

in the investigation as to man's origin except by those who understand what man is now. The comprehension of this, and especially of the true nature of human language, will, we confidently believe, amply suffice to make plain the existence of at least one necessary and inevitable limit to evolution.

---

## SOCIALISM.

**S**Ocialism, in its technical sense, may be defined as that ethical theory which aims at the amelioration of man's social condition through community of goods, and co-operation in labor. It traces nearly all the ills of society to individual ownership, and to isolated individual effort, in the production and the distribution of the fruit of man's toil, and seeks to remedy them, by the removal of these two, as it declares, prolific sources of human misery. It has, thus, a twofold bearing, the one, theoretical, which finds its expression in Communism; the other, practical, which is called Co-operation.

Communism denies the right of private ownership, and places the dominion of external goods exclusively in the community, or in the government, as the representative of the community. A distinguished modern communist has declared ownership—individual ownership—to be theft, theft from the State. Thus, under this system, people might use external goods, but not own them, except in the sense in which a citizen of the United States is said to own the National Park, or the White House, a light-house, a revenue cutter, or a government ambulance. Some communists, from Plato to the Oneida Perfectionists, have extended this community of goods even to wives and children, whom they have regarded as property. The transfer of private property to the State, advanced communists think, should be effected by revolution. The more moderate advocate its purchase by the State, or, its gradual absorption by legislation. Others, recognizing the impracticability of these methods, would vest it in voluntary associations, based on community of goods, and of labor, till the whole property and industrial energy of the nation would be absorbed by them.

Communism is not a thing of recent date. It was defended in theory, and reduced to practice, long before the Christian era. It was advocated by Plato in his *Republic*, and incorporated by Lycurgus into his system of laws. In *The Republic* it is provided that children be taken away from their parents, and nurtured under the supervision of the State, lest their tender minds be biased by "the blasphemous nonsense with which mothers fool the manhood out of them." Education, marriage, the number of births, the occupations of the citizens, were, according to this philosopher, to be controlled by the State. The most perfect equality of conditions and careers was to be preserved. Women were to have similar training with the men. The inequalities and rivalries between rich and poor were to cease, for all were to be provided for by the State. (Book iv., p. 249, Joweth's translation.)

The Essenes, a Jewish sect that lasted from the second century before Christ, till the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, were practical communists, and we can trace a communistic tradition from the Manicheans of the third century, through different sects, to the Cathari, in the thirteenth, and the Anabaptists, in the sixteenth. Doctrinal errors, false theories of asceticism, the love of plunder, the oppression of the poor by the rich, combined in each succeeding age to make it more or less popular, and, sometimes, dangerous. "Brethren," said Muntzer, the prophet and leader of the Anabaptists, "we are all children of Adam; God is our father. And see what the great have done! They have, the wretches, remade the work of God, and created titles, privileges, and distinctions. They eat white bread, we have rough labor; they have fine clothing, we have rags. Does not the earth belong to all?—is it not our common inheritance? And they have taken it from us! When did we renounce the inheritance of our Father? Let them show us the deed of resignation. It does not exist. You rich ones of the time, who keep us in bondage, who have pillaged, oppressed, and mutilated us, restore to us our freedom, give us back our bread. It is not as men only that we now demand back what you have stolen from us, but as Christians. In the infancy of the Gospel, the Apostles divided with their brethren in Jesus Christ the money which was laid at their feet; give us back the Apostles' means, which you unjustly detain. Unhappy flock of Christ, how long will you groan in oppression, under the rod of government?" (Audin's *Luther*, vol. i., p. 417.) On another occasion he told his hearers: "Under God's heaven, every creature ought to be free, all property common,—air and water, fish and fowl, herbs and rocks." (*Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 137.)

During the two years in which he sought to enforce these doctrines by the sword, a hundred thousand men fell in battle, seven

cities were dismantled, a thousand religious houses razed to the ground, three hundred churches burnt, and immense treasures of paintings, sculpture, stained glass, and engravings destroyed. (Ibid.) But, every one knows how that war ended; how the unhappy peasants were slaughtered like sheep by the allied nobles of Germany, at Frankenhause, and their leader beheaded. Luther, who had encouraged them to revolt, abandoned them, called on the nobles to crush them, and boasted of having done so. "For it is I," said he, "who have shed it (their blood) by God's commands, and whoever has fallen in this war, has lost body and soul, and is the prey of Satan." "I have done right," he adds, in another place, "in recommending against such caitiffs ruin, extermination, and death." "At the day of judgment," says Cochlous, "Muntzer and his peasants will cry before God and his angels, 'Vengeance on Luther!'"

About the middle of the last century, J. J. Rousseau, whilst living as a Sybarite, bewailed the miseries the division of the soil had entailed on humanity. During the Revolution, Babeuf and others taught, that all men had equal rights in all property, and in the enjoyment of it; that every exclusive appropriation of the soil, or of a branch of industry, was a crime; that all persons should receive the same kind and degree of education; that the functions of the government should be, to superintend the division of labor, the collecting of the produce in public stores, and the distribution of it to communities and individuals. (*Cyclop. Amer.*) Babeuf's later followers abrogated marriage, and wished all towns destroyed as the natural hot-beds of tyranny. Fourier, Louis Blanc, Proudhon, and other recent socialistic writers, have but elaborated most of these theses, with, however, some important modifications.

