

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY
AND
PRINCETON REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. 3.—JULY, 1872.

ART. I.—PRIMITIVE GREEK RELIGION.

By TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D., Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

THE earliest traceable link between the Greek Mythology and the primitive Patriarchal Monotheism must be looked for in the grove of Dodona, on the Western coast, afterwards called Epirus. Long before the war of Troy, a Deity was worshipped there of whom Homer seems to speak with awe, as of one belonging to an antiquity transcending the theology of his day, and whose religion carried with it a more hoary sacredness: "O Dodonæan, Pelasgian, Zeus, *τηλόθρι ναίων*—*αιθέρι ναίων*—dwelling afar, dwelling on high." It seems to convey the idea of something separate, holy, unapproachable. There were two peculiar features in this very early Dodonæan religion. One was the worship of Zeus alone, as unassociated with any other divinity; the other, the esteemed sacredness of the oak. Both testify to its primitive character. As far as can be known this feeling of regard for the oak never degenerated into an idolatry of its object, although it early became the vehicle and fosterer of a gloomy superstition. It gave character to this primitive oracular seat, and inspired that marked reverence for it which is so evident in the Homeric and the earliest Grecian poetry. It is certain that, from the first, a great impression had been made by something in the history and in the local surroundings of Dodona. The seat of the oracle was, originally, not a temple but a grove. Natural causes here, as well as elsewhere, lent

ART. II.—THE LABOR QUESTION IN ITS ECONOMIC AND CHRISTIAN ASPECTS.

By LYMAN H. ATWATER, D.D.

THAT the conflict between capital and labor is growing to a magnitude and universality, in itself and its threatened consequences, which make it one of the portents of the time, is only too evident. It is quite time that it receive the serious attention of all earnest and thinking men, especially such as reach the public mind, and have any vocation to enlighten it on questions of duty. We therefore make no apology for asking the attention of our readers to some thoughts on this great subject.

What, then, is labor, and what is capital? Labor is not every form of human activity or exertion. But it is human effort intentionally applied to natural objects so as to produce utilities not otherwise existing, i. e. to supply some want or gratify some desire of man. There are several elements in this definition. It must not only be human effort, but intentional, that is with an intelligent design to produce some result beyond itself. It must not terminate merely in itself or its own pleasurable sensations, like games, dances, or mere sport. It must produce some result beyond itself, either transient or enduring, coveted by man. This may be the sensations which immediately follow it and then vanish, as the exhilaration consequent on friction of the body, or enduring, as the granite monument. And this result is still further some desired, and, in this sense, useful modification of natural objects of more or less duration. There is no form of labor without these marks, and whatever activity possesses them is labor. The only seeming exception is intellectual effort, in some form of acquiring or imparting knowledge or mental discipline. But practically this is no exception. For it enters not into the labor involved in the great contest between labor and capital now under consideration. Withal, this sort of effort contributes immensely to the efficiency of

that labor on material objects with which we are immediately concerned. Besides, considering the mind or spirit as a natural object, which it surely is, effort for the purpose of increasing the knowledge, or vigor, or purity, of one's own or other's minds, surely comes within our definition of labor.

Now of the results or utilities so produced by labor, as already intimated, there are two kinds, the one evanescent or transient, the other more or less enduring, because embodied in natural objects more or less enduring. These latter are products or commodities, which, with respect to their form as thus modified, are the creations of labor. All food, raiment, fuel, buildings, tools, farm improvements, are of this description. It is these products more or less, that survive the effort of making, which constitute the property, wealth and capital of society. Nothing else is wealth or capital but natural objects so modified by human labor as to have a new utility not otherwise inhering in them, whereby they will exchange for other equivalent labor or product of labor, be this product money, gold, silver, iron, or whatever else. Paradoxical as this may seem to those who have not studied the subject, it is capable of apodictic proof, because nature works gratuitously for all who will take her works and products, and it is not till some human effort increasing their natural utility has been put upon them, that they will exchange for other labor or products of labor. What more useful than air and water and land? What more gratuitous, till in some form human labor has been expended in putting them in the condition or place in which we want them, as in water-works, ventilating apparatus, the masts and sails which catch the winds, or the roads and vehicles which render land accessible? The lands adjacent to the North Pacific Railroad have been wholly unsaleable because inaccessible. They are now fast becoming marketable. Why? Just because of the human labor, in itself or as embodied in capital expended on that railway. All Manhattan Island is said to have been purchased from the Indians for about a hundred dollars. What makes it now worth a thousand or thousands of millions? Just the labor upon it and in the avenues of com-

munication with it, which make it the great centre of American commerce. Moreover, it is worth noting, because it is a most pregnant as well as simple truth, that the effort of labor consists solely in moving things in such a way that they serve us, or enlist the powers of nature in gratuitously serving us, more effectually than were otherwise possible. This statement will stand every possible test.

This being so, we are prepared to answer the questions, What is wealth? What is capital? Wealth is the sum total of commodities or of natural objects endued with new utility to man by human labor. The further and longer we search, we shall find no wealth which does not answer to this description. In other words it is the savings of labor: just that and that only. It is that portion of the products of labor which the laborer forbears to use and enjoy at the time of production, and reserves for his own or other's future disposal and enjoyment. It is simply the reward of his forbearance to spend all he produces or earns, or of his putting it to use in further production. We cannot further expand this prolific truth. We pass to say that:

Capital is that portion of wealth, or of the accumulated savings of labor, which is devoted to the support and assistance of the laborer in future production. This is the strict meaning, although it is often used loosely for all property or wealth, or for principal as distinguished from income or interest. But without stopping to vindicate this definition, it is enough that, at any rate, it precisely defines capital so far as it has to do with the present discussion. It is that wealth which employs, supports, and coöperates with labor in production, that we are now dealing with. It is with this only that labor has relations whether of harmony or conflict. Wealth consisting in ornaments, paintings, and most luxuries, is not of this nature, although it may be exchanged by its owner for what he may use as capital in employing and aiding labor. The same person is often capitalist and laborer too. This is almost universally so with small farmers, mechanics, and tradesmen. They labor in production and distribution. But the food, raiment, fuel and shelter which sustain life meanwhile, the stock

in trade, the tools, seed, animals, agricultural improvements, buildings, fences, etc., are their own. The saw, axe, beetle and wedges of the woodman, as also his food and raiment while working, are his capital. Of course in such cases there can be no conflict between labor and capital. And this affords a clue to our solution of the problem before us: that in all great manufacturing establishments requiring an aggregate of capital vastly beyond the possible accumulations of laborers, as far as possible, the laborer should in some form and degree, however small, be made a capitalist or sharer in the fortunes of the business.

