

525
6
py 1

GOD AND WAR

By

PROF. L. T. TOWNSEND, D.D., S.T.D.

Author of Credo, God-Man, etc.

LC

PRICE 25 CENTS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
No Accidents in this World	3
God Rules in Human Affairs	4
When Will the Present War End	5
Will the Armies of the Kaiser and His Allies or those of Great Britain and Her Allies be Victorious	5
Numbers and Guns not Always Decisive	6
Germany and the Turks Need Chastisement	7
Great Britain, France and Russia Need Chastisement	7-8
Are the United States to be Involved in the War	8
The United States are Guilty of Sins of Commission and Omission	9
Mexico and Armenia	10-13
John Bright's Prediction	17
Mr. Bryan's Views Invite War and Disaster	17
Lincoln Colcord's <i>Vision of War</i>	21
God not Always for Peace	21
The Command, "Thou Shalt Not Kill"	22
Bible Revelation and War	23
War a Necessity in a World of Wheat and Tares	27
War and the War Spirit of Service to the World	30
No Apology called for in the Announcement of Christ—"I am not come to send peace on earth but a sword"	37
Monetary Cost and Death Roll of War	37
False Views of Life and Death	38
Is God Working out a Plan that may Involve the United States and the Entire World in War	39
Self-assurance Invites War	39
The Peril of Conflicting Interests	40
Isolation No Longer a Protection	40
The Monroe Doctrine	41
The United States No Longer Feared	41
The Possible Bankruptcy of the Warring Nations	43
Germany and Japan	44-48
Carranza and Villa	48
What May Become of the War Loan	50-51
A Nation's Only Hope are Preparedness and a Trust in God	52-55

GOD AND WAR

By

PROF. L. T. TOWNSEND, D.D., S.T.D.

Author of Credo, God-Man, etc.

Published by

CHAPPLE PUBLISHING COMPANY, Ltd.

BOSTON, MASS.

1915

D 523
7a

Copyright, 1915

by

L. T. TOWNSEND.



\$0.25

© Cl. A 420242

DEC 11 1915

no. 1.

God and War*

THERE are no accidents in this world," was the opening sentence of the eulogy spoken by Charles Sumner after the death of Abraham Lincoln. And the longer one lives the more inclined is one to introduce that sentence, "there are no accidents," into one's religious creed.

In an oration of Edward Everett are these words:

When a great event is to be brought about in the order of Providence, the first thing which arrests the attention of the student of history in after-times is the appearance of the fitting instruments for its accomplishment. They come forward and take their places on the great stage of action. They know not themselves for what they are raised up, but there they are.

Daniel Webster expressed the same thought when saying:

God has a Providence in human affairs; and it is a part of that Providence to triumph over error, and to assign to the actors in great events their proper places.

Victor Hugo in his remarkable essay on Mirabeau concludes his analysis thus:

Who among us does not feel, amid the tumult of the tempest, amid the conflicts of all the systems and all the ambitions that raise so much smoke and dust, that under yonder veil still hiding from our eyes the providential statue hardly yet hewn, behind the cloud of theories, passions, and chimeras, crossing, jostling, and devouring one another in the fog; beyond that sound of the human word which speaks all tongues at the same time through all mouths, under that violent whirlwind of things, man and ideas called the nineteenth century—who does not feel that something great is being accomplished? And God remains calm and does his work.

And who in this twentieth century if he thinks soberly for an hour or more does not feel that God, in the midst of the present

* This booklet is the substance of an address delivered before the National Reform Convention at Park St. Church, Boston, Mass., October 19, 1915, by Professor L. T. Townsend, D.D., St.D.

awful tumult of inconsistencies, remains calm as He did in the nineteenth century and does His work now as he did then?

The foregoing quotations show conclusively that these men were able to grasp in some measure at least the sublime truth, that God rules in the affairs of men, in times of war as well as in times of peace. And these quotations also show that the men who spoke those words were in fellowship with the inspired writers of the Book of Books.

One of its greatest, wisest and earliest writers thus repeats the words of Jehovah:

See now that I, even I, am he and there is no God with me: I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal; neither is there any that can deliver out of my hands.—*Deut.* 32:39.

And this, in the prophecy of Isaiah, is of the same theistic complexion:

I am the Lord and there is none else; there is no God beside me. I girded thee (speaking of Cyrus), though thou has not known me.—*Isa.* 45:5.

This same thought is spoken by another of the Jehovah prophets:

And all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing; and he doeth according to his will in the armies of Heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?—*Dan.* 4:35.

These quotations, and there are many others of the same import, make it clear that modern atheism, that rules God out of pretty much all equations, except those where we may conveniently admit Him, and that plunges us into a sea of anxiety and perplexity whenever anything untoward happens, had no grip on those Old Testament prophets.

And is there any other message that would more likely afford assurance and comfort in view of what is now transpiring at home and abroad than this,—that God's hand is directing whatever is taking place, sunshine or tempest, though to our impatient age he seems to linger when we think there should be haste.

During this hour, then, let us dismiss, if we can do so, the atheism of the day and bring God back to our thoughts—the God who notes the fall of the sparrow, who numbers the hair of the head and who cannot, therefore, be disregarding

of what is now taking place among the peoples of Europe and Asia, or be unmindful either of what our own country is doing in the way of helping on a carnage unequalled in ancient or modern warfare and doing our part of it for gain and nothing else.

This that we have been saying should help in answering three or four questions that are being constantly asked.

The first is this: When will the war close; in one more year, or five or ten? No man on earth can tell, is the reply, unless the gods reveal it to him. There have been already many predictions and the time has passed when some of them, if true, should have been fulfilled. And others of them are much out of the way so far as one can now see. The only sane prediction seems, therefore, to be this: When the Almighty Ruler of the Universe sees that there has been accomplished what he intended when he permitted the nations of Europe to make war upon one another, then will the war close, and not a day, nor an hour sooner. We may hold peace conventions, but that will not end the war. Men of wealth may contribute millions of money to secure peace but that will not end the war, and as for that matter, such money might as well be thrown to the bottom of the sea. The head of the Roman Catholic Church may admonish and plead and pray for peace until his voice is hoarse, or hushed in death, but that will accomplish no more in the future than it has in the past.

Christian men, churches and conventions may vote and pray, but that will not bring peace to the fighting nations. And the only way to pray for peace is the way men should pray for all things else—always closing with, "Thy will be done." God's plans concerning the war may be a long way yet from their accomplishment. And the end, as we said before, will not be until his plans and purposes are accomplished. God's plans may be to punish a disobedient world, on an arena larger than we yet have dreamed, before peace shall be restored.

The second question often asked is this: Will the armies of the Kaiser and his allies in the end be victorious, or will victory be with Great Britain and her allies?

There are people who talk as if very sure that the armies of Germany and Austria cannot fight much longer and must surrender. They do not see how Germany can contend successfully against superior numbers, aided by money, war muni-

tions and sympathy from the United States. So it would seem, if God has no interest or control in the affairs of men.

The only way, however, to answer the question is this: God and not man is on the throne and victory will be as he intended when the war began. If it is best, all things considered, that Germany shall dictate terms of peace and have her say as to settlements, boundaries and indemnities; and if it is best for Great Britain, France and Russia to be humiliated and beaten under the blows of the Teutons, or be plunged into bankruptcy, and if God has so determined, then the question of numbers, money or sympathy will play but a small part in having it otherwise. Victory is not always with the strongest battalions is what sacred history has recorded. We are assured that one shall chase a thousand and two put ten thousand to flight, if the Lord be so minded.

The sword, the spear and the shield in the hands of a giant shall avail nothing against a pebble, if that is the Lord's plan. Trumpets and pitchers with nothing but candles in them, in the hands of only three hundred men who could shout, "The sword of the Lord and Gideon," put to flight, in a panic the mighty hosts of Midian. The words of assurance spoken to the people of Israel by a servant of God were these:

When thou goest out to battle against thine enemies, and seest horses and chariots, and a people more than thou, be not afraid of them: for the Lord thy God is with thee, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.

And it shall be, when ye are come nigh unto the battle, that the priest shall approach and speak unto the people, and shall say unto them, Hear, O Israel; ye approach this day unto battle against your enemies: let not your hearts faint; fear not, and do not tremble, neither be ye terrified because of them; for the Lord your God is he that goeth with you, to fight for you against your enemies, to save you.—*Deut.* 20:1-4.

And later we read these words:

And the children of Israel pitched before them like two little flocks of kids; but the Syrians filled the country. And they pitched one over against the other seven days; and so it was, that in the seventh day the battle was joined: and the children of Israel slew of the Syrians an hundred thousand footmen in one day. But the rest fled to Aphek, into the city; and there a wall fell upon twenty and seven thousand of the men that were left. And Ben-hadad fled and came into the city, into an inner chamber.—*I Kings* 27:30.

"Two little flocks of kids" put to flight a mighty host!

For the Lord had made the host of the Syrians to hear a noise of chariots, and a noise of horses, even the noise of a great host: and they said one to another, Lo, the king of Israel hath hired against us the kings of the Hittites, and the kings of the Egyptians, to come upon us. Wherefore they arose, and fled in the twilight, and left their tents, and their horses, and their asses, even the camp as it was, and fled for their life.—*II Kings* 6:7. Comp. *Amos* 2:14-16.

And other unaccountable and uncontrollable panics have decided, instead of numbers and guns, the fate of armies. And in some instances we now see that such panics were for the best, all things considered.

According to the rules of war, Napoleon should have conquered at Waterloo. He never could understand why he was defeated. But God knew, and He is above the rules of war.

But the question recurs, Will Great Britain and her allies or will Germany and her allies be victorious? No man on earth knows, is the repeated answer, though all men on earth can guess or may think they know. But it is God alone who will determine in the end who shall conquer and who shall be defeated, and his decision all things considered, will be wisest and best.

It may be difficult to see why Germany with her monstrous materialism, her brutal military ambitions and disregard of international law, and her murderous assaults upon passenger steamships, can be victorious. Nor is it much less difficult for one to see why the abominable Turk, the ally of Germany, with a cruelty almost more than barbarous and blasphemous, should not be overwhelmingly defeated and swept from the face of the earth.

But, on the other hand, Great Britain has hardly been on such good behavior as to insure the Divine favor. Nor has she been scarcely less ambitious than Germany and perhaps no less arbitrary and despotic in ruling some of her dependencies than Germany has been. Can God approve of a government that places a tax of two hundred and twenty-five million yearly upon the poor people of India, expending one hundred million upon an army in which no Indian can be an officer? Is England dealing fairly when in proportion to the income of the people she places a tax nearly twice as heavy upon India as upon her home country? An Indian's yearly income on an average is only ten dollars, while that of an Englishman is two hundred.

Sir Henry Cotton shows that the average per capita deposits in the banks in England is one hundred dollars, while the average per capita deposit in India is fifty cents. May not such greed and oppression justly provoke God's displeasure and chastisement? At all events England is now having to part with some measure of what seems to be ill-gotten wealth and in ways least to be desired. Nor should it be forgotten that England has attempted the starvation of all the German people and would do it today if she could.*

And may not France with her social evils and religious disregard need correction? And is it easy to see why the brutal ally of Great Britain and France, we mean Russia, with her tyranny and long persecution of the Hebrew people, having Siberia for a prison house, should pull out of the conflict with victory perched on her banners?

While, therefore, there are many things of which we are not sure, there are other things of which we are sure—two at least, one of which is that while Germany and allies are guilty of what deserves correction, England and her allies are a long way from meriting divine approval. The other thing of which we are sure is that whoever gains the victory, the kingdom of Christ will make an advance and the hand of God will be seen when the smoke of battle clears away.

