

## THE PULPIT FOR TO-DAY.



INTO the United States God has poured a vast heterogeneous population. The picture which John painted in the Apocalypse may be seen here, with a difference: men gathered out of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues, but not before the throne of God, nor praising him. Every phase of individual character is here represented; every race, every nationality, every language, every form of religion. Here are the Irishman, the Englishman, the Frenchman, the Swede, the Norwegian, the German, the Hungarian, the Pole, the Italian, the Spaniard, the Portuguese. Here are the Celt, the Anglo-Saxon, the African, the Malay. Here is the negro, with his emotional religion; the Roman Catholic, with his ceremonial religion; the Puritan, with his intellectual religion; and the unbelieving German, with his no religion at all. Hither they have come trooping, sometimes beckoned by us, sometimes thrust upon us, sometimes invading us; but, welcome or unwelcome, still they come. To America the language of the ancient Hebrew prophet may be almost literally applied:

The sons of strangers also shall build thy walls,  
And their kings shall serve thee;

Thy gates also shall be open continually;  
They shall not be shut by day nor by night;  
That men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles,  
And that their kings may be brought.\*

This heterogeneous people occupy a land which embraces every variety of climate from northern Europe to middle Asia, and every variety of wealth from the wheat fields of Russia to the silver mines of Golconda. Its fertile soil gives every variety of production from the pine-trees of Maine to the orange groves of Florida. It has for agriculture vast prairies of exhaustless wealth; for mines, mountains rich in coal, iron, copper, silver, gold; for mills, swift running rivers; for carriage, slow and deep ones; and for commerce, a harbor-indented coast line, lying open to two oceans and inviting the commerce of both hemispheres. I do not dwell upon the magnificence of this endowment,—that is a familiar aspect,—but upon its diversity. The nation which occupies such

\* Isaiah lx. 10, 11. The whole chapter applies in a remarkable manner to the present condition of the United States.

a land must be diverse in industry as it is heterogeneous in population. The simplicity of social and industrial organization has long since passed away. There are few richer men in the world than in America, and none who have amassed such wealth in so short a time; there are no poorer men in the world, and nowhere men whose poverty is so embittered by disappointed hopes and shattered ambitions. In the Old World men are born to poverty, and accept their predestined lot with contentment, if not with cheerfulness. In America the ambitious youth sees a possible preferment in the future; counts every advance only a step towards a further advancement, and attributes every failure to injustice or ill-luck. Society, thus made up of heterogeneous population, subjected to the educational influence of widely differing religions, engaged in industries whose interests often seem to conflict, if they actually do not, and separated into classes by continually shifting partition walls, is kept in perpetual ferment by the nature of its educational, political, and social institutions. The boys of the rich and the poor sit by each other's side in the same school-room; their fathers brush against each other in the same conveyance. The hod-carrier and the millionaire hang by the same strap, and sway against each other in the same horse-car. Every election brings rich and poor, cultivated and ignorant, into line to deposit ballots of equal weight in the same ballot-box, and makes it the interest of each to win the suffrage of the other for his candidate and his party. The caldron, political and ecumenical, is always seething and boiling; the bottom thrown to the top, the top sinking in turn to the bottom. The canal-boat driver becomes President; the deck hand a railroad magnate. The son of the President mingles with the masses of the people in the battle for position and preferment, and the son of yesterday's millionaire is to-morrow earning his daily bread by the sweat of his brow. In the Old World men live like monks in a monastery; each class, if not each individual, has its own cell. Here all walls are down, and all classes live in commons. All this is familiar; it is enough here to sketch it in the barest outlines; for my only purpose in recalling it is to ask the reader to consider what is its moral meaning. It can have but one. Into this continent God has thrown this heterogeneous people, in this effervescent and seething mass, that in the struggle they may learn the laws

of social life. African, Malay, Anglo-Saxon, and Celt, ignorant and cultivated, rich and poor, he flings us together under institutions which inextricably intermix us, that he may teach us by experience the meaning of the brotherhood of man.

