

Love's Labours Lost . . . or Found?

Convention

1974

Early in his career William Shakespeare wrote a bright and witty play that sought to dramatize the superiority of real-life learning over mere book-and-brain learning. The central focus of this Renaissance-spirited composition, as you might guess by the title "Love's Labour's Lost," is the erotic attraction between man and woman. In the play one of the lords attending King Ferdinand of Navarre asks the King unbelievably how it would ever have been possible for him to discover the excellence of study "without the beauty of a woman's face?" And to his fellow lords, with whom he had earlier sworn to pursue book-study alone apart from the attending pleasures of food, sleep, and women, this same lord now puts the question of whether perhaps that oath might have been a mistake.

Now, for not looking on a woman's face,
You have in that forsworn the use of eyes
And study too, the cause of your vow;
For where is any author in the world
Teaches such beauty as a woman's eye?
Learning is but an adjunct to ourself
And where we are our learning likewise is;
Then when ourselves we see in ladies' eyes,
Do we not likewise see our learning there?
O, we have made a vow to study, lords,
And in that vow we have forsworn our books.
For when would you, my liege, or you, or you,
In leaden contemplation have found out
Such fiery numbers as the prompting eyes
Of beauty's tutors have enriched you with?
Other slow arts entirely keep the brain;
And therefore, finding barren practisers,
Scarce show a harvest of their heavy toil;
But love, first learned in a lady's eyes,
Lives not alone immured in the brain;
But, with the motion of all elements,
Courses as swift as thought in every power,
And gives to every power a double power,
Above their functions and their offices.
.....
Then fools you were these women to forswear,
Or keeping what is sworn, you will prove fools.

For wisdom's sake, a word that all men love,
 Or for love's sake, a word that loves all men,
 Or for men's sake, the authors of these women,
 Or women's sake, by whom we men are men,
 Let us once lose our oaths to find ourselves,
 Or else we lose ourselves to keep our oaths.
 It is religion to be thus forsworn,
 For charity itself fulfils the law,
 And who can sever love from charity?

Shakespeare's advice in this play may well be important for those who have locked themselves up into a closed off world of unreal academic stuffiness. And one can hardly fail to appreciate the masterful and playful use of English displayed here. But what can we learn about the labor of true love from these lords and their maidens? And how serious, in Shakespeare's mind, is the possibility of losing our labours of love? I am afraid that the famous author's erotic playfulness fails to take us very far toward an answer to these questions.

For where, after all, is the origin of man's delight in woman? How was it that man discovered "maleness" to be only one half of "manness"? We know full well that God Himself is the Author of that garden of pleasure and joy where man and woman first appeared as the creation of God's love. The sensuous excitement and the deep-hearted thrill that Adam knew when God gave him Eve was certainly but a deepening of his knowledge of God because of the labor of God's own love in creating man male and female.

We also know that God called Adam and Eve to labor in His love and to love one another in their laboring. A beautifully tailored garden would be one result of their labor even as children would blossom forth from their love. The labours of man's love, you see, are but the fruits of the original love of God for man and of man for God. The erotic pleasure enjoyed by man and wife, therefore, is only one side of creational love. Moreover, true love among men and true love between men and God is the only fruitful source of all earthly labours.

But love's many labours, both God's and man's, are indeed threatened with loss. And again we know, without much help from Shakespeare however, what the source of that threat is. Man and woman began to distrust their only true Lover. God's love was and continues to be despised in disobedience and faithlessness. Consequently the labours of God's love—His creatures man and woman—are threatened with extinction: man must die! Likewise the labours of man's love are destroyed by the resulting lovelessness among men. You know the familiar story:

In the course of time, Cain brought an offering to Yahweh of fruit of the soil. For his part, Abel brought the finest of the firstlings of his flock. Yahweh showed regard for Abel and his offering, but for Cain and his offering he showed no regard. Cain resented this greatly and his countenance fell. Yahweh said to Cain, "Why are you resentful, and why has your countenance fallen? Surely, if you act right, it should mean exaltation. But if you do not, sin is the demon at the door, whose urge is toward you; yet you can be his master."

Cain said to his brother Abel, ["Let us go outside."] And when they were outside, Cain set upon his brother Abel and killed him. Then Yahweh asked Cain, "Where is your brother Abel?" He replied, "I don't know. Am I my brother's keeper?" And he said, "What have you done! Listen! Your brother's blood cries out to me from the soil. Hence you are banned from the soil which forced open its mouth to take your brother's blood from your hand. When you till the soil, it shall not again give up its strength to you. A restless wanderer shall you be on earth!"

