

his "Philosophie des Unbewussten."<sup>1</sup> One of the most cautious of our younger students of philosophy has noted with care in a recent article the indications that "the era of doubt is drawing to a close."<sup>2</sup> A statesman like Signor Crispi does not hesitate to cut loose from his former atheistic connections and declare that "the belief in God is the fundamental basis of the healthy life of the people, while atheism puts in it the germ of an irreparable decay." The French critic M. Édouard Rod declares that "only religion can regulate at the same time human thought and human action."<sup>3</sup> Mr. Benjamin Kidd, from the side of English sociology, assures us that "since man became a social creature the development of his intellectual character has become subordinate to the development of his religious character," and concludes that religion affords the only permanent sanction for progress.<sup>4</sup> A famous biologist, Romanes, who once professed the most absolute rejection of revealed, and the most unqualified skepticism of natural, religion, thinks his way soberly back from the painful void to a position where he confesses that "it is reasonable to be a Christian believer," and dies in the full communion of the Church of Jesus.<sup>5</sup>

All along the line, we see men who once thought it necessary or desirable to abandon forever the soul's abode of faith in the unseen, returning by many and devious ways from the far country of doubt, driven by homesickness and hunger to seek some path which shall at least bring them in sight of a Father's house.

#### THE INDOMITABLE CONSCIENCE

And meanwhile we hear the conscience, the ethical instinct of mankind, asserting itself with splendid courage and patience, even in those who have as yet found no sure ground for it to stand upon. There is a sublime contradiction between the positivist's view of man as "the hero of a lamentable drama played in an obscure corner of the universe, in virtue of blind laws, before an indifferent Nature, and with annihilation for its dénouement,"<sup>6</sup> and the doctrine that it is his supreme duty to sacrifice himself for the good of humanity. Yet many of the skeptical thinkers of the age do not stumble at the contradiction. They hold fast to love and justice and moral enthusiasm even though they suspect that they themselves are the products of a Nature which is blind and dumb and heartless and stupid. Never have the obligations of self-restraint and helpfulness and equity and universal brotherhood been preached more fervently than by some of the English agnostics.

#### THE NEW CRUSADE

In France a new crusade has risen—a crusade which seeks to gather into its hosts men of all creeds and men of none, and which proclaims as its object the recovery of the sacred places of man's spiritual life, the holy land in which virtue shines forever by its own light and the higher impulses of our nature are inspired, invincible, and immortal. On its banner M. Paul Desjardins writes the word of Tolstoi, "Il faut avoir une âme—it is necessary to have a soul," and declares that the crusaders will follow it wherever it leads them. "For my part," he cries, "I shall not blush certainly to acknowledge as sole master the Christ preached by the Doctors. I shall not recoil if my premisses force me to believe, at last, as Pascal believed."<sup>7</sup>

#### SIGNS OF THE TIMES

These are the signs of the times. Surely we must take note of them, surely we must labor and pray to understand their true significance, if we are to say anything to our fellow-men which shall be worth our saying and their hearing.

Renan made a strange remark not long before his death: "I fear that the work of the twentieth century will consist in taking out of the waste-basket a multitude of excellent ideas which the nineteenth century has heedlessly thrown into it." The skeptic's fear is the believer's hope. Once more the fields are white unto the harvest. The time is ripe; ripe in the sorrow of skepticism, ripe in the return of aspiration, ripe in the enthusiasm of humanity, for a renaissance of the spiritual life. Blessed are they who are come to the Kingdom for such a time as this, if indeed they believe and preach a living, saving Gospel for the present age.

<sup>1</sup> James Orr, "The Christian View of God and the World" (Randolph, New York, 1893), pp. 456, 457.

<sup>2</sup> "The Methodist Review," January, 1896, "The Return to Faith," by Professor A. C. Armstrong, Jr.

<sup>3</sup> Édouard Rod, "Les Idées Morales du Temps Présent" (Paris, 1894), p. 304.

<sup>4</sup> Benjamin Kidd, "Social Evolution" (London, 1894), p. 245.

<sup>5</sup> "Thoughts on Religion," p. 196.

