

The Struggle Between Labor and Capital

THE struggle which is daily growing in importance, and which, with every industrial advancement is becoming more and more complicated, is one in which we find the laborer, on the one hand, lead on by natural self preservation, endeavoring by every means to free himself from the depressing influence of free competition in the labor market ; and the employer, on the other hand endeavoring to purchase the greatest amount of labor at the least possible wage.

It is a struggle which has existed for centuries and one in ascribing the causes of which, most economists has erred. Many of their theories seemed reasonable at the time in which they were adduced ; but the passage of time bringing with it changed circumstances—particularly those wrought by the “division of labor” and the impulse which that gave to invention—have rendered absurd almost all principles, assumed as causes effecting the struggle for wages.

In 1798 Malthus wrote his famous essay on the “Principles of Population,” in which were many mistaken ideas concerning labor and capital ; chief among which mistaken theories was that known as the “wage fund,” namely that there is at any time an amount of wealth set apart by economic forces for the payment of wages. The ratio between the aggregate capital and the portion thus devoted to the payment of wages is necessarily the same in different countries at the same time, and in the same countries at different times. It appears by this that the “wage fund”—that is the amount to be distributed as wages—is, at any given time, irrespective of the number and industrial quality of the laboring class. This theory was the result of the idea that capital pays wages ; and the cause of that perverse notion that an increase in the numerical greatness of the laboring class must necessarily be followed by a decrease in the inverse ratio in the wages. But in this theory, in pursuing which, it seemed necessary

to check by positive measures the increase in population, there was not considered effects of the introduction of improved machinery, of the laws of increasing or diminishing returns in production.

Next came Ricardo, endeavoring to establish a wage theory founded on the hypothesis that labor is paid out of capital ; and that as a natural consequence there is no way of raising the employers profits but by lowering wages, or in other words, that the Capitalist employer is the residual claimant upon the product of industry. Dr. Quincy has summed up the Ricardian doctrine by saying, that profits are the leavings of wages. The economic conditions of the time in which it was formulated, most remarkable of which was the very great independence of the Capitalist-class—lent to the doctrine a color of probability ; but the removal of those conditions brought to light the incompleteness of the theory. We understand that the employer purchases labor with a view to the product of labor and not through any motive of wishing to see the laborer employed. The kind and amount of labor determines what wages he can afford to pay ; and it is the greatness of the anticipated product that induces him to pay more or less as wages—that it is production not capital that furnishes the motive for employment and a measure for wages.

Walker in his deductive theory on wages is perhaps the clearest of all economists on the subject. He shows the absurdity of the Malthusian and Ricardian theories, and holds out a hope for betterment in the conditions of the laboring class. Regarding the profits of employer in the same way as Ricardo the differential gain, he holds that under free competition the employer's profit is an exact measure of the extent to which his business abilities surpass that fellow of his class who is scarcely able to float himself and receives no profits, but only a subsistence. Now, following out this theory, Walker, asserting, that rent is the " differential gain " hence independent of wages, and that interest, on invested capital under free competition is like water and tends to a level, concludes that rent,

employer's profit and interest are deducted from the aggregate product, but not from wages. By this rule of distribution, no gain in efficiency of the individual laborer, no mechanical invention or chemical discovery however much the capability of production may be increased thereby, can directly benefit the laborer, but indirectly as it enhances the profit of the laboring class, and thereby adds to the capital of the "wage fund" to be thereafter expended in the purchase of labor.

