

# NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXXV.

---

DECEMBER, 1883.

---

## GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF THE TELEGRAPH.

---

THE telegraph wires extend over the length and breadth of our country; wherever the traveler journeys, or commerce is carried on, there the telegraph office is found. Though the correspondence by telegraph is increasing more rapidly than that by mail, yet it is under no governmental control except by State legislation. Unfortunately, the laws of the several States are sometimes conflicting with one another; and no State has the power to legislate for a business which extends into every State and Territory, and to every quarter of the habitable world. In this article I shall show the growth and importance of this business, the evils of the present telegraph system, their cause, and the remedy.

The Western Union Company practically monopolizes the telegraph business of the country. The growth of the telegraph is shown by the statistics of the business of this company from its re-organization, in 1866, to the present time. The telegrams have increased from 5,000,000 to 40,000,000, the capital from \$20,000,000 to \$80,000,000, the gross earnings from \$6,000,000 to \$19,000,000, the wires from 75,000 miles to 432,000 miles. The telegrams have doubled every six years, and now equal in number the letters transmitted by the Post-office in 1843, when Congress made an appropriation for the construction of the first telegraph line; and the revenue for the year ended July 1, 1883, is larger than that of the Post-office Department in 1870.

VOL. CXXXVII.—NO. 325.

38

## MORALITY AND RELIGION.

MR. KIDDER.

THE man who does not accept the doctrines laid down by the authorities of the Christian Church is set down as an "unbeliever," and the Church has heretofore so dominated the sentiment of society as to make it a term of reproach. It is ceasing to be so. The most intelligent, the most cultivated, and the most conscientious members of the community are coming more and more to reject the doctrines still deemed essential in the Church, while their character for virtue and respectability has to be recognized. Doubt very naturally arises as to whether religious belief has any necessary connection with moral conduct, whether, in fact, the so-called believer is any better than the so-called unbeliever.

In the first place, the difference between them is not that one believes and the other does not believe, but that they do not believe alike, and that their belief has not the same foundation. We dispute the right of the Church believer any longer to cast reproach on the believer outside of the Church, or to thank God that he is either better or safer than other men. But what do "unbelievers" believe? They believe as much in virtue and good morals as Christians of the "straitest sect." They believe in uprightness—righteousness, if you please—as best for mankind in this life and in any life to which they may be destined, and they believe in promoting virtue and uprightness by every means. But they believe that what is called the Old Testament Scriptures is simply a mass of Hebrew literature, subject to the same canons of criticism that apply to any other collection of books. They believe that the judgment which selected these particular books and called them sacred was a fallible human judgment. They believe the Pentateuch to contain a purely mythical account of the creation of the world and the origin of

the human race. They believe that the account of the origin and history of the Jewish people is mixed up with legend, much of it incredible. They believe the Mosaic law in all its details to be a human production, applicable to a particular people in a rude age, though it contains some moral precepts universally accepted. They believe the early Jewish idea of the Deity to be a monstrous combination of the attributes of the heathen gods and the Oriental despots of the time, exalted by the genius of Moses, and varied from time to time by the priests and prophets of the Jewish people. They believe that the annals of the Hebrews contain a good deal of rubbish and some absolutely disgusting incidents, and that the whole mass is to be treated like any other literature of an ancient people. The prophets and psalmists, like the philosophers and singers of other nations, produced many things worthy of preservation and admiration, but nothing that should be exempt from a discriminating criticism. The people for whom the present writer speaks have their belief about the Old Testament, as clear and positive as that of the Church.

So have they of the New Testament. They regard that as a peculiarly interesting collection of literature, pertaining to the life and teachings of a singularly pure and enthusiastic preacher who sacrificed his life to the intolerant spirit of the established theology of his time and who has exercised a wonderful influence over human history. They admire his character and his teachings, but believe that both have been amazingly distorted. The record written up from tradition long after his death is, of course, imperfect. Superstition and credulity added much that would be rejected in any other old record and should be in this. "Unbelievers" believe the gospels to be a crude and imperfect record, containing many errors of fact and much coloring of belief derived from writers who were not cognizant of the facts. They regard Paul and the apostles as the real founders of Christianity as a system, but they believe that Christianity as it now exists has been a growth, like every other system, whether of religion, politics, or philosophy,—the work of man in the same sense in which government and the theories and methods of public administration are the work of man.

