
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Man's service to God, in the broadest and best sense, has thereby been ennobled, and his hope of a higher service hereafter immeasurably assured.

But Music has its own career and destiny, apart from the individual history of the souls of men. In the progress achieved in the generations past, we see something of God's purpose in the ages; and Music must still bear a part, one among many, all ordained of God, to prepare and consummate the

> One, far-off, divine event
> To which the whole creation moves.

ATHERTON KNOWLES.

ART. V.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALTRUISM.

ONE of the most characteristic features of this extraordinary age is its excessive altruism. There are many things, no doubt, that will bear upon the future historian, when he takes in hand the latter half of the nineteenth century, with a weight which he cannot ignore; some which are so apparent that we see them now, others which are steadily permeating the vitals of society, subtle and unseen; but this regard for the feelings of others is so instilled into our religion, our social ethics, yes, and even our politics, that perhaps it will be held as the predominant note of our era. We all know what is meant by altruism. It is regarding the happiness of others as of equal importance with our own. Other people's feelings are as sacred as our own; their opinions, if not the same as ours, even if diametrically opposite, may perhaps be all right, while our own are all wrong. And it is remarkable that this phase of the *zeit-geist* does approach very nearly to the actual meaning of the word, *i.e.*, thinking only, or chiefly, of others. One's self is quite subordinate; the motto is *vivre pour autrui*. Utilitarianism aims at the happiness of the whole, or the greatest number, but reckons the personal unit of equal importance with the other units; but, strictly speaking, altruism altogether sinks consideration of self. No doubt such a state is practically impossible; our natural instincts rebel against it; nor does it seem to be Scriptural; but it is curious and remarkable how it struggles for assertion in our writings and actions of to-day, and not altogether without success.

But it will readily be seen that such altruism may easily pass into a maudlin and unscientific condition. Even where

it is dictated by the purest and noblest motives, there is the danger of running into inaccurate excess. "Love your neighbour as yourself," our Saviour said. But the important point is, Of what nature is our love for self? If it is merely hedonistic; if material pleasure and comfort are the sole and only things which we desire for ourselves, then we do our neighbour an injury by loving him in the same way, and desiring only the same things for himself. On the other hand, if we clearly see the inestimably higher and nobler sources of true happiness than are found in material pleasures; if we appreciate the advantages of character; if we understand the beauty of self-denial, the refinement of suffering, and the reality of religion, we *must* wish our neighbour to share equally in these, and not in physical comfort only, else we do not love him as ourself. It has yet to be argued that pleasure is the end and object of existence, even by philosophers. Christian philosophers are well persuaded otherwise. An altruistic hedonism is not the essence of the Sermon on the Mount. The Golden Rule does not supply the regulations of ill-considered benevolence.

But even conceding all this, there yet remains much, very much, for which all impartial observers are deeply thankful to Almighty God. In religion, education, politics, industry there is more general regard and consideration for others than perhaps the world has ever seen. Even an excess of this is infinitely preferable to a hard, crude, and irreligious egoism. It is better, on the whole, to be foolishly generous than deliberately illiberal. It is well that the whole house should be filled with the savour of the ointment.

It will perhaps be useful to examine, as signs of our times, certain books which have recently appeared, dealing mainly with social and ethical questions, which have quickly acquired more or less notoriety.

And first let us take that very remarkable work, "Social Evolution."[1] When grave journals, such as the *Times* and *Spectator*, go into raptures over an unknown author, it may be taken for granted that he has written a book worth reading. This impression would only be confirmed after a perusal. It is written in a remarkably clear and easy style, in pleasing contradistinction to many books on sociology, the authors of which appear to think it is necessary either to rant or to be obscure. Mr. Kidd neither indulges in false sentiment nor pompous verbosity. He is plain and scientific, and knowing this, it is all the more important to note that the leading idea of his work is to point out the immense, the necessary, part

[1] "Social Evolution." By Benjamin Kidd. London: Macmillan.

played by religion in the development of human society. His own religious convictions are carefully hidden from view. One can only, indeed, infer that he personally is a believer; whether a Roman Catholic, Unitarian, or Evangelical is entirely uncertain. This strict and rigid neutrality again renders more impressive the elaborately worked-out idea, that hitherto Science has been utterly to blame in her unscientific conflict with Religion, and in wilfully ignoring the essential part played in human life by a belief in the supernatural.

