

The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1923

THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEAS OF DANIEL

Before entering upon the discussion of the origin of the ideas of Daniel, several fallacies must first be considered.

Thus it is claimed that it is possible to determine the time of a revelation from its ideas in the same manner as we would determine that of a mere human production. But, for those who believe in a thinking God who has made the universe including man it is impossible to deny the possibility of a revelation to His creatures of Himself and of His plans up to the capacity of those creatures to receive such a revelation. How and why He makes such a revelation it may be impossible for the objects of it to determine or to understand: but that He can reveal what He desires to reveal must be admitted.

Further, to all who believe that God has begun to make such a revelation it is clear that no limits as to the time and manner and order and emphasis, extent and subject-matter, of such a revelation can be set by the creatures who receive it. These are matters for the Revealer to determine and not for the persons to whom the revelation is made.

To those who accept these premises (and we take it that all Christians must accept them), all objections against the book of Daniel on the ground of the character of the revelation that it contains may safely be looked upon as beyond the legitimate realm of discussion. Whether God saw fit to reveal these truths in the sixth or in the second century B.C. must be a matter of comparatively little importance. What is of importance for us is, that He has revealed them.

To object to the fact of a certain alleged revelation that it is too detailed, or that it is written in veiled language, or in an unusual rhetorical style, or in a novel literary manner, is

PROTESTANTISM AND PROPERTY

Never, in the years since the Reformation, has the whole of Protestantism held a definite attitude toward property. It does not now. It has a wealth of opinion, a plethora of past and present writing, and several "Social Creeds" which show a deepening interest, but as yet no decided acceptance of a clearly defined basis on which to found, not only an authoritative, but also, a unitedly Protestant code, applied by clergy and laity alike, to the problems of obtaining, possessing, using, dispensing, and more important still perhaps, lacking property. "Property is the kernel of the whole social question. The economic problem of the future is not the production of property, but its distribution."¹ Inquiry into the subject reveals great divergence in the thought of the Protestant church as a whole. To seek the historical causes of these differences and the growth of the modern conceptions, with a hope of achieving some logical unity, is the purpose of this paper. The natural development of the subject is, then:—

- (1) The teachings of the Medieval Church bearing on property which were repudiated by Protestantism.
- (2) The teachings advanced by the Protestant Church during the Reformation and the two subsequent centuries.
- (3) The growth of the economic and materialistic attitude with the consequent loss of the Protestant Church's commanding position.
- (4) Recent and present attitudes claiming Protestantism's attention.

I. TEACHINGS OF THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH THAT WERE REPUDIATED BY PROTESTANTISM

The Protestant Reformation found a Medieval Church organized and systematized as no other institution in the world's history. Because of this organization² and because

¹ Strong, *The Next Great Awakening*, p. 196.

² "At the beginning of the present era the church was a despotic and exploiting organization. Instead of a great exemplar of fraternity, it was ruled by a monarchical hierarchy which used its immense powers to lord it over the people and enrich itself" (Rauschenbusch, *Christianizing the Social Order*).

she had so complete a system the Medieval Church had a very definite and quite inclusive attitude toward property. This attitude was of course interrelated with her teaching on many other subjects, and was also, through the peculiar theological casuistry and ethical legalism of the Schoolmen, applied to the ultimate minutiae of each individual's existence.

When Luther attacked one dogma of this Medieval Church, all felt the shock. Indeed it was the spirit of the Renaissance and the Reformation to investigate even the most sacred of accepted things, one discovery leading on to another. So a Galileo, a Columbus, an Erasmus and the various Reformers followed, each in his own way, the light. It is most significant that the spark that lit Luther's lamp was his disgust with the mercenary sale of indulgences and his sympathy for the poor people so swindled. The sale of indulgences was at heart a profoundly religious question; but its social and economic significance was tremendous. To say that the Protestant Reformation was occasioned by a dispute over the spending of money will sound startling only to one who does not have in mind what that dispute involved. Such a movement must inevitably repudiate some at least of the Medieval doctrines with regard to property.

Foremost, then, the Reformers denied the doctrine of the "Treasury of Merit" (*Thesaurus Meritorum*),³ necessarily overturning the idea that merit was stored up by the saints, especially those who followed the 'Evangelical Counsels of Perfection,' *i.e.*, poverty, chastity, and obedience,⁴ believing that thus, serving God more perfectly than common men were required, they were adding by this to the infinite merit bestowed by Christ and the Virgin on the Church. They believed and the Church claimed by the power of the keys to be able to distribute this treasure as she pleased in indulgences,

³ A short discussion of this is found in Vol. V, Part II of Schaff's *History of the Christian Church*, with references to the modern doctrine.

⁴ See articles in the *Catholic Dictionary* and the *Catholic Encyclopedia* on "Evangelical Counsels" and related topics.

etc. The following quotation from Calvin⁵ is the typical attitude of the Reformers: "The Schoolmen have discovered either their ignorance or their wickedness in a most pestilent manner . . . when . . . they have made them to be counsels which we are at liberty to obey or not to obey, and have confined the necessary observance of them to the monks, who on account of this very circumstance would be more righteous than plain Christians, because they have voluntarily bound themselves to observe these counsels."

(A) The renunciation of property, poverty by taking a vow, said the Medieval Church, was the teaching of Christ and the Apostles as a way of attaining Apostolic Perfection. Thus such passages were quoted as Matt. 16:24, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me,"⁶ and Matt. 19:21, "If thou wouldst be perfect, go sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." "Take nothing for your journey, neither staves nor scrip, neither bread, neither money; neither have two coats apiece."⁷ "Sell all that ye have and give alms; provide yourselves bags which wax not old,

⁵ *Institutes*, Vol. I, p. 446, cf. the following pp. (Bk. II, Ch. VIII, par. 56).

⁶ A careful perusal of such Mediaeval books as *The Mirror of Perfection*, *An Imitation of Christ*, *The Inner Castle*, etc., will reveal quotation, among others, of the following passages: Matt. 16:24-26, Matt. 18:8-9, "Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off and cast them from thee," etc. Matt. 20:26, "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." Mark 8:35, Luke 9: 23-25, Mark 9:21, Luke 14:26, "If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." Luke 14:33, "So whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath cannot be my disciple." Luke 16:13, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Luke 17:33, Luke 18:29, Luke 18:22. It will be noted that these were spiritualized and applied to the monastic life in a truly Medieval manner. Also that many of these passages apply also to the next section on almsgiving. We will not quote them again however but refer the reader's attention to them here where they first seem pertinent. The Reformers of course did not lack in their love and adherence to these scriptures, but they refused to interpret them as counselling the renunciation of property and the taking of the vow of poverty.

⁷ Luke 9:3.

a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth. For where your treasure is there will your heart be also."⁸

The words and example of the Apostles they added to these. They "sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to every man, as every man had need."⁹ "Our Lord Jesus," they taught, "though he was rich yet for our sakes he became poor, that through his poverty ye might become rich."¹⁰ All these passages and many others we find quoted by the Medieval Church as proof that voluntary poverty was such an aid to perfection.

To these may be added the influence of tradition. The legendary lives of the Apostles and the Christians of the Early Church, and the writings of the Fathers, it is true, do not teach that there were counsels of perfection. Indeed, as Calvin says, "Who can doubt that the fathers would have sincerely abhorred such blasphemy?"¹¹ But it cannot be denied that they show a decided ascetic emphasis. Take up the *Vitae Patrum*,¹² the *Acta Sanctorum*,¹³ or even the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*,¹⁴ and at once you feel that here is an adulation of renunciation, especially a renunciation of property. Even modern writers on the apostolic age, as we shall see later, extol the poverty of the early Christians, and none can speak of their charity without mentioning also their renunciation.¹⁵

⁸ Luke 12:33-34.

⁹ Acts 2:45.

¹⁰ II Cor. 8:9, cf. Rom. 8:13, I Cor. 2:27-28, II Cor. 6:10.

¹¹ *Institute*, vol. III p. 289 (Bk. IV. Ch. VIII, par. 14.)

¹² *Vitae Patrum*, Rosweyde, Antwerp 1615-23, very scarce but well known in its century.

¹³ *Acta Sanctorum*, prepared to go with the saints' days by the Bollandists in Brussels, still incomplete.

¹⁴ *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, the work of Smith and Wace, 1877. Four volumes going up to the 8th century only.

¹⁵ Cf. Uhlhorn, *Christian Charity in the Early Church*. E. Hatch, *Organization of the Early Christian Churches*; A. Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*; Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*; Dobschutz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*. Many other works and writers are mentioned by Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vols. I and II.

Similarly the patristic, apologetic, and early ecclesiastical writers generally exalt the ascetic life, Clement,¹⁶ St. Augustine,¹⁷ and all the rest indeed upholding the life of renunciation as ideal. Complete renunciation of course "centered itself round three points: poverty, chastity, and obedience";¹⁸ but of the three poverty seemed "the most absolutely essential." If any man calleth aught his own he maketh himself a stranger to the elect of God," says Basil."¹⁹

No doubt, as some have said, the influence of the Essenes may be traced in this asceticism.²⁰ Or again the agency of the Therapeutae may have influenced the growth of this ideal, especially as it contributed to a life free from distraction.²¹ However this may be, there is a noticeable repetition throughout the ages from St. Anthony to St. Francis of the re-enactment of the story of the rich young ruler.²² This story especially, and the words of Christ we have quoted, seem to have found a ready response in the spirits of earnest Christians of the age. Was every Christian to feel the same? "Are all called to be Ministers?—Missionaries? Is the same sacrifice demanded of every child of God? Is the sacrifice of Abraham, 'Thy son, thine only son Isaac'—an incident in every life? Is the command: 'Go sell all that thou hast and give to the poor,' of universal application? Are there no martyrs? Put in this form" by the Medieval Christian "the question answers itself."²³ It seemed clear that only a cer-

¹⁶ *Who is the Rich Man that is Saved?* and *Epistle to James*, VIII, X, Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, Vol. I, p. 467.

¹⁷ In adulation of Saint Anthony and in his advice to his sister.

¹⁸ Workman, *Evolution of Monasticism*, p. 55, cf. Zoeckler, *Askese in Monachtum*, pp. 156-165. Harnack, *Monasticism*, p. 10.

¹⁹ *Regulae Brev. tract Interrog.* 85, op. ii. p. 629 in ed. Garnier, Paris, 1839.

²⁰ Moffat "Essenes" in Hastings *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*.

²¹ A fine discussion of this point will be found in Conybeare, *The Contemplative Life*.

²² Cf. St. Anthony, Paul of Thebes, Simeon Stylites, The Sarabaites, Ambrose, Rhemoboths, Hilarion, etc., in such works as Reuffner, Uhlhorn, and Cassian and Palladius.

²³ Workman, *Evolution of the Monastic Ideal*, p. 336, cf. "God makes

tain few were so called in order to serve the whole church. When this thought was fully developed, monasticism became "a veritable stampede from the Catholic Church, as though that great creation of Christian energy were no better than the evil world from which escape was sought."²⁴ No doubt the wealth and the lack of spirituality in a church such as Constantine, by his establishment, created had much to do with the more devout seeking a purer religious life in the wilderness.²⁵ Surely Roman society had little to commend itself to one desiring to live a life of faith.²⁶ Perhaps the chiasm of the Early Church had some influence in making the religieuse willing to sell his possessions.²⁷ There was however more than anything else the fact of a regular and attractive establishment of the monastic life under Benedict (529 A.D.). The Anchorites²⁸ had been too scattered, the Coenobites too unruly, it was in the life of a monk under the rule that the church found the life of renunciation most attractive.

However the Benedictine form of renunciation was never complete, it remained for the Franciscans and the Dominicans, particularly the Franciscans, to exhaust the human possibilities in following this ideal. Witness the first rule of St. Francis.²⁹ "Money, O my brother," says St. Francis, "is unto the servants of God naught else but the devil and a poisonous serpent."³⁰ To be sure, after the death of Francis there was some moderation of the original rule of absolute

no class legislation, 'If any man will come after me'; that includes rich and poor alike; the terms are all inclusive, to missionary and mechanic, to prince and peasant, the words are the same." Strong, *The Great Awakening*, p. 137, expresses the Protestant view.

²⁴ A. V. G. Allen, *Christian Institutions*, p. 139.

²⁵ Harnack, *Monasticism*, p. 44.

²⁶ S. Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*.

²⁷ Harnack, *Monasticism*, p. 27, cf. J. F. Silver, *The Lord's Return*.

²⁸ See Schaff Vol. II, p. 392, and Vol. III, p. 147, for references.

²⁹ Quarrachi ed., *Opuscula Sancti Patris Francisci Assisiensis*, etc. See, P. Robinson, *A Short Introduction to Franciscan Literature*.

