

with far greater ease and safety than where the sovereign power is centralized." "This race (the Anglo-Saxon) of unequalled energy, with all the majesty of numbers and the might of wealth behind it—the representative, let us hope, of the largest liberty, the purest Christianity, the highest civilization—having developed peculiarly aggressive traits calculated to impress its institutions upon mankind, will spread itself over the earth." "My plea is not, save America for America's sake, but save America for the world's sake."

But if the Anglo-Saxon race is accumulating irresistible power with which to press the die of its civilization upon the world, it should be made more fit for its work, and "it is critically important that our plastic institutions be brought under the moulding hand of Christ, and that His teachings be recognized as binding on all men, not only in their relations with God, but also in their daily relations with one another." For those who do not accept His teachings as authoritative, Dr. Strong briefly sums up the internal argument for believing that "the character and life portrayed in the Gospels is, beyond peradventure, genuine," and points out very clearly that any other hypothesis would be infinitely more incredible. In this connection he makes a remark which many over-timorous Christians would do well to ponder:—"It has been a mischievous mistake on the part of many Christians to build their faith not solely on Christ, the Rock of Ages, but partly and largely on the shifting sands of human theories. Not a few are saying to-day that if they are compelled to surrender their belief in the inerrancy of Scripture their faith in Christianity will have to go with it. That would be a sacrifice as gratuitous as sad. Nothing can shake my confidence in Christianity which does not shake my confidence in the life and character of Christ, for He is the only true foundation of the Christian faith."

But Dr. Strong enforces the fact, that, while Christ laid down the fundamental laws which provide for the full development of individuals and the perfect organization of society, the Church has not been true to the second of these laws, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Obedience to this command would necessarily regenerate the whole social system, by eradicating the selfishness which now vitiates it. It is too true that the Church has too generally ignored this "royal law," that, as Dr. Strong observes, she "has regarded the second great command as an ideal beyond the attainment of human society; a beautiful sentiment to be admired, rather than a practical law to be obeyed in all the relations of life—social, industrial, commercial and political. So true is this, that many will look on a serious attempt to make the law of love to one's neighbour the warp running through all our social fabric, as highly quixotic."

"This failure of the Church to discharge her high mission has," says our author, "had far-reaching consequences, has maimed and belittled Christian life, made an injurious distinction between the 'sacred' and the 'secular,' a distinction unknown to the early Church; has established a fatal divorce between doctrine and conduct, cultivating a selfish individualism, and naturally resulting in an organization of society which is not Christian." So generally is this acquiesced in, that our author quotes a most reputable man of business as remarking: "There is no such thing

as business without lying;" and another writer as declaring that "a sensitive conscience must be left behind when its possessor goes into the office or the shop." We are all familiar with similar remarks in our daily intercourse.

Dr. Strong cites the widespread and deep discontent of the artisan class as sufficient evidence that our industrial system is not based on Christian principles, and declares, with a true appreciation of the situation, that "we shall have no industrial peace until political economy becomes a department of applied Christianity, or, as some would prefer to say, till Christianity has been substituted for political economy." Till recently, indeed, "the Church has left the study of the science of society almost wholly to unbelievers, giving, of course, the common impression that religion is a thing apart from the ordinary life of man, and alienating from Christianity not only the great class of workers, dissatisfied because their condition has not improved proportionately with the general improvement of conditions, but also the growing class of men who cherish higher ideals respecting society than those which the Church seems, by its inaction, to endorse.

Dr. Strong's chapter on "Popular Discontent," is a very fair and suggestive analysis of the causes of the widespread dissatisfaction among the lower classes with the existing conditions of their lives. With regard to the vexed question whether the labourer is better off to-day than he was centuries ago, he quotes several differing opinions, concluding with that of Prof. Ely and President Low, which seems to hit the truth: "When we compare the actual amount of wages received by the labouring classes now with their former wages, we find ourselves obliged to abandon that superficial optimism based on an imperfect analysis of industrial conditions. There seems to be an absolute improvement, but can we certainly say that this has been relative?" At all events, so long as New York city holds 1,103 millionaires, with from one to one hundred and fifty millions each, and living in an extravagant luxury in keeping with their millions, side by side with two-thirds of the population living in tenement houses and many of them in poverty and wretchedness beyond description, with deaths from starvation perpetually taking place, Dr. Strong evidently thinks that American society, at least, is a long way from being based on the Christian law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

In his chapter on "The Problem of the City," Dr. Strong considers carefully the various evils and dangers of city life—over-crowding, civic corruption, heathenism of the masses, pauperism and intemperance. His strenuous words might well rouse the Church to a more active and practical share in combatting these evils. The solution of the problem of pauperism Dr. Strong places (rightly, we believe,) on the principle of personal contact, including, of course, sympathy and personal influence. The poor cannot be uplifted by machinery, or by any rough-and-ready wholesale measures, or "short and easy methods," or by poor-laws, which substitute a cold and degrading officialism for the warm and mutually beneficial contact of heart with heart. He believes that the churches could cope with this growing evil, if they could arouse their members generally to the high and holy duty of following in their Master's steps, by giving of themselves to the needs of their brother man, instead of paying

some deputy to do this for them; and he reminds us that the Church, in caring for the temporal needs of men, would be only following its Master's lead. He gives a well-deserved meed of praise to the Salvation Army which has nobly set the Church the example of coming down to its fallen brother and raising him up by the outstretched hand of brotherly love. We should be glad to discuss a few more fully some of Dr. Strong's practical suggestions, such as the necessity and possibility of co-operation among our divided sections of the Christian Church, a necessity that cannot be too strongly insisted on. For, as he remarks: "If the Churches do not soon organize for the prosecution of social reforms, they will lose their opportunity of leadership, and will hold on the masses, and to shape the civilization of the future." And this can be done only through co-operation. "The competitive principle utterly defies Christianity." To cure the latter evil, and apply the principle of co-operation, Dr. Strong proposes a federation "not from the top but from the bottom." "a federation of local churches, co-operating with each other in arranging for territorial house-to-house visitation, the organized care of the sick poor, the cure of pauperism, the education of the children by Christian kindergartens—something, in short, like Mr. Stead's 'Christian Church,' with the addition of the element of personal touch; a 'personal power which the Church has largely lost,' and 'the exercise of which is not laid on the conscience of non-professing Christians as a necessary part of Christian living.' And why should not the Christian Churches thus co-operate? Is there a single reason which will stand a Christian test?"

But they will do it only if they are more generally inspired with the "enthusiasm of humanity" which was the very spirit of the Master. "The great wrongs of the world exist because human appetite and passion are enlisted on their behalf. They are opposed by the spirit of benevolence. As long as appetite and passion are stronger in wicked men than benevolence in good men these wrongs will continue. Hence the necessity of arousing Christians to an enthusiasm in humanity—we are to overcome the difficulties of Christianity by effort."

But how are the great mass of apathetic and selfish professing Christians to be roused to such an enthusiasm? Dr. Strong replies: "We can get the sacred fire and the oil to feed it where the early Christians got them. And only there can the oil be got which can permanently feed the sacred fire."

We trust that we have said enough to give some idea of this forcible and practical appeal to the Christian Church to arise to discharge her high commission, in view of the needs and possibilities of this age of accelerating movement. And every like-minded reader will echo the author's closing words: "that the whole Church, with unbroken sacrifice, until the Kingdom is fully come, and God's will is done on earth even as it is in heaven."

O, the eye's light is a noble gift of Heaven.  
All beings live from light, each fair creature  
thing—the very plants turn with a joyous  
transport to the light.—Schiller.

FIDELIS.