THE ETHICS OF LABOR

By
FATHER CUTHBERT, O.S.F.C.

New York
THE PAULIST PRESS
401 West 59th Street

THE ETHICS OF LABOR

BY FATHER CUTHBERT, O.S.F.C.

IN considering the industrial restlessness of today, it is well to bear in mind that the question of wages no longer constitutes the fundamental problem of the Labor aspiration. What the working-class is claiming as its right and what it is restlessly seeking to achieve, is not merely nor primarily a just wage, but that its labor and the conditions of labor shall be an expression of human personality. The worker wants not merely to exist, but to live a human life and to find in his work the freedom to express and develop himself. A man may receive just and generous wages and yet be a mere tool or machine in the hands of his employer; a mere *thing*, industrially considered, and not a human being with personal interests clamoring to be recognized. The motive underlying the movement of organized Labor today is to obtain such recognition both for the personality of the worker and for his human interests. The organized workers now demand economic freedom as well as a just re-

muneration. As one writer puts it: "They want greater security as regards employment and better provision for their old age; the opportunity of taking a greater interest in their work; and more freedom as to the ordering of their own lives." [1] Nothing less than that will satisfy the more intelligent worker; and we may all add, nothing less will satisfy the awakened Christian conscience.

It need hardly be said that the Catholic Church in its ethical teaching is at one with this new development in the Labor movement, with its claim that every man shall have as his natural due the *status* of a free agent in the disposal of his labor and the ordering of his own life, and in asserting the principle that the ultimate object of labor is not the acquisition of wages, but the development of human life and character. Thus, for instance, Leo XIII., in his Encyclical, *Rerum novarum,* on the condition of the working class, declares: "If the owners of property should be made secure, the workingman in like manner has property and belongings in respect to which he should be protected; and foremost of all, his soul and mind. . . . No man may with impunity outrage that human dignity which God Himself treats with reverence, nor stand in the way of that higher

1 H. Sanderson Furniss, in *The Industrial Outlook* (London, 1917), Introductory, p. 16.

life which is the preparation of the eternal life of heaven. Nay, more; no man has in this matter power over himself. To consent to any treatment which is calculated to defeat the end and purpose of his being is beyond his right; he cannot give up his soul to servitude; for it is not man's own rights which are here in question, but the rights of God, the most sacred and inviolable of rights."[2] Hence, the Pope continues: "It is neither just nor human so to grind men down with excessive labor as to stupefy their minds and wear out their bodies."[3] Further, having regard to the same principle, he lays down that the employer who exploits the necessity of the worker, to enforce an insufficient wage or inhuman conditions of labor, infringes the "dictates of natural justice (which is) more imperious and ancient than any bargain between man and man."[4] And he suggests that "in these and similar questions, such as, for example, the hours of labor in different trades, the sanitary precautions to be observed in factories and workshops," etc., society or boards either of the workers themselves or of employers and employed should be formed "to safeguard the interests of the wage-earners"—an anticipation of that demand for a share in the control of labor,

[2] See *The Pope and the People* (Catholic Truth Society. Edit., 1912), pp. 203, 204.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 204.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 207.

which is now generally adopted by Labor organizers.

Throughout, the keynote of the Encyclical is the principle that conditions of labor shall be made more human and less servile, and for that reason that the worker be placed in a condition of greater economic freedom both as regards his security against want and the conditions of his labor. The worker is to be regarded as a human agent and not a mere tool; and as one who has the right *by means of his labor* to achieve a wholesome human existence, since, as the Pope says, it is only by his labor that he can preserve and develop himself. His necessity gives him the right to such conditions of labor as will enable him to achieve a complete human existence. Moreover, the same necessity demands that he should claim this right;[5] since, as the Pope says, "a man cannot give up his soul to servitude." Yet that is just what he was required to do under the economic system hitherto prevalent in modern industry. Nor is he relieved of that servitude merely by receiving a higher wage, he simply sells his soul at a higher rate, unless the essential conditions of servitude are abolished. To continue to blunt his mind and soul by excessive bodily labor, to go through the continuous monotony of a machine-

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 206.

existence, to be perpetually harassed by the insecurity of labor dependent on the arbitrary will of an employer; to have to work in circumstances degrading to body and soul—under such conditions labor cannot but be demoralizing, however high the rate of wage might be.