Our national history confirms this interpretation—if any confirmation were needed. The questions of our national history have all been social, not theological. We can hardly conceive that battles were fought, as bitter as our civil war, over the question whether God should be defined as existing in one Person or in three; whether the Son should be defined as proceeding from the Father or created by Him; whether he should be described as of the same substance or only as of like substance. We can hardly conceive that Europe was plunged into fierce wars by the question whether righteousness was imputed or imparted. But these were the real questions of the past, and if they seem insignificant to us now, it is only because we do not look beneath the form to the substance of the issues involved—issues as sublime as ever demanded the supremest concentration and the most devoted zeal of men. For these questions men once willingly died; for them they now unwillingly keep awake for half an hour of a Sunday afternoon. The questions for which we have fought, and are willing to fight again if need be, are questions of a different sort. Slavery, temperance, labor and capital, the tariff, public education: these present the questions of our national life, and they are all aspects and phases of one question—What are the divine laws of social life? Are there any principles of government, known or discoverable, which will enable men who differ in origin, in condition, in race, and in religious belief to live harmoniously together in one commonwealth—that is, in one social and political organization, fashioned and carried on so as to promote their common welfare?

This is certainly a question which the clergy and the Church must help to answer. It is emphatically a religious question.\* If the Church does not interest itself in what concerns humanity, it cannot hope that humanity will interest itself in what concerns the Church. Why, indeed, should it? If the Church shelters itself under the plea that religion is a matter between the individual soul and God, it adopts a very much narrower definition of religion than that of the Bible. The Hebrew prophet who asked, "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy

God?" had a conception of religion two parts of which have to do with our relations to our fellow-men, and one part with our relations to God. Christ's summary of the law and the prophets puts as much emphasis on the brotherhood of man as on the fatherhood of God. Indeed, it could not be otherwise. A religion which did not teach us how to live on earth would have small claims upon our respect when it claimed to teach us how to prepare for heaven. A captain who does not know how to manage a ship at sea cannot be trusted to bring her into port. A teacher who cannot tell his boys how to get along with each other in school is not the man to prepare them to get along with each other as men in manhood. Christianity is not merely individual; it is organic. That Judaism is so no Bible student will for a moment question. It deals mainly with organisms—religious organization in an established church, political organization in a Jewish commonwealth. Hebrew scholars even doubt whether the Old Testament knows anything about a future life; it certainly concerns itself mainly about the life that now is. The New Testament equally concerns itself with social organization. It undertakes to build up, not merely individual Christians here and there, but a Christian society. Christ begins his mission by proclaiming that the kingdom of God is at hand. His first published sermon is an explanation of the duties which men owe to one another, and of the principles on which they are to act, if the kingdom of righteousness and peace is ever to be established on the earth. His second sermon is a prophetic survey of the processes by which that kingdom will be developed. He does not lay more stress upon the declaration, "One is your Master, even Christ," than upon the accompanying declaration, "All ye are brethren." The minister who does not discover laws of social life in the Bible has studied it to very little purpose. The minister who does not teach those laws does not follow the example of either the Old Testament prophets, the New Testament apostles, or the divine Master of both.

To whom else shall the people look for instruction in the moral principles of a true social order if not to the ministry? Shall they look to the politicians? I am not going to enter upon any cheap satire of the politicians. They are like the preachers, some good and some bad. But, good or bad, their function in a democracy is not to inculcate, still less to discover, great principles. They are executive officers, not teachers. They are appointed to formulate in law and so set in motion the principles which, under the instruction of

\* "Every political question is rapidly becoming a social question, and every social question a religious question."—*Mazzini*.

