

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE III.

THE GROWING SOCIALISM.

BY THE REVEREND ANDREW BURNS CHALMERS.

“ALL that I have is mine, and all that you have is mine if I can get it,” is an expression of the selfish individualism of our race at the beginning. Every babe begins where the race began,—in selfishness. The great race-man was ready selfishly to seize and appropriate everything, bidden and forbidden; the baby of to-day will toddle off his own yard to the playground of his little neighbor, and become a first-class freebooter. To the strong baby belong the spoils of the selfish struggle. Each individual is a miniature of the race. The human family began in individualism, and is surely, if slowly, going toward socialism; the individual always begins in selfishness, and gradually grows toward unselfishness. The last man of the race must win anew in his personal life the victories that all the struggles of our humanity have won since the beginning. All the dead ancestors of a man arise from the grave of a hundred thousand years, and compel him—a new child of the race—to conquer them anew, on his march toward the goal of goodness.

If each individual has, gathered up in his completed physical life, all the elementary forms of animal life, from the simplest protoplasmic process to the Divine-human form, shall he not personally pass through all the degrees of growth, mentally and morally? At one period in his development he has no more mentality than a tadpole; at another, no more spirituality than a Hottentot.

Original sin was man's earliest possession, according to theologians; if proved that he had original sin, it was his only possession, according to biologists. The theologian and the scientist believe now that man had no more original sin than he had original art or science or literature. He had nothing originally except a bundle of hereditary tendencies, plus a power, not his own, that has made for progress. The race goes back to Adam to find Eden; the individual finds both Adam and Eden in his personal history. If the race has a memory of an Eden, where all were perfect and innocent, the individual has the same memory of a time when he lived unconscious of selfish choices and innocent of willful transgression. A baby without clothing and without shame is in Eden. He must go from Eden, even as the race did, and the Eden of the future for him is better than the Eden of the past, even as it is for the race. Wherever there are undeveloped and unclothed races or individuals, there is Eden to-day.

The "flaming swords" that kept the first man from returning to the race-Eden, forbid the last man from returning to his personal Eden of ignorant innocence. Eden for the race was individualism; Eden for the individual is the territory of selfishness out of which he came. Both the race and the individual began in selfishness, and must acquire the virtue of service. Socialism has grown, and is growing, from individualism. Man began to care only for himself; he has learned to care for others. The naturalist now believes, with the moralist, that care for others is as necessary for the development of the race as self-care.

The ethical tendency has from the beginning been altruistic. The first selfish conception, "what I have is mine, and what you have is mine if I can get it," became modified to this statement: "What I have is mine, and what you have is yours if you can keep it." This was an evident advance in the moral standard; it was an expres-

sion of justice. Men came to feel that the strong should not take everything from the weak.

The Mosaic legislation is the most ancient expression of this law of justice. That legislation is summed up in the statement, "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." Fifteen hundred years before Christ, when they took both eyes for one, it was a distinct ethical progress to get men to be willing to take only one eye. In a time when the taking of one tooth cost the offender all his teeth, it must have seemed too high a standard for men to reach, to take only "a tooth for a tooth." The good man was the one who took an eye for an eye; the bad man, the one who took both eyes for one.

This law of justice is the foundation of much of our modern business. A man is considered honest who gives an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. Justice led to mercy. Now the ideal expression of life is this: All that you have is yours, and all that I have is yours if you need it. This altruistic principle seems very difficult of attainment. Men say that it is too high a standard for human life. One cannot behold the selfishness of his day, and believe that society is living by this law of love; one cannot take the age view, and doubt that society is moving in this direction. There are evidences of progress from individualism to socialism.

If it took ten thousand years for men to pass from "All I have is mine, and all you have is mine," to "All I have is mine, and all you have is yours," it may also take ten thousand years to prepare the world to say, "All you have is yours, and all I have is yours to serve you in the highest things." Ethnology teaches that the race began in selfishness; history proves that the world has been going from selfishness to service. The present generation is witness to the truth, that the movement toward altruism is still in progress.

True socialism, which has its foundation in love, is sometimes confused with anarchism. They are distinctly opposite. Anarchism grows out of hatred; socialism is the fruit of love. Anarchism selfishly says: "You must give me what you have"; true socialism generously says: "We should give of what we have." Anarchism wants to get; socialism wants to give. Anarchism is for self; socialism is for others. Anarchism is waning; socialism is waxing. Anarchism says: "All yours is mine"; socialism says: "All mine is yours, if I may serve your real life." Socialism is founded on, "We should bear one another's burdens," said by the strong in recognition of the debt of duty to the weak. When the law is, "Every man for himself," the Devil gets the foremost as well as the hindmost. When the law becomes, "Every man for his neighbor," the Devil, or selfishness, will be no more; for the kingdom of kindness will have come, and coöperation, instead of competition, will then be the law of life.

