

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06827310 5

TOPICS OF THE TIMES

met

ZIZ

Macquart

TOPICS OF THE TIMES


TOPICS OF THE TIMES

BY
REV. HOWARD MACQUEARY
AUTHOR OF
"THE EVOLUTION OF MAN AND CHRISTIANITY"

NEW YORK
UNITED STATES BOOK COMPANY
SUCCESSORS TO
JOHN W. LOVELL COMPANY
150 WORTH ST., COR. MISSION PLACE

[C 1891]

RF



COPYRIGHT, 1891,
BY
UNITED STATES BOOK COMPANY

TO
PROFESSOR ANDREW D. WHITE, LL.D.
CORNELL UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK.

MY DEAR SIR :—Permit me to express my sincere appreciation of the sympathy and interest you have shown in my humble efforts to liberalize and rationalize the thought and life of the Church by dedicating to you this little volume, in which you will doubtless find much that you will disapprove, but I flatter myself that you will also find something in it which you can cordially indorse. I have the honor to be,

Very truly yours,

HOWARD MACQUEARY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PART I.

LECTURES.

	PAGE.
I. The Conflict Between Labor and Capital,	13
II. An Exposition of Nationalism,	31
III. Truths and Errors of Henry George's Views,	44
IV. The Savages of Civilization,	68
V. Popular Ideas of Poverty,	83
VI. Reduction of the Hours of Labor,	94
VII. The Negro in America,	101
VIII. The Bible in the Public Schools,	112

PART II.

SERMONS.

I. Our Country : Its Character and Destiny (A Thanksgiving Day Discourse),	120
II. The Sabbath Question,	129
III. Criticism of the Bible,	139
IV. Did the Fish Swallow Jonah?	150
V. What's the Use of Praying?	162
VI. What is the Evidence of Life After Death?	173
VII. The God-Filled Man,	185
VIII. Unshaken Religious Beliefs,	196
IX. Should We Have Creeds?	207
The Real Rights of Woman,	218

PREFACE.

THERE are two radically different ideas of the Church and the Pulpit. By many the Church is considered a sort of "fire escape," an institution established for the purpose of saving men from a distant burning prison. The clergyman is regarded as a sort of religious policeman, whose duty it is to hold up before sinners pictures of hell to scare them into doing their duty. He must scourge them into the straight and narrow way with the thong of fear. In other words the Church and the Pulpit are supposed to deal with the future world, not with this, at least not primarily with this.

Religion is separated, or at any rate distinguished from Morality, and it is taught that "a man may be a moral man, a very moral man, and yet go to hell."

On the other hand, many think that Jesus came to save His people from their sins (Matthew i. 11); to intellectually, socially, morally and religiously regenerate and elevate men in this world; to save them from the hell of a depraved soul, and from the consequences of such depravity here and hereafter; to convert earth into paradise. They, therefore, hold that the Church and the Pulpit have something to do with the moral aspect of every question, political, social or scientific; that the best way to prepare men for the next life is to make them better in this. They hold that Religion and Morality are twin-sisters. Religion is Morality heightened by emotion; morality based on belief in and love of God and love of man. Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: To visit the fatherless and the widows, and all sufferers in their affliction and relieve them if possible, and keep oneself unspotted from sin. The clergyman, therefore, should denounce

political corruption and industrial slavery, and social degradation, and scientific disbelief, as well as "preach Jesus Christ and Him Crucified." Indeed, the man who preaches "orthodox theories" of the Atonement, the Incarnation, etc., etc., and leaves unpreached the great moral truths of the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount, will find himself at the last day in that large company who will cry "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name and in thy name done many wonderful things?" But He will answer: "I never knew you." And when I speak of preaching the doctrines of the Sermon on the Mount, I don't mean preaching them in general, apologetic terms, but I mean applying them to the solution of particular problems, regardless of whom they offend, regardless of the loss of popularity, position and salary. We hear any amount of talk in the Pulpit about "oppression of the poor and the elevation of the lower classes," but the man who has railroad magnates or coal kings in his congregation is decidedly weary about denouncing the evils of monopolistic corporations, trusts and combines; but this is precisely what he ought to do, and the more of such men he can get in his congregation, the more strongly should he preach against such evils. Of course, he need not and should not descend to personal abuse, and he should not be indiscriminating in his censure, but he should be bold and honest and faithful, as a minister of Christ. Such a preacher may expect to incur odium, as Christ did, but what of that? He will be accused of desiring to create "a sensation." It is impossible to preach on living issues without being accused of sensationalism. On the other hand, if a preacher confines himself to a reiteration of platitudes, commonplaces, he will be called a "fogy." Choose, then, between sensationalism and fogyism, and for the sake of Truth, do not choose the latter. Of course the old men and women will call your sermons "lectures," and will probably stay away from church, but thinking men and women will come to hear you, and after all it is thinkers who move the world.

Therefore, let none of the popular objections to the modern idea of the Church and Pulpit deter you from acting upon it. "Modern idea," did I say? Why, it is as old as the prophets of Israel. Old Samuel, and Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and all their noble band, boldly de-

nounced the political and social evils of their time, and the great "court preachers" of the Christian Church did the same. What we must do is to revive their idea of the function of the Church and Pulpit, and follow their example, and this is being done to a great extent. The clergyman is paying less attention to the women and more attention to the men; he is doing less "pastoral visiting" and more "pastoral work;" he is putting aside theological dogmas, and considering the problems of life; he is ceasing to deal in pious platitudes and preaching "a muscular Christianity;" he is trying to get men to come to church and pray on Sunday; but he is trying more earnestly to make them do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly before their God and fellowmen during the week; and it is because I wish to help forward this good work, in my humble way, that I have published this little volume of lectures and sermons. They are examples of the sort of preaching which I think our age needs, but in offering them to the public, I beg leave to say:

They are intended to be *popular* discussions of the great problems considered. They are by no means intended to be exhaustive or original. I have not aimed to say anything new or startling, but while I do not claim originality for this book, I may say that I have made the ideas of others used herein my own: they have not been swallowed without being digested. While, therefore, the materials of the book are derived, they bear my image and superscription, which my friends will recognize; they are cast in my own mental mold. Originality after all is a relative term. A man is original to some people and decidedly unoriginal to others. I am original to many people ("chiefly fools!"), but to Solomons I am an archaic echo. This book is not written for Solomons, and should one by mistake happen to take it up, I beg him to read no farther than this passage. My aim has been, chiefly, to find the truth in other people's ideas, and to present it in a popular manner to those who have had less leisure for reading and studying than I have, and if I have done this, I have done all I desired.

Furthermore: The book is not "a learned work." I say this because my short experience as a writer convinces me that "originality" and "learning" are considered indispensable prerequisites to authorship by many critics, even if (especially if) the critics themselves are not original and

learned. I never knew what an ignoramus I was until I wrote a book, and therefore I humbly admit that I am not learned, and no production of mine can bear the desirable stamp of erudition ; but as learning no less than originality is relative, as a man may be very "deep" to shallow minds and very learned to the uneducated, perhaps I may get a hearing and a reading, since the Solomons are decidedly in the minority in these degenerate days. At any rate, some of my friends who heard these lectures and sermons were good enough to assure me that they were worthy of publication, and therefore I venture to offer them to the public. They have, of course, been thoroughly revised, much of the original matter being omitted and some new matter added.

HOWARD MACQUEARY.

TOPICS OF THE TIMES.

I

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

THE conflict between labor and capital is at least three thousand years old. In an ancient document we have an account of such a conflict which reads like a socialistic novel of the present day. The parties concerned were a wealthy country gentleman who owned large tracts of land and large flocks of sheep and herds of cattle, and a noble outlaw, who, at the head of a body of bandits, lived in the caves of the mountains on which the rich man's flocks browsed. The scene of this story lay in the East, in a country bordering the Mediterranean Sea, where the shepherd's life is peculiarly delightful and peculiarly dangerous—delightful because of the rich pastures and sunny skies—dangerous because robber bands prowl through the country and are apt to make severe inroads on the flocks. Now, on the occasion referred to, the herdsmen of our wealthy lord drove his flocks far away from his residence into the mountains, where the band of outlaws were hiding; but the leader of the band, being more noble than men of this class usually are, not only restrained his men from committing depredations upon the flocks, but he actually protected them from the attacks of other robbers lurking in those parts. Soon the time for shearing the sheep came round, and our bandit chief then sent several of his followers to the wealthy sheep-owner asking that he requite their services with a few pieces of mutton. But

my lord the sheep-owner replied, "Who is this fellow that he should make such a demand of me? There be many servants nowadays that break away from their masters! Shall I then take my bread and my water and my flesh that I killed for my shearers, and give it unto men whom I know not whence they be? No! get you gone!" So the young man returned to the chief and told him the result of his request. "Well," he exclaimed, "come, boys, gird ye on every man his sword," and we will show this fool who are masters and who are servants."

So they sallied forth, four hundred strong, armed to the teeth, to take by force what they had failed to get by peaceable means. But lo, on the way they met the wife of my lord the sheep-owner, coming with a body of servants and laden asses, bringing a large supply of bread and wine and mutton and raisins and figs. And she fell on her face before the outraged chieftain, beseeching him to accept her peace-offering and do no violence to her fool of a husband. Her beauty and her generosity melted the heart of the noble outlaw and he gladly accepted her bounty and invoked a blessing upon her for preventing him from shedding of blood. Meanwhile, her husband, who knew nothing of his wife's conduct, was feasting and drinking with his friends; as a result of his carousal he was taken ill the next morning and died in ten days; and then his beautiful wife married the bandit chief, of course.

You recognize in this story the history of David and Nabal. It is written in the twenty-fifth chapter of the *First Book of Samuel*, and I submit it not only reads like a novel but it is most suggestive on the subject in hand. Indeed it reveals both the causes and the cures of all labor trouble. (1.) We remark that the first cause of this conflict between labor and capital was the *contrast between the condition of David and that of Nabal*. It was the contrast between the rich man and Lazarus. Nabal had abundance and to spare: David had nothing—not even a shelter for his head save a hole in the ground, and he had six hundred men following him and depending upon him for support. Moreover, his straitened circumstances were not due to any fault of his, but rather to the jealousy and injustice and cruelty of his king—Saul. It is no wonder, then, that he should seek food from his wealthy neighbor, whose flocks he had not only not injured but had actually protected. Now, this

state of things has ever preceded a social revolution. When Rome was tottering to her fall, we are told, "a whole population might be trembling lest they should be starved by the delay of an Egyptian corn ship from Alexandria, while the upper classes were squandering a fortune on a single banquet, drinking out of myrrhine and jewelled vases worth thousands of dollars; and feasting on the brains of peacocks and the tongues of nightingales. Over a large part of Italy most of the free-born population had to content themselves, even in winter with a tunic; and the luxury of a toga was reserved only, by way of honor, to the corpse. Yet at this very time the dress of Roman ladies displayed an unheard of splendor. One, it is said, was seen dressed for a betrothal feast in a robe entirely covered with pearls and emeralds, which had cost the amazing sum of over two million dollars; and this was known to be less expensive than some others.

In the history of the French Revolution of the last century we have the same contrast in the conditions of the rich and the poor. An eminent abbé of the time and a leader in the revolution, exclaimed in the National Assembly: "What is the *Third Estate*? Everything. What has it hitherto been in the body politic? Nothing. What does it demand? To be something." Whatever exaggeration there may be in this statement, due to the passion of the orator, it certainly points to the fact that the great mass of the French people were slaves to the upper-classes and had no recognized political rights worthy of mention.

In our country to-day we have a similar state of things:—on the one hand immense fortunes—the greatest ever known—on the other, the most abject poverty. "There are worlds and worlds," says Mr. George, "even within the bounds of the same city. The man who comes into New York with plenty of money, who puts up at the Windsor or Brunswick, and is received by hospitable hosts in Fifth Avenue mansions, sees one New York. The man who comes with a dollar and a half, and goes to the fifteen or twenty-five cent lodging house sees another. On the one hand are those to whom life, with its round of balls, parties, theatres, flirtations and excursions, is a holiday, in which, but for invention of new pleasures, satiety would make time drag. But this bright world is very different from that of the old woman who, in the dingy lower street.

sits from morning to night beside her little stock of apples and candy : and from that of girls who stand all day behind counters and before looms, who bend over sewing machines for weary, weary hours, or who come out at night to prowl the streets. Never since great estates were eating out the heart of Rome has the world seen such enormous fortunes as are now rising : and never more utter proletarians."

What is true of New York is true of all our large towns and cities. Dives and Lazarus lie down together, the one at the gate with the dogs, the other in the mansion with his sweet wife and dear children and congenial friends. But shall we, therefore, conclude that a great revolution is brewing like that which destroyed Rome and rent the French Monarchy asunder? We cannot say positively, but we may say that it is not at all *necessary*—that it is not yet too late to prevent such a catastrophe. We remember that Abigail stepped in between David and Nabal and averted the threatened destruction of the fool, and we may hope that the spirit of Abigail is broad in our land to-day and is sufficiently strong to settle our industrial troubles.

2. The second cause of the conflict between David and Nabal was the *social superiority* which the wealthy debauchee asserted over the noble-chieftain. He assumed that because he was rich he was made of better clay than David was. He therefore exclaimed in much haughtiness, "Who is this David, and who is the son of Jesse? There be many *servants* now-a-days that break away every man from his master." The fact was, David had been anointed *king* over Israel, and his reduction to a bandit's life was due to the injustice and cruelty of Saul, not to his inherent inferiority. All his pride, all "The old Adam" in him therefore, was aroused by this insulting reply of Nabal and he very naturally proposed to show him who was who. Now we hear a great deal of talk about "the dignity of labor" and "the brotherhood of man" in our day. The politician is very *suave* in his address and very cordial in his grasp of the working man's hand—just before the election; the clergyman paints beautiful pictures of the Nazarene Carpenter and "love in a cottage," and very fervently calls the working men "dear brethren" on Sunday, but unlike his Master he is not so ready on Monday to go and dine with the publicans and sinners. He enjoys much more a chat over the wine glass with the refined, wealthy,

educated employer than he does "hard tack" and a glass of milk in the humble lodging of his employee. Of course it is not so in every case. There are noble exceptions among both the clergy and laymen. There are men who will lift their hat to the working man and his wife at other times than election days, and there are clergymen who not only preach but practice the fraternity of Jesus. But unquestionably, these are exceptions; else working men would love the parson and the politician more than they do. The opinion is widespread and is based on facts, that whatever may be the "dignity of labor" *theoretically*, yet money gives one power, position, and even character. Hence the young woman looks out for a "good catch" and the broken down aristocracy of England and France come to America in search of heiresses. The parson and the politician, the employer and the employee, all seek wealth, and when they get it they generally speak of others as their "servants," even though they may have royal blood flowing through their veins. And this is as true of working men who become rich as those who inherit their wealth. Indeed, we have all doubtless known of men, who have "risen in life" and who make the very worse kind of employers and the most unbearable snobs. But this sort of thing arouses the very devil in men who know that whatever may be their misfortunes, their blood is as pure, their clay is as good, as that which sits in cushioned chairs, sleeps on golden bedsteads, drives in a coach and four and swills wine from silver decanters. Working men and women are getting tired of being called "servants" and "hands"—mere machines to enrich others—and so they are beginning to cease to respect those who treat them as Nabal treated David, and we need not wonder if they feel tempted to bring fools to their senses by hard knocks. Don't misunderstand me. I am not advocating such a method of procedure. I am only stating facts, and maintaining that as long as *money* instead of *character* is made the basis of social superiority—as long as the relation of "master" and "servant" is emphasized—as long as the wealthy employer passes his "hands" on the street as he would a crowd of dogs—so long must there be a feeling of spite and ill-will. Only by a recognition of the dignity of man as *man*, only by the acknowledgment of the fact that his employees are co-workers, partners with him, can any pleasant relation be-

tween employer and employed exist. Don't infer from this that I am a Socialist, for I am not. Socialism is too much of a machine system to suit men, but it rests on a grand truth—a truth proclaimed nineteen centuries ago by the Nazarene Carpenter—the truth of man's unity and brotherhood.

3. A third and indeed the most important cause of the conflict between David and Nabal was *a failure on the part of both to recognize certain rights*. David was right in believing that he should be rewarded for his services, but he was wrong in employing force to get such remuneration. On the other hand, Nabal cannot be utterly condemned for not seeing at once the reasonableness of David's demands. He argued thus: "I pay my laborers what I promise them. I never asked this David to guard my flocks: he did it of his own accord. Why, then, should I pay for services I never engaged? Shall I take my bread and my water and my flesh that I have killed for my regularly employed laborers and give it unto men, whom I know not whence they be?" David's demand, therefore, appeared to him an extravagant and insolent one, provoking unfeigned astonishment and indignation. He considered it an invasion of his rights—a dictation with respect to the employment of that which was his own. Recollect, too, that this view of the irresponsible right of property was not *Nabal's* invention. It was the view probably entertained by all his class. It had descended to him from his parents, and hence he could not be expected to see things just as David saw them. David undoubtedly had a *moral* right although he had no *legal* right (to use a modern distinction), to a portion of the stuff he had protected, and Abigail, with the keen conscience of the woman, saw this at once, and hastened to satisfy the just demands of David. But Nabal could not see this, and his modern representatives are quite as thick-headed. They "do business, don't you know!" They don't carry a Bible around in their pockets, or paste up a copy of the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount in their shops and offices. They don't object to hearing the preacher expound these great truths in the pulpit on Sunday, but he must not come into their offices Monday morning and urge them to apply the principles he had advocated the day before. The "business-man" thinks that the Ten

Commandments have as little to do with business as the United States Senator said they had to do with politics. They do very well to preach about, but the minister who steps into the office of a wealthy parishioner of his and urges him to adopt those principles in his business, will be politely reminded of the fact that "he knows nothing about business." He would better go up to the house and talk to the ladies, or go home and say his prayers, and prepare his sermon and let "business men" run the shops! And these modern Nabals must be partially excused on the ground of *false education*. They have been taught that "competition is the life of trade"—that "wages are governed by the law of supply and demand"—that they must, therefore, buy their labor in the cheapest market, and that they are not responsible for the cheapness of labor. This miserable political economy—this false and immoral teaching,—has been pounded into their minds from the cradle up, and has furnished the governing principles of business for generations, and we cannot therefore be surprised if they treat David's demand as an invasion of their rights—a dictation to which they must not submit. Shallow people often say it matters little what one *believes*! It makes a tremendous difference what one believes! A man who believes the theories just alluded to will never be convinced of the justice of the laborers' demand, but, like Nabal, will spurn it from him with astonishment and indignation.

Such, then, are three of the prime causes of the conflict between labor and capital. The existence of great wealth side by side with abject poverty, which begets the conviction in the mind of the masses that there is a screw loose somewhere in the social machinery. How often do we hear a poor man say, as he looks at his wealthy neighbor's fine residence, etc., "It doesn't seem right that a few men should be so rich and the many so poor!" This is not simply an expression of envy, but it is a condemnation of the social and industrial system. Then the pride and arrogance of the wealthy toward the poor, and the application of false economic or "business principles" so-called instead of great moral maxims in industrial affairs, contribute still more largely to the production of a conflict.

What are the *remedies*?

(1.) Shall it be *force*, such as David employed? God

forbid! As Professor Richard T. Ely, of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore—a friend of the working men—says: “It is high time for those men to keep quiet, who, little in heart and mind, have no better remedy for social ills than physical force. They fail absolutely to understand the age in which they live, and will involve us all in ruin if allowed to execute their savage plans.”

(2.) Shall we, then, adopt the Socialist’s program—the joint control of land and capital, worked by associated labor? That is, shall we make land and the means of production common (public) property and the State the one and only employer, and distribute the products either according to the *needs* or the *deeds* of the individual workers?

Judging from the enormous sale of Mr. Bellamy’s book (“Looking Backward”), we must conclude that thousands of the best minds of our day think that this is the panacea for our social ills. But as already stated, I consider Socialism too much of a machine system. It would not allow the freedom to the individual that it promises, and I for one don’t want to be a mere pin or screw fixed in one place in the great social machine. Mr. Bellamy’s picture is very attractive, in some respects, especially in the dignity assigned to labor and the universal plenty it offers, but it is much easier to draw such a sketch on paper than it is to make it work in practice; and I dare say that the people of the twentieth or the twenty-fifth century will find the machine offered quite as unmanageable as we do.

(3) Shall we, then, adopt the Anarchist’s proposition:—abolish all laws and make every man a law unto himself? Yes, we may do that—*when the millennium comes!* But if we were to do it now I for one should beg to be transported at once to Mars or some other planet! The Anarchists are too good for this world, and should all be sent immediately to Heaven! In all seriousness, the Anarchist believes that we can get along without law, and that it should therefore be altogether abolished; but much as I love the Gospel, I fear that, human nature continuing as it is, the Gospel must be spiced with law for some centuries to come—perhaps less law than we now have, or, at least with better law, but still we must have some law—the only question is, *What and Where?*

(4.) Shall we, then adopt Henry George's theory—abolish private ownership in land by the appropriation of its economic rent as taxes? This would be a comparatively simple solution of the social problem, and much may be said in its favor. But many of us cannot agree with Mr. George that the ownership of land is in itself criminal, nor can we see that the adoption of the Single Tax would remove all our social ills. We hold that labor spent upon land gives the same title to it that labor spent upon the materials of a house gives to it, and Mr. George admits that labor spent upon a house makes it ours. We also admit that our present methods of taxation are about as unjust and iniquitous as they could be, but we fail to see how *any* method of taxation could cure all of our industrial evils. Now it must not be inferred from this glance at Socialism, Anarchism and Georgeism that I don't appreciate the high intellectual and moral character of such men as Mr. Bellamy, Mr. Hugh Pentecost and Mr. George, or that I consider their theories altogether irrational and impracticable: far from it! I have the utmost respect and admiration for these men, for their motives and aims, and I doubt not that many of the reforms they advocate would be practicable and beneficial—only I think that none of these systems taken as a whole, contains remedies for all our social ills. We want a system larger than any of these, which will comprehend all their truths and exclude their errors, but that system is yet unborn.

While, then, we await its birth, what shall we do to be saved? "There are four agencies," says Professor Ely, "through which we must work for the amelioration of the laboring classes as well as of all classes of society. These are the labor organization, the school, the State, and the Church."

I. The *Labor Organization*—what is its function and duty? It seems to me that labor organizations have made a grand mistake though perhaps a natural and pardonable mistake. They have imagined that their great object was *strikes*,—the raising of wages, the obtainment of their desires by means of force. Of course, I know that this is not avowed in their platforms as their prime object, and many labor leaders have always been strongly opposed to strikes, except as the last resort, and some may have opposed them altogether on principle. But, assuredly, the

majority of working men have felt that they must obtain their rights by force, and to that end they have joined organizations. They made the mistake of David, and it is to be hoped that the recent deplorable strike on the New York Central R. R. (1890) will be the last one. Strikes are not only expensive, they not only disturb business and destroy thousands of dollars worth of property, but experience shows that they are for the most part useless—or at least that more harm than good generally results from them. A spirit of bitterness and strife on both sides is engendered which does harm to everybody, and must be deprecated. What, then, is the function of labor organizations? It is threefold; to impart information on economic subjects, to arbitrate matters in dispute, and to influence legislatures by petitions and otherwise. I have the word of working men who have long been members of labor organizations that their chief benefit was the education the members received in them. By means of lectures, the papers published and taken, the discussions in their various meetings, etc., they stir up thought on economic subjects, and surely any one who has even a superficial knowledge of facts must know that the ignorance of the simplest principles of political economy and social conditions is simply prodigious, not only—not mainly among the working men,—but also among the employing classes. Go to any employer and ask him, What is the source and law of wages? and he will immediately answer that wages are drawn from capital and governed by the law of supply and demand; and if you contradict him he will at once flare up and declare you to be “a labor agitator,” a “Socialist,” an “Anarchist,” a Henry George man, or perhaps the devil! Yet it is well known to most intelligent working men and to all students of economics that, not only have the Socialists and Anarchists, Henry George, Gunton and other so-called “labor agitators,” shown that the popular theory of wages is false, but Gen. Francis A. Walker, Professor Ely, and other eminent political economists who are not “labor agitators,” have proved the same. It has been shown that wages are *not* drawn from capital, but from the products of labor—that capital is, in fact, itself a product of labor—and that wages are *not* governed by the “law of supply and demand,” but by the laborer’s standard of living—that is, the least that will satisfy his needs, and by the utility of his

labor to the employer. Now, the erroneous idea of wages which most employers hold, and which is due not to their depravity of heart but to false education, produces immense practical difficulties; and yet it will probably never be eradicated from their minds except by the influence of labor organizations and their friends. By a wide diffusion of economic knowledge through the labor journals, lectures, etc., these organizations will indirectly and slowly influence the general press of the country, and sow good seed which will ultimately bear fruit. At any rate the main function of labor organizations is educational, and its importance cannot be over-estimated. Another function is *arbitration*, and as the organizations generally "recognize this in their platforms it is unnecessary to dwell long upon it—only they should not let this principle remain a dead letter. The working men should restrain their Davids when the Nabals arouse them, and should send out *their* Abigails. Unfortunately, the beautiful wives of the employers will not be easily persuaded to follow the example of the ancient heroine and mediate between the antagonists and so the working men must send out their Abigails. I mean, of course, that they themselves must make the advance in the spirit of Abigail and be governed solely by reason and conscience, even when the employers are not. That was the spirit of the Nazarene Carpenter, and is becoming more and more the spirit of the times. Experience shows that arbitration works better than force, even though its operation be slower, and the laboring men have to suffer considerable loss and oppression before they reap its rewards. Arbitration is destined to supersede force in the industrial and political world, in the individual and international relations, and so the labor organizations, by adopting this method of adjusting disturbed industrial relations place themselves in the very vanguard of human progress.

Finally, the labor organizations can exert an influence upon the national and state legislatures. "What!" I hear some indignant working man exclaim, "talk about the laboring men influencing a Senate of Millionaires and a House of boodled Representatives! Nonsense!" Yes, but I don't mean quite that. I know full well that the chief business of Congress, as it is now constituted, seems to be to unseat congressmen that have really been elected, to kick down doors and to pass partizan legislative acts, and

of course it is absurd to think that such a Congress will do anything for working men. But when I say that labor organizations may influence the legislature, I mean they may *create it*. Working men, *vote for those that will vote for you!* By that I don't mean that you should necessarily form a working man's party, though that may be the ultimate result of your action, but I mean that you should for the present create no new party lines, and ignore those already existing, and vote for men who, you have good reason to believe, will consider and stand by your interests in the National and State Legislatures. The majority of the voters of this country are working men, and if they are oppressed by corrupt "boss governed" politicians it is their own fault. They have the remedy in their own hands and whenever they choose they may cleanse the political Augean stables; and then, but not till then, can they hope for help from the Government such as they need. All this is more or less fully recognized in the platforms of the various labor organizations, but too often their principles remain dead letters. Hence it cannot be too earnestly urged upon such organizations, that they have among their members men of sufficient brains, and through their medium they may get sufficient education to fit them for Congress, and they should be sent to Congress by working men.

2. A second agency in the solution of the labor problem mentioned by Dr. Ely is the *School*. "Chief attention (he says) should be directed to the young, and with a good will and energetic action they can be so influenced as to change the character of the population materially in one generation. They should, when necessary, be removed from vicious surroundings and universal and compulsory education ought to reach every child in the land. Schools may be improved by the introduction of instruction in manners and morals. Manual training for boys, sewing and cooking for girls, gymnastic exercises and suitable structures for both are all desirable, and would yield a large return for every dollar invested." One of the great political parties to-day professes to be very much interested in "the protection of labor." If, now, instead of taxing the commodities the poor man uses, it would provide the means of making his labor *more efficient*, and therefore more valuable, we should be more inclined to believe in its cry of "protection to labor;" and when we think of the

millions the Nation spends in educating men at Annapolis and West Point for the purpose of killing their fellow men (which purpose fortunately is not often fulfilled), we think that a crumb flung to the working man in the shape of industrial training would be not simply a boon to him but a blessing to society as a whole. But again it is necessary that working men should be represented in the National and State Legislatures before they can expect the State aid they need in education. Until then they must be content to see "the surplus" of their hard earnings, that accumulates from time to time in the Treasury, spent on public buildings in the various congressional districts, and for other purposes which, however commendable they may be, are far less important than the intellectual and social elevation of the people.

Of course, there are various objections urged against State aid to education. Some object to it on religious grounds others on economic grounds, but "proof of the pudding is eating it," and whatever may be the defects of our public school system—and they are neither few nor trifling—it produces much more good than evil; it is a national blessing; and may be greatly improved, especially by the addition of a system of manual training.

3. The third agency in industrial regeneration which Dr. Ely suggests is the *State*. "The individual," he says, "has his province, the State has its functions, which the individual cannot accomplish at all or cannot accomplish so well. But an obstacle to the proper economic activity of the State has been found in the low view men have too often taken of its nature. Calling it an atomistic collection of units, some have even gone so far as to speak of taxation for the support of Public Schools as robbery of the propertied classes. Now it may be rationally maintained that if there is anything divine on this earth, it is the State, the product of the same God-given instincts which led to the establishment of the Church and the Family." Of course, the Professor does not mean that any particular State as it actually exists to-day, much less does he mean that the Government (which the popular mind generally identifies with the State) is divine, but he means the State as it *should be*,—a real Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" would be divine. In other words, the *idea* of the State is of Divine origin, as is the idea of the Church and

Family, while its actual realization among human beings necessarily partakes more or less of all human attempts to attain to the Divine. But supposing the people—the great masses—are fairly represented in the Government, and this may be accomplished by an intelligent use of the ballot by the people, then the State may perform the following functions to great advantage: It can shorten the hours of labor; it can equalize taxation and abolish all restrictions upon commerce: it can cease from discriminative legislation, by which the few are enriched at the expense of the many: it can prohibit child labor, and provide educational facilities for the masses: it can regulate immigration—protect American working men, not from the *products* of “the pauper labor of Europe,” but from “the pauper labor” itself: it can give women their rights—enact that women who do the work of men shall receive the wages of men: it can provide for the careful inspection and due ventilation of factories, mines, etc., it can establish Postal Savings Banks, and, Dr. Ely would add, it can and should control municipal gas-works, electric lighting, waterworks, street railways, telephones, telegraphs, and steam railways. Whether it should go so far as that or not, the State may certainly do the most of these things *without running into Socialism* and to great and endless comfort of millions. I do not forget the Anarchists’ objections to all this, but I cannot consider them now.

Dr. Ely maintains that there are certain businesses, such as the telegraph and railroad, that are monopolies by *their very nature*—“natural monopolies,” as distinguished from these monopolies created by legislation: and he holds that State control of these natural monopolies would redound to the welfare of the whole community, and would be much better than their private management. If so let us have State control of such businesses. But let the superiority of public control over private enterprise be fully proved by facts and reasons before it be adopted. The great question of the day is, How to adjust the relation of monopolistic and individualistic enterprises? and Professor Ely’s suggestions on this point are very important. But without discussing this question at length it is all important to emphasize the fact that the State *has* an industrial or economic function, as well as a civil and military function—that the economic function is, in fact, the most important; and

this is fully recognized by tariff legislators—only they put the shoe on the wrong foot.

4. Finally, the *Church* must claim her full place as a social power existing independently of the State. And now, lest it be thought that I have a clergyman's interest in this matter, I shall quote Prof. Ely's words on this subject also. "A wider diffusion of sound ethics (he says) is an economic requirement of the times. Christian ethics—by all acknowledged to be the most perfect system of ethics, regardless of any divine origin—contain the principles which should animate the entire labor movement. But how are men to learn these? The masses can acquire such an acquaintance with the data of ethics as to render them a living reality only through some one who is a personal embodiment of them. Abstract ethics have not and never will become a mighty vital power in this world. It is the concrete that moves men. Now I know only one perfect concrete embodiment of Christian ethics and that is their *Founder!* He it is who must become the personal Saviour of the labor movement, if it is ever to accomplish its legitimate end. American working men will sooner or later perceive that the Christian Church is not hostile to their just aspirations, but rather their best friend." It must not be inferred from this that Dr. Ely is blind to the faults of the Church, or that he commends it as a whole. On the contrary, no one has denounced more severely than he the sins of Christians and the failure of the clergy to do their part in this great work. But he recognizes the fact that all human societies must be more or less imperfect—that the tares and the wheat must grow together: still he urges, rightly, that the wheat is there. "Enumerate (he says) the men outside of the laboring classes prominent for their advocacy of the cause of labor, write all the names on a slip of paper and cross out the names of clergymen, and you will find three fourths of them gone. No other large or influential class in the United States is so devoted to the working men's welfare, and I know how to give them no better advice than to urge them to seek counsel and friendly aid in all their endeavors from Christian ministers." Now, if this did not come from a layman and one who is known to be a friend of the working man, I should hesitate to quote it, lest it be thought that I was pleading my own cause. But I must confess that I agree with Prof. Ely. Through the Nazarene Car-

penter, his Church and his Ministers, will great blessings be obtained for the laboring classes. I have already frankly admitted that the majority of the Clergy are not as wide awake on social and industrial subjects as they ought to be, although, as Dr. Ely says, there may be more of the Clergy than other professional men interested in the laborer's welfare. I have received no special favor from my clerical brethren that I should defend them, but I do believe that most of them are kindly disposed to the working men and would fain render them a good service. The reason why more of them do *not* do this is found, not in their depravity of heart but in their false education. There is not (*as there should be*) a chair in social science in every one of our theological seminaries to teach candidates for the ministry how to apply Christian principles to the solution of the complicated industrial problems. They are not taught that the Church has an important part to perform in the political and social sphere. On the contrary, they are taught that "Christ's Kingdom is not of this world"—that "the Church has nothing to do with politics"—that this subject must not be mentioned in the pulpit. Their minds are crammed full of Latin, Greek and Hebrew; they are taught how to prove that miracles happened nineteen centuries ago—or rather they are taught to *attempt* to prove this, but the teaching for the most part is a failure: they are taught Church history in order to show that *their* Church is *the* Church—the only Church: they are in short, taught sectarian theology—theories of Inspiration, theories of the God-head, theories of the Atonement, theories of future retribution, theories on this and theories on that subject, but they are *not* taught the grand truths contained in the Sermon on the Mount, the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," or in such parables as that of the Good Samaritan. I mean they are not taught to apply these great principles in detail to particular cases of political corruption and social oppression regardless of whom they offend. But we have reason to hope that the day is not distant when these things will be done while those things will not be left undone. No one believes more firmly than I do in a thorough education of the clergy in the Languages, Apologetics, Theology, Church History, etc.; if these subjects were taught *philosophically* and not from a narrow sectarian point of view, no one would object to such teaching:

but neither Christ nor Saint Paul devoted himself to theological instruction. They rather emphasized *practical religion*, and this is what we must have. Meanwhile, I plead for the clergy on the same ground as that on which I have based a plea for the Nabals—that is, on the ground of false education. Both are educated after a fashion, but it is not such an education as will lead them to do the work we are now talking about. Working men, therefore, must not make unreasonable demands of the clergy. Let them remember that they are mere human beings: let them consider the amazing influence of environment or surroundings, the force of heredity and early education: above all, let them remember that some, indeed many, clergymen are already aroused and are doing what they can, and their example and influence will tell in due time. What the working men should do is not to stand aloof from the Clergy and the Church, for they certainly can never win their help by such means: nor should they denounce them either in a bunch or individually, but they should get *possession* of the Clergy and the Church. We want a Working-man's Church, if not a Working-man's Political Party, and the working men can give us this. They can put their men into the ministry and build them churches, and tell them to preach not theology but the "ology" of Jesus Christ—the Gospel of Good Deeds—and then they should go to hear that Gospel. I have found that working men will sometimes go to church when the minister proposes to preach on their favorite topic—say the Eight Hour Movement, Socialism, Georgeism, and such like—but they will not go at other times. Of course, I know that we naturally like to hear the subjects we are specially interested in discussed better than we like to hear other topics preached about; but we should remember that other people are interested in different subjects, and so we should be as willing to listen to discussions on those subjects as they are to hear sermons on our favorite topics, and when we refuse to do this it looks like the child's "I won't play if you don't do to suit me."

The minister preaches to all classes: he is the friend of all—the rich and the poor alike—and must not take sides just to gain the favor of either party. It will be remembered that a young man came to Jesus on one occasion, and asked him to speak to his brother that he divide his living

with him, but the Master refused to do so saying, "Who made me a judge and divider over you?" (Luke xii. 13-15). He was the friend of both and would not therefore take sides; but he immediately laid down the great principle which should govern both parties, viz.: "Beware of *covetousness!*" That is the position the Clergy must take on the labor question: they must denounce spiritual wickedness in high as well as in low places without fear or favor, but they must *not* become partizans, and the working men must not ask them to do just as they would have them do and swear at them and desert them if they don't do this. Let them stand by the parsons and the parsons will stand by them—at least some of them will—and they can easily separate the sheep from the goats.

AN EXPOSITION OF NATIONALISM.

IN our day the world is deluged with books, and the flood is so great that it sweeps many thousands of volumes into the whirlpool of oblivion almost as soon as they are produced. Among the comparatively few books that are destined to escape this fate and exert a lasting influence upon the thought and life of the nation is Edward Bellamy's "Looking Backward." It is not only interesting as a novel, it has not only had a larger sale than perhaps any book of the age, but it deals with facts and conditions that will claim the attention of the best minds for many generations to come, and as long as "the social problem" remains unsolved, so long will the views advocated by Mr. Bellamy prove interesting, and to many persons attractive, if for no other reason simply because Socialism, which is merely another name for Nationalism, offers one of the noblest *ideals* to man and society. It promises a fulfillment of the great prophecy, that men would one day "beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks," and allow every one to live peaceably and happily under his own vine and fig tree. It proclaims the possible realization of the Nazarene's doctrine of a Universal Brotherhood, and hence, it will always stir the souls of philanthropists. For such reasons it is here proposed to give another exposition of Nationalism, in order that its power and principles and objects may be more widely known. I shall not attempt much criticism, but simply explain the Nationalist programme, and perhaps, point out its good features, leaving to others the indication of its weakness and shortcomings. The first point to be made clear is the exact nature of Nationalism, for there is profound ignorance, even among otherwise well informed people as to what Socialism is, and especially as to what it aims to do. They know that the Socialists attack the industrial system, and would overturn the social order,

and they immediately conclude that a bloody revolution, like that which occurred in France at the close of the last century, is proposed. Nothing of the kind! There are peaceful revolutions, and these peaceful revolutions are as necessary to the life and progress of humanity, as are the revolutions of the Earth around the Sun. Jesus Christ was the greatest revolutionist that ever lived, but we are not afraid of Him; on the contrary, we want to fight under his banner. So the Socialists, for the most part, are, in spirit, followers of Jesus—certainly Mr. Bellamy is—and hence their characters should be a sufficient refutation of this popular error.

Socialism, then, means the joint control of land and capital worked by associated labor. In other words, land and the means of production are to be made common public property, the State the one and only employer, and the products are to be divided according to the needs or the deeds of the laborers. Hence, we read in "Looking Backward" that, by the close of the twentieth century, industry and commerce had ceased to be conducted by a set of irresponsible corporations and syndicates of private persons at their caprice and for their profit, and were intrusted to a single syndicate representing the people to be conducted in the common interest for the common profit. The Nation, that is to say, was organized as the one great business corporation in which all other corporations were absorbed: it became the one capitalist in the place of all other capitalists, the sole employer, the final monopoly in which all previous and lesser monopolies were swallowed up, a monopoly in the profits and economies of which all citizens shared. Socialism, thus proclaims all men to be brothers: it condemns the principle of "competition" as is rational and brutal, and would substitute "co-operation" or "association" in its place; it aims at a substantial equality of wealth among the citizens of a society, which equality will be the result not of an arbitrary division from time to time, of the products of the country (as many foolishly suppose), but it will be the result of service rendered—the *natural* result of the industrial system. Among the measures proposed by the Nationalists are: 1st—Nationalization of railroads, whether by constituting the United States perpetual receiver of all lines, to manage the same for the public interest, paying over to the present security

holders, pending the complete establishment of Nationalism, such reasonable dividends on a just valuation of the property as may be earned, or by some other practicable method not involving hardship to individuals ; 2d—Nationalization of telegraphs and telephones, and their addition to the post-office, to which, as departments of transmission of intelligence, they are said to properly belong ; 3d—The express business of the country will be connected with the post-office, as it is now in some countries ; 4th—Coal mining, which at present is most rapaciously conducted as respects the public, and most oppressively as regards a great body of laborers, will be nationalized, to the end that the mines may be continuously worked to their full capacity, coal furnished the consumers at cost, and the miners humanely dealt with ; 5th—Municipalities generally shall undertake lighting, heating, street car service, and such other public services as are now performed by corporations, to the end that such services may be more cheaply and effectually rendered. A fruitful source of political corruption will be by this means cut off, and a large body of laborers will be brought under the humane conditions of toil. Of course, all nationalized and municipalized industries will be conducted at cost for use and not for profit. Moreover, this nationalization of industry is to be a gradual process. "We advocate," say the Nationalists, "no sudden or ill-considered changes ; we make no war on individuals ; we do not censure those who have accumulated immense fortunes simply by carrying to a logical end the false principles upon which they are now based."

The operation of these industries by the State, according to Mr. Bellamy, will be somewhat as follows : The industrial force will be organized on the principles of the standing army. First ; the worker (man or woman) will be put through a course of mental, physical and manual training, until, at the age of twenty-one, he or she will be mustered into service. The worker will, of course, be allowed to select whatever profession or business, he may desire, and after the thorough course of training to which he would be subjected, it would be comparatively easy to make a choice. All work would bring exactly the same remuneration, that is to say, each one would receive all the necessaries and comforts of life, and in return would be required to render only such service as he was able to perform. To the obvi-

ous objection that such an argument would allow idleness and be unjust to some, it is answered ; 1st—The man who is intellectually and physically *able* to do more work than others is more morally *bound* to do it, and a correct public opinion would see this at once ; 2d—In order to get every one to do his best certain powerful inducements would be offered, not in the way of money, for under the Socialistic *régime* there would be no money, but in the shape of more powerful incentives. “Does it really seem,” asks Mr. Bellamy, “that human nature is insensible to any motives save fear of want and love of luxury? No! When it is a question of the grandest class of efforts, the most absolute self-devotion they depend on quite other incentives. Not higher wages, but honor and hope of men’s gratitude, patriotism and the inspiration of duty are the motives we set before soldiers when it is a question of dying for the nation, and never was there an age of the world when these motives did not call out what is best and noblest in men.” It should be remembered that, under the socialistic system, these motives would be greatly strengthened by the early education of the young and the lofty public opinion, and money being abolished, the powerful incentives consisting of desire of influence, of social elevation (i. e., prominent position), a reputation for ability and success, would be the only motives which could operate, and considering the might of these motives in a large minority of cases, even now, it is not irrational to believe that the whole nation might, under proper conditions, be moved by them ; so that laziness would by no means characterize the socialistic order. But if all these motives should fail to influence some hard, obstinate, brutish ones, there is the workhouse or prison which may be used as the last resort. “A man able to do his duty,” says Mr. Bellamy, “and persistently refusing, is sentenced to solitary imprisonment on bread and water till he consents.”

Supposing then, that these motives are sufficient to make each one do his duty, at the age of twenty-one he would be mustered into service, in which he would remain until he was forty-five. At first, he would be classed among unskilled laborers, and would remain in this category for three years. From this common stock would be drawn workmen for the different pursuits and professions, and after a man had chosen his trade or profession, he would,

of course, as in our day, generally stick to it on account of his knowledge in this special line, and the associations he would form, but he might if he chose abandon one trade or profession and adopt another. At the age of forty-five, as just stated, each one would be retired and then life would really begin. Under this *régime*, a man would look forward to his forty-fifth year, as the schoolboy now looks forward to his graduation, and by reason of his early training, his first class mental and physical development, he would be younger at forty-five than men now are at twenty-one. Besides, he would be sure of an abundance of the comforts of life, not only for himself but for his children, and hence the afternoon and evening of life would be the most delightful part of it, instead of the most gloomy part as it now is.

The most important function of the Presidency of the Socialistic State would be the headship of the industrial army. This, according to Mr. Bellamy, might be divided into ten or more great departments each representing a group of allied industries, each particular industry being in turn represented by a subordinate bureau, which would keep a complete record of the plant and force under its control, of the present product and the means of increasing it, etc. Statistics would of course be annually furnished, and on these estimates of the probable demand for the various articles of consumption would be based, and production would be governed accordingly. In each town, or city, there would be a great central warehouse to which all articles would be sent and stored. Scattered through the town would be "sample-stores," one in each ward in which would be deposited samples of all goods manufactured by the nation, and to which the customer would go to make a selection. Of course, the goods would be sent by electrical cars or otherwise to the home of the purchaser. In these stores there would be no such clerks as those in our stores—none to urge people to buy what they do not want, and to swindle them when they do buy. What a prodigious amount of lying and thievery would thus be prevented! One of the most striking propositions of Mr. Bellamy, is the abolition of banks. As there would be no such thing as money under the Nationalistic *régime*, banks would, of course, be useless, and so the mighty host whose business is simply the handling of paper and metal would be turned

into producers of wealth. Instead of money a "credit-card" would be issued to each citizen, which would give him the privilege of drawing so much goods from the common fund. The dollar, which is now well nigh almighty, would thus become an abstract algebraical sign, like X , to indicate how many articles of consumption each one should be entitled to, and all would get the same amount, whether he were the president or a hotel waiter. There is said to exist a tribe in Africa which has a species of "abstract money," i. e., no money at all but an imaginary coinage. They estimate the value of things by what is called a "macute." If, for instance, two persons want to exchange a cow and a horse, they estimate each at so many "macutes" and exchange, and if they be of unequal value, the party who gets the more valuable article stands debtor to the other so many "macutes" which he pays, of course, with some other articles his creditor may need. It is well known that in colonial times tobacco was used as a circulating medium, which took the place of money. So that the god Mammon turns out to be an idol resting on feet of clay which may be easily, and perhaps advantageously overthrown.

Another business that would be suppressed by being rendered unnecessary under the Nationalistic scheme would be life insurance. Each one would be provided for as he came into existence, and during his sojourn on earth, and, therefore, no husband need fear that his wife and children would suffer after his death.

State-Government, too—that darling of the Democrat and bugbear of the Republican—would be abolished, although municipal or city and town bureaus and councils would be necessary. The schools and colleges, of course, would all be nationalized, and every dining-room would be made public, and would be served by persons taken from the class of unskilled laborers. These servants would not be looked down upon, as they often are now, as persons belonging to the "lower classes," because every one, even the president himself, would have to pass through this or a similar grade of service. What a blessing to housekeepers some such arrangement would be! The bane of housekeeping is "domestic service," and "girls" are becoming more and more averse to doing such service, partly no doubt because it is

considered rather degrading. The only possible solution of this important phase of the social problem lies in the adoption of some method which will elevate the status of the domestic. In certain cases even now a number of families club together and employ a caterer, and have their meals prepared in a common kitchen. Perhaps we must have a bureau of some sort which will furnish other domestic services, house-cleaning, etc., whose employés will be no more looked down upon than a salesman in a store or a clerk in an office. At any rate, unless something be done to elevate the social status of the domestic, a "home" may become impossible, unless, indeed, the madam and the daughters (if there be any) determine to do the work themselves.

Another great blessing which the Socialistic programme promises is the abolition of the legal profession. Lawyers would become useless, because there would be no criminals to try and imprison; but, of course, clergymen and physicians would remain indispensable! The one would still be needed to expound mental, moral and spiritual truths, the other to heal disease; and perhaps an occasional trial of some recalcitrant fellow might be necessary, and so a *few* lawyers might be allowed to exist! In this sketch of some of the details of the Nationalists' programme, I have followed Mr. Bellamy not because his outline is considered final by his disciples, but simply for the sake of illustrating the alleged workings of the scheme. It must not be thought for a moment that the details above given, or laid down in "Looking Backward," are of the essence of Socialism—are necessary parts of it. On the contrary, they may never be realized, and yet Socialism may become a fact. The essential features of this social philosophy are indicated in the five points stated, and details must be left to be worked out by time and circumstances. Now, it is commonly believed by those who get a general idea of Socialism that it is an altogether visionary scheme; it is a pretty theory, but can never be made to work in practice. On the contrary, say the Socialists, Socialism is not only practicable but is absolutely necessary. Society has passed through many stages, and is now about to enter upon the highest of all—the Socialistic stage. The evolution has been as follows: 1st—There was the Hunting Period, when men lived chiefly on products of the

chase ; 2d—this was followed by and gradually merged into the Pastoral Period, when the herding of flocks as Abraham and Lot did, and as the modern Arabs do, was the chief employment and means of living. Then came the agricultural age, when the tilling of the soil began, and civilization become possible. "In Ancient Greece and Rome the village communities grew and were consolidated into the cities so famous in history, the economic basis of which on the whole was slavery.

"The Roman empire, which had absorbed the entire ancient world, was overthrown in western Europe by Teutonic tribes, with whom the agricultural stage passed into the feudal system. The land was held by a feudal tenure, that is, was associated with great public burdens and functions, such as military service. The labor was generally that of serfs, bound to the lords.

"The feudal system, which to people looking back appears a scene of confusion and internal strife, was as compared with the condition of things preceding it among the Teutonic nations, really a process of consolidation and building up. Toward the end of the fifteenth century, the feudal states underwent a further process of consolidation into a centralized state. The centralized state was represented in England by the personal monarchy of the Tudor Period, but it attained to its completest development in the absolute monarchy of Louis XIV. of France.

"The transformation of the medieval society resting on Feudalism and Catholicism into the modern system was in most countries a long and painful process. The downfall of the feudal system began in England so early as the middle of the fourteenth century ; and even yet we are burdened with survivals of it, in such institutions as the House of Lords. As regards Europe generally, it is chiefly since the French Revolution of 1789 that the absolute monarchy has been more or less effectively displaced by constitutional government with parliaments consisting of representatives chosen by the people. In economics the period is marked by private property in land superseding the feudal tenure, by competitive industry and free labor, free, competitive individualism.

"Now it is the contention of Socialism that, in the evolution of society, a period has come requiring the transition into a higher and wider form of organization,

economic, social, and political; a society embodying a nobler ethical ideal, and free democracy with a fit and suitable industrial system; a form of society which will better adapt the mechanical achievements of the industrial revolution to the services of man, for the wider extension of freedom, happiness, and culture. Such a form of industrial organization, suited to a higher ethical and political stage of human advancement, Socialism claims to be."*

The Socialists claim that there are causes now at work in the industrial world that will necessarily produce a Socialistic system: First of all, says Prof. Kirkup, of Edinburgh, Scotland: "The organization and concentration of production in large factories, with an improved mechanical power and a large number of wage workers, is one sign of the Socialistic tendency of things. Let such organizations as the Standard Oil Company and the Western Union Telegraph Company, for instance, continue, as they probably will continue, to grow and increase in number, and it will not be very long before they will come under public control, and the whole nation may be organized as the one great business corporation in which all other corporations will have been absorbed. At any rate," says Prof. Kirkup, "Socialists regard these colossal corporations, and the wealthy bosses that direct them, as the greatest pioneers of their cause. By concentrating the economic functions of the country into large masses, they are simply helping forward the Socialistic movement. Their mission is to displace the smaller capitalists, but they will thereby eventually undermine capitalism altogether."

Second: In proportion as these companies grow, the active and effective management must be entrusted to paid officials, and the capitalist ceases to be the real controller of industry: he tends to become a receiver of interest and dividends, while managers, clerks and secretaries do the work. It is obvious how the development of such a tendency will facilitate the transference of the great industries to social control. For instance, with regard to the railway system, if it should appear expedient to place it under collective management the State would find a staff of officials, and employés ready to its hand. The present organization, modified chiefly in the direction of further

*Prof. Thos. Kirkup, "Inquiry into Socialism," pp. 90-93.

centralization and greater economy, would be sufficient.

Thus, it is believed, the capitalist rulers of the great industrial companies will be displaced, and the people will get control.

Third: The rapid growth of democracy, say the Socialists, is perhaps the most conclusive proof that society is tending towards the Socialistic order. This beginning with the American and French Revolutions of the last century has gone forward so swiftly, especially in this country, that it seems not unreasonable to believe that, ere the close of the next century, we will have a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," in a deeper and truer sense than most of us imagine.

Fourth: State and Municipal Socialism is being rapidly developed in Germany, France, and England, and is destined to send its waves over this country. The reform bills beginning in 1802, such as factory acts, mining acts, municipal corporation acts, public health acts, shop-hours regulation acts, etc., indicate the progress of the Socialistic sentiment in England.

"Experience has proved that such local rule may with advantage be extended in many directions. Gas, water, parks and means of recreation, better housing for the poor, the interest of public health, and to a large degree education, are all now regarded as belonging to the legitimate sphere of local government. By and by we may see local control effectively extended to building sites and the drink question, and this state and municipal Socialism, it is said, is liable to extend more and more as the people attain to a clearer consciousness of their rights and a more effective organization."*

"The combinations, trusts and syndicates of which the people at present complain," says the Nationalists' declaration of principles, "demonstrate the practicability of our basic principle of association. We merely wish to push this principle a little further, and have all industries operated in the interest of all by the Nation, the people organized."

This would, of course, abolish all the evils of private corporations, which are managed in the interest of a few persons at the expense of the many, and at the same time

*See "Kirkup's Inquiry," *passim*.

it would preserve its great (and commendable) principle of association and co-operation.

Now this statement of Socialism is open to fewer objections than might at first sight seem. First, it is not an ideal, visionary scheme, for it proposes to recognize existing facts and conditions and follow the natural development of things. No sudden or violent revolution of the industrial is proposed. (2.) It would not be an unwieldy machine, for other governments manage, most effectively, their railroads, telegraphs, telephones, etc., and the management of such enormous corporations as the Western Union Telegraph Company would have seemed fifty years ago quite as impossible as the national control of industries, such as Socialism proposes. (3.) The objection that the governmental management of railroads, etc., would produce political corruption is not so formidable as many fancy, since such a result has not been realized in Europe, and the elevation of public sentiment and public morals which Socialism proposes would effectually destroy political corruption. This, of course, sounds quite Utopian to any one familiar with practical politics. But a hundred years ago in England it would have been impossible to have deposed the leader of a great parliamentary party for private immorality, as happened in the celebrated Parnell-O'Shea case. May we not rationally believe that a half century hence as great an improvement in public morals will have been brought about in our country?

At any rate, three of the principles of Socialism may be and are accepted—viz. : its principle of human brotherhood, of association instead of competition in business, and of the economic function of the State. Whether we are Socialists or not we believe in these great principles, at least professedly and to a great extent. We acknowledge our fraternal relation to the so-called "lower classes" by the establishment and support of great, organized charities. It would be much more rational and beneficial to all concerned if instead of doling out "alms," and thus keeping the poor always with us, we would spend the money and energies thus consumed in securing work for the unemployed and developing in them a spirit of self-dependence. Our great trusts, syndicates, labor organizations, and various co-operative movements attest our belief in the efficacy of the principle of association, while the cries of starving

millions and the wails of the "small employers" that are crushed in the great struggle for life condemn as brutal and diabolical the principle of "competition," show that "competition is *not* the life of trade."

Finally, all who believe in any sort of "tariff legislation" admit that the State has an economic function. Indeed, as wars become less and less frequent, as the intellectual, moral, and religious life of the country advances, as the enormous resources of the land are developed, in short, as men become more human and less brutal, the industrial pursuits of the country must claim more and more the attention of the people, and become the chief concern of the government. While I would not be set down as a Socialist, for many of the features of Socialism may prove impracticable, perhaps unjust,—yet I recognize its truths as against Anarchism. It seems to me that it will ultimately solve the great question as to the relation between monopolistic and individualistic enterprises, and this is one of the most perplexing problems before us. Professor Richard T. Ely of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, has made suggestions on the subject that are full of wisdom. He makes a distinction between "natural monopolies" and "artificial monopolies"—monopolies that are made by law and businesses that are monopolies by their very nature. Railroads, telegraphs, telephones, gas and water works, etc., are said to be "natural monopolies," and their public management is therefore advocated by the professor, who has accordingly been called a Socialist. He denies the accusation, however, and claims that he simply believes that some sorts of business should be controlled by the State, while others should be left to individual enterprise. Apart from his own economic classification, the proposition that certain businesses, being "natural monopolies," can be managed better by the State than by private corporations deserves most careful consideration, regardless of the question whether it is of a Socialistic nature or not.

While I thus recognize the great truths in Socialism, I can also see that the enormous increase of governmental interference in business that it proposes may endanger and curtail the rightful liberty of the individual, and therefore we should not be hasty in the adoption of its proposed measures. The ideal society is, of course, that in which every individual will have an equal opportunity with every

other to develop his manhood, and perhaps the conflict between Socialism and Individualism may result in at least an approximation to this ideal, but its realization cannot be forced. The grand *sine qua non* of such a state of things is the mental, moral and manual education of the people, and this must be the result of ages of work. Meanwhile, millions in our great city are starving and freezing and demand our immediate attention and help, and no theory must prevent us from doing all we can for the betterment of our fellow beings. While Socialists, Anarchists, Georgemen, and all other social reformers may advocate their peculiar theories in their lectures, papers, books, etc., yet it seems to me most unfortunate that they cannot find some basis of co-operation for the relief of the poor from present distress. Granted, for the sake of argument, that the ideal of Socialism or Individualism is the Christian ideal, granted that the adoption of the Single Tax on land might produce immense benefits, yet while the people are being educated up to the adoption of any of these schemes, millions are dying for want of bread and clothing, and it is to be feared that many stand aloof from movements to afford immediate relief to these sufferers, because they do not exactly fall in with their ideas of social reform.

