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

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

For the first time he enjoys God. For the first time he is born of God. For the first time his life is hid with Christ in God. God, *God*, GOD, is the one being to whom his soul mounts up, and in whom he enters into rest. He may be flooded with joy unspeakable, because he is engulphed in the blessedness of GOD.

ARTICLE III.

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

BY REV. GEORGE N. BOARDMAN, BINGHAMTON, NEW YORK.

THE science that has for its object the laws of wealth must have many relations to a gospel intended specially for the poor. The names of Chalmers, Whately, and Wayland suggest to every mind an association of Political Economy and the Christian Ministry. The sermons of the period of the American Revolution show that the pulpit has heretofore in stirring times considered the public weal as properly coming under its survey. The essays of such men as Dr. Palmer, Dr. Thornwall, Prof. Hodge, called forth by our civil war, show that those who expound the laws of God consider it their right at least, no doubt their duty, to expound also the principles of civil government. The clergy of our land have never, to any considerable extent, relinquished the right to advocate such social virtues as temperance and the observance of the Sabbath, nor will they, until they expunge the decalogue from the Sacred scriptures, cease from their efforts to suppress profaneness and licentiousness. Still it may be questioned whether they have not left these works too much to occasions and transient excitements, whether they have sufficiently considered that the godliness which they preach has the promise

of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come. Domestic comfort, the supply of physical want, the use of worldly wealth, might have been made themes of popular discourse far more frequently than they have been, since in their connection with practical morality they force themselves upon the consideration of one who fills the office of both pastor and preacher.

It will be the aim of this Article to state some of the advantages to be derived by the Christian minister from the study of political economy; also some of the advantages which his profession gives him for the pursuit of this science. Our purpose will not require a collation of the various definitions of political economy; it will be sufficient to say we use the term in its broadest sense, as the science of wealth, meaning by wealth not merely that which has exchangeable value, but that which contributes to man's temporal weal or well-being.

I. It will be in place to begin with a few remarks on political economy as an intellectual discipline. The members of the clerical profession have generally recognized the importance of occasional intellectual exercises, undertaken for the purpose of retaining the culture of the mind at its highest elevation. For the promotion of such an end no science is superior to political economy, while none is so nearly related to the great subjects on which the preacher of the gospel dwells. There is no science that makes a larger demand upon some of the best qualities of mind; as, the comprehension of a mass of facts; the ability to distinguish between the important and unimportant, the relevant and irrelevant; the ability to keep the eye on some one central truth of a discussion, distinguishing it from all its counterfeits, and recognizing it under any of its Protean forms; the courage to lay aside all previous notions, and abide by a fair conclusion; the intellectual integrity that accepts a demonstration, though at first startling. If we add to these the patience of contemplation, and the continuity and consecutiveness of thought

which the investigations call forth, we shall have before us qualities of mind which the preacher especially will consider desirable. Indeed the style of the pulpit is becoming more and more germane to that which would be adopted in popular discussions of political economy. Sermons that have an aim at some useful result, that produce conviction by argument, while they sway the mind by a moral power infused into them, are recognized as best meeting the wants of a parish. And since religion extends its claims into the realm of morals, and absorbs its principles as being subordinately religious, no department of morals will be found more truly in accord with the proper aim of the pastoral office than the science before us.

Moreover, there are still open questions in the science, on which those who desire it may have opportunity for the full exercise of all their powers, and in which valuable results will be rewarded with the gratitude of the world. For instance, the discussion still rages as to the wealth or poverty of the earth. Is population likely soon to outstrip the resources of nature, so that the earth will be too strait for her numerous family? Are the richer and more productive soils the first or the last to be brought into use? How are we to interpret the decrease in the value of capital as civilization advances? Do the three per cent paid for the use of capital in Europe and the ten per cent in Illinois show that relatively labor is more important in old countries, and so wages are really higher, or that capital and its universal concomitant, labor, represented by wages, are becoming of less and less value together? These questions, and those of free-trade and the currency, are subjects on which any one is at liberty to try his skill.

Political economy furnishes some of the best illustrations of the truth that in intellectual operations the battle is not always to the strong. The pulpit would do well to take note of the fact, and remember that he is the best reasoner who selects his premises best, not he who handles them most resolutely. Ricardo's theory of rent may be taken as

an illustration. The world knew what rent was before his day, indeed, but no one seems to have separated it from everything else, and to have adequately defined it, as the difference of income from lands that simply pay for tillage and those that pay a surplus. Another example will be found in the happy solution by Say of a problem connected with over-production. He showed that a glut was not caused so much by the superabundance of articles of one kind, as by a scarcity of articles of other kinds. The remedy of the evil is therefore in larger production. Products remain unsold because there are none of another kind to exchange for them. It seems very easy to see this and to say it, and to deduce from it: That the general prosperity is the prosperity of each one; that imports do not indicate a decrease of production; that consumption does not of itself promote commerce, but production is its only possible foundation; all these seem very natural observations, when they are stated; but to hit upon them was the difficulty. The subject of free-trade furnishes another example of the necessity of looking at the right point in the discussion of a question. As men began to make progress in moral science when they looked for virtue in the will, and in intellectual science when they examined the understanding for the laws of thought, so have they advanced, though they have not completed the work, since they began to look at trade to see how it should be most free. The freedom of one man may be a tax upon another, and then a tax upon himself. Suppose the producers of cotton themselves export all they raise, those who would otherwise manufacture the article are compelled to resort to production, and so by competition reduce its price. This amounts to a tax upon both parties. Does not, then, the protection of labor to such an extent that *finished* products shall be exported really secure the freest trade? We do not discuss the question, but merely desire to show how eminently this science calls into exercise the student's sagacity and skill.

II. Natural theology is illustrated by political economy.

The first thought perhaps will be, that the comfort of the human race for the past six thousand years does not throw any very favorable light upon the goodness of God, if indeed it serves to establish our faith in his existence and government. Do not ages of darkness and lands which are the habitation of cruelty point to a malignant ruler of the world? Or, do not ages of disorder teach that there is no God? Political economy will not, more than any other science, assume to teach why men were not created angels, nor why they were allowed to sin, nor why the fulness of time required four thousand years before the coming of Christ. But, assuming these to be truths, and assuming that courage and wisdom on the part of the people, and wisdom and virtue on the part of rulers, would have rendered human life one of comparative happiness, we may trace many indications of a beneficent Providence in the well-being of men, particularly in the successive improvements in the condition of humanity in the successive ages of history.

