

Christ's Teachings on Social Topics

II.—Christianity and Socialism¹

By Lyman Abbott

Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit.—Matt. xii., 33.

If we are to understand the relation of Christianity to Socialism, we must understand what Christianity is and what Socialism is. But there are many and very divergent definitions both of Christianity and Socialism. Some men regard Christianity as a system of doctrine; some as a kind of worship; some as an ecclesiastical organization; some as a purely individual life. The differences in definition of Socialism are quite as numerous and quite as great. Compare these two definitions of Socialism, both by men eminent for culture and for ripeness and sobriety of judgment. The first is James Russell Lowell's:

Socialism means, or wishes to mean, co-operation and community of interests, sympathy; the giving to the hands, not so large a share as to the brain, but a larger share than hitherto, in the wealth they must combine to produce; means, in short, the practical application of Christianity to life, and has in it the secret of an orderly and benign reconstruction.

If that is a correct definition of Socialism, I should hope we are all Socialists. The other definition is Professor Robert Flint's, of Edinburgh, a man quite as eminent in his own country as James Russell Lowell in ours:

Socialism, then, as I understand it, is any theory of social organization which sacrifices the legitimate liberty of individuals to the will or interests of the community.

If that is Socialism, there are no Socialists—certainly not in this congregation; in fact, it would be very difficult to find any man anywhere who would profess to be a Socialist under that definition. One might say, "I approve of sacrificing the interests of the individual to the interests of the community," but it would be very difficult to find any man anywhere who would say, "I believe in sacrificing the legitimate liberty of individuals to the will or interests of the community." There are no Socialists if that is the definition. We are all Socialists if the other is the definition.

I do not propose to add another definition of Socialism; there are enough already; but I do propose to try to trace a little the history of Socialism and point out some of its characteristics.

Men have attempted to trace Socialism back to early ages. They have found it in the mediæval Church; in Plato's "Republic;" in Christ's teaching; in the teaching of the Hebrew prophets; and in the organization of the Hebrew theocracy. But, however true it may be that this great movement has roots in the past, the word Socialism is wholly of modern origin. It came into existence in the year 1835. It was coined at that time for the purpose of describing certain theories of the social life propounded by Robert Owen. Socialism, then, as a modern movement, dates from the beginning of this century; and it is of Socialism as contemporaneous with the word which describes it that I have to speak to-night.

And Socialism as dating from the commencement of the nineteenth century is a reaction against the excessive individualism which preceded it, as that was in turn a reaction against the paternalism which preceded that. In the sixteenth century Luther woke slumbering Europe with a trumpet-call to liberty. His fundamental doctrine was not justification by faith. It was the individual responsibility of every soul to God. Over against the notion that that responsibility could be taken by a corporate institution, by a Vicar of Christ, he insisted that every man must give account himself to God; and that every man, therefore, had not only a right but a duty of judging of his religious obligation, of framing his religious opinions, and of answering to the Almighty for those opinions and for the fulfillment of that duty. This doctrine he kept within due bounds, but the men who followed him did not. Out of

the Lutheran movement there sprang what is known in theology as the Antinomian movement—that is, the doctrine that there is no law, that every man is free to do what he will—there sprang an excessive individualism in the Church. Men not only denied the authority of the Pope and the authority of the Church, but they denied the unity of the Church. And the process of segregation went on until, in this country, there are seven great denominations; and, if you count the smaller ones, one hundred and forty-three different denominations; for each one of the great denominations is divided into smaller ones, according to the taste, the fancy, or the opinion of those who constitute it. Thus you may belong, if you like, to any one of six kinds of Adventists, twelve kinds of Mennonites, twelve kinds of Presbyterians, thirteen kinds of Baptists, sixteen kinds of Lutherans, seventeen kinds of Methodists, besides a variety of Episcopalians and Congregationalists, to say nothing of Jews. And if this does not satisfy you, you can join any one of the one hundred and fifty-three independent congregations who have no fellowship with any one. And yet there are those who think there is not liberty in the Church of Christ! I wonder what they want!