I remember a tramp through the slums of New York City with a friend of mine who had a scheme (perhaps a wise one) of social regeneration, and he strongly denounced the Church and private societies, and individuals, for attempting to relieve the paupers inhabiting those dens; but when I asked whether he would endorse their action, if they were to devote their energies and funds to the propagation of his views and plans, he admitted that he would. As I then and there looked around upon the misery and degradation of thousands, and listened to the words of my good friend, I was more strongly impressed than ever with the thought that some theories of social reform may really impede the progress of the good work, and hence if some plan, whether it be General Booth's or some other, could be adopted for the immediate relief of the poor—a plan which would gain the support of all, or nearly all social reformers, while allowing them to ventilate their peculiar opinions, it would be a great blessing to mankind, especially to the submerged portion.

III.

TRUTHS AND ERRORS OF HENRY GEORGE'S VIEWS.

HENRY GEORGE and his views are so well known, and their influence has been so great upon the popular mind, in one way or another, that it is now time to ask, What place in economic history and philosophy are they destined to hold? What are the truths in Mr. George's philosophy which will live, and what are the errors that must die? It is commonly supposed that his Land Theory is his only theory, but while certain opinions on this subject, more or less peculiar to him, have made him famous, this is by no means his only theory; indeed his greatest service to economics may be found rather in his lucid, forcible and eloquent presentation and advocacy of opinions held by other economists. His Land Theory may never be realized, and yet he may always hold a prominent position among social and economic reformers and philosophers.

Frederick Robertson says: "There are two sorts of men who exercise influence. The first are those who perpetuate their own opinions, bequeath their own names, form a sect, gather a party round them who speak their words and believe their beliefs. This is the influence most aimed at and most loved. The second class is composed of those who stir up faith, conscience, thought, to do their own work. They are not anxious that those they teach should think as they do, but that they should *think*; nor that they should take this or that rule of right and wrong, but that they should be *conscientious*; nor that they should adopt their own views of God, but that faith in God should be roused in earnest. Such men propagate not many *views*; but they propagate life itself in inquiring minds and earnest hearts."

Now, Mr. George enjoys the enviable distinction of belonging to both these classes of men. He has established a "George Theory" and a "George School of Thought," but I think that this school is destined to be absorbed by other, and perhaps profounder, economic schools in the future; but, even so, it will be Mr. George's lasting honor that, more than any other one man of his time, he has made the great mass of men think on economic subjects; nay,

more, he has called in question long established and deeply rooted opinions, and has made men think deeply—examine the very foundations of society and civilization. Hence I say, if his Land Theory should never be fully realized his work may produce immense results.

First:—Among the truths he advocates is his view of Trade. He is a radical Free Trader. Indeed, all sensible men are Free Traders, or, rather, I should say, all Free Traders are sensible men. Mr. George's book on "Protection and Free Trade" is a thorough discussion of this important subject, and to my mind is perfectly unanswerable. It considers and refutes all the fallacies and common arguments of protectionists. First, he answers the popular, silly remark that "free trade is right in theory but wrong in practice," by saying "a theory that will not agree with facts must be false. Its agreement with facts, its practicability, is all that makes it right, and therefore it is a contradiction in terms to say that an opinion is right in theory but wrong in practice." The theory of free trade may be carried to the point of ideal perfection, for to secure free trade we have only to abolish restrictions, but to carry the theory of protection into practice some articles must be taxed and others left untaxed, and as to the articles taxed different rates of duty must be imposed, and this leads to endless wrangling in Congress and great dissatisfaction with any tariff bill that may be enacted. But of course those who say that free trade is right in theory but wrong in practice mean that it is right from a moral standpoint but wrong from a business point of view; that is, it will not bring the advantages to one class of traders that protection will. To which it may be replied: (1st)—What is morally right cannot be politically or industrially wrong, however much it may seem to be; (2d)—This is a begging of the whole question, for the very point to be proved is whether free trade or protection will benefit all parties more than protection.

Second:—Mr. George answers the contention, even now made by some eminent protectionists, that "the foreigner, not the consumer, pays the tax on imported goods." When the McKinley Tariff Bill of 1890 was passed, its framer, in a public speech at his home, made this fallacious statement. Mr. George admits that there are two cases where the foreigner may have to pay the tax: First,

“an import duty on a commodity of which the production is a closely controlled foreign monopoly may in some cases fall in part or in whole upon the foreign producer.” He may prefer to reduce the profit on what he sells to this country rather than lose the market. Second, “A Canadian farmer so situated that the only market in which he can conveniently sell his wheat is on the American side” might prefer to pay the duty to shipping it at a greater cost to some Canadian market. But how rare, comparatively, are such monopolies and situations? These are mere exceptions which prove the rule that the consumer, not the foreign producer, pays the tax. A simple bit of experience proves this contention. A book which would cost me fifteen dollars in England has cost me twenty-five dollars in New York, simply because of tariff duties, and so in every case. The man who wears a “protected” hat, made in Paris, for instance, pays more for it than he would have to pay for a New York hat made of the same material, because of tariff duties; or rather he has to pay more for either hat because of the tariff, for the New York manufacturer adds the duty to his hat, although he pays no duty on its materials, and this is the very object of the tariff tax. “The possibility that exceptional duties may in part or in whole fall on foreign producers, instead of domestic consumers, has in it even for those who would gladly tax ‘foreigners’ no shadow of recommendation for protection. For the cases in which an import duty falls on foreign producers, are cases in which it can afford no encouragement to home producers. An import duty can only fall on foreign producers when its payment does not add to price; while the only possible way an import duty can encourage home producers is by adding to price,” and thus increasing their profits. To plain, moral, and common sense the idea of taxing a “foreigner” just because he is a foreigner, in order to increase our revenues, is repulsive. It is really a species of selfishness; it is robbing our neighbor, instead of doing to him as we would be done by. There is no more reason why nations should be governed by such a rule of action, than there is why individuals of the same state should adopt it. There is no reason why free trade between New York State and Virginia should be allowed, and free trade between England and the United States should be prohibited; for an exchange of products will take place be-

tween nations as between individuals, only when it is mutually advantageous, and why should such an exchange be taxed or prohibited by the government? "To raise revenue," say the advocates of a low tariff, but even this, is not the best method of raising revenue, while a protective tariff, if it protects the home producer by excluding foreign products, does not increase the revenue; no revenue, is paid, because no goods are imported, but the domestic producer's bank account is increased and the poor consumer is consumed.

Third:—Mr. George explodes "the infant industry argument," as well as the chief contention of the protectionists that a protective tariff is necessary to "build up home manufactures." The "infant industry" argument, as Prof. Taussig, in his admirable "Tariff History of the United States," has shown, used to be more powerful and popular than it now is, for "the infants" have long since grown gray-headed and are still crying for "protection" and "fostering." He also shows that "little if anything was gained by the protection which the United States maintained in the first part of this century." The great manufactures that grew up with protection owed their growth mainly to other causes—natural advantages, introduction of improved machinery, good markets, etc. Mr. George admits that "as an abstract proposition there may be industries to which temporary encouragement might be profitably extended." But such encouragement, he thinks, can be better given in the way of bounties than by protective tariffs. Moreover, there are insuperable difficulties in the way of discovering *what* industries would repay encouragement. All experience shows that the policy of encouragement, once begun, leads to a scramble in which the strong, not the weak, the unscrupulous, not the deserving, succeed. What are really infant industries have no more chance in the struggle for governmental encouragement than infant pigs have with full-grown swine about a meal-tub. On the whole, the ability of any industry to establish and sustain itself in a free field is the measure of its public utility, and that "struggle for existence" which drives out unprofitable industries is the best means of determining what industries are needed under existing conditions and what are not. The only safe course is to give all a fair field and no favor. In considering the protectionists' plea that their object is

not the encouragement of infant industries but the encouragement of all home industry, he makes the following points: (1st)—The vast *majority* of our industries need no protection and can get none. “Duties upon commodities entirely produced at home can of course, have no effect in encouraging home industries,” since no such commodities would be imported. “It is only when imposed upon commodities, partly imported and partly produced at home, or entirely imported, yet capable of being produced at home, that duties can in any way encourage an industry. No tariff which the United States imposed could, for instance, encourage the growth of grain or cotton, the raising of cattle, the production of coal oil or the mining of gold or silver; for instead of importing these things we not only supply ourselves but have a surplus which we export.” The industries that cannot be protected are by far the larger part of our industries, and yet protectionists tell us that protection fosters industry. They urge that the tariff encourages the protected industries, and then the protected industries encourage unprotected industries; protection builds up the factory and the iron furnace, and the factory and iron furnace create a demand for the farmer’s products. Mr. George cleverly disposes of this plausible argument by supposing that two citizens of a town should propose to enrich all the other citizens by collecting from each of them a tax of five cents, saying, “This slight tax will make us wealthy: we will at once enlarge our businesses, improve our houses and grounds, set up carriages, hire servants, give parties, and buy much more freely at the stores. This will make trade brisk and cause a greater demand for labor and so on.” Who would listen to such nonsense? Yet this is the protectionist’s argument. Protection enriches the protected and impoverishes the unprotected; it enriches a few at the expense of the many, and this is the great and fatal objection to it.

A commonplace idea is that the United States is or ought to be a manufacturing country, but some of the ablest thinkers I know among the protectionists do not believe this. Manufacturing is certainly a small part of our industries now, and is destined to be for some time to come. Moreover, if we have not power and resources enough to hold our own against other countries we should let them do

the manufacturing for us, just as individuals do what each can best do. Why should we attempt to compete with countries which have natural advantages over us in the production of certain things? Why not let them produce those things, and devote ourselves to the production of other things in which we excel and which we may exchange for those things? The application of this simple, elementary principle in international trade would produce as great and beneficial results to all parties concerned as it does in the dealings of individuals with one another. One of the favorite objections to free trade urged by protectionists is that our manufactures cannot compete with European manufactures owing to the higher wages which American workingmen demand and receive. Mr. George answers this objection in the 14th chapter of his "Protection and Free Trade." That answer is twofold: (1st)—We should attempt to compete with Europe only in those things in the manufacture of which we have natural advantages over her. (2d)—High wages do not necessarily mean high cost of production. On the contrary, it is a well-known fact that low wages mean and cause high cost of production. Southerners know that slave labor is the most expensive sort of labor, and the cheap, free negro labor is even more expensive. The man who pays his employés good wages gets more and better work done. Well paid workmen as a rule are more intelligent and diligent, and those who employ "the pauper labor" of Europe know how inferior it is to our well paid labor. It should be remembered, also, that such poorly paid labor is quite as easily secured in this country as in Europe. Besides, labor is only one factor in production, and it is absurd for a manufacturer who can get materials superior to those used in European manufactories, who can sell his goods near home, while the foreign producer must ship them across the sea, etc., it is absurd to attribute to one cause effects that (if they should be realized) ought to be attributed to many causes. It is absurd to consider the American manufacturer's "high labor" without also taking into the account its superiority to "the pauper labor of Europe" and the other advantages which he has over his foreign brothers.

Fourth :—Mr. George demolishes the stronghold of protectionism, viz. : the contention that "protection benefits

labor." How can protection benefit the laborer when it increases the price of every article he uses? It is answered, "while it increases the price of the commodities the working man consumes, it also increases his work and his wages." How does it do this? Where does it do this? We have just seen that all the tariff does is to enrich a few at the expense of the many—to make a few dozen millionaire manufacturers and millions of paupers who are not manufacturers. Even if it be granted that these few wealthy employers are enabled by the tariff to work a larger force of men, yet they draw their profits from unprotected farmers and others, and so injure the great mass of men while filling their own pockets. Furthermore, they do not pay better wages to their employés because of the tariff. In some cases they actually pay less wages than unprotected employers, and they frequently import "the pauper labor" of Europe, or employ it when it comes. If protectionists are friends of labor why don't they protect workingmen from this evil? Why don't they prohibit the importation of foreign *labor* instead of prohibiting the importation of the *products* of foreign labor? They leave the working man to compete with this labor and protect the rich employer from competition which free trade with Europe would bring in the products which the employé consumes, and yet they have the courage to call themselves friends of the working man! If they are really anxious to help him, why don't they, in addition to prohibiting or judiciously regulating the importation of foreign labor, establish and encourage industrial schools which will make his labor most effective and valuable? But no! They protect themselves against competition with Europe and leave the poor man to struggle against pauperism and ignorance and oppression, and then howl "protection to American labor!" How long will working men be duped and hoodwinked? Forever? Or will they rise in their might and destroy their enemy and oppressor? Protectionists tell us that wages in this country are higher than they are in England, because of our protective tariff, and England's free trade policy. They overlook two facts: (1st)—Wages in England are higher than they are on the Continent of Europe where protection prevails: (2d)—If wages are higher in this country so are the prices of the things the laborer consumes. His wages, therefore, are

only apparently, not actually higher than the English laborer's. But even if they are a little higher here than there, this is due not to our "robber tariff" but to our natural advantages over England and Europe generally. England has about half as many inhabitants as the United States, and it is not larger than one of our great states. It were a shame, indeed, if, with a country capable of supporting a thousand millions of people and having only sixty-five millions, with such magnificent lands as the West has, and the enormous resources of our mines, etc., we did not pay better wages, on the whole, than a little island whose inhabitants have hardly elbow room. "The very class," says Mr. George, "that profess anxiety to protect American labor by raising the price of what they themselves have to sell, notoriously buy labor as cheap as they can and fiercely oppose any combination of workmen to raise wages. The cry of 'protection for American labor' comes most vociferously from newspapers that lie under the ban of the printers' unions; from coal and iron lords who, importing 'pauper labor' by wholesale, have bitterly fought every effort of their men to claim anything like decent wages; and from factory owners who claim the right to dictate the votes of their men. The whole spirit of protection is against the right of labor."

But Mr. George shows that while this is so—while it is easy to explode the fallacies of protection and prove the advantages of free trade—yet, as a matter of fact, men—working men—will vote to tax themselves, and protection hold its own in spite of all the denunciation of it by free traders. Why is this? "Vitality inheres in truth, not in error. If the protective theory is incongruous with the nature of things, and so inconsistent with itself, how is it that after so many years of discussion it still obtained such wide and strong support? Free traders usually attribute the persistence of the belief in protection to popular ignorance, played upon by special interest."

But the people are not ignorant of this subject. Perhaps there is no economic question which the ordinary man can discuss with more force and intelligence than this. Mr. George, therefore, rightly urged that tariff reform or abolition is only one step in the industrial revolution necessary to the betterment of the working classes. It is, indeed, a most important and necessary part of the general reform,

but free trade by itself cannot and will not usher in the social millennium. We must have something more, and until we get that, even working men, especially those employed in protected industries, will continue to be duped by the protectionists' appeal to "facts" as against "theories." They will continue to say: "Free trade may be a good thing for the great mass of men, but protection will keep this factory in which we work going, and, therefore, give us bread and butter, and we cannot sacrifice that for the sake of an unknown majority." It will be in vain to urge that the welfare of the majority involves the welfare of the said factory. The workingman "can't see it;" and so Mr. George rightly urges that along with the abolition of the tariff must go other reforms even more radical, which will give free trade room and power to run and be glorified. Free trade may be given us, but if other industrial conditions remain to destroy produce and business, what shall we have to trade? Our author thinks that in order to make free trade in products of labor effective, we must have free trade in land; it must be owned by the community and tax on all other sorts of property must be abolished. We shall examine this contention directly, but meanwhile remember that while we advocate free trade, we do not consider it a panacea for all our social and industrial ills.

IV.

MR. GEORGE'S THEORY OF WAGES CONTAINS MUCH TRUTH AND SOME ERROR.

THE negative part of his theory is true : the positive part is false. He rejects, along with General Francis A. Walker and other eminent political economists, the "Wages-Fund Theory," which teaches that wages are drawn from capital,—from a fund which is laid aside for this purpose by the capitalist, or employers. This theory was advocated by all the older economists, Adam Smith, the "Father of Political Economy," Ricardo, McCulloch, Mill, etc., and in the present day it has been supported by the English economist, Prof. Cairnes. Great confusion of thought on this subject arises from the fact that the terms "capital," "profits" and "wages" are not clearly defined and the definition strictly adhered to. Mr. George accepts Adam Smith's simple and sensible definition of capital, viz. : "That part of a man's stock which he expects to afford him a revenue is his capital." The capital of a boot and shoe manufacturer, for instance, consists of the leather, thread, pegs, tools used in making the boots and shoes and all that is made in their manufacture upon which the manufacturer will get a return. The labor spent in making them is manifestly different from the stuff used in making them, and the return for the labor is, therefore, different from the return for the material. Suppose a pair of shoes sells for \$5.00 and that the leather, thread, etc., cost \$2.00, that the shoemaker gets \$2.00 for his work and that an average of 10 cents per pair is required to pay the rent of the building in which the work is done, the manufacturer or employer would make 90 cents on the pair of shoes. Here we see the distinction between capital, rent, wages and profits. Are wages drawn from capital? Obviously not; but labor added something to capital for which it received a return, and capital charged more for the pair of shoes than was spent upon them by capital, land and labor combined, and, therefore, made a profit. We are, therefore, forced to hold that wages are not drawn from capital, but

from the products of labor. This is perfectly plain where the laborer is paid in kind. If, for instance, the manufacturer pays his shoemaker in shoes, he would have to make two and a half pair of shoes in order to get one \$5.00 pair of shoes, and in this case none could deny that labor was paid by itself from the products it had created. If a farmer furnishes the land, horses and seed (or "stock") and a tenant furnishes the labor and gets one third of the produce, it is clear that he pays himself out of the products of his own labor. But generally the employer pays the employé in money before the products are sold, and hence it seems that wages are drawn from capital because they are paid out of a purse which was filled before the products of the labor had been gathered in. Still, it must be remembered that in every case the labor is given before it is paid for. It is, therefore, stored up in the things the employer owns, and a return for it will be realized whenever he sells those things. His money is a mere equivalent for that stored-up labor. He pays his workman \$10 and gets five pairs of shoes; those shoes may be put away in his storehouse for some time but by-and-by they will be sold and then he will not only get a return for his capital and the labor he paid for, but he will make a profit on both. Really capital is produced by, drawn from, labor, instead of the reward of labor (wages) being drawn from capital. The materials of which the shoes are made were either accumulated by the efforts by the manufacturer as a laborer, or by some laborer or laborers who gave him this capital. This ought to be clear to a child, and yet eminent doctors dispute most violently and continuously over so evident a proposition.

It is attempted to prove the wages fund theory by showing that an increase in wages decreases the profits of the employer. Pay the shoemaker \$2.25 for his work on the pair of shoes and the employer would only get 65 cents instead of 90, and this is why employers, are so strongly opposed to an increase in wages. But it must be remembered that the additional 25 cents is drawn from *profits* not from capital, and some employers are willing to share the profits with their employés in order to keep them and do justice to them. Why should this not be done? Suppose the employer's contribution to the product is worth \$2.00 and the laborer's contribution is worth the same, but

the sale of the shoes brings more than what the joint contribution cost. Why should not both parties to the transaction receive an equal share of the profits? However, the point here insisted upon is that wages, or an increase in wages is not drawn from capital, but either from the product of labor or from a third something (profits) to which capital has no more right than labor.

Mr. George, then is right in his idea of the source of wages ; but an even more important question than this is, What determines the *rate* of wages. What makes wages rise or fall? And Mr. George's answer to this is wholly erroneous. He says : "In their degree wages rise and fall in obedience to a common law. What is this law? The fundamental principle of human action—the law that is to political economy what the law of gravitation is to physics—is that men seek to gratify their desires with the least exertion. Now under this principle, what, in conditions of freedom, will be the terms at which one man can hire others to work for him? Evidently they will be fixed by what the men could make if laboring for themselves." This is not true, Mr. Gunton well says : "Suppose the employer can and will pay the laborer *more* than he can get working for himself, then this whole contention falls to the ground ; for in that case what the laborer could earn working for himself would have nothing whatever to do with deciding what his wages would be in working for another."

It is remarkable that so practical a man as Mr. George is should put forward such contention, for it is well known that everybody prefers to work for himself and only works for another because he can make more than he can by working for himself.

But the most serious defect in Mr. George's wages theory is his claim that "wages depend upon the margin of cultivation ; or upon the produce which labor can obtain at the highest point of natural productiveness open to it without the payment of rent." In other words, the wages of the country are governed by what the laborer could make on land given him by the government or in a shop for which he had to pay no rent. But suppose an employer in Pittsburg would pay the western farmer more to drive one of his wagons than he could make on his no-rent land, what would its productiveness have to do with determining

wages? Or if he would pay the village blacksmith more than he could make in his no-rent shop what connection, would his no-rent shop have with his wages or the general rate of wages in the factory? If wages were determined by the produce which labor could obtain from the most productive no-rent land, then wages would be far below their present level in many countries. In Switzerland the peasants cultivate the barren hillsides for which they pay no rent, and in Holland they cultivate the no-rent sand dunes and barely eke out enough to breathe on. If Mr. George's contention that the general wages of a country are determined by the produce of the best of such land, wages in Switzerland and Holland ought to be much lower than they are. Prof. J. B. Clark of Smith College well says: "The theory that the general reward of labor is fixed by the gains that men can realize by tilling no-rent-land, if this theory has any accurate meaning, must claim that when land is not to be had in fee simple for the asking but when valueless land may be occupied rent free, the gains realized by workmen in all departments are gauged by the product realized on such land by actual hand tilling. It means that workers in Belgian mills must take, with allowance for minor variations, what Belgian peasants get by cultivating the sandy wastes that border the sea. It means that watchmakers of Switzerland must accept pay that, with similar allowance, tends to conform to the amount that their peasant countrymen can extort from patches of green among the crags. It means that, when the free lands of America shall have been allotted to owners, wage-earners will generally get what any one of them might produce, if he chose to build a shanty and by the sufferance of a proprietor, till a piece of poor and untenanted ground. This would be a peculiar kind of 'squatter sovereignty'—the man in the shanty, dominating labor, extending his power over workmen of every class and fixing the amount of their wages and the consequent level of their lives." As a matter of fact, we know that nothing of the kind happens. The rate of wages is determined by something entirely different from "the margin of cultivation." From the laborer's side, it is governed by his "standard of living," that is, the least that will satisfy his actual wants. From the employer's standpoint, it is governed by the utility of the labor to him.

No man could work for less than would furnish food, and clothes for himself and family, at least for any length of time, and so his wants fix the minimum wage he will receive. On the other hand, the utility of the labor to the employer will fix the maximum wage he will receive. If the employer is a carpenter, for instance, and is building a number of houses and sorely in need of "hands," he may pay them \$3.00 a day each, and yet the working man may not actually need more than one or two dollars for the necessaries of life. In that case, of course, his wants would have nothing to do with the fixing of the rate of wages. It may be said just here that I have left out a very important, indeed the most important factor in the determination of the rate of wages, viz.: "The state of the labor market." But I have not; that is included in the consideration of the utility of the labor to the employer. If there are many carpenters out of work and anxious to get it, their labor being superfluous is, of course, less useful and hence the employer would offer less to any one he might employ. The least, too, that the most needy workingman in a given trade would take would fix the rate of wages of all the rest. Of course, I don't mean that the man who could live the cheapest would settle the rate of wages, but just the opposite. The man with a large family would need more than a single man, and he would therefore set the rate of wages. The single man, being as good a workman as the married man, would, of course, demand the same wage, and as the married man could not live on less (say) than \$2.50 a day, the single man would get this also, and this naturally happens. Hence the rate of wages is determined by the cost of living of him whose necessities are the greatest—whose expenses are the heaviest. As the other workmen in the same trade would not take less than he and as the employer would not pay more, his needs would be the determining factor in settling the rate of wages. Just here comes in the advantage of labor organizations. Working men by combining and studying each other's needs can ascertain the cost of living of the best workmen, and most expensive families, and can, therefore, fix the rate of wages. We conclude, then, that wages are drawn from the products of labor and are governed by the wants of the laborer whose family expenses are the greatest and by the utility of his labor to the employer.

V.

MR. GEORGE'S VIEWS ON THE OWNERSHIP OF LAND SEEM TO ME WHOLLY ERRONEOUS.

HE thinks that private property in land is morally wrong—is unjust. “What constitutes the rightful basis of property?” he asks. “What is it that enables a man to justly say of a thing, ‘It is mine’?” From what springs the sentiment which acknowledges his exclusive right as against the world? Is it not, primarily, the right of a man to himself to the use of his own powers, to the enjoyment of the fruits of his own exertions? As a man belongs to himself, so labor when put in concrete form belongs to him, and for this reason, that which a man makes or produces is his own, as against all the world—to enjoy or destroy, to use, to exchange, or to give. The pen with which I am writing is mine. No other human being can rightfully lay claim to it, for in me is the title of the producers that made it. It has become mine, because transferred to me by the stationer, to whom it was transferred by the importer, who obtained the exclusive right to it by transfer from the manufacturer, in whom by the same process of purchase, vested in the rights of those who dug the material from the ground and shaped it into a pen. A house and the lot on which it stands are alike property, as being the subject of ownership, and are alike classed by lawyers as real estate, yet in nature and relations they differ widely. The one is produced by human labor and belongs to the class in political economy styled wealth. The other is a part of nature, and belongs to the class in political economy styled land. The essential character of the one class of things is that they embody labor, are brought into being by human exertion, their existence or non-existence, their increase or diminution, depending on man. The essential character of the other class of things is that they do not embody labor, and exist irrespective of man. The moment this distinction is realized, that moment is it seen that the sanction which natural justice gives to one species of property

is denied to the other. Whatever may be said for the institution of private property in land, it is, therefore, plain that it cannot be defended on the score of justice."*

This is Mr. George's argument against the private ownership of land, fully stated in his own words and with his own illustrations, and he says that he is willing to test his theory by this high moral standard, and let it stand or fall according as it shall or shall not stand the test. We accept the position and undertake to refute the contention.

First, let us consider Mr. George's idea of our right to ourselves. What gives us a right to the possession of our bodies? The fact, answers our author, that we have produced them by adding to them materials taken from the great storehouse of Nature. Of course this leaves out of consideration the origin, the primal derivation of our bodies; but we will let this pass, and admit that our parents had a right to give us of their substance. The continuous preservation of our bodies, after a certain age, is due to the fact that we have added to them by taking certain materials from Nature's storehouse and weaving them into our frames. What have we done? We have simply moved certain materials of nature from one point—say the field or the garden—to another point in Nature, viz., our stomachs. Yet this moving of materials, says Mr. George, truly, this mixing of our labor with natural products, makes them ours—gives us a right to our bodies.

Secondly, the same is true of the pen we use or the house we live in. Manifestly we do not create the materials out of which our bodies, pens or houses are made. We simply affect their superficies, we merely move them from one point in Nature to another, and create new combinations of these materials. We, therefore, produce no *thing*, but only a *combination* of things, and our author admits that such an action gives us a right to these things. "The essential character of the one class of things (houses, etc.) is that they embody labor, are brought into being by human exertion." They "embody labor," but their materials are not created by man. "The essential character of the other class of things (land) is that they do not embody labor." Why not? If I go into the forest and clear off the timber, drain its bogs, fence the land,

* "Progress and Poverty," Book VII., Chapter I.

break it, plant it, etc., why does it not "embody my labor" as truly as the house which I build from the materials taken perhaps from the same source? I have created nothing in either case, but I have affected very deeply the superficies of both the land and the timber in the house; my labor is truly embodied in both, in one as well as in the other; and since Mr. George admits that such embodiment of labor gives a right to ownership in the one case, he must logically admit that it gives a right to ownership in the other. Both houses and land may be rightfully, justly held by the same tenure. The fact that makes one mine may make the other mine also. I have discussed this subject with Mr. George, but his attempted answers to this argument were as unsatisfactory to me as they were to several others who argued the case with him. Tried by his own test, therefore, his theory of land-ownership falls to the ground because the distinction he draws between the basis of landed property and other sorts of property is gratuitous and fallacious.

If, now, Mr. George had argued with Herbert Spencer, that the mixing of labor with a thing cannot give a title to it in any case; that the catching and training of a wild horse, or the building of a house, does not give a right to it, then indeed he might logically hold, with Spencer, that private ownership is and must be morally wrong.* But when he admits that labor spent upon the materials of a house makes it ours, he must logically admit that the labor we put upon land makes it ours. I think he has done a good service by clearly showing that neither conquest nor priority of possession can give a valid title to land, but only labor. If this test were rigidly applied, how many land-monopolists and dishonest speculators in land would lose their occupation!

But there is another line of argument which may be more forcibly urged against the private ownership of land, and that is that by permitting it we may *injure society* as a whole or some members of society. Let it be at once observed that we have now passed from the moral to the economic aspect of this subject. The question is no longer, Is the private ownership of land *right* and *just*? but, Is it

* See Spencer's "Social Statics," Chapters IX. and X., which, however, was somewhat modified by Spencer in the latter part of his life,

best for society—is it expedient? My owning a piece of land may prove quite inconvenient to some people who would like to use it, and yet by virtue of the labor I have spent upon it I may justly exclude them from its use. But even from the economic standpoint—the standpoint of expediency—Mr. George's argument against the private ownership of land cannot stand the test of logic. He is a strong anti-Malthusian. He does not believe that population increases, or tends to increase, faster than the means of subsistence. He believes that the Earth—even that part of it called Ireland—is quite capable of supporting all its inhabitants. There is, and always will be, he thinks, more than enough standing-room for the people; there will be plenty of land to use. Why, then, object to their using it? If there is enough and more than enough land for *all* men, why object to *some* men owning, exclusively using, certain portions of it? Why may they not say to others: We have spent our labor upon this land or our fathers did and they transferred it to us just as the manufacturer and seller of pens transferred your pen to you and therefore you must go elsewhere and get land? Of course if they cannot truthfully claim ownership of the land by virtue of their spending labor or the equivalent of labor upon it, then they have no right to it; and I freely admit that many land-monopolists and speculators have no such good title to their lands. But that is not the point here considered. The point is that if there is, as Mr. George says there is, enough land in existence for all men now on earth or that will be on earth at any future time, then however crowded may be the population at any given point in Ireland or China for instance, yet there are unoccupied tracts of land at other points of the earth's surface to which the landless men should go instead of disturbing those men who own land by virtue of their own labor spent upon it or the labor of those who gave it to them. Hence we conclude that the private ownership of land is morally right *provided* the owner has either spent his labor upon it or given the equivalent of a former owner's labor for it.

4. Finally, Mr. George's theory of *land taxation* seems to me utterly erroneous. His views on this subject are often misunderstood and misstated and therefore I shall state them in his own words. "I do not propose," he says, "either to purchase or to confiscate private property in land,

The first would be unjust ; the second, needless. Let the individuals who now hold it still retain it, if they want to, the possession of what they are pleased to call *their* land. Let them continue to call it *their* land. Let them buy and sell and bequeath and devise it ! We may safely leave them the shell if we take the kernel. *It is not necessary to confiscate land : it is only necessary to confiscate rent.* We already take some rent in taxation. We have only to make some changes in our modes of taxation to take it all. What I, therefore, propose . . . is . . . to *appropriate rent by taxation.* In this way the State may become the universal landlord without calling herself so, and without assuming a single new function. In form, the ownership of land would remain just as now. No owner of land need be dispossessed, and no restriction need be placed upon the amount of land any one could hold. For rent being taken by the State in taxes, land, no matter in whose name it stood or in what parcels it was held, would be really common property, and every member of the community would participate in the advantages of its ownership." This result may be accomplished simply by "*abolishing all taxation save that upon land values.*"

The word "rent" as here used has a technical meaning, and must be explained. "The term rent," says our author, "in its economic sense—that is, when used as I am using it, to distinguish that part of the produce which accrues to the owners of land or other natural capabilities by virtue of their ownership—differs in meaning from the word rent as commonly used.

"In common speech, we apply the word rent to payments for the use of buildings, machinery, fixtures, etc., as well as payments for the use of land or other natural capabilities : and in speaking of the rent of a house or the rent of a farm, we do not separate the price for the use of the improvements from the price for the use of the bare land. But in the economic meaning of rent, payments for the use of any of the products of human exertion are excluded, and of the limited payments for the use of houses, farms, etc., only that part is rent which constitutes the consideration for the use of the land." It is this economic rent that Mr. George proposes to appropriate as taxes, while all other property is to go scot-free from taxation.

The important question, therefore, arises : Why should land be made to bear the whole burden of taxation? For many reasons, answers Mr. George. First, "rent or land value does not arise from productiveness or utility of land. No matter what are its capabilities, land can yield no rent and have no value until some one is willing to give labor or the results of labor for the privilege of using it, and *what* one will thus give, depends not upon the capacity of the land, but upon its capacity as compared with that of land that can be had for nothing. I may have very rich land, but it will yield no rent and have no value so long as there is other land as good to be had without cost. But when this other land is appropriated, and the best land to be had for nothing is *inferior*, either in fertility, situation or other quality, my land will begin to have a value and yield rent." In other words, our author means that the value of land depends upon the growth of the community, and since the community gives value to the land it is right that the community should receive from the land its value.

On the other hand, it is assumed that the growth of the community does not add to the value of other property, "labor products," and therefore it has no right to appropriate any such values as taxes. We utterly deny the truth of both propositions. First, the growth of the community does not entirely create the value of land. It does *increase* that value, as we constantly see happening in the case of growing towns and settlements. But the land has an inherent value. If not, why should Mr. George want it? Why quarrel about a valueless thing? Suppose a man be shipwrecked and cast on a fertile and fruitful but uninhabited island. I fancy that he would consider it very valuable, first, as affording him standing room, an escape from a watery grave, and, secondly, as furnishing him food, etc. ; and if he were to cultivate the products found there, drain the land, clear off the forests, fence it, etc., who will deny that his island home is valuable to him? It is simply false, therefore to say, "It is only where *two* (or more) men want the same land that it has value." Land always has value to its *owner*, or he would not own it. Take land near a city. Some of it, say, is uncultivated, undrained, unfenced, uncleared and infertile ; other some is in "good order," well cleared, drained, fertilized, etc.

Suppose now five or ten thousand people move into this town. Land, of course, rises in value. But is its value only now *created*? Of course not. The fine farm was valuable to its owner before the increase in population occurred, and all that happens by the increase in population is an *increase* in the value of land. But that land upon which labor has been spent is worth more and brings a better price than the unused land *because* of the labor that had been spent upon it; and this shows that land is inherently valuable; that labor spent upon it adds to its value, and hence the growth of the community is *not* the only cause of land-values. The community, therefore, may not justly appropriate all the rent or value of land as taxes. All that Mr. George's argument proves is that land varies in value from zero upward, owing partly to the differences in the demand for it. But this is equally true of every other species of property, and hence we deny that the growth of the community does not increase the value of labor products. How strange that a thoughtful mind should deny this simple fact! Every huckster knows that the scarcity of his articles of sale or an increased demand for them increases their value and price. Every tenant knows that the scarcity of houses, even where the *ground rent* is paid to the municipality, as in Savannah, Ga., increases his house rent. The value of *everything* is increased when two or more men want it, and hence if the community has a right to appropriate such value in one case it has a right to do so in every case. Mr. George has never answered these two fundamental objections to his theory of taxation. In attempting to do so before the Social Science Association at Saratoga, in 1890, he admitted that the increased value of *franchises* due to the growth of a community, is like the increased value of land from the same cause. "As the village grows," he said, "into the city, the business of the street railway becomes more profitable. So with gas-works, water-works, etc. So with railways generally. But, if their increased profits are not ultimately resolvable into increased economic rent, they are of the same nature. Such franchises are special privileges, like the privilege of holding valuable land, and the profits due to the general growth ought, as we hold, to be taken for public use, or diffused through the community by a

reduced price of services." To this Prof. E. R. A. Seligman, of Columbia College, New York, well replied :

"Now, this means one of two things, either the community must tax them (the franchises) or it must acquire them by purchase or confiscation. If the State taxes them, we no longer have the single tax on land values, but also an additional tax on something else. What, then, becomes of the great crusade for the single tax? But if the State acquires them—that is to say, nationalizes all occupations, which enjoy a special franchise, how is Mr. George to be distinguished from those Socialists whom he professes so to abhor? These are the horns of the dilemma." The professor also properly denied Mr. George's contention that there is no "unearned increment" in anything but land. Thus, he said, the value of railway securities in the United States to-day is over \$9,000,000,000, and the securities of other corporations amount to many millions more. It is safe to say that the value of the bare land, owned by individuals, is far less than these corporate securities, which form a large part of the intangible personal property of individuals. Now, has anything that Mr. George advances tended to disprove the existence of unearned increments in these? I invest \$100,000 in the railway bonds of a young corporation; I get 6 per cent. interest, and pay perhaps \$50 on the par value of them. In the course of twenty years, during which time the community has grown and given the railroad more traffic, this bond is worth par or even \$150, and my investment represents now \$200,000 or even \$300,000. Have I earned this increment? Have I individually done anything to produce the added value? It is as much the work of the community as the increase in the value of any land. Why take away the unearned increment of the land-holder and leave intact the equally unearned increment of the bondholder? Do you not see that this is the rankest injustice?"

We conclude, therefore, that the growth of the community is not the only factor in the production of land-values, but labor is as much of a factor in producing such values as it is in producing other values; and secondly, the growth of the community increases the value of other things, "labor products," as truly as it does the value of land, and hence it is unjust to appropriate all land-values as taxes. There

are other objections to the single tax. It violates that canon or rule of taxation, universally accepted, even by Mr. George, that taxes should fall *equally* upon the subjects of a commonwealth; that each one should contribute to its support according to his *ability*. In this case land-holders alone would contribute to the support of the government and others would go scot-free. This is one of the points most strongly urged in favor of the single tax, and it means that land-holders are the only persons who derive any advantages from society for which they should pay—a palpable absurdity. The very object of society is to protect life and property (of all sorts), and hence all men derive benefits from society and should pay something to its support.

There is much said *pro* and *con* about "compensation" of land-owners if the land should be nationalized. Of course, if it be admitted that nothing can be done to land, in the first place, to entitle one to it, then, indeed, Mr. George is right in saying that land-holders should not be "compensated" for the loss of what they have no right to.

But as we hold that labor spent upon land increases its value, that the growth of the community also increases its value, for both of which the present landholder has to pay, if he is robbed of his property he must be compensated for it, just as railroad corporations would have to be reimbursed if the railways were nationalized.

Such, then, are some of the truths and some of the errors of Henry George's peculiar views. I have not, of course, stated all of his opinions, for he holds many commonly accepted opinions; nor have I attempted to discuss and refute them in every particular, but I have stated his distinctive views and the most simple and forcible objections to them. From all this it should be clear that however great may be the service Mr. George has rendered economic science, he has not discovered and formulated a panacea for all our social ills. He has drawn glowing and stirring pictures of the social millennium which would be ushered in if the Single Tax were adopted, but while our methods of taxation are most iniquitous, while certain features of land speculation are most unjust, while the popular ideas of wages are thoroughly erroneous, while our "protective tariffs" are barbarous, yet a reform in no

one of these great departments of social, industrial and political life, perhaps not even reform in all of them will restore the departed glories of Eden. Still, let us hear from every one who has anything to say that is worth hearing on these important issues, for "in the multitude of counsellors there is safety," errors are exploded and truth is established.

VI.

THE SAVAGES OF CIVILIZATION.

THIS chapter was caused by a visit through the slums of New York City. Of course, no adequate idea of the horrible depths of degradation that exist there could be formed from observations made during one short trip through the slums. But being familiar with poverty in other cities, and having read such comprehensive and valuable works as Mr. J. A. Riis's "How the Other Half Lives," General Booth's "In Darkest England," etc., I feel fairly well qualified to say a few words on this important subject.

When Prof. Huxley lived as a medical officer in the east of London he acquired a knowledge of the condition of the life of its denizens, which led him to say subsequently that the surroundings of the savages of New Guinea were much more conducive to the leading of a decent human existence than those in which many of the East Londoners live. The same is true of the New York slums and their inhabitants; nay, it is substantially true of *all* the slums of *all* our large towns and cities. I have seen as abject poverty in Washington City, under the very shadow of the National Treasury, whose vaults were overflowing with a great "surplus," taken from the pockets of the poor and spent (squandered) on "public buildings" in various congressional districts, which helped to re-elect boodled politicians to seats which they disgraced—in our national capital I have seen as great poverty and suffering as there is in New York City. In a wealthy, thriving western town of twenty-five thousand inhabitants, a family consisting of fifteen members have been found living in one small room! And so the savages of civilization are not confined to New York City, and I shall speak of them simply as the most notable examples of suffering humanity in our midst.

The total number of tenements in New York on August

1st, 1890, according to the reliable authority of Mr. Riis, was 37,316; their population numbered 1,250,000, and the number of rear tenements, amounted to 2,630. The denizens of these places consist of the scum of Europe and America—Italians, Russians, Poles, Germans, Jews, Irish, English, Chinese, Negroes, etc. Mott Street gives us Chinatown, with its pigtails, opium, and gambling. Bayard Street holds the degenerated descendants of Jacob who constitute "Jewtown," with its sweating hells. Baxter Street furnishes the nauseating old-clothes' shops. Fifth Street, Thirty-eighth Street, Fifty-fourth and Seventy-third Street, harbor the Bohemian "rats." Mulberry Street with its historic "Bend," "foul core of New York's slums," its stale beer dives and unimaginable horrors, caps the climax of slum degradation. The characteristics of the population of these and such like sections are as follows (beginning with the cradle): the waifs that are cast by their poverty-stricken parents on doorsteps, the street, or into the Foundlings' Hospital; the "street arab," who has not where to lay his head, except on the pavement, or in some corner in an alley, with his feet stuffed into a box; the "growler gangs," consisting of the "toughs" from fifteen years upward, who infest the water-fronts, belt the city and wage a real guerilla warfare upon its inhabitants even far inland; one hundred and fifty thousand girls and women who work for sixty cents a day on an average; "the common herd," numbering thousands upon thousands who do not live but simply breathe; myriads upon whom the monster Rum has naturally if not necessarily set his deadly grip; the blind, the deaf, the dumb, the insane, the maimed, the wrecks and wastes of humanity are all found here or are supplied from this source. Here is the great tenement swarming with one or two hundred human brutes. Here are the horrible barracks with the foul and reeking courts and alleys that form their purlieus, and the swarming rumshops that lie in wait to catch the victims their sights and stenches have prepared. Here is the "cheap lodging-house," ghastly caricature of the American "hotel." Here are hells which even a Dantean imagination could not conceive and paint in all their horrors, and before which the abode of the damned pictured in traditional orthodoxy fades into a paradise. But why attempt to describe what it would require volumes to portray

in all its awful reality? Mr. Riis, in the book just referred to, has given us a full and accurate picture drawn from facts observed by himself, and to it and such books as General Booth's "Darkest England," Helen Campbell's "Prisoners of Poverty," etc., the reader is referred for fuller information as to the conditions of the poor in New York and other great cities. I am here concerned with the causes and possible remedies of this civilized (?) savagery.

1. The first cause assigned by most writers on the subject is *immigration*. But I consider this an entire mistake. It has been estimated by Rev. Dr. Strong, in his book "Our Country," and others, that the United States is able to support a thousand millions of people, and as we have only about sixty-five millions it is absurd to say that immigration is the cause of the crowding and poverty of the slums of our cities. It is true that immigration might, at times, have the effect upon New York and other ports that a rush of people to the city or town to see the circus or attend a political "jollification" would have on the hotels and lodging-houses: it might *temporarily* overcrowd the cities. But if the immigrants heard of any attractions outside of the cities they would soon disperse through the country and find work and homes. Immigration cannot account for the slums of London, for there is no immigration into England, but, on the contrary, people leave that country as fast as possible when sufficient inducements are offered. Immigration cannot explain the *permanency* of the slums in this country or any other.

2. Well, then, it is said it is due to the *natural* pressure of population upon the means of subsistence. I don't believe a word of it! Whatever truth there may be in the Malthusian theory of population, no one familiar with the facts of the case will say that England or the United States is *unable* to support all of its inhabitants.

There is plenty of land, there is or may be plenty of work, there is or may be plenty of wealth in both countries to afford a comfortable living to every man, woman and child in them. Let us, therefore, not lay upon nature the blame which belongs elsewhere.

The New York *Tribune*, in reviewing Mr. Riis's book, said: "It is one of the conditions of existing civilization all over the world that pressure of population accompanies what is called progress, and from the pressure arises a

competition which, despite of all legislative remedies, forces the poor into a more desperate and breathless struggle for bread, and keeps down the wages of labor as nearly as possible to the starvation point. But it must at once be seen that in New York the natural pressure of population upon the *wage-fund* is enormously increased" by immigration, etc. If this be so, we need not be surprised that Socialists and Anarchists should cry, "Away with existing civilization!" If progress increases poverty it is *not* progress but retrogression, and we would better abolish "existing civilization," and return to primitive savagery. But, fortunately, both statements of this able paper are false. Pressure of population, whether natural or artificial, as just shown, has little or nothing to do with our civilized savagery, and, as shown in the last chapter, there is no such thing as a "wage-fund"—a fund set apart by capital out of its proceeds from which to pay wages. *Labor pays itself and adds to capital*, and what we want is no increase in an imaginary "wages-fund," but more and greater opportunities for *work*, which being used will produce both capital and wages in greater abundance. *It is because men are not allowed to work that poverty exists.* Land and other means of production are so monopolized and mismanaged that labor cannot find employment. *This is the real cause of poverty, not progress, not a too great demand upon an imaginary "wages-fund."* The *Tribune's* statement shows what evil a false political economy may produce.

It is said that the influx of the country people into the cities is a cause of the slums, and it is simply a fact that the cities are growing much more rapidly than the country population.

"In 1790," says Dr. Strong, "one-thirtieth of the population of the United States lived in cities of 8,000 inhabitants and over; in 1800, one twenty-fifth; in 1810, and also in 1820, one-twentieth; in 1830, one-sixteenth; in 1840, one-twelfth; in 1850, one-eighth; in 1860, one-sixth; in 1870, a little over one-fifth; and in 1880, nearly one-fourth. From 1790 to 1880 the whole population increased twelvefold the urban population eighty-six-fold. From 1830 to 1880 the whole population increased a little less than fourfold, the urban population thirteenfold. From 1870 to 1880 the whole population increased thirty per cent. the urban population

forty per cent. During the half century preceding 1880, population in the city increased more than four times as rapidly as that of the village and country. In 1800 there were only six cities in the United States which had a population of 8,000 or more, in 1880 there were 286." * This looks as if we are destined to be a nation of cities, and the only way to relieve the cities that are overcrowded from time to time seem to be to absorb the country into the city and town as fast as possible. Our slums are due to this gathering of the people into centres instead of dispersing them through the country, say many writers on the subject. Why do they stay in or come to the cities? they ask. Because, we answer, they cannot make a living in the country. It is really amusing to hear people saying that the poor of the cities should go to the country. What could they get to do if they were to go to the country? Who would employ them? It is well known that thousands upon thousands of farms are burdened with mortgages, and the farmers, as a class, must be numbered among the less favored ones of the land. Any one who has ever been engaged in agricultural pursuits, as the writer has, knows that farming does not "pay," and year by year it pays less and less. Of course, there are rich farmers as there are rich manufacturers, but their wealth has been due to peculiar circumstances, and these very men will tell you that their farms are not paying them now; while the vast majority of farmers can barely support themselves and families. During harvest time they need "hands," but not all the year round, and if the cities were to dump the contents of their slums upon the farms there would be an uprising of the farmers unparalleled in history.

Farming must be made more profitable, work must be increased in the country and small towns, before the stream of population will set in that direction, and as soon as this is done all who can get there will go to the country, and form new towns and cities more flourishing than the old. But there are myriads who are financially unable to get out of the cities even if they had a place in the country to go to, and many more are unfit for farm-hands. Those who talk about the slum-dwellers going to the country little know what is necessary to a successful and comfort-

* Strong's "Our Country," p, 128.

able life in the country. "Misery loves company," and many of those who have been sent to the country have returned to the city simply because their solitary misery was unendurable. But the important point is that the country, for the most part, is, *under present conditions*, quite as unable to support the starving millions in the cities as the cities are. What is imperatively demanded is *work* and an increase in *production*.

In former years the cry, "Go West and take up land!" was more rational than it is now, for so much of our public land has been given away and otherwise disposed of that Dr. Strong tells us "the farming lands of the West will all be taken before the close of this century." Even if we had the land to give to the poor, how could they get to it, and what could they do with it? We see, therefore, the folly of the cry, "Go to the country!"

Other causes are assigned to account for the slums and poverty in general, but I shall reserve a consideration of them for the next chapter, and turn to the proposed *remedies* for the evil.

II. How shall we abolish the slums or improve the condition of the tenement-house dweller? Of course, there are many nostrums propounded for the cure of this social disease, but the following sensible words of General Booth effectually dispose of them: "Of the schemes of those" (he says) "who propose to bring in a new heaven and a new earth by a more scientific distribution of the pieces of gold and silver in the trousers pockets of mankind, I need not say anything here. They may be good or they may not. I say nothing against any short cut to the millennium that is compatible with the Ten Commandments. I intensely sympathize with the aspirations that lie behind all these Socialist dreams. But whether it is Henry George's Single Tax on Land Values, or Edward Bellamy's Nationalism, or the more elaborate schemes of the Collectivists, my attitude towards them all is the same. What these good people want to do, I also want to do. But I am a practical man dealing with the actualities of to-day. I have no preconceived theories, and I flatter myself I am singularly free from prejudices. I am ready to sit at the feet of any who will show me any good. I keep my mind open on all these subjects, and am quite prepared to hail with open arms any Utopia that is offered me. But it must be within

range o. my finger-tips. It is of no use to me if it is in the clouds. Checks on the Bank of Futurity I accept gladly enough as a free gift, but I can hardly be expected to take them as if they were current coin, or to try to cash them at the Bank of England.

“It may be that nothing will be put permanently right until everything has been turned upside down. There are certainly so many things that need transforming, beginning with the heart of each individual man and woman, that I do not quarrel with any visionary when in his intense longing for the amelioration of the condition of mankind he lays down his theories as to the necessity for radical change, however impracticable they may appear to me.

“But this is the question. Here at our shelters last night were a thousand hungry, workless people. I want to know what to do with them. Here is John Jones, a stout, stalwart laborer in rags, who has not had one square meal for a month, who has been hunting for work that will enable him to keep body and soul together, and hunting in vain. There he is in his hungry raggedness, asking for work that he may live and not die of sheer starvation in the midst of the wealthiest city in the world. What is to be done with John Jones?

“The individualist tells me that the free play of the natural laws governing the struggle for existence will result in the survival of the fittest, and that in the course of a few ages, more or less, a much nobler type will be evolved. But *meanwhile* what is to become of John Jones? The socialist tells me that the great social revolution is looming large on the horizon. In the good time coming, when wealth will be re-distributed and private property abolished, all stomachs will be filled, and there will be no more John Joneses impatiently clamoring for opportunity to work that they may not die. It may be so, but in the meantime here is John Jones growing more impatient than ever because hungrier, who wonders if he is to wait for a dinner until the social revolution has arrived. What are we to do with John Jones? That is the question. And to the solution of that question none of the Utopians give me much help.”

Does anybody else? The sentimental philanthropist is ready to go down into his pocket, or rather into the pockets of *other* people, and bestow an alms upon these

poor wretches. But any one who has had the slightest experience in work among the poor knows that almsgiving has the very worst possible effect upon most of its recipients : it makes them lazy and wasteful, and is wrong in principle.

He that is able to work and will not work, if he has the opportunity, ought not to be allowed to eat other people's substance, and so what the poor should be given is *work*. If this cannot be given them, then give them nothing, and starvation will soon produce such horrible results that the community will thereby be more effectually aroused than by all the appeals of philanthropists or the exhortations of moralists. Of course, I do not mean that the wealthy should not contribute to this work ; far from it. They should give and that largely to the support of industrial schools, orphan and foundling asylums, institutions for the aged, the insane and the hopelessly maimed, and so on, until the material conditions of the friends of such unfortunates shall be so improved that they can and will provide for their own. They should especially contribute to all projects advocated and fostered by *scientific* philanthropists, who are seeking to permanently elevate the characters and improve the conditions of the poor.

The agencies employed in this great work confess their inability to grapple successfully with it. Mr. Riis pays high and deserved tributes to the Children's Aid Society of New York, the Five Points Mission, the girl's "College Settlement," the Neighborhood Guilds, the King's Daughters, the Board of Health, and the various efforts of tenement house reformers and charitable organizations.

Millions upon millions of dollars are spent annually in New York city alone, and yet it not only has not removed the evils in question, but those who are best qualified to speak on the subject sorrowfully admit that the agencies at present employed cannot remove them. Mr. Riis thinks that "tenement-house *reform* holds the key to the problem of pauperism in the city." Yet he adds sadly, "We can never get rid of either the tenement or the pauper. The two will always exist together in New York. But by reforming the one, we can do more toward exterminating the other than can be done by all other means together that have yet been invented, or ever will be."

Miss Collins in New York and Mr. White in Brooklyn

have shown not only what can be done in the way of tenement-house reform, but they have shown that the tenements may be *profitably* improved. The dwellers in these miserable dens pay, in proportion, as high rent as any resident of the city. The owners of the tenements make from twenty-five to forty per cent., on the money thus invested, and, of course, they oppose and will continue to oppose tenement-house reform. They can make more out of them in their present condition, but they can make a fair profit upon their money if they improve their tenements, and they should be *forced* by public sentiment and the law to do it. It is no charity to the poor to demand this, but simple justice. They have to pay for their houses and they should have decent residences. These words of the *New York Tribune* are sensible and suggestive: "When private enterprise," it says, "has practically solved the question (as in this case) how to do certain things, a great step in advance has been taken. Thenceforth half the dependence of the defenders of abuses is gone; thenceforth the friends of reform are furnished with concrete illustrations of their subject. To provide decent housing for the poor at reasonable rents is obviously the first consideration. When this has been done for some of the poor, the way to accomplish it for the rest lies open, and the question then resolves itself into one of means."

Here lies the strength of the reform position at present; and while unquestionably the difficulties to be encountered are still manifold and great, there is ample room for encouragement. While the tenement will probably remain a necessity in New York, owing to its peculiar location on an island, in Philadelphia and other cities it is not and ought never to be allowed to become a necessity. On the contrary, the good example of Philadelphia in furnishing neat and commodious if modest houses for the work-people ought to be followed everywhere. But after all has been done that can be done towards providing houses for the poor, there still remains that vast unnumbered host who have *no* work, and cannot, therefore, rent a single room even, but must go to the cheap lodging-house, the alley, anywhere they are permitted to stretch their weary limbs. What shall be done for or with these thousands? Only one man to my knowledge has made even an approximately practical attempt to answer that question, and, of

course, he has been overwhelmed with abuse and has met with all sorts of opposition, so that one almost hesitates to mention his name and discuss his proposition. I refer, of course, to General Booth, of the Salvation Army, and his remarkable colonization plan. This plan is so well known that it is unnecessary to do more than glance at its chief features. These are three, consisting, first, of a colony planted in the midst of the slums; secondly, a colony in the country; and third, a colony in foreign parts. The last-named has less interest for us than the other two parts of the plan have. General Booth recognizes two great facts: that the personal *character* of the slum-dweller must be reformed, and that in order to return the masses to the country whence they came they must be enabled to go there and to earn a living after they get there. His city colony would serve the first purpose. He would put up a number of buildings in the midst of the slums, somewhat like the shelters of the Salvation Army, where the starving could get bread and the naked clothing and the suffering relief, but they would have to *work* and pay for what they got. A number would be employed in gathering waste food and cast-off clothing from the kitchens and closets of the rich who would give for this purpose. What an enormous amount of stuff, now wasted, could be thus gathered! Then there would be factories where the old clothes, etc., would be "made over," and these, of course, would furnish much work for the beneficiaries. There would be a labor bureau to secure work elsewhere, and, in short, there would be a scientific application of the most approved methods of poor-relief. Then, as the rescued were prepared for it, they would be sent to a farm owned by the managers of the scheme, where they would find all the necessaries to successful farming, and where they would be thickly enough settled to prevent the misery of solitariness. He only asks five million dollars to put this plan into practice, by which he would provide for three million poor people. England spent two hundred million dollars in freeing her slaves, and we spent as much in proportion. Will England or the United States spend the pittance necessary to free the millions of white slaves at our doors? Judging from the puerile objections raised to General Booth's scheme, we may fear that the public mind and conscience are too ignorant and prejudiced to endorse

a plan that does not satisfy everybody. Nobody has ventured to deny the facts stated by Gen. Booth, and the consequent necessity of a gigantic effort to remove the evils. No one, so far as I know, has shown that this plan could not be put into operation with the means General Booth asks. All the objections refer to the methods of *administration* of affairs. Some bigots objected to it simply because the leader of the Salvation Army originated it. It is the same old cry, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" Had it come out of Canterbury or Parliament it might have been more satisfactory to these people. But considering that most of our good things come out of Nazareth, it is about time to have done with such silly objections.

