RELIGION IN SOCIAL AND NATIONAL LIFE

ROBERTS

I believe . . . in the service of Man being the service of God.—*Florence Nightingale.*

RELIGION IN SOCIAL AND NATIONAL LIFE

BY
H. D. ROBERTS

LONDON
5 ESSEX STREET, STRAND, W.C.
1914

THE LINDSEY PRESS

PRINTED BY ELSON AND CO.
MARKET PLACE, HULL

CONTENTS

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

A PHILOSOPHER who is also a statesman has recently declared that 'Religion is still the greatest moving force in the world.' But when we concentrate our gaze upon the life and words of the greatest exponent of religion the world has seen, Jesus of Nazareth, and pursue logically the human inferences of his gospel; and then follow the unfolding of that history of organized religion called Christianity, we are forced to wonder at the great gulf that lies between promise and achievement.

It is possible to argue that this failure is but an incidental and necessary factor in the upward quest for the Ideal. The injunction to love God and one's Neighbour falls easily from the inspired lips of the great Idealist, but is humanly difficult to follow and to fulfil. The modern doctrine of Evolution adds point to this argument. Nevertheless, when we look at the great spectacle of the world of to-day after its nineteen centuries of posses-

sion of the Christian ideal of God and Man, the actual fruitage seems meagre indeed.

Speaking for the western world, it may be said that organized Christian religion has, largely failed to inculcate the typical content of the message of its Initiator: love to God proving itself in love to men. It can hardly be claimed that the great Christian ideals are in any sense the levers and inspiration of the world as it is. Organized Christianity has not adequately recognized that the problems of social and national ethics are essentially and necessarily within its sphere. It has emphasized other-worldliness long after such emphasis became a disastrous division between Sacred and Secular, the Church and the World, Earth and Heaven. 'Catholics as Catholics,' said a Roman Catholic bishop the other day, 'have nothing to do with this world.' No wonder that religion has presented and still presents the spectacle of personal cults apart from regard for the duties of human fellowship or for social obligations: avowedly compatible with a detached aloofness from the crying evils and disabilities of the nether world of modern life.

It is true, of course, that there have been practical and initiative mystics who would

not consent to be 'saved' alone. But it is also true, to quote an orthodox American writer, that those Christian conservatives who most value individual conversion have not been so active in recent forward movements to save society as the so-called liberals. 'Let us not forget,' he adds, 'what all Christians now sadly admit, that Christian conservatives were not as unanimously active in the anti-slavery war as they should have been. Whatever value there may be in divisions of labour by specialists, it is not wholesome to divide the work of spiritualities and humanities between conservatives and liberals.' And we may also quote a theological conservative who does not 'relegate reform to the rear,' and gives a warning to the church not to be 'out-moraled by the moralist and out-humaned by the humanitarian.'

The fact is, that religion as evidenced in organized churches has not included life as a whole, nor humanity as a whole, but only some few aspects of life and humanity. A secondary implication drawn by the critics of orthodoxy, and presenting a curious contrast to the emphasis on other-worldliness, is that after all the Christian religion in its

collective aspects has generally conformed to the ideals and practice of the average man. The average man more easily allows his social inferiors a contingency of well-being in the future world than any equality of chances in this present one—a facile ceding of an 'inexpensive eternity,' in Bernard Shaw's phrase.

The average man's imagination is not equal to the proposition that the present classification of men into drivers and driven, served and servants, may not be eternal even in the nature of things. Here again the critic objects, with serious irony, to the efficacy of organized Christianity, in that its benefits are chiefly invisible and conjectural, and that rather than helping the oppressed of society of this world it has contented itself with pointing to another and a better but, necessarily, a problematical one. It might be conceded that no historic religion has pretended to recommend itself to men solely on the ground of its value for the present life and social order. Religion being a vision of spiritual values and a dream of good, it is always impossible that it should remain satisfied with the material even in altruistic efforts. There is truth in this suggestion.

But where organized Christianit has failed

is to recognize that even the spiritual has its roots in the material, at least on this planet; and that the wretched physical conditions which for large numbers of people have precluded all possibility of spirituality or nobility of living are its business, and its first business, in this world. It has faced two worlds with its problems of human relationship. But its perspective has got wrong. The ideal has been glimpsed by some persons and at some times, but the means to its attainment has been on the whole neglected. The church has been more interested in the giver of alms than in the recipient. The way to heaven lay through the poor; and the word of Jesus that the poor are always with us has had great Christian acceptance—and misunderstanding. The poor, necessary links between the rich and benevolent and their spiritual rewards, are accepted as eternal conditions of their patrons' spiritual development.

This may not have been consciously the idea of a lady friend of the writer, who, marrying the squire of a parish, was heard to bewail the fact that 'there were no poor' in it. Possibly she aspired innocently enough to the picturesque rôle of Lady Bountiful and earthly Providence, and was at the same time

anxious to be really and practically kind.

This charitable woman assumed that age-long attitude of the churches which is only now beginning to be seen in its true light. For now these assumptions, so religious-seeming, are being interrogated in their connexion with the reality, the scope, and the ideals of the democracy of real religion. It becomes impossible to believe that the Divine Purpose deliberately sanctions as beautiful and in order the moral wretchedness of some lives as a sacrifice to the moral improvement of other more materially fortunate lives; or that it must needs develop with nepotic interest chiefly those who possess the means which in this economic civilization ensure fastidiousness of personal habits, or who are able with some amount of certainty to name one or other of their forbears in the dark backward and abysm of time.

We cannot deny to the Divinity which hedges in and permeates all our lives alike the great aim which we recognize in the finer minds of to-day: the aim of the enlarging and the perfecting of even the most contracted social existence. The sensibility, more and more widespread, which becomes

A nerve o'er which do creep
The else unfelt oppressions of mankind,

must needs be a reflection of the divine solicitude, urging towards a more effective knowledge and practice of the relations and duties of men to each other. The church has long needed, and needs now, deliverance from the sin of loving nothing so much as its own virtue.

It would be foolish to assume that religious institutions have always tended to forget their real object. But, speaking broadly, the 'Church' has had a narrowing influence and has made for exclusions. Antitheses arise in it which militate against human progress and human fellowship; and in enforcing the great antithesis of 'the church and the world' it has failed to make the world religious in the spiritual and practical sense. This is the more remarkable when we consider the pretensions put forward and the credentials claimed by the church. In its claim of caste and of privilege, following on its claim of divine origin, it has always tended to declare that man is made for the church, not the church for man, and to protest against any human reforms which touch its status or its perquisites. Canon Sanday wrote on the

Welsh disestablishment question, 'Churchmen cannot allow that there is anything unjust in inequalities that have their root and explanation in history': a characteristic churchly utterance, even if it is allowed that 'they would be glad to see those inequalities reduced to the smallest measure possible.'

The democratic communities called the Free Churches, delivered from the pride of dominion and inheritance, and urged on by what has been slightingly called the Nonconformist conscience, have done much for the winning of ecclesiastical and political freedom as well as for social reconstruction. But the numbing influence of certain 'necessary beliefs,' such as the theory of the innate degradation of humanity, has delayed, here too, the realization on earth of the kingdom of God. Instead of estimating the values of religion by their practical effect on individual character and the social order, they have spent themselves in asserting the divine origin of their doctrines together with their absolute and unchanging finality. They, too, emphasized the antithesis of sacred and secular, eternity and time, earth and heaven or hell, the church and the world, and enforced between these terms artificial theo-

logical chasms. That if God is in the one he is also in the other; that there must be a spiritual oneness into which enters as a logical consequence the solidarity of mankind; that if religion is not co-extensive with humanity it is not religion at all; that there is nothing anti-human in religion as interpreted by Jesus; that in fact faith in God can only be tested and proved by faith in and love of men; had not penetrated the Nonconformist thought-atmosphere. The value of men, some men, was a strange, incredible, and in fact an irreligious idea. Value was only acquired by the process of propitiatory salvation.

'Religion,' we quoted, 'is still the greatest moving force in the world.' But to the modern mind with its changing conceptions, its growing impatience of the old terminologies, its craving for spiritual assurance and development outside discredited or questioned church definitions, religion if it is to be admitted still as a world-moving force, must manifest and express itself in other terms than those which are stereotyped in the churches. Dimly it begins to see that 'the spiritual life is an actual and active personal adventure,' to quote P. H. Wick-

steed ; ' that it is far less an affair of another world than men have usually thought,' to quote Sir Henry Jones ; and that the ' nameless sense ' we call the religious consciousness does not exist for self-realization alone. Rousseau strikes some of us now with a kind of astonishment when we find him saying : ' Christianity is an entirely spiritual religion, concerned solely with heavenly things ; the Christian's country is not of this world. He does his duty, it is true ; but he does it with a profound indifference to the good or the ill success of his endeavours. Provided he has nothing to reproach himself with, it matters little to him whether all goes well or ill below.' These are strange words to a generation which has known Nietzsche, and been goaded by the pitiless paradoxes of the modern prophets of revolt. Thomas Paine, that bugbear of a ' religious ' age, strikes a much more modern note when he says : ' The world is my country and to do good is my religion.'

Religion, then (which it is not our present duty to attempt to define in its essence), must be for us *ethically creative and deliberately social*. It is not merely a fact in history in the course of which essentials and inessentials

have often changed places, and the two inseparable factors of love to the divine and love to the human have been cut apart. It is a fact *now* ; and the most living fact in the world. It is the unconquerable thing in our hearts, which sees the present life as significant and death as incredible, and persistently looks on existence as a grand adventure on which God and man are embarked together. In this view every moment becomes pregnant and every life of untold value, because the divine is seeking the human in this very place and time to be its vehicle—the word is seeking to be made flesh. In this view, to stand aside asking coldly ' Am I my brother's keeper ? ' becomes blasphemy. The modern truly religious man takes his stand beside Francis Thompson, and cries with him : ' The very streets weigh upon me. Those horrible streets, with their gangrenous multitude blackening ever into lower mortifications of humanity. . . . These lads who have almost lost the faculty of human speech ; these girls whose very utterance is a hideous blasphemy against the sacrosanctity of lovers' language.'

Organized Christianity stands in all its religious refinements, over against these.

What will it say to them? Will it still pass by on the other side, asking carelessly 'Who is my neighbour?' The man of religious enlightenment knows that it is on the answer given that its fate depends.

If we could conceive of a great Christian church becoming an initiative and practical working energy; claiming all life as its province; excluding no sincere thought and eager for mental progress; bent passionately on social reformation; co-extensive with humanity; less concerned with conserving past history than with making great values in new history; honouring man and woman as the manifestation of the divine and so refusing to dishonour either in soul or body; not passionately concerned about hierarchies, caste, or emoluments; less interested in speculative antiquities than in the crying problems of the day; issuing, not dead letters but live protests against every social evil, and that without fear of private interests; denouncing war and preaching peace—if we could imagine such a church as approximately possible, then would be the portentous and magnificent approach of the dream of Jesus: the kingdom of God on earth.

But though we can point to no religious

institution as incarnating all these things, we know that they characterize an increasing number of individuals both within and without religious institutions. The collective body has seemed unprogressive, unbending, obstructive, obscurantist, exclusive, the bulwark of the rich, the frequent encourager of war, the laggard in great reforms, concentrating on things which do not matter. But the prophets are here, prophesying real things, and seizing on souls and bodies rather than sacraments. The prophet never has rested on external authority. It is the spirit within him that urges him on to his ineluctable task. No scheme of supernatural rewards or punishments encourages him or frightens him. The universe itself justifies his ideal, and his fight with the world for the world's sake identifies his own interests with the highest *for* the highest. Just as 'however mutilated, fragmentary, or interspersed with myths, however destitute of miracles the Gospels may be, there *was* a man no farther off than Galilee who felt God with his flesh and blood all the way from his peasant's workshop to Calvary,' so, in however much smaller a degree, he who does the will, knows.

The writer is not unaware of the great increase of the social virtues during this generation. The world is certainly becoming juster and humaner, and the view that 'morality is man's conception of his duty to his fellow creatures' is steadily gaining ground. 'It is a curious fact,' says that shrewd and untiring observer, Mr. Arnold Bennett, 'that the one faith which does really flourish and wax in these days should be faith in the idea of social justice. For social justice simply means the putting into practice of goodwill and the recognition of the brotherhood of mankind. . . . In England, nearly all the most interesting people are social reformers. . . These people alone have an abounding and convincing faith. . . . Despite any appearance to the contrary, therefore, the idea of universal goodwill is really alive upon the continents of this planet; more so, indeed, than any other idea—for the vitality of an idea depends far less on the numbers of people who hold it than on the quality of the heart and brain of the people who hold it.'

The object of this little book is by no means to sound a jeremiad over any alleged degeneration of the age. It will probably be best remembered by posterity as the age

of social awakening, of the deliberate and conscious recognition of man's responsibility for his brother man. But not only have the churches as a whole not been leaders in this strong movement, engaged as they still are in the affirmation of propositions which have ceased to be alive; not only have they taken little part in the *revaluation of men and affairs* which is such a strong modern note; they have even been reactionary. They are still moving 'like laborious ghosts, out of the daylight, immersed in a dead world,' whence comes no collective protest even against the gigantic sin and suicidal folly of piling up armaments with their everlasting threat of demoniacal destruction. They seem outside the line of the social ferment and perturbation, and the new faith in the essential dignity of the nature of man. The world waits for the church to declare itself among all the deformities of crowded life, and to project divine ideals into the actualities of existence; and in so doing—at last—to transfigure them.

> Not in Utopia—subterranean fields—
> Or some secreted island, Heaven knows where!
> But in the very world, which is the world
> Of all of us—the place where, in the end,
> We find our happiness, or not at all.

Chapter II

WHAT IS MAN? HIS PLACE IN PRACTICAL RELIGION

THIS question may not seem pertinent to a study of practical religion. Yet if religion ceases (as it is ceasing) to be regarded as an authoritative imposition from without, and is seen as the highest manifestation of human personality, the answer becomes of the first importance. It is true that no inclusive or conclusive answer can be given; for Man, who finds himself on this planet and has so modified its conditions that he is the co-creator of it as it is to-day (for good and evil), still remains a mystery to himself; as does 'this world's great frame' which he has filled in with so wonderful a picture. But if he cannot fully know himself, if he is so secretive of his deepest self as we know him to be, at least he may be said to know himself better than he knows

anything else. Hence the importance of the question. Man is now seen as the starting-point of the spiritual venture and of practical religion; and that is his greatest achievement.

But until recently the Christian student has usually begun, so to speak, at the other end. Beginning with God he has worked downwards to Man. To assert that Man may be a factor in the world-progress, that he himself is within certain limits 'creative,' has seemed an encroachment on the prerogative of Almighty Power. This has resulted in the mechanical system of imposed dogmatic theology from which we are now emerging. The scientific materialist, also, has begun his reading of the world-problem in the external world with its rigid sequences, and he has tended to interpret himself by the inexorable necessity he finds without, in which free will and creativeness seem impossible. The mechanical and materialist view of men and things denies to every corner of the external or internal world that freedom which alone can give meaning to human life. It makes an unreality of personality, and assigns to Man as his highest quality the rôle of an automatic spiritual, or an automatic material, machine.

It seems obvious that religion now depends for its stability upon a foundation of self-knowledge. We must literally begin at home, not with the external world. To find religious authority in the 'Absolute,' to use philosophical language, or in the 'Church' in the Catholic sense, or in the Bible in the Protestant sense, as organized religion has always tended to do; or to begin our examination with 'Law' in the Determinist sense, or with 'Matter' in the physicists' sense, brings us, at least theoretically, to an *impasse*. Man, who has originated all these theories and to the tribunal of whose mind they must ultimately appeal, finds that in them he has practically eliminated himself. They have no need for him as an individual being.

To-day we are in the midst of a reaction against the kind of thinking which makes an unreality of Man. Led by a crowd of brilliant thinkers, by William James, by Bergson, by Eucken, who, whatever their philosophical connexion with one another, are all 'activists,' we ask, 'Is the will of man effective? Is man in any sense a creative force?' Certain watchwords sound on every side. Men become aware of pragmatism;

a sense of values is borne in on them; they begin to re-value values; there is a thrilling awareness of human energizing power, and a passionate search for reality. Life is seen to be the great issue; not theories, however complete and comprehensive. No longer do men merely talk abstractions, beat the void, soar into speculation remote from all actual life. They dare to talk even of values in Truth. How does this theory *work*? they ask. Has it value? The Humanist believes that *man counts*; and his belief may range from the assertion that Man alone counts, to the declaration that Man is impinging on a Divine Reality, that he has that within which gives assurance of 'boundless affinities and a communion unseen,' and that, as the followers of Jesus said long ago, he is a co-worker with God. He does not begin with the Whole to explain the Whole, for he is not acquainted with the Whole; he cannot really conceive of it. Realizing that in all practical questions it is well to begin with the known, he begins with that little bit of the Whole which is himself, which if he cannot claim fully to understand he at least envisages, and from that argues outward toward the Whole. If it be said that a man's conclu-

sions about himself are invalid, we destroy all argument, reasoning, or knowledge; and certainly cannot base validity of knowledge of the Whole on the invalidity of knowledge of ourselves.

The way of approach then, by and through himself, modifies directly the wayfarer's vision of God and Man. Man's power, his worth, his will, his value in the scheme of things, his place in the universe, his attempts at solution of the problems that concern him, all hinge upon the way of approach.

This becomes more evident when we see how a particular way of approach works out in actual life, and especially in what we call organized Christianity. When any externality is claimed as finally authoritative and binding, so that a man's inner self is brought into bondage by it, whether it be a Theory, a Book, or a Church, enslaving consequences make themselves felt. The mental freedom of a man is discounted or placed under penalty. In the same way all insistence on external rites and ceremonies as obligatory, all stress on the uniquely saving efficacy of sacraments or objective acts, all obligatory doctrines of mediatorship between the Divine Reality and the human soul, minimize the

sacred freedom of the inner self. Theories sincerely adopted of pantheism, predestination, and determinism have a tendency to sap the moral fibre, and doctrines of atonement through mediatorship infringe on the reality and vitality of the kinship of spirit with Spirit.

Outside the pale of organized religion we have languished under the nightmare of mechanical naturalism, of the machine-man in his machine-world with its automatic, necessarian helplessness. Now we are placing these things under examination, putting them beside the facts of life, estimating their 'working' value, not as a mere series of propositions but as energizing and creative vital factors. And it seems that in them is no longer a saving gospel either for the individual or for society. They fail to take account of Man as thinking, progressive, purposive, and creative; of Life as an apprenticeship in creativity; of Society as a potential 'kingdom of God.' To the modern religious consciousness they have largely become intellectual unrealities, transcended by that spiritual creativeness of Man which against a Divine background works out his future and makes his truth.

Briefly, then, the older way of Christian thinking of Man sees him as spirit in the making, helpless and valueless until rescued by a salvation external to himself and to be accepted under penalties dogmatically defined; fallen and essentially degraded. The newer way looks at man as persistently rising by his own effort, as a co-operator in building up reality, as not ready-made but as making himself, as creative both personally and socially, as both maker and judge of all institutions and authorities whether religious or social, as creatively impelled to realize new values transcending the old and if need be breaking with the past. It asserts the value and essential nobility, not the native degradation, of Man, and claims him as a co-operating partner, however junior, in the creation of spiritual good. Based on human experience, the only experience possible, it asserts human freedom within limits which allow Man to be an intelligent helper in the process of continuous creation. 'Man's relation to the Absolute,' says the American philosopher, Hocking, 'has not obliterated him, not over-mastered him: enabling him to reflect, it has given to him himself: enabling him to create it has given to him a

freedom which might well be called freedom in the concrete.'

It is not within the scope of this work to take the next step and attempt to construct a world-rationale; to argue from our souls to the Universe which has its own Soul, and its own counsel which is not ours. We admit on the evidence that Man did not originate nor build up the Cosmos, nor is his the spirit which guides it. It is sufficient here to assert that there is nothing in the higher fields of mental and spiritual life *but that the human will helps to make it what in human experience it becomes*. For present practical purposes we confine ourselves to contrasting the modern affirmation that Man is a real striver in a real world, with real aims and hopes, real purposes to be achieved, and on a real pilgrimage through a world with a real meaning in it; with the centuries-old affirmation of the essential worthlessness of man. We contrast the older idea of Man with Eden behind him, and the newer one of Man with Eden in front of him, to be made, if made at all, by himself; and we ask: Which idea is the more fruitful and practical? Organized Christianity has stood for the older idea, but an examination of society to-day shows us

that the assertion of the worthlessness of Man has by no means redeemed the world. Social redemption is slowly coming about through a passionate belief in the value of Man.

Before proceeding to trace the working results of the older view of Man and to ask how much or how little it has contributed to his elevation, it is interesting to examine into its origin. Especially is it important to inquire whether the great religious Personality who stands behind the development of religious thought we call Christian himself thought meanly of Man, and whether he seemed inclined to assert that a religious sense of God was practically possible without a religious sense of humanity. Did he, or did he not, assert that the religious view of life must be a practical one; that it must 'work'; and that religious experience is not so much an attitude towards theories as a creative attitude towards life? Did he, in his own terms and those of his day, speak of practical religion as having a social bearing?

A faithful endeavour to answer these questions leaves us amazed at the modernity of Jesus. We cannot find in him any idea of Man as intrinsically worthless. Rather it

seems that his thought of Man—and Woman—is what we, with philosophy and science to help us, are now struggling towards. To all intents and purposes he was original in this. His thought of God, however deepened and heightened, was not altogether his own. But his enthusiasm for humanity as he gave it to the world was purely a new thing. That the germs of it appear in his scriptures, as in the 'all souls are mine' of Ezekiel, does not lessen his originality. And the fact that organized Christianity has failed on the whole to grasp the true inwardness of the idea of Jesus explains its failure to make explicit in the world what was implicit within it.

To Jesus a man certainly had an essential value without preliminary purification or preparation; and, still more astonishing fact, in Man he included Woman. He was, it seems, always implying this, often with that telling use of understatement which indicates that adequate statement is impossible: 'ye are of more value than many sparrows,' a striking comparison likely to stick in the memory of hearers and be verbally handed down.

This value of Man rested on the fact that he was a son of God—for Jesus a son irre-

vocably whatever he is: just or unjust, the elder son or the prodigal. The idea had been dimly approached here and there in prophetic Judaism and in Paganism. The Greek and Roman worlds, notwithstanding their milieu of slaves and prisoners of war, were by no means incapable of an artistic admiration of the sense of humanity: 'I am a man, and nothing human is alien to me.' But with Jesus this was more than an intellectual idea; it was a passion. He went the whole way and took all the consequences. Whether he started or not with a preference for the Jew we cannot tell; we know he did not stop there. A man at the worst was a man for him, a woman at the worst was a woman, and both were capable of rising. He was permeated with this conviction of the worth of the individual. If any statement can be made without fear of controversy from the records as we have them it is: that here we see portrayed a man who felt this with an unparalleled passion and pity which as far as we can see was a new thing in Western human history, even as the compassion of the Buddha had been a new thing in the East. There was no distinction of sex, rank, character, or occupation. If Jesus ever does

seem to undervalue the human it is not the poor and wretched and sinful; it is the wealthy and respectable man who rouses a feeling of antagonism in his breast, and lays him open to the accusation of being hard on the rich man because he was rich, and of making poverty a virtue in itself. If that is so, it is just that indignant sympathy with the poor and disgust at the implications of riches which are so surprising. All those miserable, superfluous, problematical wastrels still had a value in his eyes. Under those wretched bodies he persisted in seeing the soul—with God's stamp on it. Then he looked at the rich men, superior and comfortable; he saw that the tendency of riches is to atrophy the finer things of the soul; and judging in a way human enough of the whole class of rich men by certain individuals, he pointed his pity of the poor by sharp words spoken of the rich. This may have been a defect of his quality; if so, it makes his quality the humanly dearer.

Jesus presumably went from Fatherhood to Brotherhood, from Godhead to Manhood, from the Kingdom to its Citizen.

Now, as we have seen, we tend to go the other way: from Manhood to Godhead, from

Brotherhood to Fatherhood, in our seeking after the Kingdom; but we arrive at the same goal. However organized Christianity has travestied these ideals and ignored this teaching, we are approaching the conviction that to claim the name of Christian and to be complacently content that our brother (or sister) should wallow in a slum; to be content to live refined and delicate lives while our brother (or sister) sinks in a mire of outraging and indecent poverty; to be proud of our fastidious virtue while our brother (or sister) is polluted in body and soul by shameful conditions; is to assume a name which in its application becomes a satire, and to take our place in that class to which Jesus, carried out of himself by righteous anger, exclaimed 'Woe unto you!'

Jesus was the first champion of Woman considered as a human being. To the Greeks, the Romans (whatever the traditional dignity of the Roman matron), the Rabbinical schools, to Paul and ensuing Christianity, the Woman was an inferior creature. Not to Jesus. He thought of Woman as a soul, and in his idea of the soul there was no sex. Marrying and giving in marriage, the whole of what we now call the sex question, Jesus seems to

have looked on in a curiously detached and composed way—except when his indignation was aroused on behalf of the weaker. The sex question is incidental to earth and to time; the troubles and distractions arising out of it are inevitable; but 'sins of passion' are not, it seems, in the eyes of Jesus nearly so soul-destroying, so ungodlike, as sins of contempt, of arrogance of spirit, of hypocrisy. It seems certain that he probed lovingly down to the soul of a prostitute when he had nothing but condemnation for the self-righteous respectable man. This attitude gathered from the records towards the virtuous and conventional members of society has been counted as a fault in Jesus. After all, it may be said, the Pharisee is a better member of society than the prostitute, and there is a good deal to be urged for the respectable and conventional from the outwardly decent and decorous point of view. But Jesus had a unique penetration of soul which never stopped until it reached the other soul, making little of surface things whether faulty or virtuous. The exquisite story in John, whether verbally authentic or not, gives the whole atmosphere and spirit in which Jesus regarded 'sinful' woman.

That story in its consistent and photographic detail could hardly have been invented. Who at the time could invent it? The blatant, coarse accusation; the woman defaced by a partner who shares neither the shame nor the consequences; the womanly self-consciousness suddenly awaking in the presence of a strange delicacy and purity, and shrinking ashamed from their contact; brazen-faced bystanders at first coarsely amused, then with one flash revealed to themselves—'he that is without sin among you'; two faces left alone and confronting each other in a gaze which shuts out all the other faces in the world: 'Hath no man accused thee?'

'No man, Lord.'

'Neither do I accuse thee. Go, and sin no more.'

How new this was, how life-giving, and how like Jesus! Yet through the long Christian ages the hideous sacrifice of prostitution has been offered up, and men have gone on doing that very thing which at that dramatic moment filled his righteous soul with compassion and anger: they have accepted the sacrifice and have sacrilegiously despised the victim.

Whatever may have been his actual pronouncements upon divorce, there is no doubt that here too Jesus regarded the soul as well as the body, and strove to lift the marriage relation on a nobler plane. In this also with his usual heroism he ran counter to existing opinion and custom. Marriage was for him a subtle and spiritual relationship, guarded by the majestic prohibition: 'What God hath joined together let not man put asunder.' From being a mere household chattel he raised woman into equality with her husband, having equal rights of union. Organized Christianity has translated the spirit of 'what *God* hath joined' into a letter of bondage, and for 'God' it has always read 'the Church.' The large feeling of Jesus has been belittled into a mere ecclesiastical mechanism, consecrated by custom rather than by God. It may be urged and perhaps admitted that it has acted in self-defence and to prevent worse evils. But it is certain that organized Christianity has failed to deal adequately with marriage as it has completely failed to deal with prostitution; and practical religion whether within the church or not is forced into regarding both questions: the mass of unreality, wretchedness,

and hypocrisy that lies within marriage, as well as the vast mass of corruption that lies outside it. The day of veiling platitudes is over. Society will have to do as Jesus did, and regard all men and women as *souls*. It will have to adopt his phrase and feeling: 'It is not the will of my Father that one of these little ones should perish.'

