

ARTICLE IX.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS.¹

BY MR. Z. SWIFT HOLBROOK.

THIS book has in it so much that is commendable and worthy of praise, that it would be an injustice not to make full and frank acknowledgment at the outset of its freshness, its vigor and originality. Dr. Abbott is far from being a prosaic or platitudinous writer. A preacher who could arouse a continent upon so trite a question as the real meaning of a phrase in the Declaration; or who could stir up, not only the Manhattan Association, but the entire theological world, by a single address on Jonah and the whale, has a mind to be reckoned with in these times of much speaking and cheap printing. To what extent it is possible to become conspicuous by saying *outré* things from a distinguished pulpit, is not my province here to discuss. Any clergyman, however, is to be commended who does not pass the dead-line of laziness, as Dr. Behrends calls it, and permit his pulpit to lapse into a state of innocuous desuetude, where conservatism degenerates into dry-rot, and "orthodoxy" is like charity in one particular at least,—a mantle that covers a multitude of sins.

No one can accuse Dr. Abbott of being icily regular and splendidly null, as Tennyson expresses it, for he is nothing if not heroic, frank, fearless, unconventional, and always interesting. He reminds one of Dr. Herron in his manner of saying some things so startling, and provoking, that,

¹ By Lyman Abbott, D.D. Pp. 370. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$1.25.

though he awakens thought, he does it at too great an expense, for it costs him our confidence in his judicial poise. It does not help the matter any to dodge behind Jesus for indorsement and protection, if such an expression may be pardoned. These essays are many of them sermons preached from Plymouth pulpit and, as such, deserve high praise. Many so-called gospel sermons are flat, stale, and unprofitable, simply because they lack intellectual and moral earnestness. They might as well be delivered by a phonograph, for they are not born of hard work, nor do they reflect the individual power or convictions of the preacher. They are not what he thinks, so much as what he thinks he ought to think. They fall flat, not because of people's hostility to truth, so much as that the audience is simply starving for the truth. There is not a live church in Chicago that is not comfortably filled, and some of them crowded, each Sunday, to hear some good news; and though some eminently respectable churches are dying a natural death, the fault in every instance is found in one word,—dry-rot in the pulpit or mildew in the pews.

Dr. Abbott is to be praised for his earnestness, his push, his enterprise, his fearless attacks on monopolies and trusts, on stock gambling, and selfishness in all its forms. It requires heroism to speak from his pulpit such plain truths to respectable sinners in New York and Brooklyn. It reveals a faith in the triumph of right principles that in these days, when there is more or less of pew degeneracy and pulpit sycophancy, is simply refreshing. He is keenly alive to social questions, and is in deep sympathy with democratic principles and institutions,—a lover of humanity and the friend of the common people. His exalted conception of the character and mission of the Ideal Unit of society is brought out in his chapter on the Founder of Christianity, and is a fine piece of word-painting. It is Christ the Ideal, the embodiment of beauty, whom Dr. Ab-

bott worships; for Christ's personal character is beyond criticism, and his teachings are truth in the norm. Art is the expression of an idea in material form, and it is fine art when it has no relation to utility. It is when Dr. Abbott departs from the sphere of fine art and approaches the useful, the practical, that we begin to part company from him.

Ruskin says that the entire vitality of art depends upon its being either full of truth or full of use; and that, however pleasant, wonderful, or impressive it may be in itself, it must yet be of inferior kind, and tend to deeper inferiority, unless it has clearly one of these main objects,—either to state a true thing or to adorn a serviceable one.¹ Now the world has appreciated and paid homage to Christ as the wisdom of God, the flowering of truth or beauty,—a piece of fine art, having no relation to utility: but the new conscience, the outgrowth of the demand for better social conditions, as reflected in all modern social ethics, is looking to Christianity as the Art of Social Control. Utility as well as beauty; the Real as well as the Ideal; the practical no less than the theoretical. As the truth and the life for individual needs, Christ has been worshiped, but now the social reformer would find in him the social Way. Reality, sincerity, practicality, like art in the days of Pindar, before the beginning of the change of Greek ideal art into a beautiful expediency.²

The new social conscience thus awakens the new hope that Christ is coming to earth again, not in bodily form but in a practical way, for a dwelling-place in the midst of new and just social conditions. The clouds that parted to receive him from human eyes, and left him to the world as a beautiful ideal which it has attained to but slowly, must roll away and bring him back to earth, the leader and friend of the common people, of the downtrodden and the

¹ Relation of Art to Use, p. 100.