This brings us to the third question: Are the United States to be involved in this war: or after the war will they be called upon to adjust some unadjusted disputes, and do this at the mouth of the cannon? The reply is, that no man knows. No magician, or astrologer, or sorcerer, or Chaldean, or statesman, or jurist, or poet, or essayist, or clergyman can answer that question, with an assurance that the answer will be the right one. Strenuous efforts are making to keep ourselves clear of trouble. Petitions have been going up to the President of the United States to keep his hands off, and many seem to think that he has been navigating the ship of state on the whole with remarkable wisdom; and perhaps he has, but he has been far at sea and his course has been about as vacillating as it could be, and for all he can do, the ship may go on to the

* It appears to be well established that the German Emperor wanted peace during his reign. He was spoken of by Mr. Carnegie as "The peace-loving monarch." It also has been shown that French soldiers, enemies of Germany, entered Belgium twenty-four hours ahead of the Germans.

rocks any day or hour. And all his advisors are equally inefficient in protecting this country against being involved in war. It is God who has that matter in hand; and if he sees that we need severe chastisement then it will come, in one way or another, sooner or later; and if war, all things considered, is the healthiest form of correction for us, then it will be war, and twenty presidents and forty Bryans, if lecturing before Chautauqua assemblies three times a day cannot prevent it.

And who can doubt that this country needs chastisement—a country that has no constitutional recognition of God; a country abounding in prosperity, with only a formal kind of gratitude once a year to the Merciful Giver of All Things; a country whose civilization is permeated with commercial greed and other unsanctified ambitions; a country that is now congratulating itself that while Europe is bankrupting, we are heaping up money by the million, without caring whether the war is prolonged by it, provided we can sell the goods at a profit; a country in partnership with a traffic whose victims of misery and death outnumber many fold those of the battlefield; a country that manufactures rum and sends it by the shipload to the poor and benighted people of Africa, simply for the money gotten out of it, though it adds wretchedness to a people already wretched enough, as God knows. We are not entirely given over to badness, there is a measure of goodness, but the iniquity, hypocrisy and greed of which we are guilty is incredible—amazingly so when we stop to think about it. And as a nation, we are remiss and sinful in other matters—in sins of omission as well as those of commission.

At this point one could not do otherwise than expect a few words as to our remissness in Mexico. And may I be pardoned for saying that I have been a student of Mexican affairs and history for several years. I have been through the country from the Rio Grande to Progreso, Yucatan. I have eaten the food of the poorest people and have slept on the floor of adobe huts, where there was but one room for an entire family, where there never had been a bed or chair, and have eaten where there never had been a table, a knife or a fork. I have worn the dress of a Mexican and have been asked by tourists if I could speak English. I have preached in Mexico with a revolver in sight in my belt, and have been a witness of things so distressing that they are difficult of belief. On the

other hand, I have been entertained by some of the wealthiest families in the Republic and received from the Governor of the Federal District passes that enabled me to visit places from which the general public is excluded. I met a cordial reception in the national palace at the hands of President Diaz and had for an escort his only son. In a word, through the guidance of four brave missionaries, including the very efficient superintendent, Dr. J. W. Butler, I have had very rare opportunities to study the people of Mexico under all conditions of life, in that wonderful country. I may be pardoned for saying this much, because of my desire to establish the claim that from personal observation I have some knowledge of Mexico and her people.

Since our war with that country, 1848, there have been twenty-five revolutions and during the century of Mexican independence there have been seventy-five years of war. And during all these years the great mass of Mexicans, eighteen millions out of twenty, in a country unmatched in natural resources, have remained half famished, kept in ignorance and superstition, suffering every conceivable wrong and crying to God for help and mercy.

During the last four years our country has been hearing that cry as never before and yet we, their neighbors, have been waiting and watching and doing scarcely anything by the way of actual relief. Is that playing the part of the Good Samaritan whom Christ commended? Rather, have we not been acting the part of the priest and Levite, who passed by on the other side of the road leaving the victim of robbery, for all they cared, to die of the wounds that had been inflicted? And fittingly that priest and Levite have been held up to the world for two thousand years as examples of all that is despicable in human nature.

And almost worse than this, we have sold to the different warring factions of Mexico, until the recognition of Carranza, powder and guns simply because we are making money out of it. We have been taking from that people all we could get, but have done nothing that amounts to a bundle of shucks to end the causes of their trouble. Cowardice and selfishness as to our conduct of Mexican affairs is the verdict of a world of surprised lookers-on. Ours is the cowardice of a people who have lost their faith in God and his righteousness. And we are

losing at the same time the most splendid opportunity any nation ever had to act the part of a good Samaritan to this next door neighbor. And beside this, we are losing perhaps the best opportunity the United States ever will have of teaching the whole world a lesson in moral grandeur by doing for the millions of those wretched peons what a Christian nation ought to do.

And yet there are men among us who seem to care nothing for all this, and who would have conditions continue there just as they have been for two hundred years rather than lift a finger to make them better. The miserable feeling is that we must do nothing that can get us into trouble, and that the looking after Mexicans is, after all, none of our business. *None of our business?* God asked Cain this question, "Where is Abel, thy brother?" Cain replied, "I know not; am I my brother's keeper?" In other words, it is none of my business where Abel is. That was Cain's answer to God's question. But Cain was a murderer and God cursed him.

Our neglect of opportunity and duty in Mexico may prove more troublesome later on, than anything now threatening on this side of the Atlantic; of this we will speak later. Had faith in God, instead of cowardice and selfishness been in control, we, before now, could have saved hundreds and thousands of lives; we could have brought peace to that country after giving assurance to her people that we were there, not to add to our territory, but to help settle their differences and to end their warfare.

We did give that assurance on a small scale while in Vera Cruz, and in doing so we lost no friendship on the part of the Mexican people. But we cowardly withdrew and their troubles have not diminished since our warships sailed away. Our government could have lifted that people on to a plane where they would have had what never has been theirs, since the fall of Montezuma—the treatment due human beings. We could have lifted Mexican women out of a pitiful degradation and have introduced them to the blessings of a Christian civilization. We could before now have shown the poor peons how to build houses of brick instead of mud and have shown them how to hope instead of living in despair. We could have shown them how to rise from almost helpless apathy into the altitude of the sons of God.

But there they are, a wretched people still, and we have been for two years waiting and watching; and at Niagara Falls, in New York City and Washington we have been and are still hobnobbing with A. B. C.

But some one may be saying, Have we not recognized Carranza as the ruler of Mexico, and is not that a step forward? Does any one who knows Mexico believe that that recognition will right the wrongs of two hundred years? If his recognition is redemptive, the step should have been taken two years ago and have shortened by so much the misery and death roll of that people.

And notice this vacillation, that after adopting the policy of non-intervention, and after proposing to unite the different warring factions in order to secure a stable government, we have recognized the only leader among them all who spurned the proposals of the United States. Such is the man that the United States have recognized as the head of Mexican affairs—a man capable of perpetrating unspeakable villanies, unprintable outrages, and unthinkable brutalities. His recognition means that Mexico is to be governed not by the worthy men who have fled the country, but by a gang of criminals, led by a prince of criminals, whose word and promise mean absolutely nothing. From our point of view, the recognition of Carranza is a crime against civilization and against humanity, and if we mistake not, he will prove not many months hence to be the most obdurate and troublesome foe to all things our government had hoped for, and in case of war, so far as an alliance between the United States and Mexico is concerned, Villa, bad as he is, would have been far more trustworthy and of greater service.

After being helped into a position of authority by the United States and furnished with munitions of war, Carranza is just the man to sell out to Japan, Germany or any other country, or make alliances with them unfavorable to the United States, if a tempting offer were made. The recognition of that man Carranza from almost every point of view is not a step forward but a long step backward. Unfortunate Mexico, unwittingly but cowardly betrayed by the United States of America! And by this betrayal we have advanced towards the war zone instead of moving away from it, as presently will be seen.

But we must leave Mexico, and call attention to another

splendid opportunity for the United States, to say something, or better do something, that might establish our right to an existence among the nations of the earth and gain God's approval. We have in mind the persecution of the people of Armenia.

For information on this subject we have the report of the secretary of the Committee on Armenian Atrocities, Professor Samuel T. Dutton. And we have the statements of returned missionaries and those of the correspondents of the London *Chronicle* and the London *Times*. And we have the report of Monsignor Dülci, the apostolic delegate to Constantinople, and these earlier reports are now vouched for by British and Italian consuls, by physicians who are on the spot, and by officers and teachers of schools and colleges. These reports are so well authenticated that no possible doubt can longer be attached to them. The one impression received is that nothing more terrible and horrible in the way of fiendish persecution can be shown on the blood-stained pages of all the centuries. There has been a studied and systematic effort on part of the young Turks, led by Enver Pasha to exterminate an entire race of people. Those of the Armenians who are expelled can carry scarcely anything with them and their belongings that are left are taken possession of by Moslems who move into the vacated houses. In some instances women, stripped naked, are compelled to march day after day in that condition. Those defenceless and innocent non-Moslem Armenians are imprisoned, tortured and unspeakably mutilated. The population of some of the districts is completely annihilated. In a single afternoon the entire Armenian population of Trebizond, numbering ten thousand or more, were murdered. There are among those victims Christian families of the highest standing and young men and women who have been teachers and who have graduated from American colleges. Estimates are made that not fewer than two millions of these people have been murdered by the Turks since last May, or sent into exile—an exile worse than would be death by hangman or gunman. The caravan routes are marked by the most gruesome sights imaginable of unburied and naked corpses.

The mode of exile has been to send from each Armenian village day by day as many persons as a railroad train could

carry. An American missionary, who arrived at Constantinople the first week of last month, said that he had seen not fewer than fifteen thousand Armenians waiting at railroad stations to be sent "on a journey from which none would ever return."

When these exiles reach Könish, or some adjacent station, they are taken from the train, conducted over Mt. Taurus, supplied with a small amount of food and are told to continue their journey to Mosul where they will find safety. But before many hours have passed they are met by marauding bands of Cossacks, Kurds and Bedouins who rob them of everything they had taken with them, then kill, or leave them to die of starvation and thirst. Not one of those victims ever is known to have reached the looked-for destination. Should one try to escape in any other direction than the one designated, or try to return to his own country, the journey would be a short one, for Turkish shepherds have orders to shoot all such at sight. And no one acquainted with Turks believes this inhumanity will cease until all Armenians are exterminated unless there are forcible measures to prevent it.

Germany and Austria will not back up any protest that may be offered, and it is suspected that Germany is involved in the murderous plot. Count von Reventlow, in a Dutch publication, October 7th, unblushingly upholds these Turkish massacres. After referring to the request of the American Government that the German ambassador at Washington should use his influence with the German Government in behalf of the Armenians, the Count adds these words:

There can be no question of meddling, at the instigation of a third party, with the affairs of our Turkish ally. If the Turkish authorities believe it opportune to take vigorous measures against unreliable, bloodthirsty, riotous Armenian elements, it is not only its right, but its duty to do so. Turkey can rest assured that Germany will always regard the matter as one concerning Turkey alone.

So much for the German attitude. England, France and Russia can do nothing for they are at war with Turkey. Monsignor Dülcı rightly declares in a published statement that if effective protest and help come at all it must be from America.

But in all these months what has America been doing? We have conferred with the German ambassador in Washington to have these atrocities stopped. And our Secretary of

State sent a request direct to the Turkish government to desist from further persecutions. And is this all that our great Christian country is going to do about it? Great God! The wonder is that we have escaped chastisement as long as we have. But the mills grind late!

Well, then, it is asked, Would you have the United States declare war against Turkey? We might do a worse thing. But if we should say to Turkey with something of the fiery emphasis that the case demands, You stop your murderous work or we will stop it for you, so help us God! If we would say this, as it ought to be said, and with faith in God, such as we ought to have, Turkey would not exile another Armenian.

Had we the faith in God and the courage of Cromwell, our country would have no fear of war with Turkey, whatever we might say or do in behalf of the Armenians. Cromwell, with sword in hand, said to the Duke of Savoy, "You stop the slaughter of the Alpine Waldenses!" The duke trembled and obeyed. Is it to be supposed that if we had Cromwell's faith and his courage that Turkey would not tremble and obey if we gave command? And may we add that if we had faith in God and the courage becoming such a nation as ours, and had said to Germany when beginning to trample Belgium under foot, you stop or we will join the Entente Allies and fight you to a finish, Germany would have made her best bow and have found some other way to enter France.