There are, at present, in the United States, eight communistic societies, divided into seventy-two separate communities, with about 5000 members, including children. The Shakers, established here in 1780, have fifty-eight of these communities. The Oneida Perfectionists, established in 1848, are the only society of strictly American origin. The others are English, French, or German.

The fundamental error of socialism, and the chief reason why it has been condemned by the Church, is, its denial of private dominion, or ownership. One would suppose that the belief and practice of all ages and nations would have made this right clear to all men. But we live in a time when the most obvious truths have lost their hold on the minds of thousands, not only among the ignorant, but even among those who are called educated. And this must be our excuse for undertaking to prove, before proceeding farther, that our farms, our houses, our furniture, our money,

our securities, and even the clothes we wear, belong to us individually, and not to the States of our Federal Union, nor to the government of the United States.

Dominion is generally defined, "the right to have, and to hold, and dispose of a thing as one's own, in any way not forbidden by law, or compact."

Now, how did individuals acquire this right in regard to external goods? Did they get it from the State? Certainly not. They had it before any State was formed. Was it derived from the compacts made between individuals, families, and classes of men, before civil society was organized? No, for these compacts suppose this right in those who made them. The very first man knew and felt that he had a right to live, and, therefore, a right to the means of living. His innate desire, too, of happiness, made him see and feel that he had a right, not only to the absolute necessities of life, but to its rational enjoyments, also. But, how could he have enjoyed, or even supported life, without the right to own external goods? This, indeed, proves, directly, his right to the use only of these goods, but, indirectly, it proves his exclusive right to them, when he thinks this necessary to insure their proper use. He had the right to own a home, and the movable goods that belong to it, and a portion of the soil, if he deemed its occupation necessary, to secure for himself and his family the necessities, or the comforts of life, and this, not only because "his right there was none to dispute," but because having occupied these things for the reasons and with the purpose just mentioned no one *could* have disputed it, even had there been any one to attempt to do so. Thus, he would have occupied and improved the soil, at the expense of his time and his labor, without interfering with the right of others to do as he had done, and reason dictates that a man has a right to the fruit of his own toil. Whether our first parent actually occupied a farm or not, is uncertain, though it may be safely presumed that he did, since we read in Genesis that "the Lord God sent him out of the paradise of pleasure, to till the earth from which he was taken."

For a long time, men's possessions were limited chiefly to flocks and herds and movable goods generally. To hold them in the peace and security necessary to insure their proper use, certain compacts were entered into by the owners, similar to those existing between the ranchmen on our western plains. Abraham and Lot, though just men, could not dwell together in peace. "Abraham, therefore, said to Lot: Let there be no quarrel, I beseech thee, between me and thee, and between my herdsmen and thy herdsmen; for we are brethren. Behold, the whole land is before thee; depart from me, I pray thee; if thou wilt go to the left hand, I will take the

right ; if thou choose the right hand, I will pass to the left." (Gen. 13: 8-9.) But as families multiplied, and as particular districts became more thickly settled, farms succeeded to ranges ; villages, towns and cities sprang up ; mining, manufacturing, and commercial centres were created ; different kinds of proprietorship were established, and, *pari passu*, local, municipal, and state governments were organized, and laws enacted to protect and foster them, and the conditions determined under which property could be held, conveyed, and bequeathed. The people did not transfer to those governments their individual possessions. On the contrary, the governments were organized chiefly to protect and regulate private property by the authority and sanction of civil laws, or, in other words, the power of the communities was invoked to protect each individual member in what he had justly acquired. Individual ownership was thus established in accordance with reason and the law of nature, and it has been sanctioned, regulated and protected by the civil law of every nation, down to the present time.

The divine law, too, everywhere recognizes it. Cain was a husbandman, and Abel a shepherd, and the latter offered to the Lord "of the firstlings of his flock, and of their fat. And the Lord had respect to Abel, and to his offering." Would this offering have been acceptable, if ownership were theft? The Patriarchs, and many other eminent personages mentioned in the Old Testament, were distinguished for their wealth as well as for their piety. Abraham paid Ephron four hundred sicles of silver for the field in which he buried Tara (Gen. 23). Joseph, too, we read, bought all the land of Egypt, every man selling his possessions. The Decalogue forbade men to steal, or even covet their neighbors' goods. These prohibitions were reiterated and emphasized under the new dispensation. Salvation came to the house of Zacheus, though he did not renounce his wealth. "But Zacheus standing said to the Lord : Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor ; and, if I have wronged any man of anything, I restore him fourfold." Jesus said to him, "This day is salvation come to this house." (Luke 19, v. 8-9.)

God, it is true, did not make the division of goods, such as has existed from the beginning, imperative on the human family. "The earth he hath given unto the children of men," but he did not say how it was to be held or enjoyed by them, whether individually, or in common. This he left to their own reason to determine. And they did determine it, in the manner already described.

When society was organized, it had nothing to determine respecting this matter. It had been already settled. All society, or governments, could do, was to recognize what individuals or individual families had done ; to regulate, protect, and develop it. This,

and no more, they have continued to do, up to the present time. They did not introduce individual ownership; they could not and cannot destroy it.