With the growing conviction of the value of man and woman such a terrible indictment of centuries of organized Christianity as John Galsworthy's poem, 'Deflowered,' should become impossible:

> Look back at me, sad men!
> *What I am now, you made!*

The idea of the dignity, the creativity, the wonder of the human being, the real implications of humanity, will achieve what organized Christianity with all its threats and its rewards has failed to achieve, and show as blasphemously horrible the long holocaust of Womanhood. With whatever re-arrangements of institutions, the new practical religion will see to it that the destruction of souls and bodies ceases, and vindicate triumphantly Jesus Christ's view of Woman. For none of us can pride himself on the dignity and value of his manhood in the modern sense

unless he is also prepared to concede the same dignity and value to his fellows of either sex. If he is a man, then indeed nothing human is alien to him. He must accept the logic of his position. The man who saw this, said this in his own terms, and exemplified it in his own life, once appeared in the bosom of Judaism, and we call ourselves in his line of descent. While the Jew gloried in his traditions and his aristocracy of religion; while the Roman conquered and organized, classified and legalized with a sort of rough justice founded on his aristocracy of nationality; while the Greek philosophized and analysed in the pride of aristocracy of intellect; while the barbaric ends of the earth fought and worshipped strange gods, and the strong-armed man was the great man; while the planet reeked with the old inhumanity of Man to man, this one man lived a brief life in a small corner of the earth. And he said out of the depths of his matchless soul that men were brothers, that they were all alike the children of God, that there was no service of the Divine without service of the human, that no man could claim value for himself without granting it to his fellow man, his fellow being.

It was too stupendous an assertion to be assimilated. Christianity in its organized form never has assimilated it. Paul, as we shall see, ran counter to it and despised Woman. The church developed a pseudo-purity which impiously insulted the half of humanity. The world rushed on with its long sacrifice of the weak to the strong, until a latter-day prophet arrived who flouted the rabble of weakly self-seeking 'Christian' men, and held up to scorn the ethical concepts of Jesus as mere negations, an altruistic disease, a mercy which weakens him that gives and him that takes. Men, said this prophet, are mostly and properly slaves, fit only for a cowardly service—morality; and God is dead.

There is room for such a prophet, that our easy acquiescences and sham moralities may be called into question; that we may touch the truth once more by startled reaction, and not crystallize it in mere tradition become a dead letter; that we may insist as Jesus did that human beings are the highest values of life, and act as if we meant it.

This revival of interest in men and women is characteristic of the finer minds of to-day. It is in short the religion of many, by what-

ever name they may choose to call it. By it every department of society is questioned, from military systems, industrial systems, economic systems to the more elusive aspects of social phenomena. What, it is asked, is the *human justification* of these? How do these things contribute to the elevation, or how do they force on the degradation, of the human beings concerned in them? This is almost a new sense, analogous to the new consciousness in Woman which is making through straight or devious paths for the emancipation and creative values of her soul.

The intrinsic value of Man and Woman is, then, the great contention of practical religion to-day, whether within or without organized Christianity. It reads life in the light of the human heart by which we live. It recognizes in another the things it knows as worthy in itself even if they are overlaid by circumstance: love of love, love of truth, desire of truth, hatred of injustice, longing for the Divine, home-sickness for the Infinite, awe of the unknown, awe of the implications of the universe. 'If thou sinkest deep enough into the human,' said Augustine, 'thou wilt find the Divine.' One who deepens his own soul before he essays to

plumb the inwardness of another knows that this is true. The spectacle of modern society proves that to impress on men and women that they are originally and essentially evil has not been a regenerative idea. To suggest and to believe that they are potential saints may be more to the purpose. That was the method of Jesus; though the ecclesiastical methods of historic Christianity have kept it out of sight.

CHAPTER III

THE TRADITIONAL IDEA OF MAN

WE have seen that the degraded idea of humanity which has characterized our Christianity for so long was not derived from its ostensible Founder, and was in fact contrary to his ideas and his teaching so far as we can gather these from the extant stories of his life. It becomes necessary, therefore, to look elsewhere for the origin of a conception which has influenced so profoundly Christian thought and by which so many are still influenced, even if unconsciously or unwillingly. And this brings us at once to that wonderful Jew whose thoughts and speculations have shaped and moulded the Christianity of history, whose influence has largely determined the orbit in which the religion of Jesus has revolved.

What did Paul think of man, of woman, of their nature and possibilities, of the relation of men to this world and to life? Here we

come upon a sharp contrast between the 'word' of Jesus and the 'word' of Paul. Paul regarded man as essentially bad, a failure and deformed; and his pessimism about man seized on Christian thought and literature. It impelled Augustine, shrinking from the abysses of his own self-revelation; it informed Thomas à Kempis. The *Imitatio Christi* is a psychological imitation indeed, but of Paul, not of Jesus. Calvinism and modern Evangelicalism are the direct offspring of the theories of Paul. They too do not derive from Jesus, nor are they of his spirit. Paul's own life was an ardent conflict, mental and spiritual. His theories ought to have made him a fatalist, a necessarian, a man of passivity. But every man of strenuous action is a practical believer in human liberty, and if ever man was strenuous in action that man was Paul. If ever any man appealed to the latent inner ideals of the natural man, that man was Paul. He was an invincible optimist in practice, whatever his theories.

The combination of mystic and practical man, of dreamer and doer, of visionary and activist has always been a powerful and fascinating one. Such was Paul, and as

such he is for ever interesting to us. In his activities thwarted and persecuted, cast down yet indomitable, it was Paul against the world, but Paul appealing to the world and to succeeding ages, as well as to the motley crowd of strange and discouraging people in little scattered gatherings who composed (as he thought) his audience. He is a magnificent spectacle, and at the same time he is a magnificent contradiction between theory and practice. His practice thrills the religious consciousness and appeals to men as men; his theories have made strange work in the world. Between the good and the evil that they have wrought who shall hold the balance? His personality and his practice testify and exemplify the dignity and value of man; his theories have cast a stigma upon man and woman which they bear to this day. His gift of expressing the indefinable moods of his inner self has made him one of the greatest interpreters that ever lived of nameless and inarticulate personal longings and cravings, and of the antinomies we find within ourselves; but his complexities of speculation have confused the clear issues of the ideals of Jesus in imaginative interpretations and doctrines of his person.

The modern inquiry of what Paul thought of man includes the specific inquiry of what he thought of woman. Here we are forced into a comparison of the attitudes of Jesus and Paul. Woman to-day is revolting, not against the thought of Jesus, but against the thought of Paul, for to Paul she is more or less a chattel, more or less a cipher, though certainly an evil cipher. Paul's theories are responsible for untold degradation of woman. The marriage relation, which Jesus dignified, beautified and spiritualized, Paul regards as a preposterous proceeding in this soon-to-be-ended world—at the best it is a merely fleshly necessity for the incontinent. He does not soar to the higher thought of marriage, and his preoccupation with it is solely from the point of view of masculine necessity. Let those who are married be as though they were not married, for the Day of the Lord draweth nigh. To Paul the unmarried, Paul with his mind roaming amongst things other-worldly, mundane marriage is in fact unclean. It is merely a compromise between entire chastity and the weakness of the flesh, and only better than prostitution. Only the unmarried woman can in his thought be holy both in body and soul.

Paul, in fact, never seems to rid himself of that habitual slighting of womanhood against which, as we have seen, the attitude of Jesus was a protest. Yet he is not incapable, in his practical dealing with the people who looked to him for guidance, of carrying the spiritualities above the whole question of sex. The man is not without the woman, nor the woman without the man, in the Lord; and we feel this is a concession to the woman. There is no hint of this condescension in Jesus, but rather a peculiar tenderness; his most lovely attributes manifest themselves in his dealings with women and children. Woman for Jesus is a human being; for Paul she is chiefly a female, and children scarcely exist for him.

It is the attitude of Paul, not that of Jesus, which has been perpetuated in the history of ecclesiastical Christianity. The pseudo-chastity, the prurient views of life and humanity, the false ideals, the asceticisms that have crippled and sullied, the sexual subjection of Woman, which have all been dignified with the name of Christianity, are derivative from Paul, or from the interpretation or exaggeration of his words. Paul in his thought of Woman shows far from his

best; though here again his practice was other and better than his theory. Whether or not some personal history of weakness or temptation or want of vitality lies behind this teaching we shall probably never know. But there it stands; and the consequences of it constitute a crucial social problem to-day. To Jesus Woman owes infinitely more than to any great religious teacher and initiator who has ever appeared on this planet; to Paul—and to Paulinism—she owes a costly modification of the impulse given by Jesus. To-day the intelligent purpose, the consistent determination, and the abiding conviction in the best women of the value of the human being, are vindicating the ideals of Jesus in current thought and foreshadowing their ultimate realization in human society.

It is not the province of the writer to describe in detail the development of Paul's theology as such, but to touch on those theories of his which have been so industriously applied by generations of Christians to the derogation of Man. We are apt to be amazed to-day that the influence of Paul should have so over-ridden the influence of Jesus. Jesus, the Divine Man, the Heavenly Adam, the theological Mediator, has been

exalted at the expense of his own teaching. According to the implications of Paul's doctrinal theories, the creation of Man has been a failure; God fore-ordaining the Christ to die in behalf of a fallen humanity whose degradation and sinfulness were also fore-ordained. The cosmic failure has necessitated a cosmic sacrifice: an overwhelming and unique episode of propitiation at a definite moment of historic time, as the only means of rectification of the cosmic mistake.

But even this does not really suffice. For before fallen man can profit by this stupendous sacrifice he must believe, at his peril, in its saving significance. But so helpless is man that even this necessary faith turns out not to be his own. It is not a human performance at all. Righteousness cannot be achieved; it cannot be humanly created. It must be received as a gift of free grace. It is not a righteousness of effort that is necessary, but an imputed righteousness.

When we read the letters in which this practical mystic is beating his theory out, it occurs to us to wonder how the Omnipotent and Omniscient Creator of Paul's belief ever thought to make such a hopeless, helpless, intrinsically evil thing as man—and

woman: poor derelicts and orphans in the universe—which is moreover filled with hostile spirits busily working against them and against God. For man is no more naturally and in himself the child of his Creator than he is righteous in himself. We have travelled far from Jesus and his 'your Father which is in heaven.' It is only as a deed of condescending grace that God adopts this wretched and outcast orphan whom he has so unaccountably created, shifts his pre-ordained and inevitable burdens of sin on Christ as the Hebrews placed it symbolically on their scapegoat, imputes by a fiction the righteousness of the sacrificed Christ to him, and in the end by a whole series of fictions comes at last to call this orphan 'child.' It is evident that we are here in a wholly different thought-world from the thought-world of Jesus. The planes of thought have not a line in common they do not even intersect. There are no fictions in the parable of the Prodigal Son, of the Pharisee and the Publican, of the Good Samaritan.

To say that Paul himself is not consistent in his eager theories, that he himself presently controverts them and shows that there is natural good in a man, is not to the

point. The point is that these damning doctrines of the native worthlessness of man have conquered and held the field in Christendom; and that, however unreal they are beginning to sound in the ears of the modern man, they hold the field to-day. They are still the official creed and teaching of organized and orthodox Christianity. The generations have looked through the eyes of Paul at Jesus and at man. It may be said that if they had not done so they would not have seen Jesus at all, for Paul it was who preserved Jesus to the world. That is as it may be. The fact remains, that men have listened to the ideas and ideals of Jesus through the medium of Paul's particular views of his person; they have looked through Paul's eyes for a Second Coming which has minimized the importance of this world and the people in it; and they have regarded Paul as a better authority on God, on Man, on Woman, on Religion, and on Jesus himself than the teacher from whom he mystically derived.

To-day the orthodox pulpits of Christendom proclaim Paul's personal views on all these subjects, and call them not only the religion of Jesus but the authoritative revelation of God. Through most of the

Christian ages to dissent from Paulinism has been accounted heresy and penalized. As a result, with all this insistence on spurious and schematic Christianity the Christian world has experienced more of hate than love, of separation than brotherhood, of social evil than efforts towards common good.

The kingdom of God of the dream of Jesus remains a dream. Men have been prone to forget that this same Paul said: 'Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels and have not love I am become as sounding brass'—which is everlasting religion. They have remembered that he said: 'Though an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you let him be accursed'—which is not religion at all. They have not remembered Paul by his splendid and transfigured moments so artlessly immortalized in his letters. They have rather remembered him by his controversial moments when he hammered out his theories, without a suspicion that they were to be regarded in the future as divinely authoritative and to be universally accepted under penalty. They have taken what he presented as a Gospel of Redemption and used it as an engine of exclusiveness and condemnation. Belief in

the results of Paul's mentality has proved a better passport through the Christian ages than honest freedom of thought coupled with personal rectitude. Many of the doctrines which have been fathered on Paul have made for weakling dependence, mentally and socially in men.

It is sometimes generously argued that 'election,' for example, is compatible with and in fact calls for a sense of responsibility in the 'elect.' But how do we know who the 'elect' are? 'It is in the field of religion,' says Dr. James Drummond 'that we use the word Election. There we observe that our religious sensibilities, our pure ideals, the warnings of conscience, our glimpses of eternal things, are all gifts which we may spoil but cannot create. They are the Divine call to a holy life; and their varying quality in different persons depends on Divine Election or Choice.' This beautiful phraseology of 'the spark within the clod' is appealing. In some mystical sense it must be true. But to follow it to its logical conclusion leads to a negation of personal responsibility. According to our experience, on which we must eventually judge, the Divine Spirit in some way both illumines men

and respects their personality, so that it seems to men that their minds work independently towards it. Election excludes the free initiative and power of man, and makes no answer to the questions: What is man? Here is God; Where is man?

Paul, then, from the theoretical point of view, found a way of approach, indeed, to the vital problems of human concern which ever engage the mind of man. But he did not find one which was to remain eternally and universally valid. In the view of Jesus of man and woman we have nothing to unlearn. If Christianity had insisted on this as it has insisted on the views of Paul, the world to-day would be a different place.

In Paul's teaching we have antinomies, contradictions, abysses and heights. He was always bound by authority. When the authority of the Jewish Law was abrogated for him, he substituted the pre-existent Messiah, the Second Adam, the Ideal Heavenly Man, the Demiurge of his own intricate speculations; and in the light of all this he looked at man and God. Jesus set man over against God and saw Heart answering directly to heart and Spirit to spirit. The child approached the Father naturally and

immediately, taking always his brother with him. But Paul interrupted this divinely simple relation. Man could not approach the Divine immediately; the Father was alienated from the child; between these two (whom Jesus saw ever seeking each other) were interposed a whole series of fictions spun out of Paul's own mind, and coloured by the theology, poetry, philosophy, and mystery-cults of the day in which he lived. He has imposed himself upon the world in a Christianity loaded with dogmas and devices for getting man to God by the longest possible way. Yet his heart was sound to the core and his ethical teaching often sublime. He reached his greatest heights by intuition, not by reasoning. He was of the mind of that Jesus whom he so adoringly transfigured, and of all great religious men.

If we saw Jesus *only* through the eyes of Paul what would our vision be? A phantom Ideality, a Person hidden in the attributes of imagined Deity; but not the man whose blessed feet walked over those homely acres two millenniums ago; not the man who spoke luminously in parables by sea or on hill-side, and yearned over the children, and understood the women, and read the

men, and welcomed exquisitely the sinner who turned and looked back. We should only have seen a mystical Person who died and rose from the dead, but who to all intents and purposes never lived. A superhuman Being lost in an unearthly halo, the starting-point of an elaborate dogmatic system—so only should we have seen the Brother of our souls; and thus many see him this very day, calling on them for beliefs about himself which time is questioning and denying.

Paul's method, his way of approach, is not our way now, nor can it be. Jesus built upon Man, was splendidly convinced of human values, believed that all men and women were worth saving, and could be led into the way of saving themselves. In his thought, it seems, God and Man were always *together*. Paul began with a pre-conceived theory of the world, in which a place had to be made for Man as it were on sufferance. He invented a cosmogony in which God and Man were far apart, and he invented an elaborate process by which they could be brought together. His way of looking at Man and at Woman has wrought strange havoc in the world. And yet when we hear Paul expressing the true man within

him he rises to heights which have never been surpassed. This is his lasting value to the humanity which he was fated so wonderfully to impress. His theological system will go the way of all theological systems, and is even now going. His theological force is nearly expended, and the new spirit makes little of his specific doctrines in its undoubted revival of interest in religion.

The new way of looking at man is not Paul's way. But whatever the changes of thought and of the world, whatever the new movements against patronage of humanity and towards human and social justice, and whatever the new expressions of spiritual experience, it will always remain true that though a man speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, he is but as sounding brass or a clanging cymbal; that love seeketh not her own; and that love is greater than systems of belief and schemes of knowledge. For what is the religious life for men and women of to-day but the moving of the whole being to higher levels of mental integrity and practical and social benevolence, however these may diverge from time-honoured and accepted models? To the Pauline formulas we may no longer

be true. To the Pauline spirit of love we must be true, for that still means loyalty to the highest self, and so loyalty to humanity.

Religion to-day is not institutionalism. It is not a theory of the universe, or a view of the person of Jesus. It is an illumination, inward and outward, of life, rather than impositions of schemes of belief; it is endowment of life with deeper quality and finer issues. Says one, 'Religion is often little more than taking out a licence to disapprove,' and the irony goes home. Against this temper new religious currents are setting strongly. Arraying ourselves on pinnacles of disapproval on the score of another man's outlook on the eternal mysteries begins to savour of absurdity. When, amid his theorizing, Paul declared that the supreme idea of good was love, he uttered what may seem a platitude, but is even mildly novel and adventurous as a setting and solving of modern problems. In this Jesus, blessing and banning in Galilee, Paul, momentarily lifting the veil of the Holy of Holies, and the modern reformer with the sharp thrust in his soul, are at one.

CHAPTER IV

THE HERETIC AS NEIGHBOUR

IF we grant a Divine Purpose in the world then surely it was as much made for man as man for it. If the 'Church' claims a divine origin and purpose, then similarly, it was made for man, not man for it. But as we have seen, this has never been the note of religious institutions. They tend to consider tradition as immutable and set rigid bounds to invention, to reform, and new statements of truth. The social reformer has always been with us, but he has generally been outside the church, voluntarily, involuntarily, or unconsciously. He has generally found the orthodox atmosphere too stifling. His attitude towards religion is undogmatic and undenominational, for the reformer is not of those 'who live easily' and safely in accustomed ways. He has to create new values; which means an ad-

venturous courage set towards the future in spite of the present and the past. The Reformer can never be comfortable. It is the spirit in him which is urging him towards humanity, and that spirit distrusts orthodoxies and is distrusted by them. So we find that 'the tough hearts that pioneer their kind' are nearly always heretics.

In history we see that the heretic has been the chief factor in every human advance: he has always gone beyond the orthodox, and has created new values which orthodoxy has first opposed and then received.

The religious revival of to-day, the new note of practical religion, is the note of social reform—which means a new conception of man and woman, a new sense of their value, a new passionate concern for all other people. This religious revival recks little of 'Established Religion.' Its inception, its progress, its ideals, and its contentions have been and mostly are apart from the 'Church.' Its prophets have usually been heretics, that is, full of faith, but careless or even hostile to forms of faith. It is true, to quote Mr. Arnold Bennett again, that 'A large proportion of the best modern imaginative literature has been inspired by the dream of social

justice,' and one of the most obvious characteristics of modern literature as a whole is its divorce from religious conventions and authorities. This is in fact the new religion; but no one can suppose it is the outcome of established religious institutions. If these have come into it at all, they have come in at the end. Organized religion failed to initiate the creative and humanitarian impulse, so deeply in accord with the spirit of Jesus.

And if organized religion is to get into the current of this great modern force, it must shed its outworn and unreal shibboleths; it must work for inclusion and comprehension and drop its preoccupation about schisms which include the greatest vitalities of the day; it must look into the present for its theology and not only back to the past; it must gain a living sense of human values; it must make for God on earth (not only in some problematical heaven) and in the conditions of human life; it must be more intent upon bringing about the Kingdom of God than in preserving ancient dogmas.

But although we have said that the passion for social justice is the great mark of the day, we know well how vast numbers of minds

seem unaware of it and untouched by it. Even at this crisis of weakened or weakening religious forms there seems no room for, and no idea of anything but orthodoxies in many people's mentality. Or there is a fear of competing interests. Believe and thou art saved—is not that still all-sufficient? That is the be-all and end-all of life on earth, with its ultimate reward in heaven. Catholic, Anglican, 'orthodox Nonconformist' join hands on this principle, though each may scout the particular dogmatic interpretation of the others. The 'principle of authority' must not yield to human hypotheses; spiritual jurisdiction must not be tampered with, for it is infallible. 'The Church teaches, not merely delivers opinions; she lays down doctrines, commands obedience. Those who reject her, reject Christ.' So speaks a modern Catholic Vicar-General in the old unchanging terms.

We see how a stereotyped dogmatic religion, instead of contending for the value of man and his creative power, becomes the most bitter and potent divider of men. Outsiders are pariahs, not fellow creatures. There is no room for social or national fellowship. The outcome of religious absolutism, its anti-

democratic, non-human, and unchristian tendencies, are well illustrated by Lord Hugh Cecil's 'Conservatism' (Home University Series). The author rejects the idea that any social tendencies of pre-Puritan times were rooted in notions of 'justice.' The authorities were only 'concerned to perform the Christian work of almsgiving.' He scoffs at the plea that the present Poor Law, or any remedial aids, are demanded as human justice. 'Christian charity' is or ought to be the basis, not 'any supposed right in justice.' Wonderful, indeed, is the narrowness of the hierarchical aristocratic idea of the divine nepotism, compared with the immeasurability of the human claim on the human as compassed by the sympathetic imagination! Yet 'Conservatism must not shrink from the appeal to Christian morality,' although the writer lays it down that 'even if the claim of a right to equivalence between the benefits mutually rendered by the State and the individual could be established it would be found utterly impossible to satisfy in practice. It is altogether impossible to measure the relative value of services and benefits except by the standard of the competitive market, and that . . . is not governed by any ethical

consideration.' Such is this aristocratic rendering of the kingdom of God on earth of Jesus: pessimistic, non-human; at its best unmoral, at its worst, blasphemous.

A sermon preached recently before the yearly conference of a religious denomination in Wales sounds the same note. It 'created a deep impression.' The end of that conference and all other church organizations was 'to witness for Christ.' But how? The character and aims of the Church had been fixed by Christ for ever: they could not be revised, they could not be subject to development. 'It is the faith of the church that the Lamb slain in a definite place is now in the midst of the throne. . . . The ministers of the church are not philosophers in quest of an unknown truth but heralds who announce a truth already revealed.'

We may well point to the world to-day and ask how it is consistent with that revealed truth. And the preacher goes on to enumerate the evils of the times: the commercial immorality that prevails, the dragon devouring our youths, making them first rogues, then atheists, the ravages of the drink traffic sometimes found in alliance with venerable religious institutions, the

growing greed of luxury, the great defect in experimental religion. Yet organized religion has been long in possession. Is it confessedly powerless, divine depositary as it is, before all these things? 'The day will come,' said the preacher, 'when many evils . . . will be doomed to extinction when the conscience of the church should have the courage of its convictions.' When will that day come? The world has waited long. The day indeed comes, but the dragons will not be fought by churchly weapons.

One might have expected here that an appeal for religious social service would follow. But the preacher proceeded: 'Do we not shrink from speaking about ultimate things? Is not our heaven grown misty? . . . The rivalries of wealth and poverty, of capital and labour are not likely to be adjusted by arithmetic and legislation, and it is not our mission to attempt the task, but rather to evoke the spirit in which they should be discussed and solved.'

So we have the old withdrawal from real human problems into the old futilities which have proved of no avail. Such words would doubtless please the 'capitalist' hearer and those who worshipped secretly 'the god of

things as they are.' But what of the poignant problem of the poor man? He might well ask: 'If the religion of this Jesus whom these who are "witnessing for Christ" talk about includes me, how is it that these witnesses disclaim interest in me and my problems? Why do they stand aside and let "these little ones" perish, while they content themselves in "evoking the spirit" in which they should be discussed? And when will the spirit be evoked?'

'From every pulpit in Christendom flows and fulminates a divine eloquence, setting forth the sublimest maxims of conduct and enforcing them by the most terrible denunciations and by promises which almost overwhelm the imagination by their grandeur. Such streams of divine eloquence have been flowing for these hundreds of years, and the type on which the world fashions itself remains much the same. Nay, if you choose to go back to the remotest antiquity, you shall find contemplative Brahmins teaching from their Vedas, or what not, how we are all brothers, and should love and help each other as brothers. It all profits nothing. The world listens to the moral rhapsody, listens and applauds, and goes on its old

way. You cannot have more exalted morality taught than is taught in every parish church—not to say each nonconformist chapel—throughout England, nor enforced by more terrible penalties or more sublime rewards. What can be the meaning of your moral progress?'

'Evoking the spirit' of Christ! Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say? But Jesus is not taken seriously, or is forgotten in 'the Christ.' The emphasis is on the other world. 'The past alone is deified.' The present world calls in vain.

But it is also true and more encouraging to know that if social enthusiasm did not begin in the 'Church' it is slowly beginning to invade it, as we see by the various Unions of Social Service in connexion with organized churches. Individual enthusiasts have been brought together by their religiously social aspirations, however slight their connexion may be with the worship—or worshippers—of their churches. Many of these recognized that if the church continued to fail to use its power for the creation of human values, the world, in the words of a high Anglican, would sweep it away and institutional Christianity would cease to exist. 'These

schools of social science are signs of the times, and are a recognition that half their religion consists of their duty to their neighbour. . . . Many of their problems would not have arisen if Christians had been true to their faith in the past. The wrongs and the evils have come because Christians have been so un-Christian ; and it is now for them to show the whole world a Christian civilization without shame or wrong, oppression or degradation, which will convince even the heathen world that they have something which the world needs.' 'What we need,' said a Welsh college principal, 'is a Christian philosophy of human life.' 'What right,' asked another professor, 'have we to expect a human soul to blossom as the rose in a slum ? '

It is probable that this social enthusiasm, this practical religion of goodwill, will at last bring religious men together as they have never been brought together before. Sceptic or sectarian, theologically differing or indifferent, they can be at one in the great religious belief of the value of men. We have, then, the spectacle of a living belief leavening organized religion, instead of organized religion, as has always been the proud

claim, propagating a living belief. There is an irony in the situation, especially when we remember that the 'Church' has always verbally acquiesced in the statement of Jesus that our duty to our neighbour constitutes one-half of religion—and in fact that the other half, of duty to God, is vitiated by its absence. Nor is this saying all.

Men have often done their duty nobly to their neighbour ; but this active principle of Christlike brotherhood has not sufficed to include them within the safe ringed fences of rightly believing and 'sound' religious sects. The test has not lain in the good fruits. Pioneers in untried ways of human betterment, urged therein by human love, have often been thrust out of the kingdom of God ; whether that was thought of as on earth or in heaven.

