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

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

ARTICLE II.

SOCIALISM IN ITS BEARINGS ON CAPITAL, LABOR, AND POVERTY.

BY THE REV. JAMES MACGREGOR, D. D., OAMARU, NEW ZEALAND, LATE PROFESSOR IN THE FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

CHRISTIANITY, as it does not make believers to be judges or dividers over men in temporal things, confers no special qualification for judging in them. And if in such matters we take it upon us to lay down the law in the name of Christianity, the antichristian arrogation may bring discredit on the usurped name. The present matter is one of science: which reminds us of the case of Galileo's judges, condemning science to be silent, and the earth to stand still. They had no Joshua's power: the earth moved on; and ever since then there has been a perpetual motion of the tongue of infidelity, jeering at Christianity on account of that old stumble of men who took it on them to judge in the name of religion where it has not authorized them. Still, there are aspects of the received economic order which Christianity is specially called upon to consider for its own guidance. And, not assuming to be judges authorized to lay down the law, we will look at matters with a view to seeing what may be the duty of Christians in relation to them, as compared with what socialism prescribes in relation to them.

AS TO CAPITAL.

Socialism proposes to abolish private capital as "a grinding tyrant." And some who are not socialist yet blame the existing system of capitalist employment of labor as bring-

ing woes upon the working-classes, through making selfishness, at the impulse of competition, to be the mainspring of business life. We will begin at the beginning, and look at the things, and allow them to explain themselves. As a matter of fact, under the existing *régime* of capital, the working-classes have earnings as large as they are prepared to make a good use of. It is also a matter of fact, that it is impossible for a capitalist, or for any one else, to prevent that happy condition, so long as working-men are not made slaves, as socialism would make them. For if they be free, the capitalist cannot obtain the labor he wants unless they be satisfied with the wages-price he offers for it. But now, in a straightforward, simple way, let us go into the A B C of the matter.

What is "Capital"?—It is commodity available for production because not required for consumption. It is money that can be applied to employment of labor. It is ten shillings which a frugal Frenchman in London wishes to invest in a pair of shoes, hoping to sell them next week at Paris for eleven shillings. An English workman wishes to obtain employment, that his children may have food. The two men enter into a free contract of labor. Consequently, a young Parisian dances to school more gaily in the elation of new shoes, the London children have supper, and the frugal Frenchman adds one shilling to his capital.

Here we seem to see, that to make capital a grinding tyrant, and wages woful to the workman, would be absurd; as it would be, to say that sunrise makes the birds to mourn, and the flowers to fade. It seems to be for the workman as a well in the desert, and for business life "as heart's blood to the stricken deer." But let the capital be £10,000, which employs 100 workmen, who support 100 families, which go to make "sweet Auburn, loveliest village of the plain." Still we see no "grinding tyrant," nor villainous Legree; but (Ruth ii. 1–4) in the harvest a gracious grandee

Boaz, with a blessing for the reapers, and gleanings for the widow forlorn, and a necessity of his nature "to scatter bounties o'er a smiling land."

Now, however, to make sure that we see the matter through and through, and round and round, let us look at it closely in a number of cases.

First Case.—The capitalist is *a co-operative association* of working-men, every one of them contributing £100 of the £10,000, and all sharing alike in the profits, losses, and risks. What would be the meaning and effect of raising the wage-rate from ten shillings a day to twelve? Suppose that ten shillings is all that the business will really yield. Then they are living on their capital to the amount of £10 a day: the business is bleeding to death at the rate of £3,000 a year. They are ruining the 100 families, and impoverishing the thriving town, as surely, though not so visibly, as if the 100 workmen were taken out and shot to death at one stroke of the bell. In this case clearly, the most vital interest of the whole community, and especially of the working-class, is, to guard that capital most sacredly, as the soldier shields his heart in battle; or as brave Horatius, in barring the way to the heart of Rome, was nerved by the thought that he was shielding lives more precious than "the ashes of his fathers, and the temples of his gods."

Second Case.—The capitalist is *an individual employer*, whom we will call Samuel Budgett. He is a father to his work-people: taking a practical interest in their economics, education, recreation; and leading them in the service of God. But, with a warm heart in his bosom, he has not a soft head on his shoulders. He began, when a very small boy, with walking a number of miles to sell for a penny (?) a horse-shoe he had found on the road. With him, "business is business," at which no man can outwit him. Suppose that he is entreated, in the name of human fellowship and universal brotherhood, to raise the wage-rate two shillings

a day. Against such a proposal he is hard and unyielding as a flint. It only strikes out of him a flashing fire of scorn, as if you had implored him, for mercy's sake, to soften the rigors of the multiplication table. And it is well for the work-people that this "master" is masterful, with an unbending soul of steel. Where is the £10 a day to come from? Shall he add so much to the price of his commodities?—his customers, i. e., the business, will leave him. If he pay the extra two shillings a day out of his own pocket, the business will bleed to death at the rate of £3,000 a year.

Third Case.—The capitalist *has a second* £10,000, which is not in the business—as the life's blood is in the body. It is simply private means. And he lays it out in raising wages from ten shillings a day to twelve. First, that is not business, but charity, like Earl Derby's subscription of £10,000 to the Manchester cotton famine fund. It is a bonus, which Budgett might as well have given to another man's work-people. It is really outside of the business: as if an eccentric wealthy grocer should present (not as ground-bait) an ounce of coffee to every purchaser of a pound of tea at his shop. Such a freak of liberality would really do harm. There is a corrupting element of pauperism in working-men's receiving two shillings a day, not out of the business, but really as a gift. And such dependence upon windfall may lead into an expensive manner of living: a bequest of £1,000 each to twelve families in a Scottish Highland glen was thus the ruin of them all but one (*teste* the head of that one). Further, there would be a tendency to awaken discontent elsewhere, and so spread mischief in the general business of the community. We need not, however, wear ourselves out with these apprehensions. For, 1. The £10,000 would not last long enough to do much harm: there would soon fly away the last feather of a goose that does *not* lay golden eggs. And 2. Budgett is not a goose, but a "successful

merchant," with whom business is business. Money thus not productive goes away, after doing some harm in disturbing good business habits. If the money were laid out in doubling the business, or in establishing a new business, it would support another 100 families, and help to make a second Auburn flourish. (So Jevons.) But all this time,—

What about the "enormous profits" in which, we hear, the capitalist is "wallowing"? We shall see about that under the fourth case. But before proceeding to that, we will take a side-look at the statement, often heard, that the workman has a *right* to the profits, because he is the *sole producer*. 1. Is he the sole producer? (1) Without *machinery* his working is only beating the air: which—Paul knows—will never produce a tent. (2) Without *raw material*, toiling at machinery would comparatively be fruitless as the infamous tread-mill. (3) Perhaps the sole producer is *capital employing* machinery *plus* material *plus* labor. But supposing that the laborer is the sole producer, then 2. Does that give him a right to the produce? His labor which went into the production is not *his* now. He *sold* it, and got the price of it: just as he bought commodities at the dealers, and paid the price of them. If the workman have a right to the employer's profits, has not the dealer a right to the workman's dinners?