We cannot, of course, do more than give a very incomplete and fragmentary sketch of this fascinating volume. The author begins with a graphic delineation of the state of society at present, and of the outlook before us. His picture is highly coloured, but, on the whole, correct. There is not much real doubt that the times are pregnant of great changes. Even the unobservant, or the unwilling, must admit that looming away beyond the threshold of the twentieth century there are probably changes in the constitution of society which will rank with any that have before occurred in the world's history, if, indeed, they do not surpass them. Already there is the uneasy vibration in the air that carries to our hearts the conviction that great alterations, for good or for evil, are brooding over civilization. Scientific men are aware of this, but, and this is Mr. Kidd's dominant contention, the connection of religion with these evolutions is ignored by them. He writes:[1]

"These religions of man form one of the most striking and persistent of the phenomena of life when encountered under its highest forms, namely, in human society. Yet, strange to say, science seems to have taken up and to have maintained, down to the present time, the extraordinary position that her only concern with them is to declare (often, it must be confessed, with the heat and bitterness of a partisan) that they are without foundation in reason. But . . . the more we regard the religious phenomena of mankind as a whole, the more the conviction grows upon us that here, as in other departments of social affairs, science has as yet obtained no real grasp of the laws underlying the development which is proceeding in society. Religious phenomena are among the most persistent and characteristic features of the development which we find man undergoing in society."

This is perfectly true, and it is more than pleasant to find such convictions expressed in an unbiased and perfectly "scientific" manner.

[1] P. 20.

The conditions of human progress are traced in successive chapters, that progress which it is altogether beyond our power to check, which we can only observe, and which results from innate physiological causes. But though we cannot check, nor even permanently alter, the stream of human progress, we can observe its causes and guess at its tendency. Now, one of the most important conditions of progress is that there must be more people in a country than the resources of the country can support on an equality. There must be a constant struggle, not only for existence, but for a favourable existence. Without this conflict there is no improvement. A standstill leads to stagnation, and that to corruption. As Mr. Kidd says,[1] "If all the individuals of every generation in any species were allowed to equally propagate their kind, the average of each generation would continually tend to fall below the average of the generation which preceded it, and a process of slow but steady degeneration would ensue."

From this it follows that the conflict of individuals in one stage of existence is bound to produce an improvement in the conditions of life of their successors. But we all know that it is very difficult for the social unit to console himself for his struggles by the thought that his posterity of an indefinite future will benefit. In fact, the interests of the social unit, and of the whole social organism, are always in conflict. We know that perfectly well. "If we examine the motives of our daily life," says our author, "and of the lives of those with whom we come in contact, we shall have to recognise that the first and principal thought in the minds of the vast majority of us is how to hold our own therein."[2] To borrow an easy illustration, how many of us would deny ourselves a single scuttle of coal so that there would be more left for the twentieth century? The central fact with which we are confronted in our progressive societies is, therefore, that the interests of the social organism and those of the individuals comprising it at any time are actually antagonistic. For the interests of progression, therefore, there is no sanction of individual reason.

But progress continues. What, then, supplies the sanction for it? Some sanction there must be, or else man would abandon the struggle which causes improvement. His intellect gives him no encouragement; nay, dissuades him from the task, bidding him employ every possible means for his own enjoyment alone. Here, then, comes in the fundamental truth of social evolution. Rationalism supplies no sanction for the progress—no, but altruism does. This is what Mr. Kidd calls the central feature of human history; that the sanction supplied

[1] P. 37.

[2] P. 53.

for the conditions of all human progress is ultra-rational; it is religious, it is Christian. Science plays next to no part in the improvement of humanity at large, and its social amelioration; all is due to the altruistic instinct inculcated by Christ. In short, Mr. Kidd's definition of a religion, in the sense in which alone science is concerned with religion as a social phenomenon, would run somewhat as follows: "A religion is a form of belief, providing an ultra-rational sanction for that large class of conduct in the individual where his interests and the interests of the social organism are antagonistic, and by which the former are rendered subordinate to the latter in the general interests of the evolution which the race is undergoing."[1]

Such is a brief sketch of the main contention of this remarkable book. The thesis as a whole is supported with wonderful elaboration of detail, and copiousness of illustration. There are many points, no doubt, on which one would desire clearer information. To our mind, the great world-religions are placed on too much of an equality, though it is only fair to say that the author is clear enough on the fact that to Christianity alone is the true altruistic sentiment due. And after all, perhaps it is a great advantage that in this, the first book which logically places the relations between religion and science in social evolution on a proper footing, there should be no bias of any kind whatever apparent, but simply calm, clear statement of fact.