Cain replied to Yahweh, "My punishment is too much to bear. Now that you have banished me this day from the soil, and I must hide from your presence and become a restless wanderer on earth, anyone might kill me on sight!" "If so," Yahweh said to him, "whoever kills Cain shall suffer vengeance sevenfold." And Yahweh put a mark on Cain, lest anyone should kill him on sight. (Gen. 4:3-15, Anchor Bible, Translation by E. A. Speiser)

Man's sin against God and against his fellowman leads to nothing less than the cursed loss of all that is good in God's and man's labours.

But the biblical account which we have just heard does not stop with the story of loss. God, the original Lover, hears the call of Abel's blood from the ground; He sees one of His loved ones put to death; He is angered with the loss of the beloved's labours. God comes to find an answer—to find and

recover love and love's fruits. Love's labours will not be lost, but will be found again in the recovery made by God's love.

God's love, however, must put to flight all lovelessness and faithlessness. "Cain! Damned Cain! You are indeed your brother's keeper," says the Lord. "Will you not see that the loss of Abel is your own loss? Without your love for him there is no fruit from your labors? Cursed be the soil which was made for labours of love and not for those of hatred, Cain! And damnation upon you who would be a settled farmer. Get away--Wander, Wander without rest!"

With Cain, even as with Adam and Eve, though, we see God's judgment tempered with the mercy which will recover love's labours. Adam and Eve were upheld in life by God's love, and their love went on to produce offspring. Cain, in the cursedness of wandering, is nevertheless protected from extinction by the One who made him for love. And from that moment on, God has continued with the eyes and ears of a lover to see and hear His children who are threatened with loss. Even Shakespeare knew that

A lover's eyes will gaze an eagle blind;
A lover's ear will hear the lowest sound.

To Moses God says, "I have surely seen the affliction of My people who are in Egypt, and have given heed to their cry So I have come down to deliver them from the power of the Egyptians." (Ex. 3:7-8, New American Standard. Cf. James 5:4-5) We see from the Scriptures then that God's promise to recover man's labours of love in the labouring of His own love becomes the sole hope of history.

Therefore, my beloved brethren, be steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your toil is not in vain in the Lord. (I Cor. 15:58, N.A.S.)

Let Thy work appear to Thy servants,
And Thy majesty to their children.
And let the favor of the Lord our God be upon us;
And do confirm for us the work of our hands;
Yes, confirm the work of our hands. (Ps. 90:16-17, N.A.S.)

Fellow workers in the Lord, there you have it: the two motives which drive us forward and embrace us in all of our labouring are, on the one hand, the love of God and love one for another, and on the other hand, that brotherly hatred which derives from man's adulterous desertion of God. We are compelled to act either as Cain who refuses to be his brother's keeper and thereby suffers the loss of every fruitful labour of love, or else as repentant servants caught up by faith in the loving recovery of life by God in Christ.

Here is the perseverance of the saints who keep the commandments of God and their faith in Jesus. And I heard a voice from heaven, saying, "Write, 'Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from now on!'" "Yes," says the Spirit, "that they may rest from their labors, for their deeds follow with them." (Rev. 14:12-13, N.A.S.)

But for the cowardly and unbelieving and abominable and murderers and immoral persons and sorcerers and idolaters and liars, their part will be in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone, which is the second death. (Rev. 21:8, N.A.S.)

The labours of man are either lost in the fire of judgment or they are found by Christ's love and carried right on into the final Sabbath rest of God.

It is in the context of the struggle between these two dynamic motives of mankind that we find ourselves even at this present moment in the affairs of labour and industry. We discover, in fact, that the very phrases referring to "brotherly strife and hatred" on the one hand, and to "brotherly love" on the other, must be used to describe what is really happening today. A recent article on "strikes" in the rail transportation industry reports:

For years, the only thing sicker than the railroads themselves was their labour relations. While truckers and other competitors were draining away the freight life-blood of the railroads, managers and unions were locked in a fratricidal struggle that crippled any meaningful competitive response. (Lester Velie, "They're Finding Better Ways than Strikes," Reader's Digest, March, 1974, p. 178, italics mine.)

Yet on the other hand, by God's grace, your Association boldly announces that its program is based "on the Christian principles of social justice and love

as taught in the Bible," and that labour can only become whole again when the unquestioned assumption of labour-management conflict is overcome by a new practice of cooperation and selflessness in the integral work community.