But now we shall see that perhaps it is not worth while to raise bad blood by debating that punctilio about right to profits.

Fourth Case.—In this case *the workmen share the profits*, upon, say, this plan, That at the close of the year an actuary, on behalf of the work-people, examines the books of the business; and, after a fair deduction on account of the employer's interest in the enterprise, the profits are divided among them in proportion to the respective amounts of their wage-earnings in the course of the year.[1] The principle of

[1]Plan expounded by Professor Jevons in Essays in Social Reform.

this plan is as old as the time of Jacob and Laban, and is familiar in our existing pastoral economy: in cases in which a shepherd, besides fixed wages, has an interest in the increase of the flock. But of late the plan has been tried in the more complicated industries both of France and of Britain.

Benefits expected from it are: 1. *To the work-people*, a chance of profits, a happy sense of personal interest in the business, a cordial incentive to steady industry, and immunity from strikes and the fear of them; 2. *To the employer*, immunity from strikes and the fear of them, a happy relation to the work-people, and an increased assurance of obtaining fair interest on his capital invested in the business, and a fair salary for labor in managing. Here the employer is seen parting with those "vast profits" in which he was supposed to "wallow." But really he has never cared much about them; and he now has got what he cares much more about, in that augmented assurance as to interest and salary. On the other hand, the workman's interest in profits can be seen to be quite insignificant as compared with his interest in the wage-earnings of steady employment.

Let us consider *what, really, is "profit"*—as appearing in this case.

It is not what remains of net returns from sale after deducting the amount of wages paid in course of the year. There also has to be deducted, before we reach a remainder which is profit, the amount of the following items on the employer's account: 1. Fair *interest on his capital.* It would have been bearing interest elsewhere if it had not been in this business. He is not to give the use of his money gratuitously: does a land-owner give the use of his land without rent? That would be charity, not business. 2. A fair *salary for his management* of the business. He may really be a Wellington of business, worth a hundred ordinary managers. But into the present calculation there

enters only ordinary salary, such as he would be earning in the service of others with the same expenditure of skilful energy. 3. *Insurance* against business losses, along with provision for keeping up the machinery, etc. The expense of this has to be met out of ordinary revenue: otherwise, so far, what goes on is not business, but gambling at the risk of capital, which is, risk of throwing the work-people out of employment and means of living.

When these items are deducted there may be nothing in the "profit" margin. There may be a loss: perhaps a ruinous loss (and the workmen have no risk of that). The prudent employer is satisfied (though there be no "profit") if he obtain for himself, as means of living and thriving, the above items 1. and 2. A speculative business may have windfalls of large profit; but in such a business employment is precarious, while to an individual workman the amount coming from a large "profit" might be comparatively insignificant. For the most important thing to a workman—steady employment—cannot be made sure of except in a steady-going business, where the chances of profits are small. And thus, happily for all parties, the mere speculative matter of profit is in reality of small importance.

Now let us pause to consider the *moral* interest of the matter here appearing. We saw that the actual amount of wage-earning is sufficient if wisely used. But if there be anything dishonest or rotten in the nature of the economy, that result must be precarious, and those who believe in God cannot hope for a blessing on prosperity so obtained (Prov. i. 32). It is therefore a thing to be truly thankful for that we now have seen an honest, wholesome economy in what is the very heart and the backbone of the interest of the great laboring class, whose economical condition is in large measure equivalent to the happiness or unhappiness of mankind. And the talk about selfishness as resulting from competition may now be disposed of in few words.

What is "selfishness"?—It is not a regard to one's own interest. Wise self-regard is (Bishop Butler) a strong virtue: the want of it is vicious weakness—e. g., of improvidence or prodigality. The existence of it is assumed, as desirable and right, in the highest law of social duty,—"Love thy neighbor as thyself." What makes real selfishness, in action or in disposition, is self-indulgence at the cost of what we ought to guard; e. g., of religion, patriotism, family, personal freedom. Socialism, sacrificing all these interests for a mess of pottage, is a perfect selfishness of the basest sort.

On the other hand, with reference to the received economic order, 1. Is it selfishness on the part of a co-operative association, to be influenced in not charging a higher price than is needful, by the fact, that to raise the price of one's goods is to close the market against the sale of them? 2. Is it selfish on Budgett's part to be influenced in his adherence to that honesty, by the fact of its being the best policy, in the interest of "his own, especially those of his own house"? On the other hand, 3., as to the workman, if he can live on ten shillings, why should he not accept this rate of wages, which will enable his employer to live? Why should it be reckoned a fine thing on his part to stand out for twelve shillings when ten shillings is the real market value of his labor? Is it because of the wrong done to his master, that a man is *made a hero by battling, in his own selfish interest*, for wages that will add ten shillings to the price of his neighbor's coat, or add a penny to the price of the loaf for all mankind? "Clear your mind of cant," is a precept not always practised where it is praised.

Does competition make business life to be selfish? "To the pure all things are pure." Judas (John xii. 6) will find opportunity for the dirtiness of selfishness in his treasurership of sacred money for the poor. The question is about the nature of competition, not about the possible vileness of a competitor. Competition is in itself a clean thing. Ri-

valry can be generous. The closest human friendship may be between two men who are rivals in the same pursuit, each of them bent with all his heart in excelling the other. Each of them may be prepared to rejoice with all his heart when it is the other that is crowned. The generous rivalry of competition in the public games may appear (cf. 2 Tim. ii. 5; 1 Cor. ix. 25) to have been the one thing in the open air of heathen life that was rested upon with pleasure by the eye of Paul. The feeling which competition, by its own nature, awakens in the heart is emulation: that to which (2 Cor. viii. 1–9), rising up toward the cross, Paul appeals in his endeavor—of love's provocation to good works—to stir up the laggard Corinthians (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 13) by the example of their generous neighbors in the north (cf. Phil. i. 7; iv. 14). But a man importing selfishness into competition will find opportunity for that ungodliness (Act. xx. 35) of inhumanity.