³⁰ Everyman ed. *Little Flowers*, p. 345, cf. pp. 3, 4, 10, 12, etc.

poverty and mendicancy³¹ but still it was a saying of the Church "The Franciscans, Christ, and the Apostles held no property." "Though all in general who worship God may be called religious," said Thomas Aquinas, "the name is especially given to such as dedicate their entire lives to the worship of God, keeping aloof from worldly business."³²

There were many fanatic movements of protest at the time of the Franciscan movement³³ and shortly after. The world was getting ready for the final protest of the Reformation in which all this system should be overthrown, and with it the Medieval Church's praise of the renunciation of property.

(B) Protestantism however found that underlying the ideal of Evangelical Poverty (the renunciation of property), was the ideal of Christian Charity. The Division of Property with those in need, or Alms, said the Medieval Church was enjoined on the Christian as a debt, the paying of which was only an act of justice. "Rich is the man that pities many," they read,³⁴ "and in imitation of God bestows from what he hath, for God giveth all things to all from his own creatures. Understand then, ye rich men, that ye are in duty bound to do service, having received more than ye yourselves need. Learn that to others is lacking that wherein you superabound. Be ashamed of holding fast what belongs to others. Imitate God's equity and none shall be poor." This thought was derived of course from the passages quoted above where Christ commends almsgiving and from the following also:

³¹ The conflict between the Spirituals and the Moderates led to this modification.

³² *Summa*, II, II Q. lxxxii, "Of Religious" Art. I.

³³ *E.g.*, the Poor Men of Lyons, The Flagellants, The Cathari or Albigenses, and the Lollards. See, Glaser, *Die Franciskanische Bewegung*, Stuttgart, 1903, which treats of poverty and its relation to the reform of the M.A. and is a scientific Protestant work; also "Economic Self Interest in the German Anti-Clericalism of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries," A. E. Harvey in the *Amer. Jour. of Theol.*, Vol. 19, p. 509; also "The Roman Law and the Peasant Revolt," Sidney Fay in the *Amer. Hist. Rev.* 1911, Vol. 16.

³⁴ *The Preaching of Peter, Didache* 1:5-4:6-7.

“He that hath two coats let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath meat let him do likewise.”³⁵ “Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.”³⁶ “But whoso hath this world’s goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him.”³⁷ Several passages from the Old Testament were also influential in creating this attitude. “If there be any poor man of one of thy brethren within any of the gates in thy land which the Lord thy God giveth thee thou shalt not harden thy heart nor shut thine hand from thy poor brother: but thou shalt open thine hand wide to him and shalt surely hand him sufficient for his need in that which he wanteth.”³⁸

The church writers emphasized almsgiving all through the Middle Ages. St. Ambrose speaks for them, “Nature produced all things for the common use of all men. Nature produced the common right of property but usurpation the private right.”³⁹ So, says Gregory Nazianzen, we should give alms and “not be bad stewards of what has been given us.”⁴⁰ So again the Shepherd of Hermas, “Every man ought to be rescued from his misfortunes, for he that hath need and suffereth misfortune in his daily life is in great distress and necessity and suffers like torment with one in bonds.”⁴¹ “Instead then of the fields buy ye souls in distress as one is able, and protect widows and orphans, for to this end the sovereign Master enriched you, that ye might perform these services

³⁵ Mark 3:11.

³⁶ Matt. 5:42.

³⁷ I John 3:17. Cf. also Matt. 5:42, 6:1-4, 10:42, 19:16, 21, 28, 25:31-46, 28:19. Mark 10:17, 21-28, 12:41. Luke 3:11, 6:29, 35, 38, 10:25-37, 11:41, 12:33, 14:12-14, 16:19-26, 18:22, 19:1-10; John 12:5-6, 13:29; Acts, 2:45, 3:2, 4:36, 9:36-41, 10:2, 31, 11:28, 24:17; Romans 12:7, 13, 15:26; I Cor. 9:1-19, 13:3, 16:2; II Cor. 8:4, 14, 9:9, Gal. 2:10, Phil. 4:15, II Thess. 4:9; Heb. 13:16, 10:34; I John 3:17; Rev. 2:9.

³⁸ Deut. 15:7 and 8. Cf. Ec. 22:5, Deut. 15:4, 7, 9-11; I Kgs. 8:50, etc.

³⁹ *De Officiis*, i, 28; *Comm. on Ps.*, cxviii, 8-22.

⁴⁰ *Oration*, xiv, xvi.

⁴¹ *Similitude*, X, iv, 2.

for Him."⁴² Irenaeus also, "Wherein anyone can do good to his neighbors and does it not, he shall be reckoned alien to the Lord's love."⁴³ Tertullian speaks of alms as "fellowship in property,"^{43a} while Cyprian holds that property is held in trust for God. "Not only open-handed, but just, is an imitation of God the Father."⁴⁴ So again Lactantius speaks of alms as justice because of the claims of need upon property, especially where there is to spare. Christ came, he says, to restore justice as dutifulness (*Pietas*). *Pietas* and *aequitas* contain justice.⁴⁵ Equity between men he concludes is *humanitas* or charity.

All the Medieval theologians are of the opinion that the institution of private property is lawful, yet the claims of all those who are in want continue to be valid. "Alms are justice rather than mercy," says Gregory the Great.⁴⁶

This principle that almsgiving is an act of justice rather than mercy, is very significant, and forms a very important element in the Medieval conception of property.⁴⁷ In short to the Fathers and the Medieval Church the only natural condition is that of common ownership and use. They admit however that human nature being as it is (since the Fall) greedy, avaricious, and vicious, it is impossible for man to live normally under the conditions of common ownership. Private property is therefore practically the creation of the state and is defined, limited, and changed by the state. So they traced from the words of the law, the prophets, the wisdom writers, Christ, the apostles, and the schoolmen a distinction definitely

⁴² *Similitude*, I, 5-8, Cf., *Mandate*, VIII, 10. Harnack, *Patrum Apost. Opera*.

⁴³ *Fragment 10*, in Harvey's ed., II, p. 477.

^{43a} *Apology*, ch. 39.

⁴⁴ *De Opere et Eleemosynis*.

⁴⁵ *Divine Institutes*, V, 5-6, and VI, 9.

⁴⁶ *Lib. Reg. Past.*, iii, 21.

⁴⁷ Ambrosiaster, *Comm. on 2 Cor.* 9:9, says, "it is a matter of justice that a man keeps not for himself alone what is intended by God for the good of all. . . It is just to distribute. . . He is a just man who does not retain for himself what God gave for all." Cf. St. Augustine, *Tract VI in Johannis Evang.* 25, *Epist.* XCIII, 11, and *Sermo*, L, 2.

made in the canon law by Gratian in the twelfth century between the law of nature and the positive law in regard to property. "By the law of nature," says Gratian,⁴⁸ "all things are common to all men; and this principle was observed by the Christians in Acts. This principle was also handed down by the philosophers (note the influence of Plato, Seneca, and Aristotle here). Actually private property is the creation of the state." "The temporal goods that heaven bestows on a man are" then "his as to ownership," says Thomas Aquinas,⁴⁹ "but as to the use they ought not to be his exclusively, but also should benefit others, who can be maintained out of them. Wherefore Basil says, 'It is the bread of the hungry that ye withhold: the naked man's coat that you keep in store: the shoe of the barefoot that is mouldering in your house: the money of the needy that you have buried in the earth.'" "There are times at which one sins mortally in omitting to give alms: on the part of the receiver, when there is an apparent and urgent need, and no appearance of anyone at hand to relieve it: on the part of the giver when he has superfluities which are not necessary to him in his present state, according to a probable estimate. Nor need he consider all the cases that may happen in the future, for that would be to think of the future, which the Lord forbids."⁵⁰

⁴⁸ *Decretum*, D. viii, Pt. I.

⁴⁹ *Summa*, II, II, xxxii, Art. V. Qu. 2, par. 2.

⁵⁰ *Summa*, II, II, Q. xxxii, Art. V. Qu. 2, par. 3. It may be of interest to see how the Summist distinguishes the life of the religious from the ordinary Christian duty however. In answer to the question "Is Almsgiving an act of charity?" he says, "A work whereby something is given to one in need, out of compassion, for the sake of God is" under certain circumstances an act of charity. (*Summa*, II, II, Qu. xxxii, Art. I.) "On the side of the giver we must observe that what is distributed in alms should be of his superfluity, and to give alms to him who is in extreme need: otherwise almsgiving is a matter of counsel, as there are counsels for every better good." (*Summa* II, II, Q. xxxii, Art. V.) "However" (Art. VI.) "it would be an inordinate thing for one to deprive himself of so much of his own goods to give to others, as not to be able on the rest to pass his life suitably to his state and the calls of business. But from this rule there are three exceptions. The first is

The practical bearing of such a doctrine may be baldly stated thus: the beggar becomes an equal if not a superior in piety to the rich, laziness and vagabondage are extolled and profligacy and prodigality become virtues.⁵¹ Such an inverted doctrine could not help but have a disastrous social influence. The Reformation put private ownership on the basis of a divine institution taught in the Decalogue⁵² and opposed begging and mendicancy with an entirely new attitude toward work and almsgiving. Said Calvin, "God sets a higher value on the pious exertions for the government of a family, when a holy father of a family free from avarice, ambition, and other corrupt practices, devotes himself to this object that he may serve God in a particular calling."⁵² The Protestant Church never accepted the Medieval Church's teaching that almsgiving was a work of justice, or that the demands of poverty for a division of property could be based upon the common right to its use.

(C) The third teaching of the Medieval Church with regard to property, rejected by the Protestant Church was the forbidding of usury by the Canon Law. For this provision it seemed to the Medieval Church that there was scriptural warrant. "Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury

when one changes his state, say, by entering religion: for then in *giving away all that he has* for Christ he does a work of perfection, and transfers himself to another state.

⁵¹ Of Prodigality, "Is Prodigality the opposite of covetousness?" *Summa*, II, II, Ques. cxix, Art. I. "In exterior behavior it belongs to the prodigal to exceed in giving, but to fail in keeping or acquiring."

⁵² "By this commandment, (8th) the proper owning of peculiar substance is lawfully ordained and fully established. The Lord forbiddeth theft, therefore He ordaineth and confirmeth the proper owning of worldly riches. For what canst thou steal if all things are common to all men? For thou hast stolen thine own and not another man's if thou takest from another that he hath. But God forbiddeth theft; and therefore by making His law, he confirmeth the proper possession of peculiar goods" (Bullinger, quoted by Levy, p. 147).

⁵² *Institute*, Book IV, Ch. xiii, par. xvi. "It is a beautiful thing to live the life of a philosopher in retirement at a distance from the society of men; but it is not the part of Christian charity for a man to act as if he hated all mankind, withdrawing to the solitude of the desert, and abandoning the principal duties that the Lord hath commanded."

of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury."⁵³

Space suffices for only a quotation or two from the writers of the pre-Reformation church. Gregory Nazianzen calls it "Farming not the land but the necessity of the needy."⁵⁴ Thomas Aquinas in answer to the question "Is it a sin to take usury for the lending of money?" says, "To take usury for the lending of money is in itself unjust⁵⁵ because it is a case of selling that which is non-existent; and that is manifestly the setting up of an inequality contrary to justice." For that matter St. Thomas even frowns on trade, excessive gain being considered a form of usury. "Trade⁵⁶ considered in itself contains a certain unseemliness, in so much as it does not essentially involve any honorable and necessary end. . . . Clerics ought to abstain not only from things in themselves evil, but also from the things that have the appearance of evil, and this observation applies to trade, both because it applies to earthly things of gain, of which the clergy ought to be despisers, as also because of the vices frequently found in persons engaged in trade, because 'a merchant is hardly free from sins of the lips' (Ecclus. 26:28). There is another reason, because trade too much entangles the soul in secular

⁵³ Deut. 23:19. Usury is forbidden in Ex. 22:25, Lev. 25:35-37; Deut. 23:19, Ps. 15:5, Prov. 28:8, Isa. 24:2, Jer. 15:10, Ezek. 18:8, 13, 17, 22:12. It is rebuked in Nehemiah 5:1-13. Authorized toward strangers, Deut. 23:20, and exacted according to the record of Ezekiel 22:12, but it is plainly said that just men do not exact it, Ezekiel 18:8.

⁵⁴ *Oration* xvi, 18.

⁵⁵ Question lxxviii in II, II, Art. I, par. 5, says: "It is to be said that he that is not bound to lend may receive compensation for what he has done in lending but ought not to receive more."

⁵⁶ *Summa*, II, II, Art. iv, Ques. lxxxvii. "Still though gain, which is the end of trade, does not essentially involve anything that is honorable or necessary neither does it essentially involve any element of vice, or aught that is opposed to virtue, hence there is nothing to hinder gain from being referred to an end necessary or even honorable. And thus trade will be rendered lawful: as when one refers to moderate gain that he seeks from trade to the sustenance of his family or to the relief of the distressed."

cares, and withdraws from spirituality: hence the Apostle says: 'No man being a soldier of God entangleth himself with secular matters' (2 Tim. 2:4)." How deeply Protestantism disagreed with these thoughts we shall shortly see.