² Ruskin, Relation of Art to Religion, p. 39.

poor, who are waging an unequal warfare with organized injustice and tyranny. It is an interesting question as to how far Christianity, even practically applied, is the solution of all of the so-called evils of poverty. Christ disappointed those who would make him king in order to bring a release from the yoke of Roman bondage. "My kingdom is not of this world," said he to the question, "Art thou a king?" We hasten to record Dr. Abbott's name, however, high among the apostles of the New Coming of the king. Not for the accuracy of all his conclusions, but for the spirit, the purpose, the heroic faith that breathes through all his sayings. And the same is true of Dr. Herron.

What the outcome will be of this intense desire to demand of Christianity the remedy for unjust social conditions, and thus to unite utility with beauty, no one can predict. One thing is certain: if literature is now to come forth on Christ the Banker, the Merchant, we must know him, not as the creation of any particular imagination, nor as an impracticable idealist, but as he was and is,—interpreted through the enlightened Christian consciousness of to-day. The state recognizes two kinds of corporations,—one for pecuniary profit, and the other philanthropic. Does Christianity demand the repeal of laws making this distinction, and insist that all corporations must be philanthropic? Does it oppose the current ideas of sound principles of banking? Does it deny the right to acquire, destroy the sense of ownership, and ignore the natural rights of man? Shall the laws of economics be re-written at its behest, that consumption, production, distribution, accumulation, may revolve around a new center,—duty to neighbor, instead of self?

So long as Dr. Abbott keeps Christ upon the Mount of Transfiguration, all must join him in his deep homage. The moment he brings Christ down, and makes a working factor of him, healing diseases and casting out devils; and

especially advising bankers and merchants how to run their business, that moment he begins to draw somewhat upon his imagination, and picture a Christ that is not altogether like the one of the New Testament. The cogs slip between the ideal and the real. Commerce must hitch its wagon to a star; but to do so requires a knowledge, not only of astronomy, but of the marts of trade. The man of affairs views the facts of the external world inductively, and obstinately resists the introduction of a poetical and artistical idealism, such as Plato's Republic is founded upon, in place of actuality. Aristotle's practical work is nearer to truth, in the mind of the educated business man of to-day, because it is not deductive but inductive. Commerce is not a hungering and thirsting after ideal beauty so much as for utility.

The teachers of practical social reforms; those who are showing us how to control trusts and monopolies; how to bring the natural monopolies under the supervision of the state; how to house the poor in model tenement-houses, and pay dividends on the investment; how to avoid the asperities of competition, and yet retain individual liberty; how to bring woman to look with charity upon her fallen sister; how to distribute charity, and not rob the recipients of their self-respect,—all such social reformers and teachers are practical and Christian. This is the way to move onward and upward toward the attainment of the ideal social condition, for it is a union of idealism and practical sense, a steady growth. But a Christ, born of the imagination and not a historical fact; put forth as a theory for a working hypothesis, not inductive but deductive, will simply lead social reform out into the wilderness, and cast reproach upon his name.

The obstacles in the way of practical social reform are sufficiently numerous and difficult to surmount, with human nature as it is, and the historical Christ as he is; but

these obstacles simply become infinite, and the task becomes hopeless, when we have pictured to us a human nature that does not exist, and a Christ for an ideal who never was born, and never will be. Such a pseudo-Christ would at once usher in a flabby and insipid social condition, where every man is minding his neighbor's business, and paying no attention to his own; where the fruitage of a proper regard for self, such as self-respect, self-reliance, and a host of similar virtues, are positive sins; where life, liberty, property, reputation, are meaningless terms, because the ego has been so lost in alter that a cartilaginous substance has taken the place of the backbone; where mental and moral virility and heroism have been supplanted by a senseless sentimentalism. This is the new human nature of Bellamy; and all we need to fit to it to make the picture complete is the Christ of modern birth, and we have some problems to solve that make the present social problems seem as child's play.

