

LIBRARY

Storrs Agricultural College

Vol. 6165,

Class No. 261

Cost. .84

Date June 8... 18. 98

~~261~~

~~G45~~

~~6165~~

BOOK 261.G45 c.1
GLADDEN # APPLIED CHRISTIANITY



3 9153 00067108 3

By Rev. Washington Gladden, D. D.

THE LORD'S PRAYER. 16mo, \$1.00.

APPLIED CHRISTIANITY. Moral Aspects of Social Questions. 16mo, \$1.25.

WHO WROTE THE BIBLE? A Book for the People. 16mo, \$1.25.

TOOLS AND THE MAN. Property and Industry under the Christian Law. 16mo, \$1.25.

RULING IDEAS OF THE PRESENT AGE. 16mo, \$1.25.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY,
BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

APPLIED CHRISTIANITY

MORAL ASPECTS OF SOCIAL QUESTIONS

By WASHINGTON GLADDEN



BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY
The Riverside Press, Cambridge

1897

Copyright, 1886,
By WASHINGTON GLADDEN.

All rights reserved.

6165.

NINTH EDITION.

The Riverside Press, Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.
Electrotyped and Printed by H. O. Houghton & Company.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CHRISTIANITY AND WEALTH	1
IS LABOR A COMMODITY?	38
THE STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS OF SOCIALISM	53
IS IT PEACE OR WAR?	102
THE WAGE-WORKERS AND THE CHURCHES	146
THREE DANGERS	180
CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL SCIENCE	210
CHRISTIANITY AND POPULAR AMUSEMENTS	248
CHRISTIANITY AND POPULAR EDUCATION	284

APPLIED CHRISTIANITY.

CHRISTIANITY AND WEALTH.

THE Christian economists of America are confronting a great problem. The wealth of the country is increasing at a prodigious rate. Every census shows the population multiplying, and wealth multiplying much faster than the population. In 1860 the estimated valuation of all the property, real and personal, in the United States was a little over \$16,000,000,000; in 1870 it was a little more than \$24,000,000,000; and between these dates came a wasting war, with the destruction of a million of producers, and the extinguishment of property in slaves reckoned at \$1,500,000,000. The census estimates for 1880 put the wealth of the nation at \$43,642,000,000, and make the United States the richest nation in the world, exceeding Great Britain by several hundred

millions. Signs of this increase of wealth appear on every hand: railroads, factories, farm buildings and machinery, warehouses and docks, long lines of wholesale stores and retail shops, great financial institutions — banks, insurance companies, trust companies for the storage and use of capital; houses going up in the cities and the towns by the hundred thousand, many of them palaces; equipages, furniture, rich costumes, costly works of art. The one impression made upon the mind of the philosophical observer who makes a tour of the watering-places, and notes the scale on which multitudes of his fellow-citizens are living, is that this is a rich country. He may doubt whether these people can all afford to spend so much; but the money is here, else they could not be spending it. It may not all rightly belong to them, but it is in their hands, and no one can see the floods of it that are poured out without feeling sure that there must be oceans of it.

In 1860 the census told us that if all the property of this country were equally divided, there would be for every man, woman, and child about \$514. In 1870 the share of each would have been \$624. In 1880 the valuation per capita is \$814. The population increased during these twenty years a little more than 59 per cent., the wealth a little more than 170 per

cent. These figures are reduced to a gold basis, and do not take into account the fluctuations of an inflated paper currency.

This increase of wealth appears, in a somewhat less marked degree, in the mother country. The national wealth of England in 1860 was estimated at \$26,000,000,000; in 1870 at \$34,000,000,000; in 1880 at \$43,000,000,000.

It is easy to discover a part, at least, of the sources of this swelling flood of wealth. Vast areas of fertile land in this and other countries have been brought under cultivation; better methods of agriculture have added to the productiveness of the lands cultivated (the production of cereals in this country in 1879 was considerably more than twice that of 1869); mines have been developed on an enormous scale, yielding untold stores of the precious and the useful minerals; the discovery of petroleum has added another to the great staples of commerce; natural gas adds a tremendous force to the development of our mechanical industries; railroads, pushed in every direction, unlock the resources of new countries and bring their wealth to waiting markets; steamships sail from every shore with the contributions of all the continents to the world's trade; above all, machinery, driven by steam, or falling water, or imprisoned air, or electricity, is multiplying

the power of man to turn the crude products of the earth into forms that shall serve his needs or gratify his desires.

The world is fast growing richer; of this there can be no doubt. And what has the Christian moralist to say about it? Does the ethical system of which he is the expounder authorize him to say anything, and if so, what? Should he teach that this increase of wealth is a good thing or an evil thing; a blessing to be rejoiced in, or a misery to be deplored?

One fact thrusts itself in our faces as soon as we ask this question: this great increase of wealth is visible mainly, after all, in Christian lands. We said that the world is growing rich, but it is our world — the world with which we are brought into closest political and commercial relations — of which this is true; it is not true of the teeming populations of Africa, save of those tribes that have received Christianity; of them it is true. It is not true of China, nor of India, nor of Persia, nor of Turkey to any great extent.

I have referred to the change wrought, in respect of wealth, in the tribes that have lately received Christianity. This is a notable phenomenon. When we wish to prove the beneficent nature of Christianity we often mention this. Pointing to such a people as the Hawai-

ians or the Zulus, we say: Remember what they were before the missionaries visited them, and now look at them. They had no houses, no clothing to speak of, few cultivated fields, and these but rudely tilled; no stores of food to keep them from famine. Now they dwell in ceiled houses; they are clad in the garments of civilization; many of the comforts of home are in their houses; they are cultivating the soil with skill and success; they have barns, plows, hoes, many instruments of husbandry; they are learning some of the mechanical arts; they produce more than they need, and have a surplus for less fruitful seasons. That is to say, there has been a great increase of wealth among them. Every one of the statements that we have made respecting their changed condition comes under this generalization. We say, therefore, and say truly, that one effect invariably produced by Christianity upon an uncivilized people receiving it is to multiply the wealth of that people. We point to that result as an evidence that Christianity is a blessing to mankind. The major premise of the syllogism here involved must be that the increase of wealth is a benefit rather than an injury to men.

If the Christian moralist were called on to justify this proposition, he would be likely to appeal to the Scriptures, and he would find

plenty of Scripture on his side. In the Old Testament, especially, this doctrine is almost fundamental. The connection of prosperity with righteousness is taught on almost every page. When the old servant of Abraham went to the far land of Padan Aram after a wife for his young master, Isaac, he wanted to make on the kindred of Rebekah a strong impression of the fact that God had been his master's friend, and this was the way he put it: "I am Abraham's servant; and the Lord hath blessed my master greatly, and he is become great." What is the proof of this? "He hath given him flocks and herds, and silver and gold, and men-servants and maid-servants, and camels and asses." This was the evidence that God had blessed his master. Everywhere in the Old Testament statements are found in which the possession and the increase of wealth are adduced as proofs of the favor of God.

In the New Testament this teaching is not contradicted, though the proportion is somewhat changed. Our Lord admonishes us, indeed, that a man's life consists not in the abundance of the things that he possesses; he means that we shall learn to regard material good as inferior to spiritual good — a truth not so clearly brought out in most of the Old Testament references to prosperity. But Jesus him-

self promises that the meek shall "inherit the earth"; that to those who seek *first* the kingdom of God all earthly good shall be added; and his apostle tells us that godliness has promise of the life that now is as well as of that which is to come. So far, therefore, as the Christian documents are concerned, the increase of wealth is abundantly approved. Christianity expects to see the possessions of men multiply — their lands bringing forth abundantly, their garners filled, their homes supplied with comfort and adorned with beauty.

It has good reason to expect this, for its uniform effect upon human nature is to create in man many of those wants which it is the office of wealth to supply. The savage has few wants; the fully developed Christian has many; the progress of the savage from barbarism up to Christian civilization consists largely in the multiplication of his wants. A missionary lately returned from Africa testified that the great difficulty with the natives, as the missionaries found them, was that they had so few wants; "their greatest want was a want." How to develop in them the sense of want — that was the problem for the missionaries. It was a great encouragement when one day a Zulu found out that he wanted a wash-basin. Pretty soon he wanted a shirt and a pair of trousers,

and, after a little, a house with a chimney, and a hoe, and a plow, and by and by he wanted a book to read; and when he had got all this property he was a wealthy man compared with his neighbors. So Christianity always has the effect to develop faculties that require for their exercise the possession of property, and to waken desires that can be gratified only by the use of those material goods whose aggregate we call wealth. If it develops these faculties, it must expect us to exercise them; if it awakens these desires, it intends to have them gratified.

The Christian moralist must say, then, that the increase of wealth is not of itself an evil; that it is, instead, a blessing to mankind. This is not to say that it is a blessing to a child to be born rich; but it is surely better to be born into a community filled with the resources and the opportunities that wealth creates. At any rate, it is historically certain that the reception of Christianity by a people who have hitherto lived under any other form of religion will result in greatly increasing the material prosperity of that people. Christianity cannot be hostile to the production of wealth without making war upon itself; for it is the one grand cause of the production of wealth in modern times.

But now comes a harder question. How is

this growing wealth divided? Is it rightly or wrongly divided? If it is wrongly divided, has the Christian moralist anything to say about a better way? Christianity, as we have seen, has much to do with the production of wealth; has it anything to do with its distribution?

We saw a little while ago that there is enough wealth in the country so that, if it were equally divided, there would be for each person eight hundred and fourteen dollars; a family of six persons would have, say, something less than five thousand dollars' worth of property, of one sort or another. But the wealth of the country is not equally divided. One man recently exhibited evidences of wealth amounting to seventy-three millions of dollars, and said that this was only part of his estate. If the property of the country were divided into shares as big as this, it would hardly go round; in fact, about five or six hundred men would own it all, and there would be more than fifty millions of us who would not have a penny apiece. We shall all agree that this would not be a judicious distribution. Yet there are quite a number of persons in this country who count their gains by tens of millions, and hundreds who count by millions. If any one will take pains to find out how many millionaires there were in the United States forty years ago, he

will get a vivid idea of the increase of wealth. Besides this considerable and constantly growing class of the very rich, there are thousands who have attained to competence, and even to opulence, who are able to live in elegance, without labor, on their accumulations. Then comes a larger class of the well-to-do, who by combining the income from their savings with moderate earnings are able to live in comfort, and even to allow themselves many luxuries. It is impossible to draw the line between the rich and the poor; but as we descend the scale of material possessions, we come next upon a large class of those commonly called poor, who live in a measure of comfort, and who have attained to some degree of independence, who earn a decent livelihood and have a few hundred dollars invested in a dwelling or in the savings-bank or in a life insurance. Below these still, there is another large class of the really poor. of those whose earnings are small, whose life is comfortless, who have nothing laid by, who are often coming to want, many of whom frequently become a charge upon society, either through their failure to fulfill their contracts or through their receipt of public or private charity. This class of the very poor — those who are just on the borders of pauperism or fairly over the borders — is rapidly growing. Wealth is increas-

ing very fast; poverty, even pauperism, is increasing still more rapidly.

“Unpleasant as it may be to admit it,” says a late writer, “it is at last becoming evident that the enormous increase in productive power which has marked the present century, and is still going on with accelerating ratio, has no tendency to extirpate poverty, or to lighten the burdens of those compelled to toil. It simply widens the gulf between Dives and Lazarus, and makes the struggle for existence more intense. The march of invention has clothed mankind with powers of which, a century ago, the boldest imagination could not have dreamed. But in factories where labor-saving machinery has reached its most wonderful development, little children are at work; wherever the new forces are anything like fully utilized, large classes are maintained by charity, or live on the verge of recourse to it. . . . In the United States it is clear that squalor and misery, and the vices and crimes that spring from them, everywhere increase as the village grows to the city, and the march of development brings the advantages of the improved methods of production and exchange. It is in the older and richer sections of the Union that pauperism and distress among the working classes are becoming most painfully apparent.”¹

¹ *Progress and Poverty*, pp. 7-9.

These words of Mr. Henry George are not overstatements of the fact. We may say what we please about Mr. George's explanation of the fact ; for my own part I do not regard it as a sufficient explanation ; but the most orthodox political economists, Mr. David A. Wells, for example, have borne testimony to the truth which Mr. George thus emphasizes.

Plainly there is something out of joint in our machinery of distribution, or this state of things could not be. During the past fourteen years the wealth of this nation has increased much faster than the population, but the people who work for wages are little if any better off than they were fourteen years ago. It is doubtful whether the average yearly wages of the mechanic, the laborer, or the operative will purchase for him more of the necessaries of life now than at that time. At any rate, the gain, if gain there has been, must be very slight. What is true of the wage-laborer is true, also, of the small trader who subsists upon the laborer's patronage, and also quite largely of clerks and of teachers, as well as of those professional men whose services are chiefly in request among the poorer classes. There is a considerable class in the community whose fortunes are closely linked with those of the wage-laborers.

This, then, is the existing state of things.

The production of wealth in the country increases enormously year by year; the workingman's share of what is produced, and the share of those economically affiliated with the workingman, increases very slowly. This is exactly what Professor Cairnes laid down, some years ago, as the law governing the present industrial system — "a constant growth of the national capital, with a nearly equally constant decline in the *proportion* of capital which goes to support productive labor." And the result of this, as he points out, must be "a harsh separation of classes, combined with those glaring inequalities in the distribution of wealth, which most people will agree are among the chief elements of our social instability." And Professor Henry Carter Adams has lately declared it to be a fact that "the benefits of the present civilization are not impartially distributed, and that the laborer of to-day, as compared with the non-laboring classes, holds a relatively inferior position to that maintained in former times. The laborer himself interprets this to mean that the principle of distribution which modern society has adopted is unfair to him." By "former times," I suppose that Professor Adams means fifty years ago, and not five hundred. Five centuries ago the laborer was commonly a slave. But as compared with recent years, the labor-

er's *relative* position in society is certainly lower than formerly. Great as the inequality now is, Professor Cairnes says that under the present industrial system it is sure to increase; that "the rich will be growing richer, and the poor, at least relatively, poorer."

What has the Christian moralist to say about this state of things? He is bound to say that it is a bad state of things, and must somehow be reformed. He is bound to declare that "the laborer is worthy of his hire"; that, in the words of the apostle Paul, "the husbandman that laboreth must be the first to partake of the fruits." The broad equities of Christ's rule demand that this great increase of wealth be made, somehow, to inure to the benefit, in a far larger degree, of the people by whose labor it is produced. He will not deny that the capitalist should have a fair reward for his prudence and his abstinence; he will not refuse to the "undertaker," the *entrepreneur*, the organizer of labor, who stands between capitalist and laborer, enabling them to combine in the production of wealth, that large reward to which his superior intelligence and experience entitle him; but he will still insist that the workman ought to have a larger share than he is getting now of the wealth that grows so rapidly under his hands. And Christianity, by the lips of all

its teachers, ought with all its emphasis to say to society: "Your present industrial system, which fosters these enormous inequalities, which permits a few to heap up most of the gains of this advancing civilization, and leaves the many without any substantial share in them, is an inadequate and inequitable system, and needs important changes to make it the instrument of righteousness."

But when this testimony is borne, we shall hear men answering after this fashion: "Suppose it is wrong; what are you going to do about it? Would you have the state take possession of all the property and divide it equally among its citizens?"

To this question an answer will promptly come from another quarter before the Christian moralist has time to open his mouth: "Certainly. That is the Christian solution of the problem. That is exactly what the first Christians did at Jerusalem, after the Pentecost." But to this the Christian moralist, as soon as he gets a chance to put in his word, will be likely to reply that whatever division of property was made at Jerusalem was made voluntarily, and not under compulsion of the state; and that it affords, therefore, no precedent for the communistic schemes.

In the second place, he will deny that the

whole property of those disciples was put into a common fund out of which all were supported. They had "all things common" in this sense, that each man *considered* his property as held by him in trust for the benefit of all that were in need. "Not one of them *said* that aught of the things he possessed was his own." Each one must, then, have possessed some things. But no one *said*, "My money is my own, and I will do what I please with it;" every one said, "My money is for the service of the wants of my brethren as well as of my own wants." And "as *any* man had need," they sold their possessions and goods, so far as it was necessary, and supplied his needs. That is about all that can be got out of this narrative of the Acts of the Apostles. It is plain that there was in Jerusalem a voluntary consecration by each member of the infant church of his property to the supply of the actual needs of the brotherhood. That is, no doubt, the Christian rule; but that stops a long way short of the communistic dogmas.

Perhaps the question with which we are trying to grapple will be more easily handled if we divide it just here into two separate inquiries:

1. What ought Christians to ask the state to do toward a more equitable distribution of wealth? What should be attempted in this direction by political methods?

2. What should Christians teach that individuals ought to do to promote a more equitable distribution of wealth?

First, then, it is undoubtedly the duty of Christians to do what they can by means of law to secure a better industrial system. But this is not saying that Christians should ask the state to take the property of the rich and distribute it among the poor. It is true that the state does something in this direction already. It takes, by taxation, the property of the rich in large amounts, and expends it for the benefit of all, the poor equally with the rich. Thousands who pay no taxes at all have the full benefit of streets, street-lamps, sewers, sidewalks, water, police, fire department, and schools, not to speak of important provisions made exclusively for the poor, such as city physicians and dispensaries, alms-houses, insane hospitals, and the like. The destitute classes thus get the benefit of a considerable distribution of property annually enforced by the state. And it is pretty clear that the state is now going quite as far in this direction as it is safe to go. Certainly we want no more eleemosynary distribution of money by the state than we have now. The time may come when the nation will be compelled to take under its control, if not into its ownership, the railroads and the

telegraphs, and administer them for the common good. They are falling, in far too large a degree, into the hands of men who use them for the spoiling of our commerce and the corruption of our politics. But the wisdom or the equity of this measure is not yet so clear that it can be demanded as an act of public justice, and therefore the Christian moralist will not yet venture to pronounce upon it.

There are, however, one or two things that he will insist upon as the immediate duty of the state. Certain outrageous monopolies exist that the state is bound to crush. It is an outrage on public justice that half a dozen men should be able to control the entire fuel supply of New York and New England, forbidding the miners to work more than two or three days in a week, lest the operatives of the New England mills or the longshoremen of the New York wharves should get their coal at a little smaller price per ton. This forcible suppression of an industry by which one of the necessities of life is furnished, this violent interference with the natural laws of trade in the interest of a few monopolists, is so contrary to public justice and public policy that some way must be found of making an end of it. The coal barons must not be permitted to enrich themselves by compelling the miners to starve at one end of their

lines and the operatives to freeze at the other. In like manner the great lines of transportation from the West are under the control of three or four men, and although they have not hitherto been able to combine in such a way as greatly to enhance the price of breadstuffs, it is not improbable that combinations will yet take place by which such a levy will be made upon the food of the nation. Even now the oil in the poor man's lamp is heavily taxed by a greedy monopoly. All these iniquitous encroachments upon the rights of the people must be arrested; and it is the duty of every Christian, as the servant of a God of justice and righteousness, to say so in terms that cannot be misunderstood.

Another gigantic public evil that the state must exterminate is that of gambling in stocks and produce. This system of gambling in margins is a system of piracy; by means of it hundreds of millions of dollars are plundered every year from the industrial classes. It is treason to say that it cannot be put down; it must be put down or it will destroy the nation. It is the vampire that is sucking the life-blood of our commerce; it is the dragon that is devouring the moral vigor of our young men. When these monsters of the Stock and Produce Exchanges are killed, and a few of our great mo-

nopolies are laid low, the greatest obstructions to a free distribution of wealth will be removed, and the working classes will secure a larger share of the product of their industry than they are getting now. All such violent hindrances to a free and fair exchange of commodities and services — all such hungry parasites of industry — the state is bound to remove, and Christian morality calls on all its professors to enforce this obligation on the state.

Beyond this they cannot go far in this direction. To urge a distribution among the poor, by the power of the state, of the goods of the rich, would be a blunder so nearly criminal in its dimensions as fairly to justify Fouqué's paradox. No one who clearly apprehends the drift of Christian teaching on the subject would ever think of such a thing. If all the property of this country were equally divided to-morrow morning, before to-morrow night thousands would be penniless, and some hundreds would already be well on the way to fortune. The division would need to be remade every night — a rather troublesome bit of administration. Moreover, the speedy loss of their portion by the great multitude of those who had nothing before would be the smallest part of the calamity befalling them; having it for even so short a time would do them great harm. After it

was gone they would be far worse off, physically and morally, than they were before it came. Money is almost always a curse to those who have not won it by their own industry and frugality. "The result," says Professor Roscher, of the attempt to equalize possessions by the communistic scheme would simply be "that where there are now one thousand wealthy persons and one hundred thousand proletarians, there would be, after one generation, no one wealthy, and two hundred thousand proletarians. Misery and want would be universal. For the purpose of giving the crowd a very agreeable but rather short-lived period of pleasure, — a period simply of transition, — almost all that constitutes the wealth of a nation, all the higher goods of life, would have to be cast to the waves, and henceforth all men would have to content themselves with the gratification afforded by potatoes, brandy, and the pleasures of the most sensual of appetites." An enforced communism is not, therefore, likely to be urged by Christian teachers. They have not often interpreted their documents as authorizing any such experiment. The story of the social life of the early church at Jerusalem has, indeed, frequently been quoted as sanctioning such measures; but those who have carefully studied the Christian ethics have never been

misled by this narrative into the adoption of communistic theories. Roscher exactly expresses the consensus of Christian opinion on this subject when he says : —

Every approximation toward a community of goods should be effected by the love of the rich for the poor, not by the hatred of the poor for the rich. If all men were true Christians, a community of goods might exist without danger. But then, also, the institution of private property would have no dark side to it. Every employer would give his workmen the highest wages possible, and demand in return only the smallest possible sacrifice.

All that intelligent Christians will ask the state to do, therefore, toward promoting the distribution of wealth, is to provide for the general welfare, as it now does, by taxation ; to protect all classes in the exercise of their rights ; to strike down those foes that now clutch our industries by the throat, and then to leave the natural laws of trade and the motives of humanity and good-will to effect a more equitable distribution.

The second half of our question is not less important. What does Christianity require individuals to do in their private relations toward securing a juster division of the growing wealth of the nation ? Make the question concrete and personal. In every city or large town

are more or less rich people — people with large incomes — people who are spending large incomes, at any rate; and a good share of them are making all they spend and more, so that they are rapidly accumulating competence or fortune. Not a few of these are Christians in belief and purpose; many who have made no profession of their faith recognize the Christian rule as the right rule, and mean to conform to it. In every city or large town, also, is a much larger class who have no property at all, among whom there is not a little discomfort and distress. A few among them are helpless invalids, with none to care for them. Another class — in some communities a large class — are paupers in spirit and purpose, determined to get a living without work if they can. The great majority are working people of various sorts, — mechanics, operatives, laborers, clerks, errand and office boys, — who subsist on their wages, well or ill, and no more. Among them in many large cities and manufacturing towns are crowds of young men and women, many of whom are away from home, most of whom are working for small wages, all of whom are exposed to many temptations.

Here are the two classes over against each other in the same community. The one class is rich already, and is rapidly growing richer.

The wealth of the community, increasing so fast, goes mainly into their hands. The other class has little or nothing, and cannot, under existing industrial conditions, expect as wage-laborers to get much more than a bare livelihood.

The social gulf between these two classes is already pretty wide in many places, and the political economists tell us that it is sure to grow wider year by year.

We have already settled it that there is something wrong in this state of things. No possible system will remove all inequalities; but a system which tends to the depression of any class in the community, which prevents them from reaping their full share of the advantages of an advancing civilization, is a system that needs to be reformed. But what can individuals do to reform it? What message has Christianity for those who are getting the lion's share of the profits of production, respecting their duties to those who are getting so small a proportion of it? Does it bid these rich people divide their gains with their poorer neighbors?

There are plenty of philosophers who could answer that question, off-hand, with one word, yes, or no; but I must have a little more room.

1. It is clearly not the duty of these rich Christians to go about town with their hands full of money, bestowing a dollar here and a

hundred dollars there, without much knowledge of the real needs of the people to whom they give it. Most of what was thus carelessly given would go into the hands of actual or incipient paupers, and the fruit of such sowing would be a harvest of pauperism. Of course there are hundreds of poor men who are always saying of this or that rich man, "He might give me a hundred dollars and it would n't hurt him a bit." Possibly; but it is certain that the habit of depending on such gifts would hurt the receivers fatally. An eleemosynary distribution of their surplus by wealthy men among the able-bodied working people of their neighborhood would not be a judicious proceeding.

2. Helpless invalids, old people, and little children who are destitute have a special claim on those who have abundance. Those to whom wealth has been given ought to make sure that no persons of these classes in their neighborhood are ever left to lack for the comforts of life.

3. Another form of voluntary distribution that can sometimes be judiciously practiced is the quiet helping of honest and worthy persons who are struggling to get on in the world, and who have proved themselves to be possessors of a moral quality that would not be enervated by such bounty. I said just now that money is

almost always a curse to those who have not won it by industry and prudence. Almost, but not always. There is now and then a young man or a young woman or a young couple who would be benefited by timely assistance. George Macdonald says that a man is often better worth endowing than a college. But you must be sure of your man.

4. The possessors of large wealth who wish to use their abundance in such a way as to benefit their neighbors may do so in a very effective way by supporting various public voluntary institutions and benevolent agencies. In every city or large manufacturing town is a multitude of persons who are working for low wages or small salaries, and by whose labor the prosperity of the community is, in large measure, produced. The people who are growing rich so fast, are, as a general rule, growing rich out of the labor of this working class. The work of the factories and shops could not go on without these working people; they are drawn together in such multitudes to serve the purpose of the organizers of labor. It is out of their earnings, too, in great part, that the profits of the retail merchants and shop-keepers are made. Now, it is the plainest dictate of Christian principle that those who are profiting by the presence and labor of these thousands of poorly-paid em-

ployees should see to it that they take as little detriment as possible from their environment. The property-holders are taxed, as I have said, to make many public provisions for the benefit of these people ; but there is much that cannot be done by taxation, and that needs to be done by voluntary contributions for their physical and moral welfare.

Many of the families of this class find it hard to secure decent tenements. A most Christian charity is the building of sanitary tenement-houses, well lighted, well ventilated, to be kept in good order and rented at a fair price. Nor would this be altogether a charity ; the experience of Sir Sidney Waterlow and Miss Octavia Hill, in London, and of Mr. Alfred T. White, in Brooklyn, shows that it may be a good investment. Mr. White reports a net income of six per cent. from his beautiful tenement-houses, after paying all taxes and charges, and making constant improvements. Remunerative though it might be, such an expenditure would prove in many places an unspeakable blessing to the wage-receiving class, promoting their health, their happiness, and their virtue. It would seem that intelligent men of large incomes, who are often puzzled to find ways of spending their money, might discover in the study of this subject and in the construction of

model tenement-houses, a kind of diversion quite as satisfactory as that of spreading banquets, or sailing yachts, or speeding horses.

But the moral welfare of these multitudes of working people, and especially of the young men and women, should be the especial care of men of wealth who recognize the Christian law. Those whom their labor is enriching ought to guard them in every possible way from evil, and to surround them on every hand with wholesome moral influences. The foes that lie in wait for them are many; the agencies by which they may be shielded and saved should be multiplied and strengthened. Many of them are without homes; whatever can be done to supply in part the influence of home should be done without stint. The churches are the proper agencies for this work, and, in spite of all their delinquencies, they are doing more of it than any other social organizations. They ought to be fully equipped for it, and stirred up to take hold of it. They should be provided with attractive social rooms, and with all the appliances needed for furnishing entertaining instruction and wholesome social diversion to these homeless people. Whatever money is wanted for this work ought to be forthcoming. Whether they attend the churches or not, the prosperous men of all our large places ought

to see to it that the churches that have a mind to do such work are not crippled for lack of money.

Many other agencies of the same nature ought to be strengthened and created. Public libraries should be handsomely endowed and made free. Buildings devoted to the social uses of young men and young women should be erected on the principal streets, safe, bright, attractive places of resort, with coffee-rooms, reading-rooms, amusement-rooms, music-rooms, lecture-rooms, gymnasia — places whose beauty and freedom and hearty good-fellowship should overmatch the allurements of the beer-garden or the variety show.

In every community there are men of good-will, who, if they had the money, could organize methods of work among the tempted classes by which many of them could be saved; by which the patronage of the saloons could be visibly reduced; by which many snares now set for the feet of the unwary would be broken. And the Christian moralist thinks that men of wealth ought not to wait to be begged to furnish the means to do this work; that they ought to take the initiative themselves, seeking out the men of good-will who are ready to undertake it, and bidding them go forward. Such would be the dictate of Christian love, and the

dictate of prudence with ominous finger points the same way. Out of the social conditions produced by the herding together of so many people without homes in our large industrial communities, moral pestilence and social peril are sure to arise, and none can tell when the blight will fall upon his hearthstone. It is only by a vigorous and determined use of moral preventives that society can be protected; and this will call for a liberal distribution of the wealth that is so rapidly accumulating.

5. But there is a method still more effective, in which men of wealth who are the employers of labor may distribute a portion of their surplus among their employees. It is confessed that, as a general rule, the capitalists, or the organizers of labor, are getting the lion's share of the abundant wealth produced, and that the laborer's portion is small. Out of this notorious fact grows the troublesome labor question. The laborers are discontented. It is idle to tell them that they are better off to-day than people of their class were fifty or a hundred years ago; that a workingman's wages will buy more of the necessaries of life in the days of President Cleveland than in the reign of Queen Anne. That may or may not be; the fact is that they are not getting a fair share of the wealth that their labor is now producing. And the truth

for every Christian employer to note is that under the wage-system, pure and simple, there is no prospect that the laboring class will ever get their fair proportion of the game of civilization. Under this system, says Professor Cairnes, "the margin for the possible improvement in their lot is confined within narrow barriers which cannot be passed, and the problem of their elevation is hopeless. As a body they will not rise at all. A few, more energetic or more fortunate than the rest, will from time to time escape, as they do now, from the ranks of their fellows to the higher ranks of industrial life; but the great majority will remain substantially where they are. The remuneration of labor, skilled or unskilled, can never rise much above its present level." With Professor Cairnes agree other economists. It is becoming pretty clear, after fifty years' experience of the large system of industry, that under it the wage-receiving class will never escape from a dependent condition. Now, the first thing for the Christian employer of labor to recognize is the existence of this state of things, and the fact that, for the laboring classes, it is a bad state of things. The wage-system, so long as it rests wholly on competition, is fundamentally wrong. Competition is of the nature of warfare: in warfare the victory is with the strong-

est; capital is stronger than labor, and, therefore, in competition, labor always goes to the wall. The workman who must have wages or starve is in no condition to try conclusions with the corporation. The historical fact is that strikes are almost always unsuccessful. All the economic harmonies that can be reasoned out will never alter this stern fact. It is the sufficient demonstration of the weakness of labor when pitted against capital.

Society results from a combination of egoism and altruism. Self-love and self-sacrifice are both essential; no society can endure if based on either of them to the exclusion of the other. Without the self-regarding virtues it would have no vigor; without the benevolent virtues it would not cohere. But the combination of capitalists and laborers in production is a form of society. Both these elements ought to be combined in this form of society. The proportion of altruism may be less in the factory than in the house or the church, but it is essential to the peace and welfare of all of them. Yet the attempt of the present system is to base this form of society wholly on competition, which is pure egoism. It will not stand securely on this basis. The industrial system as at present organized is a social solecism. It is an attempt to hold society together

upon an anti-social foundation. To bring capitalists and laborers together in an association, and set them over against each other, and announce to them the principle of competition as the guide of their conduct, bidding each party to get as much as it can out of the other, and to give as little as it can, — for that is precisely what competition means, — is simply to declare war — a war in which the strongest will win.

The Christian moralist is, therefore, bound to admonish the Christian employer that the wage-system, when it rests on competition as its sole basis, is anti-social and anti-Christian. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" is the Christian law, and he must find some way of incorporating that law into the organization of labor. It must be something more than an ideal; it must find expression in the industrial scheme. God has not made men to be associated for any purpose on an egoistic basis: and we must learn God's laws and obey them. It must be possible to shape the organization of our industries in such a way that it shall be the daily habit of the workman to think of the interest of the employer, and of the employer to think of the interest of the workman. We have thought it very fine to *say* that the interests of both are identical, but it has been nothing more than a fine saying; the problem now is to *make* them identical.

It is not a difficult problem. The solution of it is quite within the power of the Christian employer. All he has to do is to admit his laborers to an *industrial partnership* with himself *by giving them a fixed share in the profits of production*, to be divided among them, in proportion to their earnings, at the end of the year. If there were no profits there would be nothing to divide ; but a certain percentage of the gains of the year might thus be distributed when gains were made. The employer ought to have a large reward for his abstinence, and for the intelligence and experience required in organizing and managing the business — a reward far larger than any of his workmen. That principle few among them would think of disputing. They would expect him to reap the benefit of his superior power ; and they would understand that his accumulations must be sufficient to enable him to meet the losses occurring from time to time, which they could not share. But if they could see that they were to be sharers of his prosperity, — that the larger his gains were, the larger would be their dividends at the end of the year, — they would have a motive to do good work that now is lacking, and a wholly new relation would be established between themselves and their employer. That this would be for the interest of the employer,

I have no doubt; that it would attach his laborers to him, and awaken a feeling of goodwill and a hope of bettering their condition that would add greatly to their happiness and to their efficiency, seems plain. But the strong reason for the change, in the mind of a Christian man, would be the simple justice of it. Experience has shown him that the wage-receiving class are getting no fair share of the enormous increase of wealth; reason teaches that they never will receive an equitable proportion of it under a wage-system that is based on sheer competition; equity demands, therefore, that some modification of the wage-system be made in the interest of the laborer. If it is made, the employer must make it. Saint Paul's doctrine is that "the husbandman that laboreth must be the first to partake of the fruits"; and this doctrine, for substance, is receiving the indorsement in these days of many of the ablest political economists. Such a limited industrial partnership of employer and employed is indicated by careful study of the economic laws, as well as by the Christian ethics. It incorporates the altruistic element into industrial society. Until some such fundamental readjustment has been made the whole structure will remain in unstable equilibrium.

Whether Professor Henry Carter Adams, of Michigan University, wishes to be ranked as a Christian moralist or not, I do not know; but the following words of his exactly express the substance of the Christian doctrine as applied to the labor question: —

To employers who feel the moral responsibility of their position additional considerations may be addressed. They are asked to analyze human nature until they recognize this truth: *There can never be any equitable or continuous adjustment of the wages question upon the basis of free competition in labor.* If the unions become well organized, they may fluctuate about the equitable point; but peace and harmony between employers and employed there will never be. The only true rule for wages is that they *fluctuate with profit.* But, objects some one, this will change the basis of all business. Certainly, but that basis must be changed. To pay labor in proportion to profit, by whatever method that may be accomplished, is to recognize the true relationship between capitalists and laborers, which is that of common partnership. . . . Professor Cairnes is right in claiming that the ultimate solution of the labor question is the establishment of coöperative industries. This solution is beset with difficulties, but it is the only one in harmony with the democratic spirit of the century or Christian business principles. The creation of industrial partnerships forms the intermediate step.

The sum of all this discussion is that the possession of wealth is justified by the Christian ethics, but that it puts the possessor under heavy obligations to multitudes less fortunate. He could never have become rich without the coöperation of many; he ought not to hold his riches for his own exclusive benefit. The great inequalities arising from the present defective methods of distribution will only be corrected through a deepening sense of the obligations imposed by the possession of wealth. The economic law, like the moral law, can never be fulfilled without love.

IS LABOR A COMMODITY?

THAT labor may be considered and treated as a commodity is beyond question. That it is so considered by some economists, and so treated by some employers, is undeniable. Whatever can be purchased for money is a commodity, and labor is purchased and sold for money. That it is, and, to some extent, must be, under the law of supply and demand; that scarcity of labor has a tendency to make it dear, and that abundance cheapens it, is also evident.

Is it anything other and more than a commodity? Should the economist and the employer put it into the same category with corn, and coal, and pig-iron, or does it belong in a different category? Are there any other laws, besides the law of supply and demand, that should govern the purchase and the sale of labor?

That the labor market ought to be free, may be admitted. That the employer should be free to purchase labor of those who will sell it

to him at the lowest price, and that the workman should be free to sell his labor to those who will buy it of him at the highest price, seems evident. Our laws assume and guaranty this freedom. Nevertheless, it is somewhat abridged by combinations on both sides, employers combining to reduce, and laborers to enhance the price of labor.

It may also be admitted that self-interest, in its three forms of desire of wealth, love of ease, and craving for costly indulgences, is a fairly constant element in human nature, and a powerful force in determining the selling price of labor. Given a free market, to which no employers and no laborers resort who are not wholly under the sway of these egoistic motives, and it would be a sound deduction that the rate of wages would be governed wholly by the relation between the supply of service and the demand for work. Some economists have assumed a market absolutely free, and a race of human beings so purely egoistic, that no important correction, due to the operation of other motives, needs to be made in the calculation of their conduct. On this basis they have constructed a science of wealth. The "economic man" of these economists is a man governed wholly by avarice and indolence and love of pleasure; the business of economy, they say, is

simply to find out how such men will act, and what will be the consequences of their action. It is not necessary to prove that such a man, if a purchaser of labor, will always buy it in the cheapest market ; and, if a seller of labor, will sell it in the dearest. Labor, in the estimation of such a man, will be nothing but a commodity.