'Every genuinely religious person,' says Mr. Bernard Shaw, 'is a heretic and therefore a revolutionist.' At any rate it is true to say that the heretic has proved in the long run the more dutiful neighbour and the better social man, the while he is 'a jest to the complacency of crowds.' It is a general rule that any religious community has rendered social service to men in inverse ratio to its

dogmatic orthodoxy. *One might even venture to classify the chief religious denominations in England in an ascending scale according to their heterodoxy and their social service*: the Roman Catholic, the Anglican, the Wesleyan Methodist, later Methodist bodies, the Baptist, the Congregationalist, the Friend, the Unitarian. When a German Catholic writer on economic subjects and on social organization declares that 'the actual material backwardness of the German Catholics is indisputable,' we feel bound to agree with him. When he adds that the Protestant minority in a Catholic town usually takes the lead in social and economic position, he is giving a particular instance of what seems generally noticeable. When he takes the authorities to task for directing the eyes of their flocks too exclusively towards the other world, he is supporting the contention made in this book against 'orthodoxies' in general. He raises the question whether in the instruction of the Catholic people in relation to the value of worldly goods, of the spirit of gain and of industry, in comparison with the infinite value of supernatural blessings, too little stress has not been laid on the earthly moment; and he

quotes Ireland as an example of the fatal result of the penetration of a whole people by this sense of indifference.

Really efficient human life, as has already been laid down, demands that there should be no antithesis between religion and this world in matters that count for development. Dr. Rost contends that the people must learn, not indeed that the Christian should serve Mammon, but that he must make Mammon serve him, for the development of intellectual powers and the strengthening of Catholic influence in public life. The Catholic, he says, devotes enormous sums to Masses for the dead; the Protestant sets up educational or economic institutions for the benefit of the living. The review of Dr. Rost's work in the Literary Supplement of *The Times* (Sept. 4, 1913) is so pertinent that the following quotation is made from it here:—

'For the state of things revealed in these pages the Protestant has, of course, a definite psychological explanation. He urges, in the first place, that to commit to an ecclesiastical authority the sole and supreme right of dictating our beliefs and actions in regard to all the most important spheres of belief and action, is necessarily to sap the individual

conscience, the individual sense of responsibility and independence. And the ensuing paralysis, when we look at things broadly and in the long run, will naturally make itself felt in every department of life. Furthermore, it is claimed that if the human spirit be enclosed within a fence of theological dogma, all may, indeed, go well as long as that spirit has room within the fence to grow and expand; but soon or late the time must come when the boundary will be reached, and then one of three things must happen: either the fence must be broken down, which is the Protestant way; or it must be made so elastic as to be almost imperceptible, which is, roughly, the Modernist way; or, failing these ways of escape, the impoverished spirit as we have seen in Islam, as we see to lesser extent (because Western peoples do not take their creeds so seriously) in Catholicism, must gradually petrify; the spring of vitality will be broken or enfeebled, and life in general must be carried on at a lower level.'

The case is well put if to 'Church' are added all external religious authorities, Biblical or other. The only escape from religious slavery is freedom of the spirit. Noting the dogmatisms of to-day: the ultra-

dogmatism of the Catholic Church, the dogmatism of the Anglican and Wesleyan Methodist Churches (between which there is no difference in kind and little difference of degree—since the Conference of the latter carries a heavy burden of old-fashioned dogma), the less rigid dogmatism of the newer Methodist bodies, of the Baptists and Congregationalists, and the more elusive bonds of that admirable body, the Society of Friends, we come to the religious bodies of the avowedly 'Open Way': religious freemen, Theists, Liberal Christians, Unitarians, among whom there is a unity of spirit and a smaller diversity of religious belief than among 'orthodox' Christians. Here we find a gradual disappearance of dogma and a growing revolt from old-time absolutisms.

Professor Blackie said that the absolutisms are the Absolutism of Revelation, the Absolutism of Dogma, the Absolutism of Custom. We know how strongly entrenched are all of these and how uncharitable to new ideas. It takes courage, in a word, a *man*, to stand up against any of them; and a keen mental and moral struggle. Often, too, it means conflict in the arena of a man's nearest affections: the home and the

church. The price has to be paid, and there must be the will to pay it, whether to home, church, or world. It is not achieved—how should it be?—unless the self-regarding sentiment is confronted with a higher motive than self-interest. The new ideal, whether it be theological, ethical, or social, must soar above dependence upon the thought or conduct of the masses of men, and above the easy sanctions of custom. On the other hand the forces, active and passive, ranged in opposition call forth a sustained valour of behaviour and a sustained dislike of misty thinking; and the heretic often merges into the hero. There is a radical antagonism between the conservative spirit necessarily inherent in organized religion and the progressive spirit that doubts, inquires, looks in a new way at an old question; and difficulties are the fate of the pioneer.

A modern psychologist says that 'if the self-regarding sentiment has been initiated in normal fashion by the exercise of authority over the child within the family circle, no boy or man can bear up against universal disapproval *unless he has found some higher source of moral guidance*.' It is never a light thing to break with the past, and the universal condemnation, even if not actual persecution, of the man who elects to go forward instead of standing still, has always put a premium on insincerity. The affinity of the heretic for social service has not lessened this condemnation.

It is pleasant here to contribute a meed of admiration to the services to mankind rendered by the Society of Friends. It was not enough for the early Quakers (according to the defence in the charge of heresy made against the Boston Martyrs) that Jesus should impute his righteousness to them; he must reveal and bring forth the same righteousness *in* them as he wrought for them. There is no being saved by belief even in the intercession of Jesus; there must be true fellowship with him in his death, and his immortal seed of life must be raised and must live in them. Thus they had learned the dignity of human nature; therefore they helped the poor and set free the slave. 'They have an influence out of all proportion to their numbers. Their unwavering testimony in the cause of Peace and their bold experiments in social service have put all the churches to shame.' Their social service and their free spirit have gone to-

gether, certainly in the last two generations. Their sincerity, their compassion, their sanity, their feeling for the dignity of womanhood, their conviction of the value of man, have constituted, in that quiet and retiring spirit which has marked them, a fine example of productive rectitude to the world.

It has been easier to render praise to the Friend than to the Unitarian. Whatever the Friend's actual theological position may be, it is not overt heresy. To the general his attitude is a little mysterious. He is not a propagandist of theological articles, and therefore does not now excite open hostility in the 'orthodox.' His religious history, a singular one, is not likely to be repeated. Men will not follow George Fox in his denunciations; nor will the future reformer lay stress on particular texts of scripture. But it is much more probable that the stages of development behind the Unitarian will be reproduced—in fact, allowing for difference of circumstance, they are being reproduced, and largely, to-day. Dr. Selbie, in 'Nonconformity' (Home University Library) contrasts the Unitarians with sects which 'fear new ways and need the support of some external authority.'

The Unitarians 'stand for the very opposite view. They are intellectualists pure and simple, and with them religion is a thing of the head rather than of the heart. They have rendered very great service to the cause of the Free Churches by their zeal for education and social reform, and by their steady advocacy of freedom of theological thought.'

This acknowledgment of human solicitude in the heretic is often accompanied by the curious charge of religious heartlessness. He is admitted to have shown love to his neighbour; yet he is said to be entirely detached from religious emotion. He has been the Samaritan; often the good Samaritan. It is true that he has not theorized so much concerning the vineyard, and has advocated the enlarging of its borders; but he has worked in it; and admittedly.

Social service in the 'orthodox'—shall we say especially in the High Churchman?—is accounted a beautiful thing. It has æsthetic as well as religious values, and there is always an element of surprise about it. And surely any man who works eagerly for his kind must *feel*, and feel deeply, before he works on such a scale as to force a more or less unwilling testimony from those who

do not see with him eye to eye. The secret of the matter is the meaning that is put on the word *religious*. The orthodox man denies the possibility of the heretic being religious. If he believes wrongly, he cannot act righteously. In the heretic the 'religious' life is the moving of the whole man to high levels of mental integrity and practical benevolence, although these may diverge from accepted models. He may not be true to a formula; he must be true to himself; and being true to himself he comes to have loyalty to humanity.

A well-known Low Churchman commenting on the Church Congress of 1913 deprecated the introduction into a paper of the phrase of Royce, that the Christian life is essentially 'loyalty'—loyalty to the beloved community. There seemed to him a rivalry of the beloved community with the 'beloved Saviour.' To place beside this objection we note the words of the President: 'I fear (or shall I hope?) that we may hear things in this Congress said frankly, though temperately, which will make us realize how little . . . Churchmen recognize the need for unflinching application of Christian principles to social injustices, to economic problems,

to race prejudices. Has the idea, in many cases, so much as occurred to them?'

These are wise and brave words. One is fain to put beside the two expressions other words which sum up the whole matter:—

'Forasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren ye did it unto me. He that doeth the will of my Father . . . the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother.'

Here then are five points of a liberal and social religion:—

Religion must shed its shibboleths, for shibboleths are no longer authentic.

Religion must look forward and not only backward for its theology and its ideals; raising its eyes to the prophetic spirit 'that inspires the human soul of universal earth, dreaming on things to come.'

Religion must work for inclusion and comprehension, ceasing all exclusions of men in whom conscience, 'God's most intimate presence in the soul,' is reverenced and obeyed, and remembering that *man* is God's most perfect image in the world. There are no schisms in real religion.

Religion must regain a living sense of human values.

Religion must look abroad over the earth and the present conditions of human life—looking out, and not always brooding within. It

> Must hear humanity in fields and groves
> Pipe solitary anguish; [and] must hang
> Brooding above the fierce confederate storm
> Of sorrow, barricadoed evermore
> Within the walls of cities.

These five points are not merely arbitrary and theoretical figments of unreality. They are the practical fruit of a historic movement which in England, as elsewhere, has reached the content and aspect of the religious spirit broadly known as 'Unitarian.' Beginning with the personal desire for comprehension, making for toleration in matters religious, pleading against enforced subscription to human creeds, taking a stand on the Bible and the absolute and inherent right of private judgment, projecting liberty into the wider domain of the spirit, claiming the prerogative of 'free and candid religious inquiry,' the worth and value and dignity of these religious freemen is, in the arduous and continuous effort of two centuries and a half, an achieved fact. *And that which they have won for themselves, they have asserted, and do strenuously assert, for all other men.*

The 'free' religious man has proved himself an effective factor in ecclesiastical, political, social, and economic spheres. The full history of this broad and broadening religious movement has yet to be written, but one fact may be seen emerging: the heretic has steadily enlarged the sense of the value of man, and the significance of man as 'neighbour,' in the sense of Jesus. He has done this the world over, irrespective of class, caste, colour, or creed. He has been a man of the world, because in some mysterious way he believed in himself as a son of God. He has felt himself called upon to help to create the social kingdom of God and to uphold and contribute to the dignity of its citizens. And it must frankly be conceded that a measure of religious achievement stands beside his name.

Chapter V

PRACTICAL RELIGION AND CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS

CLASS consciousness is as old as organized society. It is a natural protection against a probably or possibly hostile world, and is the earlier basis of human relations before men come to understand the meaning of human comprehension and human companionship. Class consciousness is evidenced everywhere even to-day: in the province or the quarter, in the city or the suburb or the slum, in the drawing-room or the third floor back, in the public or private school. It is not all wrong and it is not all right, as we begin to suspect of most things in this complex adventure of life. But, looked at from the point of view of the value of man as a primarily religious conviction, it begins to be seen that exaggerated class consciousness has not been a religious thing. It has

even been absurd. Its good fruits have been admittedly a dignity of behaviour and a sense of *noblesse oblige*. It has fostered refined women and well-mannered and 'well-groomed' men. The fastidious and delicate refinements of living have been multiplied by it, and it concentrates into an easy and agreeable fellowship people who are naturally at home with one another. It has set up a worship of ancestors, genealogically speaking, and produced a decent atmosphere in which gross and ugly failings may not openly find a place. Certain places, institutions, and communities it invests with a sort of affectionate poetry, and so adds to the picturesqueness and enthusiasms of existence—for the class.

All this we recognize in aristocratic (using the word largely) class consciousness. But it has given other and more dubious fruits which are similar to those of a too exclusive orthodoxy. Shibboleths are regarded by it as the universal language; and it invests caste prejudices with a cosmic value. It loses from habitual thinking a sense of proportions in things, and persists in putting the universities before the universe. In a word, its sense of values is not justified by life. Unimportant things become the

touchstones of human worth. The evils of snobbery, that least-erected spirit, the evils of self-glorification, the evils of servility, the evils of pretence all arise from it.

The curious thing about class consciousness is that each class admits and justifies its own, but considers any other as reprehensible. This is the case all the way down the scale. John Stuart Blackie once said, 'A barn-door hen is not unhappy in respect of locomotive capacity so long as it is not conscious of the difference between itself and an eagle.' The class consciousness of the eagle may be all right, we say, but class consciousness in the hen will only be injurious to her. If the hen tries to emulate the specific qualities of the eagle, that is true; but the ultimate value to the planet of the class represented by the eagle and the class represented by the hen is another question.

The question is not merely one of convention; it has wide human aspects. As we look at the vast cinematograph of incident which the past has unrolled we see the continual play of one motive in the quickly moving scenes. The scenes themselves merge and change, the actions differ in type, the costumes and circumstances and faces alter,

but one impulse incites the actors in the unending biograph. The classes on the top, intensely self-conscious, wish to stay there, lords of all they survey; the classes below wish to share more and more fully in the things pertaining to a place on the top.

Many modifications appear through this never-ending desire. It arrives after long evolution, for instance, in most 'civilized' countries, that the town becomes more important than the castle which dominates it, and a burgher class, self-aware, strong-willed, pushful and effective, asserts itself. In England, towards the close of the eighteenth century, the great industrial age shows itself on the film, and the manufacturers are imbued with a class consciousness which becomes a sacred thing. Trade—with a capital T—has now acquired almost a mystic sanctity, not to be interfered with for merely human considerations. There is no thought of regulating the hours of labour which feed this class consciousness; the merely human is negligible. Lancashire in particular becomes the arena of a brutal exploitation of life and labour which presently, when Lord Shaftesbury confronts it with his sense of the value of man and woman, needs all

his efforts to modify at all. The dominant class consciousness creates its own laws in its own favour, and, being in political power, sets up such laws in the name of the State at large. The State works in the interests of the few to the hurt of the many, and hands over the poor to the exploitations of the rich —and those whom their labour makes rich.

It must be admitted that history proves that the classes in power have always—one must say naturally—legislated for their own interests and looked at their fellow beings simply in the light of those interests. They have hitherto been a congeries of self-seeking individuals, not always essentially selfish, but acquiescing contentedly in the idea that a benevolent Providence has arranged that they, as a matter of course, should inherit the earth. To them is might, majesty, dominion and power, in the very nature of things. It is only quite recently, in world history, that the idea of a 'great synthesis of human purpose,' as Mr. H. G. Wells calls it, has dawned on the general consciousness. The classes in power, absorbed in this closed universe of their class consciousness, composed often enough of estimable personalities, have looked on at the waste and ruin of human life, at

industrial slavery, at all sorts of preventable waste, disorder, futility, and horror; and have even ludicrously regarded it all, not as cause and effect; not as having any real connexion with them, but as part of the natural order of things, which in fact it would be impious to interfere with.

Those in power have ever identified themselves with the divine interests. They have always believed, honestly no doubt, that God was on the side of the well-to-do person, the well washed and delicately fed. They have believed that privilege was theirs by divine right. *Privilege*—that is the keyword of class consciousness. 'The great army of class and its dependents,' to use Mr. Gladstone's expression in 1886, have held on to privilege, to possessions, and have abhorred all thought of change; for change in what was already (to them) the best of all possible worlds could only be for the worse.

This brings us to the fact that the basic circumstance in class consciousness has been economic: having to do with the purchasing power of hard cash. It is not of course the only factor in this complex psychological ramification, but it must be basic: for culture, potentialities of interest, possibilities of

extended existence and realization of life, leisure, freedom of mind and body, time and power to enjoy are all grounded more and more on the economic foundation. 'Other-worldliness' conveniently ignores all this. Life in town, life in suburbs, life in aristocratically secluded country, foreign travel, new books, the drama, refined and hospitable social intercourse, the fine arts, holidays, recreations, hobbies, material interests of any kind, are all simply impossible without the economic purchasing power. And the most pertinent point of our present inquiry is, *how has the religious consciousness stood* in regard to this question which has had such far-reaching consequences in the life of the people?

The answer must again be given that religion, at least as organized in churches, has had very little to say in the matter. When has the church as a whole stood for the weak against the strong or voiced the revolt of the oppressed against the tyranny of men? One gospel utterance indeed the church has consistently associated itself with, theoretically and practically: 'the poor ye have always with you.' The value of the poor man, finally classified, was considered in the light

of conveniently enhancing, by the opportunity he presented, the spiritual values of the rich. But though this is true of the church, it is not true to say that the religious *spirit* in past ages has not known the burden of the economic question, either in the East or the West. The great prophets of Israel spoke almost in the tones of the modern social reformer. 'Ye have multiplied the nation,' cried Isaiah with superb irony, 'but not increased the joy thereof.' Without entering upon critical Biblical history we see how the compilers of the Jewish Law were strongly aware of it. There was to be the year of Jubilee, for instance, when the slaves were to be freed, and the land returned to the clan or original owners. Whether a jubilee year in this sense ever actually occurred or not its place in the Jewish scripture accentuates the ideal of the religious consciousness, and the more so as contrasted with the probable practice of those in possession.

It may be said of medieval religion that if it made no organized stand for the human *rights* of the poor, the religious individuals and religious houses proved themselves their friends. But in the general chaos which followed the Reformation the

man at the bottom soon came to find himself utterly helpless and friendless, and became the problem which has gone on through the centuries increasing in difficulty. The treatment of the poor became sharply differentiated from religious and humane ideals. Presently the poor were ground under the iron heel of an amazing system of political economy. Economic laws were counted inexorable; human beings could only submit. The iron law of wages, the law of population ever increasing beyond the means of subsistence, with the utter absence of altruism, seemed to condemn the great majority of men and women to conditions of helpless misery.

Against all this we have revolted; and indeed it was impossible that the human mind should be permanently enslaved by such a system. However crushed and ridiculed idealism may be, however distrustful of itself as 'sham heroics,' it will sooner or later lift its diminished head. Idealism rose again. The protest of Carlyle and the school of Carlyle against the 'dismal science' awoke men's consciousness. The value of man became once more, at least, a live proposition. Robert Owen and the Rational Religionists

saw well enough how the church and the world together had not failed to 'discount that fatal Sermon on the Mount.' A new self-conscious mental history of the proletariat began which is working itself out at this day all over Europe. A new class consciousness arose—the class of the workers, with its own speakers, poets and philosophers. As long ago as 1848 Karl Marx declared that production was producing wealth and was also producing poverty. 'There is only one class from which a real and reckless fight against authority can be expected: the proletariat class. But the proletariat cannot emancipate itself except by . . . *re-creating man as a member of the human society* in the place of established states and classes.' Once more man as man asserted his value and his creative power.

To-day we find the leaders of the workers fostering their class consciousness, and if some of the evils of class consciousness appear we have no right to be surprised. In a labour manifesto circulated during recent municipal elections in Liverpool, the men were urged 'to stand as solidly for labour as other classes do against labour, and to send representatives of their own class who

would go in their interests, and their interests alone.' This was immediately after the great Liverpool strike of 1911. No similar plea has been made since. The worker no longer regards himself as an isolated and quite negligible unit at the mercy of invincible forces. He himself is the initiator of force; in the economic world his value is so great that in combination he is in the end invincible. That in his new class consciousness he sometimes expresses himself crudely and violently is not astonishing. He has only recently learned his creative value, and has only just learned to express himself. He has not yet got over his amazement at hearing himself speak at all after long ages of silence, and he is more concerned with what he has to say than how he says it.

The new class consciousness much aggrieves and offends the older class consciousness. The invasion of its monopoly of *esprit de corps* seems lacking in taste, delicacy and sense. There are many arguments against the unfitness of it, but on the whole they amount to this: that the poor man is coming out of his proper and appointed place by asserting his value as a man and a class; that he has no right to rebel against his

poverty, which is obviously part of the fitness of things; and that, really, he is not poor after all. The underling, even if half-fed, stunted, and in the real sense of the words not *living* at all, should be content to remain as he is. Protest for himself, for his wife, for his children, for his share of life on this planet, is inappropriate, irreligious and immodest. Life is in fact (so it is tacitly claimed) the privilege of the few, not the right of the many. 'He brought up a family of six children,' said a very rich man of the writer's acquaintance in regretful approval of an old-fashioned poor man of the type now unhappily disappearing, 'and he never had more than eighteen shillings a week in his life.' What more could he want or need?

The writer knew of a lady, one of the 'furry, feathery, silken creatures' of Mr. H. G. Wells, ignorant from her cradle of any difficulty in living, her lines for ever cast in pleasant places, who, discussing some small dole, some crumb of comfort she drops yearly from her luxurious sphere to that dim limbo where the poor suffer eclipse, suddenly broke off into: 'But I am very *angry* with the poor now! I really don't feel inclined to do anything more for them!'

That a thoughtless woman should make a thoughtless remark about those whom she dubs ' the lower classes ' is in no way remarkable. What is remarkable is that it seems nowadays so remote from reality. It is so curiously unrelated to the solemnities looming in our consciousness: life and death and eternity. Love, pity, faith, imagination, brotherhood, the strong pain, the pathos, the struggle of human life in its tiny span in the sunlight, its resistless peering out of mystery into mystery, the dimly felt bosom of God on which she and the poor, all alike naked souls, cling together—what have all these, after all, to do with class consciousness which is ' angry with the poor ' ? That sad brotherhood whom Jesus loved are striving at least in this new day, blindly it may be and not beautifully (never, indeed, having much training in the æsthetic values) to rise in the scale of manhood, to realize and to create themselves, to make explicit something of that divine which if it is in any of us is in all.

And yet so prevalent still is the old aristocratic class consciousness which in the church envisaged the souls of the poor but failed to estimate the importance of the body, that the idea of scientific and ordered effort from

the economic standpoint savours, to many ' religious ' people, of the bogy ' socialism,' and oddly enough of atheism. District visiting, bazaars, jellies for the sick, Christmas charities, are all in accord with one's evident duty to the less fortunate; but that there is any human right about the matter is a disturbing and inadmissible idea. It would be as wise to sweep back the tide with a broom as to continue supposing that these things ease any longer our awakened social conscience. We shall have to acknowledge that the class consciousness of the workers is as valid as the aristocratic class consciousness of nobles, landowners, merchants, burghers, manufacturers and propertied persons, and that its awakening is a religious and a creative fact.

Beginning with physical life, it will go on to the spiritual life (though it may not be by way of organized religion); its future begins, in Bergson's phrase, ' to overflow its present.' And the men and women who hear the new voices and the spiritual demand striking past, if need be, religious institutions directly to the human heart, recognize the divine urge in the psychology of the new class consciousness. They cannot deny the

right of the worker to consider the imperative need of the class which works. They do not expect in him, in his rough living in hard places, the social shibboleths of the university, the club, the drawing-room. As he has fought for bare existence from the age of twelve, thirteen, or fourteen years, it is probable that his language, if vigorous from the essential fact of having something to say, will not consist of meticulously picked phrases.

Let a man be a man; that he should be 'a well-groomed gentleman' matters little to earth and nothing to heaven. The manly man will easily find good manners. The nameless heroisms which the worker, not conceiving them as heroic, achieves as a daily matter of course, may conceivably be his patent of nobility in a dimension where the homespun honours of heraldry are ineffectual. So they rejoice in the awaking of the monotonous drudge of our 'polished' civilization to hope and to dignity; not expecting him alone of all human creatures to achieve immediate perfection, but knowing that men and women are the highest moral values of life, that persons not things are the ends of conduct, that economic necessities are only necessities because men need

them for their strange life in this present world; and that man is not made for the vast industrial scheme but that that scheme, the State and the whole régime of labour, are made for man. So comes about what we see on every side in the men and women who are high in the scale of being: a fine enthusiasm for all sorts and conditions of men, and an unconquerable faith in them.

To sum up. The widespread unrest and discontent of our time come from a new self-consciousness followed by a new class consciousness. The underlying dynamic is revolt against penury and disorder and uncertainty, and the belief that they can be prevented. But that is too objective to include the whole truth. This rather lies in the subjective: the new conviction of individual value and the demands and desires therein implied. The decline of naturalistic and materialistic ideas of life, and the increasing consciousness of mysticism and subjectivity in the human spiritual being are all factors in the trend toward self-realization; and if for any, then for all. It is not the elimination of suffering alone and as such which is the goal, but the emergence of a new personality. This is hampered in its self-expression by untoward

conditions, caging the soul in its enhanced sense of worth. Hence the appeal for fuller, richer, freer personal life, and the varying manifestations of dissatisfaction. Hence also the varying methods urged for the bringing about of the better thing :

1. The spiritual method—the conviction that human nature is ultimately good, the faith in humanity and in human creativeness, the desire to initiate a new outlook on life and a fresh impulse within.

2. The social method—a social order realizable in time, and emphasizing the State as a divine entity caring for the under human world ; the embodiment of freedom, working for a high individualism and taking its character from that ; the State as a means towards good life, and itself the creation of self-governing persons ; no mere abstraction, but a socialized people.

3. The economic method—the destruction for ever of the idea that work is a mere commodity to be bought and sold, and with it the destruction of that immoral and monstrous idea, 'the economic man.' The human being is not primarily a profit-making machine ; he must be judged as a man and master of himself.

None of these may be ideal or sufficient. But that they each enunciate a great truth cannot be denied. That we must begin with individuality and a deep and true self-recognition ; that social experiments must be made for the benefit of the individual ; that a solution of economic problems is possible and must be faced—man himself being the creator of economic theory and the dispenser of economic practice, and so able to pull down what he himself has set up—all that is evident to the eyes that see and the ears that hear. It is a religious question.

Every man who is religiously conscious must cope with the question, and not necessarily with regard to the promulgations or actions of organized religion. He can no longer get away from the fact that religion speaks to-day in human values. It is not in the air ; it is here, among men. The way to God is now through human and social regeneration. It is not only a sentimental question ; there is laid on the religious man a 'moral obligation to be intelligent,' and the long warfare between religion (so called) and intelligence is over. For real religion the warfare never existed. The 'religious' man must make his own judgments and

select his own schemes and methods. There is only one thing he may not do—pass by on the other side, coldly inquiring 'And who is my neighbour?' To be religious is to enter into vital and helpful relations with the real life of mankind; to be aware with John Stuart Mill of the 'permanent interests of man as a progressive being.' For the saving of his own soul a man must be aware of the souls of others. And the future belongs to those who 'have a right to believe that the world is good in the sense that it can really be made good by men and women who are strong because they feel the thrill of creative evolution in their hearts.' To this the essential life is urging our lives to-day—to take part in the new 'shaping spirit,' and so be ourselves on the side of the Great Purpose moulding men.

CHAPTER VI

ORGANIZED RELIGION AND THE AGRICULTURAL LABOURER

IT is possible that the statement made in the previous chapters that the 'Church' has failed as a reforming agency in the world may be controverted on the plea that the church should be judged by its ideals and not by its actualities. No human institution ever has reached its ideal, and the good it does is reached by its efforts on the way; it should not be judged by an unattainable perfection. The church was to its degree practical and operative; that is to say, the adherents composing it *did* do certain things, even if they failed to live up to the requirements of the ideal church. In estimating the church, then, credit should be given for the ideal which it saw as well as for the things which it did.

