

SOCIALISM
AND THE
WORKINGMAN

R. FULLERTON,
B.D. B.C.L.

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



GIFT OF

Nixon Griffis



Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924030334241>

Cornell University Library
HX246 .F97 1911

Socialism and the workingman /



3 1924 030 334 241
olin

SOCIALISM AND THE WORKINGMAN

BY

R. FULLERTON, B.D., B.C.L.

NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO
BENZIGER BROTHERS

PRINTERS TO THE
HOLY APOSTOLIC SEE

PUBLISHERS OF
BENZIGER'S MAGAZINE

DUBLIN

M. H. GILL & SON, LTD.

E. N.

Nihil obstat :

JOANNES WATERS,
Censor Theol. Deput.

Imprimi potest :

✠ GULIELMUS,
Archiep. Dublinen.
Hiberniæ Primas.

DUBLINII, die 22^o Junii, 1911.

P R E F A C E .



THE following Essays were written during spare moments, now and then, just as the subject suggested itself.

The reader need not expect anything like a full treatment of any of the subjects of the different sections. My object was to repeat and emphasise some main idea under the various headings, so that the ordinary reader might get a grasp of some principle which would serve to direct him in forming a correct opinion on the manifold side-issues arising out of the main subject.

I shall be satisfied to know that I have succeeded in this.

R. FULLERTON.

BELFAST,

1st May, 1911.

Nihil obstat :

JOANNES WATERS,
Censor Theol. Deput.

Imprimi potest :

✠ GULIELMUS,
Archiep. Dublinen.
Hiberniæ Primas.

DUBLINII, die 22° Junii, 1911.

P R E F A C E .



THE following Essays were written during spare moments, now and then, just as the subject suggested itself.

The reader need not expect anything like a full treatment of any of the subjects of the different sections. My object was to repeat and emphasise some main idea under the various headings, so that the ordinary reader might get a grasp of some principle which would serve to direct him in forming a correct opinion on the manifold side-issues arising out of the main subject.

I shall be satisfied to know that I have succeeded in this.

R. FULLERTON.

BELFAST,

1st May, 1911.

CONTENTS.



	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY	I
I. INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS	6
II. THE SOIL OF THE EARTH	17
III. RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF LABOUR	33
IV. THE LIVING WAGE	46
V. THE FAMILY WAGE	59
VI. SOCIALISM	73
VII. SOCIALISM AND RELIGION	88
VIII. SOCIALISM AND MORALITY	103
IX. SOCIALISM AND INDUSTRY	117
X. SOCIALISM AND CAPITAL	134
XI. SOCIALISM AND TRADE UNIONISM	154
XII. SOCIALISM AND LIBERALISM	170
XIII. SOCIALISM IN PRACTICE... ..	181
XIV. CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM	207

Fools, that expect your verdant millennium, and nothing but love and abundance, brooks running wine, winds whispering music—with the whole ground and basis of your existence champed into a mud of sensuality; which daily growing deeper, will soon have no bottom but the abyss.—CARLYLE.

INTRODUCTORY.

SOCIALISM is still on the up-grade: its literature is increasing, its influence spreading, its advocates multiplying. Books, pamphlets, and newspapers continue to assure us that the dangers to the stability of the social order were never before so serious as they are at the present time. It seems to be taken for granted that class is ranged against class in deadly opposition; that labour has declared war against capital; that the working man is practically in arms against his employer. The cry continues with increasing vehemence, that the rich are becoming richer, and that as a direct result the poor are becoming poorer; that capital is passing into the hands of a few, and that the many are being reduced to a state of slavery or starvation; that with the growth of monopolies and the application of science to the improvement of machinery, labour is becoming scarcer, the number of unemployed increasing, the rate of wages being proportionately lowered, and the condition of the working classes becoming daily worse.

Whatever amount of truth may be in statements of so serious a nature, certain it is, that the frequency of strikes is alarmingly increasing, indicating a dangerous feeling of growing discontent, and revealing a smouldering fire of dissatisfaction among the masses which is being fanned into flame by social agitators, and may at any time burst into fierce conflagration. Thousands are ready at a moment's notice to put themselves out of work, only to starve on the streets or by the waysides, laying the blame, rightly or wrongly, at the employer's door; thereby strengthening the cause of the employer's enemies who are the enemies of the worker, too, and continually adding fresh fuel to the fire. Society has worked itself up to a pitch of feverish excitement, and it would seem as if it were only a matter of time till war broke out with such fury and such far-reaching results as modern history has not before witnessed.

In Ireland these grave social dangers may not be so imminent; and yet there are not wanting signs, from time to time, that even here we have not escaped the general infection. But in England and Scotland, and especially in France, Germany, and America, the social problem has assumed such vast proportions that thoughtful men are beginning to fear that the time may not be far

distant when law and order will be set at nought and universal anarchy reign supreme. Governments are aroused, legislation is being talked of, societies are formed for the purpose of preventing excesses in the application of remedies for the removal of grievances; everywhere the means is sought of allaying the growing discontent, of reconciling the different classes of those that want and those that have, and of readjusting the relations between capital and labour, between employer and employed.

Whatever opinions we may have on the reality or magnitude of the evils alleged to exist, of this there can be no doubt, that the working man must have some protection against the harshness, the grasping and grinding, the avarice and injustice of that capitalist employer whose only thought is to obtain the greatest amount of labour at the least possible expense; for if the worker has no means of protecting himself against the tyranny of an unscrupulous employer, his condition is worse than that of the beast of burden. All employers are not, indeed, without conscience, nor are all capitalists thieves; but there are dangers, and it is only natural that there should be dangers, when money is one of the sources of greatest temptation and avarice the besetting sin of humanity—there are dangers that unless some

means are found for keeping the balance adjusted between labour and capital, employers will too often ignore the natural rights of the employed.

It is repeatedly asserted at the present time that the evils consequent on the system of employment heretofore in vogue have already been multiplied over most of the civilised world to such an extent that the working classes are now degraded to the level of mere producing machines. Assertions of this kind should, however, be examined before they are accepted; nor should we regard as permanent conditions of the workers those temporary crises when trade is bad and work scarce, crises which will arise in any state of society composed of men such as we are.

It is not from exceptional cases of this kind, for which, perhaps, nobody is responsible, that we should argue for a radical alteration in the relations of employer and employed. We should beware of attempting to inaugurate sweeping changes on account of temporary depressions which are as natural, and will as certainly occur, as changes in the weather. We cannot expect that it will always be fine, and no matter what we expect, storms and sunshine will continue to succeed each other as surely as the seasons. In the world of work we must expect to find gloomy seasons, times of want, which, however we may

regret, we cannot avoid. And we should be carefully on our guard lest we be made the dupes of plotting men or plotting women, who, taking occasion from depressions in trade and hard times, endeavour to excite the fury of the working classes; and rousing the poor man's envy of the rich, seek to bring about a condition of things which would not only not remove, but, on the contrary, greatly augment, the evils to which our present state exposes us.

In this, as in most other matters, it will be found that the remedy lies not in the extremes but in the mean. On the one hand, the worker should have some defence against the tyranny of the employer, should that tyranny manifest itself; and on the other, extreme measures should be strictly avoided lest they prove to be the very antithesis of the Millennium, and the cure be found worse than the disease.

I purpose to set forth here as briefly, as plainly, and as simply as I can, the fundamental principles which govern the relations of man to man, and which must be maintained in accordance with the dictates of the Natural Law in any proposed solution of the problem that at present confronts society; and then to take a glance at the solution of present-day difficulties which Socialists propose.

I.

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS.

IT is especially important that we have clear notions on fundamental principles in the present age when no speculation is too wild, nor any guesswork too fantastic, to command a following. Suppositions are made, hypotheses formed, theories built up, and we applaud and shout, we understand not why, like crowds in the streets who rush along they know not whither or for what purpose. In these social questions clap-trap orators, busy editors of papers, and enthusiastic writers of books, start from false premises, substitute glowing promises for sound logic, and lead the crowd a wild dance through mazes of rhetoric. Some original state or other of things is taken for granted, and, as the process of theorising and argumentation goes on, we are unconsciously persuaded into believing that really, after all, the superstructure is being raised on solid foundations.

Now we cannot discuss the social problem as it presents itself to-day, till we have settled the question whether the individual can acquire

exclusive rights over private property, and examined the basis of his claim to private rights, if such exist. On the answer to this question will depend our views on the present state of society, the evils alleged to exist, and the remedies proposed for their removal. One would naturally expect to find this the first question discussed by modern saviours of society in their books and lectures and speeches ; yet I cannot remember seeing the matter squarely faced by any one of them. Perhaps the omission can be accounted for by the fact that the answer lies ready to hand and remains a standing refutation, here at the outset, of theories with which we are all by this time familiar.

In order to realise that a private person can lawfully become owner of property, we have only to call to mind the nature of man and his place in the universe. Nor need we stop to consider modern evolutionary theories of the origin, nature, and destiny of the human being ; rather we can assume the rational nature of man, in accordance with the teaching of sane philosophy and the obvious dictates of ordinary common sense. For, "what a piece of work is a man ! how noble in reason ! how infinite in faculty ! in form and moving how express and admirable ! in action how like an angel ! in apprehension how

like a God ! the beauty of the world ! the paragon of animals !”

But in the sober language of philosophy man is defined to be a rational animal ; that is, he possesses on the one hand the nature common to the lower animals, and on the other, is endowed with rationality which completely differentiates him from the rest of the animal kingdom. The animals below man have no reason and no choice of their own ; they act from instinct and are determined to action by sense alone. But man, while possessing the full perfection of animal nature, enjoys that faculty of reasoning and that freedom of will which raise him completely above the brute and make him a human person. It is only reasonable, therefore, that the human being should have the right to possess as his own those things which are necessary to supply the wants of his rational nature. The brute is satisfied with the things that are required to relieve its present need and perish in the using ; surely something more is due to man whose nature is specifically higher than that of the highest of the brutes.

This is the line of argument relied on by Leo XIII. in the Encyc. *Rerum Novarum* (On the Condition of Labour). “And on this account,” he concludes—“viz., that man alone among

animals possesses reason—it must be within his right to have things not merely for temporary and momentary use, as other living beings have them, but in stable and permanent possession ; he must have not only things which perish in the using, but also those which, though used, remain for use in the future.”

Then, consider man's place in the universe. We observe at once the rising series in which the different orders in nature are made to serve each other. The mineral kingdom supplies nutriment for growth to the plant world ; grass and grain crops, fruit and vegetables draw on the inexhaustible sources of the soil for their sustenance and development : the animals live on the products of the plant kingdom ; and man utilises the animals for his own use and benefit, for food, clothing, work, etc. And thus there is observed throughout nature an order of subservience in an ascending scale up to man.

But what of man? Here the subservience ends. For man is not made to be, nor can he be, subordinate to any other created nature. In his very essence he is free and independent, and subject to the Creator alone. He is the crowning work of all creation, combining in himself and representing all the different kingdoms below him, the animal, the plant, and the mineral, and

reflecting the perfections of all. An epitome of the rest of God's works, he is endowed, moreover, with the God-like attributes of reason and will by which he is constituted in the image and likeness of God, and ordained to give to the Creator that extrinsic glory which is the final aim of all His works.

From his very nature, we see at once that man is superior to all the other works of the universe. It would be, therefore, a subversion of the established order to subordinate the human being to any other of the departments of created nature, or to treat the rational animal as we do the beast or the plant or the chemical compound.

For a similar reason the individual human person is not by nature intended for the use or service of other individuals, even human, but for himself and through himself for God. For, considered as a person, apart from all accidental circumstances, each individual of the human race is as much a human being as any other. The dwarf has human nature as well as the giant, the beggar as well as the prince, the dunce as well as the genius. In this are all men equal, that all belong to the same order of rational nature. It is, therefore, a violation of that order, against nature and against reason, that any individual should be subordinated to any other in those things which

make him a human person. Accordingly, in his specific characteristics, in the attributes which constitute him a rational being, in his life and faculties, every man is independent of all other men and subject to God alone.

From which it follows that every person has rights in regard to life and the faculties of soul and body which cannot be interfered with unless by a superior, that is by God, without transgressing the order established in nature by the Author of nature.

St. Thomas, with his usual clearness and terseness, puts the case admirably :—

“In a system making for an end (he writes), any part of the system that cannot gain the end of themselves must be subordinate to other parts that do gain the end and stand in immediate relation to it. Thus the end of an army is victory, which the soldiers gain by their proper act of fighting : the soldiers alone are in request in the army for their own sakes ; all others in other employments in the army, such as grooms or armourers, are in request for the sake of the soldiers. But the final end of the universe being God, the intellectual nature alone attains Him in Himself by knowing Him and loving Him. Intelligent nature therefore alone in the universe is in request for its own sake, while all other

creatures are in request for the sake of it. . . . Subsistent intelligences . . . are cared for for their own sakes, and other things for their sake, in this sense, that the good things which are given them by divine providence are not given them for the profit of any other creature: while the gifts given to other creatures by divine ordinance make for the use of intellectual creatures." (*Summa Contra Gentiles*: Rickaby's Translation, pp. 273-274.)

Man has consequently the right to protect his life and to promote its welfare, to preserve and develop his faculties, and to advance himself generally along rational lines towards his full perfection.

But this cannot be done without external goods. The body will require food and clothing and the mind time and means for education both secular and religious. It must, therefore, be within the right of every man to acquire and possess as his own those things which are necessary for the preservation and betterment of the body and the development of the higher faculties of soul; for he who has a right to a certain end has a right also to the means necessary for attaining that end.

Furthermore, human beings must be free to make provision for the future. For, as Leo

XIII. points out, man cannot, like the brute, be content to have merely his present wants satisfied, to acquire momentary possession of things which perish in the using. Endowed with reason, he is not confined to the present, but looks before and after ; and seeing what changes human fortune is subject to, what accidents human life is exposed to ; knowing that as the rainy day has often come in the past it will be sure to return in the future ; that as sickness and disablement are of frequent occurrence, they may, at any time, fall to his own lot ; that unless a premature death cuts him off, old age will for a certainty overtake him, it is only reasonable and right that he should make provision against the freaks of fickle fortune and lay up something against the winter, against the accidents of human chance, and the declining years of life.

All this appears so perfectly plain, that the bare statement of it sounds like a repetition of first principles. Yet I feel that it is a want of proper appreciation of this view of human life that enables Socialistic demagogues to draw the unreflecting crowd with the sounding brass of hollow theories. If the individual has *from nature* the right to acquire and retain for his own use some of the goods of this world, there is left no solid basis on which to establish the Socialistic Utopia.

For it cannot be maintained that the State should have the care of all its individual members, and should provide for the wants of each as these arise. Apart from the impracticability of any such scheme, apart from the fraud and avarice which would frustrate it at every turn, these rights belong to the individual altogether independently of the State. Man is older than the State, and he retains the rights he enjoyed before the State as such existed, rights arising from his own nature as a human person, and rights which can neither be alienated nor appropriated by the State or by anything else.

Besides providing for himself, it is the right, as well as the duty, of every man to make provision for his family. He is nature's appointed guardian and protector of those dependent on him, and accordingly should provide for their sustenance and as far as possible for their comfort. This he cannot do unless he can acquire property and retain it in permanent possession, from which he will not only supply their daily wants but also put something by against the accidents of life, infirmity, old age, sickness, death, and the expenses which these entail.

Here again let it not be said that the State should supply all these wants. Whether it could or not, and we believe it could not, the family,

like the individual, is older than any State constitution. The State is made up of families, which must therefore have preceded it ; and the rights inherent in the family arise from nature, and are independent of the State. Moreover, the very existence of the State depends on the maintenance of family rights, any violation of which will tell against the State, and the abolition of which would mean the end of the State.

We shall have something further to say on this aspect of the question afterwards.

Finally, the rights of the individual to possess property are not only necessary for himself and his family, on which account they are safeguarded by the natural law, but they are also necessary for the common welfare of society. If we were enjoying some kind of angelic existence, or if the race had continued in its state of innocence, there might be no very urgent necessity for a division of the world's goods ; but unfortunately we are not pure spirits, but mortal men who have fallen from our state of original justice and have become the victims of powerful passions. Laziness, covetousness, pride, and envy are large and important factors with which we have to reckon in human life, nor can we hope that the time will ever come when we shall be able to ignore them. It is necessary, therefore, among men such as we

are, that the individual should be thrown on his own resources and made provide for himself as best he may, consistently, the while, with the rights which he must recognise in other individuals like himself.

Were any other system attempted, the result would be endless confusion. Where would be the incentive to work, if the worker could not hope to enjoy the fruits of his labours, and if the lazy would, as most likely they would, find ways and means of living as comfortably as the industrious? Thrift and industry and all the social virtues would cease to have an influence on human life; society would be turned topsyturvy, and law and order set at nought.

In addition, therefore, to the rights which spring from the nature of the human person and the nature of the human family, the safety of the State and the preservation of society demand that the individual, altogether independently of the State, should be free to acquire, possess, and retain a share of the good things which nature provides for the maintenace of man.

II.

THE SOIL OF THE EARTH.

WE have already seen that the individual has rights arising from his nature as a human person to acquire and retain in permanent possession part at least of the goods which nature has provided for man's use and benefit. We have now to see what provision nature has made for the support and advancement of the life of the individual and the family, and through them for the well-being of society.

You will observe at once that the soil of the earth is nature's great store-house on which man is continually drawing for the supply of those things which are necessary or useful for him. Food, fire, clothing, and shelter are the things he stands constantly in need of, and these the earth is incessantly yielding in generous profusion. The crops, and the animals which are raised on them, furnish a plentiful supply of food and clothing; turf, coal, timber, etc., afford abundant means for cooking and for warmth, for lighting and locomotion.

On the products of the earth we are all dependent. Some own the land, till the soil, sow and reap the crops ; others supply the work, and from the wages of their labour support themselves in turn on the produce of the soil ; while the remainder, who have to work for a living, are engaged in the various other departments of labour, skilled or unskilled, and exchange the wages of their work for the fruits of the earth.

And thus the earth is the bountiful mother to whom we have all to trust for the daily supply of the daily wants with which life is continually burdened. If, then, man has a right to acquire and retain in unmolested possession the things that are required for decent maintenance, it follows that he has a right to own and retain part, at least, of the soil of the earth and the products thereof which nature has provided for this purpose.

Hence we find the individual appropriation of nature's gifts as far back as the fall of Adam, when the parents of the race made for themselves scanty garments from fig leaves. Then, when God visited Paradise after sin had been committed, He made garments with which to clothe His creatures. "And the Lord made for Adam and his wife, garments of skins, and clothed them." He then sent them out of Paradise to till

the earth from which they were taken, for, with labour and toil, they were to eat of it all the days of their lives.

Of the sons of Adam, Cain was a husbandman, and Abel a shepherd, the one possessing crops, the other herds; and thus, at the very beginning of the race, we see clear indication of the individual possession of private property. When Cain killed his brother Abel, and being cursed by God "went out from the face of the Lord and dwelt as a fugitive on the earth at the east of Eden," he built a city and called it after his son Henoah. Here we have the first instance of fixed habitations. Then, Jabel, the sixth in descent from Cain, "was the father of such as dwell in tents and herdsmen," and his half-brother Tubulcain "was a hammerer and artificer in every work of brass and iron." Accordingly, as the race multiplied and extended, the people began to settle down and to gradually fix the limits of individual possessions.

About two hundred years after the Flood, in the days of Phaleg, the earth was divided among the descendants of the sons of Noah—Sem, Cham, and Japheth. They were dispersed throughout the world, or that part of the world, according to "their kindreds, and tongues, and generations, and lands, and nations." Thus as earth's in-

habitants increased and spread out over the world, it became necessary that the land should be divided amongst them and that each should possess his own without interference from others.

And the reason for this necessity is not far to seek.

Though the earth was given for the support of human life, it is evident that nature itself has not assigned any particular portions to individual persons ; neither would any such allotment have been called for had the race continued in the state of innocence in which it was originally constituted. Unfortunately, however, man fell from his original state, and the passions which formerly were held under the control of reason broke loose, with results only too evident all down the world's history. Hence, among men as we now find them, and as they have been since the fall of Adam, swayed alternately by virtue and vice, it is necessary that there be some means of avoiding the general confusion which would surely result from a universal community of interests in the goods which nature supplies for the use of all. With a strong propensity to slothful indolence on the one hand, and a driving passion of grasping avarice on the other, society must at once come to an end, and could never, indeed, have been established at all, unless the individual could

acquire and retain as his own a share in nature's great store-house to the exclusion of all others from its use. And since this exigency arises from the very constitution of human nature, consequent on the fall, and as it now exists, it follows that the natural law must sanction the means of avoiding general turmoil and of safeguarding universal order. How then was this end accomplished?

We are not now going to discuss all the various ways by which one may become the owner of land, as by legacy, gift, etc. ; nor are we just now concerned with theories which if realised might or might not be an improvement on our present system, but only with the means which nature has furnished first-hand to give to the individual a permanent right to the earth's soil. Let us look at it in this way.

The earth was once a wide, wild, free, and untilled field—the raw material fresh from nature's hand, to be worked by human skill and human toil as a fruitful source of all things necessary for the support of its inhabitants. If, then, in the days when earth's inhabitants were comparatively few, and vast stretches of land extended away around the globe's circumference, a man marked off and fenced in a plot of ground made for the use of man and as yet belonging to no one, would

it not thereby become his own exclusive property? And if such a one broke up the virgin soil, lavished on it his skill and labour, and made the hitherto unproducing earth bring forth in abundance, would he not thereby have acquired the right to continue in peaceful possession of what his toil produced? Would it be fair that he whose sweat and skill and care and anxiety had forced the stubborn earth to yield the means of livelihood, should be ruthlessly driven from his possessions and another enjoy the fruits of his toil?

Suppose, at the present day, a man discovered an island uninhabited and belonging to no one, and that he set to work and worked hard, till smiling gardens and rich orchards and teeming harvests replaced the barren monotony of the primitive state, would it not be violation of the plainest justice, opposed to reason and repugnant to the most ordinary common sense, that the next arrival on the island should drive out the original owner and possess himself of all the fruits of his labour, his care, and industry?

By the very fact of a man occupying a portion of the earth yet unpossessed by another, it becomes his own; for the earth was given to man for the support of human life and all that human life entails. But when, in addition to that, a man

lavishes his care and industry on the soil, expends his strength to make it productive, when his own personal energy has gone forth from him and into the earth to render it fertile and fruitful, the soil so changed must surely belong to himself and not to another.

“We are told (writes Leo XIII. in the Ency. on *Labour*) that it is right for private persons to have the use of the soil and the fruits of their land, but that it is unjust for anyone to possess as owner either the land on which he has built or the estate which he has cultivated. But those who assert this do not perceive that they are robbing man of what his own labour has produced. For the soil which is tilled and cultivated with toil and skill utterly changes its condition ; it was wild before, it is now fruitful ; it was barren, it now brings forth in abundance. That which has thus altered and improved it becomes so truly part of itself as to be in a great measure indistinguishable and inseparable from it. Is it just that the fruit of a man's sweat and labour should be enjoyed by another ? As effects follow from cause, so it is just and right that the results of labour should belong to him who has laboured.”

Suppose, again, that a man buys a farm or a plot of ground, does he not on that account become the owner of it to the exclusion of all

others, both public and private? Or is it not the soil itself or ground that he can purchase, but only a right to the use of it?

A labouring man, let us say, by attending continuously, punctually, and thoroughly to his work, and by careful economy at home, has been able to put by part of his earnings every week, till after a time his savings amount to what, for him, is a considerable sum. He invests his little capital in a piece of land for cultivation or in a plot of ground for building. The property thus purchased represents so much of his wages—it is his earnings in another form. He has given the money which he made his own by the work of his hands and the sweat of his brow, not for a right to cultivate the land or build on the ground, not for a right to the crops or to the rent, but for the soil itself of the earth to use or abuse as he pleases. The fruit of a man's sweat and toil and care and anxiety, increased by perhaps sometimes restricting himself in the necessaries of life, often depriving himself of life's comforts, must surely belong to himself and not to another. And whether it is in hard cash, or in land, or in house property, or in any other shape, it is his and his alone; and to deprive him of it when it takes the form of land or something permanently connected

with land, is clearly as unjust as to deprive him of his lawful hire, a crime crying to heaven for vengeance. The doctrine, therefore, which demands for the community at large the land belonging to private owners is plainly unreasonable, as it is repugnant to the grossest notions of natural justice that a man should be deprived of what is his own by another who has no claim whatsoever on it.

And yet there are those who contend that such spoliation is not only justifiable but obligatory; that the land should belong to the State and not to the individual, since the earth was given to all for the good of all. But the falsity of such a contention should be manifest from the considerations we have just advanced; and the spurious nature of the argument is made still more manifest by understanding the real meaning of the half truth contained in the reason given.

It is true indeed that the earth was made for the support of all, but it is also true that nature never intended the whole earth to remain the common property of the race; nay, from the very nature of things, from the constitution of human nature consequent on the fall of Adam, the division of the earth among its inhabitants becomes a necessity, and must therefore have the sanction of the natural law.

It is perfectly evident that the earth cannot remain the common property of mankind, that peoples separated by oceans and continents should have rights, at least negative rights, that is to say, rights that they should not be excluded from the soil of the earth on both sides of the globe. It is plainly irrational to maintain that the inhabitants of the Frigid Zones should be free to descend on the fertile plains of the Tropics and possess themselves of the soil made rich by the industry and toil of their owners.

Can anyone contend with any show of reason that the people of one continent have a right to drive out the natives of another and enjoy the fruits of labour which they never performed? Is it not manifestly absurd to suggest even that the natives of the Australian Bush or of the Andaman or the Coral Islands have any rights whatever to the vineyards of the Rhine or the wheatfields of Canada? These are extreme cases, but we must remember that extreme cases test principles. And it is just the conscious or unconscious suppression of this absurdity, to which their doctrines logically lead, that enables self-constituted social reformers of the present age to carry the applauding crowd with patch-work theories and Utopian dreams which will not bear the light of logic or the test of ordinary common sense. Plainly the

soil of the earth, though made for all mankind, could not remain the common property of the race without division and private rights.

And if this is true, it follows that no particular State can claim ownership of and the right to dispose of the earth's soil or rights permanently connected therewith, without reference to private owners already in possession. For on no particular State as such was ownership in any portion of the earth bestowed. Hence the State has no greater claims to possess the soil than has any private individual.

But apart from this negative equality, inasmuch as the individual is older than the State, his rights are prior in point of time ; and from his nature as a human person his claims are prior, as an almost universal rule, in point of tenure also.

It cannot be too constantly kept in mind in this whole matter that man is a rational being, that he has received his life and his faculties for the glory of the Creator, and consequently for his own individual good also—but only consequently, for it is impossible that God should produce any creature for any other primary end than the manifestation of His own divine glory. Whatever else, therefore, exists in creation should be made, and is ordained by Providence to be, subservient to this great end—the manifestation of

the glory of God through rational creatures. Man is, accordingly, bound to utilise the life and the faculties which the Creator conferred on him for the purpose of realising this sublime object of the works of the Almighty.

And it is with a view to furthering this end that men come together and form themselves into State societies, in order, that is, that by mutual aid what one is deficient in, whether mental or physical, may be supplied by another, and what one has not time for may be accomplished by another ; and thus, by mutual assistance, supporting one another, supplementing defects here and restraining excesses there, all may advance to the full perfection of their rational nature and the manifestation of the glory of Him who gave it.

From all of which it follows as a necessary consequence that man is older than the State, and that he has rights independently of the State ; that if he has availed himself of the rights he has from nature and acquired property in land, he cannot be deprived of it by the State or by anything else, consistently with the plainest justice and the most obvious dictates of the natural law.