I will not here discuss the utility of this conception of the "economic man." Let it be granted that some scientific gains may result from considering man solely as a money-making and pleasure-loving being. But great practical difficulties have arisen from confounding the "economic man" with the actual man. Not a little of the trouble now existing in the industrial world has sprung from this confusion. The "laws" of political economy, as drawn from observation of the "economic man," have been supposed to be laws of conduct ; men have read the descriptions of the actions of men under the influence of egoistic motives, and have regarded themselves as authorized to act in the same way. Indeed, some of the more enthusiastic students of this science have gone so far as to say that when men act solely from self-interested motives, the result of their action will be wholly beneficent ; from which it follows that selfishness is a duty. But when this conclusion

has not been stated, it has often been inferred from those discussions which, in the words of John Stuart Mill, are "concerned with man solely as a being who desires to possess wealth," and which make "entire abstraction of every other human passion or motive, except those which may be regarded as perpetually antagonizing principles to the desire of wealth, namely, aversion to labor, and desire of the present enjoyment of costly indulgences." The economists of this school endeavor to show us how men *will* act under the influence of these passions, and men say, "This is the way we *ought* to act."

When human beings are acting freely, under the impulse of self-interest, say these economists, labor will always be bought in the cheapest market and sold in the dearest; the law of supply and demand will regulate the prices. Other teachers, rising up to instruct the people, take their words out of their mouths and transform them from an economic generalization into a moral obligation. "Labor, like flour or cotton-cloth," say these moralists, "*should always be* bought in the cheapest market and sold in the dearest. The *sole legitimate condition* that regulates wages is the demand for service and the supply of workers." Hence we get the dogma that labor is nothing but a commodity:

that it is to be put into the same category with flour or cotton-cloth; that no different motives or principles are involved in the purchase and sale of it from those which are involved in dealing with other forms of merchandise.

This confusion of what is with what ought to be is a source of great mischief, and it should not be difficult to detect the fallacy and avoid the resulting injury. Political economy recognizes many facts, and points out many tendencies, which the wisest of its teachers do not approve. "In Circassia," says President Walker, "a beautiful daughter is wealth, and is popularly and justly so accounted. No one, in making up the list of his wealth, could omit this item from the account, any more than he would leave out his fields." The economist records the fact that a daughter is merchandise in Circassia, but it does not follow that she ought to be. And there are quite a number of economic facts in this country that do not require of us apology or reproduction. It may be true that there is a strong tendency among the purchasers of labor to regard labor simply as a commodity; that the actual man, in the person of the employer, is becoming more and more assimilated to the "economic man" of the theorists; but, if so, the tendency ought to be resisted. Doubtless the massing of capital under the large sys-

tem of industry promotes this tendency. The men who receive the profits often have no knowledge whatever of those who receive the wages. "Labor," to the people who pocket the dividends, is often just as impersonal as coal or cotton. This is what is, but is it what ought to be? Is it not, indeed, a serious question, whether an industrial system thus constituted can permanently and peacefully endure? Let us, however, consider the simpler case of an individual employer.

A cotton manufacturer goes to New York and purchases a hundred bales of cotton for his mill. Of course, he buys them in the cheapest market. This is the law of trade. It is impossible for him to consider what the effect of his purchase may be upon the seller of the cotton; he buys it in open market as cheaply as he can, and that is the end of the transaction.

At the same time he hires a hundred men, women, and children to work in his mill. Doubtless he buys this labor as he bought his cotton, at the cheapest market price. These laborers, under their contract, come to live in the neighborhood of his mill, perhaps in tenements owned by him. He meets them, more or less, day by day; he knows, or may know, something of their manner of life; his relation with them is, to some extent, personal and continuous. Is

it now desirable or possible for the employer, under the relation thus formed, to put this labor, which he thus purchases and uses, into exactly the same category with his cotton? Can he deal with this labor wisely and productively if he does not bring into action any other feelings, or motives, or principles of conduct than those which come into play when he purchases his cotton on the cotton-exchange and ships it to his factory? Let it be granted that he has a right to buy cotton at the market rate, and that he is not bound to ask any questions, for conscience sake, as to what will become of the men who sell it. May he purchase his labor in the same way, at the market rate, and have no care as to what becomes of the people who sell it? Does he thus establish a proper relation between himself and them — a relation that is likely to be permanent and peaceful and profitable to him and to them? If these questions cannot be answered without hesitation in the affirmative, some suspicion is thrown on the theory that labor is nothing but a commodity.

For my own part, I must express a doubt as to whether such a theory is workable. There may be some scientific advantage in formulating it, but it does not seem to include and explain the facts of life. It might afford a curious and interesting study, if one were to consider

human beings simply as clothes-wearing animals, and to formulate a science of clothes-wearing, showing the effect on individuals and on society of desiring clothes, and of buying and selling clothes, and of wearing clothes. Carlyle has laid the foundation of such a science in "Sartor Resartus," and some valuable hints might be gained from its generalizations as to our relations with our fellow-men; but it is not at all clear that such a science would afford an adequate basis on which human beings could usefully associate for any purpose whatever. Man is a clothes-wearing animal, but he is something more. Man is also a money-making animal, but he is something more. If he were nothing but a money-making animal it might be correct to regard labor simply as merchandise; if he is something more, the philosophy which makes abstraction of everything else but the desire of wealth and the passions which directly antagonize this desire, furnishes no adequate rule of human conduct.

The theory that labor is to be regarded simply as a commodity does not, I say, appear to include some of the cardinal facts arising out of the relation between the employer and the laborer. To go back to our cotton manufacturer, what does he desire when he hires the hundred laborers? Does he merely desire to

employ the muscular power of these persons for a certain number of hours a day, as if they were beasts of burden? Probably he expects a great deal more than this. He wants intelligence, skill, and honesty; he wants a practical interest in the work on the part of the workers; he wants their hearty good-will toward himself and toward the enterprise; he wants them to be cheerful and hopeful in their work, since work that is not done in this temper is not apt to be well done. Are these intellectual and moral elements no part of the "labor"? I think that they are essential parts if it; that the labor which lacks these is worth but little. Are these elements obtainable by those who proceed upon the theory that labor is simply a commodity, to be bought in the cheapest market, and sold in the dearest? A slight knowledge of human nature, and a little observation of human relations, will convince any man that they are not. The employer who wants these elements infused into the labor that he purchases must consider and treat this "labor" as if it were something besides merchandise. Sentiments, motives, principles of action must come into play in dealing with "labor" that find no place in the purchase of cotton or of corn, or else these intellectual and moral qualities which give to "labor" the

greater part of its value will not be properly developed. If the employer desires intelligence and skill, he must treat his laborers as if they were intelligent beings; if he wants them to be trusty, he must not only trust them, he must himself be trustworthy; their good-will toward him can only be begotten by his good-will toward them; their interest in the enterprise will be aroused by showing them that the enterprise is conducted in their interest.

The employer and his laborers are coöperating in production; and men cannot coöperate successfully for any purpose if the sole bond between them is self-interest. The theory that free-contract and cash payment furnish a sufficient basis for industrial society has been tried, and found wanting. The notion that the relation between masters and men should be regulated solely by supply and demand — that thus the master will get the most labor, and the men the most wages, and the community the greatest benefit, is a very pernicious notion. John Ruskin's theories of political economy may often be wide of the mark, but what he says about this pestilent heresy is everlasting truth: —

It would be so, if the servant were an engine of which the motive power was steam, magnetism, gravitation, or any other agent of calculable force. But he being, on the contrary, an engine whose motive

power is a Soul, the force of this very peculiar agent, as an unknown quantity, enters into all the political economist's equations, without his knowledge, and falsifies every one of their results. The largest quantity of work will not be done by this curious engine for pay, or under pressure, or by help of any kind of fuel which may be applied by the chaldron. It will be done only when the motive force, that is to say, when the will or spirit of the creature, is brought to its greatest strength by its own proper fuel, namely by the affections.¹

Whatever may be said, therefore, about the scientific value of this theory, by which self-interest in its coarsest form is regarded as the sole economic force, it is evident that it is a theory which very inadequately explains the facts of industrial society; and which, when adopted as a philosophy of industrial society, and put to work, is sure to make unceasing trouble. As a matter of fact, it has been adopted consistently by but few employers; the attempt to follow it to its logical results would quickly plunge society into chaos and anarchy. It is the constant bringing in of other and better principles of action which makes possible the coöperation of employer and laborer. The theory that labor is nothing but a commodity is a theory that will not work.

¹ *Unto This Last*, p. 23.

Nothing is more unphilosophical, nothing can be more stupidly unpractical, than to try to bring human beings together, and to get them to associate for industrial purposes, or any other purposes, upon a basis that is essentially un-social. That is exactly what is attempted when industrial organizations are founded upon the theory that labor is simply a commodity, and that the only principle which can regulate the relation of employer and laborer is the law of supply and demand. It must by this time begin to dawn upon the minds of some of its most ardent advocates that there is some flaw in this theory.

But the fact that it is not workable is not the only reason for condemning it. By the practical test it is found wanting; by the ethical test it must also be rejected. The employer is bound to consider the effect of the employment which he furnishes, and of the reward which he gives for this service; upon the lives of those whom he employs. The health, the morality, the happiness of the people whom he employs, are affected more or less by the work they are doing, and the life which they need must live. So far as it is in his power, he is bound to see to it that they take no detriment from the work he gives them, or from the environment which he provides for them. Especially is this true

if he is prospering by the use of their labor. He has no right to grow rich and powerful while the people by whose labor he is thriving are poor and hungry and hopeless. He has no right to wax fat by consuming their strength and their life. It is possible that some of the disciples of Ricardo may require me to prove these propositions; but I am loath to argue the thesis that a man ought not to be a cannibal. I will venture to regard it as a moral axiom. All talk of cheapest and dearest markets is impertinent in face of these great facts of human degradation and human suffering. The employer is bound to know how the people whom he employs are affected by the work that he furnishes, and by the wages that he pays. If the conditions under which they are at work are unsanitary, so that their vitality is needlessly impaired by their labor, he must correct that evil; if the wage that he pays is so small that they are starving, he must not heap up profits coined from their life-blood, no matter what the market rate of wages may be; if the whole effect of the labor which he furnishes them and of the recompense which he gives them be to rob them of heart and hope and vigor, it is plain that he has no vocation as an employer; let him get this business which he is bungling so fatally out of his hands at once.

The man who enters the labor market as a buyer must beware lest he impair or destroy this vital force on whose healthy action the life and prosperity of the country depend.

Those who recognize no higher law than that of patriotism must feel the force of this obligation. The welfare of the nation requires the highest possible degree of health, vigor, and independence in all its citizens. It is not by the amount of wealth produced, so much as by the productive energy of the whole people, that the state of the nation is most wisely judged. A people's life consists, no more than a man's life, in the abundance of the things which it possesses. It is not commodities that we want so much as men. The main question for the people to ask is not how fast the aggregate of their products is increasing, but rather how it fares with the multitude of their producers. It is just here that the political economy of the Ricardian school diverges from that of later economists. The one fixed its attention wholly on the increase of the national wealth, the other considers more anxiously the increase of the national vigor. Says a recent writer:—

The rapid increase of wealth may be taking place at the cost of the future and to the detriment of posterity; and while the increase of the comforts and enjoyments of life is a good thing, it is not a good

thing that they should be obtained by imposing an intolerable burden on those who come after us. We cannot, then, be satisfied with economic principles which are almost wholly concerned with the greatest production of useful things in the present, but we require principles that shall help us to husband the strength and resources of the nation to the best of our wisdom.¹

↳ This is the right end for the nation to keep in view, and it is no less the proper aim of every good citizen. The individual employer must bring his enterprise to this test. The question is not merely whether he is multiplying the abundance of things; the more urgent question is whether he is improving the quality of the citizens. If he can so organize labor as to make the people about him constantly more intelligent, more vigorous in body and brain, more hopeful and more contented, he is a benefactor; if the effect of the labor which he organizes upon the people who perform it is to render them more and more degraded and discouraged and incapable of self-support, he is a malefactor, a public enemy, no matter how useful may be the wares that he produces or how abundant the profits that he hoards.↳

The labor of the nation is the life of the nation; is that a commodity to be bought in the cheapest market and sold in the dearest?

¹ *Politics and Economics.* By W. Cunningham, D. D.

THE STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS OF SOCIALISM.



THE time has passed when socialism can be dismissed with curses, or threats, or sneers, or interjections of amazement. We may be greatly astonished to hear that men entertain theories so chimerical; we may think it a sufficient answer to call them cranks or lunatics; we may denounce them as freebooters and look about for forcible measures to suppress them; but none of these methods will avail. They are here; they are the natural progeny of existing industrial conditions; and they will not be exterminated by all the hard words we may fling at them, nor silenced by any amount of indifference or contempt.

There is, indeed, a class among these socialists to whom it is difficult to make any reply. The more violent wing of them, whose mouths are full of cursing and bitterness; who constantly threaten us with revolution and with rapine; who march about the streets of our

cities with bands and banners, shouting that our homes are soon to be pillaged and our churches destroyed, — these crazy nihilists are not entitled to any consideration at our hands. On their rage discussion is wasted. It is idle to ask them what they mean; they tell us plainly: they mean murder and arson; they mean the destruction of the present social order, that anarchy may take its place. To such a frenzy no answer is possible. The kingdom that is based on unreason cannot be overthrown by reason. When these men begin to carry out their threats we shall know exactly what to do with them; and the business will be speedily and thoroughly done. Meantime the best thing to do is to give the utmost publicity to their movements and their outgivings. Few of their speeches and manifestoes are uttered in the English language, but they ought to be reported and translated and disseminated as widely as possible. Let the workingmen of this country hear what are the plans and the threats of these destructionists. They are able to judge for themselves whether the nihilistic programme is practicable and desirable.

It must not, however, be supposed that these miscreants are the exclusive representatives of socialism in this country. Mr. Rae, in the introductory chapter of "Contemporary Social-

ism," justly says that "American socialism is a mere episode of German socialism; that it is confined almost exclusively to the German population of the United States." A writer in the "North American Review," quoted by Mr. Rae, mentions the fact that the socialist vote has been increasing of late more rapidly in New York and Chicago than in Berlin, and attributes the fact to German immigration. Beyond a doubt a considerable portion of this increase consists of the more extreme and violent elements of the Social Democracy of Germany. The severe measures resorted to by the German government, after the attempt to assassinate the emperor, had the effect to hasten the departure of many of these rash spirits from their native land. Probably, therefore, the proportion of nihilists among the German socialists of this country at the present time is greater than among the same class in Germany. Nevertheless, in this country, as in Germany and even in Russia, the violent elements are but a small minority. What Mr. Rae says about Russian nihilism will bear pondering by Americans: —

A party of violence and extreme principles can only thrive in the warmth of the countenance lent it by the less demonstrative disaffection of the more moderate members of society; and it always withers away when the latter classes are satisfied by timely

concessions. Procrastination only swells instead of mitigating the revolutionary spirit, for it but prolongs the political unrest from which that spirit is thrown off. The nihilists of Russia are merely the extremer and more volatile minds who have been touched by the impact of the present upheaval. They are the spray and the foam which curls and roars on the ridge of the general political movement which has for years been rolling over Russia, and their whole real importance is borrowed from the volume and momentum of the wave that bears them up. Folly, it is said, is always weak and ridiculous till wisdom joins it; and the excesses of nihilism, if they stood alone, could not be the source of any formidable danger. But they do not stand alone; they flame out of an atmosphere overcharged with social discontent and political disaffection.¹

It is not, then, the spray and the foam of these nihilistic assemblies that should engage our thought, so much as the wave that bears them on. That "less demonstrative disaffection of the more moderate members of society," which furnishes the Russian destroyers with their excuse for being, is present in Germany and in America. Among the German immigrants are many socialists of the more rational as well as of the more violent type; and the theories of Rodbertus, and Winkelblech, and Karl Marx, and Ferdinand Lassalle have been

¹ *Contemporary Socialism*, pp. 316, 317.

transplanted to our soil. About the roots of these exotics not a few Americans have been digging somewhat cautiously; the feeling that something is fundamentally wrong with the present organization of society is entertained by many thoughtful and humane persons; and the books that expound the socialistic philosophy have been widely read, by some for the sake of controversy, and by some for the sake of information.

There is, therefore, in this country at the present time a considerable number of persons who have some knowledge of the various schemes for the reorganization of the social and industrial order, and not a few who expect these schemes to be realized. These persons are by no means all lunatics. Their hopes for the future of society may seem vague, but there are those among them who are ready to give you a reason for their hopes. They have studied history. They are familiar with the theories of political economy. They rest their demands on a reasoned system of philosophy. They can only be answered by a completer induction of historical facts, a broader political economy, and a sounder philosophy.

On what grounds do these people base their demand for a reorganization of society? Not solely, as some suppose, on their envy of those

who are better off than themselves, but on certain economical evils, acknowledged and deplored by all intelligent political economists.

They observe that the wealth of the world is rapidly growing, and that the share of it which falls to those who work for wages is increasing much less rapidly. This is a fact that they have learned of the most orthodox political economists. "It is only too manifest," says Mr. Rae, in the work from which I have already quoted, "that the immense increase of wealth which has marked the present century has been attended with surprisingly little amelioration in the general lot of the people, and it is in no way remarkable that this fact should tend to dishearten the laboring classes, and fill reflective minds with serious concern." Mr J. E. Cairnes, one of the most careful and thorough thinkers among recent economists, says:—

The fund available for those who live by labor tends, in the progress of society, while actually growing larger, to become a constantly smaller fraction of the entire national wealth. If, then, the means of any one class of society are to be permanently limited to this fund, it is evident, assuming that the progress of its numbers keeps pace with that of other classes, that its material condition *in relation to theirs* cannot but decline. Now, as it would be futile to expect, on the part of the poorest and most ignorant of the pop-

ulation, self-denial and prudence greater than that actually practiced by the classes above them, the circumstances of whose life are much more favorable than theirs for the cultivation of these virtues, the conclusion to which I am brought is this, that, unequal as is the distribution of wealth already in this country, the tendency of industrial progress, on the supposition that the present separation between industrial classes is maintained, is toward an inequality greater still. The rich will be growing richer, and the poor, at least relatively, poorer. It seems to me, apart altogether from the question of the laborer's interest, that these are not conditions which furnish a solid basis for a progressive social state.¹

It may be imagined that the reasonings of Mr. Cairnes apply only to the state of things in his own country; but this is not the case. His conclusions are drawn from the operation of the laws of free contract and competition in the labor market, and they are just as applicable to America as to England. Indeed, some of the most thoughtful of our own teachers of economy have joined with Mr. Cairnes and Mr. Mill and Mr. Fawcett in teaching the same doctrine.

This, then, is the foundation fact on which the theories of the socialists rest. Their philosophers, men like Karl Marx and Lassalle, are

¹ *Some Leading Principles of Political Economy*, p. 340.

profound students and independent investigators in all this field of political economy, and they have disciples in every nation. A book lately published in this country, "The Coöperative Commonwealth," by Laurence Gronlund, exhibits these economical laws lying at the basis of their system. To bring the fact now under consideration before the eyes of his readers, Mr. Gronlund has prepared a series of diagrams, representing the increase of the net product of the industries of the United States through the last four decades, and the manner in which this product has been divided between "wages" and "surplus." The diagrams with the accompanying figures, drawn from the census, show that while the net product of our manufactures increased from \$437,000,000 in 1850 to \$1,834,000,000 in 1880, or more than four hundred per cent., the average annual wages of labor increased from \$248 in 1850 to \$346 in 1880, or about forty per cent. The increase of the population, during this period, must also be considered: Mr. Gronlund's disproportion would thus be considerably reduced. The increase of the "net product" is due, of course, in great part to the increased use of machinery and the improvement in methods of production. That the laborer has been benefited to some extent by this enormous increase of the

productive energies of the nation is thus apparent; the fact is one that well-informed socialists do not deny; they only point out that the increase is disproportionately small; that the laborer is getting some share of the growing wealth, but by no means his fair share.

Attempts have recently been made by Mr. Giffen in a paper read before the Statistical Society of England, by Mr. Mallock in his "Property and Progress," by Mr. Rae in "Contemporary Socialism," and by others, to break the force of this assertion. Figures have been marshaled from many quarters, tending to show that wages have risen as rapidly as wealth has increased, and that the laboring class are receiving their full share of the gains of modern society. These figures cannot be examined here in detail. Suffice it to say that the conclusions based upon them are far from being settled. Mr. Giffen's reasonings, for example, are confined to the improvement which has taken place in the condition of the English working classes during the last half century; but the point of comparison from which he starts was notoriously one of the very lowest in English history. The laboring classes had reached a point below which they could not have sunk without becoming extinct. From that point they have rapidly risen during the past fifty years. This improve-

ment is mainly due to three causes: the abolition of the corn laws, the factory legislation protecting women and children, and the effective combinations of the trades-unions. But as Mr. Thorold Rogers has clearly pointed out, the recent rise in British wages cannot be rightly estimated without taking account of the previous depression. If from any causes the laborer is thrust below the level at which he can subsist and rear his family, his return to that level can hardly be reckoned as "progress." And, as a matter of history, Mr. Rogers declares that the English workman was better off four hundred years ago than he is to-day, — not only relatively, but positively better off; that the real wages of labor were higher then than now. There have been great fluctuations in the remuneration of labor in England, as Mr. Rogers so clearly shows in his monumental book on "Work and Wages." By taking one of the extreme points of depression in the past, and comparing the condition of the laborer then with his present condition, it is easy to show that he is far better off than formerly; but a complete and exhaustive study of wages and prices, running through six centuries, like that of Mr. Rogers, leaves the student in a much less optimistic frame of mind. The real question is, however, what has been the effect upon the

laboring class of the large system of productive industry now in vogue, — the system which comprises the massing of capital, the division of labor, and the use of machinery, with free contract and competition as the regulative forces. And the answer to this question given by the socialists is, I am persuaded, substantially correct. Doubtless they exaggerate the facts, but, making all due allowance for exaggeration, the facts support their assertions. Indeed, although Mr. Rae, in the chapter to which I have referred, tries to dispute the conclusions of Mr. Cairnes, I do not see why he does not himself fully admit, in the sentences I have already quoted from him, all that Mr. Cairnes asserts and all that the socialists claim. If “it is only too manifest that the immense increase of wealth which has marked the present century has been attended with surprisingly little amelioration in the general lot of the people,” Mr. Cairnes’s law is exactly fulfilled; and I confess myself quite unable to reconcile Mr. Rae’s statement, just quoted, on page 319, with his contention on page 324, that “it is a mistake to suppose” that the wage-laborer “has a less share in the wealth of the country than he had when the wealth of the country was less.”

The socialists lay much stress upon what they call the “iron law of wages” enunciated by

Ricardo, who taught that the natural rate of wages is "that price which is necessary to enable the laborers one with another to subsist, and to perpetuate their race without increase or diminution." It is true that Ricardo qualified this law by teaching that the consent of the laborer is an element in the determination of the price of labor, and that this consent is influenced by custom. The "natural" price is the lowest on which the workman will *consent* to marry and rear a family. But the introduction of this element into the problem takes away all its scientific value. To say that the natural rate of wages is what the laborer is willing to accept is to utter an extremely indeterminate proposition. And, although Ricardo did endeavor to qualify his law by adding custom and choice to physical necessity, there is not much doubt but that the actual working of unrestricted competition strongly tends to fulfill the law in its narrowest statement, and to confine the remuneration of laborers to the stipend actually required for the maintenance of life and the perpetuation of their race "without increase or diminution." A bare support is all that the economical forces, working unhindered, will guaranty to the laborer. So long as competition is the sole arbiter of his destiny, that is about all he will get. If in England during

the last fifty years he has been getting more than this, his prosperity is due to the restriction of competition by the Factory Acts and the trades-unions. If in America he has had more than this "natural" rate of wages, it has been because free land has constantly tempered the iron rule of competition.

The socialists point out the fact that the multiplication of commercial crises and the frequent recurrence of periods of stagnation and depression, causing great insecurity and distress among laborers, are natural consequences of the present industrial system. It is all due, they say, to overproduction, and is a natural and inevitable result of the system of competition.

Private enterprise, [says Mr. Gronlund], compels every producer to produce for himself, to sell for himself, to keep all his transactions secret, without any regard whatever for anybody else in the wide world. But the producer and merchant — the small ones especially — find out daily that their success or failure depends, in the first place, *precisely on how much others produce and sell*; and, in the second place, on a multitude of causes — often on things that may happen thousands of miles away — which determine the power of purchase of their customers. They have got no measure at hand at all by which they can, even approximately, estimate the actual effective demand of consumers or ascertain the pro-

ducing capacity of their rivals. In other words, "private enterprise" is a defiance of Nature's law which decrees that the interests of society are *interdependent*; and Nature punishes that defiance in her own crude way by playing ball with these individualists, and, what is worse, by rendering all production, all commerce, chaotic.¹

The existence of this evil is not disputed, nor the suffering that it causes to multitudes of laborers. Karl Marx, as paraphrased by Dr. Ely, shows how the latter class is affected by it.

During prosperous times manufacturers employ all the men, women, and children who will work. The laboring classes prosper, marriage is encouraged, and population increases. Suddenly there comes a commercial crisis. The greater part of the laborers are thrown out of employment, and are maintained by society at large; that is, the general public has to bear the burden of keeping the laborers — the manufacturers' tools — for their employer until he may need them again. These laborers without work constitute an army of reserve forces for the manufacturer. When times begin to improve he again gradually resumes business and becomes more prosperous. The laborer's wages have previously been reduced on account of hard times, and the manufacturer is not obliged to raise them, as there is a whole army in waiting, glad to take work at any price.²

¹ *Coöperative Commonwealth*, p. 42.

² *French and German Socialism in Modern Times*, p. 181.

The verification of this statement was easy when this was written. In many of our cities from one twentieth to one tenth of the population were receiving during the winter of 1884-5 partial support, either from the city authorities or from voluntary charities. But this is only a fraction of the burden thrown upon the general public by laborers out of employment. Count in all the rent bills, board bills, butchers' and grocers' bills, store bills of all sorts, which remain unpaid in times like these, and are finally charged up to profit and loss, and it will be evident that the wage-receivers become in these times of depression heavy pensioners upon society at large. This evil, according to the socialists, is inseparable from the present industrial system, and can only be cured by reforming that system out of existence.

They call attention also to the fact that the tendency of trade and manufactures at present is toward the creation of great enterprises and the destruction of the lesser ones. The class of small tradesmen and capitalists is rapidly becoming extinct. "The same causes," says Mr. Rae, "have of course exercised very important effects upon the economic condition of the working class. They have reduced them more and more to the permanent condition of wage-laborers, and have left them fewer openings than they

once possessed for investing their savings in their own line, and fewer opportunities for the abler and more intelligent of them to rise to a competency." ¹ That this will be increasingly true under a system of unmitigated competition is a simple deduction from the recognized laws of political economy. The wage-laborer has now "less chance than before of becoming anything else," and his chances will lessen as time goes on. The concentration of industrial direction in fewer and fewer hands is part of the logic of events.

As a consequence of this we have the growth of the plutocracy, into whose hands is gradually falling the power of the state, as well as the direction of commerce. Against the vast combinations that are made by the great corporations and the great capitalists the people seem to have little power. During the past ten years the number of rich men in the Senate of the United States has greatly increased. Doubtless these gentlemen have not resorted to Washington as a mere pastime. That some of them have used money freely in obtaining their seats is notorious; and these are "business" men, and not likely to expend so much time and money without a definite, "practical" purpose. We may expect to see this class of men increase

¹ Page 324.

in the Congress of the United States. If this is becoming, indeed, a plutocracy, — if, in other words, our economical system is contrived in such a manner as to throw a steadily increasing proportion of the wealth of the country into the hands of a few rich men, — we must expect that those whom we thus exalt will possess themselves, in one way or another, of a steadily increasing share of the political power of the country. Until human nature is greatly changed the political power will rest in the hands of those who possess the physical power.

Such is the indictment of the present order which socialism has drawn. Is it a true bill? It must be said, at any rate, that a *primâ facie* case is made out, and that the complainants are entitled to a hearing. Indeed, these tendencies to which they point, — the tendency of wages to sink to starvation point, the tendency of the workman's share of the national wealth to grow constantly smaller, the tendency of commercial crises and depressions to become more frequent and disastrous, the tendency of all business operations and enterprises to become concentrated in fewer hands, and the consequent tendency to confine the wage-laborers more and more rigidly to their present condition, with the steady growth of a plutocracy on the one side and a proletariat on the other, — all these are, as I

believe, the natural issues of an industrial system whose sole motive power is self-interest, and whose sole regulative principle is competition.

To show that this prediction of the socialists is not a mere scarecrow, let me quote a few sentences from a master in political science who will not be accused of rashness.

If, however [says Dr. Woolsey], that to which we have referred more than once already should be found to be a law of social progress, — that the free use of private property must end in making a few capitalists of enormous wealth, and a vast population of laborers dependent on them; and if there could be no choice between this disease of free society and the swallowing up of all property by the state, — then, we admit, it would be hard to choose between the two evils. Nothing would lead the mass of men to embrace socialism sooner than the conviction that this enormous accumulation of capital in a few hands was to be not only an *evil in fact*, if not prevented, but a *necessary evil*, beyond prevention. . . . If such a tendency should manifest itself, it would run through all the forms of property. A Stewart or a Claffin would root out smaller tradespeople. Holders of small farms would sink into tenants. The buildings of a city would belong to a few owners. Small manufacturers would have to take pay from mammoths of their own kind or be ruined. Then would the words of the prophet be fulfilled: "Woe unto them that

join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place that they may be placed alone in the earth." For if this went to an extreme in a free country the "expropriated" could not endure it; they would go to some other country, and leave these proprietors alone in the land, or would drive them away. A revolution, slow or rapid, would certainly bring about a new order of things.¹

It is evident that this cautious thinker recognizes the *possibility* of the result which the socialists prophesy. In another place he says, still more significantly: "If any such law, fatal and inevitable, is at work, its progress must be measured, not by years, but by centuries. The socialists have done existing order a favor by calling to it the attention of men."² This must imply that the danger, though remote, is real. The socialists would be entitled to no thanks for discoursing of purely imaginary perils.

These words, and, indeed, the respectful treatment which all the more intelligent students of political science give to the discussions of the philosophical socialists, make it quite plain that they have something to say; and it is precisely here, in its criticisms of the present order, that the strength of socialism is found. Its arraignment of the methods of industry and commerce now existing is trenchant and timely. The

¹ *Communism and Socialism*, pp. 297, 298.

² Page 281.

warnings that it utters every wise man will heed.

But criticism is always easy ; construction is another matter. When the socialists begin to outline the new order which is to supplant the old one, they reveal their weakness. The first problem, of course, is to dispose of the stock of political and social goods now on hand. What shall be done with the present order ?

The nihilists and anarchists, as we have seen, have their answer ready. In one word, it is dynamite. They propose to wipe out the present civilization, to raze it, even to its foundations. They want to blow the whole social fabric into fragments. Out of the chaos thus produced they expect to evolve some sort of socialistic cosmos — a new heaven and a new earth, wherein every man shall do that which is right in his own eyes. Those brutal outbursts of reasonless and reckless hate to which they treat us now and then are the signs of a fatal weakness. The spasms of an epileptic exhibit the same sort of energy.

But it would be unfair to hold the philosophical socialists responsible for the freaks of these madmen. Their programme is, for the most part, much more rational. They denounce the present system, but they hold the men guiltless who have been nourished by it. Nay, they hold

that the present order is a natural and necessary outgrowth of the past; a stage that was inevitable in the process of evolution, and, until it had fulfilled its purpose, beneficent.

The social state of each epoch [says Mr. Gronlund] was just as perfect as the corresponding development of our race permitted. The evils, therefore, of the "let-alone" policy are to be considered the legitimate workings of a principle to which humanity in times to come will find itself greatly indebted. This conception ought to guard us against any ill-feeling towards the individual members of our plutocracy. Passions directed against the system are most proper, for it is only passion that can nerve us sufficiently to overthrow the system; but our capitalists are as much the creatures of circumstances as our paupers are. Neither should we forget that there have here and there been employers and capitalists who would willingly have sacrificed them all to right society. Robert Owen was the more noble a man for being rich.¹

This is the tone which the more moderate socialists adopt, though even these are sometimes found emitting the sulphurous breath of the anarchist. Thus the generally reasonable writer whose words I have just quoted refers in the last chapter of his book to the natural force called *vril*, described in Bulwer's romance,

¹ *The Coöperative Commonwealth*, p. 59.

“The Coming Race.” “It can be stored in a small wand which rests in the hollow of the palm, and, when skillfully wielded, can rend rocks, remove any natural obstacle, scatter the strongest fortress, and make the weak a perfect match for any combination of number, strength, and discipline. No wonder that these people attribute their equality, their freedom, felicity, and advancement to this discovery. What if this *vril*” — so Gronlund muses — “is but a poetic anticipation of the civilizing power of that real, energetic substance, which we call — *dynamite!*”¹ Coming, as this does, in the course of a conjectural discussion of the ways in which socialism may be realized, it is little better than fiendish. Dynamite is, and will always be, the weapon of dastards. When the ideas of socialism shall have gained possession of the minds of the majority of the people, its reign can be ushered in without resorting to assassination. Until that time shall come, the men who undertake to force it upon a disbelieving and hostile community by the methods of the dynamiters are savages.

It is not, however, by these diabolical methods that intelligent socialists expect to see the new order replace the old one. They regard it as the next step in the evolution of society, —

¹ Page 275.

sure to follow the capitalistic régime, as that was to follow feudalism and slavery. And they regard these very tendencies which we have been considering as movements in the direction of socialism. The large system of industry, by which laborers are drawn together in masses, the trades-unions, the Knights of Labor, and other organizations of similar character, are all preparing the way for the new order. The separation of society into two distinct classes, of the very rich and the very poor, — a plutocracy on one side and a proletariat on the other, — is, to them, a cheering sign. They are quite willing that the wage-laborer should remain a wage-laborer, and they look with no favor upon any attempts to introduce coöperative industries or industrial partnerships. The faster the work of concentration and division goes on, the better they are pleased. When that time shall come of which Roscher speaks, in which there shall be “a well-defined confrontation of rich and poor,” the middle class having practically become extinct, the hour of the new order will strike.

Another sign of the good time coming, to which the socialists point, is the increasing amount of governmental interference. When Sir Arthur Helps wrote his “Thoughts on Government,” twelve years ago, his plea for paternalism was thought to be extremely heret-

ical; but the current is now setting strongly in this direction. As an acute writer has recently said: "*Laissez faire* is at the present time losing ground because of evolutionary tendencies, which neither political power nor social philosophy can resist; the government must assume a larger share of duties, and *laissez faire* must so far stand aside."¹ Mr. Herbert Spencer's late essays on *The Man and the State* are one prolonged complaint of this tendency.

Evidently, then [he writes], the changes made, the changes in progress, and the changes urged will carry us not only toward state ownership of land and dwellings, and means of communication, all to be administered and worked by state agents, but toward state usurpation of all industries; the private forms of which, disadvantaged more and more in competition with the state, which can arrange everything for its own convenience, will more and more die away, just as many voluntary schools have, in presence of board schools; and so will be brought about the desired ideal of the socialists.²

So universal is this tendency that Adolf Wagner, the great German economist, has enunciated it as a law — the law of the increasing function of government. From the operation of this law, which causes Mr. Spencer so

¹ *Reforms: Their Difficulties and Possibilities*, p. 212.

² *The Man and the State*, p. 39.

much anxiety, the socialists expect the introduction of the new régime.