The capitalist is left free to make what use of his own he may choose, as he shall answer for it (Col. iii. 23–25; Eph. v. 9). Though he carry on his business on safe and sound business principles, he is not, in his relation to his work-people, tied to do nothing but business. In his servant he may see "a brother beloved" (Philem. 16). At a dismissal of factory operatives for the day, one was asked by Lord Panmure ("Foxe Maule"), how long he had been there: the answer was, "fifty years." In all those years there was not a day in which the Messrs. Coxe had not, at Lockee, along with a strict adherence to business principles, twenty-four hours all full of "opportunity" of brotherly kindness to that man, such as his lordship had opportunity of showing to the tenants on his estates (in Eph. v. 16 the Greek word for "time" is that for "opportunity" in Gal. vi. 10—and for "season" in other places). Life is all one great "opportunity" (Act. x. 38).

A Glasgow merchant, the first Campbell of Tulliechewan,

—who in his youth heard Chalmers preach the "Commercial Discourses,"—can tell in his old age (he told the present writer) that all through his prospering life he has laid himself out for opportunities of putting capable men (and women—we have been reminded at the Antipodes) on a way of business for themselves. Co-operative association is only one of those ways; and often it may not be open, or may not be the best in the particular case. An Australian grandee, who perhaps is by newspaper patriotism described as a "bloated capitalist" whose delight is in "keeping the poor man off the land," may be able to show a whole region that is occupied by thriving sheep-farmers who once were his tenants, and whom at the seasonable time he helped on to the land, because he knew that they were worth helping. A flock-master, who is a candidate for parliamentary honors, is by the paper patriotism found out as having land of his own, and consequently being "a tyrant squatter": whereupon P. I., a quiet citizen, well esteemed, writes to the paper, that he, P. I., left that squatter's employment with a cheque for £1950, and knows that the only use the tyrant makes of his freehold has been, "to give the shepherds a chance."

In the ordinary course of his business relation to his work-people, an employer may (as in the case of domestic service) have abundant opportunity of showing personal kindness and respect—"honor all men." There may be the reality and the effectual practice of earnest good-will to them, though they should be away on the Hoogly, or on the sea, or scattered in hamlets and villages round the counties adjacent to Belfast and Dundee. It may or it may not be suitable to adopt the plan of workmen sharing profits. What does it matter? If the plan should be discontinued by the Dennys of Dumbarton, the royalty of heart will remain, to be a sunshine of working existence in the establishment.

The employer's great opportunity is the business itself.—For the greatest material service a capitalist can do his work-people is, just to keep his business going in life and health, so as to give steady employment at normal wages. And there are cases in which a capitalist, who, at a darkly perilous time, could save himself and his family by timely withdrawing from the business, nevertheless holds on for the sake of the work-people and their families. He perhaps is in this way deliberately sacrificing himself for them, and racked with anxiety on their account, on occasion of that visit of keen inspection, when they look on him as an enemy who is looking down upon them as a coldly distant moon through a baleful night of storms. He, too, may have need of a kind word or look, and feel that it is not only on one side that evil may be done "through want of thought" more than "through want of heart."[1] Peter (1 Pet. iii. 9) will show us that (Ruth i. 1–4) the reapers ought to have a "blessing" to give to Boaz. Socialism will make impossible all personal kindness to work-people by destroying the relation of free contract.

AS TO LABOR.

The socialist economy, we saw, would at once plunge a large part of mankind into starvation; while the socialist morality, making life not to be worth living, might speedily extinguish the human race altogether, without any manifestly supernatural "vengeance" of God (Gen. vi. 7; Jude 7). On the other hand, we have seen, under the existing order, the system of wages provides, in an honest, wholesome way, for making the amount of reward of labor as great as the nature of things will permit, while growing fitness for making a good use of earnings is accompanied with growing amount of those earnings. But now, passing from the subject of reward of labor, we come to the point as to labor

[1] Song of the Shirt.

itself. And the point which Christianity here makes is that of—

The nobleness of service.—Socialism profanes man, not only in the innermost of social relations and the relative affections, but individually, in his innermost core of manhood, the freedom of self-determination. Fletcher of Saltoun,—"the patriot,"—alarmed at seeing all Scotland full of "sturdy beggars," proposed that they should be "held to labor" as slaves. Socialism is in its nature a system of universal and permanent forced labor. This is a necessity of the nature of a system which lays on the community the care of providing for all individuals a means of living out of a common stock. The community has to make all capable individuals contributors to that common stock, placing them under a necessity of labor.

But now we will consider only the condition of those who at present are in view as laborers—the existing laboring class. Their condition is to be bondage: the individual workman is to be a slave; not permitted to dispose of his earnings as he may desire; but only promised rations, a morsel of meat, at the discretion of a godless Epicurism.

The will, as "will of the flesh," a resultant of animal impulses, is to survive in the community; but in the individual that rational spontaneity, without which man is a mere thing, is in the life of labor to cease to exist. That is to say, *the whole of the workman's characteristic life* is to be non-human or mechanical. Labor is debased into drudgery, manhood sinks into mechanism. And that profanation, too, is by Christianity prohibited in the name of God and made impossible in the heart and soul of man. This religion saves manhood from that profanation by making service to be noble, where socialism perpetrates the profanation in a vain endeavor to abolish the service which is natural to man.

To be in subjection (Eph. v. 21) one to another ought to be the choice of all men, because it is variously conform-

able to the nature of man as social, and natively beneficent in its influence upon the individual's moral and spiritual condition; tending to the full formation of true manhood (Eph. iv. 13—where the Greek for "man" means not simply *human being*, but *male human being*—the species in completed fulness of formation). The sort of individualism that is the ideal in the view of some is exclusive of the society from the individual's life, so far as can be compatibly with the bare existence of social connection; and thus is a selfism strongly contrasted with Christian individuality, which is a stone of a temple, a branch of a tree, a member of a body. And out of the varied relations of the individual to the society there arise various modes of subjection, which Christianity lays hold of as opportunities of manhood in the nobility of service.

The phraseology about a "dignity of labor" is sometimes intended to conceal the fact of service, of obligation to obey. There is really no dignity of labor as such. It is true that Paul delights[1] in thinking of himself as the *laborious* apostle. But a criminal on the tread-mill is laborious. And the symbol of labor simply as labor is, not man, but the drudging ox. When (Ps. civ. 24) among the creatures of earth, "man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor unto the evening," the new thing that appears under the sun is, freedom in the worker, rational spontaneity of labor. And that freedom, which the socialist plan of life destroys, at the cost of profaning manhood, Christianity employs in its redemption of man's life, by the method of ennobling service.

