

insisted dogmatically that business is a property right that should be protected by injunction.

Here again the soundness of his position depends upon the concrete case. Would he say that a lawyer may have an injunction against the publication of alleged facts showing him to be a shyster? Would he say that a grocer may have an injunction against the publication of statements that he sells oleomargarine for butter or sand for sugar? Certainly not, unless he would "improve" upon the established law of libel. Yet a lawyer's professional reputation must be as truly a property right as the good will of a merchant or a manufacturer, and a retail grocer's good will as that of a manufacturing celebrity.

To go a step farther in the direction of injunctions against labor boycotts, would Mr. Taft say that a grocer should have an injunction against a publication, for the purpose of diverting the trade of his prohibition customers, of a true statement that he keeps whisky for sale in his cellar? And would it make any better case for the injunction, if, with the same purpose of influencing prohibitionists, the statement were analogous to Mr. Taft's discrimination against secondary boycotts, and truly declared that the grocer bought his groceries of a wholesaler who kept whisky for sale?

To assume that Mr. Taft would deliberately say any of those things, would reflect upon his common sense. By what process of reasoning, then, does he conclude so positively that labor unions may lawfully be prohibited by injunction from truthfully announcing to persons who would confine their trade to what they regard as "fair" businesses, that certain specified businesses are either "unfair" themselves or deal in the products of others that are "unfair"?

+

His answer might be that the labor boycott is a conspiracy to destroy a business by diverting custom from it by unlawful means. But what are the unlawful means?

It is lawful to do it by exposure of facts which customers have a right to know. And haven't the labor union members and their sympathizers who patronize a business the right to know that its goods are made under circumstances which they condemn, whatever the reason for their condemnation may be?

+

Is it likely that indictments would be sustained in such cases? Indictments! Ah, there's the rub.

On the trial of an indictment for publishing an "unfair" list, witnesses would have to appear and

be cross-examined; but in contempt proceedings for violating an injunction, this is seldom done and need never be. On indictment, it would be necessary to show violation of a law of universal application; but in contempt proceedings, nothing more is necessary than to show that the act charged violates an injunction of limited application. On indictment, a jury would decide; but in contempt proceedings, the injunction judge would decide. There are still other differences which lead the advocates of "government by injunction" to prefer this method of dealing with labor controversies. Its advantages to the privileged classes are obvious.

Especially valuable are the advantages of injunctions in restraining freedom of speech and press—a freedom that is very trying to the privileged classes. On indictment for abuse of this freedom, the jury is judge of the truth of the publication, of its meaning, and of the excuse or justification for it; but in contempt proceedings its truth or falsity, its meaning, and the excuse or justification for it, are decided by a judge without a jury, and in advance of the offense. The injunction to prevent abuses of freedom of speech and the press, under cover of prohibiting labor boycotts, is the modern plutocratic method, as the Star Chamber was the old monarchical method, of suppressing exposures and stifling discussion.

---

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

---

### A CLERGYMAN ON THE CHURCH AND SOCIETY.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

Very frequently the reformer blames the church for not taking a more active part in promoting the world's great reforms. He would have the church champion the cause of some specific reform or reforms, and prove the necessity of each member taking hold thereof and fighting therefor. Some reformers grow so bitter against the church because she will not advocate their special reforms that they lose interest not only in the church but in all religion. They regard the church and religion as dead.

Is this fair? Is it just? That the church has been remiss in her duties in the past, that she has even allied herself with the cause of injustice, is undoubted. But this no more condemns the church than a weak individual who, despite all his weaknesses, has nevertheless some strong points. We must look to the strong points in everyone. And the church has some strong points. Her strength does not lie in her open identification with any particular reform or reforms. She really shows a weakness when she points out the remedy. For

the selection of any remedy for existing evils must always be a purely personal matter; it never has been, and never will be, a matter about which the church as a whole can agree. When the time has come when it is seen that there is one remedy and only one remedy for any given evil, only one way of righting a given wrong, and no other, then it will be time for the church to preach that reform as the only way out of the difficulty.

It is not here that men are agreed, and must all be agreed to ensure progress, but in the recognition of evil or a specific evil as a sin against God. This is where the church's duty lies. This is her strongest point. She must lead men to see that sin is sin, that black is black, and not white, and that they tolerate sin at their peril. But she must leave men in freedom to find the best method to get rid of sin, the best thing to put in its place.