In evidence of what we are saying may we recall a few facts from a page or two of history, beginning in 1864. It was then that Maximilian sought to found a Roman Catholic empire in Mexico. He was supported by Austria, by France, and by the Vatican. And this was during the closing dark days of our Civil War, when it was thought that the critical conditions then existing were such as to prevent any protest on the part of the United States.

But Secretary of State William H. Seward sent this message to Napoleon III: "You had better withdraw the French troops from Mexican soil without any unnecessary delay." Napoleon waited for no second admonition, but withdrew his army from Mexico, leaving Maximilian to his own fate. Austria did nothing. And the Vatican in no way interfered with the ruling of the United States, though Carlotta, the wife of Maximilian, went to Rome and plead with the Pope to help

her husband. She plead for two hours, left the Vatican, and has been a maniac ever since.

Under a former Democratic administration, Mr. Cleveland notified the great British empire that the United States would take a hand in settling the Venezuelan matter. England might have said, "You attend to your business and we will attend to ours." But she did nothing of the kind; she did what the United States required.

Does any one imagine that if Grover Cleveland were now our Democratic president that he would have allowed the British government during a year and more, in nearly a hundred of her ports, to hold up two thousand ships carrying American cargoes? Cleveland would have said, "Those ships are loaded with food for the hungry; it will damage if detained, and American shippers will lose millions of dollars; let them go or the United States will set them free." In fewer than ten days the cargoes would have been on the way to their destination.

Secretary of State John Hay made what would seem at the present time a tremendous stretch of American authority, if not an audacious interference in European and Asiatic affairs of state, when he informed the world that China must not be involved in the war between Russia and Japan, but must adhere strictly to neutrality. At that time not a country in the world ventured to question the requirement of our secretary. Europe, China, Japan, and later, Russia submitted and fell into line.

The administration, right or wrong, recognized the Republic of Panama. The Republic of Colombia bristled at the time, then became ostensibly submissive. The rest of the world hardly passed a criticism, but followed the example of the United States, recognizing the new republic.

When a sort of rebellion started on the Isthmus of Panama, a few words were spoken by our representative there, a few blue jackets appeared on the scene, checked the uprising and quiet reigned as if there had been no outbreak.

And now, what is the moral of these sayings and doings of the United States if not this, that we once were what we are not now, and that we have degenerated, and that if we keep on much longer we shall fail of having "an all-sufficient excuse" for an existence as a great republic, and leave a page

of history that will bring a blush to the faces of our descendants when reading it.

It was John Bright, always our staunch friend, who said, that if the war against the Union (1860-1864) failed, and if the United States remained united for forty years, not a gun could be fired anywhere in the world without our consent.

But John Bright then had in mind such a president as Lincoln, such a secretary of state as Seward, and such a secretary of war as Stanton.

It is hardly believable, or scarcely thinkable, that Lincoln and Seward and Stanton would have permitted the humiliations that have been coming to our country almost every day of the week for the two or three years that have passed. And were John Bright living today it is likely enough he would take back every word of his remarkable prediction.

From some points of view, in trying to escape from war, we are inviting and provoking it. And from similar points of view, Mr. Bryan and those who are obstructing war preparedness are doing more than all our militant progressives in America to bring on the very thing they are trying to avert. The government protests, and Bryan-like gives a toss of the head, and wink of the eye, as much as to say, we can't fight, we won't fight, we would rather die than fight, which, of course, negatives any protest and invites more insults and a possible disaster.

We may be pardoned for saying an additional word or two about Mr. Bryan, not because he is Mr. Bryan, that would make it scarcely worth while, but because he is a Chautauqua speaker, and represents a following, many of whom are honest but none the less perilous to the best interests of this country. We regard Mr. Bryan as one of the most danger-inviting men in this republic. He continues to boast that he has been instrumental in securing thirty or more peace treaties, but fails to see that at present they are scarcely worth the paper they are written on, and that they may prove, sooner or later, a serious entanglement and embarrassment to the United States. Such treaties are for times of peace, but avail nothing in times of war.

July 1st of this year *The Temps* (Paris) published the following open letter by Baron Destournelles de Constant to William J. Bryan:

I fully understand that it is repugnant to you to see the United States join the belligerents and give the lives of your sons on the same side as ours, but it is much more repugnant to encourage crime by making it certain of immunity. The silence of the United States government in regard to the invasion of Belgium has surprised all your friends. The German people themselves would have been grateful to you for opening their eyes to the truth, which their own government has concealed from them. They would certainly have been impressed by the infamy and the enormity of the crimes for which they have been made responsible, if you had raised your voice; then they might, perhaps, have recoiled with horror. And what are you doing now? You are preaching peace. What kind of peace? A peace that will enable German militarism to retire from the struggle unhurt, to make preparations for another attempt whenever Germany thinks there is a chance to realize its fatal schemes of conquest.

Excuse me, my dear Mr. Bryan, if I speak thus frankly. You are acting against your own purpose. You are running the risk of prolonging the war by your eloquence. You will cause still further bloodshed. The recruits who enlist under your flag are so many supporters lost to the good cause—the cause you have advocated all your life. We do not want the kind of peace you suggest. We do not understand it. We want to remain unregenerate sons of the French revolution and the defenders of liberty and justice, just as you are the sons of American independence. The peace that you expect to see when the combatants are worn out will not be our peace. Such a peace, or rather truce, would be worse than death.

Does Mr. Bryan listen to this friend of his who doubtless has studied the peace and war problems with far more thoroughness than Mr. Bryan ever has? Not at all, but he goes on repeating for the fiftieth time his Chautauqua lecture that contends for peace at any price.

In the *Wildman News Series*, 1915, Mr. E. L. Fox reports an interview with Professor Ludwig Stein who had been the most noted disciple of the world's peace that Europe has known. In this interview the professor makes this confession:

You cannot know or feel what it is to reach my age and then to realize that everything you have worked for is futile. It is a terrible thing to have attained sixty and then to have to renounce all your ideals—years and years of ideals. But I am convinced, alas, that the world today cannot be governed with oil of roses, but only with blood.

It will take about a hundred years to educate and solidify the white race alone. It will take about ten thousand years, let us say, to educate all the races of the world and achieve a world brotherhood.

The great mistake that is made is in thinking that the ideals of the Bible are possible today. They are utterly impossible.

I suggest armament for the United States. You say that this is against every teaching of the peace propagandist in your country. Alas, armament is for this day and generation. If the people of the United States believe that the peace movement is bound to save them from war, they have either totally misconstrued it or they have been grossly misinformed. A nation must be prepared for war. If the rulers of a nation leave their country unprepared they are guilty of criminal neglect.

In China its four hundred millions of people are unprepared, and are therefore at the mercy of a few million Japanese who are prepared. That is because in this generation might is right, and all that we workers for peace can do, without injuring our States, is to face the facts of this generation, be prepared for war, if war there is to be, and keep on working for our ideal. Anything else is a dream.

No statement of the case could be wiser than this of Professor Stein. But does Mr. Bryan listen to this distinguished advocate of peace who has been compelled by the stern logic of events to abandon views formerly held and advocated? Mr. Bryan listen! Is that his way? Is it occasion for surprise, therefore, that the general public has a growing conviction that Mr. Bryan's conceit is of colossal magnitude?

And, as before suggested, Mr. Bryan's position and effort are leading straight away from the path of peace to that of war. And God does not seem to be profoundly recognized by him as he should be, though prayer is offered three times a day.

The words of Mr. Bryan, repeated by him east and west, are enough to make the blood of a sensitive man boil. This is what he says:

If any nation challenges us it is our duty to say, "With the welfare of a hundred million of people to look after, and the priceless traditions to preserve, we will not get down with you and wallow in human blood."

Such a statement is an insult to every soldier who has fought for his country's honor or safety. Almost everything this ex-secretary of state has said, or has done, makes one feel as Elbert Hubbard was wont to say: "If this is the path of sanity, kindly direct me to the bug-house."

Mystics have their place and are entitled no doubt to a goodly seat on some platform somewhere, but at the present

time that place is not in the halls of legislation, nor in the United States war office. Not mystics, but courageous, wise and unselfish God-fearing statesmen should be in evidence there. Our peace advocates some day will learn, too late, perhaps, that the way to have peace is not to be too eager for it, but to be ready to engage in war, when it is an honorable warfare that confronts us. He that is willing to lose his life shall in the sublimest sense find it. One of Emerson's immortal stanzas fits the hour in which we are living:

Though love repine and reason chafe,
 There came a voice without reply,—
 "Tis man's perdition to be safe
 When for the truth he ought to die."

One is reminded in this we are saying of an incident in Israelitish history. It was in the days of Jeremiah the prophet. At that time there were peace-at-any-price people who through fear of the king of Babylon thought best to go to Egypt in order to escape war. But the Lord through his prophet gave this admonition and command:

Be not afraid of the king of Babylon, of whom ye are afraid; be not afraid of him, saith the Lord: for I am with you to save you, and to deliver you from his hand. But if ye say, We will not dwell in this land, neither obey the voice of the Lord your God, saying, No; but we will go into the land of Egypt, where we shall see no war, nor hear the sound of a trumpet, nor have hunger of bread; and there will we dwell; now, therefore, hear the word of the Lord, ye remnant of Judah; Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, If ye wholly set your faces to enter into Egypt, and go to sojourn there; then it shall come to pass that the sword which ye feared shall overtake you there in the land of Egypt, and the famine, whereof ye are afraid, shall follow close after you there in Egypt; and there ye shall die. So shall it be with all the men that set their faces to go into Egypt, to sojourn there; they shall die by the sword, by the famine, and by the pestilence; and none of them shall remain or escape from the evil that I will bring upon them. And ye shall be an execration, and an astonishment, and a curse, and a reproach; and ye shall see this place no more. Know certainly that I have admonished you this day.—*Jer.* 42:11-19.

That seems to be what Jehovah thinks of a people who would purchase peace at any price.

The trouble, as we said before, is that we are ruling God and his righteousness out of the equation and substituting

in their place a peace that is shameful and a safety that is disgraceful to our humanity, and as the prophet said, a peace that is "an astonishment, and a curse, and a reproach," a peace that makes war on the United States not only possible, but probable.

Peace advocates could do worse than commit to heart Lincoln Colcord's poem, entitled, *Vision of War*. This is what he says about peace:

Peace is the cry of the world, O let me be!
 Peace is the cry of the body, O hurt me not!
 Permit me to eat my fill, sleep, be warm and contented;
 I wish everyone in the world were as happy as I am;
 And I think if everyone had lived as well as I have, and worked as
 hard, he might be just as happy;
 So let us have peace, and all will turn out well.

What ask you, Soul? Ask you these things?
 (Tell me first if there are any wrongs to be righted;
 Tell me if justice is everywhere accomplished;
 Tell me if all men, rich and poor alike, are paid according to their
 just deserts;
 Tell me if governments are performing works of brotherhood and
 love;
 Tell me if parliaments are voting righteousness;
 Tell me if citizens are intelligently supporting righteousness;
 Tell me if democracy is free and universal;
 Tell me if greed, and selfishness, and insincerity have vanished from
 the world;
 For I am pledged beyond transgression to fight the fight of truth, in
 every time and place;
 And until I look upon the face of truth enthroned, I may not rest or
 falter.)

And now are we confronted with this question, Is not God for peace, and notwithstanding our transgressions and remissness, cannot he interpose and save us from war and bloodshed?

The careful student of history is often inclined to think that God is for war, and very decidedly. Let me say in passing that the assumption that God is always for peace is as unwarranted in the sacred Book and by existing facts as anything one can imagine. They were the false prophets, under the old dispensation, who were all the while crying for peace. They were on the other hand the Jehovah prophets who constantly responded, there shall be no peace.