Gentlemen and ladies, I applaud your humble and thankful response to Christ's love in the daring and courageous undertakings of this Association. My sorrow comes only with the realization that a Christian Labour Association is such a strange and lonely looking creature in our day. For as you seek here to develop the meaning of brotherly service in place of fratricidal strife, I cannot help but think of the thousands and millions of wandering, restless workers around the world who are locked into associations built upon the principles of Cain. Go forward then with all the strength and energy that God gives you to unfold the true meaning of labour as the fruit of a work community that reflects love and service and cooperation among all the participants. With every swing of your hammers, with every turn of your wrenches, with every push of your pencils, let the excitement of your vision and the dynamic of your hope radiate across the wastelands of lostness in which men labour without meaning.

In particular may I urge you to give even greater attention to four key elements of brotherly stewardship that you have already begun to develop. (1) The first is this idea of the integral work community which indeed ought to replace every broken situation of brotherly hatred between labour and management, between those in authority and those under authority, between those who work at one trade and those who work at another, between one labour union and another. Your work along this line is already impressive, and we must hope with expectancy that men and women without vision will come to see this side of the news of Christ's resurrection.

"The collective agreement," as your ~~Submissions~~ to the Construction Industry Review Panel state so well, is considered by so many men to be little more than

a cease fire document, introducing a terminal period of coexistence, and its termination frequently means a resumption of hostilities. In collective bargaining, gains for one side are invariably considered losses for the other, and vice versa. There is an almost complete lack of recognition that both management and workers ought to be engaged in the same undertaking to provide goods and services for the fulfilment of genuine needs in society, and that the rendering of such true service should be the dominant and primary goal of the enterprise.

However small the operation, however gigantic the corporation, the deep structural critique and reform to which this single principle of the integrity of work can lead in labour and industry will continue to be of enormous and momentous proportions. The complexity and massiveness of modern economic issues and institutions must not be allowed to obscure our Christ-found insight into the all-encompassing and simple fact that owners, managers, and workers must either work together in communal service and love at one task or else find their end in the restless fruitlessness of splintered confusion and hatred which is death.

(2) The second great contribution you are making which needs expansion in the months and years ahead concerns the meaning of work itself as a labour of love in opposition to the popular conception of work as a functionalistic means to other ends. Work must not be reduced to a mere means for obtaining money or prestige or power or greater leisure as though the work itself is insignificant or worthless. Nor may the workmen be reduced to mere tools or functions in the economic machine. As Bob Goudzwaard properly insists, we must never lose sight of the basic motive of the Christian trade union movement which is to recognize that the worker is God's image bearer and not just an economic production factor. ("Religion and Labour," The Guide, October, 1973, p. 7)

Work is properly part of our genuine response of love in life, and any man who is labouring as a reduced functionary at a task which is so meaningless in itself that it does not allow him to express his love for God and man is a worker guaranteed only the loss of his labours no matter how great the financial reward. Every economic enterprise in our technologically oriented society needs to hear this testimony of yours.

(3) The third contribution to Christian stewardship which you must continue to enlarge upon manifests itself in perfect contrast to Cain's jealous murder of his brother. The CLAC must show the necessity for pluralistic communal freedom in labour relations. The false doctrine of the "unity of the working class" has been little more than a front for organizing hatred of the managerial class by monopolistic unions. It is a doctrine in Cain's line which pits brother against brother with the result that the integral meaning of work itself is divided and destroyed. And if some workers refuse to sign the oath of so-called brotherhood in the working class, they are also cut off without mercy. Some brotherhood! Some unity!

In face of every attempt to force all men into a single-union conformity, the CLAC must continue to work for the kind of brotherly love that encourages men to cooperate on the basis of freely confessed and freely organized communal differences. Here more than anywhere else there is the need to be our brother's keeper. Christians who individualistically refuse to unite communally for the purpose of developing a Christ-like way in labour relations fail to see that they are only encouraging and condoning the fratricidal warfare that goes on around them in the name of the "unity of the working class." They are, in essence, responding to the Lord's question about their non-Christian brothers with the reply, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Indeed we must come to see that if our fellowmen are bent on destroying their own work and one another, we are responsible for showing them another way. To do that, however, it is necessary to penetrate to the real roots of industrial conflict. The most serious warfare is not between labour and management but between the principles of Cain and the principles of Christ operating throughout all levels of business and industry. And in order to show what love and service and cooperation in the work community will mean, there must be Christian communal action in business and industry on the part of workers, managers, owners and everyone else involved. Workers with Christian convictions must have the freedom to organize alongside other organizations of workers without penalty either to themselves or to the others.

