

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE SECRETARY.

VOL. XLI.



LONDON :

(Published by the Institute, 1, Adelphi Terrace House, Charing Cross, W.A.C.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1909.

*491ST ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1st, 1909.

PROFESSOR E. HULL, LL.D., F.R.S. (VICE-PRESIDENT),
IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting having been read and confirmed, the following candidates were elected as Associates of the Victoria Institute :—

Edwin H. Banks, Esq., M.A., D.L., J.P.
Miss Mary Beachcroft.

The following paper was then read by the Author :—

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM. By W. CUNNINGHAM,
D.D., Archdeacon of Ely.

FEW occurrences in the history of the English people have been more remarkable than the rapid strides which have been made by Socialism, during the last thirty years, in capturing public opinion, and becoming a great political force. In 1879, it had hardly any footing in England at all; the ordinary newspaper reader regarded it as a craze which took possession of hysterical foreigners, but which had no attraction for the common sense of Englishmen. Trade Union policy was entirely uninfluenced by it, in the days of the Junta;† and till the *Fabian Essays* were published in 1889, there was little evidence that its doctrines had any hold in literary circles. But the world has moved since then; many measures, which the last generation would have condemned as socialistic, have been passed by Parliament; and, in any gathering of clergy and ministers, there are sure to be many who take a pride in declaring that they are Christian socialists. It may be doubted whether any such rapid change in public opinion occurred even at the Reformation itself; and there is no other period in which the modification of accepted principles has been comparable to that which is taking place in the present generation.

* Held in the House of the Royal Society of Arts.

† S. and B. Webb, *History of Trade Unionism*, 215.

Thirty years ago there seemed to me to be some difficulty in accounting for the slow progress which Socialism, despite the influence it was exercising in foreign lands, had made in England.* The rapidity of the success of the invasion of socialistic ideas since that time has been chiefly due, as I believe, to the weakening or withdrawal of two restraining forces, one political, and the other intellectual. It may be worth while to say a word about each of these in turn before going on to discuss the relation of Socialism, as a doctrine of life, to Christianity.

I.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there had been an increasing feeling that the sphere within which the State could advantageously interfere was somewhat limited. The sentiment against unnecessary State regulation had played no small part in the growth of popular discontent which culminated in the Great Rebellion; Adam Smith had insisted on the mistakes which the State is likely to make, and on the cumbrousness of its machinery; and the evils, which grew up under the old Poor Law, had led many people to fear the incidental and unforeseen mischief which may arise in connection with the best-intentioned legislation. The fact that there are many evils which government cannot cure, was a recognised axiom on the part not only of Members of the House of Commons, but of electors during the greater part of the nineteenth century. The governing classes were convinced that it is impossible to make men moral by Act of Parliament, whereas Socialists hold, according to Mr. Shaw in to-day's *Times*, that they cannot be made "either moral or happy in any other way." But the Reform Bill of 1832 transferred a large share of political power into the hands of sections of the community who were inclined to hope great things from their new rights. The Chartists had reckoned that, if only they could secure political power, all merely social wrongs would be put right; and the classes, who were enfranchised in 1832, have been inclined to cherish the same belief; it is the mainspring of much of the agitation for Women's Suffrage in the present day. The powers of the State are so vast and far-reaching, that it is easy to form an exaggerated view of what it can wisely undertake and carry through; and those, who have not

* Compare my article on "The Progress of Socialism in England," in *The Contemporary Review*, xxxiv, 245, January, 1879.

shared in political power themselves, are apt to attribute the failure of the legislature to introduce more general conditions of welfare to the indifference, or the selfishness, or the greed of the landowner and capitalist. Since the classes which had hitherto been unrepresented began to realise their strength, they have been eager to put forward such proposals for improving the material condition of the most helpless elements in the community, as that for providing at public expense for the housing of the poor. According to the older opinion it would be impossible for the State to take up such matters wisely and without the serious danger of doing in the long run more harm than good.

II.

While then there has been a new incentive to the introduction into Parliament of schemes which a bygone generation would have denounced as socialistic, there has been less facility for discussing them thoroughly and critically, owing to the changes which have taken place in the academic study of Political Economy. The *laissez faire* doctrine had diverted scientific investigation from the empirical enquiries which can be most usefully undertaken* ; such are investigations as to the best means of attaining some particular material benefit, the maintaining rates of wages, the improvement of employment, and the opening of new markets, or as to the best means of rendering small holdings profitable, and so retaining the rural population upon the land. Much admirable work of this kind has been done by Royal Commissions, and is embodied in their Reports, but it lies outside the scope of current economic science. The academic economists in England, under the influence of *laissez faire* principles, were not inclined to spend much time in studying the precise conditions of any industry or branch of commerce; they believed that the growth and decay of trades could be left to settle themselves. So far as practical life was concerned, they were merely prepared to take the part of critics—to formulate the principles according to which the increase of national wealth would go on most rapidly—and to approve or condemn particular proposals by the application of these principles. They did not profess to lay down what ought to be done in regard to any matter, but only to criticise actual projects from a particular

* See p. 80 below.

point of view; they held that theirs was an important standpoint, but they were careful to make clear that they did not regard it as the only standpoint. The Classical Economists dealt with one side of life—the pursuit of wealth—which was isolated for the sake of convenience of study; they had a strong position for negative criticism, by pointing out cases in which injury was likely to be done to national opulence, as, for example, war must injure it, for a time at least, and perhaps for an indefinitely long time. But they did not pretend to be able to give positive advice as to what ought to be done, because they were not wholly forgetful of the one-sided character of their own knowledge.

A purely critical *rôle* is one which rouses little enthusiasm, especially when experience proves the criticism to have been sometimes mistaken. Carlyle and Ruskin gave expression to a sort of disdain for the dismal science which was increasingly felt in the fifties and sixties. The British public have been inclined to resent the self-restraint of scientific students and to insist that, if their science is worth anything, Political Economy ought to be able to give direct and positive guidance in political life, not merely on particular economic questions, but on matters of social policy. The controversy over the Corn Laws proved to be a turning point in this matter; on the one hand there was the attitude of MacCulloch—the last and the most learned and most realistic of the classical economists—who criticised restriction from the scientific standpoint; and on the other there were Cobden and Bright, preaching an economic doctrine of free exchange as the harbinger of welfare at home and universal peace throughout the world. From 1846 onwards it became increasingly difficult to maintain the old attitude as to the narrow limits of scientific investigation in economics, and to maintain its hypothetical character. The popular view that it was capable, not merely of criticising, but of giving positive guidance in regard to the material aspects of national life became more and more deeply seated.