<sup>6</sup> Madame L. Ackermann, "Ma Vie" (Paris, 1885), p. xviii.

<sup>7</sup> "Le Devoir Présent," p. 45.

There can be nothing in a nation or a State or a city, however exalted its aims, or however perfectly organized, which is not in the persons composing the city, the State, or the nation. An ultimate standard of worth is an ideal of personal worth.—*Horatio Stebbins.*

## Some of the Rights and Wrongs of Labor and Capital<sup>1</sup>

By an Employer

Labor unions enroll but a small proportion of the working classes. Only those trades which require special knowledge, such as comparatively few possess, can with any hope of success maintain a union.

The great multitude of the most poorly paid, who do the drudgery work of life, are too numerous and too heterogeneous to be united. The hardships of this class are nearly always really great, whereas those of the united classes are only comparatively so, and that spasmodically. But the publicity given to the quarrels of united labor with united capital, and the inconvenience the public suffers from their hostile tactics, gives to their grievances a prominence which overshadows the far greater sufferings of the submerged orders of society. Nevertheless, their claims are not less pressing because less prominently forced on public notice, and the risks which society runs from neglecting them are infinitely greater than those which society is exposed to from the actions of trades-unions, whose aims are defined and methods understood. The conflict, however, between united labor and united capital constitutes to the industrial world "The Labor Question."

Trades-unionism, in its modern phase, made its appearance first in England, but became soon acclimatized in this country. The objects of trade-unions have been from first to last the same: to secure shorter hours of labor, higher wages, and legislation against the employment of children and women in unsuitable occupations. Mutual aid and life-insurance benefits have been incorporated in the constitutions of many unions as subsidiary advantages. As a rule, trades-unionists are not Socialists. The old trades-unionism in the last Trades Congress held at Cardiff, in England, gained a decisive victory over the new trades-unionism, which embodies in its programme political changes of a distinctly Socialistic tendency. And the Socialist party was defeated in the Parliament of the Labor Federation recently held in this city. But both in England and here the Socialist wing, if not dominant, is strong. Its increase or decrease in numbers will be largely influenced by the attitude of the great employers of labor—a consideration which should have no small weight with them before exciting conflicts which can by any legitimate possibility be averted. Nor do the trades-unions seem to favor profit-sharing, co-operative manufacturing, or any of the other devices by which philanthropic manufacturers have striven to improve the fortunes and stimulate the intelligence and independence of their workmen. As the unions fight primarily for high wages settled in cash, in order to insure compact action they almost necessarily insist on a uniform rate of wages, and therefore demand that the trade pay for the services of the inefficient at the same rate as for the best. They thus degrade the best man to the level of the worst. On that account we blame the more intelligent workman for slavishly submitting to the dictation of the union, and for merging his individuality and independence into the interests of his class. Is he not to be commended for his unselfishness in doing so? for did he act otherwise, combination and the strength it imparts would be impossible.

After all, do we not every one of us do the like? Under our representative system of government, as conducted on party lines, every man chooses his side, and is branded as a renegade if he thinks for himself and breaks away from party control. So, on entering a trade combination, many a firm which previously prided itself on its independence foregoes the right and dignity of individual action and control of its own affairs in the hope of benefiting by submission to a policy deemed best for the general good. In this respect the workman is no more a craven than the party politician or the wealthy monopolist. If one is wrong, all are wrong. If one is right, are they not all right? and cannot the principle and policy of combina-

<sup>1</sup> For an introductory article on this subject see *The Outlook* of April 18.

tion be carried still further and embrace in one union Consolidated Capital and Consolidated Labor?

While the aims of trade-unionists have always been essentially the same, the methods of enforcing their demands have varied as little. These are: strikes, and intimidation of non-union workmen. The one method is theoretically and economically wrong; the other is a crime.