In this whole matter, of the freedom of labor, Christianity has what may be spoken of as a vested interest, if not a vested right of interference with a civil constitution; in that the modern freedom of labor is distinctly a creation of Christianity. But irrespectively of the past, in the pres-

[1] Concordance, "labor."

ent and future, wherever and so far as this religion exists in power, there it will make socialism impossible by keeping alive a flame of individual freedom in the soul of man, and feeding that flame with the idea of the nobility of service. Service (1 Cor. iv. 1—"ministry") is the highest office it can see on earth, and (Rev. xxii. 3) to its apprehension the loftiest of creature conditions in the eternal world. It sees (Phil. ii. 6–10) the eternal Son of God making the infamous cross to be most glorious upon earth and in the universe by "taking upon him the form of a servant"; and (1 Pet. ii. 21) in this it sees the Crucified One set us an example that we should follow in his steps.

Our new industrial epoch, at a time of general awakening among the peoples passing out of the Middle Ages, was inaugurated by the discovery of America and of a sea-passage to the East Indies, giving a great impulse to commercial enterprise among the peoples of the western Christian world. The epoch has been carried into its present ripeness of manifestation of industrialism in its character, especially by the invention of the power-loom and the application of steam-power to machinery, occasioning a vast expansion of manufacturing and of other industrial arts of life—so that a laboring class is now a very great proportion of mankind. But the distinguishing characteristic of this new industrial epoch is, that the laboring class is free; and *this freedom of the laboring class is distinctly a creation of the gospel. It nowhere existed in the heathen Roman empire of Augustus and of Nero; it everywhere existed in the Christian Roman empire of Charles V. And it is the gospel, working in the hearts and lives of men down through the Middle Ages, that wrought the change.*

The "servants" addressed in the apostolic Epistles were almost all bond-servants ("under the yoke") or slaves. Free service was in the civilized "world" (Luke ii. 1) almost unknown, while almost all really laborious work was done by

servants. The condition of the mass of mankind, thus doomed to an inglorious toil, was practically hopeless; and its desperate misery was evinced by those formidable slave-insurrections—"servile wars"—which had deluged the plains of Italy and Sicily with blood. Slaves and slave-owners became Christians. Bond-servants formed a very large part (1 Cor. i. 26–28) of the membership of the primeval apostolic church. And the duties arising out of the relation thus existing were a leading subject of the moral instruction of Christianity through its apostles. Children's duty is only referred to in one of the two apostolic directories for common duty; servants' duties are carefully emphasized in both (1 Pet. ii. 18–25; Eph. vi. 5–9). In only one of the two are masters' duties referred to, and the reference there is a sort of pendant to what is said about servants.

The new religion did not prohibit the outward relation of bond-service. On the contrary, that was allowed to remain undisturbed (Philemon). The Christian (1 Cor. vii. 20–24) was taught, while recognizing the greater desirableness of freedom, yet, if his position was that of bondage, not to imagine that as a Christian he was entitled or bound to break away from it. On the contrary, a Christian's ordinary duty was to remain in the position where God had found him: to "abide with God" there, there "serving Christ." And the result was, not perpetuation of slavery, but emancipation of the slave.

The process through which this great result was brought about is in its nature spiritual, and is represented by the word of Paul to a slave-owner about a runaway slave, now, when Christianized, coming back to his place, a "brother beloved" (Philem. 16). Men brought into right relation to God as the Father were thereby (Eph. ii. 11–18) rightly placed in relation to one another as brethren. A new heart thus came into the relation, and the light of life kept shining. It was the spring-time: the sun went on shining, and

the frosty snow-clad winter gave place to the summer from that spring. This was the real emancipation. The formalities of outward emancipation cannot in many cases be distinctly traced. The reality, making freedom of labor to be inevitable, and socialism so far to be impossible, is where Christianity lives in men.

Mr. Lecky, in a passage to be quoted further on (p. 59), describes the Christian idea, which was thus operative, as being that of "universal brotherhood." The description is vague, and may mislead. *Universal* "brotherhood" is not a biblical expression. The Christian principle which wrought the slave's emancipation, did not need to be expounded in the apostolic age. It had been exhibited at full length under the Old Covenant. From Abraham's time downward (see John viii. 33) the bond-servant, one of the chosen people, was on the same level of spiritual privilege with the free (Ex. xix. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 9; Rev. i. 5). The "brotherhood" was through redemption, bringing about a new and true filial relation to God (Gal. iv. 26–29). This, instated in the mind and heart of men, was the true spring, by which the winter of heathen bondage was made to pass away.

In Israel, the bond-servant's condition was from the outset essentially different from that of a heathen slave. And the emancipating principle so worked, quietly—as "the kingdom of heaven cometh not with observation"—that in the gospel history it is impossible to find a trace of bond-service as continuing to exist in Israel: thus far, Palestine was (cf. John viii. 33) a land of freedom in a world of bondage. In the sisterhood of nationalities which arose in Christendom, there took place the same process, through the same principle, as in that oldest of the nations—which alone of ancient peoples made public statutory provision for the protection of slaves.

The position of a Christian slave, especially of a female

slave, of a heathen, must in that first age have often been terribly perilous as well as painfully revolting. The apostles in bidding their converts remain there, "with God," "serving Christ," put a strain upon their human "endurance" as compared with which the short agony of ordinary battles or campaigns is nothing. But the obscure "endurance" of those weak despised things which are not (1 Cor. i. 26–29) achieved the vast result for mankind of retrieving the position of labor, and showing service to be noble.

Of the nobleness of service we have a most beautiful picture (2 Sam. xxiii. 14–18) in the old heroic story of David's longing for drink "of the well of Bethlehem, which is by the gate." There, at the place of resort, he must often have mingled with the people in his boyhood. Now, though his heart draw him to the spot, the commander is restrained by an overmastering heathen force around the little town. But three paladins twice break through that flame girdle of heathenism, to appease the human longing in the heart of their great hero-captain. And he will not drink the water so procured: he "poured it out before the Lord"—deeming that which was the equivalent of three such devoted lives, too sacred for every lower purpose than solemn libation (cf. Phil. ii. 17) to the Lord of hosts and King of heaven. The "three mighty ones" were servants of the king; and they made service noble.

The working-man has opportunities of this high thing in life: not only if his employer's factory be on fire, or his flock in peril of snow-storm or flood, or his dwelling assailed by robbers or by rioters. The old Lochee operative had fifty years of opportunity, filling ten or twelve hours of every working-day. The grand opportunity is in the service; doing that "heartily, as unto the Lord" (Col. iii. 23).