The new conscious aim in Labor organization, which puts human personality in the foreground and explicitly regards wages and material advantages as mere means to an end, has undoubtedly a higher human and ethical quality than was found in the purely materialistic schools of economics: and for that reason deserves the sympathetic attention of all Catholics.

The fact that this new purpose on the part of the Labor Organizations is associated among certain sections with a policy of expropriation, hardly distinguished, if at all, from confiscation of the capitalist's property, must not blind us to the justice of the main purpose itself; nor is it helpful to the cause of the Catholic Church to regard merely the extravagances and more violently revolutionary forms of the movement and to ignore the saner teaching of those who regard an economic revolution as inevitable, but believe that, with reasonableness on all sides, a just and peaceful solution of the problem is possible. That the economic system must be radically changed in

many ways, few will be found to doubt, who have given any serious attention to the subject. Capitalism in the forms in which it has hitherto dominated the industrial world, is bound sooner or later to give way before the growing unity and consciousness of power among the workers; just as in the latter Middle Ages, feudalism had to give way before the growing power of the commercial class.

The only question today is whether this radical economic change can be brought about peacefully by a mutual recognition of reasonable claims on the part of the employer and the worker, or whether a violent solution is inevitable. If either party refuses to treat with the other in a spirit of reasonableness and with intent to recognize the fundamental principles of justice underlying the situation, then violent revolution, in the opinion of sane and impartial observers, will surely come: and unfortunately on both sides there are those who are prepared to stake their all upon a violent issue. If that issue is to be avoided, it is needful that all who wish for a peaceful solution should unite in a careful and sympathetic consideration of the ethical questions involved. For, after all, the problem as it presents itself today, is primarily and ultimately an ethical problem. "It is not merely discontent as to wages, but dissatisfac-

tion with their lives as wage-earners, that lies at the heart of the trouble." [6]

Undoubtedly the question of wages is the first practical consideration, since a man must have sufficient to provide for his bodily sustenance, if he is to cultivate mind and soul: and as connected with wages, come proper housing and whatever is needful for a healthy bodily existence. But beyond a just wage, there are other conditions to which the worker has a rightful claim, if he is to live a properly human life and not be degraded to the level of a mere tool or to a condition of servitude. As we have seen, these conditions are mainly three: security against unemployment, a larger control in the management of his work, and a greater liberty in the ordering of his own life. Ethically, his right to these conditions is undeniable, provided, of course, that he is capable of fulfilling the duties which go with the rights; since every right has a corresponding duty with which it is indissolubly connected in the sphere of morals.

The first of these conditions, then, is security against unemployment. The ethical right to this security is derived from the fact that the worker's labor is a necessity. He must work in order to

[6] H. Sanderson Furniss, in *The Industrial Outlook*, Introductory, p. 16.

live. In the words of Leo XIII.: "The preservation of life is the bounden duty of one and all, and to be wanting therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to procure what is required in order to live; and the poor can procure it in no other way than through work and wages."[7] If this be so, it follows that every worker, dependent on his work, has a certain right to employment and to security against unemployment. Employment is for him a necessity of life. It may be said, of course, that his moral claim is not so much to employment as to the means of living, and that, consequently, so long as he is otherwise provided for, for instance by charity, he has no claim to employment. That might be so if merely bodily subsistence had to be thought of: but in dealing with human life one has to consider a man's self-respect and the general well-being of society at large.