The November, 1895, number of the "Bulletin of the Department of Labor" gives the following startling statistics, approximately correct, of the havoc caused by strikes between 1881-1894 in this country alone:

Number of establishments involved in strikes and lockouts,	75,234
"    strikes between 1881-1894.....	14,390
"    lockouts between 1881-1894.....	6,067
"    employees thrown out of employment by strikes,	3,714,406
"    employees thrown out of employment by lock-	
outs.....	366,690
LOSS OCCASIONED BY STRIKES BETWEEN 1881-1894	
Loss occasioned to employees .....	\$163,807,866
"    "    employers.....	82,590,386
LOSS OCCASIONED BY LOCKOUTS	
Loss occasioned to employees.....	\$26,685,516
"    "    employers.....	12,235,453
Total.....	\$285,319,209

There are no accurate statistics to show how many strikes have failed and how many have succeeded; but the same authority gives the following as approximately correct:

Strikes which have succeeded.....	44.49 per cent.
"    "    "    partially succeeded.....	11.25 "
"    "    "    failed.....	44.23 "
Lockouts which have succeeded.....	40.33 "
"    "    "    partially succeeded.....	9.58 "
"    "    "    failed.....	47.45 "

It is probable that the defeats have outnumbered the victories; but it is also more than probable that many demands would not have been acceded to had they not been made at the muzzle of that most destructive trade weapon—a threatened strike; for while a defeat depletes the treasury of the union, it works often incalculable loss to the victor, far greater prospectively, as well as immediately, than a reasonable concession would have involved. On the whole, therefore, the strike has proved an effective piece of armor for both attack and defense. The whole odium, however, of using these ruinous tactics should not be laid to the door of the unions; for under other names they have been resorted to by organized capital. The lockout is the counter-movement to the strike, and the boycott of an obnoxious railroad company by the Railroad Association, or the exclusion by a powerful corporation of the products of a weaker rival, or of a competitor, from a given market, are acts of coercion just as tyrannical and repulsive as, though more cunningly disguised than, the brutal assaults of unionists on non-union "scabs." It is true that "two blacks never made a white," and that the outrageous lawlessness and barbarous brutality of some trades-unionists cannot be condoned by quoting the high-handed exercise of power by corporations against their men, or of corporation against corporation. But till capital, which is controlled by men of higher education and intelligence, and who are not goaded to acts of heartlessness and lawlessness by want, abandons all such methods, blame and punishment should be meted out with rigid impartiality; for such acts, no matter by what side committed, are equally subversive of personal liberty and of social order. Such impartiality it is difficult to exercise amidst the prejudices of class, the temptations of trade, and the necessities of political ambition. It is wonderful, for instance, how tenderly the bravest politicians touch the gross abuses of law and right of which trade combinations and trade-unions are guilty. Even Mr. Cleveland, when commenting in his message on the atrocities perpetrated on Italian laborers by the miners of Colorado, does not direct a word of blame or warning against the culprits themselves, but traces the catastrophe back to the *padrone* system, which he can safely abuse without risk of forfeiting many votes.

One cannot, however, look at the enormous figures which represent the immediate loss and misery inflicted by

strikes and lockouts (and it must be recollected that the far greater consequential damage cannot be counted by dollars and cents) without being humiliated by the thought that our vaunted nineteenth-century civilization and Christianity have simply involved us in an industrial war of a most ruthless character. Christianity itself is certainly not guilty, nor is civilization to blame. Yet if they cannot effect a remedy, they will be virtually guilty of an anachronism.

The revolution against individualism and towards communism is a tendency attributable distinctly to advancing civilization; and it is to it that is due the combination of both capital and labor. Both forms of consolidation seem to be inevitable, and therefore, for this and other reasons, it seems to be sheer madness to think of suppressing trade-unionism by legislation or by force. For though the actual members of trade-unions may not outnumber all the other voters of the country, a vast majority would rally to the workman's standard if interference with the rights of the unions were made a political issue. Trades-unions are, therefore, an established social and economical force with us; and as heretofore this force has been used as a disturbing element only, it is a dangerous one. There is no use trying to disguise the fact that it is a focus of discontent and revolt, nor can it be supposed that the discontent will be dispelled by bayonets and bullets. We may sneer at Debs, but Debs would not have been able to masquerade as a dictator unless he had had a dangerous following. Nor is it reasonable to suppose that the thousands who left their work and their pay at his bidding did so out of servile obedience to his will, and without any feeling of personal wrong to be righted. The feeling may have been a fiction, and the wrong imaginary. If so, it should be the more easy to assuage the feeling and to disprove the wrong. But, considering how widespread is the irritation, whether it be warranted or not, and with what violence it expresses itself, it is simply the part of reason that capital should take account of the risk it runs by delaying to adopt, in the only way it can be done, efficient means to restore harmony by disproving the delusions under which labor rests, if they be delusions, or rectifying its wrongs, if they exist. Nothing will be gained by abusing labor organizations and their leaders, or by merely putting down violence by force, however necessary and justifiable that may be when the uprising occurs. Men smarting under defeat are the more easily convinced that their grievances are real and intolerable. They are therefore the more exposed to the blandishments of demagogues, and the more easily tempted to use their rights to organize, and to cast their votes at the polls for dangerous and revolutionary changes in our economical life.