Let the question be: How do the laws of wealth, or we should prefer to say, how does the well-being of man in this life, illustrate the existence and government of God? The Christian religion, as a part of history, takes its place among other events and institutions as occuring in the providence of God. If Christianity were only a cunningly devised fable, its effect on civilization and human happiness would be the same, and the deist would still recognize in it a power for good or evil in the social world. Now, if we were speaking of the value of the sun, we should not begin with its chemical effects in photography, nor in speaking of the value of the Christian religion would we speak first of its effects as a cause in nature; but in a subject like the present, incidental effects, tending to elevate society in temporal enjoyment, are worthy of notice. The deliverance of the sixty million slaves of the Roman Empire, and the continuance of freedom to their descendants for thirty generations are results which entitle Christianity to a place

among the temporal blessings of mankind. The Christian religion did not prevent the decay of the nations to whom it was first preached, nor did it set an impassable barrier to the incursions of the Northern tribes; there were other causes at work not under the control of Christianity, but the new religion did alleviate the horrors of those days of confusion; the mother church sung the requiem of the old civilization as it expired upon the coast of the Mediterranean, and she learned the rougher speech of the incoming barbarians, that she might also sing the cradle-song of the new. And though "Alaric and his Goths" may seem an intractable infant, still the gentle teachings of Christianity have secured us a better civilization than did the influences that surrounded the heroes of old, such as bore their fruit in refined but pugilistic Greece.

Another source of human weal, which is older than Christianity and more extensive than Judaism, is the Sabbath. The father of political economy, Adam Smith, without regard to its religious associations, acknowledges that it is indispensable in social life. Man's constitution seems to have an inborn necessity of a weekly holiday. Were he only an animal compelled to observe the day of rest he would praise God, as unintelligent nature praises him, in the enjoyment of his rest, in the physical comfort it bestows, in the health it preserves, in the life it prolongs. But the intellectual and moral man finds the holiday a restorer of vitality and vigor to the mind, and a power that regenerates the moral aspirations. The divine goodness in the appointment of the day is the more obvious, in that the rest subtracts nothing from the labor of the world. Experience shows that the poor man cannot afford to lose the day of rest, and those who are pressed with urgent duties cannot spare the exhilirating and clarifying effect of a Sabbath on their mental faculties. Indeed God has given man one seventh of his time for leisure, making, if efficiency were the *only* measure of time, the six parts really more than the seven.

Again, design and supreme skill on the part of the Author of social life are exhibited in the mutual dependence of the different classes of the community upon each other. If we were to say, man's nature is such that his self-love compels him to support others in order to gratify himself through them, we should only say, God compels the rich to support the poor. This is seen in all grades of society. The successful man, — the favorite of fortune, — in times of semi-barbarism is a landlord, whose lands must be tilled, and whose dignity demands a pompous retinue of servants to be sustained at his own expense; in the advance of civilization and wealth, he is a merchant or importer, who competes with the landlord in the number of his dependants; and in more refined life, when barbaric pomp becomes childish, and households are depleted to the numbers necessary for service in a community governed by law, he is the gentleman, the scholar, or the man of taste, whose gratifications are in libraries or works of art, whose servants are the cultured brain of the author, and the skilled hands of the artist, the mason, and the architect. In either of these instances the man who sets in motion the instruments of self-gratification causes them to affect himself only by aiding, if not sustaining, an army of men necessary to the result.

The facility with which all men find a place in every state of society is one of the marvels in the government of God. Occasionally all the foundations of society seem to be broken up, and the entire mass of the population seems a sea of molten metal, but in a moment it begins to crystallize, and whatever the new form may be, almost every particle of the old material is demanded by it. It is strange how rapidly, beginning on the instant, society settles itself after any commotion, and how impossible it is to leave any large class of the population unprovided for. The happiness of the vast majority of the world is not, indeed, what we could wish, but extreme suffering is generally due to improvidence and indolence.

An irresistible proof of the divine goodness is found, again, in the wealth treasured up of old for the good man, by the Creator of the earth. The beds of coal formed at a period long before the creation of man; the beds of salt deposited in what are now inland regions, when the ocean seemed to have promise of eternal sway over all the globe; the oil flowing out of adipose rocks, and the various metals in their mines, all indicate a paternal providence in the supply of the future wants of the children of God. Man in entering on his inheritance finds that some one had beforehand gone through all its departments and made ready for him. And there is occasion to observe that a wise providence has ordered as well the discovery and use of wealth, as the preparation of it. Any one who studies the history of the old world, and aims to catch the spirit of its civilization, will be impressed with this idea, that neither the aims of the higher classes nor the aspirations of the populace indicate a readiness or a fitness to rise up and take possession of the world, and use it for the good of man and the glory of God. None but a Christian civilization could ever make any claim to the kingdom of all the world; none has ever gone before whose right it was. But, from the first, the outreaching of Christianity, and the duties imposed upon it, have been no dim prophecy of its universal sway. Its prevalence in the Roman Empire was early and on the whole easily achieved. But when its warfare seemed to have been accomplished it was found only to have begun. It had no sooner obtained sway in the warmer climates around the Mediterranean than its very existence compelled it to disciple the inhabitants of the colder climates of the north. But is the restless mind of the Northman susceptible of being moulded by civilizing and Christian influences? And if so, can the church, without being unfaithful to her Lord, suffer those who still remain in the harsher climates of the north, above the Danube and around the Baltic, to remain in ignorance of the way of life? The long struggle of the church with barbarism

in the Middle Ages had hardly answered these two questions before another, apparently more difficult, arose; viz. Can northern regions — the hills of Scotland, the bleak coasts of England, the frozen plains of Norway — sustain a Christian civilization, if once it is planted there? Can the institutions of Christianity, with the indispensable institutions of learning, be supported in these realms of poverty? This question was answered, and as soon as it arose, in the wonderful providence of God. The perfecting of the mariner's compass, and the discovery of America by Columbus, put Christianity in possession of both the Indies; while the enterprise of the restless Northmen in commerce and manufactures put the Anglo-Saxon, Dane, and Norman, still in his own bleak home, in possession of the products of the tropics. Yet these events would not have secured the civilization of the North but for an event that followed immediately upon them, — the use of coal, — which first imports, as has been said, a tropical climate into the north, and then, as a power in manufacture, affords the means of exchange. The production of raw materials is now of less account than their manufacture, and the steam-engine, used as yet mostly in cold climates, gives the skilful mechanic or the capitalist an actual advantage over the possessor of the most fertile soil.