We said that it is impossible to tell the author's own religious convictions, but we must not omit to notice his intense respect for the Reformation. According to him, it was a re-birth of Christianity. Again and again he insists on its paramount value, speaking of course chiefly from the standpoint of social science. But the following is a remarkable passage: "It is to be doubted whether the peoples who, in suppressing the religious development of the sixteenth century, succeeded in preserving the outward forms of ecclesiastical unity, will be so successful in ultimately preserving the essential spirit of Christianity as those amongst whom the development was allowed to pursue its natural course."[2]

One other feature, too, remains to be pointed out. What relations does Mr. Kidd bear towards the great modern movement known as Socialism? He seems to think that socialism falls between two stools. On the one hand, it is right in perceiving and adopting the altruistic sentiment which now pervades the white peoples; but on the other hand, it is wrong in trying, under rationalistic sanction, to grasp material comfort for one section of society at a given time, regardless of the

[1] P. 103. [2] P. 303.

necessities of posterity. So to speak, ordinary collectivism will try to condense at one period, and for the benefit of one generation merely, all the social comforts on an equal footing of distribution, and to prevent by State control any interference with this arrangement by subsequent generations. But in such an aim as this, the great fact of man's necessary and continuous evolution is lost sight of. Such a sitting on the safety valve would produce an explosion. There must be the continual strife to produce continual improvement. The function of the State, Mr. Kidd thinks, in the twentieth century, will be to preserve and secure free competition rather than to suspend it. At the end of this nineteenth century, he thinks, equal political rights have been extended to all; the task of the succeeding age will be to secure equal social opportunity for all. All people will engage in the rivalry of life on conditions of equal opportunities. We quote again:

"It may perhaps be inferred that the development of society in the direction indicated will be itself a movement towards socialism. This is not so. The gulf between the state of society towards which it is the tendency of the process of evolution now in progress to carry us, and socialism, is wide and deep. The avowed aim of socialism is to suspend that personal rivalry and competition of life which not only is now, but has been from the beginning of life, the fundamental impetus behind all progress. The inherent tendency of the process of social development now taking place amongst us is (as it has been from the beginning of our civilization) to raise this rivalry to the very highest degree of efficiency as a condition of progress, by bringing all the people into it on a footing of equality, and by allowing the freest possible play of forces within the community, and the widest possible opportunities for the development of every individual's faculties and personality."[1]

This duly seems to express in scientific language the instantaneous objections that leap to everyone's mind when the term socialism is employed. How can we do away with competition? how can we interfere with the natural inequalities of mankind? Such and similar expressions occur to the ordinary man with a force that he feels to be unanswerable. And, more or less, they are unanswerable. The altruistic instinct which pervades us is the very mother of fair and reasonable improvement. It cannot strangle its own child. It must continue to nurse it. Man cannot be made magnanimous by machinery, even by State machinery. But altruism, inspired and maintained by Christianity, can remove harsh and artificial inequalities, can

[1] P. 238.

induce men to love one another, and to give to each other the same opportunities for a religious and rational use of God's gift of life.

With this necessarily inadequate synopsis we must leave a volume which would well repay serious study. But on quitting this and similar scientific works, and regarding merely general literature of the present moment, how much we find, in those books which are on the lips of everybody, of the essence of altruism, either vague or well-defined! In fact, it is not too much to say that all "serious" writing, even of fiction, apart from the ephemeral class of what might be termed *Answers* literature, is tinged either with altruistic, or with anti-altruistic, that is to say, individualistic, ideas. To take for instance, the last translation into English of a work by the Russian mystic, Count Tolstoi.[1] Here we have what might, without offence, be called altruism run wild. Count Tolstoi's religious ideas are well known. He is a most out-and-out exponent of the non-resistance of evil, and while there is much that is fantastic and unreal in his statements, no one would deny that there is a great deal that is beautiful and true. But what an injurious thing it is to a writer when he loses his sense of proportion! One could take any single truth that is taught by Christianity, separate it from the others, place it in a hot-house of mysticism and unreality, and force it to an unnatural growth—but it would not then be Christian. All heresies contain a truth, but a truth distorted to excess. So in reading this book, interesting and suggestive as it is, which is aimed against war and military service, the impression left upon one's mind is "This is beautiful, but it is impracticable and unreal," and nothing that is unreal is exactly Christian. When Tolstoi relates some of the horrors that are perpetrated by the authorities in Russia, indignation throbs in our hearts in sympathy with his, but when he urges that no man should take arms, even to defend his native country, we shut up the book.