But cannot the organizations of labor, so strong in numbers and often in the intelligence and the earnest disinterestedness of their leaders; and the organizations of capital, so skillfully constructed and so masterfully commanded by certain captains of industry and commerce, be used for conciliation as well as for war, and for peace as well as for the promotion of business interests? Many of the commanders of both armies are men not only of talent—for otherwise they would not occupy the positions they do—but men of lofty purpose and honest intention. What nobler work could they engage in than using their genius and influence to bridge the breach instead of widening it between capital which both need, and the labor to which the rich are so deeply indebted for their prosperity? It is in the highest degree praiseworthy on the part of Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Rockefeller to give of their millions to public purposes, to build libraries and music-halls, and to endow universities. One is inclined to wonder betimes whether it might not have been better for the people at large had they never made so many millions, but instead of accumulating it had distributed in higher wages among their workmen and in cheaper goods to the community what they now give away in great benefactions. But, be that as it may, they must be men of exceeding liberality and public-spiritedness thus to dispense wealth which once won becomes so dear to the owner. Or take, again, a man like Mr. Depew, whose tact and many mental resources



have been so well trained and turned to such good account that they have raised him to a position where he is intrusted with the management of hundreds of millions, and whence—and that is a more responsible dignity still—he is the arbiter of over ten thousand lives. These men are all great organizers. They are all men who by their personal qualities have exercised immense influence over such of their fellow-men as they have come into contact with, for single-handed they could not have accomplished what they have.

On the other hand, no one knows better than they that some at least of their opponents, who control the labor unions, are men of talent, fairness, and even moderation. What would be the result if these leaders of men would try to forget the past, except in so far as it can teach lessons of wisdom for the future, and would form a combination of great hearts and strong hands with the determined purpose of deliberately reviewing this terrible labor question and discussing it dispassionately? While peace reigns is the fit time for such peace-preserving action. If undertaken by these men, who have never failed in less laudable pursuits, they would certainly not fail in this, nor would the experiment be tried for the first time. They would make it with the help which the experience of others would give them. The Board of Arbitration and Conciliation of the iron trade of the North of England, which grew out of the great strike of 1866, was made possible only by the organization formed for offensive warfare by the men and the ironmasters. Strikes and lockouts at the time followed each other till they were seen by both sides to be insanely suicidal. Then, chiefly through the initiative of Mr. David Dale, a scheme on the general line of that successfully inaugurated by Mr. Mundella in the woolen trade of the Midland counties was proposed and accepted by both sides. It has worked well, and averted incalculable misery. Each works appoints a master and a workman delegate. They meet in general conference twice a year to adjust wages and discuss disputes which could not be settled through a standing committee or by the delegate and the foreman of the works, with whom grievances do, or in most cases are supposed to, originate. Only in the rare cases where men and masters cannot adjust their differences has arbitration been resorted to. The spirit of trustfulness in the men, where they have reason to believe in the honesty and ability of their employers, cannot be more convincingly expressed than by their having several times agreed to submit the differences to Mr. Dale himself as arbitrator. Mr. Dale, now Sir David Dale, on the presentation to him, some years ago, of his portrait by the joint board of masters and men, made the following remarks, which should certainly carry weight, as the utterance of perhaps the largest employer of labor in the North of England: "I have just ventured to say that the system has secured peace and regular work; for although there have been from time to time ebullitions of feeling at an award deemed by some of the men whom it affected to be unreasonable, if not unfair; although there have even been loud assertions that an award would not be accepted, and in a few cases actual resistance to its adoption, the loyalty of the general body of men has always shown itself, and, supported by this and by public opinion, the men's leaders have quelled promptly all attempts at repudiation, and have brought into submission those who threatened revolt. Let me, therefore, declare emphatically, as the result of long and varied experience, that the best security that employers can have for the rule of reason and the observance of engagements on the part of the operatives of any trade is that those operatives should have among themselves a union strong in numbers and with an able and thoroughly trusted executive."