There are other events that no less strikingly than those now noticed show the ordering of Providence. The multiplication of cheap books, not when slave-holding Greeks had leisure to spend the day in the market and hear and tell the news, but when an industrious populace had won for itself a warm fireside for the leisure of the evening, will be recognized as being no accident. Again, this position of the people, by modern civilization dissociated from the lord or knight, will also be admitted as occurring in the good providence of one who has the higher laws of wealth all at his own control. Truths like these, it seems to us, ought to impress not only the clergyman, but that class of economists who so much bemoan the poverty of the world; who fear

that the rapidly increasing family of the human race will soon exhaust all supplies and be left to starve. We think the past is something of a warrant that in the future God will be beforehand in the supply of his children's wants. Sooner than believe that man will freeze when the mines of coal are exhausted, we will believe that he will then have learned to burn water. And when we see the vast regions of the earth's surface appropriated to productions the least profitable, who can fear that the Almighty will be obliged at last to resort to the suggestion of the devil, to command that "stones be made bread"?

III. The preacher ought to study political economy, so far at least as to form clear ideas of the nature of exchangeable value, and of the meaning of the word "property." His office lays upon him the duty of speaking at times of such things; he may, for instance, be called to warn his hearers against worldliness; to speak of wealth with disparagement; to inveigh against the luxuries of the times, or the self-indulgence of the lovers of pleasure; he may perhaps be led to speak of the use which might be made of the money that is wasted in intemperate or foolish gratifications; he may declaim against the wastes occasioned by war, and the oppression of the poor through the increase of taxes; he may call upon his own people to deny themselves for the sake of aiding some object of benevolence; it is proper at times that any of these things should be the theme of remark from the pulpit. But the nature and uses of money are of so subtile a character that he is liable to entertain crude notions on such topics; his philosophy may be wrong, the common sense of his hearers may rebel against his teachings, and practical men may smile at the immaturity of their instructor. Every man, at least every teacher, ought to know that a state of civilization which has most wants to be gratified, whether the supply go under the name of the necessaries of life, the comforts, or the luxuries, is the highest state, provided the wants are founded in nature, and not unnaturally developed. Every preacher of right-

eousness ought to promote such a state of civilization. It will increase the expenses of living, but it will also increase wealth, for, since wealth consists of the means of supplying want, the more numerous the wants are, the larger is its possible amount. There is no such thing as property absolute; it is the want that transforms dead matter into property. Even Chalmers, whose great mind seems to have been subject to some great prejudices, appears to have labored under a mistake here. He says, the manufacturing of gloves, for instance, adds nothing to the wealth of the realm, for if there were no gloves to be bought there would be just the same amount of property, which would be expended in some other way. He seems to have considered or assumed that the barest necessaries of life were the constituents of wealth. But if gloves are wanted, and the wearer will pay for them, they are not only property, but they increase property. The men employed in making them are not in the ordinary conditions of society wanted for anything else, nor is the material used; therefore the world is the richer by the worth of these products. If we throw aside gloves, shoes, hats, etc. from the articles of use, and bring ourselves to want nothing but food, we have not concentrated the same amount of property into this one article that was before diffused through all our supplies, but we have merely annihilated property. Suppose the desire for food could be reduced one half, so that bread without meat should be its supply, the bread would cost no more than it does now — just the labor of raising it. Add the demand of meat, and you raise animals fit for slaughter to property, and double the wealth of the world. Add, again, the demand for clothing, and you make wool, cotton, and silk property; and so every additional want lays the foundation for an increase of wealth. The want of anything, if the want is founded in nature and is permanent, raises the means of its supply to the dignity of a possession, and possessions constitute the wealth of the world. The preacher may not, then, indiscriminately inveigh against

luxuries, for the sum of wealth cannot be too great, if well used, and luxuries are the only foundation of large wealth in any community. The real object of attack from the pulpit is the combination of ignorance and selfishness with wealth. The man who must dispose of a large income, and who knows nothing of books, nothing of art, nothing of sympathy with those in want, is the one who needs advice from the pulpit; he is *too* rich. But so long as laborers are in excess, and employment is sought, which is the case in almost all countries, there are no legitimate and honorable wants that may not properly be supplied, and their demand increases the wealth of the community. The clergyman has no right, then, to present a gospel that does not permit, we do not say demand, the culture of all the tastes with which God has endowed man.

When the pastor of a church calls upon his people to deny themselves for the sake of objects of benevolence, he will certainly prefer to address those whose culture has led to an appreciation of books and the higher gratifications of intelligence. Self-denial will be more probable in such a community, while it will be immensely more to the advantage of the cause which is pleaded. A curtailing of luxuries in such a community, a saving of the money otherwise to be paid to the artist or architect, will add far more to the contributions of any *religious* assembly than a curtailment of the gratifications of the palate or of the grosser appetites. We should bear in mind, when we declaim against the multitude of demands and the tendencies to indulgence, and portray the beauties of the simple life of nature, that the refinements of culture are all that make wealth, in any considerable amount, possible, and of course large contributions to objects of benevolence possible. Poverty is not the cause of wants being few and simple, but the result. The cause is narrowness of mind and lack of culture. In all grades of culture, however, with the great majority of the people, large benefactions must generally be with self-denial. And there is no more beautiful

exhibition of the effect of Christianity on the heart than this, enduring privation for the sake of those in want. Here Christians in all parts of the world are essentially in the same condition, and are equally called upon to deny themselves for Christ's sake. The child denying himself some article of food, the man a tour of travel, the family a horse and carriage, are alike instances of self-sacrifice, and perhaps equal instances of that virtue. On the other hand, we should remember if nature and social habit did not make the things dispensed with objects of desire, the self-denial would result in no pecuniary profit to those who are to receive aid.

IV. Political economy sets in a very clear light some important truths respecting the nature of wealth, on which the preacher, and perhaps the pastor, may insist with great force. He should show wherein it differs from exchangeable value. He ought to teach that wealth does not consist of the abundance of personal possessions merely, but depends on the state of society in which one lives, and the state of mind with which one receives the bestowments of Providence. The most valuable things we possess have no exchangeable value. Air, water, sunlight, cost us nothing. There are many sources of enjoyment that a certain state of society makes essentially free to all. Security of life and property, the privilege of the public worship of God, a rudimentary education for children, the use of public libraries, are among the things of value, which a community may bestow at almost no cost to the individual. While the preacher should exhort men gratefully to appreciate the natural wealth which God bestows, he may also exhort them to be generous to the world in the communal wealth which an advanced civilization renders possible. And he may here set himself against a tendency, perhaps an instinctive tendency, to hoard property for future generations, instead of using it for the good of the present generation. A sermon on serving one's generation by the will of God may often be in place. The direct opposite of this is serving a future