But the Christ of history and the forces which he set in motion have spoken now for more than eighteen centuries, and, by the docile student, their voices may be heard in tones of authority, and not as the scribes. They speak for both poles of truth on every subject: self and neighbor; individualism and societism; liberty and law; ownership and stewardship; democracy and aristocracy; idealism and realism; theory and practice; subjectivity and objectivity; the spiritual and the material; beauty and utility; faith and works; competition and coöperation; worship and work.

The world has moved forward in each age too largely by fits and starts, by over-emphasis of some half-truth, and its progress has been intermittent,—a succession of chills and fever. The pendulum swings from one side to the other, and a century is lost in extremism. Many social reformers and teachers are trying to set the pace for the new century

along these same old lines of error,—of seizing upon a half-truth, and pressing it into service for a whole truth. Dr. Abbott has done this in many places, though in others he seems to answer his own arguments. He gives an estimate of self that is a denial of the fundamentals of Christian ethics; a view of individualism that makes practical socialism a pressing necessity; a conception of stewardship that denies ownership; an estimate of the evils of competition that makes it supreme selfishness, instead of the law of social development and of individual worth; a definition of liberty that is license; a conception of retributive justice that is not a vindication of law, nor even vengeance, but revenge; and incidentally he seems to favor single tax, and the quantity rather than the quality theory of money.

The commercial world will never hitch its wagon to such a star. Because the age is one of invention and discovery, revealing beauty in utility; leading men on to attain the ideal through the real; because it is a commercial age of ingenuity in combining, concentrating, and coöperating for the accomplishment of its purposes; for these very reasons it will never be led into the wilderness of quagmire and fog, into ethical and economic transcendentalism. Transcendentalism in theology may secure an audience, but in economics and ethics it will not be heeded for a moment. While the country is in debt to advanced thinkers like Dr. Herron (though he is simply a voice crying in the wilderness, and makes no pretension to accuracy of speech or precision of definition; and though such religious newspapers as the *Kingdom* are the outgrowth of the demand of the times and meet a want); yet the obligations to the conservative universities like Yale, Harvard, and Princeton, and to the standard weekly religious press, for their defense of fundamentals, can scarcely be estimated.

Let us now examine critically some of Dr. Abbott's propositions, and discover their true import and ultimate bear-

ings. The most fundamental of these is found in his ethical conception of the value of self compared with neighbor. Many social critics, observing the abnormal development, in this day, of the passion for acquisition, and that manhood seems devoured by the canker-worm of selfishness, and that the proper regard for neighbor has too little show of recognition, imagine that this state of affairs must be cured by extremism in the other direction,—*similia similibus curantur*. Hence the absurd teaching, that self must be withered to zero, while neighbor must be exalted to unity. But the very cure for the mad haste to be rich, it seems to me, is not to cure one exaggeration with another, but to do as Christ did, hold up to rich men the very importance of self and the accountability of each to God.

For many years I have known that Dr. Abbott sympathized with Dr. Herron in his philosophy of the comparative importance of self and neighbor. Dr. Abbott was the author of that ingenious interpretation of the Royal Law that made it the Judaistic law of justice, and not a remedial law of sacrifice. Years ago he said that the Christian law demanded, not that thou shalt love thy neighbor *as thyself*, but *better* than thyself, for did not Christ say: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you"? In other words, neighbor equals unity, while self equals zero. He quoted a mother's love as ideal; forgetting that it is an instinct, and not the harmony of the will with the reason, which is righteousness.

In the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* for October, 1894, I took the pains, at great length, to show the fallacy of this reasoning, and have never had occasion to change my mind, that this equation is not founded on sound Christian ethics. I speak of it again, because it leads to some absurdities in Dr. Abbott's book, as I shall try to show. It obstructs the view of the natural rights of man,—life, liberty, property,

and reputation; it ridicules subjectivism; it warps the notions of the right of ownership in property and land; it takes one-sided views of individualism, of arbitration, of stewardship, even of liberty. If the remedy for extreme individualism is the exalting of the state into paternalism; or, in ethics, the reducing of self to zero; or a denial of the right of ownership, then the remedy is worse than the disease.