Those whom the Church calls unbelievers found their belief on the study of nature and of man. It is made up of the best conclusions of human experience, human knowledge, and

human study up to this point in the world's development. Those conclusions contradict most of the belief based on what is called revelation; consequently they cannot accept that revelation as Divine or authoritative. Do they believe in a God, in immortality, and in a future state of man? That depends on the definition of these terms and on the mental constitution of the believer. Few pretend to have any positive answer to make to unanswerable questions. They go as far in their conclusions as human knowledge and human reasoning can carry them, and there they stop. They have no right to assume, save each for himself. They do not, like the Church, claim a peculiar conclusiveness or a peculiar sacredness for their assumptions, or try to impose them on others.

It makes no difference what men believe upon the doctrinal points of religion; they are no better or worse for believing or not believing. In other words, there is no connection between morality and dogmatic belief. A man may reject the doctrines of the Church entirely and be just as virtuous, just as upright, just as good, and just as safe for all the chances of eternity as the most devout believer in them. The moral teachings of Christianity do not differ, in the main, from the moral teachings of philosophy. Unbelievers accept them, not as the result of revelation or the offspring of religion, but as the best deductions of human experience and thought. They are apart entirely from matters of doctrinal belief or religious worship, and just as good coming from Zoroaster as from Solomon, from Buddha as from Jesus, from Socrates as from Paul, from Shakespeare as from Augustine. The question does not directly concern what the Church has done or is doing as an organization for the good of humanity. If our position is sound, it could do just as much without its dogmas, and its power to do it is not dependent on its system of doctrinal belief; or the same good could be done by a human organization otherwise founded. Moreover, the unbeliever in Christian doctrines, as we have defined his position, must not be confounded with the class which does not think at all and which has no belief of any kind. This class, being ignorant and unintelligent, is apt to be vicious, but it is not usually graced with the epithet of infidel. It is subject to superstition and given to credulity; it is moved by appeals to the hopes and fears, and it may be that the Church in the peculiar character of its teachings still serves a useful purpose in improving the lives and conduct of the lower ranks of

humanity. Perhaps the philosophy of the unbeliever could not or would not directly reach and elevate them, though it may be claimed that methods which elevate the race as a whole bring up the very lowest layers and let light into the darkest places. The results of scientific study and of progressive thought enlighten the every-day common sense of the people, and it is not merely the student and thinker who refuses to be a believer, in the sense imposed upon the word by the Church. The mass of the people are coming more and more to reject the old dogmas, and less and less to need them.

Systems of theology in the past have been the product of human need in the lower stages of mental and moral development, and they have served their purpose in the progress of civilization. To-day, theology is in the rear of thought and not in the van. It holds to worn-out dogmas, potent in times of ignorance and superstition, impotent in the light of science and philosophy. The latter are destroying religious belief as it has been held in the past, and the result is not a lower standard of moral conduct. To the man who reasons clearly the promises and threats of religion are futile, and it is through promises and threats that it has done its work. Such a man can govern his own conduct and try to improve others without these. We have reached the stage where society generally can do without them; they are losing their effect, and agencies of moral support and improvement can be made quite as effective without any regard to the doctrines that are now held by the Church as essential to salvation. The belief of the "unbeliever" is as good for the moral well-being of man as the belief of the Christian.

Nor do we ignore the needs of what is called the spiritual nature of man, or, more accurately speaking, his emotional nature. But we contend that the highest intellectual view of the life and destiny of mankind, a view based on knowledge and reason and requiring no other revelation, gives room for the loftiest development, the fullest exercise, and the amplest sustenance and support for that part of man's nature usually denominated spiritual. To admit that it requires a belief which intelligence and reason do not accept would be equivalent to holding that delusion is necessary to the comfort and consolation of the human soul.