From all this it appears that labor, in order to any productiveness beyond the rude subsistence of the first savage who picks up a hand-to-mouth subsistence on berries, roots, and nuts, must be sustained and reinforced by capital, either circulating or fixed; the former being that which must be immediately consumed in the very process of production in order to be at once reproduced with interest, by exchange for it of the commodities it and the laborer have combined to produce. Such circulating capital includes the laborer's means of subsistence, together with the raw material consumed in production. Fixed capital, on the other hand, is what permanently abides to aid in producing a long series of commodities. It consists of such things as buildings, tools, machinery, fences, whatever, in short, is not exhausted in any single commodity or commodities simultaneously produced, but continues to aid in the repeated production of commodities. It is consumed only gradually, and is replaced not by the profits of the products of any one time, but by the cumulative profits of a larger or shorter series of productions. Now, it is obvious that without the support and coöperation of such capital, both fixed and circulating, labor must be comparatively unproductive and fruitless. And this capital must be furnished in larger quantities than is practicable for the bulk of individual laborers. Nay, it must be supplied in ever increasing quantities in order to enlist the greatest aid or coöperation of the powers of nature, and secure the largest advantages of the most complete division of labor. In proportion as we enlist steam, water, the

most powerful machinery, and the number of hands required for the most profitable division of labor, the amount of capital needed ever augments. Witness this in the great railways, mines, and factories of our country. All this immensely increases the productiveness, and even the rewards of labor. For, after all that goes to the profit of capital so enlisted, the laborer gets a larger fruit of his labors than would be possible without the coöperation of this capital which, in the form of tools, machinery, and needful structures, so largely subsidizes the powers of nature. The axe-maker will earn more by working in an immense axe-factory at the wages there allowed, than by hammering axes out by hand in his own smithy. So of the spinner at the spinning-jenny as compared with the hand-wheel. And so of all handicraft whatsoever, in which large capital successfully brings in natural forces to enable one hand to do the work of many, or at least of more than one.

Hence it is one of those natural laws, which it is not in the power of man, or combinations of men, to alter or abrogate, that labor is absolutely dependent on capital, in some amount at least, for its very possibility and sustentation; and in still larger and ever increasing ratios for its success and rewards. Capital is the natural ally, support, and coadjutor of labor. It can not be otherwise, except in distempered misconceptions, or through some strange and monstrous mal-adjustment.

But if labor is dependent on capital for its success and reward, capital is no less dependent on labor for its own compensation, which is technically called profit. This is too evident to need proof. Let labor cease and capital at once becomes unproductive and worthless. Tools, machinery, farms, animals, railroads, mines, when once the hand of human labor is withdrawn from them, are unproductive and at once incur loss and injury. There is not only no gain, there is constant loss. "By much slothfulness the building decayeth, and by idleness of hands the house droppeth through." "He that is slothful is brother to him that is a great waster." "The hand of the diligent maketh rich." The sociology and economics of Scripture, like all else of it, are infallible. It is true

that in a drawn battle, in which labor and capital both bring each other to a dead-lock, the capitalist may at once lose the most and hold out the longest, simply because his resources are greater. After all his losses up to the time when the laborer is brought to the verge of starvation, something is likely to remain to the capitalist for his continued subsistence.

Hence it follows that capital and labor are mutually dependent and auxiliary. Neither can say to the other "I have no need of thee," any more than the members of the human body. Nor are they, certainly they should not be, any more antagonistic than these. It is only a genius of evil that can place them in such an unnatural attitude.

It is next to be observed, that labor and capital must each be compensated, or have a fair prospect of compensation, or they will be withheld from productive employment. So far as labor is concerned, it not only violates our natural sense of justice that it should not be compensated, for "the laborer is worthy of his hire," but from the very constitution of human nature men will not work for nothing. Nay, they cannot. For they must be fed, clothed, and sheltered up to the working point. And beyond this, the laborer will ordinarily require, and justly require, as much more as he can command in the existing state of the labor market—exceptional cases of extortion, whether by the laborer or capitalist, aside. He demands, and justly, when the labor market will afford it, not a bare subsistence, but a comfortable and decent support for himself and his family; and this not merely as animals, but as suited to their position and destiny as rational, accountable, and immortal beings, with their manifold capabilities, tastes, and aspirations. And it is his right and duty, on the other hand, to make his labor as effective for these ends as possible, without infringement of the rights and just claims of others.