This excessive individualism, which has wrought out these sectarian differences in the Church, appeared in a similar manner in government. Rousseau produced his doctrine of the Contract Social. He maintained that the state of nature is the ideal state. Men then were in liberty, he said; every man could do as he pleased. But men found certain advantages would accrue from combination. They therefore surrendered a part of their liberty, contracting one with another to give up something of their freedom for a common gain to be obtained by a combination. Little by little thus they parted with their liberty. And he taught that what the world wanted was to get back to a state of nature, to annul the contract, to get back to the individualism of the early ages. So Rousseau and his doctrine imported into this country became this: that the sole function of government is to govern, to protect the community from the aggressions of other communities and the individual from the aggressions of other individuals; that there its duty stops; that its existence is due to evil; that it is itself a necessary evil; and that the less government there is the better. But individualism did not stop here. If government is a necessary evil, it is not strange that men said, Let us have no government: abolish it altogether. And so there grew up in modern times—a natural product of Rousseau's democracy—Nihilism or Anarchism—the doctrine that there ought to be no government. It is rather curious to see the daily papers putting Anarchism and Socialism together, as though they were alike. You might as well put Romanism and Independency together, as though they were alike. Socialism and Anarchism stand at the extreme antipodes one of the other. Socialism, in its extreme form, is the doctrine that everything should be under government, all industries should be controlled by it. Anarchism is the doctrine that there ought to be no government, but every individual should be left free to do whatever he pleases. Says the Russian Bakunin, one of the prophets of Anarchism: "The liberty of man consists solely in this, that he obey the laws of nature because he has himself recognized them as such, and not because they have been imposed upon him externally by any foreign will whatsoever, human or divine, collective or individual." That is Anarchism. No government; every man to do what he will.

The same individualism which entered the Church and split it into sects, and entered into government and led on to Anarchy, entered into industry and founded what is known in political economy as the Manchester School, because it had its center in Manchester. The doctrine of individualism in industry treats man as governed by self-interest. "Political economy," says Mr. Mill, "is concerned with man solely as a being who desires to possess wealth, and who is capable of judging of the comparative efficacy of means to that end." That is the definition of political economy given by one of the most famous representatives of the individualistic, or Manchester, school in political economy. We are not to think of man in any other

¹Sermon preached at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, December 1, 1895. Reported stenographically by Henry Winans and revised by the author. For the previous sermon in this series and two sermons introductory to the series see The Outlook for January 4, January 11, and February 1.

aspect than this: a being who desires to make wealth, and knows how to do it; we are to make no account either of his prejudices and his passions or of his nobler nature. All that is laid aside. The world is made up of men who are struggling for wealth, and we will consider how we shall organize society out of the units that are thus struggling with one another for wealth. And the Manchester School proposes to organize them in this way: Let every man alone; take off the shackles; remove the restraints; let the laborer sell his labor where he will; let the capitalist hire his labor where he will; if this man has goods to sell, let him sell them, or keep them if he cannot sell them; and if this man desires to buy goods, let him buy them, or go without them if he cannot pay the price. And by and by things will find their level; men will get the wages they deserve and the prices their goods are worth; government must not interfere. Let this mass of men who desire to get wealth, and whom we are considering as though they desired nothing else, let them struggle together, and the man who best deserves the reward will get it.

The issue of this individualism, this spirit of sectarianism in commerce, this spirit of anarchy in industry, has been just as bad in the industrial world as it has been in the religious and in the political. It has brought untold evils upon the human race. After some reflection, I have decided that I will not try to picture these evils to you in my own terms. There has been so much heat in these discussions that I have desired to furnish light, not heat. There are some aspects of the inhumanity of man to man in the battles of industry that I could not speak of, if I used my own words, with sufficient calmness for this evening's purpose; so, instead—though the extract is a little long—I will read from a volume of Professor Walker, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (a man whom no one will think of accusing of Socialism or Socialistic tendencies), some paragraphs in which he describes the results of individualism in England:

We know that mill-owners are harassed with applications from their hands to take children into employment on almost any terms, and that the consciences of employers have required to be reinforced by the sternest prohibitions and penalties of the law to save children ten, seven, or four years old from the horrors of "sweating dens" and crowded factories, since the more miserable the parents' condition the greater becomes the pressure on them to crowd their children somehow, somewhere, into service; the scantier the remuneration of their present employment, the less becomes their ability to secure promising openings, or to obtain favor from outside for the better disposition of their offspring. . . . What is the single laborer in a cotton-mill? What does his will or wish stand for? The mill itself becomes one vast machine which rolls on in its appointed work, tearing, crushing, or grinding its human just as relentlessly as it does its other material. The force of discipline completely subjects the interests and the objects of the individual to the necessities of a great establishment. Whoever fails to keep up, or faints by the way, is relentlessly thrown out. If the wheel runs for twelve hours in the day, every operative must be in his place from the first to the last revolution. If it runs for thirteen hours or fourteen, he must still be at his post. Personality disappears; even the instinct of self-assertion is lost; apathy soon succeeds to ambition and hopefulness. The laborer can quarrel no more with the foul air of his unventilated factory, burdened with poisons, than he can quarrel with the great wheel that turns below.