The demand soon called forth a supply; Professor Marshall has made a gallant attempt to re-cast Political Economy, so that it shall be better accommodated to meet the popular need of positive guidance. He has endeavoured to enlarge the scope of Political Economy, by abandoning the view that it confines its attention to material wealth, and to the motives which it calls into play. In his inaugural lecture* he showed

* *The Present Position of Economics*, 1884.

that he was jealous of the fair fame of the science, and determined to present it in a form in which it could no longer be stigmatised as selfish, but should concern itself with motives to action of many kinds, altruistic as well as self-regarding. As thus re-cast, it seems to give a doctrine of what is wise to do in regard to material things; and Professor Pigou in his inaugural lecture* insisted on the practical aspects of Economic Science, though he reserved the right to speak authoritatively to the chosen few who can conjure with the mysteries of statistics. He does not disclaim the power of giving positive guidance; he seems to think the scientific economist could really do it if only he had time enough. Unfortunately the age is in a hurry, and wants to act, while academic economists are temporising and weaving a web of pretentious words.

From the point of view of the plain man it is important that morality should be taken into account adequately, if it is dealt with at all. The old Political Economy did not pretend to deal with it, and disclaimed any pretension to use the word "ought"; the "new" Political Economy speaks with a less certain sound. The "new" Political Economy does not allow fully and properly for the operation of public spirit or the sense of duty; such things evade the economic calculus; but still it professes to take account of them as utilities, and merges them all in the calculation of expediencies. The older economists could make clear what they were talking about; and especially could specify what they left out of account temporarily, in order that proper stress might be laid upon these other factors at the proper time. Just because the older economists made it quite clear what they assumed and what they had before them, it is possible to learn a great deal even from their mistakes; it is very instructive to try and see how far a man like MacCulloch was mistaken, and why he was mistaken, and this is possible because his treatment was really scientific. But the "new" Political Economy never makes plain what it assumes; it is so far concerned with subjective forces that it is difficult to use it to explain the actual occurrences of the past, or to test it by them. I have argued elsewhere that in framing it there has been an abandonment of the scientific attitude, and that the result is a mere "hybrid" science†; it fails to provide a good

* *Economic Science in Relation to Practice*, 1908.

† *The Wisdom of the Wise*, 17. Compare also the criticisms of the New Political Economy, by Professor Nicholson (*Principles of Political Economy*, L. 51-65). Professor Ashley (Presidential Address to Section F

mental discipline in preparation for the investigation of the facts of actual life* ; and it has done much to divert economic study in England to lines that are unfruitful, while it has also exercised a still more regrettable influence on the public mind. The fact that a "new" Political Economy has been put forward, in academic circles, has gone a long way to discredit the older doctrine all along the line. The Malthusian principles of population, and the law of diminishing return for land are in popular opinion part of the "old" Political Economy which has been discarded, and it is supposed that they have ceased to deserve any attention. The body of scientific principle which has been established as the foundation for the criticism of practical proposals has been abandoned, and there is no longer any recognised basis of organised knowledge from which to criticise the projects of any sentimental charlatan. Since the "new" Political Economy has come into vogue the warnings of the prophetic voice have been silenced, and the public are encouraged to hope that a much desired image will sooner or later be available, to go before the people to the promised land.

III.

The rapid progress of Socialism is sufficiently accounted for when we see that the Government of the country has to a great extent passed into the hands of classes who have an exaggerated belief as to the work which the State can wisely attempt to do ; while the old scientific standpoint from which its projects can be effectively criticised and rightly appreciated has been officially abandoned. To a very large number of educated persons it has come as something of a relief to believe that they are now set free from any intellectual obligation to refrain from advocating proposals, to which they are impelled by a sentiment in favour of the less unequal distribution of wealth, and their sympathy for the poor. In so far as they had read Political Economy, *e.g.*, in John Stuart Mill, they had found much of it clear and convincing ; but yet there seemed to be a blot upon it, from its persistence in studying the effects of self-interest ; and in so far as it was popularly made a basis for or a justification of practical conduct, it was clearly unchristian. The "new"

of British Association at Leicester in *Economic Journal*, xi) and M. C. S. Devas (*Political Economy*, 23, 129).

* See my article, *A Plea for Pure Science* in *Economic Review*, iv, January, 1892.

Political Economy has seemed to remove the old blot, and to present the truth about material wealth in forms in which it is easily compatible with Christian teaching. Hence to many minds there appears to be good hope that it might now be possible to devise a gospel of material welfare which shall be in accordance with Christianity. The example of the Free Trade era, and the positive preaching of an economic doctrine which carried in its wake the hopes of an universal peace between nations, gave a sort of inspiration as to what might be attempted in regard to the reorganisation of society within the realm. Though the superficial observer may not remark upon it, a little reflection shows that the fundamental principles of those Free Traders who have abandoned *laissez faire* are the accepted axioms of socialism ; and the consciousness that this was the case has rendered a large section of the educated public ready to believe that Economic Science was in favour of both one and the other. Since social enthusiasm has been hailed as "the beginning of economic science," it has appeared that science and religion might unite together in advocating, not perhaps the extreme views of anarchists, but the milder form of revolution, which professes to be a Christian Socialism. It may be worth while to consider in turn and very briefly whether this new doctrine has a sound basis in science, and whether it is really compatible with Christianity as a philosophy of life.

IV.

There are undoubtedly many features of the present industrial system that must be regarded as wasteful ; if society were better organised, energy that is now spent in pushing the goods of particular firms might be diverted into other channels, and much of the uncertainty in business, with the fluctuations in trade, might be at all events reduced ; though it may be doubted whether any organisation could get rid of these variations altogether. In so far as State socialism or municipal socialism can supply a system of administration which meets these defects, and enables the business of the country to be better carried on with less waste, and equally effectively as regards the requirements of the public, it would approve itself. In so far as socialism can get similar results by less wasteful methods it would prove itself economical ; and hence all the economic criticism of the existing system may be regarded as an invitation to suggest and attempt an experiment that shall prove itself better. That is a process that is going on every day, in the State

management of the telephone and telegraph service, and the municipalisation of electric lighting and power, and tramways; it is a form of the competitive process through which a great many experiments in collectivism may demonstrate their superiority, and survive and flourish. There are some people who believe it is going on too fast, and that some of the alleged savings are unreal; but the two alternatives of public management and private enterprise are to be tested by economic considerations, and it is probable that one may be preferable or the other in communities of different types, according to the habits and degrees of education which are current among the people.