The intimate relations between ethics and economics are such that an absurd and unsolvable equation in ethics calls for the substitution of sentiment for reason as a working factor, and the result is the Sentimental school in economics. Against this, not only all sound economic scholars protest, but the unerring instincts of practical business men revolt, with the sure result, that a contempt for scholastics and collegians will permeate the marts of trade as it did the mind of Horace Greeley. For a bank to attempt to save men's souls, instead of their financial credit, or, for courts of justice to attempt to follow Dr. Herron's advice and become "courts of redemption," accomplishes no practical good; it simply awakens, and justly so, the contempt of sound business men for theorists and sentimentalists. Commerce and trade will never come into the kingdom on such a philosophy.

The theory that neighbor equals unity, and self equals zero, finds no sanction in Christian ethics, and any philosophy founded on such equations will never become a working principle in commercial circles. It sounds good, but it is not the gospel of the practical and sensible Christ. Phillips Brooks' well-known sermon on "Son of man stand upon thy feet, and I will speak to thee," is an answer to such a sentiment; and likewise Paul's saying: "They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, . . . let them come themselves and fetch us out."

Nor is it because the world practically is so far from the

ideal that men are principally concerned with their own business, and are too selfish to care for that of their neighbor's. The very laws of Christ's kingdom enforce the same truth; for no one can become interested in the salvation of neighbor, until he has first been concerned about his own. Love worketh no ill; but that love is good-will, and the highest fruitage of good-will is justice, not sentiment. The theory of non-resistance according to Tolstoi and his follower, Ernest Crosby, would raise havoc in business circles. A bank run on such a theory would close its doors, and thus rob its depositors.

The same line of reasoning will apply in a measure to the law of stewardship in matters of property. It is a spiritual law, and is not to be taken into account by courts of justice or in deeds of transfer. For all practical purposes, absolute ownership is the commercial idea. The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life, must be observed when the attempt is made to govern commercial circles by laws intended to govern man in his personal relations to God. The Calvinistic argument advanced by the colored brother, who had fallen from grace and stolen a chicken, will illustrate. "I am not personally responsible, your Honor, for stealing that chicken; it was foreordained that I should take it." Said the Justice, "Then it was also foreordained that I should send you up for ninety days." Bronson Alcott confused the doctrine of stewardship with that of ownership, if he helped himself, as it is said he did, to his neighbor's melon patch. It does not impeach a whole system of truth because some evils grow out of it. Every virtue has its corresponding vice. Let the tares grow with the wheat. The desire to acquire cannot be held responsible for the ravages of avarice any more than mother's love can be charged with the crimes of lust, or the spirit of genuine faith be held responsible for the caprices of credulity.

In speaking of Christ's first sermon at Nazareth, Dr. Ab-

bott says: "The spirit of this sermon has entered the church and has gradually changed the avowed function of religion from the selfish one of seeking the personal salvation of the worshiper to the unselfish one of inspiring him to become a saviour of others. With this change in the conception of religion has come a change in the organization of the church" (p. 34).

When he characterizes the desire for personal salvation as "selfishness," his error is an ethical one, in confusing self-love with selfishness. Much confusion of thought can be avoided by distinguishing always between the higher self and the lower self. True piety is not a growth in self-consciousness, nor in sentimentalism, nor in selfishness; though it is a positive and persistent growing consciousness of the real value of the higher self compared with the lower self. Through a vision so clarified, the communion becomes deeper and sweeter, as the years go by, with Him who is, and is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. The inner world becomes the great reality, and the outward the shadow; the seen and the temporal fade away in the light of the unseen, the immortal; and over the horizon of the soul rises the Light of the world. In his Bampton lectures, Barry says, "The soul in its supremest moments is conscious of but two existences,—God and self."

In his "Philosophy of Kant," E. Caird says: "We must, in the first place, remember that analysis and subjectivity on the one hand, and synthesis and objectivity on the other hand, go together in Kant's mind."¹ The two poles of thought necessary to any perfect philosophy are revealed in two sayings: "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose himself," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The fruitage is practical piety and Christian altruism. As Hegel said: "Christianity, we know, teaches that God wishes all men to be saved.

¹ P. 413.

