned, Labor is at a disadvantage when both become unproductive. For idleness soon entails want to the average laborer, while Capital, as a rule, can wait and bide its time, especially when production has been abundant. The only thing which might have done away with this disadvantage of Labor, charity, was, as experience also painfully demonstrated, a rare bird on both sides, and Capital, on the contrary, openly figured on the wolf on the other side and computed the time when want would bring Labor to terms.

In this plight, Labor saw no recourse but simply to restrict the freedom of its competitors, to dictate its terms and coerce its competitors to accept them. Under the sway of Trade Unions, a manufacturing firm is no longer in free control of its business and of the capital invested. When the Union determines what wages shall be paid, how many hours the machinery shall run, what material shall or shall not be used, who shall or shall not work, to whom the output shall or shall not be sold, by whom it shall or shall not be shipped, it is, *pro tanto*, Labor, not Capital, which controls the works and the production and distribution of the produce. Mr. Connolly's answer before the Royal Commission, "We do not take masters into account at all in our arrangements,"¹⁾ tersely and clearly states the point in the case. To make this point, the organization of Labor was requisite. "In union there is strength," the strength required to bring Capital to terms, "to wrest from the masters a larger share of the profits

1) Q. 1349. See QUARTERLY, present Vol., p. 99.

than they would concede to a request unsupported by the power to enforce it.”¹⁾ “Organization and united action are the only means by which the laboring classes can gain any advantages to themselves. Good and strong labor organizations are enabled to defend and preserve the interests of the working people.”²⁾ Control implies the power to control, and since Labor has learned that, in order to wrest from the masters a larger share of the produce, it must wrest from the employer the control of production and the means of production, organization for this purpose is a matter of course. Hence the efforts of organized Labor to strengthen its ranks and the animosity of Unions toward the “scabs” who stand aloof and refuse to join in the endeavors which alone can secure success.

But this refusal to co-operate is not the “scab’s” only sin. He appears also as the competitor of organized Labor, in times of peace and, especially, in times of war. While the competition of laboring men among themselves is free, when every man may determine for himself at what price he would work, regardless of the prices dictated by the Union, Capital is to the same extent free to employ Labor at the terms agreed upon between the contracting parties, both parties being, as they should be under the law of contracts, free to offer and accept the terms of the contract by which they would mutually stand. But this freedom of competition, as we have seen, does not work to universal satisfaction. Especially does it seriously interfere with certain measures of organized labor. If, in case of a strike, competing labor steps into the vacant places and remains there, the strike will result in a twofold failure: the employers will not be coerced, and the strikers, instead of securing a gain, will sustain a loss, the loss of their positions with all their emoluments. Hence this free compe-

1) Trant, Trade Unions, p. 76.

2) Constitution of the Cigar Makers’ Intern. Union.

tition must cease. In the Preamble of its Constitution, the Building Trades' Council of St. Louis and Vicinity said:—

"It is furthermore agreed, that to protect our organizations from the destructive influence of non-union men, we shall not work with non-union men of any trade, when such trade is represented in this Council; neither shall we work on buildings where non-union men have been employed regardless of the protest of this Council." Of course, when these organizations say, "We will not work with non-union men," the true meaning is, "Non-union men shall not work with us." The free laborer shall either become a member of the Union and thus step out of free competition with the Union men; or he shall be shut out of all competition, free or unfree, by being denied the privilege of working at any trade represented in the Labor-organization. What will become of him in the latter event, does not concern the Union men. If he can find work by which he does not compete with them, let him. If he can not, and must suffer want in consequence, let him. Perhaps want will change his mind and drive him into the Union, where he ought to have been long ago. To join the Union is, in fact, looked upon as a social duty, the neglect of which should bring suffering upon the delinquent. Says an English Member of Parliament:—

"Looked at from its purely social aspects, much can be urged in favor of the utmost pressure being applied to induce workmen to belong to the Union. Those who persistently remain outside, neglect an obvious duty—the duty of manfully doing their part to keep the current rates of wages, and maintain a maximum working-day. Non-Unionists are always ready to take advantage of the fruits of others' labors; they ought to partake of some share in sowing the seed, tilling the ground, and promoting the growth and maturity of the harvest, as well as reaping and gathering it in."¹)

1) G. Howell, M. P., *Trade Unionism New and Old*, pp. 83 f.