Prof. Huxley refused to assist in promoting the scheme, first, because he did not consider the Salvation Army a fit instrument for the accomplishment of the work; and, secondly, because it placed too much power in one man's hands. The Archbishop of Canterbury expressed essentially the same objections. "Few social evils," says Huxley, "are of greater magnitude than uninstructed and unchastened *religious fanaticism*; no personal habit more surely degrades the conscience and the intellect than blind and unhesitating obedience to unlimited authority. Undoubtedly harlotry and intemperance are sore evils, and starvation is hard to bear or even to know of; but the prostitution of the mind, the soddening of the conscience, the dwarfing of manhood, are worse calamities." As if, forsooth, the minds of the poor wretches in the slums are not already prostituted to the lowest purposes, their consciences soddened to the very depths, and their manhood entirely crushed! Such objections are characteristic of the agnostic philosopher, who objects to instructed and chastened religious "fanaticism," as well as to the Salvationist's kind. Prof. Huxley takes his stand by those who say, "Because a thing does not fully satisfy me I will have nothing to do with it." I disapprove of the Salvation Army's methods of religious work as cordially as Prof. Huxley does, and I know that religious feeling influences Mr. Booth and his co-workers in this movement; but Mr. Booth himself over and over again shows that the *social* and the *religious* parts of his work will be kept distinct. Certainly they can be, and the supporters of the scheme

could see that they were. The question is not whether the religious fanaticism of the Salvation Army is a good thing, but whether the methods of rescuing the "submerged tenth" from the ocean of misery they are now in, proposed by General Booth, are rational and practicable? No one will be compelled by the Army to adopt its religious opinions, and if some do adopt them and become Salvationists voluntarily, would their minds really be more prostituted, their consciences more soddened, their manhood more dwarfed, than they are now? Compare the dwellers in Mr. Booth's barracks with those on the Embankment of London, and answer. Prof. Huxley strains at a gnat, and swallows a camel. He appeals to the worst prejudices of the worst bigots in the Church in the passage quoted.

His second objection, however, is more rational. "What guarantee," he asks, "is there that, thirty years hence, the 'general,' who then autocratically controls the action, say, of 100,000 officers, pledged to blind obedience, distributed through the whole length and breadth of the poorer classes, and each with his finger on the trigger of a mine charged with discontent and religious fanaticism; with the absolute control, say, of eight or ten million pounds sterling of capital, and as many of income; with barracks in every town, with estates scattered over the country, and with settlements in the colonies—will exercise his enormous powers, not merely honestly, but wisely? What shadow of security is there that the person who wields this uncontrolled authority over many thousands of men shall use it solely for those philanthropic and religious objects, which, I do not doubt, are alone in the mind of Mr. Booth?" To the same effect writes the Archbishop of Canterbury. "The centrality and universality of the scheme, and the dominion to be exercised over it, appear to me to amass difficulties for the future." These suggestions, I think, make it plain that the Salvation Army should not be the *only* agency employed in this work. But is this a necessary part of Mr. Booth's scheme? Surely, if he is, as he says he is, "ready to sit at the feet of any who will show him any good," he would gladly have other philanthropic agencies *unite* with the Salvation Army in this work, and these agencies could and would limit its power. It is nothing more than just that those who contribute to

such a purpose should have a voice in the management of affairs, and I see no reason why the Church and philanthropic agencies now at work among the poor could not effect a basis of union and co-operation with the Salvation Army which would be satisfactory to all parties. One danger should ever be guarded against, viz., the influence of *politics*. Such a work should not be trusted to State management, for if so there would soon be as great a scramble for positions and power in it as there is now in other governmental work. But let it be observed that here again the question is not as to the inherent reasonableness of Mr. Booth's scheme, but simply as to the best method of putting it into effect; and surely when a great scheme like this has been conceived, further thought and discussion upon it will perfect it.

The New York *Churchman* for January 17, 1891, made some sensible and suggestive remarks on the scheme. It stated two serious obstacles in the way of its success. "First," it said, "it is a fact, which it would be idle not to recognize, that the followers of Jesus Christ our Lord are so wretchedly *divided* from each other, and in spite of all their boasted tolerance are so pettily jealous of each other, that it is only the larger souls in the different denominations that can sincerely rejoice at good done by men belonging to other denominations. In the discussions of General Booth's scheme that have come under our observation the most humiliating thing we have had to observe is the small spirit of *sectarianism* which has arrayed itself against the man and his scheme, and the rancor with which both have been held up to contempt." This is sadly true, and I know of no severer arraignment of sectarianism than this. To think that millions of our fellow-men must suffer and die because the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ are divided in opinions concerning unessential and often puerile doctrines is enough to make angels weep and devils keep jubilee. But not only do denominational differences prevent Christians from uniting in philanthropic work: scientific or philosophic prejudices frequently influence men like Huxley in declining to endorse such work, although they say they think that the one redeeming feature of the Church is its social and moral power. But the *Churchman* admits there are some "larger souls" in all churches who can rise superior to denominational prejudices, and I think that

the number is large enough to constitute an effective working force. If, for instance, the work were committed to a general board, the members of which would be elected, say, triennially by the conventions of the Church and the Salvation Army, I am sure that enough large-souled men could be found to fill the positions. Surely those large souls already engaged in charitable work are not all who are willing to engage in it, and this combined force might accomplish wonders in spite of the evils of sectarianism. By such a union of forces, too, the *political* importance of such a social power as any one organization of such magnitude would become would be prevented. The different churches concerned could effectively say to each other, or to any power that would attempt to manipulate things to a political advantage, "Hands off!" A second serious objection to the Booth scheme cited by the *Churchman* is that "it proposes to do a great police work without police powers. After the Salvation Army had done all it possibly could do there would still remain a mighty multitude of people who, in spite of poverty and suffering, prefer the crowded street, and the gin palace, and the freedom of vagrancy, to any mode of life that the Salvation Army would offer them. The hand that shall successfully deal with that multitude must be the strong hand of a Rumford, armed with the entire police powers of society, and able to compel submission until it can conciliate and secure willing compliance. The evil to be removed is a social evil of enormous magnitude." Yes, but by a union of the mighty forces, social, moral and religious, such as is here suggested, the necessary police force could be commanded, and so again we see the necessity of union and co-operation between philanthropic societies and workers.

The *Churchman* also says that the Booth scheme fails to provide decent houses for the poor in the cities where they must live in order to be near their work, and to remove certain economic difficulties. As to the first objection, it is met by the proposition to continue and extend tenement-house *reform*, and this could be included in the Booth scheme as well as not. The second objection of the *Churchman* has no force in it, because it rests on false premises. "The progress of modern civilization," it says, echoing the *Tribune's* false political economy, "tends to submerge the great mass of the laboring classes in deeper and deeper

hopelessness." Not so! The progress of rascality and respectable robbery among landlords, monopolists, corrupt politicians and the so-called upper classes, "tends to submerge the laboring classes," and it is just this progress of meanness that it is here proposed to stop. We want to give the working people a chance by furnishing opportunities for work, and then production will be increased, wages will rise and capital become more abundant and widely and equally diffused. The introduction of machinery and the invention of the steam engine have no doubt changed the whole face of industrial society, but it should have increased the prosperity of the toiling millions by creating more wealth, and it would have done this had not that wealth been grabbed by the "upper classes," those on top who are submerging the laboring classes. We propose to put machinery, land, and the other means of production into the hands of the work people, and see what they will do with it all. We believe that they will soon exterminate poverty among themselves, and also benefit the wealthier classes by rendering their position more secure. As it is, they now sit on a volcano which may burst under them at any moment.

For such reasons I endorse the Booth scheme. I do not think it a panacea for all our social and industrial ills. Indeed, I am not sure that it would produce all the good that even I might expect if it were adopted and applied with the modifications here suggested. But it rests on the right basis. It proposes a reformation of individual *character*, and it further aims to *provide work* for those who want it. It proposes to send many of the city poor to the country, but it would not send them unprepared to an unprepared country, and it combines many if not all the best features of "scientific charity." Suppose the scheme is tried and fails, what of it? The experiment would, doubtless, teach lessons which would be far more valuable to social and economic reformers than the few millions spent upon it. The Government wastes more money in experimenting in building gunboats, etc., etc., than would be necessary for this experiment in poor-relief. I therefore say, All hail, success and triumph to General Booth! Thou art the Good Samaritan! And may the good Lord enable you to teach the priests, Levites, Scribes, Pharisees, and hypocrites a lesson which the ages shall confirm!

VII.

POPULAR IDEAS OF POVERTY.

No text of Scripture has been more misunderstood and perverted than that which says, "Ye have the poor always with you." It is often interpreted as if Jesus meant not only to state a *fact*, but that He meant to say it was a *necessary* and *unalterable* fact. Such interpreters would have us believe that the poor are not only here and here to stay, but that we cannot even partially exterminate poverty. Besides, they do not distinguish between absolute and relative poverty; between poverty and pauperism. I may be poor as compared to Smith, who has millions, but I may be rich as compared to Jones, who has only a few pennies. And while we may not be able to exterminate relative poverty, we can certainly do much towards destroying pauperism and elevating the poor morally, intellectually, and materially. Neither poverty nor pauperism is necessary. But both popular political economy and philanthropy assume that it is, and therefore seek to discover and assign the causes of this sad state of things.

First, the popular political economy, as stated in former chapters, assigns pressure of population upon the means of subsistence as the great cause of poverty. This theory is called the Malthusian Theory of Population, after its originator, the Rev. Thomas R. Malthus, of England, who lived during the first part of this century. It really amounts to the Darwinian "Struggle for Existence," which it suggested, and which, in turn, has contributed to its support and confirmation.

It is found in the writings of all political economists since the time of Malthus, except Henry George's and a few others. It is well and moderately stated by Prof. Richard Ely, of the Johns Hopkins University, in his "Political Economy" for the Chautauqua University. "Let us suppose," he says, "that there are only two people on the face of the earth, and that population doubles

only once in fifty years. At the expiration of three thousand years the whole surface of the earth, land, and sea would be covered with people piled one on top of the other eight hundred deep."

This is truly appalling! It reminds one of the man who paid the blacksmith one cent for the first nail he put in his horse's shoe and doubled the amount for every other nail, and thereby bankrupted himself! Vanderbilt himself could not have his carriage horses shod at this price! The fact is, no such man ever existed, and the assertion that population tends to increase faster than the means of subsistence by no means explains the existence of poverty.

First, it is one thing to say that population *tends* to increase faster than subsistence, and quite another to say it *actually does* so increase. As long as tendencies do not become actualities we care very little about them. That the tendency in question has not become an actuality is conclusively proved by the fact that, although the human race has been in existence many thousands of years—a hundred thousand, say some anthropologists—yet there are to-day many millions of acres of unoccupied and unused land, and the earth is able to support many more millions of inhabitants than are now on it.

In the second book of his "Progress and Poverty," Mr. George shows that even India, China, and Ireland, with their swarming millions, could support them all if land and the means of production were properly managed. Certainly, if the unoccupied lands of Africa, America and other countries were inhabited and worked to their full capacity, and the products were fairly distributed, there is no reason whatever for believing that the earth could not support its occupants.

Even Malthusianism admits that the alleged tendency of the human race to multiply more rapidly than the means of subsistence never becomes an actual fact, but it misstates the checks to the growth of population, and this is the second and radical defect in the theory. It makes poverty both an effect and a cause. It says that population increases more rapidly than the means of subsistence; this produces a scramble for bread, and in the struggle many are killed by starvation, and thus the growth of population is checked. Now I believe an effect is here assigned to a wrong cause. I don't believe that poverty ever greatly

checks the increase of population, except in very rare, exceptional cases. When the potato crop in Ireland fails, the poverty of its peasants doubtless destroys some of them. When the famine occurred in Israel, those who were not so fortunate as Jacob's sons were may have suffered. When the great fire of London reduced thousands to beggary, their poverty may have destroyed them, and thus checked the increase of population somewhat. But these are exceptional cases, and cannot prove Malthusianism. The growth of population is checked by entirely different causes from that assigned by Malthusians—by wars, and pestilences, and earthquakes, and disease, and death from old age, etc. These are the checks to population, and they are sufficient, I believe, to keep the number of the earth's inhabitants so low that it can support them if they use its resources. They will prevent population from so pressing upon the means of subsistence that starvation must mow men down in order to save others. If the Creator (or Nature) sends men into this world, He gives them two hands with which to fill each mouth, places them upon a planet where they may find ample standing-room, plenty of meats, vegetables, minerals, etc., for their use, and in due time He removes them to make room for others. It is not necessary that He should starve them out, for He can and does remove them by less painful methods, and omitting starvation as a factor in disposing of men, the deaths from other causes pretty well balance the births. It is so easy to blame God or Nature for man's iniquities, and the Malthusian theory is well adapted to soothe the consciences of those who, intentionally or unintentionally, rob the poor of their just dues.

The following facts cited by Mr. George tend to disprove this theory. "At the period of her greatest population (1840-45)," he says, "Ireland contained some eight millions of people. But a very large proportion of them managed merely to exist—lodging in miserable cabins, clothed with miserable rags, and with but potatoes for their staple food. When the potato blight came, they died by thousands. But was it the inability of the soil to support so large a population that compelled so many to live in this miserable way, and exposed them to starvation on the failure of a single root crop? On the contrary, it was the same remorseless *rapacity* that robbed the Indian ryot

of the fruits of his toil and left him to starve where nature offered plenty. A merciless banditti of tax-gatherers did not march through the land plundering and torturing, but the laborer was just as effectually stripped by as merciless a horde of landlords, among whom the soil had been divided as their absolute possession, regardless of any rights of those who lived upon it."

Again, speaking of man's food-resources, he says: "It is from the vegetable and animal kingdoms that man's food is drawn, and hence the greater strength of the reproductive force in the vegetable and animal kingdoms than in man simply proves the power of subsistence to increase faster than population. Does not the fact that all of the things which furnish man's subsistence have the power to multiply manifold—some of them many thousand-fold, and some of them many million or even billion-fold—while he is only doubling his numbers, show that let human beings increase to the full extent of their reproductive power, the increase of population can never exceed subsistence?" Whether this fact proves as much as our author claims or not, yet it is quite worthy of consideration. It is a remarkably wise provision of nature that the sources from which man's subsistence is drawn should be thus capable of multiplying themselves. Moreover, they utilize things that man could not use; and if it is said that plants and animals multiply more rapidly than the means of *their* subsistence, we know as a matter of fact that "no species reaches the ultimate limit of soil, water, air, and sunshine: but the actual limit of each is in the existence of other species, its rivals, its enemies," the least of which is not man.

Further, unlike the increase of any other living thing, the increase of man involves the increase of his food. He is not merely a consumer, he is also a producer. Beast, insect, bird, and fish take only what they find, but their progeny can be increased and improved by man's efforts, and thus he may increase the amount of his food. Of course, the "law of diminishing returns" from the cultivation of the land is cited as a check to man's efforts to increase the amount of his food. This "law" simply means that land after a certain amount of labor has been spent upon it, and a certain quantity of produce extracted from it, begins to yield less and less until it reaches zero. Or, to put it dif-

ferently, land that produces twenty-five bushels of wheat per acre cannot be made to produce fifty bushels by doubling the amount of labor, but will yield, say, only thirty-five bushels per acre. This, no doubt, is true, but as long as the checks to the growth of population, just mentioned, operate to keep population down to the point where plenty of land may be had which does not require such extra labor, there is no cause for alarm, and at present it seems that as this planet is exhausted by old age and use, the human race, from old age and such causes, will diminish *pari passu* and so, however true "the law of diminishing returns" may be in theory, there is no prospect of its being realized in practice to the great and endless misery of man.

The question, then, is this : Does the relative power of producing wealth decrease with the increase of population ? Consider the marvelous growth of population in the United States during the last fifty or a hundred years, from natural causes as well as from immigration and the hand in hand increase of wealth, and answer. Remember, too, that while the New World has thus been receiving and adding to its population, certain parts of the Old World have been gradually depopulated. The rich valley of the Nile once held millions of people where it now has only thousands.

In what we know of the world's history *decadence* of population is as common as increase, and, of course those sections of the globe which are depopulated increase in fertility while other sections are supporting earth's inhabitants. For millenniums the stream of population has been setting westward, but the time may come when it will return to the point whence it started, and there find a house, not swept and garnished, but replenished by a kind Providence, and thus begin its majestic march over again.

At any rate, the Malthusian theory of population does not explain poverty, because, whatever may be the tendency of the human race to multiplication, this tendency is held in check by death from causes other than starvation ; the resources of nature, vegetables and animals. *naturally* multiply faster than man's wants, and by his efforts may be even more rapidly multiplied, and as man becomes more and more civilized and elevated in tastes and conditions, his reproductive power seems rather to diminish than to increase. The old adage "A rich man

for luck and a poor man for children," proves this. "The proportion of births is notoriously greater in new settlements, where the struggle with nature leaves little opportunity for intellectual life, and among the poverty-bound classes of older countries, who in the midst of wealth are deprived of all its advantages and reduced to all but an animal existence, than it is among the classes to whom the increase of wealth has brought independence, leisure, comfort, and a fuller and more varied life."

It would seem, therefore, that the best method of checking the growth of population is not starvation, but an elevation of man's social, intellectual and material condition so as to curb his mere animal, passionate nature and develop his *spiritual* nature. Let it always be remembered that whatever may be the *possibility*, of the human race so increasing as to demand more food than can be got, the actual fact is that at *present*, and for many millenniums to come, poverty is attributable not to "the niggardliness of nature, but to the injustice of society," not to necessary but to removable causes, and any instance of the pressure of population upon the means of subsistence that may be cited among earth's inhabitants—in India, China, England, Ireland or America—may be readily and correctly explained as due to "man's inhumanity to man."

Turning now from the explanations of poverty, offered by the Economists, we find popular writers and expositors, especially among the employing class, assigning *extravagance*, *drunkenness* and *laziness* as the chief causes of poverty among the working classes. All such works as Mr. Samuel Smiles's "Self Help," "Thrift," "Character," "Duty," etc., assume that the fault lies with the laborer and that a reformation of his character is all that is necessary. Now, I certainly do not undervalue Mr. Smiles's works, nor do I deny that extravagance, drunkenness, and laziness have much to do with poverty, but I do think that *too much* is attributed to them and certain important facts are overlooked.

First, an examination of the reports on labor furnished by the Government annually, or a perusal of such works as Mr. Riis's, Mr. Booth's, or Helen Campbell's, will show that there are thousands of men and women who are willing to work, anxious to work, and cannot get work at any price, and therefore they have absolutely nothing to econo-

mize. It is absurd to ask men to save what they haven't got. It is a mockery to say that men who haven't a crust of bread or a shirt should "lay by something for a rainy day." Every day is a rainy day with them, and the clouds are so dense, the storms are so severe, that it is impossible for them to survive, much more to save something.

Then think of the hundred and fifty thousand women in New York who make on an average sixty cents a day, many of whom may have children to support; how on earth can such persons "save" anything out of such a pittance? But even among the better-paid workmen there are excuses for their alleged extravagance. I remember once hearing a clergyman and a professor of political economy discussing this question. "Why, professor," said the minister, "it is the *extravagance* of the poor that makes them poor. I met my hired girl down the street the other day and she was actually dressed so finely that I did not recognize her, and when she came home she reproached me for passing her without speaking to her." "Well," answered the professor, "don't the well-to-do classes *set the example* of extravagance to the poor people? Your servant has discovered that a fine dress is necessary to an entrance into 'society,' and hence she will starve her stomach to clothe her back." The clergyman yielded, and well he might, for the lightning struck near home, since his own wife and wealthy parishioners set the evil example. True, they were more able to wear fine clothes than the hireling, but the latter did not consider this; and if facts are considered, it may be found that many are able to live more luxuriously *because* others are deprived of their just dues. The very question is, Why this discrepancy between the classes? Why should not the faithful worker be able to wear decent clothes and set a bountiful table? One fact is undeniable: extravagance is not confined to the poor classes, and those who preach the Gospel of Economy should address themselves, first to the rich, and then to the poor. If this is done, I for one will heartily endorse the preaching. I do not defend extravagance in any one or any class, but it does not explain the existence of poverty, or, if it does, it is rather the extravagance of the rich that impoverishes others than their own wastefulness.

Then as to drunkenness, no one can deny that it produces terrible evils and suffering among the poor, but

neither can it be denied that poverty itself produces intemperance. Says Prof. Ely: "While intemperance is a monstrous evil and cannot be too earnestly fought against, we should not fail to see that it is at the same time both an effect and a cause. Go to our crowded cities and great industrial centers. Here we find industrial and social conditions which force us to believe that, until they are remedied, we can look for no lasting growth of temperance or strengthening of character. On the one side, immense wealth, with its temptations of pride and luxury; on the other, crowded tenements, hot and noxious in summer, always loathsome and repulsive, occupied by those who do not know whether they will find work that day or not. Their condition is often the effect of their former intemperate habits, and in turn it drives them and their children into further depths of inebriety. An important reason for the craving for intoxicants, as is shown by one of the foremost American physiologists, is the lack of sufficient food or of a sufficient variety of wholesome food, and especially poorly cooked food. These and many other facts with regard to the economic conditions of our day admonish us that the thoughtful temperance advocate must embrace in his efforts both temperance and industrial reforms."

Here, again, the poor compare most favorably with the rich. Dr. Ely shows that the social clubs of working men never have a bar-room attached, and labor organizations foster temperance, while rich men's clubs almost invariably have bar-rooms attached, and the wealthy classes frequently promote intemperance among the poor, especially on election days, when they want their votes. It may be safely said that the working classes are, on the whole, even more temperate than the "upper classes," and there are thousands of poor people who do *not* drink liquor who yet have to struggle for dear life. I have little patience with those who cite the drunkenness of the poor as the cause of their poverty, for while I know as well as any one that drunkenness does prevail to a sad extent among all classes, I also know that many are ground down by poverty who are even "total abstainers," and it is for these that we plead. We include temperance and economy in our programme of social reform, as well as other things, but we do not attribute all poverty and suffering to two or three causes,

nor would we apply one reform to only one section of humanity, but we would preach economy, temperance, and righteousness to all alike.

Finally, as to laziness among the poor. No one knows better than I do how lazy many of them are. Both among the blacks of the South and the whites of the North, I have had ample opportunities to learn how careless of the interest of their employers are many working people. I also know how ready they are to botch their work and how prone they are to attempt to lord it over their employers. I do not in the least palliate any of their numerous faults, but urge as strongly as any that they must be remedied before they can succeed. Still, it must be admitted that there are thousands who are industrious and would be faithful in their work if they could get it to do, and against them the charge of laziness cannot be brought as an explanation of their poverty. But the great question is. *How to get these idlers to work?* Denunciation will do no good. Either we must be content with inefficient service or we must adopt some plan which will call forth the best efforts of employés. I know of but one such plan, and in lieu of a better I shall advocate its more general adoption, and that is *profit-sharing*. This simply means that the employer will pay his employé the nominal market rate of wages, and over and above this will give him a share in the profits of the business. By this means the worker's *self-interest* is enlisted on the side of the employer and the result is more vigorous effort, greater economy in the use of materials, and greater care of the machinery used.

Now, of course, the opponents of profit-sharing are ready with their everlasting "objections." They will point to the few attempts made in this country, under most unfavorable circumstances, which have failed, as proof positive of its impractical and "visionary" character. But two facts are sufficient to my mind to meet any such objections. First, I am sure from experience that the principle of profit-sharing is right, and that it will, under favorable conditions, work well. I have got lazy negroes in the South (and of all lazy people the negroes are the laziest) to do faithful work by giving them a share in the crops. The very negroes who would idle as soon as the employer's back was turned would work from daylight till dark, when they were "working on shares." Moreover, why should

labor not share in the profits? If, for instance capital contributes two dollars and labor gives the same to the production of a pair of shoes, and they are sold for five dollars, why should one party to the contract or transaction receive all the profits? Justice would share the profits equally between the two.

Secondly, Prof. Sedley Taylor of England has made a special study of profit-sharing, and in his admirable little work on this subject he tells us how the system was originated by a French house-decorator in 1842, and has spread over Europe, producing most satisfactory results. "Putting together the most recent data," he says, "I shall be below the mark in saying that one hundred continental (European) firms are now working on a participatory basis. The principle has been introduced with good results into agriculture; into the administration of railways, banks and insurance offices; into iron-smelting, type-founding and cotton-spinning; into the manufacture of tools, paper, chemicals, lucifer-matches, soap, card-board and cigarette-papers; into printing, engraving, cabinet-making, house-painting and plumbing; into stock-broking, book-selling, the wine trade and haberdashery. The movement," he adds, "is making still further headway, a considerable number having given in their adherence during the last four years."

The benefits accruing from participation successfully practiced he sums up thus: "It furnishes to the workman a supplementary income under circumstances which directly encourage, or even actually enforce, saving; and, by associating him in a very real sense with his employer, it arouses aspirations from which great moral improvement may be confidently anticipated. The employer, besides sharing in whatever surplus profits are realized by the more efficient labor which participation calls forth, obtains the boon of industrial *stability* and the support of a united corporate feeling elsewhere unknown. Independently of these advantages to the two parties directly concerned, the customer of a participating house finds in its very organization a guarantee for enhanced excellence of workmanship and rapidity of execution. The fund, of course, on which participation draws is the *surplus* profit realized in consequence of the enhanced efficiency of the work done under its stimulating influence. Such extra profit is,

therefore, obtainable wherever workmen have it in their power to increase the quantity, improve the quality, or diminish the cost of price of their staple of production by more effective exertion, by increased economy in the use of tools and materials, or by a reduction in the cost of superintendence."

The justice and practicability of profit-sharing would be apparent to all business men if they were not already wedded to a different system; if they did not worship "competition" and think that "the supply and demand" theory of wages was the only rule of action.

As to the failures of certain attempts at profit-sharing, Prof. Taylor well says: "In order to infer from the abandonment of a system the unsoundness of its central principle, evidence must be forthcoming to show that the evils which led to failure were *necessary* consequences of the principle. This certainly can never be proved with respect to the unsuccessful experiments in profit-sharing." Both reflection and experience prove that the principle is all right, however often misapplication of it may fail to produce good results. One thing is certain: neither false theories of political economy nor denunciation of the poor for their extravagance, drunkenness and laziness will ever remedy our social and industrial ills. Only the Gospel of Truth and Justice—only a frank recognition and confession of sins on both sides and an earnest, energetic effort by both parties to the controversy to set matters right, can produce harmony and peace and happiness between capitalists and laborers.

VIII.

REDUCTION OF THE HOURS OF LABOR.

THE conflict between capital and labor is artificial. Their interests are naturally identical ; and so no measure should be advocated or adopted which would really injure either one of these two parties. No philosophic economist will consciously and deliberately be a partisan in such matters, and if he advocates a reduction of the hours of labor, or any other industrial reform, it will be because he sincerely believes that it will benefit everybody. At any rate, that is my position, and yet I once alienated one of my wealthiest parishioners by advocating the eight-hour movement. He not only quit attending church, but he antagonized me in other ways ; and yet I honestly aimed to do that man as much of a service by urging a reduction of the hours of labor as I did when I aimed to show that the wicked might have another chance of salvation hereafter. He was thoroughly pleased with my advocacy of a second probation for sinners, and well he might be ! He was one of those "practical" men who think they know it all, and that professors, clergymen and statesmen, for the most part, are fools and visionaries. There is no greater obstructionist than the so-called "practical man." But I hope to show to unprejudiced minds in this book that many if not all the reforms herein advocated would be beneficial to all parties, among which is the reformation of the working day.

The first reason assigned for the reduction of the hours of labor is that it *would give an opportunity for work to the unemployed*. Mr. Gunton, one of the most enthusiastic advocates of the eight-hour system, says : "The immediate effect of the adoption of an eight-hour work day would be to reduce the working time of over eight million adult laborers about two hours a day. This would withdraw

sixteen million hours' labor a day from the market without discharging a single laborer. The industrial vacuum thus created would be equal to increasing the present demand for labor nearly twenty per cent.

"The fallacy of this argument," says General F. A. Walker, "lies in its assumption that the reason why a certain portion of the population cannot get work is because those who are employed work as long as they do, say ten hours a day. But what are these persons doing during the ninth and tenth hours? Each of them is producing goods which are to become the means of paying other laborers for their ninth and tenth hours of work." This is true. But would it not be better that these workers should be given less work and more leisure for other purposes, and allow the unwilling idlers to do their share of the work? It is hardly just to make the majority support the minority, and it would be better that all should work eight hours a day than that some should work ten and others none, and it cannot be denied that a reduction of the term of labor would furnish work to the unemployed even if there are (as there are) other reasons for enforced idleness besides the length of the present work-day. The reduction of the hours of labor really amounts to an increase in wages, for it is not proposed to reduce the wages of the workmen together with a shortening of the hours of labor, and the employer therefore would have to employ a larger number of men to do the same amount of work. This is why the employing class object so strongly to the shortening of the work-day. But the increase in wages which would thus be produced would prove beneficial to the employer as well as to the employé in this way: The unemployed, which in 1886 amounted to about one million in this country, would be furnished work, and would therefore become producers of wealth instead of *parasites* on the industrial body, and also customers, directly or indirectly, of their employers. It is because employers fail to recognize the fact that their workmen are also their customers, and that the general welfare of the country and of the working people means *their* welfare, that they oppose many industrial reforms. They think that every advantage given labor is so much taken out of their pockets; and yet if they would reflect that the aforesaid million of unemployed men must live either on charity or by

robbery, they would see how important it is to all parties to furnish work to such men. What they would lose by a reduction of the hours of labor they would gain by an increase in the consumption of their products and a reduction of charity and almsgiving. Hence their loss would be only apparent.

Take a definite instance of the working of the eight-hour system. Suppose a manufacturer of agricultural implements were to adopt it: he would have to employ a larger number of workmen to do the same amount of work. This would absorb some of the enforced idleness of the community into producing power. Men who had gone with empty stomachs and thinly clad backs would begin to set a better table and to wear better clothes. This would create a demand for more farm products, and this in turn would necessitate the making of more agricultural implements. Would not such an increase in wages be beneficial to the employer as well as to the workman? At any rate, it may be laid down as an axiom that no nation can afford to let one-tenth or one-twentieth of its workmen remain idle, much less can the employing class permit this, and one of the greatest benefits derivable from a shortening of the work-day would be the employment of the unwilling idlers who are now a burden to themselves and the community.

It is sometimes said, in order to reconcile the employing class to the reduction of the hours of labor, that by virtue of their increased efficiency the men would do as much work in eight hours as they now do in ten. But if so, there would be no advantage to the workmen from such a change. The demand for labor would not be at all increased. If one hundred men would do in eight hours what they had been doing in ten hours, manifestly the employer would have no need of an additional twenty-five men under the new system. I think the efficiency of the workmen would be increased under the eight-hour system, but not so much as the enthusiastic would have us believe. Besides, although their efficiency would be so increased that they might, if they *chose*, do more work in eight hours than they now do in the same length of time, it is questionable whether they actually would choose to do it. The real advantage of the reduction of hours of labor would be reaped by the now unemployed men of the

country, and the improvement of their social and material condition would redound to the advantage of the employing classes particularly and to the welfare of society in general.

A second, and perhaps, the strongest, argument in favor of the reduction of the hours of labor is that *it would give working people time to improve their intellectual, social and moral status.* One man has as much right as another to time for the cultivation of his mental and moral nature, and in asking that the work-day be so determined as to allow the laboring classes an opportunity for needed recreation and intellectual improvement, we make no request for *charity*, we base our claim on the ground of *justice.* We build and furnish public libraries, art galleries, museums, etc., partly, if not chiefly, for the benefit of the laboring classes, and yet we deprive them of the enjoyment of these things by requiring them to work so long every day that they are too tired to walk a mile or two and read a book or a paper in the evening. Here again the adoption of a short work-day would redound to the welfare of the employing class in particular and to the State as a whole. For as the social, mental and moral life of the masses was improved, they would naturally desire to live in better style. One of the very best means of promoting the material welfare of a class or a community is to improve its mental and moral condition. Hence as the masses advanced in education and refinement, they would demand and consume more of the good things of life, and thus an enlarged market would be given the producer for his goods. Again : ignorance and a low moral tone, are always dangerous, but they are especially so in a Republic, which rests on the people. It is, therefore, to the advantage of the State that better opportunities for intellectual and moral improvement be given the masses.

“But,” it is answered, “the working people would not spend their leisure in improving their minds and morals, but in dissipation and loafing.” As a matter of fact, we have seen that the working classes do spend their leisure quite as profitably as the wealthy classes do theirs, and so there is nothing in this objection. The working people as a class, especially those who lead in the eight-hour movement, are really anxious for intellectual and moral improve-

ment. On this point I quote General Francis A. Walker's words. He is rather opposed to a reduction of the hours of labor, but in the *Atlantic Monthly* for June, 1890, he said: "I have small sympathy with the views so frequently, and it seems to me brutally, expressed, that the working classes have no need of leisure beyond the bare necessities of physical rest and repose, to get ready for the morrow's work; that they do not know what to do with vacant hours, and that a shortening of the term of labor would simply mean idleness at the best, and would, in the great majority of cases, lead to an increase of dissipation and drunkenness. Is it our fellow-beings, our own countrymen, of whom we are speaking? It seems to me that this talk about the inability of the working classes to make a good use of leisure, as a reason for not letting them have any; about the hours that might be gained from toil being surely spent in dissipation and riot; about keeping the laborer at work all day in order to keep him out of mischief, is the poorest sort of pessimistic nonsense. It is closely akin to what we used to hear about slavery being a humane and beneficent institution, of a highly educational character. It is akin to the reason given by despots to-day for not enlarging the liberties of the subject.

"Work, hard work, and a great deal of it, is good for man. But while this is so, we may well desire that somewhat more, and much more of leisure and of recreation should mingle with the daily life of our fellows than is now known to most of them. It is a pity, it is a great pity, that workmen should not see more of their families by daylight; should not have more time for friendly converse or for distinct amusements: should not have larger opportunities for social and public affairs."

Doubtless some men would misuse their leisure, especially at first, just as the newly-freed slave did, but the vast majority would not, but would spend it in self-improvement and the promotion of their families' welfare. It should also be remembered that those who want to drink and riot now find plenty of time during nights and Sundays and their "periodical sprees" for it. It may be that dissipation is promoted by the long hour system, and hence the reduction of the term of labor might and would tend to promote temperance. At any rate, it is simply fair and

just to working-men that they be allowed more time for social, intellectual and moral improvement.

History proves that a shorter work-day may be profitably adopted. In Europe at the beginning of this century the average day of work was fifteen hours, but it has been greatly reduced by the factory legislation, and it is admitted by all now that this was a wise and beneficial action.

In Massachusetts the same thing has happened. In both cases, the employing class and short-sighted economists and legislators opposed the reduction of the term of labor, and raised the cry that it would ruin industry, but, as Gen. Walker says, "a positive gain" to all parties has been the result.

It is attempted to stay the movement by ridicule. "If a short work-day is a good thing," it is said, "why stop at eight hours? why not reduce it to six, to four, to two, to zero?" Well, to answer a fool according to his folly, "If a long work-day is a good thing, why not make it longer—increase the term of labor to twelve, sixteen, eighteen or even twenty-four hours?" But this is not argument. Undoubtedly there is a *natural* limit to man's energy, and there is an economic division of time. It may not be that "eight hours for work, eight hours for sleep, and eight hours for leisure" is a perfectly scientific division of time, but it is a rough draft of a natural and economic division, and we are simply aiming to discover what is the *best* division possible.

Moreover, I am not advocating a *uniform* reduction of the hours of labor in this chapter. On the contrary, the work-day should vary in different kinds of work. Gen. Walker well says: "The several trades and avocations differ so widely among themselves in the conditions under which they may be pursued, as to make any single rule the height of injustice. . . . One industry must of necessity subject its operators to intense heat or to intense cold; still others are pursued in an almost stifling atmosphere. Others allow the access of dangerous particles or poisonous gases. On the other hand, there are industries pursued by hundreds of millions of our kind which furnish the most benignant influences, or at the least require their laborers to submit to no condition injurious to health." Manifestly, therefore, it would be the height of folly to adopt a uniform work-day, and in advocating a reduction of the hours of

labor I do not urge the adoption of the eight-hour system in all kinds of work, but only in those where it is a necessity and would prove beneficial.

How shall we find out what trades can advantageously adopt a shorter work-day, what not? What means shall be employed in bringing about the needed reform? I think it should be effected as far as possible by the efforts of employers and laborers, and that an appeal to the State for its help should be made only as a last resort. I have no prejudices against State action where it is absolutely necessary, but I believe that labor and capital should co-operate cordially with each other as much as possible, and that the economic and industrial functions of the State should not be unnecessarily enlarged. To quote Walker again: "The term of daily work which prevailed at the time when the greed of masters was utterly unrestrained by law meant the degradation and demoralization of the working classes, and produced a hideous mass of disease, vice and crime. Out of such a slough it is the right and duty of any government to raise its people by main force, through the strong arm of the law. But when laboring populations have once been placed upon ground firm enough for them to gain a fair foothold and to get a leverage for their own exertions, it is, according to my political philosophy, much better that they should thereafter be left to make progress to successively higher planes through their own strength, skill and courage." Of course, in those cases—and there are still many—where the greed and oppression of employers are degrading and demoralizing their workmen and women, producing vice, crime and misery, and yet they will not heed the demands either of their own employés or organized labor for shorter hours and better conditions of work, the State should come to the rescue.

We do not believe that the adoption of a shorter work-day will usher in the social and industrial millennium, but it will tend greatly to elevate the material, social, intellectual, moral and religious conditions of the toiling masses, and therefore redound to the welfare of the whole community.

IX.

THE NEGRO IN AMERICA.

THE Race Problem will probably have to settle itself. Why discuss it, then? it will be asked. For many reasons—chiefly because discussion may induce us to recognize the course of *natural* development and follow it. The following facts should be noted and admitted: First, the negro race *as a race* is inferior to the white race. This idea is not due to Southern prejudice against the negro (the writer is a Virginian), but it is based on most unquestionable facts—facts of history and facts of science. “When we consider,” says Prof. Alexander Winchell, “what mankind has achieved, these humble (black) races never enter our thoughts. They have written no history: they have achieved no results for history to record. Their thousands of years outlived are silent and dark and blank. Not an echo of a former generation comes down to our apprehension. If we learn aught of their past, it is through the studies of the white race. If we unravel the mystery of their migrations, their affinities or their origin, it is by studying their zoological characters and their fossil remains, as we investigate the natural history of the horse or the pig. For all which *they* have achieved, this planet would have remained in the wildness and ruggedness of Nature.”

To the same effect wrote Theodore Parker—that great abolitionist: “The Caucasian” (he says) “differs from all others: he is humane, he is civilized and progresses. He conquers with his head as well as with his hand. It is intellect, after all, that conquers, not the strength of a man’s arm. The Caucasian has often been master of the other races—never their slave. He has carried his religion to other races, but never taken theirs. In history all religions are of Caucasian origin. All the great limited forms of monarchies are Caucasian. Republics are Caucasian. All the great sciences are of Caucasian origin. All inven-

tions are Caucasian—literature and romance come from the same stock: all great poets are of Caucasian origin—Moses, Luther, Jesus Christ, Zoroaster, Buddha, Pythagoras, were Caucasians. No other race can bring up to memory such celebrated names as the Caucasian. The Chinese philosopher Confucius is an exception. To the Caucasian belong the Arabian, Persian, Hebrew, Egyptian, and all the European nations are descendants of the Caucasian race.” This is not the utterance of the white man’s pride. It is simply a statement of facts. In the light of the great discoveries of Livingstone, Stanley and other African explorers, it is absurd to say that the assertion of negro inferiority is due to Southern prejudice. It is equally foolish to attribute this inferiority to lack of *opportunity*, or to the enslavement of the negro. All Africa protests! It is now known to be one of the finest countries on the globe, and there is no more reason, so far as his surroundings are concerned, why the African should not have progressed than there is why the people of India or Europe should not have advanced. The latter have established great empires and promulgated systems of philosophy and religion which are the wonder of the human mind, and yet their dark-skinned brethren across the Nile and around the great inland lakes of Africa are sunk in such an abyss of degradation as to win for their country the name of the “Dark Continent.” It is dark as regards the character and civilization of its natives, yet the land is a “goodly land.” Why not admit, then, the natural inferiority of the negro, and not either try to tickle his vanity by making him out to be what he is not, or degrade the white man or denounce him because he contends for his birthright? He is not the friend of the negro who does this. Again, Science proves that the negro is inferior to the white man. First of all his *physical* organism is seen to be more like the animal’s than is the white man’s. Prof. Winchell and others show by comparisons and measurements that the shape of the head, the brain-stuff, the length of the arms, the tissue of the skin, etc., of the negro are decidedly inferior to the white man’s. In mental power, also, he is inferior. He possesses a strong curiosity to gaze at new sights, but it is the curiosity of the child. He is almost incapable of forming *abstract* conceptions, and hence we never hear of his producing any great original work in mathematics or philosophy.

His imaginative and æsthetic powers are likewise feeble, and poetry, sculpture and painting owe little or nothing to negro genius. His moral and religious sentiments are even weaker than his mental powers. Prof. Winchell says, rather strongly, that "negro worship is, for the most part, a brainless voluptuousness of religious emotion." An old colored preacher once said to his congregation: "If you'll jes' jine de Church—

" 'You may rip and t'yar,
 You kin cuss and swar,
 But you jess as shuah of heaven
 As ef you done d'yar! ' "

This shows that the negro's religion is more emotional than rational, whereas the contrary is true of the white man's worship. I suppose that few intelligent people will have the hardihood to maintain that the negro race *as a race* is either intellectually or religiously as far advanced as the white race, however highly developed individual negroes may be, and however degraded certain whites may be. Even Senator Ingalls, in a speech in the Senate in February, 1890, admitted parenthetically, the superiority of the white man over the negro. "Mr. Frederick Douglass" (he said), "the most illustrious living representative of his race is greater, I think, by his Caucasian re-enforcement than by his African blood." Mr. Douglass himself seems to have thought the same, since he married a white woman. Now, this contention that the negro is naturally inferior to the white man ought not to offend the former, since it is not prompted by Caucasian conceit but proved by facts, and since we are both derived from the lower animal. The white man has merely got a little farther away from his ancestral home than his black brother has, but they sprang from one stock. The writer agrees with Huxley, Tylor and other physiologists that there is no reason to believe that mankind sprang originally from more than one pair. Nevertheless, there are remarkable *varieties* of man as there are varieties of other animals.

There are many varieties of pigeons, for instance, yet Darwin and others have shown that all these different sorts of pigeons are derived from the Rock Pigeon. So God hath undoubtedly made of one blood all nations of men

upon earth, but there are many branches of the genealogical tree. The negro is a lower branch. But what then? Why, it is urged by a certain class of statesmen, "No inferior race should be allowed to rule a superior race; and therefore the negro should be excluded from political office and power." The conclusion, I answer, does not follow from the premise. The negro is inferior to the white man, but he is not *so* inferior that he should be made either his political or chattel slave. The Southern negro has shown himself during the last twenty-five years, *capable of improvement*, and many negroes compare very favorably with the whites in intelligence and education—witness Ex-Senator Bruce, Frederick Douglass, etc. True, these may be exceptions, and their superiority over their brethren may be largely due to the Caucasian blood flowing through their veins; still these men are classed among the negroes, and they represent a large number who are competent (or may easily be made competent) to take part in political affairs. Moreover, there are pure Africans who have shown themselves capable of high intellectual, social, and moral development. The Rev. Alexander Crummel, D. D. of Washington City, a graduate of Oxford University, England, is a striking example. He is a scholar and a gentleman; and while he may be an exception to the majority of his people, yet such instances prove that a great deal of the talk about negro inferiority being a sufficient reason for the negro's exclusion from political power is simply demagogical clap-trap. Let the inferiority of the negro race as *a race* be admitted, or even insisted upon, as has been done above, yet there are many, many individuals (black or mulatto) among the American negroes who are competent to exercise political power, and there are myriads of them who may be made competent. Hence the American Negro should be represented by *members of his own race* in the Government. Whether all negroes should be allowed to vote will be considered further on.

A second fact which should be admitted is that by reason of negro inferiority, the *amalgamation* of the blacks and the whites must be condemned, because it would injure both races. Two witnesses to the truth of this are all that need be brought forward. Prof. Winchell gives the result of the observation of a colored picnic party. "Here" (he

says) "were both sexes—all ages, from the infant in arms to the aged, and all hues, from the darkest black to a color approaching white. *There was no old mulatto among them*, though there were several old negroes, and many fine looking mulattoes, of both sexes, evidently the *first* offspring from the pure races. Then came the youths and children removed one generation farther from the original stocks; and here could be read the sad truth at a glance. While the little blacks were agile and healthy-looking, the little mulattoes, youths and young ladies, were sickly, feeble, thin, with frightful scars and skin diseases and scrofula stamped on every feature and every visible part of the body. Here was hybridity of human races, under the most favorable circumstances of worldly condition and social position (for these were Northern negroes), and yet it would be difficult, and even impossible, to have selected from the abodes of crime and poverty more diseased and debilitated individuals than were presented by this accidental assemblage of the victims of a broken law of nature."

This, and much more like it, was written in reply to a remarkable article in the *Princeton Review*, Nov., 1878, by the Rev. Canon Rawlinson, of England, who there advocated the amalgamation of the white and the black races in this country.

Senator Ingalls, in the speech already referred to, said: "There is no natural affinity between the races, and this solution of the problem (amalgamation) is impossible, and in my opinion would be most deplorable. Events have shown that the relations between the sexes in the time of slavery were compulsory, and have disappeared with freedom. The hybrids were the product of white fathers and black mothers, and seldom or never of black fathers and white mothers, and the inference from this result ethnologically is conclusive of that question. Such a solution, in my judgment, would perpetuate the vices of both races and the virtues of neither. There is no blood-poison so fatal as adulteration of race."

This is written not because I believe that there is the slightest possibility of solving the race problem by the amalgamation of the two races, but because it may possibly tend to prevent some people from following the evil example of others, and either marrying or illegitimately

cohabiting with negroes. It may be true—let us sincerely hope that it is true—that “the whites in the South are getting whiter and the blacks blacker,” yet even so there is still a most deplorable amount of illegitimate intercourse between the sexes among the whites and the negroes. Of course, this is mainly due to lust and passion, but some superficial thinkers may complacently look upon this breach of natural law as the beginning of the solution of the race problem. Let the aforementioned facts disabuse their mind of this foolish and dangerous notion!

A third fact which must be admitted is that *the negro is here to stay*. It is absurd to talk about transferring, or inducing him to emigrate, to Africa; he will not go, and even if he would it would be wrong to force him to do so. On this point I quote the words of that eminent Southerner, George W. Cable, from an able speech which he delivered in Feb. 1890, before the Massachusetts Club of Boston. “The most irrational scheme of all” (he said) “is that embodied in the bill” (then before the Senate) “for the deportation of negroes to Africa. The graceful arguments of its advocates in the Senate have been fully, ably, brilliantly answered in the Senate, and there is no excuse for more than a word to the point here. The early admissions and confessions of Abraham Lincoln have been much used in this debate by excellent men who still repudiate and antagonize the conclusions of his latest wisdom as they once did his earlier. Let us in that wonderful spirit of more than Washingtonian generosity which made him impregnable and irresistible in debate make every supposition of the advocates of deportation that can be made. Say the bill is found to be not unconstitutional; that hundreds of thousands of negroes *want* to go; and that Southern white men generally will let them go despite the palpable fact that the men most likely to go will be, to use an old Southern word, the most ‘likely’ men; the men of health, strength, self-reliance, enterprising; and despite again the fact that no large emigration can take place without carrying away millions of ready money with it. Every 100,000 of European immigrants to this country brings about \$8,000,000 ready money with it. The industrial value of every 100,000 unskilled laborers is \$80,000,000. Is a white immigration likely to make up such losses? Let us suppose even this, although no one ever yet heard of one set of emigrants

pouring into a country from which a poorer set was pouring out, and although if they will come at all there is abundance of room for them now, without deporting a single negro. What shall we say? We say pass your bill; get your ships ready; proclaim free passage to whosoever will accept it; only let there be no *compulsion*. We are branded as a whole nation with our fathers' sin of bringing these people here; let us not now add to that our own sin of driving them back. Therefore, no compulsions. But the land is full of compulsions. The main argument for their going is that we are making their stay here intolerable to them. Before we buy or hire one ship, whether these compulsions are in South Carolina or Mississippi, Illinois, Ohio or Massachusetts, let the compulsions be removed. When State and Federal Governments have exhausted, as neither has yet done, all their power of legislation and police to make the negro in America as free as the white man, then, if the negro cannot be content and the people choose to bear the expense of his deportation, let the folly be charged to him, of leaving a free land to which better men were glad to come and fill his voided place. But let this nation never again open the sacred Scriptures on Independence day, or on the birthday of Washington lift up its hands to God, if as matters now stand, we provide money or ships for the flight back to Africa of the victims of our own tyrannies. This is not the way to settle, but only to delay and hinder the settlement of the negro question."

This is refreshing. Some of us, thank Heaven, have a little moral sense, a little conscience left, and we feel that we owe certain duties to "the victims of our own tyrannies," which cannot be discharged by shipping them back to the benighted land from which we stole them away.

A fourth fact should be admitted, namely, not only is the negro here to stay, but *his chief place of residence must be in the South*.

In *The Arena* magazine for June, 1890 the Hon. Wm. C. P. Brekenridge M.C. advocated in an interesting article on the *Race Question*, the diffusion of the negroes through the Western and Northern States as "the best solution of the problem." But with all due deference to this

honorable gentleman and able statesman, I venture to say nature is against his proposition. At one time negroes lived in New England, but "slavery" (says Senator Ingalls) "retired from the valleys of the Merrimac, the Connecticut, and the Hudson, to the Potomac and Southward by the operation of social, economic and natural laws, and not through the superior morality of those who defended the Union" against the Southern confederates. "The conscience of new England," adds the Senator (and his words should be pondered by certain new Englanders) "was never thoroughly aroused to the immorality of African slavery until it ceased to be profitable; and the North did not finally determine to destroy the system until convinced that its continuance threatened, not only their industrial independence but their political supremacy." These words might be used with good effect against certain schemes often advocated to secure the political supremacy of the negro in the South. But I quote them to show that candid Northerners admit that other considerations than moral and natural reasons influence many men in advocating negro supremacy in the South.

The negro takes to warm latitudes as a duck does to water, and while a good many of the blacks may be induced to go West, especially Southwest, yet we cannot count on such migration for a solution of the race problem. The negro must be elevated and dealt with on Southern soil—his natural and his ancestral home.

Another serious and perhaps alarming fact is that the negro race *multiplies* more rapidly than the white race. Making all due allowance for imperfection in statistics, yet this fact cannot be gainsaid; and hence it would seem inevitable that the day must come, and that not many generations hence, when the blacks will largely outnumber the whites in the sections of the country inhabited by them. What, then, will be the result? Shall the majority, contrary to the fundamental principle of our constitution, be ruled by the minority? Or will the minority migrate Westward or Northward and leave a *black South*? The second idea will, of course, be flouted by Southerners; while Northerners will see to it that the first proposition is not carried into practice. Hence one of two things must happen—either one race must be exterminated by the other (which God forbid!) or *the negroes must be*

industrially, mentally, and morally so educated and elevated that they will cease to be objectionable to the whites.

I believe that the Southern antipathy to negro influence in politics rests more on the fact of his ignorance, social and moral degradation than upon the color of his skin. Surely no thinking man would refuse to accept a wise proposition just because it was made by a man with a dark skin! If, for instance, Senator Bruce, while in the Senate, had been so fortunate as to have devised a plan which would have settled the race question, I am sure that the most bitter opponent of "negro rule" in the South would not have rejected it because a colored man originated it. Hence it is evident that the reason why Southern statesmen are opposed to the political equality of the negro is, not because he was once their slave, nor because he has a black skin, but because he is ignorant and degraded. I say "Southern statesmen" are opposed to the political equality of the negro because of his ignorance and degradation, but of course foolish people, who are influenced more by sentiment than sense, and by pride and prejudice than by brains, object to his political equality because he was once their slave. But fortunately we need not concern ourselves with these people very much. It is the men of brain that will settle this question.

From what has just been said it is evident that both the Church and the State should push forward education, industrial, mental, and moral, among the blacks of the South. State aid to education should by all means be given. Schools should be multiplied and improved—churches should be built and furnished with earnest, sober-minded, judicious clergymen, who would check and guide the exuberance of the negro's religious emotions. It is a great misfortune to all parties that the ballot was put into the hands of the negro before he was prepared to use it intelligently, but now that he has it, it is impossible to lawfully take it from him. No State will ever vote to disfranchise itself, and hence we cannot apply "the educational qualification" to voters, and therefore the only thing to be done is to educate the ignorant voters, and this cannot be done by means of gun and club but by precept and persuasion.

The race problem, then, seems to be at bottom an educational question. When the negroes are elevated in-

dustrially, intellectually, and morally, we may hope that the absurd race prejudices will have so died out that the white man will no longer object to sitting beside and cooperating with the black man in political matters. Meanwhile, of course, we must submit to misrule and all *that* means. Every consideration leads us to insist upon the industrial, mental and moral education of the negro. Because he is our inferior brother; because our forefathers stole him from his native home and made him their slave in this land; because he is an American and a citizen; because ignorance and irreligion are dangerous—for all these and many other reasons we should earnestly and zealously seek the elevation of the negro.

It must have been thoughts like these that made Prof. James Bryce, M.P., author of "The American Commonwealth," say, as the result of his visit through the South, that "the race question would soon be determined satisfactorily to whites and blacks if both the great political parties would cease to make it a *political* question." "He declares," said the Philadelphia *Ledger* for Nov. 18th, 1890, "that in his extended travels through the South he perceived few signs of a real antagonism, or of any irreconcilable feeling of ill-will, or of prejudice, even, between the two races, which was not the consequence of political disagreement."

Desirable as it might be to make the race question a sociological rather than a political question, yet we fail to see how this may be done now that we have the Fifteenth Amendment to the National Constitution and two political parties bidding for the negro's vote. But perhaps we may *emphasize* the sociological rather than the political aspect of this problem.

The *Ledger* well says: "The Southern whites and blacks are not nearly so united now, the one as Democrats and the other as Republicans, as they were fifteen or even ten years ago; and as they receive the advantages of education, and become owners and renters of the land they till, and skilled workmen or effective laborers, they will be influenced more by individual opinions or convictions or material interests than by previous prejudices, with the result of dividing their strength between the two parties. It has been noticed by many intelligent authorities that in the border States of the South the colored people are much

less of a single party than they were but a few years ago, and that the entire relationship between them and the whites is less antagonistic than it was, and that it is certainly, if slowly, growing more cordial. The race question, therefore, is almost settled along the border States of the South, and it will be settled in the other States in course of time. Education and common interests will in time do a great deal to bring the two races into closer and friendlier relationship."

"Moreover," continues the *Ledger*, "it is not only the Southern blacks who need to learn something. The whites still need a good deal of education. The whites have not too commonly tried the policy of kindness, or of justice even. They have not tried so much to induce the blacks to be of the Democratic party as to prevent them from voting with the Republican party. The means they have too frequently used to do this have been so unjust as to influence the blacks to continue in their united opposition." I fancy that if the negroes were, as a body, Democrats, Southern statesmen would not be quite so strongly opposed to "negro rule" as they are. Let them, then, *educate* the blacks in Democratic principles. Let them, if you please, show that such principles are better suited to the development of the South than Republican principles. Let them show the negro that his *interest* lies in the South, and that whatever promotes its welfare promotes his happiness, and the problem will be solved. Of course, this will be slow work, but the future is before us, and the elevation of a race, industrially, mentally and morally, must be the work of ages. Meanwhile, let both political parties abstain from such legislation as the Lodge Elections Bill of 1890, which is calculated to stir up strife and foment sectional discord. Let things pursue the natural course of development.*

* Compare Henry W. Grady's "New South,"

X.