We are aware, nevertheless, that the Bible is appealed to by our peace advocates and for a proof text they repeat the command, "Thou shalt not kill." Those words were placarded on the walls of the Congregational Hall, Beacon Street, of a Monday morning a while ago when the ministers had assembled there to talk of peace.

But if these words, "Thou shalt not kill" are forced into a literal and unqualified meaning then our forefathers should not have battled the Indians who raided for seventy years the frontier settlements of New England. If the command, "Thou shalt not kill" is without limitation, then one should not protect one's self by killing tigers, wolves, wildcats, snakes and other destructive animals. All boy scouts should be disbanded for a part of their duty has been to kill flies, mosquitos, and gypsy moth pests in their breeding places or elsewhere; and all meat-eaters are under condemnation, for they are in league with the butcher.

But is not this forcing an interpretation beyond sensible limitations?

Well, then, let the interpretation be limited to our human kind. May I, or may I not, strike the villain who is assaulting my wife or child, even if the blow I strike is fatal? The judgment may be wrong, but one may doubt very much the Christianity of a man who, seeing a brute making an assault on a woman or a child, hurries home to read a chapter in the Bible and offer prayer for his daily bread, instead of leveling his gun, if he has one, straight at the miscreant and pulling the trigger when the sight is at its best.

But what have our peace advocates to say as to that other command? "Whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed." "Thou shalt not kill"! Those words under a strict, literal interpretation are nonsense in the kingdom and administration of God, and it is well to remember that "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." "The scarlet thread" is an ordination of heaven and is an object-lesson on every page of geological and human history.

The evident meaning, therefore, of the command, "Thou shalt not kill" is this, "Thou shalt not commit murder." And war is not always murder. If it were then some of the commands of Jehovah are murderous.

We read in the book of Chronicles that the armies of

Reuben fought the Hagarites and were victorious, and the reason given is this: "Because the war was of God."

And other passages read thus:

The Lord is a man of war; the Lord is his name; shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not be afraid? shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?

Thus saith the Lord, I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and I create evil; I the Lord do all these things.

One man of you shall chase a thousand: for the Lord your God he *it is* that fighteth for you, as he hath promised.

But what you are quoting, someone is saying, is from the Old Testament. Well, we have the feeling that the Old Testament is still of use and contains lessons of much value that the twentieth century would do well to heed. The critical Bible student, without difficulty, is able to find the Old Testament concealed in the New, and the New concealed in the Old; the Book is one, though the Testaments are two.

But let us turn for a moment to the New Testament and we shall find that the war spirit of the Old Testament is not an absent factor. We read in the New Testament that:

There was war in Heaven; Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought with his angels.—*Rev. 12:7*.

We need not discuss the question whether this passage is to be interpreted literally or figuratively, but manifestly in in either case the meaning is that no place in the universe is too sacred for warfare if causes exist that demand an armed force, either that of aggression or resistance.

Probably our peace advocates would have urged Michael to let the dragon alone, that it was none of his business; and then there would have been peace in Heaven (?) No! There would have been hell in Heaven. Peace did not come there until the dragon was vanquished and cast out, and his angels with him. (*Rev. 12:7-9*.)

It was the Apostle Paul who commended those biblical heroes who "waxed valiant in the fight" and "turned to flight the armies of the aliens." (*Heb. 11:24*.) A profounder statement of the rightness and purpose of enforced judicial and military authority cannot be found than that announced in Paul's letter to the Romans:

For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt

thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good and thou shalt have praise of the same; for he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.—*Romans 13:3-4.*

And what saith the Lord, our Master?

“Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I am come not to send peace but a sword.”—*Matt. 10:34.*

He that hath no sword let him sell his garment and buy one.—*Luke 22:36.*

This command shows this at least, that there are times when the sword is called for.

Is the reply heard that Christ was more an advocate of peace than of war? To be sure; but the peace of which he spoke to his disciples was not freedom from war among nations, but rather was the peace of God in the human soul; a peace that can triumph amid tempests, pestilence, the carnage of battlefields, and death in any form—that was the peace of which Christ spoke, and that he still gives to those who follow him.

The battlefield rather than freedom from war is the world's inheritance and will be of God's permission, if not of his ordering, to the end of time, and nothing Christ ever said promises any different outcome. This is what he says:

And when ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars, be ye not troubled: for such things must needs be; but the end shall not be yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there shall be earthquakes in divers places, and there shall be famines and troubles.—*Matt. 24:7-8.*

Do the great men of the day, and our peace advocates think they know better of these things than did the Lord Christ?

And in the modern sense Christ was not altogether a peace advocate. He made an assault upon the Scribes, Pharisees and hypocrites in language that almost strikes terror to those who now read it. And he drove headlong from the temple traders and money-changers who had made the temple of God a place of merchandise.

But someone asks, what about a passage in the prophecy of Isaiah which reads thus:

They shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks; nations shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.—*Isaiah 2:4*.

Though this is from the Old Testament, still our peace folks are ringing all sorts of changes on the words, regardless of the seeming conflict with the prophecy of Christ and with words spoken elsewhere in both the Old and New Testaments.

But let us see as to the significance of these supposed Old Testament prophetic words. The reading is this:

And many people shall go and say, Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nations shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

This is to be noticed, that these are the words of a gathering of Gentile people who were looking and hoping for peaceful conditions they never found. These, therefore, are not the words of Isaiah, whose prophecies are never in conflict with the teachings of Christ. Isaiah merely recorded the words of the people who spoke them. The Bible reader should always distinguish between what the Bible says and what is said in the Bible.

And then there is another announcement apparently overlooked by the advocates of peace in which this command is spoken:

Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles: Prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near; let them come up: Beat your ploughshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears; let the weak say, I am strong.—*Joel 3:9-10*.

To tell the truth, we are tired of the unqualified reproaches cast upon war and of the oft repeated saying that "War is hell," though these words were first spoken by one of our bravest and noblest generals.

Pardon me for saying that I am not altogether unfamiliar with war. I was in the war that cost the United States millions of money, and in round numbers, north and south, five hundred thousand lives, the flower of that generation.

I fought through the jungles and swamps of Louisiana and along the bayous of Mississippi and before the rifle pits of Port Hudson, and until the present war with its submarines, Zeppelins, and shells filled with poisonous gases, unknown in the days of our Civil War, I venture to say that there are no horrors in warfare except death and mutilation that I have not experienced or witnessed.

The present war with its carnage, and appalling sacrifice of human life, horrible beyond description, is also in some measure understood, and yet we insist, while there have been and are still battle scenes that are like hell, that war is not always hell, and that there are conditions and experiences far worse than war.

"The destruction of life is bad," says Dr. Hedge, "but it is not the worst of evils. The waste of property, the desolation of cities and villages, the ruin of families, the tears of widows and orphans are bad, but the sacrifice of justice, the abandonment of principle, the loss of a nation's rights, are worse, infinitely worse, for these are the only things that make life worth having; and if these can be maintained only at the expense of life, who would not say, let life be the price and let it be spent like water for the redemption or preservation of these better and greater things."

"While to engage in war without a clear necessity is a crime," says Southey, "still when the necessity is clear, it then becomes a crime to shrink from it. The soldier is not regarded in the Scriptures as the author of war, nor is he armed to encourage war; but is a minister of righteousness authorized to protect society and maintain order and tranquility."

It would seem, therefore, that the beautiful plea of non-resistance and non-interference under certain conditions in which society any day may find itself is defensible upon no conceivable ground; it is neither safe, sound, philanthropic nor religious.

While we do not agree with everything said by ex-President Roosevelt, yet his speech at the University of Paris while touring Europe, is beyond criticism:

The good man should be strong and brave, that is to say, capable of fighting, of serving his country as a soldier, should the occasion arise. There are well-intentioned philosophers who declaim against the iniquity of war. They are right, provided they insist merely

on the iniquity. War is a horrible thing; and an unjust war is a crime against humanity. But it is a crime of this sort because it is unjust, not because it is war. The choice should always be in favor of right, whether the alternative is peace or war. The question should not be simply: Is there going to be peace or war? but should be: Shall the cause of right prevail? Are the great laws of justice once more to be observed? And the reply of a strong and virile people will be: Yes, whatever the risk may be.

The fact is that the day on which moral evil entered this world and corrupted human hearts, upon that day the sword began to have its use—even at the gates of Paradise and in the hands of angels and will continue to have its use until evil no longer exists. While wheat and tares grow together on the same soil, and on the same soil they will grow until Christ comes, conflict with arms must be provided for. Peace measures in which the sword is dishonored or forgotten more than once have been tried; but with results strikingly uniform. Carlyle, speaking of a time in Great Britain when peace sentiments were in the air, employed these words:

The English nation, having flung its old Puritan sword and Bible faith into the cesspool, or, rather, having set its old Bible faith, minus any sword, well up in the organ-loft, with plenty of revenue, there to preach and organ at discretion, on condition always of meddling with nobody's practice, thought the same a mighty pretty arrangement, but found it hitch before long.

And if there were no force back of civil law it would be only a name and one would scarcely dare walk day or night the streets of any large city. And if there were no warships, the plunder and treachery of black flags would imperil the commerce of all oceans and seas.

It is equally true that all judicial processes rest upon this fundamental principle of restraint by fear or force. Whenever the existence of law and a magistrate to enforce it are necessary, that moment the presence of the sword and likewise its use, are also necessary. It is a maxim recognized by all jurists and statesmen that "Law is a dead letter unless there is force behind it." No representation or symbol of justice is complete except sword in hand—a sword always unsheathed.

To lose faith in the Puritan sword and to fling it as Carlyle would say, "into the cesspool," or in other words, not to provide adequate military defences, and not faithfully to

cultivate the military spirit at least until evil in the land shall cease, is not only treason to the state, but is unchristian in spirit.

The day for melting cannon into church bells will be when men do as they would be done by, loving philanthropy better than greed or plunder. The longed-for day for beating swords into ploughshares will not have its sunrise until ploughshares can turn the furrow without fear of the bludgeon, nor until all other industries can be pursued without fear of cobblestones, in the hands of an angry mob; but that day is not yet.

It is not fitting at this time to engage in a discussion of the merits or demerits of any of our great labor strikes. But our contention with peace advocates in every case is this, that they are wrong in trying to put an end to war, instead of trying to put an end to that which makes war necessary, and therefore justifiable in the sight of an infinite God.

When strikes are in progress, the calling out of the militia, and even the calling out of the regular army, are not things to be deplored. It might be, in the state, a crime not to do this. What is to be deplored are the causes that demand the presence of the state and national troops. The brickbat in the hands of workmen, the grinding greed of mine owners, and the ostentation of wealth, are the cause of the trouble. When, therefore, the brickbat goes to his place in the sidewalk, and mine owners are fair and considerate in their dealings, and when Christian socialism prevails, then guns may be stacked and swords go into the scabbard; but not till then.

There exists at the present time an organization known as the "Carnegie Endowment." Its treasury holds one hundred million dollars, with an annual income of five hundred thousand. If this income is to be used to remove the causes of war, we commend it; but if used for seeking peace at any price, we would put every dollar of it back into the iron mines from which it was dug. Such endowment may become an agency very embarrassing to the general government and by its ample supply of funds may some day be a national menace, "a meddling nuisance," and a curse worse than national poverty. And the same may be said of the two million dollars set aside by Mr. Ford, of automobile fame, for use against national armament and in the interest of the peace propaganda—as if money in a world like this can secure or keep the

peace! Peace is not a thing to be bought or bribed, flattered or coaxed. It will come of itself when the world is ready for it. Most of the peace efforts now making are, therefore, of the least possible account. The society called the "League to Enforce Peace," a name that seems self-contradictory, of which ex-President Taft is president, and the "National Security League," the "Massachusetts Peace Society," "The Navy League," "The Woman's Peace Party," and others like them, are of no avail except as they make for preparedness, and help in the recognition of God as the infinite Ruler, at whose disposal is the destiny of nations.