others, the people have adopted. This is what more or less effectively they are doing; and this is what they ought to do. The politician is not a motive power; he is a belting, and connects the motive power with the machinery. He gets things done when the people have determined what they want done. The bankers and financiers deliberate and discuss, and when the popular determination as to currency is reached as the result of this discussion, Congress incorporates it in a law. The politicians will never determine what is the best legal method of dealing with the liquor traffic. When the people have determined, the politicians may be trusted to carry that determination into effect. The people cannot learn the moral laws of the social order from the politicians; the politicians must learn them from the people. The master does not take orders from his servant; the servant takes them from his master. Shall we then look to the editors for moral instruction in sociology? The editors ought to be public teachers, but with few exceptions they have abdicated. The secular press is devoted to secular news-gathering and to party service; the religious press, to ecclesiastical news-gathering and denominational service. There are some notable exceptions, but they do but prove the rule. Not long since I heard the editor of one of the wealthiest and most successful, though not most influential, of American journals say in a public debate, that the daily paper was organized to make money, and that was what it ought to be organized for. So long as this is deemed true by the editors, the newspaper cannot be a teacher. The world has never paid for leadership until the leader was dead. Such a press can only crystallize the public sentiment which others have created, and so make efficacious a feeling which otherwise would effervesce in emotion. This it does, and for this service we are duly grateful. But it cannot—at least it generally does not—do the work of an investigator. It does not discover laws of life. It does not create; it only represents. It is a reservoir, without which the mill could not be driven; but the reservoir must itself be fed by the springs among the hills. The real formers of public opinion are the teachers and the preachers, the schools and the churches. The former are necessarily empirical; they deduce the laws of life from a study of past experience. The latter ought to be prophets. Their sympathy with all classes of men, their common contact with rich and poor, their opportunities for reflection and meditation, and their supposed consecration to a work wholly unselfish and disinterested, ought to combine with their piety to give them that insight into life which has always

been characteristic of a prophetic order. I do not mean to demand of the ministry the impossible; but if this is not their function, it would be difficult to say what function they have. They cannot formulate public opinion in laws as well as the politicians; they cannot represent that public opinion which is already formed as well as the journalists; they cannot extract the truth from a scientific study of life as well as the teacher and the scholar. But so far as natural selection, aided by special studies and a generally quiet life, can equip any class of men for a prophetic function, and so fit them to discern the great moral laws of the social order, the ministry are so equipped. If they will leave the professional teachers to expound the secular, that is, the empirical side of social science, the newspapers to reflect the conclusions respecting such science as are formed, and the politicians to embody those opinions and principles in law, and will devote themselves to the spiritual study of the Book, and of life,—that book which is always being written and is never finished,—they can be leaders of the leaders. They can lay the foundations on which other men shall rear the superstructure. They speak, or can speak, to all classes in the community, for they belong to none. They address audiences of personal friends, whom they have counseled and aided in the hours when friendship is the most full of sweet significance. They speak to these friends at a time when baser passions are allayed and moral sentiments are awakened. The very smallness of their auditory as compared with that of the journalist adds force to their counsels and affords protection from misapprehension.

The pulpit for to-day, then, must be competent to give instruction in the moral laws which govern social and industrial life—the organized life of humanity. The age requires this instruction; the people desire it; the ministers should give it.

It cannot be expected in such a paper as this that I should attempt to unfold a Christian sociology. This has yet to be done, by the interchange of many opinions, and the interaction of many minds. I may, however, indicate certain lines of thought as illustrative of the kind of teaching which the exigency of the nineteenth century demands of the pulpits in America.

I. What is the Christian law of liberty?

“The true liberty of a man,” says Carlyle, “you would say consisted in his finding out, or being forced to find out, the right path and to walk therein. To learn or be taught what work he was actually able to do; and then by permission, persuasion, or even compulsion to be set about doing of the same. . . .