This claim, however, never brings the

actual church to any touchstone of criticism at all. The ideal church, the might-have-been, the problematical splendour that might have been if only the church had acted differently or more nobly than as a matter of fact it did act, must always remain outside the practical judgments of life. After all, the only judgments men can ever make are by what *has been*. An absolute judgment may indeed take into account unfulfilled possibilities, 'all instincts immature, all purposes unsure,' 'thoughts hardly to be packed into a narrow act'—that is, indeed, our faith—but human judgment cannot do so. To say that though the church acted imperfectly its adherents were only the inadequate representatives of an ideal system is an illegitimate fiction of excuse. Churchmen who acted imperfectly cannot really be separated from an ideally perfect abstract church. The church exists in churchmen, and stands or falls by them; or there is no church at all.

To be willing to pass judgment upon churchmen, with the saving clause that the church remains the irreproachable, spotless, perfect spouse of Christ, is a too facile method of deprecating criticism. It is a distinction without a difference. The plain man to-day

is not under any glamour of churchly claim. That has become to the great majority unreal, like so many other authoritative claims. He judges an exalted and perfect church by her fruits, and he has good authority for so doing; by the deeds and words of her only actual and visible constituents.

He may quite justifiably ask where was this spouse of Christ, where did she dwell, while her lieges and representatives were committing faults, outraging moral ideals, or omitting their moral duties in her holy name? If he searches all human history he will find no such realized ideal and perfect entity existing apart from its representatives. Nay, he may be driven by churchmen who urge an ideal church untouched by its followers' failings to accept brutally the standard urged, and proceed to judge its acts and omissions by what its conduct ought to have been and was not.

A very pertinent illustration is to hand as this book goes to press. Roman Catholics have been twitted with the reputed judgment of Pope Sixtus V on Pope Clement's 'sordid motive' in the matter of Henry VIII's marriage with his brother's widow. The official Catholic apologist seeks a way of

escape by declaring that only 'the personal character' of Clement was assailed, whilst 'his official infallibility as teaching the universal church what is true as a matter of faith or right as a matter of morals' is unscathed. And the assertion of Lord Acton is triumphantly quoted: 'Our church stands and our faith should stand, not on the virtues of men, but on the surer ground of an institution and of a guidance that are divine.' The faithful priest who redelivers this apologia fails to see that this perfect and infallible 'institution' has never yet existed.

We must take the Church, then, or the churches, as we find them actually to have been. Though on the other hand we must not judge former stages by our present ideals alone, by our twentieth century conception of a worthy church, ignoring the actualities of historic facts. This also is a danger. In the light of present-day standards seen by experience gleaned from the past, we must look sanely on the actions and actors of the past with their curious clouded conceptions. Take for example that strange phase which fell upon miserable and unoffending old women and hounded them down in a witch-hunt. To-day this is incredible to us—this

universal panic and its awful consequences. Learning was not superior to it. Science with Bacon at the head looked seriously on. Law under Sir Edward Coke joined in the pursuit. Shakespeare, whether seriously or not we cannot tell, added new horrors to it and suffused one of his greatest works in its lurid atmosphere. And above all the church, far from coming to the rescue of the victims, added its weight to the pursuers and bestowed on them the benediction of divine authority. The witch-hunt is one of the blackest annals of 'civilized' history, and the church is in the thickest of the superstitious shadow. In defence it is not sufficient to declare that the church has always possessed the ideal of mercy, pity, and justice. What it did with the 'witches,' not what its ideal showed it ought to have done, is the point. On the other hand, if it is claimed that the church had lost sight of the ideal for the time being, it is pertinent to question the divinity of its origin and its constitution.

Just as we look back to-day at the customary horrors of former times and 'old, unhappy, far-off things,' so future generations will look back with equal amazement at the

ills we allow to haunt human life at the present time. That the witch-hunt preceded the humanitarian age astonishes us; that the slum, the public-house, and the state of the agricultural labourer existed *in* it will be the incredible thing to them. They will ask especially why a great 'religious' body of people, organized for the specific service of God and man, full of supposedly Christian sentiment, could apparently exist contentedly side by side with these things—just as we ask how the church could not only have permitted but joined the hue and cry after the witch. They will ask especially how the Established Church of England, stronger in rural than even in urban districts, could have ignored with entire complacency the state of the agricultural labourer. No question is more pertinent to the church, the great, historic, 'national' church, than this of the agricultural labourer. The Catholic Church called herself the friend of the poor, and as we have seen during medieval times she was the only dispenser of relief. The Anglican claim is to be the church of the land, including in beneficent range every order of society. She knows, so she asserts, neither class nor caste. In a national church all are

equal. But as we have seen, she has had little to do with the making of a self-reliant ideal among the workers of the nation, if we take out two or three isolated idealists, like Charles Kingsley and F. D. Maurice.

The church might regard the land, and the labourer upon it, in a special aspect. The land is, so to speak, God-made and God-given, even as the air; in a different sense from Consols or watches in which we think chiefly of human creation. God has limited the extent of land. Here men stand in presence of a power not their own—a Power which alone can create, in the primary sense, and the Power before which organized religion bows. How then have these Christians who constitute the church advocated the claims of those who are in closest touch with this unique, God-created, God-given land, who have borne the burden and heat of the day, who have given their lives to the answering of the universal prayer 'give us this day our daily bread'; these especial and peculiar servants of mother earth?

This is a most interesting question. It is necessary to remember that until the Reformation, when the path forked, the church called Catholic was our common religious

root. It belongs, with its faults and benedictions alike, to all Englishmen. We cannot if we would get away from our common forefathers. We have our part in the Anglo-Saxon age which saw the origin of the land system characteristic of the Teutonic peoples, when the unit of corporate life was the village community, when this community was a society of free proprietors, the first conquerors of this island or their descendants. Here, whatever our views of the slave-cultivated latifundia of Roman Britain, is the germ of our present land system: a clan of kindred families, the head of each family being supposed to have received an allotment of land, the more powerful, perhaps, having larger allotments. About this community would be a belt of woodland and uncultivated land, common to the community. Nearer the dwellings was the tilled or meadow land, divided into lots belonging to the individual owners, though there was a fixed order of husbandry. After the harvest these lots would be thrown open for common pasturage. Each homestead had its little enclosure, its paddock, garden, or yard, appropriated to itself. Already to the little 'township' was a religious centre. In early days a

Runic cross, rudely sculptured with Igdrasil, the Tree of Life, stood for the religious consciousness of the early settlers who called upon Odin and Thor and Balder the Beautiful. In later Saxon days we see that the largest and most dignified building has become a 'church'—and Christian. Igdrasil and the Runic cross have acquired different meanings. But presently a change comes into these simple relations of life, and a kind of progressive inequality shows itself. Perhaps the first step is the big man's severance of his allotment from the common land. He encloses it; and begins to claim a lion's share of the waste land. Eventually he acquires the power to treat it as his own property, subject no doubt at first to rights of pasturage and turbary. And so, before the Norman Conquest, already the most powerful man is the greatest landowner; the greatest landowner has become what we now call the lord of the manor; and the other members of the clan have come to accept or acquiesce in a state of vassalage. So when the feudal system stands confessed in England, agrarian relations, already established apart from the personnel of proprietors, undergo, we may judge, no violent change.

When Norman William divides the land among 1,400 tenants-in-chief, and there are over 7,800 sub-feudatories, who own all the manors in England, we see the prototypes of the two to three thousand noblemen or squires who this day possess fully half of England and Wales—and more than that proportion if we include Scotland. Under the Plantagenets the best part of the cultivated land, ranging from one-fourth to one-half the extent, forms the lord's private demesne, and is tilled by villeins performing forced labour under a bailiff, or by free labourers working for hire. The rest of the cultivated land is divided among free tenants and villeins, each possessing right of pasturage and often of turbary, over waste land. These are the prototypes of the modern tenant farmer, being in those days dependent for protection on the lord, though always enjoying fixity of tenure when they did not hold under lease.

The lower order of villeins is the prototype—at last we reach him—of the modern agricultural labourer. They were worse off than he is in so far as they were attached to the soil, but better off in so far as they had a proprietary interest in it, and could look

down upon a slave class below them. In the centre of all this order of life was always the church. In each manor was an old Saxon church, or a Norman edifice, or the newer building which we now call Early English, some venerable relics of all which still remain. In these churches was read the gospel of Jesus, not indeed in the language of the people; but the preacher might and did deliver his homely homily in the vernacular. This we cannot doubt was an influence for good. There is a proof of it—the beneficent efforts of the Anglo-Saxon church in mitigating and diminishing slavery. We read of English nobles breeding slaves for market in the eleventh century, but, largely owing to the efforts of great churchmen like Lanfranc and Wulfstan, there was express prohibition of the *export* of slaves under William the Conqueror. It is claimed that the medieval church, besides standing for something higher than common life even in its miracle plays and mysteries, was the great leveller. All orders in the church were free by 1500. This is the proudest boast of the Catholic Church: that it was—or became—a democracy; remaining free from the distinctions crystallized in the outer world.

We need not minimize the force of this by hinting that when celibacy was accepted as the rule of Latin Christendom any churchman could be raised to any rank without the drawback of his founding a family of nobles.

We may admit, then, that the church exercised a humanizing influence on feudal society in England, and that the agricultural labourer owed much to its ethics and jurisprudence. Good Archbishop Anselm stood out in 1102 for the abolition of any sale into slavery—whether within or beyond the English seas. From an early period slave-emancipation was recognized as a religious act, though religious corporations were not forward in manumitting their own bondmen. Perhaps it was sacrilegious to diminish the property of Holy Church herself. But churchmen in England made mild landlords. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries one-quarter to a half of the total landed property was in the hands of ecclesiastics. To-day not one-twentieth is in the hands of any or all public bodies, Crown, Church, or Collegiate.

So advantageous was church rule to the tenant that people acquiesced, though not without occasional outbursts, in the fact of

her immense possessions. We may speak favourably of the church as landed proprietor. 'It is one of the glories of the medieval church that it did its best to enfranchise the labourer,' says a writer on the economic aspect of the question. The civilization of the Middle Ages is a civilization, not of castles, but of monasteries. Who can look at that most noble pile of Fountains Abbey without the conviction that its builders and successors did make for life, according to their knowledge and ability? One glance in historical retrospect at what the cloisters alone have meant in English civilization and learning will tell us that. 'The work, too, of a labourer in the fields was never looked on as derogatory to the monastic profession.' The monks themselves worked in field and garden and orchard for a large part of their working hours. The monks and the agricultural labourer were peculiarly in sympathy in the common love of the earth. In some orders, as the Cistercian, to which belonged the great Abbeys of Furness and Fountains, there was much ceremonial over manual tasks, the Prior giving out tools and leading the way to the scenes of digging, planting, weeding, or ploughing. In Cluniac

houses the Abbot came into the midst of his monks assembled at the cloister door, saying *Eamus ad opus manuum*, and together they went to work, the youngest leading the way, singing or saying the Miserere. The monks stood round their Abbot to finish the psalm at the place for work. 'Look down,' said the Abbot, 'upon thy servants and upon thy works, and guide thou thy sons.' The monks answered, 'And may the glory of the Lord our God be upon us, and may he guide us in the works of our hands, and may he guide us in our manual labour.' Then they bowed to the Abbot and to each other and began their tasks.

To wander among the remains of the Cluniac houses in Norfolk, Sussex and Essex, and to picture the simple ritual of the old-time monks before they set to their work of tilling the familiar soil with their hands, might not be a useless religious exercise.

But soon we see a change coming. The Black Death—that incredible epidemic—is the arch-innovator. The surviving labourer rises from among the crowds of his dead fellows master of his fate. The scandalized proprietors in Parliament pass Statutes of Labourers requiring the landless man to work

for any employer at the old wage, forbidding villeins to leave their own parishes. In vain. The struggle begins—the long struggle, which embraces that great medieval socialistic movement in 1381, the Peasants' Revolt, the growth of the towns and their need of farm produce, the new money wages offered to the indispensable labourer, the spreading sense of independence of Lollardy, the preaching of a new gospel of the rights of the poor and the dignity of man by 'Piers Plowman,' the growth of a democratic spirit, the devastation of the baronial classes by the Wars of the Roses, the entry of many descendants of the old villeins into copyhold land property, the emergence of the yeomen—and all resulting in the *divorcing of the underman* more and more from the land.

Then comes the economic crisis and chaos in which the monasteries are dissolved, the tilled lands are turned into pasture, sheep take the place of men, the landowner makes great profits, and the Catholic Church as such quits English society as an establishment for ever. The Poor Law is substituted for the distribution of alms to all comers at the Abbey gate; and instead of a king-like Abbot whose sway has been on the whole

beneficent, rules an individualist proprietor intent on profits. The immense problem has begun. Good old Protestant Latimer sees what is looming ahead. 'Beware of covetousness,' he cries to the court sermon-tasters newly enriched in abbey lands who stand beside the king, 'the cry of the workman is come up to mine ears. For God's love let the workman be paid if there is money enough or else there will whole showers of God's vengeance rain down on your heads.'

The landless and, in too true a sense, the homeless class of labourers has been the growth of centuries, but the full effect of economic causes has not made itself apparent until our day. And it is an ironical fact that the state of the labourer as a free man has got steadily worse. The game of grab has gone on apace. The enclosure of waste lands for use, even if an economically sound practice, has always been the worse for him. In all changes he has been the sufferer. When corn was the cry again the man was neglected. By the accession of George II when, as Macaulay said, 10,000 square miles had been included in cultivated England, there was no compensation for the labourer, who could no longer turn out his pig, fowls,

or geese on the common, and held his cottage at the will of his landlord. In 1819 churchwardens were empowered to let a portion of land to any industrious inhabitant of the parish, to be cultivated by him at a reasonable rent, for a term to be fixed by the vestry; but we find in 1868, when a Commission reported on the employment of women and children and incidentally mentioned the labourer, that a very sparing use had been made of this power. Of the seven million acres enclosed since 1760 only about two thousand had gone to the peasant.

Alfred Russel Wallace told of land which, as a youth, he saw enclosed by the lord of the manor, and which he saw still enclosed sixty years after, and still uncultivated, though the Enclosures Act had provided for cultivating purposes. It is generally admitted by the economists and writers who have of late given so much attention to the agrarian problem from the point of view friendly to the labourer, that the smallest holders of 'rights' enjoyed a certain power of common grazing, turf-cutting, and the like in the 'waste'; and so far, the common field and general rights favoured the poor.

On the other hand, the general public

never possessed any rights in the common field; and, speaking legally, enclosures did not affect them or their claims. In law, the general public, as such, enjoyed no right in land. But insistence has been laid on the importance of a word: 'common' in the face value and import of the word did suggest the common interests of the general public. Though in law it was only definite individuals who had undisputed hold of the common field and established rights of common in the 'waste' of the manor, and the rural public could claim no 'common' rights, privilege being vested in the individual and never in the community, still the word 'common' proved too strong for the law. Even in relatively early days there was a feeling that in some undefined sense 'common' must include the community, and this feeling grew with the progress of democracy. Enclosure, though technically a new distribution of rights among the existing legal possessors, seemed to represent an encroachment on the public as a whole; and the feeling grew so strong that enclosure, except for public purposes, is no longer legal. Thus, it is suggested, by Professor Gonner, in 'Common Land and Enclosure,' to the misinterpretation of a single word is due the fact that large stretches of land have been rescued from private ownership. It may be admitted that the rural poor were not treated so badly as the urban poor in the rise of the vast industrial system. But enclosure was too expensive for the small holder or peasant; at best, the holding went to pay the cost.

Nor was this all. When the rights came to be divided up and small parcels of pasture or the waste were specifically assigned to the poorer members, this often proved so little that it was not worth having. So the small cultivator and yeoman tended to disappear. None thought of the 'bottom' man; the church was no longer interested in him. If enclosure did not lead to depopulation, it is admitted that it rendered employment more precarious and encouraged the already existing drift towards the town. History shows that two hundred years ago the English villager had communal rights in common pasture and common arable land, with rights of fuel and manure in the waste lands. To-day he has not in most cases the shadow of such rights, and the remnant of rights or actual use of privilege is continually being deleted by the immigration of rich villa

residents. The 'needs' of the commercially wealthy blot to the verge of extinction the local rights of the peasant squatters on the soil. The matter is summed up pithily and pathetically in the statement that the agricultural labourer is stranded 'between two civilizations, one of which has vanished with its lost peasant traditions, and the other has not yet brought its modern benefits his way.'

Such is the briefest survey of the history of the labourer. We may imagine his speaking somewhat after this manner: 'I, who am the son of the soil, always wrenching from it bread by my labour, have been the agelong sufferer. I suffered when I was a villein, a mere apanage of the manor. When the law gave me freedom I suffered yet more. The great old church, the Catholic, was indeed in some degree my friend: at least the monks felt for me and with me, for they were my fellow workers. But the Church of England, becoming, or continuing to be (what matters it to me which?) the national church, has utterly neglected me and my interests. It has become the apanage of the upper middle classes. For three and a half centuries it has read to me, stupid and half asleep on the back benches as far as may be from the

squire's pew, the gospel of Jesus and the Sermon on the Mount in my own tongue. It has seen me stunted and stinted, rained on through the roof and poisoned through evil conditions, kept almost to the level of the animals I tended; and it has never, collectively or effectively, taken my helpless side against the powers that kept me as I am. There have been, and there are, noble pillars of the Established Church, who will not allow me to pick up a few sticks broken by the wind in the great park lands they or their forbears have enclosed. The church said no word; the parson seldom interfered for me.

'True religion has not altogether passed me by. The Wesleys and the Whitefields saw that I, too, had a soul, and when the church slept torpidly they called me to some sense of holy things, and so joined hands with the pre-Reformation Catholic. If I, touched from my dullness into Methodism, left my helpless brutality for helpful dissent, then my national church banned me. This church taking millions in tithes, bound to the land, its parishes including *all* the land, beholds me now wandering to the towns; for I have no abiding place where my father lived and my grandsire laboured. It sees the spirit of

democracy, the new sense of human values, touch me, who have become an Ishmael, even me, into a new cry for life. But still the church says no word. The church, whose peculiar care I should have been, has failed me. It has not through all the ranks of its hierarchy made any organized effort for my betterment, either in a sense of justice towards me, or in desire for my fuller life. It has joined hands with privilege and vested interests, and has shared in their class consciousness. I have been of no account, except as I have been dumbly necessary, like the horse which ploughs. As a man, the church has given me doles. As a class, I have no standing on my own mother earth. Now at last, the new humanist, not in contact with the churches, has taken up my cause, and ahead is a glimmer of hope.'

The Church, who has herself profited financially by the labourer's expropriation—game and ring-fences and caste having silenced the gospel—reads the words of the prophets of Israel on their appointed day.

'Hear this, O ye that would swallow up the needy and cause the poor of the land to fail. Shall not the land tremble for this?'

'When ye reap the harvest of your land,

thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of the harvest. And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather the fallen fruit; thou shalt leave them for the poor, the fatherless and the widow. When thou reapest thy harvest and hast forgotten a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it; it shall lie for the stranger, for the fatherless and widow.'

Are there signs to-day of an awaking religious conscience in the Church? The answer must be yes and no. The Church Congress of 1913 devoted a morning to 'The Kingdom of God and Social Order.' Mr. Christopher Turnor, of Stoke Rochford, Grantham, blended the aspirations of the idealist with practical suggestion. He emphasized particularly the fundamental need of the reconstruction of village life. The number of cottages which stand on only two or three poles of ground is enormous, and yet within a stone's throw is often a grass field or an arable field occupied by a farmer, the former containing the cows which produce the milk the villagers cannot buy, and the latter yielding a poor crop of wheat or beans, and sometimes full of twitch and

weeds. Resentment at seeing land which they so sorely need themselves and could make good use of, badly farmed under their very noses, is at the bottom of most of the rural unrest and discontent. We must, said this speaker, begin to think of the smaller farmer, and even more of the labourer. . . . Wages are far too low in many counties; in all opportunities of advancement are few. Every cottage must be sanitary and must have one-eighth to one-quarter of an acre of garden. Adequate cow-keep must be provided for every village, and every man having cow-keep should have an allotment of at least one acre of arable land within easy reach on which to grow his mangolds and his oats for winter keep. There must be a village hall and an active parish meeting. . . . The reconstruction of village life must come through education and religion. 'I would like,' he said, 'to see the church entering more fully into the life of the rural community than it does at present. I would see the clergy . . . less academic and more versed in country life, understanding more the labourer's point of view, and able to give practical assistance in all schemes for rural betterment. In the United States a certain

knowledge of agriculture is becoming more and more a qualification expected of the rural clergyman. The Roman Catholic priests in Belgium give us a great example of what a church can do to develop country life, and I believe it should be possible for our clergy to do as much.' The speaker quoted in conclusion a passage from the Report of the United States Country Life Commission urging the rural church to develop concrete country life ideals, and to recognize its social responsibility.

Mr. C. R. Buxton, formerly M.P. for Mid-Devon, asked his hearers to realize what was meant by an average wage all over England of 17/6 a week, after allowing fully for extras, privileges, and advantages of all kinds. If the Rowntree standard of living was to be accepted, then, to get more physical efficiency, the wage must be something like 20/6 a week—an alarming figure, but it was no use pretending that less would do; for even that figure meant nothing for newspapers, beer, holidays, letter writing, or the wife's occasional shopping in a neighbouring town. Unfortunately it had not seemed to the labourers that the church had realized their condition and taken their side in trying to

improve it. Adequate remuneration of the labourer should always be the first charge on an industry. The church would have a rich reward in any action by her in the reawakened trust of the labourer.

Mr. Charles Bathurst, M.P., dealt with agricultural co-operation as a factor, and by no means the least important, in rural betterment. He incidentally remarked that if all the squires of England, large and small, were to set the example of giving all the labourers in their employment a pound a week, the problem would be more than half solved. Co-operation, he said, should precede and not follow more practical education in rural areas. England was the last of the important countries to apply co-operation to farming.

To criticize from an idealizing aspect what was a blunt practical speech would be manifestly unfair. But one wonders if the Marquess of Salisbury realized the significance of his words at the Church Congress of 1913 on this subject of Rural Betterment, and their saddening implications. 'Good cottages,' he said, 'have not paid for generations.' What a satire is this on both the heart and the intelligence of the country-side,

not excluding the squire! 'Any conceivable rise of wages,' said the Marquess, 'I mean rise which will not cripple the agricultural industry, will be altogether insufficient.' Surely this is to admit that the 'agricultural industry' can only exist by sweating labour. Does Lord Salisbury perceive this? Or does he believe with his brother, Lord Hugh Cecil, speaking on the same day at the Congress on 'The Ethics of Property,' 'that the teaching of the New Testament about poverty is not only that Christians are to relieve poverty, but also that poverty is a more blessed state than riches'? 'This,' said the speaker, 'seems like a paradox, because the church on the one side has to take a lead in putting an end to poverty, and on the other side has to say that poverty is a state of life more favourable to Christian living than riches. . . . The primary duty plainly written [in the parable] is not to save Lazarus from his sufferings, but to save Dives from the fate that awaited him.' There was laughter at this religious witticism. It does not require much imagination to picture the author of the parable answering it. 'The primary duty . . . is not to save Lazarus from his sufferings.' *He* is not the hero of the story; the

universe is naturally chiefly concerned, in this world and the next, about Dives. Who can wonder that such convictions do not bring too quickly into realization Jesus' dream of the kingdom of God! If these speakers really represent in any complete sense their class consciousness, it is well that the democracy of England are already learning the truth and obtaining a grip of the situation.

'Common-sense,' conceded the Marquess of Salisbury, 'of course prescribes as essential that housing should be healthy. Overcrowding is unhealthy, morally and physically. Besides health there is comfort. But why ask the agricultural working class to ask for baths when they do not want baths, and so unnecessarily increase the expense? Or why suggest that the unskilled labourer requires a parlour as well as a kitchen, when he cannot pay rent for a parlour, and every parlour added means less cottages on the whole? Neither baths nor parlours are the saving of souls, nor do they even make any substantial difference in the public health. But unless you reduce expenditure to a minimum you cannot solve the problem. Health is an essential consideration, but in comfort you

must cut your coat according to your cloth. Then with rather higher wages and rather cheaper construction, we may reduce the difficulty to manageable proportions.'

> Even the luckless Gadarene,
> Preferring swine to Christ, may learn
> That life is sweetest when 'tis clean.

But not apparently the English labourer. The universe has satisfactorily achieved baths at Hatfield, as is due to the family who adorn it, but to do the same in the labourer's cottage would be an evidence of cosmic short-sightedness. It is true, no doubt, that neither baths nor parlours save souls; corroboration of that fact may be obtained from the mansions to which, however, they seem to be appropriate—'other-worldliness' notwithstanding. We cannot wonder that a woman speaker who followed on these deliverances said that she knew the clergy had their difficulties. They were afraid of turning away the churchwarden or of offending the squire.

Evidently *religious* education is poignantly needed. It will not be inappropriate to close this chapter with one of the points in the address of the President of the Congress on 'The Kingdom in the World,' setting forth

the episcopal idea of the fundamental truth :

'We can distinguish such principles as these : The value of each human life in man, woman and child : the value and the equal value. Political or social applications of this spiritual truth and principle might be unwise because premature ; or they might be neglectful of other truths, such as the truth of differing function or endowment. But it is a fundamental truth. They who have the advantage of it are bound to pass on to others the power and advantage of it.' . . . 'The opposition to the kingdom is individually in our own breasts, and corporately in the faults of our own class, party, or nation ; and the twofold attitude of self-judgment and championship ought to characterize kingdom and church. But if the kingdom is a crusade, and they who serve it need a crusading spirit, the kingdom is also a building, and even more properly and deeply an organism and a growth, and in the growing and in the building as well as in the fighting, the church must have a leading part and they in the church.'

If this is true, the land problem presents itself for all the crusading and building the church can compass. 'As a corporation,'

writes the Rev. C. W. Lloyd Evans, vicar of Milborne St. Andrews, 'the Church of England is one of the great landowners in the country. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners own on behalf of the church a great deal more land than is commonly supposed. . . . If the present land system is wrong (and no thoughtful man will argue otherwise) the clergy should be foremost in pressing for reform. As long as we remain passive, waiting for a reform, we are answerable. Has the church no message to her sons, or is the primitive and apostolical conception that the poor are the real treasure of the church a dead letter ? A church built on prerogatives must fall, whether they are state or land prerogatives. The true support of the church is the hearts of the people—the humble labourer, the artisan, as well as the squire or lordling.'

Chapter VII

ORGANIZED RELIGION AND MODERN INDUSTRIALISM

IF, as has been suggested, it is on the whole fair to say that the Anglican Church cannot be freed from historical responsibility for the condition of the agricultural labourer, it will be found that the Puritan and his successor the Nonconformist cannot be disconnected with responsibility for the miserable plight of the lowest strata of industrial workers. The history of England since the days of Charles I and the Commonwealth shows that to Protestantism in the widest sense and to its Puritan adherents in a somewhat narrower sense is due the *rise of individualism*. The economic consideration of this movement illustrates both the native glory and the incidental disgrace attendant upon the incomplete emergence of the 'independent' man. It is perhaps not necessary

to assume that the successive stages from medieval feudalism to modern industrialism were inevitable. The facts are indisputable.

If it is true that the course of legislative action together with the apathy of the Established Church—whose prerogative and privilege it was to be termed national—has resulted in a landless peasantry, and that the people in their collective aspect are faced with the problem of raising the rural labourer from a position of absolute zero to some acknowledged place on the earth, so it is just as true that the policy of Puritan individualism has left the people with a similar problem in respect of the industrial worker.

The plight of men, women and children in the early days of the Lancashire cotton trade marks the terrible and complete absence of soul from the industrial sphere. Here the wave of depression sank deeper and sooner than the wave of depression of the land, and a gradual rise began earlier in time. It is possible that the evils consequent upon individualism righted themselves more quickly than the evils inherent in absolutism, because the more the value of the individual became convincing the sooner arose the human claim for betterment.