When, however, we pass from the criticism of the existing order to approval of plans for the reconstruction of society, it is impossible to appeal to Economic Science with any confidence. The underlying principles, which have been put forward by the advocates of Free Trade, and which are adopted by Christian Socialists, are not matters on which Economic Science speaks decidedly or on which it can claim to say the last word.

1. Free Traders are inclined to look entirely to the consumer as the person to be considered, in considering the success of our trade policy. It is clear that all the inhabitants of the realm are consumers, though not all are producers of material goods, and therefore this standpoint seems to take account of the requirements of all members of the community, and not of any particular section. The advocates of Free Trade assumed that in the present constitution of society, with individual enterprise and competition, production was sure to go on somehow, and that under a Free Trade system every kind of production would be carried on in the place to which it was best adapted. But it is a somewhat different thing to look principally at consumption and the distribution of the wealth already acquired, when we are discussing the reconstitution of society; we are not justified in taking for granted that efficient production is sure to go on under all social conditions. Production and consumption are both phases in the process of economic life; but the primary thing economically, for the maintenance of society and for its progress in the future, is that there should be favourable conditions for production. The more distribution is improved, so as to be as little unequal as maybe, or so that whatever inequalities exist can be justified as reasonable and right, the better; but if production is injuriously affected, there will be less material wealth available, and a diminution of average material well-being. If we lay undue stress on consumption we are in danger of giving exclusive

attention to the desires of the present generation; it is by turning our attention to production that we can best take thought for the generation of consumers who are yet to come. When we are looking to the organisation of society in the long run, the important thing is, not to look merely at consumption, but to make sure that the production of useful things, so that they shall be available for distribution, goes on steadily and well. Consumption looks to present conditions and the wealth that has been acquired, production looks to the future, and the prosperity of society in the long run. It is of course conceivable that Socialism may in some circumstances and conditions supply greatly improved organisation for production, and therefore an increased mass of wealth (see p. 76, above). It is particularly unfortunate, however, that socialistic writers and speakers at present are so much inclined to dwell on the advantage of distributing wealth differently among consumers, and are not at more pains to show that the stimulus to efficiency in production will be maintained under their system.

2. Economic science may have much to say about the production, distribution and exchange of wealth, whatever kind of community is taken as the unit. In the ancient world, and in medieval times, the city was a convenient unit for most economic purposes; and with the rise of nationalities, in modern times, the nation has come to be a convenient unit, both for political and for economic purposes. But the advocates of Free Trade have taken a somewhat new departure in treating the world as a whole, as the unit they had in view;* they are inclined to disparage the attempt to promote the wealth and power of any one country, and to view all as contributing to and drawing from the common stock of the world as a whole. This cosmopolitan habit of mind is also adopted by socialists, who are inclined to disparage patriotic sentiment and to propose a system which takes no account of difference of race and history. But after all, the cosmopolitanism of Free Traders assumed the continued existence of nations; each one of which should be part of a complex system, bound to the other members by ties of commercial connection. It is not quite

* In 1891, when I gave a presidential address to the Economic Section of the British Association at Cardiff on "Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism in Economics" (*Statistical Society's Journal*, liv, 644), I did not realise as clearly as I do now, the grave evils which are inevitably connected with cosmopolitanism, or the practicability of treating the Empire as an economic unit.

clear what the relation of each consumer or nation to the others would be, in a socialist system ; how far each would lead an independent economic life ; or how far there would be trade relations between different communities. In both cases there is a disparagement of patriotism, and the advocacy of something which is regarded as desirable for all men everywhere ; but the relations in socialist systems of the smaller centres of organisation, to one another, and to the whole are not easy to apprehend.

3. Free Traders have been confident that if certain material conditions are introduced, they will react so as to bring about a change of sentiment. It was argued that the mutual interdependence of nations for purposes of trade would tend to create friendly feelings, which would render international quarrels impossible. In a similar fashion the socialist holds that if an equality of condition is imposed, a sense of brotherhood will be developed among all citizens, and that under these circumstances public spirit, instead of individual success, will become an effective motive to induce men to engage in strenuous work. It may perhaps be doubted, especially when we remember the threatened coalition against us at the outbreak of the Boer War, whether fifty years of Free Trade have disarmed all jealousy of this country in the minds of foreigners, or created a sympathetic enthusiasm all over the world for the prosperity of the British Empire ; but even assuming that this has been the case, it can hardly be regarded as certain that a similar love of one's neighbours would be engendered within any community when the transition to socialism is complete. It would hardly be likely to arise till the old order was completely forgotten ; in some minds a sense of injustice would rankle ; in others there might be disillusionment and disappointment ; it does not seem clear that a stronger sense of brotherhood, and desire to engage in self-sacrifice for the common cause would be called forth universally, by the mere force of changed circumstances. There is much to be said for the view that "life develops from within" ; and that an enthusiasm in the heart, however kindled, will act on the will, and find expression in action. But there is little reason to believe that the connection also works in the other direction, and that we can supply material conditions which will inevitably call forth a change of aspiration. At all events, this speculation takes us into the domain of psychology, in which economic science is a learner, not an authority. The principles which are common to Free Traders and to Socialists are not so scientifically established that the vaunted success of

the one system in one part of the world can give us much confidence as to the wisdom of attempting under similar guidance to reconstruct society everywhere.

These deep-seated resemblances are obscured by the fact that Free Traders continue to advocate the doctrine of *laissez faire* in regard to foreign commerce, even when they abandon it in regard to everything else. This maxim, which was adopted by Adam Smith and many of his followers as a counsel as to the best means of attaining opulence, has never been accepted by economists generally, and has been generally discarded in Germany and America, through the influence of List. The extent and manner in which the State can wisely interfere in industrial and commercial life is not to be settled by any formula; it varies with the habits and conditions of each community. The study and co-ordination of actual experience in many lands and many ages is necessary to enable us to take up wisely the task which is enjoined on us by a sense of duty to maintain the heritage of well-ordered political life we have received, and by the desire to plant it in other lands. We are learning to think imperially, and to take the Empire, not the island of Great Britain, as the unit to be considered;* and economics as an empirical science gives us the means of learning from experience as to the best means of developing every part of the Empire, and of encouraging each part to co-operate for the good of the whole. This was the admirable scheme which was thought out by Mr. Wakefield; and with our longer experience and larger knowledge we ought to be able to do much to relieve the congestion and unemployment at home, and at the same time to develop the more backward areas of the British Empire. Imperialists and Socialists are at one in rejecting the doctrine of *laissez faire*, but Imperialists desire to rely on the experience of the past to promote a clearly understood aim, while Socialism is necessarily a leap in the dark; so far as its constructive side goes it can adduce little support from the organised study of experience.

V.