Professor Cairns in treating this question maintains that a reduction of wages could not prove an ultimate injury to the laboring class. For he states it thus:—"Suppose a group of employers to have succeeded as no doubt would be possible, in temporarily forcing down wages by combination in a particular trade, a portion of the wealth previously invested would become free. How would it be invested? Unless we are to suppose the character of the community to have been changed in a leading attribute, the wealth so withdrawn from wages, would in the end and before long be restored to wages. The same motives which lead to its investment would lead to its re-investment; and, once re-invested, the interests of those concerned would cause it to be distributed among the several elements of the capital in the same proportion as before. In this way "covetousness is held in check by covetousness, and the desire for aggrandizement sets limits to its gratification." The mistaken assumption in this theory seems to be that there is but one direction in which the enlargement of profits at the expenses of wages must go—namely that of becoming again capital. He never considers the many other ways toward which that surplus of the Capitalist might be divided, as for instance—increased living expenses.

From all these deductive theories we see, not only that this labor problem is not a new one, but also that it has always been so complex that almost all attempts at a solution of it, have been unsuccessful. The main reason that so many economists have failed to establish logical truth in establishing prime principles on which to base their deduction, was due to the fact that they attributed all conditions to natural causes, and

never considered the many causes extrinsic to the natural relation between labor and capital in a country, that may intervene to disproportion that relation.

Malthus lived at a time when the superfluity of the laboring class was greatest. The industrial revolution had begun ; machinery was rapidly replacing labor in the factories ; and, added to this, the return of the armies from the continent after the French Wars, left the supply in the labor market very great in proportion to the demand. It is watching those great alternations in economic conditions, and believing the laboring class to be consigned to ruin by over population, that induced him to set down as a prime principle that population increases in the geometrical ratio while means of subsistence increases only in the arithmetical ratio.

As it was with Malthus, so was it with Ricardo, and even to some extent with Cairns : For Ricardo was deceived by the phenomenal changes wrought by the Settlement Acts of 1760.

But the age of Classical or abstract economists has passed away ; and, in the transition from classical to historical schools of economy, we have John Steward Mill, who was the first to discover that every specific condition requires its own prescription ; that is to say, it is impossible to make one general economic theory suitable and verifiable in all countries, or at all times in any one country. He was convinced that the physical laws of production were unalterable and therefore looks for amelioration in a change of the method of distribution. Feeling strongly that it was overpopulation that caused the depression in the laboring class, he sets out to reform society radically ; and has become the chief socialistic economist.

But, leaving Mill, who has established that every country requires its own political economy, and Walker, who has demonstrated clearly that only an increase in efficiency or productiveness of the laboring class, can ultimately benefit the laboring class, we are ready to pass from those abstract relations, to considering labor conditions in their realities.

The very low status of the laboring class of any country may be attributed to various causes. In England by the Enclosure Acts, as a result of which great numbers of the poorer class were obliged to leave what they had previously used as common land, a condition in the laboring class of that country was established, from which they were never strong enough to free themselves.

For the past century the advancement and changes in the method of industry have been so complete and thorough that what were causes of labor conditions at the start of the century, were at the close only auxiliary causes or perhaps not causes at all. The division of labor by which means, a proportionate increase in the product was effected, making it possible for many employers to discharge many of their men and still produce enough to satisfy the market demand; the introduction of new machinery taking the place of labor effecting still greater production in industry; and free competition in the labor market, where all causes lowering the demand for labor and hence lowering the wage.

For nearly two centuries in England, France, Germany and The United States, the social position of the working class was most wretched. The employer had unchallenged control over his laborers; and exercised that control with all selfishness, ever using labor as machines from which to get the greatest results at the least expense possible. At the present time, notwithstanding the relieving effects of trade unions and other pressure from without, the degrading conditions of the factories and mines are sometimes inconceivable. Many laborers, their wages becoming less than that necessary to keep them in good working efficiency soon become unable to earn the wage and are discharged. They engage to work in some other factory at a lower wage, but, cost of living remaining the same, they sink gradually downward till finally they are incapable of meriting a wage of any sort.

Within the past fifty years there have arisen in many countries, in the form of trade unions, and trade

boards of conciliation and arbitration, forcible checks upon the employer of industry.