(D) The fourth, and perhaps least prominent Medieval dogma that Protestantism refused is a corollary of the third just mentioned. Usury, gain, luxury, all opposed themselves very naturally to the teachings mentioned, but 'the root' of all these, said the Church, was money divorced from toil and things. The Capital of the Middle Ages⁵⁷ was embryonic and small, yet it existed in the hands of the Jews, the Fuggers, and in markets such as Genoa, Venice, and later the Hanse towns. Money that took the place of exchange by barter—money that was more mobile than goods—money became the object of hatred to the monks and the target of the Medieval preacher.

Here again we can quote from Scripture: "For the love of money is the root of all evil; which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows."⁵⁸ The money changers of the Gospels were recalled as the type of sinner especially addicted to this evil.⁵⁹ To the Fathers, money was a heathen and was never naturalized into the Kingdom of Heaven. The extortion of exchange and usury made money itself an object of hatred and enmity. St. Francis is represented as "despising perfectly all things which are of this world, above all things did he execrate money . . . more than the dung of an ass."⁶⁰ Money that was found in a purse he declared some

⁵⁷ "That Capitalism as such is older than Puritanism even Weber will not deny" (Felix Rachfahl, "Calvinism and Capitalism," 1909, in *Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik*, p. 1293. This article is rather critical of Calvin's influence.).

⁵⁸ 1 Tim. 6:10.

⁵⁹ Cf. Matt. 21:12, Jesus overturning the tables of the money changers. Mark 11:15 and John 2:15 give accounts of the same or similar events. How these episodes are differently interpreted is a key to the change in the Church's attitude.

⁶⁰ *The Mirror of Perfection*, Ch. xiv.

"devilish contrivance" which a miracle proved it to be.⁶¹ "He was wont to call money 'flies' " and taught that begging food was better than buying it because thus one does not need to handle money. Protestantism never held this enmity. Luther and Calvin distinguished between the "love of money" and "money itself" as we shall see.

II. THE POSITIVE TEACHING OF PROTESTANTISM

There is then the positive teaching that Protestantism offered following the Reformation. Luther or Calvin, or the other Reformers asserted some new truths in regard to property. Surely they were interested. The Reformers were social and political leaders as well as theologians.⁶² He who reads the Reformation merely as a battle of abstract theological doctrines mistakes the whole age. Out of the smoke of those days Protestantism emerged with certain ideas about property that we can clearly recognize. As one might expect their source was largely the old Testament and Paul's Epistles, the

⁶¹ *Life*, Ch. vii. A fine picture of the Medieval Friar preaching against money is given in Reade's *The Cloister and the Hearth*, in the character of Brother Jerome.

⁶² There are many books and articles upholding the view here expressed. The following may be mentioned here: Vedder, *The Reformation in Germany*; B. Bax, *The Social Side of the Reformation* (three volumes); *Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. I, pp. 564ff and 590ff; Carlyle, *History of the Medieval Political Theory in the West*, especially Vol. I, Ch. 12 and Vol. II, Ch. 2; Chalfant Robinson, "Some Economic Results of the Protestant Reformation Doctrines," in the *Princeton Theological Review*, Oct. 1917; Max Weber, "Protestant Ethik und der Geist des Capitalismus," in *Archiv für Socialwissenschaft und Social Politik*, Vol. XX, pp. 1-54, Vol. XXI, pp. 1-110; Werner Sombart, *Quintessence of Capitalism*, pp. 222-267; Ward, "Darstellung und Würdigung der Ansichten Luther's von Staat und seinen wirtschaftlichen Aufgaben," in Conrad's *Sammlung nationalökonomischer und statistischer Abhandlungen*, pp. 47-51, Jena, 1898; Waring, *Political Theories of Martin Luther*, pp. 205ff; A. V. Heister, "Calvin and Civil Liberty," in the *Reformed Church Review*, Aug. 1909; P. T. Forsyth, "Calvin and Capitalism," *Contemp.* 97:728; Forsyth, "Calvin in the Business World," *Living Age*, 266:634; A. Kuyper, "Calvinism, the Origin and Safeguard of our Constitutional Liberties," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 52:385, 646; Kampshulte, *J. Calvin: Seine Kirche und sein Staat in Genf*; A. E. Harvey "Economic Self-Interest," etc., *Am. Jour. of Theology*, 19:509.

fertile ground from which sprang Calvin's assurance of God's sovereignty and Luther's restatement of justifying faith.

(A) First among these Protestant teachings let us put the conviction that material prosperity is a sign of God's blessing.⁶³ How often the Old Testament speaks in support of this.⁶⁴ Abraham, Jacob, David, and the Psalms, Proverbs, and the spirit of the Book of Job—all are in line with this thought. So Luther puts wealth as a great good. "Wealth itself, honestly acquired and honorably employed is a great good."⁶⁵ "Riches are not bad in themselves, nor is poverty anything good in itself. Everything depends upon the man who uses it. God does not require us to be without money, as some fools among the philosophers and some crazy saints among the Christians have taught. He permits some to become rich, but He does not want them to set their hearts and their love upon money. The fatal mistake is when men consider themselves the owners while they are but stewards. You may earn as much as you can in an honest way and in the fear of God, not in order to satisfy your avarice but in order to use it for others."⁶⁶ Calvin also sees the righteous man blessed with riches, thankful to God alone. "The necessary consequences," says he, "of the knowledge of Divine Providence of God are gratitude in prosperity, patience in adversity, and a wonderful security respecting the future. Every prosperous and pleasing event therefore, the pious man will ascribe entirely to God, whether His beneficence be received through men or by the assistance of inanimate creatures. For this will be the reflection of his mind: 'It is certainly the Lord that hath inclined their hearts to favor me, that hath united them to me to be the instruments of His benignity to me.' In

⁶³ See the outline of the Protestant view in Gore, *Property: Its Duties and Rights*, a symposium by various authors.

⁶⁴ Cf. Genesis 12:16, 17:23, 24:35, 30:25-43, Exodus 21:4, 23:25, Deut. 6:10, 12, 23:24, Ruth 3:10, 1 Kings 10, Job 42:12, Ps. 41:1, 112:3 and 9, Prov. 3:16, 27, 18:8, 14:21, 24; also Matt. 6:25, 7:6, 9:11, 11:19, 1 Cor. 9:19, 16:2, 16:15, 1 Tim. 6:17.

⁶⁵ Waring, *Political Theories of Martin Luther*, p. 205.

⁶⁶ "On Trade and Usury," cf. *Luther, the Leader* (Uuelsen, p. 237).

the abundance of fruits of the earth, he will consider that it is the Lord who regards the heavens, that the heavens may regard the earth, that the earth also may regard its own productions; in other things he will not doubt that it is the Divine benediction alone that is the cause of all prosperity."⁶⁷ This is the consistent attitude of the Protestant, especially the Calvinist and the Puritan. "Riches are chanceable to us, but not unto God: for God knoweth when and to whom He will give them, or take them away again."⁶⁸ Failure to advance your prosperity is regarded by Baxter as sin. "If God shew you a way in which you may lawfully get more than in another way, if you refuse this and choose the less gainful way, you cross one of the ends of your calling and you refuse to be God's steward." "Labor to be rich for God" said he.⁶⁹

(B) More powerful than this first and primary concept was the application of the doctrine of a man's calling by God to every kind of work, especially the new forms of industry practiced in the towns and cities. Luther thus advises all to work, "If a man will be poor, he should not be rich, let him put his hand to the plow if he will be rich and get wealth himself out of the earth."⁷⁰ There is no sympathy here with voluntary poverty or idleness. The labor itself is considered a command of God. "Labor is not only not forbidden but is urgently enjoined."⁷¹ All forms of labor are alike pleasing to Him. "Christ does not enquire whether you are a man or a woman, an emperor or a groom. You should obey God in whatsoever position of life you are and not refrain from labor."⁷² Luther bitterly assails idleness and idlers. "No one wants to work, therefore employers of labor must grant holidays. Even the laboring people are thus free, no one may coerce

⁶⁷ *Institutes*, pp. 233-234. First American Ed.

⁶⁸ *Latimer*, I, 478, Parker Soc. Ed.

⁶⁹ Levy, *Economic Liberalism*, p. 22.

⁷⁰ *Political Theories of Martin Luther*, p. 219.

⁷¹ Erlangen ed., Vol. V, p. 93.

⁷² Erlangen ed., Vol. I, p. 250, cf. Ward, "Darstellung und Würdigung der Ansichten Luther's von Staat und seinen wirtschaftlichen Aufgaben," in Conrad's *Sammlung nationalökonomischer und statistischer Abhandlungen*.

them. There is a great complaint how disobedient, faithless, ill-bred, and profitless they are."⁷³ All the Reformers attacked the abuse of holidays, the number of which was excessive.⁷⁴

They met the problem of monks and nuns freed from the monasteries by exhorting them to choose some calling. "Choose some labor in order that you may eat your bread in the sweat of your brow, for this is the proper application of the command 'Thou shalt not steal.'"⁷⁵ "In so far as usefulness was both the opportunity and the discipline of this inner asceticism, the idea of calling received a new and accentuated meaning, differentiating it both from the Catholic and Lutheran conceptions. The Middle Ages had closely connected the lower kinds of temporal labor with the spiritual rites of the church, but the connection was perspective and potential only and required to be amplified by purely religious service. Nor was it binding on the lords of the religious life, and the representatives and exemplars of the truest Christian feeling. Protestantism first identified Grace and Nature by teaching that work in this world was given by the will of God and making it the normal and necessary test of each man's state of grace. The economic and social consequences of this conception were remarkable: labor in a calling and intensity of worldly activity became in themselves religious duties, no longer merely a means of existence but an aid and sign of active faith."⁷⁶ "Not good works, said Luther and Calvin, but good work."⁷⁷ From now on the believer tested his state of grace by his success in his calling, thus all he did became a

⁷³ *Luther's Werke*, Erlangen ed., Vol. XX, p. 272.

⁷⁴ "All saints days and festivals should be abolished, and Sunday alone retained. The reason is this: the feast days are now abused, by drinking, gambling, and idleness, and all manner of sins. Over and above the spiritual injury the common man receives, two material injuries appear; he neglects his work and spends more than at other times, may also weaken his body and is unfit for work" (*Address to the Christian Nobility*, Erlangen ed., p. 127).

⁷⁵ Erlangen ed., Vol. IX, p. 319.

⁷⁶ Troeltsch, *Die Sociallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*, Tübingen, 1912, p. 652.

⁷⁷ Robinson, "Some Economic Results of the Protestant Reformation," *THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW*, Oct. 1917, p. 629.

religious duty and the "sign of active faith." "Good works," said Baxter, "in the proper comprehensive sense, are all actions internal and external, that are normally good; but in the narrower acceptation, they are works not only formally good, as acts of obedience in general, but also materially good, such as a servant does for his master, that tend to his advantage, or to the profit of some other, whose welfare he regardeth."⁷⁸ Ordinary work is extolled and the support of a family is to Calvin an act of highest faith and charity.⁷⁹ If labor was an act of religious faith then surely the fruit of labor was blessed of God. This was the logical attitude of Protestantism toward property, the product of labor. "It is no sin but a duty to labor, not only for the labor's sake, formally resting on the act done, but for the honest increase and provision which is the end of labor; and therefore to choose a gainful calling rather than another, that we may be able to do good and relieve the poor."⁸⁰ The practical results of this Protestant principle are self-evident⁸¹ and have been

⁷⁸ *Christian Directory*, Part I, ch. III, x.

⁷⁹ See footnote 52 *supra*.

⁸⁰ Baxter, *Christian Directory*, Part IV, ch. xxi; cf. also Part I, ch. iii-x. So also Wesley, (*Sermon* 50) says, "Gain all you can by common sense, by using in your business all the understanding that God has given you. It is astonishing how few do this." "By the institution of Almighty God and the dispensation of His Providence I am bound to industry and fidelity" said Sir Matthew Hale. (*Life and Death of Sir M. Hale*, by Gilbert Burnet, London, 1682.) "If God show you a way in which you may lawfully get more than in another way, if you refuse this and choose the less gainful way, you cross one of the ends of your calling and you refuse to be God's Steward." "Labor to be rich for God," said Baxter (Quoted by Levy). "The Protestant idea of calling with its reformed acceptance of capitalistic profit and its reformed severity in the control over that labor which proved the certainty of election. . . This conception of calling and work with its prohibition of all indolence," is noted by Troeltsch, *Soziallehren*, p. 716.