The attraction of Socialism lies not in the reasoning which supports it, but in the hope it holds out and the sense of duty it inspires. It is the form which the enthusiasm for humanity

* Compare my "Plea for the Study of Economic History" in *Economic Review*, ix (January, 1899).

takes in the present day. With a strong sense of the grinding poverty and degradation in which millions of their fellow men are sunk, the generous spirits of our day can hardly fail to be intensely eager to give to every human being the opportunity of developing the best that is in him, and of sharing in the heritage of culture and knowledge that has come to the heirs of all the ages. And this new and eager desire, which so many are hailing as a gospel, seems to have a very intimate relationship with Christianity. That, too, has been an "enthusiasm for humanity"; it cherishes a hope for a new heaven, but it also labours for a new earth. The moral character of Socialism is high; its philanthropy is deep and genuine, as if it had the closest affinity with practical Christianity, so that to many clergy it seems possible to blend the two, and by their combined forces to bring about a new society that shall be better materially and more truly religious. If Socialism can be brought to accept the leadership of Christ, it seems that enormous progress might be made for the ennobling of man and the service of God.

On the other hand it appears that there are many socialists who do not recognise this kinship or desire to strengthen any affinities which may exist between Christianity and the movement they have at heart. They may indeed feel an admiration for the Founder of Christianity, but they believe that the movement He inaugurated has proved a failure, and that it is necessary to give their energies to something else. To their minds Christianity, as it is at the present time, is embodied in powerful institutions closely allied to the social forces which they find most hostile; and they believe that in its true inwardness, Christianity has little or nothing in common with Socialism. Personally I believe that the insight of the non-Christian socialist is not mistaken; whatever superficial resemblances there may be between Christian philanthropy and socialistic schemes, I hold that Christianity is quite inconsistent with socialism as a doctrine of life; and that those Christians who dally with Socialism, are in danger of losing their hold on the very essentials of Christianity.

The forms of Socialism are so various that it is not easy to indicate its essential character in a few words, but in all its shapes it aims at procuring more enjoyment for the mass of individuals—both intellectual and physical—by governmental action and organisation. The range of its vision is bounded by the present world, and it neither knows nor greatly cares what there may be beyond. This attitude of mind is always tempting—Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die

—but it is not Christian. Christianity holds to a belief in the reality of undying spiritual power; it insists that for every human being to order his life here as the beginning of an immortal life to come is the true way of forming the noblest type of human character. Christianity recognises the joy of life on earth, but does not admit that earth can give the best that man is capable of enjoying; and Christianity, if it is true to itself, must beware of a doctrine which fails to inculcate self-discipline and tends to encourage men to set their affections on things of earth. That the Christian principle of aloofness from mundane things may seem to many to be mere hypocrisy, is true enough; but it is none the less the business of Christians personally to try to make that principle real in their own lives, and to be on their guard against any associations that may weaken it.

The ends in view of Socialism and of Christianity are different, and the proposed means for attaining them are quite distinct. Both aim at an improvement in society, but Socialists try to attain it by compelling other people to do their duty, Christianity by inducing every man to do his own. The method of compulsion is not altogether easy to justify; when it is no longer the suppression of a definite breach of the law of the land, but is dictated by considerations of expediency, it may insensibly become a well-meaning tyranny. In all taxation there is depriving a man of a portion of his property, and many taxpayers are inclined to resent the demand that they should be forced to contribute towards objects of which they do not approve. Nor is it only in connection with the disposal of property that this difficulty arises; in a highly organised State-Socialism it would seem impossible to give much scope to the individual for choosing his own employment or distributing his own time. Perhaps the danger of tyrannical government by a bureaucracy is less formidable than that of bringing about a deterioration of character in those who grow up under a system which gives insufficient scope for initiative and enterprise on the part of individuals. A highly organised society may be in danger of becoming mechanical, and of turning out citizens of one prevailing type.

Christianity, on the other hand, appeals to each individual personally, by holding out an ideal, and stirring up his will; it does not hope to accomplish its object by pressure from without, but by inspiration from within. And thus, while Socialism is not obviously compatible with freedom, and hampers the growth of strenuous personalities, Christianity is

liable to no such charge. Since Christianity endeavours to safeguard the inner freedom of every man, and to encourage the formation of strong personalities, the doctrine of Christ affords a basis for a morality that at once holds out the highest ideal, and points out the method by which we may make progress towards it. The schemes of the Socialist could only bring about the embodiment of current ideals of human life in forms which would be too stereotyped to leave room for further advance.

Since Socialism is inconsistent with Christianity, both in its aims and in the means on which it relies to attain them, there can be little call for the Christian to take an active part in the reconstruction of society on this basis. But reconstruction is hardly in sight at present; the Socialist feels that there is still much to be done in the preliminary work of clearing the ground and breaking the stability of the existing social order. Socialism has a destructive, as well as a constructive side. Those who are unconvinced of the wisdom of socialistic schemes may yet think it possible to go half-way and take an active part in attacking the evils of the day in the hope that something better may eventually be found to take the place of existing institutions. This is the attitude of the anarchist; but it is surely impossible for any one to take this line in the name of Christ; a Christian anarchist seems almost a contradiction in terms. The characteristic feature of Christ's work and life, and of His commission to His followers is the fostering of what is good, so that it may outgrow the evil; He did not commend the action of the Old Testament prophets in calling down fire from Heaven to destroy evil, as if it were worthy of imitation. He did not profess to remedy injustice in the division of an inheritance, and though His followers should, of course, be good citizens, and take their part with Jews, Turks, infidels and others in wise attempts to suppress wrong, it is not specially incumbent on the Christian, as a Christian, to denounce what is evil. Omniscient insight is needed to discriminate the wheat from the tares as they grow together, and human hands are not called to arrogate to themselves the power of taking vengeance on guilt. If constructive socialism is different in aims and in methods from Christian teaching, socialism on its destructive side is wholly alien to the Christian spirit.

As against Socialism, Christianity is to-day the most effective guardian of reliance on personal energy and personal character as powers which can leaven the world with good; and those who deplore the slow progress that is made, who are in danger of losing

heart, and inclined to combine Christian sentiments with socialistic methods, may do well to bear in mind the old warning against undue haste. The delays in realising the Christian aims are partly moral and due to the weakness of human will; but they have also been intellectual. Some portion of the blame must rest with those who, in one age after another, by striving to render Christianity more conformable to current habits of thought, have obscured its spiritual character and lost sight of its spiritual power. We shall do well to be faithful to the trust we have received, rather than allow ourselves to attempt the unworthy task of accommodating Christian aims and efforts to the spirit of the present day.

DISCUSSION.