Trade unions are of many different kinds. We have that Union which is composed of the laborers of particular industry ; the general trade union in which the laborers of all the different industries unite to press their claims, and lastly the universal trade union—of which the Knights of Labor have been the most complete actuality—constituted from the unions of the different industries of any communities or states.

To ascertain adequately, the merits and demerits of trade union, is a very difficult proposition, and one on which opinions are very diverse. It is certain that trade unions have been a potent force in over-coming the evils of unequal competition in the labor market, and in giving starving workmen a living wage. Trade unions are, however, often injudiciously employed in making unreasonable demands upon the employer, and in prolonging injurious strikes. Yet it may justly be said that, not only are strikes not natural effects of trade unions, as some of the most violent insurrections have taken place without them—but on the contrary, by providing trade boards for industrial conciliation and arbitration, these unions have become the most effective preventive of strikes.

There are many who, although admitting that trade unions have done much to raise wages and shorten working hours in factories, maintain that from an educational and moral point of view all species of trade unions are unsafe and must eventually bring disaster upon a nation.

Their criticism condemns the “uniform wage” which regarding neither age or skill, serves to degenerate labor, and remove every incentive to increased energy. Moreover, it is stated that trade unions do not make for happiness ; for that is a state of mind proceeding from the completion of some work well done ; and shortened hours, better clothes and more food do not necessarily contribute to genuine content, any more than do the luxuries of the rich. Under union conditions good will, generous zeal and loyalty, essential to contentment in the laborer are ever absent

from him ; for he gives his work with a grudging spirit, which prevents the realization of true happiness. Furthermore, that spirit which is general among unionists, that the less a man does the better, renders precarious the progress of civilization, which depends on universal and steady productive labor.

We have seen that trade unions have been instrumental in rescuing the victims of free competition ; but we can also see that there is something artificial in the system and something which threatens any country in which it has become established, with the future demoralization of its root and fiber—the laboring class. One of the best methods of escaping from those effects is found in profit sharing or co-operation in industry, a system which will extend both to employer and employed the same motives for faithful, and successful productiveness.

We have already in this paper referred to strikes as being injurious to both laborer and employer, but to ascertain the real influence, which they have had in improving conditions in the laboring class is a distinct question. For many centuries in England, strikes were prohibited by the Government as unsafe and unnatural methods, but for the past couple of centuries they have been employed in many countries ; and have been the means of wrenching from the employers and vesting in the employed, a great amount of power and self confidence.

Whatever may be said of strikes from the view that they are destructive agents and often drive the capable employer out of business to be replaced by one less skilful—thus impeding production and indirectly harming the laborers themselves, it may justly be maintained concerning strikes, that as insurrections have played a most important part in the elevation of down trodden people through the fear they have produced in the minds of oppressors, so strikes may be said to have exerted in the past a most powerful and salutary influence in breaking the crust of custom which has formed over the rate of wages or in destroying combinations of employers formed for the purpose of controlling the laborers.

The first attempt to employ peaceful means for arranging future contracts was made in 1836, when Glasgow potters, after a strike, agreed to hold an annual convention to fix wages and provided that, if any dispute should arise about the rate of wages, it should be submitted to a court of arbitration comprised of three masters and three laborers.

In 1806 the council of "Proud homme" was established at Lyons by Napoleon in order to regulate matters regarding wages, and hours of work between employers and employed in the silk industry.

Trade boards are bodies of delegates elected from the trade unions of the different industries to represent and push the claims of the laborer at meetings of conciliation and arbitration.

Conciliation and arbitration may be voluntary or compulsory. The compulsory system is that in which by legislation the laborers and employers when a dispute arises, are forced to send their trade boards either to settle matters by the help of an Umpire appointed by the government or to refer the matter to the round table of conciliation, where very often a disinterested chairman presides.

Voluntary conciliation and arbitration arises from a mutual sympathy which exists between employer and employed, and a desire to prevent strikes in which both classes suffer ; and it is to this sympathy that the greater merits achieved by the voluntary methods, must be attributed.