The religion of Jesus before the 'establishment' of Christianity showed an approach to the ideal of citizenship; but this citizenship was rather in heaven than upon earth. With the alliance of church and empire a new view arose. Jesus had not by a second advent fulfilled the fond hopes of his early followers, and with the church no longer a persecuted minority but in the ascendant there came a new way of looking at public affairs. It was not now counted so irreligious to be in the world; the tendency for the Christian to hold aloof from the transitory business of life diminished. But his mystical union with Christ had obliterated for him the identity formerly existing of earthly citizenship with a man's particular religion, or with religion.

There was this difference between Christianity and Stoicism as philosophies: Stoic cosmopolitanism may be said to have overstepped Roman citizenship as the Roman Empire overstepped the old Latin and Italian states which were once identical with the Roman. But the Stoic cosmopolitan, however comprehensive he might claim to be, was an earthly citizen still. The early Christian laid stress on citizenship of an invisible city, and so tended to look on the world as an untoward

necessity. He did not see the divine in the human; he yearned for the divine out of all earth relation. The invisible world was to him the real world; he sought the continuing city to come. When the visible church became strongly organized, it assumed the claims of the invisible city on the terrestrial plane.

This change of view, with the elevation of the formerly oppressed into the possible position of oppressor, this qualified acquiescence in an earthly and local abode, was fraught with great issues. The church became imbued with the ideals of its ally, the empire; and as the succession of events demonstrates it soon out-imperialized the empire itself. By degrees, to speak to the aspect with which we are immediately concerned, the church, by its canon law and its prince bishops, invaded and appropriated large portions of that 'secular' sphere which the earlier Christian had counted alien to his peculiarly celestial province; and so we find that earthly power became for long ages the constant tradition of the church.

Democratic evolution has usually taken place in spite of and as opposed to the aristocratic principle of ecclesiasticism. Its pioneers have generally been unorthodox,

acting from frankly human motives. A certain number of admirable humanists within the church have sympathized with these pioneers, but the main body has kept apart from the movement and distrusted it. It has identified itself with the 'divine right' of monarchy, and 'No bishop, no king' was the logical outcome. The vital issue of the English Civil War was between absolute monarchical and ecclesiastical government on the one side and the rights of the citizens on the other. And these 'rights' were not only religious and constitutional but also economic. That the economic factor was not ostensibly so much to the fore is no proof that it was not active and insistent. 'Before the Civil War and at each subsequent reactionary impulse of the later Stuarts the English people suffered positive damage from the interference of the national church in economic matters. Where there were Nonconformists to suppress, the Episcopalian haggled neither at the use of economic weapons to enforce conformity nor at actual injury to trade.' Religious, civic, and economic issues became inextricably mingled; and though it was in the name of religion that the church persecuted and the Puritan

suffered; though it was for the sake of religion that the Puritan was ready 'to undergo pillory, commercial boycott, heavy fines,' and the wrench of emigration from his native land; nevertheless, it was the 'divine right' of taxation that so grievously embittered the civic conscience and actually emitted the spark which led to the explosion of civil war.

The most concise and acute survey from the trade aspect is presented by Dr. Hermann Levy in his recent work, 'Economic Liberalism.' Having worked the same historical field, I gladly pay tribute to the value of Dr. Levy's book. The sixteenth century was indeed, he says, a period of religious strife; but the triumph of ecclesiastical independence affected politics, and the individualism of religious emancipation not only directly involved constitutional emancipation, but instituted an era of economic independence.

The history of the seventeenth century affords conclusive proof of the present argument that the *fruits of all liberty are rooted in the conscious freedom of religious thought.* Monopoly is the alpha and omega of absolutist theories; arbitrary decree always supplants reasoned assent; the exercise of authority is always at the expense of private

judgment. Opposition to absolutism arose from the House of Commons and the Puritans. These came to be committed to the rights, liberty, and self-development of the individual in religious and political matters, and in consequence in economic relations also. After 1650 the religious motive was fully projected into the arena of economic problems. Just as to the treatment of trade matters the Crown had brought its ideal of absolute monarchy, the High Church its idea of an all-embracing hierarchy, so after many days the Man who revolted in religion applied his free religious claims to the attainment of an independent course in matters of trade. Leslie Stephen suggests with obvious reason that 'the squire was interested in the land and the church; the merchant thought more of commerce and was apt to be a Dissenter.'

Hence *some species of individualism* was the natural avenue of emergence from the fetters of feudalism. It came to be recognized that the most active traders were schismatic. It was among the industrial middle classes and the growing class of merchants that dissenters from the church establishment were to be found. In the reactionary days of the later Stuart times

'the gaols were crowded with the most substantial tradesmen and inhabitants; the clothiers were forced from their homes; and thousands of workmen and women whom they employed set to starving.' 'In every country,' says another writer, 'the most active traders are heterodox.' In 1719 'those who differ from the Established Church are generally of the lowest rank, mechanics, artificers, and manufacturers.' The result was a great desire and appeal to be let alone, and this as a natural and logical consequence of former medieval arbitrary despotisms.

The Dissenters began to regard individual private activities as a 'calling' making for the honour of God, honest profits as a distinction, and industry as an essential moral and religious duty. They believed that labour and industry formed their duty towards God. This devotion to business was directly accentuated by their exclusion from public office and 'positions of honour.' It is significant that in the eighteenth century, that age of intellectualism, Malthus, an Anglican clergyman, distrusted human capability, and Godwin, once a heretical dissenting minister, was imbued with a hopeful confidence that man can be trusted. The upshot

of theories of independence, religious, civic, economic, was a trust in the unfettered exercise of the desires and needs of the individual. Man if left to himself will come out right. That sentiment became the axiom of the subsequent political economy.

It is not intended to trace the details of industrial history of three centuries. It is sufficient to say that those individuals who were well equipped by ability or other advantage did come out successfully, and could find no fault with the 'mercantile' assumption that commercial independence is as desirable as political independence, and can be as plainly secured. Nor had the interested classes any cause to dispute the arguments of the economist school which claimed that the present arrangements by which wealth is created and public forces utilized are inherent natural laws, irrespective of time; are in fact eternal laws, which must always rule society. They would receive with entire acquiescence Adam Smith's dictum that working men, having no considerable property, are 'under the necessity of submitting themselves for the sake of present subsistence,' to the terms offered them by their employers. And they would

not dispute with any animus his generous plea that 'servants, labourers, and workmen of different kinds make up the far greater part of every great political society. But what improves the circumstances of the greater part can never be regarded as an inconsistency to the whole. No society can surely be flourishing and happy of which the far greater part of the members are poor and miserable. It is but equity, besides, that they [the labourers] who feed, clothe, and lodge the whole body of the people should have such a share in the produce of their own labour as to be themselves tolerably well fed, clothed, and lodged.'

Any latent dissatisfaction of the prosperous at this plea for the welfare of the others would be swallowed up in the satisfaction that the public benefit could conveniently be secured by the commercial ambition of men aiming purely at private interest, so that all things were beautiful and in order. In pursuance of this theory the more enlightened among them could advise the workers to be temperate, to work hard, and to have small families. The utilitarian principle that the individual is infallible in following his interest was irrefutable and timely.

It is no wonder that *the underman fell lower and lower*. With a meaning perhaps unperceived by Adam Smith how true it has proved that the interest of the labourer lies, as does the interest of the other classes, in the prosperity of the country; but—'the labourers are incapable from their circumstances of understanding the public interest and its connexion with their own.' They had none to plead their cause—except, indeed, that 'prodigy of crime,' declared by Lord Chancellor Eldon to be so highly immoral as to be unfit to take charge of his own offspring, the poet Shelley.

> The seed ye sow another reaps;
> The wealth ye find another keeps;
> The robes ye weave another wears;
> The arms ye forge another bears.

So he cried 'To the Men of England,' to the unutterable horror and detestation of the cultivated intelligence of the country.

Economists were the spokesmen chiefly of capitalists, farmers, and manufacturers; there was no spokesman among the labourers for the labourer. He was not asked as to the truth or untruth of an alleged double share of original sin in him, disinclining him

to work; or as to sloth being the sole necessary explanation of able-bodied poverty; or as to unemployment being simply the result of his own laziness; or as to whether his own general imperfection was not the sufficient and comprehensive cause of all his wretchedness. He had never read that pamphlet of 1675, 'The Grand Concern of England explained,' where 'the mischief of high wages to handicraftsmen' is discussed, and the remedy suggested in 'setting the poor to work and then these men will be forced to lower their rates.' The ordinary worker could only be the passive victim of the postulate that *low wages are economically desirable*. If by any chance the logic of working at particularly low wages for articles of export was borne in on him, the fact about it that would be most striking to him was the depletion, poor creature, of his own pocket, and not the treasury of his employer.

The patriarchal condition of affairs, in which the very lowest had the right to his place, was gone; the 'survival of the fittest' became the underlying if not the expressed economic standard. The pious did not connect this state of affairs with their religion, and if the infidel Shelley glimpsed the conse-

quences of the brotherhood of man that was only further proof of his atheism. Even the 'charity' to the poor worker of the older absolutist system was gone ; there were no longer men like the old Papist employers who gave the poor 'earnest money.' And here it is just to record that in the year 1648 Anglican Cooke had made the wonderful suggestion that each merchant should give four to twelve pence of his profits to the poor. 'The truest charity is to relieve such a man [the needy, labouring, mechanical man] and to lend this man money to buy him a cow, a sheep and a hog or some such necessaries, and,' Cooke adds, with a religious insight that is truly astonishing, 'if the kingdom were in a gospel frame every man would quickly be provided for.' But we do not find any eager response among the merchants or any greater inclination of the kingdom towards a 'gospel frame.'

We cannot wonder that after this long and stern apotheosis of the independent economic man the nineteenth century burst out into the clamour of Chartism, Socialism, and Communism. In 1848, the leading journal could say, 'The right and privilege of the English artisan is that he can carry his labour to the

market, where it will fetch its price, just as oil and tallow or any other commodity.' The utter irreligiousness of such language in an age of organized evangelicalism and religiosity strikes us now with amazement. The statement that man was made 'in the image of God' was received by the vast majority as being literally and verbally true. But its logical consequences were not perceived at all, and the human touched zero.

The industrial labourer stands side by side with the agricultural labourer to utter the same indictment of religion, and with the same pathos. It is of course a fact, however, that the industrial indictment cannot be directed so inclusively against the Free Churchman as the peasant's indictment against the Established Church. The Free Churchman has only come lately into political power: in the House of Commons his voice has been in the minority, and in the House of Lords almost entirely unheard. But once the case is placed before the Free Churchman, however dimly he may perceive the implications, onus is especially laid on him to be up and doing, for he cannot plead privilege. His theory of man needs a much wider, deeper, and more spiritual application.

Fortunately for religion the Free Churches are awaking. The note of human value is being sounded without uncertainty, and in the sound the *Puritan principle of individuality* must be extended, and extended to all classes of human society. The claim which has recently been advanced must be made good: 'An essential doctrine of Protestantism is that the decent living of the labourer shall be a first charge on an industry.' This has not been true of the past, but it will become true if Free Churchmen so will it.

The social reproach attached to Protestantism will be done away when the theory of individualism in the full sense of human individuality is not applied merely to certain favoured classes, but becomes effective for each and every worker in all classes. Practical religion is demanding of Protestantism that it should definitely acknowledge the brotherhood of man.

The new order amounts to this: if society permits such a monopoly of the land that a brother man has no room to live and no chance to make his way to a position of independence and freedom, then religion lays it down as our duty to fight that man's battle. If society permits the poor and the

helpless to be sweated and compelled for the sake of mere food to labour under such conditions as shorten life, destroy health, and atrophy the soul, then religion lays it down as our duty to abolish those conditions.

This is a truism, but it is a matter of common experience that it is a dangerous and novel idea to many 'religious' people. They will willingly acquiesce in the sentiment of the brotherhood of man, but when it comes to the right of particular brothers to lead human lives, a sudden dubiousness surrounds the question. 'I could point to a philanthropist or two,' remarks Mr. Bernard Shaw, with characteristic candour—'even to their statues—whom posterity, should it ever turn from admiring the way they spent their money to considering the way they got it, will probably compare very unfavourably with Guy Fawkes.' Shaw's lashes have got home even to the routine-ridden consciousness, and what he would call the stupid self-satisfaction which opposes reform as a matter of principle. But it has not been sufficiently pressed home to the 'religious classes' that social reform is religious, and that for the 'religious man' to acquiesce comfortably in the economic damnation of his brother is a

practical proclamation of his own 'religion' as an established untruth.

At the Autumn Assembly of the Baptist Union (1913) the following resolution was passed unanimously: 'That Labour Unrest demands the earnest and immediate attention of the Christian church, that an appeal for justice ought not to be ignored, and that the insistent application of Christ's law of love to the crying painful problems of modern industrial life must secure for all, not only the right to a decent living, but that such living shall be the first charge upon every industry.'

This encouraging resolution has not been without influence on other Nonconformist communities. That the worker's wage shall be a living wage and a first charge upon every industry has justified itself to the moral sincerity of many congregations touched with the modern spirit. In the consciousness that multitudes are doomed to a maimed life below the standard of human dignity, it is safe to say: 'Democracy may be upon its trial; the Christian church is upon its trial also.' James Larkin, 'agitator,' did more for the social kingdom of God in Ireland than the churches. With whatever waywardness and unrestrained impulses, he proved his soul in the face of the oppressed.

There seems reason to hope that the social enthusiasm of the best minds, however, is beginning to penetrate the peculiar and callous utilitarianism which has long characterized the churches; and in some cases at any rate to dissipate the economic conventions which have so curiously seemed compatible with the religious outlook. The religious non-conformist is beginning to see that he must burst the bonds of any conformity which strangles the life of even the poorest man in the kingdom. The least in the new social order must be greater than the best in the old. Just as it has become imperative that the free human spirit should fling off the old external dogmatisms and official absolutisms because they are now too straitening, so, economically, industry, in order to be humanly free and expansive, must break the old industrial monopolies; for liberty which only meant liberty to starve in a world of unrelated human beings was a mere negation of the life-force of the people.

It has long been the fashion to say that 'sentimentalism' must not enter into industrial relations. The modern view of the

social question no longer excludes the emotional intuitions from their legitimate place in the social development. The acceptance of man by man is a part of the new spiritual utterance of human values. A callous world, a selfish world, an obtuse world, begins to hear a new voice of the human conscience. *Men matter.* That the churches should have arrived, even if only here and there, or under this or that ministry, at a practical recognition of this thing, is the most interesting as well as the most significant sign in modern religious thinking and living.

The President of the Church Congress (1913) asked: 'Did the Ex-President of the Congress [1912] use light or false words at Middlesbrough when he spoke of the extraordinary apathy and sloth of the average member of the Church of England on these questions of paramount public and social importance?' Bishop Gore has again answered the question. Speaking in support of the new organization for promoting Women's Trade Unions, he said: 'When I look back upon the history of the church in the matter of labour conditions I am filled with great shame. In the lower sense of charity we have been trying to pick up the wounded in

the industrial struggle and heal them; but we have almost all neglected the prior duty of thundering at the gates of tyranny. We have not stood up for the poor. Why was it left for Mr. Larkin, when there was a church in Dublin which rightly claims to be the church of the poor, to call attention to the appalling condition of things in the Dublin industry through all those years? In England we have covered the country with our parishes. We claim to know all about every district in the country, and to have an officer of the church in every parish with this singular opportunity. Why did not the Church of England, with its great parish organization, years ago appear manifestly before the country, telling what it knew about the housing conditions and the condition of wages of the agricultural labourer? Why, when Mr. Arch was in the field forty years, did not the church stand out and say, "This is the merest claim of justice"? I do not think we can look back with pride in these matters on the progress of our own church, and the revival of church life in this country. There is a great act of repentance and reparation which it is not yet too late for us to make.'

Such is the fine note struck by the Bishop of Oxford—a great call to attention. The voices in the wilderness are being heard in Nonconformist churches, also, and their action is beginning.

CHAPTER VIII

RELIGION AND THE SWEATED WOMAN WORKER

'SOME little time ago I beheld paraded through the streets of London an enormous banner, followed by a multitude of Chartists. On this purple banner, and in letters of gold, one might read the motto—"A fair day's wages for a fair day's work." A more modest motto, you will say, was never displayed in purple and gold. A more impossible demand was never made. No legislative power on earth can give them their fair day's wages for their fair day's work. They must look after that matter, each one for himself. Nay, if Parliament, in her omnipotence, should settle what shall be a fair day's work and a fair day's wages, Parliament must next consult the gods and mother earth to know if these recognize the tariff. Your work and your wages are finally settled

—somewhere out of Parliament. But if this clamour rises, if this motto becomes a popular faith, then wealth in England will also take the alarm ' (Seckendorf in ' Thorndale, or the Conflict of Opinions,' written in 1850).

This reads strangely to us now, those of us who know something of saving discontent, and see behind economics the bodies and souls of men, women, and children. Yet the author of ' Thorndale ' was himself a heretic in many directions. He has studied the ' best writers on political economy,' and finds, according to their ideas, that it is impossible to benefit by raising wages by legislative means ; with a fixed wage fund the result would be to starve some labourers in order to feed others better ; that if, urged by benevolence, you extend charity to all who need it—if you give to the wants of one man a claim on the superfluities of another—*if mere poverty should have its rights*—you would bring speedy ruin on the whole society.

It is a hard doctrine, the writer reflects, this of self-reliance, when taught to the lowest and weakest ; it is a hard struggle that the poor have to maintain ; yet if the struggle is not kept up there where precisely it is

hardest, the whole machinery gives way, goes wrong, or scarcely will go at all. And the only ground on the economic premisses on which any systematic charity can be justified is this : that there is an improvidence of despair worse than that improvidence which your benevolence will foster ; for the despairing creature lives and propagates with brutal apathy. Our system has a completeness of its own. Each one for himself and a law that keeps the peace. A great game is played of getting and keeping. The system has its excitements, though the game goes hard against some of the players and there is from time to time a dreadful outcry against the rules of the game. ' Some start with so poor a chance.' The system, however, is not one to be lightly meddled with. ' But,' adds the writer, ' I would say, communing with myself, cannot I see lying out there on the golden shores of futurity, a quite different system—one which shall consecrate the principle of labouring for the good of some whole of which we constitute a part—a quite different organization, based on an intelligent and equitable co-operation ? "Aide toi, le ciel t'aidera " is thought a good maxim. If instead of " help yourself " we

read "help yourselves" would it not be a better formula? and would not all good influences and the whole scheme of nature be as likely to conspire with us?'

This sympathetic and prophetic interest in a democratic future in which will and character are to work creatively through co-operative institutions (almost an anticipation of T. H. Green) forms a fitting exordium to the present and following chapters. The 'golden shores of futurity' still lie beyond, but they have been brought a step nearer by the awakening of society to those who start with the poorest chance of all: the sweated women workers. As a direct outcome of the horror aroused by the Sweated Industries' Exhibition in London under the auspices of *The Daily News*, the National Anti-Sweating League was founded. As a branch of this the Liverpool Anti-Sweating League came into existence in 1907, and emphasized three main points: (1) The promotion of the Sweated Industries Bill (now the Trade Boards Act of 1909); (2) The organizing of women's labour; (3) The rousing and educating of public opinion on the whole subject.

It was quickly seen that the poor woman worker was entirely helpless by herself, and

had no helpers. She had no power, will, time, opportunity, or money to co-operate or organize with others placed as she was. The Liverpool League appointed two organizers; and the adoption of the essential function of organization and the creation of women's trade unions necessitated a formal severance from the National Anti-Sweating League which considered such an undertaking as either impossible or outside its immediate scope. Events have justified the policy of the Liverpool League; and the National League has prolonged its existence in order to aid in the extension of the schedules of the Trade Board. What was deemed incongruous or impossible by the heterogeneous committee of the National League is now about to be attempted by another association of the more ardent and advanced spirits on the National Anti-Sweating League committee, along with other advanced humanitarians. In November, 1913, publicity was given to a conference, the subject of which was (1) To raise a fund to secure satisfactory industrial representation on the Boards to sit for the fixing of a minimum wage in regard to four newly scheduled 'sweated' industries; (2) To

organize the workers for the forwarding of their interests as wage-earners.

It was clear to the promoters of the Liverpool Anti-Sweating League that Women's Unions, of whatever nature, were absolutely imperative, whether precedent to the governmental establishment of any Trade Board, or subsequent to such establishment.

The pamphlet incorporated in this book was printed and published for the Liverpool League in 1912, and the present writer is responsible for the facts stated and the opinions expressed therein. The pamphlet was quoted in the House of Commons, and so far as the writer is aware no question has been raised as to the accuracy of any single statement. If any apology is needed for the inclusion of these pages it is to be found in the fact that no survey, however brief, of the social conditions of this country, regarded from a national, humanitarian, or religious point of view, can possibly ignore that unspeakable tragedy of the underworld: *the tragedy of the sweated woman*. It is astonishing, here again, that organized religion has not taken up her cause. The thought of the sweated woman should have pursued religion, in Mazzini's phrase, 'like a remorse.' As a

matter of fact, it has been impossible to raise any sympathy or interest in the matter in the churches as a whole, even with the powerful advocacy of the present Bishop of Lichfield, who at the time of the League's inauguration, was Canon and Rector of Liverpool. The sympathy and support has come from a few individuals; mostly, it must be said, 'heretics' from the point of view of the orthodox churches. The attitude of organized religion on the whole pitiable subject has been more than unimaginative; it has been, as Carlyle said of democracy, paralytic.

Minimum Wages in the Paper Box Trade

'The *Board of Trade Labour Gazette* announces that the Board of Trade have made an order, dated September 12, making obligatory the minimum time rate of wages for female workers in Great Britain employed in the making of boxes, or parts thereof, made wholly or partially of paper, cardboard, chip, or similar material, fixed on March 11, 1912, by the Paper Box Trade Board (Great Britain). These rates are 3d. per hour for female workers, other than learners, and

from 4s. to 10s. 6d. per week of fifty-two hours for female learners, according to age and experience. It is remarked that any agreement for the payment of wages at less than the above-mentioned minimum rates, clear of all deductions, will be henceforth void.

'Henceforth the penalty for paying wages at rates less than those which have now been made obligatory by the Board of Trade will be a fine not exceeding £20 for each offence, and in addition the worker will be entitled to all arrears. In certain circumstances, however, the Trade Board may, in the case of time-workers who are affected by infirmity or physical injury, grant permits exempting their employment from the operation of the minimum time rate.'

I propose to make this announcement my basis and my starting-point.

In the first place, it will be instructive to detail the steps which have made this basis possible. The Paper Box Trade was one of the four trades scheduled as definitely within the scope of the Trade Boards Act. Those who have read the reports of the Liverpool Anti-Sweating League are aware that the establishment of Trade Boards was the

immediate object of the founders of the League; though they had the foresight to educate the workers into an appreciation of the importance of the Act, and all along have strenuously laboured for the formation of Women's Trade Unions. Usually the wages in the Paper Box Trade amounted to sums which mainly ranged from 8s. to 9s. per week, and these sums were only gained, it must be noted, when work was abundant. The average wage was about 8s. per week—being the full pay for a full week's work. Now that the award under the Act is legalized, the wage is a minimum of 13s. per week, if of 52 hours. This is at the rate of 3d. per hour. A little calculation will serve to elicit the fact that this is equivalent to an increase of fifty per cent in wages. Being compulsory, it bears evenly upon all employers. Before this award, an employer could undercut his rivals in the industrial market by 'sweating' his employees. This is no longer possible, for the Act is a legislative, opportune, and overdue brake upon the rampant evils of unrestricted competition.

If there be any doubt as to the truth of this sad expression 'rampant evils' read and ponder over the tragedy implied in the

words spoken by a layman at the meeting of the Congregational Union, and reported 17 October, 1912. He declared :—

'That while the present condition of things existed, it was morally impossible for a Christian employer to do as he would with his labour. With undue competition, over-production, and a whole host of other iniquities, they were obliged to sweat labour. They could not pay a living wage, and evolution from the Christian Church, or revolution, not necessarily violent, were the only alternatives, and labour was tending towards the latter.'

The general application of the principle of the Trade Boards Act to all low-paid labour will prove an immense lever in the process of amelioration. For what is wrongly termed over-production may not be so frequent, (i) when better rates of pay are earned by the worker, and (ii) when the worker is thus better able to become a purchaser. There can be no doubt in the mind of any social student that the granting of Old Age Pensions has proved no inconsiderable factor in the steadying of trade. For what manufacturers and distributors obviously need most is a permanent rise in the

buying power of the whole community.

The question now comes: To what industries and occupations may the Trade Boards Act be extended? Chain Making and Lace Making have already their final awards, whilst 'proposals' have been provisionally put forward by the Tailoring Board.

What of others? More especially, what is the condition of the women workers in Liverpool—the city and district which is the particular sphere of our influence?

If we take as a minimum standard the award in the Card Box industry, that of 13s. a week, which, significantly enough, is the amount of weekly income of which the 5s. a week Old Age Pension may form a part, we find an unholy and uneconomic position. There are perhaps 100,000 women workers in Liverpool and district. I have given very careful study to all the available statistics, and if I say that 50,000 earn under the 13s. standard, I believe I am distressingly accurate. When responsible women acquainted with the life of the people assign 7s. as an average weekly wage for women's work throughout the country, my calculation for Liverpool cannot be swept aside as a mere sentimental opinion.

But before entering upon a specification of sweated and distressful trades, it will be well to ask—

Why are Women so badly paid?

The question is a preliminary necessity in order that we may have a grasp of the social and economic situation.

1. To the individual woman, the employer certainly tends to offer a lower wage than to the individual man when both are seeking to fill similar places and perform equal work.

2. He does this because of woman's fatal readiness to offer herself as a cheap labourer. That is to say—the woman is taken at her own modest estimate of her worth; she is looked upon as a curious and docile kind of working animal; and her labour is requited at the cheapest rates.

3. The history of women's wages is the narration of a continuity of practical serfdom. The household, without direct pay, is still considered to be the place of woman; and when she steps into the industrial arena, it is convenient for the employer to assume that she is still within the circle of domestic support, and that she emerges merely for his convenience.

4. The woman, as paid industrial worker, thus appears spasmodically and irregularly, and consequently her work has hitherto never been regulated, and is not yet put upon a strict commercial and business footing. 'Only in a carefully regulated profession,' says a chief Woman Sanitary Inspector, 'like that of medicine, can present-day women escape from the consequence of the century-long self-depreciation of those women who preceded them.'

5. The separate individuality of women is acknowledged with dubious hesitation; and notwithstanding the Married Women's Property Act of thirty years ago, the principle underlying that Act receives only tardy recognition. Woman is still treated too much as a 'chattel.' Nothing will serve save the frank and practical expression of the equality of human beings in matters political, civic, and social.

These considerations bring us logically to another preliminary question: *Are there any existing ethics of employing? Do any responsibilities rest upon employers?*

Speaking generally, and especially in reference to women, the *ethics are non-existent*, and the *responsibilities are unfelt*. The em-

ployer acknowledges a relationship, but it is only the relationship of a capitalistic impersonality to an aggregate of human working machines. The disclosures of tyranny, unquestioned and therefore termed unquestionable, in regard to 'approved' societies under the Insurance Act, constitute painful examples of the low estimation in which the woman worker is held. Masters have invited or at least allowed into their works the agents of Insurance Societies; the women have been a compelled audience; and have not been able to call their souls their own. Why? it may be asked. Because these girls and women are so much afraid of affording even a suggestion of excuse for the dreaded and dreadful dismissal that they acquiesce like the soulless automata they are indeed considered to be. Masters have directly forbidden their workwomen to enter 'approved' societies which are connected with Trade Unions. Some of the bolder spirits have nevertheless followed their own judgment, and these pioneers of independence have often prevailed upon their hesitating sisters to follow their justifiable lead. This is well illustrated by an incident which took place at the room of the Liverpool Anti-Sweating

League one day. The door opened; in came a worker at the head of three bashful followers. With an air of complete triumph the brave leader exclaimed, pointing proudly to the retinue, 'I've saved three!' Nor is it three only that have been put into personal touch with an 'approved' society in connexion with the Women's Trade Unions; the efforts of the two organizers have resulted in upward of 700 Liverpool women joining such 'approved' societies. Before the formation of the League such an achievement would have been impossible.