No honest man willingly submits to be a drone in the community or to receive from others the wages of work whilst remaining unemployed, when he is capable of doing useful work. To force any man into a position in which his self-respect suffers, is to degrade him. St. Paul's words: "If a man will not work neither let him eat," expresses at once a social obligation and a

[7] *The Pope and the People*, p. 207.

proper sense of personal dignity. Every man, thus, has a right as well as a duty to some sort of useful employment: it is a condition of an honorable human existence. But in the case of the worker whose only honorable means of subsistence depends upon marketable labor, the rightful claim to employment and security against unemployment has a specific significance. But his ethical right in this matter of security is further derived from the fact that without a reasonable certainty of being able to maintain himself and those dependent on him, the anxiety about merely material things, must take away his due liberty in the cultivation of his mental and spiritual interests. A normal healthy cultivation of mind and soul can with difficulty be achieved without a reasonable security against material want.

Indeed, there can be hardly any question as to the moral right underlying the worker's claim to security against unemployment. Less clear, perhaps, is the determination as to the incidence of the obligation to provide such security. There are those who would put the entire obligation upon the State; others would share the obligation between the State and the employer. But to put the entire obligation on the State is to assume a sphere of activity and responsibility on the part of the State towards the individual, which log-

ically leads to a servile State. The wider the responsibility taken over by the State in the ordering of the individual's life, the less individual liberty there will be. In a free community ethical responsibilities must fall in the first place upon the individuals concerned, and only secondarily upon the State as the protector of the rights of the community and of the freedom of individuals. Doubtless in a matter which affects the general well-being of the community so vitally as does the Labor problem, the State must necessarily intervene very largely, especially during a transitional period such as the present. That necessity of State intervention, however, will be less in proportion as employers of Labor regard security against unemployment not merely as a matter of national expediency, but as a principle of inherent justice in the status of the worker which directly enters into the moral character of the contract between employer and worker.

The worker, dependent as he is upon his work, has a moral claim to security against unemployment, and that claim must enter into the contract between himself and his employer. When, for instance, a professional teacher demands "security of tenure" as well as a fixed salary, the demand is not merely arbitrary, but is based in a true sense of moral right. He may be forced by

necessity to accept a position in a school which leaves him in constant danger of being arbitrarily dismissed to suit the convenience of the school manager, perhaps at a time when further employment may be difficult to obtain. But in accepting such a position through force of necessity, "he is made the victim of force and injustice," [8] just as truly as when he is forced to accept an unjust wage. Arbitrary dismissal, which takes into consideration merely the convenience or advantage of the employer without consideration for the well-being of the worker, is thus a real injustice. We are, of course, assuming that the worker is fulfilling his part of the "national bargain" by honestly discharging the duties he has undertaken; as otherwise he himself has broken his contract and has forfeited his claim upon the employer. Cases may indeed arise in which, through no fault of his own, the worker may be incapable of continuing in the service of the employer through a change of conditions which are of general advantage, as well as to the employer's interest: as for instance when new machinery or methods of higher scientific value are introduced into a manufactory. Yet in such cases there can be no doubt that the employer is under an obligation to do what he can to secure new employment to

[8] *Cf. The Pope and the People*, p. 207.

the honest worker; he cannot, without a violation of justice, dismiss him with no regard for the future: just because in the worker he is dealing with a human life and not with a mere tool.

But if this is true, then the worker has surely a right to take due measures that his just claim shall be safeguarded against the employer's arbitrary decision and, if need be, to invoke the intervention of the State. Whether the actual methods proposed by Trade Unions for enforcing this right are commendable or not, is another question. They have been accused of thinking too exclusively of the workers' rights and too little of their duties. If that be so, they will, in the long run, defeat their own ends. There is, however, evidence that amongst the leaders of the Labor propaganda, a keen sense of the workers' responsibilities is manifesting itself, and that an increasing insistence is being laid upon the workers' efficiency in labor and upon self-discipline. Without efficiency and self-discipline on the workers' part, it is felt that no real progress can be made towards the further achievement of the new Labor ideal: and this should go far towards bringing about a peaceful understanding between the employers and employed.