O! if thou really art my senior, seigneur, my Elder, Presbyter, or Priest—if thou art in any way my *wiser*, may a beneficent instinct lead and impel thee to conquer and command me. If thou do know better than I what is good and right, I conjure you in the name of God, force me to do it; were it by never such brass collars, whips, and handcuffs, leave me not to walk over precipices!"\*

No! this is not liberty; it is servitude. Servitude may be better than walking over precipices; it may be in every way justifiable if the freeman be a lunatic, and is bent upon pushing men weaker than himself over precipices. But it is not liberty. We hold in this country that men can be kept from walking over precipices, or thrusting their fellows over, without the use of brass collars, whips, and handcuffs; but how this is to be done we do not yet, I fear, very clearly discern. When the mob of anarchists, aroused to frenzy by the appeals of Most and Parsons and Spies, march to burn and kill and destroy, and are met by steel bayonets and whistling rifle-balls, we have come to Carlyle's definition of liberty, to brass collars, whips, and handcuffs. These are preferable to the precipice; but they are not liberty. "Liberty," says Webster's Dictionary, "is ability to do as one pleases." "Freedom is exemption from the power and control of another." How can a great heterogeneous people, made up of every nationality, race, class, and religion, be thus free, be endowed with this ability to do as they severally please? For if Webster is right, liberty is a large ability. It is power; it is competence.

On my lawn is a goat tethered by a rope to a stake. He is not at liberty. Why not cut the rope and let him go where and do as he pleases? Because, if I do, he will gnaw the bark of the young trees, trample down the garden beds, pull up the strawberry plants by the roots. In a word, because he is not able to perceive and be obedient to an invisible law, he must be subjected to a visible and tangible one. If it were possible to train him so that he would leave the young trees alone, would keep out of the garden, and would eat only the grass and the burdocks, of which latter he is fond, and which we should be glad to have him destroy, he might be set free, to go where and do what he pleases. Because he cannot be taught to please to do right, he must be tethered. We have also a collie dog. Fond as he is of a ramble with his young masters, the boys have only to say to him, "No, Victor; go home," and he lies quietly down on the lawn and looks wistfully and pathetically after them. Formerly they had to tie him when they went off for a ramble. But he has

\* "Past and Present," p. 213.

learned obedience, and therefore has acquired liberty. This is a very simple illustration of a very simple truth; namely, that liberty is not exemption from law; it is spiritual perception of and voluntary obedience to law. The goat can never be made free, because it can never be taught to perceive and to respect the invisible law. Law and liberty are not opposites. We come into liberty when we become a law unto ourselves. Liberty and independence are not synonymous; liberty is voluntary subjection.

Aristotle classifies government in three classes—government by the one, government by the few, government by the many. We have added in America a fourth class—self-government. The mass cannot do what all the individuals in the mass are incapable of doing. If the individual American cannot govern himself, the American people cannot govern themselves. A pack of wolves is no more capable of freedom than is a single wolf. The first condition of self-government in a community is that each individual should possess the power of self-government in himself. Each individual must be endowed with ability to do as he pleases or the state cannot be free. If even a considerable minority are engaged in schemes for pushing their fellows over the precipice, we must have recourse to Carlyle's brass collars, whips, and handcuffs. But the first condition of self-government is the ability to recognize an invisible law, and to subject one's self to its restraint. This is what Isaiah means when, in that resplendent picture of peaceful industry replacing war, he declares that the law shall go out of Zion. This is what Christ means when he says, "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." The law of liberty is the supremacy of the individual conscience in the individual life. It is the law written within, and therefore needing no whips and handcuffs imposed from without. If ever our churches by their preaching shall lighten the sanctity of the divine law, shall suffer the people to forget that the Father of mankind is also its lawgiver, shall let the Old Testament, with its Thou shalt and Thou shalt not, drift into obscurity; if ever the ties of family life are loosened, and children forget to honor their father and their mother, and to obey their parents in the Lord; if ever the community comes to entertain a contempt for its appointed law-makers and its interpreters of law, and to allow its self-imposed requirements to be disregarded with impunity; if ever sheriffs and governors dally with mobs, entreating where they should command, and giving promises where they should give shot and ball; if ever Justice drops her sword and wishes to retain her office by virtue of her scales alone; if ever

entire states are allowed to dissever their allegiance to the constitution of the land and fight for lawlessness and call it liberty — unless in that hour there are ministers in the pulpits to recall Mount Sinai, and fathers to remember the story of Eli, and governors to bear the sword not in vain, and a national determination to maintain liberty by maintaining law at any cost of blood and treasure, the end of the republic will not be far distant.