What is to be the new régime? It is, briefly, the nationalization of capital. The state is to own all the land, all the mines and factories, all the machinery, all the raw material of production; it is to assume the direction of all the productive and distributive industries; it is to own and manage all the railroads, the telegraphs, the telephones, — all the means of transportation and communication; it is to keep in its storehouses the fruits of the earth and the products of labor; it is to distribute them where they are needed, and to facilitate exchanges between different groups of workers. Gold and silver and their representatives will be abolished; the only currency will be labor-checks, given in exchange for certain amounts of labor, and exchangeable at the government stores for commodities. All callings are to be classified, and the government is to be administered through these classes of laborers, the principle being that of appointments from below and removal from above. Let Mr. Grönlund tell us how the thing may be done: --

Suppose, then, every distinct branch of industry, of agriculture, and, also, teachers, physicians, etc., to form, each trade and profession by itself, a distinct body, a trades-union (we simply use the term because

it is convenient), a guild, a corporation managing its internal affairs itself, but subject to collective control. Suppose, further, that, *e. g.*, the "heelers" among the operatives in a shoe-factory at Lynn come together and elect their foreman; and that the "tappers," the "solers," the "finishers," and whatever else the various operators may be called, do likewise. Suppose that these foremen assemble and elect a superintendent of the factory, and that the superintendents of all the factories in Lynn, in their turn, elect a — let us call him — district superintendent. Again, we shall suppose these district superintendents of the whole boot and shoe industry to assemble themselves somewhere from all parts of the country, and elect a bureau chief; and he, with other bureau chiefs of related industries, say the tanning industry, to elect a chief of department. However, we do not want too many of these chiefs. for we mean to make a working body, not a talking body, out of them. We mean that these chiefs of department shall form the *national board of administrators*, whose function it shall be to supervise the whole social activity of the country. Each chief will supervise the internal affairs of his own department, and the whole board control all those matters in which the general public is interested.¹

This national board is, however, in Mr. Gronlund's scheme, less a legislative than an executive body; for all general laws framed by it are to be referred to the people, and will only be-

¹ *The Coöperative Commonwealth*, p. 79.

come laws when ratified by them. He also proposes that every directing officer have the right of dismissing any of his subordinates, and that the highest in every department, the chief, be made liable to removal by the whole body of his subordinates. "The subordinates elect, the superiors dismiss," except in the case of the highest in rank, who, since he can be responsible to nobody above him, is to be responsible to everybody below him. The question what the foreman of the primary group is to do with refractory or negligent workers is not an easy one to this philosopher. "Whereto could a worker be removed?" he inquires. "He must be employed somewhere. Of course, there must be some kind of remedy by which society could protect itself against any rebellious or negligent worker. For such cases, a trial by his comrades might be provided, the issue of which might be removal to a lower *grade*, or some sort of compulsion." The question, however, concerns the *lowest* grade. What could be done with people who would not work even there? This part of the programme must be carefully thought out, for unless human nature changes mightily before the dawn of the new order, there will be a great multitude of these people; and their persistent attempts to get a living without work are likely to make trouble in the best-regulated phalanstery.

The state will have three chief functions : it will be Superintendent, Statistician, and Arbitrator. It will direct and control all the farming, mining, manufacturing, carrying, teaching, healing, buying, and selling. It will also collect information from all parts of the country, upon which it will base its decrees concerning the amount of each product necessary for the year. "In the socialistic state," says Schaeffle, "the functionaries who would have to do with sales would ascertain the amounts needed, would distribute the national work accordingly among the different classes of people doing business and the persons concerned in production, transportation, and storage, and would assign to the products a value according to the mass of socially necessary work spent upon them."

Nothing like trade or commerce would therefore exist in this state; the shops and stores by which our products are now distributed would give place to vast government bazaars, where your labor-check would be good for a given amount of any product that might happen to be in stock. No leasing would be possible, for all the lands and tenements would belong to the state. Householders would pay taxes to the state for the premises occupied. The state would help itself, out of the storehouses, to any additional amount needed to de-

fray its own expenses. These expenses would not be small, for a pretty large army of officials would be required to supervise all the multifarious details of production, and distribution, and transportation, and instruction. Physicians, teachers, judges (arbitrators, Mr. Gronlund calls them), and all such "non-productive" laborers would be remunerated out of the government stores. The pay of all workers would be assimilated to that of the common laborer, making due allowance for the amount of time required by the skilled worker to fit himself for his calling. The compensation would be graded on this principle. The difference in the various kinds of work, Mr. Gronlund says, "consists simply in being more or less complicated. It takes, simply, more time to learn the one than the other. The most complicated kind of work can always be reduced to ordinary unskilled labor, may always be considered as multiplied common labor." Thus, for example, the actuaries of the new order may determine that the average number of working years in a man's life is thirty. A coal-heaver, who needs to take no time to learn his trade, would have thirty years to work. A teacher must spend five additional years in study; he would have, therefore, but twenty-five years for work. He should receive, therefore, for his twenty-five years'

labor as much as the coal-heaver for his thirty years' labor. The teacher's daily stipend should be one fifth larger than that of the coal-heaver.

It will be observed that, under socialism, every citizen would be directly and consciously in the employ of the government. The government would be the only employer. The civil service would include the whole population. The shoemaker or the hod-carrier would be a government officer as much as the post-master or the department clerk.

Under this régime private property would not be abolished, but it would be greatly restricted. A man might live, doubtless, on less than the amount of his daily earnings, and thus an accumulation of labor-checks might be made upon which he could subsist while devoting his leisure to study or travel; but the savings of day-wages must needs be small. Loans with interest would be prohibited; for it is the very foundation-stone of socialism that capital — that is, property of any kind from which income is derived — shall all belong to the state. Every man's income would be strictly confined to his actual earnings; and the state would be his employer and would fix his stipend. Inheritance would also be restricted or forbidden. Private property would not be allowed to accumulate in this way, in families, by transmission.

On this question, however, there is not entire agreement among socialists; some of them holding that the right of bequeathing one's personal savings should not be denied. The limitation of private property would, however, be pretty strict, if Mr. Gronlund is a prophet. This is his judgment: —

Every millionaire is a criminal.

Every one who amasses a hundred thousand dollars is a criminal.

Every president of a company with nominal duties, if his salary is but a thousand dollars, is a criminal.

Every one who loans his neighbor one hundred dollars and exacts one hundred and six in return is a criminal.

It is evident that the reign of the plutocrat will cease when socialism comes to its own.

One interesting feature of the new order is conveyed in the assurance that the question of domestic service will be forever settled. "Domestics will be incorporated in the family, as members of it. No one, then, surely will be so slavish as to accept the position on less honorable terms." After making this fact known, Mr. Gronlund imagines some objector crying out, "Is the man crazy? No one to black our boots, sweep our rooms, attend us at meals,

nurse our children! No one to look after our comfort!" To which he makes this answer:—

We really think you will have to "look after your comfort" yourself. Most of your fellow-men, many of them far more worthy than you, now have to do that. At the public places, of course, you can have all your wants supplied and yourself attended to, but mark! by persons as much public functionaries as you yourself will be, and conscious of being so, and whom you cannot familiarly call "Ben" or "John" except on an equal footing. But at home you will have to be "served" by members of your family, and such people whom (*sic*) your personal qualities will attach to your person.

Socialism aims, fundamentally, at the reconstruction of the industrial order; and it need not concern itself with questions of morality or religion. Whatever may be said by its expositors about these questions should be taken as mere *obiter dicta*, and should not be suffered to bind or to ban the system. Nevertheless it is noteworthy that those socialists who touch upon domestic and ethical matters indicate their preference for a somewhat radical reconstruction of society along these lines. Their prediction is that marriage will be purely voluntary; that society will interpose no obstacles to the separation of discontented partners; that the control of children by their parents will be

much less absolute than at present; that in many of the most important interests of life society will stand *in loco parentis*. "Children do not belong to their parents," says Mr. Gronlund; "they belong to society." "In the very nature of things family supremacy will be absolutely incompatible with an *interdependent*, solidaric commonwealth, for in such a state the first object of education must be to establish in the minds of the children an indissoluble association between their individual happiness and the good of all. To that end family exclusiveness must be broken down first of all."¹

As to morals, the socialists are inclined to charge all evil-doing upon the present order of society, and to excuse, if not to justify, the existing race of criminals. The new order will make men good by furnishing them with a better environment; it will successfully tempt them to do right.

As to religion, something of that nature will still remain, no doubt. There is no reason in the nature of things, as Dr. Woolsey says, why socialists should not be Christians. They might even make Christianity the state religion. There is in Germany at the present time a considerable body of Christian Socialists, whose programme is, indeed, much less radical than

¹ *The Coöperative Commonwealth*, p. 224.

that of the Social Democrats, but who are fairly entitled to the name. As a matter of fact, however, the great majority of socialists are violently opposed to all that is known by the name of religion at the present day.

“Socialists,” says Schaeffle, “pronounce the church to be a police institution in the hands of capital, and affirm that it cheats the proletarian ‘by bills of exchange on heaven.’ It deserves to perish.”

This exposition of the philosophy and the aims of socialism is necessarily rough and incomplete; I have endeavored to set forth, as fairly as I could, the main features of the system. In doing so I have exhibited its weakness. As a positive programme for the reconstruction of society its ineptitude must be apparent. It can never survive a thorough popular discussion. So long as it is content with criticising the present order it can gain a hearing; and, as a matter of fact, it does, for the most part, confine itself to this rôle. Its advocates are chary of definite information about their plans. They are able clearly to point out the evils of competition and capitalism; but when they are asked to tell what they would put in the place of the existing system, they at once begin to deal in generalities. An

attempt such as Mr. Gronlund has made to furnish an outline of the new order is the most convincing argument against it. The reflections that must force themselves on all who take the trouble to think out this scheme are briefly these:—

1. The attempt to regulate the social and industrial life of a great nation like ours by a centralized bureaucracy would break down under its own weight. The work would be so vast and complicated, the details so multifarious, the adjustments so difficult, the administration so herculean, that its collapse would be speedy. To do all this work an army of “non-productive” government officials would be required, whose draft upon the products of industry would be enormous; it is a question whether the “productive” workers would obtain any larger portion of the net product of their industry than they are now receiving. Under any system labor must be supervised and directed, and exchanges of products must be effected, and this work of direction and exchange must be remunerated. Socialists must carefully count the cost of all this before they enter upon the warfare in which they are now enlisting. The cumbersomeness rather than the cost of the method is, however, the feature upon which attention should be fixed. That a “national

board of administrators " at Washington should set out to ascertain and measure the desires of fifty millions of people for the necessaries, the comforts, the luxuries of life, and should undertake to produce all these " satisfactions " and distribute them to those who crave them, seems, on the face of it, preposterous.

2. Closely connected with this objection another fundamental weakness of the scheme appears. This is the attempt to base all values upon cost of production, without any consistent reference to the principle of supply and demand. Things are to be worth just what it costs to produce them ; the strength or the weakness of the desire of the consumer is not to have any measurable influence in determining the price that shall be paid for them. Mr. Gronlund admits that supply and demand is a natural law, and that it has at present a great deal to do in fixing the prices of commodities, and he thinks that a little room may perhaps be found for the play of this force under the socialistic régime ; but it is evident that he likes it not, and would willingly be rid of it altogether. The practical difficulties which would arise on account of it are easily conceived. Suppose, for example, a group of manufacturing tailors produce one hundred thousand coats, which are sent to the government warehouses to be sold. The price

of each is fixed by the time expended by the workman in making it. Suppose another group manufactures the same number of coats out of material costing exactly the same, and with the same amount of labor, and these go into the warehouses in the same way, to be sold, of course, at the same price. Owing to the differences in the color and style of the material, and in the pattern and finish of the work, the one lot of coats is quickly disposed of, while the other lot proves unsalable. What is the government to do with this product for which it has paid, and which nobody wants? Will it dispose of the stock for less than its actual cost in labor? Will it not continually find its storehouses filling up with goods that nobody will buy? Mr. Gronlund allows that sacrifices would sometimes have to be made in this way, which the government, "as the universal insurer," would be obliged to meet. He thinks, however, that the government would find ways of controlling this troublesome factor — that is, of causing the people to demand those commodities, and those only, of which it has the supply. It is easy to see how this might be done, in part, by establishing uniformity in a great many of the features of life where now diversity exists; by compelling the people all to dress exactly alike; to dwell in houses of uniform

size and cost; to lay aside their individual tastes and preferences, and live a life prescribed by governmental regulation. The socialistic scheme can never be worked without the enforcement of such a uniformity in most of the details of life.

3. It is evident that the freedom of the individual would be greatly limited under such a régime. No despotism could be more absolute or more intolerable than that which this fierce democracy would be sure to exercise. Many of the questions which men are now left to determine for themselves would be determined for them by the state; the range of their choices and responsibilities would be greatly narrowed; the forces by which high character is developed would be correspondingly weakened. It is by no means clear that the right of movement from place to place would be left to the individual. Mr. Gronlund insists that it would be, but he has not shown us how this great governmental machine will be able to carry on its work successfully, unless it has the power to compel its workmen to stay where they are put, and do the work assigned to them. As Baron J. Fötvös¹ has strongly said, "The unconditional subjection of the individual under the state" is the first principle of socialism.

¹ Quoted by Woolsey, *Communism and Socialism*, p. 269.

“What the form of the state would be in its socialistic era,” says Dr. Woolsey, “would be of little importance. The essential characteristic is that it must become all but unlimited; and our readers are well aware that all unlimited governments are more like one another, whether they be called monarchies or oligarchies or democracies, than they are each like to a limited government of their own name.”¹ That this unlimited government, though democratic at first, would easily pass under the control of a single despot, is a truth which reason announces and history confirms. It was revolutionary and communistic France that flung herself so suddenly and so eagerly into the arms of Napoleon. Mr. Gronlund’s “national board of administrators” would soon find some single will ruling in its councils, and the question of the responsibility of this body, with which its inventor labors, would be promptly solved.

4. But socialism is fundamentally an economical method, and is, therefore, fundamentally wrong, because it is based on a doctrine of economy which is false; namely, the doctrine that all value is the product of labor. This doctrine of value, formulated by Karl Marx, is the cornerstone of socialism. “Nothing,” says Mr. Gronlund, “can so effectually kill our cause as the

¹ Page 232.

successful impeachment of the answer we shall give to the question, 'What is value?'"¹ This is undoubtedly true, and therefore socialism can never survive a thorough discussion of its economical basis; for no matter whether Ricardo or Marx be the author of this doctrine, it is unsound. Other elements besides the "quantity of common human labor measured by time" help to make up value. Here are two groups of a thousand men, equally industrious and capable. The workmen of the one group find such occupation as they can; but many of them have poor tools, and many others are lacking in constructive or artistic skill, and do not know how to direct their own powers; and many others make mistakes of judgment in determining what they will produce, and continually find that they have expended their energies upon products for which there is no demand; and many, still more helpless, though willing to work, are idle a good part of the time because they can find nothing profitable to do. The other group are employed by a man of intelligence and experience. He possesses an ample supply of the best tools and machines; he knows, by wide observation and careful study of the market, for what articles there will be an efficient demand; he has the con-

¹ Page 16.

structive skill and the taste that enable him to produce the goods that will please the people ; he knows when to get them to the market, and how to put himself in communication with purchasers. Under his direction the second group of men work for a year. Will any man say that the product of their labor, thus directed, will possess no more value than the product of the first group, who wrought blindly during the same time, without direction ? Will any man say that the knowledge, the skill, the taste, the judgment, the enterprise, the organizing ability, of this employer are not elements in the production of this enhanced value ? The majority of the men who work lack the power of directing their own labor so as to secure from it the most valuable product. A very large share of the value produced by their labor is given to it by the intelligence and the organizing power of their employers. To say that this intelligence and this organizing power have nothing to do, or but little to do, with the creation of value is to talk arrant nonsense.

The power to organize and direct labor is highly useful to society. We owe to it the great multiplication of wealth and the rapid progress of the industrial arts. The workmen themselves have derived from it incalculable benefits. And this power has been developed

in great degree by the operation of that same "private enterprise" whose doings the socialists so constantly execrate. Even Mr. Gronlund is forced to acknowledge this: "We heartily admit that it has performed wonders. It has built monuments greater than the pyramids. Its Universal Expositions have moved greater masses of men than the crusades ever did. It has done mankind an immense service in proving by hard facts that wholesale manufacture is the most sensible form of labor."¹

This is a grudging admission. It has done far more than this. With all its mischiefs and its curses, — and they are multitudinous, — private enterprise has filled the world with blessings. It has been the motive power of material civilization.

But socialism proposes to dispense with it. It will suffer private property, in a restricted sense, but it will not suffer private *enterprise*. The state is to monopolize the enterprise. The organizing genius, the constructive skill, the executive energy which have built up modern civilization have been developed by giving an open field to private enterprise, and permitting individuals to reap for themselves the rewards of their own vigilance and sagacity. The closing of this door would paralyze industry and

¹ Page 53.

put a stop to development. The prospect of profit from industrial investment is the main-spring of industrial progress. In the words of Mr. Cairnes: "The inducement thus offered to the acquisitive propensity in man constitutes under the actual system of things the ultimate security for all the results which go to form our industrial civilization. The feeling appealed to may, if you like, be a coarse one, but it is at any rate efficacious; it does lead to habitual and systematic saving, and furnishes society with the necessary basis for civilized progress." The proposition of the socialists to exterminate or repress this central principle of human nature is clearly unscientific; the reform for which they call is "a reform against nature."

The just demand of the working class is that they shall share in the growing wealth of the world. "Now this," says Mr. Rae, "involves two things: first, progress; and second, diffusion of progress; and socialism is so intent on the second that it fails to see how completely it would cut off the springs of the first."

The two coördinate forces of the ideal society are self-interest and benevolence. In the perfect society they will exactly balance each other. The present industrial order makes self-interest the sole motive power. Under this one-sided régime the mischiefs have arisen of

which socialism complains. The remedy which socialism proposes is the entire reconstruction of society upon the other principle of benevolence, allowing no opportunity for the free play of the self-regarding motives. From the one extreme it flies to the other. Because civilization has gone on one leg till it is lame, socialism insists that it shall go on the other, exclusively, till that too breaks down. Its health and its progress will be promoted by permitting it to go on both legs. Private property and private enterprise must be maintained, and some means must be found of infusing into them a larger measure of good-will. The manual laborer is not entitled to the whole of the net product of his labor; but a wise philanthropy, studying his conditions, freely allows that a larger share of it than he now receives equitably belongs to him, and insists that some adjustment shall be made by which he shall obtain a larger share. The wage-laborer ought to have not only the market rate of wages, under competition, but a stipulated share in the profits of business. He ought to be identified in interest with his employer; and he must be, before there can ever be peace between them. The system of profit-sharing, or industrial partnership, saves and enlarges the gains of private enterprise, and permits the workman to participate in them. By

some application of this principle the efficiency of the present wage system will be preserved, and its worst mischiefs averted. If any one wishes to know whether this method is practicable or not, let him read that eloquent little book by Sedley Taylor on "Profit-Sharing,"¹ in which the results of a large number of experiments along this line are clearly set forth. More than a hundred establishments upon the continent of Europe are now working happily and prosperously upon this basis.

The socialists, indeed, as I have said, are altogether unfriendly to this method. They prefer that the gulf between the laborers and their employers should go on widening and deepening. The faster this proceeds the sooner will come the social revolution for which they pray. Therefore they denounce all workmen who enter into such partnerships with their employers, as a class "with one foot in the camp of the *bourgeoisie* and the other in the camp of the proletariat." Exactly so. In this lies the wisdom and the glory of the method. It is not divisive, it is unitary. "It is only," says Mr. Rae, "by linking a lower class to a higher that you can raise the level of the whole."


There is good reason to hope that this simple readjustment of the economical relations of em-

¹ London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

ployer and laborer would put a new face upon industrial society. Peace would take the place of strife, confidence of distrust, hope of despair. The efficiency of labor would be promoted, and the gains of civilization, for all classes, indefinitely increased.

Instead, therefore, of pulling down the existing order, as the socialists propose, the thing to be done is to enlarge its foundations. They are right in saying that an industrial system whose sole motive power is self-interest and whose sole regulative principle is competition will end in pandemonium ; but they are foolish in thinking that humanity will thrive under a system which discards or cripples these self-regarding forces. What is needed is the calling into action of the good-will which is equally a part of human nature. This also must be made an integral part of the industrial system ; it must be the business of the employer to promote the welfare of his workmen, and the business of the workmen to promote the interest of their employer. The organization of labor must be such that the one class cannot prosper without directly and perceptibly increasing the prosperity of the other. This is the true remedy for the evils of which the socialists complain. The reform needed is not the destruction but the Christianization of the present order.

Yet, in the language of Sedley Taylor, these methods of profit-sharing and industrial partnership, "valuable as they are in themselves, constitute no self-acting panacea; . . . their best fruits can be reaped only by men who feel that life does not consist in abundance of material possessions, who regard stewardship as nobler than ownership, who see in the ultimate outcome of all true work issues reaching beyond the limits of the present dispensation, and who act faithfully and strenuously on these beliefs." Those who are under the sway of such motives must take the initiative in this great enterprise of making peace between the workmen and their employers. Edme-Jean Leclaire, founder of the Maison Leclaire in Paris, and a man whose life was devoted to the building up of a noble and beneficent industry upon this foundation, wrote, upon his death-bed, this confession of his faith: "I am the humble disciple of Him who has told us to do to others what we would have others do to us, and to love our neighbor as ourselves; it is in this sense that I desire to remain a Christian until my last breath." Out of such a faith ought to grow such fruit. If our Christianity has any life in it, it can solve this problem of the relation between labor and capital. And every employer over whom Christian motives have any power



ought to feel the weight of the obligation resting on him to establish between himself and his workmen a relation in which it will be natural for them as well as for him to obey the Christian law.

As a consequence of this economical readjustment better relations would be established between all classes in society, and sympathy and kindness would take the place of suspicion and alienation. The iron law of wages would be broken, and the yawning chasm between rich and poor would be bridged by goodwill.

◀ The principal remedy for the evils of which socialists complain is to be found, therefore, in the application by individuals of Christian principles and methods to the solution of the social problem. The notion that the state can cure all these mischiefs is not to be entertained. Nevertheless, though the state cannot do everything, there are some things that it can do, and must do. The limits of governmental interference are likely to be greatly enlarged in the immediate future. New occasions bring new duties; the function of the state must be broadened to meet the exigencies of our expanding civilization. ▶ We may go far beyond Mr. Spencer's limits and yet stop a great way this side of socialism. Out of unrestricted competition

arise many wrongs that the state must redress, and many abuses that it must check. It may become the duty of the state to reform its taxation, so that its burdens shall rest less heavily upon the lower classes; to repress monopolies of all sorts; to prevent and punish gambling; to regulate or control the railroads and telegraphs; to limit the ownership of land; to modify the laws of inheritance; and possibly to levy a progressive income tax, so that the enormous fortunes should bear more, instead of less, than their share of the public burdens. The keeping up of such fortunes is against public policy, and the state has the same right to discourage them that it has to inspect factories or ships, to tax saloons, or to prohibit the erection of a slaughter-house upon the public square. By some such measures the state may clearly indicate its purpose, while carefully guarding the essential liberty of its citizens, to restrain those oppressive evils which grow out of the abuses of liberty; and, while protecting property and honoring industry, to check, by every means in its power, those tendencies by which society is divided into the two contrasted and contending classes of plutocrats and proletarians.

IS IT PEACE OR WAR?

THE question of peace or war between capital and labor includes several questions: whether there is at the present time peace or war between these two great powers, and if it is war, what they are fighting for; whether war is better than peace, and if not, how the war is to be brought to an end and peace is to be made, — whether by capital subjugating labor, or by labor subjugating capital, or by finding some way of uniting their interests.

The question whether peace or war now exists in the industrial realm need not detain us long. The answer is too easy. Optimists have been diligently assuring us, for a score of years, that there was no such thing as a labor question, except in the minds of a few crazy agitators; that everything was lovely in the industrial world, and constantly growing lovelier; that those beautiful harmonies of the French economist were sure to make everybody rich and contented and happy very soon. Few are now

heard talking in this strain. Everybody admits that the relations between the working classes and their employers are extremely uncomfortable; the strikes, the lockouts, the boycotting, the rioting here and there, make up a large share of the telegraphic news in our daily papers. The state of industrial society is a state of war, and the engagement is general all along the line.

This state of things is the natural result of a system of pure competition. Competition means conflict. The proposition is disputed, but if any philosopher wishes to test its truth by a scientific experiment, let him gather a crowd of twenty urchins together upon the sidewalk and address them as follows: "Here is a handful of coppers, which I propose to divide among you, and I wish to tell you how I am going to make the distribution. To begin with, you have all got to stand back on the other side of the curbstone; then I shall heap the coppers on that flat stone; then, when I give the word, let each one of you come forward and take what he can get. The only principle, my dear young friends, that we can recognize in the distribution of this fund is the principle of competition. Neither justice nor charity can have anything to do with it. Under competition, the political economists tell us, everybody gets a reasonably

fair share. All ready! One, two, three—grab!” If our philosopher will stand by now and watch his experiment, he will see reasons for believing that competition is not uniformly a beneficent force. In the first place, it will turn out that the biggest boys will begin at once, while he is talking, to crowd themselves up nearest to the curbstone, and nearest to the pile of coppers, pushing back the smaller boys. Likely enough they will have a fight for this vantage-ground while he is making his speech explaining the beauties of competition. When he gives his signal they will rush in at once, trampling on one another, the strongest, of course, seizing the largest share, and many of the little boys getting only a stray copper or two that may be dropped from the hands of their more greedy and powerful companions as they make off with their booty. This is the way that competition works. The whole story of the competitive régime is outlined in this thumb-nail sketch of the curbstone financiers. Competition means war. And the law of war is the triumph of the strongest.

What is it that the scientific people tell us always happens in the struggle for existence? Is it not that the strongest individuals and the strongest races kill off the weakest? Competition is the struggle for existence, which is the

law of the inferior races, adopted as the law of industrial society. It works in society exactly as it works among the inferior races. I will not stop to argue whether or not it is a good thing to kill off the weaker classes; my only point now is that under a system of which competition is the law this is the tendency. Naturally, the weaker classes object to being killed off, and fight against it with what strength they have; hence the conflict which always must accompany a system of pure competition.

It may be admitted, however, that a system of fair competition would work better than the existing system. If all the competitors were equally intelligent and equally strong, and if our laws were able to prevent classes among them from securing by unjust means unfair advantages, then we should see a different state of things from that with which we now have to deal. For, bad as unrestricted competition would be, we have something now that is worse. Fair competition between the strong and the weak, between men of trained faculty and men of low intelligence, is pretty sure to result in combinations on both sides, by which the bitterness of the conflict is greatly intensified. This is what we are confronting to-day. Competition, as the regulative principle of our industry, has utterly broken down, and combination

has taken its place. It began with the establishment of those great financial and industrial corporations in which capital was encouraged by the state to combine, and, thus organized, was exempted from certain liabilities and given advantages which the individual proprietor does not possess. And these corporations, and the great business firms and banking institutions in which the savings of many are consolidated under the management of one, have learned the art of combining among themselves, so that, in all branches of industry and commerce, competition is greatly crippled where it is not killed, and prices as well as wages are largely fixed by conferences, and syndicates, and pools of all sorts. Is it competition that determines freight rates and railway fares? Not at all. The best part of the railroad business of the country is done under agreements between the great companies. The price of oil, the price of coal, the prices of many of the common necessities of life are determined much of the time by combinations among the producers or the dealers. "Our various industries," says the Rev. Josiah Strong, "are combining to force down production — that means that workingmen are thrown out of employment; and to force up prices — that means increased cost of living. There are lumber, coal, coke, oil, brick, nail, screw, steel.

rope, fence-wire, glass, wall-paper, school-book, insurance, hardware, starch, cotton, and scores of other combinations, all made in the interests of capitalists. Small dealers must enter the 'pool,' or be crushed. Once in, they must submit to the dictation of the 'large' men. Thus power is being gathered more and more into the hands of conscienceless monopolies." On the other side, there are powerful combinations among the workmen which seek to control the rate of wages and the hours of labor, and sometimes to prevent improvements in industry — combinations rapidly increasing in numbers and in power. Under this reign of combination there is no longer any such thing as free or fair competition. The individual coal operator in the Hocking Valley cannot compete with the other operators for the labor of the miners; he is tied up by an agreement to pay no more than a certain price. The individual miner cannot compete with his fellows for the wages offered by the operators; he is bound by his union to take no less than a certain price. And these combinations on all sides are made for fighting purposes. The big dealers combine that they may crush out competition, and kill off the small dealers. The employers combine to fight the workmen, and the workmen combine to fight the employers. Doubtless it is an illusion

to suppose that competition, under the best conditions, while human nature remains what it is, would ever give us peace; however that may be, it is certain that the combinations which have so largely supplanted competition are calculated to give us nothing else but war. And war it is, bitter, and destructive, and desolating. "Masters and men," says a great Belgian economist, "are in a state of constant warfare, having their battles, their victories, and their defeats. It is a dark and bitter civil war, wherein he wins who can hold out longest without earning anything; a struggle far more cruel and more keen than that decided by bullets from a barricade; one where all the furniture is pawned or sold; where the savings of better times are gradually devoured, and where at last famine and misery besiege the home and oblige the wife and little ones to cry for mercy."

The war arises in the division of the product of industry. The capitalist employer on the one side, and the laborer on the other, are fighting over the wealth produced by their joint exertions. The capitalist says that the laborer wants more than his fair share, and the laborer says the same thing about the capitalist; the capitalists, on the one side, combine to keep the laborers from getting any more, and the laborers, on the other side, combine to get as

much more as they can. Then the question of the hours of labor comes in; the laborers contending that the world's work can be done in fewer hours, and the employers as a general rule resisting that demand. Still other matters in dispute are the right of the workingmen to combine, and their right to dictate to the employer whom he shall employ. The workingmen think that if they are to succeed in this conflict they must be able to combine and to bring the whole force of labor into the combination; and the employers think that if they are to succeed they must prevent the combinations of laborers by some means or other. Perhaps both are right. I cannot see how the workingmen can win the battle without uniting; and I am equally unable to see how the masters can win unless they can break up the unions. Such attempts as that of the manufacturer in Springfield, Ohio, to crush the labor organizations, are perfectly logical if war is the proper relation between labor and capital. Such attempts as those made by the employees of the Third Avenue railroad to compel the company to discharge some of its old hands because they would not join the union are natural and legitimate, if war between employer and employee is the necessary and normal condition of things. These are war measures on both sides. Are they right? They

are right, if war is right. Is it right to march through the country, destroying barns and grain-ricks, appropriating the farmer's pigs and chickens, driving off his cattle and horses, and pillaging the stores and the smoke-houses in the cities and villages? It is right, if war is right; it is a common and sometimes a necessary war measure. Is it right to kill men who have been guilty of no crime by thousands and tens of thousands? It is right, if war is right; this is the immediate object in view when people go to war. Is it right for the labor unions to endeavor to coerce men to join their ranks under pain of starvation? It is right, if war is right; it is a natural war measure. Is it right for an employer to discharge men because they belong to a union? It is right, if war is right; it is attacking the stronghold of the enemy. Many things which, in a state of peace, are inexcusable and even criminal, are justified, as everybody says, by the laws of war. Falsehood, deception, violence, homicide are the very substance of war. In a state of peace it would seem an abominable piece of tyranny to insist that no man should be permitted to earn his daily bread in the trade which he had practiced all his life, unless he would join the trades-union. In a state of peace it would be a gross outrage upon personal liberty for an employer

to discharge his workmen for belonging to a society which they had formed to promote their own interests. These are war measures. This fact cannot be too strongly emphasized. Let us get clearly before our minds exactly what we are doing and why we are doing it.

Of course, both parties to the conflict claim that this warfare is purely metaphorical; that they neither propose nor condone illegal measures. But it is hard, in such a deadly controversy, to keep within the law. It is inevitable that coercion should take violent forms. Society must deal sharply with such disturbances, but it is not easy to prevent them. They are indefensible, they are criminal, yet they are terribly logical. But even those coercive measures on both sides which keep within the law can be justified only as war is justified. If war is a good thing, they are good things. If war is evil, they cannot be good. What, then, shall we say about this fundamental question?

Is a state of war the natural and proper state of mankind? Are the happiness, the prosperity, and the morality of the people at large promoted by the maintenance of warfare? We shall agree, doubtless, that war is not the best employment for human beings; that it is not, on the whole, a good thing for people to be divided into classes and arrayed in armies

for the purpose of encroaching upon one another's liberties or possessions. Surely the world is not enriched by warfare; it is impoverished, rather. While men are fighting they are not producing wealth; they are consuming what has already been produced, and they are very likely destroying, wantonly, about as much as they consume. This war between labor and capital, as we have seen, is about the division of the product of industry; and it is certain that the more they fight the less they will have to divide. The more constant and persistent the fighting is, the smaller every man's share of the world's wealth must be.

But this is not the worst of it. Such a warfare as this destroys the moral wealth of the nation even faster than its material wealth. It tends to make men bitter, suspicious, cruel; it turns neighbors against each other; it keeps the embers of resentment and hate all the while smouldering. This is the saddest part of the whole business. Those who have some knowledge of the temper of the combatants know that suspicion and distrust and ill-will have been steadily growing more intense on both sides. Surely it cannot be well for men to cherish such feelings toward one another, and one cannot help wondering whereunto this will grow. In a recent letter from over the sea,

written by one who is giving his life for the welfare of the working people, are these solemn words: "There is a strong feeling among employers and employed that the cruel conflict between capital and labor, aggravated by competition, is destroying some of the best elements in human character." This is the kind of destruction most to be dreaded. When the old feelings of friendliness are gone, when a sullen envy and a rankling hatred have taken their places, the very foundations of the social order will be gone, and chaos and anarchy will be at hand. None of us will be very rich or very happy when that time comes.

War is not, then, a good thing. Yet there are evils worse than war. In the olden times the men who did the world's work were mainly slaves. There was no warfare then between capital and labor, because labor was owned by capital. That was not a good state of things for the laborer, and it was no better for the capitalist, though Carlyle lauded it and longed for its return. It is better that the laborer should be a free man, even though some measure of conflict and suffering be the price of his emancipation. And if the laborer could see that the tendency of the industrial system under which he was living was to reduce him to a state little better than slavery, so that he

would be dependent upon his employer, so that his chances to rise in the social scale would grow steadily less — if the laborer could see that this was the steady drift of the existing system, then, I think, he would be justified in fighting against that fate ; in being willing to die rather than submit to it.

War is always a terrible evil ; but it is sometimes the lesser of two evils. The degradation of a large class in society would be a greater evil than a war undertaken by that class to prevent such degradation. Now, it is certain that the wage-workers of this country feel that they are in danger of social degradation ; in danger of falling behind the rest of the community in the march of industrial progress ; in danger of becoming, to a great extent, dependent upon their employers, or upon the community at large, for subsistence and livelihood. We must do them the justice of recognizing this as the real reason of the widespread discontent that exists among them. The certainty that they are losing ground socially, and the fear that they may come to want and dependence, are the sources of the present tendency to combine for offensive and defensive warfare.

I am not referring to any such outbreak as that which, at this writing, is taking place in Chicago. That is not war ; it is rapine, assas-

sination, savagery. It is not the work of the Knights of Labor, nor of any other labor organization; it is led by men who, in the brutal harangues by which they stirred up the mob, denounced the Knights of Labor; men who have no part nor lot in the legitimate labor organizations; who, by creed and profession, are simply destroyers. It is a cruel injustice to identify these miscreants with the army of labor. The labor forces sometimes make sad mistakes and commit serious offenses, but nothing like this fiendishness can be charged upon them. It is not with such weapons that they are waging war. No wrongs ever existed in any state of society which could justify the methods of these men. I am not, then, discussing their complaints. I am considering how the matter lies in the minds of the great body of sober, industrious workingmen.

Some time ago Mr. Powderly described the working classes in this country as the "army of the discontented." He meant that there were enough of the discontented to make a large army; but it is also true that it is their discontent that is leading them to organize themselves into an army, that they may the better do battle against the evils which cause their discontent. If they are right in thinking that they are losing ground, if they are reason-

able in their fears about the future, then they are justified in organizing thus for protection and defense.

Are they right? I will not try to answer so large a question; I will only indicate the answer that the thoughtful workingman is inclined to give. To begin with, the fact that this country is rapidly getting rich is a fact that the workingman, though not a political economist, knows very well. The evidences of this growing wealth are before his eyes. I will not rehearse the familiar figures paraded during the last two years by so many persons, for so many purposes; by Mr. Blaine, to prove that national salvation could not be found in any other than the Republican party; by Mr. George, to show that poverty and progress advance with equal step. Unless the figures of the census are greatly at fault, the wealth of the nation is increasing much more rapidly than its population. With this great increase of wealth, with the enormous development of lands and mines, and with an improvement in machinery which is said to double the productive power of our manufacturing industries every seven years, it would seem that the average annual income of the individual must be greatly increased. Of some classes of the population this seems to be true. To speak of the

class with whose circumstances I am most familiar, I should say that clergymen must be receiving incomes at least fifty per cent. larger than they were receiving twenty-five years ago. It is certain that they are living much more expensively now than they were living then; that they can afford many luxuries of furniture and decoration and travel that they could not then afford. This is not probably true of all the country ministers, but of the clergy as a class I believe it is true. The clergy are not exceptionally prosperous: the same is true of the other professions. The average lawyer or the average physician gets a far better living to-day than he got twenty-five years ago. I think that the salaries of teachers, and salesmen, and book-keepers, and clerks in the great offices have also been considerably advanced. Besides these, between the capitalists on the one hand and the wage-laborers on the other, there is a large class of persons who render professional and personal services of various sorts, many of whom are well remunerated. Such are musicians and teachers of music, artists and teachers of art, actors, and purveyors of public diversions. This class has greatly increased within the period under consideration, and is much better paid for its services now than formerly. A large share of the national income falls into the hands of such persons.

Without considering the condition of the employing classes, it is evident, therefore, that signs of increasing prosperity are visible in other parts of society. But how is it with people who work for wages? Some of the English statisticians have been trying to prove that the income of the wage-laborers in that country has increased as rapidly as that of any other class; but the validity of this cheerful conclusion is by no means established. The latest and apparently the most thorough investigation, by Professor Leone Levi, shows that the actual money-wage of the English laborer has increased during the past twenty-seven years about thirty per cent., while the cost of meat and other necessities of life has also risen almost but not quite as much; so that the English laborer is a little better off to-day than he was twenty-seven years ago. Is this the case with the American wage-laborer? The statistics do not permit us to dogmatize. Professor Richmond M. Smith has shown us some of the fallacies of the labor figures. The doctrine of averages has not been well understood by some of our statisticians, and their conclusions are not trustworthy. Two or three considerations must be borne in mind in determining this question.