The boards of conciliation where the employers and workmen meet to talk over relations are the surest means of preventing strikes. By the free intercourse of employer and laborer at those meetings of the board they come to know each other, their respect and esteem for one another is increased, and mutual confidence is encouraged. Furthermore, the workmen begin to perceive the complexity of the problem of distribution and that wages are not determined by employers but by economic forces acting through them. The employers in turn begin to look upon the human side of business—their outlook is widened and they appreciate better their responsibilities as employers.

Boards of conciliation then would be valuable if they were only a means of maintaining industrial peace, but since they form a remedy for want of confidence and for the suspicion and prejudice which exists between employers and employed, they are doubly valuable.

Communism has always been so intimately connected with this struggle, that it would be improper to pass it over without mention. The idea of it will be found to have existed in one place or another at almost every age. The earliest form of communism was perhaps that which Plato advocated in his republic, a study of which will show the actuating principle to have been an utter dissatisfaction of existing conditions, not only social and economic, but also of the body politic. For there is nothing more convincing that he was imbued with this principle of utter dissatisfaction of political conditions, than a glance at his Ideal Republic, so fundamentally did he wish to possess in it a transformed society.

The Utopia of Sir John Moore was little less radical. The wealth produced and the instruments of production were to be shared by all, and distributed by magistrates. The only important respect in which Moore's ideal state differed from Plato's, was that in the Utopia, the community of wives and children had to be dispensed with, as irreconcilable with Christianity.

So long as communism remained untried it was impossible to prove, to dreamers, and those who are visionary, that it lacked the saving results which they attributed to it. But the unfavorable outcome of experiments made in America under conditions suitable for its propagation, have been of great value in establishing the limitations and drawbacks of the system. Where communism has failed most obviously in reaching its ideals, is found in conditions where the societies are founded by men of intellectual and cultivated attainments. From which fact, those who have studied the subject, its effects and possibilities, deduce that communistic success depends upon the feeling among all its members of the unbearableness of the circumstances in which their lives were previously cast.

The American societies hold out a life, which is tolerable only to those whose original circumstances are most unfortunate, and even this humble life can be offered only at the price of one's sacrificed, individuality, liberty and intellectual development.

We will now pass over communism for the present, to consider an organization which is the production of the last century and which threatens the present social order with complete extinction. Socialism is the declared enemy of capitalism. German socialism used to be accounted a reaction against the monarchy. In England for the collective uprising, the landlord monopoly was given as explanation. But France is a republic and the land is in the hands of small farmers, yet socialism sits in her cabinet and they have had a socialistic prime minister. Denmark is almost entirely given to socialism as is also the north of Italy.

From this we see that, despite the efforts of governments and of capitalism, this organization wins its way; and the causes of its rapid growth is the discovered excesses of the competitive system, that fails to meet the minimum of equality that powerful sections of these communities demand.

Within the past fifty years socialism in its various forms has taken root and grown in the United States at a pace that has startled not only the capitalists, but has alarmed so greatly political parties both democratic and republican, that they have in all cases combined to fight the common enemy. Yet socialism grows stronger after every reverse, and there is reason to expect that in its more revolutionary form it will have a large field in the United States. Conditions in that country for its growth are more favorable than in any part of Europe. Prosperity, higher wages, mobility of labor and freer ways of the incoming peasants all tend to this end.

To define socialism satisfactorily is perhaps impossible, as this appellation, socialist, is received by so many with very diverse political schemes and purposes. There is, however, one quality found in common, and essential to all these different species of socialism, namely—a conscious purpose to extend the powers of

the state beyond a certain necessary minimum line of duty for the supposed public good. Many persons join the socialistic party because they feel that there is nothing but corruption in other political parties; and for this reason, socialism in its milder form is often termed "a political disinterestedness."