On the other hand, capital must have reward or the prospect of reward, else it cannot be had. Men will not save it, or forbear to consume it upon their own pleasures, or guard it against waste, or risk it in production, if they can have no benefit of it or reward for it. This is self-evident. Moreover

it is equally evident from the principles of human nature, that, exceptions aside, so far as men act intelligently, there is a certain normal rate at which they must be compensated, in order to be induced thus to save wealth, and then to use it as capital to sustain and cooperate with labor in further production. That rate includes the following elements: 1, The prevailing rate of interest which it will command, if securely loaned. There is no motive to incur the risk and trouble of managing it in business, for a compensation which can be secured without them. 2, An additional compensation for the risk of the capital, at least to the extent of the cost of insurance, and still more for all further risk of loss, unless it may be offset by proportionate chances of gain. But before the capitalist can be in a position to be willing, after risking his capital in production, to share the profits with the laborer to whom he has already ensured his wages, he must first be compensated for his risk in addition to the interest he would receive without risk. 3, He must be paid for the labor of superintendence whether performed by himself or others. This, really, is one department of the labor involved in production, which is requisite to the efficiency of all other labor, and is of course entitled to a reward proportioned to its value. But as it is often performed by the capitalist, so its reward is often confounded with the profit of capital. Now, in order to find a motive to embark capital in production, there must be a fair prospect of a return beyond simple interest, the cost of insurance, and the wages of superintendence, all which give the capitalist no better reward than if his money were securely loaned, unless he find some inducement in the profit of insurance, by being his own insurer, or chooses to put his capital to this use in order to furnish himself congenial and remunerative employment, or, from benevolent motives, to provide such employment for others.

From all this it follows that all laborers, or those who have labor to supply, constitute a proportionate demand for capital to employ it efficiently and remuneratively, and all capital constitutes a proportionate demand for labor in order to its remunerative employment; that the greater the quantity of either seeking employment the more bidders it furnishes and

the better terms must it make for the other : that the increase of each is for the gain of the other : that the increase and mutual co-operation of both serves in a still higher proportion to increase the produce of both and the consequent reward of each, or the amount of useful and enjoyable things respectively provided for the usufruct of each : that all stoppage of labor, whether by strikes or other causes, and all inaction of capital, whether from strikes, distress, timidity, or stagnation of business, involve so much diminution of the produce of both labor and capital for the reward of each : that the average wages of labor, making all allowance for circumstantial variations, will be the quotient of the labor-fund of community divided by the number of laborers seeking employment : that the greater this labor-fund, the greater their wages : that all war of labor against capital to destroy it or its profits is insane and suicidal : that the conflict between labor and capital so industriously fanned, blindly by some and basely by others, is simply a contest between labor in making commodities and labor already performed and embodied in commodities, which, instead of being spent, have been saved to sustain the labor thus arrayed against them ; in short a war of labor against labor : labor now doing against labor already done to sustain and help the labor which is doing and to be done : that labor cannot succeed in breaking down capital without breaking down itself ; and, per contra, that the more adequate the reward of labor, the more elevated, thrifty, buoyant, and productive it becomes. And as there is a profound and stubborn skepticism in regard to the advantages derived by labor from the increase and accumulation of capital, we ask the patience of our readers for a few words more on the subject. This appears (*a*) from the fact that the laborer can only be paid from the capital provided for this purpose and in proportion to that capital ; (*b*) from the fact that it is only in proportion to the capital saved and invested in them, that the tools, machinery and motors can be had that render labor effective ; (*c*) from the further fact that, other things being equal, while the absolute rewards of both labor and capital are augmented by the in-

crease of the latter, the rewards of labor are increased from this source in a greater ratio than the rewards of capital. The smaller the capital in existence, the greater its proportionate reward, i. e., the greater the demand for it, the bids for it, and the reward of it, with a given amount of labor. Thus suppose the first hand-wheel for spinning yarn, or any other newly invented labor-saving implement; suppose that only one is owned in a region where a hundred could be profitably employed. Now, since, with the aid of this, one person can spin, say fifty times the thread he could without it, it follows that every laborer will be the gainer if he pays the capitalist owning it four-fifths of what he saves by it. The latter will find abundant employment for it at this exorbitant rate. But now suppose from the savings thus made twenty such wheels are procured for the use of that community, and that they can all be employed to advantage. It is plain that they can only find employers at much lower rates, as they will compete for such employment, say for one-fifth of the labor they save. Now the capitalist receives a fourfold greater absolute compensation than before, at one-fourth the rate. But how immensely is the reward of the laborer increased absolutely and relatively? There is an increase of twenty times the former product, and of all this increase he gets three-fourths. How immensely is all this multiplied in geometric ratio in our great cloth mills and spinning jennies? In our childhood as much was paid first for spinning, and again for weaving by hand the linen fabrics then in use among farmers and laborers, as is now paid for the completed cotton cloth which better serves the same purpose. This, too, aside of all cost of raw material, bleaching, dyeing, or otherwise finishing for use, and when money was of more than twice its present value, certainly would exchange for more than twice as much labor as now.

There is scarcely room for doubt that while the vast increase of capital devoted to cloth making has received an increased absolute amount of profit, yet the ratio of this gain bears no proportion to the gains of labor from this source.

A given amount of labor will obtain in return at least four times as much cotton cloth as half a century ago.

Hence it results still further, that the law of liberty is the true condition for the highest efficiency and productiveness of labor and capital. All restrictions upon the use of capital or labor by monopolies, strikes, trades-unions, or other artificial obstructions, impair the united product of both, just as much as manacles impair the working power of the human body. Let capital be at liberty to enter that field of honest employment in which its owners see their way to the largest profits, without legislative, trades-union, or other artificial obstacles, and it will surely be employed in the broadest and most profitable scale, with the largest competition, demands, and remuneration for labor. Then let labor be perfectly free to follow its chosen occupation, to find its own sphere, cultivate and exercise its own special gifts and endowments to the best advantage, fix its own terms, prices, hours, and other conditions, without let or hindrance from legal obstructions, or illegal violence from individuals or combinations. Then labor and capital will both find the spheres, modes and conditions of working in which they are most productive; bring the highest rewards to both parties, and the largest accumulations for their future increase. This, of course, is subject to any qualifying exception in behalf of such legislation as may prevent the over-straining of the young, or secure their proper mental education or industrial training and on hygienic, sanitary, and moral grounds; or to give a fair encouragement to tentative efforts to introduce new branches of industry.