Hugh Miller elected not to aim at being an employer. He reckoned that he would be more free, for the career of self-culture on which his heart was set, by simply earning

wages. A very large proportion of the working-class may prefer the security of wages to the chances of co-operative association. The position of a wage-earner is in Christian communities thoroughly appreciated as honorable. And for those who have the ambition and the gifts for rising to a higher external position, ways are open, and new ways are opening. But for the real happiness of mankind, so largely consisting of a laboring class, the one thing needful in this relation is, practical realization of the nobleness of service. The Christian slave at Ephesus or Colossæ might have a very different master from Philemon, and a very different place from "the church in the house" (Philem. 2). But John Knox as a galley-slave could maintain "a reasonable merry countenance." And of that slave's place Paul said, "Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, there abide with God."

One who has ever learned to swim is a swimmer ever after, and a language once learned is not forgotten when the learning process ends. It is a question whether, when the community of mankind have once attained to freedom of labor, it would not be physically impossible to revert to the condition of bond-service. If it were possible, it would be infamous. But service is never infamous, and can be made always glorious.

AS TO POVERTY.

By poverty we will understand not scantiness of means, but dependence upon others for means of living. Under the received economic order, the provision made for the poor is regarded as matter of charity, and as being thus a specifically different thing from wages, which is matter of right. Socialism, abolishing that distinction which makes dependence disgraceful for those who are physically capable of self-support, creates a dangerous facility and temptation for multiplication of "sturdy beggars": whom, without the proverbial "patriotism" of Fletcher, it has to "hold to la-

bor" as slaves. And economists and philanthropists alike are of opinion that the abolishing of the distinction would be a grievous misfortune to the genuine poor, by its closing the fountain of that charity, which is nature's own provision for sympathetic help to them in their sad need.

Upon the socialist view, that the care of all individuals is properly incumbent on the civil community, it would be no good ground of reproach to Christianity though it should have made no distinct provision for poverty, but left that matter, like the criminal law, entirely in the hand of the civil powers that be. But the religion proceeds upon the fact, that "the poor we have always with us": there will always be need of occasional private charity, as distinguished from the systematic operations of the state; and there may be call for a testimony of Christianity to the state as to the mind of God regarding the care of the poor. We now will consider the question, whether Christianity has in it an energic force for the offices that may thus come to be in request upon its part.

In our time there have, with reference to the common Christianity of English-speaking peoples, been voices in the air about "a selfish middle class," which by interpretation is otherwise heard of as "the comfortable church-going classes,"—to the effect of saying, that the common Christianity of the peoples is now torpidly effete, wrapped up in a comfortable selfishness, regardless of the suffering of mankind; so that the world has need of a new Christianity, to inaugurate and take the lead of, a new economic order. The new Christianity may be found leaving out the old gospel of Christ.[1] But we now have room only for some observations on the previous question of fact: Is the common Christianity really effete, or otherwise wanting in resource of charity, as an affection that may be found an available "balm in Gilead" for the case in view?

[1] Rigg, Modern Anglican Theology.

1. *There still is the "physician there."*—Christ is far the greatest power in Christendom. The Bible is the common law of the Christian peoples, the text-book of their teachers, the *vade-mecum* of their true believers in a daily walk with God. The light of Scripture on this matter is not seen by us as by men out on a darkly troubled sea who catch glimpses of a dim light in an ancient Pharos tower on a distant long-forsaken shore. It is the sunlight of the daily life of Christians round about us. The new heart which it labors to create in them is "an heart of flesh." And we may expect to find in them, who are continually under its influence, some result of that humanizing operation of the word of God.

Christ himself is set forth (Act. x. 38) in the first view of him given to the Gentile world, "as going about doing good." His apostles, at their memorable conference (Gal. ii.) regarding the plan of campaign, while they agreed to go their several ways with the one gospel for the soul, as regards the body, covenanted (ver. 10) that they all, go where they might, "should remember the poor." A persistent appeal for contributions, in relief of distressed brethren at Jerusalem, is a curiously interesting side-work in the great career of the apostle of the Gentiles. And he is privileged to transmit (Act. xx. 35), as a sort of fifth Gospel "according to" Paul the Magnanimous, the only known word of the Lord Jesus not recorded in the Gospel histories, "It is more blessed to give than to receive"—which he makes an argument for laboring "to support the weak." We need not dwell on the great place which this privilege and duty of charity had in the teachings of the apostles (cf. 1 John iii. 16, 17; James i. 27; 1 Cor. viii. 9; Gal. vi. 10; Eph. iv. 28).

The whole matter is summed up in the Old Testament declaration of the true spirit of Christianity or Messiahism in Isa. lxi. 1, along with what is said of the fulfilment of

this prophecy by Christ himself (1 Luke iv. 16–22; Matt. xi. 3–6, where observe the Spirit's *anointing*, and the fact that the Hebrew for "anointed" is *Messiah*, and the Greek for it is *Christ*). There the believer sees, that relief of temporal distresses, with a special reference to "the poor," is of the very essence of the religion of Christ. Thus the "peace" which is "like a river," is intended, in its progress through the lands, to bring to them a blessing and glad song of comfort and of healing for the body as well as of salvation to the soul.[1]

There have been Christians—as there have been heathens—who, under an impression that ghostliness is spiritual-

[1] It is in this connection an important fact, that the Redeemer's work on earth was a campaign for deliverance from natural evil on account of its being a stronghold of tyranny of spiritual evil (Acts x. 38). Exorcism with him was "medicine to a mind diseased" (Luke viii. 35); and (xiii. 16) bodily ailment, making a "spirit of infirmity," was pronounced a bondage of Satan. Healing of the body led on to joyful assurance of being forgiven. The whole campaign of miracles, in Palestine as (Ex. xii. 12) in Egypt, had thus a spiritual purpose to serve through operation on the natural world and life. But on the other hand it is an important fact that, in addition to such bearing on the spiritual condition of mankind, the Bible shows that God, and men who are like him, have a real regard of complacency to men's temporal well-being on its own account. The following notes have reference to that aspect of the matter:—