⁸¹ "The spirit of rational regular discipline in work, created by Protestantism, and thence more or less logically transferred . . . this conception of work . . . gave a strong and systematic impulse to production. Troeltsch, *Soziallehren, u.s.w.*," p. 955. Cf. Max Weber, "Die Protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Capitalismus," *Archiv für Social Wissenschaft*, Vols. XX, XXI; also XXV, XXVI, XXX and XXXI.

well summed up by Levy. He says, in substance,⁸² that the Protestant freed from the hindrances of the Medieval Church, and the persecutions of the early Reformation was now mentally and materially able to devote himself to any gainful occupation, and to strive for success there as pleasing to God.

(C) Positively again, Protestantism speaks against the Medieval encouragement of alms, begging and prodigality. Protestantism taught a new charity. The Old Testament attitude toward foolish spending and the many verses teaching that poverty is a punishment and a curse sent from God were remembered here as a source, with the special exhortations of the Epistles and their directions as to Christian Almsgiving.⁸³ Those who were poor in a biblical sense were consid-

⁸² The full statement is as follows: "For the laboring and middle class the achievement of religious freedom was the necessary preliminary to all other occupations, especially to industrial activity which was for the believer especially for the Puritan only conceivable on a religious foundation. Until this foundation was secure from external attack religious impulses were continually diverting them from industry, either by obvious and material means such as emigration, money fines, or commercial ruin, or because religious problems distracted and absorbed men's powers and prevented them from putting forth their full working capacity.

"When the religious ideals of strict Calvinism spread among dissenters in opposition to Laud's tendencies individual private activities began to be regarded as a calling for the honor of the Lord, honest profits as a distinction, and industry as an essential moral and religious duty. The victory or at least recognition of the Dissenting Churches strengthened the Protestant conception of the moral nature of the calling. Its importance lay in the ethical foundation it gave to material and economic life; and in its attempt to harmonize the striving for profit with the striving for God. The central point in this system was no longer an external organism ordained by God for all time to which the individual subjugated himself: on the contrary, the individual was left to his own conscience with absolute liberty to develop the capacities and forces given him by higher powers" [sic!] (*Economic Liberalism*, p. 57).

⁸³ Prov. 22:2 and 7, 29:13, 19:17, 30:9, 21:17, Jer. 5:4, 22:16, Matt. 7:6, Titus 1:11, Rev. 3:17, represent poverty as judgment from God. Matt. 5:42, 10:42, 19:16, 21, 25:31, John 12:5-6 and 13:29, with Acts 2:45, 4:36, 9:36, 10:2, 11:28, Romans 12:7, 15:26, 1 Cor. 9:1-19, 13:3, 16:2, 2 Cor. 8:4 and 14, Gal. 2:10, Phil. 4:15-19, 1 Thess. 4:9-10, many passages in 1 and 2 Timothy, Heb. 2:16, 1 John 3:17, were construed as teaching who were the biblical poor and how they should be treated.

ered a community charge by Luther. "Every town should support its own poor, and all beggars should be done away with." "It is enough to provide decently for the poor that they may not die of cold and hunger."⁸⁴ "It is not right that one should work that another should be idle, and live ill that another may live well, as is now the perverse abuse, for says St. Paul, 'If any will not work neither let him eat.' God has not ordained that anyone should live by the goods of others except priests and ministers alone, as St. Paul says in 1 Cor. 9:14, 'for their spiritual works' sake,' as Christ says of the apostles, 'The laborer is worthy of his hire.'"

Idleness (not exactly unemployment) was to be met with discipline. How different is this from the Medieval idea of unquestioning alms to all beggars.⁸⁵ The 'poor' in a biblical sense are now limited to those visibly incapable of work, and those temporarily in need of assistance. "There is the poor laboring mechanical man," says John Cook,⁸⁶ "that is oppressed in a great charge, and many times does not make his wants known. He wrestles with poverty, but it comes like an armed man upon him, he cannot resist it: the truest charity is to relieve him, to lend this man money, to buy him a cow, a sheep, and a hog or some such necessaries. If the kingdom were in a gospel form every man would be quickly provided for." Charity, which now takes the place of "Almsgiving" as the accepted word for this deed is thus commended by Baxter,⁸⁷ it makes us like God, it pleases God and profits others and ourselves, it is a delight, a debt to God paid to others, a recognition of social unity and a standard of God's judgment. As objects of "Charity" he recommends Foreign Missions, Church Unity and Education at home, Schools,

⁸⁴ Waring, *Political Theories of Martin Luther*.

⁸⁵ Levy, *Economic Liberalism*, p. 79.

⁸⁶ *The Poor Man's Curse*, p. 49. Cf. Manly, *Usury at Six Per Cent*, p. 24, "A laborer will fall into extreme poverty by abundance of children, long sickness and the like, in which sense these are God Almighty's Poor. *The Rest* which is *three* times their number are of their own making, by idle, irregular, and wicked courses."

⁸⁷ See a summary in *Property: Its Duties and Rights*, p. 156.

Books and Literature; also apprenticing children, helping needy ministers, and finally poor relief. He emphasizes the part of the state in this last.

As a religious ideal this 'charity' was very prominent "in the actions of Puritans and Dissenters."⁸⁸ However this charity was restricted to uneconomic matters like the relief of widows, orphans, and cripples. There charity still had its sphere. So long as the problem could be solved by economic means, charity was cast out and replaced by disciplinary measures." Workhouses were established, poor laws enacted, and legislation of every sort was attempted for this purpose.⁸⁹ Clearly as work became a virtue, punishment instead of alms seemed the logical way to meet the problem of idleness.

(D) Add to these three positive teachings of Protestantism the eventual outgrowth of the inner ascetic tendencies of Protestant self-restraint, especially as we see it a century or more after the Reformation in the Baptist, Calvinist, and Lutheran Pietist, as well as in the later Wesleyan and Quaker. Protestantism balanced her doctrine of Work with the ideal of Frugality. This was the outgrowth of the principle of stewardship. The Protestant Christian was to regard himself as a steward⁹⁰ and hence to be very careful in his accounting⁹¹ and spending.

Ostentation, superfluity, luxury, were never characteristic of the Protestantism of those days. This was a great check on the abuses of the previously mentioned principles. It restrains usury and extortion. "The conception of stewardship and the Puritan condemnation of worldly living will be found to have contributed more to the morale of capitalism than either the love of gain or any conscious adaptation of a

⁸⁸ Levy, *Economic Liberalism*, pp. 80-81.

⁸⁹ Some slight disagreement will be found with this in the article by Wood in *Property: Its Duties and Rights*. See, however, Cunningham, *Christianity and Politics*, pp. 85-86.

⁹⁰ "A World of which a good and gracious God is the proprietor and we are the tenants," John Woolman, *A Word of Remembrance to the Rich*.

⁹¹ "The keeping of accounts became a religious duty," *Property: Its Duties and Rights*, p. 150.

class to their place in the productive process."⁹² Cromwell's parliament passed a law against interest more than six per cent.⁹³ Anyone found guilty of such usury was excluded from the sacraments.⁹⁴ So again John Knox condemns "Oppression of the poore by exactions deceaving of thame in by-ing or selling by wrang met or measure."⁹⁵

The Church followed Calvin's rejection of the Canon Law and preached standards that appealed to the inner sense of justice. "The Calvinists adopted a standard of honesty that appealed to upright men, whatever faith they might profess."⁹⁶ "Calvin refused to condemn the taking of interest as usury."⁹⁷ Some of the Reformers, like Hugh Latimer and John Hooper sided with Luther in his detestation of usury and in his detestation of trade. Calvin and the Puritans found their chief support in the city men and recognized interest as a legitimate source of gain.⁹⁸

If the Protestant was a steward in acquiring, he applied the same inner asceticism or stewardship to waste and spending. Not that he did not enjoy what he spent, "For the Lord hath in no place forbidden mirth, joy and the sweet use of wealth, so far forth that nothing be done indecently, un-

⁹² Wood in *Property: Its Duties and Rights*, p. 154. See the record of cases where the Puritan Commonwealth prosecuted monopolies and profiteers and sought to reform any abuses that made many poor and a few rich (pp. 145, 146).

⁹³ *Property: Its Duties and Rights*, p. 141. Manly, *Interest at Six per cent*, London, 1669.

⁹⁴ "He that hath usury proved against him so that he lose his principle for taking above ten in a hundred, yet shall he also, for committing so heinous an offense against God and his church, to the very ill example of others, not be allowed to the sacraments until he show himself repentant for the fault and study thereby to satisfy the congregation so offended him" (Thomas Cartwright, *Puritan Manifestos*, p. 120).

⁹⁵ Hume Brown, *John Knox*, p. 144 of Vol. II, quoted from the *Scotch Book of Discipline*.

⁹⁶ Cunningham, *Christianity and Politics*, p. 71. ⁹⁷ *Ibid*.

⁹⁸ *Property*, p. 138, cf. Cunningham, *The Moral Witness of the Church on the Investment of Money*, pp. 25-26; W. Ames, *De Conscientia*, 1631; Bullinger, *Decades* iii, p. 42; Baxter, *Christian Directory*, Pt. IV. ch. xix. qu. xii; Clarendon's *History*, Bk. I, par. 206; Penn, *No Cross No Crown*, Pt. I, ch. xii, par. 8. (Works, Vol. II, p. 141.)

thankfully, or unrighteously," says Bullinger.⁹⁹ The Puritan was always the champion of good taste, "compelled to think about the way he spent his money . . . he was led to seek quieter pleasures and to purchase more enduring objects of delight than the conventional standards of his day suggested."¹⁰⁰ Self denial however was considered virtuous,¹⁰¹ and we learn from John Wesley's Journal that except for twenty pounds to the poor, his expenses were twenty-eight pounds a year.¹⁰² He preached that no silks or luxuries are for the Christian lest he be affording them to rob God.¹⁰³ Others were even more austere. Wilberforce emphasizes the Christian's duty to acknowledge God's claim to all and warns against holding a part for oneself.¹⁰⁴ The Quaker went further still in the life of austerity, but the spirit was the same.

Thus far our discussion has been largely in the realm of Christian ethics. Before passing on to the third part of the subject it would be well to summarize what has been said and point its force and effect.

Protestantism we have seen definitely rejected (1) the Medieval doctrine of the Renunciation of Property asserting that such an act had no merit and that no Christian was counselled to take a vow of such import: (2) Almsgiving as an act of atonement or good works, or from a conviction that by the law of a supposed natural state they were a debt to be given or restored when one had possessions and saw an appealing need was replaced by the conviction that private property is an institution of God in the Decalogue and that as a steward the Christian is to give charity only to the biblical poor. Begging and idleness are sin; poverty is the punishment of sin and sloth. (3) The definition of Usury in the Canon

⁹⁹ *Decades* iii, p. 55.

¹⁰⁰ *Property*, p. 153. Cf. Milton, *Allegro*; Maurice Low, *The American People*; Jeremy Taylor, *Holy Living*, ch. iii, sec. 3, par. 4.

¹⁰¹ Law, *Serious Call*, ch. viii, counsels the rich to practice the same self-denial they expect of the poor.

¹⁰² *Journal*, Vol. iii., pp. 312-313 (Everyman ed.).

¹⁰³ *Sermon*, 126.

¹⁰⁴ *Practical View of Christianity*, ch. IV, sec. 2.

Law and its prohibition of gain or profit thereby was rejected and a common sense view of the forbidding of extortion in any way and the propriety of moderate gain in such transactions was accepted. (4) The idea that in itself trade and possessions and money were evil was replaced by an entirely different attitude of a positive nature.

It accepted the principles (1) that property itself was a blessing and the possession of it a sign of God's favor; (2) that work at a calling for gain was a religious duty and (3) that idleness and begging and the encouragement of it by almsgiving, except to those poor in the biblical sense, were sins and crimes and deserved punishment, and (4) on the other side that the gaining and more especially the spending or enjoyment of wealth was to be governed and curbed and guarded by an austere and frugal ideal of stewardship.

Obviously these all tended in the same direction and produced some very definite social and economic results in the Protestant countries. Idleness and vagabondage and poverty to a certain extent ceased, production increased and consumption was stabilized if not decreased. A surplus thus accumulated for trade and export and this in turn made wealth and capital. These changes however had some very definite effects on the relation of the Church, especially the Protestant Church to the Sociological and Economic Problems of Property.

Rutledge, Pa.

EARNEST E. EELLS.