The paper being concluded, the CHAIRMAN expressed the thanks of the Members and Associates and all those present to Dr. Cunningham for his very able paper on a subject of such pressing and immediate importance.

The Rev. F. E. SPENCER (vicar of All Saints, Haggerston) said:— I propose to say a few words on this subject, and with the Chairman's favour, first, as I have to go immediately. What I have to say is not based specially on books or theories, but upon intimate contact with the people extending over twenty-one years in the East end of London.

The most grievous phenomenon to my mind in recent years has been the rise and spread in our fatherland of atheistic and international Socialism. And the reason at bottom seems to me still more painful. It is a reason not based in its strongest position upon theories or treatises, but upon the actual condition of the industrial classes in this country. It is alleged with only too much ground that Christianity has proved itself a failure to adjust and ameliorate their condition, and on this account it is cast overboard by the stalwarts of a new gospel. Now, I am not a socialist, nor even a Christian socialist. I do not believe in socialist principles. They are largely a gospel of hate; they have no room for patriotism, and they seem to me to be a short cut to tyranny.

They are still open to the attack that Burke brought to bear upon the French Revolution. Burke said: "It is the inability to wrestle with difficulty which has obliged the arbitrary assembly of France to commence their schemes of reform with abolition and total destruction. And to make everything the reverse of what they have been is quite as easy as to destroy. No difficulties occur in what has never been tried. Criticism is almost baffled in discovering the defects of what has not existed, and eager enthusiasm and cheating hope have all the wide field of imagination in which they may expatiate with little or no opposition" (*Reflections*, Clarendon Press, p. 198). But I scarcely think we can fail to record a comparative failure of Christianity in two respects—(1) intellectual, and (2) moral.

1. The Manchester school has surrounded the subject with such complicated perplexities that the intellectual way out has not been found. This perhaps is the most difficult place of the subject. I can scarcely conceive that any Christian man will doubt long that it is the duty of Christians and of a Christian nation to obey what is the great law of spiritual gravitation, which binds all the societies of the universe to the throne of God—"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," as it has been explained by Christ in the golden rule. But to apply it in practice to the transactions of the market place is a difficulty which has not been intellectually overcome. The man in the street regards the practice of our Church Catechism with a smile of hopelessness or of derision. We are no nearer to an intellectual way out than when Moore Ede gave the Hulsean lectures on this subject in 1896. It is this probably more than anything else which fosters defects in practice. We need an enlightened conscience. There are conspicuous, honourable and well known examples of those who have found a way out, and *found it to pay commercially*. But they are exceptions still, as my long and varied experience tends to prove.

2. The haste to be rich and the gospel of comfort, which characterised the last century, have robbed intellectual investigations in the region of applied Christianity of their sufficient motive.

That at present Christianity is a comparative failure in its industrial application of the golden rule abundantly appears from the following observations, taken from what I am in daily contact

with, and almost at random: (1) the fierce and immoderate competition which rules at present quite *unnecessarily* embitters the existence and probably shortens the life of most who have to do with it. But its special weight falls upon the industrial community. Unreasonable hours, inconsiderate arrangements, and insufficient pay press a large proportion of them down. The conditions of a contract which keep men working in a pit with exhausted air for thirty consecutive hours just outside my door so that they can scarcely crawl ought, for instance, to be amended. There is no one to blame. The conditions are stupid, but perhaps less stupid for those at the top. It is the system as a whole that is a failure; (2) wages are reduced by competition of aliens; sweating is as bad as ever. If the Christian intellect cannot find a way out, the unchristian will, with danger to the State; (3) rent in the centre of large towns is out of proportion to possible wages. Rent in the suburbs is rising, with insanitary conditions. Living at a distance from work results in the insanitary crowding of every available conveyance morning and evening, and the bringing up of working people to the centre, hours before they are needed, with insufficient breakfasts. The effect of this on great numbers of anæmic girls and boys is a danger to the State and to the future generation. (4) Unemployment is at present heartrending—not the unemployment of the worthless, but of the worthy. Things come from abroad that our own people could make better, and are often dumped down at a price which defies honest competition. (5) There is at present a most lamentable wastage in boy and girl life. Industrial conditions make it essential that they should swiftly earn something. In large numbers they take the first little place which opens. By eighteen years of age they are no longer wanted. They are turned into the street without any career to swell the ranks of the unemployed, or even, as I know very painfully, to learn how to steal.

I am convinced that with regard to our own kith and kin, our nearest neighbours, the restoration of the idea of Christian brotherhood, not as a sentiment, but as a practice, is a crying need. It is to such things as these that the highest powers of Christian philosophers, divines and statesmen should be patiently directed. They menace, as it is, much that we all hold dear. If a Christian way out cannot be found an unchristian will, to ultimate disaster.

It is the old problem of conservative reform—not using the word in a purely party sense. The atmosphere of the East end is one of cheerful and patient endurance. But it may not always be so. All around is the *fomes peccati*.

Lieut.-Col. ALVES said: The previous speaker has remarked that Christianity has proved a failure in dealing with social problems. But Christianity (as such) has nothing to do with such problems. Its object is to call out people to form a special body to bear witness by its conduct to those without it that they are not living as God intends us to live.

One cause of failure has been the application of New Testament laws, which form the Church of God, with those of the Old Testament, under which nations live. Another cause has been confusion between the teaching of the first three (synoptic) gospels with the fourth (the Church) gospel.

The synoptic gospels deal with the Kingdom of Israel, which, as a nation, was shortly to be broken up. Getting rid of property was, therefore, only anticipating voluntarily what would, in a few years, be compulsory.

Professor LANGHORNE ORCHARD, M.A., B.Sc.—There is no doubt as to the prevalence, amongst a portion of our population, of much social distress and wretchedness; nor can this be a matter of indifference to a Christian. But, obviously, the misery is not a result from Christianity, it is in spite of Christianity.

Nothing can be more unfair than to attempt to charge it upon Christianity. The Bible bids us love our neighbours as ourselves, and, as we have opportunity, do good unto all men. It is in the carrying out of *these* principles that the true betterment of society is to be sought. Socialism would make matters a thousand times worse than they are. Socialism is the great enemy of Christianity. It has been pointed out* that while Christianity says, "Mine is thine," Socialism says, "Thine is mine." The sole agreement between the two systems lies in a desire to ameliorate society. They differ radically in aims and methods, as the author conclusively shows on p. 82. Socialism† would make no distinction between merit and demerit, between clever and stupid, between industrious and lazy;

* By the late Dr. Adolf Saphir.