Whatever, therefore, can be said in favour of the nationalization or the municipalization of land, this at all events is certain, that individuals can

acquire ownership of land and of things permanently connected with land, of which they cannot be deprived against their will without injustice. The State has no *a-priori* claim to the soil, and if the soil already belongs to private individuals, by what principles of justice can the State step in and deprive the lawful owner of the property which belongs to him and to him alone ?

Not only has the State no power to do anything of the kind, but, on the contrary, it is the bounden duty of the State to uphold and safeguard the rights of its members, to prevent and punish violations of these rights, to secure private individuals in peace and tranquility in the enjoyment of what is theirs ; and if the State fails in this it neglects its duty ; but if it attempts to go further and to interfere with the sacredness of private ownership, then it oversteps its duty, flagrantly violates the precepts of the natural law, on the observance of which it depends for existence, and thus paves the way for its own downfall.

In case of grave general necessity the State can provide for the common welfare out of private property, but this is only lawful in order to avoid national disaster, and in every case the individuals whose property is interfered with must be com-

pensated for their losses as far as compensation is possible.

The State, therefore, has jurisdiction over private property; it has the right, and it is its duty, to watch over the interests of its individual members, to ensure that they be allowed to continue unmolested in the peaceful possession of what belongs to them; but the State has not ownership, beyond the qualified exception just referred to, over the property of individuals, nor can it, without open rapine, meddle with the rights in which private individuals are confirmed by the natural law.

In conclusion, I may refer briefly to a line of argument continually adopted by Socialistic reformers. This is how it runs. All the land is, let us say, already in the possession of owners, let and sub-let till it barely enables the last holder to support himself and pay the rent. When all the land is distributed in this way, another man, the Adam of the great Proletariat, comes on the scene. Food and clothing he must have, or die of starvation. Food and clothing he cannot get without money. The unfortunate fellow has no money, and cannot get any unless he sells something. But he has nothing to sell. What, then, is he to do? A desperate idea strikes him. He'll sell himself. He offers himself for sale,

and is bought by a land owner or tenant proprietor to work on his farm. Then the latent horror of all this !

Rather the patent absurdity of such unvarnished nonsense. If that progenitor of the Proletariat takes it into his head to sell himself and acts on the resolve, we are inclined to think that he should be supported by the rates and have a warder to wait on him. What a sane man would do, would be to go and work for his living, do honest work for honest wages, and support himself decently and respectably.

You will observe that this inhuman treatment of the Proletariat is altogether beside the question. For the main point to be settled is whether the occupiers of the land are in lawful possession or not. If they are the lawful owners, they cannot be dispossessed, Proletariat or no Proletariat. But social reformation cannot be brought about, it would seem, by straight thinking. In the last place (I cannot say where, as I have mislaid the reference) in which I found a pen-picture of that heartrending scene when the Adam of the Proletariat was obliged to sell himself, one may observe the following complaint on the preceding page : Tenant rights, instead of being granted in perpetuity, and so securing for ever to the tenant the increase due to unforeseen

improvements in production, are granted for leases for finite times, at the end of which the landlord can revise the terms or eject the tenant. Now, suppose the leases were granted to the tenants in perpetuity, and that all the land was leased when our friend Adam of the Proletariat comes along, what would you advise him to do? Dispossess the person whose rights you think should be granted in perpetuity? Or sell himself? But there are just two other courses open to him. One is, to work like an honest man for his living; another, to become a social reformer.

III.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF LABOUR.

THE land and wages are the two subjects round which the social battle will ever continue to be fought. Important though the land question is, and will always be, wages present a problem of no less moment. For the great majority of the world's population are still affected, and shall for ever remain affected, by the stricture imposed on the father of the race : " In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread." A life of means, which can dispense with labour, is confined to the few : the great bulk of mankind must work for their living. But it should be borne in mind that those whom fortune has placed in such a position that they are not compelled to work for their support are not on that account one whit superior to the man or the woman who must earn their bread by the work of their hands. For work is honourable ; it is the means by which God intended we should live ; it has been sanctified by the Son of God himself ; and it is surely a manly and independent way of going through life for a man to depend for his

support on himself and on the work of his own two hands.

But this is not the view taken of the matter by social reformers and mob orators of the present age. Rousing the poor man's envy of the rich, and taking advantage of times of depression in trade and slackness of work, social demagogues, who have never done anything besides shouting to improve the poor man's condition, endeavour, by sophistical arguments and high-sounding promises, which they have no power, perhaps no desire, to fulfil, to set class against class in deadly opposition.

But nature never intended the rich to be the enemies of the poor; nor, indeed, are they; neither is capital in the hands of individuals the natural enemy of the working man. Still there is danger that those in power may treat unjustly those whom they command, just as there is danger that those who obey may fail to view aright the relations in which they should stand towards those over them.

We shall, therefore, endeavour to review, in brief outline, some of the more important rights and obligations which must be maintained between masters and work people.

Here, again, we must remember and keep steadily before our minds, man's dignity and his

place in creation. For man is not intended by his Maker to be a mere machine ; nor can he, consistently with the precepts of the natural law, be treated as a beast of burden. He is a rational being, made by God to fill a place in the divine plan of the world, owing obligations first and above all to God, and to himself and others on account of God. Man's first duty, therefore, is religion ; and on this account he cannot let his labour, nor can another accept it, on such conditions as will preclude the fulfilment of the duties due to Him who is superior to employer and employed alike.

There are certain rights enjoyed by every person which are inalienable and which must be preserved inviolable in all relations between man and man. A man cannot, without violation of the natural and divine law, renounce his right to seek his ultimate end. The purpose of our existence imposes the first obligation which calls for fulfilment ; and each one is accordingly bound to employ the means which God has placed at his disposal for attaining the end for which he was placed in the world. This is a duty which can yield to no other ; a duty which no reason can excuse a person from fulfilling ; and a duty which, if neglected, will entail everlasting penalties. The atheist may scoff at eternal penalties, God,

and religion, but an atheist's laugh does not affect the unalterable character of the eternal truths of the Almighty.

No man, therefore, can let his services, nor can another accept them, on such conditions as will prevent him from accomplishing in a reasonable way the end for which the Creator intended him. Hence a man's work must be so regulated as to leave him reasonable time for satisfying his religious obligations to God, and in that way preparing himself for his last end—the final cause of his existence.

This does not mean, of course, that it is unlawful in particular cases—say, in times of special urgency, when work must be done, and quickly, in order to prevent great loss or serious inconvenience, especially to the public—for workmen to be prevented from fulfilling their religious duties in the ordinary way; but it means that employment should not be made the exchange equivalent of a person's salvation, and, further, that it should be such as not to hinder a person, unless in exceptional circumstances, from attending to his religious duties in a becoming manner.

It is a crime for servants to accept employment in such a way as to be prevented from performing the service that is due to God; and it is no less a crime for employers to contract on

such conditions for the services of those seeking employment. It is criminal to trade at all on the need of another—that is, to give less than a fair price for what is sold or hired on account of the necessity of the other party—but it is still more criminal to take advantage of the indigence of servants or other work people, who must accept what employment they can get or starve, and to bargain for their services at the sacrifice of their religion. Our first duty is to God, and neglect of what is here essential, or co-operation in its neglect, is an offence which nothing can excuse. But, besides what is essential, we are bound also to what is becoming in religion ; and to fail in this, or to be the cause of another's failure, is still sinful unless it is justified by sufficient cause.

The cessation from work on Sundays is consequently a matter of strict religious observance. It is not intended to be merely rest from labour, but, in addition to that, it is meant, and mainly meant, to be a time devoted to the worship of God. As the Creator ceased from his work on the seventh day and called it Sabbath—the day of rest—so man, after the labour of the week, rests on Sunday, and withdraws his mind from the troubles of time to contemplate the things of eternity. There is one thing necessary, no

matter how we may theorise and philosophise about it, and it is on account of this supreme necessity that we must, first and above all, maintain aright our relations with God—our last end.

Besides the obligations arising from religion, there are others springing directly from morality which must be observed in all their sacredness by employer and employed alike. It is the duty of employers to see that all requisite and reasonable provision is made for safeguarding the morals of those in their employment, by preventing or lessening, as far as they can, the dangers which arise especially from the intermingling of the sexes. It is the bounden duty of masters to punish promptly transgressions of decency which, unfortunately, are not of unfrequent occurrence amongst those whose religious training does not enable them to estimate Christian virtue at its proper value. It is obviously the duty of the work people, and especially of the young whose habits are not yet formed, to be strictly on their guard lest they become victims of vice which they will find it extremely difficult to break with afterwards.

Then, there are the rights and obligations of a man with regard to himself as a human person. These rights, with their correlative obligations, are immediately concerned with the life of the

individual and his faculties, both mental and physical. Man is not made for himself or for other men, but for God ; and he is, accordingly, bound to use the life and the faculties given him by the Creator in the way which the Creator intends. No one is free to abuse the natural gifts he has received, for they are given him not in ownership but in use : they are not absolutely his own ; they have been bestowed on him only that he may use them for the manifestation of the glory of the Giver and for his own eternal happiness as a consequence. Everyone is, therefore, bound to employ all reasonable means to preserve his life and his faculties, both of soul and body ; and all others are bound to respect these rights, which are inalienable, and in regard to which all men are equal.

It is on account of the inalienable character of these personal rights that slavery in the strict sense is unlawful. A person may, indeed, give to another his services for life for whatever reward he chooses, should it be but for food and clothing ; but no one can transfer to another rights over his life or a right to use or abuse at pleasure his faculties whether of soul or body, for such rights do not belong to man himself, and hence he cannot relinquish them, nor can another unlawfully usurp them.

And the same holds in the case of free service done for pay. A man must not endanger or notably shorten his life except for some very grave justifying cause—the gravity of the cause required will, of course, depend on the seriousness of the danger. The public good, as well as the opportunity of earning a living, will justify a working man in undertaking an employment which would otherwise be unlawful.

But in all cases sufficient time must be allowed for the rest which the body stands in need of. A man is not a machine : he is a rational being, and a being with only a very limited supply of energy at his command. His body must get sufficient breathing space to enable it to recoup itself for the wear and tear of life's hard toil. The hours of labour should be regulated according to the difficulty of the work, and also in proportion to the ages of the workers.

The worst feature by far of life among the working classes at the present day is the almost inhuman treatment of the young, especially of young girls. There is nothing which can so appeal to a fair-minded man's sense of justice and charity as to see the little girls of our manufacturing towns, half-fed, half-clad, toiling away through the long tedious hours of the day for less, in many cases, than a living wage. It is criminal

to so cruelly crush the young promise of life ; to break the young spirit when it is struggling to be free ; to stupify the young mind when it is just beginning to open out to nature ; to arrest the young body's natural development and extinguish the vigour and freshness that are natural to youth.

Some means must be found for the removal of these social evils ; wages must be increased, working hours lessened, and the age limit raised. Seeing the violent contrasts between classes, the physical and mental crippling of the young, and the inadequate reward for labour, which entails a miserable existence, it is small wonder that the working people should seize on any remedy which holds out a hope, however slight, for a betterment of their condition.

Nevertheless, we must not allow our zeal to run off with our reason. It is only by resolutely pressing for reasonable concessions that we can hope to achieve success. We must make the rights which each one enjoys from nature the basis of our scheme, if improvement is to be permanent. These rights, which we have so far endeavoured to outline, are summed up by Leo XIII. thus : " In all agreements between masters and work people there is always the condition, expressed or understood, that there be allowed

proper rest for soul and body. To agree in any other sense would be against what is right and just ; for it can never be right or just to require on the one side, or to promise on the other, the giving up of those duties which a man owes to his God and to himself."

There remains for consideration the right of a worker to a fair return in the form of wages for the labour he performs. Here we touch the root of the whole social evil ; and it is just here that we require to be circumspect, and to view both sides of the problem—that on which the employer commands as well as that from which the labourer complains ; for we shall never be able to redress our wrongs or effect lasting improvements unless our remedies are grounded on common sense and backed by justice and equity. It is the onesidedness of their view of labour that makes the doctrines of modern Socialists so pernicious, and forbodes calamity for the worker no less than for his employer. For the present, however, we shall be content with stating the fundamental principle which forms the basis of the working-man's right to wages for his work.

Absolutely speaking, a man is free to work or not to work, as he pleases ; there is no physical necessity directly constraining him, just as there is no physical determination compelling him even

to live, for he is at liberty to take away his life if he so chooses. He is not, of course, morally free, since no one can interfere with the life and the rights connected with it, which do not belong to himself but to God, and of which he has only temporary ownership, to use but not to abuse. But a human being in the present life may violate any obligations, even the most sacred; and he may fail, criminal though the failure be, to live up to the designs of the Creator in small things and in great: he may neglect the proper care of life, of body, of soul, as he is free to omit or to employ the means necessary or suitable for the reasonable maintenance and advancement of himself as a rational being. And as a person is thus free to work or not to work, when work is necessary for life's support, so he is free to let his labour for a large wage or a small one, for a wage sufficient for decent upkeep or for one inadequate to satisfy the requirements of human dignity. And from this point of view the employer is also at liberty to hire the services of the worker at a rate of wage which will not afford the employed the means necessary for decent support.

But there is another aspect of the question which changes the whole outlook. For man is bound to maintain himself in a way befitting his human dignity. He is bound to preserve his life

and faculties, to protect and develop by all reasonable means the gifts which God has given him. This the general run of mankind can only do through work for wages. The wages, therefore, are due to the worker as a means of supporting himself through life ; and as he is bound to maintain himself in a way becoming a rational being made to the image of the Creator, so the wages of his labour are due to him by rights proportionately stringent. He is not, therefore, free—that is, morally free—to accept a lower rate of wage than will enable him to support himself decently, nor is his employer free, in ordinary circumstances, at least, to give him in return for his work a wage less than is sufficient for this purpose. This is the *basis* of the living wage as laid down by the Pontiff in the Ency. *Rerum Novarum*. “The labour of the workingman (he writes) is not only his personal attribute, but it is *necessary*, and this makes all the difference. The preservation of life is the bounden duty of all, and to fail therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to procure what is required in order to live ; and the poor can procure it in no other way than by work and wages.”

The right, then, to a living wage is not founded on an equality between the work supplied and the reward given, though this factor is,

no doubt, present ; but rather on the divinely imposed obligation each one is under of preserving his life and maintaining himself in a way in keeping with human dignity. As work is for most people the necessary and the only means by which this can be done, it follows that the reward due to labour must be such as will enable the wage-earner to discharge this fundamental duty to himself and God.

IV.

THE LIVING WAGE.

IF all, or even part, of the energy that has been wasted during the last sixty years or so on an attempt at overthrowing all social order in the interests of humanity had been spent on a reasonable effort, backed by natural justice, to ameliorate the condition of the workers, the crisis which now threatens society might never have arisen. But social reformers seem to have been at but little pains to examine the reasonableness of the demands they have been making; and while they exaggerated, as they still exaggerate, out of all recognition the grievances of the work people, and pressed, as they are still pressing, for the recognition of rights that never existed, one never hears or sees, from platform or Press, a single word on the rights of capitalists and employers. The workingman's rights and the workingman's wrongs constitute the whole theme of Socialistic propagandism. We hear a great deal about profits, surplus value, unremunerated labour, and all the rest of it; but never do we

find one word on the employer's rights or the employer's share in the production of wealth.

"Agitators," writes Leo XIII., "are aiming at making use of the labouring classes as instruments whereby to satisfy their own ambition. They delude them by empty promises; flatter them by proclaiming loudly their rights, without referring ever to their duties; they enkindle in their minds a hatred of landowners and of the wealthy classes; and at length, as soon as they deem the moment favourable for their harmful purposes, they launch them into perilous enterprises wherein none but the ringleaders reap advantage." (*Workingmen's Clubs and Associations.*)

Now, it is easy to understand that a prejudiced, one-sided view of the question, which ignores the rights that exist on the other side, will never appeal to the sympathy of right-thinking men, and will never bring about any permanent settlement of the difficulties which we are face to face with at present. If we are really serious in looking for a solution, we must approach the question squarely and honestly, and uphold the rights of the employer as stoutly as we condemn the grievances of the worker.

The employer has rights which must be maintained, for we should remember that wealth is not

now produced by labour alone, but by labour combined with capital. Labour is only the partial cause of production, for without capital labour, in existing conditions, would produce little.

And there is yet another consideration. A man of means is perfectly free to allow his money to lie idly by without fear of loss. He is not obliged to invest it in a venture which will give employment to those who would otherwise be without an opportunity of procuring the means of livelihood. If a person does invest his capital, thereby giving work to idle hands, he takes many risks. He may lose his money at a stroke from any of the innumerable accidents which are continually thwarting human designs, or the market value of the produce may fall so low that, after paying cost of production, he may find his balance at the wrong side. Thus, instead of profiting by the opportunities he gives to others, the capitalist may lose his property. Some consideration must be allowed for this risk that always accompanies the investment of money in wealth-producing concerns. But, besides this, we should always bear in mind that labour is not the sole cause of production, for labour without capital would, in present conditions, be fruitless: it is capital combined with labour, not labour alone, that is really the efficient producer of current wealth.

It is the persistent neglect of this side of the question that leads to the pernicious views on real and imaginary grievances that are doing so much to frustrate a reasonable and equitable readjustment of the conditions of labour, where such readjustment is a recognised necessity.

Reverting now to the worker's rights, we have to see what reward a workingman can justly claim for the labour he supplies. His right to a return is founded on his right to live, which most people can only exercise by means of work and wages. But mere existence is not sufficient to satisfy the obligations imposed on each one by the law of nature ; for, considered as a human person, every one is bound to live in a manner conformable to human dignity. This Leo XIII. defines to be "reasonable and frugal comfort."

"Let it be granted, then (he writes in the *Ency., On the Condition of Labour*), that, as a rule, workman and employer should make free agreements, and in particular should freely agree as to wages ; nevertheless, there is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort."

The least remuneration, therefore, according to the teaching of the Pontiff, that can in justice

be given or accepted for labour, must be such as will enable the worker to support himself in reasonable and frugal comfort. This is the living wage.

At first sight it appears no easy matter to determine what should be regarded as reasonable and frugal comfort, there are so many ranks in society, so many grades in the different ranks, so many various aspects of living even amongst those on the same social level. For

Variety's the very spice of life
That gives it all its flavour.

Different countries and different times demand different modes of living: money itself varies in value with various places.

In estimating reasonable comfort, we may fairly leave luxuries out of the reckoning; understanding by luxuries those things without which people got on very well in life in the past, and without which many people can still live comfortably enough. In any particular place it will be found that there is a pretty generally recognised standard of living in regard to housing, food, and clothing, which meets all the reasonable requirements of a person's station in life.

Now, as regards the ordinary labouring man, a living wage should be sufficient to pay the rent of a commodious house, neatly and usefully fur-

nished ; to supply the earner with plain, healthy food and drink ; to provide strong, comfortable clothes for working in, as well as a suit or two of finer woof for Sundays, holidays, and other special occasions ; and, finally, it should be enough to allow him to put something by against life's uncertainties. The amount of money required will vary, not only with different places, but also with the rise and fall in the market prices of food and furniture and clothes. But taking all these adjuncts into consideration, the workman has a right in justice to a wage sufficient to enable him to live in such comfort as we have tried to outline.

This right arises from an obligation which binds every man, and is antecedent to all contracts between employer and employed—the obligation, that is, which is imposed on every rational being to preserve his life and to maintain himself in a manner in keeping with the dignity of his rational nature. This does not, however, exclude the liberty of the individual to forego the exercise of certain rights, to be content with less than he might demand or what is in justice due to him, or to choose a life of poverty, as our religious do, retaining no rights to personal property, provided always he does not seriously injure his life. For the attainment of a higher good may

make it lawful for a person to renounce those rights which he is free to exercise. In this way religious, for the sake of a greater spiritual good, embrace a life of poverty and work for no other reward than the necessities of existence and the spiritual advancement of their souls. But these are exceptions. Men, generally, are made for fighting the battle of life in a world of contending parties ; and God has given to each one the right of supporting himself throughout life as becomes a rational creature.

In estimating how much is due to work for this purpose, we should not confine ourselves to mere money remuneration. A workingman may be the recipient of other benefits from his employer, which must also be taken into consideration. All grants in the way of food and clothing, grass, ground for vegetables, horse-work, housing, and reduced prices in what the worker buys from his master have a money value, and must be reckoned in estimating how much is rendered as a living wage.

So far we have only viewed the question of a just return for work done from one side. But there is another aspect, also, for there is another party to the contract. As the employer is bound to give a fair remuneration for the labour he receives, so the employee is bound to give his

master fair value for his money. In calculating what is just in this instance, we must look to the workingman of average capability. Some persons are old ; others sick or naturally weak ; others, from various causes, rendered incapable of doing work to any considerable extent ; and such people cannot, sometimes, though they may have no other means of support, supply such an amount of work as a fair-minded man would consider deserving of a reward sufficient to procure even the necessaries of life. We cannot, therefore, establish a principle of general application to all classes of persons ; but we must in this, as in all other matters of a similar character, look to the general run ; in this case, the general run of working people.

Further, it is evident from the very nature of the question, especially when we advert to the extraordinary variety of employments on which working people are engaged, that we cannot state in precise, definite language how much work would give a person a right in justice to a living wage : we can only express what natural justice demands in the form of a general principle, that at least a living wage is due to the worker when he performs what in the estimation of a fair-minded man would be an honest day's work. The length of the working day and the

nature of the work, as well as the capability of the worker, would have to be taken into account.

In all departments of labour, however, a fair day's work can be accurately determined, and is sufficiently recognised by men generally. It is within the employer's rights to insist on this amount being done, or to refuse to pay what would be a living wage; for the employer, no less than the wage-earner, has rights to maintain.

What we have said up to this point comes to this, that a person who performs an honest day's work has a right in justice—a right arising from the dignity of his rational nature—to at least a living wage; that is, a wage of such amount as will enable him to live in reasonable and frugal comfort. I have qualified the statement by "at least" a living wage, because more than this may be due in justice.

Labour, like all things else which men can bargain for, has a market value; and, just like other commodities, its market value rises and falls. With the decrease of demand for its products, the value of labour will fall, as it will increase when the demand for the labour itself rises. What its value at any given time is must be inferred from common, public estimation.

This cannot, of course, be fixed with mathematical certainty, just as we cannot determine absolutely the prices of a suit of clothes, a cow, or a horse, to a few pence, a few shillings, or a few pounds, respectively. Market value, estimated by public opinion, is always more or less elastic, and leaves, or may leave, room for bargaining. But there are two extremes—the maximum price and the minimum price—above and below which injustice lies. It is unjust to demand more than the maximum price for goods or for service, or to pay less than the minimum price for them, taking advantage, for instance, of the necessity in which the other party to the contract finds himself, when he is forced to part with his goods or his labour for any reward he can get, in order to stave off a greater evil.

“If, through necessity or fear of a worse evil, the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or a contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice.” (Leo XIII., *On the Condition of Labour*.)

The reason for this is plain. Every contract, to be just, must be fairly balanced on both sides: the seller has a right to get an equivalent for his produce, his stock, or his service, and the buyer has also a right to get value for his money.

When the value of labour goes up in the

market, the workingman has a right to an increase of wages, and when it goes down he must be satisfied with less. Working people are sufficiently alive to their rights in this matter, as is abundantly evidenced by strikes for higher pay in mills, in factories, and in other concerns, when demand is brisk and profits high.

A very important question is here suggested, viz. : when the market value falls so low that the employer cannot retain any profit if he pays a living wage, is he still bound to give to the wage-earner as much as will suffice to keep him in frugal comfort? If a person is in extreme necessity—say, in danger of death from hunger—he has a right to as much as will satisfy his present want ; and if this is refused him, he may lawfully take it without the consent of the owner. That much is due to him in justice, for in such circumstances the original negative community of all things is restored.* But apart from extreme cases of this kind, there seems to be no solid

* By negative community is meant the right in virtue of which no one can be prevented from appropriating those things which are as yet unpossessed by any. Positive community implies the right by which individuals can prevent others from obtaining exclusive possession of those things which belong to the community, *e.g.*, the fish in the high seas may be said to be held in negative community by all ; on the other hand, the property of shareholders in any concern is held in positive community.

reason why an employer should hand over all the profits to the workers and retain nothing for himself. For should the worker claim frugal comfort as the reward of his labours, could not the employer also claim some share for his contribution to the production of the wealth? It is not to labour alone, nor to capital alone, but to the combination of both, that the resulting wealth is attributable: so that it would seem only reasonable that a fair division should be made.

In all normal circumstances, or at least when the produce of labour is of such market value as to enable the master to get a fair interest on his capital and to pay a living wage to his workers, he is bound to pay this much at the lowest; and he is bound also to give of the excess, if any there be; in other words, to give to the wage-earner in return for his work an equivalent, judged by the standard of present market value.

On the other hand, though individuals here and there may be content to labour for less than will keep them in frugal comfort, and may lawfully do so from motives of religion, these are only the exception. Men generally are not intended for the poverty of the monastic life, but for the world; and they are bound to live as becomes the dignity of man. This obligation they owe to God, towards whom all men are bound—to pre-

serve the lives which He has entrusted to their guardianship in a way befitting their dignity.

“The preservation of life (writes Leo XIII.) is the bounden duty of each and all, and to fail therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to procure what is required in order to live ; and the poor can procure it no other way than by work and wages.”

V.

THE FAMILY WAGE.

IF, instead of building Socialistic castles in the air, we had given our serious attention to sensible, practical work for the improvement of the conditions of the labouring classes, they might not now be groaning under grievances which, we are assured, threaten the existence of society. Had the reformation of the social world been begun on a solid and sensible basis, and conducted along lines of natural justice, all necessary amelioration in the state of the toilers might reasonably have been hoped for.

If, in place of trumpeting complaints, arousing the passions of the complainants, stirring up discontent, fostering idleness, and fomenting rebellion, Socialistic reformers had instructed and encouraged the working people in the practice of industry, economy, temperance, cleanliness, punctuality, and thoroughness, the condition of labour might not now stand in need of such radical reformation as Socialism advocates.

If, instead of increasing and multiplying the

causes of discontent, in order to bring about a more drastic revolution against existing systems, labour had been combined for the purpose of pressing practical demands, which could not fail to enlist the sympathy of sensible men ; if, instead of drawing pictures of a coming Utopia and announcing the advent of a Millennium, the working classes had been organised to defend their rights, while maintaining, in all their sacredness, the rights of employers, we should not now have such urgent need for Socialism to reform society, as Socialists are fond of assuring us. But all this would have meant building up, and it is immensely easier to keep on pulling down.

It is only by working along practical lines that we can hope for any measure of permanent success ; and no system can claim to be in accordance with right reason which runs counter to the laws of nature.

We must first, and above all, recognise and uphold the rights of employer and employed alike, for the former, no less than the latter, are fixed and safeguarded by the natural law. The only rational solution of difficulties which may arise between them is to readjust their relations, and bring these into conformity with natural equity ; but any attempt at reformation which will, on the one hand, ignore the

rights of capital, or, on the other, magnify the rights of labour beyond the limits of natural justice, originating in injustice, must end in disaster.

There is nothing, indeed, which appeals so much to a man's charity and fellow-feeling as a large family without food, when several of its members are able and willing to work, if they could only get the opportunity. Still, we must remember that the necessities of one party do not always abolish the natural rights of another. There is no necessary logical connection between the wealth of the capitalist and the want of the worker ; and it certainly does not follow from the indigence or absolute starvation of some people that all capitalists and employers are, therefore, robbers and murderers. All of us, anti-Socialists as well as Socialists, deplore the condition of the poorer working classes, and are anxious to see it improved ; but there is this difference between Socialists and us, that while they lay all the blame at the door of the capitalist, we cannot help attaching some blame to the methods of the worker too ; and, further, while we agree with them in condemning the abuses of the employer's power, we differ from them, inasmuch as we refuse to ignore the abuses to which in most, if not in nearly all, cases are attributable the pitiful scenes of want amongst the working classes.