In England socialism dates from 1817, when Robert Owens, during a discussion of the poor law by the committee of the House of Commons, brought in his scheme for a socialistic community. About the same time Saint Simon and Fourier were representing a movement in France. The ideals of the last two men, as set forth in their society scheme, were largely communistic and utopian.

Socialism of the same nature as that advocated in England by Robert Owens, was afterwards carried on over Europe by the school of Karl Marx and styled "the modern democracy."

Marx watched the constant changes in industrial operations; the inevitable tendency towards concentration which followed the introduction of the steam engine and factory system—by which the smaller producers were superseded by the larger, and the larger capitalists by monopolies and trusts—and imagined he perceived a great constructive process going on, as a result of inherent tendencies of industrial development. It was a process which he believed would simplify the transference of the means of production to collective management by society. The great decrease in productive forces, only serving to intensify national and international competition and render labor superfluous and dependent, were explained by Karl Marx as symptoms of breakdown in the present economic order. He conceived an evolution taking place in society, on which, taking Ricardo's theory of unpaid wages as hypothesis, he founded the theory: "that as slavery was succeeded by feudalism, and capitalism, by natural tendencies overcame feudalism, so capitalism is the natural link leading to socialism."

Marx's philosophy in applying ethical categories to judgment on economic processes that are purely natural, seems to be at variance with sound reasoning.

For at the same time that he condemns the greed of the capitalists, he affirms that, by means of the capitalist, a great social and industrial function is being performed in completing the "historic evolution."

The prime principle upon which Marx founded his theory, rests on the Ricardian hypothesis,—the inadequacy of which has already been established in this paper,—that every increase in capital is the result of unpaid wages. He made no allowance for the fact that difference in profit under similar conditions, is almost invariably caused by greater skill in management of industry. Socialists in general fail to ascertain the importance of the employer; and regarding him as a parasite and a burden in the economic order, hold him wholly answerable for the precarious conditions of the laboring class. But we know that, by so much as greater ability in management has at all times been accompanied by greater prosperity in industry, by so much the more is it true in modern industry, where competition is most severe and technique most complete, that sagacity, shrewdness and decision in a manager are factors indispensable for productive success.

During the eventful year of 1848, in which political and social tempest prevailed throughout Germany, Emmanuel Von Kettler, Bishop of Mainz, moved by a Christian desire of helping the masses in their struggle against liberalism, tore himself from his secluded life as bishop in the country, to enter the arena in the momentous social struggle. He was elected to represent the district of Tecklenburg, in the national assembly at Frankfort, and immediately threw himself with all his courage and talents into the social contest by championing the cause of Catholic socialism in Germany.

Kettler stood at variance with both liberalism and communism. He expounds the doctrine of St. Thomas, explaining the right of private property to be restricted to usufruct, but not a right given to man to use at his pleasure the goods of this world.

God created everything that is, hence he has the only absolute right. But, in as much as, in his providence he has destined some of those things for the sustenance of man, there arises a natural right of owner-

ship. But only on condition that man recognize the order established by God, does he hold this right. Again, this doctrine of the right of property, having its origin in God, is possible only where there is living faith in God. Separated from God, men regarded themselves as the exclusive masters of their possessions, and regarded them as a means of satisfying their ever-increasing love of pleasure.

This theory of the nature of man's right of ownership is a necessary following from the relation of God to his creatures. Man's right of ownership is nothing but a right given him by God, to use the goods of earth as the Creator has ordained. The will of God, in this matter, can be done in two ways; men can administer the goods of earth in common; or they can possess them divided so that each man has property rights over a specified portion of them, and is at liberty to dispose of the profits derived from them.

Which of these two systems is destined for man? St. Thomas solves the problem in the following manner: "that in usufructory rights two things are to be considered. First—the right of management and administration, and second—the right of enjoyment of profits. This division is essential because the goods must be prepared by man for consumption."