Here, however, we are concerned with the essential claim itself that the worker should have

security against unemployment, and on ethical grounds the claim cannot be denied. At the same time the duty of safeguarding the worker against unemployment does not rest with the employer alone.[9] The worker himself has his coördinate share in the responsibility. Everyone will admit that no employer is obliged to keep in employment an idle or dishonest worker: nor can any individual employer be justly forced to employ or to retain in employment the inefficient who is incapable of earning his wage at least, when the incapability is not brought about by the employer's own act. These limitations of the employer's responsibility points to a corresponding duty on the part of the worker and of those upon whom the worker is naturally dependent. It is at once clear that if the worker has an ethical right to employment, he has a duty to fit himself for employment and to do what in him lies to justify his claim to be employed. Not only must he be honest and willing to work: he must also do his part in fitting himself for the work demanded of him by the needs of the community. This is a duty he owes at once to himself and to the com-

9 We are not considering here the duty of the employer to provide for those who have given good service and are incapacitated by age or sickness. Such provision is part of the question of wages. Nor are we referring here to the accidental inefficiency of the worker, caused by some action of the employer, as when a change of method is introduced. In such a case, as already noticed, a certain responsibility lies on the employer.

munity at large: he owes it to himself since work is an essential necessity in his life; he owes it to the community since otherwise he runs the risk of becoming a mere burden upon his fellow-men, and of fulfilling no useful part in the life of the community upon which he must ultimately fall back for his maintenance.

This duty of fitting oneself for useful employment is the one, perhaps, which the worker has most consistently ignored, or concerning which he has been too frequently left in ignorance. The fault is not altogether his, nor primarily his; it lies chiefly in the apathy or thoughtlessness of those who are responsible for his education.

Yet efficiency in labor is an integral element in the full moral claim to employment. No man who deliberately ignores his duty to fit himself for employment, can justly claim, on his own merits, security against unemployment; simply because he has not fulfilled his proper part as regards that anterior dictate of justice upon which all particular bargaining depends for its ethical obligation. The State may indeed, in the public interest, intervene to give him employment; but in such a case he becomes a dependent on the State rather than a free worker. Liberty, it must be remembered, is essentially bound up with capacity and duty: economic freedom in the fullest

sense is for those who are capable and willing to do their part in the community's economic life.

And here, it would seem, comes in one of the more abiding duties of the State in the matter of securing the freedom of the worker and that security against unemployment which is part of that freedom. Allowing that the moral obligation towards efficiency of labor lies primarily with the individual and those immediately responsible for his early education, and, not least, to the Trade Unions which take the responsibility of enforcing his rights—allowing this, it yet remains for the State in the interest of the community at large, to give due opportunity for the worker's education and training, such as will fit him for his future work; and not only to give the opportunity, but to take such means as will best secure that the opportunity is not neglected. Further, it is the duty of the State to see that this security against unemployment enters into the bargain between employers and employed, and is not jeopardized by merely arbitrary action of either employer or worker. Thus, for instance, when new processes or methods are introduced into any industry, the State should insist that the change be made so as to minimize the danger of the worker finding himself without employment as a consequence of the change.

The proper action of the State is, however, limited. It cannot so control the conditions of industry as to leave no personal freedom to either employer or worker in the control of labor; for that would cut at the very root of personal responsibility and consequently of real personal liberty. But it can protect both employer and worker against the mere arbitrariness of physical or moral force, and it can also give opportunities which conduce to the fulfillment of moral obligations. The giving of these opportunities is indeed its most positive contribution to economic freedom, and more directly constructive than any restrictive or "police" intervention.