It is all very well to sit down in comfortable studies with piles of census books before us to work out theories to condemn wholesale the methods of employment; in the meantime, out of our abundant charity for the poor and for ourselves also, shedding copious crocodile tears over the destitution and the disabilities of the Proletariat. But there are some of us who are intimately associated with the poorest of the poor, and are perfectly acquainted with their daily lives, and we know on first-hand authority, without census books or theories, that in the vast majority of cases the cause of want is not referable to the capitalist, but to the workers themselves.

The family in which the virtues of sobriety, thrift, domestic economy are practised, are rarely, if ever, in a state remotely akin to destitution. Instances will occur, now and then, when, through no fault of their own, a family will be reduced in circumstances; but, for my own part, I cannot hope for a realization of conditions in which this state of affairs will not occasionally confront us. It is scarcely reasonable to attempt such sweeping changes as Socialism contemplates, on account of exceptions of this kind.

We would have a great deal more faith in the methods of social reformers if they undertook

to do something practical for the improvement of the living of the workers. Really, after all, it is of very little assistance to the struggling family to know that some Socialist or other has made a fine speech, or delivered a terrible lecture on the sins of the capitalist. If the poor were shown how they themselves might improve their condition by temperance, by frugality, by careful economy in the home, they would have no need for the glowing rhetoric and meaningless promises of modern philanthropists. But this is just the side of the question that Socialism is at pains to avoid. Nor is this the worst complaint that sensible people have to make against the new gospel; for, not only do Socialists make no effort to improve the lives of the poor, but they would even take away the rights which the law of nature has conferred on the family—rich and poor alike. I shall return to the consideration of this point afterwards.

For the present I will confine my remarks to the question of wages.

This is really the core of the social problem, so far as the family as such is involved: and if we could only see our way clearly here, we should avoid the ditches into which blind leaders of the blind fall themselves, and draw their followers after them.

According to the teaching of Leo XIII. :—

“ It is a most sacred law of nature that a man must provide food and all necessaries for those whom he has begotten ; and, similarly, nature dictates that a man’s children, who carry on, as it were, and continue his own personality, should be provided by him with all that is needful to enable them honourably to keep themselves from want and misery in the uncertainties of this mortal life.”
(*Rerum Novarum.*)

This right, which the father of a family possesses to support his family honourably, is based on the further right, according to the same authority, which man enjoys to enter the married state and become the head of a family :—

“ No human law (says the Pontiff) can abolish the natural and primitive right of marriage, or in any way limit the chief and principal purpose of marriage, ordained by God’s authority from the beginning—*Increase and multiply*. Thus we have the family ; the ‘ society ’ of a man’s own household ; a society limited, indeed, in numbers, but a true ‘ society,’ anterior to every kind of State or nation, with rights and duties of its own, totally independent of the commonwealth.”
(*Ibid.*)

Any rights which a person may possess to a family wage do not arise, as is obvious, from the dignity of the individual person, but spring rather

from the rights the individual holds from nature to become, if he chooses, the head of a family. The command, *increase and multiply*, while not imposing an obligation on every individual of the human race, but only on the race as a whole, gave to each one, as a general rule, the liberty of entering the married state and becoming, prospectively, the head of a family. Individuals are, of course, free to live a life of celibacy; nevertheless, celibacy is only for the few, and, generally speaking, the married state is the natural condition of humanity.

Therefore, since nature gives to a man the right of entering the married state and becoming the head of a family, it also gives to him the right of appropriating, in a legitimate way, as much of nature's goods as will enable him to keep his family in moderate comfort, as an individual living wage is the amount required to keep a thrifty individual in reasonable and frugal comfort.

The only way in which the poor can acquire as much of the world's wealth as will suffice for this purpose is by work and wages. Consequently, as much wages will be due on account of the work of the wage-earner as will enable him to maintain his family decently. And as the reward for which the individual works, in order to fulfil his duty in preserving his life and supporting

himself in a becoming manner, is due to strict justice, so the family living wage, being based on man's natural right to become the head of a family for which he must provide, would seem to be due in strict justice also.

From this it follows that a man, whether he is married or unmarried, has a right to, and can in justice claim, a family living wage; for, in addition to his right to enter the married state, from which arises his right to the family wage, there is another very important reason why married and unmarried should be treated alike. If the unmarried had not a right to as much as the head of a household, masters, naturally enough, would seek the services of the unmarried, thereby putting a premium on single life, for which reason men would be slow to undertake the greater responsibility of supporting a family, when employment would, on account of that responsibility, become more uncertain, and the race would suffer accordingly.

It is well to keep in mind that we are dealing with the least reward due to fair, honest work when the labour market is normal, because the market value of labour may exceed the amount necessary for an individual or a family living wage, in which case the wage-earner has a strict right to more than a living wage—he has a right

to the full value of the labour he supplies to his employer. Should the market value, however, fall below what is sufficient for frugal family comfort, we have seen that justice would not demand a living wage, for the reason that the master has rights also—he has a right to a fair return for his brain work and his utilised capital.

As in the case of the individual living wage, so here, various circumstances have to be taken into account in order to arrive at a fair estimate of the amount due to the head of a house for his labour with a view to the decent upkeep of his family. The same conditions which we referred to in dealing with an individual hold here also—a working day of reasonable length, considering the nature of the work ; a workingman of normal health, willingness, and capability ; and, further, we must not forget to include the advantages, in various ways, which the worker or his family may derive from his employer.

Besides these conditions, we should bear in mind that we can only deal with a family of normal size. It would be unreasonable to seek for the establishing of a principle by which we could defend the labourer's right to a family wage no matter how many members the family contained. The average family is generally computed at five or six, and this must guide us in deter-

mining the living wage, because in this, as in all other cases or classes of cases, we look to the average, not to the extremes.

But the amount due to a fair day's work, sufficient to keep this normal family of five or six persons in frugal comfort, is again limited by very important considerations, for the mother and children can contribute not a little to the support of the household.

Every individual human person is bound to preserve his or her life, and to go through life in a way befitting rational nature. Hence, though the father has to bear the brunt of the battle of life in providing for the family, the wife is bound to second his efforts and to take her share in the family economy. Indeed, a good, thrifty, careful housewife can contribute very much to home comfort, to the respectable maintenance of herself, her husband, and the children, and to lightening the toiler's burden. It is a wonderful stimulus to increased exertion for a man to know that his hard earnings will not be recklessly squandered, but put to the best account; and it is no less an incentive to industry and sobriety for the toiler to be cheered on his return from his hard day's work by a bright, comfortable home, solaced by the companionship of an industrious helpmate, and surrounded by the shining faces of his happy, innocent children. But alas!

Wives and mothers among the working classes, and among what are called the upper classes, too, are not at all alive to their duties, or, if they are, they culpably neglect them in very many cases. A slight acquaintance with the homes of the working people is sufficient to convince one that the mother and wife has it, to a very large extent, in her own hands to make the home comfortable and to preserve the husband and father from the evils that surround him. It is little wonder that the man who has worked hard all day should prefer the attractions of the public-house, the stimulus of spirits, or the society of the card-room to a dirty, uncomfortable house, coarse, badly-cooked food, and the companionship of an untidy wife and unkempt children, his own though they be.

The industrious wife will be careful to make small things go a long way, to economise in food and clothing, to make, to a large extent, her own clothes and those of her children; she will be able, by recasting old clothes, by washing and patching, to avoid the necessity of having recourse to the draper or the pawnshop for every change in the way of dress for herself, her husband, and her children.

In all my reading of Socialistic literature I have never come across a single passage bearing

on this aspect of the social problem. We read a good deal about the starving wife and ragged, unfed children ; but where do we find any reference to the lazy, thriftless, drunken wife and mother ? If Socialists set about socialising the family, they would find plenty of practical work to do, without troubling at all about a Socialistic State. If the poor man's wife spent less time at the beer-shop or in idle gossip with her neighbour, and gave more attention to the application of soap and water, patching, baking bread, and so on, the condition of the working classes would not stand in need of such radical reformation as Socialism is pleading for. It would be just as practical to begin here at the beginning and try to effect some improvement in household methods as to be satisfied with making speeches and writing books about grievances. We are all perfectly well aware of the grievances. We want them redressed ; but we don't want moonshine.

The children, too, as they grow up, can help, directly and indirectly, in keeping the wolf from the door and increasing the family comfort. If they are not yet able to earn money, they can take charge of the lighter duties in the house and leave the mother free for other work. In various ways all the members of a well-regulated family will be able to contribute a share to the domestic

economy, to the comfort and happiness of the common home.

That they are bound to do this is evident, for the duty of preserving life and of living respectably falls primarily on the individual, and the obligation on the father is to provide for those who cannot work, or to supplement the efforts of those who can partially support themselves.

It is thus seen that the family living wage is not to be reckoned at a sum sufficient to keep even an ordinarily-sized family in frugal comfort if the individuals will not make an effort to provide for themselves when they are able to do so. Rather, a family living wage is fair and just when it enables a man, apart from exceptional circumstances which will now and then arise and which cannot be ruled by any general laws, to supplement the work of his wife and children, and thereby supply them with everything necessary to maintain them in a decent, respectable way, befitting their station in life.

A further question naturally arises here. If the support of the family devolves on the mother on account of the death or disablement of the father, can she claim a family living wage for the work she performs? She may, of course, have a right to the equivalent of a family wage, because this amount would be only a fair return for her

labour; but with regard to the particular title which we are now discussing—viz., providing for the family—it would seem that the mother cannot demand a family wage, for the reason that she is not intended by nature for head of the family; and if it so happen that she must take the place of the father, this is an accident for which, like all other exceptions of the kind, the natural law makes no such provision as it does in case of the father. Other obligations may intervene and bind an employer to give a widow, or a wife whose husband is unable to work, a wage sufficient to support herself and her family; but this is outside our present scope.

For the same reason a living wage is not due in justice to a man who has to support his parents, brothers, sisters, or other relatives. No doubt, he may be bound to support them, but this, unlike headship of his own family, is not his natural destiny, and so far forth natural justice gives him no right to a wage for this purpose. Obligations of piety and even of justice may bind a man to support his relatives, but these obligations do not and cannot, except for some special reason, affect his employer, and can in no way establish a title to a family living wage, which arises directly out of a man's natural right to enter the married state and become head of a family.

VI.

SOCIALISM.

EVERY day brings its fresh list of troubles, disputes, strikes, not unfrequently accompanied by bloodshed. Masters and men are living in a state of perpetual uneasiness, knowing not what day may witness the open declaration of war. The relations between employer and employed are becoming more and more strained; the mutual understanding between capital and labour which would promote the interests of both is becoming gradually less; the capitalist is getting more jealous of his interests, the labourer more envious of his master's large profits; the working classes who supply the labour complain that the lion's share goes to the rich employer, while they only receive a petty pittance. Machinery, which was thought to be a blessing, so the complaint runs, is really proving a curse: with every fresh advance in the application of science to the means of production more workers are thrown out of employment, the demand for labour decreases, and wages can be cut down accordingly.

And the complaint, the dissatisfaction, the restiveness are not confined to one department

of labour or to any particular country ; from all branches of employment and from every land we hear the same grumbings and the same rumours of war between the classes. Nor is the cause necessarily all on one side. For it can scarcely be denied that the condition of the working classes in very many cases might be considerably improved, while still allowing a fair interest on his capital to the employer ; and, on the other hand, the workers are commonly enough complaining of grievances where none exist, often magnifying out of all recognition real causes of complaint. Led by social reformers and platform orators, they fail to see, through distorted glasses, the fundamental principles on which the relations between capital and labour must be reasonably maintained if existing hardships are to be removed, instead of being intensified, and if social order is to be preserved.

“ To remedy these wrongs (writes Leo XIII., in the Ency. *On the Condition of Labour*), the Socialists, working on the poor man’s envy of the rich, are striving to do away with private property, and contend that private property should become the common property of all, to be administered by the State or by municipal bodies. They hold that by thus transferring property from private individuals to the community the present mis-

chievous state of things will be set right, inasmuch as each citizen will then get his fair share of whatever there is to enjoy. But their contentions are so clearly powerless to end the controversy that were they carried into effect the workingman himself would be the first to suffer. They are, moreover, emphatically unjust, because they would rob the lawful possessor, bring State action into a sphere not within its competence, and create utter confusion in the community."

And yet, notwithstanding these pernicious evils to which Socialism logically leads, and which must appear plain to anyone who seriously considers the question, there is still no subject attracting wider attention or engrossing the mind of the modern world to a greater extent. Not excepting Evolution itself, of which Socialism claims to be the offspring, no other subject commands such interest, possesses a more widely diffused literature, or finds more general favour with political agitators. Books and pamphlets and papers are met with in profusion in every bookshop and library, or scattered broadcast in all directions, to be had merely for the picking up. Everyone nowadays feels called upon to discuss Socialism; and indeed discussion is rife enough. It is Socialism in the train, Socialism on the tram, Socialism in the mill, and Socialism at the coal-boat.

Nor is it to be wondered at that such a doctrine should excite such interest ; for it affects at the same time the noble and the commoner, the rich and the poor, the employer and the employed, the industrious and the thriftless, the idle and the busy, the model man and the profligate. No phase of life can escape its influence ; for Socialism seeks to level down all class distinctions, to make the peasant sit with the prince, to compel the capitalist to work for the labourer, to clothe the poor from the wardrobes of the rich, to feed the needy from the tables of the wealthy—in a word, to distribute the world's goods equally amongst its citizens, and to usher in an era of peace and contentment, happiness and prosperity. There are to be no more workhouses, no more slums, no more poverty, no more palaces : all must work for a living, but wages will be increased and working hours shortened, and from a uniform distribution of wealth all will be equally rich, equally prosperous, equally happy.

This delightful state of things is to be brought about by the transference of all private property to the State.

“The State is the only proprietor of all means of labour—of all lands, all manufactories, all means of transporation, all labour tools, all commerce, and perhaps also of all the schools.

At the head of the organisation stands a perfect democratic government, to be chosen by the people, say every two years ; this government culminates in a committee, perhaps in a president. The committee has the administration of the entire State ; not only the political (legislative, executive, judicial), but also the control of the entire production, of the entire distribution, of the entire consumption (at least in its more general aspect, *e.g.*, how much is to be deducted from consumption in favour of production, etc.). Although labour may be entrusted to the direction of sub-committees and departments, yet there must always be one comprehensive, supreme, and decisive authority. Under this central authority are the provincial departments and communal bureaus, which discharge the same functions in behalf of their several districts as the central committee in behalf of the State ; but all these must be subordinate to the supreme central board." (Franz Hitze : *Kapital und Arbeit*, p. 286 ; cited by Fr. Cathrein, *Socialism*, p. 255.)

Thus Socialism has set before it the task of dispossessing private owners, seizing all productive capital, and transferring all the means of production, distribution, and exchange from individuals to the State as by Socialism estab-

lished. The State is to control all the wealth, all the machinery, all the traffic, all the commerce—everything out of which money can be made or exchange value extracted. Every citizen, irrespective of birth or position, will be compelled to work for his living; he will be paid enough to keep himself decently and comfortably, and perhaps, if he is economic, to save a little; which little, however, he cannot invest or trade with in any way, except in procuring from the State what the State may be willing to sell to him. But this will not be any very serious drawback when the world's goods will be equally distributed amongst all, when all will have sufficient to enable them to live comfortably, and no one will be better off than another. Thus, too, envy, jealousy, competition, and anxiety will be put for ever to rest, and peace and tranquility sit smiling over a harmonious and contented world.

It is a beautiful picture, a delightful prospect. The pinched mother of a large, unfed family will rejoice to see her children clean and neat and well fed, while she herself will apply the soap provided by the State, dress in the clothes supplied by the State, and take her place beside her who is now the rich man's wife. The hard-wrought labourer, who seldom knew the luxury of a whole suit or dry boots, will now dress in fine clothes, sip his

beer and smoke the pipe of peace with him who was formerly his master, whose nod was law. Riches and poverty alike will cease ; work will be a pleasure ; want will be unknown ; the rainy day will no longer have any meaning ; pleasures and pastimes, joy and love and peace will be equally shared by all, and the only drawback remaining will be the anxiety of each one to contribute still more to the enjoyment of others.

Talk of Arcadia and Elysium and the coming Millennium ! The world is Arcadia, the Millennium is at the doors ; the wolf is slaughtered, Socialism has saved us !

It is little wonder that those who are allowed to view only one side of the Socialistic Utopia should clamour for its advent. It is undoubtedly a fascinating theory which can so readily rid the world of anxieties and troubles that have been harrassing mankind since Adam heard the sentence, " In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread," and which secures to each individual of the race the tranquil enjoyment of everything required to satisfy the wants of man.

But how is the delightful plan to be executed ? At present there exists the greatest inequality ; there are millionaires and multi-millionaires in a society which contains starving beggars by the thousand. There are men who own property,

and who assert that they have a right to retain it, and there are Governments established on firm bases sworn to protect their rights. Are these people going to peacefully throw their property into the common fund and take their chance of a decent livelihood from the Socialistic distributors? Are kings going to quietly step down from their thrones and shoulder the pick and shovel? Are the wealthy willing to walk out tamely from their houses when the Socialistic bailiff comes to take possession for the community? Are capitalists ready to transfer ownership in their money, as well as their vested rights, to the community, and begin with the rest to labour for a living? Certainly not, while human nature continues to be what it is and what it has been since the days of Adam, and while the natural and divine law sanctions the possession of private property no less than that of public.

How, then, is the universal peace and harmony, brotherly love and charity unbounded of the Socialistic programme to be realised? Socialism is ready with the answer. Force must be employed, relentless war must be waged on capitalists and on every man who, by hard work, thrift, industry, frugality, economy, sobriety, has outstripped in the race of life the lazy, the indolent, the spendthrift, the besotted drunkard,

the reckless gambler, and the all-round profligate. Thieves and robbers and loafers, the Proletariat, as the name goes in Socialistic parlance, are to be drilled and armed and marched out to smash open the doors of wealth, productive and unproductive, and distribute the spoils among the owners and the plunderers. Nothing short of red revolution all round will satisfy the demands enlightened Socialism is making in the name of struggling humanity. This is no mere deduction from Socialistic principles; it is the bold, explicit declaration of the leaders themselves, expressed time and again in no unmistakable language.

In the Communist Manifesto Marx and Engels declare "that their purposes can be attained only by a violent subversion of the existing order. Let the ruling classes tremble at the Communist revolution."

At the Hague Congress, in 1872, Marx declared—"In most countries of Europe *violence* must be the lever of our social reform. *We must finally have recourse to violence in order to establish the rule of labour.* The revolution must be universal, and we find a conspicuous example in the Commune of Paris, which has failed because in other capitals—Berlin and Madrid—a simultaneous revolutionary movement did not break out in connection with this mighty upheaval of the Proletariat in Paris."

Bebel, commenting in the German Reichstag upon occurrences in Paris, says—"These events are but a slight skirmish in the war which the Proletariat is prepared to wage against all palaces." And in one of his works (*Unsere Ziele*, p. 44) he writes—"We must not shudder at the thought of the possible employment of violence; we must not raise an alarm-cry at the suppression of 'existing rights,' at violent expropriation, etc. History teaches that at all times new ideas, as a rule, were realised by violent conflict with the defenders of the past, and that the combatants for new ideas struck blows as deadly as possible at the defenders of antiquity."

And Karl Marx, in his work on Capital, exclaims—"Violence is the obstetrician that waits on every ancient society that is about to give birth to a new one; violence is itself a social factor." (*Vide Cathrein, Socialism*, p. 209.)

This is the real, genuine, modern Socialism, as originally formulated by its founders, Marx and Engels, and as still advocated by the Socialist bodies throughout the world. True, there are found in all European countries Socialists of a milder type—those, viz., who are called reformists, or opportunists, or revisionists. The aim of these is the same as that of the revolutionists; but they hope to attain their end, not by strife,

but by peaceful measures. They rely upon trade-unions, co-operation, municipal reform, labour legislation, democratization of the State. They will not attempt to seize the supreme power; they will co-operate with it, in the hope that by gaining concessions and by the enactment of laws to compass collective ownership the power may gradually pass from the capitalist government to the labouring classes.

This conservative wing, however, has had practically no influence on the Socialism of the world. At the Dresden Convention, held in 1903, after a most passionate discussion between the revolutionists and the reformists, a resolution condemning reformism was carried by a majority of 288 to 11. In the following year, 1904, in the sixth International Socialist Congress, assembled in Amsterdam, the Dresden resolution was moved by the French Socialist Party and carried by a majority of 25 to 11, the votes being taken by countries. For the resolution voted Germany, Bohemia, Bulgaria, Spain, America, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Poland, and Russia; against it, the British Colonies. The vote of the following countries was split:—Great Britain, the Social Democratic Federation voting for the resolution, and the Independent Labour Party against; France, the Socialist Party of France (the

Guesdists), being in favour of it, the Jaureists against it; Norway, the Argentine Republic, Belgium, Denmark, Holland, Sweden, and Switzerland abstained from voting. (*Vide* Ming : *The Religion of Modern Socialism*, p. 36.)

In 1905 France closed its ranks and united on a revolutionary programme. American Socialism is still solid for the original tactics advocated by Marx and Engels.

Practically, therefore, there is only one form of Socialism, and that is essentially revolutionary. To quote the words of James T. Van Rensselaer, a leading Californian Socialist—"At some length I have attempted to demonstrate that there is no Socialism that is not revolutionary Socialism. This I have defined as a revolutionary ideal, to be obtained by a revolutionary class, preaching a revolutionary propaganda through the agency of a revolutionary party, and by which the workers are to secure the general ownership of all the means of production and distribution for all the people." (*Ibid*, p. 40.)

And when the war is over, when kings are dethroned, and governments broken up, and capitalists dispossessed, and all law and order swept clean off the face of the earth, then peace and prosperity will hold undisturbed sway over a happy and contented world! The gallant soldiers

of the revolutionary army will not attempt to appropriate any of the booty which may come in their way during the campaign ; for will they not be fighting for the abolition of private property ? And the unselfish men who will officer this humanitarian army will not be induced to touch anything till they see that everyone else is satisfied ; for will they not be fighting solely in the interests of men—their brothers ? When the conquest is complete there will be no more selfishness left in the world. No, indeed, only Socialistic selfishness, but that does not count just now.

The recent French trouble furnishes a striking illustration of the facility with which a Socialistic programme can be reduced to practice and private property transferred from individuals to the State for the benefit of the community. The French Government sent out its officials to seize the private property of bishops and priests, of dioceses and parishes. How much good came to the community from the spoliation ? Not a franc's worth. The State officials ran off with the spoil, and neither the Government nor the people profited anything by the most shameless and cold-blooded rapine that has disgraced modern civilization.

Can any sensible man have any sympathy with a programme such as Socialism contem-

plates? Or can any man in whom there is left any sense of natural justice identify himself with such a system? Robbery is perfectly justifiable according to the Socialistic morality, provided we only take what we have a right to. We have a right to our share of the world's goods, and, of course, no man who has a Socialistic conscience would think of taking more than what is due to him. Let us, therefore, by all means steal and plunder; but, in the name of Socialism, let us not be too greedy. And of course we won't.

We can murder, too; there is no reason why we should not, if we confine our attention to the enemies of Socialism and of the poor man, for whom Socialism has such compassion. Perhaps you will say that Socialists would not go so far as to allow or approve of murder. You can judge from the following:—"Hirsch Lekuch was executed June 10, 1902, for a murderous attack on the Governor of Vilna. The *Vortwärts* (the chief Socialistic organ), under the heading "A Martyr of Oppression," remarks:—"The executed man has been enrolled for ever in the history of the downtrodden people of Russia, which is a history of dreadful sufferings no less than a history of dauntless heroism." "Is this," asks Fr. Cathrein, "not open commendation of political murder?" (*Socialism*, p. 210.)

We see, then, what Socialism really means. The first plank in its platform is robbery, open spoliation of private owners of property. These private owners and capitalists of every kind may be abusing their power ; they may be guilty of injustice towards the labourers they employ ; they may be sometimes, as Socialists say they are always, amassing wealth by the exploitation of the Proletariat, by grinding and crushing the indigent work-people who must accept what employment they get or die of starvation. Such a state of things is to be deplored, and none of us can have any sympathy with it. But, however we may disapprove of the methods of capitalists, we cannot, without covert injustice or open rapine, deprive them of what belongs to themselves and not to us. Whatever grievances the working people suffer from—and we are not at all disposed or desirous to minimise them or to shut our eyes to them—should be removed, or lessened as much as possible, by wise legislation, by rational combination among the workers themselves ; but, in the name of common sense and of natural justice, let us have nothing to do with mad dreams which can never be realised, and which, if they were realised, would only mean universal social disaster.

VII.

SOCIALISM AND RELIGION.

THE greatest complaint which believers in God have to make against Socialism arises from the attitude of venomous opposition which its propagators take up in regard to religion. And the cause of complaint increases as sensible people realise the utterly groundless premises from which Socialistic anti-religious conclusions are drawn. It is a fundamental tenet of Socialism that the human being has no soul any more than a dog, and that the existence of God is only a myth. Consequently there is no place for religion, and no need for it. Evolution is the foundation of the Socialistic system ; and evolution, in the only form in which Socialism will accept it, is a theory according to which all things—minerals, plants, animals, and men—arose from a cloud, the origin of which we know nothing about.

The Darwinian theory of evolution, though enjoying for a time a fair amount of popularity amongst the learned, has of late years been practically discarded, and at the present time no

really scientific man who has any regard for his reputation would identify himself with the small fry of so-called scientists who, by an application of the principles of Darwinism, endeavour to reason God and the human soul out of existence. Even Atheists themselves, the men who are loudest in denying that there is a God, are decidedly opposed to the conclusions of the evolutionists who while away their time or make a livelihood by playing at science. Socialists, however, do not mind that much ; and if the denial of the spirituality of the human soul and of the existence of God suits their purpose, as it undoubtedly does, it matters little to them whether their doctrines are true or false. They continue, accordingly, to repeat what has been repeated and refuted times without number, that in evolution, in the gradual rise and development of all things from some primitive form of matter, the origin and nature of which are unknown, is to be found the explanation of everything of which observation or experience can tell us anything. Hence, to evolution we must look if we would understand the foolishness of religious beliefs and the fickleness of moral standards.

The explanation, however, is anything but satisfactory. Engels, for instance, tells us that "religion had its origin in a very primeval period

from ambiguous and rather primitive views of men concerning their own nature and their surroundings." Now, it scarcely satisfies one's curiosity to be told that in primeval times rather primitive views prevailed concerning man's nature and his surroundings. Bebel assures us that "the gods do not create men, but men create gods and God." The reference in both instances is obviously to the ghost-theory of the origin of religion which Tylor popularised in his work on *Primitive Culture*. As I have elsewhere discussed and, as I believe, refuted the theory, I shall not stop here to discuss it further. It is sufficient to know that all the facts ascertained from savage and civilized life, apart altogether from revelation as contained in the Bible, show that belief in one God and worship of one God was the primitive religious state of humanity.

Bebel throws some further light on the situation when he declares that "natural science has shown 'creation' to be a myth; astronomy and physics prove that 'heaven' is a phantom." On the contrary, the foremost natural scientists of the present day prove to demonstration that creation must have been an actual fact; astronomy and physics confirm in the most strictly scientific manner the truth of the Psalmist's words: "The

heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of His hands."