What we contend for is simply this: The position of unbelief in the distinctive dogmas of the Christian Church to-day is the result of scientific investigation and critical study, and is gener-

ally accepted, not only by students and thinkers, but by the intelligent common sense of the mass of mankind. It is strengthened by every advance in discovery and in that philosophy which is the outcome of human knowledge. The prevailing type of Christianity, on the other hand, clings to superstition and credulity as the basis of its influence. It will not, so far as it can help it, permit common sense to assert itself in the place of unreasoning faith in the dreams of the olden time. The consequence is that the Church is losing its hold on the convictions of men and on the conscience of the community. The belief that is founded on scientific conclusions and common sense affords as solid a basis for moral character and as firm a support for virtue as belief in the religious doctrines of the past or present. It is not denied that the Church, as an organization, has done and is doing good to humanity, nor is it claimed that it makes no difference what a man believes, or whether he believe anything, in matters of ethics. But it is claimed that if the Church abandoned its outworn creeds, and gave up old superstitions about Divine revelation, vicarious atonement, salvation by faith, and future retribution, it could do far more good by reaching and elevating a larger number of people. It is certain that if it does not keep up with the mental progress of the race, it will fall behind in moral progress, and will lose its influence upon the intelligent and thinking part of mankind.

F. A. KIDDER.

---

PROF. HODGE.

It is quite possible that, during the long history of theological disputation, some orthodox dogmatist may have equaled, in disconnected utterance of unproved assertions the agnostic text furnished us, in the stead of a subject, as a basis for this discussion; but it is impossible that any one of them could in this regard have surpassed it. From the eddy of remark we disentangle three unsupported assertions, each of which could be adequately met by a simple denial.

*First.* It is asserted that the designation of those who reject as untrue the common faith of Christendom, by the term "infidel," is unjust, and that "the difference between them (Christians and non-Christians) is not that one believes and the other does not believe, but that they do not believe alike." Now, this has

always been understood equally by both parties in the use of the word. We maintain that when the epithet "infidel" is applied, as is universally intended, to one who holds the characteristic truths of either or both natural or revealed religion to be incredible, it expresses with scientific accuracy the facts of the case and nothing more nor less. These persons are "infidels" in relation to those objects of faith understood definitely on each occasion of its application. The radical significance, the infinite importance, the practical consequence of the truths rejected; the millennial continuity, the catholic consensus, the venerable dignity of the Church; the substantial agreement of the vast majority of the European peoples,—require that dissent from *this* faith should be emphasized as *the* "infidelity." As believers, we wish to be known only precisely for what we are. Why should skeptics desire to apply to themselves the designations which centuries of association have inseparably bound to the faith they despise? If the term "infidel" carries with it unpleasant suggestions, arising from historical associations, which party is to blame for the fact?

*Second.* It is contended that the result of scientific progress and of critical investigation has been to render incredible the distinctive doctrines of the Christian Church, and that this is recognized not only by the highly cultured, but also "by the intelligent common sense of the mass of mankind." This involves the claim (1) that men of high culture, as such, see the impossibility of the truth of Christianity, and (2) that the power of Christianity as a living system of faith is visibly declining among the mass of civilized mankind; and the scope of the contest involves the claim that this disillusionizing effect of modern enlightenment extends to the whole field of natural as well as of revealed religion. No evidence of either of these assertions is suggested, and each alike is preposterously untrue. As to the former it is answered that, of course, a skeptic may also be a man of science; but to claim that culture renders Christian faith impossible is merely to beg the question, by making skepticism a part of the definition of culture. It is absurd to claim that the highest culture in this age renders faith impossible, when Gladstone and Bismarck are orthodox Christians; when Agassiz, Herschel, Sir William Thomson and Owen are at least thorough theists; when Cuvier, Henry, Tait, Balfour Stewart, Clerk Maxwell, Asa Gray, Guyot, Mivart, Charles Young, W.

Kitchen Parker (the most advanced of English evolutionists) are but specimens of a great multitude of earnest Christian professors who maintain their position at the forefront of scientific progress. Multitudes of the highest scientific authorities assert that the proved results of science present no obstacle to faith. The protest against it comes with no force higher than that derived from the vagrant speculations of a transient philosophy. And this is ventured against Christianity, which for two millenniums has retained her serene throne, while a countless succession of such philosophic tides have ebbed and flowed around her feet.