The socialism of love was manifested by the early Christian church. They shared—the weak with the strong—in the common possessions and opportunities. It was the socialism of love, and not the socialism of law, that compelled them "to give to all men as every man had need." Socialism that is the result of an inward love usually leads to a socialism of outward law; but the socialism of love is before the socialism of law. This fundamental idea of socialism,—that each is to serve; that the strong belong to the weak for help; that the wise owe much to the unwise; that the good have a debt of service to the bad,—is revolutionizing our present thinking and living. All power, individual, institutional, or national, must be judged by this law of service.

The suicidal competitive system in business is doomed. Competition remains, but it is a vanishing quantity in commerce. The process of eliminating the factor of com-

petition in the industrial problem has been rapidly progressing within the past decade. When man comes to be unwilling to greedily grasp from his brother in the same household, he is on the way to treating his brother-man, of another color and condition, unselfishly. When love, the fundamental principle of socialism, begins to work in him, it is then only a matter of enlargement of the heart until the demon of selfishness will be finally cast out of world.

Our present progress in socialism is the result of a painful process from individualism. Business men in the same line of trade tried to undersell each other, until they learned the folly of a selfish individualism; then they began a limited socialism. They destroyed selfishness in their own line of business, but retained it beyond their particular trade. They realized first that socialism was better than competition in their particular branch of business; they are learning since that this principle of brotherhood, which was given a limited application, is universal. Combinations of capital have been the product of the spirit of socialism. If the selfish spirit has been retained in the particular combination, it has remained only to be more fully exorcised by a combination of combinations of capital. All efforts to repress further combinations of capital have been futile, because they have been against the eternal evolution from individualism to socialism.

Not until the last years of the nineteenth century did we see the million-dollar combination of capital; in the first months of the twentieth century we have the billion-dollar socialism among capitalists,—and this notwithstanding much shortsighted legislation against capitalistic combinations. It is as easy to suppress by legislation the tendency toward a larger socialization of capital as it would be to eradicate, by legal enactment, the growing spirit of brotherhood among men. When the million-dollar combinations grew weary applying the principle of hate and indi-

vidualism, they formed the billion-dollar brotherhood of capitalists in which to apply the principle of socialism,—toward each other. After there are other billion-dollar combinations of capital formed, and they come to know the results of the ruinous policy of competition, we shall have the further socialization of capital in the trillion-dollar combination. Should there be sufficient trillion-dollar combinations of capital, we shall finally have the quadrillion-dollar combination,—and this will surely be the complete socialism of capital. Without realizing it, capitalists have been, through their combinations of combinations, the most powerful agencies at work toward a complete industrial socialism.

The pulpit has been decrying the tendency toward combinations of capital; the press has been printing tons of protests against trusts; the politician has howled his voice into huskiness against this pre-election evil; professors of economics and sociology have prophesied disaster for our country; legislatures have enacted prohibitory laws;—and all the time capital has become more nearly socialized in combinations. The fight against the trusts has been faithfully fought. Our best men, from labor-unionists to college presidents, have stood shoulder to shoulder in this fight against the tendency of capitalists to eliminate the competitive principle and establish the principle of sympathy and coöperation. It seems to be a losing battle. There was never a time when the spirit of coöperation has been so powerful as at present. After such a war has been waged against trusts and lost, we must begin to find something good in the socialism of capital, or lose faith in the future of our country. On the surface the combinations of capital seem solely selfish and individualistic; their tendency is toward unselfishness and socialism, for a larger number are brought to share the fortunes of the coöperation. If it be selfishness, it is farther removed from the

individual, and when the process of combination is complete, selfishness will be destroyed in socialism. If the individual capitalist is still selfish in the combination of capitalists, his selfishness is not entirely individualistic, for he rejoices that his neighbor capitalist is prosperous with his own prosperity. Certain it is that the socializing tendency of capital has been the parent of a larger brotherhood of capitalists. No one who studies deeply our present social problems thinks it wise or possible to go back to the individualism of fifty or even twenty-five years ago.