An obvious and common criticism on the foregoing views of the intrinsic harmony of the interest of capital and labor is, that, while they may be true in the general and in the abstract, they fail in their application to any actual concrete case. It is alleged that, after all, it still remains true that in any particular case the interest of the laborer is to get as high wages as he can, and of the capitalist to give as low wages as he can, and that hence the contest arises as to what relative share of gain shall go to the compensation of labor

or of capital respectively. Thus antagonism is inevitable. This, however, does not invalidate any of the principles we have laid down as to the mutual oneness of interest between labor and capital in the long run and on the broad scale. It is none the less true that labor and capital are most productive and most helpful to each other, when they are both most fully and skilfully employed in the largest amounts. And this is so in each particular case. It is for the interest of labor that the business should be prosperous and profitable to the capitalist. In proportion as it is so, he will be able and disposed to augment it, and to attract the best laborers to it by the offer of the best remuneration. It is only by such laborers that in the final issue his business will be most thrifty. On the same principle, it is for the interest of the laborer that by his skill and fidelity, he should make the business of his employer so prosperous that he can afford to pay, and make it his interest to pay, the highest wages ; and be enabled by the superiority and cheapness of his fabrics, made by such workmen, to command at all times a remunerative market, and afford remunerative employment to his operatives when other establishments manned by inferior artizans and under inferior management are obliged to suspend work.

It cannot be denied that the feeling among laborers of dissatisfaction with their relations to capitalists and employers is deep and wide-spread, whether with or without reason. It is impelling to a vague unrest and uncertainty ; to efforts more or less blind or intelligent, organized and unorganized, lawful and lawless, to rectify supposed wrongs, and assert the rights supposed to be denied them. Out of these come combinations, first local, or in particular trades, then general and in all trades ; now state-wise, now national, now international. They are often assuming a portentous aspect. They have taken their opportunity in the old world to place Paris for a time under the reign of terror of the Commune and make it a temporary pandemonium. Whatever looks to the abolition or invasion of private property unquestionably tends towards a similar goal, in whatever country. That the thoughts of the more radical labor reformers drift in this direction is omi-

nously evident. We will close this discussion by a brief exposure of the fallacy of some of the more prominent and popular of their remedies for existing evils, real or supposed, followed by a suggestion of the Christian and only true remedy.

1. Here come all schemes for the relief of laborers through the forcible seizure by the state of the private property now in the possession of individuals, and the tenure and use of it by society for the equal possession, use and enjoyment of all its members. In short, it is some form of Agrarianism or Communism. Such proposed seizure and distribution may be partial or total; immediate or gradual; direct or indirect; tentative and provisional, or complete and permanent; under the form and pretence of taxation tending or amounting to confiscation, or by downright spoliation, whether intended and avowed, or undesigned and disavowed. But some favorite watch-words of Mr. Wendell Phillips and other demagogic agitators on this subject, mean this, however intended, or they are absurd shams, as discreditable to the discernment of their authors as intrinsically infamous. These are such as, that "labor creates all the property, and therefore it of right belongs to the laborers." "It is unjust that the idle should live on the earnings of the industrious," etc., etc. Now this means that the property of society ought to be distributed to its laborers, and that all ought to be put on the footing of laborers, or it is nonsense. But what labor has made the property now in existence? Is it not the past labor of those who have saved a portion of their earnings, and embodied them in the commodities which now constitute property? And if they saved instead of spending them, by forbearing to use and enjoy the fruits of their labor, are they not entitled to the use, enjoyment, and disposal of them, provided they do not use them to the injury or ruin of the state? And if they are not allowed this possession, use, and disposal of their savings, will they make and husband them? Will any property or capital be accumulated? Will men toil and deny themselves to lay up what they can neither possess, control, or dispose of? Where will be the labor-fund of society to sustain the

laborer, and the additional capital in improvements, materials, machinery and the like, so indispensable to render that labor effective? Nay, however some small abnormal communities, made up of eccentric voluntary recruits, may establish and maintain a police which guard their labor and commodities, and ensure thrift, yet how is this possible in society at large when private property is abolished? Will not each one seize what he can, and while he can, before it is grasped by others? Will they not thus pluck fruits, seize crops and fabrics, while yet unripe, raw, unfinished? In short, it is universal devastation. Every project of reform aiming at the destruction of private property, does with equal certainty aim at the destruction of all property, all means of sustaining labor, or rendering it productive. It drives back society to the poverty and privations of savagism. It destroys the family, merging it in a common herd, gregarious, indeed, like the brutes that perish, but not social according to the constitution of men whose society, civilization, culture and refinement begin "solitary in families," as their first spring and centre. Without the liberty of gathering, keeping, using and securing earnings, for the benefit and comfort of wife and children, and giving what has so been accumulated for their support and advantage when the head is passed away, the very foundation and cement of the family are gone. Free-love usurps its place. In short, instead of the amenities of Christian civilization we have unbridled licentiousness and the abomination of desolation.

2. Labor cannot ameliorate its condition by any eight or nine-hour laws or by any mere legislation whatever. Legislation cannot alter the laws of nature, of man, of political economics. It is impossible for eight hours' work to produce what ten hours' work will. If it does not, it cannot deserve or command the wages of ten hours' work. Suppose all occupations to come into the eight-hour system. It is plain, that unless eight hours exhaust their working faculty, they can thus produce only four-fifths as much as if they worked ten hours. There will then be only four-fifths as much for all consumers to enjoy. If then the laborers receive as much of