Socialists were at pains for a long time to give the world to understand that there was no cause for dispute between them and those who believed in God, in the immortality of the human soul, and in a future life ; that they were in no way concerned about religion, that their only anxiety was the poor man's hardships and the amelioration of his state, the rich man's heartlessness and the restraint of his merciless power. Hence, they never wearied insisting on their attitude of absolute indifference to religion as far as their Socialistic propaganda was concerned, declaring on every possible pretext that religion was a private concern. One or two samples of this religious indifferentism will suffice. Mr. Blatchford writes :—

"Another charge against Socialists is that they are Atheists, whose aim is to destroy all religion and morality. . . . This is not true. It is true that many Socialists are Agnostics and some are Atheists. But Atheism is no more a part of Socialism than it is a part of Radicalism or Liberalism. Many prominent Socialists are Christians, not a few are clergymen, etc."

In a letter to the Most Rev. Archbishop S. G. Messmer, of Milwaukee, from two Socialist

leaders, Victor L. Berger and Winfield R. Gaylord, we find :—“ We repeat most emphatically Socialism advances ‘ purely economic questions.’ We repeat most emphatically Socialism advances no doctrines ‘ touching matters of religion, ethics, and natural law.’ These are private matters of individual belief or knowledge, and Socialism or the Social Democratic Party has nothing to do with them,” and so on. (*Vide* Ming: *The Religion of Modern Socialism*, pp. 228, 229.)

Father Ming asks :—

“ What is the real reason of so emphatic a declaration that Socialism is not irreligious? Is it part of Socialist tactics? Is it caution lest they might be denounced and attacked, or might shock the Christian workingmen, and thus render a propaganda among them impossible? . . . The reputation of Socialists would fare much better both as to honesty and learning if, when attacked, they did not deny and disavow the teaching which on other occasions they openly proclaim as the only saving truth and the only science worthy of mankind.” (*Ibid.*, p. 232.)

Socialists, however, cannot be seriously accused of excessive selfishness in the matter of reputation, otherwise it would be impossible to find such glaring contradictions and unpardon-

able falsehoods as make up the sum and substance of the writings of the whole school, from the leaders themselves down to the small fry who follow at a distance trying to catch up the echoes of the heavier artillery.

What Socialists have been, and are still, anxious for is the accomplishment, no matter by what means, of the end they have in view, viz.—the abolition of all law and order and authority in affairs religious as well as social. An open, candid declaration of their aims would of course have defeated their purpose, especially in those countries in which the people still clung to the old religion and recognised its teaching authority as from God, and where religious disruption had not yet prepared men's minds for acceptance of the shocking irreligion which is the logical outcome of Socialism. Profession of religious indifference was an absolute necessity in the beginning. But as the movement gathered strength, its leaders threw off the mask and disclosed the duplicity under cover of which they tried to carry the unsuspecting. And here we are not left to guess-work, or speculation, or deductions from Socialist principles; we have the bold, fearless statements of Socialists themselves, set forth with a reckless disregard for their own character which is truly astonishing. One's surprise at the candour with

which Socialists lay bare their hypocrisy is only equalled by one's astonishment at the shameless effrontery which made it possible.

"Those who still cling to religious ideas," Bernstein is reported to have said, "are an obstacle to our movement. Therefore, we must not recognise religion even as a private concern. From our demand (separation of Church and State) it follows that we must also declare ourselves against religion. . . . The first leaders of Socialism were all Freethinkers. . . . Since the party became stronger we have adopted in the party programme the article 'Religion is a private concern,' because the attachment to religion of the Lowland population was an obstacle in our forward movement. A mere policy in order to gain votes at the election."

The German journal, *Der Zimmerer*, wrote in 1902 :—

"The expression in the Socialist platform, 'Religion is a private concern,' is often taken to mean that Socialists should abstain from religious questions, that to do otherwise is an infraction of the party platform. This, of course, is not, and cannot be, its meaning. The above expression does not manifest the attitude of Socialism towards religion ; it merely declares the attitude towards religion to be assumed by the existing

governments. The modern labour movement would suffer a thorn to remain in its flesh if it allowed any obscurity to subsist concerning its attitude towards religious belief. Social democracy can have no other relation to the Church than to reject its soporifics, and to wage relentless war on by far the greater part of its doctrines."

The present leader of German Socialism informs us that :—

"In politics we profess Republicanism, in economics Socialism, in religion Atheism."

Yet Robert Blatchford assures us that Socialism has nothing to say to religion!

Dientzgen gives us the following piece of information on the subject :—"If religion is to be understood as a belief in super-sensible, immaterial substances and forces, if it consists in a belief in higher gods and spirits, *democracy has no religion*. In the place of religion it sets up the consciousness of the insufficiency of the individual, who for his perfection requires to be supplemented and consequently subordinated to the entire body social. *A cultured human society is the supreme good in which we believe*. Our *hope* rests upon the organization of social democracy. This organization shall make that *love* a reality for which religious fanatics have displayed such irrational enthusiasm." Leibknecht de-

clares : "I am an Atheist ; I do not believe in God." And again : "We may peacefully take our stand upon the ground of Socialism, and thus conquer the stupidity of the masses in so far as this stupidity reveals itself in religious forms and dogmas." Karl Marx, the great apostle of Socialism, says : "Religion is an illusory sun which revolves around man as long as man fails to revolve around himself."

This is the trend of all Socialist literature. In France, Spain, Austria, America, in every place in which Socialism has got a foothold, we find writers and speakers giving expression to the same attitude of implacable opposition to God and religion. Nor need we go further than the fearful anti-religious utterances of the author of "*God and My Neighbour*," the editor of *The Clarion*, to learn what Socialism means from the religious point of view.

Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost are turned into mockery by Socialists, who have composed blasphemous songs for the celebration of these great Christian festivals. Here is a sample or two :—

Woe, woe, to that pale Nazarene,
As well as he I am, I ween,
The Godhead's own incarnate son.

The following expresses the Socialistic view of Christmas :—

And though we are of faith devoid
 In the Christ of our childhood days,
 And though from clashing fables dark
 We strive to reach the blessed light,
 And though our faith has disappeared
 That us from bondage to redeem
 A Saviour came in heavenly light—
 Yet Christmas still we celebrate,
 Because in firmest faith we trust
 That tyranny will disappear, etc.

Immortality is thus scoffed at by another poetical genius :—

And if I die, what shall to me
 Hereafter then be shown ?
 Thou fool ! thy question has no sense ;
Hereafter is on earth alone.

And can any man in whom natural decency is not yet dead identify himself with a party whose official organ, the *Vortwärts*, had the insolence to publish the following report of the death of Archbishop Corrigan in 1902 :—

“ New York, May 6.—Archbishop Corrigan died last night after a protracted illness. Preparations are going on for a grand funeral, with the usual paraphernalia. The ‘soul’ of the prelate whizzed out of his mortal remains straight up into the seventh heaven, and now the Bishop is staying there with lovely little angels and other

beautiful beings hovering about him. Let him who is fool enough believe it."

Now, I submit that a respectable man should have nothing to do with blackguardism of that kind; that a man who retains any self-respect should hold steadfastly aloof from a school of scoundrels from whom the faintest feelings of common decency must have completely disappeared.

This is Socialism; this is the real meaning of Socialism; this is how modern philanthropists are going to remove the workingman's wrongs. What a horrible mockery to hear these shallow blasphemers lamenting the condition of the poor, sympathising with the wage-earner, agitating for better conditions for labour, and all the rest of it! What have they done to improve the condition of those over whose state they are shedding their crocodile tears? What man amongst them has done anything to put in practice the doctrines he is inculcating on others? Can Socialists lay claim to anything except an attempt to substitute immorality and irreligion for the greatest consolation the poor man has—his religion and the hope for better things beyond the grave?

Remember it is not a question of Socialism *versus* Catholicity, but Socialism *versus* Christianity, *versus* religion of any kind and every kind.

Religion is the one social disorder that has got on the nerves of the body social, the one social blemish which at all costs must be stamped out. There is to be no temporising, no compromise, no reformation ; religion must go, and quickly ; God must not be spoken of unless by way of blasphemy, nor things spiritual mentioned unless to cast ridicule on them.

By falsehood and calumny, and lying promises which they are hopelessly incapable of fulfilling, Socialist demagogues are endeavouring to find favour with the labouring classes, whose condition renders them liable to fall into the snares of cunning mischief-makers. But when or where have they proved their sympathy with the poor as the Church against which they are directing their fiercest onslaughts, the Church of Rome, has done in all ages and in every place ? Has Socialism anything to compare with the work for the poor that has always been cheerfully done, without hope of reward in this life, by Catholic communities of men and women ? How do Socialists, who content themselves with shrieking blasphemies, in the interests of labour, against God, and hurling denunciations, for the sake of the poor, against Christian Churches, compare with the members of the *St. Vincent de Paul Society*, for instance, in the work of relieving distress ?

We do not require Socialists to remind us of the evils that exist. We know them ourselves, and many of us know them infinitely better than the Godless platform speakers and the infidel writers of books. Men, like myself, who are proud to belong to the Church of Rome, whose lives are spent the year round amongst the poorest of the poor, know perfectly well the social inequality that exists; but we should consider it poor consolation for those in misery if we contented ourselves with going down the back streets shouting horrible blasphemies that would taint even the fetid air of our squalid slums.

What are we to think of men who call themselves ministers of religion who subscribe to such a programme as Socialism presents? Here is the manifesto of 113 Protestant parsons:—

“ We, the undersigned ministers of Christian Churches of various denominations, desire to make this declaration in view of the widely-circulated suggestion, which has been made in the Press and elsewhere, that the Socialism we believe in differs fundamentally from the Socialism advocated by the recognised Socialist organisation. We declare that the Socialism we believe in (sometimes called Christian Socialism) involves public ownership and management of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, and is

therefore essentially the same Socialism as is held by Socialists throughout the world." (*Catholic Herald*, Oct. 10, 1908: Fr. Puissant's paper, "The Church and Socialism," read at the Catholic Truth Conference, Glasgow.)

Is this the religion of Christ? Is this the spirit of Christianity? Ministers indeed of *Christian Churches of various denominations!*

On the question of Christian Socialism, referred to in the above important declaration, there has appeared a great deal of literature which would be amusing were the subject not so grave. I think I have seen even the question of Catholic Socialism debated. But the matter assumes a very solemn aspect when one finds serious discussions carried on in journals professedly Christian and Catholic by men who are Christians and Catholics, and not unfrequently clergymen. I may, perhaps, at some future time, return to this question of Christian Socialism. For the present I will just give what seems to me to be the only conclusion at which a person can arrive from an impartial view of the whole situation: If Christian, not Socialism; if Socialism, not Christian. If you adopt a name you may find it extremely difficult not to live up to everything the name connotes. I cannot understand how Catholics consider themselves free on this matter of

Christian Socialism after the clear, explicit teaching of Leo XIII.

Now, let the Christian, no matter what form of Christianity he professes, who has any leanings towards Socialism, seriously reflect on the nature and the real meaning of the Atheism, blasphemy, and blackguardism of Socialist hypocrites before deciding on joining their ranks. I have put forward some, and only very few, of the anti-Christian and anti-religious declarations of the leaders themselves as to the aim and object of their propagandism, from which it is manifest that the choice lies between them and Christ, between Socialism and Christianity, for these two are as incompatible as light and darkness. You must renounce Christianity if you wish to become a Socialist.

VIII.

SOCIALISM AND MORALITY.

It is obvious that Socialism and right order are incompatible terms. Starting from injustice and ending in universal anarchy, Socialism can have nothing in common with right conduct. Any system which is so diabolically antagonistic to God and religion as Socialism is, cannot well pretend to have much regard for the preservation of the moral order or the advancement of social virtue. If you take away the authority of God and the sanction of religion for the maintenance of morality, you have left no solid basis which can give permanence and stability to any system of right and wrong. Socialism, therefore, ignoring the authority of God and shifting the ultimate sanction of the moral order from religion to the passing whims of human fancy, necessarily tends to confound all distinctions between right and wrong, and to plunge society in universal disorder.

Here again Socialists ground their contention on evolution, and here again they are hopelessly at fault.

There is no God, to begin with, according to the Socialist conception of the world. All things that are arose and developed from we know not what, without any interference of a being outside the universe : alongside of the evolution of other things we find the gradual growth of the ideas of right and wrong conduct. But Socialism tells us, in the same breath, that most of our notions regarding the relations of men to each other and the relations of individuals to the State are decidedly incorrect, for we have been accustomed to look upon the rights of individuals over their own property as inviolable, which Socialism tells us is false, and we have traditionally regarded obedience to existing lawful authority as commanded by the law of nature and of God, which, however, Socialism says is nonsense.

This is one of the numerous points in Socialistic morality from which we have failed to extract the smallest meaning. For if evolution is the sole origin of morality, by what manner of means can the notions which have grown up amongst men be false? By what standard can we judge of their falsity, if we must confine ourselves to evolution and are forbidden to look higher up the scale of being than the level of the blind forces of nature? And what meaning are we to attach to the term wrong? On the materialistic view of human

history has what is wrong not as much moral sanction as what is right? Socialism, which denounces religion and laughs at the spirituality of the soul, has left no court of appeal and can find no authority for its precepts except the authority it is pleased to confer upon itself.

There is no basis of probability for the theory that human society and men's notions of morality slowly evolved from some savage state which recognised no distinctions between what is right and what is wrong. Infidel evolutionists have been trying their best for years to unearth some evidence to support the hypothesis of the savage origin of human society, and so far they have signally failed. There is not a tittle of evidence in favour of the contention: all the facts, and they are very considerable even from the most conservative scientific point of view, confirm the rational conception of human history. Cheap literature, and not unfrequently dear literature too, discourse with ease and comfort on the evolution of society from a non-human state, and display an array of supposed facts and fancies which have long ago been discredited by the best and most reliable authorities on the subject.

The evolution of morality carries its own refutation. There never was such an evolution, nor could there have been. Men find it difficult

enough to observe the precepts of the moral law that is already established ; so difficult, in fact, that it seems altogether incredible that they would set about formulating regulations restrictive of liberty at a time when no restraints existed.

The Socialist conception of morality is false in its foundation, and in its application it is manifestly pernicious. It is not necessary to point out at length the total disregard for morality fostered by a system which would legalise wholesale robbery. To deprive a person against his will of what belongs to him is theft or robbery ; and this is the main plank in the Socialists' platform.

But the worst feature, by far, in the present Socialist movement is the elasticity of the matrimonial contract advocated by its leaders. The greatest danger the modern world has to fear arises from the laxity, now unfortunately to an alarming extent encouraged by law, in the relations between man and wife. To me it seems perfectly plain that the facilities of the divorce courts are a standing menace not only to the peace, but even to the preservation, of society, and that unless the indissolubility of the matrimonial bond be restored to its ancient sacredness modern civilisation will for a certainty go the way of the classic culture of Greece and Rome.

You cannot hope to maintain social order when you have cut away the foundation, nor can you expect to find law and order respected in society in which wholesale violations of the natural law are endorsed by positive enactments of the State.

Any system, Socialist or other, which ignores the indissoluble character of the matrimonial contract, which interferes with parents' rights, which lessens or attempts to lessen the obligations of parents with regard to the guardianship and education of their children, will tell against the morality of the rising generation, and to the same extent against the whole body social.

Socialism, in its campaign against the indissolubility of matrimony, strikes at the very foundation of the social order, and is the worst enemy society has to fear.

But Socialism must be scientific, and science, of a degraded kind, favours the Socialist view of humanity. With the spread of Darwinism, the theory of evolution began to be applied to every branch of knowledge which can engage the mind of man. It was not long till Anthropologists appeared on the scene, who, pushing the principles of Darwinism to their last conclusion, brought the human race, too, under what they are pleased to call the general law of evolution.

Socialists saw at once the value of a theory of

this kind, and, without waiting to weigh its merits or examine its proofs, deduced from it what is now known as the Materialistic Conception of History.

According to this view, family life was not the original social condition of human beings. In the remote past people lived in communities, but in every group or tribe all the women belonged to all the men. The father was not the head of a household, nor indeed did any household, as we understand it, exist. Gradually, however, exclusiveness was introduced, and went on increasing till the monogamous state was ultimately reached.

If we place blind confidence in evolutionary writers, or if we take only a superficial glance over the whole situation, we may be inclined to grant that the theory has a kernel of truth in it. But on reflection, apart from the absolute gratuitousness of the whole business, is it not manifest that the theory of evolution in general is a flat contradiction of this particular application of it to man?

It will be admitted by all that human beings are more advanced along the line of evolution than the brutes. Now, there is observable among the higher animals a more or less stable and exclusive union between male and female not unlike a monogamous family. Therefore, accord-

ing to the evolution hypothesis, we should expect to find this stability and exclusiveness increasing more and more as we ascend the scale of being. But materialists, to suit their purposes, when they come to human beings, reverse the process on which they base their contention, thereby breaking the backbone of their whole theory.

I have elsewhere refuted the theory, so that I will not stop to examine it further here. I may state, however, that from the beginning of the race the live-long union of one husband with one wife was nature's ideal state. What little science has to say on the matter goes to confirm this view; and revelation leaves no room for doubt.

We shall not, however, ask materialists to accept any argument from revelation as such. But it would be no difficult task to show that the foremost materialist thinkers look upon Christ as the greatest moral instructor this world has ever seen. And do not Socialists go to infinite pains to demonstrate that Christ is their leader? It does seem a curious fact, therefore, that the teaching of Christ on this question of matrimony, the most fundamental within the whole range of social relations, should be so thoroughly ignored by Socialists, who, where occasion suits them, profess to follow only the doctrines of the Redeemer.

The words of the Saviour on the indissolu-

bility of marriage place His views on the matter beyond all dispute. "And there came to Him the Pharisees tempting Him, and saying: Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? Who, answering, said to them: Have you not read that He who made man from the beginning, made them male and female? And He said: For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh. Therefore now they are not two but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let no man put asunder." That this conjugal union of man and woman lasting for life was always the best arrangement, and that it alone had the absolute sanction of God, our Lord proceeds to show, when, in answer to the question, "Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce?" He said, "Because Moses by reason of the hardness of your heart permitted you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so."

From this passage in the Gospel of St. Matthew xix., from Mark x., and from Luke xvi., as well as from 1st Cor. vii., 10, 11, there can be no doubt as to the teaching of Christ on the question of matrimony. "What therefore *God* has joined together, let no *man* put asunder." And the Redeemer not only restored the mar-

riage contract to its original holiness, unity, and indissolubility, but he raised it to the dignity of a sacrament; thereby placing the family, of which the matrimonial contract is the foundation, on the plane of the supernatural.

How, then, does the teaching of Socialists fit in with the foregoing? According to the explicit teaching of the leaders, marriage is not a contract which cannot be rescinded at will by either party, but rather a social arrangement between man and woman, which, if found inconvenient or disagreeable, can be broken up at any time at the whim of either or both. "In the choice of the object of her love," Bebel writes, "she (woman) is no less free than man; she loves and is loved, and enters into the marriage alliance with no other regard than that of preference. This alliance is a private agreement, without the intervention of any (public) functionary, just as marriage was a private concern till late in the Middle Ages." This last clause displays crass ignorance or something worse: marriage was never regarded by the Church as a purely private concern.

Without appealing to revelation or to facts of history, it is easy to see to what pernicious conclusions premises of this kind lead. If such a principle of private agreement were once admitted, there were an end to the family and an

end to society of any kind deserving the name. If it were regarded as right for married people to dissolve partnership and enter into fresh alliances, there would be found but few couples who would remain exclusively in each other's company and co-operate with one another in rearing and educating their children to be good and useful members of society. The education of the children is one of the two principal reasons why the marriage bond must be maintained indissoluble. What would become of the offspring did the parents separate and form new temporary alliances with others? Socialism tells us that the State can take charge of the children's education well enough, and in fact that it ought; that it is the duty of the State, and not of the parents, to see to the bringing up of the future citizens. The mother would be allowed to nurse the child as long as this would be possible and necessary. "When the child waxes stronger his equals await him for common amusement, under public direction; the introduction to the various kinds of useful labour—to manufacture, gardening, farming, and to the entire mechanism of production—follows in due succession. But the intellectual development, in the meantime, is not to be neglected——

"Such will be the education of both sexes——

equal and common—for the separation of the sexes can be justified only in those cases in which the distinction of sex makes it an imperative duty. And this system of education, strictly organised, under efficient control, continued to that stage of life when society shall declare its youth to be of age, will eminently qualify both sexes for all rights and duties which society grants or imposes on its full-grown members. Thus society can rest satisfied that it has educated members that are perfectly developed in every direction.” “This,” says Father Cathrein, “is one of the midsummer night’s dreams in which Bebel’s ‘Frau’ delights to revel.” Industrial schools are not, indeed, such an unqualified success as to justify us in establishing them on the magnificent basis that Socialism contemplates.

The family is the ground-work of society, and it is only by remaining in the family and being educated there in the ways of virtue that children can be made good and useful members of the State. The children must remain under the care of their parents till they have been sufficiently instructed to recognise the duties incumbent on them as citizens and children of God. For this purpose nature has implanted in the bosom of parents and children a love for each other the most disinterested this world knows of. Any

attempt in theory or in practice to stifle or impair this all-important and all-powerful natural virtue can only entail consequences the most baneful to the individual and the most destructive of society.

The brickmaker's wife with her sick child makes a deeper impression on the reader's mind than perhaps any other scene in *Bleak House*. "Jenny's asleep," said the kindly neighbour, "quite worn out. She's scarcely had the child off her lap, poor thing, these seven days and nights, except when I've been able to take it for a minute or two." But we need not go to fiction to understand the operation of this law of nature. All of us, I dare say, have, some time or another, witnessed the care and anxiety and self-sacrifice of the mother wearing out her life in watching and tending, out of pure love, the helpless, troublesome child that is wasting away for months, sometimes for years, when all hope of recovery is gone. Would it be a good thing to attempt any reformation of society which would diminish or do away with this beautiful virtue which even angels might envy?

The virtue inculcated by the command "Honour thy father and thy mother" is the basis of love for our neighbour and for our country; without it we might hope to rival the

beasts, but not to surpass them. If this family affection is taken away, how can we expect that men will have any regard for the good of the society to which they belong, or be anxious to promote its welfare? In such a state the virtues which draw men together and which impel them to respect each other's rights, to advance each other's interests, to support the weak and counsel the strong, to console the afflicted and reclaim the erring, should no longer have any influence in shaping human conduct and directing the course of social development. Without the virtues cherished by family life, by the mutual and life-long love of husband and wife, by the interdependence of parents and children, and their unselfish love for each other, implanted in their hearts by nature and fostered in family society, social order would have to be maintained by brute force; and even force of the most drastic kind would not be able to hold human passions in check and secure anything like permanent peace for the community.

Socialism, therefore, with its unnatural free-love, is a standing menace to society, for it strikes at the basis of the whole social order, as well in advocating facilities for divorce as in attempting to take the education of the children out of the hands of the parents and entrust it to the State,

thus preventing that development of social virtue without which society would be an impossibility.

“No human law can abolish the natural and primitive right of marriage, or in any way limit the chief and principal purpose of marriage, ordained by God’s authority from the beginning—*Increase and multiply*. Thus we have the family; the society of man’s own household; a ‘society’ limited, indeed, in numbers, but a true ‘society,’ anterior to every kind of state or nation, with rights and duties of its own, totally independent of the commonweath.” (Leo XIII. in the *Encyc. Rerum Novarum*.)

IX.

SOCIALISM AND INDUSTRY.

IT undoubtedly does make one feel a great deal of philanthropy when one sits down at one's desk or in an arm-chair to prepare a fine Socialistic speech for the Sunday meeting in Hyde Park, or some other such place, the following day. And in the oratorical heat of the moment, when we are dealing human grievances wordy blows, demolishing for ever the fortifications of heartless capitalism, and lifting up the toiler from his present penurious position to one of moderate prosperity and comparative bliss, there is unquestionably a danger of deceiving ourselves into the belief that we are really benefactors of the race, and that if the rest of men were like ourselves the world would soon be rid of its troubles. But when the meeting disperses, at a convenient time before the public-houses close, and we turn away to think of the work before us for the next six days, in case we are not running a lucrative business for the amelioration of mankind, I am afraid the good of humanity, the wretched condi-

tion of the poor, and the crimes of capitalists find but scanty space in our busy business lives. There is nothing easier than making a fine speech, writing scathing articles for the Press, or even turning out books, when you have something to denounce, and especially when your denunciations appeal to the passions of those to whom you speak or for whom you write ; but it is by no means easy to carry out consistently in your own life the philanthropic plans you lay down for others.

Ever since the days immediately preceding the French Revolution the world has been listening to speeches, lectures, pleadings, condemnations, in the interests of struggling humanity ; books have been produced in profusion for the same purpose ; newspapers, journals, periodicals of more or less frequent issue have been dinning into the ears of mankind the need of Socialism for the reform of society. Is it not now high time that some one of the hosts of loud-mouthed philanthropists, who denounce wealth so vigorously and clamour so incessantly for the spoliation of capitalists, should himself set the example of what he is pleading for in the interests of the world at large, and prove in concrete form that he really believes the doctrines he preaches, that he is not playing a

part for the sake of money, amassing a fortune by gulling the people ?

I am not aware that anything of the kind has yet been done. Moreover, I believe it will never be done on any even moderately large scale.

I certainly cannot hope that the time is coming, or will ever come, when men generally will be willing to sell all they have and give the proceeds to the poor from no higher motive than the mere luxury of doing good. I have not indeed such a low opinion of my fellow-men as not to be prepared to believe that a man may here and there rise above his surroundings and above himself, and renounce all he possesses in favour of those in want ; still the generous souls who are actuated by motives of that kind will be found to be few and far between.

There is a large amount of humanity in every man. The love of self is really the most potent element in all our worldly lives, and we may just as well recognise it at once, whether we are Socialists or ordinary mortals.

I'll no say men are villains a',
The real hardened wicked,
Wha hae nae check but human law,
Are to the few restricted ;
But, och ! mankind are unco weak,
An' little to be trusted ;
If self the trembling balance shake,
It's rarely right adjusted.

Yet it is a mistake to regard selfishness as some kind of metaphysical evil. No doubt, it has come to have a sinister meaning from the persistent and almost exclusive application of the term to the inordinate seeking after one's own good, to the exclusion of the interests or rights of others. But there is nothing which we will not abuse. We must remember, however, that the evils consequent on the abuse of that which is good does not make the thing in itself less good. Hence, though excess of self-love constitutes one of the worst traits of a human character, still when rightly regulated it is not only a lawful but a very beneficial element in human life, and indeed in any life. It is on account of its potency for good that I have introduced it here.

When we come to reflect on it, is not the love of self at the very bottom of our existence, or at least of our continuance in existence? If we were wholly indifferent to ourselves, caring not for our own good, and especially for the greatest good we naturally enjoy in this world, our own lives, we should very soon have removed all the ills that beset humanity by having removed the race itself. It is the love of self that prompts our efforts at self-preservation; that makes us have a care for our bodies, our minds and faculties; that stimulates our exertion to educate and improve

ourselves both physically and mentally ; and, strange as it may at first sight appear, it is our own selfishness that enables us, in more cases than probably we should care to admit, to pluck up courage enough to make a sacrifice for a neighbour.

If we just attend for one day to the little things that make up the sum of our little lives, we shall be, perhaps, surprised at the amount of latent selfishness there is in our own generous selves. This self-examination is not pleasant work, it discloses so many things we would keep covered up and hidden away even from ourselves ; but it is extremely useful—useful not only for directing our own conduct, but also for mitigating the judgment we are prepared to pass on others.

After the love of ourselves comes our love for our fellow-man. In the family, husband and wife hold first place in each others affections, because by the matrimonial union they have been made one, “joined together by God.” It is because they belong to each other, that husband and wife are bound together in life-long love ; so that really their reciprocal affection is only a slight extension of the self-love of each. The same is again true in regard to the love that exists between parents and children, for the child is, as the late

Pontiff put it, "a continuation of the father's personality." And so on outwards, till we embrace all mankind. Our love for ourselves comes first, then love for others, in greater or less degree, according as the relationship between them and us is more or less intimate.