There have been many attempts to move the world backward. Many movements among men have met the stern opposition of the good, in their time. The long struggle between the theologian and the evolutionist is an example. Good men saw only evil in the theory of evolution, in the beginning of the advance of this thought into the mind of the world. Good men prophesied the decline of Christianity and the ruin of the church. When pulpit, religious press, and well-balanced conservatives generally, had made a fruitless fight against the evolutionary philosophy, more men saw some good in it. Now all men acknowledge it the friend instead of the foe. When men have learned the folly of fighting the socialization of capital, they will know that the present uncontrollable movement toward combinations has helped rather than hindered the final industrial socialism.

If the impulse toward combination among capitalists were entirely selfish, we should expect to find a growing tendency toward extreme miserliness among the individual capitalists in the combination. The picture of a great capitalist, wearied with the competitive struggle in commerce, putting his millions into the recently formed billion-dollar combination, that he may have time to bless countless communities with churches and public libraries, is not altogether dark; nor does it feed the faith that the so-

cialism of capital is entirely without the soul of good beneath the apparent selfishness. Before the days of large combinations of capital, there was small philanthropy. The men who made their money in the selfish individualism of competition, kept it "until death did them part." It was impossible for them, sharing the spirit of self-seeking in their time, to do what some of them have done through their children, who are heirs to the better fortune of the growing spirit of socialism.

While capitalists have been unknowingly forwarding socialism, laboring-men have been working to the same end. There was in the beginning an intense individualism among laborers. Employers of labor were willing to encourage competition among laborers, even after they had formed a combination among themselves. Laborers soon found that what was good for the capitalist was good for the laborer. Fellow-craftsmen learned at length that for them to undersell each other in the labor market was no less suicidal than for employers to undersell one another in the products of their labor. The time was when the carpenter receiving one dollar and fifty cents lost his opportunity for work to the carpenter who asked only one dollar a day. When carpenters realized that competition meant starvation, they developed a socialism by organizing a carpenter's union. Having destroyed the spirit of individualism in the local field, and in their special craft, they retained this evil spirit toward workingmen in other fields and crafts, until men from other places came to underbid them in the labor market. Then the local union saw the wisdom of a further extension of the socialism of labor, until by natural evolution there is a national brotherhood of workingmen. While capitalists were forming combinations of combinations, laborers were forming unions of unions, until we now have the million-men socialism of labor and the billion-dollar socialism of capital.

Both capitalists and laborers have been wrong in their desire to keep the other unorganized. Employers have been unfriendly to the trades-unions, and employees have foolishly fought the combinations of capital. Capitalists have applied the principle of a coöperative socialism among themselves, and the evil spirit of a competitive individualism toward laborers. On the other hand, laborers who have found brotherhood better than competition among themselves, have tried to prevent the spirit of brotherhood in combinations of capital. Capitalists have held that the foundation of the trades-unions was selfishness, and that they have been organized only to secure a larger wage. Granted that this is the only ground for the organization of the union of laborers, it is not entirely unworthy of a body of men to claim a fair share of the partnership of capital and labor to provide better opportunities for themselves and their families. If the labor-union seems to be founded on selfishness, it is with the unselfish result that the toiler in another trade, and even in another state, must share the same prosperity. Before the combination of laborers in unions, a man would selfishly take the bread and butter from his neighbor's wife and children. Since the organization of the National Federation of Labor, the member of a local union will not treat his brother-laborer who lives on the opposite side of the country, selfishly. If the element of selfishness remains in the socialism of labor, it has been removed to a remote place. When the lover of his kind beholds the member of the local brotherhood of laborers willing to starve rather than underbid in the labor market, his neighbor of another nationality, color, and state; at the same time, knowing how the brotherhood of laborers will support such a one out of work, and in sickness, he cannot believe that the socialism of labor is only organized selfishness. Selfishness does not usually manifest itself in deeds of brotherly love. When we see

the individual capitalist socializing his capital, to have more time for benefactions, we believe that the combination of capital is not wholly bad; when we see the individual in the socialism of labor reach into his pocket and pay his unfortunate brother-workingman's grocery bills and doctor bills, it is not easy to believe that the socialism of labor in unions is altogether evil. We must come to understand that neither capital nor labor can go back from a slowly developed socialism to a vicious individualism. No generation can by legal enactment undo the work of all past generations. One must find something good in the socialism of labor, or lose faith in his kind.