this as when working ten hours per day, the deficit must be borne by the capitalist. It is obvious that in all ordinary cases this would be sufficient not only to consume the profit of capital, but to eat into the capital itself. The consequence must be, first, that the capital which sustains and reinforces labor would gradually be consumed, even if still employed in its support. But it would not be so employed. It would be withdrawn, and placed at interest, or hoarded unproductively, or used for the pleasure of its owner. Men will not employ their savings or property, whether the fruit of their own labor and self-denial, or of their ancestors bequeathed to them, in business, merely to exhaust and lose it. This scheme, therefore, universally carried out, must frustrate itself. There cannot be less work without less wages, or gradually repelling and destroying the capital that gives wages. For like reasons, if some trades succeed in reducing the hours, and keeping up the wages of their labor, while others do not, it can be only by enhanced prices for the products of their labor. That is paid by a tax levied upon all other laborers who consume these products. Surely such a scheme will work out its own failure in due time. The only qualification of the foregoing views is, when in employments that use up the strength in less than ten hours, as railroad engineers, glass-blowers, or when capital invested in new and increasingly effective appliances for bringing the powers of nature to the aid of labor enables it to accomplish in eight hours more than heretofore in ten, besides affording a due profit to this capital. Then eight hours' work may gain the wages or more than the wages before awarded to ten hours' work. A greater advance in wages than this has thus been achieved within the past twenty years. We may look for further advances from this source in the future. Already the day's work has been reduced to nine hours in many British factories without destroying the profit of capital. But this is due to the increase, reward and encouragement of capital, not to repelling, warring against, or destroying it. No-legislation can annul the laws of God and nature. It cannot make four-fifths of a day's work accomplish a day's work, or deserve its wages, or exchange for them. Laborers must be

rewarded in proportion to what they do. Otherwise it is no longer true that the "laborer is worthy of his hire;" or that masters are bound to "render unto their servants that which is just and equal." The true solution of this matter in the end must be working by the hour or piece. This is too obviously just to satisfy the extreme labor reformers and trades-unions. Hence some of them are vehement against it. The demagogic vote in Congress to make eight hours' work entitled to the pay which ten hours' work usually commands in this country, is simply a vote to tax all other laborers of the country to pay extra rates to those who, through political favor or other devices, can elbow themselves into government employ.

Here, as elsewhere, the moral and economic principles coincide. That men should enforce as much compensation for less work as for more, for less products as for more, is in contravention of eternal justice. It is just like saying a dollar is entitled to buy as much as five, i. e., is worth five; eight hours can never permanently receive the wages of ten hours till capitalists can afford to pay it and still make a profit.

3. The next remedy which laborers are blindly applying to redress their supposed grievances is strikes—the combination of laborers to refuse work in some given occupation or group of occupations until they can thus enforce from capitalists or employers their demands for increased wages or other privileges. Upon this it may be observed generally, 1. That it is essential to the success of such efforts, not only that those in the combination stop laboring, but that they prevent others from laboring in their place; otherwise the combination is thwarted at once. In order to this, lawless violence is often necessary to be used to prevent those from working who are disposed to work. This is an outrageous infraction of the fundamental rights of man—the right to labor and to support himself by labor. Such violence should be repressed, and the right of each man to the free use of his own powers vindicated at whatever cost. The state is faithless to its supreme trust if it do not put forth its utmost power to repress such violent interference, and secure to every man the

inalienable right to exert his powers in useful service. All who interfere with, or conspire to despoil men of this God-given right should find the whole power of the state put forth to thwart them as enemies of the human race. 2. During the period for which strikes render capital and labor unproductive, laborers and capitalists alike must subsist by consuming and diminishing capital previously accumulated, and detracting so much from the labor fund, and therefore indirectly from the wages of labor in society. A part of this diminution is suffered by the laborers themselves during the continuance of the strike when they get no wages. A part is borne by other laborers who consume the products they make in the enhanced prices they are compelled to pay for them. The recent coal strikes in Pennsylvania involved a tremendous and cruel levy on all the laborers elsewhere dependent on anthracite for their fuel, or motive power in manufacturing. The fearful price they were obliged to pay for it was their contribution to make up in part the loss of the coal capitalists and laborers from their long enforced strike. But it repaired the loss of the capitalist more than of the miner, because the enhanced prices went rather to him as the owner of what coal remained to command them. The losses to the miners of their own capital, consisting of previous savings laid up in provident institutions, and spent in supporting themselves and families during the suspension of labor, were not made good. Nor, after their long idleness and consequent losses, did they gain their demand or obtain any increase of wages adequate to compensate for their losses. Consequently, exceptional cases aside, in the long run and on a large scale, strikes must cost the laborer more than he gains by them. 3. In the end, there is no way in which the laborer can realize so much for his labor as from the unrestricted competition of capital for his services in its various modes of employment, and the exercise of the greatest possible skill, fidelity and assiduity on his part as a laborer. Thus will it be for the advantage of the capitalist to give him the highest wages; he will be free to give them, and have the highest motive to give them. On the other hand the mo-

ment strikes or eight hour laws render it unprofitable or extra-hazardous for capital to employ labor in any department, it will find its way elsewhere. No strikes can permanently alter the normal rate of wages determined by the relation of supply and demand—the supply being the number of laborers seeking employment, and the demand for them being the amount of capital seeking laborers to use and work it at a profit to its owners. The most that strikes can do is to produce the loss resulting from the idleness of labor and capital caused by them and from other derangements indirectly resulting, as from the stoppage of manufacturing in 1871, caused by the want of coal to produce the necessary motive power. All this resulted in unmitigated loss to labor and capital in all quarters, and by consequence, so far forth to the labor-fund of community and the universal reward of laborers. While strikes thus work unmitigated evil, they, at the best, accomplish nothing which the free competition of capital for labor would not better accomplish without them. They may, for reasons already given, depress wages below this normal average. Nothing can permanently raise them above this standard. Here the laws of economics and ethics coincide in demanding the completest fidelity in behalf of all interests and all parties.