In religion there is a reaction against the individualism of the past. We stand for religious liberty as Luther did, but we no longer think that liberty is the only word, and we are reaching out for a fraternity in religion as well. The Pope is sending his message to the English people to come back to their loyalty to him. The English Church is studying the question how it may bring about the union of the Greek and Anglican churches in one great organization. The Congregationalists are proposing a simpler creed and a greater liberty of interpretation, that the churches may work together, hand in hand, shoulder to shoulder. We are framing plans for the confederation of churches, if they cannot unite in one great organization. We are forming organizations like the Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, the King's Daughters, the Societies of Christian Endeavor, and the like. The movement of this

nineteenth century is a movement to add fraternity to liberty in the realm of religion.

And the movement may be just as clearly traced in government. We no longer anywhere believe in what has been well called the night-watchman theory of government. We no longer, save a few doctrinaires, believe in the doctrine that the simple function of government is to govern. We no longer believe that its sole duty is to protect one community against another community, or one individual against another individual. By government we protect and promote manufactures. By government we aid with subsidies railroads and canals and various public enterprises. By government we carry all the mails. By government we educate the children of the commonwealth in all the elements that are necessary to citizenship. By government we establish parks for public playgrounds, and maintain music in the parks for public recreation. Government has run far beyond any bounds that Thomas Jefferson would have recognized as legitimate. If we go across the sea, we may see the same tendency there. In Great Britain government takes care of the savings of the poor. In Germany government provides life insurance against sickness, death, and old age, for the workingman. In Switzerland government runs the express business. And in Australia government owns and operates the railroads. These are only a part of the functions on which government is entering. Philosophy supports politics in this view. We have long since learned that there never was a state of nature in which all men are free. We have learned that Rousseau's picture of an ideal state of nature was coined out of his own brain, and has no history to warrant it; that the earliest governments were military despotisms, and that the progress of the world has been steadily away from despotic authority and brute force toward a larger liberty. Government is not founded on a Contract Social; government is a divine institution. It belongs to the inherent order of things. God, who has set men in families, has set men in communities, and we are born into government as we are born into the household.

Now, the same reaction which has produced a movement toward fraternity in religion and toward fraternity in politics is producing, and has produced, a movement toward fraternity in industry. We have definitely abandoned *laissez-faire* and the Manchester School. It has no longer any place in any of our industrial conceptions. It is sometimes attacked by men as though it were an existing thing. It is not an existing thing. In 1802 the first factory legislation was introduced in England—"the greatest invention in the science of government in modern times," says the Duke of Argyll. This factory legislation undertook to regulate the relations between employer and employed, and it has gone steadily on from that year, in England and in this country. The employment of children under a certain age is prohibited; the employment of children in certain vocations is prohibited; the employment of women in certain vocations and certain hours is prohibited; sanitary conditions are required by law for the house and the factory. Government has definitely, distinctly, and finally declared that the relations between men in industry cannot be left to the conflict of self-interest. There must be, in some measure, government control exercised over them. And from that declaration we shall never, I believe, in any Anglo-Saxon community, go back to the old pagan individualism.

While we have thus been exercising governmental supervision over industrial relations we have been creating industrial organizations for the better production of wealth. It is popular in certain quarters to denounce corporations. Some corporations have acted in such a way that they deserve denunciation, just as some individuals have acted. But the corporation is a modern contrivance in the interest of fellowship. It is a contrivance by which many men can combine their brains and their purses in a common enterprise. On the other hand, labor also has framed its organizations. It is customary in certain quarters to denounce trade-unions. And I must frankly confess that it sometimes requires all my faith in the principles of the rights of men to associate themselves together for common ends, to defend trade-unions, when I see some of

the things which they have done and are doing in the name of labor every day. But I remember history; I know how in England the trade-unions have passed through the barbaric stage of organizations for labor-war, into the present stage of organizations, which, on the whole, are peaceful and make for peace. I hope that our own country, following the example of our most advanced neighbor, may also learn to lay aside the war spirit, and that the trade-unions of to-day will become in fact not only peaceable, but peace-makers. Where labor is organized there it is best paid, there it is best educated, there, for the most part, it does its work best. The progress of the nineteenth century is in the direction of a larger education and better organization both of capital and labor. The days of pure individualism are over.