From the two view-points, self-love and family love, let us see what blessings the triumph of Socialism would confer upon the world.

First, with regard to the individual. In a Socialist State all wealth of every kind would be in the hands of a few unselfish, philanthropic men who would distribute it, without favour or prejudice, amongst all the citizens according to their wants, irrespective of birth or rank—in fact, there would be no ranks, that envious distinction would have been cut away, like all other hurtful excrescences that have grown up with the progress of time on the body social. There would be no want in the Socialist State, and very little work, just enough work to make life pleasant.

Now, the first question which suggests itself to one's mind is: How is this fabulous wealth of the Socialist Commonwealth to be got together?—for it will require fabulous wealth to keep mankind on perpetual holiday. Of course, Socialists are ever ready with all sorts of prophecies and promises which are merely the babbling of idiots,

sound signifying nothing. When you come down from the clouds and tread once more this solid earth, looking facts straight in the face, must it not appear evident that by no human means could enough consumers' wealth or enough food be produced in the Socialist State to keep the citizens even on starvation fare? If at the present time, in flourishing countries where every nerve is strained in industry and agriculture to produce the greatest quantity of the best and cheapest goods, the average income is so low—about £24 per person per annum in such countries as Great Britain, Saxony, Prussia—what can we expect but absolute starvation in a State in which there is no motive whatsoever for individual effort, and where everyone is depending on everybody else for even the necessaries of life? If the average man, with the average amount of good and evil in him, could not make the fruits of his labour his own, do you think he would be very industrious? Would he work at all? Just take any one of our ordinary mechanics or labourers and imagine him one of the workers in the Socialist commonwealth, in which all men are equal and in which, moreover, no one can lay by any of the fruits of his toil. Can you picture to yourself such a one jumping briskly out of the warm blankets at the sound of his alarm-clock on a

cold, dark, winter morning, swallowing a hasty breakfast, and hurrying off with all speed in order to be at his post in time? Can you imagine our mechanic or labourer anxious to do his work well during the day, and returning home in the evening well satisfied that he has done a good day's work for the community?

In the Socialist State we shall, perhaps, have changed our notions of men and things, but as we view matters at present we should not hesitate to consider such a man a fool if he acted as I have suggested. But there is no need to call names; our imaginary man is only imaginary; you will never see him in any State, Socialist or other.

When you go out into the streets of a busy city like Belfast, and see the tens of thousands hurrying to the shipyards and the factories in the morning or at the meal-hours, and ask yourself how these people would act in such a State as Socialism contemplates, does not your Socialism appear grotesquely ridiculous? You would not get people of this kind to go to work at all if they were not certain of hard cash on Friday evening or at mid-day on Saturday. Even you did manage to get them into their places in some miraculous way, they would run away as soon as they got the opportunity: they

wouldn't work unless you placed a gaffer over each with a whip in his hand. And I doubt very much if the gaffers themselves would be very anxious to push forward the business: if they were, I am certain they would soon have to seek other employment.

In the factory and the field work would cease with the cessation of individual wages, and your Socialist government would be obliged to resort to the old method of bribing the workers with good solid metal, current coin of the realm.

There is a common saying that you appeal most effectively to a man through his pocket. So true is this that if the man has no pocket or only a pocket you cannot get at, your appeal will induce him to do just what he likes. It is money that appeals to people, it is money that people want, because it is, and will always be, the great means by which they can keep themselves independent of the doubtful charity of others, even though it be government charity.

We all wish to be free, and, moreover, we are all anxious to go on, to push ourselves forward, to secure a still more advantageous position in the race of life. It is the love of the dear old self that is the mainspring of all our actions; and once that spring is broken, there is complete collapse of the whole human frame-work. What

a pitiful spectacle is that poor wretch who has lost all interest in himself, except the interest that haunts him like a hideous nightmare!

Hold out to a man the continual prospect of the means of supporting himself honourably and pushing himself on in life, and you will get good work out of him, if he is a man; but ask him to work for the upkeep of the whole community, good and bad, thriftless and industrious, lazy and diligent, drunk and sober, saint and sinner—for these we shall have always with us—and he will refuse, because he is a man.

Bebel had dreams; in fact his “Frau” is one long dream in which he must have been wandering in imagination through the Isles of the Blest or the Land of the Young. He is perfectly certain “that such an organisation of labour (as Socialism will set up), based on perfect freedom and equality, in which one would stand for all, and all for one, would awaken the highest consciousness of solidarity, would beget a joyous spirit of industry and emulation, such as is nowhere to be found in the industrial system of our day.”

Now just fancy the rope-workers of that large factory down there, with their highest consciousness of solidarity awakened, and, actuated by the joyous spirit of industry and emulation, standing one for all and all for one!

Why, these people don't want to work at all. They wouldn't work if they could help it. What is everybody's business is nobody's. If you ask them to stand one for all and all for one, and do not promise them any pay, they will not merely stand, they will sit down or go to bed, if they do not take to looting the neighbouring houses. I am not blaming them for it; we would all do the same.

To any man living in this world it must be perfectly manifest that the only way of getting work done, and thereby producing as much food as will be sufficient to stave off starvation, is to throw the individual on his own resources, to appeal to his self-love by holding out to him the hope of the means of supporting himself and of advancing himself in life.

Then, in the Socialist State labour time will be very much shortened; it will not be more than half what it is at present. I am rather inclined to think that it should be doubled in order to avoid a world-wide famine in a State in which, on account of each of us standing for all, we shall be all standing and doing nothing.

The reduction of the labour time to half what it is now would mean practically that the number of workers would have to be doubled in order to provide even the necessaries of life. To procure

twice the number of workers we shall have to call on the inhabitants of some neighbouring and friendly planet, for this one of ours can certainly not supply them.

Socialists think that the lazy drones of the modern world, being compelled to work (a strange expression in a Socialistic commonwealth where we are to be jostling each other to get standing for all), will, with the rest, make up a sufficient number for the necessary productive labour. But where are these lazy drones? They are, for a certainty, not to be found, to any considerable extent, amongst the wealthy, the millionaires, or the multi-millionaires, who, if they do not work with their hands, work very hard with their heads. The only drones in any number worth talking about are the lazy loafers who won't work, preferring rather to disturb society with immoral theories, or to stand at the street corner or the public-house bar, with pints of porter in their hands, waiting for the advent of the Socialist Millennium, when they hope to have more porter but will do no more work.

Here, perhaps, you will remind me of the large numbers of unemployed who are willing and anxious to work if they could only get the opportunity. I may be allowed to state that I yield neither to the Socialist nor to anyone else

in sympathy with the needy, honest, industrious, sober workman who cannot get employment ; but what I have to ask is whether such a one is the exception or the rule, even in our present industrial system.

I can lay claim to some experience of the lives and methods of the working classes, especially of those who are the object of Socialistic solicitude, and I find that in nearly every case the cause of poverty and destitution and want of employment is due to the drunken, gambling, reckless lives of the workers themselves.

You are not to understand me, however, as even insinuating that the living of the industrious working people could not and should not be greatly improved ; but I am not concerned with that just now. What I wish to insist on is that, as far as my observation goes, those who are out of employment through no fault of their own are rare exceptions. Can you reasonably bring forward these exceptions as an argument for turning society topsy-turvy, and introducing a state of things in which the strongest desire would naturally be to remain unemployed ?

As a matter of fact, the experiment has already been tried, and with the most disastrous results, though conducted with precautions that Socialism would scorn to employ. By a decree

of 25th February, 1848, the Provisional Government of the French Republic bound itself to give every man an opportunity of exercising his "right to work." On the following day the establishment of the national workshops was decreed. What was the result? Victor Hugo, an ardent Republican, speaking in the National Assembly, made use of these words :—

"The national workshops have proved a fatal experiment. The wealthy idler we already know; you have created a person a hundred times more dangerous to himself and others—the pauper idler."

To save the State from bankruptcy, the national workshops had to be closed. As a matter of course, the abolition of the "right to work" was followed by an insurrection, and one unparalleled by anything France had witnessed even in the darkest days of the Revolution. In four days nearly as many men were killed in the streets of Paris as fell at Waterloo.

Louis Blanc, one of the members of the Provisional Government and an avowed Socialist, repeated the experiment on his own account with the Paris tailors in the Hotel Clichy, which was turned into a large workshop. The result was again complete failure. It is the same the world over. You will not get men to work with a will,

you will not get them to throw themselves into their work and do their level best to produce the most satisfactory results in the quickest time, indeed you will not get them to work at all, unless you make them feel that they can make the fruits of their labour their own, and that the rewards to be reaped depend solely and entirely on their own individual effort.

Coming now to the family aspect of the question, I need not do more than make a passing reference to it. Few arguments, indeed, are required to convince one with any knowledge of the world that the support and the decent upkeep of the family are the greatest incentives the head of a household has to continual, strenuous exertion in the execution of his daily toil. Hence, I will only give just an illustration or two.*

A widow in an East End parish said to the vicar's wife :—" I'm glad, ma'am, that this free-feedin' of school children didn't come in till mine was grown up." The clergyman's wife, somewhat surprised by this remark, asked for an explanation. " Well, ma'am, you see it's this way. My husband was a drinkin' man, but he

* They are taken from *Problem and Perils of Socialism* : Letters to a Workingman, by J. St. Loe Strachey, Editor of the *Spectator* : an exceedingly thoughtful, comprehensive, interesting, and useful little work.

was very fond of the children, and if it hadn't been that he was obliged to find something for them he'd have been ten times worse than he was." Anyone moving amongst the labouring classes can easily observe hundreds of similar cases.

Our author proceeds in his conversational way :—“ I know you are a reader of Kipling. Do you remember the striking poem about the Kaiser's Rescript, and the discussion of the proposal that all nations should agree to a law preventing any man from working more than eight hours a day? When an English working-man speaks at the conference, this is what he says :—

And a British delegate thundered : “The halt and the
lame be blowed,
I've a crib in the South-West workshops, and a home in
the Wandsworth Road ;
And till the 'Sociation has footed my burial bill
I'll work for the kids and the missis. Pull up !——”

The delegate winds up in language which leaves no room for doubting his sincerity.

It is this spirit of work and industry that Socialism would remove from the world by taking the children out of the hands of the parents and giving them in charge to the State ; and it is this

spirit which Socialism would put an end to by assuring the father that he need have no anxiety about the children or the wife, that the State will liberally provide for him and them alike. It requires no great depth of philosophic thought to draw the obvious conclusions.

X.

SOCIALISM AND CAPITAL.

CAPITAL is the great bugbear which seems to be perpetually snarling round the legs of Socialism. The man with the money employs the man in want, pays him a petty pittance for his work, and unjustly pockets the balance. So says Socialism. It is a fundamental principle of the Socialistic system that capital and labour are essentially antagonistic and eternally irreconcilable. Of course Socialists would never dream of attributing to the worker any responsibility for the attitude of opposition which is supposed to exist: the capitalist alone must bear all the blame.

Starting with false notions of the real meaning and significance of capital, labour, and wealth, it is only to be expected that reformers should arrive at conclusions as impracticable as they are unfounded. From a confusion of principles and a perversion of right reasoning spring the false and pernicious opinions with which working people are imbued, who look for light and guid-

ance from those who proclaim themselves the strenuous defenders of the "struggling masses" and the heaven-sent apostles who are to herald in a new and prosperous era for all.

Carried away by the tinkling cymbals of Socialistic demagogues, and impressed, not unnaturally, with the lurid representations of imaginary grievances on the one hand, and equally imaginary crimes on the other, working people, who are only allowed to see one side of the question, will be strongly inclined to look upon the capitalist as their natural enemy, and regard as theirs the property which is his. It is on the workingman that Socialists rely to carry out their destructive programme, and hence their anxiety to play upon his envy of the rich and to arouse his impatience of his master's methods. It is a game that is easily played, and Socialists are experts at it.

What, then, is the attitude of Socialism to capital? By capital, it may be stated at once, is understood the sum total of all the means of production. It is not, therefore, confined to money, but embraces everything utilized in production.

A man starts with a certain amount of capital; he employs labour, and for the work supplied he pays a certain sum in the form of wages. But after paying the cost of production, there remains

an amount of profit over and above : this the employer puts in his pocket, to the great consternation of the workingman's friend—the Socialist. This remainder, which is over after paying for the labour, is called surplus-value ; and this surplus-value appears to be the root-cause of the whole social evil. It is an evil in itself, according to Socialistic principles of justice, and the source of an infinite train of evils.

The iniquity of the appropriation of what is called surplus-value, or the wealth resulting from unpaid labour, was first brought to light by the school of economists to which Adam Smith, J. S. Mill, and Ricardo belonged, though these economists could not see any remedy for the evil.

Adam Smith, in his *Wealth of Nations*, made a fatal blunder, which paved the way for Socialistic teaching, when he defined wealth to be the creation of labour. The mistake was taken over and popularized by Ricardo. Out of this arose another error, or rather another aspect of the same error, that the value of a commodity is to be measured by the labour expended in producing it. The value of a thing—that is wealth, for wealth and value are practically the same—is to be estimated by the amount of labour the thing costs.

If this were true, the obvious conclusion would be that the labourer has a right to the whole market value of the article he produces.

Ricardo and his confreres had no intention of sowing the seeds of discontent amongst the labourers. Their view of the situation was, that this relation of workmen to masters was due to the nature of things, over which neither capitalist nor labourer had any control.

But now a weighty thinker, Karl Marx, entering the arena, appealed straightway to the revolutionary spirit, demanding a reason why, wealth being the creation of labour alone, should the lion's share go to the capitalist and the producer of the wealth be compelled to accept merely the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table. Accepting the principle of Ricardo, that labour is the sole cause of wealth, Marx proceeded to point out that the capitalist's share will be greater the smaller the amount paid in wages. Accordingly, the aim of the capitalist will be to secure as large profits as possible, and wages will be cut down in proportion—injustice being thereby done to the worker, to the extent to which his wages fall short of the market value of the product of his labour. Profits, said Ricardo, can only be secured at the expense of wages. The profits, said Marx, are merely surplus-value accruing from *unpaid* labour.

Marx explains the process:—Suppose the workingman needs three shillings for his ordinary daily support. This is the exchange-value of his labour, and therefore also the wages he receives. A part of his working time—let us say six hours—is expended in producing again in a different shape the value which he has received in money—three shillings. This part of the working time is called by Marx the necessary time. But the workingman is required to work beyond this time even up to twelve hours. If his activity did not extend beyond the necessary time there would be no surplus-value for the capitalist, who would get back in a different shape what he paid in wages to his workingmen. (*Vide* Cathrein : *Socialism*, p. 48.) The result is that the capitalist pockets the value of the extra six hours' labour. This surplus-value is then employed like the original capital, and, in turn, produces more surplus-value, which again may become capital, and so on. And all this accumulated surplus-value represents, according to Marx, so much injustice to the worker, since all the wealth, according to him, is due to the labour alone.

But there is worse to come. Capitalists, in order to still further increase their profits, will employ the cheapest labour—that of women and children ; so that the workingman becomes, as it

were, a drug on the market; the capitalist is master of the situation, and can make what terms he pleases. Moreover, machinery, according to Marx, is used for the further exploitation of labour. The effects of the employment of machinery, as far as labour is concerned, are said to be—First, to reduce wages; second, to prolong the day of labour; third, to over-work one-half of the working class; fourth, to throw the rest out of employ; and fifth, to concentrate the whole surplus return in the hands of a few capitalists, who make their gains by exploiting the labourers, and increase them by exploiting one another. (Hector Macpherson: *A Century of Intellectual Development*, pp. 151-152.)

The obvious conclusion to which Marx is forced by these principles is that, The rich are becoming richer and the poor poorer.

Some means must be found, Socialists say, for redressing these alleged evils, and raising the worker up at least to the level of a human being. The means which Socialism has ready to hand is the abolition of the whole capitalist system and the nationalization of all the means of production and distribution.

If the theory were sound and the statements true in the foregoing, we could not hesitate to employ the most drastic measures to overthrow a

system founded on such injustice. But lest we should rashly rush to false conclusions, and accept as principles what are only prejudices, let us examine the different aspects of the theory a little more minutely.

Is it true that increase of capital must always come out of the wages of the worker? Or, on the contrary, is it correct to say that multiplication of capital tends to increase the remuneration of labour? There can scarcely be any doubt that in order to increase the workingmen's wages you must increase the world's capital. For if we view capital from the same standpoint from which Socialists view labour, we find that the argument on which they rely is just the one which knocks the bottom out of their whole theory.

This is how it is. As the workingman is always anxious to earn wages, so also is capital always trying to earn wages, under the name of interest. The workingman wants to let his labour, capital wants to let itself. Now, when workmen are scarce, they can demand higher pay; when they are plentiful, employers can cut down their wages. On the other side, if capital, or the opportunity of working, is small, the number of hands seeking employment will be proportionately great, so that the employer is free to dictate terms. Whereas, if there is a large amount of capital waiting for

workers to convert it into wealth, higher wages will naturally be paid for labour.

And here we may reply to the machinery difficulty in the words of Mr. A. Maurice Low: "One explanation of the greater productivity of the American workingman . . . is the greater use of machinery, and it has been shown that only in a country in which the rate of wages is high is it economical to use machinery. . . . The history of American industry affords convincing proof that the use of the most improved types of machinery, and the most highly specialised and best paid labour, results not in increasing the cost, but, on the contrary, in decreasing it." Again, "The more extensively machinery enters into manufacturing processes *the lower the cost to the consumer*. Therefore, machinery increases wages and cheapens production, so that the labourer obtains a double benefit by receiving a greater reward for his labour and having to spend less on the necessaries of life." (*Protection in the United States: Apud Balfour: The Case Against Socialism*, pp. 327-328.)

With increasing capital goes increase of competition. Every nerve is strained to produce the greatest quantity of the best quality; and as the quantity increases, prices will be cut down in order to secure the greatest demand.

Hence, by the multiplication of capital, as Mr. Low says in regard to machinery, the worker will benefit in a twofold way—he will get higher wages and he will be able to procure the necessaries of life at a cheaper price.

The logical effect of Socialistic teaching is to induce the workers to abstain from accumulating money, which, on Socialistic principles, they cannot make their own; and, further, to abstain also from promoting in any way the interests of capital, which Socialism says should rather be obstructed. If this teaching were carried into practice, the result would be a decrease in the rate of wages, consequent on a diminution of capital. As some one has said, the workers would be killing the cows instead of milking them.

Sometimes, indeed, Socialists are forced to admit the weakness of their teaching. "Socialists," writes Mr. Balfour, "when driven into a corner have reluctantly to admit that it is only the capitalist they seek to abolish, and that *capital itself must continue to exist*."

"It will accordingly be necessary for the State to capitalise a portion of each year's revenue." "Now," as Mr. Thomas Mackay pertinently remarks in the following important passage, "the superintendence of capital (under Socialism) will

have to be paid for. Inspectors and auditors will be required far beyond what is necessary in the present *regime*, where most men are dealing with their own and not their neighbour's property. The use of capital will not even here be given gratuitously. Further, it would give rise to a perpetual dispute as to the amount of capital to be subtracted from the due meed of the labourer. The increment taken from capitalisation, and for the cost of superintendence, would be regarded as a tax, and paid as grudgingly. There would be a never-ending battle between the bureaucracy and the labourer. The former would naturally wish to increase the capital under their charge, and the labourer would resent all such deductions as a fraud on his claims." (A. J. Balfour: *The Case Against Socialism*, p. 187.)

But however this may be, the ordinary stock-in-trade doctrine of Socialists regarding the relations between capital and labour is obviously incorrect. And the same must be said of the view taken of Value by Socialists.

We have already seen that, according to Ricardo and Marx, the value of a product of labour is the equivalent of the labour expended in producing the article. Now, it does not require much reflection to realise the absurdity of such a contention. For suppose a man procures a

thimble, and proceeds to empty the ocean into a spring-well a mile distant, and another takes to making drains or making trousers, will the value of the result in both cases depend on the labour involved? A person may spend a lifetime searching for the philosopher's stone or trying to find perpetual motion, while another in a moment makes a discovery or invention which will revolutionize the world. It is perfectly manifest that the value of the result in each case cannot depend on the labour. No one in his senses would think of paying the man, who spends the day throwing the sea out on the strand, the same amount of wages—or any wages, for that matter—as the man who employs his time making shoes.

Marx had too clear a mind not to perceive the absurdity to which his theory led, and hence he narrowed it by the qualification that value depends on “useful” labour. This, however, is an abandonment of the whole position.

“Useful” labour suggests the general question, whether the value of a thing depends on its utility. By value we understand here exchangeable value—that is, the value of a thing in barter, when it is given in exchange for something else, money or its equivalent. Clearly the exchange value of an object does not depend on its utility, for the oceans, the air, the sunlight are so neces-

sary that life would be impossible without them, and yet they are of no value. No one would think of capturing the sunlight or bottling up air for the market in order to make a fortune. Nobody would buy either, for the simple reason that each can be had in abundance for nothing. Hence we arrive at this conclusion, that a thing has no value if the supply is unlimited ; in other words, the value of a thing depends on its limitation or scarcity.

But, again, an object may be very limited in supply and still be of no value whatever, for the reason that nobody wants it. For instance, a stone an inch and a half long, pointed at both ends, may be very rare, but it is valueless. We reach, then, this second conclusion, that the value of anything depends on the demand there is for it. What is required, therefore, to give an article exchange value is that there be a demand for it and that the supply be limited. As the demand increases or the supply diminishes, the price, the exchangeable value, will rise.

The theory, therefore, that value depends on labour does not hold. In its revised form, however, that the value of an object produced by human work depends on "useful" labour, the theory seems to be acceptable to many who unhesitatingly reject it in its previous form. Yet I

am inclined to think that the labour expended on the production of any object has generally nothing to do with its value. For instance, two equally skilled stone-cutters start to work on two blocks, one of which from its natural structure requires very little labour to make it a finished article, the other, rough and irregular, requiring twice the amount of labour. The result in both cases may be the same, and therefore the value will be the same ; but the labour in the one case is twice as much as that in the other. Hence, it would appear that the value of the product in no way depends on the labour, but on the thing itself judged by the standard of current prices. We cannot, of course, take into account inefficient workmen or badly-executed work.

We see, then, that the claim of labour for a reward depends, not on the amount of time or the amount of labour, but on the demand society has for the product. In other words, wages depend on the law of supply and demand. As I pointed out when dealing with Wages,* a workman has a right, apart from the question of the living wage, to a reward for his labour which is to be reckoned according to the market value of what he produces.

* Pp. 54, *et seq.*

So far, we have seen that the Socialist's view of capital is wrong, and that his theory of value is false. But admitting, for the sake of argument, that labour is the sole cause of value or wealth, we have then to examine the meaning of labour.

When the Socialist speaks of labour, he has only in his mind picks and shovels and crowbars and spades, etc. But there is another kind of labour, of far more importance, inasmuch as it is necessary in most cases in order to make manual labour at all possible ; and in all cases it increases the opportunities for work. There is intellectual labour, which manifests itself chiefly in inventing and organizing. Socialists do of course, by times, allow for this labour of the brain, but they very carefully suppress the truth when it is likely to make their arguments inconvenient for themselves.

It cannot be denied that wealth and wages have increased enormously during the last century. To what are we to attribute the progress ? It can certainly not be contended, with any show of plausibility, that the unquestionable advance is due to muscular effort. To what, then, are we to attribute the better conditions of labour and living ? Principally to invention and improvement in machinery which, Socialists are never tired of assuring us, is the curse of society.

Anyone, who gives a thought to it, can realise the enormous boon conferred on the working classes by such men as Watt and Arkwright, to whose inventive genius is due the employment of tens of millions of hands throughout the world.

The Socialist listens in pathetic silence to the monotonous throbbing in the mills and factories of our manufacturing towns, and prepares a fine speech for the next meeting of the Proletariat, on the horrors and disabilities of the workers' lives. No doubt there are iniquities which cry to Heaven for vengeance, in those stifling dens of sweated labour, where young humanity is being done to death. This, however, we must bear in mind, is but the abuse of our present industrial system. The abuses should be removed while we preserve the system, for we need not amputate the limb in order to heal an external sore. But the Socialist would do well to remember that the possibility of so many people getting work, is due to the intellectual labour that set the machinery in operation.

Again, when we consider how the principle of the steam-engine has changed the geography of the world, we see at once how short-sighted is the Socialist's view of labour when he confines it to mere manual labour. Must all our attention and sympathy be given to the chimney-sweep, the coal-heaver, the blacksmith, the joiner, and no

notice be taken of the mental work which has covered the seas of the world with steamships and girded the earth with a network of railway lines? Must all the wealth arising from production go to the men who work with their hands, and no reward be given to those whose genius has annihilated the ocean distances separating continents and brought the nations of the earth within speaking distance of each other? And all this has resulted in increased competition, increased opportunities of employment, increased wages, and a diminution in the prices of the necessaries of life.

To make the case concrete, let us take for example the large shipbuilding concerns here in Belfast. The Socialist's heart bleeds with compassion as he listens to the incessant ring of the hammers from morning till night, wielded by the horny hands and brawny arms of honest but needy workmen who are wasting away their lives in building ocean leviathans for fabulously rich companies. The Socialist conveniently forgets the mental worry of the men at their desks making out calculations which would drive any but experts mad; and he forgets, too, that were it not for the brain-work of the experts, or men like them, not a single sound would be heard from those enormous shipyards that now give employ-

ment and the means of obtaining a livelihood to tens of thousands. But behind the men at the boats and the men at their desks, is the man with the money : it is his capital that has set and keeps the machinery going.

If it is said that the State could do this as well as private individuals or limited companies, we must give the statement an unqualified negation. It would be carrying coals to Newcastle to show, from this point of view, the absolute hopelessness of Socialism. In the Socialistic State we would require a gaffer over every workman, and either the gaffers would not do their duty—I do not see why they should—or, if they did, the working-day would be spent in a stand-up fight between them and the workers. In the Socialistic Commonwealth both the men and those over them are bound, no matter what happens, to get their support from the State. Why, then, should they, on the one hand, trouble themselves about working, or, on the other, annoy themselves about seeing that work is done? But the capitalist comes along and says : Men, you must do an honest day's work or there will be no pay. Do your work and you will receive your money ; but refuse, and you will find the gates locked in the morning.

And here we see the second kind of intellec-

tual "labour"—organizing and directive. As Bagehot well says : " A body of separate labourers has many of the characteristics of a mob ; but one acting under the control of a capitalist has many of those of an army. A capitalist provides his labourers with subsistence, directs each what he should do and when, and educes the desired result of the whole combination at the proper time, much as a general does. He and his men will live and produce riches where a mere multitude of labourers will starve.

"When in modern times it has been endeavoured in schemes of ' co-operation ' to enable labourers to subsist without dependence on an individual capitalist, it has been necessary, under cloak of the combination, to invent a capitalist in disguise." (Hector Macpherson : *A Century of Political Development*, p. 186.) If this is true of " co-operation " without individual capitalists, what shall we say of the Socialistic State ?