And when it is obvious that woman is beginning to occupy an ever-increasing area of the provinces of industry, thinking and sympathetic citizens will perceive the imperative need of a living wage, not merely as being paid to living workers, but as being paid for such labour as is both honourable in itself and necessary to the well-being of the State. For whilst no one desires any private individual to employ workers at a financial loss (and indeed few such altruistic employers exist), every one must call for a due return in wages for services rendered. Further, the question of the financial equivalent of work performed must be totally severed from any

consideration of *the number of workers* who would be ready to offer themselves for that particular industrial function. This equivalent ought to be what the employer would be willing to pay if he were competing with his fellow employers for the rank and file of women workers. That is to say, just as the employer is then likely to offer for labour a price somewhat approaching its real value to him—such a price as he would pay rather than go without the labour—so we maintain such a price should become the normal because it is the just standard. Only the existence of strong Women's Unions will be able to extract and compel this common measure of justice, but meanwhile there is to hand, in the establishment of a Minimum Wage for any particular industry, a ready means of partial betterment. It is this we are now advocating.

In the light of what has been laid down the reader should be capable of appreciating the need and the obligation of a legal minimum wage. Nothing remains but to learn the facts concerning woman's wages in our city. And these stern facts form a depressing and ghastly record.

We remember the assertion that half the

women workers of Liverpool do not earn a wage sufficient to satisfy in any sense the modest wants of human life. Let me indicate the data upon which I make this appalling statement. I will cite only from what has come under my own personal investigation.

The manageress of a shop gets 9s. a week; her assistant, aged 25, is granted 5s. Another woman 'manages' a bread shop and keeps the books for 8s. a week. Take a bird's eye view of the multiplicity of shops where such wages are paid in Liverpool, and endeavour to imagine the humiliating human result.[1]

A girl of 18 at the pay desk in a leading store gets 5s. a week. Through her hands pass notes and cash to an extent of hundreds of pounds in a day. She is responsible for losses. One evening she is found short of a five pound note. After a threat of the police and various insulting suggestions of

[1] The Co-operative movement, through three Congresses, has declared that the following scale of wages for women employées ought to be adopted by all Co-operative Societies:—

Age	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Wage	5/-	7/-	9/-	11/-	13/-	15/-	17/-

The Toxteth and City of Liverpool Co-operative Societies have adopted this scale as a minimum wage. Manageresses are to get 20s. a week.

thieving and evil company, the girl is at length liberated from examination and the shop after 11 o'clock. The note is found amongst other papers the next morning, and the girl is dismissed. A reference to the firm is permitted!

Riveters at a tin canister factory average from 5s. to 6s. a week. The medical man is frequently called in to attend to accidents. If these girls are led to destruction, it is not by a 'primrose way.'

Two instances out of many such may be given from dressmaking. (X) aged 18: 6s. per week of 63 hours; expert hand. (Y) aged 18: 7s. per week of 63 hours; 4½ years' experience.

We may note that three years as a learner in the Card Box Trade enables the worker to claim 13s. per week of 52 hours. And what a pitiful budget after all is one on the comparatively munificent sum of 13s. per week may be discerned in 'Accounts of Expenditure of Wage-earning Women and Girls: Presented to Parliament by Command of His Majesty,' price 5d., or in the Report for 1911 of the Liverpool Anti-Sweating League.

In the Bookbinding and Stationery Trade

even the maximum wage is often not more than 10s. It will be remembered that much public attention was given at the time to the case of two sisters who went off with the Mormons. One was a bookbinder earning 6s. a week.

In a soap factory the average is 9s. In the confectionery business the average is from 8s. to 9s. Bottle washers get 6s. 6d. per week of 9½ hours a day.

So the industrial account runs its suggestive course. There are better payments and worse in identical occupations, depending apparently on the arbitrary decision of the employer. It is clear that a legal minimum wage would equalize conditions, and the better employer would not be penalized for his less grinding capacity.

But there are two industries on which to dwell particularly as typical of many large business undertakings:—

(A) is a most respectable wholesale concern. Taking women only, I give ages and wages:—

Age 19 .. 8s.		
,, 20 .. 8s.		
,, 21 .. 9s.		Women of 40 years of age (with twenty years' continuous service) get 9s. a week.
,, 23 .. 9s.		
,, 26 .. 9s.		

This firm insists that applicants for work shall produce a testimonial from a Sunday school teacher, a clergyman, or a minister. That means nothing less than that all the virtues of the Christian armoury are demanded and supplied—for 8s. or 9s. a week.

Charles Booth, in his 'London,' tells us that the A.B.C. shops of the day exacted a declaration from their assistants that they were members of a good respectable home. This was a guarantee of proper standing, as well as an excuse for meagre pay. And just lately a restaurant proprietor, holding several large establishments in our own city, told me, without any consciousness of shame, that all his girls had 'good homes.' It is an excellent thing that girls should have good homes, but it is a shameless thing to presume that commercial shortcomings of pay and food are covered by the complementary support and protection of these good homes.

Such commercialism is pure and deadly parasitism. The Liverpool firm (A) cited, falls into this category.

(B) pays its women an average of 8s. 11d., the women averaging 22 years of age. This firm, a very large manufacturing business, up to and even after the time the Sanitary

Inspector was set to work, provided one bucket for 40 women to wash in at the dinner hour. If the nature of the occupation could be disclosed (as it would be if it were politic in consideration of the workers), it might be truly said—How easily we manufacture human tuberculosis along with our other manufactures.

On the boards of directors of both (A) and (B) are to be found leading Liverpool citizens and politicians.

These respected and honourable directors and all the rest of us who hold shares in these and similar enterprises will be[1] publicly shamed. It is certainly incumbent upon all who honour their own good name and prize the sanctity of a satisfied conscience to proclaim speedily and peremptorily the crying need, not only for the sweated worker, but for the assurance of an aroused and quickened civic spirit, of a Compulsory Living Wage for all occupations. If this means of liberation, this economic lever for women's regeneration,

[1] It is suggestive to read the account in the daily papers of the last Annual Meeting of ('A'). (1914)—'Owing to Labour troubles the Directors have bettered the conditions of their workers: and trust the Company will get better work in return.'

has been unduly delayed, the time for action is so much the more obligatory upon all citizens who are not thus 'sweated.' Procrastination is fatal, and discrimination between industries is unfair. Why, one set of employers may well complain, should we be compelled to give higher wages when so many others as guilty as ourselves or more guilty go on in the old vicious ways? Here, too, lies the possibility of quieting many a troubled conscience. The minimum wage will prove a source of real joy to those employers, who, uncomfortable about the rate of wages they are paying, are yet prevented by stress of competition from giving more. It may as readily be assumed that thousands of shopkeepers have felt a load lifted from their souls by the recent legal and compulsory half-holiday. The problem of women's regeneration is many sided, but a tap-root solution is immediately possible.

It is a Liberal Government which has set up the machinery of the Trade Boards Act. These are the words of a local and humane Conservative M.P., Colonel Kyffin-Taylor :—

'The fact remains: we do not go to the root of the social evil unless there is a living wage for living work. I would add to the

Statute Book a law rendering it possible for every man [and much more for every woman] in every trade and occupation to have an authority to which he can refer to fix a minimum wage. That would have the immediate tendency of abolishing all sweating, which is probably the root of all evil.'

I gladly make these words my own.

Nevertheless, for badly-paid occupations the machinery already stands. The President of the Board of Trade has the power to extend the application of the Trade Boards Act to any 'sweated' trade. It is for us to see to it that the scope of the Act is forthwith enlarged. This is one main function of the work of the Liverpool Anti-Sweating League, and though on behalf of women the appeal for aid is made in the first place to large-hearted women, the need for men is just as urgent.

On this point no social student has any lingering doubt. For if men are more highly advanced in all matters of organization, and consequently are not included in the avowed objects of the League, it is the working men and their wages that bear the brunt of 'sweated' woman's labour. The woman must needs be kept somehow.

Too often they are 'kept' in the evil sense by other men. Thus it comes about that the State, i.e., the citizens at large, must step in to help the unorganized and defenceless women, who, to their credit be it said, are so eager to work at any price—if only they can earn a pittance in order to live. Amongst men there is established the practice of 'collective bargaining.' This collective bargaining implies that competent officials and representatives are appointed by the men, who meet in council with the employers and come to mutual terms with them.

The Trade Boards Act makes this principle compulsory for certain trades in which women are mainly concerned. We ask for its extension to all women's work, but not in the interests of women only. For, if women earn low wages in any trade, even though no men work in that trade, that meagre rate of women's pay tends to lower the wages of men in other trades. And when as in these days of improved mechanical appliances the border line between men's work and women's becomes indefinite and vague, the following incident that occurred in one workshop is likely to become stereotyped. A new machine was introduced into a certain shop, and the

word ran: 'You men can go home, and send your wives instead'—say at one-third the pay. There can be no wonder that many men call out for the nationalization of industry. We, as a League, are not committed to this theory; individual members are entitled to hold their own private opinion whether for or against; but we stand unanimously for State Regulation of Sweated Industries.

Wages and the White Slave Traffic

I was present at the annual meeting of the National Vigilance Association, 18 October, 1912, at the Town Hall, Liverpool, and could not help wondering as the speakers, men and women, followed one another, that no distinct emphasis was laid upon the economic side of the problem. This is not so surprising perhaps if the particular object of the Association is kept in view. The supporters wish to prevent girls from falling into the hands of the 'traffickers,' and as such the work is legitimately termed, and actually is 'preventive.' But there is a much more radical prevention possible, and that is the question of a *living wage*.

A trained hearer might, however, note

the unconscious accent on this 'economic' strain. One lady spoke of the infamous 'flat' tenant and his hired female manager, who ordered the girls out into the streets to bring back 'earnings.' A Jewish Rabbi mentioned the 'terrible conditions of wretchedness' in the Eastern portion of Europe. Reference was also made to girls landing with 'little or no money in their pockets.'

A London vicar, a member of his Board of Guardians, whose parish is situated in a poor and congested district, said not long ago that 'the women workers are those who suffer the most. This sweated labour is the cause of half the immorality of London.' It is pathetically clear that the economic inferiority of woman has an ethical and too pertinently moral aspect; it is painfully obvious that underpayment means that the worker is losing vital power as a human being, or is subsidized by poor law relief and private charity, or 'else finds money in a way that is far more common than the average respectable person thinks. The relation of women's low wages to early and improvident marriages, for example, and to that dread trade which one hesitates to mention would probably be interesting lines to

follow out.' These 'interesting' and lamentable lines have been followed out by medical investigations made by trained observers who might by no means agree with all that most of us assert about the 'evils' of prostitution.

The resultant testimony can certainly be held as unbiased in the matter of the economic factors of prostitution. Returns are made from scientific experts in various countries. 'Thus the broad and general statement that prostitution is largely or mainly an economic phenomenon due to the low wages of women or to sudden depressions of trade, is everywhere made by investigation. It must, however, be added that these general statements are considerably qualified in the light of the detailed investigations made by careful inquiries.' Various numbers and percentages are given under the headings—destitution; inclination; drink and desire for drink; ill-treatment by parents; desire for an easy life; bad company; persuasion by prostitutes; too idle to work; love of luxury, and the like. Nevertheless, the ancient dictum that *poverty engenders prostitution* still stands. And 'prostitution is the result of the bad conditions in which many girls grow up, the result of the

physical and psychical wretchedness in which the women of the people live and the consequence also of the inferior position of women in our actual society.' There can be no doubt that the conditions of social life, coupled with the imperfect opportunities for self-development, and the galling and cramping restraints upon the leading of a full personal life, are primary factors in these continual accessions to the most degrading and miserable of occupations. Obligation is upon us to introduce a 'saner and truer conception of womanhood, and of the responsibilities of women as well as of men, by attaining socially as well as economically, a higher level of human living.' This seems truly the sum of the matter.

What is possible for women and girls who earn say 9s. per week in a city with multitudinous manifestations of luxury and wealth? Have they not eyes, ears, yearnings, desires, just like their more fortunate sisters? What does life offer to them on 9s. a week? Monotonous drudgery without beauty, without books, without ideas, without any pretty vanities such as a young girl loves, without amusement, without change, without anticipation, without opportunity, without the dreams

of youth. They look out of their own dull lives, and they see all the beautiful things denied to them showered in excess upon others. Is it to be expected that they shall possess the moral strength to acquiesce quietly in the cruel inequality of fortune? They are only flesh and blood like the rest of us; flesh and blood moreover unused to moral discipline, or moral suggestion, or affectionate training. Can we wonder that such a young girl offers for a taste of the tantalizing visions she sees everywhere around her, the one thing she possesses which will obtain it? The wonder rather is that so many put by the temptation, and continue to live decent lives of self-restraint and modesty on a starvation wage.

Miss Jane Addams, the well-known social worker in Chicago, says in 'A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil': 'It would seem that the virtue of women is holding its own in that slow-growing evil, which ever demands more and more self-control on the part of the individual.'

Miss Addams has the clear head and the warm heart of one whose passion for social justice is typical of the best men and women of our day. As an example of her sane

optimism, we note her reflection that: 'In the midst of a freedom never before accorded to young women in the history of the world; under economic pressure, grinding down on the working girl at the most wistful age, it is necessary to organize a widespread commercial enterprise in order to procure a sufficient number of girls for the white slave market.'

It is for women and girls of this sterling human stamina that we plead, in the name of sisterhood and righteousness and justice.

To any men and women who may still be in doubt, not as to the justice but as to the *practicability of the minimum wage*, the judgment of two men of somewhat diverse outlook upon social affairs may prove helpful.

Sir William Lever, in answer to a question at a public meeting, is reported to have said: 'If wages are doubled the country will be twice as prosperous.' Plainly, the wage earner's capacity for buying and consuming depends upon his pay.

In his recent book, 'The Living Wage,' Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., thus writes of the legal minimum in Victoria (Australia): 'What effects, it may be asked, has this Wages Board Act [more inclusive than our

Trade Boards Act] had in raising wages? The answer to that has, in fact, been already given in the statement that trades have clamoured to come under the operation of the Act. The number of factories has risen by 60 per cent, and the number of workers employed in them has more than doubled. Shirt-makers of one class had the rates raised from 2s. 4d. a dozen to 3s. 3d., finishers from 4½d. to 8d. per dozen. Trouser-makers had the rates raised from 6s. per dozen for stock vests to 11s. per dozen. The Savings Bank investments have risen from £4,300,000 to £15,400,000.'

I know well, from personal experience, the conditions of life in that Southern Continent. I know also too well the desperately untoward and depressing conditions of our home industries. There is hardly the possibility of comparison between the two, so different are the conditions. How strong then is our plea for the extension of the operation of the Trade Boards Act to all underpaid women's work. Here is the immediate lever for a minimum instalment of that good social time which it is in the power of men and women now to create.

Postscript

The Tailoring Board has given its final award of 6d. per hour for men, 3¼d. per hour for women.[1] The awards under the Trade Boards Act have effected increases ranging from 30 to 150 per cent. The increase in the Card Box Making Trade of over 50 per cent is about the average increase gained. Three more 'sweated' trades now come under review: (i) Sugar Confectionery, Jam Making, Food Preserving Trades, with the incidental occupations; (ii) The Hollow Metal Trades; (iii) Shirt Making. It is estimated that upwards of 400,000 workers, mostly women, are included in these seven scheduled trades. This is not a mean achievement, though

[1] Another branch of the Tailoring Trade is now scheduled (1914); and a Bill is to be laid before the House of Commons by the Labour Party for a drastic extension of the Trade Boards Act and for judicial inquiry into wages below 25/-. This seems to be based on the Commonwealth of Australia decision of 1907 as to the necessity of 'a fair and reasonable standard of wages in order to meet the normal needs of the average employee regarded as a human being living in a civilized country.' The Arbitration Court of New South Wales has fixed (Feb., 1914) seven shillings a day 'as a living minimum wage for the lowest class of unskilled labour based upon the needs of a family of two parents and two dependent children.'

naturally the wholesale inclusions advocated come tardily. 'No legislative power on earth,' said Seckendorf, 'can give them a fair day's wages for their fair day's work.' Now it is admitted, at last, that the State must itself come in as aid to those who have neither the power, nor the knowledge, nor, so abjectly helpless and eclipsed has been their condition, even the inclination to help themselves. And once a legal minimum has been established the workers are in a more hopeful position, seeing that 'mere poverty has its rights,' to help themselves.

A young woman lately came into the office of the Liverpool Anti-Sweating League and confronted the organizers. 'When are we going to get more wages?' she asked. 'You have had an increase,' was the reply.

'Yes,' said the girl; 'I get 12s. 6d. a week of 50 hours. But I pay 10s. a week for board and lodging, and 2s. 6d. is too little for the rest of life. We want more.'

It is too little. But the spirit is now awaking, and the legal minimum wage, which lifts above actual starvation, may by considered and wise organization become the lever for a higher power of life. Before the law became operative this girl had received,

for all the purposes of life, 8s. The extra 4s. 6d. has had a creative value. She feels that she, too, is of value in the scheme of things. From a machine, blind and deaf to all but the frantic labour for bare existence, she has become a personality.

It may be of interest to add that under the auspices of the Liverpool Anti-Sweating League the first Dressmakers' Union in the United Kingdom has been formed, and numbers (July 9, 1914) 500–600 members. Already the Union has been 'recognized,' and reductions of hours have been effected. The aim is by mutual consent to achieve something of the results of a Trade Board 'determination.'

CHAPTER IX

RELIGION AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

MANY treatises would obviously be demanded for any adequate treatment of such a sublime and complex subject as social justice, and for the sketching of any 'conceptions equal to the soul's desires.' If a religious man of whatever creed or no-creed has convinced himself of the social reality of true religion, he will not be concerned to ask at the outset for a definition of justice. Rather he will feel drawn to that new conception of divine justice emphasized by Jesus of Nazareth which so strongly resembles an indifferent treatment of the righteous and the unrighteous—'He sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust'—in order that all should have life. And that is alone reasonable—pure justice is absolutely impossible. If we all had our deserts who should 'scape whipping? even, perhaps, a

question to be asked of the great ones of the land who discourse so easily on 'Charity and Justice.' Many of the earlier bishops of the Christian Church gave all they possessed to the poor, and that not as an act of charity but as an act of justice.

The supreme test of a Church to-day is whether it enters into vital relations with the real life of men and women. In the solution of social problems the Church ought to *create the motive* and supply the indispensably necessary persons who shall energize and vitalize that motive in actual life. A French economist has declared that the causes of the present social crisis are moral. Given moral conduct in men, given that the worker shows himself conscientious in the execution of his tasks, given that the employer refrains from abusing the misery and lack of foresight in his workers and from appropriating the lion's share of the proceeds of their toil—given all this, humanity would find itself liberated from an enormous weight of evil. This is true; it is, veritably, a moral crisis. But from the point of view of a Church the problem is essentially a religious problem.

'The four Gospels,' writes an American minister, even if a trifle grandiloquently,

'are the protoplasm of democracy. In Bethlehem was sounded the knell of exclusive privilege and inaugurated the era of universal welfare. The process begun in Galilee is not yet completed, and will not be until political economy learns and teaches the doctrine of distribution as well as of accumulation.' It is generally admitted, even boastfully, that business is not altogether conducted on the lines of the Golden Rule, and there are not a few recognized if not explicit business amendments to the Decalogue.

Some of us remember the opposition, or rather open hostility, encountered by the Field Labourers' Unions from squires, clergy, doctors, and local farmers. These upholders of privilege and class consciousness were endeavouring to modify what appeared to them the outrage of the law which had allowed the principle of association even among the workers. Yet no word can be more pertinent than 'while sweated industries still maintain a parasitic existence, while the whole standard of industrial morality requires to be raised, while inadequate wages turn the lives of thousands of our people into the dreary round of ceaseless toil, the one

word to which we must steadfastly refuse to listen is the word Halt.' 'Religion,' says the same writer in 'The Spirit of Association,' 'should raise the moral standard on the question of the adequate remuneration of labour,' and 'competition cannot be regarded as a satisfactory final arbiter of human fate.' He would suggest as remedies a modification of evils by legislation and by voluntary association on the principle of mutual aid. 'Progress can only be surely attained by the building of individual character, by the fitting of each human being to fulfil worthily life's task, and by the consequent elevation of the whole moral plane and the ennobling of the impulse by which our home, social, and industrial relations are controlled.' Religion cannot accept anything less than this.

There is another aspect of the matter. If every force which tends to raise these industrial classes to a higher educational level and to instil self-control and foresight serves to bring them more and more within reach of the 'associative effort,' this force also tends to develop better members of religious communities. It is just such men and women that the churches, helplessly bemoaning their emptiness, need. After all,

it is not only a question what religion shall do for these men. The reverse is equally important: what will not these men do for religion? Certainly, unless it can somehow get hold of the masses, the days of organized religion are in the long run numbered.

One is driven to ask: Are the dogmatic churches intolerant of human ascent? Are they afraid of a higher order of constituents? Does the progress of humanity leave them unconcerned, even if they do not find a dangerous savour of irreligiousness in the very words? It has been said that no genuine saint was ever solicitous about the future fate of this planet. He had no salvation for terrestrial humanity. He had salvation for you and me, this and that human soul, all who will obey and tread the narrow path which he indicates to them, one by one, as leading to the portals of promise. But what is Utopia to him? Why should he care about successive generations of men? The eternal beatitude of one immortal soul outweighs them all—to him. But what must be the constituent factors of an 'immortal soul'? They must be immortally created. Is the God of these immortal souls interested only in *their* infinitesimal fraction of im-

mortality? The eternal soul itself must be eternally creative. Religion to-day *must* envisage Utopia. It cannot confine itself to a few 'souls' here and there and refuse to be the keeper of the generations. If it talks about 'the love of God' it must remember that that pertains to the whole of life. As the nobility and happiness of life develop, the greater is life, the greater is love, the greater the hope of the generations. Advancement in human life means increase of promise for all future generations.

The Congregational lay-preacher who declared that he was a great believer in the 'open-air treatment' in religion was of the latter-day saints who have a true perspective of things. When they preached to people living in slums where the sunlight never entered, how could the denizens be expected to believe in the wholesomeness of life and the goodness of God? In some of the worse districts of our cities the people are poorer, mentally and physically, than Hottentots.

When Booker Washington made his recent study of 'The Man Farthest Down' he found the poorest negro in the Southern States was not to be compared with the man at the bottom in England. 'As I drove from the

railway station in the grey of the early morning,' he says, 'my attention was attracted by a strange, shapeless, and disreputable figure which slunk out of the shadow of a building and moved slowly and dejectedly down the silent and empty street. . . . He struck me as the most lonely object I had ever laid my eyes on. . . . In the course of my journey across Europe I saw much poverty, but I do not think I saw anything quite so hopeless and wretched. I had not been long in London before I learned that this man was a type. It is said that there are ten thousand of these homeless and houseless men and women in East London alone.' A little later he makes the comment: 'One of the marvels of London is the number of handsome and stately churches. One meets these beautiful edifices everywhere, not merely in the West End . . . [but] even in the grimiest precincts of the East End, where all is dirt and squalor.'

Have we ever realized yet what a satire on organized religion is the juxtaposition noticed by Booker Washington? Certainly the greater part of the religious work of the future must be social work. If we can imagine a cosmic vision marking that jux-

taposition, what a universal irony there must be over the inane cultivation of an inane soul merely intent on its own salvation, while this social horror cries aloud to the heavens and is unregarded by men!

Religion demands more life and fuller for those other crippled ones, the hundred thousand in London alone who are living on the verge of starvation. Fuller life is better life; better life is creative life; creative life is progress and an impetus of progress. There is no religion of values without this, and no social justice. And how is justice to be achieved? Only by recognizing the possibility of a growth in human personality.

A satirical fact emerges: that the bewailing over industrial unrest and the general signs of the times comes from those very members of religious communities whose chief concern is the saving of what they please to term their souls. They cannot understand why the toad should not be contented under the harrow. The vulgar discontent of the poor is becoming so blatantly articulate that it echoes even within the hushed ecclesiastical interiors where their souls are being blandly and picturesquely attended. A French Catholic newspaper is

alarmed at the undisciplined spirit of these very human malcontents; an English Evangelical Churchman is almost tearful over these unwarrantable convulsions. A course of living for a few months on the verge of starvation would be as beneficial to many 'religious' people as a course of baths at Buxton is to many rheumatic ones.

The agenda of the first International Syndicalist Congress contained a proposal for the founding of 'a new code of religion and morals for the proletariat of all countries.' Can we wonder at it, when we realize what the existing pattern must look like in their eyes? These unimaginative religionists fail to perceive that the less stable, the less assured, the economic position of the worker, the greater the ease with which he puts himself out of work, and strikes. Socialist Owen could declare as the result of twenty-nine years of work during a co-operative period—no necessity for magistrates or lawyers; no legal punishments; no known poor-rate; no intemperance or religious animosities; reduction of the hours of labour; education of all the children from infancy; improvement of the condition of adults; diminution of their daily labour; interest paid on capital;

profit cleared of £300,000. It sounds Utopian; but his new source of wealth was simply the willing co-operation of his work-people. As we have noted before, the chief tenet of his social faith was improved mental and physical surroundings. These in his opinion were the most important factors in individual development, for Owen regarded man as the creature of circumstance.

This is not the whole of our belief concerning man; yet who can deny the influence of external conditions? The casual labourer of to-day is evidently the victim of his environment; a working-man's wages represent his subsistence, his power of life. He is dependent on changeful and precarious circumstances which are altogether beyond his control.

It must not be forgotten that a precarious subsistence is not only a great evil in itself, but renders almost impossible any cultivation of prudence, foresight, and other desirable moral habits, the absence of which in him is so much deplored by the safe and comfortable classes. If no one buys his labour he must starve or beg—a condition not conducive to high moral development. In any case his nature is stunted. The well-placed man or

woman deplores strikes and abhors the strikers.

But, asks a well-known writer in a daily newspaper, how is it with this abandoned creature? 'There is talk about the misery and starvation and the rest of it occasioned by strikes, and it is perfectly true that now and then some exceptional distress is caused by them. As a general rule, however, the strike appeals to the working-man as a matter no worse and sometimes not nearly so bad as the common incidents of his working life. Have those who use exaggerated language on the subject never heard of loss of time through unemployment, through sickness, through accident, through enforced [and unpaid] holidays, through waiting for material? The time lost, the misery and destitution occasioned by these things is infinitely worse than that caused on the average by a strike.' The fact is that those who live in security are seldom able to realize what it means to live perpetually on the edge of insecurity, with no protective margin whatever. A sane and cautious Trade Union leader says, 'The new Trade Unionist, more particularly in the so-called unskilled trades, is more a creature of impulse than of reason.'

We cannot justly blame him for this. He seems to be the sport of circumstance.