An institution that had its origin in the needs of human nature, that has been sanctioned, upheld, and defended in all times, in all places, by every class of men, by the individual conscience, by public opinion, by legislatures, by courts of law, by the Church, by the State, in a word by every recognized judge of human acts and of human conduct, must be founded in natural justice, must be indispensable to the well-being of society, and the rights acquired under it should be held sacred by all men. No doubt these rights have been much abused in the lapse of ages. They are abused still in many places. But this abuse is no proof that they have ceased to exist, or that, though existing, they should be set aside. What earthly good, what gift of God is there that has not been abused? Do not the great majority of men abuse their natural freedom? Do they not employ health, talents, and life to offend, instead of to serve their Maker? Do not thousands in every land abuse the civil liberty they enjoy, not only by neglecting their civic duties, but by positive offences against law? The common sense of mankind dictates that the remedy for this abuse is not to deprive men of liberty, but to prevent the misuse of it by the ordinary means of reform, or where this cannot be done to punish it.

Community of goods is a thing not evil in itself and under all circumstances. Some writers think that if man had continued in the state of original innocence, individual ownership would not have been established. It existed among the first Christians at Jerusalem, and it has been practiced from the earliest times by the Religious Orders of the Church. This could not have been the case if it were in itself wrong.

From these two facts, however, no argument can be deduced in favor of Communism. It is not to be wondered at that community of goods should have existed among a people who had seen our Saviour, who had witnessed His poverty and heard the woes He had pronounced on the rich. They adopted it, however, not as of necessity or of precept, but voluntarily, and as a free exercise of detachment from the things of this world, which are the occasion of much temptation and of many sins to all classes of persons. This is evident from St. Peter's question to Ananias: "Ananias, why hath Satan tempted thy heart that thou shouldst lie to the Holy Ghost, and by fraud keep part of the price of the land? Whilst it remained did it not remain to thee, and after it was sold was it not in thy power?" (Acts 5 c.) It was not then like Communism, intended to become the basis of a political system; it did

not extend beyond Jerusalem, and even there it soon ceased altogether.

Religious Orders, too, are voluntary associations, whose members seek first their own spiritual perfection, and next, the spiritual and temporal good of their neighbors. Their aim is not to remodel but aid society as it is, and they do so by ways that are in perfect harmony with existing institutions. They instruct the ignorant, they minister to the poor and sick, they preach the Gospel in Christian and in Pagan lands. And that they may be able to discharge these duties with all the perfection possible in our weak nature, their members give up all personal claims to property, hold all things in common and obey a common rule, the wisdom of which has been tested by the experience of ages and approved by the most enlightened tribunal on earth, that of the Roman Pontiff. They must be persons of exceptional virtue, a virtue not to be looked for, and in point of fact never found, in the large number of men necessary to administer the civil affairs of a nation, much less in the majority of its people. They are admitted to membership only after long and mature deliberation on their own part, and when their superiors are satisfied beyond reasonable doubt of their fitness for the kind of life they are to lead and the works in which they are to be engaged. They practice community of goods without injury to others; they do it not for any material profit to be derived from it, but from the highest spiritual motives that can influence mortals. Its advantages, then, in the Religious Orders can give no assurance whatever of its success on a national scale and under widely different circumstances.

Community of goods is wrong only when made the basis of a political system as explained and defended by communists. Thus understood, there is nothing to recommend and every reason to condemn it. It denies the right of private property sanctioned by the law of nature, and recognized and protected by the laws and customs of all nations. It aims not merely at the relief of the poor and needy, but would take from the well-to-do what they have justly inherited, and the fruit of their toil and their savings, for the benefit of those who have no claim to either that has ever yet been recognized by any civilized people. The poor, indeed, have claims on individuals and on society that cannot be disregarded with impunity, but is it not repugnant to common sense to say that those who are not in need have a right to be made better off at the expense of others more industrious or more fortunate than they?

Then, such a system is utterly impracticable. If compensation were to be made to individual owners for what would be taken from them, where could the means of doing so be found? What government could pay for all the possessions of its citizens. To

attempt to do so by taxation would simply be to steal what they have by little and little.

And were the levelling process called for by Communism attempted by force and without compensation, is it to be supposed that any people would submit to it without rebellion and bloodshed? Would, for instance, the property-holders of this country, its farmers, merchants, manufacturers, bankers, storekeepers, and well-to-do mechanics and laborers, hand over their accumulated savings to a state or federal commune without a struggle, and do so for the benefit of men to whom they hold themselves under no obligations, and very many of whom are as great strangers to honest labor as the lilies of the field, and for a theory which, when reduced to practice in private corporations, has, thus far, almost always proved fallacious? They would perish first in their defence.

Nor would their experience of the administration of our public affairs be calculated to alter or modify their determination in this respect. Look at our city, state, and federal governments! If they are not greatly belied they are about the most corrupt in the world. In these bodies poor men grow rich, and the rich become richer, and everything is for sale but public virtue. No legislation, however just or necessary, can be obtained from them without paying for it in proportion to its importance, and they hardly give bread to the orphan without first taking a slice of it for themselves. Their schemes to enrich themselves by "jobs" and appropriations and blackmailing laws and ordinances, are so numerous and ingenious that men who have anything to be taxed look forward to their meeting with apprehension and experience a sense of relief when they separate and the members return to their homes. And what is said of the legislative is charged in no slight measure against nearly every other department of government in this country.

Now, if to these bodies were given control of the *entire* property, capital, and industry of the country, what would be the result? This much only I would venture to predict. They would gracefully accept the responsibility. They would administer their trust to the great relief of the former owners, and allow them and others the inestimable privilege of adding to it at pleasure. Politics would become the most popular of all pursuits, and the number of men anxious to serve their country in public offices would be greater than ever.