Such action the worker and the community at large can justly claim from the State. Thus education in the broadest sense, and such an education as will best develop the capacity of the worker to earn his living, is the worker's most urgent claim upon the State, since it is intimately bound up with the whole claim of the worker to economic freedom: without it the worker will always be in a servile condition either towards the individual employer or the State, just because the uneducated and inefficient worker is unable to stand upon his own merits, and is forced to depend upon the bounty either of the individual employer or of the community at large. As we have said,

security against unemployment may be guaranteed by the State even to the inefficient on grounds of public policy: yet it is well for the worker clearly to recognize that his indefeasible moral right to security is ultimately bound up with his personal capacity and efficiency.

We come now to the second of the three claims put forward by the Labor Organizations: "a larger control in the management of his work." The term "larger control" needs, perhaps, definition. To the Syndicalist, it signifies the expropriation of the capitalist and the entire management of industry by the workers. The ordinary Trade Unionist demand has, however, been thus expressed by one of their representatives: "Would it not be possible for the employers of this country to agree to put their business on a new footing by admitting the workman to some participation, not in profits, but in control? We workmen do not ask that we should be admitted to any share in what is essentially the employer's own business —that is, in those matters which do not concern us directly in the industry or employment in which we may be engaged. But in the daily management of the employment in which we spend our working lives, we feel that we, as workmen, have a right to a voice—even an equal voice—with the

management itself."[10] This seems to be the general demand at the present moment; and it has already been accepted by some employers with some acknowledged measure of success.

So far neither Syndicalism nor Guild-Socialism have secured the adherence of any large number of workers: and that for two reasons. The average worker has no wish to concern himself with what is outside the sphere of his labor itself. "They have no wish to be responsible for the purchase of raw material, for the raising of capital, the marketing of produce," etc.[11] Moreover, the workingmen as a body are well aware that they have not the training which will fit them to discharge the function in industry at present discharged by the employer. This does not mean that the Syndicalist or Guild-Socialist ideals may not yet gain a larger support. Much will depend upon the general attitude of employers, whether Collectivism or Syndicalism and kindred systems will further draw to themselves the allegiance of the workers, as an escape from conditions against which they now revolt. As they stand at present, all these systems are ethically objectionable inasmuch as they unduly curtail personal liberty:[12]

[10] Mr. Gosling, at the Trade Union Congress, 1916, quoted in *The Industrial Outlook*, p. 398.

[11] H. Sanderson Furniss, in *The Industrial Outlook*, p. 17.

[12] On this point see the Encyclical, *Rerum novarum*, in *The Pope and the People*, p. 189, *et seq.*

at the best they propose to substitute one form of servitude for another: and that doubtless is what the common sense of the majority of the workers is aware of.

At the same time, however, whilst rejecting on ethical grounds the Socialist systems as generally propounded, there is no ethical reason why, under new economic conditions, the worker should not aim at becoming a part-owner in industry, provided that the transfer of ownership is brought about without injustice to others and that due regard is had to individual liberty. What is true of a wider division of property in land, as advocated by Leo XIII., equally applies to a wider extension of property in industry. "Many excellent results," says the Pope, "will follow upon this; and first of all, property will certainly become more equitably divided. For the result of civil change and revolution has been to divide society into two widely differing castes. On the one side there is the party which holds power because it holds wealth; which has in its grasp the whole of labor and trade; which manipulates for its own benefit and its own purposes all the sources of supply, and which is even represented in the councils of the State itself. On the other side there is the needy and the powerless multitude, broken-down and suffering, and ever ready for disturb-

ance. If working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the consequence will be that the gulf between vast wealth and sheer poverty will be bridged over and the respective classes will be brought nearer to each other. A further consequence will result in the greater abundance of the fruits of the earth. Men always work harder and more readily when they work on that which belongs to them. . . . That such a spirit of willing labor would add to the produce of the earth and to the wealth of the community is self-evident. And a third advantage would spring from this: men would cling to the country in which they were born; for no one would exchange his country for a foreign land if his own afforded him the means of living a decent and happy life."[13] The same economic and human results, we take it, would follow were the workers to be given some ownership in any industry in which they are employed; and such ownership would meet with the blessing of the Church, equally with ownership in land.