The physical influence of circumstance is set forth in the last report of a Medical Officer of Health, who cannot be said to look with a favourable eye on all measures of amelioration, and is curiously blind to the need and utility of a Municipal Lodging House for women in a great town. In cases of consumption, he says, 'a complete sanitary inspection of every house occupied by a consumptive is made, and defects remedied as far as possible. Thus the patient is placed at once under improved hygienic home conditions—a fact of supreme importance in the home treatment of this disease. . . . There are instances where the patient has had a relapse after returning home, probably as the result of exposure, unsuitable work, insufficient nourishment, or unsatisfactory conditions in the home. . . . The old people are found in very miserable circumstances, incapable of keeping themselves clean, and with no one on whom they can depend for help. They are often extremely poor, as even if in receipt of the Old Age Pension they are without adequate means of support, having about 2/- weekly to provide food,

clothing, and cleansing materials, after rent, coal, and light are ensured; and it has therefore frequently been found advisable to remove them to workhouse or hospital.'

On the effect of re-housing he says: 'There is undoubtedly a marked improvement in the habits of those who occupy Corporation tenements, as indicated by the external and internal appearance of the dwellings. To appreciate fully the marked change one must be conversant with the original insanitary conditions under which these people lived. The improvement is particularly noticeable among the children, and is so marked that one can hardly realize that they are the same children who formerly lived and played in the insanitary courts.'

Practical religion, then, must concern itself and at once with the environment of the people, in order that their creative faculties may come into play. It is useless to be angry with them because they are not independent of their environment, or when, aware of its hopelessness, the creative impulse within them impels them, by the only means in their power, to its modification. The occasion for despair lies in those who hopelessly acquiesce.

But in human personality there are great latent possibilities still untapped. The tremendous fact of the awakening to a new consciousness of Woman is prophetic of a new realization of practical religion. This new development of capacity joined with sensibility spells Sisterhood as a comprehensive function which religion, instead of standing aloof, will do well to recognize. Mrs. H. Luke Paget, wife of the Bishop of Stepney, speaking at the Church Congress, said very truly that the newly awakened responsibility of women is one of the greatest forces placed at the disposal of the churches. 'If God himself chose the co-operation of a woman in his plan for our redemption, there could be no loss of dignity in seeking that co-operation of women in grave questions or for serious work.' Whatever may be our views on a Virgin Birth, we must recognize that this is an interesting way, even an audacious way, of putting forth the new relation of woman to her world. 'Protean as were the manifestations of this movement,' said another woman, 'its general aim and spirit are the same: it wishes to secure for women a richer inward development and a greater social activity.' Women, with that

passion of pity surging through them which has hitherto worked intensively not extensively, can bring to the service of the nation special gifts of insight in which life is seen from a different angle from that of man.

Here is an unexploited sense of value, and the demand is for its realization in the complex of modern life. The situation is of course anomalous. The casual labouring man is often without the sense of value and creativeness; it has not yet been aroused in him. But he has the vote. The awakened woman, fighting for the vindication of her personality, and full of intellectual imagination as well as an eager desire to serve, has an intense sense of value and creativeness. But she has not the vote. The hand of this social injustice is heavy upon us at the moment, as we wait for woman to solve her own problem by the very weight of her plea. But she is already adding to life's possibilities a rare and unprecedented gift as the wider work of the world opens out gradually before her.

The dominant question in the best minds of to-day is, in fact: How shall social justice be done? The conditions and the question seem alike appalling, but they both lie at the

very root of religion. Shall we take from the 11,800 persons whose incomes average £13,000 a year, or from the 120,000 persons who own two-thirds of the accumulated wealth of the United Kingdom, or from the 2,500 persons who are owners of more than half its land, some of their superfluous money to give to the 10,000 homeless people who horrified Booker Washington, or to the myriads who live always on the verge of starvation? Shall we shut up all the public-houses and set free for food and clothing what goes for drink—as in those halcyon strike days of 1911 in Liverpool? No solution lies in those ways; and as for the latter way, is it not the proud prerogative of the free Englishman to be free either to starve or to drink himself to death? The *drink and the phenomena of poverty* which glare at us from every side go hand in hand. One thing is at least certain: that the days of what Mr. Price Collier calls our 'well-fed imperiousness' are giving place to a period of national criticism in which one truth shrieks for recognition:

> Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates and *men decay*.

And even so it is amazing to realize how

little 'religious men' take in the situation. 'Political things,' exclaimed an Evangelical the other day, 'more and more perplex our wisest and noblest men. There is confusion in all governments; men are wondering; their hearts are failing them for what is coming upon the earth.' So far he is right, perhaps. But what is his remedy? Again the *old unreal other-worldly note* is struck, and all things remain as they were: 'The kingly office of Christ is the great key to the whole matter. God is about to set his king on the throne, and then righteousness will prevail.' Still men are exhorted to wait for a coming salvation from the outside, and in the meantime organized religion can sit down with folded hands. Hereditary beliefs have had their long chance, and have resulted—in this. Routine will not save us any more. Now, if ever, man must work out the salvation of man, and many within the churches begin to see that this is in fact God's own appointed means.

We hear from many mouths the old foolish objections to dragging 'religion into politics' or of 'politics into religion,' as if religion to be anything at all could have anything less for its sphere than the whole of life; as

if anything that touches our brother man were not in itself a matter of religion; as if religion were a decorous garment instead of a vital thing of creative activity, which must justify itself pragmatically in this world to-day. *The one great question to be asked of religion is: Does it work? and does it work always and everywhere?* 'People are thinking that legislation and taxation can reform the world,' said a speaker, with that superb consciousness of success and supremacy regarded as a divine birthright which is so much worse than a pose, 'and cure all human ills. The pantheistic New Theology tends to lay exclusive emphasis on the material service of man, for that tends to be regarded as the service of God. It is a service of God, but God is not man, nor man God; and the most successful social reforms fall far short of what is due primarily to him who is above all men.' In this plea, as it was, for the retention of the Anglican Church in Wales, one wonders if his very orthodoxy had not taught the speaker the words: 'Forasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me.'

It is this conception of religion with its

assumptions of knowledge of the Divine and its human unrealities that is bringing religion, or at any rate organized religion, into disrepute. It can hardly be said too often that this sort of religion has failed, as is proved by the state of the world. And now, 'either religion, the family, the school and the State will moralize our mammonized industry, or an immoral industry will demoralize them.'

The only religion for to-day is *a vital belief in man*, in every man, and in his divine relations. The words Fatherhood and Brotherhood have served; and they have the imprimatur of that lovely spiritual genius who realized man and God and saw them in such an exquisite relation that we still feel the authority of his intuitions. That great principle vitalized at the beginning; it will and it must vitalize now. Any great principle, if it be a living principle, will eventually work out its own development; the extended action of a root-principle—mutual solicitude and co-operation—designedly issuing in mutual good. But it must be a principle; it can only live by being lived. In this principle each man and each woman must be treated as a living organism—with room to

live and to grow. Whether it be the child, the adolescent, or the adult; whether in the home, the school, the factory, or on the land, the principle must always necessarily hold.

We must build up from below, knowing that 'every brick that is laid in a poor man's cottage' is of more significance not only to him but to the well-being of humanity, than any decorative architecture can be to individuals who already have sound roofs over their heads.

It may be said that such talk is only a crying in the wilderness, and that nobody listens except the already convinced. But it is the most hopeful thing of to-day that more and more do listen. More and more the fine minds and the best men are caught into the social enthusiasm which serves God and the present and the future by serving its own generation. Already, as we have seen, the awakened woman waits to throw herself into service, especially the service of her sex. Notwithstanding criticism, we know that wherever Churches are alive, they are alive because their imagination has been quickened into a new attitude towards their fellow creatures. All the 'ministers of religion,' orthodox and unorthodox, who count,

have this passionate question laid heavily on their souls. The people who have no touch of this human enthusiasm, who are sceptical about the value of men, who despise faith in others, who cry 'business is business,' and glory in immoral moralities and moral immoralities of their own; the women who spend life in dressing, shopping and pleasure-seeking, safely sheltered in luxury apart from the main movements of their day; are all pathetically behind the times. They can hardly be said to be living at all, in this throbbing vitality of modern experience. The people who are alive are those who have a living faith in men and an overwhelming desire for social justice, and whose faith, not satisfied with repeating that agelong futility, 'I believe,' works out into values which *tell*, somewhere and on some one.

For what are religion and justice? To do justly, to love mercy, to walk humbly with thy God—that unutterable and ineffable Divinity which if it is in me is in my brother also.

Las Casas, in his 'terrible' tractate 'The Destruction of the Indies,' emphatically attests that the great bulk of the Spaniards

dreaded nothing so much as the conversion of the Indians. 'If they are once Christians,' they would ingeniously inquire, 'and have all learned that they have one Maker and one Redeemer with us, and are appointed to the same immortality, will they not ask, Why are we made bondservants to our brethren?'

The implications of the Christian religion were thus most clearly seen by those who had no wish to practise the gospel of Jesus.

CHAPTER X

RELIGION AND INTERNATIONALISM

THE contemplation of facts and of the actual position seems to justify the assertion that religion in its organized form has failed more seriously in wielding influence for good in international affairs than even in national and social problems. It has failed to apply or to diffuse the spirit of Jesus in all of these. The right conditions of citizenship have been as little inspired by the power of the church as have international relations. Yet the matter of friendly relations between nations seems peculiarly within the province of the great Christian churches. The Pope at least was once regarded as the arbiter in the final court of international appeal, but the Protestant religions have exerted no such jurisdiction, whether moral or spiritual; nor have they ever aspired to fulfil so natural

a function. The writer has vivid personal recollections of delivering an address to a local Anglican congregational gathering on the moral claims of international peace. The people present were uncompromisingly unconverted. 'Trust in God and keep your powder dry' was the axiom of the clergy who spoke. Wars were necessary to humanity. Such human regeneration and development as would relegate the killing of men by other men to the limbo of other outgrown horrors were impossible—unless, indeed, God worked a miracle, which was not at all to be expected and hardly to be desired. The contentions of the Prince of Peace whom they worshipped were beside the mark.

Their indignation at being told that that was a pagan and not a Christian attitude had something quite humorous about it. Why and how is this uncivilized attitude? It would seem that those respectable people are, even in this new world, as medieval in their outlook on life as their theology is medieval. The fervent universality of Isaiah is too modern for them. Not learn war any more! Such a revolution in habit and custom and tradition might be appropriate in heaven, but not in this world.

Canon Grane, in his fine and lucid book, 'The Passing of War,' has accurately stated this common Anglican position. This work is a compendium of the arguments against peace used by some dignitaries of the Anglican Church in Bampton Lectures and other public utterances. 'It is not the act of slaying but the spirit of murder, hatred, and revenge which Christ condemns': 'We need not love a man less because it falls to us to strike the final stroke.' The plain man, whether Christian or not, rubs his eyes when confronted by such utterances coming from 'holy men.' Well may Canon Grane ask, But how does the collective murder of the battle-field come under Christ's rule of life? We may ask how does the whole atmosphere of war, the abrogation as a necessity of the moral law, come under Christ's rule of life, or even of the enlightened humanitarian ideal? Canon Grane finds an attempt to answer the question in a sermon given by Dr. Mozley before the University of Oxford in 1871: 'It is the judicial character of war, as a mode of obtaining justice, that gives to war its morality and enables it to produce its solemnizing type of character. . . . War is thus elevated by sacrifice.'

The 'responsibility of the churches is surely enormous,' declares the author of 'The Passing of War.' 'What will mere questions of orthodoxy prevail when Christ asks "Why, after two thousand years of Christian ministry, is it still possible that even the most Christian nations may burn with passionate hatred of each other?"' It is, he perceives, the heretic from Christian orthodoxy who is mainly the advocate of peace: 'We leave it to a few "singular" people, like William Penn and his companions, to prove conformity to Christ's teaching practical, and forget how protected by invisible weapons and strong with unseen strength that band of men lived for seventy years in the midst of ten barbarous and powerful Indian tribes, with no military defence whatever.'

A saddening recollection is the impassioned plea made by the late Dr. John Watson (Ian Maclaren) when preaching before Nonconformist ministers in London, before the disastrous Boer War. In his idea men needed the purifying influence of war. 'Our national condition,' he said, 'is unhealthy; our ideals are lowered through the sluggishness of peace. We need war as a purifying element—but oh, the widows and the

orphans!' But for the nauseousness of the last phrase, Dr. Watson was one of a large company in this belief. From Tennyson, who before the equally disastrous Crimean War, 'spoke of a hope for the world in the coming wars,' down to a French writer who recently fervently declared his personal belief in the 'wholesome and holy war which sweeps away all dross,' men have gravely argued that to 'let slip the dogs of war' with all the demoniacal furies which drive them is somehow to bring about moral regeneration. It is true, of course, that such as these are always evading the direct issue: 'We draw distinctions between private and public life; between the individual and the nation; between conduct reprehensible in the case of man and man, but admirable in the case of States. The lever of Christ may lift the private citizen, but we refuse it as a fulcrum on which to raise the world. To take one life is immoral, but to take it wholesale may be sublime. Individual hatred, causing a single murder, deserves abhorrence and the gallows. But collective hatred, driving a nation to the multitudinous murder of war, wins patriotic pæans and a solemn Te Deum to the Prince of Peace.'

His sad face on the cross sees only this
After the passion of a thousand years.

We may believe that Canon Grane refused to utter the prayers issued, or suggested, by the ecclesiastical authorities at the time of the Boer War: 'Graciously to hear us that those evils which the craft and subtlety of *the devil or man* worketh against us be brought to naught, and by the providence of God's goodness may be dispersed.'

As long as we include our enemy, whoever he be, in the naïve collocation 'the devil or man,' and persist in regarding this enemy as *therefore* the enemy of God, international righteousness is a mere phantom phrase in which nobody believes. But all such phraseology belongs to a conception of the Power or Principle behind the universe which is totally inadequate to our experiences and mode of thinking. We can frame no idea of this Power, nor of any Power which we conceive of as spiritual, taking sides with one section of humanity against another. We may indeed throw aside all such considerations, and frankly hate and fight with our brother for frankly mundane ends; but to drag 'other-worldliness' into it, to make God

umpire in a prize fight, begins to savour not only of falseness but of indecency.

'O Almighty God, the sovereign commander of the world, in whose hand is power and might which none is able to withstand, we bless and magnify thy great and glorious name for this happy victory.'

When the Homeric heroes pictured the several Olympian deities, taking these the Greek and those the Trojan side of the conflict, they had no difficulty in supposing a division in heaven on the subject. But the Boer and the Briton called upon the same Almighty God, and each thanked him for 'happy victories.' Each hailed the 'God of battles,' but neither knew even the 'God who loveth the stranger.' Montesquieu sounded a truer note than either the British Churches or the Bible-reading Boers when he said, 'If Europe should ever be ruined it will be by its warriors.'

It is not to the churches with their pæans to the Prince of Peace that we look for the passing of war, but to the people. Not from the classes whose long prerogative it has been to preach and teach will the dawning of the peace era come, but from the masses Already the workers are impelled towards

internationalism. 'Les classes populaires,' says Anatole France, speaking for France, . . . 'sont pacifistes; elles sont en totalité pacifistes. Tous les ouvriers de la grande industrie, tout le prolétariat—il importe grandement de le savoir—est entiérement hostile à l'idée d'aggression, de conquête, d'impérialisme. Elle est penétrée de la maxime socialiste "*l'union des travailleurs sera la paix du monde.*" Il serait dangereux de la réveiller trop brusquement de son rêve de concorde universelle. Je le dis parceque je le sais, parceque je le vois.'

The federations of the workers, their labour unions are necessarily on a broad basis of human brotherhood and are all more or less international. Liberty is itself an international ideal. Any man who looks ardently towards that ideal begins to be aware of the oneness of the human race, and to feel himself, in Lamartine's phrase, the 'concitoyen de toute âme qui pense.' This assertion is a sweeping indictment upon organized Christianity. Authority in religion has been a bitter brake upon the progress of the peace ideal, which is indeed of the very soul of religion. 'Do not bother about dressing the platoon,' cried an officer

vexed and hampered by the machinery of war. 'Get the men forward anyway.'

It is not authority in religion which has got the men forward, which has shaken the souls of men out of their paltry preoccupations, provincialisms and prejudices. It has always been the passion for some ideal, often the heretical passion for an ideal, which has proclaimed great things for trifles, human understanding for caste or class or race exclusions, the comprehensiveness of the Divine solicitude for personal animosities, the divine brotherhood of men for sections of a Church. Authority in religion 'always knows, therefore it can never learn,' as John Wesley said in another connexion. The learners are going forward to the determination to have nothing to do with war, or with that preparation for war which claims to be necessary to keep the peace.

The work which has really arrested the public attention with its subtle appeal to self-preservation and self-interest is Mr. Norman Angell's 'The Great Illusion.' The author's demonstration that a national conquest does not reap material gain has made certain people listen who turned deaf ears to what they called the sentimental pleas of

peace. But there are many believers in war to whom these forcible arguments are not convincing. War, say these, is for the high ideals of honour and justice—ideals which they do not seem to allow to the advocates of peace. Whatever the definition of the honour and justice which are furthered by war may be, the objection holds as a protest against putting the plea for peace on merely selfish and material grounds. Nevertheless the book, as a complement to Canon Grane's idealistic treatment, is a most valuable contribution to the subject, especially for the prominence given to certain facts.

The 'fact' that the real elements of greatness in this Empire are the non-military ones of administration and commerce is employed with skill; and the 'fact' that where force is used at all it usually approximates to the co-operative function of the policeman, points the way towards the formation of an international police. A 'fact' of another nature is as potent in suggestion, namely, that the truth is (and this is admitted by many soldiers) that the military code of morals is both lower than and different from the code of the civilian. The substantial accuracy of this statement

is borne out by the frank admission of a general in the proceedings of the Commission after the Boer War. This runs, in effect: You cannot judge war by your civic ethic. And yet, as Sir Edward Grey said in 1909, 'one half of the national revenues of the great countries of Europe is being spent on preparations to kill each other.'

In spite of the apathy or dubiousness of organized religion, however, forces are at work which make for peace, as is shown by a survey of the position from another standpoint.

War used to be the normal condition of existence. It was a means of livelihood, a mode of legal seizure, the way to empire and honour, the sport of princes and the upper classes, the most honourable of all professions. To-day fighting is not the normal condition of existence, and individuals are not allowed to fight in civilized countries. Boys fight, it is true; but girls, from the higher stage of civilization reached by woman, look on physical fighting with disdain. Wager by battle is obsolete amongst individuals; private wars are disallowed; province cannot war upon province, nor castle on town. The rivalry of Lancaster and York can only

consist to-day in the peaceable if strenuous strife of football fifteens. Even the duel is practically dead—that 'indispensable safeguard of the honour of a gentleman.' Whatever your enemy does to you you may not kill him, whether by facing him with a sword or pistol or by stabbing or shooting him in the back. And yet war is still the litigation of the nations. Animals and boys, savages and nations alone arrogate to themselves the privilege of resorting to war as an offensive or defensive measure. War, then, is an animal and puerile, a savage and national monopoly; and though men admit they have outgrown it individually (having reached years of discretion), many contend that it is impossible to outgrow it internationally, physical force being (as they say) the only ultimate appeal.

But as certainly as individual freedom from fighting has been gained from the past, so the spirit of progress is against the murderous monopoly of international fighting in the future. Common sense alone must regard war as a political and economic blunder. To spend eighty-one millions in preparation for War and only sixty-four millions on Education, Old Age Pensions, Insurance and

Labour Exchanges, Road Improvement, Payments to local taxation, and other Civil Services, is not only foolish but positive madness. To spend as much for war preparation as for bread; to spend ninepence for war and twopence for education; seem the acts of a nation bent on suicide—and so doubtless they will appear to that posterity which will at last have got rid of war.

The nations must also face the fact that the world is now fairly divided up, and that acquirement of territory brings with it costly and troublesome responsibilities. The game of grab is bound to slacken when there are no new worlds to occupy, and when it is realized that the game is a very expensive affair for the conqueror. And always and above all the *new class consciousness of the worker* is the greatest factor of anti-militarism all over Europe. This is permeated with the conviction that international struggles are not to the interest of the workers but only of the ruling classes. As long ago as 1864 the watchword of the Internationalists was 'Workers of all countries, unite!' and conscious working-class policy more and more emphasizes the brotherhood and friendship of workmen in all nations,

united as they are by identity of interests.

But the question of war is finally a *moral question*, and into it enters at once that enhanced sense of the value of man which marks our day. To this sense the habit of mind which approves war and war preparation appears increasingly blasphemous, for by no means can men, with all their implications, be credibly regarded as mere instruments of mutual slaughter. This is strongly shown even now by the attitude of civilized nations in the very midst of war. No sooner do we begin the murderous trade than we are hastening after the guns with the Red Cross; men and women with set faces and healing hands following in war's bloody footsteps that they may try to cure what war has tried to kill. After the holocaust healing forces rush together striving to undo; heroic persons strain and agonize to make alive again. It is magnificent, this—and it is not war; it is in spite of war; but it is an ironical situation. The sense of the value of man makes haste to pick up and tend the victim, but it does not yet succeed in preventing his being sent out to be shot.

With all this organized religion seems to have had little to do. In fact it confuses the

issues, as is shown by the mean course of the aftermath of the Balkan War. 'This veritable chaos of nationalities'—so says an English Unionist paper—'for which there is no excuse whatever except the earth-hunger of the annexing States, is painfully complicated by religious intolerances and Church rivalries. The Bulgarian Exarchate has been swept away throughout the new dominions, and the local Bulgars, if they do not go over to Rome, or are not protected by the great powers, will have to struggle against the long pent-up rancour of the Patriarchate. This of course will give rise to reprisals on the Greeks of Bulgaria proper. How the Jews of Salonika and Dobrudga and the Kontzo-Vlachs of Southern Macedonia will fare is also the subject of not unreasonable apprehension.' And who can sound the praises of Bulgaria? It is impossible to palliate the cruelties committed by the Bulgarians, or to conceal one's opinion of the unholy, inhuman, irreligious, mean, grasping plunge into a gratuitous second and interfraternal campaign—of which account is still to be taken in Bulgarian home politics. To us of this country, conscious of the mental changes of the time, a religious war, as such.

might truly seem a thing of the past; but this modern example of the national and international failure of Greek and Bulgarian Christianity only gives another instance of the failure of organized religion to sound the high moral note in the time of crisis.

A far more amazing spectacle than that afforded by less advanced Eastern Europe is the spectacle of England and Germany. Evidently 'meant by nature, history, and tradition to be united,' these nations have been at enmity with each other. Sprung from the same stock, equal in civilization and culture, intellectually profoundly interested in and indebted to each other, professing the same religious ideas, both strongholds, in particular, of Protestantism, they confront each other in an insensate rivalry of Dreadnoughts. 'The British have made war upon many European nations, but they have never fought the Germans.' Now the possibility of this fratricidal war hangs like a pall over the continent and lays an enormous and ever-increasing burden on both peoples which threatens to crush them. The people of each country, who do not in the overwhelming number of cases desire war, are caught and half strangled in the meshes of an iron

net, from which they cannot escape. Both countries are ostensible followers of the Prince of Peace. Organized religion is now happily more alive to the situation, and by means of a representative Council of the Churches of both countries has worked for a wiser and better understanding between England and Germany.

The recent letter of a well-known Nonconformist to a daily paper is so pertinent that it is worth quoting here. The writer declares that for some years past he has been trying to discover the weight of religious thought in this country on the subject of war; studying reports of congresses, and the religious press, listening to countless sermons and addresses, and talking to hundreds of ministers. 'I have come to the conclusion,' he says, 'that the churches in the main are supremely indifferent to the whole matter. A minister said to me the other day that "it was impossible to run a modern State on the principles laid down by Jesus Christ; that Christianity was a beautiful ideal, but unworkable in the present state of the world, and that war might not only be necessary but a Christian duty." All ministers are not so candid and outspoken;

but I have little doubt that the foregoing represents a widely entertained opinion. One of our prominent statesmen a short time ago, speaking of the century of peace between England and America, said it was unfortunate that in their strivings after peace in Europe they looked in vain for any help from the churches. . . . During what Lord Morley called our "guilty war" in South Africa, the churches were frankly jingoistic. That the Established Church should uphold the State in its war policy was perhaps natural, but the Nonconformist churches were just as warlike and in some instances more so. . . . The Christian church, which ought to be a great peace society, is nothing of the kind. It is either supremely indifferent or frankly antagonistic. There is not a government in Europe but knows full well that in its war policy it will get no opposition from the churches. . . . That there is a large body of opinion in England opposed to militarism in all its forms there can be no doubt, but it is more outside the churches than inside. The churches are too busy wrangling about things that don't matter. As your correspondent says, "If deliverance depends on the churches, it is as good as lost." '

It is, however, only fair to remark that a great change is manifest since the Boer War. One is reminded by this criticism of the attempt of Grotius to show how a 'political philosophy' including ethics and economics 'can be built up without the aid of theology'; and be appealed not to religion, but to the fact that all men are kindred in Adam and constitute a common humanity. As the civil laws are of advantage to citizens, international laws are of advantage to men as a body everywhere.

It will be commented that the Society of Friends stand outside this letter-writer's charge in their long, consistent, and magnificent efforts in the cause of peace. The Friends are indeed a triumphant exemplification of practical religion, and it is a significant fact that in their case what we commonly understand by organization is reduced to a minimum. Moreover, they are the outcome of 'heresy.' The Unitarians, as a body, may also fairly be excluded. While the Boer War was in actual progress half the Unitarian ministers signed a petition for peace; and most of those who did not sign were of the same opinion as the present writer that then the time had become in-

opportune, but they made the first gleam of promise a plea for terms of settlement. The writer remembers with chastened pride that his congregation was the only one in a cathedral city which pleaded for arbitration before the actual outbreak of the war. But when once the dogs of war were let loose and the country had entered on the 'Mafficking' orgies which astonished the world, men of peace and goodwill could do nothing in the cause of peace except suffer indignity from the 'patriots.'

What, we may now ask, is the real problem with which the churches are confronted in this matter, and what are the factors which militate so strongly against the religious consciousness which must necessarily abhor war?

If Professor Giddings is correct, in human conduct is 'the consciousness of kind.' Our conduct towards those whom we feel to be most like ourselves is instinctively and rationally different from our conduct towards others whom we believe to be less like ourselves. This is indeed a very primitive psychological factor as applied to sociology, and it still holds largely true. It is this consciousness arising from like traditions, like associations, like prejudices, and like

ritual which keeps, for example, so many liberal religious thinkers within the pale of churches whose dogmatic contentions they have entirely outgrown. 'It is about the consciousness of kind that all other motives organize themselves in the evolution of social choice, social volition, or social policy.' The same factor applies to nations. This instinct must have played a useful part in social evolution by 'keeping men together,' as Mr. MacDougall says, 'and thereby occasioning the need for social laws and institutions, as well as by providing the conditions of aggregation in which alone the higher evolution of the social attributes was possible.' But, as he goes on to say, in highly civilized societies its functions are less important, because the density of population itself ensures a sufficient aggregation of the people; and in fact its direct application among modern nations is apt to produce anomalous and even injurious social results. It is class consciousness writ large. This consciousness of kind does seem to cut athwart the economic, the political, and the religious motive with its claims of a common history and a common language.