When the Apostle to the Gentiles said, "Work out your own salvation (preparedness) with fear and trembling (without conceit), for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure (the co-operation of God and man)" (Phil. 2: 12), he announced what is fundamental and, therefore, applicable to individuals and to nations the world over. Any different scheme for securing peace is to play with bubbles, or possibly with matches.

Herbert Spencer showed himself not a keen prophet when he wrote that competition in traffic and industry among the nations will some day take the place of war. For was it not jealousy between England and Germany, growing out of competition in traffic and industry, that had no little to do in bringing on the present war?

A statement made by Admiral Fisk, that one may think needs qualification, is to the effect that while Christianity, as compared with civilization and commerce, furnishes the greatest hope for universal peace, yet even Christianity will fail to bring peace to the world, if not permitted to bring something else first. As evidence of this, the Admiral points to the singular fact that the warring nations are now evoking Christianity in order to stimulate patriotism, arouse the war spirit and thus actually to exert a powerful influence, not towards peace but towards war. And this may not be so bad as it at first appears, for a true Christianity is militant—must be so, in a world beset with evil. We may say, then, and without fear of contradiction, that there are no agencies on earth that can avert war while its causes, real, or perhaps, imaginary, continue to exist. Even religion will not interpose until the brotherhood of man is a more finished product than it is today.

And now, in view of the odium that is cast upon war, whatever the cause, and by implication upon the teachings of the Bible concerning war, and by further implication upon the God of the Old Testament, who more than once ordered his people to the battlefield, one is justified in saying a few words appreciatory of warfare and of the war spirit.

A general statement is this: While some wars have appeared to be without justification and, therefore, were criminal, others unquestionably have pushed the world up to a higher plane of civilization. It was by the wars recorded in Old Testament history and enforced by the commands of Jehovah that the idolatrous and murderous peoples of Palestine were conquered and the Israelites saved to become the nation from which sprang Christ and Christianity. It was by the fortunes of war that the Greek language was introduced into Asia, and that the world was united from the Cheviot Hills to the Danube and Euphrates, and thus rendering possible the early spread of Christianity. It was by war that the empires of Babylon, Egypt and India were unlocked and their material wealth and antiquities of immense value to the Bible student were made known to the rest of the world. It was by war that Europe escaped the monotonous quietude of China. It was by war that the feudal system in 1346 was destroyed and the half savage tribes scattered over the different countries of Europe were consolidated into nations to the advantage of mankind. It was the French and English wars, 1754-63, that freed New England from the control of the French empire. It was the war of the American Revolution, 1774-1781, that saved the United States from continuing to be a province of Great Britain. Directly and indirectly by the wars of 1859-66 and 1870 Italy was united and became a nation that was in position to curb the political ambitions of the Vatican which, in the judgment of the wisest statesmen, has been a blessing both to the church and state. Our war with Mexico in 1845, as unjustifiable as it seemed to be, resulted in freeing Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma and California from the wretched dominion of Mexico. The Civil War of 1860-64 emancipated from slavery four millions of people and decided forever the question as to whether the Union is a nationality, or simply a league of states that can be dissolved at the pleasure of any one of them. Our war with Spain in 1898, splendid in its

purpose and results, freed the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico and Cuba from a brutal and demoralizing tyranny.

Nor is the argument in defence of war destitute of other important support.

The saying once was, "that war and pestilence go hand in hand." But now war, medical science and the hospital nurse with her Christlike benedictions and almost sublime devotion and sacrifice, go hand in hand.

Military control in modern times has nearly put an end to the scourge of yellow fever, a disease that civil administration had unavailingly struggled against for centuries; and so far as one can see the disease would have continued to kill its victims for years to come had not the military spirit, the militant spirit, "the valiant spirit" of which Paul speaks, as cultivated and developed in the United States army, made an heroic fight against the disease; and now the world is largely free from that terror of the centuries. When the United States raised her flag in the Philippines the medical army corps began its fight against disease as well as against insurrection, and now on those islands the scourge of smallpox and cholera is almost unknown. The Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama, once the plague spot of the earth, was attacked by the same medical corps, and now that Zone is becoming one of the health resorts of the world. They were the officers of the medical corps with their militant spirit ordained to fight evil, who on entering Cuba, that had been a breeding place of deadly fevers that all the time were threatening the United States with imported death-dealing diseases, turned that island into one of the attractive garden spots and winter resorts of the western hemisphere.

The present war in Europe, as we are assured, is not without recognized compensations.

It is the opinion of surgical and medical scientists that preventive medicine, surgery, sanitation, therapeutics, public and individual hygiene, isolation of the wounded, will make strides that would not have been thought of but for the stimulation of the battlefield. The getting of society, by the ministrations of war, out of old ruts may cost a sacrifice, it usually does, but there is almost always in turn an immense benefit that comes from new incentives and opportunities.

When speaking of war, we are therefore to keep this in mind that the business of war and of the military spirit when

rightly employed is to fight evil, physical and moral, of every kind and wherever found. It is true that mistakes at times have been made in the exercise of this spirit, but the much it has done for humanity does not justify any people in trying to banish it from the world without being able to substitute anything in its place.

There are several other phases of this subject that are scarcely less deserving of mention. For instance, the amazing triumph against intoxicants that never hardly had been dreamed of, and that two years ago seemingly would have been impossible, is an outcome of the present war. It is safe to say that more has been done in restricting that horrible and murderous traffic, at least among the fighting nations, than had been achieved by all other agencies during the last half century. Russia, which before the war, encouraged the use of alcohol because of the large revenue derived from it, completely reversed herself in that business. France has done much, England and Germany have done something, and if the war continues, they all will do still more.

The Kaiser is on record as saying, "that military supremacy will rest with those fighters who are freest from alcohol." Before long he may, therefore, be compelled, as a war measure, to issue a command for strict prohibition. Of these facts the whole world is now taking notice, and some day may take action.

In enumerating things that may be said in palliation of war, its beneficial effect upon soldiers themselves should not be overlooked. While doubtless war has debauched and ruined some men, it has evoked the most sterling manhood in others. It has stimulated enthusiasm in sluggish breasts and has awakened patriotism in hearts that never felt it before. Many of our peace advocates know nothing of the indescribable thrill and uplift that comes to a patriotic soldier who, standing in the line of battle is conscious that within an hour he may place his life on the altar of his country. Our peace pleaders never could have composed, or have sung the song of Deborah the prophetess.

The surgeon-general of our Grand Army of the Republic, Dr. Lewis S. Pitcher, who probably more carefully than any other man has studied the physical and ethical effects of the American Civil War upon the enlisted soldiery, made the

following statement to the favorably known reviewer, Mr. Edward Marshall:

My general feeling is that the men who came out of the Civil War were better physically, mentally and morally than they were when they first joined the army. There is no doubt in my mind that almost every Northern soldier was materially benefited by his conviction that he was fighting for the right, and I am inclined to believe that this psychological benefit was at least as marked among the soldiers of the South whose convictions were certainly as vivid as those of the Northern troops.

Commenting upon the present war, the Rev. Dr. R. J. Campbell of London offers the opinion, to repeat his own words, that "England is living on a loftier religious plane than when the war broke out." The London correspondent of the New York *Evening Post* puts the matter thus:

The clergy of all denominations are rejoicing in the larger opportunity that is coming to them, not only in their increased congregations, but in the more attentive hearing they are receiving. Unselfish zeal is frankly and thankfully recognized, even by those who are still of the opinion that war has closer affinities with hell than with heaven.

We read in the *English Friend* these words: "Amid the darkness one of the gleams of hope we should prize and cherish is that, while but a few weeks ago English people were divided into a variety of groups of persons trying to get something from the State in support of their particular interests, now the country, and in its smaller sphere the society, is full of persons banded together to give something to the State. Everybody is not only willing to help, but anxious to help, and the problem is to turn this immense fund of personal service to practical account.

"Kitchener's call for recruits has awakened a spirit of self-sacrifice in all classes of the community. If we may believe the *Times'* History of the War, it has even been an effective agency in the reclamation of habitual criminals. According to that publication, 'It is not a coincidence that throughout Britain the war period is marked by an amazing absence of crime. There may seem to be no direct antagonism between a scheme of world-war hatched at Potsdam and a burglary planned in Whitechapel. But many a burglar, moved to honest indignation by the German outrage, enlisted as a soldier or found some other way to declare himself on the side of the Right; and thus many police officers are set free, to protect the nation's interests, instead of watching criminals.'"

The same essentially is true of France. A correspondent writing from Paris says:

No country is being so spiritually awakened as a result of the war as is France. She has emerged from the long period of materialism and indifference that has cursed her, and the churches of the country are being filled with devout believers. France is now turning to the living God. The Reformed Church and the Methodists, and other branches of Protestantism, are reaching the life of the people and are proving everywhere centers of spiritual power unknown of late years.

In our own country, from the nature of the case, the change for the better since the European war began, is not so pronounced as in Europe, but it is clear that materialistic evolution, unbelief in God, and disregard of his word are making no new inroads in the thoughts of our people. Men are beginning to feel that war is a serious business even though it is on the other side of the Atlantic, and when men are serious they are thoughtful, and are more inclined to be religious when "the flaming image of eternity" confronts them. The count in New York City shows that there has been an increase in church attendance since the war began of from twenty to twenty-five per cent. And if our people were more in the war zone than they are, patriotism as well as religion might more generally prevail, and the feeling that we owe the nation a debt the moment the country is in peril might be uppermost. There is many a man, should war be declared, who would pay his taxes with better grace, feeling that something worth while is being done with his tax money; and many another man would rise to the highest dignity of self-sacrifice and with tear-filled eyes and choking voice would bid his only son go in defence of his country, or to right the wrongs of some other country. Patriotism is not dead in America, but is in need of something to awaken it, and that something would be a call to arms. Quicker than most men dream, sacrifice under that call would take the place of selfishness. The soldier who has left a home of luxury would be found singing patriotic and religious songs in the war trenches and if the stress were severe enough, women whose lives are now worse than empty and useless, would be found bearing, with calm and splendid patience, burdens and sorrows that now seem far beyond their strength or disposition.

And judging from the effect of the war in England upon the low-downs and criminal classes, we may infer that if we

were drawn into war that there are burglars, pickpockets, thieves and hoodlums who are a terror in our cities, and tramps who are a terror to our less populous towns, who would rise to a plane of decency and even of honor, if they would enlist in the army and offer their lives in defence of the stars and stripes. The incentive and opportunity might be to them redemptive. And it is not a harsh judgment to say that the present generation of young men of well-to-do families are sadly in need of a schooling that times of peace never will give them, and that a certificate that they once stood before the cannon's mouth, or in a war trench would be in the future worth more to them or to the family name than a diploma from any college or university in Christendom.

But on the other hand, we shall be pardoned for saying that the counsels of Mr. Bryan and those he represents, if followed, would be a sure way of emasculating American manhood and American womanhood.

Students of Israelitish history recall the fact that there was a time, in the days of Shungar, when the highways were deserted, when travellers skulked in byways, and when idolatry prevailed with all sorts of attendant degradations. And that was the very time when the military spirit was dead and when there was not a shield, nor a spear, by way of armament, among the forty thousand of that miserable, Israelitish people. It was at length a woman who lived on Mount Ephraim, the prophetess Deborah, who aroused the war spirit and stood side by side with Barak, the commanding officer, when battling for Israel. And it was another woman, Jael, the Kenite, who drove a spike into the head of Sisera, the commanding general of the army that had been sent to put still greater indignities upon the unarmed and non-resisting Israelites. Jabin's army was defeated; Deborah sang a war song, the oldest on record; the glory of Israel was restored and there was a time of prosperity that lasted forty years. Full of wisdom is the saying that "wars are the birthplaces of new eras." And Deborah, and Jael, and the Maid of Orleans, and others like them, make one think that women may have some rights in this world after all that has been said against it.