† If we may believe some of its influential spokesmen.

and would throw every man's property, including his time, into one common melting pot. And to injustice would be added loss of liberty. The unhappy people would be under the dictatorship of a bureaucracy which would appoint to each man his work, thus affording an instructive commentary upon the boast, "Britons never, never shall be slaves," and suggestive of Israel under Egyptian task-masters.

Socialism, in my judgment, attacks the three great principles of justice which are fundamental to social law, namely, that a man be safe-guarded with respect to his life, his liberty, and his property. Through lack of stimulation to production, Socialism would commercially be injurious to the life of the individual. It would to a great extent rob him of liberty and of property, in which term may be included character, which the author has shown would suffer deterioration. If ever *Socialism* be accepted by justice-loving, freedom-loving, and reflective Englishmen, it will be because they are deceived by their leaders, or as a counsel of despair through an idea that any change is better than none. The awakening and disillusionment will, in such case, be serious, and may be terrible.

We shall, I am sure, thoroughly endorse the learned author's closing remarks, and thank him heartily for his admirable paper.

Mr. H. CHARLEWOOD TURNER said that his experience in social work, mainly amongst working men, had led him to have much sympathy with Socialists, however much he was opposed to their views.

In his opinion they would do little good by denouncing Socialists as robbers, and men urged on only by greed and selfish desires. No one with any practical experience of Socialists and their schemes could make this charge. Undoubtedly, many unscrupulous agitators were advancing their own ends under the guise of Socialism. But on the other hand it was a striking thing that of those men who were keenest on the higher things of life, and most desirous of improving the education and surroundings of themselves and their fellow workers, the majority were Socialists. As to why this was so, he was in absolute agreement with Mr. Spencer of Haggerston.

They had only to look to the results of the present economic system to find the justification of the Socialists. If the followers of the new creed opposed Christianity, and not all of them did, they

opposed not for itself, but on the ground that it had forgotten its ideals, and had allowed the terrible ills of the present day to grow up in Christian lands.

Before condemning men for following the only system that as far as they could see gave them any economic hope, and before setting aside that system as incompatible with Christianity, it was surely their duty as Christians to propound an alternative and a remedy to the existing state of affairs.

REV. SIDNEY PIKE.—I rise to draw attention to two books, *The Problems and Perils of Socialism*,* and *The Triumph of Socialism*.† The latter has on its cover a significant illustration: a man carrying a large sack labelled "Nationalisation," as indicating the vast aims of Socialism; and from a hole in the bottom are dropping out, one after another, "Credit," "Capital," "Trade," "Commerce," "Employment," "National Security," the final outcome of the Socialistic propaganda.

A few quotations from *Problems and Perils* may be given:—

"The chief peril of Socialism is waste—waste both in the moral and in the economic sense. Socialism would not only deteriorate character, but it would lessen product. Our present organisation does provide an incentive to work. Socialism substitutes the much less powerful incentive of coercion, depriving men of their liberty, preventing full-grown men selling their labour at their own price and under their own conditions."

The old Poor Law of 1800–1834 is quoted as an "Experience of an almost complete Socialistic system." "There was State endowment for the old, for the unemployed, for motherhood." "The destruction of family life and family ties was accomplished by the indiscriminate Poor Law relief of those days, e.g., 'A widow with two children, in receipt of three shillings a week from the parish, married a butcher. The allowance was continued. But the butcher and his bride came to the overseer and said that they were not going to keep those children for three shillings a week, and if a further allowance was not made *they should turn them out of doors and throw them on the parish altogether.*'"

On the economic side Mr. Strachey says, as to municipal trading

* By I. St. Loe Strachey.

† By John D. Mayne, Barrister-at-Law.

and nationalisation of railways :—" You place a very large number of men in the paradoxical position of being both employer and employed " ; and " Suppose the Government were to nationalise the railways and one or two large industries, say those of mining and shipping. In that case it might be quite possible that the employées in the Post Office, the railways, the mines, the shipping industry, and the Civil Service might be half, or a little more than half, the whole working population. What would then prevent the employées of the Government using their votes to increase their salaries all round ? This would not only be an enormous injustice to persons in private employment, who would pay the increased taxes and yet get no benefit themselves ; but it might also lead to the bankruptcy of the nation. It seems also extremely unjust that the State or the municipality, having well-nigh inexhaustible resources of taxation, should compete with private individuals."

Finally Mr. Strachey holds up the Roman Empire as a warning which " was not destroyed by the barbarians' armies. Rome fell because her people had been ruined and pauperised by the insidious action of State Socialism."

All, or most, of us here admit the evils of Socialism. It is due in large measure to the unlawful and grinding exactions of employers upon employed. Those revelations made by a previous speaker from his own observation are terrible and demand redress. The fact remains that Socialism is with us and has to be faced. The question therefore is :—" What is the remedy ? " I unhesitatingly answer, " The gospel of Christ proclaimed and lived in a loving and sympathetic manner in the midst of the toiling masses." It was a great pleasure to find the author of the paper insist upon the importance and power of Christianity, and its distinguishing difference from Socialism, and a surprise to hear a clergyman say— and repeat it—that " Christianity is a failure." Nay, Christianity has not failed, or to put it in a better way, *Christ* has not failed and never can.

Take a concrete illustration of the benefit and power of a living and practical Christianity. In a poor parish of 6,000 (next to my own in Liverpool), a dignitary of our Church began the work in a cellar with four people present. In a thirty-three years' ministry he had built a church and three mission halls, and carried on a ragged school at a cost of £300 per annum, former pupils from which are now

occupying responsible positions in life. He succeeded in securing 200 fellow-workers, some of whom held open-air services four times a week. The communicants rose to 800 ; three Bible Women and six Scripture Readers were supplied to Liverpool, and nine men were trained to become clergymen. Let such an example be imitated—where such is not the case—in the East end of London, and in the large towns throughout our land, and Socialism will speedily die of inanition.

Let us hear a converted socialist. “Christ is the solution of all problems. Not Christ with an ‘ism’ attached to His Name, but *Christ Himself*, the living Christ. There is chaos in society, but when the Son of God was sent from the bosom of the Father to reveal the Divine plan, and that plan is rejected by the Church and the world, how can it be other than chaos? Why must professing *Christians* go to atheistic socialism and accept their plans for putting society right, rather than go to the Son of God for His Divine plan.” This was said to a meeting of socialists, who put to the speaker some thirty questions, to which unanswerable replies were given.