“Despotism may govern without faith,” says De Tocqueville, “but liberty cannot. Religion is much more necessary in the republic which they [the atheistic republicans] set forth in glowing colors than in the monarchy which they attack; it is more needed in democratic republics than in any other. How is it possible that societies should escape destruction, if the moral tie be not strengthened in proportion as the political tie is relaxed? And what can be done with a people who are their own masters, if they be not submissive to the Deity?”\*

That question I leave to the reflection of the reader.

II. What is the Christian conception of labor?

Throughout the Middle Ages war was the only honorable pursuit. He who plundered others was knighted; he who clothed the naked earth with fertility by his toil was a villain. Down to our own time, in England, the only refuge of the younger sons of the nobility has been the Church, the army, and the civil service. The scion of noble stock might walk the deck of a man-of-war, but if he drove a nail in making her iron sides he was an outcast. He might preach borrowed sermons in the pulpit, but if he were to do one honest day's work in laying up the stone work or shaping the rafters of the church he became a pariah. Nor can we say that even in American society this conception of labor as an indignity has no root and breathes out no pernicious odor upon the air. The iron masters of the Lehigh Valley tell me that they cannot find workmen enough and must send to Europe for them; the Pacific coast is beginning to ask, If the Chinese must go, who can be found to till our vineyards, and tend our small fruits, and make our vegetable gardens for us? But almost every village has too many lawyers for justice, too many doctors for health, too many shopkeepers for trade, and too many ministers for good morals. Twice in the last two or three years I have received letters from fathers saying, “My son wants to be a farmer; I should like to send him to college and fit him for a profession. What should I better do?” What

\* De Tocqueville, “Democracy in America,” Vol. I., p. 393.

nobler profession is there than to obey God's mandate to Adam, to dress the earth and keep it; to win back a Garden of Eden from the thistle-cursed wilderness? So far has this conception of labor as an indignity entered into thought, that the Church itself imagines that toil was inflicted upon man as a penalty for sin. Our systems of education are corrupted by this servile conception of labor. The brain is educated, but not the eye to see, nor the hand to fashion, nor the muscle to do, nor the body to endure. We live in a country which clamors for men who know how to compel reluctant Nature to disclose her secrets; and yet it is hardly a quarter of a century since scientific schools were engrafted on even our higher education; and not yet are the simplest principles which underlie the industries of the vast majority of our people inculcated in our public schools, or known to the teachers in them. Seven and a half millions of men are engaged in various agricultural employments, that require for their best prosecution an intelligent comprehension of the chemistry of nature, of comparative physiology, and of the great laws of trade on which the markets of the world depend; but the student may go through the entire curriculum of the public school — primary school, grammar school, high school, and even State university — and hardly know that there is a chemistry of nature, or that a comparison of the physiological structure of the animal race has been made, unless in his later years he has learned these facts in an “optional.” The highest ambition of the laborer in the lower ranks of the hierarchy of labor is to reduce his hours from twelve to ten, or from ten to eight, or even from eight to six; and the highest ambition of the laborer in the higher ranks of labor is to retire, *i. e.*, to reduce his hours of labor to none at all.