1. *The New Testament* is in this relation only the interpretation clause of a "law" which (Matt. v. 17–20) is given in the Old. The bearing of Christ in the Gospel history toward the natural life of man is humanely sympathetic, genial. He is the realized ideal of the saying, "I am a man, and all that touches man comes home to me" (cf. Heb. iv. 14, 15; ii. 17, 18; v. 1, 2). Hence the Christian feasting with those who rejoice, as well as weeping with those who mourn. Such, too, (witness the Parables,) was his bearing toward the natural world of man; whence (?) the Christian "love of nature." In the apostolic age his followers had occasion to take joyfully the spoiling of their goods, and showed themselves willing, not only to be bound, but to die for the name of the Lord Jesus. But they were not inhuman. The inhuman asceticism, which represses natural affection connected with the body, was by apostolic authority condemned as antichristian (1 Tim. iv. 1–9): as in the Gospel history (Mark iii. 15) the only thing on which those eyes which are as a flame of fire, are said to have looked "with anger," was that inhuman asceticism of imagined spirituality which is real

ity, aim at spirituality through harsh inhumanism of repressing natural affections connected with the body. These may think meanly of temporal well-being of mankind. But ordinary Christians, not aspiring to be ghosts, but wishing to be good and happy human beings, have not so learned Christ (Matt. xi. 29–30). And Christ himself, the realized ideal of *homo sum, nil humani alienum a me puto* ("I am a

carnality, and which by being inhuman is shown to be ungodly. In order to see what was the feeling of the first Christians in relation to temporal good, we must take into view the fact, that in the primeval times *the Bible* of Christians was the Old Testament (2 Tim. iii. 14–17; 2 Pet. i. 19–21), as it had been the "It is written" of Christ himself (Matt. iv. 3–19).

2. *In the Old Testament* the matter is set forth as if leisurely at full length. This has reference to the church's childhood: in which as to the body she learned to sing, that God the Father "giveth food to all flesh, because his mercy endureth forever."

(1) *In creation and providence*, his "goodness" (the key-note of the psalmody) appears; markedly in the temporal well-being of man favored by God (cf. Chalmers' Bridgewater Lectures—"adaptation of the eternal world to making a virtuous species happy"); (2) in connection with *redemption*, a good estate on earth (Gen. xviii. 8) is in the foundation gift of divine redeeming love. The "rest" of God for his redeemed is outwardly in a "good land" (Deut. viii. 7–10—a realistic description of the best conceivable land for settlement), "a land flowing with milk and honey."

The (partially) realized ideal, sung in Ps. lxxii. is shown in 1 Kings iv., with reference to the nation's temporal prosperity in Solomon's long, glorious reign of peace. Two things were countlessly multitudinous: (1) the manifold royalty of wisdom in the great heart and capacious intelligence of the king (1 Kings iv. 29); and (2) the covenanted population of the country, prosperous outwardly as well as inwardly: and safely guarded in the prosperity (vers. 20, 25). That picture of a happy golden age of the past shows what, as good for man, God loves to bestow on those men whom he loves. The idea of it—never fully realized, because Israel did not keep the covenant of their tenure of the land—fills the book of Psalms, and is everywhere on the background of the Prophecies, alike in threatenings and in promises. "This God doth abide our god." The Old Testament was "the law" of Christianity in the formative epoch of its first heroic age. All who really are formed, as Paul was, and Peter and James and John, and the Son of Mary, in accordance with the spirit of it, will seek (Prov. xxx. 8) to place man free from sordid care and want that is demoralizing; and, having learned to sing (Ps. cxliv. 15), "happy is the people that is in such a case," will desire for men true godliness on account of its promise of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come.

man, and all that touches man comes home to me"), is recognized by them as a pattern of whatever is truly humane in sympathetic geniality (Heb. iv. 14–16; cf. Matt. ix. 15–17) toward the natural life of man. Hence Christians for themselves are sufficiently appreciative of the promise which (1 Tim. iv. 8) godliness hath for the life which now is: and they know the principle of, "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

Here, too, the fundamental "law" (Matt. v. 17–20) is that of the Old Testament (2 Tim. iii. 15–17), to which the New Testament is as interpretation clause. The whole Old Testament revelation of God's mind toward man—in history, prophecy, and song—proceeds upon the view, that temporal prosperity is among those blessings which God has it in his heart to bestow upon man as the object of his love (cf. Deut. viii. 7–10). And in the Old Testament we see that the miracles of Moses were, like those of Jesus in the New, a campaign for man's deliverance from a tyranny of spiritual evil of which the stronghold was seated in material ill conditions (cf. Acts x. 38, with what the same historian says in Luke viii. 35; xiii. 16).

This latter fact has a parallel in the fatal effects, in our time, of evil material conditions in relation to moral and spiritual well-being and well-doing. Abraham's God Almighty, who calleth things which are not as things which are, and raised up the Lord Jesus from the dead, is able to bring a clean thing out of an unclean. He can keep his regenerate stainless amid "the pollutions" (2 Pet. ii. 20) as white sun-rays in a sepulchre, and scatheless amid a very sea of searching fiery trials (1 Pet. iv. 12) as (Dan. iii. 25) he guarded the three children in the seven-times heated furnace. But here *there is a something that can be done by man* in the destruction of strongholds of moral pollution in physical evil. And when that is so, it is the Christian's part to consider, not only the omnipotence of God (Isa. xl.

25–31) as a ground of comfort, but also and especially, as a guide of action, his manifested *will:* his will as manifested, e. g., in that constitution of man's nature which he has created, and in the permitted course of evils under his adorable providence.

Now in the present case the fact is (Prov. xxx. 8) that, while riches have their temptations and their perils,—which are wide of our present point—poverty demoralizes: it is ensnaring, not only as tempting to break the law of man, but as tending toward that desperate self-abandonment (Eph. iv. 19) which opens the flood-gates of wickedness in life; and still more, toward a mental condition of sullen discontent, fatal to religion, represented by the expression which Mr. Rae puts dramatically into the mouth of his typical socialist of the artisan class—"We are not atheists, but we have done with God."

It is this view that especially moved Chalmers to his great labors at economics, in his public administration, and through the press. His large heart, full of the milk of human kindness, was naturally grieved with seeing his fellow-countrymen suffering, so that sweet life itself was made bitter to them, through mere want of means of living. The born and bred economist within him—with his "kingly governing faculty"—was indignant at the shameful waste of manhood thus occasioned to the community by mismanagement on the part of perverse imbecility of statesmanship. But on a memorable occasion he publicly owned, that he had been too much absorbed in calculations about finite quantity, so as not to be duly mindful of *that* quantity—infinity—which is the one thing needful. And yet it is after the great change in the whole tenor of his inward life, that we find in its outward course all his really memorable labors in theoretical and practical economics. The deep abiding conviction, that certain material ill-conditions are effectively fatal to religion and morality among mankind, burned as a fire in his

bones, and bore him through those labors as in a mighty river of divine compassions for the perishing lost. Why should we think that the heart which beat in him was a stone in the bosom of his brethren (2 Cor. iii. 18)?