Songs sung in praise of peace, doubtless deserve repeating, but the war song of Lincoln Colcord already referred to, entitled *Vision of War*, is certainly of no less merit:

There, on the field of carnage and death, stand forth the highest
 instincts of the soul;
 There find ye courage, strength, nobility, ungrudging service;
 There find ye infinite tenderness and compassion, the generosity of
 worthy foemen;
 There find the surest instances of friendship and humanity;
 There neither lies nor lying thoughts nor base suspicions;
 There honored, truth believed;
 There miracles of faith made manifest;
 There souls' co-operation, pain subdued for others' sake and for the
 cause;
 There nothing held back, the last gift freely given;
 There spirit's power supremely shown, rising to greater and greater
 sacrifices;
 There marvels, too, of bodily strength, endurance, health, the body
 supremely shown;
 (For the body is only supreme where the spirit is supreme);
 There life stripped of its fundamentals, seem at last, in the cold and
 hunger and wet, in the pain, in the presence and hour of death;
 All simple, wise, heroic, natural, true.
 There near-appearing, the dream that stood far off in times of peace;
 Love without bond, love compassing the enemy and friend alike;
 Unselfish love, a flash of the ideal;
 Love of humanity—the Brotherhood of Man!

And now shall we say that war is hell and never anything better? War often has been redemptive; hell never is, and in that fact is a broad distinction.

While war has its desolations and horrors, yet the student of history need not read far before discovering that peace as well as war also has its desolations and horrors. Such evils as cowardice, selfishness, stagnation, moral corruption, irreligion, and practical atheism have had their most vigorous growth, not in times of war, but in times of peace.

Rear Admiral Fisk, of the United States navy, writing in the October number of the *North American Review* (1915), thus states his opinion on a yet broader basis:

The trend of nations has been towards a clearer recognition of the efficiency of military power and an increasing use of the instrumentality of war * * * The experience of men has shown abundantly that no moral, mental or spiritual force, nor argument or persuasion, but physical force has been the most effective agency in national affairs and is so still.

And now, in view of all we have been saying, does not the conviction deepen that God need not offer an apology when

the inspired writer says, "The Lord is a man of war; the Lord is his name?" And need the Christian offer apology when his Lord and Master says, "I am not come to send peace on earth, but a sword"?

Those who are opposed to war, have for their stock argument the monetary costs and death roll. Here, again, are shown selfishness, cowardice and atheism, or at least it is shown that God is not potentially in all the thoughts of these peace men.

As to the cost of war this much can be said: If we are engaged in the cause of righteousness, God can give years of plenty and refund with interest all losses. The silver and gold are His and the cattle on the thousand hills and all are at His disposition. But if we shrink through cowardice and selfishness to do what should be done we may find ourselves putting the money coming to us in these prosperous days, as the prophet said, into a bag with holes in it. (Haggai 1:6.) Or what is worse, the crops of the fields on which much, if not almost everything, depends, may be overtaken at God's command by blasting or mildew, grasshopper or palmer-worm.

As already suggested, Old Testament teaching and warning belong to the twentieth century as well as to the centuries before the dawn of the Christian era, and are as applicable to Americans as to the people of Israel.

God's control of the elements and His use of destructive agencies for chastisement are thus set forth by His prophet:

And also I have withholden the rain from you, when *there were* yet three months to the harvest: and I caused it to rain upon one city, and caused it not to rain upon another city: one piece was rained upon, and the piece whereupon it rained not withered. I have smitten you with blasting and mildew, and when your gardens, and your vineyards, and your fig-trees, and your olive-trees increased, the palmer-worm devoured *them*.—*Amos 4:9. Comp. Ex. 23:28; Joel 2:25.*

We cannot, therefore, reckon upon another year's grain crop large enough to feed our own people, whatever may be the planting, unless God shall add his blessing to human effort. It is, therefore, suicidal to haggle, or hesitate at the cost of war. If it is just in the sight of God, there should be no fear.

As to the death roll, no one can tell how large it will be if our country is drawn into the war, but even that does not

matter so much as some men think. The views of life that our peace advocates entertain are not always on the highest plane. The entire trend of Bible revelation is that human life is not to be accounted the greatest thing, but the giving it up for a worthy cause is its crown and glory. The Jehovah prophets, the apostles and our Lord himself held views of life, of death and sacrifice very different from those most men entertain.

We can live but a brief space at the longest. The soldiers who died fighting in the armies of Assyria, of Greece, of Rome and Carthage preceded only a little those who did not fight and the men who out-lived those wars are all dead.

Many soldiers who fought under Nelson, Wellington and Napoleon were killed, but those who were not killed then, are dead now. The same may be said of our Revolutionary soldiers, and very shortly of all the Civil and Spanish War veterans. Only a hundred years and it will matter little so far as the present life is concerned between the millions who have fallen in the war now raging, and those who stayed at home. "The dread artillery of time" never hears the command, "cease firing!"

And there are many forms of death just as dreadful and deplorable as death on the field of battle. One would rather be shot to death by a rifle bullet than run down by an automobile. The miserable death of the drunkard in delirium tremens; the horrible deaths of suicides who cut their throats, shoot themselves through the heart or brain, throw themselves in front of a railway train, are from some points of view many times worse than death on a battlefield.

Among the last words spoken to me by a retired naval officer when dying were these: "The regret of my life now is that I was not killed in battle on a man-of-war."

And when we are sober enough to think, we know that the matter is not how we die, or when, or where, but how have we lived. We know that we are not in this world to live at our ease, or to pile up fortunes or to get a great name, but we are here to do something that is worth the mention and to help make this world better and fitter to live in, and if death is the price to be paid, then welcome death on the battlefield or elsewhere, should be the attitude of every man who bears the Christian name.

Having shown that God is to be reckoned with in all one may think, or say of war, and that he employs war as one of his agencies in the chastisement of the nations, and that war has its compensations, and is sanctioned in the teachings of the sacred Scriptures, we now return to the question already asked, but only partly answered, Are the United States to enter the war zone in spite of all efforts now employed to prevent it?

Since God rules, man can speak only of possibilities, or at most, of probabilities. God is working out a plan, and for ought we know, that plan may not be perfected until not only the United States but every nation on this planet is in a conflict at arms.

While the war now waging may not be the Armageddon of Bible prophecy, yet Armageddon may be the outcome before a final peace can be declared.

We may note, first of all, that our inordinate conceit, self-assurance as to safety and consequent unpreparedness, are not taking us away from the war zone, but leading us into it. We are told that in a few years our population will number two hundred million, and that we now are a mighty people, a hundred million, and that in case of war a million men would spring to arms between sunrise and sunset; that our American people are natural born soldiers, and that we could equip a million men over night. But those who talk in terms of millions have but a poor conception of what it means to equip and discipline a million undisciplined men. We could be whipped twice over before that could be done.

Rear Admiral Mahan speaks of our "national, ignorant, self-sufficiency"; that phrase is well taken. The Germans have spoken of our "colossal innocence," and those words are equally well-timed, and our colossal conceit might be added. The Japanese have spoken of us as a nation of "what-nots"; and honestly what else are we? And the evidence is overwhelming that we are a wabbling nation.

Some people are quite confident that in case of war the mass of our recent immigrants, in gratitude for what America has done for them, would shoulder a musket, fight in our behalf and frighten away the invader. But, alas, gratitude is the last emotion that has been felt in the hearts of our recent immigrants.

And we do well to recognize the fact also that there are

conflicting interests in these United States, and that we are very far from centralizing them for the public good. Our recent immigrants, as suggested by the author of "Problems of Power," are forming states within our state—an Irish state, an Italian state, a German state, a Scandinavian state, a Hebrew state and a Roman Catholic state. The hyphen has been thought to be an unnatural product of our soil. But, unfortunately, the hyphen has been forced upon our negro population and upon the yellow races, and is preferred by many others to any different, or closer connection with our country. Between the rich and poor, between the laborer and the employer there is a long hyphen—a breach really; and what is coming of it no one can tell.

And native Americans and Protestant citizens are being treated in some of our large cities as if they were foreigners, having merely hyphen connections, and having no rights, in religion, education or politics that are worth respecting.

Whether, therefore, in case of war all these various peoples could be centralized into one brotherly commonwealth of undivided interest and sentiment is a matter of grave uncertainty.

There were Tories during our Revolutionary War, Copperheads and Hunkers during the Civil War and Obstructionists during the Cuban War. Is it, therefore, less likely, in case of another war, foreign or civil, that there may be those who will play the part of Tories, Copperheads and Obstructionists? Our peaceadvocates and hyphenized people are also pronounced and numerous enough, if war were more threatening than it is, to be a downright embarrassment, if not a menace to our government.

There is another fact that cannot be overlooked. It is this, that we are no longer an isolated country. To thoughtful minds, grave responsibilities were incurred when we took part in the Peking Expedition in 1900, though we do not say that that step was unwisely taken. The same is true when in 1913, without waiting for the co-operation of other nations, we made haste to be the first to recognize the new Republic of China, and along with the recognition we extended almost effusive congratulations. While all this was not conservative, yet the recognition and the congratulations need not be criticised. But having done this which was not "a hands-off policy," what shall now be said when our government hesitates to unite

with other nations in an effort to preserve that republic? Uncle Sam in this act will add to his reputation of being a wobbling coward.

When we established ourselves in the Philippines, in the Sandwich Islands, in Porto Rico, and when we built the Panama Canal, each end of which and the ten mile strip along its entire length, must now be maintained as United States territory, we assumed responsibilities that we must not now try to escape by running away. And the Monroe Doctrine, "that shining star of authority in the western hemisphere," adds much to our present perils.

William Morton Fullerton is correct in suggesting that "the luxury of the Monroe Doctrine" may be mighty expensive when a little later we are called upon to defend it. We are not speaking against the doctrine nor against its defense, for both may be regarded as thoroughly Christian, as well as a political and protective measure, but the point is that we must abandon the doctrine, and even abandon the highway that leads to a "world power," towards which we have been traveling in the last forty or fifty years, or else we must build a navy and organize an army that will command not only the respect but the fear of all other nations. We must be in position to guard our Atlantic coast and our Pacific coast, and have a voice, and a strong voice, in the affairs of the Caribbean Sea, for it is far from being a dream of lunacy that the centre of interest, or "of gravity," in this world, as it has been put by Fullerton, "will soon be shifted from the Mediterranean to the Caribbean Sea."

While enumerating the possibilities, at least the danger of war, there should also be mentioned the fact that we are no longer feared by any nation that would care to fight us. And why should we be feared, or even respected, when we allow Mexican troops, Indians or bandits, it matters little which, to kill American citizens and soldiers, not only on Mexican soil, but to cross our borders and do the killing at our very doors, and we meantime not daring to follow the murderers across the border line lest we get into trouble? How much longer must American citizens for protection crawl into a hole or flee from their homes? A world of lookers-on, before we know it, may render the verdict, that America is a nation of cowards, or peace-worshipping lunatics. Our national lust

for money and our lust for commercial advancement and profit may be no worse in the sight of Heaven than our lust for peace, for under strict analysis the tap root in each case will be found the same—cowardice mingled with selfishness. Plainly, what the government at Washington has been in need of is a revival of self-respect. It is to be hoped that we are not too far gone for recovery. Our attitude in Mexico and elsewhere, except in Hayti, reminds one of a story that Lieutenant-General Huyshe, a hero of the Indian Mutiny, used to tell on one of his fellow-countrymen who had entertained a French guest. The Parisian had flirted with the daughter and was detected in the act of eloping with the host's wife. Then the master of the house called him aside and said: "You have lowered the moral tone of my daughter; you are about to elope with my wife. I warn you, a little more of this and you'll rouse the sleeping lion!"

And so our sham, mystical peace policy has suggested to the world that we are waiting submissively to be disregarded, disrespected, cuffed and kicked again and again, by anybody disposed to do it, and even then show no resentment that means anything. We have hung up in the halls of the nations for them to look at, a bird-cage, with a dove in it, as an emblem of what the United States intend to do in case of an assault. The symbol would better be a piece of sackcloth and a handful of ashes.