The church cannot point out a specific remedy for any particular evil, for many valid reasons. It is impossible for any minister to master his special work, that of recognizing evils as contrary to the laws of heaven, and at the same time master all the reforms advocated by the world's reformers, compare them and be able to determine which is the right one. Moreover, it is not a question of the "right" reform, but the "best" reform, not a matter of right or wrong, but of good and better. And all men differ on this point.

Suppose a minister recognizes the evil of monopoly and advocates socialism as the remedy. Some members of the congregation are not at all in sympathy with socialism, but believe in individual regeneration as the remedy. Others are strong single taxers, while others again believe in governmental control. If he believes in socialism and preaches socialism from time to time, those who do not agree with him will soon leave the church and go elsewhere. Suppose another minister in town preaches single tax; he will soon drive away the unsympathetic. Possibly the single taxers in the first case would support the last mentioned preacher, and the socialists go where they would get their views voiced, and so on. But then what would be the result? These churches would be turned into institutions for promoting specific reforms, and the church would be no more.

The minister of any church neglects his duty when he refrains from condemning the sins which are seriously injuring society. But he is not only injudicious, but out of his sphere, when he defines the remedy. To preach a given method of reform is like dictating to a sick person the system of cure—homeopathy, osteopathy, hydropathy, or some other pathy. Surely the individual must be left in entire freedom to select his own system or no system. It is right for a minister to condemn the evils of gambling on the stock exchange or elsewhere, but out of place to say how society shall be protected. It is proper to denounce the evil of divorce for wholly unjust causes, but assuming too much to advocate the measure that will alone control this evil. And so with a thousand other social evils. The word comes with authority when the evil is proved to be an evil in the sight of God, contrary to His law, but it loses all its force when the minister imposes upon the people his personal beliefs

as to what ought to be done to rectify it. As a member of society the minister is entitled to hold and enforce his private opinions and views, but as a minister he does the most efficient work when he enables men to recognize evil as sinful in the sight of God and inspires them to do something to get rid of it.

Furthermore, social evils are not the only evils that need man's attention to reform the world. There are innumerable individual evils for which the individual alone is responsible, and which he alone can remedy. Equal attention must be given to these evils. Indeed, it is questionable if they ought not to receive greater attention. For the more we study social evils the more we see how completely dependent they are upon individual evils. War would be an impossibility if the majority had sufficient control over their tempers in private life. Monopoly is but the expression on a large scale of the mean advantages which individuals strive to obtain in their petty relationships with each other. And so with other great social wrongs. The church must cover the whole field. Sin in the individual and in society is its subject.

Yet further, there are very many sins in the individual which the church ought to help men to recognize which are deeper than the outward violations of the law, more secret, and more difficult to detect. These are the root cause of evils that are seen. They are the beginnings of all evils in the heart; the love of honor, love of gain, love of ruling over others, covetousness, and lusts and passions of a great variety. It is the duty of the church to call upon men to get rid of these evils as well as all external evils.

Now to expect a man to study these evils and help others to see them in the light of heaven, and also to study all the known remedies advocated and determine which is the best, is not only unreasonable but unjust. The reformer has a just complaint against the church that does not decry evil and call for repentance, but not when he demands that she shall apply the remedy, and especially his remedy. The reformer is apt to become intolerant, intolerant of all who do not press his favorite reform before every other reform, even as he is intolerant of all who differ from him in method. Intolerance is an evil. It stood greatly in the way of the church in the past, and to a great extent disturbs her progress today. It has the same influence in reform work among reformers. The more tolerance we have in the world, the better for all. We ought to cling to our untried methods tenaciously, but yet grant due respect to those of others. And all will be benefited when each expects of the other no more than is his due, of the doctor a knowledge of disease and how to cure it, of the lawyer a knowledge of precedent and a high sense of justice, of the merchant a knowledge of the goods with which he deals and how to supply public wants, and of the minister a good understanding of evils and how to get men to fight against them as sins against God. And from all men we expect devotion to their respective duties and an honest effort to uplift society, each, however, in the way that seems to him best.

LOUIS G. HOECK.