We have so far endeavoured to analyse the Socialistic theory as regards capital, value, labour. The theory led Marx to the conclusion that the rich are becoming richer and the poor poorer ; and the cry has been taken up, repeated, and re-echoed with increasing insistence ever since. We have now to examine this last phase

of the subject. It is solely a question of facts. What, then, are the facts? Mr. J. A. Hobson, who is regarded as an authority on the subject, and who is certainly not blinded by any prejudice in favour of capitalists, says: "Taking as our criterion money, wages, and hours of labour, we are able to trace in every nation, and in almost all recorded trades, a distinct advance in the position of the wage-earners during the last twenty years." (H. Macpherson: *A Century of Intellectual Development*, p. 161.) In Belgium, Germany, France, Holland, Scandinavia, the United States, and Japan there has been a considerable rise in wages during the same period. Mr. Hobson says: "Until a few years ago it was customary, not only for platform agitators but for thoughtful writers on the subject, to assume that "the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer." This formula was ripening into a popular creed when a number of statistical inquiries choked it. Professor Leone Levi, Mr. Griffin, and a number of careful investigators showed a vast improvement in the industrial condition of the working classes during the last half century. It was pointed out that money wages had risen considerably in all kinds of employment; that prices had generally fallen, so that the rise in real wages was even greater; that they worked shorter hours, consumed more and

better food, lived longer lives, committed fewer crimes, and, lastly, saved more money. The general accuracy of these statements is beyond question. . . . It seems probable that the income of the wage-earning classes as an aggregate is growing even more rapidly than that of the capitalist classes." (*Ibid.*) It is well known, as a matter of fact, that the wages of the British workman have been more than trebled during the last century.

Reviewing the ground over which we have passed, we find—First, that capital is not the curse of the world, as Socialists would have us believe, but rather the greatest blessing the workman, as such, has within his reach; the more capital, the more work, the higher the wages, and the cheaper the living; second, labour is not the sole cause of value, for this depends on market demand; third, even it were granted that wealth is the creation of labour, we must include intellectual labour, which finds no place in the Socialists' scheme; fourth, it is not true that the rich are becoming richer and the poor poorer. The worker is improving his condition every year under our present industrial system. His condition, it is true, is not yet ideal. We wish to see him in a still more secure position. But prudence, not madness, even though there is method in it, should be our guide.

XI.

SOCIALISM AND TRADE UNIONISM.

THE real orthodox Socialism is, as I pointed out previously, essentially revolutionary. There are to be no half-measures, no compromises ; capital must go ; employers, as they now exist, must cease to be ; everything must be made the property of the State ; the goods on which life depends must be violently wrenched out of the hands of private owners and transferred to the commonwealth, to be distributed amongst the citizens for the common weal. And Socialists, as we have seen, make no secret of the means to be employed in compassing this end. Violence, the leaders declare, must unhesitatingly be resorted to in order to bring about the desired result, for violence, they say, is as natural a phase of the evolution of which we are all a part as anything else.

We may here add the testimony of Mr. Rae. In his introductory chapter to *Contemporary Socialism*, he says : " Non-political Socialism may be said to have practically disappeared.

Not only so, but out of the several sorts and varieties of political Socialism only one has revived in any strength, and this is the *extremest and most evolutionary*. . . . It scouts the very suggestion of State help, and will content itself with nothing short of State transformation."

Again, Mr. Rae declares : " Modern Socialism is contended for as an object of immediate accomplishment—if possible, by ordinary constitutional means ; *but, if not, by revolution.*" (*Apud* A. J. Balfour : *The Case Against Socialism*, p. 100.)

There have always been some Socialists who would not care to go the length of revolution outright, but they have been, and are, but a voice crying in the wilderness. Real Socialism spells revolution. But revolutions can only be brought about by goading the people into rebellion. Hence, the aim of the Socialist propaganda is, not the amelioration of the workingman's condition, but precisely the opposite. The main object is to make the conditions of living among the workers so unbearable that a general rising of wage-earners against capitalists must follow as a necessary consequence. Socialism, therefore, looks upon any movement which tends to bring about a betterment of the workers' condition as an enemy to be resisted as strenuously as war is to be relentlessly waged on the capitalist.

Trade Unionism, which has for its object "to improve the conditions and protect the interests of the members," without overthrowing the constitutions of countries, is regarded by Socialists as being as great an obstacle to the realisation of their aspirations as even the traditional rights of capitalists. For when workmen have fair hours and fair wages, comfortable dwellings and nourishing food, good clothes and an occasional holiday, they will not be very anxious to exchange their present mode of living for the doubtful impartiality of the Socialist leaders when all the world's wealth is gathered into a common heap. As Trade Unionism, then, is the dragon which lies across the path of Socialism, so it is the greatest means at present by which any attempts to subvert society in the interests of Socialists can be counteracted.

Trade Unions are not a growth of yesterday : in one shape or other they must have always existed. Some writers trace their history back to the time when the Hebrew brickmakers in Egypt rose in revolt against being required to make bricks without straw. But here we need not dwell on this phase of the subject.

It may be remarked, however, that the Trade Unions of to-day are the immediate offspring of the Guilds, or "Gilds," of the Middle Ages.

Those Guilds are traceable back to classic civilization. They were formed for the same object as the present-day Trade Unions.

Economic conditions changed as time went on. With the introduction of machinery and the rise and growth of capital, the Guilds became ineffective as a means of protecting individuals against their masters. Hence, the employed formed themselves into Unions in the different departments of labour, their object being, among many other things, to secure reasonable working hours and fair wages ; to bring about a peaceful settlement of disputes between masters and men, and to avoid strikes and locks-out ; to see that the Factory Acts and other legislation for the protection of labour would be enforced ; and to provide for the support of the members when incapacitated for work owing to sickness, accident, or want of employment.

Trade Unionism in England has had a very varied career. For the greater part of the nineteenth century labour organisations were positively condemned by law. The employers were in possession, they had the ear of the Government, and they combined amongst themselves to their hearts' content ; whereas the workers had no prestige, no representation in Parliament, and no power outside of Parliament. However, the Unions

continued to exist, and, led by able and determined men, they persisted in pressing their claims till, in 1875, peaceful picketing* and "collective bargaining with all its necessary accompaniments was, after fifty years of legislative struggle, finally recognised by the law of the land." (Sidney Webb : *History of Trade Unionism*, p. 275.)

Henceforth Trade Unionism became a power which, it is stated, makes for the good of the employer as well as the employed. Since the trade organizations were established on a comparatively firm basis, it is claimed that fewer strikes and locks-out take place, that the standard of wages has been raised, being regulated by joint boards, conciliation boards, and frequently between the officials of employers and workmen's organizations.

During a discussion in the House of Commons on the Trade Union position in 1903, Sir Charles Renshaw, then M.P. for Renfrewshire, said : " We recognise the improvements which have been effected in the ^{industrial} employ^{ment} of the status of workmen

* Peaceful picketing, of the Government, on the occasion of strikes, etc., watches can be set for the purpose of ^{of the Government} and taking the names of "black-legs"—those who accept employment from the masters against whom the men have struck—but no violence can be used : they may be "merely argued with." Of course, the argument may be very suggestive of black eyes and broken heads.

by the operation of Trade Unions, not only in regard to the members of those Unions, but in respect to the men outside them also."

And in the same debate, Mr. Wolff, of Belfast, said: "I know the good work which they (the Unions) have done. If it had not been for them the hours of work would be longer and the wages much lower than they are now."

In 1906, Lord Justice Vaughan Williams, addressing a large assembly in the Rhondda Valley, and dealing with Trade Societies, said: "He was a hearty believer in their (Trade Unions) usefulness, and always had been. He did not believe that Trade Unions made it more difficult to compete with other countries, nor did he believe that successful competition was possible for a country where labour could not combine against capital. He believed that a good bargain was one which was good to both parties to that bargain. The right of the workmen to combine to raise wages and improve the conditions of life ought to be conceded." (*Vide Trade Unionism*, by Richard Bell, M.P., pp. 74-76.)

Many other employers, eminently qualified to speak on the question, have from time to time expressed similar views on the usefulness and value of Trade Unions.

Yet there are employers who refuse to take this view of the situation, and stubbornly hold out against any interference from the Unions. Such an attitude is manifestly but courting the dangers of Socialism, for when the employers scout the rights of the workers to raise their voice, and imperiously refuse to discuss terms with them, they are merely lashing the men into an attitude of determined opposition to capital.

Socialists are fully alive to such short-sighted policy, and they have not failed to use it to the full. Piecemeal, they have introduced Socialism into Trade Unions, though Socialism was never the object of the Unions. The Socialists were careful not to show their hand at first—nor indeed are they very explicit in their pronouncements yet—but as time went on the spirit of fraternity waxed stronger, till, in 1899, the following resolution, placed on the agenda by the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, at the Trade Union Congress in Plymouth, was discussed and carried :—

“That this Congress, having regard to its decisions in former years, and with a view to securing a better representation of the interests of labour in the House of Commons, hereby instructs the Parliamentary Committee to invite the co-operation of all Co-operative Societies,

Socialistic and other Working Class Organizations, to jointly co-operate on lines mutually agreed upon in convening a Special Congress of representatives from such of the above-named organizations as may be willing to take part, to devise ways and means for securing the return of an increased number of Labour Members to the next House of Commons."

The Socialists in the Trade Unions contrive, in their whole-hearted generosity, to appropriate, by way of salaries, large sums subscribed by the Trade Unions, and to secure more than their fair share of representation on the Executive Committee. This has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst the Trade Union members, and the dissatisfaction may grow to such an extent as to endanger, if not destroy, the Unions. If Socialists only succeeded in this, one great obstacle to the execution of their programme would be removed. It is, therefore, the duty of Trade Unions, wherever they exist, to be on their guard, lest the control of the Unions get into the hands of Socialists and all the good achieved by long years of persevering agitation come to naught.

That Socialists have no love for Trade Unions is sufficiently manifest at election times, when they will oppose tooth and nail, where they

can safely do so, the election of a Liberal and give their support to a Conservative. The return of a Liberal would, they think, be a step in the direction of improvement in the workingman's condition, which is just the one thing Socialism does not want, whereas every Conservative returned to Parliament is looked upon as an additional security for the capitalist and another spur to goad the worker into rebellion.

In order to appreciate the attitude of Socialism towards labour organizations, we need only take a glance at some of the controversies and negotiations which have taken place on the question within the Socialist ranks, notably in Germany and America.

Up to the time of Vollmar, Socialism aimed solely at the dispossession of all private capitalists, and the transfer of all the means of production and exchange to the State. As against that, Vollmar advocated "State Socialism." He would not adopt a policy of revolution, but his immediate aim would be, to increase the power of the State, as it already exists, and extend its sovereignty, beyond political purposes, to the field of economics, so that it might regulate the relations between workmen and employers, and, in case of necessity, assume the direct control of any branch of production.

This policy of Vollmar was immediately subjected to the fiercest onslaughts from the Socialist Democratic Party—the party which still stood for the original Marxian programme. The upshot was, that a confused and contradictory resolution of compromise was passed at the Berlin Party Convention, 1892. The resolution opens with the declaration that Social Democracy has nothing to do with so-called State Socialism. In the body of the resolution Vollmar's views are approved of, and the whole winds up in this way: "Social Democracy is essentially revolutionary; State Socialism is conservative. Social Democracy and State Socialism are irreconcilable opposites."

The feud assumed a new phase when Bernstein mercilessly assailed the foundations of Marxism. It was not with Bernstein, as with Vollmar, a question of tactics. Bernstein attacked the chief plank in the platform of Marx and Engels—viz., "the theory of collapse." This theory meant that if capital was allowed to go on developing and accumulating, it must ultimately pass into the hands of a few, with the result that the increase in numbers and in misery of the indigent working people must inevitably lead to the universal collapse of society. Then Socialism would have a free hand to set up the new Utopia.

Hence the anxiety of the Social Democrats to foster capital and to increase the misery of the poor. This is the explanation of the badly-concealed opposition of Socialist leaders—Bebel, Liebknecht, Kantsky, etc.—to Trade Unions.

Bernstein continued his attacks in face of all opposition, and at the Hanover Convention, 1899, a milk-and-water resolution was proposed by Bebel, Bernstein's chief accuser, in which, however, the Trades-Union movement and the formation of co-operative societies were approved for the first time by the Socialist Party.

The resolution was passed to meet an emergency, and much against the will of Bernstein's opponents; for, two years later, at the Lubeck Convention, the resolution was practically revoked, Bernstein himself, in a rambling speech, acquiescing.

At the Dresden Convention of 1903, the policy advocated by Bernstein was expressly condemned. So that in Germany, the home of Socialism, organizations of labour for the improvement of the conditions of the labouring classes find no sympathy from the social reformers who profess such anxiety about the penniless Proletariat.

In the United States, after the Civil War, Marxian ideas was disseminated by German

immigrants. Several Labour Unions were founded on Marxian principles. Some of them went under in a short time; others continued to exist with varying fortune. At a Convention in Philadelphia, 1876, the American Federation of the International Workingmen's Association, the Labour Party of Illinois, and the Social Democratic Workingmen's Party of the United States were amalgamated, under the name of the last mentioned. At the Newark Convention, in the following year, the name was changed to Socialist Labour Party of North America. The aims of this party, which assumed large proportions after 1890, are practically identical with those of its German parent.

The Socialist Labour Party attempted to capture the confederations of Trade Unions, the Knights of Labour, and the American Federation of Labour. The result was, that many splits and amalgamations took place between the years 1881 and 1899.

Since 1901 there are in the United States two Socialist parties—the Socialist Labour Party and the Socialist Party. Though both are in perfect accord with regard to their ultimate objects, they are very virulent in their attacks on each other. The Labour Party is accused by its rival of co-operating with capitalists and intro-

ducing dissention among the Socialist ranks; while the Socialist Party is branded by its opponent as a party of "scabs," whose aim is to prevent organization among the workers and to obstruct all progress in bettering the conditions of the labouring classes.

The Socialist Labour Party naturally claims the Trade-Union organizations as its legitimate field of operation. The Socialist Party makes the same claim, the object being to saturate the Unions with the principles of Socialism, so as to use them for political purposes. This is manifest from the following resolution appended to the platform :—

"We consider it the duty of Socialists to join the Unions of their respective trades. . . . We call the attention of Trade Unionists to the fact that the class struggle so nobly waged by the Trade-Union forces to-day, whilst it may result in lessening the exploitation of labour, can never abolish that exploitation. . . . It is the duty of every Trade Unionist . . . to join the Socialist Party, and to assist in building up a strong political movement of the wage-working class." (Cathrein: *Socialism*, p. 93.)

To point out the danger there exists of Socialism absorbing Trade Unions and using them and the workers who are their members, I

cannot do better than quote the words of Fr. Cathrein (*ibid*, pp. 96-97) :—

“ True to its settled policy, laid down in the resolution on Trade Unionism quoted above, the Socialist Party has striven with might and main to obtain control of the great labour federations. And in fact, in June, 1902, the Western Labour Union, with a total membership of about 150,000, the Western Federation of Miners, and the United Association of Hotel and Restaurant Employees, all assembled in convention at Denver, indorsed the Socialist Party in politics, and adopted its platform. In November of the same year an attempt was made at the New Orleans Convention of the American Federation of Labour to introduce a Socialist resolution, which was rejected after a prolonged debate by a vote of 3,744 to 3,344. The attempt was to be renewed at the Boston Convention, Nov. 16-21, 1903. But the twenty-eight Socialist resolutions submitted to the convention were defeated by a vote of 11,282 against 2,185. . . .

“ From the foregoing account the observant reader will easily draw the conclusion that the Socialist Labour Party is becoming comparatively insignificant, whilst the Social Democratic or Socialist Party must be styled the true representative in the United States of *International*

Socialism. Whether its future development will keep pace with its increase during the last few years, whether it will persevere undaunted in its struggle for collective ownership, or whether it will gradually become a 'revisionist' reform party, experience alone can show. This much is certain, that it deserves the most serious consideration on the part of both clergy and laity."

In Austria, Belgium, France, Spain, Italy, and other countries, Socialism has a strong foothold, and everywhere it is the same red revolutionary brand of Marxian manufacture.

In England, the dangers to the stability of the present established order of things are by no means imminent. The English workingman is of too practical a turn of mind to trouble himself about the advent of a hypothetical Millennium. His anxiety is to strengthen his Trade Unions, and make them a power to be reckoned with, so that he may thereby be able to protect himself against the tyranny of his employer. He has no faith in the Socialistic prophecy that, when capital is done away with, he will enjoy a perpetual holiday. The history of his own country, during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, has taught him the foolishness of any such promise. Hence he is content to make the most of his present circumstances, which he does by means of rational organization of labour.

But a straw shows how the wind blows, and even in England the small Socialistic element manifests the same tendencies as its bigger brother in other countries. In England, as elsewhere, the great aim of Socialism is to capture and control the Labour Unions for the twofold purpose of preventing amelioration in the conditions of labour and using the present organizations as political levers for the overthrow of established constitutions. What is known as the Labour Party in the House of Commons are advisedly lying low. They try to make the British workingman believe that they are the true representatives of Labour, and they have succeeded wonderfully. But that is all the merest bluff. They are Socialists pure and simple, though only one or two have the courage or temerity to declare it. But when the Trade Unions' harvest is ripe, when the time seems opportune for an open avowal, English Democracy will stand astounded to find where it has drifted to. Let Trade Unionism beware lest it lose itself in the chaos which Socialism contemplates.

XII.

SOCIALISM AND LIBERALISM.

“IF, when men discuss the question of Liberty, they were careful to grasp its true and legitimate meaning, such as reason and reasoning have just explained, they would never venture to affix such a calumny on the Church as to assert that she is the foe to individual and public liberty. But many there are who follow in the footsteps of Lucifer, and adopt as their own his rebellious cry, “I will not serve”; and consequently substitute for true liberty what is sheer and most foolish licence. Such, for instance, are the men belonging to that widely-spread and powerful organization, who, usurping the name of liberty, style themselves *Liberals*.” (Leo XIII.: Ency. *Libertas Praestantissimum—Human Liberty*.)

What the liberty of Liberalism is we shall see presently. But first we have to remark that, though Liberals protest in the most vehement manner that their principles have nothing in common with those of Socialists, there is, nevertheless, between them a connection as intimate as that of cause and effect.

Liberalism arose out of the reaction against the feudal system, and the pent-up passions of the people first found vent in the terrible anarchy of the French Revolution. Here feudal despotism and democratic liberty met in a fearful final struggle, and both went down together in the national chaos created in the name of Liberty.

Men called it Liberty ; but for no other reason that one can see except that it legalised murder and robbery, and bade defiance to all law and order.

But for that Liberty, such as it was, what a price did France pay ! There are two scenes rapidly described by Carlyle in his *French Revolution* which damn to everlasting infamy the liberty-loving France of 1793. Here is one :—

“ The Executioners, desperate lest themselves be murdered, seize the hapless Louis : six of them desperate, him singly desperate, struggling there ; and bind him to their plank. Abbé Edgeworth, stooping, bespeaks him : ‘ Son of St. Louis, ascend to Heaven.’ The axe clanks down ; a King’s life is shorn away. It is Monday, the 21st of January, 1793. He was aged Thirty-eight years, four months, and twenty-eight days.

“ Executioner Samson shows the Head : fierce shout of *Vive la République* rises and swells ; caps raised on bayonets, hats waving : students

of the College of Four Nations take it up on the far Quais ; fling it over Paris."

This be surely Liberty !

Another scene :—

" At eleven, Marie Antoinette was brought out. She had on an undress in *piqué blanc* : she was led to the place of execution, in the same manner as an ordinary criminal ; bound on a Cart. . . . On reaching the Place de la Révolution, her looks turned towards the *Jardin National*, whilom Tuileries ; her face at that moment gave signs of lively emotion. She mounted the scaffold with courage enough ; at a quarter past Twelve her head fell ; the Executioner showed it to the people, amid universal long-continued cries of *Vive la République*."

Liberty has achieved another triumph in the brutal murder of an inoffensive Queen.

But what will the French Democracy do with the Liberty ? " All France, that is not under the swoop of Austria and Cimmeria, seems rushing into madness and suicidal ruin." A Constitution must be established whereby suicidal France may rally and pacify itself. The National Assembly meets. Left and Right embrace and weep, and swear that whosoever wishes anything but the Constitution, and that only, shall be anathema. But on the morrow they fall out and quarrel

again. " Like fated Eteocles-Polynices Brothers, embracing, though in vain ; weeping that they must not love, that they must hate only, and die by each other's hands ! Or, say, like doomed Familiar Spirits ; ordered, by Art Magic under penalties, to do a harder than twist ropes of sand : ' to make the Constitution march.' If the Constitution would but march ! Alas ! the Constitution will not stir. It falls on its face ; they tremblingly lift it on end again : march, thou gold Constitution ! The Constitution will not march.—' He shall march, by —— !' said kind Uncle Toby, and even swore. The Corporal answered mournfully : ' He will never march in this world.' "

Liberty, Equality, Fraternity ! And in the name of Liberty, the progenitors of modern Liberalism murdered their lawful superiors, and then took to murdering one another. They sowed the winds, and the time was not far distant when they were to reap the whirlwinds.

The principles of Rationalism and Naturalism in philosophy were taken over by the advocates of Liberalism and applied to morality and politics. The fundamental tenet of Rationalism is the supremacy of Reason. There is no God, in the sense of a Supreme Personal Being : man is a law to himself, being subject to no authority above

himself. This was the philosophy of the French Encyclopedists. It was this philosophy which hurled France into the maelstrom of the Revolution.

It was only to be expected that doctrines of this kind would breed revolution. For why should the lower orders remain subject to the higher, if all men are by nature equal and there exist no power beyond their own will and the might of their masters to compel them to occupy lower places than those over them? The revolutionary brand was flung among the people, and the nation was soon ablaze. Liberty, Equality! And France flocked to Paris to vindicate the Rights of Man.

Once set aside the authority of God, and you have left no reason why men should be satisfied with less than an equal share of the world's goods. Why should some be in a position to roll along in cushioned carriages, and, clothed in fine linen, to feast sumptuously every day, while their neighbours sleep out at night, and greedily consume their crust of bread or ragful of cold potatoes? Why should one section of the community be perpetually smarting under the pinch of poverty, and another only troubled to find an outlet for surplus luxuries—if there is no Being superior to all, if we ourselves are the “be-all and end-all?”

If the Atheism of Liberalism were true, for a certainty we should have no fault to find with the conclusions of Socialism. Why should not the good things of the world be distributed equally amongst all? What reason can be given why I should not steal and plunder from those who are better off, provided I can do it with safety? Can any reason be assigned why one man should possess more than another, or, at any rate, why he should be allowed to retain it? There is no reason that would have any weight with fallen mortals, for there is no God, no Superior to enforce order. This is Liberalism; but it is also Socialism.

“The sovereignty of the people, and this without any reference to God, is held to reside in the multitude; which is doubtless a doctrine exceedingly well calculated to flatter and to inflame many passions, but which lacks all reasonable proof, and all power of ensuring public safety and preserving order. Indeed, from the prevalence of this teaching, things have come to such a pass that many hold as an axiom of civil jurisprudence that seditions may be rightfully fostered. For the opinion prevails that Princes are nothing more than delegates chosen to carry out the will of the people; whence it necessarily follows that all things are as change-

able as the will of the people, so that risk of public disturbance is ever hanging over our heads." (Leo XIII.: Ency. *Immortale Dei*—*The Christian Constitution of States*.)

Liberalism and Socialism have this in common, that both start from the same false fundamental principle—the denial of the existence of God, and consequently the assertion of the absolute supremacy of man. Liberalism is the practical application to human life of the principles of Rationalism, and Socialism is merely a particularized form of Liberalism.

"The empire of God," says Leo XIII., "over man and civil society once repudiated, it follows that religion as a public institution can have no claim to exist, and that everything that belongs to religion will be treated with complete indifference. Furthermore, with ambitious designs on sovereignty, tumult and sedition will be common amongst the people; and when duty and conscience cease to appeal to them, there will be nothing to hold them back but force, which of itself is powerless to keep their covetousness in check. Of this we have almost daily evidence in the conflicts with *Socialists* and members of other seditious societies, who labour unceasingly to bring about revolution." (Ency. *Human Liberty*.)

The starting point of Marx and Engels in

their Socialistic campaign is *Materialism*—the denial of the existence of everything spiritual. This is where Liberalism also begins. The aim of both is the same, though by neither is it openly avowed. Liberalism stands for the equality of man ; so does Socialism. It was this theory of equality which prompted the generous worthies of the French Revolution to persecute the Church, to seize her property and that of the nobles ; and when the greed of individuals was satiated with the plunder of the Church and the plunder of the nobility, then it was deemed expedient to declare in the Constitution, that private property is sacred and inviolable ! With the triumph of Socialism, we could only expect a repetition of the same political prudence.

The leaders of Socialism, just like the representatives of Liberalism who led the French Revolution, will continue to agitate, not merely for Equality of opportunity, but also for Equality of conditions. When they succeed, if they ever succeed, in compassing their end, it cannot be expected that we shall have anything but a repetition of French philanthropy.

“ Agitators,” writes Leo XIII., “ are aiming at making use of the labouring classes to satisfy their own ambition. They delude them by empty promises ; flatter them by proclaiming loudly

their rights, without referring ever to their duties ; they enkindle in their minds a hatred of land-owners and of the wealthy classes ; and at length, as soon as they deem the moment favourable for their harmful purposes, they launch them into perilous enterprises, wherein none but the ring-leaders reap advantage." (*Workingmen's Clubs and Associations.*)

No one can be so childish as to believe that Socialists are serious when they clamour for a redistribution of the world's wealth in the interests of those in want. What do Socialists care for the needy, except to use them for their own immoral purposes ? Or, if they have any anxiety to see the poor man's condition improved and distress relieved, why do we not find some practical proof of it somewhere ? Not only is there no indication of anything of the kind, but, on the contrary, there is evidence in abundance to show that Socialists are at particular pains to render the condition of the poor still more exasperating, so that at length, rising in the might of their misery, they may deal the wealthy such a blow as society shall never recover from.

Did Socialists succeed in this, what would be the result ? Obtain-who-need would become Hold-who-can. Would the Atheism or Materialism which forms the basis of their theory make a

sufficiently firm foundation to ensure the stability of a world-wide governmental Constitution? What a Constitution it would be! Worthy of its high pedigree, and imitating its devout ancestor, it would no doubt follow the dictates of conscience, set its torch to Atheism and Company, and set up some Supreme Being in their stead. What this new religion would be we cannot venture to guess, but we fancy the following words of Carlyle would be as applicable to it as they were to the irreligious ceremony which took place, 8th June, 1794, in the Jardin National, when Robespierre raised on high the Statue of Wisdom for the supreme adoration of the people of France :—

“And then? Why, then, there is other Processioning, scraggy Discoursing, and—this *is* our Feast of the Etre Suprême; our new Religion, better or worse, is come! Look at it one moment, O Reader, not two! The shabbiest page of Human Annals: or is there, that thou wotest of, one shabbier? Mumbo-Jumbo of the African woods to me seems venerable beside this new Deity of Robespierre. . . . *This* is the miraculous Aaron’s Rod thou wilt stretch over a hag-ridden, hell-ridden France, and bid her plagues cease. Vanish, thou and it!”

What a Constitution, indeed, we should be able

to establish on an Atheistic foundation, call it Atheism or whatever other name we might! It would be a perfect representation of its Liberal prototype.

“What Parliament that ever sat under the moon had such a series of destinies as this National Convention of France? It came together to make the Constitution; and instead of that, it has had to make nothing but destruction and confusion . . . a Convention decimated by the Guillotine; above every tenth man has bowed his neck to the axe . . . a Convention which has effervesced, and which has congealed . . . sitting with pistols in its pocket, drawing sword (in a moment of effervescence) . . . assassinated, decimated, stabbed at, shot at, in baths, on streets and staircases; which has been the nucleus of chaos.”

Such would be the Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity of the Socialistic Constitution. History would require to repeat itself. In order to make human society possible, another young Artillery Officer would have to be requisitioned to send a “whiff of grape-shot” into the Constitution and blow it to the moon. Only thus was France relieved, by Napoleon Bonaparte, of the Socialism of the French Revolution, which paraded before the eyes of the world under the magic name of Liberalism.

XIII.

SOCIALISM IN PRACTICE.