The Church, of all interests, has least need to fear the effect of culture. Plato, Aristotle, Bacon, Descartes, Leibnitz, Kant have all in succession brought their tribute to her temples. Our ground of complaint is that our opponents are only half-educated specialists. They study the physical sciences and not the humanities; they use the senses and not the intuitions; they prophesy the future, but do not critically study the past; they read the attacks upon Christianity, but not their refutations. We claim that the great conquests of science have been confirming the truth of God's existence and manifesting the glory of His attributes beyond our fondest dreams. We claim that the results of historical and literary criticism have laid bare the foundations of our faith, and in doing so have confirmed their strength and exhibited their credentials in an exact scientific form. Those who take in the whole field of Biblical criticism, not merely one side of it, know that the drift is now decidedly against the post-exilic origin of the Pentateuch, and in favor of the Apostolic origin of the New Testament. Luthardt, Dillmann, Keil, Delitzsch, Lightfoot, Westcott, Weiss, Ezra Abbott, and others show the claims of victory set up by the opponents of our faith to be very premature. Zoeckler, in a review of the Old Testament literature of 1882, in the January (1883) number of "Luthardt's Zeitschrift," says: "The works of last year controverting the views of Wellhausen and his school preponderate very decidedly, both in number and in scientific merit, over the works on the opposite side." See also the encyclopædic résumé of the History of Biblical Criticism, in the "Presbyterian Review," January 1, 1883.

As to the second point asserted, viz., that the power of Christianity as a living system of faith is visibly declining among the



mass of civilized mankind, the refutation is no less easily produced, and no less overwhelming. These announcements of the decay and approaching dissolution of Christianity have been repeated, only to be brought to shame over and over again, for the past fifteen hundred years, but never before with so little to excuse and so much to rebut them. In A. D. 304, at the end of the Diocletian persecutions, and only twenty years before Christianity conquered for itself imperial establishment, the Augusti were hailed with new honorary addresses, containing the incidental clauses, "et nomine Christianorum deleto," "superstitione Christiana ubique deleta." Hume, in Scotland, and Voltaire, in France, pronounced in effect equivalent judgments just before the opening of the splendid era of modern revivals of missions and of literary and theological activity, when the Church, supposed to be moribund, has exhibited both intensively and extensively more of the creative energy of the Apostolic age than it had done in any of the centuries that intervene.

We admit, of course, that the external activities of a given community are not wholly commensurate with the contemporaneous mental states and tendencies of its members. The habits of men often remain in action after the faiths of which they are the expression have begun to die at the root, even as the waves of the ocean are often high after the winds which raised them have subsided. We also admit that statistics, like all other systems of facts or of symbols, may be so used as to express untruths. But it is absurd to pretend that a rising wave over an entire ocean can be diagnostic of a falling wind, and statistics, when the induction is broad enough, are among the most solid of all scientific data. Never before has Christianity, nominal and real, advanced as during the present century. The best approximate estimates give as the whole number of nominal Christians on earth at the end of the first century, 500,000; at the end of the seventh century, 25,000,000; at the end of the fourteenth century, 80,000,000; at the end of the seventeenth century, 155,000,000; at the end of the eighteenth century, 200,000,000; and in 1880, 410,000,000. As to the relative political influence of these Christians, we have 100,000,000 of population subject to Christian government in A. D. 1500 as compared with 685,459,000 in A. D. 1876.

As to the religious tendencies prevailing at present in the population of this country, the following statistics, gathered

with great care from the year-books of all the evangelical churches, will be seen to be conclusive. In the year 1800, there were in the evangelical churches in the United States 3030 congregations, 2651 ordained ministers, and 364,872 communicants. In the year 1850, there were 43,072 churches, 25,555 ministers, and 3,529,988 communicants. In the year 1870, 70,148 churches, 47,609 ministers, and 6,673,396 communicants. In 1880, 97,090 churches, 69,870 ministers, and 10,065,963 communicants. The ratio of the communicants of our evangelical churches to the entire population of the United States at these different dates was, in 1800, one to every 14.50 inhabitants; in 1850, one to every 6.57 inhabitants; in 1870, one to every 5.78; and in 1880, one to every 5 inhabitants. This last, of course, is one communicant to every 2.5 or 3 non-Roman Catholic adult men and women. From 1800 to 1880 the population of the nation increased 9.46-fold; while, in the same time, the evangelical communicants increased 27.52-fold. From 1850 to 1880 the population increased 116 per cent., and the evangelical communicants increased 184 per cent.

The above leaves out of view the 6,367,330 Roman Catholics, who do not report communicants as distinct from the general mass of their adherents. If these are all counted as sincere believers in the truths of historical Christianity, it increases the superior ratio of the increase of those who make a personal acknowledgment of the truth of Christianity over that of the general population 100 per cent. The Catholic population has increased more than four hundred per cent. in the last thirty years.