That teaching declares that subjectivity has an infinite value."¹

Battoni's Magdalene, in the gallery at Dresden, reveals a woman, physically beautiful, lying on the ground in a cave reading the Scriptures. It is not true to life or to nature. It may be a half-truth. Asceticism, monasticism, medievalism or orientalism, whether in art or religion, must give way to modern progress, for this age is eminently practical; but when the paramount importance of personal piety is overlooked, and individual man is lost in social man, the result will be materialism. Subjectivism (a word that Ruskin so abominates), no less than individualism, comes in for indiscriminate censure with Dr. Abbott, when all we need is to remember Aristotle's tribute to the golden mean. As Ovid says, *Medio tutissimus ibis.*²

But this age is not so practical nor so civilized, nor will any other age become so, that duty to God can be supplanted by duties to society, or that man's obligations to himself can be overlooked in any assumed enthusiasm for altruism or social reforms. A labor church was started in Chicago, and the first sermon was preached by a labor leader, a demagogue whose profanity on other occasions was well known and notorious. The effort was simply blasphemy.

A peculiarity of Dr. Abbott's is seen in his lack of judicial poise; for, when he is developing one pole of truth, his intense desire to make his point clear leads him to over-emphasize its importance, and thus it may become essentially error. For instance, in one place (p. 16) he speaks clearly of liberty once being another name for lawlessness, thus holding to old Governor Winthrop's distinction between liberty and license, but later on (p. 42), in defining what is liberty, he enters upon a discussion that ends as follows: "Democracy begins self-government with the in-

¹ Wallace's *Logic of Hegel*. ² *Metamorphoses*, ii. 137.

dividual, leaves him free to do what he will, to perpetrate what blunders and inflict what self-injuries he chooses, so long as he does not directly or indirectly wrong his neighbor by his blunder or his self-injury" (p. 44).

Here is the self-equals-zero theory again, and the logic of it is, that the highest prerogative of a noble Roman is to commit suicide. But democracy does nothing of the sort, as any man will learn if he is detected in an attempt at self-destruction. If a man does too many foolish things, even in matters of property, his friends may have a conservator appointed for him to protect him from himself. The definition of liberty, "to do as one pleases," is fit scarcely for the animal kingdom, much less for civilized human beings. It is not even a definition of natural liberty, and much less of civil liberty. Carlyle's well-known "brass collars, whips, and handcuffs" argument, to which Dr. Abbott objects so strenuously, is a way of stating Christ's view, that true liberty comes through bondage to truth,—natural or civil liberty. Natural liberty is freedom from all restraint, except such as nature imposes; while civil liberty is freedom from all, save such as is imposed by government or by society. It must be said, in justice to Dr. Abbott, that in other places his conception of liberty assumes a normal shape.

On the question of Single Tax, he would seem to sympathize with the views of Thomas G. Shearman, the noted advocate of Mr. George's views. As he does not assume to take up the economic question in detail, neither will I, except to suggest, that, if individual ownership of land has multiplied the size of the earth by bestowing upon it the advantages of individualism, thus making it more productive and fruitful, it would devolve upon Single-taxers to show that public ownership would do the same, and that the taxes on unproductive land are more than offset by the unearned increment. It is an economic question, and not

purely an ethical one. The effect of private ownership of land on individual character, awakening the sense of ownership and of self-respect, has been generally overlooked by Single-taxers.

When Dr. Abbott comes to socialism, he exposes its weakness in clear language. He attempts no definition of socialism; but in the *Outlook* of December 26, 1896, this definition is furnished us: "Any system which assumes that the present evils in society are due, in whole or in part, to social malorganization, and which proposes as a remedy, in whole or in part, a reorganization of society." I assume that this is from Dr. Abbott's pen, because it is preceded by sentences taken *verbatim* from his book. Barnum's entire menagerie can be driven through such a definition. It is too general, and will let in every scheme of visionary reform that to-day is seeking a foothold on this long-suffering earth. Socialism would substitute coöperation for competition, and place all the means of production in the control of the state. It would change environment, not man. It would make men holy by machinery, and happy by legislation. It works from without inward; from the top downward. It reverses the processes of nature in social evolution. To the extent that Christian socialists, like Maurice and Kingsley, would effect these results of making men fraternal through the spirit of goodwill inspired by Christianity, no one can object; for it is voluntary, and in no wise interferes with individual liberty. Socialism can never be made to work without Christianity as its guiding spirit; and when men are imbued with that spirit, socialism is not needed.