Another remarkable book, if only from its unconventionality, is Mr. Stead's latest philippic,[2] thousands of which have been sold, both in America and in England. He takes as his *motif* Lowell's beautiful poem beginning

> "Said Christ our Lord, 'I will go and see
> How the men, My brothers, believe on Me.'"

This idea is applied all through to Chicago, but, Mr. Stead is

[1] "The Kingdom of God is within You." By Count Leo Tolstoi. London: W. Scott.

[2] "If Christ came to Chicago!" By W. T. Stead. London: *Review of Reviews* Office.

careful to explain, only as a sample of other great cities. There is much in the book that recalls vividly to the minds of those who have forgotten, or who are unconscious of them, the dreadful evils that lurk in large centres of population. But it seems to us that Mr. Stead falls into a frequent trap for fiery minds. He forgets that Christ only speaks to Christians. The moral laws of Christianity, still more its spiritual ones, have a compulsive power, a force that guides and controls, only upon those who have given in their allegiance to the Founder of these laws. "If Christ came to Chicago" He would find those who were His servants—and those who were not. Those who are not His followers do not, naturally, care at all about His regulations as to purity, self-denial, and love; but there must be in Chicago, as there certainly are in English cities, many who work for their Master, and labour for His outcast and poor. Yet the book is not without its use in encouraging those who toil, and stimulating those who lag; and it is certainly not without importance, as illustrating the keen and impassioned altruism, prompted by Christ's teaching, which is so striking a feature of much public work. It is becoming more and more impossible for public men to avoid taking it into account, and for private individuals to escape the hold of its influence, even, perhaps, where neither could be strictly called Christians.

To come to a little book which also enjoys a wide circulation—"Stephen Remarx."[1] It is the story of a young clergyman, well-born, and with every "social" possibility, who devoted himself to working and preaching among the poor. Perhaps it is not necessary to add that he dies of a dramatic street accident—"Robert Elsmere" and other books have led us to expect the early death of the self-denying hero, though on what grounds, moral, or even literary, we do not know. However, that is only a detail, born, we trust, of no gloomy forebodings on the part of the author, who has given us a very suggestive and charming picture of a modern St. Francis of Assisi. Nay, we do not hesitate to say that in some parishes, in some towns, if the working men are to be won to Christ, methods must be adopted that are akin to those described by Mr. Adderley.

But a more weighty and authoritative volume, perhaps, with English Churchmen, than any we have quoted, is the volume of sermons just issued under the auspices of the Christian Social Union.[2] The sermons are on social subjects, and were preached at a City church during the Lent of last

[1] "Stephen Remarx." By James Adderley. London: Edward Arnold.
[2] "Lombard Street in Lent." London: Elliot Stock.

year. We are told that "the idea of the promoters was to bring vividly before the minds of business men and others that the pressing social problems of the day would be the fittest object of their thoughts, prayers, heart-searchings, and aspirations during the solemn season of Lent; and that, as Christians, they were bound to seek for direction in their solution from their Lord and Master, Jesus Christ." With this object, Canon Scott-Holland preached on "National Penitence" and "The Marriage Law"; Archdeacon Farrar on "Am I my brother's keeper?"; the Dean of Winchester on "Social warnings from History"; the Dean of Ely on "The Imperial Christ and His Democratic Creed," and so on—twenty-three sermons in all, with a preface by the Bishop of Durham. We need not give quotations from the book, which probably is, or will be, familiar to our readers, but simply allude to it as yet another sign of the great characteristic of our times which we are discussing. One thing we may be permitted to regret—the undeniable tone of pessimism which runs through some of the sermons, able as they are. Perhaps this is partly to be accounted for by the influences of the season in which they were delivered, but it is apt to become depressing to the Christian worker. What does this statement mean, for example: "There is an almost shoreless sea of misery around us, which rolls up its dark waves to our very doors"?[1] We know exactly how many poor there are; what we have to do is to work with confidence and with hope; we shall not do all we want, but no good comes from reiterating statements about a "shoreless" sea. Again, to go to the other extreme, in the sermon on "Recreation," we venture to think the Headmaster of Haileybury is a little severe on professional football. At all events, a Scotch headmaster, in a recent magazine article, has taken a very different view. There is much to be said for the cutler in Sheffield, who sits all the week on his bench making always just one particular part of a knife, until he threatens to become as machine-like as a machine, and then on Saturday afternoon finds fresh air and relief to his brain in watching a match of consummate skill, even though the players are Scotchmen. And in one or two sermons one is almost tempted to think of the Archbishop of Canterbury's recent advice to his clergy: "Understand, and you will not interfere." In any case, do not let us talk about the gloomy side of things until we can speak of nothing else. Many of these sermons are instinct with hope, and full of cheerful encouragement. Mr. Gent's calm and confident treatment of "Religious Education" is especially valuable at the present