(To be continued)

The Princeton Theological Review

JULY, 1923

THE INFLUENCE OF DANIEL

A large part of the difficulty which confronts us when we consider the origin of a writer's ideas meets us also when we try to trace the influence of these ideas upon succeeding literary productions. The seeming traces may have come from some other source than the one supposed, or they may be original in the mind of the later writer without any real, or at least conscious, knowledge of the work of the preceding author. If the two works be from approximately the same period of time, or if the circumstances of the two periods of time were substantially the same, the same or similar *Zeitgeist*, or spirit of the times, would naturally produce the same or similar thoughts and expressions of thought. For example, the ennui, the *Weltschmerz*, the disgust with the world and its gifts, and the despairing flight of the soul to its refuge in God, which are manifest in the book of Ecclesiastes, may have been equally characteristic of any period of outward natural prosperity, coincident with moral and spiritual decay. The moralists of the old Egyptians of the Fifth Dynasty, such as Ptahhotep and Imhotep, as well as the Roman satirists, such as Juvenal and Seneca, bear witness to the fact that the soul of man can not be satisfied with mere earthly grandeur and material success. The Aramaic fragments of Achikar as well as the Jewish proverbs of Solomon, Hezekiah, Ben Sira, and Wisdom, exhibit in like manner the vanity of earthly greatness and the transitoriness of human friendship, wealth and happiness. How much, if anything, the Greek philosophers may have derived from the Egyptians, Babylonians, Hindoos, and Hebrews, we may never

PROTESTANTISM AND PROPERTY

III. FORCES WHICH OPPOSED THE CONTROL OF THE CHURCH OVER THE PROBLEMS OF PROPERTY.

Protestantism emerged from the Middle Ages repudiating the laws and doctrines of the Medieval Church which were restrictive of the pursuit of industry and the desire for gain. She maintained the accumulation of property by industry and thrift to be highly ethical and Christian. We shall now see how the restrictions based on an ethical legalism and a spiritual conscientiousness which Protestantism put around this activity of the Christian, with the conviction that all was a matter of stewardship, were boldly attacked and arrogantly supplanted by a utilitarian ethics and a materialistic economics until the hold that Protestantism had on the problems of property was well nigh broken. We shall also see by way of contrast how the Christian Socialist Movement with its emphasis on the solidarity of human society in one brotherhood and the social solutions found in the teachings of Christ, especially in the Kingdom of Heaven as a social ideal, sought to reach a Christian solution of the problem.

In the period of modern industrialism which we are now to discuss, Sociology and Economics early entered the field and preponderatingly shifted the attitude of Protestantism toward property from its ethical moorings. Capitalism, industrialism, world commerce, invention, exploration, and the development of new scientific, philosophic, and theological theories seemed to shake the church's hold on the material world. Mysticism and Pietism on the one hand, infidelity and atheism on the other distracted her attention. So far as the Protestant Church was concerned, self defence in the spiritual world caused her unconsciously to let go her hold on society's material organization. She became busy defending the supernatural and forgot to speak to the natural. Society also saw the coming in of great abuses; children and women entered the ranks of labor, industrial disease, unemployment, bad housing, poverty such

as the centuries before had never known. The old distinctions between idleness and unemployment, poverty and pauperism, and all the new results of the age of machinery needed definition and the whole system needed a church with a quickened ethical sense to say "Thus thou shalt do, and thus thou shalt not do!" This however the Protestant Church failed to do. Instead we must trace, as they develop, the impediments to a Protestant decision of the questions of property in the industrial age.

A. The church at the beginning of the age of industrialism relied too much on legislation. Every law passed to meet an economic crisis helped to establish the thought that the state should meet the problem of property. In England, which we may consider by way of illustration, legislation of this sort began with Protestantism. Somerset ¹ passed laws compelling all to continue to eat fish in Lent and on fast days in order to preserve the fishing industry and the fleet—a measure of maritime defense also, it is true.

The laws of Cromwell's time we have already discussed.² The laws of the succeeding century are many and multifarious. Hardly an evil but had its 'act' and the church considered such acts sufficient. "Unfortunately during this period, again the church gave no lead as a corporate body. There was a great absence of socio-ecclesiastical effort. There was no attempt to apply the broad fundamental principles of Christianity either towards guiding the development of society upon right lines, or towards extirpating the social evils which year by year were growing greater and greater, and therefore more unmanageable."³

In the payment of taxes now the Christian met the demands of charity and the distribution of state alms took the place of personal service. In the eyes of some, "this failure of the church to comprehend the ideal of Christ and to work for

¹ Albert Pollard, *England Under Protector Somerset*, London, 1900.

² In this REVIEW (April, 1923) p. 288 and note.

³ Chadwick, *The Church, the State and the Poor*, p. 162 f.

social reconstruction is the great failure of history.”⁴ Perhaps a greater failure was in not saying the right word on the other side to the Christian employers, landlords and all others to teach them how to build the new social order on the principles of Christianity. But “In the fifty years which laid the foundations of modern England the influence of the church as a witness to social righteousness was, it is hardly an exaggeration to say, almost negligible. Against the prevalent materialism of the age, with its sacrifice of human welfare to the gage of productivity, its reverence for the rights of property and its contempt for the rights of man and woman against the industrial oppression which ground the workers in factory and mine, and the political oppression which culminated in Peterloo, the church raised no voice of warning or protest. The church carried into the strange and turbulent world of modern industry the easy going acceptance of the established order which had characterized it in the eighteenth century, and repeated the watchwords of that order long after it had dissolved.”⁵ This attitude of the church is best seen as it developed under the second economic assault upon the church’s teaching as to matters of property.

B. This next assault was the individualistic philosophy of *laissez faire*. This was, to be sure, the swing of the pendulum to the other extreme from dependence on legislation, but its effect on the Protestant Church was to paralyze still more effectually all ethical activity designed to ameliorate social conditions. It was in reality the doctrine of the “freedom of the conscience” carried to the extreme of license in the sphere of economics.⁶ “The church like the rest of the upper classes, turned for guidance (from legislation) to the economists, who themselves possessed indeed, a kind of religion;

⁴ Washington Gladden, quoted by Womer, *The Church and the Labor Conflict*; cf. however *Gesta Christi*, by Brace.

⁵ *Report of the Archbishops’ Fifth Committee of Inquiry on Christianity and Industrial Problems* (1919), p. 49.

⁶ Here there is no better reference than the discussion of *Economic Liberalism* by Levy (trans. by the author from *Die Grundlagen des ökonomischen Liberalismus*, Jena 1902, and published in London 1913).

and the economists seemed to confirm the view that moral considerations were irrelevant to industry, that social misery was an inevitable incident to economic progress, and that attempts to remove by legislative intervention the evils of the economic system must be attended by consequences disastrous to all, and particularly disastrous to those for whose benefit intervention was designed."⁷ Adam Smith has expressed this theory in *The Wealth of Nations*.⁸ The two influential ideas of this work were "the belief in the supreme value of individual liberty and the conviction that man's self is God's Providence, that the individual in pursuing his own interest is promoting the welfare of all."⁹

Under perfect freedom, wages and prices, trade and industry would all 'find their natural level. This was almost the only lesson the ruling classes learnt from Adam Smith.' His equally uncompromising denunciation of the Corn Laws and other protective duties, of Combination Laws against workmen, and Settlement Acts restricting freedom of labor, his proposal to tax ground rents and not food, were all conveniently ignored.

Again Adam Smith had denounced the payment of wages in truck and said that high wages increased population, industry and production: that 'the dictates of reason' ought to moderate the hours of labor. But these views of his on labor were equally ignored. The governing classes adopted in short, those parts of the economist's teaching which appeared advantageous to themselves, and tended to neglect the remainder. When in 1795 Whitehead urged in the House of Commons the desirability of fixing a legal minimum wage, the Government of the day opposed the proposal on the ground that wages ought to be allowed to seek their own level, and Pitt recommended the disastrous alternative of lavish out-relief. When, faced with the appalling misery produced by the new conditions of industry, the hand-loom weavers begged in 1808 that the state intervene to fix minimum rates, the parliamentary Committee which examined their petition reported that the policy suggested in their petition was 'wholly inadmissible in principle, incapable of being introduced to practice by any means which can possibly be devised and if practicable, productive of the most fatal consequences.'¹⁰ Such rem-

⁷ *Christianity and Industrial Problems*, p. 47.

⁸ See Toynbee, *The Industrial Revolution*, pp. 158 ff. The "Manchester School" is still powerful though the *Wealth of Nations* was published in 1776.

⁹ Toynbee, *ibid.* p. 148; cf. Chadwick, *The Church, the State and the Poor*, p. 148 ff.

¹⁰ Quoted from *Reports on Petition of Cotton Weavers*, 1809, 1811.

nants of an industrial code as survived from an earlier age were thus abolished in deference to a gospel of free competition.¹¹

Smith's teaching was combined with that the Malthus:¹² man multiplies up to his food, the numbers are cut down by famine, disease, and vice; this is the sharp surgery of Providence, the *vis medicatrix reipublicae*.

Thus it became accepted that poverty was a sort of divine safety valve to society; evil is allowed to exist that it may stimulate us to activity. Malthus did, in fact, hold that relief of the poor created poverty which it vainly professed to cure. Gradually the Malthusian teaching had its way and was at last embodied in the act of 1834 abolishing out-door relief to the able bodied. "Pauperism is," it says, "in general, due to indolence or vice, and can be averted by ordinary care and prudence . . . To turn the independent laborer into a pauper, all that is necessary is to offer relief without conditions: conversely to turn a pauper into an independent laborer all that is required is to offer relief only on harder conditions, to make the lot of the pauper less eligible than that of the independent laborer."¹³

Ricardo's *Economics* now entered with its idea that the laws regulating profits and wages, like all scientific laws were a fixed "iron law of wages." The price of labor depended upon the supply and demand; the market price of labor tending toward the natural price, i.e. the minimum of subsistence. "Thus came the wages fund theory by a combination of Malthus' law of population and Ricardo's theory of values." Property was fast becoming a matter of hard and fast scientific law; Protestantism it seemed, had given up to the scientists all the problems of private ownership. Even in the domain of ethics, materialism, utilitarianism, and the various systems based on biology and psychology all sought some

¹¹ *Christianity and Industrial Problems*, p. 41-42.

¹² *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, T. R. Malthus, Vol. II., p. 53 (Everyman Edition).

¹³ Quoted in *Christ and Civilization*, by Paton, Bunting, Garvie, et al., London, 1910, p. 22.

other basis for private ownership than dependence on the decalogue.¹⁴ These were most powerfully aided in course of time by the application of the Darwinian theory of evolution. The synthesis of all these elements produced the third and greatest handicap to Protestantism in her regulation of property.

C. This third handicap was the most brutal and unchristian theory of all, Economic Determinism. Here is the source of the socialism of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: blind natural force translated into economic law destitute of any ethical guidance or Providential end.¹⁵ The theory of class struggle thus arises as the basis for all modern labor agitation. "The Marxian philosophy underlies all strictly working class programs. It is known as economic determinism, and is susceptible of both moderate and extreme statement. It has modified the thinking of many economists, who nevertheless repudiate it as an exclusive principle for interpreting events. Obviously in bold statement the doctrine is materialistic and explains ideals as mere reflexes."¹⁶ Needless to say we have this theory with us today and its influence well-nigh drowns the voice of Protestantism. However before we discuss the present day opposition to a Christian solution of the problems of property we must note the growth in the past century of a new Protestant teaching.

D. Though the Protestant Church was seemingly too hard bested to do battle in these days, there were some who in her spirit did endeavor to meet the problems thus presented. The good example set by such men as John Bright, Owen, Lord Shaftsbury, Sadler, Oastler, Bull and Chalmers¹⁷ must have set the churchmen thinking, At least the problems of the day demanded deep regard from spiritual leaders.

¹⁴ Note Mill, Kant, Spencer, etc. a brief notice will be found in the article "Ethics" in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (11th ed.)

¹⁵ Seligman, *Economic Interpretation of History*.

¹⁶ F. Ernest Johnson, *The New Spirit in Industry*, New York, 1919.

¹⁷ See individual biographies, also Chadwick pp. 190 ff and *Christianity and Industrial Problems*, p. 47.

Strangely enough this enthusiasm did not find expression along lines dictated by the historical attitude of the church or of Protestantism so much as in the "historical" criticism of the Scriptures, and destructive criticism at that.¹⁸ Humanitarianism, Chartism, and Reform were in the air. Christian leaders reading the sayings of Christ and the words of the prophets were stimulated to social reform. Maurice,¹⁹ Kingsley,²⁰ Ludlow,²¹ Vanisittart Neale,²² Thomas Hughes,²³ and others made valiant efforts to apply Christianity. They were called Christian socialists, although they never would have accepted what is now called socialism, but they were the first of a large number 'who came preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom.' The publication of the *Christian Socialist* and the tracts and sermons of this group show an emphasis on the scriptural teachings of the "Kingdom of Heaven." The petitions of the Lord's Prayer, the parables of the Kingdom, and the "social" ideals of the Lord and the prophets were boldly arrayed against the utilitarianism and materialism which we have already seen to be so deadly to the influence of the Protestant Church. The best summary of this movement as well as the model for present day statements of the position of the churches is found in the platform of the "Christian Social Union," which is briefly stated as follows:

1. To claim for the Christian Law the ultimate authority to rule social practice.
2. To study in common how to apply the moral truths and principles of Christianity, to the social and economic difficulties of the present time.
3. To present Christ in practical life as the living Master and King, the enemy of wrong and selfishness, and the power of righteousness and love.²⁴

¹⁸ Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, p. 27 ff.