Rev. A. IRVING, D.Sc., B.A., made no pretension to speak as an expert on the subject of the paper. Yet it presented in a connected form some well thought-out views on questions which were constantly presenting themselves in a very real and practical way ; and as one who had these matters constantly pressed on his attention, he begged to thank Dr. Cunningham for the very able paper to which we had listened, point after point of which would set us thinking more deeply. He had listened with great interest also to some of the remarks of the previous speakers. He did not think that “Socialism,” as it presented itself here in England, was to be met with the thunder of artillery. He agreed that it was utterly devoid of constructive principles ; but it was here as a fact, and we were bound to deal with it as an actual factor of modern life. It was based no doubt largely on ignorance, but it gave expression to felt needs and aspirations, which Christianity could neither ignore nor condemn. He ventured to dissent from the learned author of the paper in his contention as to the impossibility of such a thing as “Christian Socialism.” He was rather disposed to hear in “Material Socialism” a warning voice to those who profess the Christian name ; calling upon them to consider their ways ; to ask themselves whether Christians as a body have understood the true meaning of

Christianity; whether it was not too often forgotten that the central teaching of Jesus Christ was that "it was more blessed to give than to receive"; whether in talking of Christianity we were sufficiently mindful of that *fundamental principle of self-sacrifice*, which its Divine Founder had written in letters of blood across the laws of His Kingdom, when His intense love for His human brethren led Him to pour out His life's blood to redeem men from the tyranny of selfishness, and thus to show them the way. The speaker was inclined to think that there were at the present time hopeful signs of an increasing expansion and growth of that spirit from within the Church; that, as the meaning of the Church, as a Divine Society, came to be better understood, it recognised wider and deeper responsibilities towards the great human brotherhood. As an example of this he referred to the great organisation known as the Church of England Men's Society, founded by the new Archbishop of York. He trusted that Dr. Gordon Lang would carry that with him as an inspiration to the work of the Church among the hard-headed hardworking people of the north; and that it would do something to break down that class-feeling which "Socialism" bitterly and justly resented.

Dr. HEYWOOD SMITH said it was a great pity that learned societies met to discuss important questions, and afterwards nothing practical came of it. We were getting too much cramped up in our tight little island, and it was because there was no room that so much distress, through want of employment, existed. The cry of the socialists was to cheapen things for the sake of the consumer, but what about the producer? There would always be distress through lack of work as long as we allowed the foreigner to dump down his goods here and undersell our own workmen. What we should do was to bring pressure to bear on the Government to carry out a scheme of compulsory emigration. Canada and Australia stood in need of workers, both men and women. Why should we pay rates to maintain a lot of loafers in our workhouses, able-bodied men and women who ought to be made to work and earn their own livelihood? He knew of cases where inmates of our workhouses were willing to work if they could get work; who did work in the workhouse without payment, and yet the guardians put hindrances in their way, and would not let them out, unless at rare intervals, to seek the work they might get.

Professor HULL.—The Chairman considered that the subject so ably dealt with by Canon Cunningham was one of supreme importance at the present time. The large number of capable men out of employment could not fail to draw out the sympathies of us all, and the difficulties of finding a remedy were immense. The Rev. Mr. Pyke had referred to a large plan of Government emigration to our colonies, but he (the speaker) felt strongly that Tariff Reform was by far the most urgent, and most likely to benefit the working classes and the community at large. The important work recently issued on this subject shows that this country is yearly falling behind other manufacturing countries in production; owing to the fact of free imports on our part, and import duties on theirs.* Want of employment necessarily gives rise to discontent and destitution, and induces men to listen to Socialistic schemes for their benefit. The present condition of England is very similar to that of Germany, especially Prussia. In 1873-4, after the close of the great war, when, notwithstanding the enormous inflow of money from France in payment of the indemnity, trade and manufactures were found to fall off there were large numbers of unemployed workmen—and Socialistic ideas and the “Red Monster of Revolution” were spreading amongst the people. Bismarck, the greatest statesman of modern times, found it necessary to examine into the cause of this abnormal state of society, and looking around at the condition of neighbouring states as compared with his own he found that Germany was surrounded by a wall of protective countries, in which German manufactures were submitted to import duties, while Germany itself gave their productions an open door.† With Prince Bismarck to discover an evil was to immediately take measures to remedy it; and he induced his country to adopt measures for tariff reform—by which reciprocal duties were imposed on imported goods from neighbouring states. This has been the policy of Germany ever since—and we all know the result. German manufactures are replacing those of England; and we have even gone so far as to give our coal (our one great natural asset) free to our rivals—wherewith to beat us out of the markets of the world. Can it be wondered at that a condition of

* *Report of the Tariff Commission*, vol. iv (“Engineering Industries”), 1909.

† *Prince Bismarck*, by Charles Lowe, vol. ii, p. 456 *et seq.* (1887).

impoverishment has followed, and that instead of being the centre of manufacturing industries as was the case half a century ago, we have fallen back to a minor position as compared with neighbouring states? Let us adopt the policy of Germany's great statesman and we shall recover our position.

Dr. CUNNINGHAM then expressed his thanks to the Council of the Victoria Institute for having given him this opportunity of setting down his views on this important subject, and all those present for their reception of what he had had to say.

He had been extremely interested in the discussion, particularly in the remarks of Mr. Spencer. He thought there was on the one hand a duty to deal with existing distress, and on the other to try to introduce improvements in the economic system of the country. It was because he believed that a change in the fiscal system of the country would do much to give better conditions and increase the opportunities of welfare—in a way that he did not think Socialism would ever do—that he felt it to be his Christian duty to take an active part on behalf of Tariff Reform.

COMMUNICATIONS.

CHANCELLOR LIAS writes:—No one can help being struck with the pitiable condition of many a worker, as described so forcibly by my friend Mr. Spencer, nor can one dispute for a moment the correctness of his view that as long as things are in the condition he has described so long will Socialists continue to gain a hearing for their theories. If one were disposed to criticise what he said, it would be in the direction of contending that it is not Christianity, but Christians, who are responsible for the condition of many a worker at the present time. Christianity has unquestionably improved the whole condition of the world in thousands of ways. But that improvement has gone on, and is destined to go on, very slowly; God's ways are not our ways. He has eternity to work in, and He takes care to make up to mankind in another world for their sufferings here. But Mr. Spencer is doubtless right in his contention that every Christian will have a heavy account to give in the next world if he does not do all that in him lies to do away with the hardships his poorer brethren are compelled to suffer here.