generation according to one's own will. The duty of bequeathing to a community enterprise and public spirit, together with furnishing the poor with employment, is not so much dwelt upon as it might be. What is the best method of disposing of a large estate? Shall it be left to the oldest son, that one dignified establishment may be made certain? Shall a father struggle to gather an estate so large that his children shall have nothing to do? Shall he invest it with such securities as to make it an absolutely safe support for his family without causing them trouble? or shall he also have a regard to the community in which he lives in the settlement of his estate? Shall he try to bequeath to his posterity a thriving, industrious, happy peasantry, whose labors his successors in business may turn to good account as he has? The question is a far more serious one than we have been accustomed to suppose. The best inheritance for a child is the industry and virtue of the community in which he lives. If he has tact, with the advantages which wealth would give at the outset, he is abundantly secured for life; if he has not tact and mental capacity his father's skill will hardly suffice for him through life, certainly cannot be the dependence of his children. Men who amass fortunes have a right to transmit their estates to their children; but they will do well to trust the community with some claim on their estates, i.e. the right to labor for wages; for in another generation those who hold the property may be compelled to choose between paying wages and paying a poor-tax.

It is a still more important duty of the clergyman to impress upon the people the idea that wealth depends largely upon individual virtues. A discontented soul is inherently poor. Envy, jealousy, suspicion, pauperize all they touch, for there is nothing in nature that can allay them. There are certain qualities of character which are indispensable to the enjoyment of the gifts of God; there are also certain habits of life which are necessary to the comfort of the mass of the population; these the

preacher may be expected to inculcate upon his hearers. For this reason both Chalmers and Whately considered political economy an almost necessary part of ministerial education. Chalmers lectured to his pupils on the science, and afterward published a somewhat extended work on what might be called the Relation of Political Economy to Pastoral Theology. His treatise seems to us to have had too little reference to religion as a source of, and a substitute for, wealth; still it sets forth some truths with great force, and is abundantly worthy of study. His views have not the same applicability in this country that they have in the British Islands, but a brief notice of them will be in place. He has ever before him the fear of excessive population. The wretchedness, ignorance, base pleasures, vice, and crime of a swarming and unemployed peasantry are to him objects of intense disgust. He looks to the clergy to save the world from them. The minister of the gospel is to elevate the morals of the people, elevate their tastes, multiply their demands for the luxuries of life, and so restrain the people from the degradations of poverty: "Next to the salvation of their souls, one of our fondest aspirations in behalf of the general peasantry is, that they shall be admitted to a larger share of this world's abundance than now falls to their lot. But we feel assured that there is no method by which this can be wrested from the hands of the wealthier classes. It can only be won from them by the insensible growth of their own virtue. Each several clergyman who labors piously and conscientiously in the home walk of his own parish, helps forward this great consummation, till, by means of a universal blessing, peace and plenty will become alike universal throughout the families of a regenerated world."[1]

Chalmers has one simple principle from which he starts in his speculations: the human race unrestrained will increase in population just as far as the supply of food allows. "The increase of population keeping pace with the increase

[1] Political Economy, p. 359.

of food" is ever the burden of his discourse. The world is then in danger of overpopulation, and its only salvation is a check upon the increase of the men and women in it. The want of the world is not more food, but fewer eaters. Distribution of wealth, division of church lands, transformation of hunting parks to wheat-fields, abolition of taxes, free importation of corn, — all these would effect no permanent good, because the population would at once increase to the full extent that the supply of food would permit, and then live in the same destitution as before. Poor-laws are a curse to those assisted by them, because they remove restraint; and, in general, systems of public charity only give a stimulus to population. A compulsory provision for the poor "releases the people from all care or concern about the consequences of their precipitate matrimony."[1] Even if the earth produced a thousand-fold, the evil would be the same, the relief would be only temporary. "There is a point beyond which if human beings were multiplied a serious inconvenience must be felt from the mere crowding and compression of their excessive numbers. This is obvious enough should it take place within the limits of any separate locality, but it would be as sorely and severely felt, if in virtue of a production of food *ad libitum*, it did take place over the whole surface of the globe. The human species would then become as sordid and miserable as those maggots appear to be who swarm on some mass of hideous corruption. The herrings that accumulate and condense in the western bays of our island are said to push the outskirts of their shoal upon the beach. And better surely that there should be such a limitation in the powers of the land, and such an utter incompetency in human art to multiply beyond a certain point the means of subsistence, than that the great human shoal should be protruded at its extreme margin into the sea, and serve for food to the fishes there waiting to devour them."[2] The great demand of the human race therefore is some interposing power to take its stand

[1] Political Economy, p. 316. [2] Ibid. 370.

as a check upon population, to restrain it from the possible sum it might reach if left to be limited only by the lack of food. The only adequate power of restraint is education and virtue, or in a word, the idea that "man does not live by bread alone"; while there is no man who occupies a position that enables him to oppose so efficiently human degradation, and the causes of human degradation, as the minister of Christ. Chalmers's fears seem to us to be trouble borrowed from a very distant future, for all the present population of the globe could probably stand so as to be visible at once to one on the summit of Mt. Holyoke; nor do we believe that man's moral dignity is in the realization of any such promised Utopia as this: "That men with the glorious arch of heaven above their heads, and with an ample platform beneath them should walk forth in largeness and liberty, the privileged denizens of nature." Still the duty of the clergy is most impressively set forth in this work of Chalmers. It is the office of the preacher to throw around men the restraints of virtue and culture, to open before them "a reach of perspective to distant consequences, whether on this or the other side of the grave," to teach the solemn duties of those responsible for the support and education of the young, and to lead the human race into its inheritance on earth as well as in heaven. But we would have the well-being of men laid upon a deeper foundation than that proposed by the great divine of Scotland, for he confesses that he expects the conversion of but few, while he believes comfort and enjoyment possible for the many. We should prefer that the clergy should be deeply impressed with the truth that their profession is the only one that conducts the mass of men to the enjoyment of this life, because it establishes this enjoyment on a right state of heart towards God. They ought to believe, and to maintain firmly, that (if we may adapt the language of Bacon) the kingdom of heaven is the foundation of the kingdom of this world.