And yet these men have no ordinary incentives to fair dealing and fidelity in the positions they occupy. They are the chosen representatives of a free, intelligent, virtuous, and generous people. They have been called to serve a country the noblest the sun shines upon, and to uphold a Constitution which more than any other

framed by men recognizes the dignity of human nature. They live in what the down-trodden of other lands are accustomed to consider a political paradise, opened by the mercy of God and the merits of its founders to the oppressed of all nations. But, more than all this, they are Christians. They were nursed by Christian mothers? In youth they were instructed in the principles of right and wrong, read their Bible, and went to Sunday-school. They grew up under the influence of Christian teaching, and whether they will it or no, are still more or less under its influence, and obliged to respect the public sentiment of a people deeply penetrated by Christian ideas. But were they atheists, recognizing no moral law, without fear of hell or hope of heaven, men, in a word, such as modern Communism would bring to the management of public affairs, is it not safe to presume that their official debasement would be tenfold greater than it is?

And were Communism forced on a nation by a successful revolution, it could not last. It would make all equal, for a time, in the possession of external goods, but they would hold them only at the pleasure of the government. It would require all to work, but it would not allow each one to choose the trade or business to which he felt most inclined, and for which he thought himself best fitted. All this would be settled by the Commune, as would also the time to be devoted to work and the amount to be performed. It would, in a word, claim to regulate all the details of the public and private life of the citizen, for, as Mr. Nordoff says: "The fundamental principle of Communal life is the subordination of the individual's will to the general interest or the general will; practically this takes the shape of unquestioning obedience by the members towards the elders or chiefs of their society." "In some of these societies," says the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "individual liberty is entirely suspended, the smallest minutiae of the daily life of their members is regulated from headquarters. A government which decides at what hour its subjects shall go to bed at night and rise in the morning, which prescribes the color, shape, and material of the dresses worn, the time of meals, the quality of the food consumed, the daily task apportioned to each member, which enforces a rule that each of its subjects shall leave every morning a notice stating at what exact spot he or she will be found during each hour of the day—a government which can do all these things will find no great difficulty in controlling the number of marriages and births. . . . If, however, Communism were adopted throughout a whole nation, the minute despotism which distinguishes the government of existing Communistic societies . . . would cease to be possible, or if, indeed, it should ever become possible, it would be through the careful suppression of individual liberty and through

the strenuous encouragement of everything which tended to destroy self-reliance on the part of the people, and to build up the absolute power of the State. A people who purchased material prosperity at the price of their liberty would strike a bad bargain." Clearly, the only supporters of such a system would be the politicians whom it would enrich, a few theorists and dreamers who might honestly believe in it, and the poor whose condition it had bettered. All others, those whom it had brought down to the common level, and those who had hoped to rise above it would work and pray for its overthrow. Their feelings towards the government would be such as men might cherish for the band of brigands that had despoiled them, and then condemned them to menial service within their camp. But they would be controlled. The agencies that had achieved the revolution would uphold it for a time. The public revenue would flow into the treasury to be applied and absorbed by the new *regime*. Vast sums would be placed "where they would do most good," an army of placemen and dependants would be organized, and all the machinery with which usurped authority knows how to protect itself would be called into play to defend the new order of things. But in vain; government officials and dependants are in the minority in every nation, and the majority in no nation could long tolerate the unmitigated despotism of a Commune. Even those whom it had lifted up from poverty would soon be made to see that the loss of liberty, political, social, domestic, and personal, and of even the power to rise above the condition of well-fed slaves, was too much to have paid for mere bread and butter. They would tire of toiling for a public good that gave them but food and shelter, whilst it enriched their rulers and would unite with those whom the Commune had despoiled to destroy it, even if obliged to accept in its stead, the less ignoble bondage of a military dictator or a Russian Czar.

The rights of property have varied in extent at different times and in different places. According to Sir Henry Maine, in his work on Ancient Law, says J. S. Mill, "the primitive idea of property was that it belonged to the family, not to the individual." The head of the family had the management, and was the person who really exercised the proprietary rights. As in other respects, so in this, he governed the family with nearly despotic power. But he was not free so to exercise his power as to defeat the co-proprietors of the other portions; he could not so dispose of the property as to deprive them of the joint enjoyment or of the succession. By the laws and customs of some nations, the property could not be alienated without the consent of the male children; in other cases the child could by law demand a division of the property and the assignment to him of his share, as in the parable

of the prodigal son. By the Jewish law, property in immovables was only a temporary concession; in the Sabbatical year it returned to the common stock to be redistributed. . . . In many countries of Asia the ownership was broken up among several distinct parties whose rights were determined rather by custom than by law. The government was part owner, having the right to a heavy rent. . . . The actual cultivators, or such of them as had been long settled on the land, had a right to retain possession; it was held unlawful to evict them while they paid the rent—a rent not in general fixed by agreement, but by the custom of the neighborhood. . . . There were also, in many cases, village communities consisting of the reputed descendants of the first settlers, who shared among themselves either the land or its produce. . . . In Mediæval Europe almost all land was held from the sovereign on tenure of service, either military or agricultural; and in Great Britain, even now, where the services, as well as the reserved rights of the sovereign, have long since fallen into disuse or been commuted for taxation, the theory of the law does not acknowledge absolute right of property in land in any individual. The fullest landed proprietor known to the law, the free-holder, is but a 'tenant' of the crown." "It is a fundamental principle of English law," says Chancellor Kent (*Amer. Law*, vol. iii., p. 501), "derived from the maxims of feudal times; that the king was the original proprietor or lord paramount of all the land in the kingdom, and the true and only source of title. In this country we have adopted the same principle and applied it to our republican government; and it is a settled and fundamental doctrine with us that all valid individual title to land within the United States is derived either from the grant of our own local governments or from that of the United States, or from the crown, or royal chartered governments established here prior to the revolution." But though the crown in England, and in this country the government, are the original sources of title, the individual owner, in both countries, it is needless to say, has exclusive right to what he possesses. From all this it is manifest that, whilst the right to private property has been recognized everywhere and always, war and conquest, and the usages of particular countries have at times more or less limited or extended, and sometimes destroyed it. Modifications of this kind will continue to be made, for, apart from what war may do, it is the duty of governments to introduce them when demanded by the general good.