But at present the vast body of workers are not claiming such ownership: what they do claim is a greater control over their labor itself or rather over the conditions under which they are required

[13] *The Pope and the People*, p. 208.

to labor.[14] It may be pointed out that here again they have the approval and encouragement of Pope Leo XIII., when he says, speaking of the function of Labor Associations: "Should it happen that either a master or a workman believe himself injured, nothing would be more desirable than a committee should be appointed, composed of reliable and capable members of the Association, whose duty would be, conformably with the rules of the Association, to settle the dispute." Already he had declared that the purpose of these Associations should be to help "each individual member to better his condition to the utmost in body, mind and property." [15]

Here we have in principle an acknowledgment of the right of the worker to a share in the control of the conditions which govern his labor. And the right flows from the same fundamental fact which in the mind of the Pope and of the Labor Organizations is the cardinal principle of economic reform, that the worker is a human being and not a tool. As such he has a right to a certain control over his own activity, so far at least that his activity shall conduce to his proper welfare

[14] What is wanted is that the work people should have a greater opportunity of participating in the discussion about and adjustment of those parts of industry by which they are most affected (Whetley Interim Report).

[15] *The Pope and the People*, pp. 214-216.

and not be a means of degrading him in body or mind. This applies not merely to the material conditions of his labor: it applies even more urgently to the mental and spiritual conditions. Even granting that the conditions which directly affect his bodily welfare—wages, sanitation, etc.—are what they should be, there is yet the further consideration of his mental and spiritual development to which his labor should rightly conduce. One of the curses of labor under the modern industrial régime has been its tendency to stunt the mind and character of the worker; and this has been due not merely to overwork and an insufficient wage, but to the atmosphere of servitude, the dull monotony and the sense that the worker has no voice in the control of his labor.

Thus, under the prevailing system, he is not consulted about matters which directly concern his convenience or comfort; it is not considered necessary to give him any reasonable explanation of the cause which renders expedient changes of routine or method which directly affect him. If new processes are adopted, the change is made with little or no consideration for the worker himself, though the worker may have given the best years of his life to building up the industry, and has thereby acquired a vested interest in the industry, in virtue of his labor, equally with the

vested interest of the owner. Still less has the worker been encouraged to develop any personal thought or initiative in his labor. Under such a system men naturally tend to become mere machines instead of intelligent, responsible beings: and with perfect justice they may refuse to continue in such servitude, provided they are willing to accept the responsibilities which their new freedom entails.[16] For it may be well to repeat, in all cases it is true: the greater the freedom, the greater the moral responsibility, and there is no right without its corresponding duty.

How far a greater control in the arrangement in the conditions of his labor, will tend to relieve the monotony and mechanism of the industrial world, is a question difficult to answer. There are those who claim that the mechanical industry of the present day is radically soul-killing; that with the over-development of machinery and the narrow limitations imposed by specialist labor in the modern manufactory, no workman can be otherwise than part of the machinery itself, nor be other than a servile worker. Those who hold this view, plead for a revival of handcrafts and

16 One is glad to know that in practice where this greater control has been granted, the result has usually been greater efficiency and orderliness. Much depends upon the spirit in which it is granted. An employer who is sympathetic to the new system, will gain more from it than one who is unsympathetic and so fails to gain the confidence of the workers.

the simpler forms of labor. Be that as it may—and there is much to be said in favor of it—it yet remains true that a greater control over the conditions of his labor will give the worker a sense of greater freedom, and open out to him an opportunity of developing a greater sense of responsibility in his work: so far it will create a more human atmosphere in industry. Very rightly the worker regards outside arbitration, except as an occasional necessity, with repugnance: it is but shifting to other shoulders the responsibility which he, equally with the employer, should take upon himself. That is the feeling of the more serious thinkers amongst the advocates of "greater control:" and it is a right moral feeling, if the worker is to be raised economically to the status of a human being.