No nation on earth has given a more pitiful exhibition of imbecility than has the United States Government in the last two years. We have shown courage only sufficient to attack the insignificant negro republic of Hayti, and are now holding it as conquered territory, a most humiliating affair in view of what we dare not do in Mexico, or what ought to have been done outside of that republic.

Ten years ago not a nation on earth, excepting perhaps one, would have thought of crossing swords with the United States. Today no one of the nations in Europe or Asia, having any standing as a world power, has the least fear of a controversy or a conflict with the United States. Such is the outcome of our sickening, sentimental politics.

President Poincare, in his message to the French Parliament February 20th, 1913, spoke these words that our nation and all others may well heed:

A diminished France, a France exposed by its own folly to taunts, or humiliations, would no longer be France. . . . Our words of peace and humanity will all the more be likely to be heeded if we are known to be more determined and better armed. . . . No people can maintain an effective peace policy without being always prepared for war.

It has been suggested by those who are declaiming for peace that the countries now at war will be too exhausted, and financially too nearly bankrupt to venture a conflict at arms with United States. But he is not a careful student of history who thinks that bankruptcy would keep the nations of Europe and Asia from making demands upon the United States if a pretext could be invented—a thing always easily enough done. Bankruptcy is quite as likely to lead to impatience, temptation, and a desire to regain what has been lost as to be followed by quietude. It is the hungry beast, especially if it has just had a taste of blood, that is the more likely to spring upon an easy and exposed victim.

But, it is asked, are we to think no better of man than to compare him to a blood-thirsty, hungry beast? The reply is, that evolution seems to be at present much worried that "men have slipped back once more among the beasts of the field."

So that, after looking upon the incredible cruelty and slaughter now enacting by professedly Christian nations on battlefields and in conquered territories, is there any solid ground for hope that the standard of honor is so high and the losses by war so great that the United States need have no anxiety as to being forced into a war zone? We are now a fat nation in a world with those that are lean, growing more and more so; redistribution will be the temptation.

And if the European War should close right away and peace be declared, an outcome that some people are unwisely contending for and even praying for, are there not reasons for thinking that it would mean anything but the best for our country, at least if our reputation is not improved?

Joseph Choate unquestionably is correct in saying, "That the United States is one of the richest and most hated nations in the world." He might have added that in case of war we are not sure of an ally whose aid would be of any service.

Is anyone innocent enough to think that Germany, for instance, would not be minded to make demands and invite trouble

if her hands were now free. She is so angry, and justly so, in consequence of our continued service to the Entente Allies, that she would be only too ready to put us to inconvenience and even pick a quarrel. We are talking today of the triumph of our diplomacy with Germany in the matter of submarine warfare, but that controversy has generated no affection for the United States, and it is quite certain that there would have been no triumph at all had German submarines proved as successful on the Atlantic as was expected.

When the *Lusitania* was sunk our government, with high-sounding and threatening rhetoric, warned Germany not to repeat the crime. Was Germany alarmed by the warning? Not in the least. It was not because of any protest or threat, but because it was more to her advantage that she transferred the scene of slaughter from the Atlantic to the Mediterranean, where the *Ancona* has just been sent to the bottom and more American lives sacrificed. And what are the United States to do about this procedure? Protest! But why waste the time? The supreme effort straight along seems to be, not to stop the slaughter of American men, women and children, but to find some excuse for Germany in what she is doing, so that we the more easily can swallow our shame and escape trouble.

And this "Safety First" and "Hands Off" policy, most unfortunately, is slowly taking possession of the minds of our people; it is the "cult of cowardice and selfishness" that points towards a sure degradation.

Triumph of diplomacy! Let Germany get her breath, which is not all gone yet, and that is the wonder of it, and she would tax our diplomacy by laying hands on Brazil in the southern part of which she is already well colonized. The Monroe Doctrine would not stand the least bit in the way. And she may well entertain the feeling that we never would fight for its defense whatever the provocation.

The Panama Canal unquestionably is coveted by Germany, and why should it not be, and if coveted, how could we prevent her from taking possession, provided, of course, the present warfare should suddenly end?

The Canal Zone being, as we have said, fifty miles long and only ten miles wide, could be easily moved against, either from the north or the south. Colombia would like to get back at the United States for the wrong not yet forgiven, to

do which she might not hesitate to form an alliance with Germany. And if this were done, what could we do except to protest and be laughed at?

But we are up against a greater than German terror. No one need be told that Japan is just now rising to an apprehensive, if not to a threatening importance. Already she has felt a temptation. It is now two years ago, during the alien land controversy in California that Japan actually approached Germany, France and England as to financial support, requiring no other, if she adopted aggressive measures against the United States. - Congressman F. A. Britten makes the charge that this information was presented to the State Department, but that through the "ignorance and impotence" of Mr. Bryan, it was not submitted to the congressional, military or naval committees. This move of Japan establishes the fact that she has been as we said before, under the spell of a temptation to measure swords with the United States, a disease that among nations is not easily cured; homeopathic treatment has no effect. Words, then the stick, is the divine method of curing temptation.

Homer Lea, who is familiar with conditions in the far East, having rendered military service in China, 1900, 1901 and 1904, in his *Valor of Ignorance* sounds this note of warning: "This republic and Japan are approaching, carelessly on the one hand, and with pre-meditation on the other, to that point of contact which is war." It will be difficult to show that General Lea has blundered in his observation.

That we have wronged Japan, shamefully wronged and insulted her as to immigration, property ownership and naturalization, there can be no question. And we have disgracefully broken our treaties with her and did this because California required it. The plea on our part has been that our union of states is such that the general government cannot enforce its treaty obligations in any of our states if an objection were raised.

Suppose, therefore, that the Japanese should say to our general government, and very properly, you enforce your treaty obligations or we will make you; and if you cannot manage California we will take that state in hand and manage it ourselves. Are we prepared to resent that proposition should it be laid before us? In such an event, California and

other Western States might plead in vain for protection and learn to be less almightily independent and impudent.

Or what if Japan should go further and for an indemnity take possession of the Hawaiian Islands, and of Guam, Samoa, the Philippines and Alaska, and if any expense were incurred while taking possession, what if she should demand California and Oregon as indemnity, what could we do about it? We are today without a single first-class battleship on the Pacific coast, and as to the Pacific Islands the strategic position of Japan is many-fold better than ours. Is the apprehension, therefore, without foundation that we are in grave danger of sacrificing all these possessions "on the altar of the goddess of disarmament?" But perhaps our peace advocates will say, We would far better surrender these possessions and pay the indemnity rather than fight; for what are honor and land as compared with peace!—May the Lord have mercy upon us!

There is another feature of Japan's position that is neither convenient nor pleasant for us, which has not been generally commented upon. It is this, that she now has in Mexico fifty thousand of her people and easily could add sixty thousand more. What then could we do if, with this hundred thousand people, she should decide to set up a Japanese government in that section of Mexico where she now has a footing? Mexico could not prevent it. Could we? Would we? Her fingers for some time have been itching for a coaling station off the west coast of Mexico. And that too is a progressive disease not easily cured. Sulphur and two or three other chemicals are the remedy; but we have no sulphur that we can administer to Japan; we are selling it out to Europe.

And now, does the conceit of our conservative peace people lead them to say that Japan is in no way to be feared, and that all suppositions breeding anxiety as to what she may or may not do are the talk of jingoes?

But let us take account of a few facts in view of which our masterful conceit may get a needed and deserved tumble. The man is only a know-nothing who can doubt that the Japanese are a powerful people—never more so than now; they themselves know it, and other nations are not ignorant of it.

In 1895 they conquered the armies of China and in 1903-4 they defeated Russia, and from a military point of view, are far stronger today. Estimates have been made that they

could mobilize and put into the field at short notice ten or twelve million soldiers, every one of whom knows something of the use of fire-arms. We think it not an over-estimate that in twenty-four hours' fighting, on a fair field, the Japanese could kill every soldier in our entire army and make an easy job of it.

In 1909, Japan had an army transport fleet of ninety-five steamers fitted to carry one hundred and ninety-nine thousand, five hundred and twenty-six soldiers. This imposing war equipment does not include her passenger ships that in an emergency could be used for transports. And in this respect she is in better condition today than she was in 1909.

On the other hand, the United States have in all, a fleet of only ten transport ships with a troop capacity of only fifteen thousand, seven hundred and fifty-eight. And there are only four of these ships on the Pacific Coast. The difference between the United States and Japan in transport facilities are, therefore, startlingly troublesome to all except the blind and deaf.

The officials of our War College in Washington have estimated that Japan could land three hundred and fifty thousand soldiers in lower California in sixty days, with provisions for three months. Suppose she did this, and we should protest? A bland smile would be the reply and she would continue landing her troops.

Another thing that our people fail to take into account is, what Japan has of late achieved in the shipping business and industry. She has secured the very last ship of the trans-pacific line of steamers. She has in the last twelve months increased her shipping tonnage four hundred per cent. And in the building of war vessels she now over-matches the United States by fifty per cent. She is running her factories at present on double time to supply Russia with war munitions. This latter fact is unpleasantly suggestive.

We have been counting on the Panama Canal, in the event of trouble with Japan, as an asset of immense value in facilitating the movement of our navy from one ocean to the other. But a Japanese writer of late has suggested that at the expense of an old steamship loaded with dynamite, the Canal could be wrecked to such extent that doing the best we could a year's time would scarcely repair it.

The Japanese Bernhardt has published to the world that with a few sticks of dynamite, one at each point, every lock on the Canal could be disabled in almost no time. These suggestions show that temptations of this sort are lurking in the thoughts of the shrewd, undemonstrative Japanese. But at present these dynamite schemes appear to be quite unnecessary, for the Canal, without Japanese help, is badly wrecking itself.

Who, therefore, unless more than half blind to existing facts, will not say that the United States will soon need two powerful navies, one on the Atlantic and another on the Pacific Coast?

It is well to note, also, that the Japanese have been studying our coast line and it is suspected that they have charts of every mile of available seacoast from Alaska to the Panama Canal. Should she land at any point on our western coast and entrench herself, are we not powerless to prevent it? The report is almost incredible that our government has been so disregardful of preparations against invasion that we are without war maps of either the Pacific or Atlantic Coasts. And we may thank our stars, or to speak more like a Christian, we may thank God that Japan is not giving undivided attention to America, being in doubt how soon her services may be required in Europe.

But there is still another peril confronting the United States, growing out of possible alliances between Japan and other nations. Suppose, for instance, there were trouble between Japan and ourselves, could Mexico, under the rule of Carranza be trusted for a moment? That man would be quite as likely to form an alliance with Japan as with the United States; certainly this would be the case if a liberal offer were made by Japan to Carranza. And yet, we are now doing for that treacherous wretch whatever he asks. We are furnishing him with supplies and allowing his troops to cross our territory. We are almost using our soldiers to aid him in fighting Villa who has shown himself hitherto much more of a friend to the United States than has Carranza.

The scenes in the streets of Vera Cruz may, therefore, be re-enacted. There our soldiers were killed by arms and ammunition furnished by the United States. We are now providing munitions of war for Carranza that a few months later may be used against us if Mexico should league with Japan. It is a

play with matches; always a dangerous play. And this entire business of furnishing war munitions to those engaged in war while we are professing to be a peace nation, is an inconsistency that is nothing short of hypocrisy, and hypocrisy is pretty sure, sooner or later, to get back at the hypocrite.

By recognizing Carranza we have not ended the Mexican trouble by any means, but unfortunately we have offended Villa, and if he should be defeated by Carranza, it may reasonably be expected that he would move west and east in his lot with the Japanese.

Another possibility appears not far in the background. We mean this, that if the way were open, and there is nothing now to prevent it, Russia, "with her ever growing hordes of countless races," would not long hesitate to align herself with Japan against the United States, especially if there were any likelihood of regaining Alaska by way of indemnity or in some other way, now that her immense resources are better known. It undoubtedly has caused Russia no little regret, if not bitterness, that Alaska is now annually yielding to the United States six times the price that was paid for it. Japan and Russia together would make a formidable foe if confronting any nation, we may say, especially the United States.