The day of industrial individualism is gone for both capitalist and laborer. Each seems satisfied to have it so for himself, but not for the other. The capitalist desires socialism for himself and individualism for his employee. The laborer desires socialism for labor, but individualism for capital. The time is coming when each is going to rejoice in brotherhood for the other. Capital usually seems more prejudiced against combinations of laborers than laborers do against the trusts. The time was when the individual employer engaged the individual laborer, and knew him by name; the time was when the individual employee saw and spoke to his employer. Now capital employs labor through a representative, who may speak for a thousand capitalists, but inconsistently demands the employing of his men individually. If a committee of men representing a combination of laborers comes to confer with a few men who represent a combination of capital, the representatives of capital will say, "We do not recognize you. We employ our men individually." Suppose each man, as he comes for employment, should say to capital's representatives, "I do not recognize you. I want the individual capitalist to employ me." It would be difficult for these few men who manage the business of this

trust to get the individual capitalists to confer with their individual employees. Combinations of labor have rights as well as combinations of capital; and collective capital that speaks through representatives should be willing to speak to collective labor through representatives.

Not less but more organization is needed in the world of capital and labor. When capital is completely socialized, and labor fully organized, then the industrial world will have reached the final struggle in the evolution from individualism to a complete socialism. When capital and labor learn that sympathy and coöperation between themselves are better than competition, we are going to have capitalists admitted to the union, and laborers considered a part of the combination of capital. Already, in some of our best cities, representatives of capital are meeting representatives of the trades-unions, and together are adjusting the conditions of the coöperation of capital and labor. Capitalists are becoming more kind, and are considering the duties of capital more than "the rights of capital." The man who puts both brain and brawn into the business is coming to receive a more fair share of the products of the partnership than he formerly received. Labor is also becoming more reasonable, and is thinking more of duties than "demands."

James Russell Lowell gave a definition in harmony with the world's growing thought: "Socialism means coöperation and community of interests,—sympathy." With this conception in mind, we realize that there has been, within the past few years, a marked advance in the growth of socialism. One is compelled to believe that socialism is good, or that the world is rapidly going to the bad. The socialism of love prepares for the socialism of law. Law becomes necessary to mark a point of progress in the social order, so that the loveless lives may be seized by a hand

stronger than sentiment, and compelled to obey the social commands of love.

The individual grows from self-care to care for others. The race has passed through the same altruistic development. The nation that lives must have a similar evolution. In the cemetery of the nations we find no monument with this inscription: "This nation died as the result of service to the weak peoples of the earth." We see a long line of graves where nations lie buried because they lived to be served, and not to serve. If a selfish individualism is not to be commended in the unit of society, neither is it in the nation. The world is still waiting for a nation to arise in the family of the nations, "not to be ministered unto, but to minister," and thus achieve national immortality. A strong individual taking advantage of weaker individuals in commerce is contemptible. A strong nation acting selfishly is unworthy of honor among the nations. Our nation began in selfishness, in harmony with the origin of the race and of the individual. Our first war was for ourselves; our second was in reality but a continuation in 1812 of the struggle for independence, begun a generation earlier. We began the civil war for ourselves,—to preserve the union; we ended it for others,—to liberate a foreign race within our borders. Having made a national sacrifice for the black man at home, it was easier a generation later for us to serve the struggling Cubans abroad. In truth it would have been impossible to thrust this nation into Cuba's struggle for the sake of our national aggrandizement. Our great nation said that she must bear the weak nation's burden, and so fulfill the law of love among the nations. There is a growing socialism among the nations. The strong nations are learning to serve the weaker members of the national family.

There has also been a growing socialization of educational interests and opportunities. No longer does the

poor man pay for the education of his children. From the individualism of the rate bill, we have grown to even socializing text-books. The books for all the pupils in our best city systems are purchased from the common school funds. If a poor man presents a child destitute of necessary clothes, the community will clothe him, furnish him books and teachers, that he may have a common-school education. There is a growing intellectual socialism which recognizes a miserliness of mind as well as a miserliness of money; and that he is most a miser who holds the highest possessions selfishly.

The social settlement movement is an expression of the growing socialism in the realm of character. In times of industrial and educational individualism, there was also individualism in character. Then men saved themselves by separation; now they save themselves by sympathy. In individualism he is good who does no bad; in socialism, he is bad who does no good. In the great cities, men and women of the finest head and heart culture have, through the neighborhood guilds, expressed in terms of character the growing soul-socialism. They have learned that the characterful owe much to the characterless. They have socialized soul, going with their all of heart, head, and hand, living rather than saying to the morally and mentally needy, "All you have is yours, and all we have is yours, for you need it." They believe that leaven belongs to the lump, that light should go to darkness, that love owes all to the loveless lives. The wealthy, the wise, and the worthy have become the great debtors, according to the best standards of life. Men socialized their money before they did their minds; they socialized their minds before they did their souls; they must eventually socialize their all of money, mind, and soul in the growing socialism of love.