Now with regard to management, St. Thomas affirms that individual right of ownership in goods of earth must be upheld for three reasons:

Firstly: It effects better management, for everybody is naturally more careful of his own goods than what is possessed jointly with others and, in addition to this, right of management removes the incentive to laziness.

Secondly: On account of the variety of human occupations, constituting the general organization, the essential element of which, in satisfying the wants of human nature, is family property, individual rights are necessary.

Thirdly: The necessity arises from the impossibility of avoiding disputes in the frequent distribution of property.

By those arguments St. Thomas upholds the right

of private property as regards management, and so stands consistently with the commandment of the Church, "Thou shalt not steal," which commandment cannot be reconciled with communism.

But, with regard to the second part of that division made by St. Thomas, that is the enjoyment of earthly goods, he affirms that man should not consider those fruits as his exclusive property, but as common property to all, which should be shared with anyone who is in need.

This principle is compatible with the saying "Charge the rich of this world that they give easily, to communicate to others."

Thus we see that the Christian doctrine opposes, on the one hand, communism, and on the other, the absolute right of ownership, which is inconsistent with the purpose of God: that the fruits of the earth should nourish all men.

Von Kettler laid down, as a principle for his socialism, the fact that God did not give to man the unconditional right of ownership over the goods of the earth but only a privilege to use them in the manner ordained. He points out how this conception of property is in unison and accord with the divine order.

God created the earth for the sustenance of man. He could have attained this sustenance by a compulsory distribution of goods, but He wished to give free scope to man's free will; for it is only by acting as a self-determining agent, that man merits. God wished to transfer the work of distribution to man, that the creature doing the work of God might become Godlike. He allowed inequality to the acquisition of goods that man might become the dispenser of gifts to his fellow man.

Von Kettler felt strongly that there was but one means of over-coming the direful conditions of the laboring class, and bringing about just distribution of goods. He believed that the bonds that tied the laborer could not be severed by force but by the interior regeneration of hearts. A more difficult work than this had been done before by Christianity, when by the magic efforts of its introduction, the chains that

had for centuries bound the slaves in ancient Rome, were broken.

Kettler was a man of genius ; and feeling it his duty as Bishop to help the needy, he espoused the cause of the unfortunate, and for twenty-nine years until his death his zealous concern in social matters never lessened, but he gave all he had, energy, talents and means, to the cause of Christian socialism.

He urged the laborers to organize and form associations for production, and drew up many trade laws regarding hours of work, employment of women and children in factories, which ideals were to be the basis of their demand from the state.

The Bishop, by his activities in social affairs, made for himself many and bitter enemies from the liberal party in Germany ; and death came to him just in time to remove him from the painful realization of exile, which was about to be pronounced on him by the state.

The weakness in Von Kettler's social reform seems to rest in the over-much confidence he had placed in the universal effects of Christianity. For whatever may be the cause—to Von Kettler, it was the darkening influence of original sin upon the human intellect—the ordinary man never considers it morally unjustifiable to purchase labor at the price which free competition in the labor market allows. Nor does he shrink from collecting debts from the poor. It seems, then, that reforms of this nature, complete enough to change society entirely, would be nothing less than miraculous in modern life. Besides the Catholic and Democratic socialism, the latter of which exists, to some extent, in nearly every Christian country, American syndicalism, which is essentially socialism but very different in method, has, for the past few years, taken root in the United States.

American syndicalism differs from modern or democratic socialism in its revolutionary character. For the latter has cleared itself of that hatred to prosperity which was once a part of it. But the former has been aptly characterized as "the child of strife." It is an army made up for the most part of reckless outlaws, who rejoice in receiving that appellation. Their doc-

trine proclaims that there is none of the product of industry that is not created by labor ; and hence to the laborer must go the whole product. The capitalists are parasites and thieves, and, therefore, the laborer is justified in taking or destroying capital wherever he finds it.