But that is not all. We have the incipient organizations of capital and labor combining together for a common end. We have them in profit-sharing, in co-operation, in schemes of arbitration, sometimes successful, sometimes failures, but, at all events, with a better spirit of brotherhood beneath them and in them than the old spirit of antagonistic selfishness working out a result that shall give the reward only to the strong, and death to the weak.

Socialism, then—though I do not define it—Socialism I take to be a reaction against the excessive individualism of the past: in its extreme demand that there shall be no competition, and that all men in a community shall combine in a common enterprise and together own all the products and implements of labor, never to be realized, and not desirable to realize; but in the broad purpose which underlies it, of adding the word fraternity to the word liberty, to be welcomed as a tendency, and to be wisely guided as a beneficent movement.

Socialism and Christianity agree in two fundamental respects. They both desire a reorganization of society. They both aim at a reorganization of society which shall give a greater diffusion of intelligence and a greater diffusion of wealth throughout the community. In these two respects they are allied; they both seek a reconstruction of society, and they seek a reconstruction of society which shall give a wider diffusion of wealth, virtue, and intelligence. But they differ, also, in very important respects, and to these differences I wish, in what little time remains, to call your attention.

In the first place, then, Socialism puts social condition first, and the individual condition second. Socialism maintains that happiness depends upon the circumstances, Christianity that it depends upon the character, of the individual. Socialism, therefore, makes its first effort to give cleaner streets, better homes, better food. Christianity attempts as its first effort to make better men.

In the second place, Socialism considers that man's moral character depends, primarily, on his condition. It seeks to change his condition, not merely to make him happier, but also to make him a better man. In its extreme forms, it avers that all the evils of mankind are due to social habit, evil organization. Said an objector to an enthusiastic Socialist, "Your scheme would work well if men were all angels;" to whom the enthusiastic Socialist replied, "All men would be angels if you would only take away the evils of their social condition." Christianity goes on a very different assumption. It assumes that evil is primarily in the individual, and it makes its first aim to correct the evil in the individual. Christ came into the world when slavery abounded. He said no word against slavery. He came into the world when wages were low. He said nothing about better wages. He came into the world when despotism was rampant. He said nothing about evil government. But he put such hope, such love, such spirit into men that they broke the chains of slavery, they broke from the bondage of despotism, established the free school, diffused wealth. My notes are full of the historic references to justify these statements, which, because the time is short, I must leave broad and general; but I could give you page after page, quotation after quotation, showing how, by its influence on the masters on the one hand, and its influence on the slaves on the other, slavery became impossible and manumission came, not by

imperial decree, but by the act of individual Christian masters moved to liberty by the spirit of humanity which had been wrought in them. Christianity begins with the individual, and it works toward a social regeneration by the individual. Men tell us sometimes that the Church is a capitalistic institution. There is some truth in the accusation. We cannot help ourselves. We go into a region of people who are not capitalists, who are almost begging their daily bread, who are living in poverty and in rags, and by our Christian teaching we put such spirit of virtue, of honesty, of industry, of integrity into them that in a very little while they begin to want the savings-bank, and either they must move away from the neighborhood or we must move away from the neighborhood, or the church becomes a body of small capitalists. The egg lies in the nest. There is a bird inside of it. The conservative wants to leave the egg always as it is. "Do not let the shell be broken," he says. He will get an addled egg. The radical wants to break the shell by a blow from the outside. He will get a dead bird. Christianity broods the egg until the bird breaks its own shell. Then it is time the shell was broken.