On the other hand, the liberal churches, which have in some degree followed the advice to put less stress upon the distinguishing doctrines of a pretended supernatural revelation, have been relatively retrograding. The number of parishes claimed by the Unitarians in 1850 was 246, and they had only 335 in 1880, or an increase of 35 per cent. in thirty years as compared with the 250 per cent. increase made by the evangelical churches in the same time. The Universalist churches in 1850 were 1069 and only 956 in 1880, an actual loss of 113 in thirty years. The Christian Church (Unitarian Baptist) has also retrograded from 1500 parishes in 1840 to 1200 in 1880.

That these statistics represent a real faith is shown by the evidence our year-books present of the amazing missionary fruit-

fulness of these professing Christians. The work of foreign missions is a characteristic enterprise of the present century. Professor Christlieb has estimated that in 1800 the total sum annually contributed in all Christendom to Protestant missions amounted to \$250,000. In 1850 the income of the mission boards in England and America was \$2,959,541. In 1872 the amount was \$7,874,155. The reports from all the missions cannot be obtained, so that, from the nature of the case, our carefully collected reports fall below and can never equal the real facts of the case. Protestant mission societies in Europe and America reported in A. D. 1830: missions 122, ordained missionaries 656, lay helpers 1236, communicants 70,289, scholars 80,656. In A. D. 1850: missions 178, ordained missionaries 1672, lay helpers 4056, communicants 210,957, scholars 147,939. In A. D. 1880: missions 504, ordained missionaries 6696, lay helpers 33,852, communicants 857,332 (148 missions not reporting), scholars 447,602, with hearers and adherents, estimated from the actual reports of the missions, amounting to 2,000,000.

In the meantime, the aggregate funds collected by the evangelical churches in the United States for home missions amounted, from A. D. 1820 to A. D. 1829, to \$233,826; from A. D. 1860 to A. D. 1869 they amounted to \$21,015,719, and from A. D. 1870 to 1880 they amounted to \$31,272,154. Sunday-schools were instituted only one hundred years ago. Fifty years afterward, in A. D. 1830, it is estimated that there were less than 2,000,000 teachers and scholars in the world. In A. D. 1880 there were 14,000,000 teachers and scholars in the world, or 6,000,000 in Europe and 8,000,000 in America.

Young Men's Christian Associations date back only about thirty years and, more than any other religious movement, prove the intense vitality of Christian life in the bosoms of intelligent laymen of the present and coming generation. The "International Convention of Young Men's Christian Associations," held at Milwaukee, Wis., May 16-20, 1883, report in their year-book a total of 2428 associations for the whole world, including 840 for North America; 388 for Great Britain and Ireland; 64 for France; 400 for Germany; 335 for Holland, etc. These labor for the religious welfare of young men, providing for them libraries, lectures, prayer-meetings, Bible classes, and introducing strangers to the churches. Separate departments work in the special fields of "City and Town Associations," "Railroad

Branches and Associations," and "College Associations," and the reports of the latter are especially significant in this inquiry. They enumerate 170 Young Men's Christian Associations in as many colleges in the United States. These embrace 9250 members, out of 33,000 students in these colleges, and these are the working, as distinct from the professing, Christians. One thousand five hundred students in these colleges professed conversion during the past year. Dr. Ashbel Green said, in A. D. 1813, that there were only two or three students in Princeton College who professed to be religious men. When Dr. Dwight became president of Yale College, in A. D. 1795, only four or five students were members of the church. The reports of 1883 give: in Princeton, 270 professing Christians, who include the great majority of the higher scholars, out of a total of 578 students; and in Yale, 290, out of a total of 611; in Williams, 147, out of 248; and in Amherst, 233, out of 352. In many other colleges the proportions are still more favorable to the prospects of Christianity. It certainly appears as if our "cultured" friends gave too much credit to "the intelligent common sense of the mass of mankind."

*Third.* The third point asserted without proof is, that morality is entirely independent of religious opinion, and will survive without impairment when all positive opinion on religious questions is abandoned. It is obvious that such a question cannot be debated in the limits afforded for this discussion. It will be sufficient if the following points are noted in rebuttal of the absolutely unsupported assertion of our respondent:

(1.) The contention, as determined by our respondent himself, relates to the independence of morals (not only its idea, but its practical realization in the mass of a civilized community) of all the postulates of natural as well as of revealed religion.

