

the foreign policy of the nation, about which both houses of Parliament had a right to express an opinion. Such a contention would not, of course, be listened to; but it would have as many legs to stand upon as the claim that an increase in the income tax, or a shifting of the land tax, is political, and therefore within the Lords' purview. Once begin letting out the waters, and there is no telling where the floods will go. We think, therefore, that the Lords will remain where the British Constitution has placed them—dammed up so that they cannot touch money-bills.

There is, however, much quiet talk in England about their doing what they have the undoubted power, if they have the stomach, to do—namely, throw out the budget and force a dissolution. Some Conservative newspapers have advocated this course, and it has been much canvassed in the clubs and salons frequented by the aggrieved victims of the budget, as they choose to consider themselves. Why not, they ask, make an end of the business at once, and get a speedy verdict of the country on this miserable and despoiling Ministry? This question has been echoed by some Conservative members of Parliament, but it is significant that none of the leaders of the party have given countenance to the impetuous suggestion. Mr. Balfour has attacked the budget repeatedly, but never has he given an intimation that it might come to grief in "another place"—to use the Parliamentary expression for referring to the Lords. When it has been intended to destroy in the Lords previous Liberal legislation—such as the two education bills, the licensing bill, etc.—there has been no lack of premonitory speech and action. Mr. Balfour has openly consulted Lord Lansdowne; the latter has begun to talk ominously about the responsibilities of the hereditary legislators. In connection with the budget, however, nothing of this kind has been observed. If the Conservatives really mean to order the House of Lords to refuse to vote it, they are keeping their intention a deep secret.

It is hard to believe that they have any such intention. The question is not so much one of political power, as of political tactics. By forcing matters, Mr. Balfour would simply risk losing what he is almost certain to gain if he bides his time. The tide is running so

powerfully for the Conservatives at present that they may reasonably count upon returning to office at the next general election. And that trial of strength cannot be long postponed. Within two years it must come; it may easily come in the course of the next twelvemonth. So cool and patient a leader as Balfour is not at all likely to precipitate the struggle. And more than the mere element of time is involved. The entire issue might be changed if the Lords were to reject the budget on the ground that it bore too heavily on the rich. We should then see a great outburst of indignation at the selfishness and arrogance of the privileged classes; there would be a good chance of the socialists and the Labor Party pooling issues, for the time being, with the Liberals, so that the issue of the election would be a much less sure victory for the Conservatives than they now appear bound to win. All told, therefore, the probability is that the Lords will make wry faces at the budget, but will swallow it. Mr. Balfour will let it do its work of still further alienating rich and middle-class Liberals; will use vague phrases about undoing its injustices when his party is in office again; and when he actually is once more at the head of the government, will doubtless not remove a single one of the taxes which are now denounced as confiscatory and socialistic.

"SOCIALIZING" RELIGION.

The *Outlook* recently printed two remarkable articles by clergymen strongly attacking the education given in theological seminaries. Against it, the gravamen of the complaint is that the course is too scholastic and antiquated; that candidates for the pulpit do not get an insight into the social problems which will confront them later. The drift of the protest is practically against the old idea of a learned ministry. It is argued that a fairly educated man, "with facility of speech, a knowledge of the English Bible, and a real interest in the welfare of mankind," may be better fitted to preach than students who have put in three years at Greek and Hebrew, and have wasted a lot of time over people who "have been a long time dead." The seminaries should throw overboard the dead wood in their traditional curriculum, and put their main strength into "sociology, economics,

pedagogy, and ethics." The chief aim should be to teach "the social character of religion, and, specifically, the social application of Christianity." In one word, religion should be "socialized."

This term is not defined, but its meaning, in the mouths of these men and those who think with them, is not hidden. They want the churches and the ministers to regain touch with the masses; and they believe that this can be done by an active sympathy with the causes and aspirations that to-day lie near the hearts of the masses. Workingmen are more and more standing aloof from Protestant churches; to Socialism many of them are transferring the feeling which they once had for religion: therefore, the thinly veiled argument runs, religion must take on a tinge of Socialism to win them back. The Rev. Charles Stelzle frankly puts the case in a way to show both what he thinks the trouble is to-day, and what the dominant purpose should be to-morrow:

The profound religious spirit which is so evident in the labor movement bids fair either to capture the church or to become the heart of a great religious movement which will rival the church as it is now organized—*unless* the church herself so enlarges her life and vision as to include this movement. If once this movement of the working people takes on a distinctively religious aspect—and it is quite possible for it to do so—the church will with difficulty keep in the procession.

Such conceptions and hopes are amiable; but the fear caused by the growing alienation of wage-earners from the churches should not blind the latter. Take the great fact of the relation of the Catholic Church to workingmen. This is seldom referred to in the laments of Protestants over their slackening hold upon the toilers, yet it is most significant. Here we have a vast religious organization, the very life-blood of which in this country has been the attachment and devotion of the working-classes, but do we find it saying that it must move heaven and earth to bring itself up to date and become "socialized"? Nothing of the kind. On the contrary, the weight of Catholic authority has been cast against Socialism; and the Pope is as much opposed to "modernity" in labor and political movements as in theological. Doubtless, the Catholic Church in the United States loses its power over many immigrant and other workingmen who, by antecedent faith, ought to be in its com-

munion. But making all allowance for such defections, it retains a wonderful hold upon those very masses which, we are now told, can be won over only by petting labor unions and taking up with half-baked doctrines labelled "sociology."