The case of a people that had been "educated up" to a voluntary acceptance of the Commune, I do not stop to consider here, as no such case has ever arisen, or ever can arise, till men shall have changed their nature. A people may be talked out of their

liberties, out of their virtue, out of their faith, out of the kingdom of heaven; but the one thing out of which they cannot be talked is their property. It is said that the best way to tell whether a Yankee is really dead or not, when there is any doubt on the subject, is to try to pick his pocket. I am of opinion that the experiment would be equally successful in the case of a man of any other nationality. It is not alone the selfish or the greedy that refuse to "sell what they have and give to the poor," but those who have kept the commandments from their youth. This sacrifice is only for the few who desire to be perfect. Others are not required or expected to make it, and we may rest assured they will not make it, even to "have treasure in heaven."

The chief claim put forward by Communists in support of their system is that it would at once remove the evil of poverty, so widespread under the present order of things. Poverty, no doubt, is an evil, and to those who live without God in the world it must appear one of the greatest of evils. Nevertheless, it is a physical, not a moral evil, and less to be dreaded and deplored than the slightest moral evil existing in society. One venial sin, a lie, for instance, is a greater evil than all the poverty that has ever afflicted and ever will afflict the children of men. Frequently poverty is the consequence of moral evil, of sloth, culpable indiscretion, imprudence, or helplessness caused by guilty excess. In too many cases, however, it is incurred without blame, as far as men can know, on the part of those who suffer from it. But whatever may have occasioned it, it is in the power of society, as at present constituted, aided by religion, to prevent or relieve it. I say aided by religion, for no society not aided by the principles of Christian charity has ever been able, or ever will be able, to prevent or assuage the sufferings of the poor. Christian society did both, in the ages of faith, before the Reformation, and after the Reformation, the Revolution, had appropriated and squandered the treasures which Christian society had amassed, and destroyed the institutions it had founded to relieve, to console, to educate, and elevate the poor. And society would do so still were it not divorced from religion and from all the tender influences of the charity it inspires.

The poor provided for, as a truly Christian society knows how to provide for them, poverty is no longer unbearable; it is even consistent with true happiness. Thus viewed, it must be regarded as simply an inequality of condition, which, like other inequalities of the same kind, cannot be remedied in this life. Nor will they cease even with life: "For star differeth from star in glory; so, also, in the resurrection of the dead." All are not equally endowed with mental gifts. Some are talented, others are dull of

comprehension; some have genius, others are idiots; some are strong, others are weak of body; some enjoy vigorous health, others are sickly; some have "the fatal gift of beauty," others are ugly and deformed; to some is given length of days, the majority are taken before they reach mature manhood; the lot of many is cast on a sterile soil and in an inhospitable climate, others live in lands that "flow with milk and honey."

These inequalities are irremediable in our present condition. Why should there not also be inequality in the possession of money and other material goods? Communism, indeed, professes to be able to remove it, but it could not do so save at the expense of liberty and of justice. No evil, physical or moral, can be remedied by a wrong, for "a house divided against itself cannot stand." The Commune would give bread to the poor for a time, but would make them slaves. It would prevent the return of the idle and vicious poor to the state from which it had rescued them by the prison and the lash, and whilst it would give the rest little more of material goods than they could obtain under any well-ordered Christian government, it would condemn them to toil at the pleasure of a task-master, and deprive them of all the higher and sweeter enjoyments that make life worth living in any condition. "Not by bread alone doth man live."

But poverty, it should be borne in mind, is but a temporal evil. It is often hard to endure, but its shadow does not fall beyond the grave. After death it will have its compensation. "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of God." It is this thought that cheers and consoles God's poor under their privations, and gives them a peace of soul seldom experienced by the rich. The scientist, the agnostic, and the communist reject this view of poverty, but this is their fault or their misfortune. There are social problems, and poverty is one of them, that cannot be satisfactorily solved without the light of revelation, and all who seek so to solve them will have but their labor for their pains. The unbelieving poor can see no remedy for poverty but the fallacious one of Communism. "If I must have my heaven on earth," said one of them to M. Minghetti, "if I have no hope in another life, why should I be poor and leave to the rich all the happiness of life?" "You have taken from us the heavens with their joys and compensations," says the organ of the German Socialists to the Liberals of Berlin, "your science has destroyed the ancient faith. You have deprived us of the hope of hereafter, but we are determined at least to have the earth." Infidel statesmen and philanthropists will find it hard to refute this terrible logic. But this is not the logic of the Christian poor.