THE BIBLE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

SOME TIME ago Cardinal Manning of England wrote an article for *The Forum*, in which he not only opposed the teaching or reading of the Bible in the public schools, but he denounced the public school system itself, as an invasion of the rights of parents and children, and an undue assumption of power on the part of the State. This is essentially the position of the Anarchists. The Cardinal was very effectually answered in the following number of *The Forum*, in which the writer showed conclusively that our public school system does not violate the rights of either parents or children, and is no undue assumption of power on the part of the Government. The State is simply another name for the people acting in their corporate capacity, and as such it has a perfect right (in other words, the people have a perfect right) to do whatever is necessary to its (their) highest welfare. All must and do admit that national ignorance is the root of many national evils, and so it follows that the State should provide such education for its members as may enable them to intelligently discharge the duties of citizens. This is the great principle upon which our public school system is based, and it is so transparently correct—the benefits of the common school, notwithstanding its imperfections, are so great—that Americans will not surrender it at the bidding of Cardinal or Pope or anybody else. Assuming, then, that the public school has come to stay, the question to be answered is, What shall we teach in it? Remembering that this is a State institution, the following quotation from Lord Macaulay's Essay, on Gladstone's "State and Church," completely answers this question: "Mr. Gladstone's whole theory," said the essayist, "rests on this great fundamental proposition, that the propagation of

religious truth is one of the principal ends of Government as government. We are, therefore, desirous to point out clearly a distinction which, though very obvious, seems to be overlooked by many excellent people. In their opinion to say that the ends of government are temporal and not spiritual is tantamount to saying that the temporal welfare of man is of more importance than his spiritual welfare. But this is an entire mistake. The question is not whether spiritual interests be or be not superior in importance to temporal interests, but whether the machinery which happens to be employed for the purpose of protecting certain temporal interests of a society be necessarily such a machinery as is fitted to promote the spiritual interests of that society. Without a division of labor the world could not go on. It is of very much more importance that men should have food than that they should have pianofortes. Yet it by no means follows that every pianoforte maker ought to add the business of a baker to his own ; for, if he did so, we should have both much worse music and much worse bread. It is of much more importance that the knowledge of religious truth should be wisely diffused than that the art of sculpture should flourish among us. Yet it by no means follows that the Royal Academy ought to unite with its present functions those of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, to distribute theological tracts, to send forth missionaries, to turn out 'one man for being a Roman Catholic, another for being a Methodist, and a third for being a Swedenborgian.' For the effects of such folly would be that we should have the worst possible Academy of Arts and the worst possible Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

"As to some of the ends of civil government," adds this great statesman, "all people are agreed that it is designed to protect our persons and our property ; that it is designed to compel us to satisfy our wants, not by rapine, but by industry ; that it is designed to compel us to decide our differences, not by the strong hand, but by arbitration ; that it is designed to direct our whole force, as that of one man, against any other society that may offer us injury. These are propositions which will hardly be disputed,"—except, we must add, by the Anarchists, with whom we are not now concerned.

"Now." continues our author, "these are matters in

which man, without any reference to any higher Being, or to any future state, is very deeply interested. Every human being, be he idolator, Mohammedan, Jew, Papist, Socinian, Deist, or Atheist, naturally loves life, shrinks from pain, desires comforts which can be enjoyed only in communities where property is secure. To be murdered, to be tortured, to be robbed, to be sold into slavery—these are evils from which men of every religion, and men of no religion, wish to be protected ; and therefore it will hardly be disputed that men of every religion, and of no religion, have thus far a common interest in being well governed.”

It should be clear from these wise words that the propagation of religious truth is not an object of government as such, and therefore its propagation in the governmental schools, by means of prayer, reading the Scriptures, etc., cannot be advocated. The framers of the first amendment to our constitution were evidently influenced by such considerations as these. The object of the public school is simply to teach the elements of an education which will enable the recipient to intelligently discharge the duties and responsibilities of a citizen of the Republic—a People's Government. It cannot therefore compass the whole field of education and should not attempt to do so. It is a violation of the principle of division of labor to include religious instruction in the curriculum of the public school. There is an organization—the church and Sunday-school—whose business it is to impart religious instruction, and if this be faithfully used, more especially if those who clamor for the introduction of the Bible into the public schools will be faithful in reading the Scriptures and in family prayers at home before the children go to school, there will be absolutely no necessity for the instructor's prayer or Bible reading in the school. The home or the Sunday-school is the proper place for instructing the young in the Scriptures. “If,” says another, “the secular branches of study, as they are sometimes called, and the teaching of religion are mingled together, it is not always to the advantage of either the one or the other. The utmost care should be taken to surround religious instruction with the proper atmosphere. The subject should be approached through solemn preparatory services such as the Church has established in its ceremonial. The time and place should be made to assist instead of distracting the religious impression.” The pub-

lic schoolroom and 9 o'clock A.M. are certainly not especially conducive to religious impressions.

It is almost universally believed that there is something inherently irreligious in worldly occupations, and that in order to sanctify them they must be accompanied by a prayer and the reading of a passage from the Scriptures. Hence we have a chaplain for Congress to say a prayer at the beginning of each session, while the members read, write, chew tobacco, and ponder unrighteous decrees; and the graduating exercises of a college or even a nominating political convention must be opened with prayer, which is often a first-class stump-speech." In 1888 when the Republican Convention was in session in Chicago, a clergyman present made such a patriotic prayer that it brought down the applause of the Convention. Col. Robert G. Ingersoll was a member of that Convention, and I daresay most heartily applauded prayer for once. We therefore agree with a writer just quoted when he says: "The vague notion that secular occupations, whether of a higher or a lower grade, when dissevered from the clergy or from the rights of worship, are somehow tainted with evil, is a Jewish and medieval (and false) notion, of which it behooves Christians to disabuse themselves. A bank is not pagan or godless, provided it is honestly managed, even if it is not opened and closed with daily prayer. A shoemaker is not godless because he refrains from pronouncing the benediction when he delivers a pair of shoes to his customer. Enough that his leather is good, his thread strong, his work thorough and his promises are punctually kept. The same principles apply to a schoolmaster. As long as he does his proper work of teaching aright the branches of knowledge committed to him, and in his intercourse with his pupils conforms to the spirit of Christian morals, there is no taint of profaneness attached to him or his function."

The fact is all truth is sacred, and he who teaches it, whether it be truth in science, mathematics, philosophy, history or what not, performs a sacred service even if he does not begin it with prayer or reading of the Scriptures. The attempt to brand one department of study as inherently "secular" or "profane" and another as "sacred" is of a piece with the effort to make one day of the week essentially different from another and more holy. The

practical result is that many behave decently on Sunday and most indecently the balance of the week ; and many clamor for the reading of the Bible in the public schools, when perhaps it is rarely read in their families. Let us, then, have done with cant and be rational and real.

But it will be said, "Ought not *morality* to be taught in the public schools? Surely if the intellectual development of the people is necessary to the welfare of the State, the moral development is more so." Certainly it is. But is the Bible a suitable *text-book* in morals for children, and is the mere reading of a few verses from it at the opening of the school the proper *method* of instructing the pupils in morality? No! And those who urge this point make a radical distinction between religion and morality, as radical as they do between secular and sacred studies. It is "religion," whatever they may mean by that emasculated word, as distinguished from "morality," that they want taught. They frequently denounce a clergyman for preaching "moral essays" and not "spiritual sermons," and if it were only "morality" that they wanted taught in the public schools they would not call so loudly for the Bible. This book is too large and too varied in its contents and too recondite in much of its teaching to be used as a text book in morals in colleges even. How absurd, then, to talk of using it in elementary schools for such a purpose! Above all, the mere reading of a few verses from the Bible at the opening of the school is not an effectual method of teaching morality. What is needed is a small simple text book which the children will be required to study and to recite from, and this should consist of a collection of *universally* accepted moral maxims to which no one could take exception.

What most people desire in demanding the introduction of the Bible in the public schools, in order (professedly) to impart moral instruction, is to introduce *sectarian theology* into the schools. The Episcopalian would probably consider the Catechism a good text-book for this purpose. The Methodist would want the "Discipline;" the Zwinglian would ask for the Heidelberg Catechism; the Presbyterian would wish the Shorter Catechism, etc. No wonder, then, that "freethinkers," on the one hand, who consider these catechisms summaries of much that is false, and Roman Catholics, on the other, who think them altogether dam-

nable, should object to having their children taught sectarian theology under the name of morality. But neither of these parties could object to the teaching of the elementary and universal principles of goodness, as that word is commonly used. Let the Bible, then, be abandoned in the public schools and let it be taught in the proper place, the Sunday-school and church, and by proper persons, and on proper days.

But while I thus advocate the disuse of the Bible either to propagate religion or morality in the public schools, yet I do believe that Bible *history* should be taught therein, and I have been much surprised that advocates of its use in the school have not suggested (so far as I know) this point. The history of Greece, Rome, Persia and other nations is taught in the schools, why should not the history of *Israel* be taught? It was one of the greatest nations of antiquity, and its history is quite as important as that of any other people. No one could justly object to this. There would be even less possibility of teaching its history from a sectarian point of view than there is of teaching the history of Medieval Europe from such a standpoint. Of course, the Bible should not be used as the text-book on the history of Israel any more than it should be used as a text-book in morals. It is not suited to the purpose, and there are many other more suitable books which might be used. Thus Dr. Wm. Smith, editor of the "Bible Dictionary," etc., has written a History of the Old and New Testaments for the "Student's Series" (Harper Bros.), and these histories have been abridged and condensed into smaller volumes, called "The Student's Smaller Series," which would make admirable text-books for public school purposes. They are absolutely non-sectarian, merely state *facts*, and could not therefore be objected to by any one. The history of Israel, apart from all questions of religion, is a most glorious history. Her lawgivers, her poets, her orators, her warriors, her statesmen, compare most favorably with those of Greece or Rome. There are codes of law which rank with the laws of Lycurgus, Solon and Justinian. There are orations, such as those of Isaiah, which equal any of the productions of Demosthenes or Cicero. There are the poems of David which Homer and Virgil do not eclipse. There are battles which should be classed with those of Marathon, Thermopylae

and the Milvian Bridge. And yet our boys and girls are crammed full of Greek and Roman fables and history, while this great storehouse of historical lore is closed to them, owing to a superstitious reverence for the Bible which refuses to study its characters as other peoples' are studied. Therefore I plead for the introduction of the study of the history of Israel in the public school along with that of Rome, Greece and other countries. In doing this I do not take the Bible out of the public schools with one hand and replace it with the other, nor am I advocating the study of sectarian theology under cover of the study of history. I am simply urging the irrefutable proposition that there is no more reason why the history of Israel should not be taught in our schools than there is why the history of Greece or Rome should not be taught, and since the latter is taught, the former may and should be. If it be said that the teacher might impart his peculiar theological views while teaching such history, I reply, yes, and the teacher of morals or philosophy might, *if he chose*, teach that the principles of Socrates were superior to Christ's: but school teachers are not all religious cranks who would wring in their opinions in season and out of season. At any rate, there is no more danger of one's doing it in the historical department than in any other, and there is no valid objection to the proposition now made. And it would be highly beneficial in many respects. The ignorance of Israel's history, even among otherwise well-informed people, is amazing and painful, and one great reason why the Bible is no better understood than it is, is the fact that it is not studied from the historical standpoint. While, therefore, the study of Israel's history could not be justly objected to by Roman Catholics, it would *indirectly* promote a more correct knowledge of the Bible, and this should satisfy those who desire its use in the public schools.

To sum up: I agree with those who object to the use of the Bible in the public schools; (1) because this is an infringement of the fundamental principles of our civil government; (2) because it is useless, produces little or no effect upon the hearers; and (3) because morality can be taught without the Bible. But the history of Israel may be taught with great advantage, and to it no valid objection can be made. I may add that as some people fancy

that opposition to the use of the Bible in the public schools is an indication of infidelity or of Romanistic proclivities, I am not conscious of either influence, and merely advocate the views herein set forth because they seem to me correct.

PART II.

SERMON I.

OUR COUNTRY : ITS CHARACTER AND DESTINY.

A THANKSGIVING DAY DISCOURSE.*

Text :—For the Lord thy God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills. A land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig trees, and pomegranates ; a land of oil olive, and honey. A land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack anything in it ; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass. When thou hast eaten and art full, then thou shalt bless the Lord thy God for the good land which he hath given thee. . . . And it shall be, if thou do at all forget the Lord thy God, and walk after other gods, and serve them, and worship them, I testify against you this day that ye shall surely perish. As the nations which the Lord destroyeth before your face, so shall ye perish ; because ye would not be obedient unto the voice of the Lord your God.—DEUTERONOMY, viii. 7–10, 19, 20.

THE star of progress, which rose in the far East ages ago, from behind the mountains of savagery and barbarism, has been moving higher and higher in the political firmament and farther westward, until it has nearly reached the zenith, and now sheds its blessed effulgence abroad over our fair land, and it is the deep significance of this movement that I wish to explain and emphasize in this sermon.

As we glance backward through the mists of the past, we see man, in the beginning, a savage animal, wandering over the plains and amid the jungles of Southern and Eastern Asia. He lives on nuts and wild fruits, like other animals ; he has no “home,” and knows nothing of arts, science, religion or civilization of any sort ; but slowly he learns to wield his misshapen club at his fellow-creatures and to sling his rude stone axe. By and by he discovers (perhaps by the “glance” of his axe and its striking a stone, making the fire fly out) the invaluable element—fire ; and then it becomes possible for him to leave tropical regions and wander into colder parts, and so with many a

weary and halting step he painfully climbs one or two rungs of the ladder of civilization. The primitive hunting and fishing stage develops into the pastoral stage—that is, some men take to herding cattle and dwelling in tents; and this, in turn, passes into the agricultural stage, in which the cultivation of the land begins, and settled life becomes possible. The wheels of progress now commence greater and swifter revolutions, and in due time the great civilization of ancient Egypt, India, Chaldea, Babylonia, Assyria, Persia and the far East arise. Immense temples lift their sacred spires into the skies; pyramids look down upon toiling millions; the war-drum throbs through the land; the battle-flag is unfurled; the earth trembles beneath the tread of marching armies, and hieroglyphic records commemorate on palace walls the triumph of mighty kings and the fall of empires. The star of empire has arisen. By and by it begins to move westward. Alexander the Great conquers and unites the world, but it again dissolves into its constituent elements when the sod covers the hero. Julius Cæsar steps upon the scene, and mighty Rome spreads abroad the pinions of her conquering eagle. But hardly has it overshadowed the earth when a low rumble, as of distant thunder, is heard in the North, and the Huns and Goths and Vandals swoop down upon the Eternal City and capture it—only, however, to be conquered in turn by a power they knew not of—the Christian Church. About the same time “Saxon and Norman and Dane” move from the plains of their native land across the English Channel, and take possession of the British Isles. They, too, in due time, adopt the ensign of the cross. A great break-up and consolidation of states now takes place, and feudalism arises. This is followed by constitutional monarchies until the fifteenth century is reached, and then one of those mighty men whom God sends into the world at different times to drive the chariot of progress forward many leagues at every revolution of its wheels, steps upon the stage, and declares that new worlds or lands lie beyond the seas and he wants to discover them. Of course, like every great and progressive mind, he was hooted at; ridicule and persecution assailed him, but, nothing daunted, he wandered from court to court begging for royal favor and funds to fit out an expedition to the unknown country, and finally he got what he

wanted, and on the third day of August, 1492, at eight o'clock in the morning, three little vessels, with one hundred and twenty brave hearts aboard, weighed anchor in the harbor of Palos, on the southern coast of Spain, and Columbus set sail for the Western World. As the American looks back to that morning and sees those little ships nestling like swans on the blue waves of the Atlantic, and thinks of all that it meant, surely his heart must swell with emotion, and he must be tempted to fall down before the great discoverer as one of God's chosen heroes. Look over this fair land, with its noble rivers and lakes and fountains and springs: "a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig trees, and pomegranates; a land of olive oil and honey; a land wherein we may eat bread without scarceness; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills we dig coal, silver, gold and precious stones;" and remember that but for the courage and energy of one man we might never have enjoyed these blessings.

You know the story of the planting of the various colonies in this country. The star of empire rose higher and higher in these western heavens, but just as it was nearing the zenith, on the night of the eighteenth of April, 1775, the flash of a lantern in the old North Church, of Boston, proclaimed that the American Revolution had begun. You know the result—the struggles and success of the heroic Washington, and the final establishment of a Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

What is the *meaning* of this mighty movement, which, beginning in the wilds of Southern Asia, has spread itself through ages and countries until it has ended in this "good land?" Let those who can believe it has no meaning do so; but, as for me, I believe, with the Rev. Dr. Strong, that God is preparing in our civilization the die with which to stamp all the peoples of the earth. Here in America are to be solved the great problems which have puzzled the ages, and hence every true American should ask himself: What part am I to take in the solution of these problems? And this settled, he should set to work right nobly.

"Every great historian," says Archdeacon Farrar, "should be no dull registrar of events, but a *prophet*, standing, like Daniel of old, amid the careless riot and

luxurious banqueting of life, and teaching men to decipher that gleaming message of God, written as with the fingers of a man's hand, on the parliament of nations and the palaces of kings, that what is morally just must be politically expedient; that what is morally wrong cannot be politically right." It is for this purpose that I come to you this morning. I come not to puff up your national conceit, but to proclaim, with all the energy of my soul, that "righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach and pitfall to any people." I believe, with you, that our country is, in many respects, the greatest country on the globe; we are "the heirs of all the ages," as we have just seen, and the text is an exact description of our land; it is a "good land, a land of rivers and fountains and springs, which surpass all others; a land of wheat and barley and vines and fig trees and pomegranates of the rarest kind; a land of olive oil and honey; a land wherein we may eat bread without scarceness; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills we dig the richest treasures." We are the wealthiest nation on earth. We have room enough for a thousand millions instead of sixty millions of people. We lead the world in inventions and manufactures, and I believe the day is rapidly coming when we shall lead the world in education and religion. I agree, then, with the greatest enthusiast about America, but I shall not shut my eyes to the dangers that threaten our country. She *may* become the grandest nation that has ever figured in history; she may sink, as Rome and many another nation have sunk, in ruin and disgrace. It is because I love my country; it is because I believe that the greatest possibilities lie before her that ever offered themselves to any nation, that I would warn her of her danger. It is manifold.

There is, first of all, her *wealth* itself. This may be so utilized as to prove her greatest blessing, but if it be suffered to gather into a few hands, as it is rapidly doing, it will undoubtedly prove her greatest curse. A clever and judicious writer in *The Forum* for November, 1889, alleged that "25,000 persons own just about one-half of all the wealth of the United States," and he closed his remarkable article with these startling words: "Within thirty years, the present methods of taxation being maintained, the United States of America will be substantially owned by

less than 50,000 persons, constituting less than one in five hundred of the adult male population." Whether this writer's figures and speculations be absolutely correct or not, no one can deny that there is a strong tendency among us towards a moneyed aristocracy, which, if it come, will lord it over the lower classes, the poor, more severely than the lords of the middle ages did over their serfs. I do not denounce the millionaires. Placed in their position, probably all of us would act essentially as they do. I do not propose to rob them of their wealth by violent and unjust means, but I simply cite facts, and point to the inevitable result of the aggregation of the wealth of the country in a few centres, and I urge that a better industrial system may and should be adopted whereby the products of labor would be more evenly and equitably divided among the people.

Secondly, *immigration* may be a great blessing or a great curse to our country. If it be wisely guided and guarded we should turn no shipload of immigrants from our shores until our thousand millions are here. But, for the sake of America's future welfare—nay, for the sake of the immigrants themselves—let immigration be carefully watched and most judiciously directed and encouraged. America is not in duty bound to become the dumping-ground of European and Asiatic slums. It is not only unjust to her, it will not only embarrass her future progress, it is not only unfair to the immigrants themselves to permit unregulated and promiscuous immigration, but it encourages oppression on the part of the people who send them to us. Europe and Asia are as much bound to take care of all their poor that they can take care of as we are, and to allow them to shove their sickly, dwarfed, ignorant, pauperized masses off upon us when they could provide for them themselves is relieving them of a duty to these people that they ought to discharge. We are willing to take their surplus humanity, but let us be sure that it is a surplus for which they are utterly unable to provide.

Third, the Rum Power is one of our greatest dangers. Prohibition seems impracticable, and High License breeds more evils than it cures. The saloon not only kills thousands of our fellow men annually, but it has so depraved politics that nothing less than a grand crusade of the Church and all order-loving people against it, and a

general elevation of public sentiment, can destroy or curtail its power.

These are three of the greatest dangers that threaten our country, and in order to avert the doom to which they are driving us, three great reforms must take place : a reform in politics, a reform in economics, and a reform in the Church.

America will not be free, she will not accomplish the glorious destiny her loyal sons would have her accomplish, until the abominable and disgraceful "spoils system" in politics be abolished. The very mention of this curse makes us grow pale with fear and discouragement, for it is the great upas tree which the devil has planted in our political garden to poison everything with its shade, and its extermination seems impossible. Mr. Bryce, in his able work, "The American Commonwealth," truly says : "It is the spoilsmen who have depraved and distorted the mechanism of politics. It is they who pack the primaries and run the conventions so as to destroy the freedom of popular choice—they who contrive and execute the election frauds which disgrace some states and cities—repeating and ballot-stuffing, obstruction of the polls, and fraudulent countings in." These men care nothing for principle : they have no principle. All under the sun they want is to bleed the body politic. And against the rule of such men—against the "spoils system"—every lover of his country will lift up his voice in speech and prayer, until the curse be destroyed by an elevated and purified public opinion, for this alone can do it.

Secondly, an economic reform is necessary. It is certainly a most remarkable and deplorable fact that in this land, with its unparalleled resources, capable of supporting a thousand millions, and possessing only sixty-five millions of people, there should be thousands of unemployed and starving men, who walk the earth, seeking work and finding none, to whom Thanksgiving Day is a mockery and a sham ; but so it is. The reports on labor, furnished by the Government, prove it. Again, I denounce no one. I have no swift and potent remedy for the ills we are heir to ; but I must call most earnest attention to such facts, and I must insist that there is a screw loose *somewhere* in the industrial machinery, and until it be tightened America cannot accomplish her glorious

destiny. As long as these thousands of unwilling idlers are kept in their present miserable condition, so long will theft, drunkenness, poverty, murder, and political corruption lift their hydra heads over the land and play havoc with society.

Finally, a great theological and ecclesiastical reform must take place if our nation would prosper. We want no union of Church and State : nothing but evil has ever resulted from such a union ; but the Church is a great power in the land, and we want her to recognize the facts of the case, and buckle on her armor and do battle for the right. She must put herself more in harmony with the thought of the day. She should welcome gladly all the light that science can throw upon theological problems, and should relax her dogmatic bands, and receive all who desire to follow the example and imitate the spirit of the Nazarene. She should join hands with all economic reformers, and strive to give to our country that deep moral and religious foundation which is absolutely necessary to her highest development.

If all this be done, then our fondest dreams may be realized ; but if not, then the fate awaits our country that has befallen other nations, which the Lord has destroyed. Consider their fate, as graphically and eloquently described by Dr. Farrar :

“When Israel was a child,” he says, “God loved him, and out of Egypt He called his son. In the Old Testament we see that son grow up to life. Many were the sins, the follies, the apostasies of his youth. Can you point me to one folly which was not visited with its natural consequences ? to one pleasant vice which did not become its own punishment ? to one sin which was not lashed with its own appropriate scourge ? Then came the ruinous and crushing humiliation of the Babylonish Captivity—about 600 or 700 years before Christ. A remnant, which they themselves compared to the chaff of wheat, returned ; and of the old temptation, the temptation to a sensual idolatry, they were cured forever. But they were not saved from other sins. Keeping the form of their religion they lost its spirit : from a living truth they suffered it to degenerate into a meaningless ritual, into a dead formula, into a hypocritical sham. They had for centuries been hoping, dreaming, talking of a Messiah, and their

Messiah came, and how did they receive Him? With yells of 'Crucify Him! Crucify Him!' And there, at the foot of the cross, which consummated their iniquity, you may read the story of their nation's death. But history, which proves the responsibility of nations as of individuals, adds another chapter to the sacred narrative. It shows how soon the wings of every vulture flapped heavily over the corpse of a nation that had sunk into moral rottenness.

"Turn from Judæa to the short but splendid tragedy of Athenian history: how short, how brilliant, how terrible, we all know. Yes, we owe to Greece an infinite debt of intellectual gratitude. The exquisite ideal of beauty of her race, the grace, the subtlety, the activity of her intellect; the perfection and supremacy of her art; the power and splendor of her literature, conferred upon her a wreath of unfading admiration. Oh, had she but learned *righteousness*; had she but won the grace to obey, as she had received the insight to read, that law written upon the fleshly tablets of her hearts! But she chose otherwise; and now the world may learn as memorable a lesson from the rapidity of her fall and the utterness of her extinction, as from all besides; for the ever-needed moral of that little hour in which she played her part upon the lighted stage is this—that intellect without holiness, beauty without purity, eloquence without conscience, art without religion, insight without love, are but blossoms whose root and life are the corruption of the grave.

"From the palsied hands of Greece Rome rudely snatched the sceptre. And you know that so long as the character of Rome was simple and self-respecting; so long as her family life was pure and sweet: so long as she was the Rome of the Camilli, the Cincinnati, the Fabii, the elder Scipios; so long as her dictators came from the honest labor of the ploughshare, and her consuls from the hardy self-reliance of the farm, so long she prospered till none could withstand her, and impressed the world with lessons of law and order and discipline manlier and better than any which Greece had taught. But when the dregs of every foreign iniquity poured their noisome stream into the Tiber; when the old iron discipline yielded to an effeminate luxury and a gilded pollution; when her youth had grown debased and enervated and false; when all regard had been lost for man's honor, and woman's purity; when her trade had

become a flagrant imposture and her religion a dishonest sham ; when, lastly, her literature became a seething scum of cynicism and abomination such as degraded the very conception of humanity—then you know how justly, in long, slow agony, the charnelhouse of her dominion crumbled away under the assaults of her enemies, and

“ ‘ Rome, whom mightiest kingdoms curtsied to,
Like a forlorn and desperate castaway,
Did shameful execution on herself.’ ”

I need not apply all this in detail to our country, for any one with an open eye and a reflecting mind, must see some very striking resemblances between decaying Roman civilization and our own Republic. In both we see political corruption, depraved social, moral, and religious life, and inordinate immigration. But let us hope that our people will arouse themselves in time to prevent the fate of Rome befalling us. Let us lay to heart these profound words of James Anthony Froude : “ History,” he says, “ is a voice forever sounding across the centuries the laws of right and wrong. Opinions alter, manners change, creeds rise and fall, but the moral law is written on the tablets of eternity. For every false word or unrighteous deed, for cruelty and oppression, for lust and vanity, the price has to be paid at last : not always by the chief offenders, but paid by some one. Justice and truth alone endure and live. Injustice and falsehood may be longlived, but doomsday comes at last to them in French revolutions and other terrible ways. *That* is the lesson of History ! ”

SERMON II.

THE SABBATH QUESTION.

Text :—And he said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.—MARK ii. 27.

THE Sabbath Question is one of the most important questions of our day. The religious life of a people can be correctly measured by their observance of the Lord's Day. When France abolished the Sabbath, the bloody flag of the Revolution was waving over the land. In this country, especially in the West, the Sabbath is fearfully desecrated. Base ball is played, the saloons are open, many kinds of business are done, the churches are sparsely attended, and in some cases you could not tell from the appearance of things whether it was Sunday or Monday. Hence in this sermon I shall consider, I.—The Origin of the Sabbath; and II.—The Necessity of the Sabbath.

It is commonly supposed that the religious observance of one day in seven rests upon and originated from the first chapter of Genesis or the Mosaic Law; but neither idea is true. The late Hugh Miller, the eminent Scotch geologist, in his celebrated attempt to reconcile the statements of Genesis i. with the facts of geology, contended that the Hebrew word for "day," (*yōm*) means simply a period of time, not necessarily of only twenty-four hours, but an age of indefinite duration—just as we speak of "our day," meaning our age; and hence, he argued, the writer of Genesis meant that God created the world in six ages and rested the seventh. Miller attempted, without success, to identify the "ages" of geology with the "days" of Genesis, and urged that God's Sabbath is the period intervening between creation and the final judgment, during which He is performing through His Son the work of re-

demption. In short, God, he said, worked six ages at creation and is devoting a seventh to the redemption or religious development of mankind, and commands us to follow His example by devoting six-sevenths of our time to secular or worldly matters and one-seventh to religious duties. There is more poetry and ingenuity in this view than truth, and few commentators will now accept it either as a satisfactory reconciliation of Genesis and Geology, or a correct account of the origin of the Sabbath. An eminent English bishop, Dr. Goodwin, of Carlisle, has shown that it is far more probable that the week of seven days was in existence long before Genesis was written, and that the form of its first chapter is due to this fact, than it is that the institution of the week is due to the first chapter of Genesis. We know that the seven-day period of time was in use in Chaldea, the original home of Abraham, at least 2,000 years before Christ, and the Sabbath was also observed there. It is pretty certain that the author of the first chapter of Genesis lived in Chaldea, and that this account of creation was written there possibly by Abraham or some Chaldean priest or sage. The writer of the account wanted to express the idea of *progressive creation*, and so, the bishop argues, he fitted his conception into the framework he found ready at hand in the existence of the week of seven days. Just as St. John, in the Book of Revelation, framed his vision of the heavenly Jerusalem upon the pattern of the earthly Jerusalem, without intending that it should be taken as a literal description of facts, so the seer of Genesis fitted his vision of creation into the framework of the week, thereby expressing the idea of progressive creation, but not intending that it should be interpreted as a literal description of facts. This view seems to me highly rational and probable, for Genesis thus becomes a witness to the existence of the Sabbath and the week of seven days, and at the same time all the difficulties in this narrative which have hitherto perplexed scientists and theologians vanish.

If the idea that the Sabbath and seven-day period originated from Genesis i., is false, the notion that it was established by Moses at Mount Sinai is a greater mistake. The very command itself, to "*remember* the Sabbath day to keep it holy," shows that it existed prior to that time, for otherwise it would be absurd to bid people to "re-

member" it. It is probable that the week of seven days existed not only in Chaldea but also in Egypt, and even among the Patriarchs. In Genesis xxix. 27, we read that Laban commanded Jacob when he married Leah to "fulfil her week," the seven days assigned for wedding festivities, and in Genesis l. 10, we read that Joseph made a mourning for his father's death "seven days." While these passages do not prove unanswerably that the week of seven days existed among the Patriarchs, they do suggest that such a division of time was common and familiar to them, and succeeding events seem to justify the conclusion that the week did exist then. "At any rate," says Rev. Dr. Smith, in his "Old Testament History," "the whole tone of the narrative (in Exodus xx.) is inconsistent with the idea that the Sabbath was first instituted at Sinai."

It may be thought that the reason given in the Fourth Commandment for the observance of the Sabbath, viz., because "in six days the Lord created the heavens and the earth and rested the seventh," proves that the Sabbath did take its origin from the first chapter of Genesis. But Dr. Ewald, of Germany, the eminent historian of Israel, Canon Cook, the Bishop of Carlisle, and other high authorities have shown that this was probably an *addition* to the original commandment. As the Ten Commandments originally stood, say these commentators, the second and fourth were as short as the first now is. They read simply: "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image;" "Thou shalt remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." But a later editor of the Mosaic Laws, desiring some additional Scriptural authority for this command, assigned the narrative of Genesis as such authority.

Hence we are justified in concluding that the week of seven days and the Sabbath existed in Chaldea before the time of Abraham and in Egypt before the time of Moses, and that the form of Genesis i. and the Fourth Commandment are due to this fact. Moses did not establish for the first time the Sabbath, but merely revived and confirmed it.

From his day to the time of Christ, it is well known, one day in seven was more or less faithfully observed by the Israelites as their Sabbath, and that day seems to have corresponded to our Saturday. But after the death of Christ

the Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, not by any decree of the Church, but simply by the *usage* of the Apostles. Our Lord rose from the dead on the first day of the week and appeared to the Apostles once or twice on the same day. Hence we find the disciples, without any formal decision, coming together to "break bread," that is, celebrate the holy communion, say prayers and preach on the first day of the week, and this was finally established as the Christian Sabbath.

The Sabbatarians make much of the fact that there is no explicit command in the New Testament that the first instead of the seventh day of the week should be observed as the Sabbath. It is sufficient to answer: (1) While the Apostles and New Testament writers did not by *word* change the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, they did so by *deed*—by actually observing this day as their Sabbath; and (2) St. Paul positively denounces this stickling about the Jewish Sabbath. "One man" (he says) "esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike." Shall the latter, therefore, be condemned as un-Christian? No! he answers. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day regardeth it unto the Lord, and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." More plainly still. "Let no man judge you" (he says) "in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the *Sabbath days*, which are a *shadow* of things to come" (Col. ii. 16, 17). In other words, the Apostle meant to say that there is really no inherent, necessary difference between days. The same sun shines on Monday that shines on Sunday or Saturday. One day in God's sight is just as holy as another; *all* time is sacred and should be faithfully and sacredly used, and as the Jewish Church had a right to establish its holydays, so the Christian had a right to ordain its holy days. The seventh day of the week was holy or "hallowed" in the Jewish Church, not because it was intrinsically different from any other day of the week, but simply because it was devoted to religious exercises.

We "hallow" or "consecrate" a church building, not by constructing it out of different and more sacred material than that used in other buildings, for that is not done, but merely by setting it apart for religious purposes. And so

one day in seven seemed a fair proportion of time to devote to religious services, and the Israelites chose the seventh day as their Sabbath, but that was a mere "shadow" of better things to come. The earthly Sabbath is an emblem of eternal rest; and since there is no difference in the nature of days—since the first day of the week was made most sacred and hallowed by the resurrection of the Lord from the dead on that day—the early Christians were quite justified in changing the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. Moses was not greater than Paul or any other of the Apostles, and as the Christians threw off the yoke of the Jewish ceremonial law, it was quite right that this part of it should be thrown off also.

II. But in our day not only the authority of Moses, but even the authority of Christ and St. Paul is rejected. Many care little what these great religious teachers taught or what was the origin of the Sabbath; they would abolish it altogether as a religious festival, and hence we are called upon to show the *need* of a Sabbath. Fortunately this can easily be done. "The Sabbath was made for man," it rests upon the physical, mental, moral, and religious *necessities* of human nature, and hence its abolition is impossible. As long as man exists there will be need of the Sabbath.

First of all, man needs the Sabbath as a *rest day*. After six days of continuous labor, whether with head or hand, every one feels the need of rest, and experience has shown that one day in seven is the best proportion of time to devote to rest. One day in ten has been established as a rest day, but it proved to be insufficient for man's physical needs, and so the seventh day was readopted. Very few, if any, deny the need of the Sabbath as a rest day, but the mode of otherwise observing it is the question, and this must be settled by the conditions of the people. The man who works ten hours a day in the shop, or twelve or fourteen hours a day on the farm, during the week, will perhaps need *all* of Sunday to rest his tired limbs, and we need not be surprised if he does not attend church on Sunday. Indeed, I am not sure that a man, who has a family depending upon him for food and clothing, will not be doing God a better and more acceptable service by resting at home on Sunday in order to be able to win bread for his

wife and children during the week, than he would be to walk one, two or five miles to listen to, or rather dream through, a dull service or sermon. The only way by which we may secure the attendance of such people at religious services is by giving them half of Saturday as a holiday and bettering their condition generally. It is wholly unreasonable and un-Christian to work men and women ten, twelve or fourteen hours a day up till dark, Saturday night, and require them to rise early enough to get ready and come to church Sunday morning. If the Christian employers of the country really wish to promote the religious welfare of their employés, or indeed their own interests, they will give them Saturday afternoon as a holiday.

Secondly, the Sabbath is needed for the *mental development* of man. As just intimated, the great mass of men are worked late and early from Monday morning till Saturday night, and hence they have neither inclination nor time to cultivate their minds. Of what use to the work-people are our public libraries, art galleries, museums and parks? They are, of course, too tired to use these to any extent in the evenings during the week, and owing to an absurd prejudice they are closed on Sundays. All these places should be open at least part of Sunday, say from 1 to 6 o'clock, and in summer the city bands should be allowed to play in the parks for the benefit of the working people. This should not only be sanctioned, but it should be urged and superintended by the Church. One great reason why the laboring classes stay away from church is just this: she opposes many things which they know they need and should have. And those who are so fanatical about the desecration of the Sabbath by such means should seriously consider these two facts: (1) They do not get the working people to come to church by shutting up the libraries, art galleries and parks, but they rather embitter these people against the Church by their opposition to the use of such places on Sunday; and (2) Would it not be infinitely better, from every point of view, that the poor people should spend a few hours on Sunday listening to sweet music, looking at beautiful pictures or reading good books and papers, than it is to shut them off from these pleasures and advantages in their dreary homes, where they nurse bitter feelings and hatch dangerous schemes of vengeance? There can be no question that the safety and

welfare of both Church and State depend upon the mental and social elevation of the masses, and one great means of such elevation would be the use on Sundays of the public libraries, art galleries, parks, etc. If it be said that after six long days of work the laboring people would not feel any more like using these places than they would like going to church, it may be answered that after a Sunday morning's rest they *would* enjoy these privileges, and, as a matter of fact, in England and elsewhere they do avail themselves of these advantages. Nor need this at all interfere with the religious exercises of the day. Those who would come to church with these places closed would come if they were open. Indeed, if the Church were *instrumental* in furnishing such advantages to the work people, many more of them would in time come to church than do now come, for the education and refinement they would receive from this beneficent action of the Church would naturally tend to draw them closer to it. However, in deference to the religious prejudices of many and perhaps to prevent Sunday being wholly used for intellectual and æsthetic purposes alone, it would probably be well to open such public resorts only from 1 to 6 o'clock on Sundays.

As many people consider Sunday intrinsically different from, and more sacred than, other days of the week, so they are puritanical in their idea of certain kinds of employment, such as the reading a novel or the writing a letter on Sunday. But while some novels should not be read on any day, and many letters should never be written, yet there is really no sin in looking at beautiful pictures in an art gallery on Sunday (we often see them in the windows of churches) nor in listening to fine music (we have it in the churches when we can get it, and it is often decidedly operatic music), and most of the books and papers in our public libraries are quite as edifying as the general run of sermons. Hence the distinction between "secular" reading, music, and so forth, and "sacred" books, music and services is generally artificial, and the choice is not between these, but rather between the so-called "secular exercises" and something worse. The working people *will not* come to hear hymns sung, the Bible read and sermons preached, and the question therefore is, Would it not be better to get them in the libraries and galleries and parks than it is to leave them in their

houses, the slums, the "commons" or the saloons? There can be but one answer to this question, and that is, It would be far better for all of us.

But while I am disposed to grant all these privileges and advantages to the working people on Sunday, I am less disposed to grant them to those who have plenty of time and opportunity for reading, riding, driving and otherwise recreating themselves during the week. It is true that there are many lawyers, physicians, teachers and merchants who work as hard as any shop-hand, and these should be allowed the Sunday privileges accorded to him; but there are many who could, and who do, freely indulge in social and intellectual pleasures during the week who would also devote Sunday to this purpose, and upon them should descend the condemnation of the Church. But the hard-working professional or business man, who attends church at least once on Sunday, may be excused for taking a drive in the afternoon, or making a friendly visit to a neighbor's in the evening. The proviso, however, in this case as in most cases, is very important: he should not neglect his church and religious duties for social and intellectual pleasure, and this brings us to our last point.

The Sabbath is not only necessary to the physical and mental welfare of man, but it is more especially necessary to his *religious* development. There are not a few, alas! who think religion and the Church a curse to humanity, and would therefore wipe them from the face of the earth; and when we remember what cruel forms religion has sometimes assumed, and how often the Church has been the foe of light and truth, we need not wonder that a few despise them. But the vast majority of intelligent and educated men believe in the Church—in some sort of religion.

Man has a moral and religious nature, and its cultivation and development are even more important than is his mental training, since his passions and prejudices are stronger than his reasoning faculties. If, therefore, this desirable result—man's religious development—is to be accomplished some time and effort must be devoted to this purpose, and surely we who believe in religion ask very little when we ask that one day in seven, or at least a part of it, be set apart for religious work. Every think-

ing man, every patriotic mind, every philanthropic soul, must admit this, and should aid the good work by word and deed—by contributing money to and attending the services of the Church. The work of the Church should not be thwarted by allowing any unnecessary business, whether it be base ball or saloon keeping, to be done on this day. The running of the mails, the printing of the newspaper and such like work seems necessary to man's intellectual, social, and even his religious development; and while it may be plausibly argued that a game of base ball or the drinking of a glass of beer on Sunday is no more harm than reading in a public library or sending the mail, yet these latter are *necessary* to man's highest welfare, the other not, and the line must be drawn somewhere, and it should be drawn between what is necessary and what is not necessary to man's greatest and best development. The Sabbath was made specially for the spiritual improvement of man, by which I mean his emotional and his intellectual as well as his religious elevation. The use of art galleries, libraries, parks and newspapers, and the transmission of mail are, in our complicated society, all necessary to our best welfare, but base ball, the sale of beer and such like things are not necessary, and should not, therefore, be permitted to monopolize the short time allowed for the work of the Church.

Having thus freely admitted that there is much truth in the modern notion of the Sabbath as a day of rest and recreation—a day upon which those who cannot enjoy social and intellectual pleasures during the week, should be admitted to the public libraries etc.—I must insist that these things should be *subordinated* to the religious observance of the Lord's Day. Frederick Robertson, who advocated the view of the Sabbath here set forth, said: "Æsthetics are not religion. It is one thing to civilize and polish, it is another thing to Christianize. The worship of the beautiful is not the worship of holiness; nay, I know not whether the one may not disincline from the other. At least, such was the history of ancient Greece. Greece was the home of the arts, the sacred ground on which the worship of the beautiful was carried to its perfection. Let those who have read the history of her decline and fall, who have penned the debasing works of her later years, tell us how music, painting, poetry, the arts, soft-

ened an debilitated and sensualized the nation's heart. Let them tell how, when Greece's last and greatest man was warring in vain against the foe at her gates, and demanding a manlier and more heroic disposition to sacrifice, that most polished and humanized people, sunk in pleasure and sunk in trade, were squandering enormous sums upon their buildings and their æsthetics, their processions and people's palaces, till the flood came, and the liberties of Greece were trampled down forever beneath the feet of the Macedonian conqueror.

"No ! the change of a nation's heart is not to be effected by the infusion of a taste for artistic grace. 'Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid which is Jesus Christ. Not art, but the cross of Christ. Simpler manners ; purer lives ; more self-denial ; more earnest sympathy with the classes below us ; nothing short of that can lay the foundation of the Christianity which is to be in the future, broad and deep.'"

While, therefore, we would not be puritanical in our observance of the Sabbath, while we would willingly give up part of it for the cultivation of the mental life and æsthetic tastes of those who have no time for this during the week, yet we must insist that the primary and main object of the Sabbath is the religious development of man, and it should not be used chiefly for other purposes. Let the moral and the spiritual come first, the intellectual and the æsthetic next. Let the cultivation of the mind be preliminary to the culture of the heart and the spirit. For, as Robertson again says, "Experience tells us that those Sundays are the happiest the purest, the most rich in blessing in which the *spiritual* part has been most attended to—those in which the business letter was put aside till evening and the profane literature was not opened, and the ordinary occupations entirely suspended—those in which, as in the temple of Solomon, the sound of the earthly hammer was not heard in the temple of the soul—those of which we could say, We were in the *Spirit* on the Lord's day."

"Blest day of God ! most calm, most bright,
The first, the best of days :
The laborer's rest, the saint's delight,
The day of prayer and praise."

SERMON III.

CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE.

Text :—“ Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.”—*I Thessalonians* v. 21.

EVERY age has its peculiar and distinctive questions or problems to solve. In the time of Christ the great problem before the Church was the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom on earth. It was, how could the Gospel be successfully preached and the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles be broken down, so that both might be brought into one fold, under the one Shepherd. To this end great missionary journeys were made, sermons were preached and epistles were written. In the sub-apostolic age, the question was, how to formulate doctrines so as to exclude error and organize the Church into an efficient corporation.

This was essentially an uncritical age so far as certain facts were concerned. Belief in miracles, or extraordinary interference with the ordinary course of nature, was universal.

It was quite common for obscure writers to attribute their books to some great man in order to give them greater authority and influence, and the authorship of writings was not rigidly examined. It thus happened that many books were ascribed to persons who did not write them, and events were believed which are now incredible. From the time of Constantine the Great (325 A. D.) to the sixteenth century the Church was busy building itself up into a great political and ecclesiastical power, and its officers were often not only profoundly ignorant but grossly immoral. When the Reformation of the sixteenth century broke out, the great question with Luther and his co-workers was how to throw off the ecclesiastical accretions that had

accumulated around the apostolic faith and order, and of course in doing this they naturally and necessarily appealed to the Scriptures as against the commandments and traditions of the Church. But although Luther and a few other Reformers (Erasmus, etc.,) manifested considerable critical ability, and handled the Bible quite freely, yet the inspiration and authority of the Bible were quite generally *assumed*. No such searching examination of the authorship and contents of the Scriptures as this century has seen was dreamt of by the Reformers. And in the immediate post-Reformation period the necessity of offering some infallible, ready-made authority in religious matters in place of the dethroned "Infallible Pope and Church" led naturally to the exaltation and acceptance of the Bible as an infallible guide in religion. Thus it happened that not until the beginning of this century was the Sacred Book of Christendom subjected to a criticism such as other books have to endure. The popular idea that because the Bible's inspiration and authority and authorship have not been questioned for ages and have been widely questioned to-day—because it has been believed to have been written by the persons whose name its title-pages bear—therefore it is presumption and folly to question its authority, turns out, in the light of the facts just stated, to be, as most popular notions are, not even a half truth. During the last century the sciences of geology, biology, and historical criticism have been born. Never before was so much known of nature and her operations, of history and its meaning. Physical science has made the miracles recorded in the Bible much more incredible than they were in former centuries. The comparative study of religions has played havoc with traditional ideas of inspiration and has shown how *naturally* and universally the popular notions of God, natural redemption, miracles, etc., have been developed.

But while many think that science—physical and historical—has destroyed the Bible and religion, it can easily be shown that it has simply stripped off the husk and left the kernel of truth untouched. Those who think that Criticism has destroyed the Bible should ask themselves this question, If this is so, how could such large scholarly works as Ewald's or Kuenen's History of Israel be produced? Where could these writers get materials for their

books if they had destroyed the Bible? No! they have *not* destroyed it. On the contrary, it is the object of this sermon to show that they have really done a grand *reconstructive* work; they have merely separated the wheat from the chaff, but they declare most earnestly that the wheat is there.

First of all, criticism has cleared up the *authorship* of the books of the Bible. Thus, to confine our attention to the New Testament, it has shown that a study of the Christian origins must begin with the Epistles of St. Paul, since these are the oldest writings of the New Testament, and while some radical critics reject all except four of these Epistles as ungentine, it is now pretty generally agreed that at least eight or ten of the Epistles commonly attributed to St. Paul were written by him, viz., those to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Ephesians, and Philemon. Even those critics who reject the Pauline authorship of some of these Epistles admit that they were written by some disciple in or near the Apostle's time, and for all practical purposes they are quite as valuable as if they had been written by St. Paul himself. To make this clear, suppose it should be proved that Lord Bacon, not Shakespeare, wrote the plays bearing the latter's name, would we be so foolish as to throw aside our Shakespeare as worthless? On the contrary, would it not be quite as valuable as ever? I think so; and hence when we are shown that St. Paul did not write the Epistle to the Hebrews, for instance, but that Apollos probably did; that the epistles to Timothy and Titus were not written by St. Paul but by some disciple in or near his time; that the same is true of other epistles, it would be extremely foolish to reject these writings as worthless.

All that criticism proves is that men have been mistaken *about* the Bible, *not* that the Bible is false and unreliable; or, at most, it simply shows that certain *details* of the narratives are false, not that the greater part of the Book is a lie, and no reflecting mind will be disturbed by such a demonstration.

The same may be said of the Gospels. It has been shown that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John wrote certain short notes on Christ's life and the establishment of the Church by St. Paul, and that these notes were worked over by other disciples, and finally our Gospels and Acts were

produced in their present shape. What then? Are these writings unhistorical and valueless? Not at all.

On the contrary, this view of the origin of the Gospels enables us to account for certain slight discrepancies in them which worry us no little on the old view. Thus, when we read in one Gospel that Jesus healed one man near Jericho, and in another that He healed two men (see Luke xviii. 35, and Matt. xx. 30), we explain it by saying that these conflicting reports got into circulation by being passed from mouth to mouth among the disciples,—just as difference in reports of events in our own time arise—and were finally incorporated into our gospels.

“Oh! well,” answers the unreflecting individual, “if that is so, then the Bible is not *inspired*, and I will have none of it.”

There it is again! The Bible is inspired—only it is not inspired just as *you* think it is. The Bible is all right, but your *idea* of it is all wrong. The Bible does not claim to be inspired in *every* word and passage. That is a fiction which theologians and preachers have, most unfortunately, *added* to the Bible. What we must do, therefore, is not to throw away our Bible, but simply the *theories about* the Bible which have been taught us from our cradle up—the theological cobwebs that have been woven across the ark of God’s covenant—and then we will be able to accept and appreciate its real treasures.

The Bible comes to us just as other books do, and it offers itself to us for what it is worth. It does not pretend to be a perfect Book let down out of the skies, but it makes statements about persons who lived and events that happened nineteen, twenty-five, thirty or forty centuries ago, and it tells us to ponder these things; prove, test all these things, and hold fast that which is good; and woe unto that man or that woman who, through intellectual laziness and spiritual timidity, refuses to obey this apostolic injunction! *He* is the “heretic”! He is the real traitor to God and Christ and the Church and the Bible and his own conscience and reason, and for all this God will bring him into judgment.

Secondly, Biblical criticism has given us a rational method of *interpreting* the Scriptures.

It has been universally customary to build whole pyramids of theology on a few Scriptural texts, picked out at

haphazard, without regard to their date, authorship or primary reference: until the popular caricature of this method of "proving" things from the Bible seems almost justifiable. "The Bible," it is said, "sanctions *suicide*; for it says 'Judas went and hanged himself,' and it adds, 'Go thou, and do likewise!'" Of course, this is absurd nonsense; yet some of the interpretations or rather twistings of the Scripture of which theologians have been guilty are equally irrational and illogical. Hence comes the popular notion that "you can prove anything from the Bible." No wonder that Archdeacon Farrar should exclaim in eloquent indignation: "Tyranny has engraved texts upon her sword. Oppression has carved texts upon her fetters. Cruelty has tied texts around her faggots. Ignorance has set knowledge at defiance with texts woven on her flag. Gin-drinking has been defended out of Timothy, and slavery has made a stronghold out of Philemon. Texts were quoted by the devil and the Pharisees against our Lord Himself, and when St. Paul fought the great battle of Christian freedom against the curse of the Law, he was anathematized with a whole Pentateuch of texts." Yet the Bible does not sanction tyranny, oppression, cruelty, ignorance, slavery and the suppression of free thought. On the contrary, it is the foe of all these evils, but men—men professing and calling themselves Christians, have perverted the Bible—have snatched up texts here and there, and hurled them at the heads of their opponents, until it is no wonder that men have come to think you *can* prove anything by the Bible, and despise it accordingly. But criticism has changed all this. It no longer satisfies a reflecting mind to have a few texts of Scripture cited to prove a doctrine or a fact. He wants to know the author of the text and of what authority it is. He insists that the Bible must be interpreted by facts of science, philosophy and history, and that all these cannot be rejected because the English translation—not the original of the New Testament—speaks of "science, falsely so called."

Criticism and investigation have shown that there are other "Bibles of Humanity" besides ours—in Persia, India, China and elsewhere—and that there are other religions besides the religion of the Jews and Christians. But shall we, therefore, give up our Bible and our religion? No! On the contrary, these other bibles and these other relig-

ions throw light upon ours and help us to understand ours and make us value ours all the more. To reject our Bible and our religion because other people have books which teach many of the doctrines our Bible teaches would be as foolish as the action of a woman who would throw away her diamonds because she found that some one else had as pretty diamonds. I fancy that few women would do this, however ready they may be to throw away their Bible when told that the people in India have profound Sacred Books very much like ours. All these discoveries simply show that God has not left Himself without witness among other people of the earth besides the Jews.

Alike in sunny Greece and stately Rome, in the groves of India and the gardens of China, in scorching Africa and the far sweet islands of the sea, as well as over the hills and valleys of Judah, the Sun of Righteousness has shed His blessed beams, and while He shone most brightly over the ark at Jerusalem, the rays He shot into "heathen darkness" proclaim that God is the Universal Father, and "in every nation he that loveth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him."

When this great fact is fully recognized, when the Bible is interpreted by facts of science, philosophy and history, when Christ is acknowledged to be the King of men, the Light that hath lightened the Gentiles as well as the glory of His people Israel, the Inspirer of Buddha, Confucius, and Socrates, as well as the Teacher of Paul, then, but not till then, will the Bible regain the power it has lost by the misinterpretations which have been put upon it, and then will Christ's Church accomplish its mission to men. In the study of the Bible no injunction is more important than that of the text: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." Search the Scriptures, and compare them with the Scriptures of other nations, and interpret them by facts and reasons, and thus the Bible will become a lamp unto your feet and a light unto your path.

Third, Criticism has given us a correct idea of *miracles*.

The popular idea of miracles is this: Christ was God; all things are possible with God; the Bible says Christ wrought miracles; the Bible is inspired; therefore we must accept the miracles, word for word, as they stand recorded in the Bible, and the more incredible they seem the more faith we exercise,

Criticism answers: With God all things are, indeed, possible; it is possible that God should turn the world upside down or stop the sun in its course, but He does not do it. Christ was indeed God's Son, "God manifest in the flesh," but He himself rebuked the Jews for seeking "signs" instead of accepting His words for their own sake; and the question is not what God or Christ *could* do? but, *what has He actually done?* And in answering this question we must examine the authorship and authority of the Book that records Christ's words and acts just as we would the authorship and authority of any other book relating similar stories. We cannot *assume* that the Bible is inspired and infallible, for inspiration is itself of the nature of a miracle and must be proved as other miracles are. We know, too, that miracles are constantly attributed to ancient heroes, and is it not, therefore, probable that more miracles have been attributed to Jesus, the greatest of men and religious teachers, than He actually wrought? May not His simple-minded followers have mistaken purely natural events for miracles? May not the cures He worked be explained by causes fully recognized by medical science? May not His raisings from the dead have been revivals of persons from a state of suspended animation, which was so common in the East? Jesus himself said of Jairus's daughter: "The maid is not dead but sleepeth" (Mark ix. 24); and although the bystanders laughed Him to scorn, believing the girl was really dead, may not the Master have known better than they? And may we not have in this story the key to an understanding of the other stories of resurrections? At any rate, the critics urge, an extraordinary event must be proved by an extraordinary amount of evidence, and the more wonderful it is the more evidence is necessary. The very fact that Jesus was God's Son and performed wonders would lead to the attribution to Him of miracles He never wrought. Hence we must know who wrote the stories of miracles, when they were written and whether they cannot be explained by natural causes.

"Oh! well," answers the poor frightened soul, "then the Bible is all a lie and Christ was an impostor, and so I will none of them!" Not so fast, my good friend. There is no reason for such precipitancy. The critics have not destroyed a single object of your faith or touched a hair

of the Master's head. On the contrary, they have shown us that the miracles He wrought were performed according to the laws of nature, not in violation of them, and therefore we may rationally accept them all without doing violence to our reason. The important facts of Christ's life are not the wonders He performed, but the life He lived and the words He spoke. The important fact of His birth is not the number of human agents employed, but the production of a perfect moral and spiritual nature—the influx of the Divine Spirit into Humanity; and even if the miracles be myths (which they are not), they yet prove that such an infusion of the Divine Spirit into human nature occurred when our Lord was born. The important fact in His resurrection is not the nature of the body in which He appeared to his disciples, but the fact that He revealed Himself to them as alive after death—He made His living Presence *felt* by them—and so brought life and immortality to light.

Thus, you see criticism does not destroy your Bible, the miracles of our blessed Lord. It simply asks us to *interpret* the Scripture-stories of miracles a little differently from what we have been accustomed to interpret them; and surely this ought not to disturb any one's faith, for different interpretations have always been put upon the Bible. When it was believed that the earth was flat and stationary, the Bible was interpreted according to this belief; but when it was discovered that the earth was a globe and moves round the sun, the Bible was interpreted according to this knowledge. It was believed, until recently, that the world was created in six days of twenty-four hours each, but since geology has shown that it required millions of ages to create the world, the first chapter of Genesis has been interpreted differently by all high authorities. Now it is urged the stories of miracles should be differently interpreted. They should not be rejected; we may rationally accept all the accounts of healing in the New Testament (and most of the miracles Christ wrought were cures), for such cures were simply extraordinary instances of what prophets and apostles, Moses, Elijah, Paul and others, did—cures like those well known to medical science. The raisings of the dead were revivals of persons in a swoon. The feeding of the thousands with a few loaves and fishes was a reminiscence of the Master's

benevolence and spiritual feeding. The turning water into wine was a reminiscence of His attendance on joyous festive gatherings.* And so we are asked not to give up our Bible, but merely to understand it a little differently from what we have been accustomed to understand it, and those who have adopted the new interpretations find the Bible far more interesting and instructive because more credible than ever.

Finally, criticism has destroyed Bibliolatry, the worship of a book, and substituted in its place the worship of the Spirit of Christ. It has taken the Bible out of the Pope's chair, where the Reformers of the sixteenth century placed it, and given to Jesus the throne of His kingdom. The more we see that the Bible is not infallible, the more closely we cling to Christ. While the miracles He wrought are seen to be only extraordinary instances of wonders performed by other religious teachers, His moral and spiritual *character* and His divine *wisdom* stand out above all others proclaiming Him to be, in an unique and transcendent sense, the Son of God. And as Dr. Farrar eloquently says, "In the name of the Son of God is the secret of our progress, of our security, of our freedom, of our strength. If we build upon Him, we build on the one Foundation. It is because they put themselves in place of Him that hierarchies have fallen into corruption and ruin. It is because they failed to comprehend His nature, that philosophies have passed away. It is because they thrust the dead letter in the place of His living Spirit, that religious movements have ended in hatred and obstructiveness. It is because they have mistaken the dawn for the conflagration that theologians have so often been the foes of light. But no Church and no system and no man that has been rooted and grounded in Him in love has ever failed to increase with the increase of God."