No matter from what point of view we regard the problem of Socialism, no matter how impartially we examine the arguments for and against the advisability of nationalizing everything on which man depends for his support, we can only arrive at one conclusion—that the logical outcome of Socialism is universal anarchy and complete social stagnation. A modern writer has said with truth that “life should be a round of great duties and simple pleasures.” In the Socialistic State the great duties would continue to exist, but I cannot see how they would be fulfilled; and as to the simple pleasures, I am perfectly certain they would not long remain either simple or sinless. Were we not human beings with a large element of evil in our composition, all might go well; but, then, we would scarcely have any need to discuss methods, such as Socialism suggests, for the removal of social evils and the improvement of our present condition.

But we are not dependent on the mere theoretical discussion of the Socialistic solution

of social problems for the conviction that Socialism affords no solution. We have had Socialism in practice, and we know the result. I referred in a previous section to the Paris Workshops, and the wretched failure in which resulted the attempt to give every man an opportunity of exercising his "right to work." I am aware, of course, that the establishment of the National Workshops is a subject of much dispute; but, though I am strongly of opinion that the attempt was *bona fide*, I do not wish to insist on this instance now, principally because we have a greater and far more glaring case nearer home. The operation of the old Poor Law in England, during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, brought out in bold relief the social perils of Socialism, and taught a lesson which those who clamour for a repetition of the demoralization, on a larger and grander scale, would do well to learn and remember.

Roughly, between the years 1800 and 1834, an almost complete Socialistic system was tried in England, which ended in a dismal and disastrous failure. And it was State Socialism, regulated by law and supervised by responsible officials—a form of Socialism which the leaders of the Socialist movement in the present age would indignantly repudiate as a half-hearted measure,

wholly inadequate to satisfy their demands. If, then, a mild form of Socialism, like the Poor Law system during the time referred to, was fraught with the most lamentable consequences, we can easily calculate what would be the result of out-and-out Socialism as advocated everywhere by the leaders of the movement to-day.

That the attempt miscarried, much to the social detriment of the English people, we know from the written testimony of the Poor Law Commissioners, as contained in their Report of the year 1834. The Report furnishes, perhaps, the best refutation of Socialism that has ever been written.

It was a kind of parish Socialism, but, even as such, it had been made, by various acts of Parliament, law in all the land. "The inhabitants of a parish till 1834 had an absolute claim on the community for their support. Every man and woman in a parish could sing the pauper's song :—

Then drive away sorrow and banish all care,
For the State it is bound to support us."

(J. St. L. Starchey: *Problems and Perils of Socialism*, p. 65.)

Besides in-door relief, there was out-door relief for the able-bodied, employed as well as unemployed, for the impotent, for widows, for married persons, for fathers, and for mothers.

The Report divides the out-door relief of the able-bodied into two sections—Relief without Labour and Relief with Labour. I will give a few extracts to show the operation of the “Law” in each case.

Mr. Villiers, in his Report from the counties of Warwick, Worcester, Gloucester, and North Devon, states :—“The practice of granting small sums of money to able-bodied men without requiring labour in return is adopted in some parishes in each county. . . . At Stow-on-the-Wold, in Gloucestershire, the overseer and churchwarden stated that this practice—giving relief in money—had been adopted after the failure of many others. . . . They stated, however, that it had completely failed, as the same men again returned, and they were again compelled to relieve them. The object in view is to save trouble and prevent expense ; *the result proves a bounty upon idleness and crime*,* and is, in the end, not less expensive.”

Mr. Tweedy’s Report from Yorkshire, among other things, contains the following :—“In Gisburn a man had a sickly wife, and was allowed 5s. a week for her and for a woman to attend her. She died, and in about a year he married again ; and on the very day of his marriage said, ‘Now

* The italics throughout are mine.

I have married again, I'll work Gisburn another round'; and he has been as good as his word, having had three children by the second wife, on account of which he received £2 11s. from January to September in last year."

A scale of allowances was made out according to the number of children a man had. The result was that young people, with no prospects in life, and wanting none, married early, relying upon relief from the poor-rate. The report just quoted states that "the most profligate and dissolute are amongst this class, and if they get a little extra pay at any time, they spend it in drinking, leaving their families to be maintained by the township."

So accustomed did they become to getting relief, that they demanded it as a matter of right, and often with insolence. "An instance is mentioned"—at Pateley Bridge—writes Mr. Tweedy, "as occurring some years ago, in which a man came and said, 'We have been getting married; can you find us a house?'" and another instance occurred two years ago, in which a man came out of Craven, and claimed relief a few weeks after marriage, and was insolent in his demand."

It is the same everywhere. Once a person gets accustomed to obtaining things for nothing, he considers injustice is done him if they are refused; and once people grow accustomed to

getting their support *gratis*, they will not be at much pains to shift for themselves. Is it not, indeed, a fact that persons of this class cannot be induced to work at all?

What does Socialism aim at? It will billet every citizen on the State, and convert the world into a huge workhouse. But who will do the work to provide the food? Look at it as I may, I can find no answer to this question. Socialists believe, or pretend to believe, that we shall be all only too anxious to do the neat little jobs appointed for us by the State. But even so, who will do the ugly jobs, the dirty work in the literal sense? And no matter what the work is like, I am afraid everyone will be shirking his duty. Where, then, is the remedy? Let the backsliders starve? Be assured, they will find ways and means of staving off starvation, as long as there is food in the land.

We come now to relief with labour. This was known as the Roundsman System. It meant that the parish paid the occupiers of property to employ the applicants for relief at a rate of wages fixed by the parish, the employer receiving out of the poor-rate all he advanced beyond a certain sum. It was also known as the house row, or billet, or ticket, or stem system. We shall see presently how it worked out.

Sometimes the plan adopted was to send those seeking work on some part of the parish roads, "where they are expected to work," says Mr. Richardson, writing of Northamptonshire, "not at the farmers' hours, or anything like them, but to begin at eight, to leave at twelve for dinner—an hour—and to leave the roads finally at four. It is the business of the overseer or the surveyor of the roads, a farmer or a tradesman, who, paid or not, has his own business to attend to, to see that the men are actually working. *While he is present . . . the men bestir themselves a little ; but the moment his back is turned, a man who gives himself any trouble is laughed at by his companions.* As the overseer at Kettering told me, their remark is—' You must have your 12s. a week, or your 10s. a week, whether you work or not ; I would not be such a fool as to work—blast work—damn me if I work,' etc. ; and, of course, under these circumstances they do anything but work ; if there is a wood near, as at Glapthorne and some other places round Oundle, they run into the wood to steal firing, which they hide and carry off at a convenient time ; and universally they are in the habit of stealing turnips, or posts, or any little thing of that sort that comes to hand.

" In short, where there were many able-bodied

men employed on the roads, there everybody complained of petty thefts, pilfering, poaching, etc., as the natural consequences.

“Whatever the previous character of a man may have been, he is seldom able to withstand the corruption of the road: two years’ employment there *ruins the best labourer.*”

Yet this is Socialism, or, at any rate, the nearest approach to the system of employment in the Socialistic State that one can well imagine. Everyone knows perfectly well that this is just what would happen, only on a proportionately larger scale, if we had Socialism in the nation instead of a watered-down form of it in the parish.

Mr. Majendie reports from East Sussex:—
“The labourers are much deteriorated. They do not care whether they have regular work or not; they prefer idle work on the roads.” Why not, indeed, when “you must have your 12s. a week, or your 10s. a week, whether you work or not?”

On out-door relief of the impotent, the Commissioners very wisely remark:—“The duty of supporting parents and children, in old age or infirmity, is so strongly enforced by our natural feelings, that it is often well performed, even among savages, and almost always so in a nation deserving the name of civilized. We believe

that England is the only country in which it is neglected.”

So the strong natural feelings were eradicated by the Socialistic system of parish support. This, as we have seen, is one of the points Socialists most insist on—viz., that the care of the children and provision for the parents should be in charge of the State.*

In the section of the Commissioners' Report, General Remarks on Out-door Relief, we find some very useful and instructive information. The following is from Dr. Chadwick's Report on the Eastern Division of the Metropolis :—

“The most injurious portion of the Poor Law system is the out-door relief. I do not serve a day without seeing some new mischief arise from it. In the smaller parishes persons are liable to all sorts of influences. . . . One man to every twenty would be required to watch the paupers living out of the parish, and one man to every hundred living within the parish. Suppose you go to a man's house as a visitor : you ask, where is Smith (the pauper) ? You see his wife, or his children, who say they do not know where he is, but they believe he is gone in search of work. How can you tell, in such a case, whether he is at work or not ? It could only be by following him

* *Supra* pp. 112-113.

in the morning ; and you must do that every day, because he may be in work one day, and not another. . . . So that, unless you have a considerable number of men to watch every pauper every day, you are sure to be cheated. Some of the out-door paupers are children, others are women ; but, taking one with another, I think it would take one man's whole time to watch every twenty paupers."

Here is a question for Socialism to solve ; and the solution becomes still more difficult as we consider the difference between the circumstances in the above extract and those of the Socialistic State. Under the relief system a man had every inducement to work : he could make the fruits of his toil his own ; but under Socialism there would be no incentive whatever : work or no work, you must get your 12s., or your 10s., but you cannot make provision for the future.

But there is yet another fruitful source of mischief, which doubles the difficulty of Socialistic distribution—the fraudulency of the distributors. "The great source of Poor Law maladministration," say the Commissioners, "is the desire of many of those who regulate the distribution of the parochial fund to extract from it a profit for themselves."

Mr. Thorn, assistant overseer of the parish of

St. Giles, Cripplegate, London, confirms the above testimony :—

“The out-door relief in the City of London would require almost one man to look after every half-dozen of able-bodied men, and then he would only succeed imperfectly in preventing fraud. They cheat us on all hands. . . . There is no protection whatever from the growing evil of the increase of the able-bodied out-door poor, which is one of the greatest evils of the system, but in finding them labour out of town.”

Rev. James Donne, the vicar of St. Paul's, Bedford, says :—

“The great Bedford charity has a bad effect on the minds of all the working classes. They are discontented because they think there is an ample provision for the poor whenever they are thrown out of work.

“I have heard an engineer, resident in the town, say that he dare not employ a Bedford hand, they are so idle.”

The idleness would be increased a hundred-fold in the State which Socialism contemplates. The question the Socialist Cabinet Ministers would immediately have to face would be, how to provide enough food to feed the multitude. Tariff Reform would be only child's play compared with the creation of sufficient food to keep

the world from starvation, when everybody would be throwing the burden of production on everybody else.

I fancy the following extract from the Report on the Poor Law system would correspond pretty accurately with the first report furnished on the working of out-and-out Socialism, were it reduced to practice.

One of the questions circulated by the Commissioners was, whether the labourers were better or worse off than formerly. From the places in which the allowance and the scale—the Socialist method—were in operation, some of the replies were as follow:—“They are much degenerated, being generally disaffected to their employers: they work unwillingly and wastefully.” “Three of them would not do near the work in a day performed by two in more northern counties.” “One-third of our labourers do not work at all; the greater part of the remainder are much contaminated; the rising population learn nothing; the others are forgetting what they knew.” “They are constantly changing their services; relying on parish support, they are indifferent whether they oblige or disobey their masters, are less honest and industrious, and the mutual regard between employer and servant is gone.” “*The system of allowance is most mischievous and ruinous,*

and, till it is abandoned, the spirit of industry can never be revived; allowance-men will not work; it makes them idle, lazy, fraudulent, and worthless." "The Poor Laws are, perhaps, better administered in this parish than in many others; but such a resource in view as parish relief prevents the labourers' exertions, and the young men from laying by anything in their youth. . . . By old experienced individuals it is supposed one labourer, forty years ago, would do more than two of the present day."

Mr. Majendie states that in Adingly, Sussex, "labourers refuse work, unless of a description agreeable to them. . . . In the last hay harvest a man, inferior to the average labourers, refused 10s. a week from a farmer, saying that he could do better with the parish. At Eastbourne, in December, 1832, four healthy young men, receiving from 12s. to 14s. per week from the parish, refused to work at threshing for a farmer at 2s. 6d. and a quart of ale per day. . . . Nine able-bodied young men were in the work-house last winter; such was their character that they were not to be trusted with threshing."

Quotations of this kind could be multiplied almost indefinitely, but all relate the same sad tale. Enough has been said to show the effect of even a mitigated form of Socialism on the industry

and skill of labourers, and the mischief it makes for farmers and other employers.

Its effects on the honesty of the workers are equally striking and instructive. They are described by Mr. Collett, in his evidence before the House of Commons' Committee of 1824 :—

“ Were I to detail the melancholy, degrading, and ruinous system which has been pursued, with few exceptions, throughout the country, in regard to the unemployed poor, and in the payment of the wages of idleness, I should scarcely be credited beyond its confines. In the generality of parishes, from five to forty labourers have been without employment, loitering about during the day, engaged in idle games, insulting passengers on the road, or else consuming their time in sleep, that they might be more ready and active in the hours of darkness. The weekly allowances cannot supply more than food ; how, then, are clothing, firing, and rent to be provided? By robbery and plunder ; and those so artfully contrived and effected that discovery has been almost impossible. Picklock keys have readily opened our barns and granaries ; the lower orders of artificers, and even in one or two instances small farmers, have joined the gang. . . . Disgraceful as these facts are to a civilized country, I could enumerate many more, but recital would create disgust.”

This evidence, be it remembered, was given in 1824—a time of comparative comfort and prosperity, compared with the year 1830. The evils of the allowance system went on multiplying till the industry, skill, and honesty of the people were lost in a generation whose main characteristics were idleness, ignorance, and dishonesty. How could it be otherwise? Does not everyone with any experience of the world, or any knowledge of human nature, know perfectly well that this moral degradation must, and shall always, be the natural and necessary outcome of any such practically indiscriminate relief. Even in the particular instances that come under our own individual observation, is it not manifest how the sense of shame gives way to assurance, sometimes to insolence, on the part of those who become hardened to begging? But in the Socialistic State, there need be no shame: we shall all have a right to our support, and we shall demand our share, not as an alms, but as our rightful portion of the world's wealth. Where is the wealth to come from, you ask? And echo answers, where? The effect of the Poor Law allowances was that farmers were compelled to allow their lands to run waste; and when agriculture suffers, we know the effect on the nation.

“One impoverished farmer,” says Mr. R. Bevan, speaking of Northampton, “turns off all his labourers ; the rest do the same, because they cannot employ their own shares and pay the rest, too, in poor-rates. Weeds increase in the fields, and vices in the population. All grow poor together.” In one word, the relief system was ruinous for the employers ; and the ruin reacted all round on the nation.

The consequences were no less baneful to the labourers themselves. We have seen some of the effects already—the all-round demoralization of the workers. But there is still another aspect of the situation. Thrift and industry were actually penalized. Mr. Courthope, of Ticehurst, Sussex, tells us how it was, in reply to the query, “Could a poor family lay by anything ?”

“If a single man could procure regular work, and could be induced to lay by as he ought to do, I think an industrious man might in a few years secure an independence, at the present wages of the county ; but if an industrious man was known to have laid by any part of his wages, and thus to have accumulated any considerable sum, there are some parishes in which he would be refused work till his savings were gone ; and the knowledge that this would be the case acts as a preventive against saving.”

Mr. Wetherell, the rector of Byfield, Northamptonshire, replies to the same question :—

“With a family, it is scarcely possible he should lay by anything out of his earnings, and if he could, he dare not let it be known, lest he should be refused employment under the present system of the Poor Laws, though he is industrious and honest.”

Many instances are given of men—labourers—who had some little property acquired by industry or by legacy, and who, on their masters being forced to part with them, had no hope whatever of getting employment anywhere else, till they had consumed whatever means they already possessed. Paupers, whose wages were supplemented from the poor-rates, were naturally more desirable than the men who, on account of being the possessors of some little means, could not look to the parish for any subsidy.

It is plain, therefore, that the parish allowances tended directly to stifle thrift, that the system made the people improvident, that it put a premium on idleness and profligacy, and smothered the higher aspirations of honest working people, who might, otherwise, have been moulded into sterling, wealth-producing citizens, to the great benefit of the nation at large.

Again, comparing the relief system with that

of a Socialistic State, we see at once how, under the latter, industry must fag, and social virtue be reduced to a mere name. For under Socialism, not only would there be no inducement to practise economic virtue, but the very practice of it would be banned by positive legislation forbidding any honest worker to make the fruits of his labour his own.

Here is an interesting dialogue, which we can easily imagine taking place in the Socialistic State : it seems to me to express exactly what would occur in the field of labour, under a Socialistic *regime* :—

“ Thomas Peerce, Labourer in Husbandry, of the Parish of Govington, Sussex, examined. Witness has worked all his life for Mr. Noakes, of Wannock.

“ In your parish are there many able-bodied men upon the parish ? There are a great many men in our parish who like it better than being at work.

“ Why do they like it better ? They get the same money, and don't do half the work. They don't work like me ; they be'ant at it so many hours, and they don't do so much work when they be at it ; they're doing no good, and are only waiting for dinner-time and night ; they be'ant working, it's only waiting.

“How have you managed to live without parish relief? By working hard.

“What do the paupers say to you? They blame me for what I do. They say to me, ‘What are you working for?’ I say, ‘For myself.’ They say, ‘*You are only doing it to save the parish, and if you didn’t do it you would get the same money for smoking your pipe and doing nothing.*’ ’Tis a hard thing for a man like me.”

Is it to be expected that in such circumstances men will be economic, diligent, industrious? Why should an honest man work for the loafers? And how is Socialism going to rid society of the loafers? By placing an overseer over every twelve or twenty? Rather, I should say, there would be required twelve or twenty overseers for every two or three workers, in a State in which society recognises no rights or duties except those it creates for itself. The overseers would have a hot time of it. How could the labour necessary to preserve society be procured, when we would be nearly all overseers and very few of us workers—and extremely reluctant workers at that? As a matter of fact, Socialism is nothing more or less than a bad dream.

But we have not yet finished. The picture grows darker as we proceed.

“The character and habits of the labourer,” says Mr. Okenden, “have, by this scale system, been completely changed. Industry fails, moral character is annihilated, and the poor man of twenty years ago, who tried to earn his money, and was thankful for it, is now converted into an insolent, discontented, surly, thoughtless pauper, who talks of ‘right and income,’ and who will soon fight for these supposed rights and income, unless some step is taken to arrest his progress to open violence. Some rude efforts he may, at first, make to shake off his state of servitude; but he finally yields to the temptations of the payable and the scale, feels his bondage, and puts off his generous feelings of industry, and gratitude, and independence, and,

. to suit
His manner with his fate, puts on the brute.”

“I should state,” says Mr. Millman, of Reading, “in the most unqualified manner, that the cottage of the parish pauper and his family may be at once distinguished from that of a man who maintains himself. The former is dirty, neglected, noisome: the children, though in general they may be sent to school at the desire of the clergyman or parish officers, are the least clean and the most ragged at the school; in short, the degree of wretchedness and degradation may, in some

instances, be measured by the degree in which they burden the parish.”

An Assistant Overseer of Windsor examined :—

“What is the characteristic of the wives of paupers and their families? The wives of paupers are dirty, and nasty, and indolent; and the children generally neglected, and dirty, and vagrants, and immoral.

“How are the cottages of the independent labourers as compared to them? The wife is a very different person; she and her children are clean, and her cottage tidy. I have had very extensive opportunities of observing the difference on my visits; the difference is so striking to me that, in passing along a row of cottages, I could tell, in nine instances out of ten, which were paupers' cottages and which were the cottages of independent labourers.”

Mr. Brushfield, of Spitalfields, London, examined :—

“Have you ever compared the condition of the able-bodied pauper with the condition of the independent labourer? Yes. . . . In the pauper's habitation you will find a strained show of misery and wretchedness. . . . The children are dirty, and appear to be under no control; the clothes of both parents and children, in nine cases out of ten, are ragged, but evidently are so

for the lack of the least attempt to make them otherwise ; for I have rarely found the clothes of a pauper with a patch put or a seam made upon them since new ; their mode of living, in all cases that I have known . . . is most improvident.

“ In the habitation of the labouring man who receives no parish relief, you will find, even in the poorest, an appearance of comfort. . . . The children are under parental control ; are sent to school (if of that age) ; their clothes you will find patched and taken care of, so as to make them wear as long as possible ; there is a sense of moral feeling and moral dignity easily discerned.”

Mr. Isaac Willis, Stratford-le-Bow, London, contrasts the two classes :—

“ The independent labourer is comparatively clean in person, his wife and children are clean, and the children go to school ; the house is in better order and more cleanly. Those who depend on parish relief or on benefactions, on the contrary, are dirty in their persons and slothful in their habits ; the children are allowed to go about the streets in a vagrant condition.”

Mr. Samuel Millar, St. Sepulchre's, London:—

“ I have frequently said to the wife of an independent labourer, ‘ I can see, by the neatness and cleanness of your place, that you receive no relief from the parish.’ ‘ No,’ they usually say, ‘ and I hope we never shall.’ . . . The

quantity of relief given to the paupers makes no difference with them as to cleanliness or comfort ; in many instances, very much the contrary. More money only produces more drunkenness."

Mr. Booker, Western Division of the Metropolis :—

" The deterioration in the character and habits of persons receiving parochial relief pervades their whole conduct ; they become idle, reckless, and saucy ; and if we take them into a house, or place them at farm-houses, *the younger learn from the older all their malpractices, and are ready enough to follow them.*"

Mr. Majendie states that at Thaxted, mothers and children will not nurse each other in sickness, unless they are paid for it. Mr. Power mentions the following circumstance as having occurred at Over, Cambridgeshire, a few days before his visit :—

" A widow with two children had been in receipt of 3s. a week from the parish : she was enabled by this allowance and her own earnings to live very comfortably. She married a butcher : the allowance was continued ; but the butcher and his bride came to the overseer, and said, ' They were not going to keep those children for 3s. a week, and that if a further allowance was not made, *they should turn them out of doors, and throw them on the parish altogether.*' The over-

seer resisted ; the butcher appealed to the Bench, who recommended him to make the best arrangement he could, as the parish was obliged to support the children."

"Those whose minds," say Messrs. Wrottesley and Cameron, "have been moulded by the operation of the Poor Laws appear not to have the slightest scruple in asking to be paid for the performance of those domestic duties which the most brutal savages are in general willing to render gratuitously to their own kindred. 'Why should I tend my sick and aged parents, when the parish is bound to do it? Or if I do perform the service, why should I excuse the parish, which is bound to pay for it?'"

Then follows a number of instances in which allowances had to be made on this head.

I will bring this evidence to a close with the following dark and dismal description, given by Mr. Cowell, of his experiences of the working of this Socialism in little :—

"At the time of my journey, "says Mr. Cowell, "the acquaintance I had with the practical operation of the Poor Laws led me to suppose that the pressure of the sum usually raised upon the ratepayers, and its progressive increase, constituted the main inconvenience of the Poor Law system. The experience of a very few weeks served to convince me that this evil,

however great, sinks into insignificance when compared with the *dreadful effects* which the system produces on the *morals and happiness* of the lower orders. *It is as difficult to convey to the mind of the reader a true and faithful impression of the intensity and malignancy of the evil in this point of view as it is by any description, however vivid, to give an adequate idea of the horrors of a shipwreck or a pestilence.* A person must converse with paupers—must enter work-houses, and examine the inmates—must attend at the parish pay-tables, before he can form a just conception of the *moral debasement* which is the offspring of the present system ; *he must hear the pauper threaten to abandon his wife and family unless more money is allowed him—threaten to abandon an aged bed-ridden mother, to turn her out of his house and lay her down at the overseer's door, unless he is paid for giving her shelter ; he must hear parents threatening to follow the same course with regard to their sick children ; he must see mothers coming to receive the reward of their daughters' ignominy, and witness women in cottages quietly pointing out, without even the question being asked, which are their children by their husbands, and which by other men previous to marriage ; and when he finds that he can scarcely step into a town or parish in any county without meeting with some instance or other of this*

character, he will no longer consider the pressure on the ratepayer as the first in the class of evils which the Poor Laws have entailed on the community."

These are some of the social blessings which Socialism has in store for fortunate future generations, not in England alone, nor in any individual country, but for every people and in every land, the wide world over.

In fact, the moral debasement and sickening criminality set forth above are just the aspects of Socialism on which Socialists love to dwell: it is on this moral blight and corruption they lay most stress, as the great goal of human aims: it is on the agitation for the actualization of this brutal iniquity on a world-wide scale that they base their claim for popular support.

The realization of the dreams of Bebel's "Frau," which advocates unrestrained and irresponsible free-love, as well as the State support and rearing and education of the children, would surely be attended, but in an intensified degree, by the dirty, sordid depravity which characterized and stigmatized the British attempt at a very modified form of Socialism in the twenties and early thirties of the nineteenth century. Neither the moral nor the civic virtues—to use a popular distinction—would find any place in the Socialistic State.

XIV.

CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM.

FROM what we have said up to the present it must be plain that Socialism and Christianity can have nothing in common. So plainly, in fact, is Socialism opposed to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity that it may seem superfluous to add anything on the question of Christian Socialism. Yet, notwithstanding the manifest repugnance there exists between the tenets of Socialism and the teaching of the Christian religion, there are not wanting men, even of the present day, Christians, and sometimes Catholics, who contend for some *via media* between Socialism and Christianity. They are of opinion that Socialism is absolutely necessary for the levelling up of society, and, consequently, that it is possible to fuse it with Christianity in such a way that each will be acceptable to the other. Not unfrequently do we find writers in journals, which are unquestionably Christian, advocating such an amalgamation. One cannot help thinking, however, that those who are prepared to defend or accept a policy of that

kind, must not have grasped the real meaning of the problem they wish to solve. For if it is found that Socialism detests and abhors Christianity, and that Christianity in turn anathematizes Socialism, it is difficult to see how anyone can hope to reconcile such essentially antagonistic forces.

When we advert for a moment to the salient features of Socialism, we perceive at once that no Christianity deserving the name could ever allow itself to be identified with such open violation of the Natural Law, and such unqualified condemnation of some of the most cherished of Christian dogmas.

The Socialistic system is founded on the Materialistic Conception of History, which is only another way of saying that Atheism is the basis of Socialism. How true this is we have already seen, and we shall see again presently. Then personal property and private rights must, in the opinion of Socialists, be completely abolished. Marriage, the bond which holds society together, is, according to the teaching of Socialism, merely a private arrangement between man and woman, which can be set aside at any time, at the whim of either party to the contract. Parents, Socialism says, should not have charge of the bringing up of their children : this is the duty of the State. Authority does not come from God,

but from the people ; so that the stability of governments depends on the people's fancy.

These are some of the leading features of Socialism ; yet the truths here denied are just those which the Christian religion is tireless in keeping before the eyes of the world. Where, then, can the *via media* be found ? If Christianity is to be pared down to suit Socialism, Christianity must cease to exist, for if it gives way on even one essential point, it must logically surrender the rest. On the other hand, if Socialism conforms to Christianity, then it is no longer Socialism.

Nor can it be said that we may, without hurt to our Christian convictions, retain the name of Socialism, provided we attach a new meaning to the term. As well might we talk of retaining Christianity after altering the meaning. Socialism is too long a time before the world, and has acquired too firm a grip on society to allow of any alteration in its main significance. But, besides this, considering the end and aim of Socialism and the methods it advocates, would it not be well for us to steer clear of the danger altogether ?

However anxious some may be to come to terms for the sake of peace, it will be well in this as in other cases not to reckon without the host. We have, therefore, to see what Socialism has to say about Christianity, and in particular, that form

of it which is centred in the See of Rome, and, on the other hand, to hear what Christianity, through the spokesman of Catholicity, had to say about Socialism from 1878 till 1901.