[1] P. 33.

time. Few will dissent from the theory of the principles laid down in Mr Stubbs' "Democratic Creed of the Church."[1] Prebendary Eyton's "Social Hope" is all that its title implies. The opening words of the Bishop of Durham's preface are pregnant with calm wisdom and logical confidence. We cannot refrain from quoting its close:[2] "Some among us may naturally be stirred to impetuous action by the sight of evils which come upon them with sad surprises. During the fifty years through which I have watched the advance of national, social, and industrial reforms, I have gained the patience of courageous hope, which still grows stronger in the actual stress of conflict. Let the ideal be duly fashioned and loyally held and pursued, and little by little it will be surely established."

We think we have collected enough of the straws that show which way the wind is blowing, without discussing novels like "Marcella," or pseudo-scientific books like "Vox Clamantium." Indeed, there can be no doubt in the mind of the interested observer that now, more than ever before, whole nations are impressed, entire movements are dominated, by the spirit of putting ourselves in others' positions. The burden of the grief of others weighs heavily upon us. Concrete instances of this abstract truth—societies, laws, institutes, books, sermons, speeches—occur to our minds the instant we let our recollection range over the events of the past few years. Multitudes of exceptions there are, no doubt, supplied by individuals; but the spirit of the age is the spirit of charity. Surely, then, the responsibilities of Christian teachers are very great. "In this nineteenth century," says Professor Drummond, "we are only just beginning to find out what Christianity really is." A bold statement, and one that most of us would scarcely endorse, but in a certain sense it is true that the public life and politics of the nation realize the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount to a degree which eclipses that of any previous age. The great love of a Christian altruism, set free by the Reformation, has grown side by side with scientific civilization, but has grown faster, and is now its schoolmaster to lead it unto Christ. But as social evolution owes so much to Christian altruism, it is well that two things should be clearly borne in mind: First, that social reformers must, if their work is to be lasting and beneficial, be men of religion. Is not this evident? If the sanction for progress is supplied by religion, are not those the best guides of progress who are themselves directly influenced by that motive power? "If a man say 'I love God,' and hateth his brother, he is a liar." It is the part of us all to endeavour to promote the prayer "Thy will be done *in earth*"

[1] P. 174. [2] Preface, p. xiii.

—but the test of the true social leader must be his own character before God, for "by this we know that we love the children of God *when we love God.*" The two truths are inseparable; the decadence of the French nation will be ours if we divorce love of man from love of God, as they did at the Revolution. It is true that he cannot love God who does not love his neighbour, but the converse is equally true that no man can effectually love his neighbour who does not love his God. And again, the altruism of the twentieth century must determine clearly what are the things which it postulates. If a man desires evil things for himself, he does harm to his neighbour by conferring upon him, even unselfishly, the same gifts. So a mere materialism, unaccompanied by any graces of character, will bring no benefit to a race, but the reverse. A hard-and-fast materialistic Socialism would check all progress, would do away with ideals, and remove the motive for evolution. Then decadence and stagnation would ensue. We do not want a hedonism for the masses of the people, neither the hedonism of the champagne-bottle and the realistic novel, nor the hedonism of the pigsty. The people must be taught not to want this themselves. First and foremost it must be impressed upon them that there is One who taught us to love one another, and to Whom all must give an account of their actions —peoples as well as persons, masses as well as units. They must be taught to remember to say: "We believe that thou shalt come to be our Judge." That is what the democracy must learn, that the altruism of these times is not vague and casual, but is the concrete expression of the will of a living Person, to Whom all are responsible.

W. A. PURTON.

ART. VI.—AMBITION.

ON the occasion of our Lord's lesson from the little child, St. Peter had just been honoured by Him with a fresh mark of favour and an extraordinary distinction. He had been selected to find and pay the tribute money. The contrast which our Lord drew between the things of Cæsar and the things of God had again raised the hopes of the disciples to look forward to the restoration of the kingdom to Israel. The wonder of the coin in the mouth of the fish had seemed to them to point out some speedy development. Putting these things together, and anxious to know whether their good old friend Peter was indeed to have a supremacy amongst them in that dawn of glory and happiness to which they were looking forward, they asked the question,