2. *As to the actual state of things*, relatively to the feelings and practices of Christians, and the tendency and effect of their activity. We must remember that Christianity as an institute can directly operate on political and civil constitutions only through moral suasion, and indirectly, only through bringing men individually into a right state of mind and heart; while a large part of mankind puts itself beyond reach of the influences of this religion (Ps. ii.; John v. 40–42). And if there be a real short-coming on the part of those who profess it, the just inference may be not that their Christianity is not of God (Matt. v. 45–48), but that they are not sufficiently under the power of it.

(1) Why are the "church-going classes" "comfortable"? (Cf. Luke viii. 35.) William Jay answers,[1] after he has preached the gospel seventy years, having begun when he was a mason's apprentice at sixteen. He has known all sorts and conditions of real Christians but one,—namely, the destitute poor. And for the non-existence of that sort of real Christians he has seen two reasons: (*a*) good character and conduct, keeping real Christians out of poverty; and (*b*) good friends; who, if a real Christian should fall into poverty, will not allow him to sink into destitution. The same fact, of the "comfortableness," was observed by another trustworthy aged man, who had been a pastor twenty-eight hundred years before. He put it into a song (Ps. xxxvii. 25). It really is a thing to be glad of (Isa. xxxv);—and it is *an important contribution to the economical welfare of the community*,—a heart of "innocence, and health, and sweet content" (prayer of Burns).

[1] See his Autobiography.

(2) There may be unnoticed such contributions to that welfare,—e. g. of purity (Judges xv. 3; Ezek xlvii. 1–5). The statistics regarding a religious nation exhibit a painful prominence of one mode of "uncleanness." And some imagine (2 Pet. iii. 12 and 10) that the national type of religion is to blame for that. But one who sets himself to inquire as to facts, finds cause to believe that, in fact, where the national type of religion really has hold of that nation, namely, in its "evangelical" churches, that offence is almost unknown. This is impressive as showing what a purifying influence on life there is in even outward connection with Jehovah's temple, amid the "pollutions" of the world: especially in view of the fact that all other temples are found to be, like socialism, polluting in their influence (though they may not, like socialism, make pollution statutory). That purifying influence, counteracting poison in the body politic (Isa. i. 9), is a very great economical advantage to a community—and every one knows the fact of its existence,

Of unobserved positive beneficence, there may thus be a vast amount reaching the whole community (Gal. vi. 10; cf. Matt. v. 45–48). Who, within the community as known to us individually, are as a class benefactors? Has socialism ever been like Isa. xxxv.? In an important town, far from being universally Christian in profession, a memorial is got up, of such a nature that those who sign it are of course the pronounced Christians of the community. Then, when one calls attention to the point, every one sees the fact, that, almost with no exception, the memorial has in it the names of all those individuals, then alive in the town, who in that generation have done anything worth remembering in the way of self-sacrificing endeavor to promote the temporal well-being of that community, especially of the poor. The town is now adorned with magnificent public gardens, free library, town hall, people's park and fountains,—all of which are the gifts of individuals who, rivals in trade, but emulous

in beneficence, are members of the churches. There may be similar facts everywhere in Christendom, unobserved as the vital air, or as the goodness of God, who "giveth food to all flesh, because his mercy endureth forever."

(3) There are general facts, which are solid ground of inference in the whole question of diagnosis as to the life of Christianity,—looking at the complexion, feeling the pulse-beat from the heart. The following two general facts, regarding the time when the invective—on the part of men whose philanthropy appeared mainly in that invective—about a torpid inefficiency of Christianity was beginning to flash its maiden sword, are of that character, and full upon the mark.

First, as to "The London Charities."[1] They were annually disbursing *seven million and a half pounds sterling!* This with the then population (two millions) would have been sufficient for an allowance of eighty-five pounds a year to one London family in every five; while over all England the pauperism was only one individual in twenty. There must have been grievous absence of trenchantly able management: such as would have been contributed by that "king of the fens" (Cromwell) whom men were at the time admiring much (on paper). But the existence of so vast a treasure, far beyond what could be applied to real good purpose in relief of distress, shows that charity was not dead in the great heart of the foremost Christian people. A famous foreign evangelist is reported as having said, on occasion of a recent visit to London, that he was simply amazed at the extent to which he there saw men and women of high station and affluent wealth, with excuse as well as opportunity for simply enjoying life, who seemed to have no conception of any use of life but to spend it in doing good to others;—that in this respect he did not believe there has ever been such another city in the world. Let us hope that, though the

[1] Title of Hawkesley's work, cited by Greg in "Mistaken Aims," etc.

evidence may not be so distinctly producible as in that case, there are many other cities, and towns, and villages, where men's hearts are touched by memory of the fact, so that their lives are monumental of the fact, that the bequest of Christ to those who love him is the poor, and that our dealings with men in distress are to be the test of our eternal relationship to the Son of man (Matt. xxv. 28–46).

The following tale of fact points more distinctly to Christianity as the benefactor:—

Second, as to the experience of Dr. Chalmers.[1] It variously brings to view the existence, deep-seated in the ordinary Christian community, of a great fountain of charity, that is available if only there be skill enough to reach it, as by making an artesian well. (*a*) A few months before his death (in 1847) he crowned his love's labor at the "territorial" mission in Edinburgh West Port (of Burke and Hare memory!) by opening the first church there—where it has proved to be as an oasis in the desert. The whole of that work was the fruit of Christian charity of individuals, sacrificing not only their money, but their time and strength and personal comfort: one volunteer district visitor, through those years of "patience of hope," may have done more of real sacrifice for the good of suffering humanity than all the declaimers about a Christianity that was torpid and effete. (*b*) In the meantime he had fairly set on foot the vast material fabric of the (Disruption) Free Church of Scotland: whose dimensions have more than doubled since his time; and which, in addition to what was needed for distinctively church purposes, included six hundred public schools, and two normal colleges for training teachers which have served as models in the empire and beyond it. *That fabric has been erected and maintained wholly by means of voluntary contributions of professing Christians*—in what is deemed the closest-fisted nation under the sun. (In one of the par-

[1] Life, by Hanna.

ishes that were thus provided for it was observed, that in a four years' ministry there, a policeman had never been there on serious duty but once—when he was on the track of a thief that had passed *through* the parish. In wide regions of the land, of his type of evangelism, the people have never seen a soldier unless one be visiting his home on a furlough.) (*c*) Thirty years before, in St. John's parish of Glasgow, he had experimentally proved that, in a poorish urban population of twelve thousand inhabitants, *the poor can be far better cared for by means of voluntary liberality and volunteer agency* than by means of assessment and officialism; while there is a vast saving of expense, and a blessed binding together of the various ranks of the community through sympathetic personal intercourse. There always was an ample supply of money, and of workers who took a growing pleasure in the work. The genuineness of the success of the experiment—which has been owned by expert economists—was proved by the fact, that the success went on, augmenting, when the magnetism of Chalmers' personal presence was withdrawn from Glasgow—until the work was stopped by a poor-law. Hugh Miller, perhaps the best judge of that matter then in the world, held[1] that the stoppage made a black day for Scotland, especially to the poor. At present we appeal to this great experiment simply as furnishing incidental illustration of there being, in an ordinary community of the existing Christendom, a copious wealth of charity; —as to which it may be said to "the accuser of the brethren," "Thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep."