To gain their ends they resort to methods of direct action, sabotage and violence. Sabotage is a means by which the laborers, by spoiling the product when it is passing through their hands in the factory, may obtain concessions from the employer without stopping work.

Direct action is any method which drives the employer either through interest or fear to yield to the laborer's demand. It employs strikes of short duration, which keep the capitalist always in anxiety, and at the same time train and spirit the laborer for the general strike. The Independent Workers of the World, as this organization is commonly called, feel at liberty to leave work and return to it at will and without consulting the employer ; as they never recognize the wage system.

The leaders in this movement entertain high aspirations as to its future success. They believe that when once the workers of the world shall be effectively united in one brotherhood, the labor problem shall have been solved forever ; and if we consider the possibilities of this universal syndicalism, we will be ready to concede that their credence is not entirely without reason. They purpose to fight the employer by prolonged and universal strikes, until it remains for him to grant concession after concession in wages, or go out of business. It might be asked how the laborer is going to sustain himself during the siege, but when we recall that a union fund is being raised from the weekly copper of each laborer, this objection fails. It may also be thoughtlessly maintained that the capitalist can starve the laborer into subjection by transferring his money from one industry in which interest is forced low, to another more profitable industry. But, in this universal strike, by the very essence of which, all forms of "scabbing" is barred, all industries are simultaneously

affected, so that the capitalist cannot better himself by a transference of his capital ; and, the employer pushed until his profits become inadequate to sustain him, is forced to become a laborer. Thus, socialism may reign supreme.

We have now considered many phases of the social problem. We have seen that Catholic Socialism is, so vastly at variance with modern life as to seem unworkable ; that conciliation and arbitration are only temporary advantages to that portion of the laborers whose working efficiency fits them to command the wage ; and that even that advantage has been checked, to a great extent, by the intervention of monopolies and trusts.

Now, the question confronts us, is there no way by which the mass of wage earners may be raised to a higher status in life, without the intervention of syndicalistic socialism, essentially accompanied by demoralizing and lawless effects?

There seems to remain only one means by which the sufferings of the poorer classes may be terminated, and that remedy is co-operation in industry. In France and Germany co-operative societies for production and consumption in industry, have been found the surest remedies for the errors and perils of socialism ; and for eliminating the wasteful intermediaries.

The method of the system is very simple. For co-operative consumption, a number of small wage earners get together, buy capital, in the form of provision stores ; and appoint a board of directors with all control over the business.

In this way a great incentive is given to the laborer to work, and, at the same time, the employer must exert himself in order to hold down his job. So that the tendencies to laziness in communism, the lack of encouragement given to the employer in socialism, and the depressing influences of free competition, apparent in liberalism, are nowhere in evidence.

It would seem that such a system of production and distributive organizations would create the

economic relations, and the improvements in industrial conditions which are the aim of all political and social reformers. It is in conformity with the Catholic socialist's views on property in worldly goods, and has worked marvellous improvements in Christian countries.

LEWIS McDONALD '16.

MY FRIEND

He may be six kinds of a liar,
He may be ten kinds of a fool,
He may be a blooming high flier
Without any reason or rule,
There may be a shadow above him
Of ruin and woes that impend ;
I may not respect, but I love him,
I love him because he's my friend.

J. C. '17.

It is chiefly through books that we enjoy intercourse with superior minds and these invaluable means of communication are in the reach of us all : In the best books great men talk to us, give us their most precious thoughts and pour their souls into ours.

Where the vivacity of the intellect and the strength of the passions exceed the development of the moral faculties, the character is likely to be embittered or corrupted by extremes either by adversity or prosperity.

Discourse may want an animated "No,"
To brush the surface and to make it flow ;
But still remember, if you mean to please,
To press your point with modesty and ease.

One to destroy, is murder by the law ;
And gibbets keep the lifted hand in awe ;
To murder thousands, takes a spacious name,
War's glorious art, and gives immortal fame.