That organized Labor has not been more successful in securing the control of industry is, and with some truth, charged to unorganized Labor. We have heard Sir William Erle say that "the action of unions, so far as it excludes non-unionists from work, and requires for unionists wages to a certain amount, is founded on a supposed monopoly of a given kind of work in a given district. All such work is assumed to be the property of the union; if all the workmen who can supply the work are in the union, the monopoly is secured."¹⁾ But, as a matter of fact, this retrogression from liberalism to monopolism is far from being complete. To this day, by far the greater part of Labor is unorganized. There are great industrial communities with thousands of skilled and unskilled laborers employed by powerful corporations, where no Labor Union exists and all efforts to organize Labor have been rejected by the men. Nor has Trade Unionism done by far as much as some people think toward securing for labor a greater share of the produce. That strikes have caused immense losses to Labor is conceded on all sides. But it is not equally well established that these losses have been balanced by corresponding gains. It has been said that, while the losses were temporary and local, the gains in the form of increased wages have been permanent and general, and that, consequently, strikes have raised the rate of wages and improved the condition of Labor. But this argument contains a *petitio principii*. It is by no means proved that the increase of wages following strikes has been the effect of the strikes. We quote from an authority of high standing:—

"It is altogether a different matter to infer that because increased wages have been attained the strikes are the cause of attainment. This argument is essentially one of the kind *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*—a kind of argument more often fallacious than sound. We must remember that many other

1) See *ante*, p. 100.

causes have been in operation tending towards the increase of earnings. . . . In view of this multiplicity of causes, in fact, the method of direct experience fails.

"The last chance of a verdict conclusively in favor of strikes is removed when we remember that the general rise of wages allowed by statistes to have occurred is by no means confined to trades which are united and addicted to striking, but extends more or less distinctly to all classes of employees. Many extensive groups of workers, such as mercantile and bank clerks, Government clerks and officials, post-office employees, policemen, soldiers, and so forth, have all attained distinct and, what is more, permanent advances of salary, without anything to be called striking. Still more remarkably is this the case with domestic servants, an exceedingly numerous class of persons, quite devoid of organization, and often of an age and character little suited, it might be thought, to enforce concession. Yet, by the natural operation of the laws of supply and demand, and by their own good sense, these employees have been greatly advanced in earnings and other advantages. . . .

"So difficult, or rather impossible, is it to distinguish the cases in which strikes must inflict great loss and disappointment and those in which they may yield at least apparent success, that the economist incurs grave responsibility in expressing approval of any strikes." ¹⁾

Even so strong an advocate of Trade-Unionism as Trant says, "A trade society may retard a fall or accelerate a rise (of wages), but it cannot change the law that regulates the fluctuations, or render permanent that which in its very essence is temporary." ²⁾

To sum up again: free competition as a golden highway to human happiness has proved a failure. And the

1) W. Stanley Jevons, LL. D., F. R. S., *The State in Relation to Labor*. 3d. ed., pp. 120—122.

2) *Trade Unions*, p. 141.

endeavors of Trade Unions to put down free competition between Capital and Labor and between Labor and Labor, and thus to enhance the condition and secure the welfare of the laboring classes have also proved a failure.

And now let us consider, for a moment, at what a fearful price this failure has been bought. We will not here dwell with any length on the thousands and millions of dollars paid from the wages of laborers into the treasuries of Trade Unions and largely disbursed in industrial warfare of, to say the least, doubtful expediency. Far heavier than this expenditure is the appalling encumbrance of sin and crime with which Trade Unionism is loaded down in the sight of God and man. Millions upon millions of dollars' worth of property, other people's property, deliberately destroyed. Thousands of lives brought to a violent end. Thousands of widows and orphans deprived of their husbands and fathers. Thousands of laborers and their families reduced to utmost misery. Fathers and sons and brothers and fellow church-members forced to wage war upon each other as employers and employees, sons constrained to strike against their fathers, and fellow Christians to oust fellow Christians from employment and thus reduce them and their families to penury. Hatred and bitter enmity engendered between those who should have been encompassed with bonds of love and good fellowship. Open defiance of law and order and conflicts with municipal, state and national governments and their officers. Untold acts of ingratitude and injustice enjoined by the rules and resolutions of Unions and Federations or their councils and officers and walking delegates. And all this in the face of the divine law and precept, THOU SHALT LOVE THY NEIGHBOR AS THYSELF! Such is the burden of sin and guilt for which Trade Unionism will have to answer on the day of reckoning. Should any Christian be willing to share that guilt? And should any Christian pastor refuse or neglect to warn his people and open their eyes to these unfruitful works of darkness,

lest they fellowship with these things, because of which the wrath of God will surely come upon the children of disobedience? ¹⁾

In the performance of this duty we may, of course, expect to meet with various objections.