This very effort to develop pluralistic freedom in labour relations may lead to the death of yet more Abels, and you must not fear such sacrifice. God hears the cry of Abel's blood from the ground, and He has already secured the resurrection of the faithful in Christ. ~~So~~ continue to press on without faltering for the purpose of opening up modern industry to the freedom of multiple unions. Such freedom will make possible brotherly respect for differences in the context of a new view of work, and it will allow for your contribution of love to others in the work community.

(4) The fourth factor in your economic stewardship which holds great promise is the growing realization that modern economic institutions do not exist autonomously and independent of the rest of society. Consequently there is, as you are seeing, a special governmental responsibility for public justice which is of direct significance for sound structures and healthy operations in business and industry as well as for the rest of society. The very fact that the CLAC is consciously concerned with matters that affect

people outside the confines of this labour association; the fact that you are willing to see your own peculiar tasks and responsibilities in the light of the larger arena of the public welfare; the fact that as Canadian citizens you are concerned with the effect of your actions on those who are not a part of organized labour--all of this speaks well of your responsible brotherly attitude of stewardship.

But this kind of thinking in North America is just beginning and much work lies ahead. There is very little in our history to fall back on as concerns the relation between government and the economy which is not "laissez-faire," or "socialistic," or "pragmatic muddle."

The important economist, John Kenneth Galbraith, has, as you know, given considerable attention to these matters. He is well aware that the old liberal and Marxist perspectives are inadequate for grasping hold of contemporary economic-governmental relations. He is also very concerned that we not allow our lives to be totally determined by the economic goals of the present industrial system, namely, the goals of ever expanding economic output, ever increasing consumption, continual technological advance, and all the public images that support these goals.

But what are Galbraith's answers to the problems created by the new industrial state? With very little internal, structural criticism of our economic social system, he merely argues that man should be conceived ^{of} both as an aesthetic creature and as an economic creature and that his aesthetic needs require a kind of satisfaction that the industrial system cannot supply. What does this mean for labour and industry? It means little if any change internally--only a subordination of present economic life to "higher" aesthetic goals. We may, he suggests, eventually "come to see the industrial

system in fitting light as an essentially technological arrangement for providing convenient goods and services in adequate volume." (The New Industrial State, New York: Mentor Books, 19 , p. 382.) The possibility for this "improved" arrangement will be brought about by a new political system where "the industrial system will fall into its place as a detached and autonomous arm of the state, but responsive to the larger purposes of society." (Ibid., p. 383.)

The CLAC, along with other Christian organizations, must provide much more than Galbraith offers here. If anything, Galbraith reduces the meaning of work in the industrial system to an even lower level of insignificance than it has had to this time. Work is merely the technological production of convenient material goods and services. What will lift man above this mechanistic, animalistic life of planned control and near meaninglessness? A state which has power to guide and control educational and aesthetic development as well as the economy will provide the "chance for salvation," as Galbraith puts it. (Ibid., p. 383) If Galbraith's is not a liberal or socialist state, it is nonetheless a loveless state which sees itself as the great encompassing power that will enable man to attain his highest social purposes by keeping industrial economism in its place. No vision of basic economic and political reform comes through here. No idea of reforming a distorted economic way of life is envisaged. There is no hope of man being found by a salvation of love which restores meaning to his own labours of love. No, all we see is man the animal being given an opportunity to selfishly find a little humanistically conceived educational and aesthetic enjoyment alongside his busyness with industrial, technological, planned "progress" as that is now conceived.

Surely as Christians we need a different view of man, a different view of economic life, and a different view of public justice than Galbraith provides us with. And that, of course, is where the hard work and sacrifice on your part will come if your Association is to give helpful leadership in dealing with the question of the proper responsibility of government in labour relations and in the economy as a whole. You will have to think in non-selfish terms and spend time and money and energy that may not bring any extra benefits to you by way of increased wages or greater power or rising success. But if you don't render this service of love, who will? And if you don't practice that measure of selflessness required of you for this momentous task of seeing that public economic justice is done, then how will you be able to be your brother's keeper?