It might at first be presumed that so elementary a ques-

tion as, whether we should "seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness," had been long settled, but the discussion of it still continues. We heard a professor from West Point, in an address on education, say, that the physical man was to be first developed, then the intellectual, afterward the moral and religious traits were to be added. A certain Frenchman has sent out to the world a series of plates representing the progress of humanity. He begins with the child as a physical organism of flesh and bones; then presents us the same with a half-scared, half-wondering, look, and informs us that here the child, or humanity, is in the religious stage. We afterward have the same person calm, self-possessed, with conscious strength, proud, but self-subdued, and are informed that now man has arrived at morality. Buckle, in his History of Civilization, accounts for the poverty and wretchedness of Scotland in the past centuries by the attachment of the people to religion. "Of all Protestant countries," he says, "Scotland is certainly the one where the course of affairs has for the longest period been most favorable to the interests of superstition." The consequence was, that the people giving the first place to worship, or as he would have it, to priest-craft, were sadly deficient in all the comforts, not to speak of the elegances, of life. He states his views thus: "The Scotch, during the seventeenth century, instead of cultivating the arts of life, improving their minds, or adding to their wealth, passed the greater part of their time in what were called religious exercises." Mr. Buckle, however, had little knowledge of religion, and set it in *opposition* to the world, or worldly good, while it should really be made the *foundation* of man's temporal well-being.

This question has of late appeared upon a fairer field than the pages of Buckle or the engravings of a French artist. Our Boards of Foreign Missions have been called to face the question: Does religion precede wealth and culture, or do wealth and culture precede religion? To give the question a practical form: Shall the missionary be first

a farmer, carpenter, blacksmith, then a preacher of righteousness; shall he be first a school-master, tailor, physician, then a preacher of righteousness; or shall he first preach Christ and him crucified, then add these other things? The question is not new; it comes up in one form or another everywhere, both in civilized and barbarous life. How is it to be answered? The Boards of Missions have found the answer given in the word of God to be the correct one, viz. the kingdom of God precedes the kingdom of the world.

A mere glance at history will show us that the great mass of men, in their godless lives and in the unchristian pursuit of wealth, have not as yet been in possession of the kingdom of this world. On this point nothing more is needed than a reference to such works as Prof. Edwards's Essays on Slavery, and the preliminary portions of Thier's History of the French Revolution. But without reference to history we may see that such a result is inevitable. If we grant that a certain class actually attain, without the aid of religion, the enjoyments which this life affords, still so large a class are excluded from them that the failure in the case is almost total. Wealth centres in few hands when men pursue it as the chief good. Let men by mere competition regulate the distribution of wealth, and the production of it will soon be at the disposal of those who are favored by fortune. Were men equal in skill, the possession of capital gives such advantages that the statement of the spiritual truth, "to him who hath shall be given," would hold good in temporal things. The lands of England are held by a few hundreds of individuals, and the number is still decreasing. The wealth of almost all our cities and towns is massed in the possession of a few persons or corporations.

Now this distribution of wealth extrudes two classes from the enjoyment of the world — the rich and the poor. Those who have beyond their power to use well are as really enslaved as those who sell their bodies to others on

condition of being kept from starvation. It is related of one of the millionaires of the land, that, on being congratulated on his great wealth, he inquired of his friend, 'if *he* would be willing to have the care of such a property for his board and clothing;' the reply was such as the absurdity of the question required; "but," said the man of fortune, "that is all I get for my trouble." The remark assures us it was not all; but it indicates most clearly the truth, that there is a limit to man's ability to use property; there is a point beyond which gains are burdens. And it should be noticed, too, how very soon many of those who have acquired wealth reach that position; in other words, how little capacity the vast majority of men have for using property. The tailor, the architect, the mason, the painter, the statuary, get a support indeed from the spendthrift, while the world has the pleasure of a laugh, and garrets become museums; but if there is not much to be regretted in this, still it is to be regretted that in spending their property the young should be obliged to spend even more prodigally their health, their nervous energy, and all their valuable qualities of mind and heart. Thus on reflection it will appear a sober truth that men are generally able in personal gratifications to spend but very little money well.

But these remarks refer to comparatively few. The herd of the human race is found at the opposite extreme. The vast majority of mankind in every age have probably been too deeply sunk in poverty and its consequences to permit predicating of them either wealth or happiness. The mass of mankind occupy a kind of social dead level, at one extremity of which you find the vicious man, whom you blame, at the other the slave, whom you pity; while the intervening space is crowded with wretches whose lives are, directly or indirectly, made a burden either by vice or enslavement. Reports from brothels leave on the mind a more thrilling picture of woe than of guilt; the dens of drunkenness exhibit more than an adequate punishment, as

our human weakness thinks, for the sins there committed. The children of the streets in large cities, who go astray as soon as they are born, move our pity more than our anger. Thus, in the realms of crime, unhappiness seems more prevalent than guilt. And if we look upon those classes that suffer with comparative innocence,—enslaved negroes, bought and sold, enslaved women, not bought and sold, enslaved men in the power of landlords or manufacturers, —we shall find such misery that, if one doubts at all the doctrine of divine punishment, he doubts whether hell does not belong to this world.

A mere glance will show that the distribution of wealth has hitherto generally been such that a majority of the people have been deprived of even the comforts of life, and the number has probably always increased as wealth increased. The majority are excluded from the kingdom of the world at any time, and this majority increases as civilization advances. Subjection of the world has been taking it from the many and placing it in the hands of the few.

The question will at once suggest itself: Is religion a remedy for these evils? Does it teach the rich how property may be used wisely, and the poor how it may be acquired? It is no doubt a perfect remedy, though in many cases a severe one; some have contemplated it, and turned away sorrowful, for they "had great possessions." The rich man who is the true follower of the Apostle Paul is not only rich but poor also, for he feels the wants of all those for whom Christ died. His fortune is ever a pittance in view of the necessities of all his brethren, and while he relieves the wants of suffering individuals, he can but long for larger means to meet the wants of suffering humanity. Religion gives to man's heart what it has been said God gave Shakspeare's brain, many sides, and he feels the joys and sorrows of the human race. His capability of using wealth is multiplied a thousand-fold, for the wants of others address him as his own. It might be added his enjoyment of wealth, i.e. his real wealth itself, is correspondently in-

creased, for before it consisted in the supply of his own wants, now it consists in the supply of the wants of all.

Religion is also the remedy for poverty; it is the first necessity of the poor man in his wretchedness. His destitution has two causes, or rather one cause in two forms, the want of the Christian spirit in himself, and the same want in those possessed of wealth. He needs for himself, first of all, the morality, the animation, the hope, the expectation, with which the Christian religion endows our race. These qualities of mind and heart in himself would remove the main evils of poverty. Wretchedness is usually the result of desperation, recklessness, improvidence, and then crime. Of these, want is both the cause and the effect; but if as effect it were removed by the gospel of Christ, the evil would be essentially remedied. But religion in its effects upon both the rich and the poor would, beyond a question, remove the woes of humanity so far as political economy takes them into consideration. The principles of the gospel would, through industry and fair distribution of profits, throw men back upon God for a support. If there were then poverty and wretchedness, they would be fairly charged upon nature, upon the field from which profits are reaped, not upon the laborers on the field.