If such considerations do not give our too quick religious innovators pause, let them stop to survey some of the practical and definite obstacles which they must surmount. When they demand of the theological seminaries training in economics and solutions of social problems, they are informed that such studies are pre-supposed in the students; the colleges are to furnish them with that equipment. But that is absurd; declares the Rev. Mr. Jones. "College courses cannot equip young men with the knowledge of social conditions necessary to the ministerial profession." But can seminary courses? We gravely doubt it. Many institutions, it is true, afford their students the opportunity to see the ongoing of organized Christianity on a large scale—the institutional church, clubs, classes, missions, settlements—and all this is no doubt instructive and humanizing. But formal "sociological" teaching, dovetailed into an already crowded and hurried three years' course, would not, in our opinion, be much more successful in the seminaries than it is in the colleges. The most probable result would be the letting loose in pulpits of crude notions about "the social applications of Christianity," together with sadly muddled economics.

After all, we come back to the truth that the successful minister is born, not made. By the use of whatever tools, vitalizing even the oldest and mouldiest conventions, he comes to his real work by virtue of qualities which a theological education can neither give nor take away. If he has the soul to endure as one seeing the invisible, and a heart to throb in unison with all the varied humanity about him; and if to all this he adds the sense of a high mission and the burden of a spiritual message, he need not trouble himself overmuch to become "socialized." He will find his true power and wield it. Into the striving and sorrow of the world, he will be able to bring something of peace and comfort; and will be the better enabled to do it for having braced his mind by hard study and fed his spirit by long meditation while the fire burns, than by taking out a card in all the labor-

unions from here to California, or running, now here, now there, after the latest sociological fad.

MISTAKES ABOUT LEISURE.

Among the mistakes about contemporary life, perhaps none passes muster so readily as the one about leisure and our leisure class. It is taken as self-evident that what goes by the name of leisure here is either gilded indolence or else something worse. Here and there one finds an idle millionaire "that in trim gardens takes his pleasure," but all the rest, who neither toil nor spin, must be looked for on the sporting page or the police blotter. The average rich man who feigns leisure is generally using it, as Machiavelli's prince did, as a breathing-time to contrive plans for war—to wit, a Wall Street campaign. A. Barton Hepburn, in the June *Century*, sums up this popular impression and neatly turns it into an apology for the American business man, when he says:

America possesses comparatively few old families, . . . reserving sufficient time and strength for the development of the higher ideals of life. . . . Retiring is difficult, largely because there is no inviting field for them to enter. We have no leisure class devoted to the general purposes of life, whose ranks open invitingly and furnish a proper goal to the business man's ambition. . . . A man out of business . . . is out of countenance with current events.

Now, all this was the simple truth only a few years ago, but society has been changing since then more rapidly than opinions about it. A class "devoted to the general purposes of life," after the fashion of *Sans Souci* and the *Paris salons*, we cannot boast. The tides of life have set too strongly against it. But leisure and the opportunity to pursue high ideals have not died with it. What has changed is the organization of the leisure class. Like the rest of the world, it has been blown to bits by specialists. Probably this city alone holds as many amateurs of culture as eighteenth-century France ever did; but they are scattered about in art clubs, historical societies, political leagues, scientific circles, and colleges, each taking his leisure chiefly within his own trim garden, because he finds there so much to pluck and smell. Correggio, Anglo-Russian relations, and the nebular theory are no longer served on the same conversational menu; there is a table for each.

Leisure has undeniably become more strenuous, as a result of this opulence and virtuosity. To call it loafing is to confess one's ignorance of the joyous labors which even humble intellectual hobbies, say orchids and sociology, afford. Indeed, a mind fit to pursue the things of the spirit at all is more likely to lie awake nights than to doze away its days over them. There will always be shopkeepers to see in such zeal only a disguise for indolence, but they can sway none but those who share their repugnance toward the ideals of culture. It is doubtful if our leisure class has lost many desirable members because of the tradition that a man out of business is a pariah. Those whom it does deter would, if the tradition were annulled, become the most crotchety of putterers in whatever field of culture they invaded. Like an unhappy rich man whom Mr. Hepburn cites, they would travel feverishly and then weary of every scene; "study" Flemish art, buy some canvases, fall victims to a dealer, and soon sicken of the whole business; and, finally, after having made the round of a half-dozen hobbies, plunge back desperately into the Street. Such men think leisure means idleness, sweetened with something a little more saccharine than vaudeville, and considerably more expensive. They know they could buy idleness with dollars at any time of life, and so they fancy that they could as easily join the true leisure class. But the kingdom of higher ideals must be sought early—best while the dew still lies on life; and the admission fee is "the passionate vision."

The business man with this vision need never complain that America has no leisure class, or that its ranks do not "open invitingly," or that it does not "furnish a proper goal for his ambitions." Every large city will give him companions for his lighter intellectual moods. If he aspires high in science, art, politics, or social reform, at least our great centres teem with like-minded men. And should his attainments rise to the same level, universities will welcome him, dignifying his leisure with a few routine lectures. If, finally, he must keep up the business pace, there are public offices to be filled and political rings to be shattered.