As to the other evils, moral or economic, charged by socialists against the present order of things, it must be said that they arise not from the system itself, but from the vices and defects of individuals, and that they would not be diminished, but aggravated, under the system which communists would inaugurate. It thus appears, says Mr. Mill—no unfriendly critic of Communism—that, as far as concerns the motives to exertion in the general body, communism has no advantage that cannot be reached under private property, while, as respects the managing heads, it is at a considerable disadvantage. It has also some disadvantages which seem to be inherent in it, through the necessity under which it lies of deciding, in a more or less arbitrary manner, questions which, on the present system, decide themselves, often badly enough, but spontaneously. It is a simple rule, and under certain respects a just one, to give equal payment to all who share in the work. But this is a very imperfect justice, unless the work is also apportioned equally. Now, the many different kinds of work required in every society are very unequal in hardness and unpleasantness. To measure these against one another, so as to make quality equivalent to quantity, is so difficult, that communists generally propose that all should work by turns at every kind of labor. But this involves an almost complete sacrifice of the economic advantages of the division of employments, advantages which are, indeed, frequently overestimated (or rather the counter-considerations are underestimated) by political economists, but which are, nevertheless, in the point of view of the productiveness of labor, very considerable, for the double reason that the co-operation of employment enables the work to distribute itself with some regard to the special capacities and qualifications of the worker, and also that every worker acquires greater skill and rapidity in one kind of work, by confining himself to it. The arrangement, therefore, which is deemed indispensable to a just distribution, would probably be a very considerable disadvantage in respect of production. But, further, it is a very imperfect standard of justice, to demand the same amount of work from every one. People have unequal capacities of work, both mentally and bodily, and what is a light task for one, is an insupportable burden to another. It is necessary, therefore, that there should be a dispensing power, an authority competent to grant exemptions from the ordinary amount of work, and to proportion tasks in some measure to capabilities. As long as there are lazy or selfish persons, who like better to be worked for by others than to work, there will be frequent attempts to obtain exemptions, by favor or fraud, and the frustration of these attempts will be an affair of considerable difficulty, and will, by no means, be always successful.

These inconveniences would be little felt, for some time, at least, in communities composed of select persons, earnestly desirous of the success of the experiment; but plans for the regeneration of society must consider average human beings, and not only them, but the large residuum of persons greatly below the average, in the personal and social virtues.

The squabbles and ill blood which could not fail to be engendered by the distribution of work, whenever such persons have to be dealt with, would be a great abatement from the harmony and unanimity which Communists hope would be found among the members of their association. That concord would, even in most fortunate circumstances, be much more liable to disturbance than Communists suppose. The institution provides that there shall be no quarrelling about material interests; individualism is excluded from that department of affairs. But there are other departments from which no institution can exclude it; there will still be rivalry for reputation, and for personal power. When selfish ambition is excluded from the field in which, with most men, it chiefly exercises itself, that of riches and pecuniary interest, it would betake itself with greater intensity to the domain still open to it, and we may expect that the struggles for pre-eminence, and for influence, in the management, would be of great bitterness, when the personal passions, diverted from their ordinary channel, are driven to seek their principal gratification in that other direction. For these various reasons, it is probable that a Communistic association would frequently fail to exhibit the attractive picture of mutual love, and unity of will and feeling, which we are often told by communists to expect, but would often be torn by dissension, and not unfrequently broken up.

It is needless to specify a number of other important questions, affecting the mode of employing the productive resources of the association, the conditions of social life, the relations of the body with other associations, etc., on which differences of opinion, often irreconcilable, would be likely to arise. But even the dissensions which might be expected, would be a far less evil to the prospects of humanity, than a delusive unanimity, produced by the prostration of all individual opinions and wishes, before the decree of the majority. The obstacles to human progression are always great, and require a concurrence of favorable circumstances to overcome them, but an indispensable condition of their being overcome is, that human nature should have freedom to expand spontaneously in various directions, both in thought and practice; that people should both think for themselves, and should not resign into the hands of rulers, whether acting in the name of a few or the majority, the business of thinking for them, and of prescribing how

they shall act. But, in communistic associations, private life would be brought, in a most unexampled degree, within the dominion of public authority, and there would be less scope for the development of individual character, and of individual preferences, than has hitherto existed among the citizens of any state belonging to the progressive branches of the human family. Already, in all societies, the compression of individuality, by the majority, is a great and growing evil; it would probably be much greater under Communism, except so far as might be in the power of individuals to set bounds to it, by selecting to belong to a community of persons like-minded to themselves. . . .

Apart from all considerations of justice to the present possessors—says the same writer—the very idea of conducting the whole industry of a country, by direction from a single centre, is so obviously chimerical, that nobody ventures to propose any mode in which it should be done; and it can hardly be doubted that, if the revolutionary socialists attained their immediate object, and actually had the whole property of the country at their disposal, they would find no other practicable mode of exercising their power over it, than that of dividing it into portions, each to be made over to the administration of a small socialist community. The problem of management, which we have seen to be so difficult even to a select population, well prepared beforehand, would be thrown down to be solved, as best it could, by aggregations united only by localities, or taken indiscriminately from the population, including all the malefactors, all the idlest and most vicious, the most incapable of steady industry, forethought, or self-control, and a majority who, though not equally degraded, are yet, in the opinion of socialists themselves, as far as regards the qualities essential for the success of socialism, profoundly demoralized by the existing state of society. It is saying but little to say that the introduction of socialism, under such conditions, could have no effect but disastrous failure, and its apostles could have only the consolation that the order of society, as it now exists, would have perished first, and all who benefit by it would be involved in the common ruin—a consolation which, to some of them, would probably be real, for, if appearances can be trusted, the animating principle of too many of the revolutionary socialists is hate, a very excusable hatred of existing evils, which would vent itself by putting an end to the present system at all costs, even to those who suffer by it, in the hope that out of chaos would arise a better Kosmos, and in the impatience of desperation respecting any more gradual improvement. They are unaware that chaos is the very most unfavorable position for setting out in the construction of a Kosmos, and that many ages of conflict, violence and tyrannical oppression of the weak by the strong must intervene. They know not that