But with the growing interdependence of

nationalities in the realms of general ideas, of science, of commerce, of financial relations, of international credit, of social phenomena, of travel, of food supplies, this limited consciousness no longer remains possible. To-day it is not the 'nations' that form the rival economic units; it is the 'trades.' As Mr. Norman Angell has pointed out, England as a 'nation' has admittedly the greatest interest in foreign trade and is supposed to be feeling most keenly the competition of rivals. Suppose she could annihilate these rivals—Germany, the United States, France, Austria, all of them would she be the richer? Not only would she be faced by bankruptcy, but by starvation. Something like a third of her population would die for actual lack of food. It is forgotten that trade is exchange, and exchange needs two parties contracting. If England destroyed the German navy she would not destroy the 65,000,000 workers with hands and brains, whose competition would commercially be as great a factor as ever. If we annexed Germany the competition would be even keener than it is now. Consciousness of kind must yield to larger necessities.

The French economist Molinari is obviously

right when he asserts that war from the economic point of view is anachronistic. If it is a fact that rulers and ruling classes have artificially prolonged the existence of the military stage (there being now no need for war against barbarians) into the 'industrial era,' and if it is economically true that war if ever necessary is, as Molinari asserts, now an evil as well as the political institutions with their consequent burdens which are adapted to a military system, then only one course is open to intelligent beings—to say nothing of religious men: they must adapt society to the new conditions involved in the progress of the new human powers of production.

There is in process a conflict between the new forces and the consequences of the older systems. As after a raging storm has subsided the ocean still heaves restlessly in a mighty swell which rolls in and beats on the shore, so with human institutions. Their very magnitude asserts itself long after the pioneer is bent on the new creations. There is a great awakening notwithstanding, even though men in general continue rules and habits long after they have discarded the theories which inspired them.

The interpenetration of trade concerns is thus swamping the consciousness of kind with its belittling outlook. The Secretary of the National Transport Workers' Federation recently expressed the opinion that 'whatever their politics they would not allow anything of a political character to take place that would interfere with their industrial efficiency.'

A resolution passed unanimously by the Central Association of Austrian Manufacturers at the close of the Balkan wars protested, from motives of self-preservation, that the trend of Austrian foreign policy was wholly wrong. 'Instead of its having been an assistance to economic expansion it has led to a diametrically opposite result. It has, for instance, closed to Austrian trade markets which have been open to it for centuries past, and caused us to lose political friendships on which we reckoned for the most valuable support. Austrian manufacturers are well aware that it is primarily their own business to preserve and acquire new outlets for their products, but they have a right to insist on public opinion not blocking their way owing to a policy of prestige. This Meeting of the Central Association of Austrian Employers therefore insists, in the name of Austrian manufacturers, that the monarchy's foreign policy must be directed in accordance with this principle, and insists all the more strongly because the monarchy owing to internal circumstances is more than ever compelled to readjust the balance of trade and develop its export trade.'

In Germany, the Centre Speaker, Prince Loewenstein, said lately: 'Germany had no reason for attacking English possessions. His party shared the satisfaction at the improvement in relations between the two countries, but they did not want to exaggerate the force of this movement. The improvement was coming about because each nation was realizing that it served itself best by being friends with the other.' And a German Socialist Deputy interviewed in France declared his conviction that the great body of the German people understand that Germany can gain no profit by Imperialistic ventures, and that the economic expansion of the nation can only be maintained and increased by good relations with France and England.

It is not only the parties of Workers who make the opposition; it includes Liberals

and Conservatives. Political, economic, military, moral, and historic reasons all come into play. To try to drag back civilization to the cult of brute force, and to make armaments the sole national preoccupation, has resulted, even in the most stable nations, in grave dangers to national unity. Fortunately, these are counteracted by an accompanying awaking of reason and conscience. 'Il y va de la prospérité du monde et de l'avenir de la civilisation. Où allons-nous ?' says Anatole France in *The English Review* for August, 1913. 'Par la folie des armements, par la multiplicité des dreadnoughts et des canons, nous allons à la barbarie et à la folie furieuse. A qui le dis je ? Est ce que la noble Angleterre ne commence pas à reconnaitre, dans sa sagesse, que la puissance industrielle et commerciale d'un peuple, que l'hégémonie des mers dépend d'autre chose encore du nombre des dreadnoughts, et qu'il vaut mieux s'entendre avec un rival même incommode, que de s'user à lui nuire ?' The militarists are failing to take into account the *soul of the people*, and especially the state of soul of the working masses. Also they fail to take into account their new awareness to their own interests, to which 'la

noble Angleterre' is not wont to be so blind.

It is the opinion of Sir George Parish, joint-editor of *The Statist*, after a special visit to Germany, that Great Britain's prosperity is only limited by the degree of welfare attained by the whole human race. The 'enemies of England' are those countries and persons who refuse to make progress. He can see no obstacle to the formation of an International Police Force. If the conditions under which the commerce of the world were conveyed were considered by the Powers, it would become evident to them that the interests of one are the interests of all. The competition in naval armaments arises from nervousness, lest one sea power should suddenly be attacked by another. An international naval force would give guarantees against an aggressive action of this kind and would ensure the same safety for international as for national trade. The policy of the 'open door' and an International Police Force should now be taken into serious consideration by the Powers; for in this direction lies a good understanding, the maintenance of the world's peace, and a great advance in the welfare of the race.

The world has, in fact, an object-lesson in

the international police relations of Canada and the United States, now preparing to celebrate with enthusiasm their centenary of peace. It is instructive to remember the bitter international feeling after the Treaty of Ghent, and the activity shown in building gunboats on the Great Lakes. With perspicuity and freedom from old tradition characteristically American, President Madison saw the peril and devised the remedy. It was plainly evident that if each party augmented its force with a view to obtain ascendancy over the other vast expense would be incurred and the danger of collision augmented. He proposed an agreement to abstain altogether from armed force on the Great Lakes (except for revenue purposes). Common sense happily prevailed over the difficulty of negotiation and at length a Treaty was signed, which has become the model for a similar though unwritten limitation in land forces.

The theory put forth by so many that 'If you desire peace, prepare for war,' receives no support in America. The very abstention from military preparations 'steadied the two countries, and has kept them along the road of sanity through a century of grave disputes.'

'The historical barriers between nations are, I think, going out of repair,' said lately Sir George Reid, High Commissioner for Australia. 'National strength and national ambitions are turning more and more from the forms of brute force into the paths of industry. The blessings of peace and goodwill are escaping beyond territorial limits.' To this Viscount Bryce, in the manner both of historian and practical statesman, has given fuller expression. In his paper for the International Congress on Historical Studies, he pointed out that the world was becoming one in an altogether new sense. Nearly every part of the earth's surface except China and Japan was owned or controlled by five or six European races. Eight great Powers swayed the political destinies of the globe. A few European tongues had overspread all the continents except Asia, and even there probably those few European tongues would soon be learned and used by the educated classes as the vehicle of European ideas. By A.D. 2000, practically more than nine-tenths of the human race would be speaking less than twenty languages. Already there were practically only four great religions in the world. Within a century the minor religions

might have gone and possibly only three great faiths might remain, so swiftly did change now move. Whatever happened in any part of the globe had a significance for every other part. Industrial disputes were felt more widely than those earthquakes in Java the seismograph recorded at Washington. The money markets were affected simultaneously. Finance, even more than politics, had made the world one community, and finance was more closely interwoven with politics than ever before. World history was tending to become one history—the history no longer of many different races occasionally affecting one another's fortunes, but the history of mankind as a whole, the fortune of each branch henceforth bound up with those of the others.

These pregnant utterances taken from here and there show that the significant voices presage peace. Not by any means that we have already attained. Many of us are still imprisoned within a 'narrowing consciousness of kind.' But that may evidently be extended in its scope and transfigured in its quality. The nation is in a sense an artificial body; its moral quality may lag behind the moral qualities of many or even most of

its members. The loyalties and traditions of a nation are of their own kind and may differ from the constitution of its individual constituents. If moral conduct be social conduct it is clear that the standard of national conduct is not yet moral. International morality is not yet social; other nations not being yet admitted into equal sociality. The late action of Italy with regard to Tripoli is not on a par with the individual morality of individual Italians.

The nation is a complex organism; it is an institution; its characteristics are of slow growth, and they are shed later than those of the individual. Antinomianism may exist nationally as well as individually. But if, to repeat Professor (now President) Woodrow Wilson's declaration, 'the object of government is to establish the right in the relations of men with each other,' that object should certainly be also international. Just as certain codes of conduct endure in certain classes after they have ceased to be general (as duelling survived among officers long after it had ceased among civilians) so national codes of conduct lag behind most individual standards. Yet a War Office minute finally killed duelling. It was officially laid down

that ' it was not ungentlemanly or derogatory for a military officer to receive or make apologies for wrongs committed.' Surely it is possible by taking thought that conduct should be standardized among the nations also, that normal and moral human relations should also be possible internationally. The solidarity of mankind once stopped at the frontier; but to hold that attitude now is to confess oneself an anachronism. Society needs a deeper self-consciousness, and as Eucken puts it, society can acquire that by the development of a spiritual content and spiritual character. But this can only be done by the continual striving and struggling of a clear, self-conscious, self-determining, self-creating principle of human values and of social values from out of the welter and medley of present social life.

Surely the enunciation of this principle is pre-eminently the office of religion. The definite preaching of the end of war and the reign of law, the definite striving after international courts of law backed by an international police, international affairs conducted in probity and common sense—does organized religion declare all that is a sentimental Utopia useless to preach and impossible to realize? The Christ lived and died not only ' for his nation ' but for the whole world of men. There can be no religious exclusions for the new religion. If the Christ is not universal he is not the Christ. The ' nations of the world ' also have become divine, and the whole earth, not merely one corner of it, rests in the heart of God. If divinity is confined to me, and my kind, and my nation, then is there no divinity at all.

' A nation,' said John Milton in his Preface to ' The Reformation in England,' Book II, ' ought to be but one huge Christian personage, one mighty growth or stature of an honest man, as big and compact in virtue as in body, for look what the ground and causes are of single happiness to one man, the same ye shall find them to a whole State.'

Why not to a whole world?

In Viscount Bryce's ' South America ' he describes the well-known bronze statue of more than twice life-size standing on a natural pedestal rough-hewn from the spur of the Andes. The figure turns north to look over the two countries of Chile and Argentina, and blesses them with uplifted hand. There had been long and bitter controversy over the line of boundary, a con-

troversy which more than once threatened war. At last they agreed to refer the dispute to the arbitrament of Queen Victoria. After years of careful inquiry a line was drawn in which both nations acquiesced. 'Grateful for their escape from what might have been a long and ruinous strife, they cast this figure of the Christ out of the metal of cannon, and set up here this monument of peace and goodwill, unique in its place and in its purpose, to be an everlasting witness between them.'

In the light of the foregoing it is significant to read the words of the president of the National Union of Christian Workmen at the opening of the Palace of Peace at the Hague, August, 1913. This working man at least is imbued with the universal and religious 'consciousness of kind.' 'When ascending the imposing flight of stairs of the Palace this afternoon to honour the carpenter and son of a carpenter, Sir Randal Cremer, I was thrilled with joy . . . because there at the head of the stairs stood the statue of the Saviour, *Argentine's gift*: of the Saviour, whose words "Keep peace among yourselves," are so true, and have been so neglected to the detriment of the better and humaner feelings of mankind.'

We began this little book by quoting Lord Haldane: 'Religion is still the greatest moving force in the world.' This is true, as we have seen; for Religion is the vision, new-born and self-transcending, which ever kindles human experience into fresh vital creation. And it is showing itself now in this new way of appreciating, valuing, and estimating human personality, wherein many men and women are shaking themselves free from the clogging and clinging of mere personal desires and interests. It is Religion that is strongly urging this generation in the name of the All-Father and of that spiritual relation which remains constant in the midst of all our variations of creed, race, and nationality to realize that truly we must all alike be his children, and so reach at last Peace on earth and Goodwill among men.

It is the Dawn! the Dawn! The Nations
From East to West have heard a cry;
Through all earth's blood-red generation
By hate and slaughter climbed thus high,
Here on this height, still to aspire,
One only path remains untrod,
One path of love and peace climbs higher—
Make straight that highway for our God!

APPENDIX

SEPTEMBER 5, 1914

THE WAR AND 'RELIGION IN SOCIAL AND NATIONAL LIFE.'

IT is with the most acute pain and the utmost sadness that the writer takes up his pen again. The foregoing pages had been printed when he set off for a climbing expedition on the borders of France, Italy, and Switzerland. And now the most appalling of all human wars obsesses the minds of men even to the remotest corners of our earth. The principles laid down by us as vital to world-progress have been ruthlessly violated. Have then our axioms failed and proved devoid of foundation? Should this little book be cast aside and never see the light?

We cannot think so. The issues laid down are too sadly justified, and the way of betterment is the more pressing; when (1) 'the possibility of this fratricidal war' (p. 224) has become a mournful actuality; and (2) the German 'preparedness for war' has drastically ensured war.

Religion has proved grievously impotent. The pathetic words of Pius X and Benedict XV should pierce the heart of every religious man of whatsoever creed or nationality. 'Now I am impotent,' said the dying pontiff, 'and forced to see the spectacle of my own children, even those who yesterday worked with me here, leaving for the war and abandoning their cassocks and cowls for soldiers' uniforms. Yesterday, although belonging to different nationalities, we were here studying in sympathetic companionship. Now we are in different fields armed against each other and ready to take each other's lives.' And his successor is forced to declare '. . . especially in the Catholic world the war has armed the faithful against the faithful, while priests and bishops of each country have to offer prayers for the success of arms of their own nation. But the victory of one side means the slaughter of the other, a destruction of children equally dear to the paternal heart of the pontiff.'

And what of the Father-Heart of God?

'The Challenge,' the new Anglican weekly, 'independent in all party matters whether in Church or State,' incidentally confirms our own expressed judgment on the Churches and War. It asserts that Modern Pacificism is the work of (1) *Free Churchmen* far more than of Anglicans; (2) *Democratic movements* outside the Church. We have insisted further that the freer men are from unworthy bondage to the past, the better modern 'brothers' they become.

And now the 'mailed fist' is prepared to beat the divinity out of human life. Are our pleadings for brotherhood invalid? We firmly believe that moral suasion culminating in soul-conviction is the only permanent solvent for the ills of the world. And we believe with the Friends that (in the long run) 'the method of force is no solution of any question.' Nevertheless, many of the best minds in England believed in the pacific convictions of the best German minds. But the gospel of Nietzsche and the barbarous militarist creed of Treitschke and Bernhardi seem to have won the day over the Christian gospel which all the nations in arms profess as their own. That Germany should have justified the outcry of what has been termed the Yellow Press of both countries is her indelible shame. On the face of things she would appear to make yet more difficult the way of the peacemaker in the future. But, rightly or wrongly, we do not so read the issues.

Five New Factors have already emerged from the awakened human consciousness. They came to light in the first fortnight of the war, and though they interpenetrate, they are characteristically distinct. It is almost possible to take them in the order of their emergence.

1. *The pressing Challenge of the War to organized Religion.* It was imperatively needed; and can never again be ignored. There can only be one response, and this is the way of Divine Peace. No longer, we trust, will any woman be constrained to say as one Englishwoman did say in a remote French valley whence all the men from twenty years to forty-eight had departed leaving the women and children to fend for themselves: 'Oh! Religion does not count!'

2. *The wonderful and instant thought expressed on every side*, whether as a hope, or as an intuitive prescience, or as a profound resolve—This is THE LAST WAR: THIS MUST BE THE LAST WAR. Humanity is shocked and outraged by the hideousness and the ghastliness, the mere *fact* of it all. Evidence of this marvellous change is afforded from the most unlikely quarters. But a month or two ago a journal was scouting the aims of the National Peace Congress as the fanciful products of impracticable dreams. After the declaration of this war the same writers are declaring that measures must be taken to ensure Universal Peace. This can scarcely be accomplished by the insensate rivalry of national armaments.

3. *The 'Ethics' of War are no longer tenable.* The Germans, the avowedly military nation, the docile subjects of a War Lord, have shown the world, in all the ruthless nakedness of the infamous reality, the veritable 'ethic.' The 'necessities of war' run riot over every plea of justice, or of plighted word; as they ride rough-shod over all the elementary claims of humanity. [See note, White Papers, p. 254.]

4. *On the Social and Economic side* we in the British Isles have suddenly been precipitated into collectivist or national action. We have learned that Industry and Commerce are not only matters of some national concern, but are national in an essential degree. In a stride we are become prepared for the suggestions contained in Mr. J. A. Hobson's new book 'Work and Wealth: A Human Valuation.' It is a pleasure to have the opportunity of drawing the attention of students and citizens to this striking and constructive treatise. We are now regulating trade; we are, collectively, buying sugar; we are, collectively, marine insurance agents; we suggest concerning the growth of corn. In a legitimate sense we can extend ourselves in all matters of commerce the world over. But it is ridiculous to complain of Germany's increasing world-trade when we are so explicitly told that Germany owes her new industrial and commercial place to the energy, the ingenuity, and the adaptability of her industrial leaders and their foreign agents. From the point of view of this book the new national interest in Trade bespeaks a further care for the welfare of the worker. It is also noteworthy that on the National and Local Relief Funds the representatives of Labour find due place. Another significant matter is the stress laid upon the prevention of unemployment rather than upon providing doles of relief. We are fast coming nationally to the conclusion that if there is a duty to work there is also a right to subsistence on the part of those willing to work.

5. *The sacred regard for the independence of small nations* in the light of Belgium's heroic defence, and her present fiendish plight, is the pivot on which the world's restoration will revolve. The sanctities of this small people must be respected. A place in the sun is, of right, hers. And it can only be maintained by a World-Federation. This holds equally true of all small nationalities. The weaker nation must be rendered as secure in its world as the weakest individual citizen now is in his own country. It would hold even if a strong Germany feared a stronger Russia; or if Pan-Germanism suspected the designs of Pan-Slavism. An International Police by sea and land is the only feasible means. Assuming as the Friends appear to do (though they are Passive Resisters, and God is oftenest on the side of the biggest battalions) that what the British think Right will win, 'we shall,' in their words, 'be able to make a new start and to make it all together. From this point of view we may even see a ground of comfort in the fact that our own nation is involved. No country will be in a position which will compel others to struggle again to achieve the inflated standard of military power existing before the war. We shall have an opportunity of reconstructing European culture upon the only possible permanent foundation—mutual trust and goodwill.' These are brave and religious words.

And there is vital Religion in 'A Message to our People,' lately issued to the congregations commonly styled Unitarian. We have already intimated (pp. 76–81) that their 'open way' in matters of religious thought and the conclusions regarding God, Man, and

the World reached by the exercise of that method, will prove an example for the human race, and be no mean factor in world-regeneration.

'We have often,' says this Message, 'asked ourselves how much Christianity was left in so-called Christendom, and when the politicians of the world would have any faith in the Christ whom they professed to worship. As in the evil days when the light of Christianity first rose upon the world, may we not hope that, when these horrors are past, there will be a new coming of the Son of Man, seen in the advent of a true Kingdom of Humanity, when the nations will recognize that all are children of God, and those who are appointed to rule will feel the solemnity of their high calling as servants of the Prince of Peace?

'It is for us to watch and pray and labour for the coming of that time, and to cherish in ourselves that Holy Spirit without which all is war and confusion. . . . Then let us be ready to help in reconstituting society on a more Christian basis, and providing some more powerful and united expression of the sense of brotherhood, so that the masses of the people may be able to assert the higher will, and never again be the helpless slaves of violence and greed. Let the Lord's Prayer, so often uttered, become the real burden of our hearts, and with a depth of meaning unfelt before let us pray that God's kingdom may come, and his Will be done on earth, and that we may have grace to forgive as we have been forgiven.'

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER II

The Way of Approach: Martineau's words in 'Introduction' to 'Types of Ethical Theory,' pp. 2–4 (Third Edition, Vol. I) stand out nobly and pertinently: 'If you permit the human mind to take the lead of these objects [Nature and God] in your enquiry . . . you will rather believe what the soul says of them, than what they have to say about the soul.'

Martineau is really the leader of the present 'Activist' school; and his essential philosophic method has at last come into its own. . . . 'The veracity of our faculties is the primary assumption of Martineau's philosophy': Carpenter's 'James Martineau,' p. 373. See Upton's 'Philosophy' of James Martineau, Book II of 'Life and Letters,' Drummond and Upton.

CHAPTERS III–IV

Man as Creator; Man as Maker of Values; Man as Judge of Values: William James has written much, and not all from the same point of view. His latest views on Psychology are in consonance with Martineau's Philosophy of Man. A 'Pluralist' is at least a believer in Man. A Pragmatist must be. A Humanist is avowedly so. The Pragmatist 'turns towards . . . action and towards power,' p. 51 in 'What Pragmatism Means,' James.

Schiller's 'Studies in Humanism' is the best book I know from which the general student may gain illum-

inating insight into philosophical problems. It is keen, incisive, and vehemently clear.

Bergson's 'Creative Evolution,' and Eucken's 'Life's Basis and Life's Ideal' are magnificent expositions of the worth and power of man. Eucken's is the greater task since his object is essentially God and Man; whilst Bergson, taking 'Life' as a going concern, deals with man as 'creative.' The Italian philosopher Croce also insists on human power and human freedom, in his 'Philosophy of the Practical: Economic and Ethic.'

From what is termed an 'absolute' standpoint, W. E. Hocking in 'The Meaning of God in Human Experience: A Philosophic Study of Religion,' criticizes some of the vagaries of the extreme Pragmatist. I think Hocking's absolutist logic is sometimes too facile; but he faces difficulties manfully; and whilst assuming for 138 pages that the objects of our religious interest are all made up in advance, and that our own wills have no part to play in determining what *is*; in short, that as knowers of reality we must be passive, receptive toward the truth as it is, taking it as we find it in experience and idea—nevertheless on 'The Will as a Maker of Truth' he asserts 'there are certainly some regions of reality which are *unfinished*.' Here then is work for man. Hocking accepts fully the pragmatic, i.e., the working, practical guide to truth, but concludes that the only *satisfying* truth must be absolute. I dwell on this able book because it is so 'homely,' in the profound sense of making us feel at one with our universe. This 'absolute idealist' believes in the 'Other Mind' which is 'actively and intentionally creating' him. The stress laid on man's part in 'creating' seems to me defective. This is always the crux.

CHAPTER V

The avowed Heretic has proved himself Vir; and has thus enhanced in a practical fashion the dignity and worth of Man. The influence of the Anabaptist in the line of revolt must not be neglected; whilst the leavening of Christian thought and the direct plea for Toleration and Comprehension by the Socinian can be traced in Western Progress to our own day. The order of influence both in time and magnitude is (1) Socinian, (2) Anabaptist, (3) the resultant Protestant stalwart sects.

CHAPTER VI

Land: 'English Monastic Life,' Cardinal Gasquet, p. 149, for the Work-ritual of the Cluniacs. It is an idealizing book; but perhaps none the less valuable for that.

The following books are recommended by the Interdenominational Conference of Social Service Unions:—Smaller Books—'The Land Problem,' J. R. Scott; 'Problems of Village Life,' E. N. Bennett; 'The Land Report' (vols. 1–2), Land Enquiry Committee; 'Land Reform,' Jesse Collings; 'How the Labourer Lives,' Rowntree and Kendall; Rural Reform Supplement to 'New Statesman'; A Unionist Agricultural Policy, 'A Group of Unionists.' Larger Books, really important.—'History of English Agricultural Labourer,' W. Hasbach; 'Folk of the Furrow,' C. Holdenby; 'English Farming, Past and Present,' R. E. Prothero; 'The Village Labourer,' J. L. and B. Hammond; 'Land Problems and National Welfare,' C. Turnor; 'Large and Small Holdings, a Study of English Agricultural Economics,' Hermann Levy.

To this list may well be added 'English Land and

English Landlords,' Hon. George C. Brodrick (1881), for a readable general history. [Just published, 'The English Land System,' J. A. R. Marriott.]

CHAPTER VII

'Economic Liberalism,' Hermann Levy. The title might well read 'The Puritan as Trader and Political Economist.'

A most valuable book is 'Philosophy and Political Economy in some of their Historical Relations,' by James Bonar. I know no other books of their kind than these two. Dr. Bonar in his 'Introduction' says: 'So far as the author knows, this is the first attempt to present a view of the relations of philosophy and economics through the whole of their history, and the absence of guiding models must be to some extent his excuse for the shortcomings of his work.' In effect both books treat of Religion and Economic Theory.

CHAPTERS VIII–IX

The full title of the pamphlet incorporated in Chapter VIII is 'The Tragedy of the Woman Worker: Wages and the White Slave Traffic.' The Liverpool Booksellers' Co., 70, Lord Street, Liverpool.

The Living Wage: The literature on this subject has borne good fruit, and thus, fortunately, does not need to be particularized. On the day preceding May 8th, 1914, on which this Bibliography is being drawn up, the Upper House of Convocation at York signified its assent to the 'principle which has been called the principle of the living wage,' thus following the example of several Nonconformist Assemblies. The best concise book on the History of Work and Wages is the one under that

title by Thorold Rogers in the Social Science Series. Many illuminating remarks on 'Justice' are made in 'Thorndale, or The Conflict of Opinions,' by William Smith (2nd edition, 1858). Smith gives a humanist prelude to Spencer and Darwin. The book was written about 1850. [Just published is Mr. Rowntree's 'The Way to Industrial Peace.']

CHAPTER X

Peace and War and Internationalism: 'The Passing of War,' Canon Grane. 'The Great Illusion,' Norman Angell. 'Democracy and Empire, with Studies of their Psychological, Economic and Moral Foundations,' Franklin Henry Giddings. The 'Problems of Democracy' form the first and more stable elements in this remarkable series of essays. The basis of national life was primarily 'race-likeness,' the similarity in aims and thoughts among individuals with a common heredity. Then mental homogeneity or 'like-mindedness' took the place of relationship by blood. Against militarism came the reaction of personal liberty and the development of respect for law through respect for manhood. 'Ethical like-mindedness' became the foundation of the State, and betokened a 'common loyalty to the common judgment and will, a common willingness to share a common destiny. . . . Given a mental and moral agreement in these particulars and a nation of any admixture of blood, of interests, of religion, can wax strong, generation by generation, while yet becoming more free and more diversified in its social organization.' Here are some fundamental suggestions of a sane Internationalism, without the acceptance of all Professor Giddings' views on 'Empire.'

'An Introduction to Social Psychology,' William McDougall. The author quotes Professor Giddings; and Professor MacDougall's own studies are very valuable.

'The Foundations of International Polity,' Norman Angell; 'The War of Steel and Gold, a Study of the Armed Peace,' H. W. Brailsford.

[Just published: 'The Report of the Commission of Inquiry sent to the Balkans by the Carnegie Endowment.' This is lamentable reading.]

September 5, 1914.

The White Papers 'respecting the European Crisis' will stand the criticism of future historians so far as the British Government is concerned. A chivalrous effort was made for peace by Sir Edward Grey. It would be difficult to say anything of a like nature of the efforts of the German Government. We trust we are making a fair judgment when we say the Kaiser could have kept the peace. No doubt he had his reasons for not availing himself of the honourable and religious function of Peacemaker; and Austria had some of his reasons with others of her own. She was ready to 'discuss the substance of the ultimatum to Servia' after the expiry of the German ultimatum to France and Russia, and after the violation of the neutrality of Luxemburg, when, in point of fact, Germany was mobilized! Yet on July 20 Sir Edward Grey had told the German Ambassador that he assumed 'the Austrian Government would not do anything until they had first disclosed their case against Servia, founded presumably upon what they had discovered at the trial.' These facts constitute a horrible indictment of Germany and Austria. When Sir E. Goschen delivered the British opinion on the violation of Belgian territory, the German Chancellor could only say that for 'a scrap of paper' Great Britain was going to make war. This White Paper on the rupture ought to be in the hands of every Englishman. It is marked as [Cd. 7445].

INDEX