And what shall be said of China with her four hundred million people? Though she is not now ill-disposed towards the United States, yet her wealth and her millions under the clever and ambitious guidance of Japan may some day make "the yellow peril" a very dangerously dark one. Providential interposition certainly appears to have averted from us "a swift catastrophe," at the hands of Japan and China.

Hardly less providential is it that European nations that have property interests in Mexico have not already made coercive demands upon the United States. Had there been no war in Europe it is almost inconceivable that those countries that have suffered heavy losses in Mexico should not have said to our government, It is through your cowardly and vacillating policy that we have lost much in Mexico. You would not allow us to enter that country and right the wrongs there perpetrated, nor would you go there yourself. You have been a dog in the manger. We, therefore, hold you responsible. What reply could be made?

When Mr. Bryan was Secretary of State, American

citizens who had made investments in Mexico asked for protection. The reported reply was that they who had invested in Mexico had taken a risk and that the United States would have nothing to do in the matter. But that is a plea that Europe will have no mind to accept. And if England, France, Germany and other countries should demand a half billion dollars we should have to make a settlement. If we did not, they could say properly enough, You pay it or we will destroy your commerce, blockade your ports and rain shot and shell upon your unprotected seaboard cities. If they should say this, what could we do about it? Our present army could not defend three quarters of the area of the State of New York, and is almost fewer in number than those who attend a college ball game, or than those who followed President Wilson while doing a bit of shopping in New York City.

Or if, when the war closes, England and France, being hard pressed for money, should propose to offset their losses in Mexico by the cancellation of the bond issue of five hundred million dollars, what could or would the United States do about it? Incredible supposition! do you say?

But does the behavior of the European nations at the present time assure first-class business dealings? Let us not forget that we are living in times and under conditions that never before were thought of; so that no one can predict what will yet be the behavior of the warring nations when they are poverty-stricken.

And if those who hold the bonds should appeal, in case of default, to the United States Government for protection, judging from the past, could they look for anything better than some such announcement as this. Your people headed by Mr. Morgan and the banks, bought the bonds; you did this because you thought it was to your advantage, and now if you lose, the government of the United States can do nothing about it; those were private transactions and you must see to that business yourselves.

Where, then, could those who hold the Anglo-French bonds look for relief?

And if Germany should win out, whether or not she will God only knows, then where financially would England and France land? We are very sure that Germany knows how to pile indemnities mountain high, and are pretty sure that

England and France, if conquered, could not in two centuries pay their indemnities and their war debts: the indemnities would have to be paid first.

May we not, therefore, be pardoned for suggesting that it would seem quite as well for people who are in what are called moderate circumstances to hold off a bit, pay their personal debts, provide for the payment of mortgages on house or farm, and then, if something is left, invest it in United States securities that will soon be on the market. For if an army is organized and a navy floated such as are now contemplated, the United States must do one of two things, either issue bonds or go straight into bankruptcy.

It is gratifying to note, however, that President Wilson and Secretary Daniels, who twelve months ago was a pronounced pacifist, and that some members of Congress are waking from an unfortunate slumber that we hope will not prove a national disaster because so long continued.

What ought to have been spoken by President Wilson months ago was heard in his speech before the Manhattan Club, November 1st. The speech shows convalescence, but its lack of emphasis at some points and lack of clearness at others indicate that the recovery is not quite complete.

As would be expected, Mr. Bryan "bobbed up" opposing, with a measure of bombast and pathos, the President's new views on armament and his departure from traditions; as if political traditions count in these times of upheaval and of the overthrow of past theories and policies. Two years have turned the world upside down. Why, then, talk of traditions? And why is the ex-Secretary so obstinate? Other men as wise as he have changed their views and conduct. Cicero in a letter to Atticus, speaking of civil war, said, "I never cease from urging peace; for an unjust peace is better than the justest war." But later different, if not a better thought, seems to have come to the great orator, and he joined Pompey in his fight against Caesar.

Benjamin Franklin wrote these words: "There never was a good war or a bad peace." But later he stood among the foremost of the instigators of the American Revolution and continued in its support for seven years. Oh, brother Bryan! we are haunted with misgivings. Bumble bees! Nobel prizes! Will-o'-the-wisps! Precipice! Good-night! *Requiescat in pace.*

Secretary Lansing's warning to Great Britain, published

November 8, is a notable State paper, and shows that the administration is improving over past deliverances in daring to rebuke England, as well as Germany, for her violations of international law. But until we act as well as talk, John Bright will not rise from the dead and speak in our praise.

And now is the rejoinder heard that all this talk about war is the wildest sort of conjecture? Well, perhaps so, but not if God has judged that our national transgressions need correction and chastisement.

Nor is a war in which the United States may be deeply and frightfully involved one whit less improbable than would have been a prediction two years ago that there would be war among the nations of Europe such as is now witnessed. Distinguished men only recently were absolutely sure that national brotherhood had been so well established in human hearts that war henceforth would be impossible.

Professor L. S. Block, author of *The Future of War*, a book that led to the first Hague Tribunal, wrote thus: "There will be no war in the future, for war has become impossible."

Dr. David Starr Jordan entertained the same opinion. His words are these: "What shall we say of the great war of Europe, ever threatening, ever impending, and which never comes; humanly speaking, it is impossible." There have been other like predictions. And yet the greatest and most horrible war ever fought on earth is now fighting, with battle fronts a thousand miles in length, with cannon of such calibre that the earth trembles miles away at every discharge, with shells whose explosions shock men to death, with no other hurt but the shock, and with the sky, earth and sea converted into a common battlefield.

No man, therefore, should be thought insane when announcing the conviction that the liability of a war that shall involve America in immense trouble and even in disaster never has been greater than at this present hour.

But is there no hope that the United States may escape all these war horrors and misfortunes? We have not said that there is no escape. But we do say, what will be met with a derisive smile on the face of the thoughtless, that the people

at large have been looking for an escape from war in almost every direction except the right one—the right one being a trustful recognition of God in all our ways, a recognition that need not and should not in the least dismiss armament and preparedness.

The trowel in one hand, the spear in the other, and the true worship of God in the heart and on the lips were Israel's attitude and defense when surrounded with threatening enemies at the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem. With these equipments the perilous work was carried on to its completion. (Neh. 4: 9, 16-18.)

And what said Jehovah through the great Lawgiver to the people of Israel may well be heeded in the times through which we are passing:

If ye walk in my statutes, and keep my commandments, and do them, I will give peace in the land, and none shall make *you* afraid: neither shall the sword go through your land. And ye shall chase your enemies, and they shall fall before you by the sword. And five of you shall chase an hundred, and an hundred of you shall put ten thousand to flight: and your enemies shall fall before you by the sword.

But if ye will not hearken unto me, and will not do all these commandments; and if ye shall despise my statutes, so that ye will not do all my commandments, I also will do this unto you; I will even appoint over you terror, consumption, and the burning ague, and ye shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it. And I will break the pride of your power, and I will make your heaven as iron, and your earth as brass; and I will make your cities waste; and I will bring a sword upon you, and ye shall be delivered into the hand of the enemy.—*Lev. 26:3, etc.* Comp. *Jonah 3:1-10.*

At a later date when the people of Judah were face to face with their enemies, "a mighty host," they turned to God for help and were not disappointed. The record is of interest: "And then there come some that told Jehoshaphat saying, There cometh a great multitude against thee from beyond the sea. And Jehoshaphat feared and proclaimed a fast," and offered this prayer: "Oh our God, we have no might against this great company that cometh up against us; neither know we what to do; but our eyes are upon thee." Then one of the Jehovah prophets calmed the King with these words:

Hearken ye, all Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem, and thou king Jehoshaphat; Thus saith the Lord unto you, Be not afraid nor

dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle *is* not yours, but God's. Tomorrow go ye down against them: behold, they come up by the cliff of Ziz; and ye shall find them at the end of the brook, before the wilderness of Jeruel. Ye shall not *need* to fight in this *battle*; set yourselves, stand ye *still*, and see the salvation of the Lord with you, O Judah and Jerusalem: fear not, nor be dismayed; tomorrow go out against them; for the Lord *will be* with you. And Jehoshaphat bowed his head, with *his* face to the ground: and all Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem fell before the Lord, worshipping the Lord.—*Chron.* 20:15-18.

Are the United States disinclined to walk in such a path of safety? Perhaps the American people are too proud, or too unbelieving, or too sure of their war strength to think of taking God into their confidence, or of asking for His guidance and help. Well, that may be the case, but if so, alas, ye people!

And may we ask if our wisdom is of a higher type than that of the patriarchs, prophets and apostles of our Lord who believed in God, walked in His statutes, kept His commandments, and lifted up their eyes to Him when in trouble?

Abraham Lincoln took God into his counsels and so did Stanton, his war secretary; should it, therefore, be thought effeminate or beneath our dignity if we follow their example?

But there is no need of extending the discussion further, except to say that the conviction is deepening that war in the United States in some form and from some quarter is just as inevitable as sunrise and sunset, and that we shall be cast into "the scrap pile of ruined nations" unless God shall interpose, and we have no right to look for His interposition unless we honor, fear and obey Him. And if at this late hour we shall bow in His presence and say: Oh Lord God Almighty, we have grievously sinned against thee and disregarded thy commands; we have not observed thy Sabbaths; we have worshipped gold and silver more than Thee. Forgive, and we will do this great wickedness no more. We will keep Thy commandments. We will act courageously instead of cowardly. We will be self-sacrificing instead of grasping and selfish. We will give a helping hand to all who need our help, be they Mexicans, Armenians, Africans or others, and will do this whatever the cost or sacrifice, even to the beating of our ploughshares into swords and our pruning-hooks into spears—if we will pray that prayer in the pulpit, at the bar, at the workmen's bench, in the quiet

of the home, and in the halls of legislation, and if we will render the service that such praying demands, then we shall have a mission in the world. "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon" will be drawn in our behalf; the God of armies will take command and defend us against all our foes. He will send fear and trembling into the hearts of our adversaries, and command the tempest to sink the ships of war, whether they sail against us from east or west, and the United States of America will become a leader once more among the nations of the earth, and fulfill what we had dreamed to be her manifest destiny.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: **SEP 2002**

PreservationTechnologies

A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

PROFESSOR TOWNSEND'S BOOKS

The following books at present are out of print:

Lost Forever; Intermediate World; Fate of Republics; Art of Speech (2 vols.); Mosaic Record and Modern Science; Faith Work, Christian Science and Other Cures; The Bible and Other Ancient Literature; Story of Jonah; Evolution or Creation.

The following books, originally published at \$1.00 and \$1.50 per volume, now sold at 75 cents:

Credo; Arena and Throne; God-man; Sword and Garment; Supernatural Factor in Revivals; Bible Theology and Modern Thought; Stars Are Not Inhabited; Hell is No Myth; History of the Sixteenth New Hampshire Volunteers.

The following books at 50 cents each:

Satan and Demons; God's Goodness and Severity; Adam and Eve, History or Myth; The Deluge, History or Myth.

The following lectures and sermons, 10 cents each:

Final Judgment; The Disreputable Woman and Her Conversion; Temptation; Righteous without Knowing It; God and the Nation; Penalty of Unrighteousness, More Unrighteousness; Paul's Cloak, or Consecration; God and the Islands of the Sea; Manifest Destiny; Esther, or the Wise Venture; John the Baptist, or the Ministry Christ Approves; Is There a God such as the Bible Describes; Doctrine of the Trinity; New Theologies, only Bubbles; Collapse of Evolution; End of the World, Biblical and Scientific Points of View; Bible Inspiration; Bible Studies, Rules of Interpretation, etc.

These books can be ordered through the Chapple Publishing Company, Boston, Mass. Postage prepaid.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 547 983 3