Whether God and nature are too niggardly in their bestowments to support the human race is a question which it would as yet be idle to discuss in this country. It need only be said, complaints are out of place till industry, prudence, and a general regard for the rights of men take the place of indolence and oppression. England may not complain of lack of food so long as her soil remains a hunting-park, lying waste as the sporting-ground of a landlord. France, Spain, Italy may not complain so long as starvation follows only idleness and oppression, and waste lands increase as the people die of famine.

But this topic would be incomplete if we neglected to notice that religion itself constitutes wealth. A soldier's

life is perhaps the most bare of comforts, to say nothing of the luxuries, the gentleness, the geniality of a cultivated home, of any respectable life with which we are acquainted. Yet the army has furnished the world with some of the most lovely exhibitions of Christian character. And any life of hard service may afford the same wealth, if religion has her perfect work. "Godliness with contentment is great gain." Contentment is only trust in God, and whatever bestows this makes the world rich, while nothing else can supply all want, and remove all *fear*. The world at large cannot lay up much goods for many years; its wealth must always be in its reliance on a Father above, its system of finance, one of crédit, with God as the debtor. The mass of the world's wealth must always be its faith in its providential Ruler. And if the earth actually bears in its bosom the supply of mankind for the coming years, and if God is surely to give each year's supply as the year comes, then the world is rich in its ever-continued possessions and its faith in God. Horace professes himself content to draw from a small heap, if only he can get enough. But Christ requires no conditional trust in God; he commands us to "take no thought for the morrow."

V. Thus far we have only attempted to show how political economy may be of service to the clergyman; we turn now to notice how he may himself do service to the science. There are some questions which he may answer more correctly than those who make the science itself the only object of their investigations. The student of the word of God can bring an answer from revelation to some of the topics that have long perplexed the thinkers of the world; and if the solution thus derived seem less philosophical than the scientific faculty desires, it is too valuable, and too well confirmed by experience, to be passed unnoticed.

1. The foundation of society, for instance, is a topic on which theology furnishes political economy with the most satisfactory explanation. Physical and intellectual philoso-

phers have not sought more diligently for the atom of matter than social philosophers for the atom of society. What is matter made of? Can you reach the ultimate particle by division; or is there a substratum to which qualities are added; or is there a force which makes a substance appear? These questions are like those that demand the ultimate in the organic forms of the social and political world. Do you reach the ultimate particle by division? Do you find the ultimate in an ideal organization existing potentially from the first, and actually as men come into being? These questions were asked ages ago, and various replies have been given. One of the most popular is that of Sparta, of Louis XIV., of Hobbes, — The *state* is the unit, the ultimate particle, the original object of creation. The Leviathan of Hobbes makes mankind, combined in the state, as truly one by external pressure as Edwards's theory of original sin makes them one by internal constitution. The theologian makes men one in body and soul through propagation; the philosopher makes them one by the principle, "might makes right," and so makes truth. The leviathan devours his enemies and absorbs his friends; by this process the whole race is made a unit, for in the end the weaker leviathans must all fall victims to one devouring monster. Sparta, in a practical way, gave the same solution to the problem. Men, women, children, slaves, cattle, were the property of the state, or constituent ingredients of the state; the state being the unit, the atom. Separate from it, individuals had no existence; within it, those who endangered its safety, or failed to add to its power were to be sloughed off — the helots, if too numerous; children, if too weak. The godless and inhuman tyranny of Sparta long ago sufficiently answered the question: "Whether the state was made for man or man for the state." The result of repressing individuality and internal social relations should have satisfied every one. No state has left poorer monuments than Sparta. She was laconic when she lived; her epitaph is equally laconic now she is

dead. Yet Sparta has admirers. It would not be difficult to show that Chalmers and the economists who agree with him are a kind of Christianized Spartans. Later states have taken larger views of the true end of national organizations, and have introduced some moral elements not found in the Peloponnesian civilization; but imperial Rome and imperial France have both demonstrated the unnaturalness of the leviathan theory.

Another reply to the question: "What is the atom of society?" is found in both ancient and modern republics. They consider the unit as the individual man. The state is the balance of parties, which all indeed must support, but support for convenience' sake, while the individual is the possessor of rights, and the atom of the structure. The results in this scheme, it must be confessed, are far more agreeable than in the other case; as much more as Athens is more beloved than Sparta, republican than imperial Rome, the Franks who won the name, than the minions of the emperors of the French, who have done their utmost to eradicate the generous nature, of that people. But the individuality of the human race does not build a state; indeed it is the contradiction of society. Individuality is the segregating, selfish, centrifugal force that dissipates society; it has ever been found necessary to restrain it. No government ever was in fact a perfect democracy; it cannot be the true definition of man, that he is a born ruler. There is something stimulating to the intellect in a system which throws every man upon himself, but it must be with the detriment of morality, for morality is social — a department of manners. The universal tendency to constitutional governments in these modern times is evidence that the world now admits neither of these radical views of the structure of society.

Certain philosophers have suggested another solution of the problem: "What is the foundation of society?" They would define man as a money-maker, or a comfort-seeker, or a happiness-absorber, and make the atom of society — the

indivisible unit — to be such a collection of persons, as can make the most money with the least work, or enjoy most with least effort, or as can get most bread by least sweat of the brow. Perhaps, however, they would insist that so much prominence should not be given to mere material possessions, and so would say that the atom of the social structure is that collection of individuals that can, for body and mind, get most food with least fatigue.

Political economy accepts this end of life, but, as treated by most authors, rejects the means proposed for its attainment, and really proposes no theory as a solution of the social structure. The present tendency seems to be (for no author can treat of such themes without *implying* some theory) to combine the system of *individuality* and *selfishness* with the *results* proposed by communism. It implies therefore that selfishness, or self-seeking, is really the highest social good — enlarged, comprehensive self-seeking is public benevolence. This, however, would make the advance of society an accident, would indeed annihilate society as we understand the term. What we want is some social system which shall make self-seeking and the social good, not accidentally consistent with each other, but actually the same thing, that shall make man the social being identical with man the individual. At this point the student of the word of God may make some suggestions which ought to be of value to those who speculate upon the social problem. God has established two social organizations on earth, — the family and the church. These two, however, are one, for the church is, so far as political economy contemplates it, the family of God, and all its members are brethren. The family then is the atom of society if we take the word of God as our teacher. How the larger social systems are to be built up of these atoms is indeed a problem still to be settled, but one step of advance is made; no system that disregards the family can be correct; and no system that does not make use of the principle demonstrated in the family relation, viz. that men properly

associated find individual and social interests identical, can be relied upon as sound. The combinations of men into societies of greater or less extent would, we suspect, be found a matter of less difficulty than would at first be supposed, if only the relation established by God were sacredly regarded within its range, and made a model in all advance from it. The church has from the first aimed at, and to a large extent secured, the good which communism proposes. And national governments have so much that is negative in them, and so little that is positive, that they cannot be oppressive so long as they sacredly respect the family relation. But this point will be noticed again. It need only be remarked now that in some way the family relation does lie at the foundation of happiness in life, even if the connection between the two cannot be discovered. A reference to the preceding topic of this Article will exhibit this truth. It was there remarked that the kingdom of God is the foundation of the kingdom of the world. If this is admitted, that the actual weal of the world is based on its spiritual welfare, then the kingdom of God comes between man and his temporal interests.