The first is the fact that in most industries work is much less continuous and stoppages are

far more frequent and more prolonged now than formerly. If the day wages are larger, the annual wages may still be smaller. The precariousness of employment is now a serious matter to most workingmen.

The second fact to be considered is the effect of machinery in reducing the demand for skilled labor. To take a single example: the iron-work of carriages was nearly all made by hand twenty-five years ago; and the blacksmiths employed in the carriage-shops were skilled workmen, who could forge any part of the iron-work of a carriage, and who commanded good wages. Most of these irons are now stamped out by machinery, and the hand-work is so subdivided that very few skilled men will be found in a large factory; the hand who tends a machine, and who can learn his work in a week or two, cannot, of course, obtain the remuneration paid to the superior mechanic of the days before the war.

The third fact is the increased cost of many of the necessaries of life. Clothing and flour and some groceries are somewhat cheaper; rent, which is the largest item in the poor man's expenditure, has increased, and meats, vegetables, butter, milk, and fuel are much dearer. On the whole, then, it may be questioned whether the average annual wages of the average work-

ingman will purchase for him any more of the necessaries of life to-day than it would in the year before the war.

Mr. Carroll D. Wright, the most experienced and the most judicious of our labor statisticians, estimates that from 1860 to 1881 wages increased about thirty-one per cent., and prices about forty-one per cent. If this estimate is to be trusted, the workingman was a little worse off in 1881 than in 1860; and the year 1881 was an exceptionally prosperous year for the working people.

Nevertheless, as I have said, it is not well to dogmatize. We need more light on this question. Over-confident statements on either side are not to be encouraged. All I can say is, that such light as I can get inclines me to the belief that the real annual wages of labor are little, if any, higher to-day than they were in 1860. If this is all that can be said, then the wage-workers are falling behind the rest of the community; for, between 1860 and 1880 the wealth of the whole country increased from sixteen billions of dollars to forty-three billions, or one hundred and seventy per cent., and the average income must have been very considerably increased.

In 1860 the value of the manufactured goods produced in this country was eighteen hundred

millions of dollars; in 1880 it was fifty-three hundred millions, almost three times as much. This is the pile to be divided. The number of the persons among whom it is to be divided has grown about sixty per cent. — but not half as fast as the pile has grown. And now, when the working classes come up to get their share of the pile, they complain and rebel. “What is the matter with you?” asks some rather thoughtless onlooker. “Are you not getting as much as you ever got?” “Perhaps we are,” is the answer; “but that pile was produced very largely by our labor; it is about three times as large as it was twenty-five years ago, and it looks to us as though we ought to get a good deal more than we got then. Other people, who do not labor with their hands, are getting more out of it now than they got then; the traders as a class, the professional people, the people on salaries, most of them, are able to live in a great deal better style now than they could afford a quarter of a century ago; while as for the capitalists and employers, they certainly show us many evidences of greatly increased wealth. Some of us can remember the social conditions of twenty-five years ago, and the signs of opulence and splendor then visible were few and insignificant, compared with what we see nowadays. We can compare in our

memory the most luxurious sections and environs of New York and Boston and Philadelphia and Cleveland and Chicago then with what we see to-day, and the increase in the magnificence is amazing. There were a number of fine turn-outs at Saratoga and Newport in 1860; but the luxury of that day was plebeian simplicity compared with the extravagance of to-day. Long Branch was a cluster of simple wooden cottages then; travel up and down the Jersey coast to-day, and see the oriental pomp and magnificence that spread themselves all over that favored region. Much the same can be said of the Atlantic coast north of Boston. Such sights are common. We should know by the evidence of our eyes, if the census had nothing to say about it, that the wealth of this country is increasing very fast; we can see where the bulk of it is going; and we know, by a bitter experience, that we are getting a very small share of it.

“ We read the newspapers too, and know something of that class of plutocrats which has sprung up in this country within twenty-five years. Some of us can remember the time when there were only one or two men in the country worth a million dollars; now there are hundreds of them. We pick up a newspaper and read such an item as this, which appeared

in many of the journals in the month of January, 1880: 'The profits of the Wall Street kings the past year were enormous. It is estimated that Vanderbilt made thirty millions; Jay Gould, fifteen millions; Russell Sage, ten millions; Sidney Dillon, ten millions; James R. Keene, eight millions; and several others from one to two millions each, making a grand total for ten or twelve estates of about eighty millions of dollars.' We know, of course, that there is some exaggeration about this; but if half of it is true, the story is ominous. What is more, we know that these rich men are gaining control of our courts and our legislatures, and of the Congress of the United States, and they get the legislation that protects their interests and builds up their fortunes, and that taxes us to enrich them. It looks as though we had a system of things under which the rich were sure to grow richer, and the poor, at the best, to remain as they are, shut down to a bare subsistence. We do not like the prospect. We think it is not fair. We are not going to submit to it, if we can help ourselves; and we see no other way but to band ourselves together for mutual protection and defense, and fight against this adverse fate."

Such is the reply of the more intelligent and sober of the wage-workers to the critic who

cavils at their discontent. I submit that they make out, at any rate, a *primâ facie* case. I submit that what they say has so much reason and justice that no right-minded man can dismiss it with a growl and a sneer. Their fears of social degradation are not groundless. As things are going now, it looks as though they would steadily be forced by the combinations above them to remain at the very bottom of the ladder, while the rest are climbing over their heads to independence and opulence. And since this is the day and age of combinations, since capital in a thousand ways is forming combinations for its own advantage, who will deny to labor the right to combine for the assertion of its just claims?

Combination means war, I admit. Combinations, whether of capital or of labor, are generally made in these days for fighting purposes. And war is a great evil—no doubt of that. But it is not the greatest of evils. The permanent social degradation of the people who do the world's work would be a greater evil. And if, by combination, the wage-workers can resist the tendencies that are crowding them down, and can assert and maintain their right to a proportional share of the growing wealth, then let them combine, and let all the people say, Amen!

The state of the industrial world is a state of war. And if war is the word, then the efficient combination and organization must not all be on the side of capital; labor must be allowed to make the combinations necessary for the protection of its own interests. While the conflict is in progress, labor has the same right that capital has to prosecute the warfare in the most effective way. If war is the order of the day, we must grant to labor belligerent rights. The sooner this fact is recognized, the better for all concerned. The refusal to admit it has made the conflict, thus far, much more fierce and sanguinary than it would otherwise have been.

So far as the students of political economy are concerned, it is now, I believe, universally agreed that the right of the workmen to combine cannot be questioned. Professor Sumner, who represents the old school of *laissez faire* economists, and President Walker, who represents the new historical school, are equally emphatic in their assertion of the right of the workmen to stand together in trades-unions for the defense of their own interests. And the more reasonable of the employers are also beginning to see the point. Mr. James Means, a leading shoe manufacturer of Massachusetts, in an address to his employees last autumn, uttered these sensible words:—

If the public assumes an attitude of antagonism toward trades-unions as a whole, the sense of injustice felt by the working people will bring them at last to seek redress by extreme measures. I believe that orderly trades-unions are to be encouraged. . . . Labor is the poor man's commodity; it is the only thing he has to sell; he must get the highest price for it that he can by legitimate means. The price which labor will bring is the market price. What is the market price of any commodity? It is the point where the "bull movements" and the "bear movements" exactly counterbalance each other. The fact that labor brings a certain price in the market does not mean that such is a fair market price. It may be a price based upon injustice. If there is any one who does not believe this, let him consider what would be the effect upon the market price of wheat, or any such commodity, if such price were governed entirely by the "bears," and if the "bulls" were to cease their action. What is a trades-union? It is a "bull movement" in the labor market. Can any one wish to see the price of that commodity which we call labor governed by the "bears" alone? The "bears" are organized, and no one complains. Is it fair that the price of labor should be fixed by powerful organizations opposed by weak individuals? Is it not rather to be desired that a more reasonable price should be fixed by organization met by organization?

Other utterances of the same tenor might be quoted.

The indications are, then, that in this warfare the belligerent rights of the wage-workers will soon be recognized. Strong combinations of employers still insist that they will never recognize them, but they are fighting against fate; the community at large concedes the right to the workingmen, and those who stand out will find it hard to stem the current.

So the battle is joined. Capital and labor confront each other, both organized and resolute, both determined to win. What will be the issue? A year or two ago we should have said without hesitation, Capital will win; it is stronger and better organized, and it has the sinews of war. Up to that time the victory had almost always been on the side of capital. The great majority of the strikes had been unsuccessful. But within the last year matters have taken a turn. The organization of the laborers is much more perfect and more formidable now than ever before. It is by no means clear that it may not prove a match for its antagonist. At any rate, things have now assumed such a shape that we may fairly expect to see some destructive fighting. The combinations on both sides are so strong that they ought to be able to do each other, and the whole country, a great deal of damage. It must be possible for them to paralyze the industries of the

nation; to waste a good part of its savings; to dig the chasm that separates the employer from the employed a great deal deeper and wider than it now is; and to sow seeds of jealousy and spite that will bear a woeful harvest through many generations. *Is it not a good time to stop and ask the question whether this warfare is really worth while?*

When people go to war, they generally have before them one of two possible issues of the conflict. Each combatant may be determined on a complete triumph over the other — a triumph that shall result in exterminating or subjugating or enslaving the other; or each combatant may desire to make an exhibition of his strength which shall enforce the respect of the other and secure honorable terms of peace. It is well for these combatants to determine, before they go any farther, whether they desire to subjugate one another.

Do the employing class think it would be a good thing to subjugate the wage-laborers — to reduce them to a condition in which they would be practically slaves or dependents? Do the employing class want to keep the wages of the laboring class down as nearly as they can to the level of subsistence? Doubtless there are selfish and greedy men among them who would care very little what became of the working

people, so long as they were able to make themselves rich. But I am sure that the employers of labor as a rule cherish no such heartlessness; they know that it would be fatal to our national life if the class of wage-laborers became a permanently degraded class; they know that peace and prosperity cannot abide in the land unless all classes have an equal chance and a fair prospect. What is more, when they look at the matter from the lowest materialistic standpoint, they know that the wage-laborers constitute a very large share of the consumers of goods; that if they are able to purchase nothing but the bare necessities of life, trade will be dull; that when they have plenty of money in their pockets trade will be brisk; that it is not, therefore, for the interest of the manufacturing and mercantile classes that the laboring classes should be reduced to the verge of starvation. Capital is not such a fool as to wish to push this war to the subjugation of its antagonist.

Neither does labor, I trust, desire to subjugate capital. That, to be sure, is the socialistic programme: the theory of socialism is that the capital shall all belong to the state, and shall be owned and controlled by the workers; that there shall be no private enterprise; that all the business of production and transportation

and exchange shall be managed by state officials. But we are not ready yet for such a revolution. Beyond all question, the industrial system which is based on private enterprise is the best system practicable at the present time, and will be for a long time to come. It needs to be modified, but it cannot be overthrown without disaster to the working classes. Business will be managed for a good while yet by captains of industry; and it is for the interest of the people who do the world's work that it should be. Larger gains, on the whole, will come to them through this management properly modified than through any which they could substitute for it. The attempt to destroy or even cripple capitalistic enterprise is suicidal. So then it is absurd and even monstrous for either of these combatants to dream of subjugating the other. It is for the interest of each that the other should be free and prosperous and contented and hopeful.

The other rational object that men have in fighting is the assertion of their rights and the demonstration of their prowess. They want to make it evident that it is not safe to encroach upon their liberties; they want to lay the foundations of an honorable peace. Have not these two combatants been fighting long enough to accomplish this object? Surely labor has

reason enough to respect and even dread the power of capital; and is not capital by this time sufficiently impressed with the power of labor? Is it not a good time for the contending parties to ground their arms, and shake hands, and sit down, and have a frank and friendly conference? Is not this business of war a senseless, brutal, barbarous business, at best? Does either side expect to do itself any good by fighting the other? It is about as rational as it would be for the right hand and the left hand to smite each other with persistent and deadly enmity, or for the eyes and the ears to array themselves against each other in a remorseless feud. It is a sorry comment on our civilization that here, at the end of the nineteenth Christian century, sane and full-grown men, whose welfare depends wholly on the recognition of their mutual interests and on the coöperation of their efforts, should be ready to spend a good share of their time in trying to cripple or destroy one another. It is not only wicked, it is stupid; it is not simply monstrous, it is ridiculous.

Are not the employers ready, by this time, to hear reason? Have they not had fighting enough for the present? Are they not willing to make peace? If so, the first thing for them to do is to face the fact that the wage-workers,

by whose labor they are gaining their wealth, are entitled to a little better share of the joint product than they are getting now; that they have a perfect right to expect it, to ask for it, and to combine for the purpose of getting it. When that fact is frankly admitted, arbitration of labor disputes will follow as a matter of course.

The demand for fewer hours of labor must also be fairly considered. It does not seem, on the face of it, altogether unreasonable. With the continual improvements in machinery it is not at all incredible that the world's wants can be supplied by eight hours' work in a day. Would it not be vastly better for the health, the morals, and the thrift of the community to have our shops and factories going eight hours a day all the year round than to have them go ten hours a day for nine or ten months, and be idle all day for two or three months in the year, which is the present order in large sections of the country? The question whether the daily working time can be reduced one-fifth with no diminution in the daily wage is, of course, a question that must be settled on economical rather than sentimental principles. But some interesting experiments tend to show that, even when machinery is a large factor in production, the product of eight hours' work will be much

more than four-fifths of the product of ten hours' work. The reduction of the time will not proportionately reduce the product, and should not, therefore, proportionately reduce the wage.

It is often said that increased wages and shorter hours will only promote recklessness and dissipation among the men ; that the addition to their income would go to the saloons ; that the enlargement of their leisure would result in debauchery. Such statements are too sweeping. Some of the more ignorant and degraded of the men would be affected in this way, no doubt, but it would not be true of all of them ; it would not, I trust, be true of the majority of them. The new hope, the enlarged opportunity, would make the better elements among them self-respecting and frugal ; their leisure would not all go to the uses of the flesh. The most careful English student of this question, Professor Leone Levi, bears this testimony : —

As a rule, and in the long run, scarcity, low wages, and scantiness of food go hand in hand with high mortality, drunkenness, and crime ; while abundance, high wages, and full consumption go hand in hand with low mortality, temperance, and good behavior. A sudden increase of wages, as in the colliery districts in 1872-73, may find the recipients utterly un-

prepared for their good fortunes. And so we have heard of miners indulging in champagne wine, and of puddlers purchasing for themselves sealskin waistcoats. But reason speedily asserts her higher sway. The housewife eagerly arrests a portion of the higher wages to furnish the bare rooms, to fill the empty cupboard, and to clothe the children. Little by little, as the novel condition with its bountiful stores is realized, self-respect increases, sobriety of conduct is induced, and the family as a whole rises to habits of virtue and prosperity.¹

This is the result which we have good reason to expect, not by any means universally, but on the whole, and in the long run, from the improvement in the laborer's condition. Some laborers cannot bear prosperity; some employers cannot. Most employers, I dare say, have an abiding conviction that it would not hurt them in the least to be a little better off, and they may safely reason in the same way with regard to their men. On the whole, and in the long run, happiness is better for men than misery, plenty better than want, hope better than despair. Every effort that is made for the amelioration of humanity rests on that assumption.

Some employers chafe under the new demands of labor. Doubtless these demands are sometimes arrogant and unreasonable; is this

¹ *Wages and Earnings of the Working Classes*, p. 35.

to be wondered at? War is an essentially unreasonable business; it is not by reason that its issues are determined, but by force. "It is a pity," men say, "if an employer cannot manage his business to suit himself." It may be a pity, but it is true. If by this phrase is meant managing his business solely in his own interest, that is exactly what he cannot do. The assumption that he can is one of the bottom causes of all this trouble. It is true that employers have long been taught that if they were perfectly selfish in the management of their business, the results would be beneficent; that this kingdom of industry is the one department of human activity with which conscience and good-will have no normal relation; that self-interest is and must be the sole ruler of this realm. Most of them have believed this doctrine; some of them have acted accordingly; but many of them have behaved a great deal better than the theory required them to behave, and have mixed not a little humanity with their business, thinking, no doubt, all the while that they were doing a silly thing. It was not a silly thing. The wisdom of their hearts was sounder than the theories of their heads. The doctrine which bases all the relations of employer and employed upon self-interest is a doctrine of the pit; it has been bringing hell to earth in large installments for a

good many years. There is no department of human conduct in which pure egoism is a safe guide. No employer can manage his business exclusively in his own interest. It is not exclusively his business. The men who do the work are in reality his business partners, and he is bound to think of them, and care for them, and manage the business in their interest as well as his own. This is what employers must do if they want peace. You can have hell in your factory, or you can have heaven there, just which you please. If it is hell that you want, build your business on the law of hell, which is simply, "Every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost!" Out of that will come wars and fightings, perennial and unrelenting. If it is heaven that you want, then build your business on the law of the kingdom of heaven, which is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." That will put you in the path of peace.

If peace is better than war, the employer's first problem must be to find a way of getting his enterprise on a peace basis. He can only do that by identifying his men with himself in the hopes, the prospects, the rewards of their joint undertaking. It begins to be evident to many employers that industrial partnership in some form is the next step in the evolution of our industrial system. This method has been thor-

oughly tried in scores of establishments, large and small, upon the continent of Europe, with splendid and almost unvarying success. Multitudes of people, who never have tried it, and have never seen it tried, and who know nothing about it, are free to say that it would not work; but what is the judgment of such doctrinaires worth in the face of the almost unbroken experience of the hundreds who have tried it? It is hard to keep one's patience when those who profess to be "practical men" set up their *ipse dixit* against the solid achievements of thirty years of peaceful and prosperous industry conducted upon this basis.

I have called attention in another chapter to the inspiring recital by Mr. Sedley Taylor of the progress of this principle in Europe. Quite a number of important firms and companies in this country have been practicing it with entire success for several years; and the rapidity with which the movement has been advancing since the beginning of the present year is something notable. We shall soon have a chance to see for ourselves whether profit-sharing will work in this country.

The common objections to this method are easily answered. "Some years there are no profits to divide," it is said. True; and in such years the workmen would get their regular wages, but no bonus at the end of the year.

“But this would make them dissatisfied and rebellious,” it is urged. “They would think they had been cheated.” This is assuming that they are hopelessly unreasonable and unjust. It is probable that if the employer really wishes to make his men the sharers of his prosperity, he will be able to make them believe it, and that they will forego their dividend without complaint.

“But there are sometimes losses,” it is said, “and it is not fair that the men should share in the profits unless they share in the losses also.” Let that be granted. But the system provides for laying aside a reserve fund in the prosperous years, out of which losses could be made up in the unprosperous years. Thus the workmen do share in the losses.

“But the profits are none too large now,” it is urged; “to lessen them by an additional dividend to labor would cripple many industries.” The census makes it plain that the laborer might have a larger share of the profits without doing anybody any injustice; but this point may be waived. It is enough to say that all the economists declare that whatever renders labor more efficient is a clear gain both to labor and to capital; it makes a larger product to divide between them. And it is the general testimony of those who have tried profit-sharing,

that it makes the laborer more industrious and more economical of materials and tools; that the expense of superintendence is largely reduced; that the employer has as much left after he has paid the laborer his share of the profit as he had before. A slight acquaintance with human nature would make it easy to believe that this might be.

It does not seem at all incredible that business might be more prosperous on a peace basis than on a war basis; and it is at least possible that the employer could put it on a peace basis by making his men his business partners, and letting them share with himself in the rewards of their joint industry. I will venture to predict that peace will never come to stay until this principle, under some form, has been introduced into the industrial order.

What answer now shall we hear from the men of toil to this burning question? Shall it be peace or war? Before they give their voices for the continuance of war, some things should be well considered.

In the first place, they ought to see that the employing class is not their worst enemy. It is not the employing class, as such, that is absorbing the wealth of this country, so much as it is the gamblers and the political corruptionists. A pretty large share of the plutocrats have

gained their wealth by gambling operations in the stock and produce exchanges, and by bribing city councils and legislatures and courts and congresses. With franchises and legislative favors and judicial decisions thus obtained, they have robbed the public for their own benefit. The net profits of industry are not excessive, but the plunder of these parasites is enormous. After they have filled their pockets out of the product of industry, there is a good deal less to be divided between employers and laborers. The working classes are just as much responsible for their existence as their employers are. If workingmen had been as careful in choosing men to represent them in the city councils and the legislatures as they ought to have been, this class of parasites could never have flourished as they have done. The first fight for them to make is against these parasites of industry.

In the second place, the workingmen should make up their minds before they push this fight any further, whether they wish to overthrow the present system of industry, or whether they prefer to modify it, so that it shall be more favorable to their interest. They may be able to destroy it; but it will be well for them to count the cost before entering on that campaign. Samson overthrew the temple of the Philistines; but it is instructive to remember what became of Samson.

In the third place, if workingmen do not want to exterminate private enterprise, and if they expect to have business relations with the employing class, they cannot too soon unlearn the bitter and violent habits of speech and thought into which they have been falling of late in their discussion of the labor question. The sweeping denunciations of the capitalists as thieves and swindlers and robbers, in which some of them are wont to indulge, are both unwise and unjust. Successful business relations cannot be maintained among men who cherish such feelings toward one another. There are heartless and selfish men among employers; so there are among laborers. Wrongs are done on both sides; people who are at war are not apt to be scrupulous about respecting one another's rights. Many employers are heartily desirous of doing their men full justice; and the men by no means always show a proper appreciation of this goodwill. Permit me to say that I know something about this war; I have been in the thick of it for thirty years, trying to make peace, and helping to care for the sick and the wounded; and I know that the wrong is not all on one side, and that the harsh judgments and the fierce talk of both sides are inexcusable.

In the fourth place, if workingmen want business put on a peace basis, let them say so, and show that they mean it. If they desire to have

labor disputes settled by arbitration, let them frankly and good-naturedly ask for arbitration, and show that they have a reasonable temper and a purpose to stand by a fair award. If they want profit-sharing, let them put that into their platforms, and make it clear to their employers that they can be trusted to give the scheme a fair trial. Some of them are hoping for coöperation ; for an organization of industry in which the men who do the work shall own the capital, and receive both profits and wages. To every such enterprise, God speed ! It takes a high degree of intelligence and self-control to coöperate in production ; workingmen are gaining these qualifications steadily ; they will be ready for it before long. But production, on any basis, requires capital — capital to purchase the plant, and capital to live on while the product is maturing ; and capital can be got by those who are not born rich in only two ways — by saving, and by stealing. Workingmen cannot afford to steal ; they will never prosper if they do. It is true that many of our plutocrats got their money by stealing from the people at large, but their prosperity is a blight upon them and upon the nation. If they have been unjust, our workingmen cannot afford to rebuild the industry of the country on the same foundation of injustice. It is only by economy that the capital can be accumulated by which

they can coöperate; and it is to be hoped that profit-sharing will put them in the path that leads to this goal.

The present appears to be a critical time in the history of labor. Within the past few months our workingmen have suddenly come to the consciousness of great power. Their more compact organization, their more effective weapons of war, have given them advantages that they never had before. The question of the hour is whether they can use this power temperately and wisely. There are ominous signs of a disposition to employ it passionately and vindictively. Men who speak in the interests of selfish capital are heard to express the confident hope that the workingmen will soon overstep the bounds of prudence and justice, and ruin their own prospects. That is the real danger. Doubtless, it is hard for those who are smarting under a sense of injustice to be always temperate and judicious; but the welfare of these men depends on keeping their heads cool. Vengeance does not belong to them; and they are strong enough now to be magnanimous.

It is easy for the organizations of labor to cripple by unreasonable demands the industries of whole sections. They have done this thing already more than once. In the stoppages and readjustments thus occurring, great suffering is

caused and no advantage is gained. An unjust demand, even if it be temporarily enforced, always reacts on those who make it. The working classes have now tremendous power; they may easily employ it for self-destruction. It is quite possible for them to use their power tyrannically; and tyranny will not thrive in this day, the tyranny of a mob no more than the tyranny of an autocrat. This weapon of the boycott with which the labor unions have lately armed themselves is pretty sure to prove a boomerang. If they use it recklessly, there may easily arise a consumers' union, to fight them with their own fire—to patronize those whom they proscribe. Already the popular indignation at the unscrupulous use of this weapon is so strong that the publication of a boycott has proved, in several cases, an excellent advertisement of the boycotted dealer.

With all the improved enginery of war the labor unions are sure to find that war is dangerous business. It is all the more dangerous because of these improved weapons. It can never be anything else but perilous and destructive business. Let not these combatants on either side suppose that they can hurt and maim their antagonists and get no harm themselves!

Over all this wretched strife one can imagine those "better angels of our nature," whose ministry Abraham Lincoln once pathetically

but vainly invoked, bending with divine compassion and crying to the embattled hosts with solemn rebuke and benignant appeal: Is it well, brother men, is it well to fight? Is it not better to be friends? Are you not all children of one Father? Nay, are you not, as the great apostle said, members one of another? Your war is not only wholesale fratricide, it is social suicide. It is little to say that you cannot afford to fight: you cannot live apart; you must live for one another. That is the way you were made to live; and you will never have anything but trouble and sorrow till you learn that way and walk in it. The stars in their courses will fight against you until you make peace with one another. Have we not had more than enough of war and its dismal noises and its spectral train of woes; more than enough of silent looms and fireless forges; of children's faces pale with hunger, and women's sunken eyes; of hearts made fierce and hard by long-cherished enmities; of class arrayed against class and neighbor against neighbor? Oh, put it all away from you — the hate, the suspicion, the scorn; stand here together, brethren as you are, helpers of one another as you must be, and promise one another that you will do what you can, every one of you, to bring the day when between Labor and Capital there shall be no longer war, but peace for evermore.

THE WAGE-WORKERS AND THE CHURCHES.

WE often say that Christianity is the cure of the evils that threaten modern civilization, but the troublesome fact that rises up to confound us whenever we express this confidence is the fact that a large section of the population is wholly outside our churches, and apparently beyond the reach of their direct influence. It is true that Christian ideas and sentiments do, to a certain extent, pervade all our society; the social atmosphere contains more or less of its vital elements, and no man can breathe in this Christian land without unconsciously assimilating some of its truth. But the complete separation of large numbers of our people from the institutions of religion, their utter ignorance of us and of all that we are trying to do, is a discouraging fact. This was brought home to me a few years ago in a manner that ought to have humbled my conceit, whether it did or not. I had been working pretty busily for almost eight years in a city of New England where neigh-

bors generally know one another, and where the church-going population is exceptionally large, and I had tried to bear my part in the social and political life of the city as well as in its religious life. One Sunday a friend of mine, unfamiliar with the city, was walking down the principal street looking for my church, and three of my fellow-citizens of whom he inquired, in succession, did not know where the church was, and did not appear to have ever heard of its pastor. I suspect we should all be somewhat surprised if we could know just how many people there are within hearing of our church bells who do not know the name of the churches or of their ministers, to whose thought all our interests are foreign, to whose ear our familiar speech is an unknown tongue. Many others there are who know something of us, but do not love us; who listen with indifference, if not with resentment, when our church-bells ring; who regard our assemblies with suspicious criticism; who are not so accessible to our influence as those who know less about us.

I do not mean to be understood as affirming that the majority of our population is thus wholly outside of all church relations. This class of entire neglecters is, as yet, a minority in most of our cities, but it is a minority large enough to cause us anxiety and to furnish us

one of our hardest problems. Certain it is that Christianity can never cure the social ills under which we are suffering while so large a class remains practically untouched by its healing influences.

Our perplexity increases when we discover that this neglect is greatest in that class of the population in which Christianity claims to be specially interested, to which it has always made its most gracious promises and its most successful appeals, with which its Founder himself was identified while He was on the earth — the wage-workers and the poor. The strongest of the evidences of Christianity has always been that one to which our Lord himself pointed the disciples of John: "The Gospel is preached to the poor." It must be confessed that this proof of Christ's divine mission is losing its cogency.

I do not think that church neglect is increasing, as a rule, in other classes of the population. There are exceptional cities in which this neglect pervades all orders to an alarming degree, and seems to be steadily growing. But, generally, in our cities and large towns, I am inclined to think that the proportion of the people who attend the church or the Sunday-school — who are present in the house of God during some part of the Lord's day — is as large as

ever it was. The merchants, the clerks, the professional people, the teachers, are not deserting the churches. Of course there are multitudes of these persons who do not come to church now, and such multitudes have always been with us; but neglect does not *increase* among them, and it does increase among the wage-workers. The *proportion* of wage-workers in our churches is diminishing.

Proof of this proposition is not easily furnished, and I would much rather those who listen to me would search out the facts for themselves, than take my word for them. I suppose that there are localities in which the statements just made would not hold good, but a pretty careful study convinces me that they do hold good of the country at large, and especially of the cities. My analysis of the census makes it probable to me that the mechanics, the shop-hands, and the common laborers — the wage-workers employed in manual labor of one kind or another, with their families, constitute fully one fourth of the population. Is it true that one fourth of the membership of our city churches belongs to this class? That is a question that every pastor can easily answer for himself, so far as his own church is concerned. It is true that in our Roman Catholic churches the proportion of wage-laborers will

be found to be much larger than one fourth; the average in our Protestant churches should, therefore, be somewhat less than one fourth. It would be well for every pastor to satisfy himself what the proportion is in his congregation. Of course the reckoning must be made by families, rather than by individuals. In my own congregation, which worships in a very plain church, the seats of which are free, in a neighborhood easily accessible to the working classes, and which has been known always as an extremely democratic congregation, I find only about one tenth of the families on my list belonging to this class. The proportion would be slightly increased if I added the families which are represented in our Sunday-school, but which send no adults to any of our services. This is the result of repeated special efforts made in the interest of the working classes, with several courses of lectures on Sunday evenings for their benefit. Goodly numbers of them have attended these lectures, and there is, I think, a kindly feeling among them toward our church — certainly toward its pastor; but the number of those who identify themselves with us is still very small.

It is true that there are missions in all our cities into which larger numbers of these people are drawn; all these must be taken into ac-

count in our estimates; for although the arrangement whereby the rich are separated from the poor in their worship is not the ideal of Christianity, and although it may be a question whether in the long run church neglect may not be caused rather than cured by this arrangement; yet the question we are now considering respects the actual church attendance of the working classes — it is the question whether the proportion of wage-workers in our churches and our missions is as large as it is in our population.

To get at the workingmen's ideas respecting this question, whether the people of their class are drawing away from the churches, and, if so, why, I sent out circulars, a few months ago, to workingmen connected with the various manufacturing industries of my own city, and obtained from them a large number of replies. From establishments employing in the aggregate between three and four thousand men, I had letters, and out of these, as nearly as I can estimate, from the figures given me, not more than one third attend church; and of those who do go, a good share are Roman Catholics.

How is it with the other extreme of society? In this same city I asked one of the best informed citizens to make me out a list of fifty of the leaders of business. He did not know my

reason for wishing such a list, but after it was put into my hands, I found that fifty-five per cent. of these men were communicants in the churches, and that seventy-seven per cent. of them were regular attendants upon the churches.

A large proportion of the capitalists are more or less closely identified with the churches, while of the laborers, only a small share are thus identified, and the number tends to decrease rather than to increase.

This statement is sometimes disputed, but I am quite sure that it cannot be successfully controverted. Some of those who have expressed a contrary opinion have counted clerks, book-keepers, teachers, and office-boys into the "working class," but the question we are considering has nothing to do with these. We are talking now about the manual wage-workers — the mechanics, the operatives, and the day laborers; as to what may be the degree of neglect among those other classes, I am not prepared to express an opinion.

If the tendency of the class with which we are now dealing is what I have represented it to be, the fact is one of grave significance. If the churches are losing their hold on these working people, not only are they exhibiting a most alarming sign of their own degeneracy, but they are permitting the growth of elements and

forces which will prove fatal to the peace, and even to the existence, of society. There is no other cement that can hold society together but that genuine good-will which is the heart of Christianity. The weakening of this bond is an ominous sign. I do not think that it is the part of wisdom to ignore it. If it is true, we cannot too speedily discover it, nor too frankly confess it, nor too earnestly seek to know what it means.

What is the cause of this tendency? Why is it that the working people are slowly and sullenly drawing apart from the churches?

Many reasons are given. First, and most conclusive to the minds of some philosophers, is the comprehensive fact of total depravity. The working people stay away from church because their hearts are set against God and divine things; because they prefer to spend the day in idleness and pleasuring. Undoubtedly the working people have their full share of this universal moral disability; but I am not prepared to admit that they have any more than their share. Total depravity will account for just as much church neglect among working people as it will account for among traders, and lawyers, and teachers, and no more; and what we are now considering is the exceptional degree of church neglect existing among work-

ing people. The cause assigned will not account for this unless we assume that their depravity is considerably more than total.

Another explanation finds the reason of this fact in the infidelity prevalent among the working classes. It then becomes necessary to show that infidelity is more prevalent in these classes than in the mercantile and professional classes. I am not sure that this can be shown. But suppose that it can be shown. Admit, for the sake of the argument, that there is more skepticism among wage-workers than among the other classes of society. The next question is, how came this to be so? What has made skeptics out of these workingmen? Infidelity is not what Dr. Emmons said Romanism was, "an ultimate fact." It needs to be explained, quite as much as church neglect needs to be explained. Perhaps the same cause that drove these people out of the churches robbed them also of their faith in the doctrines on which the churches are founded. Perhaps when we have learned the reason of their church neglect we shall know the reason of their doubt.

When we ask the working people themselves to tell us why they are not in the churches, they give us various responses. I have a large bundle of letters at home in which this question is answered in many different ways. Some of

these reasons are manifestly pretexts, destitute of serious meaning. One says that it costs too much to support the churches; but this objection was made respecting a church which it costs no man a cent to attend; where he can contribute as much or as little as he chooses, and the amount of his contribution will be known to nobody. Another says that some ministers preach politics; but he is perfectly aware, of course, that some ministers do not. Another urges that workingmen need the day for rest; but he can hardly be ignorant of the fact that the Sabbath rest is not prevented, but most effectually promoted, by the quiet and refreshing service of the sanctuary. All these are pleas that the advocates do not expect us to take very seriously.

The real reasons for the absence of the working people from church, as they reveal themselves in this correspondence of mine, resolve themselves into two: first, their inability to dress well enough to appear in a place as stylish and fashionable as the average church; secondly; their sense of the injustice that workingmen, as a class, are receiving at the hands of capitalist employers, as a class. These two reasons are often combined. It is because the workingman is not receiving a fair compensation for his labor, that he cannot dress his wife

and children well enough to go to church. The plain or shabby raiment is the badge of his poverty, the evidence of the wrong that he is suffering.

One reason [writes one of my correspondents] for not attending the larger churches, which have wealthy congregations and good ministers, is that they are composed of the class who hire men to work for them, and, of course, dress themselves and their families better than the mere wage-worker can afford to do. When we see our employers going to church in broadcloth, and silk, and satin, and furs, and laces, and ribbons, it is natural for the man with a faded and patched coat, and the woman with a calico dress, to feel rather uncomfortable in the midst of such finery.

One reason of their absence [writes another] is their inability to clothe themselves in a manner to make a respectable appearance in church, owing to the starvation wages paid to them.

You want to know what the workingmen think about capitalists? [writes another.] We think [he answers, rather compendiously] that they are thieves and robbers.

Of course [writes another] the manufacturers can and should dress better than the laborer; but when we see them so full of religion on Sunday, and then grinding the faces of the poor on the other six days, we are apt to think they are insincere. They say to us, "We are not making as much as we would like; we will have to reduce the cost of our goods by cut-

ting down your wages a little." We say, "We can't clothe our families comfortably now." They say we must economize by buying a cheaper article of clothing. We say, "Hard work gives us a good appetite, and we can't set a substantial table." They say, "Corn is cheap; your table ought not to cost much." This creates an ill-feeling between capital and labor. When the capitalist prays for us one day in the week, and preys on us the other six, it can't be expected that we will have much respect for his Christianity.

This letter fairly expresses the sentiment that runs through a good share of my correspondence. The assumption of most of the letters is that the churches are chiefly attended and controlled by the capitalist and the employing classes; they make it evident that there is but little sympathy between these classes and the laboring class; and they show that the laborers have no desire to attend the churches in which their employers worship. The social barrier between them is high and strong on week days; they are not inclined to lower it on Sundays. Beyond a doubt, a great many conversations of the same nature as that reported by the workman above do take place between masters and men; and when, after all this talk about reduced wages, and consequent corn cake and calico for the workman's family, the workman sees his employer's family faring sumptuously,

and walking or riding abroad in the most gorgeous array, he is not, naturally, in the proper mood to sing the same hymns and pray the same prayers.

Nothing is more certain than that the wage-workers of this country feel that they are falling behind in the race of life. They know that the nation's wealth is increasing with almost miraculous rapidity, the figures of the census tell them so, and the fact thrusts itself upon their senses on every side. They know, moreover, if they have memories reaching back twenty or thirty years, that their condition is not greatly improved; that the *real* wages of labor are but little increased; and that, relatively to the rest of the community, they are worse off than they were thirty years ago. The annual expenditure for living purposes of the average employer has enormously increased, the annual expenditure of the average mechanic or operative has not greatly increased.