Christianity has a very different conception to give to the world, and the Christian ministry are the men to give it. It depicts, in the prose poem with which the history of the race begins, an Eden which the innocent children of God were appointed to dress and to keep. In the primitive commonwealth, which was to serve as a pattern for future generations, war is discouraged, agriculture honored and ennobled. Abraham is a farmer; Moses, a herdsman; David, a shepherd boy; Paul, a tent-maker; Christ, a carpenter. In the glowing picture of the future golden age which awaits the world the spears are not laid aside, but beaten into pruning-hooks; nor the swords hung up ingloriously to rust away, but converted into plowshares. The benediction of God is bestowed on the laborer. The Hebrew painter takes his brush to paint a picture of

ideal womanhood. This is what he places on his easel :

"She seeketh wool, and flax, and worketh willingly with her hands. She is like the merchants' ships; she bringeth her food from afar. She riseth also while it is yet night, and giveth meat to her household, and a portion to her maidens. She considereth a field, and buyeth it: with the fruit of her hands she planteth a vineyard. She girdeth her loins with strength, and strengtheneth her arms. She perceiveth that her merchandise is good: her candle goeth not out by night. She layeth her hands to the spindle, and her hands hold the distaff."

Which picture I beg permission to recommend to the thoughtful consideration of those who have in charge the higher education of women.

That is not the higher education for either man or woman which educates them away from honest industry, from hard work; which teaches the boy to shun the plow, or the girl to shun the spindle; which puts in either men or women an ambition to escape labor, not to perform it. What does the eight-hour movement mean? Does it mean two hours more for head, and heart, and home; for books, and wife, and children, and love? Does it mean less hand work, and more head work; less factory work, and more home work; fewer hours with the "boss," and more with the tired wife and neglected babes? Then all hail to it. An age in which seven men can gather from the willing earth food for one thousand ought to redeem humanity from drudgery — but not from toil. For if the eight-hour movement means merely less work — less in factory or at home, for "boss" or for children, of head or of hand, then it means more idleness, more drink, more wretchedness, more paupers.

III. What is the Christian conception of wealth?

The unchristian conception of wealth is expressed in the saying, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" It finds its perfect illustration in the saying of the French Bourbon, "The State! I am the State." This was the mental attitude of all the Roman emperors. Rome was their private property — its citizens their cattle, its wealth their personal estate. The American Republic no longer believes this to be true. That public office is a public trust is professed by all Americans, even if it is believed only by a few. What is true of office is true of property. I criticise Henry George as not sufficiently radical. He objects to private property in land. He does not go far enough. The Bible objects to private property in anything. The doctrine that property is a trust is far more explicitly taught in the New Testament than the doctrine of a vicarious

atonement, or a Trinity in Unity. The latter are deductions from Biblical statements, the former is itself a Biblical statement. Property is a trust; life is a service; the poor are the beneficiaries; the duty of the trustee is to give them food in due season; the judgment is an accounting; the self-server is an unprofitable servant; the server of his age and race is a faithful and wise servant, who has proved his capacity for rulership. This is not figure; it is not Oriental imagery; it is not theological fiction; it is plain, simple, matter-of-fact, prosaic truth. The man who takes his property to be his own and uses it on himself is as truly guilty of embezzlement as the clerk who filches from his employer's till. No Bible student doubts this; but not many Bible preachers are accustomed to preach it, and fewer still of Bible Christians adopt and act upon it.

This truth is not more clearly announced by the Bible than it is by that other great revealer of spiritual truth — life. Our country is rich. What made it so? We have been digging coal and iron out of the Pennsylvania hills, and pumping oil out of its reservoirs; we have been gathering grain from the wheat-fields of Dakota, and cotton from the cotton-fields of Texas, and silver from the Rocky Mountains, and gold from the Pacific coast. Whose are they? Who stored them there? We are rich as the child is rich who discovers the preserves which his mother has put away in her closet; and, like the child, we shall pay dearly for our theft if we imagine that the treasure we have found is ours, — ours to do with as we please. It is His who put it there; and for our use of it or abuse of it we shall account to Him. It is a hopeful sign of American civilization that never before in the world's history were there so many men of wealth using their wealth as a trust, not as a private possession. I visited, not long since, one of the largest single coal-mine owners in Pennsylvania. He had built up in the wilderness a village with five thousand population. No roof covered more than two tenements; every tenement had about it ground for a garden plot. The day-school was kept open ten months in the year; evening schools afforded special facilities for such as wished to pursue special studies; a great hall furnished them with opportunity for every kind of recreation, from a ball to a lecture; a free library and reading-room gave an evening lounging-place free from beer and tobacco; there was not a liquor shop in the town; the ladies of the mansion equipped every year a Christmas-tree for the children of the village, dressing many out of the hundreds of dolls with their own hands; but what was best of all, the owner of mine, and land, and cottages