Do such men compose the executives of our labor unions? and would the ambitious but heretofore futile endeavor to control the unions by federated labor organizations aid or interfere? These and other doubts and questionings cannot be summarily answered, for were there an earnest and conciliatory temper displayed by the employers, it would probably be responded to by the men, and the counsels of the more headstrong be less heeded than they are to-day.

At any rate, the machinery by which these irritating disputes can be adjusted exists, though constructed for more ignoble purposes, and therefore, if it could be used for these nobler aims, organization would justify its claims to be one of the highest developments of our modern civilization, and the men who are justly proud of being the creators and stimulators of many of our great industries would thus, with still better reason, deserve well of their country and mankind.



## Glimpses of Buddhism

### A Conversation with Two Buddhist Priests

By the Rev. Amory H. Bradford, D.D.

The two largest buildings that I remember in Kyoto, if not in Japan, are the huge Hongwange Temples—the Eastern and the Western. They both belong to the Shin Shiu sect of Buddhists; both are vast and beautiful, but the Western, near the Buddhist College, is the older. The Eastern, which has been completed but a few years, is fresh and new, and one of the largest places of worship in the world. Both buildings are entirely of wood, even to the noble pillars that support the large and, to Occidental eyes, top-heavy roof. Connected with the older temple is a labyrinth of buildings and gardens, which is one of the sights of that ancient capital, to my mind even more beautiful than the Imperial palace and the castle in the same city.

On the last day of November, 1895, through the courtesy of a prominent citizen of Kyoto, and in company with Professor Moreta, Dean of the Theological Department of the Doshisha University, who acted as interpreter, I was permitted to visit and converse with the two priests of these temples—both of them authors and thoroughly representative men. At the Western Hongwange Temple we were received in the reception-room of the series of buildings mentioned above. At the entrance we removed our shoes, and entered in our stockings. The floors of the long corridors were polished like glass, and the rooms opening from them covered with the whitest of matting. Only in the apartment which we entered was any furniture visible. In that were a table, a few chairs, and a stool on which was a *hibachi* (a little jar with charcoal burning). By an obsequious but exquisitely polite old man, probably a servant, we were welcomed. In due time the priest, Professor Fujishima, made his appearance. He was short in stature, with bright black eyes, round head, a mustache, and looked much like a Frenchman in Japanese dress. Indeed, he had spent several years as a student in France. Apparently he was about forty years of age. With low bows we were greeted, and had hardly taken our seats when the old servant brought in three cups of tea, and over them we conversed. A few of the questions and answers are here given. After the proper formalities had passed between us, I asked: "What relation, in your opinion, do Buddhism and Christianity bear to one another? And is there any basis on which they may co-operate?" He replied, as might have been expected from one of his sect, that Christianity was one form or phase of Buddhism. To the question of co-operation he gave no reply. I asked how Buddhism, as he understood it, and Christianity differed. He replied that the first difference was in the idea of the Deity; the Christians regarding him as a creative person, and the Buddhists as the product of eternal causation. When I asked what was behind that process of causation, he replied, "The ultimate reality." When I asked, "Is that ultimate reality personal?" he gave no definite answer, at least none that I could understand. We passed from that to the subject of sin, concerning which he spoke as follows: "Sin as an offense against an infinite and holy God has no existence. Sin has relation only to the man sinning. The evil-doer weaves a web around himself as the silkworm weaves its cocoon." The Professor was peculiarly vivid as he pictured each man making his own destiny for himself, and living independent of any divine power—an eddy in an infinite and eternal stream