In the third place, Socialism appeals, primarily, to man in his lower nature, and climbs gradually toward his higher. That is its tendency. Christianity appeals, primarily, to the higher nature and works down to the lower. So Socialism says, first: "Give this ragged man clean clothes and a bath and feed him—provide for his body; then put his children to school—educate them; then give him better wages; as to God and immortality, we will talk about that when we get there." Christianity says to men: "You are sons of God; you are immortal beings. You are not to walk with your arms bound; you are not to walk with your feet in chains; you are a bird: fly! You are a child of God: stand upon your feet!" The message of Christianity to every man groveling in the dust is the message of Almighty God to Ezekiel. This is the word: "Son of man, stand upon thy feet." It begins with its message of immortality and the divine presence, and out of the acceptance of this message it is sure all else will come—higher wages, better clothing, nobler homes, larger education. So Socialism may be without religion. One may be a Socialist and be irreligious, making the line of this life his life horizon. But a Christian cannot be. The power of his message is his faith in the divinity of manhood. The message to the poor and the outcast is, "You are sons of God." The Christian's first aim is to bring men into fellowship with the divine, sure that when they are brought into fellowship with the divine they will be brought into fellowship with one another. It is not the part of Christianity to pick out a man here and there from a wreck and save him for a future heaven. I do not wonder at the scorn which has been sometimes heaped on churches and preachers. Sometimes we have deserved it. The function of Christianity is to make men into men, and out of that manhood to develop a nobler society; it is to make a new and regenerated kingdom; but a kingdom of God on the earth, a kingdom that grows out of the consciousness of God in the soul of man.

There is an old Norse legend that the god of summer was killed and carried off in captivity to the prison-house of the dead, and the whole world went into mourning. The flowers folded their petals, the trees dropped their leaves, the brooks ceased their murmuring song and pulled an icy coverlet over themselves, and the whole earth covered its dead self with a white shroud. Then one of the gods said: "I will go to the abode of the dead, cost what it may, and see if I cannot ransom and bring back the god of summer." And he went, riding through the dark and dangerous valley until he came to the prison-house, and pleaded there for liberation, and at last ransomed the god of summer so far as this, that the keeper of the prison-house said: "Your god may return to you in the spring, but in the fall must come back again." So, every spring, according to this old legend, the god of the summer comes back to earth, and then the whole earth rejoices; and every fall he goes away, and then the whole earth mourns. We who believe in the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ are trying to bring the

god of the summer into the hearts of the children of men ; for we are certain that so long as human hearts banish Him from their presence, and the kingdom is the kingdom of selfishness, so long it will be the kingdom of poverty and wretchedness ; but that when He comes, and we receive Him, all the flowers will be fragrant, and all the trees full of green leaf, and all the birds full of song, for He brings life with Him.



The Religious World



Rev. W. H. Furness

One of the most eminent and honored of Unitarian clergymen in the United States for the last fifty years has been the Rev. William H. Furness, D.D., of the First Unitarian Church of Philadelphia. He was one of the oldest ministers, if not the oldest, in the whole country. He died at his home in Philadelphia on January 30, and his funeral was conducted in the church of which he was so long pastor on February 1, the Rev. Dr. Robert Collyer, of New York, officiating. Dr. Furness was born in Boston in 1802, graduated from Harvard in 1820, and from its Divinity School in 1823. In 1825 he was ordained pastor of the church in Philadelphia which he served until his death. He retired from its ministry in 1875, and since then had been emeritus pastor. He had, however, been heard in various parts of the country, and retained in a wonderful degree his intellectual and physical vigor. For many years he had been the oldest surviving graduate of Harvard. He was a voluminous writer, and was interested not only in religious affairs, but also in literature and municipal and civic life. Among his writings is one which we have never known to appear in print, but which we believe ought to be published if it is still in existence—a letter on the subject of immortality. It was the most beautiful and convincing argument in a brief form which it has ever been our privilege to read. It was passed from friend to friend, and was the means of strengthening and encouraging many doubting and despondent spirits. If that letter is in existence, we believe we do the whole public a service in asking those who possess it to give it to the world. Dr. Furness was one of those men whose nature defies ordinary theological classification. This was not because he was vague, but because he was profoundly spiritual, and the spiritual nature transcends intellectual analysis. Ecclesiastically a Unitarian, and reckoned in his early life as belonging to the radical wing, he accepted heartily historical Christianity, maintained the historical truth of Christ's resurrection, and regarded Christ himself as a true and unique manifestation and revelation of God to man. On these points he was spiritually in accord with the evangelical school. If he and F. D. Maurice could have exchanged educations, they might have changed ecclesiastical positions, except for one difference between them. Dr. Furness had not that subtlety of intellect which enabled one of the foremost theological optimists of the century to defend himself in using liturgically the Athanasian Creed. He who has ever heard Dr. Furness read the Bible in the pulpit will not easily forget the experience. This, which is too often a purely formal exercise, he made eloquent by his own deep feeling and exquisitely simple and truthful elocution.