The workman feels that this tendency is due to the pitiless action of natural forces which the employing classes do not try to restrain. If he does not reason much about it, he has a pretty strong notion that the fates are against him, and that his employer is on the side of fate. He knows that money, when it is massed in great corporations or companies, or heaped up

in accumulations, is power; that concentrated capital has the power to dictate terms to single-handed labor, and that it is by no means certain that any combination of labor can successfully hold its own against the power of capital; it looks to him as though a bitter and deadly conflict were in progress under the law of the survival of the strongest; and if he has ever heard of Ricardo's "Iron Law of Wages," he is inclined to think that it is being fulfilled in its narrowest sense, and that the tendency of the present industrial régime is to bring the price of labor down to the lowest figure at which the workman can subsist and propagate his species.

The kindly relations which once subsisted between the master and his workmen have disappeared; the large system of industry scarcely permits of any personal relation between the capitalist and the laborer; labor, under the modern system, is a commodity as much as coal or cotton, and the only question is how to buy it most cheaply. This tendency, obvious enough to all thoughtful observers, is clearly pointed out by the lamented Arnold Toynbee in his lecture on "Industry and Democracy":—

Apart from the system of short contracts, which does not necessarily mean transient ties, there was a cause for separation between employer and workmen

in the very constitution of modern industrial life, with its rapid migration of men from occupation to occupation and from place to place. This is most conspicuous in a new country like America, where the whole staff of a cotton factory is sometimes changed in three years; and where the Western farmer, hiring laborers for the season, seldom sees the same faces the second time. How could personal bonds exist under such conditions as these? Not only, moreover, did the workman become more and more divided from his employer, he had, as De Tocqueville long ago pointed out, become more and more unlike him. The modern capitalist understands nothing of the details of his business. He leaves the management of his factory and the engagement and discharge of his men to a subordinate, lives in a mansion far away from the works, and knows nothing of, cares nothing for, the condition of his work-people. Frequently the employer is not an individual, but a company; and towards a company, at any rate, warm personal attachment is impossible. As the result of these changes, the workman, divided from his employer and receiving from him no benefits, regarded him from a distance with hatred and suspicion as the member of a dominant class. The employer, divided from his workman and conferring upon him no benefit, looked upon him uneasily as the member of a subject class claiming a dangerous independence. The gulf between the two classes seemed, and to many still seems, impassable.¹

¹ *Industrial Revolution in England*, p. 197.

Toynbee has put this into the past tense. The conditions which he describes seemed, at the time when these words were spoken, — in the year 1881, — to be gradually passing away. Doubtless this was true of England, for the industrial revolution began earlier in that country than in this, and its fiercest stages are apparently past. But the picture that he paints is still visible in fresh colors on this side of the ocean; we have been steadily moving for thirty years in the direction which he points out; and whether or not the gulf between masters and men is yet to grow wider and deeper is at this moment a serious question. To some of us it seems already a portentous chasm.

Such, then, is the state of industrial society at the present time. The hundreds of thousands of unemployed laborers, vainly asking for work; the rapid increase of pauperism, indicated by the fact that during the last Winter, in the chief cities of this rich commonwealth, nearly one tenth of the population sought charitable aid from the infirmary director or the benevolent societies; the strikes and lock-outs reported every day in the newspapers; the sudden and alarming growth of the more violent types of socialism, are ominous signs of the times. Any one who keeps his ear close enough to the ground will hear mutterings of discontent and anger in unexpected quarters.

It is evident that the wage-workers, as a class, are discontented. They feel that they are not getting their fair share of the gains of advancing civilization.

It is evident that they are becoming more and more widely separated from their employers in the social scale.

It is evident that the old relations of friendliness between the two classes are giving place to alienation and enmity.

It is evident that the working people have the impression that the churches are mainly under the control of the capitalists and of those in sympathy with them.

If all these things are so, the reasons why the working people are inclined to withdraw from the churches ought also to be plain.

The fact of a great and growing discontent among the working classes, the fact of the increasing separation and alienation between wage-workers and their employers, are facts that cannot be disputed by any intelligent person. It may be doubted whether existing circumstances are bearing as severely upon the laborer as he imagines; it may be that he is better off than he thinks he is. But the question with which we are now concerned is, What does he think about it? He may be wrong in cherishing such unfriendly and resentful feel-

ings toward his employer ; but does he cherish them? He may be in error in thinking that the capitalist classes exercise a preponderating influence in the churches ; but does he think so? If his state of mind is what it is assumed to be in this discussion, you have a reason for church neglect which is wide-spread and deep-seated ; you have a disorder to cure which is constitutional and obstinate, and which will never be removed by the sprinkling of rose-water ; you have a problem on your hands which calls for clear thinking and heroic endeavor.

The "masses" of our cities that we are trying to reach are composed, to a large extent, of these wage-workers, and we shall never reach them over this barrier. The sooner the churches recognize this fact and adjust their theories and their methods to it, the sooner they will begin to see daylight shine through this dark problem of church neglect. So long as we ignore this fundamental difficulty, all our efforts to allure these neglecters will be in vain. A few of them will come in now and then in response to our urgent invitations ; some of them, less thoughtful, or more hopeful, or more long-suffering than the rest, will continue to worship with us, finding in the promise of the life to come some help to bear the hardships of

the life that now is ; but the great multitude will turn upon us suspiciously or resentfully when they hear our invitations, saying : We want none of your free seats, we can do without your fine music and your pious commonplaces, we do not greatly care for your hand-shaking in the house of God and the perfunctory calls of your visitors at our houses. All we ask is justice. We want a chance to earn a decent living. We want a fair share of the wealth that our labor is helping to produce. We do not want to be left far behind when our neighbors, the employers, the traders, the professional people, are pushing on to plenty and prosperity. In the midst of all this overflowing bounty, we want something more than meagre subsistence. We are not quite sure whether you people of the churches want us to have it or not. Many of you, as we are bitterly aware, act as though you did not greatly care what became of us ; and we hear from many of you hard and heartless comments on every effort we make to fight the fates that are bearing us down. It looks to us as though your sympathies were chiefly given to the people who are getting rich at our expense. Until our minds are clearer on this score, we shall never be drawn to your churches, charm you never so wisely.

What are you going to do with people who talk in this way? That is the one tremendous question which the Church of God is called to answer to-day.

Suppose you say that these people are all wrong in these theories, and all astray in their censure. Suppose you insist that they are getting their full share of the gains of this advancing civilization, or, if they are failing to do so, that it is wholly their own fault. Then it is your business to convince them of this by patient and thorough discussion. You cannot remove their misconceptions by denouncing them, or contemptuously ignoring them. You cannot disabuse them by abusing them. If they are wholly in error with respect to this matter, their error is most deplorable and hurtful to them, and to society at large; and the Church has no more urgent duty than that of convincing them that they are wrong.

Suppose that they are all wrong in their impression that the sympathies of the churches are on the side of the classes with which they are in conflict. The impression is there, and no headway can be made in bringing them into the churches until it is somehow eradicated.

“The only cure of all this trouble,” some one will confidently answer, “is the gospel. Preach the gospel faithfully, and it will make an end

of all this strife." This answer assumes that the fault all lies with the people now in the churches. What effect can the faithful preaching of the gospel have upon those who do not and will not hear it? If the gospel thus preached reaches these neglecting multitudes, it can only be through those who now listen to it. And the very trouble we are considering is that those who now frequent the churches find it difficult, and almost impossible, to put themselves into friendly relations with the neglecting multitudes.

What is meant by those who use this language is simply this: that the strife between labor and capital arises from the natural depravity of the human heart; and that, if men were soundly converted, all these grounds of contention would be removed. Unfortunately, this reasoning overlooks some important facts. The gospel, considered simply as an evangelistic or converting agency, will never put an end to this trouble. There are plenty of people in our churches to-day, who give every evidence of having been soundly converted, but who are conducting themselves continually in such a manner as to cause this trouble, instead of curing it. When a man is converted, he has a purpose to do right; and if you choose to go a little farther and say that he has the disposition

to do right, I will not stop to dispute you. But he may have very crude ideas as to what right is; his heart may be regenerated, but his head may still be sadly muddled. And there are thousands of people in all our churches who mean to do right by their working people, but whose ideas have been so perverted by a false political economy that they are continually doing them grievous wrong. If a man has been taught the wage-fund theory, or if he has got into his head the idea that *laissez faire* is the chief duty of man, the gospel, in the ordinary acceptation of that term, will not correct the defects in his conduct towards his work people. He may believe that he is a sinner, that he cannot save himself, that he must be saved from his sins by faith in Christ; and he may humbly confess his conscious faults, and trust in Christ for forgiveness and salvation. But his habit of taking the law of supply and demand as his sole guide in dealing with his working people is not a conscious fault. He has been diligently taught that labor is simply a commodity; that what Carlyle calls the "cash-nexus" is the only bond between himself and his employees. As Toynbee puts it, Political Economy has steadily said to him, whenever he has thought of governing himself, in his relations with his work people, by Christian principles, — "You

are doing a very foolish thing. You might as well try to make iron swim as to alter the rate of wages by your individual will. The rate of wages, like the succession of night and day, is independent of the will of either employer or employed. Neither workmen nor employers can change the rate determined by competition at any particular time.”¹ Fortified by this philosophy, the converted employer feels that any attempt to give his men a larger share of his gains would be superfluous, if not mischievous; that the fates will have it all their own way in spite of him; that all he can do is to buy his labor in the cheapest market, and sell his wares in the dearest. In other words, he has been taught, and he believes, that the industrial world is a world in which the Christian laws of conduct have no sway; in which sympathy is fallacious, and good-will foolishness. What can preaching the gospel, in the ordinary sense of the word, do for such a man? His purpose is right, his heart is right, but his theories are all wrong. Some people say that it makes no difference what a man believes if his heart is right. It makes a tremendous difference!

The gospel, then, as the simple evangel, will not cure this evil. But Christianity will cure

¹ *The Industrial Revolution*, p. 158.

it. Christianity is something more than a gospel. Christianity is a law, as well as a gospel. And the Christian law, faithfully preached, as the foundation of the gospel, will put an end to all this trouble. We sometimes hear it said that the pulpit of the present day is derelict, because there is not enough preaching of the law. It is true. What the Church needs is a great deal more enforcement of law — not necessarily more threatening of penalty, but more preaching of law — of the law of Christ, in its application to the relations of men in their every-day life. By the law is the knowledge of sin. Many of the Christian people in our churches have not been convicted of their sins, because the law has not been laid down to them. This Christian law, when it is faithfully preached, will make short work with the theories of materialistic political economy. It will cause the employers to understand that their wills do affect the condition of their work people; that they are bound to consider the interests of those by whose labor they make their gains — actually to love them as themselves; to use the power which capital and intelligence give them, not merely in seeking their own prosperity, but in ministering to the welfare of those nearest them. It will enforce the doctrine that wealth is a trust, and that business

capacity is a trust ; that both are to be used with a solemn sense of responsibility to God ; and that the first obligation of the employer binds him to the people in his employ. What he can do to increase their welfare, to make their homes happier, to encourage provident habits among them, to open a door of hope to them, to increase their self-respect, and develop their manliness, he is bound to do. They are not his natural foes, to be battled with and beaten down, under the stern law of competition ; they are his allies, his associates, the helpers of his prosperity, to be cherished and befriended, and bound to him with hooks of steel. In deed and in truth, they are his business partners ; and it is only right that he should so consider them, and therefore identify them with himself in his enterprise, letting them share in his profits, and making their reward depend, in part, upon the abundance of his gains.

All good Christians believe, of course, that they ought to love their neighbors as themselves ; but there are many among them who need help in answering the question, " Who is my neighbor ? " The idea that the operatives in his factory, the brakemen on his freight trains, the miners in his coal mines are his neighbors, is an idea that does not come home to many a good Christian. He has been told

that the law that governs his relations with them — the only law that can usefully govern his relations with them — is the law of competition, the law of supply and demand. In all this vast industrial realm, as he has been taught, self-interest is the only motive power. In the family, in social life, to a certain extent also in civil life, the force of good-will must be combined with the force of self-love; altruism must be coördinated with egoism; but in the industrial world, in the relations of employer and employed, this benevolent impulse must be suppressed. In this kingdom of industry they say that altruism is an interloper. In the family, in the neighborhood, in the state, if men were governed only by self-interest, we should have endless strife; in the industrial world, if we are governed by self-interest alone, we shall have peace and plenty. So he has been instructed. Over the entrance to the thronging avenues and the humming workshops of the industrial realm, an unmoral science has written, in iron letters: “ALL LOVE ABANDON, YE WHO ENTER HERE!” If beyond those portals is pandemonium, who can wonder? The first business of the Church of God is to preach that legend down, and to put in place of it: “YOUR WAGE-WORKER IS YOUR NEAREST NEIGHBOR.”

In many respects the old relation of lord and villain, of master and slave, was a better relation than that now subsisting between the employer and the workman. There was many a master who tried to obey the Christian law; who remembered those in bonds as bound with them; who identified himself with his bondmen, loved them, cared for them, ministered unto them, and who was loved by them in return. We used to preach to the masters that their slaves were their brethren; and it was the right doctrine to preach. In one respect the Christian master did infringe upon the Christian law of brotherhood; he deprived his slave of his liberty. That was a great injury. We did right to upbraid him because of it. Doubtless the denial of liberty is a grave wrong — the gravest, perhaps, of wrongs — because liberty is the very condition of character. But while the Christian master deprived his slave of liberty, he gave him love. And now, when the slave gains his liberty, and becomes the hired man of his former master, is there no more love due from the one to the other? Is the “cash nexus” the only bond between them now? Is there no responsibility of the stronger for the welfare of the weaker? When we pass from status to contract, do we leave Christ’s law behind? Is the relation between the capi-

talist and the laborer either love without liberty, or liberty without love? Nay, but it is liberty and love, — the good fellowship of brethren, whose rights are equal, whose duties are reciprocal, whose interests are identical.

This is what the Church of God has to say about this business; and it is high time that the Church of God were saying it from hearts of flame with tongues of fire. We must make men believe that Christianity has a right to rule this kingdom of industry, as well as all the other kingdoms of this world; that her law is the only law on which any kind of society will rest in security and peace; that ways must be found of incorporating good-will as a regulative principle, as an integral element, into the very structure of industrial society.

You must not understand me as denying that there have been and are many Christian employers who recognize this truth, and try to make it practical in their relations with their workmen. And there are many others who, although they always deal with their workmen *as* workmen on “strictly business” principles — always paying the lowest wages for which they can get the work done; discharging men with families when they can get from boys or girls the same service for less money, without troubling themselves to ask what will become of

the families; striving to attract into the neighborhood of their industries great numbers of surplus workmen, that in the keen competition between these they may reduce the price of labor; reckoning labor always only as a commodity, and always studying how they can get it at the lowest figure — are yet quite generous in the use of their money for benevolent purposes; giving it liberally for the support of churches and missions, for the endowment of libraries and colleges, even for the support as paupers or dependents of the people who have been reduced to penury by their own masterful combinations in the labor market. A great deal of the money that is given in charity is thus gained by the exploitation of labor. And not seldom it happens that families pauperized on starvation wages, are fed with alms taken from the fortunes that their labor has helped to heap up. With one hand capital thrusts labor down toward mendicancy by the stern law of competition; with the other hand it flings to these mendicants it has made the dole that confirms them in their life of degradation. It is hard to tell by which method we have made the most paupers, whether by our heartless political economy, or by our sentimental charity.

It should not be wondered at if the workmen denounce the bounty thus wrung from their

labor, as the alms of hypocrites ; if they have bitter words to speak of the men whose princely gifts come from wealth produced by their own poorly requited toil. But I do not think this judgment just. I do not think that it is, in all cases — I doubt if it is in the most cases — conscious hypocrisy or wanton selfishness. These men have made their money by the operation of laws which they have been taught to believe are beneficent ; their generosity to the churches, the schools, the heathen, is not always ostentation ; it is often genuine good-will ; they give of their increase, because the impulse to do good is in their hearts ; they would have shared their fortunes, just as cheerfully, with the people who have helped them make their fortunes, if they had not been so sedulously instructed that it was foolish for them to do it ; that a benevolent purpose could find no standing room in the realm where workman and employer make their contract. Of course there is selfishness on both sides of this quarrel ; there are selfish employers and selfish workmen ; but the majority of the masters that are in our churches are not brutes nor tyrants ; they would have done justice to their men if they had not been misled by a false philosophy. That philosophy must be killed ; no other dragon is devouring so many precious lives ; and it is the first busi-

ness of the Christian Church to kill it. We want no other weapon than the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. Christ's law, faithfully applied to the relations of workman and employer, will settle the whole question. With Christ's law in our minds, instead of the laws of Ricardo and Bastiat — and with Christ's grace in our hearts, we shall very quickly get the barrier out of the way which keeps the working people out of the churches.

Just a word or two more by way of specific practical suggestion.

1. It goes without saying that we must manage in some way to convince the wage-workers that the churches are not on the side of capital in the struggle now going on. It may not be necessary that the Church should take either side in this battle. She ought to rebuke the selfishness and rapacity of both sides; certainly she ought not to take the side of the stronger against the weaker, nor ought it to be possible for any fair-minded man to believe that this is her attitude.

2. The Church ought not to censure, but rather to approve and encourage, the combination of laborers for the protection of their own interests. The acts of violence and oppression perpetrated by these unions are, of course, to be denounced; but the unions themselves are

lawful and necessary. I know of no reputable political economist of any school who does not now approve of the organization of labor. Capital combines to control the price of labor; and labor is helpless to protect itself without organization.

3. Compact labor unions can secure arbitration of labor disputes. Under the present industrial system this is the best way of avoiding strife and securing justice. The influence of the churches ought to be thrown energetically and constantly in favor of arbitration. Most labor troubles are now peacefully arbitrated in England; they ought to be and can be arbitrated in this country.

4. It is not, perhaps, necessary for the pulpit to discuss the methods by which the Christian law can be applied to the relation between workmen and employer, but if any minister will make himself familiar with the facts about the working, in France and in Germany, and to some extent also in this country, of the system of industrial partnership or profit-sharing, and will bring these facts in a lecture clearly before the minds of the employers in his congregation, he may render them a great service. Profit-sharing is simply the incorporation of good-will into the industrial system as a working force; and the scores of great companies on the conti-

ment of Europe that have won magnificent success upon this basis prove it to be no visionary scheme, but one of the solidest of accomplished facts. Christianity is not a chimera; it will work. Try it! Get your capitalists to try it! Jesus Christ knew a great deal more about organizing society than David Ricardo ever dreamed of knowing, and the application of his law to industrial society will be found to work surprisingly well.

The appearance within a few months past in several quarters of a disposition to venture upon experiments of this sort shows that a better conception of their calling is beginning to gain possession of the minds of employers. I can take you to more than one manufacturing village in New England, where the capitalists, though not yet adopting the method of profit-sharing, have flung *laissez faire* to the winds, and have begun to study their workmen's welfare — villages that blossom as the rose under the breath of this benign influence.

I cannot help hoping and believing that the worst of the warfare between capital and labor is now past in this country, and that the day of peace is even now dawning.

A terrible interval of suffering there was [says Arnold Toynbee], when the workman, flung off by his master, had not yet found his feet; but that is pass-

ing away, and the separation is recognized as a necessary moment in that industrial progress which enabled the workman to take a new step in advance. . . . If, however, history teaches us that separation is necessary, it also teaches us that permanent separation is impossible. The law of progress is that men separate, but they separate in order to unite. The old union vanishes, but a new union springs up in its place. The old union, founded on the dependence of the workman, disappears — a new union arises, based on the workman's independence. And the new union is deeper and wider than the old.

God grant it! God hasten it! And let the Church of God, from all her steeples, with the chiming of ten thousand Christmas bells,

“Ring out the old, ring in the new!”

THREE DANGERS.

THERE are strong impulses in human nature that make war against society and that tend to subvert the social order. Self-love and benevolence are the central forces of human life; both are essential to progress and happiness, but they are always in conflict; individual and social welfare is secured only when they are brought into harmony. They are like the centripetal and centrifugal forces of the solar system. These forces are, so far as our measurements can ascertain, perfectly balanced; therefore, we have the rhythm and harmony of the heavenly bodies. When self-love and benevolence are perfectly balanced in human conduct, we shall have on earth the beginning of the thousand years of peace. All the mischiefs that students of social science seek to prevent or to cure arise from the excess of one or the other of these forces.

No doubt misdirected kindness is a source of much physical and moral evil. Many children are ruined by the exaggerated unselfishness of

their parents — the parents undergoing all the hardships and making all the sacrifices; the children growing up in greedy indolence, always ministered unto and never ministering; so going out into life helpless and selfish, with their powers undeveloped and their characters spoiled. Another excessive development of the same principle is seen in the sentimental philanthropy and the indiscriminate almsgiving by which paupers and criminals have been propagated on a grand scale.

But the evils arising from an excess of goodness have been small when compared with those arising from selfishness. These last are, by eminence, the unsocial evils. Pure egoism is the antithesis of society. Its impulse is to get everything and give nothing in exchange for it; while, as Herbert Spencer says, “the universal basis of coöperation (and therefore of social life) is the proportioning of benefits received to services rendered.” The selfishness which sets this law at naught is the source of all crimes against the person and property, and of all those evils which directly tend to the disintegration of society. Of these there are a multitude; but the three of which I wish to speak are — the vice of intemperance, the causes that directly assail the family, and the practice of gambling. I shall not undertake to show how they may be

counteracted; I wish simply to point out the manner in which they tend to undermine and subvert the social order.

I.

The evils of intemperance furnish a topic sufficiently hackneyed; but I wish to deal with an aspect of the question that is somewhat less familiar. I am not discussing the rule of abstinence; nor denying that there may be a legitimate use, dietetic or even convivial, for alcoholic beverages; nor considering the question as a moralist, nor as a physiologist: I would simply call attention to the unsocial effect of the drinking habits now existing among us. Let it be admitted that many persons use alcoholic beverages without being injured by them; with that form of use we have nothing to do; we are dealing now with *intemperance* in the strict sense of the word — with that use of ardent spirits which is on all sides admitted to be excessive and injurious. When a man uses alcoholic liquors in such a way that his property, be it large or small, is rapidly diminished, and he goes every month a little nearer to want and dependence; when he uses them in such a way that his physical and mental energies are impaired, and his power of car-

ing for himself and those dependent on him is sensibly lessened, all will allow that his use of them is pernicious. The harmful effect upon the individual does not need to be dwelt upon; it is the effect upon the common weal that we are now considering. It is plain that one who has a surplus, large or small, and who consumes it in indulgences which yield no benefit to himself nor to any other person, violates the fundamental law of society. The surplus thus consumed would have served him, and those dependent on him, in future sickness or infirmity sure to come; the destruction of this surplus brings him to the verge of pauperism, and makes it probable that the time will come when he, and perhaps others whom he ought to support, will be a charge upon public or private charity. In short, such a waste of savings reduces the waster to that condition in which, as soon as he is overtaken by sickness or misfortune, he will be able to make no proportionate return for the services that he will require. But society depends, as Mr. Spencer tells us, on the ability and disposition of the individuals composing it to make such a proportionate return. If all men were in the condition to which this man has reduced himself, society would be impossible.

What is true of one who wastes a surplus

that he has earned or inherited is equally true of one who consumes upon this unnatural appetite all that he earns beyond what is necessary to sustain life, so that he never gains a surplus, and always lives on the edge of pauperism.

Still more unsocial is the conduct of one who spends on this indulgence more than his net income, incurring bad debts for the necessaries of life to his landlord, his grocer, his tailor, and thus devouring the savings of his thrifty neighbors.

Still more unsocial is the conduct of one who ruins his health by his drinking habits — thus not only disabling himself for self-supporting industry, but entailing upon his offspring enfeebled and morbid physical constitutions, predisposing them to insanity or vice or pauperism or crime. If, at the same time, the home in which these children are being reared is so squalid or so disorderly that there is small opportunity for them to learn those lessons of self-respect and self-restraint by which men and women are fitted for citizenship, — so that by environment as well as by organization they are crippled and degraded, — the unsocial effects of this vice will be set in a still stronger light. And when, as the result of such drinking practices, the man is often led to direct en-

croachments upon the persons or the property of his neighbors, the fact that he has become an enemy of society scarcely requires further demonstration.

Now, consider how many thousands of our fellow-citizens there are of whom most, if not all, these things are true. As a direct consequence of the use of alcoholic liquors, they are wasting their surplus, or failing to gain a surplus; by their failure to fulfill their contracts, they are devouring the gains of their neighbors; they are ruining their health and bequeathing physical and moral disorders to their children, and entailing upon society that curse of curses, hereditary pauperism; they are appealing to their neighbors for charity, and crowding the hospitals and the almshouses; they are committing assaults, robberies, murders, — all manner of offenses against the public peace and welfare.

Look at the subject from another point of view. Sober and trustworthy estimates show that at least nine hundred millions of dollars are expended in this country every year for alcoholic liquors. That a considerable portion of this is used productively, in the arts, and innocently, or without any social injury, for drinking purposes, may be admitted.

Let us concede that one half of it is used in

this way. Half of all this amount must then be expended in such a manner as to produce those very effects of which we have been speaking. That is to say, we are paying out every year four hundred and fifty millions of dollars in the purchase of want, and pauperism, and vice, and disease, and insanity, and crime. So much money ought to procure a large quantity of these staples, and it does. Nobody can deny that we get our money's worth.

Look at it from another point of view. A low estimate puts the number of persons engaged in the sale of liquor at five hundred thousand. We have admitted that these persons render some service to the community; let us admit that half of the number would be required to dispense the amount of liquor that could be consumed without social injury. We have left an army of a quarter of a million liquor-sellers, to whom we are paying four hundred and fifty millions of dollars every year. Society is rendering to them a pretty valuable service. What service are they rendering to society? They are devoting their energies to the destruction of society. They live wholly upon the ruin of their fellow-men. The whole tendency of the employment for which society pays them so large a sum is to reduce their fellow-citizens to those conditions of want and disease and

moral degradation in which society becomes impossible. We are safe in characterizing this as a highly unsocial proceeding.

I have not intended any exaggeration in these statements; I believe that I have kept far within the truth. Neither have I any nostrum for the cure of this disease, nor any faith in those most commonly advertised. My own belief is that the roots of this evil run very deep, and that it will take many generations to eradicate them.

Nevertheless, it is well for all students of human welfare to keep distinctly before their minds the unsocial effects of intemperance — the large number of persons who, through this vice, become violators of the organic law of society, either as its burdens or as its foes.

II.

Let us now consider those unsocial forces that make war upon society by assailing the family. The monogamous family, formed by the union of one woman with one man, and by the increase of children born to them, is the structural unit of modern society. Whatever may be the political unit, the family is the social unit. Society is an organism. Now, as a physical organism is formed not of atoms nor

of molecules, but of organized cells, in like manner the modern social organism is composed not of individuals, but of households. What the earlier forms of society may have been I do not undertake to say; but it is almost certain that monogamy is a late product of the social evolution. Late or early, it is by most philosophers admitted to characterize that society whose type is the highest and whose foundations are the firmest.

Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his "Data of Ethics," tells us that:—

Tribes in which promiscuity prevails, or in which the marital relations are transitory, and tribes in which polyandry entails in another way indefinite relationships, are incapable of much organization. Nor do peoples who are habitually polygamous show themselves able to take on those high forms of social coöperation which demand due subordination of self to others. Only when monogamic marriage has become general and eventually universal, only when there have consequently been established the closest ties of blood, only when family altruism has been most fostered, has social altruism become most conspicuous.

Mr. Bagehot, in his "Physics and Politics," shows how the training of the family fits nations for survival and conquest.

A cohesive family [he says], is the best germ for

a campaigning nation. In a Roman family the boys, from the time of their birth, were bred to a domestic despotism which well prepared them for subjection in after life to a military discipline, a military drill, and a military despotism. They were ready to obey their generals, because they were compelled to obey their fathers; they conquered the world in manhood because as children they were bred in homes where the tradition of passionate valor was steadied by the habit of implacable order. And nothing of this is possible in loosely bound family groups (if they can be called families at all), where the father is more or less uncertain, where descent is not traced through him. . . . An ill-knit nation, which does not recognize paternity as a legal relation, would be conquered like a mob by any other nation which had a vestige or a beginning of the *patria potestas*.

In another place he says: —

The nations with a thoroughly compacted family system have “possessed the earth,” — that is, they have taken all the finest districts in the most competed-for parts; and the nations with loose systems have been merely left to mountain-ranges and lonely islands. The family system, and that in its highest form (the monogamous form), has been so exclusively the system of civilization that literature hardly recognizes any other.

These witnesses testify from a point of view strictly scientific; they are not the slaves of tradition; they only repeat the verdict of his-

tory. The fact that the monogamous family furnishes the highest type of the social organization — the one most favorable to stability and strength and peace — is beyond the denial of intelligent men.

The dependence of the physical welfare of society upon the maintenance of the family is easily explained. Even the physical vigor of the people is likely to decline under any other system. Population would decrease by the substitution for monogamy of either polyandry or polygamy; and the physical nature of young children can be provided for in no other way so well as in the monogamous family. As a matter of history, polyandry has commonly been based on the practice of destroying female infants, or of selling them after they are grown into foreign parts; while polygamy is ordinarily the consequence of fierce and constant wars in which the males of the population are largely destroyed. Both these forms of domestic life seem, therefore, to grow out of conditions in the highest degree unsocial.

But it is not chiefly for its physical existence and welfare that society depends on the family. It is for the cultivation of the moral qualities that fit men for association with one another that the family is indispensable. "Monogamy is doubtless the Creator's law," says Professor

Roscher, "since only in monogamous countries can we expect to find the intimate union of family life, the beauties of social intercourse and free citizenship." The passages which I have quoted from Mr. Herbert Spencer and Mr. Walter Bagehot emphasize the importance of the family as a training-school in which discipline and the habit of subordination and the unselfish sentiments and habitudes are acquired. Without these virtues society is impossible, and there is no school for the cultivation of these virtues that compares with the monogamous family. We are beginning to discover, in our charitable work, that it is better to place the children who are the wards of the State in families than to rear them in asylums and refuges; since a home which comes considerably short of the ideal is a better place for a child to grow up in than the best public institutions.

Since, therefore, the family in its present form bears to society a relation so vital; since, in Mr. Spencer's words, "those high forms of social coöperation which demand due subordination of self to others" are only taken on by those who have been trained in the family, it is evident that any force assailing the sacredness or the security of the family must be, in the highest sense of the word, an unsocial force. By so much as the permanence of the family is

disturbed, by so much is the bond of society weakened. An increase of the proportion of the people who do not live in families means an increase of public peril, a decay of social virtue, a diminution of the common weal.

Unfortunately, it is quite impossible to deny that this institution, on whose health the social order depends, is now suffering a considerable loss of respect and power. There are yet in the land hundreds of thousands of safe and happy homes; but the proportion of our population who do not live in families is steadily increasing. That this must be true is made evident by two startling facts: first, that the proportion of marriages to the population is rapidly decreasing; second, that the proportion of divorces to the number of marriages is rapidly increasing. Fewer families are formed; more families are broken up.

The statistics of Massachusetts relating to this subject are more complete than those of any other State; but, so far as the facts have been gathered in other States, substantially the same tendencies appear. We may take Massachusetts, therefore, as a fair sample; and we find that in that commonwealth the population increased between 1860 and 1880 forty-five per cent., while the marriages increased only twenty-five per cent. In 1860 there was one marriage

to every 99 persons; in 1880 one marriage to every 114 persons.

The number of divorces, meanwhile, increased from 243 in 1860 to 600 in 1878 (I have not the figures for 1880), one hundred and forty-five per cent. In 1860 there was one divorce for every 51 marriages; in 1878 there was one divorce for every 21 marriages. Massachusetts is the best of the New England States in this respect; in all the others the proportion of divorces to marriages is much larger than in Massachusetts.

It is not possible to add to the significance of these figures. They are the numerical expression of a force that is assailing the foundations of society. Fewer families, smaller families, an increasing number of families disbanded by divorce — that is the ominous record. A much smaller proportion of our people are now living in families than was the case twenty-five or fifty years ago. This means less discipline of the young; less self-restraint among young and old; less training in the virtues of industry and sympathy and helpfulness and self-sacrifice. It means, also, a greater exposure of the young and the weak to temptation, and greater opportunities of vice. Part of what it signifies is seen in the fact that while twenty years ago the number of illegitimate children annually born

in Massachusetts was less than three hundred, the number now born every year exceeds eight hundred. The population has increased, meanwhile, only about forty-five per cent.

It is not necessary to infer from these figures that the era of national dissolution has set in. On the whole, the world is growing better; but in this current of moral progress there are eddies, and we are just now in one of them. Therefore it becomes us to take our bearings.

Some reasons for this state of things readily suggest themselves. The effect of the popular social philosophy, which during the last quarter of a century has greatly exaggerated individualism, has been pointed out by recent writers. The sacredness of personality has been exalted, and the relations and mutual obligations of persons have been overlooked. Most of our talk has been of rights, not much of duties or of services; and the consequence is a disinclination to assume the responsibilities and to make the sacrifices involved in the family relation. With this intellectual cause must be reckoned an economical cause, the effects of which are visible on every side. The large system of industry which masses the population in the cities and the great manufacturing centres affords, if I mistake not, an explanation of many of the facts which we have been considering. Eco-

nomicallly, this modern system, by which capital is aggregated in vast amounts and laborers are congregated in great multitudes, is, no doubt, an improvement over the old system; it enormously increases production, and multiplies the wealth of the nation. But socially and morally the system has not yet justified itself; it requires considerable modification to make it serve the social interests of the community.

What are the facts? In the cities and in the large manufacturing villages great numbers of laborers of both sexes — more than half of them young women — are gathered together. Many of them come from the country; the growth of the cities at the expense of the country consists largely in the removal of the young men and women from the farms to the cities and the factory towns, where they find employment in the mills and the shops. Here they are thrown together rather rudely in their work; the boarding-houses where most of them spend their nights and their Sundays afford them none of the restraints of a home; their evenings are wont to find them on the streets and in cheap places of amusement. The wages of these operatives, especially of the females, are, as a general rule, very small. In a table showing the wages paid in forty-four different mills in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, I find that the

average wages paid to women was \$6.10 per week, and to female children \$3.41. I am sure that the average weekly earnings of females over fifteen years of age, in our factories, box shops, button shops, brass-works, and so forth, would be less than five dollars. Out of this those who do not live at home must pay for board and room, washing and clothing. What a pinching life this must be can be easily imagined.

In the same communities where these girls are employed are numbers of young men of their own social grade, and of grades a little higher, to whom marriage and the possession of a home seem, in the present state of society, a distant and not always a desirable prospect.

Such are the conditions — the herding together of operatives, male and female, in places remote from their homes, with low wages and strong temptations. The moral fruits of such an exposure are not likely to promote the founding of permanent families; the character and habits developed in such an environment are not the best outfit for happy wedlock.

Another feature of the life we are considering is its lack of permanence. Owing to strikes, failures, changes of business, operatives are continually flitting from one place to another. Such instability of life discourages the forming of fam-

ilies, and often results in scattering those that are formed.

I am convinced that it is to the industrial conditions which I have now in an inadequate way outlined, that much of the neglect and deterioration of family life is due. There are manufacturing communities in which these evils have been largely overcome, through the intelligence and good-will of the employers of labor. They may be overcome everywhere. But the unsocial forces that are undermining the family, and thus assailing the life of society in its most vital part, are generated to a considerable degree by the selfishness which too often characterizes the administration of capital. They will not be counteracted until employers cease to think of labor simply as a commodity, and begin to understand their responsibility for the moral and social welfare of the people by whose labor their fortunes are gained.

III.

But by far the most dangerous of the unsocial forces now threatening the destruction of society is the gambling mania. It is probably true that there is less of what may be called social gambling now than there was one hundred years ago. In the days of Queen Anne

and the Georges in England, and in our own revolutionary times, gambling was a common diversion in what was considered the best society; men like Fox, Pitt, and Wilberforce, at one time or another in their lives, plunged deeply into its excitements; it was scarcely disreputable at that time, on either side of the water, to play heavily for money. Of late years this has not been true, though the signs are that the practice is just now becoming more prevalent in fashionable society. The fascinations of poker are, if I am rightly informed, beginning to be confessed in many polite circles.

Lottery gambling, also, in spite of all the measures taken to suppress it, still holds its own pretty firmly, and especially among the poorest classes. The amount of money squandered by poor laborers, by negroes more than by any other class, in the policy-shops of our chief cities, is said to be very large. Gambling-houses of all sorts, recognized as such, are commonly suppressed in well-ordered communities; here and there in a city moral sentiment is too weak to cope with the abomination, but weakness of this sort is universally regarded as a reproach. Such places exist, of course, in all our large cities; but they generally hide themselves. The social injury resulting from those forms of gambling to which I have now alluded is, no

doubt, very great. Tens of thousands of our young men, for whom great sacrifices have been made, on whom the future welfare of households depends, are ruined by them every year; most observing persons are ready to repeat from personal knowledge sad stories of the wreck of fortune and character. But the injury done to society by those forms of gambling that are recognized and undisguised is trifling when compared with the damage done by that form of gambling which wears the mask of business. Those are the pimples on the skin; this is the corruption in the blood.