But there is one question which ought first to be asked, and which I have seldom seen asked when Socialism is discussed. *What is Socialism?* We should surely commence with definitions. I am an outsider, not an expert. But am I wrong in supposing that Socialism properly means the subordination of the individual to the community. If this be so, then Socialism is only a question of degree. Society without a certain amount of Socialism is an impossibility. We have Socialism now. Every law, every tax, every army, every prison, every policeman, is a Socialistic institution. And the only practical question for us is, how far shall Socialism be carried? We English have found that the further, within certain limits, the rights of the individual can be allowed to extend, the greater the prosperity our country enjoys. It seems pretty clear that we have carried it rather *too* far, and that we should be better off if some more restraints were put on individual liberty. But there can be little doubt that if we went to the opposite extreme, we should be infinitely worse off, as long as human nature remains what it is. My friend the Archdeacon gave a guarded approval of the municipalisation so much in fashion just now. But it is exposed, in the present condition of humanity, to two very serious dangers. First, the principle of popular election will not always provide us with the men most fitted to manage our affairs, and next, as hundreds of instances have of late made plain to us, we cannot get rid of unfair partiality and of corruption in the action of municipal and other bodies. It would, as the Archdeacon reminds us, be the extreme of folly to place ourselves under the control of a handful of men, who by reason of the incompetency of the individual elector to form a sound judgment, will in all probability be found more or less unfit for the responsible task entrusted to them. The impulse of self-interest and regard for one's family has, since the world began, been the strongest incentive to individual and social well-being. And the Archdeacon well reminds us of the deadening effect on a growing child of destroying all hope and spring in its life by the knowledge that he cannot follow the bent of his own nature, but must be bound hand and foot and all his native impulses crushed by the irresistible despotism of an all-powerful governing body. The Archdeacon tells us of the hope of benefiting his kind that animates the Socialist. But that hope may reasonably be balanced by a well-grounded fear that the

absolute rule of the many over the few, even if those few be chosen by the many, will be found the most grinding and penetrating despotism that has ever been known since the creation of man.

Mr. J. SCHWARTZ, Jun., writes:—A considerable number of fellow Christians would strongly dissent from the lecturer's sweeping statements that "Socialism is inconsistent with Christianity" and that "Christian anarchist seems almost a contradiction in terms."

If Christ's teachings on social obligations to His generation are taken to be of universal application then Tolstoy's deductions of passive anarchism and other systems of Christian communism are unanswerable. I think them mistaken because they underrate the limitations imposed by Christ's manhood: His teaching, although subject as regards worldly knowledge, to the limitations of a Galilean peasant, is most wise as applied to the then existing conditions. Interest on money He condemned because then, as still in the East, it was wickedly usurious. Property then was the result of force or fraud, not of industry and ability, and He said that it should be given up. How wise a saying was "Resist not evil" to the turbulent Jews hopelessly under the heel of the tyranny of Rome; what misery would they have avoided had they followed it.

These teachings Christ did not intend to apply to a self-governed modern state of which probably He had not the least conception. The communistic community of the early Church was the natural outcome of the mistaken notion of the speedy end of the world and not an example for all time. At the end of the tenth century, when Satan was expected to be let loose, a somewhat similar position was created in mediæval Europe.

The power of Christ for all time is in His spiritual teaching and ideal personality as ably put by our lecturer. All right-minded people who know the facts, deplore the inequalities of wealth and opportunity that have grown up. If the personal character of all or even if a majority conformed to Christ's teaching, it would be quite immaterial whether there was a socialistic or individualistic form of society, all would be well.

In dealing with the masses in their present state of moral and mental development the rugged virtues of sturdy independence and the pluck with which they face their difficulties would soon wither away under the blight of grandmotherly influence.

The sensitive sentimental natures who inaugurate such movements

would soon be elbowed out by the glib-tongued materialistic demagogues, who would tickle the vanity and excite the greed of the lower strata of the poor. History would repeat itself. The Girondins of the French Revolution were thus supplanted by the Jacobins, followed by chaos, bloodshed and the old order re-established.

Social amelioration must be gradual. The immediate doubling of working class incomes, a boon to many, would, I am convinced, show an evil balance of increased drunkenness, gambling, crime, and laziness. If anyone doubts it let him go round the public houses on a Saturday night (pay day).

All who desire to raise humanity must work hard and intelligently and be satisfied if they see slow progress; they must speak boldly against the canker of ostentatious vulgar luxury, and the feminine craze of fashion and overdressing; they must cultivate the simple life and intellectual pleasures: strengthen the law against financial thimble rigging, and wisely tone down the injustices of the past without shattering the social fabric.

Colonel ALVES writes:—I have for many years been in favour of Tariff Reform with a view to the protection of our home industries and those of our dependencies. This is seen by many. But what I do not see commented on, and what I believe to be equally important, is the attitude of Trades Unions which, beginning as protectors of the wage earners, have now become the tyrannical masters of the employers. Until their power for evil is curtailed, I do not think that even Tariff Reform will do us any great good.

We can see this amongst the leaders of the unemployed:—"Find them work, but you must give them the Trades Union rate of wages." The Socialists' theory is:—"The wage receivers do all the work, and should receive all the profits, but never make good the losses"; and the Socialists are capturing the Trades Unions.

The Trades Union policy for many years has been that of reducing activity and skill to the level of laziness and clumsiness, with a view to "spreading-out" work over as large a surface as possible. This is one of the most mischievous forms of Socialism, tending, as it does, to the debasement of character.

I fear that many of our workers amongst the poor, having more benevolence than judgment and firmness, have been great, though involuntary, workers of mischief, through failing to realise that life is a very serious war, a war waged largely in the old way by men

clad in defensive armour and using hand-to-hand weapons. Courage, skill and discipline combined, contribute now in peace as of old in war, to the safety of the warrior who, returning in safety and honour, claimed the hand of the maiden he loved.

Now, the mere fact of an unemployable having a wife of like character and a family (such families are usually large) of children probably more degenerate than their parents, is thought by many sentimentalists to give such unemployable a right to permanent employment.

To animals, God said, "Be fruitful and multiply"; but nature destroys the unfit; and if food is scarce, the stronger let the weaker starve.

To man God says, "Increase and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it." This is two-fold, joined together by God, and recognised by many heathens.

If, then, men will only act as animals, I do not see that Christians, acting in their national capacity, are justified in bolstering up such to swamp the nation with undesirables who may, by intermarriage with better stocks, deteriorate the whole nation. Such bolstering up can only end in national bankruptcy, moral and financial.

In my judgment, honourable imprisonment for life, with complete segregation from the other sex, is the only remedy for this evil. Such a course should entail no great hardship, for it is well known to phrenologists that the sexual instinct ("increase and multiply") is closely allied to the driving faculties ("replenish the earth").

There are doubtless other causes operating connected with the land, feudal rights divorced from feudal duties; the laws of succession which, in England, are not in accordance with God's Old Testament laws as regards estate, either real or personal; and perhaps other disagreeable hard facts; all of which must be faced.