they would plunge mankind into the state of nature so forcibly described by Hobbes (*Leviathan*, part i., c. 13), where every man is enemy to every man. "In such a condition," says Hobbes, "there is no place for industry, because the fruit thereof is uncertain, and, consequently, no culture of the earth, no navigation, no use of the commodities that may be imported by sea, no commodious building, no instruments of moving and removing such things as require much force, no knowledge of the face of the earth, no account of time, no arts, no letters, no society, and, which is worst of all, continual fear and danger of violent death; and the life of man solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short."

"If the poorest and most wretched members of a so-called civilized society are in as bad condition as every one would be in that worst form of barbarism produced by the dissolution of civilized life, it does not follow that the way to raise them would be to reduce all others to the same miserable state. On the contrary, it is only by the aid of the first who have risen, that so many others have escaped from the general lot, and it is only by the better organization of the same process that it may be hoped, in time, to succeed in raising the remainder." (*Fortnightly Review*.)

And here, it may be remarked, that whilst all the leaders of communism are agreed as to the necessity of destroying the present order of things, they differ widely as to what should be put in its place. In the *Democratic Social Review*, of February 17, 1879, Pauliat writes: "All socialists, we repeat, are at one in regard to the object of their organization, but there is no slight difference amongst them as to the means of attaining it. In this regard the systems proposed are almost innumerable, and there are as many schools as systems. If the leaders had their way, some of them would turn France into a vast convent, others would make it a barracks, and others still, ignoring the natural dispositions of men, would organize an impossible society from which working-men would be the first to escape."

The other division or variety of socialism is, as I have said, Cooperation, or, the association of a number of individuals or societies for mutual profit, whether in the purchase and distribution of commodities for consumption, or in the production of commodities, or in the borrowing or lending of capital, or for mutual defence or protection in commercial interests or trades. The societies founded on this idea in Europe and America may be divided into the following classes: 1. Societies of consumption, the object of which is to buy and sell to members alone, or to members and non-members, under differing conditions, the necessaries of life or the raw materials of their industry. 2. Societies of production, the object of which is to sell the collective or individual work of the members. 3. Societies of credit, or banking, the object of which is to open

accounts of credit with their members, and advance to them loans for industrial purposes. 4. Societies of workmen, to protect the interests of the particular trades to which they belong. (*Encyc. Brit.*)

The principle of co-operation is also applied to many other societies, such as friendly societies, burial and building societies, and industrial partnership, or the admission of the whole body of laborers to a participation in the profits, by distributing among all who share in the work, in the form of a percentage on their earnings, the whole, or a fixed portion of the gains after a certain remuneration has been allowed to the capitalist.

To discuss the merits or demerits of these societies as business associations, would be foreign to my present purpose. I shall consider them in their moral bearing only. Thus viewed, they are, like all other societies, good or bad, according to the objects at which they aim, the means they make use of, and the character of the persons that compose them. The object of a particular society may be excellent, yet, if the means it employs to accomplish that object be unlawful, the society is to be condemned. And, even though the object be good, and the means used to attain it lawful, the bad character of the members would make it necessary for others to avoid it. For evil communications corrupt good morals. Christian men should not put themselves in intimate corporate relations with infidels and revolutionists, for any purpose whatever. Any and all of the above-mentioned societies, if organized by Communists, or in the interest of Communism, would be worthy of condemnation, because of the evil system of which they would be at once the outcome and the support. But if, recognizing the present order of things, they aimed only at the mutual profit of the members, they might be very meritorious organizations.

Workmen may associate to promote the interests of the trades to which they belong, but they cannot interfere with the natural or civil rights of others who do not belong to their associations. They may, for instance, as a rule, and where no undue advantage is taken of the actual necessities of employers, determine the rate of wages under which they will not work, but they cannot hinder others who are willing to work at lower rates. Every man has the right to hire his time and his labor on whatever terms he pleases, or even to give them for nothing, and he can be restricted in the exercise of this right only by public authority. But employers are not free to introduce bodies of cheap laborers into localities where usage has established the equity of certain rates of compensation. They can do so only when the demands of workmen have become extortionate or unreasonable, and even then they should pay the established rates to the new-comers. When bodies of men have chosen certain callings, they become, as a rule, unfitted for

others, and it is not just nor proper that the men whose interests they have promoted, should deprive them and their families of the means of a decent support. The wrong of such a proceeding would be greatly intensified if done in a place where workmen would be far removed from other fields of labor, and from which they could not move without considerable loss and expense.