One of the most prominent churches in the State of New York is the Park Church of Elmira, of which for forty-two years Thomas K. Beecher has been the honored and beloved pastor. His service in the city of Elmira and in the southern part of New York State has produced perhaps quite as deep and lasting an impression as that of his more distinguished brother in the city of Brooklyn. There has just reached us a beautiful

pamphlet containing the report of the anniversary services. In the double frontispiece we are given a view of the old church and the new one. The old seems to have been a wooden structure, of fair size, and looking much like the traditional New England meeting-house. The new is a large and imposing structure, built of brick, and having many departments. If we are not mistaken, in addition to the large auditorium there are also rooms for prayer-meetings, a hall for entertainments, parlors, class-rooms, and the various other equipment considered necessary for an institutional church. And, by the way, we believe that this church was nearly, if not quite, the first "institutional church" in our country. For the last few years Mr. Beecher, by reason of advanced age, has not been in active service. His successors are the Rev. S. E. Eastman and his wife, the Rev. Annis F. Eastman. Is there anywhere another church whose pastoral office is jointly administered by husband and wife? Few churches in the country are better served than the Park Church in Elmira. The golden anniversary services were held on January 1, 1896. From the report we learn that its first public meeting was held on January 3, 1846, and that Mr. Beecher was called in 1854. The first constitution and confession of faith gives a clue to the causes which led to its organization. It was in the time of intense excitement concerning the question of slavery and moral reform. Among the by-laws adopted at that time is the following in regard to slavery and intemperance:

That the holding and trading in men as slaves is a sin in the sight of God, a great wrong to its subjects, and a moral and political evil inconsistent with the Christian profession ; and that : This church will admit no person into its pulpit or communion who is known to be guilty of the same.

Believing that intoxicating liquors are not only unnecessary but hurtful as a drink, and in view of the evils that result from the same, this church declare and agree that using and trafficking in intoxicating liquors is morally wrong. That we will not use intoxicating liquors ourselves, nor furnish them for others; and that it shall be a standing rule of this church that no person shall be received into it either by profession or letter who shall refuse assent to this article.

During its history the church has been loyal to the great principles which led to its formation. The pastorate of Mr. Beecher has been unique. He has bound the people to him with chains of love, and his influence has been extended and beneficent. It was fitting that the fiftieth anniversary of this church should be celebrated, and it is a cause for great congratulation that the honored pastor under whose guidance it has reached its present prominence, with his equally honored wife, were able to be present and receive the evidences of affection and honor from so many lifelong friends.

Dr. Storrs on Long Pastorates

The last meeting of the Manhattan Congregational Association was held in the Church of the Pilgrims, Brooklyn, of which Dr. R. S. Storrs is pastor, on Wednesday, January 29. Among other exercises was an interesting address by Dr. Storrs on "The Conditions and Advantages of a Long Pastorate." As many of our readers know, Dr. Storrs will complete fifty years of service in the Church of the Pilgrims next November. Apparently he is as vigorous as ever, and his friends hope that he may be spared to celebrate that anniversary and many others besides. In enumerating the conditions of a long pastorate, Dr. Storrs said he should give the first place to a patient people. When the people are patient, and do not ask of their pastor what he cannot give them, the first condition is realized. The second condition is good health. By that he was careful to indicate that he did not mean simply physical strength, but what almost every man might possess with reasonable care of himself. Dr. Storrs said that when he went to Brooklyn he was in frail health, and that he went to a physician whom he could trust and asked him to give positive orders how he ought to work ; and, he added, he had lived up to those orders for nearly fifty years. One of them was that he should do all his studying in the daytime. Another condition was that a pastor should be interested in families and persons, and from them receive much of his inspiration. Then, of course, he must be interested in the Gospel and present it in all its fullness and many-sided beauty and power. Again, he must be interested in the community in which he lives, and believe in it and love it. The community itself will then respond and help him in his work. And, finally, there must be a consciousness of success. No man can do his best unless he knows that he is not altogether failing