lived in the midst of his workingmen, and administered with his own hands the estate which furnished the one thousand workingmen with employment, the five thousand villagers with bread, and homes, and life. I thought how it would have delighted the heart of grim old Carlyle to have visited Drifton, and how even John Ruskin would have found something to praise in such a mining community.

I do not ask that men of wealth shall give more money to the Church, which is often stronger when it is poor than when it is rich; nor to the poor and thrifless, whom unearned money only keeps in poverty. I urge that the power to make money, like any other power, is a trust bestowed on the possessor for humanity. The preacher who preaches for his salary, not for the spiritual well-being of his parishioners, is a mercenary; the physician who practices for his fees, not to cure the sick, is a mercenary; the lawyer who pleads for his honorarium, not for justice, is a mercenary; the politician who enacts laws for what he can make, not for the community, is a mercenary; no less the manufacturer, the merchant, the trader, the man on 'change, who transacts his business to make money, not to give the community its meat in due season, is a mercenary. In the history of the nineteenth century, the doctrine that wealth is a trust must stand by the side of the doctrine that labor is an honor and liberty is an obedience. The materialism that threatens the American Church is not the materialism of Herbert Spencer. It is the materialism of the railroad, the factory, the shop; the materialism that puts thinghood above manhood; that does not know that things were made for man, not man for things — that God gives us, not Irishmen to build our railroads, but railroads to build Irishmen; not Hungarians to dig our mines, but mines to develop manhood in Hungarians.

These illustrations may serve at least to indicate the lines of investigation to which the needs of the nineteenth century invite the American preacher. If he will go to his Book for this purpose, he will find it quite as rich in sociological as in theological instruction; quite as fertile in its suggestions respecting the duty of man to man as in its suggestions re-

specting the nature and government of God. He will find his New Testament telling him that in Christ's kingdom the strong are to serve the weak; the rich, the poor—*i. e.*, the factory owner his hands, the railroad prince his trainmen; that controversies are to be settled, not by wage of battle or its modern equivalent, strikes and lockouts, but by mutual concessions and ultimate appeal to an impartial tribunal—in other words, by conciliation and arbitration; that the State is not a "social compact," nor government a "necessary evil"; that the one is a divinely constituted organism, and the other the necessary condition of its existence; that the judicial function does not belong to humanity, and therefore the judicial system will never become truly Christian till it ceases to be an effort to administer justice and becomes an effort to administer mercy; that the brotherhood of man is an integral part of Christianity no less than the fatherhood of God, and that to deny the one is no less infidel than to deny the other. In short, while he will find in the Book which he is appointed to interpret no light upon scientific details of political or industrial organization, he will find the great moral laws of the social order, if not clearly revealed at least definitely indicated, and in them abundant material for sermons which will be interesting because giving instruction which is both imperatively needed and eagerly desired. Sir Henry Maine has shown very clearly that democracy is not yet "triumphant democracy"; it is still an experiment. The American Revolution determined our right to try it on this continent without fear of foreign intervention; a civil war determined our right to try it without fear of domestic disruption. We have still to work the problem out. Whether a people diverse in race, religion, and industry can live happily and prosperously together, with no other law than the invisible law of right and wrong, and no other authority than the unarmed authority of conscience, is the question which America has to solve for the world. No one class in the community has a more potent influence in determining what shall be its answer to that question than the American clergy.

*Lyman Abbott.*