The simple question then rises: How do men enter the kingdom of God? The question is not, by what act of divine power, nor by what act of the individual, but from what state of life do they most naturally and most readily embrace the religion of Christ. There can be no hesitation as to the answer, the family is the nursery of the church. It is almost impossible to bring into the church of God those who have not been brought to the door of the church by the influence of the household. The apparent exception to this statement which the Sabbath-school presents in reality confirms the view, for the Sabbath-school is a confession of this most painful truth, that multitudes of children, need other parents than those who in nature hold that office. It will not be questioned that revivals of religion bring very few converts into the church who have not

before been brought in contact with the church by the family. If the wayward and profane have at times certain surgings of the religious emotions, there is but little hope that these will attain the equable flow of personal godliness unless the mind and heart have by early culture been prepared for a religious experience.

2. Another question on which the clergy have a right to speak, and in the solution of which they occupy a vantage-ground, relates to the aim of governments. Is the world governed too much? Are the intents of government essentially negative, having in view the protection of the people against evils, or do they propose also to promote interests by positive legislation? Is government to leave the poor to take care of themselves, leave feeble interests to take care of themselves, or is its office that of protection and support to the needy? There can be no doubt that the main source of human wealth and comfort is in private enterprise and individual industry. Any philosophy that teaches the young that the government is not the chief almoner of blessings; that it has very little to do with the really positive enjoyments and attainments of mankind; that it plays but an insignificant part in human life, is to be hailed as a friend, and commissioned to its important work. Still we must not hold that governments are ordained simply to prevent wrongs; they have interests also to promote. Could legislation prevent every possible wrong, that might answer its end; but the only practical means of effecting this is by making sure certain necessary interests of the people. Recent legislation in favor of homesteads, in favor of widows, in distribution of bounty-lands, indicate a recognition of the duty here referred to. Without an attempt to decide the question, Whose servant governments are, there is to us something repulsive in the thought that it should disregard the social relations which God has established, and should consider itself as simply the minister of cold justice. It may without injury rise to a higher level at once, and

stand as the protector of interests without which society cannot exist. We lose much in defining the province of governments by losing sight of the fact that there is a self-seeking which is also benevolence, that there are social interests which are identical with personal interests. But political economy is attempting now to establish itself on the principle that self-seeking will secure the best result through checks upon itself, not by being identical with seeking the good of others. It holds that commercial war is the natural state of man, i.e. competition is the natural state of business. Political economy teaches, or is attempting to teach, that the world will be best provided for, when every man provides for himself as best he can; that justice is best promoted by each man's making sure of his own rights. But the question is: Are men able to fight each other in this way, and all with success — is there a victory for every man? Is it not true that there must be some superintending power, protecting the weak, repressing violence? Is infinite war the same as peace,—every man's holding every other in place the same as every one's leaving every one untouched? Does infinite selfishness amount to the same thing as infinite benevolence? Morality and virtue are confessedly the highest or cheapest good if they can universally prevail; but inasmuch as they can only be imperfect in their influence, are we to enforce them by law, or are we to adopt infinite vice as the same thing as perfect virtue, and so set each man's injustice to act as a guard against any injustice towards himself? Is all legislation a mere carrying out of this principle, so that the murderer is hung, not because righteousness requires it, but because self-protection requires it? And, to carry the matter out perfectly, is a man to contend for the gratifications of self at the present moment in opposition to the self of any other time? Is he to say, of all times, *now* is the most important, only the pleasures of the present hour must not vitiate the pleasures of the present hour by giving occasion to fear for the future?

Perhaps the clergyman is in a better position to view this question than any other man, and the word of God aids him to a reply to the question, though it be one of social economy. It is supposable, indeed, that the poor and needy should contend with the strong, and appeal from physical to moral means to carry on a contest; and the poor man might declare that he and his family would starve rather than degrade themselves and degrade labor by working for inadequate wages; and so the man in power, the possessor of wealth, might have his choice between starving his neighbors or paying them fairly for their work. But this is only a supposition. The world is not peopled by heroes; men do work for such wages as they can get, and live uncomfortably if they cannot live comfortably. There is thus always a large class of the population who depend for the comforts of life on the virtue, benevolence, or justice of their employers; and the clergyman will demand a somewhat higher grade of these qualities than the mere man of the world. He will remember that the family is the atom of society; that whatever crushes that pulverizes it, reduces it to individuality and to selfishness — is sin against God. He will remember that the church cannot exist without the family, that national existence even depends upon it, and therefore that its rights must be sacredly guarded. While therefore he will, with Chalmers, teach the parents providence, and throw around all the restraints of duty, he will also claim that there is a morality for the rich, for the employer, that they may not wantonly crush the instincts of the poorer classes, and doom to single life, aimless, dreary, ending in suicide perhaps, those who are dependent upon the daily wages they receive. Nor will the clergyman be satisfied when those to whom he preaches are barely sustained in life; there are some moral qualities indispensable to the family which extreme poverty destroys. Not to speak of the wanton laceration of the family and the profaning of its sanctity which is seen in connection with slavery, there are families to be found in every land

in which fathers and mothers are obliged to labor till their muscles are knotted and their bones misshapen, till weariness is ingrained in the very tissues, till the feeling of fatigue is general and continuous, till patience is gone, till complaint, sighing, fault-finding have settled down upon the family circle like a blight; and these are in reality families no longer. When the children who are so unfortunate as to survive infancy are driven out by taskmasters, while they should still be at play or at school — when they are obliged to *earn* the bread they *eat* — the house is a slave-pen, the household has no ties that can characterize it as a family. When children show in their countenances an unnatural maturity, are wrinkled with age, and especially are prematurely old in sin, are unnaturally vicious, because they can find no diversions but in crimes against nature, then they are not really members of a family, and, practically, there is not any way open for them into the kingdom of heaven, the family of God.

