

tariff message of Mr. Cleveland, and enough of them voted for Mr. Harrison to elect him. They voted for him because they dreaded free-trade legislation, and desired only conservative modifications of the tariff. In 1892 they voted for Mr. Cleveland, because they did not believe in the high-protection tariff of Mr. McKinley. In 1894 they are watching the course of the two political parties, and deciding how they shall vote at the next election.

And the course of the Democratic party is not giving them satisfaction. They do not believe in an income tax. They do not all believe in free trade. They do not believe in a party which appears to fluctuate between gold monometallism and reckless silver legislation. They do not believe in a foreign policy which attempts to interfere in the governmental affairs of a weaker neighbor, even for the purpose of righting what the party leaders think to be a great wrong. They do not believe in the introduction of factional politics in determining the question of appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States.

What, in such an exigency, does political wisdom require of Republican Senators in the United States Senate? It requires putting country above party. It requires putting public interest above personal pique. It forbids following the short-sighted leader who imagines that he serves his party by fomenting factional strife over the nomination to the Supreme Court Bench. It forbids Republican cooperation with the faction led by Senator Hill, and voting with him for the rejection of a leader of the New York Bar because he was also a leader of the people in their revolt against a corrupt Democratic ring, which had dominated and disgraced the Empire State. It forbids attempting to rob, under the thin disguise of the "courtesy of the Senate," the President of his appointing power in order to transfer it to the Senators of the State from which the appointment is to be made.

The Democratic Representatives who are endeavoring to load the Wilson Bill with an income tax, and the Republican Senators who are joining with the Hill Democrats in an endeavor to defeat an unexceptionable appointment to the Supreme Court Bench, are each working for the defeat of their own party in 1896, and are unconsciously combining to disgust the non-partisan voter, who always holds the balance of power in the United States, with both parties, and so to prepare the way, in so far as they can, for a third-party movement, with more chance for success than any such movement has had in the past.

A word to the wise is sufficient; but, also, a wink is as good as a nod to a blind horse. Which proverb applies in this case? We shall see.



A Good Example

The eight-hour movement has won a great victory in England. Eight hours has been adopted as the normal working day by the War Department, and this not on the basis of any mere sentiment, but as a result of minute and exhaustive inquiries at Woolwich Arsenal, conducted for a period of seven months. As a result, the most skeptical have been convinced, apparently, that the change from nine to eight hours is not only an act of justice, but, like all acts of justice, will be a gain to both government and men. The wages are not to be lowered. Even the well-worn satire concerning "nine hours' wages for eight hours' work" has been ineffectual to block the reform. A report in the "London Chronicle" thus describes some of the advantages from the change:

"The actual time-table has not been drawn up, but it will, I fancy,

work out something as follows: The men will no longer have to leave home breakfastless at an unearthly hour in the morning—and such mornings!—but they will begin at eight instead of six, and will have their morning meal before a stroke of work is done. The employer, therefore, saves a needless and costly break in the early portion of the day's work; the men gain in comfort and in reasonable hours. Mr. Mather is strong in insisting on the advantage of this arrangement, and on the way in which it removes the sore temptation to early morning 'nips' on the empty stomach, and on the much brighter and more human domestic life which it opens up."

The change will immediately affect 20,000 men; but indirectly it will affect a much larger number. For the chief value of the victory is, not that 20,000 men will work under humane conditions, but that the British Government in one very important department has thrown overboard the doctrine of *laissez faire* and "labor a commodity to be hired in the cheapest market," and has adopted the New Testament doctrine, "Whatsoever is right I will give you." The Outlook has always believed in the New Testament doctrine, and rejoices to see it officially adopted by the British Government in one department—rejoices all the more because it has been adopted in spite of all the arguments for the old economic creed. We believe that in the attempt to solve this our industrial problem the government should be a leader in the movement toward justice and humanity, for the government is the people acting in a corporate capacity, and the example set by the people cannot be permanently disregarded by individual and private enterprises.



Can We Teach a Non-Theological Religion?