Dr. Abbott's views of individualism again reveal this want of judicial instinct. He says: "We have definitely abandoned *laissez-faire* and the Manchester school. It has no longer any place in our industrial conceptions. It is sometimes attacked by men as though it were an existing

thing. It is not an existing thing. . . . Government has definitely, distinctly, and finally declared that the relations between men in industry cannot be left to the conflict of self-interest." It is undoubtedly true that the state has stepped in to suspend some rights assumed to be individual and has greatly enlarged its duties and functions; and by wise and humane legal enactments is doing more to protect the weak from the strong, the poor from the rich, the wage-earner from the corporation. To this extent individualism has been superseded by state intervention. All good citizens wish it would discover some way now to protect us all from the monopolies and trusts that are such a poor tribute to the principle and wisdom of coöperation as well as to individualism. But in what manner and to what extent has the *laissez-faire* doctrine in economics been superseded? The competitive warfare was never so strong among merchants as now. Manufacturers combine, but middlemen compete. Individualism and human selfishness are not synonymous terms. Christianity discovered individualism as the lost sheep on the mountains, but now is turning its attention to the ninety and nine. To abandon individualism completely in a government like our own would be to return to the democracy of Aristotle, which exalted the state, and made the individual a zero.

The wise and orderly soul follows in the straight path, and is conscious of her surroundings, said Socrates.¹ This principle should govern in viewing modern social questions. The new fashion of thought that is setting in is an old fashion with new trimmings. A practical sympathy for the masses in all their needs, and for the lowest in their degradation, is born of Christianity. It is praiseworthy, and should be helped onward by every means; but, as sure as it neglects the reclaiming of individuals one by one, it will end as all fashions do,—in a passing fad. The preju-

¹ Jowett's Plato, Phædo, Vol. ii. p. 256.

dice against Christian clergymen and churches, on the part of wage-earners, is deep-seated and outspoken. Personal friendship and contact alone can overcome this. Settlements that would lift men up to the highest level must seek change of character, no less than of environment; a change of will, no less than an awakening of æsthetic emotions, for men need life more than light, regenerating more than refining. To exalt Humanity upon the throne of the universe, and bid all fall down and worship at the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, and psaltery, is simply to adopt the utilitarianism of August Comte. Its fruitage will be skepticism, rationalism, materialism. Good citizens are simply good people. Civic righteousness, clean politics, sound economics, ethical culture, are all the fruitage of faith. As Mazzini says: "Every political question is rapidly becoming a social question, and every social question a religious question."¹

The following are quotations from Dr. Abbott's book to which reference is made in this article:—

"That danger of land monopoly, which history has proved to be so great and so common a peril, was guarded against by the declaration that all the land belonged to God" (p. 6).

"We can hardly fail to see that the burden of his [Christ's] ministry was far more sociological than either ecclesiastical or theological. He intimated that there was to be a church, but he gave almost no instructions respecting its constitution or its laws" (p. 17).

"Liberty is ability to do as one pleases" (p. 42). "Whether liberty is wise, safe, or even possible may be open to discussion" (p. 43).

"Liberty is possible only through society, and society is a condition of interdependence" (p. 119).

"There are not wanting indications that a fifth small body [of men] will soon exercise a practical control over our currency, or medium of exchange" (p. 61).

"Christianity recognizes neither absolute good nor absolute evil in man. The highest faculties have their perils, the lowest their useful purpose" (p. 68).

"According to the communist, the family is the ideal of all social organization, and we shall not reach the ideal until we come to be one household and own all property in common. Nor can we set this notion of common property aside as unworthy of serious consideration. We cannot forget that this was the dream of Plato,—and Plato was a wise man. From his time to the days of Looking Backward it has been an ideal of noble men" (p. 71).

¹Quoted by Dr. Abbott, p. 36.

"Property is a trust. Whatever a man possesses is given to him, but the gift is not absolute; it is a gift in trust. He is to use it for the benefit of the whole community" (p. 81). "Property is a trust. . . . Any man who uses his property, or any part of his property, for himself alone, is guilty of a breach of trust. He is a defaulter before God. . . . It is not his to use. No part of it is his to use. . . . No man owns anything" (pp. 83-84).