Therefore, my friends, let us rely, not upon the Church, not upon a fallible Book, not upon a system of Philosophy, but upon the living Christ, whose still small voice speaks to our souls, and whose history is recorded in that Book which, despite all slight imperfections, has been for ages, and is destined to be through all time, the religious guide of the most enlightened portion of humanity. It has

* See Haweis's "Picture of Jesus," pp. 57-60, for an ingenious "natural explanation" of this miracle.

nothing to fear from criticism. It will simply shine, like burnished gold, all the brighter for being rubbed. Defects will be effaced, mysteries will be cleared up, blots which the unhallowed pen of man has dropped upon its sacred pages will be wiped out, and it will become unto us the very oracle of God. Its great characters will come into our lives as powers for good. We will walk by their side; we will hearken to their words of wisdom; we will kneel with them round the throne of the Eternal I Am. We will sit with old Abraham in his tent door and help him entertain the Three Strangers, or walk with him through the land of Canaan, whither he had been driven by the idolatry of his native place. We will feel with the disinherited Esau as he cries, so pathetically, "Hast thou but one blessing? Bless me, even me, also, O my father!" We will lie down with the exiled Jacob on his pillow of stone and see the angel ladder reaching to heaven. We will follow the outcast Joseph as he is taken down by slave traders into Egypt, we will see him overcome temptation and rise to power, and we will join in the happy reunion of the old Patriarch's family. We will stand with unshod feet beside Moses at the burning bush and listen to the awful thunders of Sinai. We will march through the wilderness with God's children and eat the heavenly manna, and listen to the prophetic cry of Balaam from the top of Pisgah, "I shall see Him, but not now: I shall behold Him, but not nigh!" We will follow the flashing sword of Joshua as he leads the armies of the Lord of Hosts to victory in the Promised Land. We will listen with bated breath to the Song of Deborah shouting the downfall of God's enemies. We will walk beside David as he follows the ewes great with young over the rich pastures of Palestine, or as he flees before the face of the angry, jealous Saul. We will stand in the magnificent courts of Solomon's Temple, listen to its soul-stirring choruses and finally behold it trodden down by the heathen conqueror. We will sit down in sorrow with the exiles by the waters of Babylon, and weep as we see the silent harp hung upon the willows in the midst thereof. We will hear with joy the decree of Cyrus that the Temple should be rebuilt and the Jews restored to their fatherland. We will listen with rapture to the prophetic declaration that a child is to be born, a king is to be given, who

will restore the departed glories of Judah. We will fight the chivalrous battles of the heroic Maccabees and Asmoneans until overcome by Rome they sank under the power of the Edomite-Herod. We will hearken to that Voice in the wilderness, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight." We will listen to the angel song over the heights of Bethlehem; we will follow the star-guided Magi to the manger and offer our precious gifts at that sacred shrine. We will watch this wonderful Child grow to manhood, behold Him baptized in the Jordan beneath the shining wings of the heavenly dove; we will fast and pray with Him in the wilderness; we will follow Him through life, struggling against sin, opposition and persecution, until finally we see Him stretched on the Cross of Calvary, and hear His dying words, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do;" "Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit." And we exclaim, "Surely this Man was the Son of God!"

SERMON IV.

DID THE FISH SWALLOW JONAH?

Text:—Then certain of the scribes and of the Pharisees answered, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee. But He answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here.—MATTHEW xii. 38-41.

THE story of Jonah is a great stone of stumbling and rock of offence to even professing Christians, and probably few of them believe it, while the skeptics find in it an eternal source of amusement. But rightly understood it is one of the most interesting and instructive narratives in the Bible, and therefore I wish in this sermon to give a rational explanation of it.

It is claimed by the traditional school of theology that we must accept the story of Jonah in all its details because it was endorsed by the Lord Jesus. The first question therefore is, Did Jesus endorse it in full? Jonah is referred to three or four times in the Gospels: once in the text, again in the sixteenth chapter of Matthew; once more in Luke xi. 29-32; and finally in Mark viii. 11-13—or rather Mark states the request of the Scribes and Pharisees for a sign but does not mention Jonah. The Master, it is said, “sighed deeply in His spirit” when He heard the request, and said, “Why doth this generation seek after a sign? Verily I say unto you, There shall no sign be given unto this generation. And He left them.” Luke reports that He said: “This is an evil generation; they seek a sign; and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of Jonas the prophet. For as Jonas was a sign to the Ninevites, so shall the Son of Man be to this generation. The

men of Nineveh shall rise up in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonas, and behold a greater than Jonas is here." The sixteenth chapter of Matthew agrees with Luke. It reports the Master's interview with the Pharisees and His reference to Jonah's preaching in Nineveh, but does not say that Jesus referred to the fish swallowing the prophet. We have, therefore, three important differences in the reports of our Lord's words on the occasion referred to: Mark says He simply rebuked the Pharisees for seeking a sign, but does not report any reference to Jonah. Luke and Matthew (xvi.) say that He spoke of Jonah's preaching to the Ninevites, but neither says that He mentioned Jonah's voyage in the fish's belly; so that the allegation that our Lord endorsed this part of this remarkable story rests on the words of the text alone. We deny the truth of this allegation, and believe that the words of the text upon which it rests were added to the real statements of our Lord by the writer of the text, and we assert this for the following reasons: (1) Such differences in the Gospels as those cited show, and external testimony proves, that they were a *gradual* growth. The disciples of Jesus did not immediately after His death sit down and write His biography. On the contrary, they went forth preaching—*telling* what He had taught and done—and the Gospels were not written for fifty or seventy-five years after His death. It was the most natural thing imaginable, therefore, that such differences in the reports of His words and actions as those mentioned should get into circulation and finally be inserted in the written narratives. We know how hard it is even now, when we have shorthand writers, to get an exact account of even most important events or speeches, and nothing but a false idea of inspiration can make us suppose that the ancient writers were more exact than the modern. But inspiration or no inspiration, the fact is, *there* are the differences in their reports which none can deny, and they can be rationally accounted for only by supposing that we have the *gist* of what our Lord said and did with more or less added or omitted by the reporters. (2) The report of His remarks about Jonah itself throws doubt upon His endorsement of the part referring to the prophet's journey in the fish's belly, "An evil and adulterous generation," He said,

“and there shall no sign be given it.” But according to the text He immediately proceeded to contradict Himself by pointing to a most wonderful sign, namely, His own resurrection from the dead! “As Jonah” (He is reported to have said) “was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly : so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.” A pretty way, that, of refusing a sign to the wicked and carnally-minded generation! We don’t believe our Lord ever stultified Himself in such a manner. What, then, shall we believe He said on the occasion referred to? He probably said that as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, so He (Jesus) was a sign to that generation. This is what Luke and Matthew (xvi.) both say, and we may be sure that they would not have omitted the important reference to Jonah’s fish-boat had it been made, and therefore we must conclude that this is an addition of a later *redacteur* of Matthew’s Gospel obtained from oral tradition. By this means we save the gist of these narratives and explain their differences, and we can do so by no other explanation. It is most remarkable that many learned commentators, after all that Biblical Criticism has done to show the uncertain authorship and gradual growth of the Gospels, should yet insist upon pressing our Lord into the service of dogmatic theology.

We, of course, have no objection whatever to hearing His testimony, if He delivered any, on the subject of the authorship of the Old Testament or its miracles, but we submit that it must be shown that His words have been correctly reported before it can be truly said that He endorsed such stories as that of Jonah. Believing that He did *not* endorse that part of the prophet’s history which states that he was swallowed by a fish, we are free to accept or reject it without regard to any supposed utterance of His.

What, then, shall we think of this remarkable story? You remember the points of the narrative. Jonah was a prophet, the son of one Amittai, who was also a prophet, that lived in Gath-hepher in Galilee, not far north of Nazareth. He flourished about 800 years before Christ in the reign of the wicked king, Jeroboam, the second monarch in Israel who bore that name, (see Josh. xix. 13, 2 Kings xiv.). Jonah first prophesied in Israel and Jeroboam did certain things

which the prophet commanded, but finally, we are told, Jonah was bidden by the Lord to go and preach in Nineveh. He refused to do so, and took ship for Tarshish, a city in Spain. On the voyage a great storm arose, and the superstitious sailors at once concluded that they had done something to offend the God of the Sea, who was, therefore, determined to destroy them. Upon questioning Jonah about the matter, he confessed that he was to blame, and the sailors immediately pitched him overboard as a sacrifice to the God of the Sea. Fortunately for Jonah, a big fish, with a big mouth and a still bigger belly, was near by and kindly offered to take care of the unfortunate prophet. Jonah naturally accepted his offer, and after a three days' journey in this unique vessel, we are told, he was belched forth by the monster, safe and sound, upon the Syrian coast—much to the relief of the fish, no doubt.

After such an experience we are not surprised that the refractory prophet should conclude that there was less danger in preaching to the heathen Ninevites than there was in trying to escape from Jehovah by flying across the sea. And so Jonah went to the great capital of Assyria—a city nearly as large as New York and there proclaimed that within forty days Nineveh would be destroyed on account of its wickedness. Wonderful to relate, the prophet had not preached one day before the king and all the people and even the *animals* repented and put on sackcloth and sat down in the ashes! Truly, Jonah must have been a mighty preacher to convert even the beasts, for we poor parsons are satisfied if we convert a few human sinners. But, strange to say, this most successful preacher got mad about his very success and complained to Jehovah that he ought to have destroyed the Ninevites. And because He did not, Jonah went outside the city and built himself a tent and sat down to pout—nay, he even prayed that God would take away his life. Jonah was not as good a carpenter as he was a preacher, and so he seems to have botched his tent, and, therefore, the Lord made a great gourd grow up in one night, whose leaves protected the prophet, and then He sent a worm to gnaw at its root to kill it. And then Jonah got so sorry for the gourd that the Lord had to remind him that the lives of the Ninevites were more precious than many gourds. What shall we think of this strange story?

Suppose the Book of Jonah, like certain other old manuscripts, had been lost until modern times, and we had just found it, what would be the first question we would ask? Manifestly, we should want to know *who wrote it* and *when* was it written? Now, we do not know who wrote the Book of Jonah, nor when it was written. Previous to the Babylonish exile of the Jews, which occurred some 600 years before Christ, the books of the Old Testament, such as Genesis, the Laws of Moses and the rest, were left to take care of themselves, so to speak. For many years the Book of the Law was buried beneath a mass of rubbish in the Temple at Jerusalem (2 Kings xxii. 8, *et seq.*), and was found by a priest during the reparation and cleaning of the Temple somewhat as the Bible was discovered by Luther in the library of the University of Erfurt. This discovery led the good king Josiah to attempt a reformation of the morals and manners of the people, which, however, was only temporarily successful, and thenceforth the Sacred Books were tossed from pillar to post until after the Babylonian exile. They were then gathered together, by Ezra or some other scribe or scribes, and formed into a catalogue or canon as we now have them. The earliest evidence we have shows that the Book of Jonah was included among the other prophetic writings embodied in this canon of Sacred Books. But, be it remembered, Jonah had lived at least 200 or 300 years before this collection of the Scriptures was made, and so we do not know at what time during that period or by whom the Book of Jonah was written. It is a mere *assumption* to say that Jonah himself wrote it, and there are many reasons (two of which will be presently stated) for doubting such an authorship. But certain it is that the mere inclusion of the book in the canon formed after the Exile—that is, two or three hundred years after the death of the prophet—is no proof whatever that he wrote it or that it is absolutely true.

These two facts, among others, throw great suspicion upon its authenticity: First, the miracles it relates are so wonderful and grotesque that only the most overwhelming evidence could render them credible. Suppose we were to read such stories in any other book—say the Sacred Books of India or Greece—and we really do find similar stories in those books—would we not at

once either reject them as fables or demand the most conclusive evidence of their genuineness? Of course we would.

Why, then, should we draw the line at Jonah? We cannot. The first miracle is less incredible than the conversion of the heathen Ninevites. Imagine a modern missionary going to Shanghai in China or Tokio in Japan, and proclaiming that unless its inhabitants repented and accepted Christ within forty days, they would all be destroyed; and suppose that they should all at one time in one day repent, would not that be a far greater moral miracle than the preservation of a man in a fish's belly for three days would be a physical miracle? Certainly it would; and so we see that this book records the most prodigious miracles, and we are asked to accept them without an atom of evidence save the mere word of a book whose authorship and date of composition are both utterly unknown. Surely no thinking mind, however devout, can be satisfied with such a proposition!

Again, we find no reference to any such wonderful conversion of the Ninevites on the *Assyrian Monuments* that have been discovered and deciphered in modern times. Dr. Layard of England and other eminent explorers and scholars have worked for years among the mounds of Nineveh and Babylon, and they have found many stories which confirm certain narratives of the Old Testament, but none that confirm Jonah. Suppose now that Shanghai or Tokio were to be converted by the preaching of some modern missionary, don't you think that so great an event would be fully and extensively recorded, and explorers hundreds of years hence might find such records among the ruins of the city? Of course, it may be said that we may yet discover an account of this event in the ruins of Nineveh; but there is not much prospect of it, for those mounds have been very carefully and thoroughly examined; and, at any rate, we must wait until this discovery be made before we can count on it. Meanwhile the story of Jonah's converting all Nineveh remains unconfirmed.

Shall we, then, reject the whole Book of Jonah as worthless? By no means! We might as well reject gold because it is mingled with dross, or wheat because it is surrounded with chaff. The rational thing to do is to

strip off the husk and accept the kernel. Jonah, as just stated, was a real person and prophet who lived about eight hundred years before Christ. The Israelites at that time were constantly coming in contact with the Assyrians, and so it is highly probable that Jonah, being disgusted and discouraged in his work under the wicked Jeroboam, should turn to the Gentiles. Being a Jew, possessed of a most exclusive and self-righteous spirit, he would naturally hesitate to preach to heathen dogs, and would be willing to suffer exile in a strange land rather than do so. But conscience, that mighty vicegerent of God within man, which taught even the bigoted Peter that "in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him," and must not be considered "unclean" or "common"—conscience once thoroughly aroused would compel the prophet to go to Nineveh, and proclaim the message which God had given him. As a consequence he would doubtless convert, *not the whole city*, but perhaps many more than he had converted in Israel, and this would amply justify our Lord's reference to his missionary labors. Then, years afterwards, his biographer might write his history; meanwhile, all sorts of stories would have arisen about the prophet. It would be natural to say that he tried to avoid doing his duty, and in order to escape this irksome task he attempted to flee over the sea—perhaps he did—and was shipwrecked and stranded on the Syrian coast. The fish might be drawn from the popular imagination, but would be accepted by the simple-minded narrator as a providential means of deliverance for the unfortunate prophet. Then, in contrast with the impenitence of the Israelites, it would be natural to magnify Jonah's success in preaching to the Ninevites, and thus we would get our wonderful story of Jonah.

Of course, many will be disposed to say, "If all this be true, then the composer of this book was a most untrustworthy individual to say the least." Perhaps so, perhaps not. It is a well-known fact that all sorts of fantastical stories gather round great names and are often woven into the history of heroes. The absurd stories about General Washington's hatchet and so forth are now known to be the products of popular imagination. Religious heroes particularly suffer from this cause. The most grotesque fables have been woven around the char-

acters of St. Francis Assissi, Francis Xavier, Buddha, and our Lord Himself, and we can only get at the truth by a careful examination of facts. Nor should we accuse the originators of such stories of lying or dishonesty. There is a strange power in the human mind by which it will slightly and unintentionally exaggerate the wonderful character of events or persons, and these variations from fact increase the more they pass from mouth to mouth. The most, therefore, we can accuse the writers of such stories of is *credulity*, and we not only accuse them of this but we insist that it was the most natural thing imaginable that in that early age when science and criticism were unborn, people should be credulous.

“Oh! well,” answers the traditionalist, “then these people were not inspired, and I will none of them.” Not so fast, my friend! These people may not have been absolutely *infallible*, but God may have breathed (inspired) into their souls a message which, despite the earthen vessel through which it passed, is or may be a very real inspiration to us, may be of great importance to us. At any rate, the Book of Jonah, interpreted as is here proposed, has some most valuable lessons for us.

First, it is one of the earliest protests against that narrow *bigotry* and religious *exclusiveness* which so disgraced the Jewish Church, and now disfigures the Christian Church. This book stands for Universal Religion. God taught Jonah what He taught St. Peter at a later day, that he was the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews, that if the Jews were His “chosen people” they were simply chosen for the purpose of teaching His religion to the whole world; they were not chosen *out* of mankind as a peculiarly righteous and deserving people. Jonah was a grand man—a prototype of St. Paul and a Greater than he. Like them, he emphasized repentance, spirituality more than ceremony, privileges, or nationality. He condemns by his example all those who think themselves better than others because they *believe* more than others or because they belong to the oldest Church. And surely in this day when Roman Catholics and Protestants abuse each other most vehemently, when Presbyterians denounce Episcopalians, and Episcopalians rail at Methodists and Methodists abuse both; when Lutherans and Zwinglians fuss with each other and the Baptists condemn us all because we do not

accept immersion or submersion as necessary to valid baptism ; when the whole of Christendom is torn into warring factions that bite and tear each other, each claiming to be the true Church of Christ and none manifesting the Spirit of Christ to such a Christendom, Jonah's prophetic cry rings out across the ages, proclaiming, not every one that saith "Lord! Lord,"—not every one that flatters himself that he is the chosen of God—is accepted of Him, but he that *doeth the will* of God, the heathen Chinaman as well as the civilized American. "In *every* nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him."

"What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God?"

Secondly, Jonah was the great *missionary* of the Jewish Church, and so he again rebukes a faithless Church. But for the Jonah-spirit we would to-day be bowing down to stocks and stones instead of worshipping the one Living and True God. It was the Jonah-spirit that seized Saul of Tarsus and converted him into the greatest of missionaries, driving him over land and sea, through perils of persecution, paganism, the prison, sickness and death, until the Torch of Life had flashed from Damascus to Antioch, from Antioch to Athens, from Athens to Corinth, from Corinth to Rome, from Rome to Spain, from Spain to Britain. It was the Jonah-spirit that sent St. Ulfilas, in the fourth century, to labor among the barbarous Goths of northern Europe. It was the Jonah-spirit that took possession of St. Patrick in the lonely forests and mountains of Ireland, in the fifth century, as he followed the ewes great with young, and converted him into "the apostle of Ireland." It was the Jonah-spirit that drove St. Columba, in the sixth century, from his Ireland home into the wilds of Scotland to Christianize the heathen Picts and Scots. It was the Jonah-spirit that moved St. Columban—another noble Irish missionary—to forsake his beloved Erin, and scale the Swiss Alps to do the work of his Master. It was the Jonah-spirit that made Pope Gregory, in the sixth century, send Augustine and forty other monks to Britain to convert the heathen Saxons and Angles into "angels." But for these and such like missionary labors we would probably be bowing down before the gods whom our forefathers worshipped in northern Europe. Yet professing Christians, who owe every spiritual blessing and privilege to missions, are often opposed to

foreign missions! Truly, the old Ninevites will rise in the judgment and condemn this generation, for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold a greater than Jonah is here, and bids them "Go preach His Gospel to *every* creature, and ye will not!"

It is often said by opponents of missionary enterprise: "If the heathen will be judged according to the light they have—if they will be saved any way—why preach the Gospel to them?" To deliver them, we answer, from *earthly* hells! I care not whether there is any hell in the spirit-world or not (I believe there is), yet the Gospel should be preached to every human creature on the earth. Jesus Christ came to save men, not from a distant burning prison, but from their *sins*—to deliver them from the hell of ignorance, passion, poverty and suffering in this world, as well as from the consequences of these in the next. For this reason, the late Charles Darwin, it is well known, contributed liberally to the support of foreign missions. He, the so-called "enemy of the Faith," was animated by the Jonah—nay, by the Christ-spirit, while professing Christians, who condemn him, refuse to support this great and good work! Verily, I say unto you, the publicans, harlots, and skeptics go into the kingdom of God before Christians!

Finally, the story of Jonah teaches us that a religion of the *heart*, not a religion of *signs* and *doctrines*, will save us. "An evil and adulterous generation," said the Divine Teacher, "seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it." Most people are more anxious to see a miracle than to do their duty. Such persons would much rather hear the fish-story in the Book of Jonah defended, than to be told that they should follow the example of Jonah, and go and preach the Gospel—the Gospel of meat and bread to the heathen in our great cities. The one requires only a slight intellectual effort; the other demands money, time, and labor: and these "an evil and adulterous and hypocritical generation" of easy-going Christians are not disposed to give. There are Ninevehs all around us. New York is one, Philadelphia is another, Chicago and Cincinnati are others, and even in smaller cities and towns we find as great wickedness as that which the old prophet preached against in the Assyrian capital. The same voice that bade him go and preach to the old Ninevites bids us proclaim the Gospel of Good Deeds to our fellow-men.

But I fear that nothing less than a sea-voyage in a whale's belly can arouse some Christians from their indifference on this subject, and make them realize that *conduct*, not *belief*, righteousness, not "signs," is what Christ demands.

Now, then, my friends, what think you of the history of Jonah? Do you say that because I interpret this remarkable story differently from what some others do—that because I reject "the fish story" as "not proven"—I destroy the value of the narrative? On the contrary, its real value and beauty are brought out and emphasized, and its truth made credible, and this is what rational criticism is doing for all the books of the Bible.

There are many good people who are dreadfully frightened because some critics have cited mistakes of Moses and of Paul; have found scientific, historical, and moral errors in the Bible. They cry, "Great Pan is dead! Their beloved idol—an infallible Bible—no longer remains and so all is lost!" The fact is, if they would only stop to consider it, the so-called "destructive critics" are doing a great work of *reconstruction* for which future generations will rise up and call them blessed. They are simply stripping off the shocking and incredible accretions that have gathered round the real facts and truths and are presenting us with a rational and credible Bible. Thus, what is lost by treating the Book of Jonah as I have done? Absolutely nothing of any real importance, but very much is gained. We see that the fish story, while not literally true, has a deeper meaning than we supposed. It expresses the great fact that Jehovah had to *force* the narrow-minded Jew to become a missionary, just as He forced Saul of Tarsus and others since his time to do the same work: just as He forces many nowadays to perform disagreeable duties. It tells of the mighty operation of the Divine Spirit upon the storm-tossed soul of the prophet, by which he was "born again," and led to see the truth as it is in God. Surely such a criticism should be gratefully welcomed! Under its influences "the unreal Bible" vanishes, and "the real Bible"—the true Word of God, takes its place. The old saints and heroes are brought very near to our hearts, and their examples come into our lives as a powerful influence. We seem to see the great missionary, clad in his rough prophet's garb, walking up and down the crowded streets of Nineveh like a modern Whitfield or

Moody, or a Salvationist, crying, "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown!" We can see the motley, eager, curious crowd thronging about him, as they did about St. Paul in Athens, or as they do around a modern missionary in Shanghai or Benares, wondering what "this babbler will say." We can hear the diverse opinions that his preaching called forth, some saying he was a good man, other some, "He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods." Above all, we can see poor old Jonah sitting under the shade of the gourd-tree, discouraged, dejected, torn by a sense of utter *failure* after the most strenuous efforts. Ah! who has not sat under Jonah's gourd? As we see him sitting there, and hear his heart-rending prayer for destruction, we think of a Greater than he—the Man of Sorrows, who was despised and rejected of those He came to save, and was pursued through life by the demon of failure, against whom He struggled in the awful shades of Gethsemane, and whom He overcame only when He yielded up the ghost on the Cross of Calvary! We are saddened; but our sorrow is turned into joy when we remember that the work of Jesus and the work of Jonah was *not* a failure after all! Eight hundred years after his death Jonah received an eulogy from the Saviour of the world—was held up as a prototype of Himself! Twenty-eight centuries later he teaches the Christian Church its duty! Ah! may we be found worthy to sit down with Jonah and his fellow-saints in the kingdom of God, when the tumult, the turmoil, the battle din of life is over! Amen.

SERMON V.

WHAT'S THE USE OF PRAYING?

“Text:—What is the Almighty, that we should serve Him? And what profit should we have, if we pray unto Him?—JOB xxi. 15.

“WHAT'S the use of praying?” is a question often asked by two classes of persons—professed skeptics and nominal Christians. The one class ask it because they doubt the existence of God; the other because they think of God as a power that works according to unchangeable law. It is, therefore, necessary to answer the first question of the text, namely, “*What* is the Almighty?” before we can say “what profit we shall have if we pray unto Him.”

We Christians believe, then, that God is Spirit—that He is the Power that works in and controls all Nature—that the forces of Nature have their root in the Divine Will. We believe, further, that this Power is Psychical or Intelligent in its nature; and holding this view of Deity we believe that He has infinite resources upon which He may draw at pleasure to satisfy the wants of His creatures, and that this may be done without disturbing the order He has established. We believe this because we cannot explain even partially the facts of creation on any other supposition. We cannot imagine how the material particles, out of which the world was formed, could have been moved and combined in the wonderful order and shapes they now have, without assuming an Almighty Power endowed with infinite intelligence. “The invisible things of God,” St. Paul truly says, “since the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being perceived by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead” (Rom. i. 20). Of course, if science did not show that there had been a creation, then this argument would not hold; but although some scientific men assume that the atoms and

their forces are eternal, yet none claim that the universe as it *now exists* is eternal. On the contrary, all believe that it has been developed out of Chaos; but we claim that this wonderful development itself involved and necessitated the operation of an Infinite Power and Intelligence. Even if it be granted that the atoms and their forces are eternal, yet we must believe that those forces were of an intelligent or psychical nature—otherwise the various and manifold and orderly combinations of the atoms into globes and finally in the vital and mental orders of Being cannot be explained.

Now, the rationality of this idea of God, and prayer to such a God, has been frankly admitted by Prof. Huxley. "The supposition," he says, "that there is any inconsistency between the acceptance of the constancy of natural order and a belief in the efficacy of prayer, is the more unaccountable as it is obviously contradicted by analogies furnished by every-day experience. The belief in the efficacy of prayer depends upon the assumption that there is somebody, somewhere, who is strong enough to deal with the earth and its contents as men deal with things and events which they are strong enough to modify and control, and who is capable of being moved by appeals such as men make to one another. . . . Certainly I don't lack faith in the constancy of natural order. But I am convinced that if I were to ask a friend of mine—a bishop, for instance—to do me a kindness which lay within his power, he would do it, and I am unable to see that his action or my request involves any violation of the order of Nature. . . . How is the case altered if my request is preferred to the Most High Being, who, by the supposition, is able to arrest disease, or make the sun stand still in the heavens, just as easily as I can stop my watch, or make it indicate any hour that pleases me?" The real objection, therefore, to Prof. Huxley's mind, to prayer for material blessings, is not the violation of natural order that an answer to such a prayer is supposed to involve, but "the inadequacy of the (historical) evidence to prove" that any such prayers have been answered.* Prof. Tyndall, in his celebrated discussion of "Prayer and Natural Law" in his "Fragments of Science," takes the same position, so

* "Popular Science Monthly" for Jan., 1888, pp. 355-56.

that we are justified in holding that physical science has no valid objection to urge against prayer for material blessings. It admits that the philosophy which postulates an Infinite Power and Intelligence as God, holding that this Power created and sustains and operates all Nature, may be made to harmonize with the facts of science as truly and easily as the materialistic or agnostic philosophy.* Now the importance of this admission cannot be over-estimated, because the moment that it is shown, as Huxley shows, that prayer for material blessings may be answered *without* violating natural laws, the most serious objection to such prayer vanishes. If such prayer can be answered *according* to law, then we may more easily believe in it. And why not believe in it? Why not believe that prayer for the recovery of a sick friend may be answered? May not Kingsley's statement that *health* is "the order of Nature," and disease is a natural disorder, be profoundly true, so that the cure of a sick person would be the *restoration* not the violation of natural order? Just here we are reminded of Prof. Tyndall's famous "prayer test." In order to test the efficacy of prayer he proposed that two wards in an hospital should be treated as follows: One patient should receive medical attention and the other should simply be prayed for, and the result should be accepted as proof or disproof of the efficacy of prayer. Of course, the proposition raised a storm of controversy, and was denounced as blasphemous. But it is really not blasphemous, and only two valid objections can be urged against it, viz.: (1) If the subject of prayer had recovered it might have been said that "he would have got well any way without prayer;" if the patient who received medical attention had died, it might have been said that bad nursing or some other cause killed him; and so neither prayer nor medicine would really have been tested. Just here, it seems to me, lies the great objection to such a testing of the efficacy of prayer. When an instance of such efficient prayers is cited it may at once be said either that some other cause produced the result or it would have happened any way. Thus, if we cite Elijah's prayer for rain (1 Kings xviii. 41-46) as an example of the efficacy of prayer for material blessings, it is immediately said, "The rain

* Huxley, "Science and Culture," pp. 268-270 and in "Popular Science Monthly," for Feb., 1887, p. 503.

would have come any way ;” and the proposition can neither be denied nor proved. Hence, all that we can hope to do is to show that prayer for material blessings may be answered according to law, and this is sufficient to afford a basis for such prayers. Take a storm at sea, for instance. It is said that it is absurd to pray against the storm, for the forces which have been gathered up *must* spend themselves—just as steam in a boiler must escape even if it burst it. Yes, but the question is, cannot the Divine Will (which controls all natural forces) so arrange it that the forces pent up in the storm may spend themselves without injuring the passengers on board a vessel? *We* may quiet troubled waters by pouring oil on them, and this does not violate the laws of gaseous pressure ; and why cannot the Divine Will perform an analogous operation by which the storm may go on its course without harming any one who may be on the ocean? It is quite rational to assert that “He who ruleth the raging of the sea,” He who has set His decree, saying, “Hitherto shalt thou come, but no farther, and here shall thy proud waves be staid,” He who upholdeth all things by the word of His power can do this, and though we may not be able to prove that He *has* done it, yet this is not necessary to show the rationality of prayer for material blessings.

The second objection to Prof. Tyndall’s proposition to test the efficacy of prayer as you would a hypothesis about the origin of life is that, while it is not blasphemous, it certainly seems highly improper and irreverent. It is as if a child were to say to his father, “I don’t believe you can do thus and so, but just to see if you can I *dare* you to do it !” And surely that would not be considered a very respectful attitude to take towards one’s father, and the parent who had so audacious a child would be justified in refusing his request on the ground of his audacity. While prayer does come within the physical sphere—is (by the hypothesis) an agent in producing material results—yet it is something more. It is primarily a moral and spiritual act, and appeals to the will and feelings of an Infinite Personality, and therefore moral and spiritual considerations should be taken into account. The man who prays believes in a Being capable of answering prayer ; he believes that the Almighty is an Infinite Intelligence ; if he does not

--if he believes that the Almighty is a blind Fate or Force that works according to *necessity*—because it *cannot* work otherwise, then he is simply a fool to pray to such a God—or rather no-God. The prime and fundamental question, therefore, is, “*What* is the Almighty?” And once answer that He is the Infinite and Eternal Power that operates Nature, that this power is essentially *free* and *intelligent*, and you have settled the question about prayer. And the proper way to ascertain the nature of God, or the Power that controls Nature, is not to set up prayer tests but to examine the facts of Creation, and if they cannot be explained by the materialistic or agnostic hypothesis—or rather if they can be better explained by postulating an intelligent (or Personal, Spiritual) Deity than by either of those hypotheses, then you may rationally pray to this Deity for your “daily bread,” or any other blessing. But, of course, prayer cannot and should not take the place of *action* on our part. On the contrary, the most prayerful man will be most active and industrious in studying the laws and utilizing the forces of Nature. There is plenty of room for the operation of the Divine Will over and above our own action. After we have done our utmost God may have a most important part to perform. Thus we may plant our corn, but between seed-time and harvest there will be plenty of need of the influences of the Divine Will in the development and maturing of the gram, and it is highly proper that we should pray for a production of “daily bread.” A physician may exhaust his skill in treating a patient, and then God may have to heal him. And so we see that the Divine Will may and must *supplement* and complete the action of the human will. We must work out our own temporal and eternal salvation, but God works *in* and *with* us. Each one has his sphere of action.

II. We are now prepared to answer the second question of the text, viz. : “What *profit* shall we have if we pray?”

Many who deny the profitableness of prayer for material blessings assert the rationality and profitableness of prayer for *spiritual* blessings. But they forget that *Law* reigns in the spiritual as well as in the physical world; and hence, if it be irrational to pray for material blessings, it is equally so to pray for spiritual blessings. Indeed, I am not sure that there are not more difficulties attaching to prayer for spiritual benefits than there are to prayer for material

things. God knoweth that we have need of spiritual as well as physical things, and it is therefore reasonably asked, Will He not give them to us without our asking for them? Does it not seem presumptuous dictation on our part to ask Him for anything? Is it not a reflection upon His love and knowledge, as though He did not know or would not give what we need? We answer by asking: Is it presumptuous dictation for a child to ask his father for a present? Is it a reflection upon His love or knowledge? On the contrary, is it not the *proper attitude* of the child towards that Being who gave him life and all things? Is it not simply an acknowledgment of the filial relation, of the child's dependence upon his father? Yes, and the proper attitude of the creature towards the Creator—the Being in whom he lives and moves and from whom he derives all things—is the prayerful attitude. By asking God for material and spiritual blessings we admit our dependence upon Him, and surely such an admission is not only proper but profitable. Prayer is the highest act of *worship*, and as such it is meet that we should render it unto the Creator. Of course, in praying for material things, we must include the condition, “if it be Thy will”—and this not because we doubt God's power or goodness, but because we are ignorant as to the possible effects which the granting of our request may have upon the other members of the human family. Manifestly, no true brother would desire his father to give him a blessing, the giving of which would injure another member of the household, and yet through ignorance he might ask for it. So we may pray for things the granting of which would injure others—or even ourselves. A parent rightly refuses to give a sharp knife to a young child lest he cut his finger; and so God may withhold things for which we pray because they would either injure ourselves or others. Hence, when we pray it must be as the great Petitioner did, “Nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt,” and *keep on praying*.

But the begging prayer of which I have just been speaking is the lowest form of prayer, and perhaps the least profitable. The prayer of *thanksgiving* is more important than the petition. Surely no earnest-minded man will object to giving thanks for the blessings of life. Even Col. Ingersoll tells us that thankfulness is right and beautiful.

I know, of course, that we often feel that life is not worth living; that we have nothing to be thankful for; that it would have been better if we had not been born. But these feelings are exceptional, and are due to peculiar circumstances. Few of us will really agree with Byron when he says :

“Count o’er the joys thine hours have known,
 Count o’er thy days from anguish free ;
 And know, whatever thou hast been,
 ’Tis something better not to be.”

If we were to cast up fully and carefully the balance-sheet of pleasures and pains, most of us would find that, despite the days of anguish through which we have passed, our lives have had much, very much in them to be thankful for. We have had, at least, a few true, loving, devoted friends, who have stood by us when others deserted us. We have had, at least, the necessaries of life supplied. We may have enjoyed good health (the greatest of blessings) the greater part of our lives. We may have had the advantages of some education, the pleasures of books, of travel and of congenial society, and we may have got even a considerable amount of worldly goods and have attained to a position of influence in our respective communities; and it were sinful ingratitude in us not to be thankful for all these things.

I know, of course, that there are many thousands in the slums of our great cities to whom life is a heavy burden, and it must be admitted that *these* persons have nothing to be thankful for; non-existence would be a blessing to them. But these are decidedly in the minority, and thank God there is a *spirit* abroad in our land which is earnestly seeking the betterment of the conditions of these people; and for this they and we may be thankful. Let us, then, not brood over our miseries or the trials and troubles of others, but look for the silvery lining behind the cloud, and we shall, at least, in most cases, find it.

Finally, there is the prayer of simple *adoration*, and this I consider the highest form of prayer. We make a great mistake by supposing that the chief end of prayer is the attainment of certain material things. “All prayer,” says Robertson, “is to change the will human into submission to the will Divine.” Many men say that

prayer affects the pray-er more than it does God, and so they conclude that prayer is useless ; whereas the proper conclusion would be that this very fact makes prayer all the more necessary. What effect does prayer, real prayer, have upon the pray-er? What profit is it to him?

First, it develops in him a *humble* spirit. It makes him realize his dependence upon a Higher Power. Some one has facetiously said: "What a blessed thing it is that Providence has implanted in each one of us the feeling, 'I am the centre of the universe'!" But this feeling produces many evils. Self-esteem is all right, but self-conceit is abominable ; and it is often hard to draw the line between the two. We cannot, therefore, be too earnestly on our guard against a self-confidence and self-reliance that puts even God Himself on one side. This is practically what men do who refuse to recognize Him in all their ways and doings. They depend on self ; they make self their God ; and no earnest-minded man can approve such a course. Who does not admire the meek and humble man, and believe that he should rule the earth? Who can read the story of Moses pleading with the Lord that He should send some one more worthy than himself to deliver the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, and not feel the greatness of the man? Who is not drawn to Him who came not to be ministered unto but to minister to the lowest and the poorest?

How eager is every biographer to record the fact that the man whose life he is writing was an humble-minded, unassuming man. This is what made Sir Isaac Newton and Charles Darwin so attractive and powerful. And while neither of these men perhaps prayed in the conventional manner, yet both possessed the prayerful spirit—the humble spirit which said, "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth." Each cherished the *receptive* spirit ; felt his littleness and the magnitude of the Creator and Creation. It may be, too, that this humility was due to early religious training. At any rate prayer is a great producer of humility. The very posture of prayer—the bending of the knee or the bowing of the head is conducive to humbleness. This is the significance of all the prostrations before kings and nobles, and this is why the proud man refuses to pray.

Again, prayer teaches *reverence*. The man who never

prays is almost sure to be an irreverent man. There may be exceptions to this statement—Mr. Darwin probably was one, but as a rule it is perfectly true. Reverence is just as necessary to the discovery of truth as humility is, and it is commended in all who possess it. The scoffer will scarcely find the truth. He considers life a farce or a joke. He seeks to gratify self and his sensual desires. He does not pierce beneath the surface of things to the unseen, the spiritual and the eternal. But the man of prayer does. The very fact that he prays shows that he believes in an Unknown Power who holds his destiny in His hands. He therefore watches the motions of this Power throughout Nature with awe and reverence. When he stands beside the casket or the tomb he recognizes that here is one of the most mysterious manifestations of the Unknown Power. It is impossible for such a man to be a scoffer. The prayerful spirit and posture are exclusive of this proud and scoffing spirit.

But the chief benefit of prayer is that it *helps us to overcome our sins*. I do not mean that prayer has a magical effect upon us—that it calls down some mysterious spirit or influence from the skies, who works in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure. It may do this; we know not the power of matter, much less the power of spirit, and so we may not deny this idea of prayer any more than we may deny that God may give us material blessings for the asking. Whether “prayer may move the arm that moves the world” or not, it is quite conceivable and not at all irrational that God may *condition* the bestowment of material and spiritual blessings upon the asking for them, and this without disturbing the physical or the spiritual order, and hence we may believe that the gift of strength to overcome sin—the influx of the Divine Power into the human soul—may depend upon the *willingness* and *desire* of the soul to receive it; indeed, granting that the soul is essentially a *free* power, it must consent to and desire the influence of the Divine Spirit, else its freedom would be destroyed. But while, I have no objection to this view of prayer, yet I am now speaking of a simpler operation of prayer, viz., its *purifying effect* upon the soul. Christ rightly said, the man who looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery already with her in his *heart*, and He urged that we should cleanse that which is *within* the

cup and platter, and the outside would cleanse itself. In other words, pure thoughts must breed pure actions, as evil thoughts must breed evil actions.

The covetous man suffers the thought of money to take such possession of his soul that he finally cannot refrain from stealing. The licentious man dwells on the pleasures of sensual indulgence until he betrays the innocent, truthful girl by his side. But prayer prevents all this. I mean real prayer does—not the prayer of the hypocrite and Pharisee. The man who yearns for purity and wrestles by his bedside for power to overcome temptation will never rob a bank or debauch a fellow-creature. Just as the confession of our sins to our fellow-men often helps us to live more worthy lives, so their confession to the great God helps. Just as the thought that the eye of man is upon us—that public opinion would condemn our action—prevents us from doing things we would otherwise do, so, in a higher degree, the thought (expressed in prayer) that the Creator's eye is upon us and that the Almighty disapproves of certain acts, prevents us from committing them. None but the atheist is excusable for not praying, for prayer is the great purifier of the soul.

We thus see that the profit of prayer is* very great. It develops and strengthens our moral and spiritual natures. It first of all expresses our belief in a Personal (or Spiritual) God, who resides in and presides over nature, and not only gives us our daily bread by His ordinary providence, but may also give us special material blessings. It cultivates a spirit of thankfulness, a spirit of humility, a spirit of reverence and a spirit of purity, and surely no one will deny that these are great benefits to human nature—to individuals and to society; without them earth would be hell. Man has a moral and spiritual nature, as well as an intellect; and while I agree with the most earnest and enthusiastic advocate of intellectual development both in the individual and society, yet I urge just as earnestly that the man who develops *only* his intellectual nature is only half a man. Many of the mightiest and wisest men of earth have been the most prayerful. Think of Jacob wrestling all night with the Unknown One and refusing to let Him go until He blessed him! Think of Moses, the Solon of Israel, pleading with Jehovah in the solitudes of Sinai! Think of David, the great poet-king crying, "Against Thee

only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight!" Think of Solomon, the wisest of monarchs, begging for wisdom from the Divine Word and offering up that immortal prayer at the dedication of his magnificent Temple (1 Kings viii.) Think of the glorious company of the Apostles, the goodly fellowship of the prophets, the noble army of martyrs whose burning words of prayer come floating across the ages as incense from the altars of holy hearts! Above all, think of Him who gave us the "Lord's Prayer," and who during His whole life was wont to retire regularly to mountain or desert to commune with the Father! Think of Him in the awful shades of Gethsemane, and listen to His heartrending cry upon the Cross, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do! and tell me whether you can believe that the only answer received was a hollow echo through the vast void of nothingness? No! No! Let him who *can* believe this do so; but as for me, I believe that the instinct of prayer in man came from God and is satisfied by God, and the treasures of this world—the great discoveries of the intellect—are as baubles compared with the spiritual blessings prayer obtains. Give me wealth, but let it be sanctified wealth. Give me intellect, but let it be sanctified intellect! Give me the intellectual and the material, but above all give me the spiritual, for in death the material must vanish away, but the spiritual must abide forever and ever!

SERMON VI.

WHAT IS THE EVIDENCE OF LIFE AFTER DEATH ?

Text :—It a man die, shall he live again ? —JOB xiv. 14.

THIS question of the old patriarch comes echoing across the centuries with all the solemn importance that it had when first asked. Indeed, in our day, the belief in immortality has perhaps been more widely questioned and doubted than ever before, and Job's question is therefore more pertinent and important than ever. It is a question, too, that should strike silence to the soul of even the most frivolous and thoughtless. "Man that is born of a woman hath but a short time to live and is full of misery. He cometh up, and is cut down, like a flower : he fleeth as it were a shadow, and continueth not. Man dieth and wasteth away : yea, man giveth up the ghost and *where* is he ?" It is not a mark of intellect or of character to speak lightly of death. It is meet that we should enter the chamber of death with muffled tread and silent tongue and solemn mien, for we stand before the most awful and mysterious fact of existence. "Talk as we will," says Frederick Robertson, "of immortality, there is an obstinate feeling that we cannot master, that we end in death. When we die we are surrendering all that with which we have associated existence. All that we know of life is connected with a shape, a form, a body of materialism ; and now that that is palpably melting away into nothingness, the coldest heart may be excused a shudder, when there is forced upon it, in spite of itself, the idea of ceasing forever to be."

Another fact even more terrible than this, is that death is not confined to human beings, but sweeps through the whole lower creation : and while some profound thinkers have believed in the future existence of at least the noblest

of the lower animals, yet the vast majority hold that man alone will be immortal. But why should he prove an exception to the great law of death? The *grandeur* of man, it is said, excludes him from the fate of other animals. He is "the lord of creation;" myriads of ages and infinite power and wisdom have been spent in his production, and it is irrational to believe that all this will be wasted—that God (or Nature, if you please) should build so noble a structure, as a child builds a playhouse, just for the purpose of knocking it down. There is much truth in this contention, yet this fact alone would not convince us of man's immortality, for consider the grandeur of the lower animals! Millions of ages and infinite power and wisdom have been spent in the production of the horse or the dog, yet they die and return to the dust from which they were originally taken. Or take even the insects. "Go," says Robertson, "and stand some summer evening by the river-side; you will see the May-fly sporting out its little hour, in dense masses of insect life, darkening the air a few feet above the gentle swell of the water. The heat of that very afternoon brought them into existence. Every gauze wing is traversed by ten thousand fibres which defy the microscope to find a flaw in their perfection. The omniscience and the care bestowed upon that exquisite anatomy, one would think, cannot be destined to be wasted in a moment.

Yet so it is: when the sun has sunk below the trees its little life is done. Yesterday it was not; to-morrow it will not be. God has bidden it be happy for one evening. It has no right or claim to a second, and in the universe that marvelous life has appeared once and will appear no more. May not the race of man sink like the generation of the May-fly? Why cannot the Creator, so lavish in His resources, afford to annihilate souls as He annihilates insects!" This is a very awful and startling question, for man, after all, is a mere atom of an atom in this great universe. Still, there are facts which at least cannot be lightly set aside, and which, to many minds, many of the profoundest minds, minds that are absolutely free from theological bias, seem sufficient to justify the belief that man shall live after death.

First of all, science has established no fact more clearly than it has the *radical distinction between the soul and the body*. One witness out of many to this fact is all we need

cite, Prof. John Tyndall. In his well-known and oft-quoted address or article on "Scientific Materialism" he says: "Granted that a definite thought, and a definite molecular action in the brain, occur simultaneously, we do not possess the intellectual organ, nor apparently any rudiment of the organ, which would enable us to pass by a process of reasoning from the one to the other. *They appear together, but we do not know why.* Were our minds and senses so expanded, strengthened and illuminated as to enable us to see and feel the very molecules of the brain; were we capable of following all their motions, all their groupings, all their electric discharges, if such there be; and were we intimately acquainted with the corresponding states of thought and feeling, we should be as far as ever from the solution of the problem, 'How are these physical processes connected with the facts of consciousness?' The chasm between the two classes of phenomena would still remain intellectually impassable. Let the consciousness of love, for example, be associated with a right-handed spiral motion of the molecules of the brain, and the consciousness of hate with a left-handed spiral motion. We should then know when we love that the motion is in one direction, and when we hate that the motion was in the other; but WHY? would remain as unanswerable as before."

In his Belfast address, he says: "We can trace the development of a nervous system, and correlate with it the parallel phenomena of sensation and thought. We see with undoubted certainty that they go hand in hand. But we try to soar in a vacuum the moment we seek to comprehend the *connection* between the two."* The authority and truth of these words will not be questioned by any eminent scientist, and so we see that the idea of a few rather superficial thinkers that the brain *produces* thought, is the *cause* of thought—that the mind is a product or an appendage of the body, is false. The brain does not secrete thought as the liver secretes bile, as it used to be maintained, nor is thought a product of molecular motion, as sound is. You might make all the particles in the universe clash together, but they would not produce a thought; they would make a fearful clatter, but out of that crash of matter no *Hamlet* or *Macbeth* would arise in all his majesty and beauty. *Ideas* are not material things and cannot be

* "Fragments of Science," pp. 420, 528.

created by a material process; they cannot be manufactured. The brain is, at most, simply the organ of the mind, and this organ would give forth no music without the soul. But this radical distinction between mind and body is very important and significant, for *association* is not the same as *dependence*, and two things that are temporarily associated together may finally be separated and lead an independent existence. The piano and pianist are frequently associated together, but are easily separated, and the pianist may get another instrument to play upon. So when it is shown that, although the soul and body are now associated together in the most intimate manner, yet they are not *identical* and inseparable, one of the greatest objections to the soul's survival after the death of the body is removed, for it is precisely because all we know of life is connected with a material body—it is because we feel that we are so inextricably mixed up with our bodies that when they are dissolved we must go with them—that we dread death as the end of all. That dread is seen to be groundless. It is only fair to Tyndall, Spencer, Huxley, and their school, to say that, while they admit that the soul and body are not identical—are, indeed, radically distinct—they nevertheless hold that the *post-mortem* survival of the soul cannot be proved. Their idea seems to be this: The body consists of a series of states; it changes its nature, or constitution, every seven years or thereabouts, and so the bodies we now have are not those we had in childhood. The soul, likewise, is a series of *thoughts* and *feelings*; it changes with the body; the thoughts of the child are not the thoughts of the man. We have, therefore, according to these philosophers, two series of phenomena, intimately associated together yet radically different, and we believe that one of the series will by and by cease to exist; why not believe that both will? Why should one continue after the other ends? These profound thinkers doubt whether one will continue when the other ceases. But Prof. Huxley frankly admits that one of the series *may* continue without the other. "Leaving aside the problem of the substance of the soul," he says: "and taking the word 'soul' simply as a name for the series of mental phenomena (thoughts, etc.) which make up an individual mind: it remains open to us to ask whether that series commenced *with*, or *before*, the series of phenomena which constitute

the corresponding individual body; and whether it terminates with the end of the bodily series, or goes on after the existence of the body has ended."* It is thus seen and admitted that even if the soul be only a series of thoughts and feelings, not a distinct *substance* or *thing*, its immortality is still possible. But this doctrine of the soul is rejected by the profoundest metaphysicians, who claim that the soul is a *thing*, not a series of somethings. It is true that my thoughts as a man are not the same as the thoughts I had as a boy, but *I* am the same; *memory* and *consciousness* declare it. If my soul is not the same soul that said and did so many naughty things twenty years ago, why do I remember them with remorse? How could I remember them at all? *How could the new pieces of soul-stuff have got and retained the impressions of the old soul whose place they had taken?* No! The soul is *not* a mere series of thoughts and feelings. There must be some *thing* to think and feel before there could be thoughts and feelings. As well talk about sensation and motion without a body to move as talk about thoughts without something to think. Moreover, I know I am the same person that I was twenty years ago, albeit a more highly developed person, and this simple fact of consciousness smashes to atoms all analogies between bodily changes and mental states. Hence we conclude that neither materialism nor agnosticism can disprove either the existence or immortality of the soul.

The second important fact which points to the immortality of the soul is its *derivation from a power or energy which is itself eternal*. Mr. Spencer tells us that "the Power manifested throughout the universe distinguished as material, is the same Power which in ourselves wells up under the form of consciousness."† He means that the energy which operates nature is *two sided*; in one form it appears as matter, in another as mind. He does not mean that the soul is material, or a product of matter, for he tells us that it would be more reasonable to translate physical phenomena into mental phenomena, to call matter spirit or a mode of spirit, than it would be to convert mind into matter.‡ Since, then, Spencer no less than Tyndall admits the radical distinction between the soul and body

* Huxley's "Life of Hume," Chapter IX, on "The Soul and Immortality."

† "Ecclesiastical Institutions," p. 839.

‡ "Principles of Psychology," I., pp. 162 and 159.

and since he further tells us that the soul is an *effluence* from the Eternal Energy which created and sustains all nature—since it is a spark flashed forth from the Divine Light, we believe that the soul partakes of the nature of its source, and may therefore exist with it forever. In other words, Mr. Spencer really agrees with the writer of Genesis i. that man is created in the image of God; his soul is a miniature of the great Soul of the universe, and hence is capable of continued, everlasting existence.

But it would be urged just here, Mr. Spencer claims that *all* things proceed from this one Power, the lower animals, as well as man, and hence if such a derivation of the human soul proves its immortality, we must conclude that the lower animals, that come from the same source, are likewise immortal. This is one of the greatest difficulties in the doctrine of man's immortality, but I think the theory of evolution itself removes it.

According to this doctrine, there has been going on from the beginning of the present order of things a twofold development—viz., a development of material *forms* and a development of immaterial *forces*.

The physical evolution resulted in the human body, the highest material form possible, and force evolution produced the human soul. By reason of this onward and upward movement of forces they would finally become so *concentrated* and highly *developed* as to form a power capable of individual and continued existence. The soul of man, therefore, may be believed to have been *individualized*, that the return of the lower forces to the fund from which they were taken does not involve its destruction.

The Creator has erected the Temple of Humanity by means of the scaffolding of the lower creation, but the removal of this scaffolding will not destroy the temple. While, therefore, the lower forces, gravity, chemical affinity, and even life and the anima (or mind) of the lower animals may be correlated and convertible one into the other, yet the high development of the human spirit may be believed to exclude it from their final fate.

The superiority of man to the lower creatures is admitted by all, and urgently insisted upon by the evolutionists.

Man can solve the great problems of mathematics; he can reason about the grand questions of Duty; he can turn his eye inward and reflect upon that mysterious some-

thing called Self; he can study its actions and laws; he can glance backward through the misty ages and picture to his mind's eye that mighty chaos that rolled through the infinite darkness "in the Beginning"; he can trace the gradual development of this magnificent universe out of that chaotic clash of atoms; he can rise superior to all this, and think of the Supreme Being who gave birth to this wonderful order, and before that Being he bows his head and bends his knee in profoundest humility and awe! This cannot the lower creatures do. We cheerfully admit their wonderful powers of mind and body; we do not deny that we are closely related to them; we gladly recognize all the merits of brute creation; yet we must still consider it brutal and far inferior to man. The glimmerings of mind in our humble kindred were but the streaks which preceded the rising of the sun of humanity, and as he ascends towards the zenith of eternity they disappear in their primeval darkness.

A third fact which points to a life after death is *the failure involved in creation* on any other supposition. It may be hard to believe in the soul's immortality; difficulties surround this belief; but the belief that death ends all is more incredible. If this be so, then, indeed, the great development stretching back through the ages to the time when the morning stars of creation sang together, has been a movement without a meaning or a goal. God (or Nature, if you please) has been guilty of the folly of constructing a magnificent organism just for the purpose of destroying it. But if death does *not* end all; if the outward and material be simply a sign of the inward and spiritual—if the grand process of development is to continue—if, in short the finite and temporal will develop into the infinite and eternal—then there is some *reason* in the universe; otherwise it is "confusion worse confounded." Hence we may hold, with Prof. John Fiske, that the more thoroughly we comprehend that process of evolution by which things have come to be what they are, the more we are likely to feel that to deny the everlasting persistence of the spiritual element in man is to rob the whole process of its meaning. Such a crowning wonder (as the soul's immortality) seems no more than the fit climax to a creative work that has been ineffably beautiful and marvelous in all its myriad stages."

It is one of Mr. Spencer's profoundest ideas that the Deity may be something higher than Personality : He may transcend Intelligence and Will as far as these transcend mechanical motion.*

May not this be the germ of truth in the Trinitarian idea of God? Certainly the "personality" spoken of by Trinitarians is something quite different from personality such as we know it in every-day life.

But if God be something higher than we can imagine (and who doubts this?), if there be modes of Being in the unseen world and beyond the tomb which far transcend any which we know on earth, does not a boundless vista of existence open up before us adown which may march the great procession of Humanity through the coming ages of the future? At any rate, it is more reasonable to believe in such a continuous development of things, especially of souls, than it is to believe in their disappearance in the night of nothingness.

A fourth fact which suggests immortality is the *universal belief of man* in this doctrine. There is no belief so universal. Tribes of savages have been found that had no religion—or, at least, none that the discoverers considered worthy of this sacred name—but no tribe has been found that did not believe in *ghosts*, and, therefore, in the survival of the soul after death.

The ancient Egyptians embalmed the bodies of their dead in order that the soul might reinhabit them ; the old Greeks and Romans pictured the unseen world filled with the ghostly shades of the departed wandering amid the delights of Elysium or in the gloomy realms of Tartarus ; the Hindu and the Buddhist dream of eternal rest in the bosom of Brahm ; the Chinese worship their ancestors ; the American Indian looks forward to the "happy hunting-ground" ; the lowest savage of Africa or the South Sea Islands believes that the ghosts of his dead friends lurk in the neighboring bush or roam about their old homes when night flings her dark mantle over the earth. This universal belief in immortality declares it to be a *natural* instinct of the soul, and we cannot believe that all men are deceived—that the deepest and most universal beliefs of the soul are false—that man's nature gives him the lie. The soul believes in its own persistence, and feels itself

* "First Principles," p. 109.

capable of eternal life, and yearns for it. In the physical world no organ exists without a sphere of action : every part of the body performs a definite work. The eye is made for seeing, and, accordingly, light is furnished that it *may* see. The ear is made for hearing, and, accordingly, the atmosphere exists as a medium of sound. The hand is made to feel, and hence there are things to be felt. Shall we, then, believe that the eye of the soul may perceive the Eternal City as Moses saw the Promised Land from Pisgah's lofty height only to die without entering into its joys? Shall we believe that the spiritual ear may catch the strains of celestial choirs only to have them drowned by the roar and crash of perishing worlds? Shall we believe that the hand of faith may grasp the throne of the Eternal only to be hurled into the abyss of Annihilation? Never! All the voices of the past protest, and declare that beyond the snows of this chill world "there is a land of pure delight, where saints immortal reign." As I stand beside the good king David, bending over the dead body of his beloved child, and hear him cry, "I shall go to him, though he shall not return to me!" As I sit with Job in his sackcloth and ashes, and listen to that ringing exclamation, "I *know* that my Redeemer liveth, and apart from my flesh shall I see God!" As I witness the stoning of saintly Stephen, and hear his death-cry, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!" As I stand in Paul's prison cell, and hear him exclaim, in full assurance of faith, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, and henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness!" As I stand amid the flames of the martyrs, and witness them submitting to the fires of hell in the hope of the joys of heaven, I *cannot* believe that there is nothing immortal—nothing Godlike in man! Above all, when I hear that heart-rending cry of Christ upon the cross: "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit!" I cannot believe that only a hollow echo through the vast void of nothingness was its only answer. It would be giving the lie to the deepest convictions of the soul; it would be stamping the noblest work of God with the mark of deception and sham, and this would be irrational.