We stated last week what seems to us to be the fundamental question at issue in our public school discussion: Can we inspire religion without teaching theology? For the number of parents in the United States who are unwilling that their children should be inspired with the spirit of faith, hope, and love is so insignificant that they may be disregarded in determining any question of public policy; whereas we all object, more or less strenuously, to any teaching of a theology which we disbelieve; and we are not agreed in our theological beliefs. So it is proposed to abolish all religious teaching in order to be free of theology; which Mr. Huxley tersely and effectively characterizes as "burning your ship to get rid of the cockroaches."

But this question underlies church and household teaching as well as systems of public education. The days of catechisms have apparently passed—at least for large masses of intelligent, virtuous, religious households. And we are constantly assured that congregations are weary of theology in the pulpit; which is certainly true if the theology is offered as a substitute for religion. Thus the question confronts us in home, church, school: Can we inspire religion without teaching theology? Perhaps we can answer this question in no way more effectively than by asking another: What system of theology did Jesus Christ teach?

It is true that attempts have often been made to deduce a system of theology from the teachings of Jesus Christ, but never with distinguished success. And by common consent such systems have to be deduced from his teachings—they are not explicit in his teachings. The Wesleyan is sure that Christ taught Arminianism; the Calvinist is equally sure that he taught election and predestination. The Trinitarian is clear that he taught an Athanasian theol-

ogy, and the followers of Dr. Channing are equally clear that his theology was Unitarian. The Quaker finds in his teaching the theory of the "inner light," and the Puritan the theory of the supreme and final authority of the Scripture. The Episcopalian finds Apostolical succession, the Romanist the supremacy of Peter, and the Congregationalist the independence of the local church. The Socialist thinks Jesus Christ was the founder of Socialism, and the Individualist is equally certain that he was the prophet of Individualism. If Jesus Christ were the teacher of a theology, the simple fact that entirely honest disciples understand him so differently would constitute a fatal criticism of his teaching. The real explanation of these differences is not that he was obscure, or evasive, or used words with a double meaning, but that he was not teaching theology at all. He was inspiring religion, which is quite a different matter; and he inspired a religion so large, so vital, so comprehensively adapted to men of all epochs, all temperaments, and all stages of intellectual development, that it enters into and vitalizes every form of religious thought, as it does every form of religious ceremonial. Religion is the molten metal; theology is the mold into which it is run. The religion of Jesus Christ has been run into a great variety of theological molds.

This non-theological quality has characterized in all ages the highest forms of religious teaching. It is distinctive in all the best religious poetry. Charles Wesley was an Arminian, Toplady was a Calvinist; but one must go outside their familiar hymns to learn the fact. No one would guess that "Nearer, My God, to Thee" was written by a Unitarian, or "The Eternal Goodness" by a Quaker, or

"There's a wideness in God's mercy
Like the wideness of the sea"

by a Roman Catholic. In the "Imitation" by Thomas à Kempis there is a mediæval flavor, but little, if any, sign of distinctive Roman Catholic theology; and as little of distinctive Anglican theology in the "Holy Living and Dying" of Jeremy Taylor. The greatest preacher of the last decade in this country was Phillips Brooks, and it was made a constant criticism of him, as it was his real glory, that one could not tell what was his theology. This was not because he was either timid or obscure, but because he was a teacher of religion, not of theology. Mr. Moody is also a great preacher, though of a widely different type; and though, doubtless, Mr. Moody's teaching is affected by his theology, he is not a teacher of theology, but a preacher of religion. His theology has to be deduced from his preaching; and if any one will take, as we have done, a volume of his sermons, and attempt to deduce a comprehensive system of theology out of them, he will find it only less difficult than to deduce such a system from Phillips Brooks's sermons or from the discourses of Jesus Christ. And when he has finished his task, the theology will be largely his own, read into the sermons, not deduced from them, still less explicitly taught by them. Most ministers have to put their religious teaching into theological forms; but that is their weakness, not their strength. And the more religious and the less theological their preaching, the more it emphasizes the spirit and the less it emphasizes the intellectual form, the more nearly it approaches the incomparable ideal which the Master has afforded.

How to inspire religion without teaching theology is another question, and to answer it requires much study, and more meditation. But that such non-theological teaching of religion is possible is demonstrated alike by the example of the greatest preachers, by the whole stream of Christian hymnody, and by the example of the Great Preacher.