Pause now for a moment with me, if you will, and let's reflect on the course we have been following. We first sought to come to grips with the deepest roots of contemporary social, political, economic conflict, and we saw that to do this it was necessary to go back to Cain's murder of his brother Abel. The loss of life, the loss of meaning, the loss of love, the loss of love's labours on earth are all the consequences of man's turning away from God's love and from brotherly love. That is Death at its roots. Moreover, it is clearly apparent to us that such fratricidal strife is a dominant motive in labour and industry today--not just incidentally among a few odd individuals, but structurally built right into the theory and practice of labour relations and all the rest.

We also pointed out, however, that hatred and murder and warfare leading to the destruction of man have not gained total dominance on earth. God sent His Son to find man, to restrain his evil, to recover his labours, to

restore him to the fellowship of His love. And out of the power of Christ's love we found at least four specific avenues of brotherly service and love along which the CLAC has been allowed to walk. The first is your knowledge that work is an integral task requiring cooperative service on the part of all members of the work community; neither work nor the community of workers can be broken up arbitrarily into opposing facets or factions. Secondly, the CLAC has been concerned with showing that work and the worker cannot be reduced to relatively meaningless functions in the service of a closed economic system; work must be unfolded freely as a responsible labour of man's love for God and for his fellowman. Thirdly, Christian reformation involves the recognition that the organization of man's work requires freedom for a pluralism of communal associations in place of the present tyranny of the majority fed as that tyranny is by the myths of democratism and the "unity of the working class." And the fourth avenue of brotherly love has to do with the recognition of government's responsibility for public justice as that bears upon the healthy operations of modern industry in today's complex society.

Now at this point, we must pose a crucial question: "What is the source of the particular structure of modern Western society, including industry and the state? How did the major problems which we have been discussing arise--the problems of the functionalistic devaluation of labour, the pitting of a labouring class against a class of owners and employers, the organization of the working class according to the principle of the tyranny of the majority, and the idea of the autonomy of economic life whether that be conceived as an autonomous independence from the state or as a totalitarian embrace of the state? And, what is the source of CLAC's conviction that the relative freedom

of the economic enterprise in its sphere is indeed legitimate as long as that freedom is guided by a biblical view of the integral work community, by a biblical view of work and the worker, by a biblical view of religious freedom and justice that encourages a pluralism of communal organizations, and by a biblical view of responsible service and intertwinement among all the spheres of societal life including business, education, family, state, and so forth?"

Are we not, my friends, dealing here with that massive, almost overpowering, historical reality of the process of secularization which has been unfolding now for five hundred years or more in the West and which is now embracing the whole world in such a way that William H. McNeill could give his history of the world the title, The Rise of the West? Lesslie Newbigin, in his valuable and important book, Honest Religion for Secular Man (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), states that "The most significant fact about the time in which we are living is that it is a time in which a single movement of secularization is bringing the peoples of all continents into its sweep." (p. 11) Is not McNeill right, after all, that the two paramount themes of the 19th century were "(1) the growth of human control over inanimate forms of energy; and (2) an increasing readiness to tinker with social institutions and customs in the hope of attaining desired goals?" (Rise of the West, New York: Mentor Books, 1963, p. 794) And are we not controlled today by the secularistic idea of development that comes from these two themes, namely, "the pursuit of goals different from those which have been recommended by the main traditions of the non-Western world, goals defined in such terms as technical development, industrialization, economic planning, productivity and the more equal distribution of wealth?" (Newbigin, p. 14) Is this not the

historical-social foundation of the influence of Western secularism throughout the whole world? And is this not the historical-social foundation of the problems and opportunities in the modern business enterprise in the world economy?

And haven't we Christians argued that the process whereby economic, political, educational, scientific, and artistic life have come out from underneath ecclesiastical control in the modern West is a process not to be rejected, since the creation was intended for full unfolding and diversification by its Creator? Are we not supporters of the process of secularization at least in so far as that has meant the process of the de-ecclesiasticizing of culture?

In the closing minutes that we have together I would like for you to allow your vision to expand to the point where we can take on this whole vast world-historical process of secularization and face these questions head on. For not only is the CLAC an organization that has nurtured a larger vision of economic life than the ordinary labour union, but it is made up of men and women who have been called to a vision and purpose in life that goes beyond even the broadest and healthiest approach to labour and industry. Therefore, not only must the CLAC grow in its service along the four avenues indicated earlier, it must also gain an ever expanding vision of its place in the whole scheme of God's purposes for His creation at this time in history.