This kind of gambling is sometimes called speculation; but speculation it is not, in any proper sense of that word. To buy property of any sort and hold it for a rise in its value is a legitimate business transaction. Speculation, when it hoards the necessaries of life, may often be a heartless and injurious business; it may, on the other hand, have beneficent results, putting money in the hands of producers in the dullest times, carrying over an unsalable surplus, and thus equalizing the pressure of supply and demand. "To buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market" may sound like an extremely selfish maxim, and the man who has no higher principle of action will not attain to any heroic virtue; nevertheless, society can have

no quarrel with him. Buying and selling may be selfish business; but buying and selling is a wholly different operation from gambling; and a very large share of the so-called commercial operations of this land to-day is not buying and selling at all, but simply and only gambling.

All legitimate commerce consists in an exchange of values. If I buy goods of a merchant, there is an exchange of money for merchandise; the merchant desires the money more than the merchandise; I desire the merchandise more than the money. It is simply a transfer of property, by which each one satisfies his wants. If I employ a physician to attend me in sickness, or a music-teacher to instruct my children, or a laborer to clean my carpets, there is still an exchange of values. I give my money for the services of the physician or the music-teacher or the laborer because they are valuable to me; they give me their services because they want my money. But when one man bets another that a certain card has such a face, or that one horse will trot a mile in fewer seconds than another, or that wheat will sell for so many cents a bushel thirty days from date, and the loser pays the bet, what exchange takes place? The winner gets the loser's money; the loser gets nothing at all in exchange for it. This is gambling. The gambler's business is

simply this: to get money or other property away from his neighbors, and to give them nothing whatever in exchange for it. Whatever money or other property any man wins in gambling some one else loses; by as much as he is enriched some one else is impoverished; for all that he has got in gambling he has given no equivalent. Other people have parted with the money that he has gained, and he has given them for it no merchandise, no service, no pleasure, no accommodation — nothing whatever. This is the nature of all gambling; and it is easy to see that it is egoism in its most virulent form — the precise kind of egoism that renders society impossible. If “society is produced,” as Carey says, “by an exchange of services,” gambling is the antithesis of society.

Here is a striking passage from “The Study of Sociology,” in which Mr. Herbert Spencer discusses the nature of gambling. He is pointing out the shallowness of the treatment generally given to this subject by moralists.

Listen [he says] to a conversation about gambling, and when reprobation is expressed, note the grounds of the reprobation: that it tends to the ruin of the gambler; that it risks the welfare of family and friends; that it alienates from business and leads into bad company — these and such as these are the reasons given for condemning the practice. Rarely

is gambling condemned because it is a kind of gratification by which pleasure is obtained at the cost of pain to another. The normal obtainment of gratification, or of the money which purchases gratification, implies, first, that there has been put forth effort of a kind which, in some way, furthers the general good; and implies, secondly, that those from whom the money is received get, directly or indirectly, equivalent satisfactions. But in gambling the opposite happens. Benefit received does not imply effort put forth; and the happiness of the winner involves the misery of the loser. This kind of action is, therefore, essentially anti-social.

And this is precisely the kind of action followed by all those persons who practice what is called speculating in margins, — that is, betting on the future value of stocks or produce. It is useless to try to disguise the real nature of these transactions; they are simply gambling, nothing more or less. What is the difference between the gambling practiced at a faro bank and the gambling practiced by those persons who buy and sell margins? One man bets another that ten thousand bushels of wheat will be worth so much at a certain future time; if it is selling in the market at that time for less than the price named, he agrees to pay the difference; if it is selling for more than the amount named, the other shall pay him the dif-

ference. Neither party owns a bushel of wheat ; there is no transfer of merchandise ; there is simply a transfer from the one man's pocket to the other man's pocket of the money won in the bet. Oil and corn and pork, and all the great staples of agriculture, are employed in the same way by the gamblers ; so are all the stocks of great railroads and steamship companies and manufacturing companies and mines. Men who never own any of these kinds of property spend their lives in gambling in them, or, rather, about them, — betting on their future prices, and doing their best by such reports, true or false, as they can circulate, and such influences, good or bad, as they can bring to bear, to raise or lower these future prices, so as to make them correspond to their bets.

To say that gambling in margins is as bad as faro or roulette is a very weak statement ; it is immeasurably worse. It is far more dishonest. The gambler in margins does his best to load the dice on which he bets his money. It is, moreover, far more injurious. By this practice values are unsettled ; business is often paralyzed ; the price of the necessaries of life is forced upward. The poor man's loaf grows small as the gambler's gains increase. Every cent made by this class of men is taken from the industrial classes with no compensation.

This must be so, because they live and grow rich, although they perform for society no service whatever. The men who play in the gambling-houses only rob one another and such innocents as they can lure into their dens; the men who bet on margins on Broad Street and State Street, and in the Boards of Trade, rob the whole country; every man who buys bread, who burns oil, who rides a mile in a railway car, pays tribute of his earnings to the treasuries of these gamblers. How many are there of them now operating in this country? How large is their aggregate income from this source? I have seen a recent estimate which puts the amount of which the "lambs" are shorn in the New York stock market alone at eight hundred million dollars a year. I do not vouch for this; it seems to me an extravagant figure. But everybody knows that the men who gamble in margins are a great multitude, and that there are not a few among them who count their gains by millions and by tens of millions. All this is plunder. The gambler's gains are all plunder. He may be a pillar in the church; he may hobnob with college presidents, and sit on commencement platforms, and be pointed out to the young men with notes of admiration as one of our merchant princes, but he is a plunderer: all his goods have been gained by the spoiling

of his neighbors ; it is not by coöperating with his fellow-men, but by preying upon them, that he has obtained the wealth that renders him an object of worship.

From whom is this plunder extorted ? Most of it comes from the pockets of venturesome people in city and country, who have heard that money is made by speculating in margins, and who risk and lose their savings, great or small — the fruits of legitimate industry. The fleecing of these “ lambs ” affords the gamblers a great revenue. Another part of their spoil is won as the result of cunning combinations, in which the courts have sometimes been induced to join, and by which the prices of valuable stocks (sometimes ironically called securities) are forced up or down to suit their purposes, the conspirators buying when the innocent and helpless owners are frightened into selling at a sacrifice, and selling when unwary investors are tempted into buying an inflated stock. This is something worse than gambling ; it is sheer robbery. And people who hold up their hands with horror at the rantings of a few crazy communists, sit by and suck their thumbs while operations of this sort are going on.

It is not often, however, that the gamblers are able to make use of the courts in spoiling their victims. A Canadian judge lately threw

out of court a suit brought to recover a debt owed by one who had lost in betting on margins, because it was nothing but a gambling debt. Similar decisions have been given in several of our own courts. The fact that such transactions are contrary to law and to public morality would be affirmed by any respectable jurist.

It is amazing to witness the dullness of the public conscience upon this matter. The evil has called forth but faint reprobation. I am ready to believe that multitudes of men who follow this nefarious business are but dimly sensible of its real nature. A practice so widespread, and against which the reputable classes raise so little objection, may well have seemed to ambitious young men innocent and legitimate. What Mr. Spencer says about the inadequacy of the treatment which the whole subject has received from the teachers of morality is profoundly true. A young man who had been graduated recently from one of our best colleges told me the other day that the only ground on which his teacher in ethics taught him to condemn gambling was that it substituted an appeal to chance for the exercise of reason and judgment. One might as well make the wrong of stealing to consist of the habits of indolence which it encourages in the thief.

Gambling is, indeed, ethically of the same nature as stealing, and is to be condemned for the same reasons. Socially and economically, the gamblers of a community sustain to its industrial system precisely the same relation as do its thieves. It is a hard word to say, but it is the exact scientific truth; and it is high time that somebody said it.

One would like to know how often and how distinctly this truth is enforced in the leading pulpits of New York and Chicago and Boston, and the other great cities where business gambling is most prevalent. We hear occasionally of clergymen who bet on margins; nobody believes that this is a common practice among ministers; nevertheless it may be doubted whether this class of our public teachers have borne witness, as they ought to have done, against the iniquity. One or two of the secular papers have treated it intelligently and vigorously; but the press in general has dealt with it but gingerly. In a newspaper controversy concerning a governor's private stock operations, the belief that he was addicted to such practices did not discredit him much in the opinion of most of the journalists; the only question was whether he had slaughtered his friends in the fray, or whether he had used other people's money in the transaction. I do

not undertake to condemn or to justify this governor; I am simply referring to the general tone of the public press in discussing the charges against him, which seemed to admit that it is all right for a governor to gamble, provided he gambles fairly. Clearly there is need of a great deal of elementary teaching on this subject, in order that a public sentiment may be created which will deal with the evil in an effective way. Those men who follow the business must be made to see that gambling, in its many phases, is the parasite of commerce, the corrupter of youth, the evil genius of our civilization, and that every man who follows the trade is as truly an enemy of society as if he went about picking his neighbors' pockets or setting their harvest fields on fire.

That these three maladies which assail the national life are necessarily fatal need not be asserted, but it is not well to conceal from ourselves the truth that they are dangerous. Over against these anti-social forces are the powers that make for unity: the intelligence and conscience and benevolence of a people among whom the Christian ethics is yet, we may hope, something more than an obsolete sentiment; the love of equity, not easily extinguished in the breasts of Anglo-Saxons; the steadily grow-

ing feeling of a common interest ; the vast combinations of industry and commerce that are wholly inoperative without confidence and goodwill. All these are mighty, and they will prevail in the end against the evil. Of their triumph on this soil, in the life of this nation, we must not, however, be so sanguine as to neglect the supply of the conditions on which alone these remedial and constructive forces will do their work. For we must remember what Professor Roscher says, that in this case the patient is also the physician ; and that the cure depends on the clearness of his intelligence and the firmness of his will.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL SCIENCE.

THE title of this essay assumes a relation between Christianity and Social Science; and the study of this relation is the task before us.

The first thing to be attended to is the definition of our terms. What do we mean by Christianity? what by Social Science?

I. We shall take the word Christianity in its largest sense, as signifying that form of social order whose organizing force is the life and teachings of Jesus Christ. Webster defines it as "the system of doctrines and precepts taught by Christ," but this definition is too narrow. Christianity is something more than a body of doctrines and precepts. A chemist might give you, in a series of formulæ, all that his analysis could discover in the human body; but his formulæ, if they were perfectly accurate, would not be a complete description of a man. There is much in a man of which chemistry takes no note; and there is much more in Christianity which the dogmatist and the moralist cannot

include in their systems. The intellectual and the ethical elements of Christianity are important, but the vital force, the spiritual essence, is the principal thing. Christianity gives us, in the words of Jesus Christ, a comprehensive statement of religious truth and a perfect rule of conduct; but this is a small part of what it does for us; its unspeakable gift is summed up in the saying, "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men."

The work of Christianity is chiefly done, not by pedagogic methods, nor even by furnishing men an example to study and copy; but by the communication of a subtle personal force, from one life to another, through which the sentiments are purified and the aims are elevated. "If any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his," no matter how strictly he may adhere to Christian beliefs, nor how scrupulously he may follow the ethical rules of the New Testament, nor how servilely he may try to copy the life of the Son of man. And, conversely, one who has the spirit of Christ, — the central motive of whose life is in harmony with Christ, — ought to be counted as a Christian, even though his philosophy may differ somewhat from that of the Christian schools. Christianity is, therefore, broader than any sect, — broader than all the sects. It is the name by

which we describe the Kingdom of God in the world.

The work of Christianity is remedial or redemptive. "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." It does not undertake to account for the moral disorder and suffering now existing; it recognizes their existence and provides a remedy for them. It finds men in ignorance and seeks to enlighten them; it finds them in bondage to tyrannous appetites and riotous passions, and offers them the freedom and the peace of virtue; it finds them poor and sick and sorrowful, and it serves their needs and cures their ills and wipes away their tears; it finds them afraid of that Power behind Nature whose laws they have transgressed, and it assures them that his name is Love, and that He is ready to forgive and save them; it finds them shivering in a dark uncertainty on the threshold of the grave, and it lifts the curtain and shows them life and immortality beyond. What form the Kingdom of God in the world would have taken if there had been neither sin nor sorrow, we may not know; but since the world is what it is, the Kingdom of God is a kingdom of salvation.

II. Social Science is a term scarcely less comprehensive. It deals, according to Dr. Lankester, with "the social relations of man to man

and the duties growing out of those relations." It proposes, according to another authority, "the systematic investigation, in various lines of research, of principles and laws affecting the welfare of mankind in society." Social Science, as well as Christianity, recognizes the fact that men are in a condition of disorder and distress. Its mainspring is the desire to relieve existing evils. The lines on which its work has run have been chiefly these :

1. The study of sanitary laws with a view to the prevention of disease.

2. The study of the conditions of social vice in the interests of public morality.

3. The study of the phenomena of crime and of the methods of restraint and reformation and prevention.

4. The study of jurisprudence, in all its branches, with the hope of making the laws more simple and more just.

5. The comparison and criticism of methods of education.

6. The investigation of the causes of pauperism.

7. The examination of the whole structure of society, to discover, if possible, whether it is organized on right principles ; and what hindrances, political, economical, or customary, are in the way of its welfare.

The realm of Social Science is thus seen to be a broad one, and its purpose a high one. And the close relation between Social Science and Christianity at once becomes manifest. They have a common field of operations; the lines on which they are working are parallel. Christianity takes thought for the welfare of men beyond this life, while Social Science does not; Christianity reaches out after the ignorant and degraded in other lands, while Social Science cares only for those at home; Christianity concerns itself directly and primarily with individual character, while Social Science studies men in masses. The range of the one is therefore broader than that of the other; but as far as Social Science goes, Christianity goes with it; there is no end proposed by the former which the latter is not seeking to promote.

The relation of Social Science to Christianity is, in fact, the relation of an offspring to its parent. Social Science is the child of Christianity. The national and international associations that are so diligently studying the things that make for human welfare in society are as distinctly the products of Christianity as is the American Board of Missions. It is only in Christian nations that such associations exist. Individuals, in lands not Christian, have given thought to such matters; but the existence of

associations of men meeting regularly for such studies, and expending upon them precious time and unremunerated labor, is a witness to the diffusion through society of philanthropic sentiments, — an evidence that not only here and there a philosopher entertains such thoughts, but that they are the common currency of human intercourse. And this is true only of those societies that have been Christianized. The very impulse from which Social Science springs is the effect of Christianity.

It would seem, therefore, that there ought to be no schism between Christians and Sociologists, but the closest sympathy and coöperation.

Yet there often is, I am sorry to say, a degree of jealousy between those who profess to be followers of Christ and those who assume to be the expounders of Social Science. That semi-savage obscurantism which performs its medicine dances in some of our pulpits, and brandishes its ignorance in the columns of some of our religious newspapers, is roused to wrath by everything that bears the name of science: the attempt to study and understand the natural phenomena of vice and crime and pauperism seems to this habit of mind almost presumptuous. On the other side, we have professors of sociology expressing their contempt for all that

savors of Christian faith. Mr. Herbert Spencer, for example, in his book on *The Story of Sociology*, repeatedly gives notice that nobody who believes in a God whose will is free can be allowed within the precincts of his favorite science. "That mode of conceiving human affairs, which is implied by the D. V. of a missionary meeting placard, is," he says, ". . . one to which the idea of a Social Science is entirely alien and indeed repugnant." Mr. Spencer seems here, as indeed often, to assume his own omniscience. It may be impossible for him to conceive how any one could believe in divine Providence and at the same time be an interested and intelligent student of Social Science; nevertheless, a little observation would reveal to him the existence of quite a number of such persons, — of persons, at any rate, who profess to recognize divine Providence, who seem, also, to be devoting themselves, with some enthusiasm, to the investigations of Social Science, and who are not by their neighbors commonly regarded either as fools or as hypocrites. And what, indeed, is there so contradictory in the two states of mind referred to? Why may not the person who puts "D. V." on a missionary meeting placard believe in the possibility of Social Science? Surely, it is possible that the missionary meeting, thus advertised, may not

take place. The house in which it is to be held may burn up or be blown down; the persons engaged to conduct it may be ill or absent; many circumstances may arise to prevent the holding of the meeting. Scientific meetings, I dare say, as well as missionary meetings, are sometimes prevented by unforeseen circumstances. Even a Social Scientist like Mr. Spencer would not wisely venture to announce that such a meeting would be held at such a future time, whether or no. The contingency of the event would be recognized. Now the phrase "God willing," introduced into such a notice, if devoutly and intelligently used, implies, first, this admitted contingency, and, secondly, the belief that the circumstances conditioning the holding of this meeting are under the control of infinite Wisdom. It does not imply any fortuitous or arbitrary interference with the holding of the meeting; the circumstances arising to prevent it may be part of the natural order: it only implies that this natural order, under which the holding of the meeting may become impossible, is under the supervision of a Divine Intelligence. Of course such a phrase may be used superstitiously, or as a mere cant term; but it may also be used devoutly by persons who simply intend to affirm, by using it, their belief that there is a perfect Wisdom and

a loving Will behind all the phenomena of Nature. I do not see how this belief disqualifies any one for the study of Social Science. Mr. Spencer himself asserts that the progress of thought is "towards an ultimate recognition of a mystery behind every act and appearance;" and he says that nothing can ever permanently "shut out the thought of a Power [he writes it with a capital P, too.] of which humanity is but a small and fugitive product,—a Power which was in course of ever changing manifestation before Humanity was, and will continue through other manifestations when Humanity has ceased to be." Very well; suppose the Christian ventures to apply to this Power the sacred name of God, and to recognize the common events of his life as part of his "manifestations," is he then and therefore incapacitated for sociological studies? The assumption is perfectly gratuitous. It is the utterance of that "anti-theological bias" against which Mr. Spencer elsewhere protests. It is not an argument, it is a sneer.

It would not have been worth while to undertake this analysis of Mr. Spencer's fling, were it not that it takes us into the vicinity of an important distinction. Social Science differs from the physical sciences in including a class of facts that do not come under the laws of

causation. The actions of men are not simply effects produced by physical causes. The law of the conservation of energy will not explain them all. The element of freedom plays a large part in all this realm. To some extent, therefore, the courses of human conduct are incalculable; and it is not philosophical to expect exact results. "It is for the social philosopher," says Dr. Lankester, "to hope that he may one day lay down the laws of society in such a manner as to indicate, with a certainty equal to that of the chemist or the physiologist, what will happen as the result of any particular circumstance arising in the social life of man." This is a visionary hope. The chemist or the physiologist deals wholly with necessary causes: the same forces, in the same conditions, will, he knows, always produce the same results. If his science is not exact, it is simply because his induction is imperfect: he does not know all the facts. But human action is not necessitated. Imagine two men exactly alike, in organization, in environment, in history; the same inducement may be presented to both at the same moment, and the one may yield to it while the other resists it. What one man may do may be done by many men; indeed, it is often the case that the action of many men is influenced by one man; and there was a mo-

ment when this one man could have taken either of two courses, his action being determined, not by his circumstances, but by himself. The expectation that the same degree of certainty can be secured in Social Science that may be secured in the physical sciences is, therefore, chimerical. Even Mr. Spencer, though he ascribes the actions of men to "causation," and often uses language which implies that the wills of men are unfree, nevertheless says that the phenomena of Sociology, "involved in a higher degree than all others, are, less than all others, capable of precise treatment; such of them as can be generalized can be generalized only within wide limits of variation as to time and amount, and there remains much that cannot be generalized." It is not only true, as Mr. Spencer says, that the difficulties of this science are greater in degree than those of the physical sciences: it is also true that it is environed with difficulties of a different *kind* from those encountered in the other sciences.

Nevertheless, it is possible to predict, with a good degree of probability, what direction men will take under given circumstances. There are certain known qualities of human nature, and certain well defined tendencies of human action; and taking men in masses, experience enables us to say that such and such results are

likely to flow from such and such combinations of circumstances. The probabilities, in many cases, are so strong that we are justified in treating them as certainties. There is, therefore, a social science, with a large and constantly growing body of valuable generalizations. The materials of this science are the facts of human history, — of that kind of human history that concerns itself not merely with courts and cabinets and congresses, but with the daily life of the whole people; that traces the effects of laws, institutions, customs, industries, habits of life, methods of charity, upon the welfare and happiness of the whole people. I do not think I am claiming too much when I say that Sociology, the Science of Human Welfare, is at once the most comprehensive and the noblest of the sciences.

The facts which form the materials of Social Science are, therefore, the very facts with which Christianity is dealing; and there would seem to be no good reason why there should not be a good understanding and a close alliance between these two great agencies. Each has the power of helping the other: the disciples of each may profit by a sympathetic study of the other. Toward this mutual service I wish to make a few suggestions.

What, then, are some of the directions in

which Christianity may look for aid from Social Science?

First. As to the nature and the amount of work to be done, the investigations of Sociology are helpful. The studies of vice and crime and ignorance and pauperism which have been prosecuted by the specialists in these departments put within our reach a vast amount of the most valuable information. We have a general idea that sin and woe abound in many of our communities; but the great majority of our church-members — even of those most active in church-work — have no definite knowledge of the physical or moral conditions of the multitudes outside the churches. There are thousands of American Christians who are better informed respecting the degraded classes in India than they are respecting those who live in the wards adjoining their own residences. The reason is plain. The missionaries whom they send to India make themselves thoroughly familiar with the life of the people there, and their careful reports are spread before the people of the churches monthly in the missionary meetings: while no such skillful and careful explorations are reported to the churches of the moral and social status of the denizens of the slums near by, where pestilence lurks, and pauperism breeds, and crime vegetates. I do not say that

no attempts are made by the churches to acquaint themselves with the condition of the degraded classes ; but the kind of work that we do for them is rather uncertainly done, and generally done by proxy. We have applied our remedies roughly, without much investigation of the real wants of these classes. Some of the benevolent workers of our churches are in possession of much information ; but the attempt is not often made to systematize the knowledge so gained in such a manner that intelligent and concerted action may be based upon it. Such a work as that of Dr. Dugdale's on "The Jukes," or such a study of human conditions and tendencies as that contained in the first chapters of Professor Walker's book on "The Wages Question," would afford some valuable hints to any Christian man who wants to do good as he has opportunity. I have mentioned two books out of hundreds that might be quoted. The literature of these and related topics is already large and rich : from all these fields of inquiry, busy hands have been gathering and classifying the facts of human life. Those Christians who desire to know what the fields are that they are called to cultivate, and with what sort of growths they are filled, and what kind of harvests are ripening in them, cannot afford to neglect the means of informa-

tion put within their reach by students of social science.

Second. We may gain from the suggestions of Social Science some useful hints as to methods of work.

1. One great part of our duty as Christians respects the care of the poor. We have them always with us, and whensoever we will, as the Master said, we may do them good, — if we know how. But it is a very delicate and difficult business, and it is quite as easy, even for those who have the best intentions, to do harm as good. And, after a somewhat careful study of the whole subject, I have no hesitation in saying that, until within the last few years, the Christian churches of this country, in the distribution of what they call their charities, have done more harm than good. They have found and relieved some cases of actual want, and it would have been a great pity if these cases had not been found and relieved; but in doing this they have bred paupers by the thousand; by their careless and unquestioning doles they have paved the way for whole families to enter the steep and slimy path of beggary; they have aided and abetted parents in training up their children for mendicancy and crime. The physical degradation and the moral mischief that have resulted from the practice of indiscrimi-

nate giving at the doors, and from the overlapping of church charities, could not easily be computed.

The philanthropic sentiment has been well developed in our churches: the readiness to give money is proof of this. There is no difficulty in securing money enough for the relief of any case of actual suffering. And the feeling is common among Christian people that the giving of money to those who ask for it is a meritorious act, no matter whether it does them harm or good. If we suppose that they need it, and give it with the purpose of doing them good, then we get the blessing promised to the givers: if they make a bad use of it, that is no fault of ours. Now this reasoning is plausible, but it is nevertheless unsound. Suppose it turns out to be true that the money thus bestowed by us is a source of moral injury to those who have received it, have we any right to go on in this way getting blessings for ourselves at the cost of the souls of our fellows? No: our duty is to take all reasonable pains before we bestow money or material aid on persons unknown or but slightly known to us, to find out whether they are likely to be benefited or injured by that which we propose to give. We may be deceived, after having diligently endeavored to find out the truth: if we are, we

may fall back on our good purposes. But this way of earning Paradise for ourselves by careless and lazy largesses that tend to corrupt and destroy our fellow-men is not to be commended. I have heard of paving the way to hell with good intentions; but it is hardly Christian for us to furnish such material for a pavement over which our neighbors shall walk down that way. The need of studying the methods of charity, of learning *how* to do good to the poor, as we have opportunity, is one of the needs of the hour in our Christian work. In solving this question the men and women who are studying the phenomena of crime and pauperism can give us most valuable aid. They can tell us some painful stories of the results of indiscriminating giving; and they can furnish us some practical suggestions as to the methods of charitable work. And I think we shall see, when we begin to look into this branch of our study, that the relation between Christianity and Social Science is very far from unfriendly. For, as a matter of fact, the latest and most emphatic word that has come from the students of Social Science respecting this problem is simply this, — that what the poor need most is not money, nor food, nor better drainage, nor better tenements, but friendship; that the one important thing to do for them is to furnish each family

with a wise, faithful, patient, strong willed friend, who shall teach and direct and inspire and cheer them in the ways of self-respecting industry and self-restraining prudence. That is counsel with which as Christians we cannot quarrel, and to the putting in practice of which we ought to spring with all our energies.

2. On many other practical questions with which we are called to deal in our Christian work some light is thrown by the studies of the Social Scientists: how to deal with drunkenness is one of these. We have been rather prone to say of intemperance what Dr. Emmons said of the Roman Catholic faith, that it is an "ultimate fact;" but much of the recent study of its phenomena leads toward the conclusion that it is quite as often an effect as a cause. It is generally assumed that intemperance bears to all other vices a seminal relation — that men are led into other vices through intemperance. That this is often true will not be doubted by any; but so far as any careful investigation of the facts has been made, the indications are that intemperance is quite as apt to be the child as the parent of other vice. It seems to be true that there are fully as many cases in which impurity leads to inebriety, as there are in which inebriety leads to impurity. And when we come to investigate the relation of these two

vices to other crimes, some rather unexpected conclusions are reached. Mr. Carroll D. Wright, the chief of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics, a gentleman better informed on these topics, probably, than any other in that commonwealth, and, withal, a very earnest and radical temperance man, has expressed the opinion that, if you reckon out the crimes against chastity and the liquor crimes, and consider the remaining crimes, more of these will be found to have been caused by licentiousness than by drunkenness. I do not vouch for this conclusion, but I think it not improbable. And whatever may be the relation of inebriety to crime, one thing is certain: it is, in the great majority of cases, the result of certain morbid physical and mental conditions. "Investigation," says Dr. Dugdale, "tends to show that certain diseases and mental disorders precede the appetite for stimulants, and that the true cause of their use is the antecedent hereditary or induced physical exhaustion: the remedy being healthy, well balanced constitutions."

All this does not show that intemperance is not an evil, nor does it encourage us in relaxing our efforts to eradicate the evil; but it may lead us to adopt in our teaching more discriminating forms of statement; to be a little less confident in our assertion that it is so much

greater than all the other evils to which humanity is heir that they are dwarfed in the comparison ; and so, perhaps, to adjust our measures of dealing with it to a broader and sounder philosophy.

Third. Another great service which Social Science is able to render Christianity is the elucidation of some of the more important truths of theology. Social Science is, as we have seen, the science of human welfare, and the facts on which it is based are the facts of human history. The laws which it formulates by the comparison of these facts are therefore the laws of human nature. The tendencies which it discovers in the moral and in the social life of men are tendencies resulting from the nature of man in his present environment. These facts and laws and tendencies are therefore the very stuff out of which that part of theology which we call anthropology is constructed. The Bible gives us an account of those matters ; but the biblical account does not invent or create the facts, it simply reports them. What the Bible tells us about men can be verified by our study of the phenomena of human nature. A large and fair induction of observed facts must give us substantially the same theory of man that the Bible gives us. We say that the Bible is a revelation, and so it is. But what does this revelation reveal ?

1. It reveals, first, the truth about God, and his nature and purposes, much of which is beyond our knowledge. But it does not *originate* this truth about God. All this truth was true before a word of the Bible was written. It simply uncovers or discloses to the minds of men the truth about God and his purposes towards men.

2. The Bible also reveals much truth concerning man, the tendencies and principles of his nature; the kind of action that is habitual with him; the effects of such actions upon himself and the society in which he lives. The Bible does not originate this truth, it reveals or discloses it. It points out the facts and laws of human life. The facts and laws of human life that it points out are the very same facts that the Social Scientist is studying. And it is certainly conceivable that we may obtain much help in understanding the statements of the Bible in regard to these matters by studying the facts themselves. If we may be aided in understanding what the Bible tells us about the creation of the world by studying geology, then we may also be aided in understanding what the Bible tells us about the human race by studying men. If the Bible be true, it cannot contradict the facts of human life; should it seem to do so, it is either because our induction

of facts is incomplete, or because our understanding of the Bible is imperfect.

3. Upon one very important part of the revelation of the Bible these studies can throw but little light. Of the grace of God, and salvation by grace, Social Science can give us no satisfactory account. The realm of grace is the realm of the supernatural; it shows us a power above nature, descending upon nature, to restore order and health and peace.

4. But the Bible takes us also into the realm of law, and that realm of law into which it takes us is the realm in which we live and move and have our being. The moral law, as revealed in the Bible, is put into preceptive form; but that precept is only a generalization of the facts of human life. The moral law, contained in the Bible, was not then first enacted when it was written down in the words of the Bible. It was incorporated from the beginning into the order of nature.

Here is a machine, made to work in a certain way. With the machine go written directions as to the manner of using it. These you may call the law of the machine. If you obey this law the machine works smoothly and productively; if you disobey this law you not only get no product from it, you derange and disable it. But did the printed directions originate and

and establish the law of the machine? Would there have been no right way of working it if no directions had been printed? Certainly there would. The law of the machine is incorporated into the structure of the machine, and an expert mechanic, studying its parts and their adaptations, and testing it in actual use, could soon tell how it ought to be worked, and could supply directions to those desiring to use it. Precisely the same thing is true respecting the nature of man. Man is made to act in a certain way. When his powers are exercised according to this rule, the result is life and health and happiness; when they are not exercised according to this rule, the result is misery and disease and decay. This rule is revealed in the Bible, but it is also incorporated into the constitution of man, and is impressed on the environment in which man lives. The moral law, recorded in the Bible, has precisely the same relation to humanity and its environment that the printed directions for the working of the machine have to the machine. It does not announce a rule of conduct as something arbitrary or *ab extra*; it simply states the moral order in accordance with which man was made, and which he must follow in his conduct, if he would have health and peace. This moral order does not exist because the Bible formu-

lates it; the Bible formulates it because it exists. If it exists, then it is rational to study it not only where it is formulated but where it is. And if it is thus studied, with humility and docility — in the true scientific spirit — it will yield us valuable results — results that will confirm the moral teachings of the Bible.

Take one of the greatest generalizations of the Bible: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." This law was given by Moses, but with a limited meaning: it was repeated by Christ with a universal meaning. The new definition of the word "neighbor" makes it a new law. But did this law then begin to be the rule of life for man when Christ first spoke it? No: it was incorporated into the nature of man at his creation. Men are so made that if they would secure for themselves as individuals and for the society in which they live, perfection and blessedness, they must obey this law. It is, therefore, a law which experience will verify. And as men gather and compare and classify the results of their experience, they find that just to the extent of their obedience to this law have they secured their own individual and social welfare. Health and happiness have followed obedience of this law: disorder and misery have resulted from the disobedience of it. That it will be perfectly obeyed in the

perfect society of the future is now recognized as a scientific certainty.

Let me justify my last remark. Mr. Herbert Spencer gives us in his "Data of Ethics" the results of an elaborate investigation into the foundations of morality. This investigation is made, of course, with no regard whatever for the teachings of the New Testament: it is an examination of the facts and laws of human nature, nothing else. And although his reasonings are by no means always to be accepted, yet when he comes to his practical rule of morality he gives us an exact restatement of the Christian law. In those chapters on the relations of Egoism and Altruism, Mr. Spencer proves, first, that unqualified egoism is self-destructive; second, that unqualified altruism is equally self-destructive, — even under the utilitarian form of the greatest happiness principle; so that the maxim "Live for self," and the maxim "Live for others," are equally irrational as rules of life; third, that the only right principle is a combination of egoism and altruism. "Self-sacrifice," he says, "is no less primordial than self-preservation." "Egoism and altruism are co-essential." What is this but the statement in philosophic phrase of Christ's own law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" — a command that enjoins a

rational self-love, and makes that the measure of our love for our neighbor? The most distinguished living sociologist, studying human beings in their social relations, and interrogating experience to find the right rule for their guidance, reaches, after much careful study, the very law laid down by Jesus Christ nineteen hundred years ago. It would seem that Mr. Spencer might have recognized this fact a little more distinctly. His grudging admission, at the end of his argument, that the result to which he has come is "a rationalized version of the ethical principles of the current creed," does him small credit. But however reluctant he may be to concede to the Great Teacher the honor that belongs to Him, the fact remains that he by his scientific studies has simply verified Christ's law.

5. If this greatest of generalizations can be verified by the study of the phenomena of human life, there is much encouragement for the prosecution of such studies. For not only can we gain from such studies a verification of the precepts of the moral law, we can also see the working of its penalties. If the precept is wrought into the moral order, so also is the penalty. The effects of disobedience are exhibited before our eyes. The terrible reactions of sin upon the character, its disorganizing and

destructive work in society — these are the very facts with which social science is dealing. If you want to know what is meant by the Scripture which says, “The soul that sinneth, it shall die,” go out with these philanthropists and study the condition of some of the poor creatures who by long courses of transgression have debauched their bodies, wasted their mental energies, paralyzed their moral powers, until corruption has invaded every part of their natures — until the awful gangrene of sin is eating them up — and the life that they are living is a living death. If you want to know what hell is, there are men who can show you. For not only is it true that good men get in this life the substance of the things they hope for, it is also true that bad men get in this life the substance of the things they are to expect; and the fearful looking-for of judgment becomes a fearful realization of judgment. Hells there are on earth — not shadows, but realities — where all that makes hell fearful, the hate, the bestiality, the spreading leprosy of vileness, fill our senses and our souls with unutterable horror.

Now I believe that any man who will study human nature in the misery and ruin which sin has brought into the world will gain in that way some clear knowledge of the doctrine of

retribution. There is much dispute about what the Bible teaches concerning retribution: why not study the retributive laws themselves, as they are doing their deadly work before our eyes? I do not think any man can understand this subject who does not constantly compare the biblical statements with the facts which they describe. It is conceded by all that there is much in the biblical teaching on this subject that is figurative: all about us are the literal facts, working themselves out in the daily lives of men. There is the great fact of heredity; men have taken the poetical statements of the Bible concerning it, and have deduced from them doctrines that seem to impugn the divine justice — doctrines that many refuse to accept; but, doubtless, these statements mean something. What do they mean? The social scientists can tell you.

I cannot dwell upon this branch of my subject any longer, fruitful though it is. But any one can see that if the human nature with which Social Science deals is the same human nature that is described in the Bible, then the doctrine of man found in the Bible may, if true, be verified by careful study in the fields of social science. And it would seem clear that this science ought to be cultivated not only by those Christians who are engaged in benevolent work,

but also by students of Christian doctrine, and that it ought to have an important place in the teaching of every theological seminary.

For considering the inquiry, What help may Social Science gain from Christianity? very little space is left. Yet I am quite sure that Sociology needs the infusion of Christian ideas and influences quite as much as Christianity needs the help that Sociology is able to give.

1. There are certain important practical aids which those Social Scientists who are at the same time philanthropists may derive from Christianity. The people among whom their studies are pursued, in behalf of whom their labors are undertaken, differ in many things, but they are alike in this — that they need, more than anything else, a moral invigoration. Their greatest defect is a defect of character. What Cassius said applies to most of them, —

The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
But in ourselves, that we are underlings.

Something can be done for them by improving the environment, but after all it is the man who needs mending more than the environment. The need of rousing, in some way, the dormant self-respect, the flagging energy, — this is the great need. I have already referred to the conclusion lately reached by some of those most

experienced in the study of pauperism — that friendship is the thing most needed by those who are sinking toward mendicancy. Material aid is, in the vast majority of cases, the very thing they ought not to have. Moral aid is what they want. The stimulus and quickening of a sound, vigorous, hopeful, loving nature brought into immediate contact with their own is the medicine they need. They ought to have a better environment — better drainage, better ventilation, better food, of course; but they ought to get them for themselves. The thing to be desired is the impartation to them of a force or an impulse that shall stir them up to get these things for themselves. This, I say, is the last word of Social Science respecting work among the pauperized classes; and, in uttering this word, Social Science has admitted the substantial truth of the proposition that I am now urging. It is a distinct recognition of the truth that the deepest needs of man are moral needs, and that the strongest forces for his elevation are moral forces. And this is the principle on which Christianity rests. The kind of work for which Social Science thus calls is the very kind of work that Christianity is organized to do. Do you say that the proper work of Christianity is to evangelize these degraded people? Yes: but they are best evangelized by living epistles.