¹⁹ *The Life of F. D. Maurice* by his son, other sources in Chadwick, p. 190.

²⁰ *Life*, see Chadwick, p. 190.

²¹ Chadwick, pp. 195 and 197.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 197.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Christianity and Industrial Problems*, p. 48. Cf. *A Year Book of the Church and Social Service*, p. 18, Chadwick, p. 218.

Thus historically we are prepared for decision on the modern questions of Protestantism and Property. How far does the Protestant Church today accept these statements? What hinders a united attitude toward the problems of property?

IV. PRESENT SOLUTIONS.

A. The first reason why the thought in the countries called Protestant is not united in its attitude toward property is found in the inevitable antagonism between Christianity as a spiritual and supernatural religion and all materialistic theories. Protestantism is opposed fundamentally to Socialism, Utopian Socialism,²⁵ and Christian Socialism²⁶ alone excepted. This is because Anarchistic Communism,²⁷ State Socialism,²⁸ Marxian Socialism, or Modern Scientific Socialism²⁹ are in their very inception materialistic. They follow

²⁵ Two Frenchmen, Count Henri de Saint Simon, and Fourier, with Robert Owen in England, advocated a system of communal settlements which were to extend and federate so as to take in the whole world. Many experiments were made in Great Britain and France and even in America, in Communistic Settlements, but almost without exception they failed. This kind of Socialism has been called Utopian because it has not been found to be practical. There was a considerable body of writers who accepted the theories of Saint Simon, Fourier, and Owen but by 1850 their influence had passed. See E. C. Miller, *The Socialists*, and Hurd, *American Communities*, Chicago, 1908.

²⁶ The word Socialism has been a handicap to this movement. See Chadwick, p. 197. The practical results of this movement in England are the cooperative stores which number eight million members, and the development of Christian teaching as we shall note later.

²⁷ J. P. Proudhon, a Frenchman and a contemporary of Kingsley "claimed that property was theft; that capital was the power of exploiting the labor of other men; and that government of man by man in every form is oppression. He had an associate and supporter in Mikail Bokounine (Bakunin), a member of the Russian nobility. President McKinley was shot by a member of this group" (Miller, p. 14). See Proudhon, *What is Property?* (Boston, 1876), and Bokounine, *God and the State* (New York, 1902).

²⁸ Louis Blanc of France and Frederick LaSalle of Germany attempted to have the state supply voluntary associations of laboring men with capital to carry on the enterprise that employed them (Miller, p. 14).

²⁹ Marxian Socialism is also called True Socialism or German Socialism. The *Communist Manifesto* written (1847) by Karl Marx and

the economic theories of the last century and could not fail to be anti-Christian. The leaders in these movements were outspokenly atheistic. Says Bebel, "The revolution denies religion altogether." Says Engels, "The first word of religion is a lie." Says Marx, "The idea of God must be destroyed: it is the keystone of a perverted civilization." According to Belfort Bax, "The Christian doctrine is more revolting to the higher moral sense than heathen rites to the early Christians." "Socialism utterly despises 'the other world.'"³⁰ We might add many other such statements, but it hardly seems necessary to do this when every day we can read of what is going on in Russia. One and all the socialists say to the church "You talk about the Hereafter, the Pearly Gates, the Streets of Gold, the Mansions of the Blessed; but we demand that you give us something in this world which is the only world we know anything about. We ask for more bread, warmer clothes, better shelter. Until you give us these things we will not believe that there is anything in your church."³¹

The church on the other hand cannot accept the fundamental principles of socialism; and for a number of reasons. (1) Collective ownership is opposed to the Protestant doctrine of private ownership based on the Decalogue.³² (2) A Socialist State is fundamentally opposed to all religious and

Friedrich Engels is its bible. Associated with Wilhelm Liebknecht and August Bebel these men organized Socialism on a political basis. La-Salle united in 1875 with these leaders; from them especially and from the teachings of Karl Marx in *Capital* we have the Scientific Socialism of today.

³⁰ Cf. Peabody, *Christ and the Social Question*, p. 16.

³¹ Miller, p. 27. The fear of the Socialist that religion will nullify his propaganda is at the basis of all this. Materialism cannot rest until it has destroyed faith of every kind. Were Materialism to get what she demands in this world, would she then allow or exercise faith in the other world? We think not!

³² Protestantism has never yet changed her primary conception of private property as a divine institution. Cf. pp. 281, 282, and 289, as well as Note 51a, p. 277 of the April number of this REVIEW. Also Miller p. 20. Socialism demands "that private ownership of wealth and all instruments of production shall cease."

especially all Christian activity and safeguards in politics, for socialists believe "that the Christian church is one of the principal supports of the capitalistic state. They claim that the church has been identified with the political *status quo* from time immemorial, that it is made up largely of capitalists; and that the working men have little or no interest in and receive little benefit from the church. They claim that the church has accumulated vast stores of untaxed wealth, and that the Roman Catholic branch alone has enough accumulated treasure to pay off the debt of the European governments. The attitude of the Socialists generally, therefore, is one of deep hostility to the Christian church, and toward all other forms of constructive religion."³³ (3) The socialist principle of the solidarity of labor is opposed to Christian patriotism.³⁴ (4) The principle of class consciousness is fundamental to socialism and fundamentally opposed to the ideals of Christian brotherhood.³⁵ The propaganda of hate is exactly the opposite of the gospel of love, nevertheless it adopts many of its methods: Sunday schools, discussion groups, hymns,—the very zeal of the propagandist simulates the Christian methods. (5) The socialist purpose to bring about a social revolution cannot have the support of the Protestant Church. Revolution for conscience sake or for moral reasons may be permitted by Christianity, but there is no scriptural warrant for a revolution based upon materialistic desires.

Yet despite these fundamental differences there are some who would have the Protestant Church adopt the socialist scheme entire.³⁶ The probability of such extreme action is

³³ Miller, p. 23.

³⁴ Calvin and Luther were intensely patriotic. Though a source of democracy, Protestantism has always been intensely loyal to constituted authorities. Cf. Kuyper, "Calvinism, The Origin and Safeguard of our Constitutional Liberties." *Bib. Sacra* 52:385ff, 646ff.

³⁵ Cf. Miller, p. 26, and Johnstone *The New Spirit in Industry*, p. 1.

³⁶ Spargo, Hunter, Stelzle, C. E. Russell, J. G. Phelps Stokes, W. E. Walling, Bishop Brown and others have at times so spoken. Cf. Noel, "Not only the new theologians, (evangelical ministers holding the 'New Theology') but older fashioned theologians are socialists and belong to

however slight. Nevertheless the "academic" acceptance of the principles of scientific socialism by professors, students, and social leaders, clergy and laity alike, is noticeable as influencing the attitude of the Protestant church today. Those who seek a scriptural or ethical basis for combining such opposite systems usually disregard church history and the accepted systems of Christian theology and, by a 'higher critical' method select passages from the prophets and from the words of Christ that appear to them appropriate. They misinterpret the Book of Acts to such a degree as to foist communism on Christianity⁸⁷ and seek to deny that the early Christians believed in and practiced the private ownership of property. It goes without saying that the socialist cause is aided greatly by those who hold liberal and radical views about the inspiration and the theology of the Bible; while the extremists would disregard historical Christianity entirely and accept Marx and Bax and modern socialists as leaders of equal inspiration and even greater importance than the apostles and worthy of a place with the reformers.⁸⁸ We believe that the time has not come—indeed that it will

some economic socialist party" (*Socialism in Church History*, Milwaukee, 1911, p. 271).—Bishop Westcott is quoted to the following effect: "Individualism regards humanity as made up of disconnected and warring atoms; socialism regards it as an organic whole, a vital unity formed by the contributory members mutually interdependent. It follows that socialism differs from individualism both in method and in aim. The method of socialism is cooperation; of individualism, competition. The one regards man as working with man for a common end; the other regards man as working against man for private gain. The aim of socialism is the fulfillment of service; the aim of individualism is the attainment of some personal advantage, riches or place or fame" (*Ibid.*, p. 262). "The Church of England stands at the parting of the ways; her own peculiar position should help her towards socialism" (*Ibid.*, p. 282).

⁸⁷ Tolstoi is thus represented by Hunter in *Why We Fail as Christians*.

⁸⁸ Noel, p. 279; see also Introduction and Chapter I. Seligman and Marx are mentioned in *A Bibliography of Social Service* published July 1918, by the Commission of the Church and Social Service, of the Federal Council of Churches, and are regarded with Spargo, Hunter, etc. as "standard."

never come—for the church to surrender her historic position as the interpreter of the inspired laws of God and to seek her authority in regard to property in so-called ‘scientific laws’ of doubtful value.

B. In Premillennialism, or Millennialism, modern Protestantism is confronted with another dogmatic system which keeps her from a definitely consistent attitude on the problems of property. This system is only the modern form of the chiliasm which has been present in the church through the ages.³⁹ From apostolic times to the present it has always been an active element in Christianity. In the Crusades, the Franciscan Movements, the Reformation, and in the Evangelical Revivalism of more recent date it has figured prominently. It is this “other-world” element in the church which appears in its most extreme form in Millennialism that so enrages the socialist. Numerically we cannot estimate the growth of this element in the Protestant Church today, but it is undoubtedly larger than many imagine. It has its representatives in every denomination and it has been claimed, though this is a matter of dispute, that in the evangelical bodies the majority of evangelists and of foreign missionaries and the workers who support them are Millennialists.⁴⁰ Their influence and the books, periodicals, and conferences of those who hold such views is undoubtedly an exceedingly powerful factor in the Protestantism of our day. Their attitude toward the problems of property is based on a literalistic interpretation of Scripture. They conceive the “Kingdom of Heaven” as a definite period of time *following* the second advent of Christ, a time when He shall rule upon the earth and all the prophecies of the millennium be literally fulfilled.⁴¹ Previous

³⁹ See Chafer, *The Kingdom in History and Prophecy*, Silver, *The Lord's Return*, and other works mentioned in the bibliography.

⁴⁰ Silver, (p. 196) mentions Reginald Heber, Robert McCheyne, Alexander Duff, George Muller, J. Hudson Taylor, H. G. Guinness, John G. Paton, A. T. Pierson, J. Willis Baer, Robert E. Speer, and many others.

⁴¹ I. M. Haldeman, *Ten Sermons on the Second Coming*, especially Sermon 10; Silver, *The Lord's Return*, Part I, section I.

to this event the world and the present social order is expected to grow steadily worse.⁴² The church is to keep herself strictly separate from secular reforms and from a social order which is distinctly "worldly." "Her commission is a spiritual one, her gospel is other-worldly, her kingdom is within the believer and not of this world. 'Her calling and destiny is heavenly. Her mission is to shine out Christ Himself and testify of His grace, but never to control and overspread the world.'"⁴³ She is to seek individuals, earnestly awaiting her Lord's return, and instead of trying to dominate the present social order, to see in every evil a sign and warning of the end of the age. "And all the signs of the times," says a leading spokesman,⁴⁴ "indicate His coming is at hand. The signs in the Protestant Church. Its worldliness, its covetousness, its love of pleasure more than love of God, its unwillingness to endure sound doctrine, its itching ears, heaping to itself teachers and ready to be turned aside by them from the Truth of God to the fables of men." He points to "the signs in the social world. The outbreaking of the people. The throwing down of old customs, the trampling under feet of old covenants, no master below, no master above."

W. E. Blackstone gives the following "Signs":⁴⁵ 1. The prevalence of travel and knowledge. 2. Perilous times (pestilence; famine; earthquakes; cyclones; political and social unrest; distress of nations). 3. Spiritualism. 4. Apostacy. 5. World-wide evangelism. 6. Rich men. 7. Israel; Zionism.

If modern socialism is in a true sense the heir of the communism of the Peasant's Revolt,⁴⁶ and of the Anabaptists,⁴⁷ then to the Premillennialist of today may be ascribed much

⁴² Silver p. 241; W. E. B., *Jesus is Coming*, pp. 230ff; Chafer, *The Kingdom in History and Prophecy*, p. 128; J. J. Ross, *The Kingdom in Mystery*, pp. 135-171; Haldeman, *op. cit.*, p. 153 ff; Riley, *The Evolution of the Kingdom*, p. 211; McConkey, *The End of the Age*, p. 83.

⁴³ A. C. Gabelein, *The Seven Parables*, p. 32.

⁴⁴ Haldeman, *op. cit.* p. 58.

⁴⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 228ff.