The CLAC, along with sister organizations in labour, politics, education, and so forth, throughout the world, must penetrate to the root of this secularization process and expose its true nature. Whereas many Christians are beginning to feel and see the evil of economism, technologism, pragmatism, and all the other fruits of modern humanism's secularism, few are joining together

in communal associations to show how the new freedom and societal diversification of the secularization process ought to be developed in the service of Christ. Many Christians pronounce and hear pronounced curses on the evils of modern materialism, consumerism, and hedonism, but all too few are banding together as the people of God to show concretely how labour and industry, politics and education, science and art ought to be developed Christianly. It is not enough for us to denounce the evils of our secular age while we continue to practice a Christianity that has only to do with some imaginary "other world." That is itself a secularistic and dualistic religion that does not deserve the title "Christian." Instead, we need to be displaying to the world right now a reforming Christianity such as gave birth to and made possible the secularization process in the first place--a Christianity which does indeed call men to full freedom and maturity in Christ for the development of all spheres of earthly existence in accord with their divinely ordained principles and purposes rather than in accord with the dominion of some human institution or earthly authority.

It is Christ's death and resurrection that have made possible man's freedom on earth; it is Christ's recovery of man's labours that has made possible science and technology; it is Christ's restoration of man's genuine stewardship responsibility on earth that has made possible the expansive development of diverse spheres of societal life in modern times. This is what we need to be showing the peoples of the world with our works of love. We simply must not continue to allow the blasphemous humanists to proclaim that Western science, technology, industrial development, and so forth are the fruits of man's own autonomous creativity. Precisely in terms of what the

secularization process ought to be bringing forth by way of Christian labours of love, we should be exposing every rotten fruit that humanism's distortion of that process has yielded. To be sure, economism, technologism, scientism, democratic totalitarianism, gluttonous hedonism, and all the rest are fruits of modern humanistic secularism. But those idolatrous, reductionistic -isms would not even have been possible were it not for the liberating power of Christ's love which called men to de-ecclesiasticize life in a true process of secularization.

Newbigin points out brilliantly that the world-wide historical process of secularization is not unambiguous. It has been possible only because of the power of Christianity, but it may be turned continually as it has been in an anti-Christian, secularistic direction. If the reality and power of the transcendent God of the Bible Who has revealed Himself in Christ is denied, says Newbigin, then we must ask whether the secular spirit will "end otherwise than in a self-destructive nihilism?" In so far as the process of secularization means the liberation of man from the control of false gods and powers, it is, according to Newbigin, "a genuine continuation of that liberation-history which is the central theme of the Bible." But just for that reason, insists Newbigin,

I am driven also to believe that this movement is misunderstood if it is seen out of that context; that it will recoil in self-destruction. Specifically I suggest . . . that if the mastery which is given to man through the process of secularization is not held within the context of man's responsibility to God, the result will be a new slavery; . . . that if the dynamism of 'development', the drive to a new kind of human society, is not informed by the biblical faith concerning the nature of the kingdom of God it will end in totalitarianism; and . . . that if the secular critique of all established orders is not informed and directed by the knowledge of God it will end in a self-destructive nihilism. (pp. 38-9)

Here indeed is the full historical context in which the CLAC finds itself today. Labour relations and all economic activities in our modern, differentiated, world society appear either as fruits of and contributors to the recovery of

life in loving service to Christ, or as fruits of and contributors to the loss of life through new humanistic slavery, totalitarianism, and self-destructive nihilism. The secularization of culture leading to the freeing and opening up of various life spheres can be a new opportunity for Christian stewardship and freedom in love because of the Kingdom of God in Christ, or it can lead to new distortions, idols, and destruction because of the deep spiritual motive of Cain's hatred.

Granted the requirements for new and large scale organization in modern economic life, Newbigin asks, "Where . . . shall the secular economic order find the roots of that sense of personal responsibility for the other without which organization cannot function? Can it be . . . otherwise than in a religious sense of responsibility towards the one who has loved us and bidden us love our brother? Can a truly secular economic order survive the disappearance of a religious motivation?" (p. 134)

What a challenge confronts the CLAC! What an opportunity for this small band of Christ-followers, tucked away in this small corner of God's footstool, to be able to announce by word and deed to the world that Christ the Lord is the sole hope of history, the sole reason behind modern cultural possibilities, the sole hope for the recovery of every human labour. Nothing less than this is at stake in your quest for pluralism in the labour union movement. You may think you are only a little labour association, but because of Who God is and because of what God has done in finding His lost creation in Christ, you are one of the new fruits of His own redemptive labouring, and the labours of your love are of world-historical significance beyond your wildest dreams.

* * * * *