With this claim to greater control over the conditions of labor goes the still wider claim that the workers should have "a larger freedom as to the ordering of their own lives." This claim is social rather than economic, though it is intimately bound up with economic conditions. What it signifies is that the worker shall be given the opportunities for the development of those human interests which make for the fuller enjoyment of life; or in the current phrase, for "the expression of personality, individual and collective," not

merely in the workshop, but in social life generally. With the majority of the workers this "larger liberty" is probably an indefinite quantity: it expresses an opportunity of doing what they like with themselves outside the daily routine of their work: it is a more or less blind revolt against the feeling of servitude. But with the more thoughtful section of the labor class, however, it means a fuller enjoyment of family life, education in the true sense of the word, a wider extension of personal interests, a greater freedom for mental and spiritual betterment. All these things under the old economic *régime* have been made difficult for the worker; and who will say that he has not a right to them?

The candid recognition of these rights will doubtless mean a radical change in the conditions of labor and, to some extent, a remodeling of the whole economic system. Wages will have to be based not upon the necessity of mere bodily subsistence, but upon the right of the worker to the enjoyment of a fuller human existence; the hours of paid employment will have to be restricted to allow leisure and opportunity for other interests. But further than that, the mental atmosphere in which employer and worker meet, will have to be radically changed. Employment will have to be no longer dominated by the idea of material

profit—whether in the form of dividends or of wages—but by the idea of human welfare: and it is here that the real *crux* of the situation lies, for it means a conversion from the material outlook on life to the ethical, and without this change there can be no hope of a peaceful solution of the difficulties involved in the new Labor demands.

Two things, it would seem, render a peaceful solution problematical. The one is the natural cupidity of men, fostered and intensified by the materialist social economy of the past three or four centuries, and especially intensified by the industrial system of the nineteenth century. The other is the blind acceptance of that system as a law of public life by the general body of Christian men and women, who, in their private personal affairs, are guided by high ethical ideals. This blind acquiescence on the part of otherwise high-minded people, is, perhaps, the greater danger of the two: since it tends, in the eyes of those who are demanding a more ethical system, to identify the present materialist economy with the Christian life, and to throw a glamour of ethical respectability over the recalcitrance of those who uphold that economy. That way lies religious and class warfare. What we shall all be wise to recognize is that a fundamental change in the economic

and social system lies before us and is, in fact, already taking place: and if it is to be brought about without violence and a disruption of society, it will only be by an unprejudiced and candid acknowledgment of what is right and just in the aspirations of the workers.

Frequently enough, the claims put forward by this or that section of organized Labor, are as unethical and materialist in outlook as are those of the employers who exploit labor for their own selfish ends. The worker is still, to a great extent, the child of the unethical and irreligious system against which he revolts: yet that must not blind us to what is his just right, and only as he becomes conscious of a willingness on the part of the employers and of the public generally, to consider his claims in the spirit of justice and equity, will he be effectually convinced that others have rights too. Until then he will stand in an attitude of suspicion and revolt. The present is a time for taking the larger view, which looks not to a selfish and narrow material advantage, but to that ethical value which determines the rights and wrongs of human life. And by none should this "larger view" be taken more deliberately and earnestly than by Catholics.

We Catholics cannot admit—if we are true to the teaching of the Church—that economics must

stand apart from ethics and religion: we cannot admit the materialistic character of industrial life. We must look to the moral and spiritual ends which alone justify any system which affects human lives. Too frequently Catholics, whether of the employing class or of the employed, are content to fall in with the ways of the world round about them without considering whether the view or the action they fall in with is in harmony with the Faith they profess. Were it not so, the Church today would be in a far stronger position as an influence in the world's industrial life, since so much in the "advanced" aspirations of the Labor Organizations finds its sanction in Catholic teaching, and is little more than a return towards Catholic ideals.