⁴⁶ Belfort Bax, *The Peasants' War*.

⁴⁷ Bax, *The Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists*.

of the asceticism and mysticism of the religious of the Middle Ages.⁴⁸ Renouncing the world and its goods in the hope that the promises of the Scriptures will be fulfilled in the millennial age to come, seeing in the underpaid minister or missionary, who is "supported by faith," the modern saint, and looking on poverty and misery as a sign of the imminent return of the Lord—this is not far from the pre-Protestant views on property. And doubtless the monks also felt that the Anabaptists were deserting the faith just as today the effort to accomplish reform of social wrongs is even regarded by some of the leading Premillennialists as a form of apostasy indicating the speedy fulfillment of the prophecy of the approaching end of the age.⁴⁹ In short the Protestant Church is divided, and this group of Protestants oppose any development of the Protestant attitude toward property that is based on the "social gospel," or that claims for the church the right or duty to concern herself with secular affairs. "For the churches to attempt the program that Christ has reserved for His own accomplishment at His coming is certain failure," says Alva J. McLain.⁵⁰ "In due time Christ will come and make His 'reign coextensive with the inhabited earth in all relationships' (quoting John R. Mott whom he is refuting). Until that time let us follow the program of God in preaching the Gospel to the nations, in order that He may speedily complete the body of people which He is taking out of the nations. If in the meantime industrial relations and conditions are not to our liking, let the church heed the advice of James on this very point, 'Be patient therefore,

⁴⁸ The Franciscan Spirituals especially were expecting the immanent return of the Lord. Cf. Harnack's Article in the *Ency. Brit.* vol. xviii. p. 463.

⁴⁹ "They preach justification and sanctification, and divine healing, and the imminent return of Christ," says Silver of one prominent Premillennial body of believers, p. 143. "Their success in raising money for missionary enterprise is astonishing. They have sent forth and are now maintaining missionaries in every part of the world." These missionaries and the ministers at home 'live by faith.'"

⁵⁰ Sermon in *Serving and Waiting*.

brethren, until the coming of the Lord.' ”⁵¹ “The Premillenarian holds that the Gospel is for the individual and that there is no salvation apart from individual repentance toward God and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ. . . . He finds in the Scriptures no suggestion that the Gospel of God is intended to give a social uplift to the masses of unbelieving men ‘who obey not the Gospel.’ ”⁵² But the individual “saved by grace” is still in the world and his life is to be a blessing and his life work is to bless the people with whom he lives. Like Abraham or Lot he is to be the saving “salt of the earth.”

C. A third group exists today in Protestantism, not as distinct perhaps as the two we have just considered, but of great influence and importance. We refer to the advocates of Stewardship. Historically this group has its origin in Puritanism and Calvinism. Its history as a distinct movement is however quite brief. Scarce a generation has passed since the inception of the “Stewardship Movements.”⁵³ Doubtless the independent and therefore self-dependent status of the unestablished churches in America and the non-conformist congregations in England stimulated their membership to give.⁵⁴ The propaganda of the Church Boards, especially the Mission Boards, also was calculated to foster benevolence. Then such plans as the Every-Member Canvass, The Layman’s Missionary Movement, and the Tithing Campaign brought systematic and conscientious benevolence prominently before the minds of Protestant people.⁵⁵ At last, these movements advancing from the mere act of giving as such to the general principles underlying Christian benevolence, have launched in almost every Protestant de-

⁵¹ A pamphlet by Philip Mauro reprinted from *Our Hope* entitled “Dr. Shailer Matthews on Christ’s Return, an Examination of his Pamphlet ‘Will Christ Come Again?’”, p. 25.

⁵² Note here however the remarks of Prof. Rauschenbusch in a note p. 56, *Christianizing the Social Order*.

⁵³ Cf. *A Tithing Autobiography*, published by the Layman Company.

⁵⁴ Cf. Allusions to “Church Support” in the *American Church History Series* especially in the *General Volume* under “Home Missions.”

⁵⁵ Cf. Cushman, *The New Christian*, Introduction.

nomination a Stewardship Movement. Without investigating every phase of these denominational movements we can note that they are all quite similar in the following details.

They seek a scriptural basis for the principles of stewardship and endeavor to determine the laws of God with regard to property. In doing this they use both Old and New Testament, with more or less distinction between their binding force, it is true, but always with the emphasis on the ethical nature of religion and especially on Christianity's duty to settle every problem from an ethical standpoint. They revive the historical attitude of the Protestant Reformation and of the Puritans, and thus have no need to establish themselves in countries like England and America where subconsciously there is already assent to their principles. Their activity ceases with getting the individual to subscribe to a statement of principles which he is to conscientiously put into practice.

The statement of the Layman's Missionary Movement which was repeated by the Interchurch World Movement is as follows :

1. God is the owner of all things.
2. Every man is a steward and must give account of all that is entrusted to him.
3. God's ownership and man's stewardship ought to be acknowledged.
4. This acknowledgment requires, as part of its expression, the setting apart for the extension of the Kingdom of Christ, such a portion of income as is recognized by the individual to be the will of God. (In the O. T. Scriptures, the tenth is recognized as the separated portion.)
5. The separated portion ought to be administered for the Kingdom of God and the remainder recognized as no less a sacred trust.

The individual may be a premillenarian or he may be a devotee of the "social gospel." Of this the stewardship movement takes no notice simply emphasizing responsibility in the matter of possessions. To be sure some of the prophets of the "Kingdom" harmonize these as a part of the "social gospel" as follows: "Stewardship, of course, recognizes the divine ownership not only of our substance but of ourselves, and hence means the use of time and power as well as posses-

sions for the Glory of God and the service of man. Doubtless most professing Christians would say that they had not consecrated themselves to make the world ideal: and not only so but they would say that they had never been taught that it was their duty to do so."⁸⁶ This however appeals to the advocate of the "social gospel" as just what the true steward should do.

Some claim that the matter must rest at the point of the individual's acknowledgment of his stewardship to God. The church should engage in the propaganda of stewardship only to get individuals to acknowledge their obligations to Him. Beyond this dealing with individuals, "The church ought not to engage in secular reforms."⁸⁷ The church is to remedy social wrongs by reaching individuals, capitalists and leaders especially, with the principles of stewardship. "The church can never remedy social wrongs unless she teaches her capitalists, her lawyers, and her politicians a very much wider conception of their duty than that of giving their money to pastor's salaries, to missions, and to the endowment of denominational colleges and theological seminaries."⁸⁸ The development of frugality,⁸⁹ austerity, and conscientiousness in every transaction in the individual Christian is to right every wrong. "Let the church teach men that not only money given to the church belongs to the King, but that invested in business, and that even when it has been honestly earned they are only its trustees—and as trustees they must not pay themselves too much salary. Let her tell her multi-millionaires and her centi-millionaires that they have not purchased immunity by giving a tenth or even a half to missions and colleges and theological seminaries, but that they must use it all, every dollar of it, for the cause of mak-

⁸⁶ Strong, *The Next Great Awakening*, pp. 177-8.

⁸⁷ Howerton, *The Church and Social Reforms*, p. 82.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

⁸⁹ "No matter how great wealth may be, luxury can find no excuse either economic or scriptural, so long as the world is in want." Strong, *The Next Great Awakening*, p. 177.

ing it impossible that there should be any multi-millionaires, and then come themselves and follow their Master in His service of love."⁶⁰ This accords well with the recent statement of the British Quakers, "We would ask all employers to consider very carefully whether their style of living and personal expenditure are restricted to what is needed in order to insure the effective performance of their functions in society. More than this is waste, and is, moreover, a great cause of class divisions."⁶¹ However such statements need further development. Indeed the whole stewardship program seems to be the beginning of a right solution of our present day problems of property that stops short of completion.

D. The "Social Gospel" or Christian Social Service advocates claim the attention of the Protestant Church. Indeed they claim more than attention; for practically every denomination has officially adopted some "social creed" and has some committee or commission whose duty it is to deal with social problems which are mainly problems of property.⁶² Historically, as we have noted, these are the descendants of the Christian Socialists.⁶³ Scripturally they are opposed to premillennialism through their interpretation of the kingdom as present, social and reformatory rather than as future, eschatological and catastrophic. "The premillennial interpretation of the gospel," says Dr. Shailer Matthews, "denies that God is capable of bringing about His victory by spiritual means. He cannot save the world by spiritual means. In order to succeed He has to resort to physical brutality. He abandons morality and uses miraculous militarism. He turns to fire and destructive forces of an impersonal nature."⁶⁴ "'Seek ye first the Kingdom of God' this does not mean as has been often supposed, 'First become a Christian,' but make the

⁶⁰ Howerton, *The Church and Social Reforms*, p. 92.

⁶¹ *Statement of the British Quaker Employers*.

⁶² These are all listed in *The Year Book of Social Service*.

⁶³ Ward, *The Church and Social Service*, Int. Cf. Sec. iii. (D) of this paper.

⁶⁴ *Christ's Return*, p. 10.

Kingdom of God and its extension in the world your daily endeavor, and then all these things shall be added."⁶⁵ "The doctrine of the Kingdom has been misunderstood for centuries."⁶⁶ "The Kingdom of God would be an ideal world."⁶⁷ "It includes earth and heaven."⁶⁸ Passages of the Old Testament especially the Minor Prophets are interpreted "historically" and applied to the social problems of our day. "From the very beginning of their national history the Hebrews were endowed with a rich social heritage derived from their nomadic ancestors. In the strenuous national crisis which marked the enlargement of Israel's life and thought these inherited social ideas were reinterpreted and expanded by each succeeding prophet until they found final and complete synthesis in the teachings of Jesus."⁶⁹

"In this critical, transitional age, when selfish greed and materialism have nearly wrecked society, we are inexorably forced to the conclusion that the social principles of the prophets and Jesus are by far the most valuable assets that the past has bequeathed us, for they furnish the only basis upon which an enduring civilization can be reared." According to these writers, the history of the Jewish people is a text book of sociology and the ideals of her leaders, including Jesus, are the ideals of social reformers. There is hardly a present day problem of property, seemingly, but was found in their history and met by their teachers. The example emboldens these leaders of modern Christian thought to examine the social problems of our day in the same spirit. They investigate conditions in the world of property as a religious duty.

Again, they claim to find in the New Testament a body of teaching that is of social significance undiscovered before. "The rediscovery of the Kingdom of God has been accom-

⁶⁵ Strong, *The Next Great Awakening*, p. 55.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁶⁹ Kent, *The Social Teachings of The Prophets and Jesus*, p. 4.

panied by the rediscovery of the Social Teaching of Jesus."⁷⁰ "The essential element in salvation, according to Jesus, was a right social attitude not only toward God, but toward one's fellow men and toward organized society."⁷¹ Some go so far as to say that "Christ wished to establish a fraternal community in Capernaum,"⁷² and that failing in that He trained His disciples and taught them the principles of a perfect social order which He called the Kingdom of Heaven. The "Hebrew prophets,"⁷³ the "teachings" of Christ,⁷⁴ the "mistaken apocalypticism" of the Early Church,⁷⁵ the "failures" of the Medieval Church,⁷⁶ the "incompleteness" of the Reformation,⁷⁷ the "survival" of Christianity in the present social order,⁷⁸ are all logically put in vital relation to this Kingdom. Because it is so much a matter of 'Liberal' conjecture this conception lends itself readily to extreme statement. Thus we have such outpourings as *The Message of the Kingdom* which says in part;

Jesus was the Peasant-Carpenter of Nazareth, the supreme teacher of the race, who at the age of thirty laid aside the tools of His trade and went forth to proclaim the most revolutionary program of history.

This program He called the "Kingdom of God," the realization of which will break the power of the world's oppressors, both economic and religious. For His fearless proclamation of His teaching He was crucified—not by the Jewish people, but by a little clique of ecclesiastics and oligarchs whose power to exploit the people His program would destroy.

The fundamentals of His program are that all men are brothers and should live together on a basis of mutual service and equality of material supply; that Mammon, the "God of Riches," is the chief enemy of God and His Kingdom, and must therefore be overthrown if the

⁷⁰ Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

⁷¹ Kent, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 193.

⁷³ On these points we refer to Rauschenbusch, (*Christianising the Social Order*, pp. 50-53) with whom others (Ward, Coffin, etc.) are in agreement.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 59-68.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 54-56, 71-73.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 78-81.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 85-88.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 96 to end.

Kingdom of God is to come, and that true worship consists not in ceremonies and creeds, but in bringing all the doings of humanity into obedience to the law of love, thus enabling humanity to develop into the highest type of spiritual beings.

For about three centuries His followers obeyed Him by living the communal life which He taught, but for sixteen centuries our so-called Christian Civilization has rejected Him for dogmas and creeds about Him, thereby making a bloody track across the ages. None of the wars, poverty, and crimes of the historic past could have occurred if the world has accepted His program.