Workmen can combine against the unjust encroachments of capitalists, but not against capitalists, as such. This would be absurd, as well as unjust. For, after all, what is capital? It is simply accumulated savings. It is the savings of men who have toiled at trades, in business, and in the professions, and which savings are now enjoyed by them, or by their heirs. The capitalist, then, has the same right to these savings that the day-laborer has to his hire. Then, how very little could the laborer accomplish without the aid of capital! It is capital that gives him land to till, mines to work, factories, workshops, mills, machinery, and so many other things that make it possible for him to find remunerative employment. And even when invested in banks or bonds, capital is of, at least, indirect advantage to him; for banks are now almost indispensable to trade and commerce; and governments and private corporations would find it very difficult to meet their obligations, and provide for necessary outlays without bonds. Capital, then, may be truly said to be the laborer's best friend. The relation between capital and labor is so intimate that employer and employed must necessarily stand or fall together. They should, then, cherish for each other, not distrust, but mutual forbearance and esteem. Workmen should care for the interests of their employers as for their own, and not take advantage of circumstances that may arise to enable them to enforce, by strikes and combinations, extortionate demands for wages. Employers, on the other hand, should not adopt a close and exacting policy towards workmen. They should not only not defraud them, in whole, or in part, of their hire, which is one of the sins that cry to heaven for vengeance; they should deal generously with them. They should give them such compensation for their labor as will enable them to live comfortably, in their station of life, to educate their children, and, with economy, to provide against such contingencies as sickness, accidents, or enforced idleness. They might establish for their benefit, reading rooms, libraries, gymnasiums, building associations, and insurance companies, of which they could avail themselves on easy terms. The larger corporations could do this, each for its own employes; the less powerful could combine for the same objects. Employers, in a word, should make all under them feel that they have their welfare at heart; they should study their wants, do all in their power to lighten their burdens, and give attentive consideration to every plan for improving the organization of labor,

that would be likely to better the condition of their employés without injuriously affecting their own.

Were employers and workmen animated by these sentiments, the trade of socialistic demagogues would soon be gone, and the unnatural struggle between capital and labor, that now threatens the peace of all civilized nations and the stability of most of them, would soon come to an end. Christian society is based on justice and charity. Where these are respected, it will endure. Where they are disregarded, it must perish. "Unless the Lord keep the city, they labor in vain that keep it."

There is no danger, at least for long years to come, that Communism will become generally popular in this country, much less that it will change or seriously affect its institutions. The American people, it is true, have scant reverence for the past and its precedents. They have given Mormonism, Millerism, and Perfectionism a trial; and there is hardly a conceivable social or theological theory for which they are not prepared to do the same, on a small scale. But neither of two things can they ever, as a nation, be induced to do: they will become neither monks nor soldiers; or, as Mr. Pauliat would say, they will not suffer this country to be changed, either into "a vast convent," or "a vast barracks." Nor can such a change be forced upon them, for, those whose best interests depend on the present order of things, whose material condition Communism could not improve, and who have sense enough to see the intrinsic wickedness and folly of this system, will always be sufficiently numerous to prevent it. Their misapprehension of the real nature of Communism and the European Revolution generally, has led many of them to sympathize with both—a thing very much to be regretted—but, beyond this, Communism cannot influence them to any serious extent.

Nevertheless, there are very grave dangers to be apprehended from Communism in the United States. In nearly all our great commercial and manufacturing centres, there are societies, either avowedly communistic or largely under the influence of communistic ideas. They are thoroughly organized, and, in some instances, drilled and armed for the struggle they predict, and which, their leaders say, they are determined to precipitate, between capital and labor, in this country. All the elements of disorder amongst us are in sympathy with them. Our great and ever growing army of tramps would rally to their support, in any crisis that might arise. Property-owners and law-abiding citizens generally, regard them with ever-increasing alarm. To withdraw their workmen from their influence, and prevent their gaining absolute political control of our cities, large firms and railroad companies are dis-

tributing their factories and shops over the country districts of every State. But the influence these organizations wield at the polls, makes them courted or feared by our politicians, who cannot be induced to favor the legislation necessary to avert the evils they may cause at any moment. The destruction of even one of our large cities would be a fearful calamity, yet who will say that it may not be brought about any day by these societies, some of which seem to be animated by the very spirit of the Paris Commune? It is but a few years since Chicago seemed, for a time, to be at their mercy, and when, in all probability, it would have been laid in ashes but for the determination of the Irish regiment that had been called out to defend it. The danger for that and other cities is not over. It becomes every day more threatening; and, unless proper precautionary measures are taken to avert it, the consequences may be deplorable. Should the injury to life and property to be apprehended from these societies actually ensue, in a single instance, their suppression all over the country would follow as a matter of course. But prevention is better than cure. They should be permitted to meet and organize and theorize as much as they please, but they should not be permitted to arm and drill for the avowed purpose of forcing their theories on others at the point of the bayonet. Men so ignorant or so foolish as to dream of attempting anything of the kind here can be no better than lunatics, and lunatics should not be allowed the use of deadly weapons. Good citizens of the nationalities to which the members of these societies belong, should try to make them understand, that in this country liberty does not mean license, but the protection of every man in his rights, under the Constitution and the laws. The representatives of the press should keep the public informed of their proceedings, and remind them, from time to time, of what they must expect, should they proceed to acts of violence against property or persons. The municipal authorities in the cities where these organizations exist, should keep a close watch on their movements, especially in times of public excitement, so as to be prepared, if necessary, to meet force with force, should they attempt a disturbance of the peace. There is, in all our great cities, much inflammable material, moral as well as physical, and dangerous popular commotions may arise there, at any moment, from unforeseen and insignificant causes. In a country where we may be said to have, practically, no standing army, even a small body of thoroughly organized desperadoes can, at such times, do infinite mischief before they are put down, unless the authorities are prepared beforehand to repress them. What occurred so recently in Pittsburg and Chicago should be a warning to these and other cities to prepare for like contingencies in the future.