Editorial Notes

—It had a mediæval sound when we read in last week's papers of the church trial of three persons for charging a fellow-member with witchcraft. But, after all, a belief in witches is only a kind of heresy, and, like many other heresies, was once orthodoxy. Perhaps some other recent charges of heresy will be pronounced mediæval before the new century dawns.

—The comments of the English papers on the outspoken declarations of Mr. Rhodes as to what would happen if an attempt were made to run Cape Colony for the benefit of England show how much we have done to educate the descendants of our British forefathers. The London journals scold Mr. Rhodes soundly, but they intimate that if the time should come when the South African colonies wish to set up on their own account, why, they may do it, and the Home Government will send neither Admiral Howe nor General Burgoyne to fetch them back!

—Dickens's strictures on Chancery's "law's delays" in "Bleak House" had a great deal to do with the reform in the system of English courts. Yet a Chancery case came up recently which has been in court since 1747! Contrary to the case of "Jarndyce vs. Jarndyce" in "Bleak House," the sum involved has grown instead of diminishing and finally vanishing. But the case is not settled yet, and Mr. Justice Chitty intimated that the claimants would be very lucky indeed if they ever actually got any money after the Government was through with the case.

—The Rev. A. V. V. Raymond, D.D., of Albany, who was last week unanimously elected President of Union College, is eminently qualified to succeed in a difficult position. He is a man of varied abilities, of unusual force of character, and of a very attractive personality. An admirable speaker, a born wit, and possessed of a geniality of temper which attracts all men without in any way blurring the keen edges of his character, Dr. Raymond has made a host of friends, and his accession to the presidency of Union will mark an era of growth in the history of that institution.

—Last year the population of Japan was increased by nearly four hundred thousand persons, and now amounts to over forty-one millions. There are nearly four thousand nobles, the gentry number two millions, and the rest are commoners. They evidently live long in Japan; for the census reports seventy-five hundred people over ninety, and one hundred and forty over a hundred years of age. The present anomalous order of things as to the Japanese and foreign courts should be readjusted. There are continual illustrations of the inconvenience on both sides arising from extra-territorial jurisdiction.

—Citizens of a republic may feel a just pride in the fact that their ruler cannot easily aggrandize himself or his family at the expense of art or patriotism. Ever since the death of William I., there has been a public subscription in Germany for a national monument to his memory. Most of the competitors introduced as subordinate figures Bismarck, Moltke, and others. The Emperor, however, has set at naught the decision of the jury, and selected as a model the statue of William I. with four emblematical Victories, thus making the monument exclusively to the glory of the Hohenzollerns.

—If her English critics are to be believed, open-mindedness is not one of the characteristics of the British matron, but evidences appear occasionally of something like a knowledge of this country among intelligent English women. A correspondent of the London "Speaker" goes so far as to express her preference for American tendencies in the matter of the training of girls rather than for the French. "The American girl," says this correspondent, "is allowed to choose her own acquaintances and to go where she pleases without too rigid a censorship from the mother, and the American girl seldom comes to harm; she is very attractive—quite able to hold her own with her married sister—and, generally speaking, I believe, she is a very good girl." To an American, who knows American girls, there is something very droll in this solemn and cautious commendation from abroad.

—The Charleston "News and Courier" recently announced in striking head-lines that the State of South Carolina had passed under "rum rule." As the "News and Courier" is itself a passionate defender of the liquor-dealers, these head-lines aroused interest in the indictment of the State Administration which followed. The reform Administration, it charged, is building up through its dispensaries a power like that of Tammany Hall. Within a year, it said, there may be one hundred and fifty dispensaries! Think of it!—a hundred and fifty liquor-stores in a State! This, however, is only a "may be." At present, the article admitted, there are but one hundred. But in every one of these, it went on with alarm, the dispenser receives \$750 a year, and in the cities \$1,000!! In some places the dispenser even has a clerk!!! The Tammany tiger, with nine thousand metropolitan saloons to slake its thirst, must certainly look out for its laurels in the political arena.