4. Another remedy closely connected with the last is the institution of Trades Unions, which include all the members of any given trade who can be persuaded to enter them, for the purpose of exacting a certain rate of wages from employers in that calling. The object is to enforce a much higher rate of wages than the normal standard that would arise from the law of freedom in the choice of occupation, and between laborer and employer. Now to associations for mutual protection and improvement between tradesmen or craftsmen of a given kind, or of several kinds, there can be no objection; everything is in their favor so long as they do not trench upon the fundamental principles of morality, economics, the rights and welfare of men and of society. But it is impossible to accomplish the objects at which many of these unions aim without such infringement of sacred rights and fundamental principles. In order to com-

pel employers to give the compensation they demand, they not only must refuse to work for less, which they have a right to do so long as they can support themselves without labor, but they must prevent others from so working who otherwise might do it. This can be only by coercion, lawless terror, and violence. Their method commonly is to refuse to work for any who employs persons not of their guild : to bring so large a proportion of their particular craft into their society, as to overawe outsiders who attempt to labor for their employers : to render it thus impracticable for any master mechanics to prosecute business except on the terms they dictate : to compel them to pay equal wages to all of their order, good, bad and indifferent : to refuse to work for those who have apprentices, or any but the smallest percentage of apprentices in proportion to other laborers in training : and thus to diminish the number of laborers skilled in their kind of work so as to ensure for themselves a virtual perpetual monopoly and enormous wages.

We can say nothing better of combinations thus conducted than that they are conspiracies against the laws of God, the rights of man, and the welfare of society. By what right do they employ violence and terror to prevent any man from working, or any employer from hiring and paying for his work, as they may both please ? By what right do they conspire to prevent rising youth from developing and training the gifts with which God hath endowed them, for their own welfare and that of society ? By what right do they compel all other laborers to pay a forced tribute to themselves ? If they are paid more, all things considered, than other employments command, or than they themselves could get under the law of freedom, is it not wrung from laborers in other branches who directly or indirectly consume, and thus pay the enhanced price for their products ? By what right do they compel employers to put the best and worst workers on one level of compensation ? What is this but to level all downward to the lowest, and rob society of the benefits of the highest skill and efficiency in production ? What is the effect of all this but to deprive society of any adequate future supply of skilled la-

bor ; to crowd into other occupations those unnaturally driven from that so monopolized by a few, thus sinking their wages below the normal standard as much as their own are forced up above it? How demoralizing, too, the effect upon the growing youth who swarm in our towns and cities, of thus forbidding them to learn useful trades? What then can they do? What but to swell the number and lower the wages of common laborers, or to fall into some sort of dishonest livelihood, if excluded from an honest one, or still further increase the fearful competition for clerkships, and the like, or the ominous growth of vagabonds, desperadoes, thieves, robbers, who live only by preying upon the life, the earnings and savings of others? We hesitate not to say that society should put forth its extremest power to repress those dangerous movements that thrive only by forcibly preventing men from using or developing their gifts and faculties. It is only one form of sheer, unmitigated robbery.

No kind of labor, even with such tactics, can permanently maintain its compensation at a rate, quantity and quality considered, above the average compensation of other kinds of labor, unless by the help of some special government bounty not awarded to the latter. The law of free competition will inevitably bring all industries, quantity and quality considered, upon a virtual level of uniform compensation, that are not kept at an unequal height by special gratuities. Or if any succeed by the terrorism of such trades-unions as we have considered, in parrying domestic competition, they will be frustrated by the importation of foreign fabrics at rates which render it impossible to pay such extravagant wages for the labor required to make them. This will forthwith remedy the evil and counter-work these terrible monopolies, unless interfered with by an excess of protection, which forces up the price of the foreign fabric so high that it cannot interfere with the monopoly of labor, against which it should be a natural defence. When protection is turned to such purposes, we do not hesitate to say that it is perverted from its true end. Instead of being used for the encouragement, it is prostituted to the discouragement and forcible repression of home

industry. We make no question that duties for revenue on imports should be so laid as to give our manufactures reasonable support during those tentative beginnings, which require some risk in testing their capacity to maintain themselves, *at the average remuneration which American labor and capital find in other pursuits.* But to protect any branch to a degree and for a period which permanently enable the workers in it to conspire successfully to compel all other laborers, and society at large, to pay them a special monopoly tax, is not what the country imposes tariffs for; and it outrages the first principles of political economy urged by their advocates in their favor. The gradual, but certain, and not slow operation of a system which enables combinations to extort monopoly prices for their labor, and prevents the training of apprentices to a practical skill in their art, is a process which, under the guise of protecting, must soon extinguish some of the most important branches of industry. A manufacturer noted for his munificence, lately said to us that the present system of trades-unions would, in ten years, nearly exterminate all skilled labor from the country. Another, who has become wealthy by the successful manufacture of articles which sell at a profit all over the globe, volunteered the declaration to us that the only way to neutralize those combinations which, by violence and terrorism, compel the rest of society to pay monopoly prices for their labor, and prevent that increase and replenishment of the ranks of skilled work without which it must needs die out, is to withdraw that excessive protection without which no business could endure the payment of such monstrous wages.

Coming now to positive methods of ending this war between labor and capital, the true solution of the problem is to be found in the perfect harmony between the fundamental principles of political economy and of Christian ethics.

1. Let the principles of Christianity be earnestly insisted on with reference to the respective compensations of labor and capital. Let the capitalist remember that, whatever be the requirements of the civil law, he is bound by every moral and

Christian obligation to give the laborer a fair and righteous share of the rewards of production. No matter if the law give him absolute despotic control over the person and services of the laborer, he is still under the most solemn bonds to the Lord of all to give him righteous wages. The laborer is worthy of his hire, whatever legal power the master has to make him work for little or nothing. And so the charge is explicit and unequivocal to masters who had despotic power over their slaves, to give unto their servants that which is just and equal, remembering that they also have a master in heaven. All oppression, extortion, fraud, grinding the faces of the poor in any way, by exacting extravagant interest for capital, are visited with unsparing condemnation.

On the other hand, laborers are no less under the most stringent obligations to their employers, which, if well discharged, will make most employers all the more able and willing to pay them righteous and even generous wages. The constant demand of Scripture only reaffirms and explicitly enforces the imperative of conscience, that we serve faithfully and cheerfully those whom we undertake to serve at all, applying all that diligence, fidelity and skill, that hearty and cheerful devotion to their interests, which we would exercise if working for ourselves. Even the slaves are charged to serve their masters, not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but with good will to do service as unto the Lord. If this obligation is upon the subjects of involuntary servitude, how much more should those who labor upon their own free contract for a stipulated reward, with alacrity and cheerfulness do their best for those whom they have stipulated to serve?