It is said that Death is the bourne whence no traveller e'er returns, and this is generally true; yet I think we have sufficient evidence to show that there has been, at least,

one great exception to this rule, in the case of Jesus Christ. The resurrection of Christ, along with all other miracles, has been most violently attacked by the ruthless skepticism of our day, and it has been shown that many details of the stories relating this event are of unknown authorship and are unreliable, and yet, despite all, it seems to me that the kernel of the stories is untouched. Let it be granted that the authorship of the Gospels, as they now stand, is unknown—that the authorship of many of the Epistles is equally unknown—yet all these writings confessedly date back to the close of the first and beginning of the second century of our era, while the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, Corinthians and some others are admitted to be the works of St. Paul, written some twenty-five years after the death of Christ. Strip off whatever accretions seem to have gathered around the faith in the re-appearance of Jesus after death to His disciples; admit that His *bodily* resurrection cannot be proved—yet even so we may believe that He made Himself known to His disciples after His death; He sent them “a telegram from heaven” that He was alive for evermore. It cannot be denied that all the disciples *believed* that they saw the risen Jesus. Hundreds of them believed they saw Him, at the same time, and they succeeded in convincing others of this fact, and upon it founded the Christian Church. The theory of visions—the claim that they only *imagined* that they saw Him alive after He was dead—is incredible. One condition is indispensably necessary to such visions or imaginings. Those who have them are generally possessed by “a fixed idea” that a certain event will happen.* But this necessary condition was not supplied in the case of the disciples of Christ. The crucifixion utterly shattered all their hopes about His establishing the Messiah’s kingdom, and the story about Thomas’s doubt, as well as the stories about the disbelief of the other disciples in the resurrection, show that they did not *expect* any such occurrence.† Something, therefore, must have happened outside of the minds of the disciples to create this belief, and, taking the New Testament as a whole, it seems to me not irrational to believe that Jesus appeared as a spirit to His disciples after His

* See Carpenter’s “Mental Physiology,” pp. 619–623, 664–669, etc.

† See Row’s “Bampton Lectures,” Lect. VII and Christlieb’s “Modern Doubt,” Chap. VII., etc.

death. Of course, if science did not show that there *is* a spirit in man—if it disproved God's existence and the soul's existence, then, indeed, no amount of historical evidence could neutralize this demonstration. But we have just seen that science does not disprove either the existence of God or the soul. On the contrary, it furnishes many facts in proof of these two important beliefs, and, believing in God and the soul, believing that He sends men into the world to teach religion, as well as science and philosophy and poetry, we may believe that He sent Jesus for this purpose, and that through Him life and immortality have been brought to light; the throbbing hopes which nature inspires in the soul are confirmed by the more positive assurance of the great Teacher.

But do you tell me, my friends, that I have not proved the immortality of the soul, after all? Well, no; I have not proved it as you would demonstrate a proposition in mathematics on the black-board. I have not put my finger on its abode beyond the grave, and said, "Behold, there it is!" But I have stated facts which you, as reasonable men and women, cannot ignore; and they are sufficient to show that whether there is another life or not, it is well worth our while to live as though there were. They are sufficient to afford a basis for faith—to confirm the natural convictions and instincts of the soul. No one accepting them can be justly accused of undue credulity, for we accept many opinions as true the proofs of which are much weaker than the evidences of the soul's immortality. Thus, we believe that *light* is produced by the vibration of the particles of a substance called *ether*, but we do not know that there is such a thing as this ether. We are forced to *assume* its existence in order to account for the phenomena of light. We believe that sound is produced by the vibration of the particles of the atmosphere, but we cannot prove this, and some acute thinkers have seriously doubted it. We believe that matter is composed of infinitely small *atoms*, which are held together in a body by forces resident in these atoms; yet when we attempt to think this proposition out in intelligible terms we are hopelessly puzzled. These and many other scientific beliefs rest on pure assumptions, and yet the assumptions are necessary to explain certain facts. So, we contend, there are facts which point to the continuance of the human soul

after death. This assumption is necessary to the *perfection* of the grand evolution of things that has been going on for millions upon millions of ages ; necessary to the explanation of the process ; necessary to prevent our being put to intellectual confusion ; necessary to the satisfaction of the deepest instincts of the soul ; necessary to the discharge of duty in its highest sense ; necessary to make life endurable and happy.

Our entire life consists in balancing facts against facts and probabilities against probabilities, and were we to act upon demonstrative evidence only, we would not act at all. Let us, therefore, not demand it in the case before us. In any event belief in immortality cannot hurt us. On the contrary, it is an *ennobling* belief. It raises us above the brute, and fills us with aspirations that stretch on into the depths of eternity. It consoles us in our sorrows and robs death of its terrors. It elevates life in every respect. It makes God appear as the Good Father and man as the child of the Highest.

I would not dogmatize on this profound subject, but, oh ! I cannot, *cannot* believe in the hard philosophy of Materialism and Fate. If my faith be only a dream, let me continue to dream. If it be only a vision, it is a glorious vision, and I would not be robbed of it. I must rather exclaim with Whittier :

“ I know not what the future hath
Of marvel or surprise ;
Assured alone that life and death
His mercy underlies.

“ And so, beside the silent sea,
I wait the muffled oar ;
No harm from Him can come to me
On ocean or on shore.

“ I know not where His islands lift
Their fronded palms in air ;
I only know I cannot drift
Beyond His love and care.”

“ Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.” Amen.

SERMON VII.

THE GOD-FILLED MAN.

Text :—In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.—COLOSSIANS ii. 9.

IN order to understand the doctrine of Christ's Incarnation or Divinity, we must first get a correct idea of God. The popular theological conception of God holds that there are *four* Persons in the Godhead, viz., three Divine Persons and one human person. The important question, therefore, is, What does this word "Person" mean as applied to God? We know, of course, what it means as applied to man. Man is a twofold being, consisting of a body and a soul. Imagine his body stripped off, and you would have left only his ghost—his spirit, and this is believed to be a power capable of thinking, acting and discerning between good and evil. In other words, man's spiritual nature consists of his intellect, his conscience and his will. These are the three essential elements in spirit.

Now, of course, God has no body. He is "without body, parts or passions." He is pure Spirit—the Infinite and Eternal Mind, Conscience and Will. Subtract all of man's moral or spiritual imperfections and magnify infinitely his perfections, and you have the popular theory of the Godhead—or rather you will have one-third of that theory, for the popular doctrine of God is that He consists of three such Infinite Persons or Spirits as that defined. The Athanasian Creed, which is the authoritative expression of this doctrine, says: "The Father is eternal, the Son is eternal and the Holy Spirit is eternal; and yet there are not three eternals, but one Eternal. Likewise, the Father is Omnipotent, the Son is Omnipotent and the Holy Spirit is Omnipotent; and yet there are not three Omnipotents, but one Omnipotent," and finally, "the Father is God, the Son

is God and the Holy Spirit is God, and yet there are not three Gods, but one God." In other words, the creed means that there are three Spirits united in one Spirit in the Godhead, but I am free to confess that this seems to me a flat contradiction—not a mystery, but a contradiction in terms and ideas. Of course, God is a mystery, everything is a mystery, even a straw and certainly man are both great mysteries, but this theory of God seems to be a verbal contradiction, and I have never read or heard an exposition of the doctrine, which did not either explain away two of the Persons in the Godhead, or leave the contradiction baptized with the name of "mystery." Still, that is the traditional and popular idea of God, and it is further maintained that the Second Person of the Godhead took man's nature upon Him, so that "in Him two whole and perfect natures, that is, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together, never to be divided" hence there are four Persons in the Godhead.

Another idea of God, held by many of the ablest minds of our day, which is even older than the Athanasian doctrine, dating back to the third century, is this: God (it is said) is the one Infinite and Eternal Spirit that created and sustains all things. But He manifests Himself in three different ways—in one as Creator, in another as Redeemer, and in a third as Sanctifier. In other words, the one God assumes three different forms, somewhat as an actor on a stage appears in different costumes: in one He appears as God the Father of all things: in another, He appears as God the Son redeeming mankind from sin in and through Jesus Christ; and finally, He appears as God the Holy Ghost completing the work which the Redeemer began; but in all forms He is one and the self-same Being. This idea of God is more popular among scientific men than the Athanasian doctrine, and certainly does seem to present less difficulty than that theory. But for my own part, I consider both views simply and mainly interesting as ingenious speculations on a great subject, which the human mind cannot fathom. They are "words flung out at a great subject." While, therefore, I would prefer the second to the first theory of the Godhead were I forced to accept one of them, yet I am not compelled to accept either. I am content to rest my faith in God upon the simple words of Jesus in the Gospels. I believe He is Spirit (John iv.

24)—the Infinite and Eternal Spirit everywhere manifested in nature, who revealed Himself to the Prophets and Apostles, and in Jesus Christ, under the name of Father Son and Holy Ghost and as such I worship Him. But what is His exact nature—what is exactly meant by the names “Father,” “Son” and “Holy Ghost”—what is the relation of the three “Persons,” or Divine Essences, to each other, the Scriptures do not say, and man cannot find out. He cannot, as old Job long ago told him, by searching find out God; he cannot find out the Almighty to perfection. He is high as heaven; what can we do? deeper than hell; what can we know? He is larger than the earth or the universe (Job xi. 7–9) and comprehendeth it, as it were, in the hollow of His hand, and since our telescopes fail to penetrate the depths of space to the limits of the universe; since our microscopes cannot analyze matter so that we may know what it is; why should we attempt to fathom the nature of the Creator and sustainer of all things? Nothing but failure has ever resulted; nothing but failure can ever result from an attempt to “fly up into the secrets of the Deity on the waxen wings of the human understanding.” Let us, therefore, content ourselves in the simple belief that God is—that “in Him we live, move, and have our being”—that “He is about our paths and about our bed and spieth out all our ways”—that if we were to ascend up into heaven, we would find Him there; if we were to make our bed in the grave, behold, He would be there also. If we were to take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost part of the universe, even there His hand would lead us, and His right hand hold us. (Psalm cxxxix. 8–12). He is the great and good Spirit who is not far from every one of us. but gives us rain and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with gladness, and it is this idea of God which I would impress upon you—the God that works in nature and in man and upholds all things by the word of His power—the living God, not the dead idol of traditional and popular theology; and if you believe in this God, then you may let such speculations about His nature as those mentioned go to the winds.

Until recently God was thought of as a Being living apart from and outside the universe He had created. It was believed that He created the world, wound it up, set

it a-going and then withdrew into the infinite solitude surrounding the world from which He watched its progress and occasionally stepped down to earth to instruct men as to what they should do and punish them for the wrong they had done by sending disease or floods or earthquakes upon them. But this idea of God has been more and more given up, on account of the difficulties it involves, until now nearly all eminent theologians hold that God is the Infinite and Eternal Spirit that resides in and presides over all Nature; the forces of Nature have their root in His will; the motions of Nature are motions of His power; the thoughts of men flow forth from the Infinite Thinker; the good deeds of men are prompted by the Good Spirit. In short, God is thought of as the Soul of the Universe, from whom all things proceed, and in whom all things consist. And holding such an idea of God we can more easily understand His manifestation in Jesus Christ. "In Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." In other words, Jesus was the God-filled man; He was filled full of God; His body was packed, so to speak, with Deity. To make this clear let me quote the striking words of an English clergyman.

"You ask me," he says, "whether all God was in Jesus. I say, No; Jesus says, No. Sides of the Almighty, of the Invisible, the Eternal—aspects inconceivable to man—never could be revealed through man's nature. God overlaps Jesus. 'My Father is greater than I,' he says.

"You ask me of Torbay or Barmouth creek whether it is sea? I say, Yes. You ask if it is the whole of the sea? I say, No. Yet a cupful, or a pailful and every part of the bay or creek is true sea—the sea, having its own mighty range and infinite potencies, has verily and indeed flowed into that earth-bound creek. All that is in Torbay is sea, but all the sea is not in Torbay; so all that is in Jesus is God, but all God is not in Jesus." In Him God dwelt bodily. The human spirit of Jesus flowed forth from the infinite ocean of Spirit, which surrounds and pervades the universe and man, and the union of His human Spirit with the Divine was essential and permanent, just as the earth-bound bay is connected with the ocean—is composed of the same substance. But how do we know that this was so? How can we prove that Jesus was filled full of God? From these three great facts; 1. Every man's spirit

comes from God, for He is the Father of all Spirits. The spirit of Jesus, therefore, could not be derived from any other source. Mr. Spencer himself tells us that that "Power manifested throughout the universe, distinguished as material, is the same Power which in ourselves wells up under the form of consciousness." That is merely another way of saying that man is created in the image of God, His spirit is a miniature of the infinite and Eternal Spirit, and Christ's spirit was a perfect finite transcript, so to speak, of the Divine Spirit. The difference between His human spirit and other spirits lay in its perfection. He was perfect; man is imperfect.

2. The general law or fact of spiritual development proves that Jesus was the God-filled man. According to the doctrine of development, there has been going on from the beginning of the present order of things a twofold development, viz., an evolution of material forms and an evolution of immaterial forces. The physical development resulted in the production of the human body, and the spiritual development produced the human soul. But at first the soul was little more than an appendage to the body, and through the long ages intervening between primitive and modern times, the soul has been struggling to get the mastery over the body—the animal nature of man. In such spiritual giants as Abraham, Moses, Job, Isaiah, Buddha, Confucius, Zoroaster, Socrates, and Paul, the on-going wave of spirit rose very high, but it rose highest in Jesus of Nazareth. He stands supreme among the spiritual Goliaths, as even the most radical skeptics admit. Those other God-sent men were only partially filled with God, but all that was in Jesus was God: "in Him dwelt the fulness of God." Nor is this mere speculation. On the contrary, it was as natural and as necessary that the spiritual evolution should reach completion and perfection in some individual as it was that physical evolution should end in the production of the human body. "But," it will be said, "after the production of the first human body, numbers of other bodies were produced, and are still being produced. Why, then, are there not more Christs produced? Ought there not to be, according to this view?" I answer: He—Jesus—was the realization of God's idea of what man ought to be. He is our exemplar: we are to become more and more like Him until He is completely formed in us

(Gal. iv. 19)—not indeed by a miracle, or sudden leap in spiritual development, such as occurred when He was born, but by a more gradual process; so that while there have not been, and doubtless will not be, any more Christs, there are and will be many Christlike persons, who will be slowly but surely developed into perfect men, “unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ” (Ephes. iv. 13). “He was the possibility of the human race made real;” and if this possibility is not fully realized in other cases in this life, it will be in the next. That is the New Testament doctrine of regeneration or the “new birth.”

3. The sinlessness of Jesus proves Him to have been filled with God, and that He was sinless is amply proved by historical evidence. It is pretty generally supposed, among a certain class of thinkers, that, because the New Testament has been vehemently attacked by skeptical critics during the present century, its authority is utterly exploded. But these people should remember that even the most radical critics admit that St. Paul wrote at least four, and many of them admit that he wrote eight or ten, of the epistles usually attributed to him, and these epistles date back to within twenty-five years of the death of Christ—a period no longer than that intervening between the late Civil War and the present day—so that we are by no means confined to the Gospels for proofs of Christ’s divine character. On the contrary, St. Paul’s unquestionably genuine epistles are the earliest records of Christ’s life and teaching, and even if the Gospels had been lost we would still have ample historical evidence to prove that all of Christ’s disciples believed Him to be sinless and worshipped Him as God’s Son. And let us consider what this means. Suppose a man were to arise now, from some obscure hamlet in our land, and were to proclaim himself to be sinless, what sort of reception would he meet with? Why, he would be hooted and hissed at. We actually do laugh at certain people who claim to be “sanctified”; and we do so because a perfectly holy man would be a moral miracle. Human nature is the same in all ages. The old Jews, Greeks and Romans did not believe in human perfection any more than we do. They knew that there was none that doeth good; no, not one. They knew that all had sinned and come short of the glorious ideal of God, and hence the fact that a poor carpenter of Nazareth suc-

ceeded in convincing hundreds of men that He was sinless is sufficient to satisfy an unbiased mind that it was a fact. Indeed the very fact that He was crucified shows that He was an extraordinarily good man. The world has generally killed and persecuted its best men. The world loves darkness rather than light, because its deeds are evil. And because Jesus rebuked—unsparingly denounced—those evil deeds, he was crucified. And if so brave a man as He had had imperfections, if He who boldly proclaimed Himself the great reformer of His age had been like other men, this fact would have been laid hold of as an excuse for His death, but not the faintest whisper against His moral character comes floating across the centuries. We know of Abraham's sins and Paul's shortcomings, and Luther's weaknesses, but the challenge of Jesus, "Which of you convicteth me of sin?" remains unanswered. Every tradition about Him and His life and death declares Him to have been a sinless man. Moreover, we do not admit that, because the authorship of the Gospels is uncertain, and some of their details unreliable, they are wholly untrustworthy. On the contrary, even the most radical skeptics admit that they contain the essential facts of our Lord's teaching. They reject a few of the stories about miracles, and interpret other miracles as natural events; but they admit that the teaching of the Lord's Prayer, the Sermon on the Mount, the Parables, etc., is too profound and spiritual and true to have come from the simple-minded Jewish and Galilean peasants who wrote the Gospels, and hence the great Teacher must have been the author of it. But we urge that it was not only impossible for such writers to forge such productions as the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount, but it was equally impossible for them to forge the sketch of Christ's *character* given in the Gospels. Let us grant, for the sake of argument, that the Gospels, as they now stand, were not written by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John; let us suppose that they are complete forgeries: then what? Why, we are forced to believe that the greatest religious Character in history was conceived and drawn by a number of Jewish and Galilean peasants who could scarcely speak and write correctly! Such a supposition is absurd, and was therefore rejected by the late John Stuart Mill, who was considered an atheist by many, and was certainly a radical skeptic. If each writer of the Gospels

had been a Shakespeare, such a result could not have been accomplished ; for Christ, as all admit, was a greater character than any Shakespeare ever imagined or produced. We know that the writers of the Gospels were not Shakespeares, and therefore we are compelled to believe that they have given us a true sketch of the Master they loved. It is easier to believe this than to believe that their sketch is a forgery. Even if it be admitted, as some claim, that they made use of the Old Testament ideas of the Messiah in working out their picture of Jesus, yet there were so many hands employed in painting this picture (and there was evidently no collusion between them)—the work was done in so inartificial a manner—it is so plain from the narratives themselves that the writers were not striving to paint a picture—a fancy-sketch ; the story is so simple and childlike that no one would ever dream of its being a forgery unless this idea was suggested to him either by a skeptic or the stories of miracles. But we may leave on one side the stories of miracles, save only such as can be explained as natural events, and enough unquestionably historical matter is left to prove our point. For it must be remembered, as already stated, that the genuine epistles of St. Paul confirm the Gospel sketch of Christ's character. They do not, indeed, confirm all the stories in the Gospels, but the essential facts of Christ's life and character are confirmed by the great Apostle, who had every means of learning the truth. Finally, remember, that for nineteen centuries the most enlightened portion of the human race has worshipped this Character as Divine. Even those who to-day attack most violently traditional opinions about the Bible, most strongly assert the transcendent character of Christ. Indeed, the most radical do not lay hands upon the Master, but avow infinite respect for Him.

For such reasons, then, we believe that Jesus was filled full of God. Every man's spirit comes ultimately from God, flows forth from the infinite ocean of Spirit, and so Christ's must have come from the same source.

Secondly, the onward and upward movement of Spiritual development would naturally produce such a perfect moral and spiritual nature. And finally, He not only convinced the men of His own time that He was sinless, but for nineteen centuries He has held supreme sway over the hearts of the greatest men that have lived, and therefore

we adore Him as the Son of God. "In Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

We do not appeal to the miracles He wrought, for other religious teachers have performed almost if not quite as great miracles as He performed. We do not appeal to His extraordinary birth, for the stories of His birth are of too uncertain authorship to be accepted as literally correct, and the mode of His birth has little or nothing to do with the fact of His divine character. St. Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel believed in His divinity, but neither says a word about His birth being different from that of other men. He came to take man's nature upon Him, and, therefore, it was proper that He should enter this life as other men do. The Divine Spirit could flow into humanity—into Christ's body—without setting aside the laws of generation. But while we lay no special stress on the stories of our Lord's miracles, yet they do help to prove that He was a great man, just as similar stories about Moses, Elijah, and St. Paul show that they were great men. These stories cannot be rejected as utterly worthless and false, even if we understand the miracles to have been natural events. The beautiful stories about the birth, in particular—the angel-song, the worship of the wise men, the application of the prophecy of Isaiah about the Virgin-born Immanuel to Jesus—all tell in poetical form the faith of Christ's disciples in His spotless purity. He was, indeed, "conceived by the Holy Ghost." His perfect moral and spiritual nature was the special product of "the Lord and Giver of Life." When I said just now that "the natural" result of spiritual development would be the production of a perfect moral character, I did not for a moment intend to exclude the agency of God from this process—on the contrary, I consider that all natural forces have their root in the Divine Will, and what many attribute to Nature, I attribute to God. God is the great Developer as well as the Creator of all things. In the development of the world from primal chaos He has wrought many miracles, or produced extraordinary effects by an extraordinary operation of His will. Thus, when life was introduced upon our globe a special operation of His will occurred; a miracle was wrought. Again, when Mind in its lowest form, and especially in man, was introduced, another miracle was wrought. And finally, when the Perfect Man was given to

the world another miracle was wrought: a perfect moral and spiritual nature was produced by "the Lord and Giver of Life," through the media of man to woman; and this great fact is attested by the wonderful stories about His birth, but especially by His sinless life. Jesus, then, to quote the clergyman just quoted, "was God manifest in the flesh. The significance—the lifting power—the salvation of it lies here. Henceforth, doubt not: plant your foot on the rock. Man's love is God's love, only not so good: man's justice is God's justice, only not so impartial: man's right and wrong is God's right and wrong—it is in the *direction* of it, although not so infallible: man's power is God's power, only not so great. His ways are not our ways, not because they are different in kind, but because they are all wise and good, whereas our best attempts are mixed. But henceforth, we know Him—because He was manifest in the flesh. Jesus Christ is a true presentation and explanation of God's moral and spiritual nature, as far as that can be grasped by man. We do not any longer grope or wonder or puzzle about His will, His purpose to usward, or His character. The lowliest Christian is at last in a position to answer that ancient and bitter cry, "O that I knew where I might find Him!" with "I know in whom I have believed." God was in Christ reconciling the world into Himself; teaching men the Way, the Truth and the Life. That is one side of the incarnation—God in Man! The other side is Man in God! Jesus the Divine Representative of Human Nature! Every one of us in Him. That's the good news. A High Priest, indeed, He is, but not separated from us, not ignorant of our infirmities. The assurance of God's sympathy for us in Him is of the closest and most personal kind. No state, no mood, no friend or enemy, not ignorant crucifiers—not sinful women, nor any aliens from the commonwealth of Israel—can escape from the Lord of Humanity. The meshes of God's net are woven too close for that. Saints are caught and sinners are not let through. This is why the Gospel hath such subduing and universal fragrance. No position too low, for he was laid in a manger; no sorrow too deep, for behold and see whether there was any sorrow like unto His sorrow; no sin too dark, for was He not tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin? No suffering too intense, for did not He take the cup of agony brimful in Geth-

semane, and drain it to the dregs on the Cross? No pilgrims of the night so weary and forlorn but His voice reaches them in the darkness—"Come unto Me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest!"

O Christus Consolator! O Salvator Mundi! O Inexhaustible Humanity of God! O great heart of Jesus! "Rock of Ages cleft for me, let me hide myself in Thee!" Amen.

SERMON VIII.

UNSHAKEN RELIGIOUS BELIEFS.

Text:—And this *word*, yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain.—HEBREWS xii, 27.

It is commonly believed among Christians and non-Christians that the pulpit has nothing of positive importance to tell men; that, in fact, skepticism has put it on the defence, so that it has to fight for its very life, and has no time or power to impart information on great subjects which men need to live and die by. It is further believed by many that religious beliefs have been substantially exploded, and that what remains is not worth considering. In this sermon, therefore, I wish to show that there are many most important truths which have not only not been disturbed by the skepticism of our day, but have rather been confirmed. Many things have been shaken and removed, but only that those things which cannot be shaken might remain more securely established, and these unshaken truths furnish a deep and broad basis for the church and pulpit.

The first truth that has not been seriously disturbed is the *existence of God*. *Ideas* of God have been greatly altered. It is no longer possible to think of God as a sort of magnified man, seated on a golden throne outside of the universe, who, with the recording angel by His side and the Book of Remembrance before Him, is dotting down the deeds of men for which He will bring them to judgment at the last day. We must think of Him as the Power in and back of nature, who is everywhere present upholding, guiding, developing all things by the word of His might. This much even Mr. Spencer and the most radical skeptics grant. But we go further and insist that God is not simply the Power that operates nature; this Power is

endowed with *intelligence*, infinitely superior to man's mind, no doubt, yet the great prototype of the human mind. We can no longer prove the intelligence of Deity as the old theologians did by appealing to the eye, for instance, and arguing that He who designed and produced this wonderful organ must possess intelligence similar to that of the optician who fashions an opera-glass. There is this great difference between the eye and the opera-glass: the one grew from a little germ, the other was manufactured all of a piece. Man is known to be a development, or the product of a long course of development, and so we cannot argue that he was fashioned *de novo* out of clay and inspired with life and mind. But we must go further back: we must trace his genealogy back through the lower animals; nay, we must connect the animal and the plant kingdoms, yea, and the very organic and *inorganic* kingdoms of nature. We must begin with the *primeval chaos*, and out of the original "star dust" scattered throughout space we must trace the gradual unfolding of this grand and glorious universe, until at last man stands forth "the lord of creation." In short, we can no longer confine our attention to a single piece of God's workmanship and argue that He is a great carpenter who turns out eyes and men and things as some mechanic would his articles of manufacture, but we must let our vision sweep backward to the time when chaos rolled through space, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and doing this we may argue that the Power which organized that misty cloud of atoms into magnificent globes—suns, stars and planets—revolving around each other in heavenly harmony; the Power that clothed each with its appropriate dress; that originated life and mind, and endowed the original simple forms of life and mind with the power of developing into the wonderful being called man—such a Power cannot be a mere force or fate, working according to a necessity of its nature, but it must be endowed with some sort of intelligence, albeit an intelligence infinitely superior to the human mind. Even if it be admitted that the *stuff* out of which the universe has been evolved is eternal, yet the *orderly* process of evolution necessitates the assumption of an evolving Power possessing and acting according to a conscious *purpose*. We cannot believe that the beautiful development of things has been due to a "fortuitous con-

course of atoms." It must be attributed to an Almighty Will and Intelligence. But we do not stop here. The same line of thought will force us to predicate another important attribute of God, viz., benevolence. While we are often tempted, as we contemplate the enormous amount of suffering in the world, to believe that the Creator is cruel, yet when we remember that out of these very sufferings—out of this awful struggle for existence—has emerged this magnificent universe! When we see that the sufferings of past ages are not worthy to be compared with the glory that is now revealed throughout nature; when we reflect further, that the present order of things will go on developing into higher and higher forms of perfection and grandeur—that the very *destruction* of this present world will probably result in a better and a grander order of things—that the death of man and of the universe will be a birth into a higher life—we find it impossible to believe that God is cruel. We must rather believe that God is love—that whom He loveth He chasteneth, and though His scourging for the present seems to be grievous, it will yet redound to the welfare of the universe. But Prof. Huxley reminds us just here that this argument in proof of God's benevolence is radically defective. "There would be something in this argument," he says, "if, in Chinese fashion, the present generation could pay its debts to its ancestors; otherwise it is not clear what compensation the *Eohippus* (first horse) gets for his sorrows in the fact, that, some millions of years afterward, one of his descendants wins the Derby." The answer to this is very simple: The first horse's pleasures *overbalanced* his pains, and while he had to make some sacrifice for the sake of his descendants, it was a sacrifice for which he was amply compensated by the joys of existence. His sacrifice was more of a negative or *privative* nature than of a positive character. He was deprived of the high development of his descendant and the consequent pleasure of winning the Derby, but, like the infants in *limbus infantum*, he was happily unconscious of the joys of the Derby paradise, while his actual sufferings from being a prey to bigger and stronger animals, who finally devoured him, were not so great as the pleasure he had in feeding in green pastures, by still waters, on the many glorious spring days which he

enjoyed. Hence we conclude that God is both wise and good—intelligent and benevolent.*

Secondly. The fact of the *soul's* existence and immortality has not been disproved. On the contrary, science has shown that there is something in man which cannot be identified with what we call matter—with the material particles of his brain or body. It has further shown that this immaterial something has undergone such an enormous development, since it began its progress away back in the ages and away down the scale of being, that it has risen superior to everything around it and has become capable of eternal life, and we cannot believe that this youngest but best child of Mother Nature will be devoured by her as a ferocious animal sometimes devours its offspring. We may rather believe that those instinctive feelings and yearnings of the soul are destined to be satisfied with the joys of eternal existence.†

Third. The doctrine of *retribution* is undisturbed—is fully confirmed. If there is one fact which science proves beyond question it is that “whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap;” if he sows the wind, he will surely reap the whirlwind. “Sow an act, reap a habit. Sow a habit, reap a character. Sow a character, reap a destiny.” This awful fact is most awfully emphasized by science. In the physical sphere, we trace the sufferings of individuals back to the misdeeds or mistakes of themselves or their ancestors. Are they consumptive? Then they have either inherited it from persons who exposed themselves to physical conditions which produced this dread disease, or they have exposed themselves to such conditions and have reaped the necessary result. All disease is due to a violation of natural laws, and the only possible way to escape the penalty of such transgression is to find out what the laws of health are and conform to them. In the political and social sphere it is the same. Are we oppressed by corrupt politicians? It is because we have sacrificed at the polls principle for policy, brains for boodle. We have sown the wind of ignorance, greed, and selfishness, and have reaped the whirlwind of folly, oppression, and corruption. Are the slums of our great cities filled with human brutes? It

* Cf. the author's “Evolution of Man and Christianity,” Pt. II. Chap. vii.

† See above sermon on “Evidence of Life after Death.”

is because they have sold themselves, body and soul, to "the upper classes," who crack the whip of the slave-owner over them. Are we disturbed by anarchistic riots? It is because the upper classes are grinding the poor and the ignorant under their heel so terribly that they are compelled to wince. We have sown the firebrands of political and social degradation, and it is natural that they should burst forth as a volcano to consume us. So in the moral and religious sphere. Is society shocked by abominable scandals? Is virginity dishonored and the marriage relation abused? It is because of the low moral tone of public opinion. It is because money and lust are our gods, and character and religion are despised. Is the Church powerless before the attacks of skepticism? It is because the Church is unbelieving and worldly. And so science goes on to trace every ill that flesh is heir to back to its cause, and shows that if we would be happy we must seek the truth and do the right. "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap," both in this world and in the next. We may *hope* that—

"Good may fall, at last, far off
At last to all,
And every winter change to spring ;"

that—

"Not one life shall be destroyed,
Or cast as rubbish to the void
When God hath made the pile complete !"

But this we know: death does not destroy the soul, and as long as it exists, so long the dispositions it cherishes and the habits it forms must remain and produce their natural effects. He that is filthy, let him be filthy *still*; he that is righteous, let him be righteous *still*! is the awful sentence which science as well as Scripture has written over the portal of death.

Fourth. The *spiritual snpremacyp of Jesus Christ* is more securely and firmly established than ever. Note! I do not say that the Divinity or Deityship of Jesus is more widely accepted, for this, I fear, is not true. There is a strong, a very strong disposition on the part of the ablest and even some of the devoutest minds of our time to deny that Jesus was God's Son in the old sense of the word. I think that this is largely due to the disproportionate

emphasis which has hitherto been laid upon this article of the faith, and more especially to a misapprehension on the part of the popular mind of the doctrine of the Incarnation. Christ has been held up too much as God and too little as man, and the union of His Humanity with the Deity has been misconceived and misstated by many, and therefore His Divinity has been and is extensively doubted. I believe the day is not distant when the swing of the pendulum of popular opinion away from this faith will be reversed. Meanwhile, we must do all we can to make the doctrine of the Incarnation rational and acceptable, and there is no better way of doing it than by emphasizing the spiritual supremacy of Jesus. However much men doubt the Deityship of our Lord, one and all admit the transcendence of His character and teaching, over the characters and teachings of all other religious sages.

The praises of Buddha have been most beautifully sung by Mr. Arnold in "The Light of Asia." The wisdom of the Vedas—the Hindu Bible—has been fully exhibited. The merits of the Persian sage, Zoroaster, have been amply attested. The characters of Confucius and of Socrates have been vehemently eulogized. But ask any of the scholars that are the most deeply versed in this mystical lore, or that have most earnestly studied the lives of these great and good men, whether they prefer any one of them as a religious guide and teacher to Jesus of Nazareth, and not one of them will answer "Yes." Ingersoll avows "infinite respect" for Jesus. Renan declares that "He will never be surpassed." Lecky says: "Christianity has given the world an Ideal Character which through all the changes of eighteen centuries has filled the hearts of men with an impassioned love, and has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments and conditions; has not only been the highest pattern of virtue, but the highest incentive to its practice; and has exerted so deep an influence that it may be truly said that the simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists. Amid all the sins and failings, amid all the priestcraft, the persecution and fanaticism which have defaced the Church, it has preserved in the character and example of its Founder an enduring principle of regeneration."

No fear, then, that the spiritual supremacy of Jesus will ever be overthrown, and those who listen to such tributes to our Lord from such men as those just quoted need not doubt that, whatever may be the spasmodic wanderings of the human mind from this great Spiritual Magnet, it will, in time, return to it, as surely as the needle will seek the pole in spite of all deflections.

“Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.”

Jesus was never more loved, more revered, more ardently worshipped; He never exerted a greater influence than He does to-day; and if men would quit insisting upon their own *theories about* this Divine Character, and merely hold Him up in all His simplicity, grandeur and spiritual beauty before men, all would be drawn unto Him as their King and Saviour, their Guide through life and their Comforter in death.

Let me, therefore, insist that you do not trouble yourselves about the theological speculations which any one sets forth concerning Christ's nature, but accept Him in all His simplicity. If you cannot believe—or think you cannot believe in His divinity—then believe in His spiritual supremacy, and follow His example and obey His precepts to love God and your fellow-men, and, believe me, in time His real nature will burst upon you as it did upon doubting Thomas, and you will fall down before Him, exclaiming: “My Lord! and my God!”

Fifth. The superiority of the *Bible* as a moral and spiritual text-book, so to speak, has been demonstrated. Observe, again, I do not say the Bible is “inspired,” for I don't want to confuse your mind or embarrass this discussion by raising the question of inspiration. Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that the Bible is simply a book, and compare it with other sacred books, such as the Hindu Vedas, the Chinese Books of Kings, the Persian Zend-Avesta or the Mohammedan Koran. Will any one familiar with all these writings dare say that they are equal in spiritual power to the Old or New Testament? Listen to these remarkable words of Prof. Huxley: “How is the religious feeling, which is the essential basis of conduct, to be kept up in the present utterly chaotic state of opinion, without the use of the Bible? By the study of what other book could children be so much humanized,

and made to feel that each figure in the vast historical procession fills, like themselves, but a momentary space in the interval between two eternities, and earns the blessings or the curses of all time according to its efforts to do good and hate evil ? ”

Again, he says : “ Greatly to the surprise of many of my friends, I have always advocated the reading of the Bible, and the diffusion of the study of that most remarkable collection of books among the people. Its teachings are so infinitely superior to those of the sects, who are just as busy now as the Pharisees were eighteen hundred years ago, in smothering them under the precepts of men ; it is so certain to my mind that the Bible contains within itself the refutation of nine-tenths of the mixture of sophistical metaphysics and old-world superstition which has been piled around it by so-called Christians of later ages ; it is so clear that the only ready and immediate antidote to the poison which has been mixed with Christianity, to the intoxication and delusion of mankind, lies in copious draughts from the undefiled spring, that I exercise the right and duty of free judgment on the part of every man, mainly for the purpose of inducing other laymen to follow my example.”

“ In the eighth century B.C.” (he adds, in another place) “ in the heart of a world of idolatrous polytheists, the Hebrew prophets put forth a conception of religion which appears to me to be as wonderful an inspiration of genius as the art of Phidias or the science of Aristotle, ‘ And what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God ? ’ (Micah vi. 8). If any so-called religion takes away from this great saying of Micah, I think it wantonly mutilates ; while if it adds thereto, I think it obscures the perfect ideal of religion.”

“ This collection of books, the Bible,” said that great freethinker, Theodore Parker, “ has taken such hold on the world as no other. The literature of Greece, which goes up like incense from that land of temples and heroic deeds, has not half the influence of this book. It goes equally to the cottage of the plain man and the palace of the king. It is woven into the literature of the scholar and colors the talk of the streets.”

Prof. Max Müller, one of the greatest Sanskrit scholars, and one of the freest of the freethinkers, in all his enthu-

siasm for Indian literature, never for a moment places it above the Bible. On the contrary, he gives to the Bible the first place among sacred books, and to Christ the throne of the spiritual kingdom. Indeed, I know of no really profound scholar who does not do this. The hymns of the Veda may be beautiful, but the Psalms of David are more beautiful. The wisdom of Confucius may have been great, but the wisdom of Solomon and Job was greater. The conceptions of the Zend-Avesta may have been lofty, but the conceptions of Isaiah and Paul are loftier. Buddha may have been "The Light of Asia," that is, the Eastern part of Asia, but Jesus Christ is the Light of the World! And, therefore, while we cheerfully accord to all these good men and their profound teachings all honor due unto them, a Greater than they is here. The Bible contains all the truths found in the sacred books of Persia, India, and China combined. As Christ is the Universal Man, so it is the Universal Book. It speaks to our *souls!* It satisfies our deep spiritual yearnings as no other book can. It inspired the soul-stirring "Confessions" of St. Augustine, the immortal "Imitation," of Thomas à Kempis, and the "Spiritual Letters" of Fenelon. It fired the soul of Milton and Shakespeare. Its philosophy, morality, and religion are the very warp and woof of modern civilization, and, although it has been subjected, during the last half century, to a criticism which would have destroyed a book less divine, it has passed through the fire essentially unscathed, and stands forth to-day the Book of books. Care not, then, my friends, for the so-called "mistakes of Moses" or of Paul; trouble not yourselves about Joshua's stopping the sun or the fish's swallowing Jonah. Be not disturbed if the stories of some miracles be shown to be false, or merely the record of natural events. These stories do not constitute the real essence of the Bible, and you may give them all up, if necessary, or accept them merely as poetical yet instructive legends, and not lose one atom of the real spiritual truth that runs, like a gold mine, through the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation. Let Mr. Moody's words, "I know that the Bible is inspired, because it inspires me," be your practical theory of inspiration, and let all the theories of the schools go to the winds, as you search the Scriptures to find in them the words of eternal life, and the witness to Him who is "the Way, the Truth and the Life."

Finally, at least *one half of the Gospel* has not been disturbed, but rather emphasized by modern skepticism. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" is as true to-day as when the command was first given, and this is one half of the Law and the Prophets. And many who are indisposed to love God with all their mind and heart and strength—who refuse to fulfil the other half of the Gospel-Law, are most ready to love their fellow-men, and do unto them as they would be done by. Indeed, there is what is called the "Religion of Humanity" whose God is the human race. The *idea* of Humanity takes the place of the *fact* of the Divine Christ. Of course, it is Humanity stripped of all its many myriad imperfections and corruptions—an ideal Humanity. But while we prefer the ideal of Humanity as it is perfectly realized in Jesus Christ, yet this fantastical form of religion so-called shows what a deep hold the humanitarian principle has upon the modern mind and heart. Heaven knows there is little enough love in this world even now, and often we are tempted to think that there is *no* love—that *selfishness* is our god. But sober thought must convince us that, despite all appearances to the contrary, the Golden Rule is being slowly but surely practiced more and more. Even where it is not practiced, it is theoretically admitted to be the true rule of conduct—the summary of all practical religion. While many still think that religion consists in belief in a set of doctrines about God and the Bible and Christ and the future life, the world at large is beginning to learn that pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit the fatherless and the widows and all sufferers in their affliction, and relieve them, if possible, and to keep oneself unspotted from sin—a violation of the moral Law written on the fleshy tables of the heart as well as in the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount. The Church is beginning to realize that Jesus came to save His people from their sins in this world; that the primary object of the Church is the regeneration of society as a whole; that the very best way to prepare men for the next life is to make them live better lives in this. In short, it is beginning to deal less with *dogma* and more with *life*; less with the *future* and more with the *present*; less in *fear* and more in *love*; less with the *devil* and more with *man*. And as this blessed change goes on increasing in

depth and width it will be more and more seen that the Church is established upon a permanent foundation—a foundation against which even the gates of hell shall not prevail, viz., the spiritual and moral necessities of human nature. Even if it be admitted, therefore (but it is *not* admitted), that the *doctrinal* foundation of Christianity has been sapped by skepticism, yet its practical basis is untouched. Nay, it may be considered to be the more securely established the more it is seen to rest not on a doctrinal basis but upon a personal life—the life of Jesus as realized in His disciples. Prof. Max Müller truly says: “If Christianity is to retain its hold on Europe and America, if it is to conquer in the Holy War of the future, it must throw off its heavy armor, its coat of mail, and face the world like David, with his staff, his stones and his sling. We want less of creeds, but more of trust; less of ceremony, but more of work; less of solemnity, but more of genial honesty; less of doctrine, but more of love. There is a faith, as small as a grain of mustard seed, but that grain alone can move mountains, and, more than that, it can move hearts. Whatever the world may say of us, of us of little faith, let us remember that there was One who accepted the offering of the poor widow. She threw in but two mites, but that was *all* she had, even all her living.”

Therefore, my friends, if you think that skepticism has reduced the faith to a few mites, remember that those mites are mighty. They are God, the Soul, Retribution, Christ, the Bible, and Love: and armed with these the very gates of hell shall not prevail against us.

SERMON IX.

SHOULD WE HAVE C S?

Text:—Then he brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.—ACTS xvi. 30-31.

THERE is a false liberalism, and there is a true liberalism. There are many people who would say of the Church, as the Irishman said of the Government, it matters not about the truth of a belief, it is held by the Church, and "I'm agin the Church." They glory in having no creed, in calling themselves "infidels" or "liberals"; and yet these same people are often the most illiberal dogmatists and believe the greatest absurdities. They disbelieve in God, but they believe that matter produces everything. They reject the soul, but they accept the brain as the cause of thought. They refuse to call Christ "Master," but eulogize Buddha to the skies. They ridicule Christianity, but they laud Mohammedanism. They are "agin the Church," but they are for all sorts of vagaries and absurdities. Such people are a weariness to the flesh, and I constantly meet them, and because I try to be truly liberal and reasonable, they fancy that I must accept all the trash that they accept. True liberalism searches freely and fearlessly for truth, and acknowledges it wherever it exists. It bows before no man-made God, but it worships the Creator of all things. It pierces beneath the material shell of things, and finds the inward, spiritual kernel. It adores Christ, while rejecting the irrational theories that men have promulgated about Him. It admits the defects of popular Christianity, but attributes them to human nature, not to the Founder of Christianity or His teachings. It recognizes scientific, historical and even moral imperfections in the Bible, but it also considers it the Book of books, the most mag-

nificent and wonderful piece of sacred literature ever published. It sees the abuses of ecclesiasticism, but it has no objection to creeds, just because they are creeds. In short, it is not "agin the Church," simply because the Church has made many mistakes and committed many crimes, and hence you need not expect in this sermon any unmeasured denunciation of creeds, although you may hear a somewhat different view of them advocated from that popularly held.

First of all, creeds are not only permissible; they are a necessity. Every man has a creed. It is utterly impossible for him to live without a creed, for a creed is simply another name for "belief," and every man believes something—unless he is a lunatic. The man who denies the existence of God believes in nature—holds that matter and its forces produce all things. If he is an educated man, he knows that science reveals the fact that once this world was not; it existed simply as a vast cloud of atoms scattered throughout space, and in accounting for the rise of this magnificent universe out of that chaos, he must either believe in an Intelligent Being, who started and guided the development, or he must endow the material particles with the power and intelligence sufficient for this purpose, and so while he smashes with one hand the theological idol, he erects with the other, the scientific Deity. He may reject the existence of the soul, but if he profoundly studies the brain and its operations he will be convinced that the brain is not all or the chief part of man; that it does not produce thought; that there is an immaterial and impalpable something, a mysterious unseen musician back of the scenes manipulating this organ, and producing the music of the soul. He may reject the popular theological doctrine about Christ's origin, nature and mission, but if he will study fully and widely religious history, he will find that no other person ever lived who is so worthy of the high title, "Son of God" and "Saviour of Men." He may fling his Bible on the floor and trample it under foot, but, like many another silly fanatic, if he happens to pick up a torn leaf of it and compares it with any other sacred book, he will find more divine truth in it than in all the tomes beside. And so I say, a creed of some sort is absolutely necessary, and every man has one; the only

question is—What kind of creed shall it be? That depends entirely on what is the object of the creed.

Second, a creed is a means to an end—not an end in itself, as so many suppose. It is because the object of creeds is so generally misunderstood, that the Church is split up into a hundred warring sects. The Church is not like a protectionist club. It does not stand for one idea, but for the whole truth. It is not intended to be exclusive, but inclusive. Its great object is the production of moral and religious character by the infusion, so to speak, of the Christ's life into our lives—the production of Christ-like souls; and whatever tends to draw men unto Christ and produce righteousness should be inserted in its creed; and whatever does not tend to this result should be excluded from its creed, however much it might be allowed as matter of opinion. This is what Christ taught. He did not say to men—Accept this or that dogma, but simply, "Follow Me." This is what Paul and Barnabas told the Philippian jailor—"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."

The object of a creed is the salvation of the soul, by which I do not mean salvation as it is taught by the popular theology. This teaches that salvation means escape from a distant hell, but the New Testament says that Jesus came to save His people from their sins. The object of a creed, therefore, is salvation of the believer from sin *here and now*. If he is a liar, he must quit lying. If he is a thief, he must stop stealing. If he is an adulterer, he must become chaste, for adulterers and whoremongers God will judge and will visit them with swift vengeance in this life as well as in the next. If he is profane, he must become reverent. If he is cruel, he must become kind. If he is selfish, he must become unselfish. If he is covetous, he must become benevolent and beneficent. If he is a glutton, he must become temperate. These are the fruits of faith, and no creed is worthy of its name unless it produce these results, and this is what the Apostles meant when they told the jailor to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and he would be saved. He had been cruel—had shut them in the inner prison—but if he would believe on Jesus he could not do such a thing. The Apostles did not mean as theology means, that the poor, ignorant jailor must believe some subtle theory of Christ's

nature or atonement. Such nonsense never entered their minds. They meant by faith in Christ, just what we mean when we say, "I believe in this or that person." If you believe in a person you trust him, and when he tells you to do anything you do it; and so if we believe in Christ we will obey Him. When He tells us not to commit murder, or a theft, or adultery, if we believe in Him, we will not do so. When He commands us to forgive our enemies—to pray for those who despise us and spitefully use us—to do good to our foes—to love our neighbors instead of slandering and hating them, if we believe in Him we will obey, and if we do not obey Him we do not believe in Him, even though we pronounce, with a long face and a loud voice and a sanctimonious air, all the creeds in Christendom, and die at the stake rather than give up one jot or tittle of them. Some of the most licentious men and women that ever lived have been the most zealous in religious profession, and if we could lift the veil we would see them writhing in hell this moment, where the worm of conscience dieth not and the flame of memory is not quenched. So I say the object of a creed is to produce character, and no creed and no article of a creed should be insisted upon by the Church which does not tend to produce righteousness. Oh, if men had only acted on this principle, how many bloody pages of history would never have been written! Paul would not have been imprisoned and killed. The early Christians, would not have been thrown to the lions in the Roman amphitheatre. The fires of the Spanish Inquisition would never have been lit. Bruno and Huss would not have been burned at the stake. Luther and Zwingli and Calvin and Knox would not have been persecuted. The flames of Oxford and Smithfield would not have been kindled around the bodies of God's truest sons. John Wesley and John Whitefield would not have been excluded from the Church. The Pilgrim Fathers would not have been driven from their native land into a strange and inhospitable country. The burning and drowning and torturing of good men and women for the expulsion from their bodies of imaginary witches and devils would never have occurred. But instead of it all—instead of the hateful spectacle of "religious war" and the propagation of the faith by the power of the sword and the fagot—we should have seen the armies of the Lord of Hosts

quietly and peacefully marching forward conquering and to conquer, with their eyes fixed on the blood-stained cross, fit symbol of sacrificing Love, flaming out in the heavens above, with the immortal inscription upon it: "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life." "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

The real object of a creed, then, is to produce character, and the object of a Christian creed is to produce Christ-like character. Until this great fact is practically recognized by the Church, she will never accomplish the glorious work the Master came to do. He came to save people from sin, to teach them to love God as their Father, Himself as their Brother and their fellow-men as themselves. He desired to draw all men unto Himself, to have them imbibe His spirit and follow in His footsteps. He did not require them to believe any special theory about the Godhead or His own origin and nature. He asked Simon Peter the thrilling question, "*Lovest thou me?*" And when the Apostle answered, "Yea, Lord," He said, "Feed my sheep, feed my lambs." Love of Him, love of God, love of man—that made one a disciple of His—and that was the essence of the Gospel which St. Paul and the other Apostles preached. There were persons in the Corinthian Church who disbelieved in the resurrection, and St. Paul, Pharisee though he was, did not excommunicate them, but in his immortal epistle argued the case with them and tried to persuade them of the truth of the doctrine—but he did not insist upon it as an article of faith which must be accepted on pain of forfeiture of Church fellowship. Neither St. Paul nor any of the Apostles had any other creed than that mentioned in the text—a simple childlike faith in Jesus—in his personal life. I know, of course, that he argues in his epistles to show that Christ was God's Son, that in Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, but he was then speaking as a teacher; he was not insisting upon belief in a special view of Christ as necessary to Church fellowship. When this question arose—when men asked the great question—What must I do to be saved? he always answered, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ—trust in Him—follow in His footsteps—do His will, and thou shalt be saved."

It is because the Churches have departed from this simple

creed—it is because they have built round the adorable Person of Christ hedges of human inventions—that Christendom is to-day split up into a thousand and one sects that bite and tear each other like ferocious wild beasts. Not until Christians practically believe and admit that the Church rests upon the life and personal character of Jesus—that every one who wishes to follow in his steps—every one who loves Him and would fain do Him service is a real disciple of the Master—not until *conduct* is made the basis of Church communion will the Gospel run and be glorified and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our God and of His Christ. And—blessed fact!—this truth is gradually becoming clearer and clearer to men's minds and being more and more accepted. Whatever bigotry and intolerance may remain among professional theologians, the great body of Christians are beginning to realize that theories of the Godhead, the Incarnation, atonement, inspiration and so on, are all the speculations of fallible human reason, and as such are not worth quarreling over. They are learning more and more clearly that charity or love is “the greatest thing in the world”—that though we may speak with the tongues of angels, and have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and have all faith, and give all our goods to the poor, and even submit our bodies to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth nothing.

Even the professional theologian when he talks to men directly about their spiritual welfare—about following Christ—lays aside his darling theories. If the man objects to the dogma of the Trinity, he is told that “nobody understands it.” If he says he does not believe that a miracle ever happened, nine times out of ten he is assured that “nobody believes in miracles in the old sense of the word”—which means that all miracles are explained as wonderful but natural events. If he objects to the doctrine of endless punishment, he is told that faith in it is not necessary to salvation or Church fellowship. When, then, he asks, What must I believe and do to be saved? He gets the true reply, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, love Him, serve Him, and thou shalt be saved.” And so, thank God, creed-worship is rapidly passing away, and Christ-worship is taking its place. It is not going quite as fast as some of us would have it go, but it is going, and

ere the next generation comes and goes, Creed-worship will be overthrown, and all Christendom will wonder at our darkness and bigotry and folly.

But while I hold that the great object of a creed is to produce character, I freely admit that a secondary object is to teach those who have not time for special study of the great problems of Being such truths as seem most probable and rational. In a large sense, therefore, the whole Bible is a creed, and is so regarded by the Church, its supremacy over all formulated statements of doctrine having always been asserted, especially since the great Reformation of the sixteenth century. But we are here concerned with those doctrinal formulas which are supposed to be taken out of the Scriptures, such as the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; the various decisions on doctrinal subjects put forth by Church Councils, such as the decrees of the Roman Church in the Council of Trent, the Vatican and so on, and the Confessions of Faith formulated by the reformed Churches. All these creeds or confessions are more or less instructive, and there can be no possible objection to such statements of doctrine, *provided* that it always be remembered that they are mere human speculations, man-made theories about God and Christ and human nature and destiny which are open to free criticism and subject to revision as new light breaks upon the great subjects with which they deal. But just here lies the difficulty. Religious creeds more than any other documents become sacred and venerable by age and use. It is really marvelous how they entrench themselves in the affections of believers until it becomes impossible to touch them without hurting the feelings and rousing the wrath of the faithful. The man who dares question what the fathers have believed is at once accused of "presumption," "sacrilege," "blasphemy," "infidelity," and Heaven knows what not.

It is easy, too, for a thoughtful mind to understand this. Not only do creeds grow sacred by age and use, but other things do also. Thus the old oak tree that stands in the ancestral yard, under whose spreading boughs our forefathers played as children, is dear to our hearts, and when the cruel lightning strikes it, and its bare and gnarled limbs point heavenward, we feel a sorrow and pity for it akin to that over the bones of a departed relative. The old home-

stead, with its hedge-rows planted by our grandfathers, its forests in which they hunted the squirrel and the deer, the fields over which they chased the fox and the hare, the farmhouse through whose halls their venerable feet trod, and in whose rooms echoed their merry laughter, their songs of joy or their sighs of grief—all these are sacred to us. But, above all, the old church on the village green, whose walls have trembled with the eloquence of silent lips, or reverberated with the stentorian sounds of those who lifted up their voices in psalm and hymn—the old church, where the Spirit of God nestled down as a celestial dove upon the penitent heads of the fathers as they gathered around the Lord's Table, or knelt before the great White Throne—the old church is too consecrated a building to be torn down and replaced by a modern edifice. We all know what energy and tact are necessary to overcome such feelings when it is proposed to build a new church on the site of an old one. Many people in the parish will often refuse to contribute to the building of a new church, but will gladly give towards the repairing of the old one. Some, however, want as little of the old material taken out as possible, and no alteration made in the form of building or arrangement of furniture; and the modern minister with his modern ideas of architecture, and little or no reverence for the antique, finds many obstacles in the way of building up the parish as he desires. So it is, in a deeper sense, with creeds. We like to feel that we are using the very words and thinking the very thoughts the fathers spoke and thought. It seems to unite the Past with the Present by a real and living bond. We seem to be standing in the midst of that cloud of witnesses and saintly souls who have gone before, and from the overhanging dome of heaven look down with approving smiles. I shall never forget the pleasure I experienced when I learnt to read the Hebrew and Greek Bible. To think that I was speaking the very words that Abraham, and Moses, and David, and Isaiah, and Paul spoke. Nay, perhaps the very words which the Lord himself uttered by the sick bed or the bier! It seemed to me that time was annihilated and the spirits of patriarchs, prophets, and apostles were holding converse with me. But all this is sentiment—poetry—which cannot bear the test of reason. We must subordinate feeling to fact, sentiment to sense. The world moves;

human nature grows ; the wants of the children are not the same as the wants of the fathers. What a terrible state of things it would be if this were not so. The world would absolutely stagnate and dry rot. We may, therefore, love the old oak, but when the snows and storms of many winters have beaten off its boughs and made it unsightly—a mere cumberer of the ground—it must be hewn down, that a more beautiful shrub or tree may take its place. We may love the old ancestral house, but its small windows must be enlarged to let in more light, its big fireplaces must be reduced in size, its creaky stairways must give place to new ones that will bear us up, its halls must be overhauled, the grandfather's clock must give place to a modern chronometer, the antique melodeon, which charmed the old folks at home on the long winter evenings, must be put aside for the Steinway or the Knabe—in short, the Past must surrender to the Present. The old church, with its brick or stone or weather-boarded walls, and its conspicuous absence of all architectural beauty, must be replaced by a beautiful Gothic or other structure. The tuning-fork of the musical director must be superseded by the grand organ and the grander choir. The world moves. The fathers did not speak the last word on Art, Poetry, Literature, Sculpture, Science, Philosophy, Politics or Religion. Magna Charta was a grand document, but a People's Constitution is grander. The Declaration of Independence was a noble instrument, but it did not say the last word on Liberty. Moses was a great lawgiver, but Christ was a greater. Isaiah was a great preacher, but Paul was a greater. Chrysostom and Augustine were brilliant orators and profound theologians ; Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and Cranmer were great Reformers, but they were not omniscient. The Nicene Council was a glorious assembly, but it was not infallible. The Fathers must be respected but not idolized. We are unworthy children if we know no more than they did. We should never have been born, if we are not to add anything to their acquisitions, and so we must not be fettered by sentiment, or chained hand and foot by a false reverence for the dead and the opinions of the dead. We honor them far more by striving to develop their mighty thoughts and classify and solve the mysteries that puzzled them, than we do by blindly submitting to their *ipse dixit*. We want no iconoclasm

merely for the sake of iconoclasm, but we want the old spiritual tabernacle renovated and renewed. And, thank Heaven! the world is beginning to realize the truth of this. Men are seeing more and more the absurdity of supposing that Science, Philosophy, Politics, Art, and all other departments of life and thought should be developed and theology should stand still. The Protestant part of Christendom, and even the Roman Church, to some extent, recognize this absurdity. Our formulas contain within themselves provisions for their restatement and reconstruction, just as the Constitution of the United States contains an article providing for amendments to it, or alterations in it; but owing to the feelings just mentioned most people are strongly averse to any alterations in theological dogmas. And, after all, this conservatism, while very annoying to many of us, is a good thing and serves a good purpose, as it checks and sobers what might otherwise be rash and dangerous progress. The law of antagonism, of opposites, of attraction and repulsion, of statics and dynamics, operates in the religious as well as in the social and material sphere; and out of the conflict will arise a new and better faith which, while it does not turn its back on the Past, turns at least one eye to the rising sun—a faith that faces both ways and sweeps the whole spiritual horizon, taking in and absorbing every ray of truth.