Some can travel from Dan to Beersheba and find all barren; because "to him that hath shall be given." It has not been so with us. But here it is satisfactory to have what we now proceed to cite, namely—

(4) *Competent evidence regarding the general question*

[1] Essays: Political and Social—"The Scotch Poor-law."

of fact as to the relative character of the existing Christianity in connection with the whole movement of this religion from the past. Mr. Lecky, as represented by his two works on "History of European Morals" and on "Rationalism in Europe," we suppose to be, in relation to that comprehensive question now before us, the most highly qualified witness to be found in books. And the weight of his testimony as to fact is here the greater, because as to faith he is not personally a believing Christian according to our view.

The following quotations are from his "Rationalism in Europe."[1] The numbering and the headings are ours.

1. *The great stream is now flowing.*—"If it be true Christianity to dive with a passionate energy into the darkest recesses of misery and vice, to irrigate every quarter of the world with the fertilizing stream of an almost boundless benevolence, and to include all the sections of society in the circle of an intense and efficacious sympathy; if it be true Christianity to destroy or weaken the barriers which separated class from class and nation from nation, to free war from its harshest elements, and to make a consciousness of essential equality and of a genuine fraternity dominate over all accidental differences; if it be, above all, true Christianity to cultivate the love of truth for its own sake, in a spirit of candor and of tolerance toward those from whom we differ—if these be the marks of a true and healthy Christianity, then never since the days of the apostles has it been so vigorous as at present" (vol. i. pp. 186, 187).

2. *The perennial fountain of that stream.*—"Although it is true that during many centuries the philanthropist was placed on a far lower level than at present, it is not the less true that charity was one of the earliest, as it was one of the loveliest, creations of Christianity; and that, independently of the incalculable mass of suffering it has assuaged, the influence it has exercised in softening and purifying the character, in restraining the passions and enlarging the sympathies of mankind, has made it one of the most important elements of our civilization. The precepts and examples of the gospel struck a chord of pathos that the noblest philosophies of antiquity had never reached" (vol. ii. p. 244).

3. *Effect on the general life of mankind.*—"The history of *self-sacrifice* during the last eighteen hundred years has mainly been the history of the action of Christianity on the world. Ignorance and error have, no doubt, often directed the heroic spirit into wrong channels, and have even made it a cause of great evils to mankind; but it is the moral type and beauty, the en-

[1] Fifth Edition.

larged conceptions and persuasive powers of the Christian faith, that have during many centuries called it into being. The power of Christianity in this respect can cease only with the moral nature of mankind" (vol. ii. p. 372).

4. *Illustrative case of slavery.*—[The view which Mr. Lecky gives, we had long ago formed independently as now expressed in this article. He states, that among the Greeks and Romans labor had come to be despised, and to be deemed infamous for freemen—cf. "mean whites" in American slave States—; and that of the mass of slaves the condition was hopeless: but that there came in two ameliorating circumstances,—(1) a certain *sentiment* of tenderness toward slaves, which rose in the moral ruin of the Roman empire, and (2) the "barbarian" invasion, tending toward abolition of slavery. Then he proceeds as follows],—

"But when the fullest allowance is made for these influences, it will remain an undoubted fact that the reconstruction of society was mainly the work of Christianity. Other influences could produce the manumission of many slaves, but Christianity alone could produce the profound change of character that rendered possible the abolition of slavery. There are few circumstances more striking, and at the same [few] more instructive, than the history of that great transition. The Christians did not preach a revolutionary doctrine. They did not proclaim slavery altogether unlawful, or, at least, not until the Bull of Alexander III. in the twelfth century. But they steadily sapped at the basis, by opposing to it the doctrine of universal brotherhood, and by infusing a spirit of humanity into all the relations of society" (p. 236).

5. *Civilization an effect of the gospel.*—"Missionary enterprises and commercial enterprises are the two main agents for the diffusion of civilization. They commonly advance together, and each has very frequently been the precursor of the other" (p. 249).

The reference to the civilizing effect of this religion (*emollit mores, Nec sinit esse feros*) recalls to mind the fact that, while it has created the modern civilization, it is every day *now* producing the same beneficent effect; e. g., in the South Sea islands transforming communities which within our memory were sunk in the lowest cannibal savagery, into orderly societies, which in important respects would favorably compare with the best conditioned Christian communities in the northern hemisphere. There are tragic illustrations of the need, where commerce has broken the ground, of Christianity for planting and watering. *It is the only power on earth that is doing such work* (Isa. lv. 10–13).

Socialism has shown itself powerful only to destroy (the word for "power" in Acts, i. 8, is *dynamis*—but the dynamite there is not atheistic force).

At the beginning of the first of the above quoted passages, Mr. Lecky has passed from a strain of in effect disparagement of the catholic doctrines of Christianity, regarding the divine-human person and redeeming work of Christ, in favor of the Christian practice he proceeds to eulogize. The historical fact is—as was anticipated by Christ and his apostles (John xv. 3; xx. 31; Matt. xvi. 16–19)—that the practice has been the fruit of the doctrines vitally apprehended. Slavery was destroyed, not by a viewy sentimental humanitarianism, but by the apprehended *fact of redemption* through the atoning sacrifice of God incarnate.[1] So of the whole great work of new creation in the primitive time, and all that is characteristic in the philanthropic life of recent Christendom. As a matter of historical fact, it all has been, and is, in substance and heart, a fruit of belief in incarnation and redemption. Movements which appear to have a different origin may be found on close inspection to be only eddies of that great stream, satellites of that sun (Gen. iii. 15. xii. 3).

[1] See in Shakespeare, the theology of the Crusades, of the heroic new life in the Middle Ages.