Still further : those who labor for wages ought to be willing and desirous that they who furnish the means of rewarding, sustaining, and energizing their labor unto due efficiency and productiveness, should be duly rewarded therefor. It is simply right that it should be so. As has been shown, capital is nothing but past labor saved and embodied in the commodities it has produced, and applied to the support and assistance of present and future labor. The reason why some possess it while others do not is, that they have forborne to spend

and enjoy it when earned, so that they or their families and offspring might reap its rewards in future. Is not labor thus saved and applied to assist other labor, as fully entitled to its reward as the labor it sustains? This is clearly the doctrine of Scripture. It is the duty of those who have talents to put them to use, that they may receive their own with usury. The denunciations of usurers in the Bible refer to the taking of usurious, oppressive, and extortionate interest, and the want of liberality and charity to the poor. Not only are men denounced who provide not for their own, but it is declared to be the duty of parents to lay up for their children as God gives opportunity. Indeed, to lay up in store against the time to come, the time of infirmity, disablement for supporting ourselves or others justly dependent on us, is impossible unless the products of labor saved or unspent now can be possessed, enjoyed, and rewarded in the future. Moreover, it is not only just, but for the interest of the laborer, that capital be well paid, otherwise it will not come forth freely for the support and reward of labor. And no less is it the interest of capital to secure to labor as well as itself generous compensation. The application of the very first principles of Christian morality and eternal justice to the relations of capital and labor tends to diminish all collision, and, like the very elements of political economy, to make them friendly coadjutors.

2. Laborers will be both content and efficient in proportion as they are made directly to share the profits which remain after paying fair wages to labor, interest on capital, compensation for risk, insurance, cost of superintendence. This would stimulate both the laborer and capitalist to task their utmost powers to secure the largest production and profit, because this secures the largest reward to both. Instead of conflict and jealousy, it stimulates cordial coöperation. And in place of reluctant, dull, inefficient eye-service, it brings in faithful, zealous, and effective exertion. This system has had an extensive trial in Great Britain, with almost uniformly happy results. It has there been the best antidote to or preventive of stubborn and desolating strikes yet discovered. It has not, however, thus far had any considerable trial in this country.

A still more perfect method, however, of identifying the interest of capital and labor, so as to bring it more to the consciousness of the laborer, is to make him at once both laborer and capitalist, a sharer in the capital upon which he is laboring, and, so *consciously* interested, to render that capital as productive as possible, by the efficiency of his labor. In the earlier and simpler forms of labor, this is largely so in the natural and normal working of things. The shoemaker, working alone, or with one or two apprentices, owns tools and the few sides of leather necessary for his business till he obtains a new supply. So of the blacksmith, the tailor and carpenter, and, even now, the small farmer. But as society advances, and labor-saving machines are introduced, which impress the powers of nature in a large scale into the service of man, immense masses of capital become requisite to the most efficient and economical production. Vast outlays of capital are required for the necessary buildings, steam-engines, machinery, fuel for motive power, raw material, wages of labor, before a dollar can be realized in return. All this is utterly beyond the reach of laborers. It is very much owing to this that the chasm and antagonism between capital and labor now become so portentous.

The device for enabling people of small means and savings to be owners of capital so situated, is the familiar one of dividing it into shares, as in the case of most of the banks, railways and great manufacturing corporations of the civilized world, particularly in this country. The very vastness of the capital required has necessitated a combination of the means of many persons in one enterprise, in order to make it possible. And hence it has been easier to invest small savings in such shares, than in almost any form of property except savings-banks. Vast numbers have their small savings invested in this way. It is wonderful how many holdings of stock in banks and great railway corporations are in small amounts, of from one to ten shares. All this may be, however, and mostly has been on the part of laborers, without investing in the stock of the corporations employing them. They have placed their savings mostly in

savings-banks and other provident institutions, which are invaluable as affording means and inducements for first accumulations, and for all who have no special reason for investing small sums elsewhere. But, until recently, few laborers have put their savings in the very capital which at once supports their labor, and is rendered productive by it. It is obvious, however, that this more perfectly identifies capital and labor, and, what is specially important, in the consciousness of the laborer himself, than any other conceivable system, in our present colossal establishments, which require such immense capital, in order to the highest economy of labor, and utilization of the powers of nature.

Of late this system has been initiated in some manufacturing towns of Massachusetts with the happiest results. The North American Review for January, in its article on the "Butler canvass," states that in Fall River, where this method has been most largely tried, manufactures have had an astonishing prosperity and unexampled development. An equivalent statement is going the rounds of the newspapers. We believe that in this direction lies the solution of that portentous conflict between capital and labor, which has arisen from the immensity of the capital involved in modern production being set over against and insulated from the laborers. The great productive establishments should be so organized as to encourage, facilitate, and invite the laborers to place their savings in the concern, and thus identify themselves with its prosperity. This of itself will form a powerful inducement to the frugality and economy which will enable them to save.

This beautifully harmonizes the principles of economics with those of Christian ethics. It makes all parties mutually interdependent. If one suffers all suffer. If one rejoice all rejoice. Like all organisms, all the parts are mutually means and ends : all working for each, and each for all. Thus the material and economical interests of men conform to the Christian ideal, whereby all are brethren, and not enemies. The address of the old Roman orator to the populace when revolting against the higher and governing classes, because the former were kept in servitude to the latter, comparing their

movement to a conspiracy of the other members of the body no longer to minister to the stomach, because they were thus its servile drudges, is quite as pertinent to the uprising of laborers against capital. So the Christian church, as a social organism, when conformed to the apostolic ideal, becomes the ideal type of all other rightly constituted societies.

What could more beautifully represent this feature of it than the Apostle's description of it as a "body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, making increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." Eph. iv. 16.