"There is neither moral nor scientific basis for the notion that the land and its contents belong, or can by any possibility belong to the accidental owner to use for himself, in disregard of public welfare" (p. 87).

"I will define the man of wealth, as one who, after fulfilling his trust to his own family by providing adequately for their best equipment, and fulfilling his trust to his co-partners, without whose coöperative industry his accumulations would have been impossible, still has a surplus. That surplus belongs to the community; it has been derived from the community; and it is to be administered for the benefit of the community" (p. 94). "In the light, both of Christian teaching and of scientific teaching, all wealth is to be held and administered as a common wealth" (p. 99).

"The same individualism which entered the church and split it into sects, and entered government and led on to anarchy, entered industry and founded what is known in political economy as the Manchester School. This doctrine treats man in an industry, as governed only by self-interest. It expects and encourages a perpetual conflict of interests, and trusts that an equable balance and a true justice will be secured by the interaction of purely selfish forces" (p. 108).

"The function of government is reduced to a minimum,—the function of protection" (p. 109).

"Such, very briefly described, is individualism in church, state and society. It has not fulfilled its promises" (p. 110).

"In religion, there is an evident reaction against the individualism of the past. We believe in religious liberty, as Luther did; but we no longer think that 'liberty' is the only word, and we are striving in religion to bring about fraternity as well" (p. 114).

"Government has definitely, distinctly, and finally declared that the relations between men in industry cannot be left to the conflict of self-interest. There must be in some measure, government control exercised over them. From that declaration we shall never, in any Anglo-Saxon community, go back to the old pagan individualism" (p. 121).

"Christianity is not individualism, in state, church, or social organization. Liberty is not independence" (p. 365).

"Wealth first, man afterward, says political economy. Man first, wealth afterwards, says Christ. Wealth the standard of value, says political economy. Man the standard of value, says Christ" (p. 183).

"Not that is the best government which best governs to-day, but that which, by the very process of government, is developing the best manhood for to-morrow" (p. 184).

"As the church, the state, and the school are to be measured by the character which they produce, so is the industrial system. . . . An industrial system, then, must produce good men and good women, or tend to produce them. If it does not, it fails, measured by Christ's standard" (p. 186).

"But the doctrine that labor is a commodity, and that capital is to buy it in the cheapest market, is not even temporarily sound; it is economically false as it is ethically unjust. There is no such commodity as labor; it does not exist" (p. 200).

"And as there is no labor commodity to be sold, so there is no labor market in which to sell it" (p. 200). "Both are fictions of political economy" (p. 202).

"Ethically, it is the duty of the employer to pay not the lowest, but the highest possible wages; as it is the duty of the employed to render, not the least, but the largest possible service. Selfishness will not solve the labor problem" (p. 203).

"Economically, it is wise for the employer to pay the largest possible wages; for the larger wages produce better men, and better men produce better work" (p. 203).

"No industrial system is righteous which does not make such a division of the profits as to give all who are engaged in it a living wage. What is a living wage I will not here undertake to discuss. It must at least provide for food, shelter and clothing. It ought to provide books, pictures, education. And it ought to enable the man to earn the livelihood for his wife and his younger children" (p. 204).

"But, meanwhile, what shall we do when labor controversies arise? Capital is organized; labor is organized. How can we settle controversies between them and put an end to strife? What alternative is there for strikes and lockouts? Christ replies: Conciliation, arbitration, law. See Matt. xxviii. 15-17" (p. 283).

"The authority to inflict such [retributive] justice is not conferred upon us,—is, indeed, emphatically denied to us by Christ himself. Judge not, he says" (p. 307).

"What we call the administration of justice, is the administration of social revenge" (p. 310).

"The object of punishment is not the protection of society from the criminal classes. This is a purely selfish purpose, and a purely selfish purpose is never beneficent and rarely accomplishes its end" (p. 310).

"Our penal systems should be animated by a different spirit; they should seek a different end; they should employ different means. The spirit should be that of love; the object should be the reformation of the offender" (p. 311).

"In brief, we are to bring the problem, How shall we deal with our criminal population? the spirit of Jesus Christ; we are to seek his ends and we are to employ his methods" (p. 312).