Life and Teaching—that is the twofold object of creeds. “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ;” worship His Spirit and absorb His life; and thou shalt be saved from sin here and hell hereafter. “Search the Scriptures” for yourself, freely and thoroughly as Paul did. “Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free!” Refuse not truth come whence it may. Fix your eye on the coming dawn and travel in the course of the rising sun. The Christ that is to be is being rapidly rung in! We hear the chimes of the morning bells sounding across the hills and valleys! We hear the song of the angels that broke o’er the heights of Bethlehem on that primal Christmas day. We behold the Star of Wisdom moving towards the manger. We see the wise men marching in goodly array to offer their gold, frankincense, and myrrh at the holy shrine! We, therefore, exclaim in rapture, “Glory to God in the Highest, and on earth, peace, good will to men!” For unto us is born again in the spiritual city of David a Saviour,

who is Christ the Lord, who is set for the rise and fall of many among the sons of men, in whom whosoever shall believe shall be saved and enter in through the gates into the eternal city of God! Amen.

THE REAL RIGHTS OF WOMAN.

Text :—And Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, she judged Israel at that time.—JUDGES iv. 4.

DEBORAH is one of the most remarkable characters in history, and the age in which she lived was a peculiar age—a transitional period for Israel—when the nation was passing from a lawless condition into that of monarchy. “Judges,” military rulers, who were raised to power by circumstances and deeds of prowess, governed the nation, and it was constantly invaded by surrounding enemies. At this particular time, “the power of the northern kings,” says Dean Stanley, “which Joshua had broken down at the waters of Merom, revived under a second Jabin, king of Hazor. The formidable chariots overran the territories of the adjacent tribes. The whole country was disorganized with terror. The obscure tortuous paths became the only means of communication. As long afterwards, in the time of Saul, regular weapons disappeared from the oppressed population. “There was not a spear or shield seen among forty thousand in Israel.” Shamgar the son of Anath, defended himself against the enemies of the South with a long pole armed at the end with a spike still used by the peasants of Palestine. In their general depression, the national spirit was revived by one whose appearance is full of significance. On the heights of Ephraim, on the central thoroughfare of Palestine, near the sanctuary of Bethel, stood two famous trees (if we may be permitted to distinguish them); both in aftertimes known by the same name. One was “the oak-tree,” or “Terebinth of Deborah,” underneath which was buried, with many tears, the nurse of Jacob. The other was a solitary palm, which, in all probability, had given its name to an adjacent

sanctuary Baal-Tamar, the "Sanctuary of the Palm," but which was also known in aftertimes as the Palm-tree of Deborah. Under this palm, as Saul afterwards under the pomegranate of Migron, as St. Louis under the oak-tree of Vincennes, dwelt Deborah the wife of Lapidoth, to whom the sons of Israel came up to receive her wise answers. She is the magnificent impersonation of the free spirit of the Jewish people and of Jewish life. On the coins, of the Roman Empire, Judæa is represented as a woman seated under a palm-tree captive and weeping. It is a contrast of that figure which will best place before us the character of Deborah. It is the same Judæan palm, under whose shadow she sits, but not with downcast eyes and folded hands, and extinguished hopes,—with all the fire of faith and energy, eager for the battle, confident of victory. Like the German prophetess who roused her people against the invaders from Rome, like the simple peasant girl (Joan of Arc), who by communing with mysterious angels' voices, roused the French nation against the English dominion, when princes and statesmen had well-nigh given up the cause—so the heads of Israel "ceased and ceased until that she, Deborah, arose, that she arose, a mother in Israel." Her appearance was like a new epoch. They chose new chiefs that came as new gods among them. It was she who turned her eyes and the eyes of the nation to the fitting leader. That leader, was "Barak," whose name means "Lightning." His fame must have been widespread to have reached the prophetess in her remote dwelling at Bethel. From his native place, "Kedesh-Naphtali, far up among the mountains of the North," she summoned him to her side, and delivered to him her prophetic command. He, as if oppressed by the presence of a loftier spirit than his own, refuses to act, unless she were with him to guide his movements, and (according to the Greek version of the narrative) to name the very day which should be auspicious for his effort: "For I know not" (he said) "the day on which the Lord will send his good angel with me." She replies at once, with the Hebrew emphasis: "I will go, I will go!" but adds: "notwithstanding the journey that thou takest shall not be for thine honor; for the Lord shall sell Sisera into the hand of a woman." And sure enough the greatest general and the flower of the Canaanite soldiery were defeated by the

woman commander. Here, then, we have a woman who is a wife, a prophetess, a ruler and a successful military leader, and as such her character and history are quite suggestive on the question of the rights and powers of woman.

1. The first right that a woman has is *a right to a thorough education*. It used to be and still is, to some extent, believed that woman is intellectually inferior to man. The world has been wont to reply as did a gentleman to Mrs. Sarah Bolton, a writer on this subject, who, when asked if the University of Berlin would probably ever admit women, said, "No, madam. If that should happen, every student would leave immediately. Besides, how can a woman need Greek or geometry in taking care of a house and baby?"

This is well branded as "the great button and slipper argument" against the higher education of women, in which it is urged if a woman were once permitted to know Greek plays or astronomy, or, in short, to nibble at any side of the apple of knowledge, there would be an end to her sewing on buttons or working slippers. The conclusion is, indeed, terrific. Facts, however, disprove it. The intellectual equality, and even (in many cases) the superiority of woman to man is proved by these representative examples; Maria Bassi so distinguished herself in mathematics and classics as to become a professor in the University of Bologna. Elizabeth Carter, of England, was a thorough Greek, Latin, and Hebrew scholar, besides understanding Italian, Spanish, German, French, Portuguese, and Arabic. The great Doctor Samuel Johnson, speaking of a celebrated scholar, said that he "understood Greek better than any one he had ever known, except Mrs. Carter." Her brother wrote to her that he had translated one of the odes of Horace so well that it was supposed to be her work. Her translation of Epictetus, the old Roman philosopher, won her fame and fortune. Caroline Herschel announced the discovery of eight comets, five of which unquestionably were first seen by her.

Lady Jane Grey wrote and spoke, with facility and correctness, Latin, Greek, Italian, and French, and was also versed in Hebrew, Chaldee, and Arabic. Queen Elizabeth spoke Latin easily and was a fine Greek scholar. Dora

d'Istria, it is said, speaks sixteen languages, and is one of the most learned women of the age.

These and such like facts, too numerous to cite in this connection have at last forced men to the conclusion that women are intellectually their equals, and all they need in order to show this is a "chance." In Cambridge and Oxford Universities, England; in the London University and University College; in the art schools and other educational institutions of England women have been admitted, and have not only distinguished themselves, but have often outstripped their male classmates or associates. In America, besides Vassar, Wellesley and Smith Colleges, where women are annually equipped to compete with the intellectual giants of the day, women are received into nearly two hundred of our three hundred colleges on an equal footing with the men. The high education of women, therefore, and their education with men in the same institution, are no longer matters of speculation but matters of fact, and the results are better than many even among the women expected. The physical constitution of "the weaker sex," which was urged against their higher education, has stood the strain quite as well as, if not better than, the men's. The distinctions women have gained and do gain in all departments of study are in every way equal to those won by the men. And so it is no longer a question whether women should be highly educated or not. As another says: "The true measure of a woman's right to knowledge is her capacity for receiving it, and not any theories of ours as to what she is fit for or what she is likely to do with it."

But while it is quite generally admitted that women have the same right to an education that men have, yet, as a matter of fact, many parents who take it as a matter of course that their sons should be thoroughly educated give their daughters a comparatively meagre education—perhaps because they secretly hold the old opinion that the girls will soon marry, and therefore not need Greek or geometry in taking care of the house and baby. As if, forsooth, an intellectual man wants to talk to an ignoramus of a wife after the baby is put to sleep for the night! The woman as a wife can be and should be a great mental stimulus and inspiration to her husband, and in order to be this she must, of course, be well educated. No doubt

girls are themselves often to blame for not getting a better education, since they prefer frivolous employments to hard study and do not insist on their parents giving them first-class educational opportunities ; but the parents may more frequently instil into their daughters' minds a sense of the importance of a thorough education and a love of study. It is the only way to elevate the intellectual condition of young women.

The mental development of woman being granted, it is quite as important to insist that she should receive thorough *manual* training. It is being more and more recognized that industrial schools for men are absolutely necessary. It is one of the best means of protecting and benefiting labor, and the very same reasons that prove the necessity of manual training for men prove the need of manual training for women. The women are taking their places by the side of men in the factory, the office and even on the farm, and hence they need special preparation for their several kinds of work. I believe that in New York City a school has just been started for the purpose of educating domestic servants. The object will be not only to make them efficient in their work, but also to teach them that it is noble and not degrading. There should be a training school for mistresses as well as for servants to teach the need of kindness and justice on the part of employers, as well as to instruct them as to the nature of certain kinds of work. In England, in connection with the South Kensington Museum there is a school of art needlework, which has done excellent work for years, and near by is a large cookery school, which is also doing admirable work both in plain and high class cookery. What a blessing to bilious people such a school must be ! In Edinburgh a cookery school was established in 1875, of which Mrs. Gladstone is a zealous patron, and it has done a most successful work.

House decoration, wood engraving and carving, painting, designing, and even agriculture have all been successfully engaged in by women in England and on the Continent of Europe, and special courses of preparation for these several kinds of work have been provided from which the best results have been realized. Let us earnestly hope that the industrial training of women will go hand in hand with their intellectual development, until science shall extend its beneficent sway over the kitchen, the laundry, the

nursery and the bed-chamber as well as over the hospital, the factory, the office, the studio, and the college-hall—until the dextrous hand of woman shall be deftly guided by her finely cultivated mind in her mission of mercy and love to her fellow-sufferers, whose tears she can dry, whose wounds she can heal, whose souls she can purify and ennoble as no man can.

Secondly, woman has a right to *an equal chance with man as a wage-earner*. Hundreds of thousands of women are employed side by side with men in the industrial sphere; they do the same work, and often they do it better than men do, but it is a notorious fact that they receive much lower wages, simply because they are women. Of course, sometimes they cannot and do not do as much work as the men, and in such cases justice would give the men higher wages. Again, the women frequently *consent*, nay, almost habitually consent, to work for lower wages than are paid the men; they don't seem to expect the same wage; why not, we cannot tell, unless it is because they have been so long oppressed that they are timid about demanding their rights. But as long as they consent to work for less than men they cannot blame their employers for paying them less. They should organize as the men—both capitalists and laboring men do—and agitate for a fair day's work, for a fair day's wage, and their more fortunate sisters—those who enjoy comparative freedom and a better education—should help them in their struggle. If you doubt the need of such an effort read such books as Helen Campbell's "Prisoners of Poverty," which gives an account of the condition of the working women of New York City, but is really a description of the working women's general status. In Philadelphia, Chicago, San Francisco and other large cities, and even in smaller towns, the same state of things exists. Woman is underpaid and overworked. In New York, one hundred and fifty thousand women work for an average wage of sixty cents a day, from daylight till ten or eleven o'clock at night. The result, of course, is starvation, disease, prostitution, insanity, suicide, and untold horrors.

Take a few examples of how prosperous firms, where the women are better paid and better treated than in other places, do work. "In a certain large factory," says Helen Campbell, "piece-work is done. French cutters and fitters,

receiving from thirty to fifty dollars a week, give that guarantee of style and elegance which is inherent in everything bearing the stamp of this firm. Experts run the machines in the sewing-machine room, being paid by the day at the rate of from six to eight dollars per week in the busy season. The buttonholes are made by women who do nothing else, and who are paid by the dozen, earning from five to seven dollars weekly. All stitched seams are done in the machine-room, and the dress passes from there to the sewing-room into the hands of the sewing-girls, who receive from three to four dollars and a half for each garment. The latter price is seldom reached; four dollars and a half or five dollars paying for a dress loaded with trimming, puffs, flounces, etc.

“At this rate there would seem to be a chance for wages a good deal beyond the average, but *it is one of the unwritten laws that no sewing-girl shall exceed five dollars per week.* Whether formulated by superintendent or by firm remains yet to be discovered. The one unquestionable fact is that if the superintendent of the work-room finds that any girl is expert enough to make over this amount, the price per garment is docked to bring her down to the level. They are never driven. On the contrary, they must wait often two or three hours at times for the arrival of “Madame” who must inspect the work, drape a skirt, or give some suggestion as to trimming. No entreaty can induce the superintendent to give out another piece of work which might fill this vacant time, and the girls dare not state their case to the employer. No member of the firm enters the work-room. Complaint would ensure discharge.

“In other large establishments the methods are much the same, with merely slight variations as to comfort of quarters, time for lunch, sanitary conditions, etc. But in all alike, the indispensable, but always very helpless, sewing-girl appears to be one of the chief sources of profit, and to have small capacity and no opportunity for improving her condition.”

The “boss” in a certain store said to Mrs. Campbell: “We don’t want men. We wouldn’t have them even if they came at the same price. Of course, cheapness has something to do with it, and will have, but for my part give me a woman to deal with every time. Now there’s an illustration over at the hat-counter. We were short of

hands to-day and I had to send for three girls that had applied for places, but were green—didn't know the business. It didn't take them ten minutes to get the hang of doing things, and there they are, and you'd never know which was old and which was new hand. Of course, they don't know all about qualities and so on, but the head of the department looks out for that. No, give me women every time. I've been a manager thirteen years, and we never had but four dishonest girls, and we've had to discharge over forty boys in the same time. Boys smoke and lose at cards, and do a hundred things that women don't, and they get worse instead of better. I go in for women."

"If they are really worth so much to you, why can't you give better pay?" asked Mrs. Campbell. "We give as high pay as anybody," answered the superintendent, "and we don't give more because for every girl here there are a dozen waiting to take her place. As to saving, she doesn't want to save. There isn't a girl here that doesn't expect to marry before long, and she puts what she makes on her back, because a fellow naturally goes for the best looking and best dressed girl. That's the woman question as I've figured it out, and you'll find it the same everywhere." "Practically," our author adds, "he was right, for the report, though varying slightly, summed up as substantially the same."

If this can be truly said—and it cannot be denied—of prosperous firms, what do you suppose is the condition of the working woman in the lower grades of employment? Read Mrs. Campbell's book and you will find the answer in facts which will wring tears from your eyes and groans for your suffering sisters. These words quoted and commented upon by this noble woman should rouse even the most thoughtless female to reflection upon her sister's wrongs and needs.

"The emancipation of woman," said a lecturer before a woman's club, "is certainly well under way when all underwear can be bought more cheaply than it is possible to make it up at home, and simple suits of very good material make it hardly more difficult for a woman to clothe herself without thought or worry than it has long been for a man."

"This is only one side of the story," says Mrs. Campbell, "for emancipation on the one side has meant no cor-

responding emancipation for the other ; and as one woman selects, well pleased, garment after garment daintily tucked and trimmed, and finished beyond any capacity of ordinary home sewing, marvelling a little that a few dollars can give such lavish return, there arises from narrow attic and dark foul basement and crowded factory the cry of the women whose life-blood is on these garments. Through burning, scorching days of summer ; through marrow-piercing cold of winter, in hunger and rags, with white-faced children at their knees crying for more bread, or silent from long weakness, looking with blank eyes at the flying needle, these women toil on, twelve, fourteen, sixteen hours even, before the fixed task is done. The slice of baker's bread and the bowl of rank black tea boiled to extract every possibility of strength are taken, still at the machine. It is easier to sit there than in rising and movement to find what weariness is in every limb." This is what cheap clothing means. The destruction of the lives of thousands of mothers and children, the degradation of women who are entitled to the same comforts and luxuries that others enjoy—nay, who are more entitled to them than these, for they toil night and day, while those who reap the rewards of their labor spend it in ostentation, idleness and sin.

For the working woman, then, I plead—for the woman who stands behind the counter or bends over the sewing-machine, or draws the needle, or handles the broom, the pan, the machine, for weary, weary hours—for the woman whose life-blood is crushed out before she reaches the bloom of womanhood, I earnestly beg a fair chance and a fair wage.

Of course, I know as well as any one the weakness and inefficiency of the woman worker no less than that of the man worker. I know, too that in many cases the employer is driven harder than the employé. Said a business manager of a firm employing 1,462 hands to Mrs Campbell : "You would have to go into business yourself to understand just how we are driven." "Suppose you refuse to be driven?" she asked. "Suppose!" exclaimed the man, throwing up his hands ; "There is no room for supposes in business, madam. We do what we must. How are we to compete with a factory turning out suits by steam power? Not that we would compete. There

is really no occasion," be added hastily. "But their methods certainly have an unpleasant influence, and we are obliged to take them into account slightly."

Yes, it is cut-throat *competition* that is driving both employer and employed to starvation and death, and yet most business men think that this is the only principle on which a successful business can be done. It is strange, indeed, that men of such fine common sense, strength of will and purpose, should see and confess the wickedness of the industrial system under which they work, and yet insist that there is no deliverance. We don't believe it! We have no nostrums for the social and industrial ills, but we don't believe they are necessary and irremovable. We believe that a sincere, manly, vigorous effort on the part of both employer and employed would result in devising some better method of doing work, whereby capital and labor would get their just reward. At any rate, we must not blink at the evils and injustices which all parties endure, and especially the sufferings of the working-woman. Her labor should be made more effective and remunerative and her lot should be generally improved—should be made at least equally as agreeable and satisfactory as the man's lot is.

Third. Woman has certain rights *as a wife* which are but grudgingly recognized and conceded. I believe in the absolute equality of husband and wife. There is a growing inclination among the women to refuse to promise to "obey" their husbands when they marry. Many a young woman will consent to use this word in the marriage service only when assured by her lover or the minister that while the woman *promises* to "obey" the man will actually have to fulfil the promise. At first sight we may be disposed to laugh at the women for such "cranky" scruples, as we may consider them, but the intelligent advocates of woman's intellectual, industrial, marital and political emancipation will tell you that there are deeper and better reasons for objecting to this feature of the marriage union than the foolish independence of a school girl. That word "obey" in the service is a relic of the past. It indicates the subjection of the woman to the man; and while public opinion has greatly improved, while this law has tended and is tending more and more to become a dead letter, yet that promise either binds the woman to

connubial slavery or it amounts to nothing. If it does the former—and we know that many husbands do require very strict obedience from their wives—it is unjust; if it amounts to nothing, why require it?

It is a relic of barbarism, indicating a matrimonial state not congruous with a truly Christian society. Jesus Christ nowhere taught the subjection of the wife to the husband. St. Paul's teaching on this subject has been and is still greatly misunderstood. In one place he does, indeed, say, "Wives, submit yourselves to your own husbands," but in the same breath he adds, "Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them." If the husbands were to fulfil this injunction, wifely subjection in any onerous manner would be simply impossible, and I submit it is unjust to tear apart the great Apostle's teaching—to quote his injunction to wives and omit his even more earnest injunction to husbands. But in another place (1 Cor. xi.) he emphatically asserts the equality of man and woman, in these words: "Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman, but all things of God." If St. Paul were alive to-day I doubt not that he would affirm as strongly as any one the equality of the sexes, and condemn wife slavery as earnestly as any advocate of woman's rights. Such advocates are wont to depreciate the influence of Christianity in elevating woman, but despite the perversions of St. Paul's and Christ's teaching on this subject, which have occurred during the history of the Church, I think an unprejudiced study of that history will show that, wherever the real principles of Christianity have been applied, the effect upon the status of woman has been good. However this may be, and I am not here to plead the cause of the Church, the fact is that the status of woman has steadily tended upward from the beginning of civilization, and she has now reached a position where she should be as independent as man.

There is nothing more interesting than the study of the development of the Family. As in every other case, there are two views on this subject. One holds that the Family was established in Eden, but owing to the Fall of Man it degenerated, until all the evils of savage unions were the result. The more rational view holds that the Eden

story refers to a later period of human history, when the Family was emerging from its degraded position among savages to a higher and better condition. At first, men and women lived together promiscuously, as the animals do, and as the lowest tribes of men do now. Then, when various causes thinned out the women, one woman would be the wife of several men. On the other hand, when different causes destroyed the men, one man would become the husband of several wives.

These two forms of union are called respectively "polyandry"—one woman for several men—and "polygyny"—one man for several women. Even in civilized America we find a state of things closely akin to these savage customs existing, owing to the disgraceful frequency of divorce. Finally, monogamy, the union of one man and one woman, was evolved, and this is confessedly the highest, the ideal form of marital relationship. Mr. Spencer, who has elaborately and clearly worked out the view of marriage here glanced at, says: "The monogamic form of sexual relation is manifestly the ultimate form; and any changes to be anticipated must be in the direction of completion and extension of it." Again, he says: "Evidently, as tested by the definiteness and strength of the links among its members, the monogamic family is the most evolved. In polyandry, the maternal connection is alone distinct, and the children are but partially related to one another. In polygyny both the maternal and paternal connections are distinct; but while some of the children are fully related, others are related on the paternal side only. In monogamy not only are the maternal and paternal connections both distinct, but all the children are related on both sides. The family cluster is thus held together by more numerous ties; and beyond the greater cohesion so caused there is an absence of those repulsions caused by the jealousies inevitable in the polygynic family." He also points out that monogamy is superior to polygyny and polyandry in productive power: its effect upon the community, socially, politically and morally, is better than in the more savage states; it prevents great mortality of offspring, by drawing parents and children closer together; it has better effects upon the physical constitution of adults, and it conduces to happiness in the declining years of husband and wife.

In this day, when the Family is threatened with destruction by lax ideas of marriage and divorce, the great philosopher's words cannot be too carefully pondered. The familiar song tells us most beautifully that "there's no place like *home*," and Frederick Robertson as truly says "a *happy home* is the single spot of rest which a man has upon this earth for the cultivation of his noblest sensibilities." Whatever, therefore, strikes at the home strikes at the heart of man, and should be resisted unto death. There never was a more beautiful picture than that of "The Holy Family," and from the birth of Christianity to the present time the Family has tended to become more and more sacred, and woman has been more and more emancipated from domestic slavery, until now complete freedom looms high on her horizon.

Under the old Roman law, the woman was in perpetual tutelage to her husband, and he had power of life and death over her and absolute control of her property. But in the reign of the Emperor Justinian, who formulated a celebrated code of laws, much of which still remains in force, tutelage was abolished and the absolute power of the husband ceased. The tendency "towards the personal and proprietary independence" of woman in modern times received its first impulse from the Justinian Code. The mother acquired, what she did not previously possess, equal rights with the father over the succession of deceased children.

Among the early German tribes woman held a different position from that which she occupied in the Roman Empire. She was peculiarly revered, and was the companion, counsellor, prophetess, and comforter of her husband. But his authority over her was absolute, and she could be sold by him or bought or beaten or killed. She was in the power of her husband in all acts of domestic life, and in civil life she could only act through him. She entered with all her property under his guardianship, but he could not dispose alone of her estate. He was not her master, and at his death she received a portion—sometimes a third or even a half of their common acquisitions. But while woman's position under the early German law was somewhat better than it was under the early Roman law, it was not enviable: a wife rated at so many pieces of silver could not be an ideal companion.

England inherited the essential features of the old German and Scandinavian law, and woman occupied a very degraded position for many centuries in that country. "The husband," says a writer on this subject, "became the natural guardian of his wife, and both represented and absorbed the person and property of his ward. Legal rights were measured by physical force." Then the archaic idea came in of retaining the property of the woman in her new family, and preventing both her relatives or herself separating it from her husband's. Thus, perhaps, arose the peculiar English idea of the married woman which has come to us in the common law. Under it the wife's legal existence was suspended or extinguished during marriage; her property was sacrificed, and she was placed almost absolutely in the hands of her husband, as regards her civil rights. Her fortune passed to her husband for his temporary or permanent enjoyment. She could not earn anything for herself, nor in general make any legal contract, sue or be sued, because she was not legally a person. The great dramatist only pictures the common law when he makes one of his characters declare: "I will be master of what is mine own. She is my goods, my chattels, she is my house, my household stuff, my field, my barn, my horse, my ox, my ass, my anything." But one great influence arose in the middle ages which tended strongly to elevate woman's position and increase her power, and that was *chivalry*. "To chivalry," says the writer just quoted, "woman is indebted in the middle ages for a position she had never before enjoyed in history, which gave her a claim almost unknown till then, and which spread over a society steeped in barbarism a grace and refinement that have come down to our day." A reader of Sir Walter Scott's great novels will appreciate the force of this statement, and chivalry was a direct product of the Christian spirit.

The legal oppression of woman in England began to be lightened in the middle ages, but especially during the last hundred years a doctrine of woman's rights more consonant to humane and Christian ideas has been maintained in the Equity Courts of England. The great truth everywhere urged by the Master, of the distinct personality and responsibility of each human being, has been applied to the woman as wife by these courts, and her equality

more and more advanced. Recent legislation "seems to give absolute liberty to the wife of acquiring, holding, and disposing of any property as her separate property ; so that even the wages of a married woman in Great Britain the profits of her literary, artistic or scientific skill, her deposits in savings banks, and indeed all property which may belong to her at marriage, is hers, to do as she pleases with."

In America efforts towards the legal emancipation of woman were begun early in this century, and have steadily increased in strength and influence, until now, in many states at least, she is placed on legal equality with man, and thus you see why intelligent women object to promising to "obey" their husbands. They have been gradually freed from matrimonial slavery, and they naturally dislike to hold on to its most hateful relic. Hence it is to be hoped that all marriage ceremonies will soon be revised according to the new light and law.

Herbert Spencer truly says: "Equity knows no difference of sex," and, therefore, justice demands the absolute equality of man and wife.

Fourth. Has woman a right to the ballot? If not, why not? Consider, first, that she has proved herself *intellectually* the equal of man. Hence if her right of suffrage be denied it must be on some other ground than that of mental inferiority. Secondly, she has become legally man's equal, and still remains a woman and a wife—perhaps a better wife than before. Third, in numbers of cases from Deborah to Queen Victoria, she has shown herself competent to guide the ship of state triumphantly over the troubled social and political waters. Fourth, this nation, fifteen years after it freed an inferior race from the bonds of slavery which it had endured for centuries, placed in its hands the ballot, and thousands of ignorant, degraded white men enjoy the same privilege. The woman is taxed as well as the man, and yet she has no voice or power in making the laws under which she lives. Manifestly this is altogether unjust. For my own part, I believe in both an extension and a limitation of the suffrage. I don't believe that my vote, which may be the result of years of hard study of the principles of government, should be nullified by the vote of an ignorant black or white man which may have been bought for \$2.00 or a glass of

whiskey. There is no sense or justice in this, and therefore I believe that the ballot ought to be withheld from the negroes and ignorant whites until they become competent to use it. But since they have it and there seems no practicable method of withdrawing this power from them, I am not in favor of trying to right a wrong by doing another. I believe that woman has a better right to the ballot than many men who now have it. I believe she will get it in due time—that she should get it; but I do *not* believe that women as a class are yet prepared to make the best possible use of the ballot, and hence it would be unwise and unjust to give it to them now. Owing to their long exclusion from political and legal affairs, and even from educational advantages, owing to their position as wives and mothers, the emotional and maternal side of their natures has been more highly developed than the rational and judicial side—sentiment instead of justice, feeling instead of reason, would therefore influence them, with few exceptions, too much in civil and political matters. The instinct for government must be more fully developed and strengthened throughout the class, and even the leaders of the movement must learn many things by experience; the whole movement must have time to purify itself of excesses and to be thoroughly rationalized before the power sought is given. In all this, there is no reflection whatever upon the female character. On the contrary, there is a full recognition of its powers, possibilities and rights, but it would be as unjust to the women as to the men to give them power which would be used to their own as well as to others' disadvantages. We do not give educated men the ballot until age and experience have taught them—or at least until they have had an opportunity to learn how to use it. We, therefore, advocate agitation of this question: we would push forward education among the women on legal and political subjects, and when the whole class, or at least a majority of them, are ready and desirous to use the ballot, we would give it them. This is essentially the view of Herbert Spencer on this subject, and as he is always appealed to by the female suffragists, I shall quote him. In his "Social Statics," which was the first book he wrote and was written in early life, he was far more radical and pronounced than he is to-day in his advocacy of woman suffrage. In "Social Statics," his

advocacy of woman's rights is unqualified, but in his "Principles of Sociology," written comparatively recently, he says: "That *in time to come* the political *status* of women may be raised to something like equality with that of man, seems a natural deduction. But such an approximate equalization, normally accompanying a social structure of the completely industrial type, is not a normal accompaniment of social types still partially militant. Just noting that giving to men and women equal amounts of political power, while the political responsibilities entailed by war fall on men only would involve a serious inequality, and that the desired equality is therefore impracticable while wars continue: it may be contended that though the possession of political power by women might improve a society in which State-regulation has been brought within the limits proper to pure industrialism, it would injure a society in which State-regulation has the wider range characterizing a more or less militant type. Several influences would conduce to retrogression. The greater respect for authority and weaker sentiment of individual freedom characterizing the feminine nature would tend to the maintenance and multiplication of restraints. Eagerness for special and immediate results, joined with inability to appreciate general and remote results, characterizing the majority of men and still more characterizing women, would, if women had power, entail increase of coercive measures for achieving present good, at the cost of future evil caused by excess of control. But there is a more direct reason for anticipating mischief from the exercise of political power by women, while the industrial form of political regulation is incomplete. The welfare of society requires that the ethics of the Family and the ethics of the State shall be kept distinct. Under the one the greatest benefits must be given where the merits are the smallest: under the other the benefits must be proportioned to the merits. For the infant unqualified generosity; for the adult citizen absolute justice. Now the ethics of the Family are upheld by the parental instincts and sentiments, which, in the female, are qualified in a smaller degree by other feelings than in the male. Already these emotions proper to parenthood, as they exist in men, lead them to carry the ethics of the Family into the policy of

the State, and the mischief resulting would be increased were these emotions as existing in women, directly to influence that policy. The progress towards justice in social arrangements would be retarded and demerit would be fostered at the expense of merit still more than now. But in proportion as the conceptions of pure equity become clearer—as fast as the regime of voluntary co-operation develops to the full sentiments of personal freedom with a correlative regard for the like freedom of others—as fast as there is approached a state under which no restrictions on individual liberty will be tolerated, save those which the equal liberties of fellow-citizens entail—as fast as industrialism evolves its appropriate political agency, which, while commissioned, to maintain equable relations among citizens, is shorn of all those powers of further regulation characterizing the militant type: so fast may the extension of political power to women go on without evil. The moral evolution which leads to concession of it will be the same moral evolution which renders it harmless and probably beneficial.”* These weighty words should be carefully pondered by all advocates of woman’s rights. They mean that their energies should be directed to the destruction of war and the war-like spirit and a development of the industrial form of society, and to the abolition of parentalism in government and the promotion of individual liberty and responsibility. In a military age and under a military *regime*, woman, by reason of her physical frailty, could not hold her place beside man; but in an industrial society she could. In a government where the rules of the nursery were applied woman’s influence would prove detrimental owing to her maternal instincts and sentiments; but when the judicial side of her nature—her sense of justice—is developed so as to control her sentiments, and society as a whole has learned to mete out justice to each individual, then her influence may prove beneficial. Fortunately for the women, war is becoming less and less frequent and more and more hateful, and industrialism and justice are slowly but surely gaining ground, and so it will not be many decades before the aspirations of woman are realized.

* “Principles of Sociology,” I., pp. 757-78.

The Rev. Charles Loring Brace, the well-known philanthropist and economist who died recently, and who was the founder of the Children's Aid Society of New York, says, in his book "Gesta Christi" (p. 296): "Christianity by itself no more teaches female suffrage than it does republicanism or free trade. But it throws into human society that sentiment of equality before God, that principle of equal rights and equal responsibility, and of universal brotherhood, which all lead logically to these results. The thorough application and carrying out of Christian principles in human society is a result only to be expected in distant ages. In the meantime it is the part of wisdom to prepare the world for these great changes, and to begin them by slow and careful steps. In the United States and England, a useful beginning has been made in regard to woman, by admitting her vote in elections for school trustees and in municipalities. The time is not far distant when in some communities her vote, limited by property and education, will be received on larger fields of suffrage. So great and vital a change will thus be made slowly and with careful preparation. Woman will be trained and educated for her new duty."

These are the opinions of all earnest minded, intelligent men and women, who are unbiased by prejudice and free from fanaticism. They cherish no preconceived notions about "woman's sphere." They believe that her "sphere" is limited only by her rights, her strength and her qualifications for the positions sought. They not only wish her Godspeed in every good and perfect work, but they will lend a hand to promote her intellectual, her industrial, her legal and her political emancipation.

In conclusion, let me urge professing Christians, on the one hand, not to oppose this movement, and woman's advocates not to be unreasonable in their demands or carried away by passion and opposition. It is a sad fact that the Church, which professedly stands for truth and justice, has, as an organization, often opposed the greatest and best reforms. It condemned Astronomy; it antagonized Geology; it denounces Biology; it refuses to participate fully in social and industrial reforms. It sanctioned and upheld slavery and even trafficked in human flesh. It has often oppressed woman. The canon law of the middle ages was largely leveled against her; and to-day there is

little disposition on the part of the Church as an organization to recognize and advocate the real rights of woman. So strong is its indisposition to do this, that some of woman's friends are strongly inclined to cut the movement entirely loose from Christianity and base it on a less intolerant and more reasonable power. But, my friends, female suffragists, I would earnestly ask you to remember that the men in the Church who have opposed and do oppose reforms do so as *men*, not as *Christians*—do it not because of their religion, but in spite of it. This is proved by the fact that in those countries and tribes where Christianity has no foothold woman's position is degraded. In ancient Rome and Greece, where secular culture reached its highest point in the old world, woman was a slave. In Asia, Europe, Africa, ancient America and the Islands of the Sea she has been and still is treated as a beast. It is not religion, but the want of it ; it is the ignorance and brutality of man that degrade woman, and her position in Christian countries, compared with her position in barbaric communities, is proof positive that if the influences of Christianity have not greatly promoted they have at least not seriously hindered her progress. Let us be reasonable, therefore, and render honor to whom honor is due—attribute to *human nature* the sins it commits, and recognize the truth and justice of Christ's teaching, however much it may have been misunderstood, perverted, misapplied, or ignored.

Whittier's words, adapted, come to the strugglers for woman's freedom.

“ God bless ye, sisters—in the fight
Ye're waging now ; ye cannot fail,
For better is your sense of right
Than kingcraft's triple mail.

“ Than tyrant's law or bigot's ban,
More mighty is your simplest word :
The free heart of an honest man
Than crosier or the sword.

“ The truths ye urge are borne abroad
By every breeze and every tide ;
The voice of Nature and of God
Speaks out upon your side.

“ The weapons which your hands have found
Are those which Heaven itself has wrought,
Light, Truth, and Love :—your battle ground
The free broad field of Thought.

“O ye who, with undoubting eyes,
Through present cloud and gathering storm,
Behold the span of Freedom’s skies,
And sunshine soft and warm.

“Press bravely onward!—not in vain
Your generous trust in human kind ;
The good which bloodshed could not gain
Your peaceful zeal shall find.

“Press on!—the triumph shall be won
Of *common rights and equal laws*,
The glorious dream of Harrington,
And Sidney’s good old cause.

“Blessing the cotter and the crown,
Sweetening worn Labor’s bitter cup ;
And plucking not the highest down,
Lifting the lowest up.

“Press on!— and we who may not share
The toil or glory of your fight
May ask, at least, in earnest prayer,
God’s blessing on the *right*.”

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBERTY

BEING THE

DEFENCE OF THE REV. HOWARD MacQUEARY

BEFORE THE

ECCLESIASTICAL COURT

OF THE

EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN NORTHERN OHIO

AGAINST

THE CHARGES OF HERESY

DELIVERED IN CLEVELAND, OHIO, JANUARY SEVENTH
1891

NEW YORK

UNITED STATES BOOK COMPANY

SUCCESSORS TO

JOHN W. LOVELL COMPANY

150 WORTH STREET, COR. MISSION PLACE

[1891]

AF

Protestant Episcopal Church in the
U.S.A. — Trunks — MacDunaway, H

PREFACE.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NEW YORK,

Jan. 12th, 1891.

MY DEAR MR. MACQUEARY :

I have read your speech carefully twice, and I congratulate you upon it most heartily. Excellent as your book was, I think that your speech shows still greater power. It stirred me deeply. You are rendering a great service to religious and thoughtful men throughout the country, but especially to those in the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Your argument seems absolutely conclusive, but I have little hope that it will clear you before a Church tribunal. That it will clear you before the great mass of thinking men in our own and other Churches, I am sure : that it will quicken liberal thought in the Church, I am also sure.

Your opponents little know what they are doing and what you have been endeavoring to do. They little know that the great danger is, that the coming generation of thinking men in the United States will separate themselves entirely from all Christian organizations. If what thinking men in the light of the dawn of the twentieth century can believe is to be tied by Church authority to what such men absolutely cannot, will not, and ought not to believe, then the Protestant Episcopal Church and other Protestant Churches in this country will be left in very much the same attitude toward the thought of this country, as the Roman Catholic Church in Italy and France holds toward the thought of those countries.

I hope for something better, and look to you and men like you to initiate movements which will bring about a proper union between Christianity and modern thought.

I think so highly of your speech that I would like to circulate copies of it. I will subscribe for a number of these, and circulate them myself, to the amount of—— dollars, and will exert myself to have others do the like.

With sincere congratulation and good wishes, I remain,

Most respectfully yours,

ANDREW D. WHITE.

THE REV. HOWARD MACQUEARY,
CANTON, OHIO.

The above letter, which is inserted in this preface by the kind permission of the writer, is one of several requests I have received to publish the following speech, delivered before the Ecclesiastical Court of the Episcopal Church of Northern Ohio, on the seventh and eighth of January, 1891, in Cleveland, Ohio, defending myself against the charges of "heresy," because I had questioned the Virgin birth and physical resurrection of Jesus in a book entitled "The Evolution of Man and Christianity" (D. Appleton & Co., New York, publishers).

It will be seen at once that the questions raised by this trial were of fundamental and lasting importance, involving as they did a consideration of the great principles of the Protestant Reformation of the Sixteenth Century,—the root questions between Romanism and Protestantism. It was attempted to narrow the issues to a simple interpretation of Creeds and Canon Law, but the Prosecutor was forced to abandon this position, and in a speech in reply to this tried to refute my argument from Scripture. That he was unsuccessful may be inferred from the fact that two of the five judges constituting the Court voted for acquittal, and men like Dr. White, whose minds are free from theological bias, consider the argument conclusive. I am satisfied that the position here taken, namely, that the Bible is the supreme Rule of Faith for all Protestant churches, and that individuals should be allowed perfect liberty of thought and speech is absolutely valid. Creeds in Protestant Churches should be open to the freest criticism and subject to periodical alterations, and no

man should be expelled from the Church on account of *opinions* held. Church history shows that ecclesiastical courts and councils have again and again erred and condemned innocent men. Observation proves that the Bible is not infallible either in its scientific, historical, or even its moral and religious teaching. There is absolutely *no* infallible guide available in religious faith and practice, and hence every one who sincerely wishes to frame and fashion his life after the pattern of Jesus Christ's—every one who loves Him and would fain do Him service in the pulpit or the parish, should be cordially welcomed into the Church and ministry. In short *conduct*, not *creed*, should be made the basis of Church fellowship, and not until this is done will the Church do the work her Master intended her to do. Perhaps the day is not distant when these truths will be *practically* recognized, and the Church may be forced to reconstruct her dogmas on a more rational and scriptural basis. If so, it will be well to have it generally known, among the laity as well as among the clergy, that the Church has merely to re-assert the fundamental principles of the Reformation and to return to the simplicity of the Apostolic and Nicene Faith.

It is with the hope of promoting, in my humble way, this desirable end that I consent to the publication of the following speech.

HOWARD MACQUEARY.

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBERTY.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURT :

The Prosecutor's speech reminds me of the old story of the French king, who, with his lords and gentlemen, was making a tour through his dominions, and when he came to a certain provincial town the deputy of the mayor came forth to meet him and began his speech thus : " May it please your majesty, there are just thirteen reasons why his honor the mayor cannot come out to welcome you on this occasion. The first is that he is dead." When the king heard this he graciously excused the deputy from stating the other twelve reasons. The Prosecutor's speech amounts to this : The doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church are fixed and unquestionable quantities, whose meaning is so clear that a wayfaring man though a fool cannot err therein. On the other hand, the opinions of the accused clergyman are so explicitly stated in his book, and are so evidently contradictory of the doctrines of this Church, that he is ecclesiastically dead, and there is nothing for the Court to do but to bury him out of sight, and perhaps erect over him a modest monument bearing the immortal words of Dante : " All hope abandon ye who enter here."

I shall, therefore, aim to show first, that the doctrines of this Church are not fixed and unquestionable, and that their meaning is by no means so clear as the Prosecutor would have us believe. Secondly, I shall show that my opinions, rightly understood, are not so contradictory of the doctrines of this Church as to justify your condemnation of them.

" There are two sides to every question," says the popular

proverb most truly, and at last the time has come when the other side of the question now before you may be heard and considered. For months my critics and self-constituted judges have had things all their own way. They have not only greatly misrepresented and vehemently denounced both my theological and ecclesiastical position, but they have attacked my moral character. They have accused me of violating solemn ordination vows and they have, with few exceptions, steadily refused to let me refute their slanderous charges. They have done this, too, knowing that they were on the popular side of the question, knowing that thousands would applaud their defense of self-styled "orthodoxy" without ever taking the trouble to examine the opinions of the man they condemned. They have thus created a widespread impression in the Church and out of it that I was simply a young, presumptuous ignoramus, who wanted to create "a sensation" and win "notoriety" by advocating erroneous and strange doctrines.

Before beginning my defense, therefore, I wish to ask this Court: Have you been influenced by these criticisms? I fear that you have, for you are not superhuman, and even the most generous and sober-minded man must be more or less influenced by the assertions of learned Christian gentlemen, which are constantly and confidently reiterated. But if you have lent a willing ear to these criticisms, then you have prejudged this case against me, and there is no use in my proceeding with my defense, for even the inspired eloquence and arguments of St. Paul himself could not overcome prejudice. But if you have come here determined to ignore the aforesaid criticisms; if you are resolved to look facts and reasons in the face, and accept the conclusions to which they logically lead, regardless of consequences; if you are prepared to stem the tide of popular opinion and to set aside the will of the majority rather than do injustice to a humble fellow creature, who is as honestly seeking to learn and speak the truth as his condemners are, to say the least of it, then, indeed, I may hope for a fair hearing and a just judgment. Trusting that you will give me this, I proceed directly to my defense.

First. The first charge which "the indictment" brings against me is that I have violated my ordination vows by holding and teaching certain opinions specified. We must, therefore, examine the said vows and ascertain their nature and meaning. The first vow refers simply to the inward and spiritual call to the ministerial office which every candidate for holy orders is supposed to experience. The second vow reads as follows: "Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain all doctrine required as necessary for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ? And are you determined out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach, nothing, as necessary to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scriptures?"

The candidate answers: "I am so persuaded, and have so determined, by God's grace."

Third vow: "Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments and the discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded and this Church hath received the same, according to the commandments of God, so that you may teach the people committed to your care and charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same?" Answer: "I will do so, by the help of the Lord."

Now, this is the vow which is specified as that which I have violated. We must, therefore, consider very carefully its meaning. The vow is understood to mean that the candidate for the ministry promises to accept and teach the Creeds and Thirty-nine Articles of this Church just as they stand in the Prayer Book. On the contrary, I claim that the doctrine of Christ as this Church hath received the same is that the Holy Scriptures contain all doctrine required as necessary to salvation, "so that whatsoever is not read therein (to quote the sixth article of religion) nor may be proved thereby is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith." In other words, the doctrine of this Church is that the Bible is her Rule of Faith and Practice, and that each individual must test and interpret the creeds and articles by Holy Scripture, not Holy Scripture by the

creeds and articles. I claim that the third vow and all the other ordination vows and the articles themselves prove this opinion to be correct. Thus, note the little word "then" in the third vow. The candidate is first asked, "Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain all doctrine required as necessary to salvation?" and having answered in the affirmative, he is next asked, "Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine of Christ as this Church hath received the same?" This little word "then" refers us back to the second vow and shows us that the doctrine *there* stated is the doctrine of this Church, and that doctrine is that the Holy Scriptures rather than the creeds and articles contain all doctrine required as necessary to salvation. The sixth article, which I have just quoted, expresses the same doctrine, and hence we must believe that the Bible is our Rule of Faith, and that our formulas must be interpreted by the Scriptures, not *vice versa*. This answers the point made by the Prosecutor that the sixth article restricts the private judgment of the individual. Of course it restricts it. But to *what* does it restrict it? Manifestly to the Scriptures.

The other vows teach the same doctrine. Thus, the candidate promises in the fourth vow to "banish and drive away from the church all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to"—what? The creeds and articles? No, but "contrary to God's word." In the fifth vow he promises to "be diligent in prayer and in reading the *Holy Scriptures* and in such other studies as help to a knowledge of the same." This vow not only asserts the right of private judgment, but the duty of private judgment. The candidate binds himself to be diligent in prayer and in such other studies as help to a knowledge, not of the creeds and articles, but of the Holy Scriptures. Why should this promise be required of him if the Church has forever ascertained and settled the doctrines of Holy Scripture in her creeds and articles? Why should he be so diligent in his efforts to find out the meaning of the Holy Scriptures, if after all he dare not suggest that some article of the Faith is erroneous and needs restatement? If my opponents be right in their interpretation of the doctrine of this Church, this fifth vow is not only useless but it is absurd.

(2) But it is said by the Prosecutor and others substantially that there are many theories of the theological schools—theories of inspiration, the atonement, the sacraments, etc., upon which the Church allows difference of opinion, and the minister must test all these by the Scriptures, but there is a limit beyond which he cannot go, a point at which he must stop and accept the judgment of the Church in place of his own, and that limit is found in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. A man may interpret the Thirty-nine Articles, or at least those which do not touch the doctrines of the creeds, according to Scripture and reason, and accept or reject them as he chooses, but he must not touch the creeds. I maintain, sir, that this alleged limitation to the exercise of private judgment is not only imaginary, but the contention is disapproved by the Church herself.

Thus, turn to the eighth article of religion on the Creeds, and read: "The Nicene Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles's Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed." Why? Why, because "they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." But who is to show that they may be so proved? "The Church in General Convention assembled," it is answered. But how will such a question ever be brought before the General Convention for its consideration? Manifestly only by the efforts of some individual, perhaps a young parson in a country or village parish. It is clear that the Creeds must be tested by Holy Scripture by some individual, and if he find reason to believe that any one of their articles is either erroneous in form or in substance, it is his duty imposed upon him by the Church herself, to say so publicly, and let the question be fully discussed, and then submit it to the General Convention for its consideration. Suppose he were to act otherwise. Suppose, for instance, that I had said nothing publicly about another interpretation or a restatement of the articles of the Creed on the birth and resurrection of Christ, but had waited quietly until I had been elected a delegate to the General Convention (or perhaps a Bishop—I might have waited a long time) and had then arisen in Convention and moved that the words "Or born of Joseph and Mary" be inserted in the

margin of the Prayer Book as a substitute when preferred, for the words "born of the Virgin Mary." This suggested alteration in, or addition to, the creed would be of a piece with the alternate form of the article on the descent into hell. But what sort of reception would such a proposition meet with in the General Convention? Why, unless there are many more "heretics" in the Church than is generally supposed, such a proposition would be greeted with groans, and the mover of it would be considered either a fool or a "heretic" who should be dealt with—in this manner. That, sir, would be the result of any attempt to alter the formulas of this Church without first discussing them among individuals and before the Church at large. Is not this the method adopted by the Presbyterians in their attempts to revise their Confession of Faith? Is it not the method we adopted in our recent revision of the Prayer Book? Is it not the method adopted in effecting an alteration in, or an amendment to, the Constitution of the United States? Think of the tremendous agitation of the negro question before the public mind before the fifteenth amendment could be passed by Congress! And suppose that amendment had never been passed: Would the promoters of it have been condemned and executed as anarchists? Would they have been deprived of any of the rights of citizens? I trow not. But they would have been allowed to hold their opinions and exercise the functions of a public office, if elected thereto, just as we permit men who now believe in Womans Suffrage or the Single Tax or Socialism to hold public office.

The twentieth article of religion, on the authority of the Church, says: "The Church hath power to decree rights or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith; and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written" . . . and "as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation." . . . Again, I ask: Who is to decide whether the Church has or not ordained things contrary to the Scriptures? How will this question ever be brought before the Church for its consideration if he who raises it is at once excommunicated?

Bishop Harold Browne in his commentary on this article distinctly says : " The authority of the Church is not absolute and supreme. The decisions of the Church must always be guided by and be dependent on the statements and injunctions of the written word of God."

It is plain then, sir, that the doctrine of this Church is that the Scriptures are our supreme guide, and that each one of her children is bound to interpret both her creeds and articles by Holy Scripture, and suggest any alteration either in their interpretation or their substance which may seem to him necessary.

(3) The chief reason why the truth of this contention is not universally admitted is that intimated by the Prosecutor, that the creeds were established by the first General Councils and have been believed by the vast majority of Christians from that day to this. It is tacitly assumed and often explicitly asserted that the first General Councils of the Church were infallible and their decrees therefore unalterable. Yet this idea is flatly contradicted by the articles of this Church. Thus, the twenty-first article says : " Forasmuch as they (General Councils) be an assembly of men whereof all be not governed with the spirit and word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, in things pertaining to God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture." The American revisers of 1789 omitted this article from the Prayer Book when they adapted it to the changed condition of the Church after the Revolution. But they state in a note that they did so " because it was partly of a local and civil nature, and is provided for, as to the remaining parts of it, in other articles." They refer, of course, to the nineteenth article, which says : " The Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome (the very Churches which formed the first General Councils) have erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith." Hence it is plain that " this Church" rejects the infallibility of the first General Councils, and consequently the infallibility of their decisions. We are just as much bound by the doctrines of this Church to test her creeds

by Scripture and reason as we are to test any one of the Thirty-nine Articles. I am here reminded of the Prosecutor's statement that we have no right to appeal to one or two of the Thirty-nine Articles unless we accept all of them. What, then, is the use of having the sixth article among the thirty-nine if we cannot appeal to that for the purpose of rejecting what may seem to be unscriptural in another? May we not appeal to one article of the Constitution of the United States for the purpose of interpreting the meaning of another article or clause of the constitution? May we not appeal to the article on amendments for the purpose of altering the Constitution? It seems to me that that would be doing what the Constitution requires of us. I confess I cannot see the force of the Prosecutor's argument on that point. Perhaps he may be able to make the point more clear later on.

(4) It is quite as easy to refute the popular idea that because the majority have believed and do believe certain things, they are necessarily—or at least presumably—true; indeed, the fact that the majority believes a certain thing is sometimes presumptive proof that it is false, for the majority of men do not *think* and are easily influenced by demagogues. At any rate, this notion is easily refuted in the present case, for if the belief of the majority is true, then Christianity, Protestantism, and the claims of the Episcopal Church are all false. The followers of Buddha, Confucius, Zoroaster, and Mohammed far outnumber the disciples of Christ; and many of these devotees of what we consider false religions are more than a match for Christians in intellectual power. At one time, the Incarnation or Divinity of Christ was all but universally denied by Christians, and then it was Athanasius, a young archdeacon of Alexandria, against the world. When Luther began the Reformation it was Luther against Rome; and the Pope actually laughed at "Brother Martin," but his laughter was soon turned into mourning, and we believe that "Brother Martin" was right, the majority wrong. The Roman Catholics to-day urge this very fact—the fact that their Church is the oldest and largest church—against the claims of Protestantism, but we reject their contention as false. The Episcopal Church is much—very much—smaller than the great

Lutheran, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist and other Reformed Churches, yet it actually had the courage a short time ago to ask these bigger sisters to accept its "Historic Episcopate ; and although this offer has not been, and is not likely to be, accepted, yet we believe (none more firmly than I do) that "from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests and Deacons." And so you see that none of us really accept the opinion of the majority as infallible, but often reject it as erroneous. Every departure from accepted opinions is, of necessity, inaugurated by one or a few individuals: Had Christ and St. Paul bowed to the will of the majority, there would have been no Christianity in the world to-day. Had Athanasius bowed to the will of the majority, the Church would now be Unitarian instead of Trinitarian. Had Luther and the other Reformers bowed to the will of the majority, there would be no Protestantism. Had Galileo and Bruno and Kepler and Copernicus and Newton and Lyell and Darwin bowed to the opinion of the majority, we should still be believing that the earth is flat and stationary, that the sun moves round the earth, that the world was created in six days of twenty-four hours each, and that the first man was made out of mud and had life and mind blown into him through his nostrils. Had Columbus bowed to the will of the majority, this glorious land of plenty and freedom would not have been discovered when it was. These are some of the most familiar and illustrious examples of individuals who have had the courage to face the world and reject the will of the majority. In citing them I, of course, do not for one moment think of classing myself with them, for I am not worthy to unloose their shoes' latchet ; but I simply cite facts of history to show that the tyranny of the majority, if it had not been rejected in the great crises of the world's history, would have deprived us of the greatest blessings we enjoy to-day. These examples show that the world is frequently, and often most fortunately, ruled by a small minority.

But, Mr. Chairman, while I thus reject the infallibility of the first General Councils and of the majority—or rather while the Church rejects it—I am willing to bow to the authority of

the Council of Nice—that great Council that formulated and established A.D. 325 the great Catholic Creed of Christendom. Will this Court bow to this august and venerable authority? Surely the Church of Ohio will not have the courage to reject the decree of the greatest Ecclesiastical Council that ever assembled! But if not—if you are willing to accept the authority of the Council of Nice, then you must acquit me at once, for that Council—the Council whose very object was to define the doctrine of the Incarnation—that Council which was summoned and opened by one of the greatest Roman Emperors after Cæsar—that Council in which sat Athanasius, “the Father of Orthodoxy,” who formulated its Creed—that Council actually *omitted* from the Creed it established the article on the Virgin Birth of Jesus and did not define the nature of His resurrection. If you will turn to the article on “Creeds” in the Encyclopedia Britannica, which was written by that eminent scholar and theologian, the Very Rev. Principal Tulloch, you will find the original form of the Nicene Creed. It reads as follows: “We believe in one God, Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is to say, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things on earth, who for us men and for our salvation came down, and was made flesh, made man, suffered and rose again on the third day, went up into the heavens, and is to come again to judge the quick and the dead, and in the Holy Ghost.” Dr. Schaff in his large works on “The Creeds of Christendom” Vol. I. pp., 28 and 29 gives the same Creed, and you will observe that not one word is said in it about the Virgin Birth or the nature of the resurrection of Jesus.

These clauses were gradually added to this simple formula, not by councils, but by individuals, in order to meet various “heresies,” until finally the Creed assumed its present form. “Even in the Council of Chalcedon, the fourth General Council,” says Principal Tulloch, which met in A. D. 481, “when the Creed existed in its enlarged form, there was still a large

number of Bishops who greatly preferred the Creed in its original and simpler form, and it appears long to have maintained its ground alongside of the others in the Eastern Church."