3. The power of Christian love should smooth and sweeten all the relations of capitalists and labor. Let all obey the injunction to do good unto all men, as they have opportunity, especially unto the household of saints; let masters thus deal with laborers, and laborers with masters, and with each other, and with men of every sort and condition, and we should soon see the irritation and clashing between these various classes brought to an end. Here capitalists and employers are under special and urgent obligations. They should so let their Christian love radiate in kindly and blessed ministries to their employés and their families, in all feasible ways, as to disarm hostility, extinguish jealousy, and provoke not envying and malice, but to love and good works. Seldom have employers manifested this benignity to their employés, without breaking down the wall of separation between them, and kindling an affectionate confidence which was proof against all venomous combinations and strikes.

And especially should the Church generally, and employers and capitalists particularly, make it a paramount concern to christianize the laboring masses, and first of all those so intimately related to them as employés. This, after all, is the grand specific which is sure to succeed, and without which all others are unavailing. It has, indeed, a supreme reference to God and eternity, but godliness hath the promise of the life that now is, and that which is to come. It is

only by celestial objects, that we can guide aright our earthly course. The Christian virtues rightly adjust all relations, parties, and duties, and the anointing of the spirit so lubricates all the parts and movements of society, that friction and collision disappear.

Moreover the Christian, and even the moral and prudential virtues, have such tendencies to thrift and prosperity as very much to dry up the springs of discontent, irritation and malignity. Improvidence, intemperance, prodigality, and various forms of vicious self-indulgence all tend to that poverty and degradation, which foment discontent, and an inclination to inpute their calamities to the injustice of other classes, especially capitalists, toward them; and tempt to organized movements to wring from their employers what they have forfeited by their own crimes. But let the Christian virtues of industry, temperance, frugality, fidelity and reasonable self-denial prevail, and their own prosperity will be only too delightful to allow them to be clamoring and banding together to extort from others privileges in the possession of which they already rejoice. This is the sovereign remedy.

The opulent should never forget that the greater the wealth in their stewardship, the more fearful their accountability. They hold it as a trust for the support of those great charitable and religious interests which cannot otherwise be adequately sustained. It is not only right and Christian that vast riches should be lavishly applied to such objects, but this beneficent use of them does very much to soothe and win the less favored classes, to quench the envy, jealousy and hate of the poor. The ordinary schemes of religious charity and benevolence must draw largely upon those who are laden with an overflowing abundance; as will instantly appear if we remember that a man worth a million and a half dollars with an annual income of \$100,000, and a single family to support, must have more than a hundred times the annual surplus of thirty men, each worth \$50,000, and from their labor and property having each an annual income of \$5,000, with a dependent family. But preëminently must we depend upon those who have accumulated vast piles of wealth, worse than

useless for any but benevolent and religious purposes, for the founding and endowment of great religious, educational, charitable and reformatory institutions which are so essential to Christian civilization and evangelization. It is from these sources that colleges, theological seminaries, public libraries, great classic training schools, adequately endowed Christian infirmaries, hospitals, suitable institutions for the worthy poor, helpless and suffering, and the unworthy too, whose anguish is but the fruit of their crimes, and much more the like, must be mainly endowed. And it is when great wealth is freely but wisely used for such purposes that it excites the love and confidence of the less fortunate classes, instead of that envy and hate which it naturally kindles when sturdily withheld from all worthy charitable and public objects, and prostituted wholly to selfish greed and selfish indulgence.

J. S. Mill has taken notice of a tendency to such use of wealth as in some measure an honorable peculiarity of Americans, especially Bostonian millionaires, with whom it has long been a recognized fashion to leave memorials of themselves in gifts or bequests to Harvard or other colleges. It is certain that the most notable example of devising liberal things in this way, both in England and his native country, has been Mr. Peabody, an American. Many others are nobly showing how great wealth, so often the curse of its possessor who makes Mammon his God, may become an unspeakable blessing to its owner, by being made a blessing to the Church and society. It is only necessary to recall such names as Lawrence, Williston, Sheffield, Lenox, Green, Pardee, Dodge, and others, to show that the number is increasing who not only know how to get wealth, but how to use it for the noblest ends. God grant that their number may indefinitely increase! Upon this, as upon every other ethical and Christian aspect of this subject, it is the duty of the clergy to be faithful and explicit in its inculcations to all parties involved; especially to "charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us all things richly to enjoy; that they do good, be rich in good works, ready to distribute,

willing to communicate, laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." 1 Tim. vi. 17-19.

Last of all, but not least, the incessant and universal dissemination of light, and exposure of error and delusion on the subject are of the utmost moment. The evils under which the industrial interests of society now suffer, largely arise from the prevalence of such ethical and economical delusions as we have attempted to expose in the preceding discussion. There is no subject in respect to which there are so many who mistake narrow and superficial views for knowledge, and so few that have that broad, profound and accurate insight which alone fits them to proffer light and guidance, as on political economy. Hence so many movements of some of the laboring classes for the redress of supposed injuries are like the struggles and throes of a blind giant, the aimless, helpless staggering of those who walk in darkness and know not at what they stumble. Therefore it is indispensable to spread light on the subject through every channel which gives access to the public, especially to the parties most intimately concerned; by the press in all its forms of periodical and other publication, - the pulpit, the forum, line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little. For in this as other things, "where no vision is, the people perisheth."

Is it said all this is true but unavailing, because the parties concerned and society at large acknowledge no allegiance to Christ? This makes it none the less our duty to do our utmost to apply the true remedy. If it be spurned because the rulers and people rebel against God and his Anointed, then we see no way of averting those social and national convulsions which the dread conflict now beginning portends. Those who defy God must reap the doom to which their madness tends. They sow the wind and shall reap the whirlwind, and become their own executioners. May God deliver the people from such suicidal infatuation! Let them walk in God's way. So shall "the rich and the poor meet together. The Lord is the maker of them all."