I will now give a small fraction of the explicit statements of leading Socialists, in which are expressed their views on Christianity, and in which their attitude towards what they style the Church of Rome is plainly put before the world.*

Dr. Woltmann supplies us with a text : *Never have the foundations of religion been so thoroughly shattered as by Marxism.*

The main foundations of religion, as we understand it, are: the Existence of God—three Divine Persons in one Divine Nature—the Rewarder of the good and the Punisher of the wicked; the universal Providence of God, sustaining and directing all things in creation; the Authority of God, and our obligation of always bowing to it; the Fall of Man; the Revelations of God to man in the Old Testament and in the New; the Redemption of the whole human race by the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity assuming human

* *Vide* John J. Ming, S.J. : *The Religion of Modern Socialism*, pp. 233-290. Those who wish for further evidence of the implacable antagonism of Socialism to religion generally will find, in addition to what I have given in the section, *Socialism and Religion*, an abundance of shocking blasphemy in Fr. Ming's work, pp. 194-232.

nature without a human person, suffering and dying on a cross, and then raising Himself from the dead—the chief proof of His Divinity ; the Establishment of the Church as a Society, under the Hierarchy of the Apostles and their successors for all time ; the granting of the Primacy, not only of honour, but also of jurisdiction, to St. Peter and his successors, to rule the universal Church till the end of the world—Christ conveying to Peter the Keys of His Kingdom on Earth, and putting him in charge not only of the *lambs*, but also of the *sheep* of His spiritual flock, and so on.

What is the attitude of Socialism in regard to these “foundations” of the Christian religion? We will not be satisfied with drawing conclusions from Socialistic principles for the purpose of pointing out the deadly opposition of Socialism to Christianity. We will allow Socialists themselves to speak, and the reader can then judge whether a compromise under the name of Christian Socialism is feasible or possible.

Ladoff says in a general way :—

“Christianity can not be harmonized with monistic philosophy. Christianity represents an entirely different cycle of ideas and conceptions from modern monistic philosophy, and must, of necessity, be diametrically opposed to modern Socialism, which is nothing else but the applica-

tion of monism or evolution to society by an organization of men. To combine the terms Christianity and Socialism is just as sensible as to combine the terms Anarchism and Socialism. One excludes the other as its antithesis, as its negative."

We freely admit the impossibility of combining the terms Christianity and Socialism ; but anyone who gives a thought to it will at once deny the parallel, viz., that the terms Anarchism and Socialism are exclusive of each other.

As to the first "foundation" of religion, the Existence of God, Lafrague tells us :—

"The ancestral gods concerned themselves only with family affairs. The Jehovah of the Bible was a god of this kind ; he lodged in a wooden box called the Ark of the Covenant, which was carried along when the tribes changed their location ; they put it at the head of the army, that Jehovah might fight for his people." Again : "The God of the first Christians is a pitiless executioner, who takes a savoury pleasure in feasting his eyes on the tortures inflicted for all eternity on the infidels, his enemies."

But listen to Robert Blatchford, the editor of the *Clarion*, and author of *God and my Neighbour*, perhaps the most revolting of all the blasphemous books that ever proceeded from the pen of man:—

“ The Biblical God, Jehovah or Iehovah, was fickle, jealous, dishonourable, immoral, vindictive, barbarous, cruel ; he was a tribal God, an idol made by man, and as the idol of a savage and ignorant tribe, was himself a savage and ignorant monster.”

I hope Mr. Blatchford has read “ Modern Infidelity Exposed,” wherein he himself is exposed as the most ludicrous caricature that ever brought human intelligence into abject disgrace.

In a pamphlet, “ What to Read on Socialism,” Charles Kerr quotes Blatchford for the following presentation of the doctrine of the Trinity :—

“ Rightly or wrongly, I am for reason against dogma, for evolution against revelation, for humanity always ; for earth, not heaven ; for the holiest Trinity of all—the Trinity of man, woman, and child.”

The Providence of God over us and all things is thus scouted by E. Untermann in the “ Appeal to Reason,” February 21, 1903 :—

“ If a Supreme Being created the world in its beginning, and then left us to ourselves, because we refused to submit to a divine tyrant, so much the worse for him. We have managed to struggle along without his help so long, and can also rise higher without him in the future. If, on the other hand, we have developed from a protoplasm to

our present advanced stage, there is so much more reason to expect that we shall develop equally high in the eternity to come, by the same means that have brought us thus far."

God's authority is speedily disposed of in the following practical way by the French Socialist, Jaures :—

"If God rose up before us in a palpable form, the first duty of man should be to refuse him obedience, and to consider him as an equal with whom one disputes, rather than a master whom one accepts."

G. D. Herron tells us that :—

"Humanity can hope to advance only as it forsakes all reliance upon any resource outside the common life. The common life and its common aims, aspirations, and efforts must be its own saviour. It makes even now its own heaven and its own hell."

The "Sozial Demokrat," the organ of German Socialists, states :—

"Christianity is the greatest enemy of Socialism. When God is expelled from human brains, what is called the Divine Grace will, at the same time, be banished ; and when the heaven above appears nothing more than an immense falsehood, men will seek to create for themselves a heaven below."

On the Fall of Man, Blatchford furnishes us with the following piece of theological lore :—

“ Man never did, and never could, sin against God. Evolution, historical research, and scientific criticism have disposed of Adam. Evolution proves a long, slow *rise*. If the theory of evolution be true, there was nothing to atone for, and nobody to atone. *Man had never sinned against God.* In fact, the whole of this old Christian doctrine is a mass of error. There was no creation. There was no fall. There was no atonement. There was no Adam and no Eve, and no Eden, and no devil, and no hell.”

The same sage authority has made some wonderful discoveries with regard to Revelation as contained in the Old Testament.

“ Much of the (Hebrew) Bible,” he says, “ is evidently legendary. Here we have a jumble of ancient myths, allegories, and mysteries drawn from many sources and remote ages, and adapted, altered, and edited so many times that in many instances their original or inner meaning has become obscure. And it is folly to accept the tangled legends and blurred or distorted symbols as the literary history of a tribe, and the literal accounts of the origin of man and the genesis of religion.”

In another place, he says :—

our present advanced stage, there is so much more reason to expect that we shall develop equally high in the eternity to come, by the same means that have brought us thus far."

God's authority is speedily disposed of in the following practical way by the French Socialist, Jaures :—

"If God rose up before us in a palpable form, the first duty of man should be to refuse him obedience, and to consider him as an equal with whom one disputes, rather than a master whom one accepts."

G. D. Herron tells us that :—

"Humanity can hope to advance only as it forsakes all reliance upon any resource outside the common life. The common life and its common aims, aspirations, and efforts must be its own saviour. It makes even now its own heaven and its own hell."

The "Sozial Demokrat," the organ of German Socialists, states :—

"Christianity is the greatest enemy of Socialism. When God is expelled from human brains, what is called the Divine Grace will, at the same time, be banished ; and when the heaven above appears nothing more than an immense falsehood, men will seek to create for themselves a heaven below."

On the Fall of Man, Blatchford furnishes us with the following piece of theological lore :—

“ Man never did, and never could, sin against God. Evolution, historical research, and scientific criticism have disposed of Adam. Evolution proves a long, slow *rise*. If the theory of evolution be true, there was nothing to atone for, and nobody to atone. *Man had never sinned against God.* In fact, the whole of this old Christian doctrine is a mass of error. There was no creation. There was no fall. There was no atonement. There was no Adam and no Eve, and no Eden, and no devil, and no hell.”

The same sage authority has made some wonderful discoveries with regard to Revelation as contained in the Old Testament.

“ Much of the (Hebrew) Bible,” he says, “ is evidently legendary. Here we have a jumble of ancient myths, allegories, and mysteries drawn from many sources and remote ages, and adapted, altered, and edited so many times that in many instances their original or inner meaning has become obscure. And it is folly to accept the tangled legends and blurred or distorted symbols as the literary history of a tribe, and the literal accounts of the origin of man and the genesis of religion.”

In another place, he says :—

“The heroes of the Bible—Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, David, Solomon, Elias, Eliseus, were revengeful, immoral, unchaste; they were liars, cheaters, robbers, murderers.

“I believe that to-day all manner of evil passions are fostered, and all finer emotions of the human spirit are retarded by reading those savage old books of the Jews as the Word of God.” Pious Blatchford of the finer emotions!

He is equally dogmatic in rejecting the historical accuracy of the New Testament:

“Matthew, John, and Paul were not eye-witnesses to the life and teachings of Christ.”

“Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John did not write the Gospels which bear their names.” “There is no certainty who St. Matthew and the other Evangelists were.”

After sweeping away with his own *ipse dixit* the truth of the books of the New Testament, Mr. Blatchford arrives at the consoling conclusion that Christianity is founded on ancient myths and legends.

With regard to the Redemption, the Berlin “Vorwärts,” in a Christmas reflection, says:

“We believe in no Redeemer, but we believe in redemption. No man, no God in human form, no Saviour, can redeem humanity. Only humanity itself—only labouring humanity—can save humanity.”

J. Dietzgen is of opinion that,

“*Work* is the name of the new Redeemer.”

“Conscious, systematic organization of labour is the redeemer of modern times.”

The “New Yorker Volkszeitung” wrote of Christmas :

“We do not believe in the Saviour of the Christians ; our saviour will come in the shape of the world-redeeming principle of Socialism.”

It follows, as a matter of course, that the Resurrection of our Lord from death is a mere fiction. Blatchford says :—

“The stories of the Resurrection, as told in the Gospels, are full of discrepancies, and are rendered incredible by the interpolation of miraculous incidents.”

I will add a few quotations to illustrate the position of Socialism in relation to Christianity generally :—

Bebel says in the “Vorwärts,” 1901 :—

“Christianity is the enemy of liberty and civilization. It has kept mankind in slavery and oppression.

Aveling writes in “To-day” :—

“Whether anything is done or nothing is done, little that is of any real lasting value can be done until men and women fairly face the fact that the terrible condition of the poor is due, as

are so many other ills, to the two curses of our country and times. These two curses are Christianity and Capitalism. . . . I know that Christianity and Capitalism support one another. They are Siamese twins. They live, they die together. A blow at one is a blow at both," &c.

"In Christianity we see not only a supporter of the greatest evils, but a system that by its fundamental principles vitiates human thoughts and distracts the attention of mankind from the natural and actual. Against these (Christianity and Capitalism), therefore, we fight."

The "Comrade" (New York, 1993) writes:—

"Christianity and tyranny are and for ages have been firmly allied. . . . There is no wrong, however terrible, which has not been justified by Christianity, no movement for human liberty which has not been opposed by it. Its very basis is a lie and a denial of the basic principle of Socialism."

G. S. Herron denounces Christianity in this mild strain:—

"Nothing so surely as Christianity stands for all that is worse in Capitalism, for all that is weak and mean in human spirit, for all that presents the basest and most peurile modes of gaining power."

"Christianity is a huge and ghastly parasite, consuming billions of treasure out of the labour

and patience of the people. . . . The world must be saved from its salvation."

Bax is even stronger in his denunciation of the Christian religion. "It is useless," he says, "blinking the fact that the Christian doctrine is more revolting to the higher moral sense of to-day than the Saturnalia of the cult of Prosperine could have been to the conscience of the early Christians. . . . 'Ye can not serve God and humanity,' is the burden of the nobler instincts of our epoch."

E. Ferri in the "Avanti" says:—

"The civilization of social democracy will never befoul itself with Christianity."

Here is another choice remark by Lafrague:—

"It is they (the capitalists) who corrupt them (the savages and barbarians) physically and morally with alcoholism, syphilis, the Bible, obligatory labour, and commerce."

We will dismiss this portion of the subject with the following polite remark of Bebel:—

"The social corruption of the Roman Empire was the dunghill on which Christianity necessarily grew up."

Not less fierce are the attacks of Socialists on the Church. The Austrian Socialists, May 20, 1898, adopted a resolution containing this clause: "Socialism is directly contradictory to Roman

clericalism, which is enslaved to unyielding authority, immutable dogmas, and absolute intellectual thralldom,"

Harry Quelch, editor of "London Justice," writes :—

"As an institution, the Church stands for obscurantism and for reaction. There is no iniquity so vile, no crime, however monstrous, that the Church has not blessed and sanctified, if perpetrated in the interest of the rich and powerful."

"As long as the Church holds the minds of the workers in its grip, there will be little hope of freeing their bodies from capitalist supremacy."

G. D. Herron says in the "Advance" :—

"Christianity to-day stands for what is lowest and basest in life. The Church of to-day sounds the lowest note in human life. It is the most degrading of all our institutions, and the most brutalising in its effects on common life. The Church is simply organised Christianity. *For Socialism to use it, or make terms with it, or to let it make approaches to the Socialist movement, is for Socialism to take Judas to its bosom.*"*

W. T. Brown writes :—

"If ever in the history of the world any human institution was completely and finally discredited, it is the religious institution, whose putrid and

* Italics mine.

decaying carcass, here at the beginning of the twentieth century, menaces the life of men. . . . It stands before the world as a foe to research, an enemy to freedom of thinking, a purveyor of baseless superstitions, a morally impotent and ethically monstrous factor in human society."

Ladoff warns his readers thus :—

"Against Christianity we must be warned for another reason than its hollowness and soullessness, its putrefication and false pretence. . . . This reason is the policy of institutional churches to take hold of irresistible, popular movements, in order to keep them in check, and control them in the interest of the ruling classes."

Four years ago W. M'Farlane wrote in the "Worker" :—

"Church and State formed a villainous co-partnership to rob mankind of all the moral excellencies of their character and to blind the human understanding, that men should not see the real principles which are connected with the attainment of the most exalted felicity."

"The ignorance, the deception, and the crime of priests had corrupted and brutalized their human nature," &c.

Enough has now been said to show how Socialists view Christianity and the Church; but I cannot pass from this aspect of the question

clericalism, which is enslaved to unyielding authority, immutable dogmas, and absolute intellectual thralldom,"

Harry Quelch, editor of "London Justice," writes :—

"As an institution, the Church stands for obscurantism and for reaction. There is no iniquity so vile, no crime, however monstrous, that the Church has not blessed and sanctified, if perpetrated in the interest of the rich and powerful."

"As long as the Church holds the minds of the workers in its grip, there will be little hope of freeing their bodies from capitalist supremacy."

G. D. Herron says in the "Advance" :—

"Christianity to-day stands for what is lowest and basest in life. The Church of to-day sounds the lowest note in human life. It is the most degrading of all our institutions, and the most brutalising in its effects on common life. The Church is simply organised Christianity. *For Socialism to use it, or make terms with it, or to let it make approaches to the Socialist movement, is for Socialism to take Judas to its bosom.*"*

W. T. Brown writes :—

"If ever in the history of the world any human institution was completely and finally discredited, it is the religious institution, whose putrid and

* Italics mine.

decaying carcass, here at the beginning of the twentieth century, menaces the life of men. . . . It stands before the world as a foe to research, an enemy to freedom of thinking, a purveyor of baseless superstitions, a morally impotent and ethically monstrous factor in human society."

Ladoff warns his readers thus :—

"Against Christianity we must be warned for another reason than its hollowness and soullessness, its putrefication and false pretence. . . . This reason is the policy of institutional churches to take hold of irresistible, popular movements, in order to keep them in check, and control them in the interest of the ruling classes."

Four years ago W. M'Farlane wrote in the "Worker" :—

"Church and State formed a villainous co-partnership to rob mankind of all the moral excellencies of their character and to blind the human understanding, that men should not see the real principles which are connected with the attainment of the most exalted felicity."

"The ignorance, the deception, and the crime of priests had corrupted and brutalized their human nature," &c.

Enough has now been said to show how Socialists view Christianity and the Church ; but I cannot pass from this aspect of the question

without referring to some choice passages from E. Untermann :—

“When the Roman State died the Roman Church became its heir. Naturally it inherited all the diseases of the rotten empire. The blight of slave labour was not removed, but sanctioned.”

“The Church extolled slavish obedience to so-called superiors as most pleasing to God, and discouraged a manhood which would have proclaimed that no man was good enough to rule another, politically or spiritually, without his consent.”

“Realize, if you can, the depth of depravity of that ecclesiastical monster, Catholic or Protestant, which stands with eyes uplifted to heaven while its greedy talons are outstretched for your earthly possessions.”

“It is revolting to think that millions of people, steeped in artificially created ignorance, and held there by this gigantic ecclesiastical machine, should have been ruled for 1,000 years by this cruel monster.” And so on.

Now let us hear a few of the leading Socialist lights on the remedy to be applied for the removal of the evils which this wicked monster, the Church, inflicts on humanity.”

Bebel, writing in the “Vorwärts,” 1901, declares :—

“We must wage an unrelenting war against the Church, because she foments civil war among the workers. We must take from her her control over public education, which she uses to corrupt children, who would otherwise become Socialists.”

“We must attack her because she is the only reactionary force which has any strength, and which keeps us in voluntary slavery.”

H. Quelch writes in the “Social Democrat,” March 15, 1903 ;—

“In answer to your letter asking me for my opinion as to the attitude of the Socialist Party toward the Church, I think that the only line to be taken is that of uncompromising hostility.”

The “People’s Press,” Chicago, January 10, 1903, grows frantic :—

“Now that the Holy (?) Church has come out and declared *openly against Socialism*, the Socialists *must* either come out the same way, and declare against and *fight* the *hoary Beast, Mother of harlots—Rome ; or shut up shop.*

E. Vandervelde asks :—

“Can a sincere believer follow the Church and yet be a Socialist?” and answers :—“We are bound to admit that, both in philosophy and in politics, there must be war between Socialism and the Church.”

A. M. Simons, editor of the "International Socialist Review," wrote in 1901:—

"The waves of Socialism are washing against the walls of the Vatican, and it is doubtful whether the next Pope will remain in the classic land of Papal tradition or move to some more comfortable place. Unless it retires to one of the poles of the earth, ecclesiastical hierarchy, like all other despotism, will soon be crowded off the earth."

Comment is needless, and therefore, having the opinion of Socialists, expressed in no unmistakable language, before us, let us hear what Christianity has to say about Socialism. I shall be satisfied with giving the opinion of Leo XIII. I quote the Pontiff* because no other man of his day had so thoroughly studied and so firmly grasped the social problem in all its bearings on human life.

In various places throughout his Encyclicals Leo XIII. points out not only many of the evils and errors to be avoided in modern times, but also draws attention to the many and great advantages which the Christian Church has conferred on society.

In the Ency., *The Condition of the Working Classes*, he writes:—

"But the Church, not content with pointing

**The Pope and the People.* Catholic Truth Society, London.

out the remedy, also applies it. For the Church does her utmost to teach and to train men, and to educate them; and by the intermediary of her bishops and clergy diffuses her salutary teachings far and wide. She strives to influence the mind and the heart, so that all may willingly yield themselves to be formed and guided by the commandments of God."

Nor is the Church such a friend of the capitalist and the wealthy as Socialists would have us believe.

"If we turn now to things external and corporeal," says the Pontiff, "the first concern of all is to save the poor workers from the cruelty of greedy speculators, who use human beings as mere instruments for money-making. It is neither just nor human so to grind men down with excessive labour as to stupify their minds and wear out their bodies.

"Neither must it be supposed that the solicitude of the Church is so pre-occupied with the spiritual concerns of her children as to neglect their temporal and earthly interests. Her desire is that the poor, for example, should rise above poverty and wretchedness, and better their condition in life; and for this she makes a strong endeavour. (*Ibid.*)

"Further, who will deny that the Church has

done away with the curse of slavery and restored men to the original dignity of their noble nature ; and—by uplifting the standard of Redemption in all quarters of the globe, by introducing or shielding under her protection the sciences and arts, by founding and taking into her keeping excellent charitable institutions which provide relief for all ills of every kind—has throughout the world, in private or in public life, civilized the human race, freed it from degradation, and with all care trained it to a way of living such as befits the dignity and the hopes of man ?” (*The Evils affecting Modern Society.*)

So great an instrument for good has the Church always proved herself to be, that in the year 1885 Leo XIII. could make his own the words of St. Augustine :—

“ Let those who say that the teaching of Christ is hurtful to the State, produce such armies as the maxims of Jesus have enjoined soldiers to bring into being ; such governors of provinces ; such husbands and wives ; such parents and children ; such masters and servants ; such kings ; such judges ; and such payers and collectors of tribute as the Christian teaching instructs them to become, and then let them say that such teaching is hurtful to the State.” (*The Christian Constitution of States.*)

I need not proceed with quotations of this kind. Those who are willingly in ignorance, or those who are actuated with a virulent malignancy amounting almost to insanity, against Christianity, are not going to have their notions rectified by anything I should write here: while those who honestly seek the light can easily find it. I pass on, therefore, to give at least an indication of the views of the late head of the Catholic Church on Socialism, for the benefit of those who are Christians, but who are anxious to combine Socialism with their Christianity.

In the Ency. *Rerum Novarum*, the Pontiff states in a general way:—

“Associations of every kind, and especially those of workingmen, are now far more common than heretofore. . . . There is a good deal of evidence to prove that many of these societies are in the hands of secret leaders, and are managed on principles ill-according with Christianity and the public well-being; and that they do their utmost to get within their grasp the whole field of labour, and force workingmen either to join them or to starve.”

“Especially with reference to the so-called ‘liberties’ which are so greatly coveted in these days, all must stand by the judgment of the Apostolic See, and have the same mind. Let no

man be deceived by the outward appearance of these *liberties*, but let each one reflect whence these have had their origin, and by what efforts they are everywhere upheld and promoted. Experience has made us well acquainted with their results to the State, since everywhere they have borne fruit which the good and wise bitterly deplore." (*The Christian Constitution of States.*)

"Hence, lest concord be broken by rash changes, let this be understood by all, that the integrity of Catholic faith cannot be reconciled with opinions verging on Naturalism or Rationalism, the essence of which is utterly to sterilise Christianity, and to instal in society the supremacy of man to the exclusion of God." (*Ibid.*)

There is nothing Leo XIII. so much insists upon, in warning the world against the evils that are eating the heart out of society, as the training of the young.

"It is thus incumbent," he writes, "on parents to strain every nerve to ward off such an outrage—the destruction of family life—and to strive manfully to have and to hold exclusive authority to direct the education of their offspring, as is fitting, in a Christian manner; and first and foremost to keep them away from schools where there is risk of them drinking in the poison of impiety." (*Christians as Citizens.*)

How much this teaching is opposed to the system of education advocated by Socialism is easy to see.

In reference to the repudiation of the empire of God over man and civil society, of which we have seen so much above in the express statements of Socialists, the Pontiff goes on to say:—

“Furthermore, with ambitious designs on sovereignty, tumult and sedition will be common amongst the people. . . . Of this we have almost daily evidence in the conflict with *Socialists* and members of other seditious societies, who labour unceasingly to bring about revolution. It is for those, then, who are capable of forming a just estimate of things to decide whether such doctrines promote that true liberty which alone is worthy of man, or rather pervert and destroy it.” (*Human Liberty.*)

“Daily we see, with our own eyes, as it were, the numerous evils that afflict all classes of men from these causes. Poisonous doctrines have corrupted both public and private life; Rationalism, Materialism, and Atheism have begotten Socialism, Communism, and Nihilism—fatal and pestilential evils, which naturally, and almost necessarily, flow forth from such principles”—the elevation of reason above God. (*The Right Ordering of Christian Life.*)

From the Encyclical *Quod Apostolici Numeris*—*Concerning Modern Errors*—it is difficult to make extracts: one feels a temptation to quote it in full, since almost every sentence in it is a wholesale condemnation of Socialism. However, I shall be satisfied with giving the following passages:—

“You understand, as a matter of course, Venerable Brothers, that We are alluding to that sect of men who, under the motley and all but barbarous terms and titles of Socialists, Communists, and Nihilists, are spread abroad throughout the world, and bound intimately together in baneful alliance, no longer look for strong support in secret meetings held in darksome places, but standing forth openly and boldly in the light of day, strive to carry out the purpose, long resolved upon, of uprooting the foundations of civilized society at large. . . .

“The natural union of man and woman, which is held sacred even among barbarous nations, they hold in scorn . . . they attack the right of property, sanctioned by the natural law, and with signal depravity, while pretending to feel solicitous about the needs, and anxious to satisfy the requirements of all, they strain every effort to seize upon and hold in common all that has been individually acquired by title of lawful

inheritance, through intellectual or manual labour, or economy in living. . . .

“With such doctrines spread far and wide, and such licence in thought and action, it is no wonder that men of the most lowly condition, heartsick of a humble home or poor workshop, should fix eager eyes on the abodes and fortunes of the wealthy; no wonder that tranquility no longer prevails in public or private life, or that the human race has been hurried onward to well-nigh the verge of ruin. . . .

“The world at large is fully aware in what earnest terms, and with what resoluteness of soul and unflinching constancy, Our glorious predecessor, Pius IX., of happy memory, by Allocutions alike and Encyclical Letters addressed to the Bishops of the whole world, levied war against the iniquitous endeavours of these sects, and furthermore even denounced by name the plague of Socialism thence bursting forth. . . .

“For the *Church of the living God, which is the pillar and the ground of truth*, proclaims those doctrines and precepts whereby the security and calm of society is provided for, and the accursed brood of Socialism is utterly destroyed.

“For although the Socialists, turning to evil, use the Gospel itself so as to deceive more readily the unwary, have been wont to twist it to their

meaning, still so striking is the disagreement between their criminal teachings and the pure doctrine of Christ, that no greater can exist: *For what participation hath justice with injustice, or what fellowship hath light with darkness.* (2 Cor. vi. 14.)”

These passages make it abundantly manifest what was the mind of Leo XIII. on the question of Socialism, and even Christian Socialism, for he points out over and over again the absolute repugnance there exists between the doctrines of the Christian religion and those of Socialism—so striking is the disagreement that *no greater* can exist. As well combine *justice and injustice, light and darkness.*

But the Pontiff goes still further and *defines* what Catholics ought to think on the question of *Christian Socialism*. In the Encyclical, *On Christian Democracy*, he writes:—

“The creed of the benefactor of the people had originally no name of its own; that of *Christian Socialism* and its derivatives, which some brought in, has not undeservedly grown obsolete. Afterwards, many wanted, very rightly, to name it *Popular Christianity*. In some places those who devote themselves to such work are called *Christian Socialists*; elsewhere it is called *Christian Democracy*, and its supporters *Christian*

Democrats, as opposed to *Social Democracy*, which Socialists uphold. Of these two appellations certainly that of *Christian Socialism*, if not also of *Christian Democracy*, is offensive to many right-minded people, inasmuch as they think there is a perilous ambiguity attaching to it. They are afraid of the name for several reasons. . . .

“There is now commonly much dispute, and sometimes over-bitter dispute, on this topic, and We deem it Our duty to put an end to the controversy by defining what Catholics ought to think.”

The Pope then explains the meaning of *Social Democracy*, which he condemns, and immediately approves the title *Christian Democracy*. “Clearly then *Social* and *Christian Democracy* can have nothing in common ; the difference between them is no less than that between the sectarianism of Socialism and the profession of the Christian law”—which, he has already told us, are as justice and injustice, as light and darkness.

Perhaps I could not more fittingly bring these Essays to a close than in the words of Leo XIII., the Workingman’s Pope, as follows :—

“For making exceptions of the ideas of certain persons regarding the force and virtue of this kind of *Christian Democracy*, ideas which are not free from extravagance and error, surely

there will be no single person to find fault with an endeavour, conformably to the law of nature and of God, to do merely this—to make the lives of labourers and artisans more tolerable, and gradually to give them the opportunity of self-culture, so that at home and in the world they may freely fulfil the obligations of virtue and religion, may feel themselves to be men, and not mere animals, Christian men, not pagans, and so strive with more facility and earnestness to attain that ‘one thing needful,’ the final good for which we came into the world. This is the aim and the task of those who would have the common people in a Christian spirit, on the one hand, suitably relieved, and, on the other, preserved against the contagion of Socialism.” (*On Christian Democracy.*)

THE END.