The gospel incarnated in wholesome, happy, earnest, loving lives, and thus brought into living contact with them in their homes, is most likely to be the power of God unto salvation. This is, indeed, the very method of the gospel. No man is a Christian who has not received of his fullness of whom it was said, "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." And the grace that is freely received is freely given. From one life to another, by subtlest channels of sympathy, flow the regenerating influences. The new method of charity is, therefore, the very essence of Christianity. And it is a good sign that the importance of this kind of work is coming to be recognized by practical philanthropists. A great deal of cheap sarcasm has been expended by certain shallow persons on the kind of benevolence which is content with bestowing good advice and spiritual consolation upon the poor, instead of shoes and coal and potatoes; and it may, indeed, be true that penurious hypocrisy sometimes takes this mask; but, after all, the physical wants of the poor are not their deepest wants; and the method of Him who said, "Thy sins be forgiven thee," before He said, "Arise and walk," is the philosophical method. The great thing to do is to get at the hearts of these people, to kindle in them the flame of a holy energy, to arouse in them

what Professor Shairp calls the "moral motive power."

For the kindling of this flame in the hearts of these miserable people, the best torch is hope. In the hearts of most of them hope burns faintly; some of them are down in the depths of poverty or disgrace; the fates seem to be against them; others esteem themselves rejected of men; others seem to themselves to be in hopeless slavery to their own appetites or infirmities. If only in some way the principle of hope could be strengthened in them, the battle would be half won. All those who have tried to lift up these fallen ones know how hard it is to overcome the dead weight of apathy and discouragement that holds them down. Now the torch of hope is the light that Christianity carries into all these dark places. "We are saved by hope," Paul says, — all of us. It is the hope set before us in the gospel that at first allures us all. We all need its quickening influence, and those who have sunk the lowest need it most. It is the very message for these poor people — the good news, the promise of peace and power, of liberty and joy. Christianity goes down to these people in their deepest degradation proclaiming freedom to the captives, and the opening of the prison doors to the bond-slaves of sin; offering to these children of wrath

and woe power to become the sons of God; opening to all glimpses of a glory yet to be revealed in the life beyond, brighter than all their fairest fancies, — in a land of rest and plenty and pure delight. It is by this glorious hope that the dull souls of many of these unhappy children of earth are stirred, and that they are led into the ways of virtue. The knowledge that some one loves them; the good news that God loves them; the hope of a better day held up before them, — these are the most potent forces to elevate and save them. And those who study the ways of doing good to these hapless multitudes make a capital mistake when they ignore the mighty influences having their source in the gospel of Jesus Christ.

2. We saw that Christianity had need of the help of Sociology in the shaping of its methods, and also in the framing of its theories. We have now seen that Sociology needs the aid of Christianity in shaping its methods. Does it also need the same aid in the fashioning of its theories? It seems clear to me that this is its most manifest need. The one thing needful for Sociology as a science is to be suffused with Christian ideas and sentiments. Without this transforming influence it is in danger of becoming shallow and heartless, of dealing with its subjects from a stand-point purely materialistic

and mechanical, and thus of utterly failing to serve mankind. I cannot now enlarge upon this topic: I can only say that students of Social Science need to keep always before their minds the Christian estimate of human nature. The sacredness and value of a man — the fact of his Divine parentage, and of the great possibilities bound up in him — these are thoughts that those who pursue these studies ought to come back to often, lest they become entangled in the network of material causes. There is a tendency to carry the methods and the maxims of physical science into this realm; and to make Biology not merely the analogue of Sociology, but identical with it; thus confining the attention to physical forces, and putting all the stress on physical remedies. To correct this aberration the Christian teaching respecting the spiritual nature of man needs to be steadily held in mind.

3. But chiefly is the intervention of Christian ideas needed in that branch of Social Science which deals with the production and distribution of wealth, — the science of Political Economy. The “dismal science,” some one has named it; and verily, as often taught, it is dismal enough; not only because of the perplexities that environ it, but also and chiefly because of the selfishness of its maxims and

the inhumanity of its conclusions. Mr. John Rae is right when he says that "the operation of the laws of political economy is sometimes represented as if it were morally as neutral as the law of gravitation." The law of supply and demand, the principles of competition, are exalted as if they were supreme over all conduct; and when we see them working misery and ruin before our faces, we are exhorted to let it all alone; it is the operation of nature and must not be interfered with. The operation of nature it is, no doubt; but of a fallen and disordered nature, that constantly needs restraining.

The current Political Economy has insisted on treating labor — that is, the laborer — as a commodity: it has discussed him just as if he were a bag of wheat or a bushel of coal. It has excluded all moral considerations from its reasonings about him: it has recognized no rights or interests that equal competition will not secure. Yet the fact stares us in the face that there is no such thing as equal competition: that under such competition as exists, masses of laborers are continually pushed to the wall, trodden down into a condition of feebleness and hopelessness from which they cannot rise. Says Mr. Rae: —

To treat the labor contract as a simple exchange

between equals is absurd. The laborer must sell his labor or starve, and may be obliged to take such terms for it as leave him without the means of enjoying the rights which society awards him, and discharging the duties which society claims from him. Look on him as a ware, if you will; but remember that he is a ware that has life, that has connections, responsibilities, expectations, domestic, social, political. To get his bread he might sell his freedom, but society will not permit him; he may sell his health, he may sell his character, for society permits that; he may go to sea in rotten ships and be sent to work in unwholesome workshops; he may be herded in farm bothies where the commonest decencies of life cannot be preserved; and he may suck the strength out of posterity by putting his children to premature toil, to eke out his precarious living. Transactions which have such direct bearings on freedom, on health, on morals, on the permanent well-being of the nation, can never be morally indifferent. They are necessarily within the sphere of ends and ideals. Their ethical side is one of their most important ones, and the science that deals with them is therefore ethical.¹

This is exactly the lesson which this branch of Social Science needs to have enforced upon it continually. We have had quite too much of the speculation about wealth that leaves moral and humane considerations wholly on one side;

¹ *Contemporary Socialism*, p. 213.

the effect of such speculations on public opinion and on legislation is injurious in the extreme; the practical result of such a divorce between economics and ethics must always be mischievous. They are things that God has joined together; let not man put them asunder. Happily there has arisen a school of economists in these latter days — men like Wilhelm Roscher of Germany, and our own Francis A. Walker of Massachusetts — who insist on infusing into the “dismal science” some elements of humanity; who agree with that fine saying of Emerson — a saying that reflects the light that shines from every page of the New Testament — “The best political economy is the care and culture of men.”

I have thus sought to define Christianity and Social Science; to indicate the near relation between them; to show how the disciples of each may profit by a sympathetic study of the other. As Mr. Mulford declares in “The Republic of God”: —

In science, as the knowledge of the process of the physical world [and not less as the knowledge of the evolution of society] there is discovery — in that form a revelation of that which is actual; and science in its furthest advance becomes the stronger ally of this revelation of God. The contest of each is with vice and crime, with the manias and fevers that shat-

ter men, with the slavery of the world, and the forces which tend to the division and degradation of humanity.¹

When the true Republic of God shall be finally established among men, Christianity and Social Science will be no more twain, but one.

¹ Page 98.

CHRISTIANITY AND POPULAR AMUSEMENTS.



THE historical relation of Christianity to popular amusements is one of antagonism. The philosophy of the church respecting the whole subject may be summed up in the cynical counsel of Douglas Jerrold to persons about to marry, "Don't!" There have been contrary voices, and not a little practical dissent has found expression; but the tenor of the ecclesiastical utterances respecting amusements has been prohibitory, not to say objurgatory. In some of the sects a less stringent doctrine has been taught; but it is not very long since the average Protestant church-member took no diversion without some compunctions or questionings of conscience.

Doubtless this inveterate hostility to amusements of all sorts is partly traditional, a survival of that wholesome horror and righteous enmity with which the first Christians resisted the

amusements in vogue throughout the Roman Empire. The frightful debaucheries and cruelties which constituted the sports of the Romans merited the holy indignation with which the disciples of the early days denounced them. The conflict of Christianity with heathenism began in this very arena. One of the broad lines of distinction which the Christians drew between themselves and their pagan neighbors was their refusal to attend the Roman games. When we know that the best actor was the one who could behave the most obscenely; that the chariot races at the circus, where there were seats for three hundred and eighty-five thousand spectators, were deemed most successful when horses and men were killed in the contest; that the spectacles at the amphitheatre derived all their relish from the butchery of gladiators by scores and hundreds in their battles with wild beasts and with one another; that the public executions also offered a delectable entertainment for the populace, the condemned sometimes appearing "in garments interwoven with threads of gold, and with crowns on their heads, when suddenly flames burst from their clothing and consumed them," all for the amusement of the people, — we are not disposed to find fault with the protest of the early Christians against the popular diversions.

“Bread and games!” was the cry of the Roman populace. “Work and prayer!” was the watchword of the Christians. Against the indolence and savage frivolity of the people about them, they lifted up their standard of industry and soberness. It was a great conflict on which they thus entered; and there was small opportunity for compromise or discrimination. The sentiments and maxims which had their origin in this early warfare have been perpetuated in the Church, and the judgments of the early Christians upon popular amusements have been repeated in modern times against sports altogether different from those of Rome in the first century.

At the time of the Reformation in England, the hostility of the Puritans to popular amusements was even more bitter than that of the early Christians to the Roman games, though the reasons for this hostility were much less cogent. Doubtless there was good cause to protest against the roystering sports of that period. The desecration of the Lord’s Day by noisy and wanton pastimes was common everywhere, and this called forth their loudest protest. But when they entered upon their crusade against the diversions of the people, they became so extravagant in their judgments, including in their denunciations so many harmless things

and failing so utterly to preserve any moral perspective in their teachings, that they never could have carried with them the consciences of intelligent persons. Those who were trained in their own households and who were subjected to the strenuous pressure of their public opinion could be brought to adopt their theories. By an educational process as careful and insistent as that, for example, to which John Stuart Mill was subjected, a child can be made to believe or to disbelieve almost anything. By such rigid training the Puritans did create in the minds that were brought under their influence the strong belief that every species of amusement was sinful; and this theory they enforced with all the fervor of religious enthusiasm, and, when they were able, by all the power of the State. But it was only from those who had been subjected from childhood to the pressure of this intense philosophy that any steady conformity to its rules could be expected. Nature and reason were against it. The utter disproportion of its judgments must soon become evident. The moralist to whom the dancing of the boys and girls around the May-pole on the village green is a "horrible vice"; who cries out, with old Stubbes, "Give over your occupations, you pipers, you fiddlers, you musicians, you tabretters, and you fluters, and all other of

that wicked brood," holding that "sweet music at the first delighteth the ears, but afterward corrupteth and depraveth the mind;" who damns the simplest and most wholesome sports quite as roundly as the worst debaucheries, — will soon find himself speaking to a limited audience. If it be true, as Knight tells us, that "drinking, dicing, bear-baiting, cock-fighting — the coarsest temptations to profligacy — were not such abominations in the eyes of the Puritans as "stage plays, interludes, and comedies," then the Puritans ought to have lost their influence with the English people.

Macaulay's remark that the Puritans opposed bear-baiting less because it gave pain to the bear than because it gave pleasure to the spectators, has often been quoted as an example of his vicious fondness for antithesis; but it is by no means clear that the cynicism lacks justice. Many a Puritan did think merriment a worse sin than cruelty to animals. The story of the Highlander who reported that he saw, on the Sabbath, men and women walking along the streets of Edinburgh, and "smiling as if they were perfectly happy," adding, "It was an awfu' sight!" illustrates the view of life which was taken by the more strenuous Puritans. Knight says that the Judicious Hooker's statement about the Anabaptists was indirectly

pointed at them: "Every word otherwise than severely and sadly uttered seemed to pierce like a sword through them. If any man were pleasant, their manner was fervently with sighs to repeat those words of our Saviour Christ, 'Woe be to you which now laugh, for ye shall lament.' "

That this overstrained asceticism of the Puritans was excusable, in view of the excesses against which they testified, may be freely admitted; albeit the reveling Cavaliers might doubtless claim some similar mitigation of their condemnation, in view of the rigors of the Roundheads. Each party was driven into worse extremes by the extravagances of the other. The philosophy of life which underlay the Puritan regimen has given way slowly. Down to the present generation it has been the received doctrine in most of the reformed churches, that all "worldly pleasures" ought to be eschewed. If personal testimony may be offered, the writer remembers very well that, when a boy of twelve, he mentally debated the question of conversion, under the impression that the change involved the sacrifice of base-ball, and base-ball was then an innocent game. This impression was gained in the religious services upon which he was a constant attendant. It is true that at that time, and long before, members of

churches did engage to some extent in sport and merriment, but generally under some protest of conscience, and with the feeling that the indulgence was a charge against their piety. The ideal Christian of the reformed churches was a man who had no use for any kind of diversion, and whose neighbors would have been shocked if they had seen him unbending in a merry game. The only enjoyment deemed strictly legitimate for the eminent saint was religious rapture — the “awful mirth” described by Dr. Watts in his psalms. It was the implicit, if not the avowed, doctrine of the Church that all kinds of diversions were substitutes for this holy ecstacy, and as such sinful. It was said, indeed, in sermons and in songs, that

“ Religion never was designed
To make our pleasures less : ”

but by this was meant that the pleasure to be found in prayer and meditation, and in the anticipation of heaven, was superior to the “worldly” pleasures abandoned; not that the common diversions of life could themselves be continued and sanctified. The time is within the memory of many of those who will read this essay, when ministers first began to say frequently and freely that a long face and an ascetic habit were not signs of saintliness. Those who were so bold as to make these as-

sertions in the pulpit were regarded at first as somewhat erratic ; it was not easy for the average Christian to comprehend that a genuine piety could consist with cheery manners and a hearty joy in the good things of this life.

Out of this traditional estimate of the nature of religion, and its relation to what is known as the secular life, came the maxims which the Church for many years applied to amusement. It is needless to say that these maxims are obsolete. In this case, at any rate, prohibition has not prohibited. The parson, with the pitchfork of excommunication, has not prevailed over nature. The rigorous rule of the Puritan, long enforced by the most tremendous motives, is utterly broken, and will not in our day be restored.

Failing to prohibit, the Church has now for some time undertaken to regulate amusements by drawing the line between the clean and the unclean. Certain diversions have been allowed, and certain others forbidden. Much casuistry of a dubious sort has been expended on this discussion ; the questions whether dancing is sinful, and whether billiards are worse than croquet, and whether cards are always an abomination, and whether church-members ought to be disciplined for attending the theatre or the opera, have been widely and hotly debated ;

most of us have had a hand in the threshing of this chaff. Whether these controversies have aided greatly in the formation of a sound public opinion on this subject may well be doubted; the grounds on which the permission of some amusements and the prohibition of others have been rested are often inconsistent and irrational; and the Church would be far wiser to give over these questions of casuistry, and insist upon a few general principles, such as these:—

1. Amusement is not an end, but a means—a means of refreshing the mind and replenishing the strength of the body; when it begins to be the principal thing for which one lives, or when, in pursuing it, the mental powers are enfeebled and the bodily health impaired, it falls under just condemnation.

2. Amusements that consume the hours which ought to be sacred to sleep are, therefore, censurable.

3. Amusements that call us away from work which we are bound to do are pernicious, just to the extent to which they cause us to be neglectful or unfaithful.

4. Amusements that rouse or stimulate morbid appetites or unlawful passions, or that cause us to be restless or discontented, are always to be avoided.

5. Any indulgence in amusement which has

a tendency to weaken our respect for the great interests of character, or to loosen our hold on the eternal verities of the spiritual realm, is, so far forth, a damage to us.

These principles will apply to all kinds of amusements, but the application must be made by individuals. ✓ Parents must reduce these principles to rules for the guidance of their children, for the power to comprehend and use principles is only gradually gained; children do not always possess it; authority rather than reason must often be their guide. But the Church must use reason rather than authority; and the pulpit can do no better than faithfully to enforce some such general maxims as I have suggested. Whatever the Church can do in the regulation of amusements, can best be done by this method.

But is this all that the Church has to do with the amusements of the people? Is its function fulfilled, in this important realm of human conduct, by repressing or regulating the diversions of the people, — by preventing excess and abuse? Has the Church no positive duties to perform in providing popular amusement?

Let me say at the outset that the churches are doing already all that they ought to do in the way of furnishing amusements of various kinds in connection with their own organiza-

tions and in their own houses of worship. The church sociable has become a recognized institution; and, in spite of certain scandalous reports, its influence, on the whole, has been salutary. It is certain, however, that the churches have gone fully as far in this direction as it is safe for them to go. It is not the business of the Church to organize dramatic troupes or minstrel companies for the amusement of the people in its own edifice. The proper function of the Church is that of teaching and moral influence; and when it goes extensively into the show business, it is apt to lose its hold upon the more serious interests with which it is charged. The duty of the Church, with respect to the provision and direction of popular amusements, will be discharged, if at all, as its duty to the unfortunates of the community is discharged, — by inspiring and forming outside agencies to do this very thing. The hospitals and the asylums are the work of the Church; but it is neither economical nor desirable that each church should undertake to provide in connection with its own edifice, and under the care of its own officers, a hospital, an asylum for the insane, and a home for the friendless. When it is said that the Church ought to provide wholesome diversions for the people, it is meant, therefore, that the Church ought to stir up the intelligent

and benevolent men and women under its influence to attend to this matter, and ought to make them feel that this is one of the duties resting on them as Christians. And the question now before us is whether any such obligation as this is now resting on the Church; whether this is a field which Christian philanthropy can and should enter and cultivate. In answering this question several considerations must be borne in mind.

1. Popular amusement is a great fact. A large share of the people are seeking amusement of one sort or another continually. In every city or considerable town the opera-houses, the concert-halls, the rinks, the museums, the beer-gardens, as well as many lower and less reputable places of diversion, are always open and generally well patronized. It is probable that more persons attend places of amusement than attend church; or, rather, that there is a larger number of persons in almost any large town or city who seldom or never attend any place of worship, than of those who seldom or never visit any place of amusement. The places of amusement are generally open six or seven days in the week, while most churches are open only two or three days. Even the poorest people, those who obtain but a meagre subsistence by their labor, and who often ap-

peal to their neighbors for charity, spend a good part of their scanty earnings for amusements. A family, known to the writer, that sold the last feather pillows in the house for money to go to the circus, is a type of a large class. Church-going is a luxury too expensive for multitudes who spend three times as much as a seat in church would cost on the theatre and the variety show.

2. The business of amusement constitutes a great financial interest. An army of men and women get their living by providing diversion for the people. Millions of dollars are invested in buildings, furniture, instruments, equipage, scenery, animals, vehicles, and appliances of all sorts, devoted to this purpose. Busy brains are all the while contriving new forms of diversion that shall prove attractive to the people and remunerative to their projectors. Large fortunes are made by successful managers; indeed, the capital of a millionaire is required for the handling of some of our great popular amusements. This liberal outlay and this enterprising provision involve a general and large expenditure of money on the part of the people. In one inland city of sixty thousand inhabitants there are two opera-houses. In each of these there is an average of five performances a week during the season, which lasts about forty weeks. Four hun-

dred performances a year, with average receipts of two hundred and fifty dollars, give us one hundred thousand dollars expended for amusements every year in these two houses — more than is paid for the support of all the Protestant churches in the city. A base-ball club in the same city received during the last season, for gate money, about twenty thousand dollars. Add all the money that was paid for diversions of various sorts at the other halls, and the rinks, and the public gardens of the city; all that was taken by several circuses and other outdoor shows; all that was devoted to billiards, and to dances, and to horse-races, and to a multitude of other amusements, more or less refined, — and it can be easily seen that the amusement bill of a city of this size must reach a formidable figure. Not counting the cost of drink or debauchery, which is not properly reckoned against amusements, — counting only the expense of what may be fairly classed among the diversions of the people, — we see that a large share of their earnings is devoted to this purpose. Complaint is sometimes made of the cost of education and of religious privileges; but it is safe to say that the people of this country spend every year for amusements more than they pay for their schools, and three times as much as they pay for their churches.

3. Amusement is not only a great fact and a great business interest, it is also a great factor in the development of the national character. If a wise philanthropist could choose between making the laws of any people and furnishing their amusements, it would not take him long to decide. The robust virtues are nurtured under the discipline of work; if the diversions can be kept healthful, a sound national life will be developed. The ideals of the people are shaped, and their sentiments formed, to a large extent, by popular amusements. It is claimed that the drama renders important service to public morality in this direction; but the claim can hardly be allowed. A careful collection and analysis, by a well-known clergyman, of the plays produced at the leading theatres of Chicago during a given period clearly indicated that the actual drama is far from being a great teacher of morality. Doubtless many plays are produced whose moral lesson is helpful and stimulating; but it cannot be claimed that the preponderance of the influence of the drama is on the side of virtue. It is conceivable that the drama might be a great friend of morality; it is possible that it will be one day; it is undeniable that there are a few noble men and women now upon the stage who are doing what they can to lift up its standards; it is not nec-

essary to indulge in any sweeping censures when we speak of it; but it is quite clear that this form of popular amusement, as at present administered, tends to the degradation rather than the elevation of the people. It is not only nor chiefly by the questionable morality of many of the plays that this injury is done; it is by their flippancy, their silliness, their sensationalism, their unreality. Their effect upon the intellect is like that produced by the reading of the most trashy novels, only more debilitating. So far as the drama is concerned, therefore, I fear that it must be said that the net result of its influence upon the national character is injurious rather than beneficial. And the same thing must be said of popular amusements in general, as at present organized and conducted. Although the people receive much wholesome refreshment and innocent pleasure from the diversions now provided for them, yet the effect of these amusements, as a whole, upon their minds and their morals and their physical health, is not salutary. I am not inclined to pessimism on this or any other subject, and I am able to look without horror on many diversions commonly regarded as wholly pernicious: yet careful observation of the effect of the popular amusements upon the people at large leads me to believe that the balance of their influ-

ence is on the side of injury. They are a great factor in the life of the people, but their product, on the whole, is evil; they do much good, but more harm.

4. Seeing that amusement is so large an element in the life of the people, seeing that it lays so heavy a tax on their resources and affects their character so powerfully, the questions naturally arise: How is it managed? By whom is it furnished? How much of intelligence and of philanthropic purpose enters into the plans of those who provide the amusements of the people?

Concerning the class of persons who devote their lives to the business of amusing the people, it is not best to make any unqualified statements. Among them are many who are exemplary in their conduct, and who would never engage in any enterprise the tendency of which would be immoral or degrading. But if what has been said is true, that the preponderance of the influence of the popular amusements is on the side of evil, then it is reasonable to conclude that the majority of those who furnish them are not persons of exalted character. As a matter of fact, the business of diverting the people is largely in the hands of men and women whose moral standards are low, whose habits are vicious, and whose influence upon those with

whom they come in contact must be evil. It is to people chiefly of this class that this most important interest of life is intrusted.

When we ask on what basis the business of amusement is conducted, the answer is that it rests almost wholly on a pecuniary basis. The main interest of those who furnish it is a pecuniary interest. The principle that regulates it is the principle of supply and demand; and this principle is interpreted, as we have seen, by persons who would not be likely to discover a demand for diversions of an elevating nature, if there were such a demand.

The question now arises whether this great interest of human life ought to be left to settle itself in this manner, by the law of supply and demand. It may be wise to allow the material interests of men to adjust themselves according to this law. But amusement is not one of the material interests of men. Man's need of amusement is one of the needs of his higher nature — his spirit, as well as of his body; his use of amusement affects his mind and his character directly and powerfully. And whatever may be said about the introduction of the principle of good-will into the business of producing and distributing commodities, there can be no question, when you enter the realm where those forces are at work by which character is pro-

duced, that the principle of good-will must come in, and must be allowed to rule. If this is true, the business of providing amusement for the people ought not to be merely or mainly a mercenary business; the intelligence, the conscience, and the benevolence of the community ought to recognize the realm of amusement as belonging to them, and ought to enter in and take possession.

Does the Church leave the religious wants of the community to be provided for under the law of supply and demand? Is it supposed that this matter will properly regulate itself; that the people will call for what they need and get it; that no care is to be exercised and no effort made to provide wise and safe religious teaching for them? By no means. It is assumed to be the function of the Church to provide Christian institutions and Christian instruction for the people; to spread the gospel feast before them and send forth the invitations to them, not to wait and see what they would like, and give them what they may ask for; not to leave this matter to be attended to by those who seek to make gain of godliness.

How is it with the intellectual wants of the community? Does the state leave these to be supplied under the economical law? Is it imagined that the people will get all the educa-

tion that they need if they are left to provide it for themselves, irregularly and spasmodically, according to their own notions of what they want? Not at all. The intelligence and philanthropy of the best citizens, expressing themselves in the laws of the state, provide education for the people, build school-houses, organize systems of education, employ teachers, offering thus to the public a large and wise and constant supply of one of their deepest needs. It may be said that the provision is only a response to the popular demand, but this is not true. The great motive power of education is not the cry of ignorance; it is the offer of intelligence. How is it in our homes? Is the education of our children the result of their call for learning, or of our constant and insistent proffer of learning to them? Here and there is a child that hungers for useful knowledge; but the great majority need to have this hunger created in them, and need to have it stimulated continually by a wise and patient presentation to them of the knowledge which we wish them to acquire. Thus all popular education proceeds, and has always proceeded, from an altruistic motive. The demand has been created by furnishing the supply; it is the intelligence, the conscience, the patriotism, the philanthropy of the best citizens — not always of the richest citizens

— that have taken this business of education in hand and managed it for the benefit of the whole people. A large part of the work of education — the work of school-boards, and trustees, and visitors — is done gratuitously. Philanthropy is not the sole motive in the work of education; the self-regarding motives have large scope among teachers as well as pupils; but the philanthropic element is an integral element in all our best educational work. Benevolence is one of the forces that keep the machinery in motion. Education deserves always to rank as one of the great missionary enterprises. The best reward of the faithful teacher is not his salary, but the consciousness that he is rendering a valuable service to those whom he instructs and to the state. When a prominent educator announced, not long ago, his purpose of abandoning his profession that he might devote himself to the getting of money, a murmur of indignant comment was heard from the noble fraternity of teachers. Among them are thousands who fully appreciate and adopt the saying of Professor Agassiz, that he had no time for money-making. If there are millions in the land to whom such a statement is incredible, and the man who makes it a hypocrite, this only indicates how deeply we have sunk into that abyss of mercantilism, wherein, as true

prophets are warning us, the best elements of our national life are fast disappearing. A sorry day it will be for this land when the work of education is wholly or mainly done for mercenary reasons.

← Now, amusement, like education and religion, is a real need of human beings — not so deep or vital a need as education or religion, but a real and constant need, and a need of the higher nature as well as of the lower ; an interest that closely concerns their characters ; and it is almost as great a mistake to leave it to take care of itself, and to be furnished mainly by those who wish to make money out of it, and who have no higher motive, as it would be to leave education or religion to be cared for in that way.

It is time that we begin to comprehend the idea that this is one of the great interests of human life which Christianity must claim and control — one of the kingdoms of the world which, according to the prophecy, are to “become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.” When these words are quoted, the thoughts of disciples are apt to fly off to Burmah and Siam and Timbuctoo ; these are the kingdoms of this world that are to be Christianized. Doubtless they are ; but the text ought to mean more than this. It should signify that

all the wide realms of human thought and action are to be brought under the sway of the King of righteousness; that the kingdom of industry, and the kingdom of traffic, and the kingdom of politics, and the kingdom of amusement are all to be made subject to his law; that all these great interests of men are to be brought under the empire of Christian ideas and Christian forces; that instead of standing aloof from them and reproving and upbraiding them, Christianity is to enter into them and pervade them and transform them by its own vital energy. The duty of the Church with respect to popular amusements is not done when it has lifted up its warning against the abuses that grow out of them, and laid down its laws of temperance and moderation in their use. It has a positive function to fulfill in furnishing diversions that shall be attractive, and, at the same time, pure and wholesome. This cannot be done, as we have seen, by the churches as churches, but it can be done by men and women into whom they breathe their spirit, and whom they fill with their intelligence and good-will.

When I say that it can be done, I speak of what I know and testify of what I have seen. The most remarkable success in the way of popular entertainment that I have ever witnessed

has been achieved along the line which I have just been pointing out. And inasmuch as an ounce of experience is worth a pound of theory, I can do no better than to tell the story of one successful experiment in this field.

The Cleveland Educational Bureau has closed its third season and issued its annual report. This enterprise owes its existence and its success to many men and women of good-will, who have heartily coöperated in sustaining it, but chiefly to the ingenuity and enthusiasm of Mr. Charles E. Bolton, its secretary and manager, to the literary skill and facility of Mrs. Bolton, and to the liberality of Mr. W. H. Doan, the treasurer, who owns and rents to the Bureau for a nominal price the People's Tabernacle, in which its work is done. The plan of operations is varied slightly from year to year, but the general design can be clearly indicated.

The "People's Tabernacle" is a plain but capacious assembly-room, built on leased land, and devoted to educational and religious purposes; it boasts few decorations, and not much upholstery; but it is clean, and well ventilated, and brilliantly lighted by electricity. A gallery runs around the hall, and the platform is pushed forward so near the centre that the audience of four thousand or forty-five hundred hears a distinct speaker without difficulty. The platform

is usually covered with a profusion of potted plants; and handsome bouquets of cut flowers in baskets and vases wait to be bestowed upon the performers at the end of the entertainment.

The manager describes his evening's programme as furnishing a "fourfold intellectual treat." Very little is said about diversion in connection with this enterprise; it is not called a bureau of amusement; it is an *educational* bureau. The appeal is wisely addressed to a higher principle than the mere craving for diversion; and the recreation is incidental and secondary, as it ought always to be. If the Bureau announced itself as a purveyor of amusement, it would not amuse the people half so successfully as it does. The play has a better relish when it is brought in as the sauce of a more solid intellectual repast. It is a high compliment to the working people of Cleveland that is paid by the managers in the invitation to devote ten of their Saturday evenings, every winter, to the exercises of an Educational Bureau. The magnificent success of the entertainment shows how well the compliment is deserved.

The "fourfold intellectual treat" begins usually at a quarter before seven, with an excellent orchestral concert. During this time the au-

dience is assembling, and by seven o'clock the building is packed to the walls. No reserved seats are sold: the motto is, "first come, first served." Early comers are not even allowed to reserve seats for their friends. A large force of neatly dressed ushers assists in seating the audience. No single tickets are sold before a quarter past seven; season-ticket holders have the exclusive right to the house up to that time.

The orchestral concert ends with a grand chorus by the entire audience, which rises and joins, under the lead of a precentor, with the orchestra, the organ, and a trained choir, in singing one of the national hymns.

Following this, at precisely a quarter past seven, is the "lecture-prelude," which is generally an off-hand address of half an hour on some scientific or practical subject. Among the topics treated in these lecture-preludes, I find these: "The Pyramids," "Architecture Illustrated," "Wonders of the House we Live In," "Microscopic Objects Magnified," "The Terminal Glacier, Illustrated," "Wrongs of Workmen and How to Right Them." Next is a "singing-school," in which a vigorous precentor, aided by the orchestra and the choir, leads the great congregation for ten or fifteen minutes in singing national hymns. The precentor drills

them finely, singing - master - fashion ; he tells them how he wants the piece sung, and gets them to sing it as he wishes ; he divides them into choirs, and makes them sing antiphonally ; they have the words and music in their hands, and are able to join, as most of them do, heartily in the great chorus.

After this comes the principal attraction of the evening, in the shape of popular lecture, dramatic reading, debate, or concert, which begins at eight o'clock precisely, and always closes promptly at half-past nine. Mr. Bolton himself has contributed several lectures of travel, finely illustrated with the stereopticon. A debate on Protection *vs.* Free Trade, between Professor W. G. Sumner and Professor Van Buren Denslow, filled one evening last winter, and aroused the deepest interest. Another debate, between Mrs. Livermore and Professor Denslow, on the question whether women ought to vote, closed the recent course with great *éclat*. It is safe for the manager to promise any speaker who has something worth saying a cordial and appreciative hearing.

During the last season, five illustrated lectures on the art of cooking were delivered by Miss Juliet Corson to an average audience of three thousand women. These lectures were free to the holders of season tickets ; the admis-

sion fee to those not members of the Bureau was fifteen cents, or fifty cents for the course. It is difficult to understand how Miss Corson could make herself intelligible to so large an audience, but we learn that her lectures were very successful, and that they were received with great enthusiasm. "Whole carcasses of animals," says the reporter, "were cut into suitable pieces on the platform, and all kinds of plain cooking were done."

The Bureau also furnished during the summer ten open-air evening concerts on the public square, which were enjoyed by many thousands of people.

Another important feature of the work is the circulation of useful literature. Each person who attends the winter's entertainments receives on every evening a little book in paper covers, printed by the Bureau for its members. Four thousand of these little books — a whole wagon-load — are distributed every evening. They are continuously paged, and the advertisements upon the fly-leaves can be removed for binding. At the close of the course a Cleveland binder puts the series of ten pamphlets into neat red muslin covers for thirty-five cents. Each pamphlet contains about forty pages, and is devoted to the popularization of science, or to some sort of useful information.

The series for 1882-83 includes a "Short History of Modern France;" a "Brief History of Science;" a "Sketch of the History of the United States;" "The Story of the Steam Engine;" an excellent little archæological essay on "Early Man," well illustrated; a series of brief biographies of "Great Artists;" a crisp and sensible essay on "Secrets of Success" (of which twenty-five thousand extra copies were distributed), and other similar matter. Each pamphlet contains also the national hymns sung by the great chorus on the evening of its distribution, and the programme for the evening.

For all this, how much are the patrons of the Bureau required to pay? The season ticket, which admits to the ten "fourfold entertainments" on successive Saturday evenings, comprising the ten orchestral concerts, the ten "singing-schools," the ten books, and the ten "special attractions" (popular lecture, elocutionary readings, debate, or grand concert), costs for this year one dollar and a quarter, or twelve and a half cents for each evening. These tickets also admit to the course of lectures by Miss Corson, and from the proceeds of their sale the summer evening concerts are provided.

In only one sense is the Bureau a gratuity. A great amount of unrewarded labor is performed in its behalf by the ladies and gentle-

men who are directly interested in its management; and many of those who take part in its entertainments volunteer their services. The "lecture-preludes" are generally given by gentlemen of the city or the vicinity, who are glad to serve the Bureau, and whose carefully prepared addresses have been highly appreciated by the audience. Most of the "special attractions," however, come from a distance and cost money. But the sale of more than four thousand season tickets pays the expenses of the Bureau, and leaves a balance in the treasury at the close of every season. The people get a great deal for their money, but they have the satisfaction of knowing that they pay for what they get — all but the good-will and kindly effort on their behalf put forth by their employers and their neighbors, which money will not buy.

I have spoken of the audience as composed mainly of workingmen and their families. The first year three thousand two hundred season tickets were sold in the shops of Cleveland. When the work was begun, Mr. Bolton visited all the great manufacturing establishments, obtained permission from the managers to have the men collected ten minutes before the stroke of twelve, and then, in a brief speech, explained to them his plan. Tickets were placed on sale

in the offices connected with the shops, the employers heartily coöperating. The interest of the mechanics was thus enlisted in the beginning, and although about four hundred school-teachers and a sprinkling of the dwellers on "Algonquin Avenue" may be counted in the evening audiences, they still consist, for the most part, of working people and their families. Mr. Bolton says that many of the mechanics carry their suppers to their shops on Saturdays, that they may be early at the Tabernacle in the evening. Few signs of this are visible from the platform, however; the audience seems to be clad in its Sunday clothes. It would be hard to find anywhere a company whose attire was neater, whose faces were brighter, whose behavior was more decorous, or whose appreciation of wit or eloquence was keener. It was my pleasure to look into the faces of these people for an hour and a half while two accomplished lady readers were entertaining them, and a more responsive audience I have rarely seen. It was an exquisite pleasure to sit and watch their movements, to note the eagerness with which they hung upon the lips of these gifted women, and the relish with which they listened to the interpretation of the masterpieces of English poetry and humor recited to them, and to feel the surges of

pure and strong emotion that swept over the throng and broke continually at my feet in a sympathetic sigh, or in happy and wholesome laughter. That it is an extremely well-behaved audience will be understood when I say that it has abolished encores and the pandemoniac practice of stamping the feet, and — *ecce signum!* — that it keeps its seat respectfully until the performance is concluded.