It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that I have pretty respectable authority to sustain my position—the Council of Nice, whose great object was to define what was necessary as a creed of the Church, and a great number of Bishops at the Council of Chalcedon, and the usage of the early Eastern Church, and last, but not least, Athanasius, the Father of Orthodoxy. Again, I ask, therefore, will this Court bow to the authority of the Council of Nice and the early Church? I wish that some representatives of the so-called "Catholic Party" in our Church—i.e., the extreme High Church Party—were present, for these good brethren are forever appealing to the early Church for authority for the revival of Romanistic rights. Will the "Catholics" bow to the authority of the early Church and the Council of Nice? If so, then let them stop abusing me and condemning me as a "heretic." They want to have prayers for the dead, and they appeal to the early Church for sanction of this custom. For my own part, I will not quarrel with them, if they want to pray for their dead, because it can do no harm, and if the wicked will have a chance after death for salvation, our "Catholic" brethren may be able to pray some of their "heretical" friends out of purgatory. But I will quarrel with them if, after I accord them the right and privilege they claim, they refuse to grant me the same liberty, and I will quarrel with them till dooms-day. Will the "Catholics" bow to the authority of Nice and the early Church? Then let them join us, the real orthodox brethren. Not only did the Council of Nice not insert the article on the Virgin Birth among the necessary Articles of Faith, but Justin Martyr, in the 48th chapter of his well-known "Dialogue with Trypho," tells us that many Christians in his day—about 140 A. D.—believed that Christ was "born *man of man*"—that is, that He had an earthly father—but did he therefore condemn them as "heretics" and propose their excommunication from the Church? No; but he told Trypho exactly what I have been telling Trypho's modern represen-

tatives, that, although he (Justin) did not agree with those rejectors of the Virgin Birth, yet it was not necessary to the Incarnation, and so in addition to the Council of Nice and St. Athanasius and many bishops in the Council of Chalcedon and the usage of the early Eastern Church, I have the support of the first great apologist of Christianity in advocating the liberty of belief I claim.

It is true that the Creeds found in the writings of Irenæus—the latter part of the second century—and Tertullian and other “fathers” have the article on the Virgin Birth, but Principal Tulloch well says, “That these creeds were not of universal authority—they were the confessions of individual Churches.” “There was (he says) *no* rule of faith universally accepted by the Church or authoritatively imposed by any Catholic body up to the time of the Nicene Council. . . Each church seems to have had its own *regula veritatis* (rule of truth) or *confessio fidei*—confession of faith,” and as I have just shown, the Council of Nice did not even mention the points on which I am arraigned for heresy. The Apostles’ Creed, as is well known, is of a much later date than the Nicene Creed. “The Apostles’ Creed,” says Tulloch, “is not found in anything like its present form till four centuries after the faith of the Eastern Church was definitely settled in the Nicene symbol”—that is, about the middle of the eighth century.

Will the Church in Ohio, then, follow the example of the modern so-called “Catholics,” and especially the example of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, and decide the question now before you by the authority of the Nicene Council and the early Church? If so, then you must fully acquit me.

But it will be said; “Although the *original* form of the Nicene Creed omitted the article on the Virgin Birth and all definition of the nature of the resurrection of Jesus, yet its present form contains these articles and the second and fourth of the Thirty-nine Articles clearly define these dogmas.” That is true, and I will consider the force of that objection presently, but that has nothing to do with the fact now under consideration. I am now considering simply the fact that this Church rejects ecclesiastical infallibility in general and the

infallibility of the first General Councils in particular. But I am urging that, even if she accepted the authority of the early Church and Councils, she could not by such authority condemn me as a heretic. In other words, I am saying that if this Court condemns me as a heretic it will thereby condemn the Council of Nice, St. Athanasius, a great number of Bishops in the Council of Chalcedon, the early Eastern Church, a number of Christians mentioned by Justin Martyr, and the great apologist himself, as heretical. You will reject the authority appealed to by the English Reformers and the modern Catholics. That is the point I am urging. I am claiming primitive and most respectable authority for my position, and I submit that it is worthy of consideration.

Furthermore. Let it be distinctly understood that, while I thus go back to the very foundation of Christianity, and to the very root-questions between Romanism and Protestantism, I am not now advocating any re-statement or re-construction of the creeds and articles of this Church. I think—indeed, I am quite sure from the past few months' experience—that the Church is probably unprepared by several hundred years for any such re-construction of her formulas; but I am simply showing that if she were ready and if such a re-construction were deemed necessary, she would have the authority of the early Church and Councils to support her action, as well as the example of the Reformers. I am simply discussing the nature of the great basic principles of "this Church" in order to show that, in exercising the right of private judgment, I am simply discharging the obligations I assumed at ordination, and I am insisting that the articles of our Church and the examples of the Reformers and the decisions of the early Church and Councils all sustain me in claiming for *individuals* such liberty of belief and speech as I claim for myself. I am not therefore, advocating an ecclesiastical revolution, but simply asking for liberty to interpret the formulas of this Church somewhat differently from what some others do. In short, I am doing exactly what a member of Congress does when he proposes to construe some clause in the Constitution differently from what it has been generally construed. I am no ecclesiastical anarchist rebelling against

all authority and proposing a complete overthrow of the constitution of this Church, but a loyal son, defending her great principles and claiming simply the liberty that she herself grants.

Mr. Chairman, it is truly astonishing that a clergyman in the "Protestant Episcopal Church," in the closing years of the 19th century, should have to make such a plea? This Church, which is the mother of English Protestantism, and, bears the evidence of the fact in her very name—this Church, whose Articles were, many of them, taken from the Augsburg Confession of Faith, which was the summary of the opinions of the man who dared burn the papal bull and alone face the Lords Temporal and Spiritual in the Diet of Worms—this Church, whose loyal sons died amid the flames of Oxford and Smithfield for the sake of religious faith and freedom—this Church, whose grand old Bishops, in the 6th century rejected with disdain the proposals of Pope Gregory, when he sent Augustine and his Monks to England to preach the Romish faith, and rather than submit to this ecclesiastical power retired with their flocks into the wilderness of Wales—this Church, which claims, (and I believe rightly) to have been founded by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, the first of Protestants, after Christ, who in his immortal epistle to the *Galatians* bade them "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had set them free" as against the tyrannous yoke which a Judaising hierarchy of the day would have imposed upon the necks of the disciples—this is the Church which will ignore the teachings of apostles and martyrs the example of the primitive church and the doctrines of Reformers, and condemn a man for heresy, because, forsooth, he dares exercise his God-given conscience and reason and defend the principles of the Church he loves? Depend upon it, sir, if this be done the day is not distant when the memory of the action will bring a flush of shame to the cheeks of all loyal Churchmen and earnest Christians.

I have thus, I trust, shown that "the doctrine of Christ as this Church hath received the same" is that Holy Scripture, not Creed or article, is our Rule of Faith and Practice, and that our formulas must be interpreted by the Scriptures, not

vice versa. Observe the contention: It is not that the Creeds and articles must be *set aside* or ignored, but that they must be *interpreted by the Scriptures* and surely this court, whatever may be its respect for the Creeds and articles will not place them above the inspired Scriptures.

(6). But it will be said—it has been said—that I reject the Scriptures, and I must therefore refute this charge, which is easily done. On page 187 of my “*Evolution of Man and Christianity*” I say: “It may appear to some that this (my) view (of the Gospels) completely destroys the historic value of the books in question. To which I would reply: Not at all; it merely destroys a false theory of inspiration—the verbal theory. It merely asserts that there may be some chaff mingled with the wheat, which must be carefully separated from the wheat, but it declares emphatically that *the wheat is there*.” That is my view of the authority of the Scriptures. I take it that I need hardly tell this court that this Church has no authorized theory of inspiration and that she allows her clergy liberty to investigate the origin and authorship of the books of Scripture. Witness every theological seminary in our land, the papers read by theological professors in the recent Church Congress in Philadelphia, Nov., 1890, and all the writings of modern apologists.

I have high authority for rejecting the theory of verbal inspiration. In the celebrated trial of the Rev. Dr. Rowland Williams for rejecting the inspiration of Scripture, the Privy Council of the Church of England decided (I quote the exact words), “That it is not penal in a clergyman to deny the proposition that every part of every book of Holy Scripture was written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and is the word of God, that proposition not being found in the Articles or formularies of the Church.” Accordingly Dr. Williams was acquitted. This decision was a heavy and authoritative blow to the verbal infallibility of the Scriptures and has many important and far reaching implications.

Remembering, then, that I accept the authority of the Scriptures and merely reject an unauthorized and false theory of inspiration and interpretation let us pass to a consideration

of the specific charges of heresy which the "indictment" brings against me.

1. I am charged with a rejection of the Virgin Birth and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus. In answering these charges I wish, first of all, to clear up certain popular misrepresentations of my views, for I have been made out a greater heretic than I am, and I cannot clearly answer the indictment without explaining what I do believe. (1) First, it has been said repeatedly that I reject the Incarnation or Divinity of Christ. This is false. On page 286 of my book I say, "Defining the Divinity of Jesus Christ to consist in a perfect union of His human spirit with the Divine, we undertake to prove that this union existed." That is simply another way of expressing the doctrine of the Incarnation established by the Council of Nice and embodied in our second Article of Religion which says, "Two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man." This I believe. I think that the mode of Christ's birth and the fact of His divine character are two entirely different questions, and the Nicene Council, St. Paul and the writer of the fourth Gospel held the same view, since they all accepted the Incarnation, but said nothing of the Virgin Birth. In modern times many earnest Christians and theologians have done the same. Coleridge is an instance. He, though not a clergyman, was a member of the Church of England, an earnest Christian, a staunch defender of the doctrine of the Trinity and a teacher of many eminent theologians, and he thought that the doctrine of the Virgin Birth not only could not be proved and was not necessary to the Incarnation, but he said that it actually "doth weaken and bedim the evidence" of this great fact. A few days ago I received a letter from a clergyman in the Church in which he said: "I graduated at Kenyon College. Professor L. W. Bancroft held a professorship in the theological seminary at Gambier then. He recommended students to read Coleridge's works. My reading Coleridge was due to this. We were never informed that Coleridge was a heretical person; but it would appear

that Coleridge can no longer have any standing in the Ohio Church, neither can those who adopt his views."

Theological professors should be careful what books they recommend to theological students or the Church will soon be filled with "heretics." The only way to prevent this terrible calamity is to prohibit them from reading "the other side" altogether.

Thus, it is clear, I trust, that one may accept the Incarnation or Divinity of Christ, whether he accepts His Virgin Birth or not. (2) But, secondly, it has been said that I reject the miraculous conception of our Lord. This, also, is false. On page 220 of my book I say: "I hold, with Keim and with many of the evolutionists, that as great a miracle was wrought at the birth of Jesus as was wrought when life or self-conscious mind, was introduced on our globe; a distinct 'leap' was made in the process of spiritual evolution at His birth, whereby the goal toward which humanity is moving was reached in one case. Jesus was therefore 'the possibility of the human race made real.'" In other words, I believe that Jesus was a sinless being—that He had a perfect moral and spiritual nature and that His perfect nature was produced by a special operation of the Divine Spirit. The human spirit of Jesus was infused into a human body by a special exertion of the Divine will—that is, He was "Conceived by the Holy Ghost" acting along the lines of natural generation, albeit on a higher plane than that of His ordinary action. A perfect man would be a moral miracle, and believing, as I do, in Christ's sinlessness, I must believe that it was due to the God within Him. I therefore differ from many (not all) theologians simply in interpreting this article of the Creed. I hold, and will presently show that there are two views of Christ's birth in the New Testament, one of which assigns Him only one earthly parent, another giving Him two parents, and therefore we must make a choice, and exercising the liberty which the Church gives me, I claim that I may adopt either one of these views which seems to me the more reasonable, probable and credible. I further hold that we have Scriptural authority for the use of the *word* "Virgin" in the sense of "young woman" simply, married or unmarried. It is

well known to all scholars that the word as it is used in Isaiah vii. 14, is held to mean this by many of the ablest lexicographers, and Isaiah's prophecy forms the basis of the Gospel account of Christ's birth and the article in the Creeds. It is evident from the 15th and 16th verses of Isaiah vii. that the Prophet was speaking of some woman of his own time. Judah at that time had been invaded by Pekah and Rezin, kings of Damascus and Samaria, and Jerusalem itself was threatened with a siege. Isaiah predicted the overthrow of these two kings, but Ahaz, king of Judah, doubted his word. The Prophet, therefore, bade the skeptical king ask a sign of the Lord, but Ahaz, out of mock humility, refused to do so, and hence Isaiah said, "The Lord Himself shall give you a sign. Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel . . . and before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings;" and sure enough this happened in due time. The "sign," therefore, here spoken of, consisted not in the unnatural production of a child, but *in the measuring of the time of Judah's oppression by the infancy of a young woman's child named Immanuel.* It was as if some one during the late Civil War had predicted the defeat of the Confederates, and his prediction being doubted, he had said, "Well, before yon infant—the firstborn of its mother, cuts its teeth, my words will be fulfilled. If our enemies are not defeated by that time then my prediction will be proved to have been false. That shall be a sign unto you." Isaiah's use of the word "Virgin," then, in the sense of "young woman" simply, justifies us in attaching this meaning to it in other cases—especially in the case of the Creed. Of course, I know that Isaiah's prophecy was written in Hebrew, and that the original form of the creed was in Greek, and that the Greek word "parthenos," was generally used in our sense of the word "Virgin." But this does not alter the fact that we have Scriptural authority for the use of the word Virgin, in a different sense. If Isaiah had spoken Choctaw instead of "Hebrew" he would have meant just the same, viz., that a young woman would bear a son whose infancy would mark the limit of Judah's

oppression by her enemies. In answer, therefore, to the charge, that I reject the Virgin Birth of Jesus, I would say, while I reject the traditional and popular interpretation of this article of the Creed, I accept it in the sense defined by Isaiah, whose prophecy is cited by the Gospel writer as authority for his statement. I accept Christ's Virgin Birth, therefore, in the Scriptural, though not in the traditional and theological sense of the word, and I accept His divinity and miraculous conception. My contention is that traditional and popular theology has departed from Scripture, not only in the use of this word in the sense spoken of, but also in its rejection of the human fatherhood of our Blessed Lord.

To justify this contention I proceed to quote, first, some passages from two eminent theologians of good standing in this Church which express my own view, and secondly, the passages of Scripture showing the truth of my claim. The Rev. H. R. Haweis, M. A., incumbent of St. James's, Marylebone, London, who, by the way, is not disturbed by the ecclesiastical powers of the Church—says in this admirable work on "Christ and Christianity," Vol. 1, page 7 (Picture of Jesus)—"I take up Mark (about A. D. 70), the earliest, and Matthew (about A. D. 80), and Luke (about A. D. 90), and I find two distinct streams of tradition about the birth of Christ. Mark says nothing about the miraculous conception or the angelic appearances. They were, it may be, not currently reported in his day, for had he heard of them he could not have passed them over. Matthew and Luke came later, and embody the later tradition of the miraculous conception, but they *also embody the earlier view of Joseph's paternity, and accordingly give the genealogy of Joseph*. Matthew traces Joseph's lineage to David. Luke goes up to Adam, and plainly says that the current opinion was that Jesus was the son of Joseph—being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph. From Matthew's and Luke's point of view Joseph's pedigree would have been of no consequence at all. The miraculous conception blots him out." And his genealogy should, therefore, have been altogether omitted; indeed, no reference whatever to him was necessary; but these accounts of his pedigree are "merely the record of what was the early Christian belief,

possibly up to the death of Mary"—and our author should have added, what continued to be the belief of many Christians even so late as Justin Martyr's time, and long afterwards. Remnants of this belief crop out in Matthew xiii. 55, and John vi. 42, where Jesus is called the son of Joseph, the carpenter, by his acquaintances, who professed to have an intimate knowledge of his family, and it is notable that our Lord did not correct their false impression, if such it were, which is certainly very strange if Joseph were not His father, but is easily understood if he was. It should be noted that the question raised on these occasions was concerning Christ's divine origin and nature, and hence an assertion of his birth, had it been a fact, was peculiarly appropriate, if not necessary. The most remarkable passage, however, in the Gospels, is Luke ii. 41-48, particularly the 48th verse, which gives an account of Joseph and Mary's visit to Jerusalem, with Jesus when he was twelve years old. It will be remembered that he tarried at Jerusalem awhile after His parents started home, and they did not discover this until they had gone a day's journey from Jerusalem. When they did discover it they immediately returned to the city and found the boy in the Temple questioning the doctors. His mother said: Son, why has thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy *father* and I have sought thee sorrowing." It has been well said that "Mary was the only person who could know whether Jesus had an earthly father, and she is not known to have opened her mouth on the subject but once, and then she called Joseph his father." Of course, the traditionalists, interpreting this statement of the holy mother by the first chapters of Matthew and Luke, have understood her to mean that Joseph was simply His *foster father*, but may it not be that they have, as usual put the cart before the horse, and that this passage gives, with others, the true account of Christ's parentage? At any rate, His *mother's testimony is clear, and there is nothing in the context of the passage to show that Mary meant foster father* when she called Joseph our Lord's father. These passages in the Gospels are like the boulders which we discover far inland, which though the sea has left them high and dry, yet indicate that the sea once flowed over that

part of the land. At first sight, we may be disposed to attach little importance to these texts. Owing to our miseducation in Biblical knowledge, we may be disposed to ridicule him who cites them as evidence of a human fatherhood of Jesus, but when we duly consider the great fact that the Gospels were a *gradual formation from oral tradition*, we begin to see the force of the claim here made. It is well known that our Lord's disciples did not sit down immediately after his death and write the Gospel accounts of His life. On the contrary, St. Paul, who was not converted for six or eight years after the crucifixion, was the first to write anything about Christ, and he did not write his epistles for twenty-five or thirty years after Christ's death, and he says nothing about the Virgin Birth. The Gospels were written much later, and during this long interval all sorts of stories were started about our Lord. When, therefore, the Gospels were written, it is no wonder that their authors should embody some unhistorical matter in them and make a few mistakes. In the matter of the birth, in particular, they were peculiarly liable to err, for many stories by that time had doubtless got into circulation, and Mary being probably dead could not correct them, and as the disciples accepted the Messianic prophecies as inspired it was natural that they should apply Isaiah's words to our Lord, and thus originate the story of the Virgin Birth.

Thus we see how two accounts of this great event got into circulation, and we must be very careful to find out which is the correct account. In view of the fact that this Church teaches that her creeds and articles must be interpreted by the Bible—in view of the fact that we have no Pope and Vatican to ascertain for us the meaning of the Bible—to separate the chaff from the wheat—each one of us—even the obscure country parson—must struggle along the thorny path of Scriptural interpretation by the light which God gives him in his own conscience and reason. This I have done to the best of my ability, and if perchance I have gone astray—this, sir, is not the way to bring me back into the straight and narrow path of traditional orthodoxy.

I beg leave to quote, also the Rev. Dr. Edwin Abbott's

interpretation of the article in the Creed on Christ's birth. Dr. Abbott is an eminent clergyman in good standing in the Church of England, headmaster of the City of London schools, author of the article on the "Gospels" in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, and several fine theological treatises. On pages 278-9 of his admirable little work entitled "The Kernel and the Husk," he says: "In the resurrection of Jesus I believe that there was a unique vision of the buried Saviour, apparent to several disciples at a time ; but in the conception of Jesus I have no reason for thinking that there was anything unnatural apparent to the senses. What can I mean then by saying that Jesus was born of a Virgin ? All that I can mean is this :—

Human generation does not by any means account for the birth of a new human spirit. So far as we are righteous we all owe our righteousness to a spiritual seed within us. "We are not," as Philo would say, "the result of generation but the work of the Unbegotten." So far as we are righteous we are "born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." (John i. 13). But of the Lord Jesus Christ we are in the habit of saying and believing that he was uniquely, and entirely righteous ; and therefore we say that he was uniquely and entirely born of God. In all human generations there must be some congenital Divine act, if a righteous soul is to be produced ; and in the generation of Christ there was a unique and congenital act of the Holy Spirit. That Word of God which in various degrees inspires every righteous human soul (none can say how soon in its existence) did not inspire Jesus, but was (to speak in metaphor) totally present in Jesus from the first so as to exclude all imperfection of humanity. Human unrighteousness—such as we are in the habit of attributing to human generation—there was in this case, none. Therefore we say that the generation of Jesus was not human but Divine.

Mr. Haweis is even clearer on this difficult question than Dr. Abbott is. He says—"You ask me whether all God was in Jesus. I say, No ; Jesus says, No. Sides of the Almighty, of the invisible, the eternal—aspects inconceivable to man—never could be revealed through man's nature. God overlaps

Jesus, 'My Father,' he says, 'is greater than I.' You ask me of Torbay or Barmouth Creek whether it is the sea? I say, yes. You ask if it is the whole of the sea? I say, no. Yet a cupful or a pailful, and every part of the bay or creek, is true sea—the sea having its own mighty range and infinite potencies, has verily and indeed *flowed into* that earth-bound creek. All that is in Torbay is sea, but all the sea is not in Torbay; so all that is in Jesus is God, but all God is not in Jesus." And then lest he be understood to say that this influx of Deity into humanity was merely a "natural" event, he adds in another place: "To me all spiritual inhabitation, however accomplished, is in the highest degree mystic and *miraculous*." So that both Dr. Abbott and Mr. Haweis, while not accepting the common view of Christ's birth, believe in His divinity and miraculous conception—hold that His perfect Spirit was infused into a human body by a special operation of the Divine Will. In a chapter on "Ministerial Tests" Dr. Abbott says, "The advice which I have given to myself, I should also be inclined to give to others who are already ministers in the Church of England, and who have scruples of conscience in consequence of some divergence from orthodox views. It is this: Stay where you are as long as you feel that you can sincerely worship Christ as the eternal Son of God; and as long as you can preach a Gospel of faith and strength, not only from the pulpit but by the bedside of the dying. If you can do this, you may stay, though you are obliged to interpret metaphorically some expressions of the Creed."

Such then, sir, is what I have to say in reply to the charge that I reject the Virgin Birth of Jesus.

SECOND DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

MORNING SESSION.

The proceedings were opened by prayer by Rev. Putnam.

THE PRESIDENT : We will now proceed with the case.

REV. HOWARD MACQUEARY : Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Ecclesiastical Court. Before resuming my argument where I left off yesterday it may be well to briefly summarize the points made. First, I showed that the ordination vows and Articles of Religion teach that the Creed of this Church must be interpreted by the Scriptures. Second, that this must be done primarily by individuals who may ultimately avail themselves of Conventions to bring their interpretations into general use in the Church.

But an individual is no more debarred from exercising his private judgment by the formulas of this Church and suggesting alterations in their substance or interpretation than is a member of Congress from offering amendments to, or different constructions of, the Constitution of the United States, unless indeed the clergyman can furnish no Scriptural authority for his suggestions.

Third. This Church rejects the infallibility of the first General Councils and the majority, but even if she accepted them she could not condemn me, since the early Church, and especially the Nicene Council, allowed the liberty of belief I claim, and the majority have not always believed the dogmas which I reject. The Reformers of the 16th century and the modern so-called Catholics in our Church appeal to

the early Church, for authority for these proposed changes in the Liturgy and Doctrines of the Church.

Fourth. I accept the authority of the Scriptures and merely reject their verbal inspiration and infallibility, and I am sustained in so doing by the decisions of the Privy Council of England.

Fifth. I do not reject the Incarnation or Divinity of Christ, but believe that "in Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," although this influx of Deity into humanity occurred without violating the law of life previously ordained by God.

Sixth. I accept the miraculous conception of Christ ; that is, I believe that His perfect spiritual nature was specially begotten by the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life—that His human spirit was infused into a finite form by special act of the Divine Spirit. I, therefore, differ from the traditional and popular theology merely in my interpretation of this Article of the Creed and I justify my difference, first, by passages of Scripture which seem to me to indicate a human fatherhood of Jesus, and, secondly, by Isaiah's use of the word virgin in the sense of young woman simply.

We now come to the question of the resurrection. Here again my position has been greatly misrepresented, and I must therefore explain away such misrepresentation in answering the charges of the presentment. On pages 225-27 of my book I explicitly accept the doctrine of the resurrection as stated by St. Paul in First Corinthians, xv., which is the doctrine of this Church in her burial service. I do indeed claim, and I give facts and reasons to support the claim, that St. Paul's account of the resurrection was written before the Gospel account ; that it must be interpreted by his vision on the way to Damascus, by his statement that "there is a natural body and there is a spiritual body ;" that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," and that "the body which is buried is not the body that shall be" the organ of the soul in the spiritual world. I hold that St. Paul treats Christ's resurrection as the prototype, "the first fruits" of our own, and since he distinctly says that God will give us different bodies in or after death from those which

are buried, it follows logically that Christ's resurrection body was not that body which was crucified and laid in the sepulchre. I hold further, not that the Gospel accounts are false, but that they are substantially true ; only a few additions seem to have been made to the primitive Pauline account. I hold that the theory of a spiritual appearance of Christ after death explains the Gospel narratives themselves, with the exception of a few passages, better than the old doctrine, and that those excepted passages cannot be rationally and fairly explained by the old view. Nothing has been said to refute this contention ; only I have been denounced and my opinions have been ridiculed. But considering the eminent character of many in our Church and others who hold the same view it would have been a little more becoming in our opponents had they restrained their ire and ridicule and manifested a little more intellectual and spiritual power. The Rev. Mr. Haweis in the 24th chapter of his book, "Christ and Christianity," teaches the same view of Christ's resurrection that I do. Dr. Abbott in his "Kernel and Husk" accepts the spiritual resurrection of Jesus and closes his masterly discussion with these words: "You cannot have forgotten how St. Paul assumes that the appearances of the Saviour to himself and to the original apostles were of the same kind and on the same footing. And Christ," he says, "*appeared* unto Cephas ; he *appeared* unto James ; he *appeared* unto 500 brethren and last of all he *appeared* unto *me* also. In the two latest Gospels these appearances have been magnified into accounts that represented Jesus as possessed of flesh and bones, as capable of eating, as reclining at a meal, and as entering into long and familiar discourses. Naturally we ask as to St. Paul's the (indisputably) earliest account of a manifestation of Christ, what traces it exhibits of similar distortions and exaggerations ? You know the answer. There are no such traces."

To the same effect writes the Rev. Dr. Fremantle, Canon of Canterbury Cathedral, England, and Bampton lecturer for 1883, in an article which appeared in the Popular Science Monthly for June, 1887. "As to miracles," he says, "the theologian of the future will probably be but little concerned with

them. We have all learned to read in a natural sense the account of the crossing of the Red Sea, which even Mr. Arnold, some years ago took as meant to record a violation of physical order. The strong east wind, the cloud which beat in the face of the Egyptians, but by its lightning showed the Israelites their way; the waters kept back at low tide, by the east wind, and walling in the course of the fugitives, but returning upon their pursuers when the tide rose and the eye of God looked forth upon them through the cloud in the morning, lose nothing in majesty or in providential importance when we read them without importing violations of the laws of nature. And so it will be in many other cases. While as to those which are notable only for their strangeness, the action of hyperbole and the growth of the wonderful by tradition will be always present to the mind of the theologian and will make him pass over them with a light foot. We have no difficulty when we read of the miracles of St. Barnard or the prophecies of Savonarola, nor do they interfere with our estimate of those great men. The miracles of healing in the Gospels will, we can hardly doubt, always appear as evidence of a peculiar condition of human life in the East in the first century and of the restorative power of a great Personality." (In other words, our author means that they will be explained as "faith cures" and "mind cures.") "Little stress," he adds, "will be laid on the accounts of the infancy of Christ, since they are mentioned nowhere in the New Testament outside the first chapters of the first and third Gospels. In the case of the resurrection, the theologian who starts from the epistles of St. Paul as the solid central ground of New Testament literature, will go upon the apostle's teachings that not flesh and blood but the spiritual personality, clothed in the new house which is from heaven, inherits the kingdom of God, and will take the vision by which the apostle was converted as the type of all the manifestations by which the companions of Christ were assured that He was not lost but gone before. He will, with St. Paul take the assurance that Christ was alive after His passion, as the fulfilment of the general hope of immortality which Israel had long entertained."

Here is an eminent Doctor of Divinity boldly and publicly proclaiming as radical opinions as ever entered my mind, and yet he is not only undisturbed in his office but he is actually given the Canon's stall in the venerable Cathedral of Canterbury, and is put forward as a Bampton lecturer, the very object of which lectureship is the defense of the faith of this Church. Surely the "heretics" are quite a respectable body after all.

Rev. Prof. Alfred Momerie, who is Professor of Metaphysics in King's College, London, and preaches regularly at the Foundlings' Hospital and elsewhere, takes the same view of the resurrection that I do in his book on "The Church and the Creed." In a letter to me, which I am at liberty to quote, he says: "The facts you insist upon" (in my book) "*must be recognized* by the Church on pain of perishing everlastingly.

"Prof Jowitt some years ago said, in a sermon at Westminster Abbey: 'People would soon give up believing in miracles as they had given up believing in witchcraft.' I have not," he adds, "said much about miracles except implicitly, I, of course, do not believe in them except as the subjective fancies of unscientific men."

Since writing this, I have got an interview with Rev. Dr. Momerie, published in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and although papers are not infallible, I dare say this report is correct.

In this interview Prof. Momerie says: "The Bible does not make the ghost of a vestige of claim to inspiration in the orthodox sense. . . . I consider that 'In Memoriam' (by Tennyson) is in advance of St. John's Gospel."

The interviewer then asked: "Don't you believe Christ rose again?"

Dr. Momerie replied: "Certainly not physically. Why, do *you*? Come, I shall have to interview you. All great religious teachers have had an immaculate conception, a physical resurrection, Gautama as well as Christ. But Christ did not rise in His body. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom. It must be a spiritual resurrection." And yet this outspoken radical clergyman is not only permitted to preach in London pulpits, but is given a professorship in King's College and his

sermons are published and recommended to the faithful by the Church Press.

These few clergymen, the list might easily be enlarged, represent a large school of thought in the Church of England which, beginning with Frederick Denison Maurice, Dean Stanley, Robertson and others, has grown in strength and numbers and influence until now its leading representatives fill many of the most prominent positions in the mother Church. Yet with these facts staring us in the face, and known to all the intelligent world, I have been denounced and presented to this court as a "heretic" and it has been said that I stand absolutely alone in this Church. Nor let it be imagined that the liberal theologians are confined to the English Church. I speak deliberately and am prepared to prove the assertion when I say that they are as thick as hops in the American Episcopal Church, and if Churchmen generally do not know them, it is due to what our Roman Catholic brethren would call "invincible ignorance," but what we may generously prefer to call charitable blindness and obtuseness. I ask permission to refer to one or two such clergymen merely by way of illustration. The Rev. Dr. Heber Newton is Rector of All Souls' Church, New York City, in a diocese whose Bishop showed himself such a champion of traditional orthodoxy last summer, when a presbyter in Ohio, who, he had some reason to believe, was treading in Dr. Newton's footsteps, was appointed to speak in the last Church Congress. Dr. Newton in a sermon on "Robert Elsmere," which was published in his parish paper and was widely circulated and even quoted without disapproval by the orthodox *Standard of the Cross and the Church*, accepts Dr. Keim's view of Christ's resurrection. "Keim," he says, "whose life of Jesus seems to be the best expression of scientific criticism, concludes that the story of the resurrection was not a mere spiritual process in the mind of man, but was an actual experience on the part of the disciples of an influence emanating from the still living Jesus, whereby he made them realize that he was verily alive, a veritable objective experience. He thinks that we may and must believe as they did that Jesus communicated with them from the spirit sphere, that they received a telegram from

heaven." Strip the story of every possible accretion of legend (adds Dr. Newton on his own responsibility), dig down through the mass of conflicting details and you will touch the core of the tradition, the appearance of Jesus from the spirit sphere. It was the persuasion in the minds of the disciples that He had *thus* appeared to them which took form in the story of the resurrection."

I will give only one more instance. Sometime ago I received a letter of sympathy from a clergyman in the West, who graduated from Kenyon college and seminary, in which he avowed himself an agnostic—which I certainly am not—as he admitted. He said: "The disbelief in the old idea of a general judgment and general resurrection has had too many upholders to cause much criticism. But all so-called miracles must share the same fate, and none is so marked as the Virgin Birth or so necessarily devoid of proof. The moment the dogma of an infallible revelation falls it carries with it most of those things that are dependent on it alone."

This clergyman said in response to my query that I might use his name if I saw fit, but it is not necessary. He is the head master of a large school in the West and is evidently a thinker, but I dare say he, like the other clergyman I quoted, followed Prof. Bancroft's advice and read Coleridge and other profound philosophers, such as Spencer, and at last finds himself a right good heretic. I might mention others. Indeed I might a tale unfold about the good "heretics" in our Church that would probably make you tremble for the fate of traditional orthodoxy, but I don't want to shock you and I have cited enough instances to serve as representatives of the large and growing school of liberal theology in this Church. Some of us are, of course, more radical than others, but all, or none, deserve condemnation as "heretics."

After what has been said it must be evident to you and the court that the great questions before you now refer to the *inspiration* and *interpretation* of the Bible and the interpretation of the Creeds. I maintain, on the authority of the Privy Council of England, that this Church has no authorized theory of Scriptural inspiration and no prescribed method of interpretation. She says simply "Holy Scripture

containeth all things necessary to salvation." She does not say that all that Holy Scripture contains is inspired and necessary to salvation. She does not say that every word in the Bible came from God. She does not even say that those passages of Scripture which are cited in proof of the old doctrines of the birth and resurrection of Christ are infallibly and unequivocally true and must be accepted as such by her clergy. The prosecutor has referred to the epistles and gospels and lessons for Christmas Day and Eastertide as Scriptures bearing the stamp of this Church's approval as inspired Scriptures. But I beg him to remember these sensible words of the twentieth Article of Religion, viz.: The Church may not "so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another." It will not do therefore to disconnect certain texts or chapters of Scripture from other passages bearing on the same subject ; but they must all be considered. I know as well as any one that certain passages of Scripture assert as plainly as possible the literal Virgin Birth and bodily resurrection but there are other passages which, considered in the light of what we know of the origin of these writings, express another view of these events. St. Luke tries to prove that Jesus had flesh and bones after he arose from the dead, but St. Paul says that "the body that is sown (buried) is not the body that shall be, but God giveth us bodies as it shall please Him." And that Christ "has become the first fruits of them that sleep." St. John says that the risen Jesus passed through closed doors, but we know enough of matter and the laws of matter to say that a body of flesh and bones capable of eating fish, honey, etc., could not do this. St. Paul says : "There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body," two different organisms ; that our resurrection body will be a spiritual organism. Mary called Joseph Christ's father, and his intimate acquaintances did the same, and many of the early Christians believed that Joseph was His father. And so we are confronted with two views of Christ's birth and resurrection, mutually contradictory and irreconcilable. Instead of attempting to harmonize them by far-fetched explanations of their discrepancies, we should accept the one offering the fewest difficulties and

explain the discrepant details as due to the gradual formation of the Gospels from oral tradition. At any rate, it won't do to cite one passage of Scripture as conclusive of a question when another passage contradicts it, for if so, we do "so expound one passage of Scripture that it is repugnant to another." Let not the Prosecutor attempt to turn this argument against my own interpretation, for I have just said that when two passages of Scripture conflict one must be given up, and that should be given up which offers the most palpable marks of error. In other words, since we cannot in such a case accept both passages as true, and since it would be foolish to reject both, it only remains for us to accept the most probable and credible. I accord to the Prosecutor the right to accept the passages of Scripture embodying the old views of Christ's birth and resurrection, if he so desire, and I claim under the authority of this Church, the right to prefer the passages of Scripture which support and suggest my views of those events. It forbids me to give contradictory interpretations of Scripture, and since the said passages do contradict one another, I am forced by the Church to make a choice, and I therefore choose those passages which seem to me most rational, probable, and credible. This has always been the method of Scriptural interpretation, and interpretations have always varied according to scientific and historical knowledge and discoveries.

When it was believed that the earth was flat and stationary and that the sun moved around it, our theological professors interpreted the Bible by this knowledge—or rather ignorance. When it was believed that the world was created in six days of twenty-four hours each the Bible was interpreted according to this belief. When it was believed—and where it is now believed—that man was made out of mud and had life and mind blown into him through his nostrils, the Bible was and is interpreted according to this science, falsely so called. When it was believed that "the sun do move" the story of Joshua stopping its mad career until he could whip Israel's enemies was accepted as literally true, but it is now interpreted differently. The cures which our Lord wrought are quite generally explained from our pulpits and

in theological treatises to have been simply faith cures and mind cures. Indeed the Bible says they were. The literal resurrection of our bodies is nowhere believed by intelligent people. All apologists make most energetic efforts to show that the miracles recorded in the New Testament were not violations of natural law and order, and in doing so they are compelled to depart from the old method of interpretation, and to reject a few of the details of the stories. And so I claim that I not only do not violate my ordination vows in proposing to interpret the story of Christ's birth and resurrection as I do, but I stand right in line with all modern apologists, some of whom have spoken out just as plainly as I have, and have not been, and doubtless will not be, disturbed in their office.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us turn from the interpretation of Scripture to the interpretation put upon certain articles of the Creed by even Bishops in the Church and we will see that my proposed interpretation of the articles on the birth and resurrection of Jesus is not one whit more strained and unnatural than their interpretation of other articles. The Creed says that there will be "a resurrection of the body," and there can be no question about the meaning of the word body as it stands in the English Creed or in the original Greek form: it means exactly what it seems to mean, and the framers of the Creed and all of the old theologians interpreted this article to mean that there would be at the last day a resurrection or a re-collection of the very particles of the body which is laid in the grave and a re-formation of them into the exact bodies that were buried. But, as already stated, no intelligent theologian believes this doctrine now. I venture to think that neither the prosecutor nor any member of this court, nor our respected Bishop himself, believes this doctrine of the resurrection, yet it is the doctrine of the Creeds if they are literally construed. The eminent Bishop of Carlisle, Dr. Goodwin, in his recent work on the "Foundation of the Creed" says of this view of the resurrection: "This view of the possibilities of the future resurrection is mentioned here because it is one which our present knowledge of matter and its laws renders it imperative upon all wise men to discard.

Matter which appertains to one body at one time appertains to another body at another. The notion of particle being joined to particle so as to reform a certain body, involves an impossibility because the same particles may have belonged to a thousand different bodies and may be claimed by one as rightfully as by another. In fact, it is only necessary to bring the notion into contact with what we certainly know concerning material particles to break down and annihilate it."

This is a thoroughly rational argument and the rationalistic method of interpreting the Scriptures and the Creeds, and had Dr. Goodwin lived a hundred years ago and expressed such opinions he would have been condemned and excommunicated as a "heretic." But he really expresses the opinion of the great body of theologians and intelligent believers. Let us apply this method of interpretation to other articles of the Creed—the articles under consideration. We know enough of matter and the laws of matter to say that it is impossible, by *the very definition of matter*, for *two* pieces of matter to occupy the *same* space at the *same* time, and hence a bodily form could not go through closed, wooden doors, as Christ's is said to have done, without breaking them open. If His body did this, then it was not a body but something else. In attempting to get over this difficulty traditionalists really convert the physical body into a spiritual organism, and so come around by a more circuitous route to our view. They would act more rationally and scripturally to let the body go in the first place. We know enough about embryology and natural order to say that the virgin birth of a person is, if not impossible, at least so *improbable* as to require overwhelming evidence to prove it. We know enough of history and of the time of Christ to say that no such evidence is forthcoming, and that such stories as those in question grew up around great persons, but were not true. I urge, then, that if we apply Dr. Goodwin's method of interpreting the Creed in its full meaning, you cannot condemn me. But the article on the resurrection of the body is not the only article of the Creed upon which a non-literal interpretation is put by even Bishops in the Church. The Creed expresses belief in "life everlasting," and perhaps no other article in the Creed has been so generally

interpreted literally. No reader of the Bible or the Creed would, unless some outside influence suggested it, imagine that the wicked are to be totally destroyed in hell and the righteous alone to enjoy "life everlasting." Yet it is well known that belief in the final destruction of the wicked is spreading rapidly in the Church. A Bishop in an adjoining diocese told me not long ago that he believed this doctrine. Prebendary Row of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, strongly advocates it in his able work on "Future Retribution." A presbyter formerly of New York City, and now rector of the largest Church in Washington City, believes this doctrine, and because of it lost the Bishopric of Virginia, yet he was undisturbed at the time by the orthodox Bishop of New York, and is now undisturbed by the orthodox Bishop of Maryland. These are mere samples of a large and increasing number of clergymen who restrict most unwarrantably the article on "life everlasting" to the righteous. This article is applied by Pearson and all the old theologians to both the wicked and the righteous. Indeed, the everlasting punishment of the wicked, and therefore their eternal existence, is still considered by many the orthodox opinion, and in former years—less so nowadays—was preached as the great power of God for saving sinners. In departing, therefore, from this doctrine, and in interpreting this article of the Creed as referring only to the righteous, theologians, bishops and preachers have all departed from the literal, *prima facie* meaning of the Creed. How, then, can this court consistently condemn me for preferring to put a non-literal or metaphorical meaning on other articles of the Creed? *Condemn us all, or condemn none*, is the dictate of common sense and common justice! If it be said that by such methods of interpretation the very essence of the Creed may be sapped and emasculated, I answer: Not so; for the *matters in dispute are not, and never have been considered of the essence of faith*. The Council of Nice evidently did not so consider them. All it required was belief in the Incarnation of the Divine Word and His *post mortem* appearance to His disciples. It did not insert the article on the Virgin Birth in the Creed, nor define the nature of the Resurrection. Whoever, therefore, accepts the essence of

these articles, namely, the Incarnation and Christ's *post mortem* appearance to His disciples, should be accounted orthodox, and be permitted to interpret the *mode* of the Incarnation and the nature of the resurrection as seems to him most rational and Scriptural. If I were a Materialist or an Agnostic; if I attacked or rejected the Incarnation or miracles altogether, then I could better understand why this court should condemn me, for I could not justly claim that Scripture sanctioned my views. But I do not reject miracles, I merely understand them differently from what some others do. I believe in prayer for material blessings, and this some of the clergy of this diocese do not believe. I beg the court, therefore, to seriously consider such facts.

It is said that my interpretation of the Creeds is not an honest one. After all I have said, after having shown that this Church requires her clergy to interpret the Creeds by the Scriptures, and both by facts and reasons, this assertion appears false. But I will quote as a further answer to it the forcible words of Rev. Mr. Haweis. He says truly: "Every living party in the Church has been charged with dishonesty just so long as it was a *reforming* party. The Low Church were called dishonest because they leaned to Nonconformity and its irregular ways; but the Low Church got itself accepted, and has long since been dubbed orthodox. Indeed, Lord Palmerston, under Lord Shaftesbury's dictation, would have none but Low Church Bishops.

The High Church was called dishonest because it leaned towards Rome, but that, too, got itself accepted, and now it is better to be rather High Church than otherwise (whether Gladstone or Salisbury be in power) if you want to be a bishop; and so the Broad Church, who are the latest reformers, are naturally denounced as dishonest because they want to remould the doctrine and the ritual of the Church into accord with nineteenth-century thought and feeling.

When people attack the Broad Church with—"Do you believe the doctrines of the Church? Do you approve of the formularies of the Church?" it is sufficient answer to say:—The Church of England doctrine is believed, and the Church liturgy is used and preached in the High and Low Churches,

but it does not sound quite the same in both, and it certainly does not *look* at all the same ; why expect more from the Broad Church ? We believe and preach the doctrines and we use the forms in our way, they in theirs ; condemn us all, or acquit us all, we are all guilty, or we are all innocent.

The Low Churches had at one time such a contempt for ecclesiastical forms that they could hardly abide the bishops, or bear the trammels of the liturgy at all. Wesley arrogated to himself Episcopal functions ; and the Lady Huntingdon connection fairly stepped across the border ; yet Lady Huntingdon's first chaplain and trustee, Dr. Thomas Haweis, lived and died Rector of Aldwinkle in the Church of England.

The High Church openly detest the word Protestant, and denounce the Reformation as a curse. Their doctrine of the Real Presence in the Sacrament is closely akin to the gross materialism of the Mass, but the High Church have stood their ground as honest men for a' that.

The Broad Church call for Re-statement. They are for dropping what is obsolete, but not all at once. They would go on printing the Prayer Book with *alternative forms and additions*. They are for recovering and re-setting the essential truth which lies at the bottom of every dogma, correlating the new knowledge with current religious thought, and re-adapting the Church functions to the needs and the intellectual, social, and æsthetic instincts of the age ; and the Broad Church presume to call themselves honest men for a' that.

You don't call your M.P.'s, Mr. John Morley or Mr. Bryce, dishonest, because they admire Republican opinions, and yet take the oath of allegiance to Her Majesty. People have almost left off calling Parnell dishonest because he, like many others, continues to be an M. P. and a Home Ruler as well.

Our judges are not thought dishonest because they take the oaths, and are content to preside over a mass of laws, some obsolete, some contradictory, some sorely in need of re-statement, and not a few which call for interpretation in strained and non-natural senses. But what are the difficulties of the British Constitution, and what is the confused and heterogeneous mass of the English law— what is the mixed

position of the M. P. or the judge compared to the confusion, the jumble of things old and new in religion, with which the clergyman of the Church of England has got to deal? And what should he do under the circumstances? Why should his principle be other than that which governs judge or M. P.?

To the same effect writes the *New York Press* for Dec. 14th, 1890, in reference to this trial: "A man," it says, "who belongs to a certain denomination, who loves it with that fervor with which organized religion, like strong political partisanship, often inspires its votaries, has a certain right to say 'I will not go out. I will stay in, and you can't put me out for anything short of treason to a vital principle. This is my religious home and country, and you cannot evict me or banish me. It is my right, under the conditions of human fallibility, to appeal to reason, and to agitate for a change for the better or for what I think is for the better.'"

"This is the position taken by the revisionists in the great Presbyterian Church, about its Confession of Faith. It is that taken by the Rev. Howard MacQueary in the Episcopal Church. We believe that sooner or later all religious denominations that do not claim that they are the only and eternal repositories of infallible truth must recognize its honesty and justice. Certainly the clergyman who takes it can no longer be pushed aside with a wave of the hand and condemned as a violator of his ordination vows, because he refuses to conform to teachings that the world's experience of practical Christianity shows to be not indispensable to the fruits by which alone we know the truth."

The most remarkable article, however, on this case, is one which appeared in the *New York Churchman* for November 15th, 1890. I wish to cite it as a witness to my essential orthodoxy, partly because this paper has been so severe in its criticisms of my position, and partly because it suggests facts which this court should seriously consider in forming its judgment in this important case. Says the *Churchman*: "We sincerely regret to learn that the presentment in the case of the Rev. Howard MacQueary has been allowed, and that

within a few weeks that gentleman will be put on trial for error in doctrine.

“The pity of the thing is that Mr. MacQueary, probably from lack of knowledge, is much nearer the truth than his wild words have made him seem to be. On the subject of the resurrection he strenuously affirms his conviction of its spiritual reality. But for one dreadful and intolerable phrase, which Mr. MacQueary does not perceive to be contradictory of his own theory, what he says of the resurrection in general might be fairly reconciled with the doctrine of St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv., and more than justified by the express language of the catechism of the Council of Trent,” (Think of it ; I’m a pretty good Romanist according to the *Churchman* !) “In this matter, therefore, Mr. MacQueary asserts essential truth ; and the intolerable error which he asserts along with it is not only contrary to his own theory and to the faith of universal Christendom ; it relates to a matter of which Mr. MacQueary knows absolutely nothing, and of which it was both needless and presumptuous in him to speak.

“Much the same may be said of his doctrine of the birth of Christ. He maintains the Incarnation to have been—as an Incarnation must be—a miracle. The nature of that miracle he does not attempt to tell ; but he presumptuously tells what, in his judgment, it cannot possibly have been. (I say nothing of the kind.) Here, as in the other matter, Mr. MacQueary affirms essential truth, and with it an intolerable error contradictory of the faith of universal Christendom, “Poor Nice !”) on a matter of which Mr. MacQueary can have no special knowledge.

“Modesty alone ought to have kept Mr. MacQueary from his gratuitously shocking assertion concerning the Crucified Body of our Lord. Modesty alone ought to have kept him from declaring that, because *he* could not understand a Virgin Birth, therefore the miracle of the Incarnation cannot have been that of a Virgin Birth. So has it been in every successive denial of the faith. The beginning is a presumptuous love of singularity ; the end is heresy and schism.”

The spirit of this article is unworthy of notice. It is characteristic of a large class of writers who think that any one

who differs from them must be a fool or a lover of notoriety and sensationalism. They cannot imagine such a one's being influenced by earnest convictions and a deep sense of duty. But passing over the contemptible slurs on my knowledge and motives, I wish to call the earnest attention of the court to these facts :

First. Even according to the strictly orthodox *Churchman* there is much truth in my opinions, and hence in forming your judgment you must carefully distinguish the truth from the error, else this Church will place itself in the unenviable position of condemning the truth as well as error.

Second. When you have sifted out the error from the truth, you will find that it is so small a particle that the Church ought to hesitate to condemn a man for holding this atom of error. She cannot *afford* to condemn her clergy for so small an offense, for while some hold this alleged error, others, as has been shown, hold opinions which, strictly measured by the letter of the formulas, are equally erroneous. Even the Evangelicals themselves will be brought under your ban if you attempt to enforce the letter of the Prayer Book's teaching. They constantly violate the rubrics and letter of the formulas. But because they accept the essence of the Church's faith you let them remain in the church, and you act wisely and well, for otherwise you would do nothing but hold heresy trials till Gabriel blow his trumpet.

Third. Remember that the article on the Virgin Birth is practically a *dead letter* in our Church. We repeat it during service, but we never appeal to it even in a sermon on purity. Now, we could understand why the Roman Church should insist on a belief in a literal interpretation of this article, for the doctrine has many practical bearings and consequences in that Church, but in Protestant Churches it is absolutely a dead letter.

I ask you, therefore, can this Church afford to condemn one of its clergy for questioning an article of the Creed which does not touch the essence of the Creed, which has no practical importance, which was not insisted upon by the Nicene Council, which is *accepted by the accused clergymen in as true a sense as the articles on life everlasting and the*

resurrection of the body, are accepted by even Bishops, and which lacks the support of science and Scripture? Surely you cannot ignore all these facts, and in deference to popular prejudice and clamor condemn a man who, whatever may be his intellectual defects, is at least honest and is honestly seeking to learn the truth as it is in Jesus, and to lead his fellow men into that truth, and fashion his life and their lives as nearly as possible after the Master's example.

But if all that I have said had little or no force in it there is another fact which I wish to appeal to, in conclusion, and which, it seems to me, cannot be too carefully considered by this court, and that is the fact that we live in a *transitional period*. Many old things and old beliefs are passing away or being changed. Theology is in a tremendous state of flux and ferment, and this Church should, therefore, be very careful about putting itself on record as bound by the letter of any formula, or opposed to any opinion that does not touch the very heart and core of Christianity. Whether the views I advocate are true or not, they are rapidly spreading among all thinking people, and ere the twentieth century dawns they will be all but universally accepted. They are spreading among both the clergy and the laity. Hear what the *Churchman* said on Oct. 4, 1890, about the general acceptance of the evolution theory by the clergy: "Whether we like it or not, the world at large has come to think and habitually express itself in the terms of evolution. It is a fact which cannot be denied or ignored that that part of mankind which thinks for itself and for all the rest has unequivocally accepted the hypothesis of evolution as the only conceivable theory of the becoming of the universe. It cannot be said that Christian theologians of any church or of any school have been in haste to accept the evolution theory. Indeed the caution, the reluctance, the almost painful aversion with which they have regarded it goes far to emphasize the fact that bit by bit it has at length made its way into many minds of unfaltering Christian faith. Instances and illustrations of this observation present themselves continually." But not only has this theory of evolution been generally accepted by theologians, the results of Biblical Criticism have also been accepted. I

need only cite two remarkable papers read before the recent Church Congress in Philadelphia by two eminent theological professors of this church. Those able and earnest minded men told the Church that, whatever imperfections might appear in the productions of particular critics, however much they might differ on minor points, they had completely exploded many of the old ideas of the inspiration, authority and authorship of the Bible, and henceforth that Sacred Book must be considered very differently from what it has been. They told us that Biblical Criticism had come to stay and its substantial results must be accepted. These ideas are in the very air we breathe. It is impossible to resist them. You may condemn me but you will not either silence me or stop the spread of the opinions I advocate. Far abler men than I am—perfect intellectual Goliaths—are waging the warfare of spiritual enlightenment and ecclesiastical freedom. All the leading educational institutions of the land are teaching these views. Yale and Cornell Universities have recently established claims in Comparative Religion and no other branch of study has done so much to broaden men's ideas of religion and to explode traditional opinions as this study has. Other institutions will follow the example of Yale and Cornell, and so the rising generation of young men and women, who will furnish intellectual and religious teachers to the next, will be thoroughly imbued with scientific ideas, and the inevitable result will be the rejection of many opinions which we consider everlasting. The Episcopal Church claims to be a leader of thought. Let her, then, prove herself to be this. She claims to be liberal. She claims to follow the example of the primitive Church. Let her fulfill this claim. She claims to have been founded by Christ and his apostles. Let her manifest the spirit of the Master and she will not condemn me, for you remember that He rebuked His disciples because they forbade one to cast out devils because he did not follow with them, and do it as they thought he ought to do it. Let the Church which claims its origin from Jesus imitate that spirit, and she will not only not condemn a man for rejecting a dogma which He never authorized, but she will

greatly increase her influence over men and draw them to the Master.

The *spirit of the age* is opposed to condemnation for opinions, Said *The Christian Union* in a recent editorial on this trial: "We regret very much that any such trial is to take place. This is an *antiquated* method of arriving at the truth, unfitted for our age. A far better method, and one more in consonance with the method of the New Testament, would be to leave Mr. MacQueary and his views to the test of time in a free field—" and yet this paper criticised my book most unsparingly and rejected much of its teachings.

Said the *New York Times* last summer: "The ecclesiastical authorities of Ohio would cut a sorry figure before the religious public in trying to convict Mr. MacQueary of having denied in his book the faith to which he pledged himself at his ordination. It would be just as reasonable for the English Church to accuse the Bishop of Ripon of heresy because he has granted, in his "Permanent Elements of Religion" that the strength of modern apologetics lies in the *ethical* rather than in the historical conception of Christianity. Mr. MacQueary's book is simply a pioneer volume in a field where theologians are just beginning to make adventures. The late Canon Aubrey S. Moore, has been strongly commended in England for doing almost precisely what Mr. MacQueary has done. To attempt to crush Mr. MacQueary by throwing him under the wheels of the ecclesiastical Jugger-naut would be to make a martyr of one (a very poor martyr, Mr. Chairman,) who is not an exception among many of his brethren in point of belief, but has simply said in his book what others are saying and holding as practical beliefs. It is to be hoped that Mr. MacQueary may be treated as one among the many searchers after truth who, though questioning old dogmas, are not opposing them with the desire to destroy the faith but to make Christianity concordant with the dictates of plain common sense. The Rev. Dr. Heber Newton barely escaped an ecclesiastical trial for holding opinions similar to those affirmed by Mr. MacQueary, and the wisdom of not bringing him to trial and condemning him has been abundantly justified."

The writer of this sensible article is an Episcopal clergyman in good standing, and he knows whereof he speaks, and he expresses the opinion of scores and hundreds, yes, thousands, in our Church and in this country. He rightly says that I am not opposing old dogmas with a desire to destroy the faith, but rather with a view to make Christianity accordant with nineteenth century thought. The prime object of my writing a book was not to create a sensation or to attack the faith, but to show that the *substance* of the Gospels and the Creed could be accepted in spite of the objections and difficulties skepticism has raised. I urge and in this speech I trust I have proved, that the physical concomitants of the miracles of the birth and resurrection of the Saviour, which so offend scientific and critical minds, may be given up, and yet the essence of the faith and the Gospels will be left untouched. But a heresy hunting "religious press," so-called, has passed by this commendable aim and has seized on the concessions I made to a reverent and conscientious skepticism in order to save the substance of the faith it doubted, and has magnified a mole-hill into a mountain of doubt and heresy, and has thus forced upon the Church an issue which ought not to have been raised and which may produce untold difficulties—may check enlightened thought among Christians and make hypocrites out of clergymen. I beseech you, therefore, Gentlemen of the Court, to act very cautiously and considerately in this matter. You are, I know, placed in a serious dilemma. On the one hand, are the so-called orthodox people in our Church and others who will denounce you if you acquit me. On the other hand are the thinking, liberal minded, charitable people who will applaud such an action as both wise and right, and they will condemn and denounce severe measures, if they be taken. Choose you, therefore, which horn of the dilemma you prefer. If you prefer to incur the disapprobation of the so-called orthodox people, your tolerance will be sustained by the early Church and Councils, by the great principles of the Protestant Episcopal Church, by the enlightened mind and conscience of the best men and women of this age and by the Master Himself, and

in a short time the wisdom of your action will be fully proved.

This, then, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Ecclesiastical Court, is what I have to say in reply to the charges brought against me.

First, I do not violate my ordination vows, because those vows not only give me the right but impose upon me the duty to study the Scriptures by the light of facts and reasons and to interpret the Creeds and Articles by the same.

Second, this Church has no authorized theory of Scriptural inspiration or interpretation, but leaves every man to adopt his own theory.

Third, I do not reject the Incarnation, Miraculous Conception or Resurrection of Jesus, but simply interpret these articles of the Creed somewhat differently from what many others do.

Fourth, my interpretations of the Creed are no more strained and unnatural than those universally allowed to be put upon it, particularly on the articles on the resurrection of the body and life everlasting.

Fifth, my opinions have been tolerated in the church from the days of Justin Martyr and the fathers of Nice and Chalcedon to modern times, and are now tolerated in the English Church and American Episcopal Churches in many cases.

Finally, it is most unwise in the Church to put itself on record in this transition period as opposed to any opinion which does not touch the very core of Christianity, and I have the authority of Nice for saying that my alleged errors do not touch the essence of the faith.

I hope, therefore, for the sake of the Church, for the sake of the truth, for the sake of honesty and freedom among the clergy, as well as for my own sake, you will return a verdict of not guilty.