The minister of Christ looking upon men in such condition as this, asks himself: Is there no protection for this class of the human race; are they to be left to themselves, and to the "tender mercies" of their employers? He will see that often there are men who with the utmost kindness furnish the poor with labor, who most benevolently care for them; but he will certainly sometimes see that the employer, driven by competition to afford his products at the lowest price, and yet resolved to make his own profits the highest possible, heartlessly sets the poor man's wages at the smallest amount. Such a view will disclose a meaning which the inspiring Spirit intended, if the apostle did not, in the text: "The wages of sin is death." A bare look at humanity shows that death is its doom if not reward. The race dies constantly, not from old age, but dies out from the distemper of poverty and consequent crime. The less favored ones are living briefly in wretchedness, and dying hopelessly; those extruded from the inner circle of privileges — the extremities of humanity, as it were — are fall-

ing constantly the victims of a wasting consumption that seems to be devouring the outskirts of the race; children are thrown into the arms of death at birth; man, hardened and debased, dies blaspheming his God; woman, wronged, crushed, in despair hurls herself unbidden to the bar of her Judge, and so death is the awful wages we receive for our work. The human race hardly increases in numbers; does not at all improve in morals, except where the Saviour of the world rescues a people for himself. He who preaches the gospel to the poor will have no doubt, in view of such facts, that governments, and all social institutions, are to be based on positive virtue, on morality, not on selfishness, not on each man's ability to take care of himself. He will have no hesitation in deciding that legislation in favor of the poor, in the form of poor-laws, or as the compulsory support of free schools, is only the legitimate increase of the wages paid by the employer; it is the wages due to the family over and above that due to the individual.

3. Another question on which the clergyman may render aid to political economy, is that of the *worth* of man. The Calvinistic theology is altogether tame in its depreciation of human dignity. The speculative divine has indeed made man damnable; but the social economists have made him contemptible. Those who judge man by what he is worth in this world, consign him to oblivion with the most perfect unconcern; even Chalmers deemed it best to admit but few human beings to enter life on this planet, but thought that God could furnish other worlds if he would have the race multiply to any great extent. But those who begin with the theological view of man's worth must hold that each man possesses in himself that which is of more value than all the world, that the soul is above all exchange; that therefore existence is of itself a blessing, if the right use be made of life; on the other hand, if life be abused, its privileges wasted, its possessor does not deserve simple annihilation as a worthless creature, but endless punishment for his guilt. He who holds to the view we have

before presented, that religion is the foundation of wealth, believing that God and nature are not yet proved to be too niggardly to support the population of the earth, will see happiness in the earthly life, and blessedness in the future, possible for all that are born into the world. The mere political economist, on the other hand, regarding only temporal well-being, knowing no means of making comparative penury consistent with a life of happiness, fearing the multiplication of the species, looks upon the floods of humanity arriving, wave after wave, upon the shores of this world with consternation, and asks: What can we do with them? — they must starve, they must steal; how shall we get rid of them? He can think of them only as destined to grow up in vice, without a generous sentiment; and, with gratitude to God for the diseases of children, he says: blessed be diphtheria and canker-rash, which sweep away these infant culprits before they begin to show what they are. There are many profound thinkers, who have speculated on the condition of man in society, who would have written Coleridge's "War Eclogue" as a Christmas carol, and would have congratulated the world on the truth of the words put into the mouth of slaughter:

> "He came by stealth and unlocked my den,
> And I have drunk the blood, since then,
> Of thrice three hundred thousand men."

One of this class is to be found in Chelsea, near London. He shuts his eyes to the future, and with a laugh and a groan and a sneer looks on the wretchedness of the present, and says: Nothing in the future can be much worse. Carlyle sees millions of men in bondage, living like brutes, dying without hope; he says: "Let them be thankful; it is the right of the lazy to have masters, and to be driven to their work." He sees nations groaning under tyranny, and says: "The groan of agony is music to the well-balanced mind; what would these wretches do if there were no one to keep them in order; they are unhappy indeed, but none

of us knows his blessings till they take their departure." He sees our own land ablaze with civil war; in the joy of his heart he says: "It is the dirtiest chimney that has been on fire for a long time; by all means let it burn." Our own gentle Emerson also sees in men only bubbles on the ocean of being, for a moment appearing, on the surface, then bursting and vanishing, of too little value to be saved.

Those who believe in a future life and in a legitimate happiness in this world, rising from the expectation of future blessedness and in an atonement for the lost, may find a possible relief for these woes of humanity. But political economy of itself promises but very partial and doubtful relief; if in this life only we have hope, the speculations to which we have referred must be admitted as sound and conclusive. In the light of revelation, however, we may declare these theories to be false, and under the influence of Christianity we may see that the crimes and immoralities of which political economy has such dread are only the legitimate fruits of heathenism and infidelity. The morals of heathenism, of infidelity, of a heathenized (Romish) Christianity, we grant, are deplorable; but must we of necessity consider them the misfortunes incident to humanity, or the evil results of falsehood, combined with the guilt of men who yield to temptation? Mere economists condemn men because they fall below a certain grade of comfort and respectability, but the Christian rejects a man as worthless only when he falls below the capability of salvation by the atonement; he holds that if one is susceptible to the influences of the Christian religion, he is not yet to be given over to disease and the sword, and says, give man first the religion of Christ, and see if he will not make good his claim to a place in the world. The propriety of this view has been abundantly established; the capability of receiving the religion of Christ is generally a test of one's capability of emerging from drunkenness or debauchery, or any form of corruption into which he may have descended. The experience of the boards of foreign

missions is to the same effect. Religion has, in the order of nature, the first place in the heart, and if it cannot be received, the things that in the providence of God are to be added to it cannot be received. All observation agrees with that of one who wrote ages before Adam Smith: "I have not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread." Those who hold that man's happiness begins with peace with God, agree with the philosophers, that the mass of men are now practically fallen below salvation; i.e. the members of crushed families, those who have never been subjected to the influence of the relation between parent and child, and those who have banished it, are actually, not to speak of possibilities, beyond the reach of religion. Religion, however, differs widely from political economy in this, that it looks forward with hope, political economy with fear. It sees salvation for all in the grace of God, and has no fear in trusting God's command to the earth to bring forth abundantly. The fear of the social philosophers is mainly as to the future; they see destruction coming because of the poverty of the earth; the follower of Christ sees it already come because of the sin of man. The latter sees man's ruin in himself, the former in the circumstances in which he is placed.