(2.) We on our side, instead of denying, affirm that man is essentially a moral being. That "the law written on his heart" and "the light of nature" render him a moral agent, capable of doing right in many relations and responsible in all known relations, irrespective of any supernatural revelation whatsoever.

(3.) The burden of proof rests upon our respondents, and they labor against the presumption created by the whole unqualified mass of human experience in the past. Morality, as predicable of any community of mankind, never has been separated from religious dogmas and practices. The Buddhists of Siam, Burmah, and China have a low form of religion to which

the morality of those communities corresponds. The princes of heathen morals, Seneca, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Plutarch (A. D. 50-125), all based their morality upon their theology. The latter states the sum of human experience, ancient and modern, when he says: "There has never been a state of atheists. You may travel over the world, and you may find cities without walls, without king, without mint, without theater or gymnasium, but you will never find a city without God, without prayer, without oracle, without sacrifice. Sooner may a city stand without foundations than a state without belief in the gods. This is the bond of all society, the pillar of all legislation." We do not deny the existence, in this day, of exceptionably lovely characters who are skeptical—often most sadly so—as to all religious truth, natural and revealed. We deny, however, that these prove that morality is independent of religion. Morality in them, as in all others, has its root in theology, and their cases are easily explainable on the scientific principles of heredity, education, and environment. The examples of prominent emancipated moralists, male and female,—as John Stuart Mill and George Eliot, etc.,—do not re-assure us. The experiments made by communities of atheists in the Reign of Terror and in the Commune in Paris, and the proclaimed principles of the "International Society" of Communists, who declare at once the abolition of God, of marriage, and of property, do not re-assure us. The "cultured" must give us proof, not assertion, for their contention that morality is independent of religion.

(4.) Morality is, as to its essence, authoritative. It is the categorical imperative. It is ultimate, incapable of analysis. There has been no success in the attempt to confound it with utility, nor in the more recent and more pretentious attempts to trace its genesis out of associated sensations or animal impulses. It is sovereign over all these and dominates them from above. It necessarily presupposes personality, moral intuitions, and rational and responsible spontaneity. It has existed, as an ultimate fact, just as we find it, throughout all stages of human history. Hence, it is as spiritual and transcendental as religion itself. The same paralysis of faith which tends to render ineffectual the abundant evidences of religion, natural and revealed, would necessarily tend equally to render obscure and ineffectual genuine moral distinctions and obligations.

(5.) Even natural religion, much more the facts and doctrines of the Christian revelation, beyond all controversy

reënforce the moral element in human nature. They supply the sublime authority of an infinite, eternal, absolutely perfect moral governor; the clear revelation of his will in all relations and under all conditions; the tremendous sanctions of future rewards and punishment; the effective exhibition of our Heavenly Father's absolute righteousness and infinite love; the utterly unparalleled ideal of wisdom and moral perfection in human form exhibited in Jesus Christ; the all-penetrating, all-informing inspiration of the Holy Ghost; the cloud of witnesses; the fellowship of the saints; and the ordinances of the holy Sabbath and of the Christian Church.

If revelation is false, its influence cannot be morally good. But if true, it evidently renders the most sufficient support to morality. If it be withdrawn, we have every reason to apprehend the most serious loss to the moral character and habits of the following generations. If untrue, religion must be immoral; hence, if its influence is moral, it follows that it must be true. This fact, so obvious and vital, is a strong corroborating evidence of the truth of Christianity, and the burden of proof lies wholly on the other side.

(6.) Science, devoid of theism, is universally pessimistic. The worlds all tend to darkness and death. The struggle for life and the survival of the physically fittest often involves the survival of the morally monstrous. Nature is proved to be, as over against all human interests and agencies, fatalistic, mechanical, unsympathetic to all agony, impassive to all struggle, and deaf to all prayer. Take away all theistic intention, and there is no basis for hope. Take away hope, and there is no basis for morals.

(7.) Given theism, Christianity follows. Theistic science leads to Christianity.

(8.) Even if morality could survive religion, our destructive critics will have to prove that morality alone will be sufficient for human needs. What if man be a sinner, as the human conscience has testified in infinite variety of forms, but with absolute identity of sense through all history? What if man needs expiation and a moral change of essential character? This we continue to believe. This is what our respondents have yet to disprove.

A. A. HODGE.