There may be those who will tell us that it is their business and not ours to determine their course in the management of their temporal affairs. To such we should say that to determine what is right or wrong in all their affairs is neither their business nor ours, but God's, who has reserved to himself the right of determining what is sin and what is righteousness, and that it is our business to inculcate the will of God upon all those whose souls God has committed to our care, ²⁾ and that it is their business and duty to hear us and to prove what is acceptable to the Lord. ³⁾

Others may tell us that, since their occupation places them in the ranks of the industrial army, they are bound to conform with the rules and regulations prevailing in the world of labor; that Trade Unions have come to be a part of the industrial system of our day, recognized and legalized by civil legislation, and that the individual must simply accommodate himself to the prevailing state of things. To these we should say that all the rules and regulations and all legislative enactments in the world cannot rescind a single commandment of God; that many divorces legalized by the law of the state are damnable sins in the sight of God; that many of the measures of the Unions are violations even of the secular law; and that where they are not, it still behooves a Christian not to be conformed to this world in its sinful ways, but in all things to prove what is the good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God. ⁴⁾

1) Eph. 5, 6 ff. Ezek. 3, 17—21.

2) Ezek. 3, 17. Acts 20, 28. Hebr. 13, 17.

3) Eph. 5, 10. 17. Rom. 12, 2.

4) Rom. 12, 2. 1 Pet. 4, 4.

Still others have objected that, unless they join the Union, they cannot obtain work, and that, since it is their duty to support their families, they must be with the union, though they would gladly be without it. These should be encouraged to seek employment where organized labor will not or cannot interfere, either in their trade or out of it, at the place of their present abode or at another place, in the country, if they fail to succeed in the city, trusting that he that is in us is greater than he that is in the world,¹⁾ and that the Lord will provide, and not leave them, nor forsake them.²⁾ To such brethren the pastor and all the members of the congregation should extend a helping hand, that by their active assistance the conscientious brother may find the fulfillment of his daily prayer and petition, *Give us this day our daily bread*. And here a duty devolves upon those members of our congregations who are employers of Labor, a duty of which they should be earnestly reminded by the pastor. A Christian employer should be led to look upon himself as a steward of the Lord who, by his apostle, has said, *As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith*.³⁾ If he must discriminate, it should be done, not against, but for, his brother in Christ as long as his hand is free thus to discriminate.

But what is the pastor to do if his warnings and admonitions are left unheeded? What will a physician do when he finds that the medicine he prescribed at his first call has not had the desired effect? Will he leave his patient to his fate? No; he will sit down and write another prescription, taking into account any new symptoms, especially if they indicate the necessity of a more energetic treatment. Nor will he after a third or fourth call abandon his patient. The time may come when he will seek a consultation with another practitioner, or recommend that a trained nurse should

1) 1 John 4, 4.

2) Hebr. 13, 5.

3) Gal. 6, 10.

be employed. Thus he will continue to fight the malady and persist in his efforts to save the life he sees endangered, until his endeavors are crowned with success and the patient has recovered, or the disease has terminated in death and all that remains to be done is to pronounce life extinct. Let the faithful pastor go and do likewise. Let him administer to his patient in the Labor Question ward the remedy by which alone he may be healed; let him continue while there are still tokens of spiritual life; let him call in all the assistance available. The day may come when he and his assistants and the patient himself may rejoice in a successful cure. Or the day may come when sin may have resulted in spiritual death and he who was once a Christian must be pronounced a heathen man and a publican. A. G.

OUTLINES OF FUNERAL SERMONS.

At the Funeral of a Little Child.

On John 3, 16.

The Lord gave you this dear little child, and the Lord hath taken it away. Job 1, 21. Or can we imagine that our beloved children fall into their graves without God's notice, will, or interposition? Did some malicious hand stop up the avenues of life, and break its springs, so as to baffle all the parents' tenderness, and all of the physician's skill? By no means! It was the Lord. It has pleased the Lord in His good and wise providence to take from this vale of tears the soul of your dearly beloved child. Matt. 10, 29. 30. Acts 17, 27. 28. Job 1, 21.

WHAT INDUCED GOD TO TAKE TO HIMSELF THIS LITTLE CHILD IN ITS EARLY INFANCY?

I.

His divine love toward this little child.

a. He, out of divine love, "gave His only begotten Son" for it ("the world") into sufferings and death, in