The professed followers of Jesus have even now ample political power to make the will of God to be done on earth. . . .

We appeal therefore—or rather we voice a universal appeal, . . . to all men and women to do the following:

1. Find out what Jesus' Social Program is; what He means by the Kingdom of God on earth. . . .

In confident assurance of the practical coming of the Kingdom which only can save and cure this distracted world, we send forth this message, to those who should be the saving salt of the earth.⁷⁹

It is perfectly apparent to the reader who has followed the development of this paper why such a piece of theological demagogery and historical nonsense as this Message of the Kingdom can never be accepted either by those who hold premillennial views or by those whose ideas of stewardship are based upon the acceptance of the Scriptures as inspired and the church as a divine and divinely-guided institution. It only appeals to the "modern theologian" who approaches the subject from the standpoint of "Rationalism," "Liberalism," or "Modernism." Says one of these,⁸⁰ "We are witnessing today a reaction against this exaggerated individualism (that of Reformation theology). It has become an axiom of modern thought that the government of God has a social as well as an individual significance, and the conception of the Kingdom of God—obscured in the earlier Protestantism—

⁷⁹ Myron T. Scudder, John Haynes Holmes, Edwin Markham, Percy Stickney Grant, Edwin D. Wheelock, Rev. John H. Dooley, Bolton Hall, all of New York City, in *The Message of the Kingdom*.

⁸⁰ Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, quotes extensively from Schleiermacher, Ritschl, etc. See esp. n. p. 138 quoting William Adams Brown, *Christian Theology in Outline*, p. 192.

is coming again into the forefront of theological thought.⁸¹ Albrecht Ritschl, in his work, *Justification and Reconciliation*, begins the discussion of his own views⁸² by insisting that personal salvation must be organically connected with the Kingdom of God. He says, "Theology has taken a very unequal interest in the two chief characteristics of Christianity. Everything pertaining to its character as the redemption of men has been made the subject of the most minute consideration; consequently redemption by Christ has been taken as the centre of all Christian life and knowledge, whereas the ethical conception of Christianity contained in the idea of the Kingdom of God has been slighted. . . . It has been fatal for Protestantism that the reformers did not cleanse the idea of the ethical Kingdom of God or Christ from its hierarchical corruption (i.e. the idea that the visible church is the Kingdom) but worked out the idea only in an academic and unpractical form. Kant first recognized this use of the Kingdom of God in ethics. Schleiermacher first applied the theological quality of Christianity to the definition of its nature, but he still treated now of personal redemption, now of the Kingdom of God, without adequately working out their connection. Ritschl has done more than anyone else to put the idea to the front in German theology, but he does not get beyond a few general ideas. He was born too early to get sociological ideas."⁸³

In the hands of such 'liberal' thinkers, Christ and the Scriptural teachings are caricatured. It is the overzealous efforts of such men that have awakened the opposition of the premillennial and the conservative theologians. With such views the advocates of Scriptural Stewardship can never amalgamate. There is however a proper expression of the Protestant attitude toward property which is the *via media*

⁸¹ A discussion of "The Kingdom in Modern Thought" by Dr. Brown, *op. cit.*, pp. 192ff.

⁸² Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, Vol. III, p. iii.

⁸³ Translated and quoted by Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, p. 138. Cf. also p. 148a and p. 152 at the bottom of the page.

between these groups and which seems the logical position for the church to take.

E. This proper expression has been the aim of the various "Social Creeds" of denominations and organizations. Essentially true to the historic Protestant position, they are based upon the accepted faith of the bodies for which they speak. They are not communistic, but recognize the right of private property.⁸⁴ They do not deny the Reformation ideal of work as a calling and do not uphold idleness or profligacy. Instead they stand "for the right and duty to work since human society cannot endure unless each of its members has the opportunity and feels the obligation to serve the common good to the extent of his ability." The Presbyterian General Assembly urges Christians everywhere "to insist that labor is incumbent upon all; that idleness, whether among the rich or poor, is sinful."⁸⁵ Every one of these creeds is consistent with the early and modern ideas of stewardship. "Christians are bound to discountenance by every means in their power the application of wealth to luxuries, to expensive amusements, and to the gratification of wasteful habits, whatever the class in which it may take place."⁸⁷ In the light of history and of the living faith of the church these statements are an attempt to complete and unify the Protestant attitude in the presence of comparatively new and modern social conditions.

The bodies represented in the Federal Council of Churches have already formally united in such a combined statement.⁸⁸ How authoritatively this body can speak for each of its members we cannot say. Still it is to be remembered that each denomination has for itself adopted some such definite

⁸⁴ Cf. *The Social Creed* adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., May 1920, Declaration 2, for the Christian obligation to use wealth and power as trusts from God for fellowmen.

⁸⁵ *The Social Creed* adopted by the General Assembly May 1920, Declaration 5.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, Recommendation 7.

⁸⁷ *Christianity and Industrial Problems*, p. 95.

⁸⁸ *Year Book of Social Service*, 1916, p. 200.

statement. Again there is doubt as to how far the constituents of each body would regard them as expressing exactly what they believe. When any statement is made which touches on such matters as family life, marriage, divorce, housing, education, child labor, women in industry, poverty, the use of liquor and drugs and the traffic in the same, health, industrial accidents and diseases, unemployment or coercion, old age and disability pensions, organization and the settlement of disputes, one day's rest in seven, hours of employment, a minimum living wage, the basis of wages and profits, and the spirit of service and toil, such a statement is not likely to meet with unanimous assent. As an illustration of a "Social Creed" we will quote at some length from the statement embodied in the *Report of the Board of Home Missions to the Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.* regarding "The Church and Industry," May 1920. It says in part:

As a Christian Church, accepting the revelation of God's nature and purpose which He made through Jesus Christ, we hold it to be our duty not only to proclaim to all men what this revelation means for the life of the individual and of society, but also particularly to instruct our members in the duties which Christian discipleship lays on them. . . .

I. The Ground of our Social Interest. Our persuasion of our right and duty to speak on contemporary social questions grows out of our certainty that God has revealed to us in Jesus Christ not only the way of salvation for the individual, but also an ideal of life which defines the right relations of men to each other. This Christian ideal of social life is formed by these beliefs:

- a. That God is "the Father of all men," and that men as His children are potential members of His Kingdom.
- b. That God has made men members one of another, bound together in society, and that therefore this society ought to be a brotherhood of love and service.
- c. That God has sent His son Jesus Christ to be our Savior from sin and to establish His Kingdom among men.
- d. That God is now and ever at work in the world, by His Spirit for the accomplishment of His will.

II. The Goal of our Social Effort. Believing thus, we hold that it ought to be our aim to bring these truths to bear on every relation of life, economic, political, legal, ecclesiastical, social. We know no way of commending the Gospel we profess so effectively as action in the spirit of our profession. We cannot but see that much in our present social order is contrary to the mind of Christ and we believe that it is our

duty to protest against these unchristian things, and, so far as we can, to establish in their place that which is Christian.

III. The Christian Method of Social Progress. We believe that all true social progress begins where Christ began—with repentance, a change of heart. We would not divorce our social from our individual gospel, but on the contrary proclaim the need of personal conversion with redoubled energy. We believe that the fundamental vice of our time is not so much any particular thing that we do, as the spirit which animates the doing of it. We proclaim therefore as the fundamental need of our time, the substitution of the spirit of love and service for the spirit of greed and selfish competition and call upon our fellow Christians to join with all men of good will of every race and walk of life to permeate industry with the spirit of Jesus Christ and to advocate such changes in our conduct of industry as shall more perfectly express His Spirit.

IV. Consequences of the Christian View of Industry. What is true of men's relations in society in general is true more particularly of the relations of men to one another in industry. Here also the spirit of brotherhood must control. As each industry exists to serve the community so each individual must be regarded as a partner in the enterprise and the relations of those engaged in it one to another must be characterized by mutual understanding and good will. The acceptance of this ideal will affect (a) the motive of industry, (b) its method, and (c) its spirit.

THE SOCIAL CREED

We hold that our church ought to declare:

1. For the social obligation resting on every man for his family, his community, and for the whole world.
2. For the Christian obligation to use wealth and power as trusts from God for fellowmen.
3. For the application of Christian principles to the conduct of industrial, agricultural, and commercial organizations and relationships. Among these Christian Principles are:
 - a. The sacredness of life and the supreme worth of personality so that a man must always be treated as an end and not as a means.
 - b. The Brotherhood of man, demanding for every worker a democratic status in industry, and mutual understanding, good will, cooperation, and a common incentive among all engaged in it.
4. For the right and duty to work, since human society cannot endure unless each of its members has the opportunity and feels the obligation to serve the common good to the extent of his ability.
5. For a worthy and just return. . . . a living wage.
6. For the abatement of poverty. . . .
7. For the protection of children. . . .
8. For regulation to safeguard physical and moral health. . . .
9. For safeguards. . . . from harmful conditions. . . . dangerous machinery and occupational disease, and for education in avoiding hazards.

10. For the assumption by industry of the burdens entailed by industrial accidents, disease, and death, and training of injured.
11. For the release of every worker for rest one day in seven, which, if possible, should be the Lord's Day.
12. For . . . sufficient leisure for physical, mental, and moral well being of the workers.
13. For the employment of arbitration.
14. For the inviolability of agreements.
15. For the right of organization.

Similar creeds have been adopted by most of the other denominational bodies.⁸⁹ Will the local churches and the individual Christians accept these as satisfactory?

The Boards and Commissions of the various denominations are of course pushing for a wide study and acceptance of these ideals.⁹⁰ Denominational colleges and study groups in other institutions are being reached.⁹¹ The Federal Council of Churches⁹² and the Y. M. C. A.⁹³ are active in the propaganda. At the time of its greatest activity the Inter-church World Movement seemed about to succeed in putting the whole of Protestantism on record but such opposition was

⁸⁹ Their statements and organization will be found in the *Year Book of Social Service*, p. 24ff. Baptist, p. 31, Congregational p. 39, Methodist Episcopal, p. 45, Presbyterian, p. 51, Protestant Episcopal, p. 57, Christian Church, p. 63, Disciples of Christ, p. 64, Friends, p. 66, German Evangelical, p. 67, Lutheran Evangelical, p. 68, Methodist Episcopal South, p. 70, Presbyterian South, p. 71, German Reformed, p. 71, United Presbyterian, p. 71, Others, p. 73. Cf also the *Report of the Fifth Committee of Inquiry of the Archbishops of England*, and the British Quaker employers, referred to above.

⁹⁰ Note the Recommendations to the General Assembly embodied in the Report of 1920 cited above. The Methodist Board publishes a monthly "Social Service Bulletin," The Missionary Education Movement printed *The Gospel for a Working World* as a Mission Study Text Book. *Poverty and Wealth* by Ward is also used for Study Classes.

⁹¹ "The religious organizations dealing with college men and women know that any appeal that leaves out the social note meets a listless audience." *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, p. 3.

⁹² The Commission of the Church and Social Service is publishing and promoting the interchange of vast amounts of literature.

⁹³ The Association Press has printed a large amount of literature for the study of social problems in the Association.

awakened by their zeal and their mistakes that at the collapse of the Movement⁶⁴ the lines of division were wider than ever before. Only time and Providence will tell whether we are to have a united Protestant attitude on these problems or whether in their solution Protestantism itself will be divided. Safety lies in adherence to the words of Scripture interpreted with a reverent faith in their inspiration, and in a thorough study of the stand that the church, especially the Protestant Church, has taken through its history.

CONCLUSION

Historically then we see Protestantism morally bound to meet the problems of the possession and use of property. The church must answer the questions that arise about "mine" and "thine" and "theirs." After a study of the development of her teaching on the matter we are bound to conclude that its solution is of ever increasing importance, and that its present urgency is due as much to conditions of society brought in by the Reformation and for which consequently the Protestant Church is in a sense responsible as to any other cause. In the face of this responsibility we find that many are still clinging to ideals that approximate those of the Medieval Church while others whose thought is a little more advanced have not as yet advanced far enough to meet satisfactorily the modern problems of industry and the other problems of our complex life of today. For these the great need is education, that they may be enabled to understand the problems of the present day and "apply" their Christianity to them honestly and wisely. For those, on the other hand, who attempt to lead the church in "social service" history has a word of caution: let them seek so to safeguard their teachings and methods as to avoid a denial of the historic faith and

⁶⁴ See "Mistakes of the Interchurch Steel Report," reprinted by the Steel Company from articles in *Industry*, a new magazine seeking notoriety. Also *Analysis of the Interchurch World Movement Report on the Steel Strike*, by Marshall Olds.

practice of the Protestant Church and rather incorporate and apply the established principles of the church since the Reformation. For such a solution of the whole matter there is an immediate need and doubtless there will be derived from it a great religious revival.

Rutledge, Pa.

EARNEST E. EELLS.