It was impossible not to reflect that a large share of these thousands would, if it were not for this Bureau, be spending their Saturday evenings in such places of amusement as might be open to them, admission to which would cost them three or four times as much as they pay at the Tabernacle; that the great majority of these would be places where their minds would be debauched and their morals damaged; where they would find a temporary excitement to be followed by disgust and ennui; where they would receive no wholesome impulses and gain no new thoughts; and where they would often have their prejudices roused and their hearts inflamed against their more prosperous neighbors; for the cheap theatre is one of the mouth-pieces of the communist and the pétroleuse. Now they are brought together in this great assembly, that is itself an inspiration, and, in its decorum, its self-restraint, and its good-na-

ture, an incarnate Gospel; good music charms their ears; a profusion of flowers on the platform delights their eyes; they join in the national songs, and their best emotions are aroused; they listen to the kindling words of poet or orator or teacher, and are instructed and quickened; they rejoice in this ample and admirable supply of one of their deepest wants, and recognize the benevolence that has devised it, and their hearts are filled with a kindlier feeling toward all their fellow-men. They go home sober, with all their week's earnings in their pockets, and a little book to read in which they will find something to divert and enlighten them; and they are much more likely to be found in church the next day than if they had spent the Saturday night in the beer-garden or at the variety show. A free gospel service is held in the Tabernacle every Sunday afternoon, and the attendance upon this service has greatly increased since the Educational Bureau was organized.

I have thus endeavored to set down a plain account of what seems to me a most wise and noble Christian enterprise. A charity it is not, in the ordinary acceptation of that word, and it is all the more charitable because it is not a charity, and because it pays its own expenses; but it is one of those effective applications of

Christianity to the social needs of men that we may expect to see becoming more and more common in the future. It is doubtful whether any revival services held in Cleveland during the winter help so efficiently in the Christianization of the people as do the entertainments given at the Tabernacle. Applied Christianity is what the world wants, and this is Christianity applied to one of the great interests of human life.

Whether Mr. Bolton's enterprise is indebted to any hint from Dr. Holland, I have not heard him say; but a multitude of readers have not forgotten the story of "Nicholas Minturn," nor the experiments of the hero in entertaining the people of the "Beggars' Paradise," in the "Athenæum." The fiction with which the name of Nicholas is connected is far less remarkable than the facts which I have just recited; the enterprise of the novel was undertaken in behalf of a more degraded class of persons; but the ideal of the story and the achievement of the Bureau are identical; both show us Christianity at work in the same field, turning the love of diversion into a pure channel and making it aid in the enlightenment and elevation of the people.

The fiction was plausible enough, but the accomplished fact admits of no gainsaying. What has been done in Cleveland can be done in every

city and large town in this country. The scheme may well be varied; the application of the principle calls for ingenuity and practical sense; methods that are successful in one city would need modification to fit them to the conditions of another; but the purpose is easily understood, and the main idea can be realized, with the expenditure of very little money, wherever there are men of good-will who will give to the enterprise the necessary thought and care. It cannot be done without work; nothing important is accomplished without large expenditure of time and effort; but it is work that brings in a large return.

Some of the conditions of success in such an enterprise may be readily named:

1. A large and cheerful hall. That the prices may be low, the audience must be large.

2. A capable manager. Enthusiasm, good temper, fertility of resource, and sympathy with the people are among his qualifications.

3. Variety in the entertainment, with no hitches or wearying pauses between the parts. The movement must be swift and sure.

4. Punctuality and business-like thoroughness in the management. Begin and end on the minute. Give exactly what you promise, or, if that be impossible, what will be recognized as a full equivalent.

An institution of this nature, wisely managed, would quickly prove itself to be a seminary of sacred and benign influences, and an agency more potent than many laws in the preservation of peace and the reformation of the public morals.

CHRISTIANITY AND POPULAR EDUCATION.

THE relation of Christianity to popular education is a parental relation. Christianity has always been the originator and promoter of education. Of the church, indeed, this must be said with some qualifications; for there have been periods when nothing in the world was more frightfully unchristian than the ecclesiastical machine. Christianity consists of the teachings of Christ, and of the life, individual and social, which is based upon his teachings and nourished by communion with Him. Christian truth and Christian life were in the world when the ecclesiastical powers were the most corrupt and malignant — hiding sometimes in the fastnesses of the mountains, and waiting for the downfall of their persecutors. Even in these days it is a mistake to identify Christianity with the various ecclesiastical machines; the Church often happens to be the very thing that needs Christianizing. If, therefore, it is

true that the Church at certain periods has shown scant favor to other than theological science, it is nevertheless true that the drift of Christian teaching and discipline has been toward the diffusion of learning.

The uniform testimony of the Sacred Scriptures is of this tenor. The value of knowledge is everywhere insisted on. It is, indeed, asserted that knowledge must rank below love; but if the Scriptures seem to disparage knowledge, it is the knowledge that despises virtue. Every careful reader of the Bible knows that the value of intelligence as the foundation of character and the solid basis of national welfare is taught with iteration and emphasis in both Testaments. Neither is the knowledge thus praised exclusively religious knowledge. The man of the Biblical history most renowned for his wisdom, and most applauded for his pursuit of wisdom, was not conspicuously a theologian, but a man who seems to have mastered what was knowable in his time of the "humanities." This wisdom of Solomon's did not keep him from falling into an abyss of sensuality; but the record does not intimate that his fall was the fruit of his learning; it was rather in spite of his learning. His wisdom is always commended and never censured. The Bible, the Christian's text-book, may be claimed as the friend of learning.

Even in the ages of darkness, when the Bible was not in the hands of the people, the churches and the monasteries kept alive what learning was left in the world. Through all this period the councils of the Church steadily required the clergy to provide gratuitous instruction for the young. Theodulph, one of Charlemagne's bishops, issued the following instruction to his clergy:—

Let the elders establish schools in towns and villages, and if any of the faithful wish to intrust to them their children to be taught letters, let them not decline to receive and teach them, but with the utmost care instruct them. And when they thus teach, let them take from them no recompense for their service, nor accept anything from them, except what parents, in the exercise of charity, of their own accord may offer them.

This epistle of Theodulph is a fair sample of numerous admonitions addressed during these times, by councils and dignitaries, to the inferior clergy. Charlemagne himself gave orders that schools be opened everywhere "to teach children to read," and that "in every monastery some one teach psalms, writing, arithmetic, and grammar." The great king's zeal for learning is noteworthy when it is remembered that his literary acquisitions stopped short with the art of reading, and left room for a dispute

among the historians as to his ability to write his name. The reasonings of his decree show how closely he connects learning and religion; he urges that, just as good conduct is prescribed by a definite rule, so also must teaching and learning be systematically carried on "that those who seek to please God by right living may not neglect to please Him also by right speaking."

The Reformation was itself at once the effect and the cause of a great revival of learning. Erasmus, the hero of the Renaissance, and Luther, the hero of the Reformation, were both apostles of the new education. The right of private judgment implied the necessity of the universal diffusion of knowledge, and both Luther and Melancthon wrought strenuously toward this end. The founders of New England, Protestants of the Protestants, by no means forgot this corollary of Protestantism; their history shows on every page how great was the estimation which they placed upon knowledge, and how close was its relation in their minds with religion. Within thirty years of the landing of the Pilgrims education had been made compulsory in every colony except Rhode Island, and this was done, as the law declared, chiefly with the purpose of circumventing "that old deluder Sathan," who seeks "to keep men from the use

of the Scriptures by persuading them from the use of tongues."

It is scarcely necessary to trace the close connection between the church and the school in the early New England commonwealths. From these came forth the impulse which has made education universal all over the Northern States of this Union; so that its schools are the earliest care and the loudest boast of every sprouting emporium and every noisy mart; so that the pioneer's axe loses its virgin edge upon the timber of which the log school-house is builded; and the ambitious piles of brick or stone, devoted to the education of the people, rival, in all the centres of commerce, the warehouses and the elevators and the factories.

That the motive of education is, in these latter days, much less frankly religious than it was in the days of the Pilgrims, must be admitted. The reasons given in the town meeting and in the city council, when appropriations are urged for public schools, are not the kind of reasons that would have been suggested in Plymouth or in Salem two hundred and fifty years ago. The reasoned basis of popular education in the popular mind is twofold: it includes philanthropy and self-defense. A considerable number of our citizens recognize the latter as the only admissible ground on which a public-

school system can rest. Philanthropy they do not believe in; or at any rate, they contend that the state has no right to go into the business of philanthropy. But the right of self-preservation does belong to the state; and if popular ignorance threatens its security, and even its very existence, then the state has the right to provide and even to require popular education. That this is a valid basis of state action on the subject, so far as rights go, will not be disputed. Whether the education which proceeds from this as the principal motive is likely to be effective in the development of the highest character in the citizens so educated would be an interesting inquiry.

But the philanthropic motive is present in the minds of many of those who advocate the education of the people. Their desire is not merely to avert a peril from the state, but to confer a benefit upon the pupils. Mr. Mill affirms, in his essay "On Liberty," that the failure to provide for a child "instruction and training for its mind is a moral crime both *against the unfortunate offspring* and against society" (p. 204). This is a recognition of the child's rights, and Mr. Mill goes on to say that the state ought to secure to the child his right to education. The love of equal rights, and the disposition to give every human being a fair

chance, is still, let us trust, an influential motive in the minds of those who advocate popular education. And this motive is the fruit of Christianity. Look on this picture, painted by the author of "Gesta Christi," and ponder his comment: —

Schools are open to all. The rich are forced to give of their abundance for the education of the poor. Not only are common schools open to every class, but higher schools and colleges of learning are provided for the masses. Even laws are made compelling attendance, and provisions are made by individual charity for those who are poor and ill-clad. This is one of the most remarkable fruits of this religion in modern times. It is a forcible distribution of wealth to confer the highest possible blessings on the needy. It is a confession of society that the most ignorant, degraded, and destitute person is a brother of the most fortunate, and must have every opportunity to exert his powers. If one could imagine the proposition made to the archai of Athens to tax the rich in order that the helots might learn to read the Greek classics, or a measure before the Roman Senate to set apart a new revenue for providing teachers for the plebs and the slaves, one could rightly measure the progress of the Christian sentiment of equality in these eighteen centuries.

That popular education, as it exists in this country, is the offspring of the religious sentiment is matter of history. But, like many an-

other unfilial child, education has shown a strong disposition of late to disown and desert her mother. The tendency has been gaining strength to withdraw education from all association with religion, to eliminate religion wholly from education, and to claim for education all the saving virtues of which society has need. There are those who think that the diffusion of science and literature will prove a sufficient agency for the promotion of the welfare of the state ; and that the learning thus diffused not only may be but must be separated from everything that bears the semblance of religion.

I have not mentioned this demand for the entire secularization of our schools for the sake of opposing it at this point in the argument, but rather for the sake of calling attention to a manifest deterioration of public morals which has kept even pace with this secular tendency in education. Twenty-five or thirty years ago most of our public schools were under Christian influences. No attempt was made to inculcate the dogmas of the Christian religion, but the teachers were free to commend the precepts of the New Testament, in a direct, practical way, to the consciences of their pupils ; and some of us remember, not without gratitude, the impressions made upon our lives in the

school-room by the instructors of our early days. All this has been rapidly changing; and contemporaneously, it is discovered that something is wrong with society. Grave dangers menace its peace; ugly evils infest its teeming populations. Pauperism is increasing. The number of those who lack either the power or the will to maintain themselves, and who are therefore thrown upon the care of the state, is growing faster than the population. The cure of this alarming evil is engaging the study of philanthropists in all our cities. Crime is increasing. The only state in the Union that carefully collects its moral statistics brings to light some startling facts respecting the increase of crime within the past thirty years. In 1850 there was one prisoner in Massachusetts to every eight hundred and four of the population; in 1880 there was one to every four hundred and eighty-seven. The ratio of the prisoners to the whole population nearly doubled in thirty years. But it may be said that this increase is due to the rapid growth of the foreign population in Massachusetts. There would be small comfort in this explanation if it were the true one; but it is not the true one. The native criminals are increasing faster than the foreign-born criminals. In 1850 there was one native prisoner to every one thousand two hun-

dred and sixty-seven native citizens; in 1880 there was one native prisoner to every six hundred and fifteen native citizens. The ratio of native prisoners to the native population more than doubled in thirty years.

And this, be it remembered, is in Massachusetts — the state in which education of every kind, public and private, has been longer established, and is more munificently endowed and more thoroughly administered, than in any other state of the Union. Massachusetts expends, through her public schools, for the tuition of every pupil enumerated in her school population, nearly sixteen dollars a year. Added to this public provision is the great array of universities, colleges, academies, and seminaries, amply endowed, far surpassing those of every other state in number and in excellence. What education can do to promote morality has been more thoroughly done for Massachusetts than for any other American State. Nevertheless, the statistics show an alarming increase of the vicious and dependent classes in Massachusetts. There is no room for supposing that the case of Massachusetts is any worse than that of the younger commonwealths. Those who have had opportunities for observing the conditions of society East and West will not be inclined to believe that the morals

of the old Bay State are any lower than those of New York, or Ohio, or Illinois. If other states would collect the facts as carefully, and publish them as fully, we should see similar conditions existing everywhere.

Neither is it necessary to draw from these facts any pessimistic inferences as to the general decadence of society. This retrograde movement, we may well believe, is local and temporary. The causes out of which it arises may be discoverable and avoidable. What they are is a question to which the social philosophers, big and little, are devoting much study. Mr. Henry George has his theory of the increase of pauperism; and since pauperism and crime are closely linked together, the one evil cannot be explained without uncovering the causes of the other. The Socialists, not content to stop at Mr. George's half-way house, go far beyond him with their philosophy and their remedy. The Protectionists have their theory of the case, the Free-Traders theirs, the Prohibitionists theirs. Besides these there are not a few who, in looking more deeply for the sources of these increasing curses, are inclined to lay the responsibility for them at the doors of our schools. If the schools were what they ought to be, they say, these streams of baleful influence would be dried up at their sources, instead

of overflowing the land. The only radical cure of these mischiefs is the reform of our educational system.

The explanation last named is partial, and the censure which it implies is too sweeping. If any man believes that popular education is the panacea for all political and social disorders, he must, of course, believe that the present disorders are due to a defective system of education; but one who does not expect the regeneration of society from methods purely educational will not be so ready to arraign the schools as the authors, by commission or omission, of the social depravity now existing. If the methods of education had been faultless, and other causes which have been all the while operating had continued in operation, we should, very likely, have witnessed an increase both of pauperism and of crime. This accursed harvest springs from more than one kind of sowing, and will not be extirpated by any one kind of implement. The growth of the vicious and dependent classes is due to many causes.

A defective industrial system has something to do with it. The relations of capital and labor are not what they ought to be. The strife between them is unnatural, and it has been fostered by a bad political economy which erects selfishness into the supreme rule of human ac-

tion. Any one who thinks that it makes no difference what men believe is commended to a careful study of the influence of certain economical theories upon the relations between employers and employed. In cases of this nature temper is a great matter; and the temper engendered by the current economy is the reverse of Christian. The collisions and conflicts that grow out of this evil temper have produced a certain portion of the increase of pauperism and crime.

Another cause is the massing of the populations in cities and in great manufacturing centres, where multitudes are deprived of the sacred restraints of home, and depraved for the want of them.

The great fluctuations of industry produced by changing fashions and by sudden and brief rages of one sort or another, creating demands for labor that quickly blaze up and are as quickly extinguished, will account for part of it. This shifting, uncertain life that our artisan classes are largely compelled to live is not friendly to morality.

The influence of immigration upon morality is suggestively set forth by Mr. W. T. Harris:

All parts of Europe and some parts of Asia are sending us their immigrants. Each immigrant brings some peculiar moral habits which clash with our own.

The result is that each and all, immigrants and natives, have to learn tolerance. But moral punctilios cannot be trilled with safety. When people are politically compelled to be tolerant of petty customs that they believe to be immoral, there follows a relaxation of genuine morality itself. Even when a false, bigoted prejudice that has rooted itself among the moral virtues is pulled up, the cardinal virtues themselves suffer injury.¹

Heredity, too, is a great factor in the production of pauperism and crime. The paupers and the criminals bring forth with great fecundity after their kind, and a careless pseudo-charity has encouraged them to persevere.

Above all, deplore it as we must, it is the historical fact that the rapid increase of wealth in any country is always accompanied by the lowering of the moral standards. The most pernicious class of youth in America to-day is largely recruited from the children of the new rich, who are debauching themselves and corrupting those about them with fearful energy. And the schools are not chargeable with the existence or the mischief of these youthful malefactors. They have little to do with the schools, except to infect them with their own idleness and vice; and the better the schools are, the less likely such pupils are to remain in them for any length of time.

¹ *Journal of Social Science*, xviii. 122.

There are reasons enough, therefore, for the deterioration of public morals outside of the school-houses. Against all of these evil tendencies of which we have been speaking the schools, with all their imperfections, lift up a barrier. They promote industry and thrift and self-support. They check, measurably, the increase of crime. Just as they are, they exert a salutary influence upon society.

Nevertheless, it is altogether possible that this depravation of morals is due in part to defects in our systems of education. Our schools have counteracted these evils to some extent, but much less effectively than they might have done. The best possible system of education would not have prevented them all, but it would have prevented more of them. The increase of pauperism and crime would have been less rapid and alarming if our schools had been more wisely organized and conducted.

It may be, therefore, that this unfilial daughter, having learned by experience that she is not sufficient of herself for the regeneration of society, will welcome a word or two of admonition from the mother whose counsels she has of late rather testily rejected. Suffer it she must, if she do not welcome it; for Christianity will by no means abdicate her right to deliver her testimony on this and every other subject that deeply concerns the public welfare.

⤴The first demand that Christianity has to make respecting popular education is that it be directed toward the formation of character rather than the communication of abstract knowledge. And inasmuch as character is largely developed by work, the intelligent Christian will insist that our public schools ought to give a great deal more attention than they ever have done to industrial training.⤵

It may be supposed that the attempt to make Christianity responsible for such a demand as this is strained and extravagant. Doubtless there is a sentimental sort of Christianity by which "secular" interests of this sort are little regarded, but it is not the Christianity of Christ nor of the apostles. When we reflect that every Jewish boy was compelled to learn a trade; that the Founder of Christianity was himself a carpenter; that the greatest of the apostles maintained himself by the labor of his own hands, and most explicitly laid down the law to the converts in the churches that he founded, "If any man will not work, neither shall he eat;" that, in the frankest contrast with the great teachers of Greece, like Plato and Aristotle, who declared all labor to be degrading to a free-man, the Christian fathers, from the very first, sung the praises of self-supporting industry, and pronounced idleness disgraceful, we readily see

that the interest of a genuine Christianity in the industrial training of the young is neither affectation nor afterthought.

The feeling that something ought to be done by the public schools in the way of industrial education has been gaining force for several years. "Mercantilism" has laid its hand heavily upon the common schools; and the training provided by them has largely ministered to the love of trade. Much of this has been unintentional and even unconscious; mercantilism is in the air, and it insensibly pervades our schools, and our school-books, and the traditions and methods of education. A boy comes out of the grammar school pretty well qualified to be a clerk, but with very little preparation for any of the handicrafts. It begins to be a serious question whether the state ought to devote so much time to the training of traders; whether it might not be wiser to afford instruction that shall turn the minds of the young in other directions also. The great majority of the pupils in our grammar schools will earn their livelihood by manual industries of one sort or another. Is it not well to recognize this fact in our systems of education, and to shape our courses of instruction in such a way that they may serve the needs of pupils of this class?

It is sometimes said that the state owes to

its children only the rudiments of a general education ; that it ought to equip every citizen for the discharge of his political duties, but that it is not under obligation to teach men trades or professions ; that the state is going a step too far when it undertakes to make men lawyers, or doctors, or carpenters, or machinists. The objection is valid. It is not the function of the state to furnish technical or professional training. But there is an industrial training which is neither technical nor professional ; which is calculated to make better men and better citizens of the pupils, no matter what calling they may afterward follow ; which affects directly and in a most salutary manner the mind and character of the pupil, and which will be of constant service to him through all his life, whether he be wage-worker, or trader, or teacher or clergyman. The training of the eye and of the hand are important and essential elements in all good education. These elements the state is bound to furnish.

The question immediately arises, How much can be done in the common schools to promote industrial education ? Some experienced educators insist that nothing can be done ; that no time can be found for such instruction in the already overcrowded curriculum of the common school ; that the attempt would introduce

confusion ; that if anything is done, it must be through the establishment, by voluntary agencies, of separate industrial schools, in which pupils may receive training out of school hours, or after they have completed the common-school course.

To these objections it may be answered that a little heroic surgery upon the swollen curriculum of the common school would be extremely healthful. In the graded schools of our cities the average pupil who completes the course spends from eight to ten years in studying arithmetic. It must be possible to reduce this time considerably, by the condensation and simplification of text-books. The same may be said of geography and of grammar. Time enough could thus be gained for such purposes, with great advantage to the schools.

It is sometimes proposed that the industrial training of the public schools should be confined to the pupils of the high schools. But this would greatly restrict the advantages of such training, inasmuch as but a small fraction of those educated by the state reach the high schools. Moreover, the majority of the boys who enter the high schools are already strongly inclined toward commercial or professional callings ; and the industrial education there offered them would, for this reason, be less wel-

come to them, and less influential in guiding them toward skilled or productive industries. It would undoubtedly be well to connect an industrial course with the high school; but the greatest benefit of such instruction would be gained by the pupils of the two highest grades of the grammar schools. The average age at which pupils leave the grammar school is fifteen; between the ages of thirteen and fifteen instruction of this kind can be most successfully imparted. This is precisely the age at which boys are apt to be restless and insubordinate; a little manual work in connection with their studies would afford vent to their surplus energies, and prove a valuable aid in maintaining discipline.

The foundation of this industrial training is drawing, which is now taught in many of our public schools, and which ought to be made compulsory in all of them. No branch of study now included in the common-school curriculum is more "practical" than drawing. At the basis of all mechanical work lies the art of mechanical or projection drawing; at the basis of all industrial art lies the arts of design. The man who is to follow any kind of handicraft, or who is to be engaged in the production of any fabrics or articles that have form or color, whether it be spades or shoes, or chairs or

wheelbarrows, or wagons or plows, or hats, or harnesses, or houses, needs to have his eye and his hand trained in learning to draw. A number of young men in a machine-shop lately came to the draughtsman in that shop and asked him to give them lessons in mechanical drawing. They were beginning to see, what neither they nor their parents could have been made to understand while they were in school, that no man can be a first-class mechanic in any of the trades who does not know something of mechanical drawing.

The application of art to industry is steadily extending into all departments of work. The commercial value of almost everything that is made is affected, more or less, by its artistic form. The commonest tool or utensil is more desirable if it is shapely and symmetrical. Therefore, the arts of design are constantly coming into play in all mechanical or manufacturing industries, and every workman needs instruction in them.

Even those who are to follow mercantile or professional callings are finding use, continually, for knowledge and skill of this sort, and are often greatly disabled for the lack of it. Who is there that does not need, every month of his life, the power to make an intelligible representation with the pencil of something

that he wishes to describe, or of something that he desires to have constructed? A little elementary training in drawing when he was a child would have given him this power; the want of it is a constant source of regret and annoyance. The notion that drawing is a mere "accomplishment," an ornamental branch of education, can be entertained by none but the ignorant. Nothing is taught in our schools the utility of which is more obvious.

The foundation of industrial education is thus laid in many of our common schools through the introduction of drawing. All that is needed is that the work in this department should be more thoroughly done.

In addition to this, instruction should be given in the use of the common wood-working tools, such as the hammer, saw, plane, chisel, and gouge. One of the rooms of every grammar school should be a shop, fitted up with work-benches and the requisite tools; and a capable mechanic should be placed in charge of it, as one of the regular corps of teachers. From four to six hours a week in the shop would be sufficient for each pupil; and the boys of a large school could be divided into classes, so that a single instructor could easily manage them all. In two years of such training, under a competent teacher, the use of

these common tools could be acquired, and a practical skill in construction and in the manipulation of materials, which would be of the greatest advantage to all pupils, no matter what callings they might intend to follow, and which would give to many of them suggestive hints in the choice of a calling.

It is probable that to these simpler wood-working tools lathes might sometimes be added, and that the simplest processes of iron-working might also be taught. The girls in the same schools should receive thorough instruction in plain sewing and in ornamental needlework, and might also learn modeling in clay. The details of the plan are yet to be adjusted, but the need of introducing this kind of instruction into the common schools of our cities is already so obvious that the working plans must soon be forthcoming. In the smaller country district-schools the difficulties would be greater, but there, happily, the need is less. The boys and girls in these schools have plenty of chance for industrial training.

Already the matter has passed beyond the stage of theory, and successful experiments have been made in several places. In connection with Washington University, in St. Louis, is a school for manual instruction in which this plan of giving a broad general training in the

various processes of mechanical work has been carried into operation with great success. In this school three hours of every day are devoted to books, one hour to drawing, and two hours to work with tools. The three years' course is about the same as that of the ordinary English high school, with the manual instruction added. In the first year the pupils learn the use of the wood-working tools, including the lathe; in the second year they work at the forge, learning the various manipulations of wrought iron, and also take some practical lessons in moulding, casting, soldering, and brazing; in the third year they go into the machine-shop, and are drilled in bench work and fitting, turning, planing, screw-cutting, etc. More than two hundred boys are receiving instruction in this school.

In Toledo, Ohio, a manual training school has been established in connection with the public schools, to which pupils from the senior grammar grade, and from the first year of the high school, are admitted. In Gloucester, Massachusetts, in Boston, and in Montclair, New Jersey, similar schools have been connected with the grammar school, for pupils from eleven to fifteen years of age. The report from all these quarters is highly encouraging. The practicability of combining manual

with intellectual training seems to be clearly indicated by these experiments.

The advantages claimed for this combination by Professor Woodward, of the St. Louis school, are briefly these : —

1. Larger classes of boys in the grammar and high schools.
2. Better intellectual development.
3. A more wholesome moral education.
4. Sounder judgments of men and things.
5. Better choice of occupations.
6. A higher degree of material success, individual and social.
7. The elevation of many of the occupations from the realm of brute, unintelligent labor, to one requiring and rewarding cultivation and skill.
8. The solution of "labor problems."

With several of these anticipated results the present discussion is not directly concerned ; but they must all be regarded as beneficent ; and the reasons given by this distinguished educator for expecting them to follow are based not only on a sound philosophy, but on a large experience. The fact that the intellectual development of pupils thus trained is not retarded but greatly quickened by the combination of manual work with their studies, appears to be established. The boys and girls of the half-time schools in England, who spend part of the school hours in labor outside the schools, easily keep up with those who devote to their studies

twice as much time. And these pupils are generally engaged in laborious and monotonous employments, far less attractive and stimulating than those of the manual training school.

One of the best effects of this method is seen in the awakening of pupils who, in their textbook studies, are dull and incapable, but who find in the manual work something in which they can excel. This puts them on better terms with themselves, with their teachers, and with the school; and the self-respect and hope thus inspired lead them to attack their mental tasks with a better resolution. Professor Francis A. Walker, in an excellent paper read before the Social Science Association, speaks strongly of this result of manual training in schools.

That the school discipline would be more easily maintained under this system, I have already suggested. This must result from "a more wholesome moral education;" and Professor Woodward can tell us how surely this is secured by the industrial method: —

To begin with, I have noted the good effect of occupation. The programme of a manual training school has something to interest and inspire every boy. The daily session is six full hours, but I have never found it too long. The school is not a bore, and holidays, except the name of the thing, are un-

popular. I have been forced to make strict rules to prevent the boys from crowding into the shops and drawing rooms on Saturdays and after school hours. There is little tendency, therefore, to stroll about, looking for excitement. A boy's natural passion for handling, fixing, and making things is systematically guided into channels instructive and useful, as parents freely relate. . . . Gradually the students acquire two most valuable habits, which are certain to influence their whole lives for good — namely, precision and method. As Professor Runkle says: "Whatever cultivates care, close observation, exactness, patience, and method, must be valuable preparation and training for all studies and all pursuits."

That the judgment would be educated by such practical lessons; that labor itself would be dignified and elevated; that the skill and facility thus acquired would render him who acquires them more versatile, more fertile in resources, and less liable to be stranded in dull times and when industries are constantly shifting, are predictions that do not greatly tax our faith. That the salutary effect of the introduction of the system upon the moral as well as the material welfare of the whole country would be clearly visible before many years, appears to me indubitable. The French Imperial Commission, appointed several years ago to examine this question, visited Belgium and studied the

effects of the apprentice schools then in operation. At that time fifty-four of these schools had been established in that kingdom, and the commission testifies: "The official reports published in Bruges, in 1863, show that everywhere instruction and habits of regular employment have produced the most successful results in improving the morals, not only of the children, but also of the parents, and that mendicity and vagrancy have almost entirely disappeared from those districts" in which these schools have been founded.

This, then, is the first admonition that an intelligent Christianity must leave with those who direct the policy of our schools. You have been building on a foundation too narrow; you must enlarge your basis; you must learn that character is the principal thing, and that character is the result of a harmonious development of all the powers — of the eye and the hand and the practical judgment and the will, as well as of the memory and the logical faculty; and you must not forget that industrial training affords a discipline almost indispensable to the right development of character.

But if the Christianity whose chief concern is righteousness has a right to reprove our state educators for having omitted to furnish this in-

direct but most effective method of moral discipline, much more has it the right to rebuke them for their gross neglect to provide direct and systematic methods of moral education. The failure to awaken and develop the moral nature of the pupils in our schools is notorious and disastrous. Moral training has become altogether secondary; the attempt to secure it is but feebly and uncertainly made.

I have before me a consolidated list of examination questions presented to teachers by county boards of examiners in the State of Ohio. This list is said to include "the whole range of the questions sent in [to the State Board] by the examining boards of the several counties," and it undoubtedly presents them in fair proportion also. Running the eye over them, it becomes evident at once that while the ability of these intending teachers to impart instruction on all other subjects is fully tested, there is very little effort made to find out what their purposes and ideas are respecting the moral training of their pupils. Upon theory and practice of teaching there are one hundred and fourteen questions; upon orthography, forty-eight; upon reading, thirty; upon penmanship, twenty-four; upon grammar, one hundred and six; upon arithmetic, one hundred and four; upon geography, one hundred and sixty-two; upon his-

tory, nineteen; upon physiology, seventeen; upon civil government, ten; upon book-keeping, ten; upon algebra, eighteen; upon physics, twenty-eight — six hundred and ninety questions in all. Of these, two questions, under the head of “theory and practice,” refer to the development of moral character — these two, namely: “Do you teach morals and politeness?” — as if it were optional with the teacher whether he would do so or not, — and, “How would you undertake to cultivate the morals of your pupils?” Now, when the state in its inquiry into the qualifications of teachers makes the ratio of morals to other subjects as two to six hundred and ninety, we could hardly expect the teachers whom it employs to be very thorough or enthusiastic in imparting moral instruction to their pupils.

As a matter of fact, we get a great deal more moral teaching in our schools than this astonishing exhibit would indicate. Many of the teachers recognize their responsibility in this matter, even if the state does not enforce it upon them; and they find ways of impressing the truths of morality upon the minds of their pupils. In their conventions and institutes, the question of moral instruction is often earnestly debated. On the whole, it is rather surprising that teachers should manifest so much interest

in this matter, when those who employ them appear to care so little about it. It is not at all to be wondered at that many of the teachers are utterly remiss in this part of their duty, and that the moral education of the young in our public schools is, in general, sadly neglected.

Mr. Harris, in the essay to which reference has been made, points out that certain of what he calls the mechanical virtues, such as punctuality, regularity, and obedience, are taught quite effectively in the discipline of the school. Cleanliness, also, which comes near being a theological virtue, is pretty faithfully inculcated in the lower grades, while the whole regimen of the school ought to be a steady exercise in truth-telling. These are important results, and they are a necessary outcome of the law of the school. For all of this let us be duly thankful. But beyond these are wide ranges of conduct in which children need careful and systematic instruction. The great duties of self-control — the duty of temperance in the indulgence of all the appetites, of restraining the passions, of ruling the spirit; the social duties of honesty, and justice, and fidelity to trusts, and courage, and honor, and magnanimity, and neighborly kindness, and toleration, and sympathy, and charity; the sacred obligations of citizenship — all these, and many others, ought to be diligently in-

pressed upon the consciences of children in school. The statute of Massachusetts sets this matter forth in large and noble characters : —

It shall be the duty of the president, professors, and tutors of the university at Cambridge, and of the several colleges, of all preceptors and teachers of academies, and of all other instructors of youth, to exert their best endeavors to impress on the minds of children and youth committed to their care and instruction, the principles of piety and justice, and a sacred regard to truth ; love of their country, humanity, and universal benevolence ; sobriety, industry, and frugality ; chastity, moderation, and temperance, and those other virtues which are the ornament of human society and the basis upon which a republican constitution is founded ; and it shall be the duty of such instructors to endeavor to lead their pupils, as their ages and capacities will admit, into a clear understanding of the tendency of the above-mentioned virtues, to preserve and perfect a republican constitution and secure the blessings of liberty, as well as to promote their future happiness, and also to point out to them the evil tendency of the opposite vices.

What this lofty statute demands is not only possible, it is the very first and highest matter to be cared for in every system of education, public or private. With all their other gettings, the children of our schools ought to get, and may get, a clear understanding of these great

matters. Doubtless, as I have said, many conscientious teachers endeavor to impress moral truths on the minds of their pupils; but what is done is done in a desultory and uncertain fashion; no systematic attempt is made to develop this part of the child's nature.

It is sometimes denied that morals can be taught from books, and asserted that such teaching is best when it is incidentally rather than formally conveyed. I am not yet convinced that this is true. The objection proceeds upon the theory that morality is something altogether transcendental and mystical, and cannot, therefore, be didactically treated. It is true that what Professor Shairp calls "the moral motive power" is a personal force rather than a formula; nevertheless, there are great truths of morals which are scientifically verifiable; laws which are as well established as the law of gravitation, or the law of the trade winds, laws which can be stated so clearly and simply that the average boy or girl of twelve or fourteen can perfectly understand them. The pupils of our schools need to have these truths put into their minds, in clear statements, that they may be remembered as guides of conduct in coming years.

The law of veracity, for example, with the natural and inevitable rewards and penalties

annexed to it, is capable of a perfectly clear statement. This law can be scientifically verified. All the experience of life will tend to its verification. Get it once lodged in a boy's mind, and he can no more get away from it than he can get away from the laws of motion. Now I think it is a great deal more important to get that law fixed in a boy's mind than it is to teach him the process of extracting the cube root, or to instruct him in the law of storms, or the law of ocean currents. I doubt whether many of the pupils of our public schools ever do get that law fixed in their minds. They know, in a general way, that it is wrong to lie; but the eternal reasons for veracity, and the sure penalties of mendacity, they do not understand. To give them these truths in simple propositions; to show them the facts on which these propositions are based; to point out to them the operation of the moral laws, as you point out to them the operation of the physical laws or the physiological processes of digestion, — this would be to many of them an inestimable service. They would remember the law; their observation would constantly confirm it; and it would influence their conduct all their lives long.

Precisely the same thing may be said of all the other great laws of conduct. They may be

clearly stated, and their natural rewards and penalties indicated; and the state is bound to give this kind of instruction, whatever else it may withhold. To leave so great a matter as this to the teacher's option, and allow him to give moral instruction incidentally, as if it were not a matter of prime importance, is to disparage and degrade the whole subject in a fatal manner. We are bound to dignify it by making it a part of the regular course of study.

Suppose the teacher tells the pupil, casually, these truths of morality of which we have spoken. The pupil is likely to take them as the teacher's individual opinion. If the pupil has great confidence in the wisdom of the teacher, these truths may make a deep impression on his mind; if he has not, they will make very little impression. In any case, they will not come to him as the ascertained and established facts of science, as truth that has been verified by observation and experiment. That is the way in which they ought to come to him. The moral laws ought to be put upon an equal footing, in the pupil's intelligence, with the laws of physics or physiology.

It is sometimes supposed that no effective moral teaching is possible, save that which refers to the Bible as authority. This is a great mistake. Doubtless many of us would rather

have the Bible taught in the schools as the text-book of morals — if it could be intelligently taught — than any other book. But this is not possible. And, although no other knowledge of morality can be so good as that which would be gained by a reverent and intelligent study of the Bible, yet a knowledge of the great moral laws and their penalties, sufficient for the practical guidance of men in earthly affairs can be gained from the experience of men and the study of human nature. The moral laws revealed in the Bible are also impressed upon the nature of man. They were in full force and effect before the Bible was written. As soon as moral beings began to exist in their present relations these laws began to operate. The facts of morality are stated in the Bible because they are true; they are not true because they are stated in the Bible; they were true before a word of the Bible had been uttered. Every law of the Decalogue, as my old teacher of morals, President Hopkins, always insists, is a natural law. Surely there can be no objections to teaching natural law in the public schools; and of all natural laws, those which relate to conduct should first be taught by the state. The neglect to provide this kind of teaching is sheer fatuity; every citizen who is a Christian, and who believes that righteousness is the principal

thing, is bound to cry out against it, and to demand, unceasingly, that this great defect in our systems of popular education be remedied without delay.

The systematic and intelligent teaching of morals in the public schools would, undoubtedly, accomplish much good. Nevertheless the fact must not be overlooked that truth of this kind, to be most effective, must be vitalized by a genuine religious faith. Religion is the inspiration of all highest morality. And while religion cannot be taught in the public schools, those teachers who possess this faith may, without any dogmatic instruction, impart it to their pupils. "It is for the teachers," says Mr. W. T. Harris, "not to claim to introduce formal religious ceremonies, but to make all their teaching glow with a genuine faith, hope, and charity, so that pupils will catch from them their view of the world as the only view that satisfies the heart and the intellect and the will."



4

Handwritten signature and text at the bottom right corner.

