

THE
NATIONAL
ANTHROPOLOGICAL
ARCHIVES

1975

BR 115 .P7 K4 1920
Kelman, John, 1864-1929.
Some aspects of
international Christianity

BY THE SAME AUTHOR
THE LIGHT THAT SAVES

16mo. Net, 15 cents

The Mendenhall Lectures, Fourth Series
Delivered at DePauw University



Some Aspects of International Christianity

BY
JOHN ✓ K E L M A N



THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK CINCINNATI

Copyright, 1920, by
GEORGE R. GROSE

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
FOREWORD	vii
PREFACE	ix
I REDEDICATION	1
II THE RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO PATRIOTISM	30
III INDIVIDUAL AND NATIONAL MORALITY	61
IV A LEAGUE OF NATIONS	93
V STATESMANSHIP IN FOREIGN MISSION- ARY WORK	125
VI BRITAIN TO AMERICA	146

FOREWORD

THE following lectures will meet a real and widespread need. They will contribute to a clearer understanding of the obligations of a true internationalism and of the strength of vital Christianity. The author, a preacher of international repute, speaks as a discriminating student of human affairs and with the moral authority of a Hebrew prophet. The conviction that the Christian religion is the only solution of the complex and baffling problems of the day, and that it has to do mightily with all the world movements is tremendously strengthened by these lectures.

The Mendenhall Lectures of DePauw University, to which this series of addresses belongs, was founded by the Rev. Marmaduke H. Mendenhall, D.D., of the North Indiana Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The object of the donor was "to found a perpetual lectureship on the evidences of the divine origin of Christianity and the inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures. The lecturers must be persons of high and wide repute, of broad and varied scholarship, who firmly adhere to the evangelical system of Christian faith. The selection of lecturers may

be made from the world of Christian scholarship, without regard to denominational divisions. Each course of lectures is to be published in book form by an eminent publishing house and sold at cost to the faculty and students of the university."

Lectures previously published:

1913, *The Bible and Life*, Edwin Holt Hughes.

1914, *The Literary Primacy of the Bible*, George Peck Eckman.

1917, *Understanding the Scriptures*, Francis John McConnell.

1918, *Religion and War*, William H. P. Faunce.

GEORGE R. GROSE.

President DePauw University.

PREFACE

WHILE I was preparing my course of Lyman Beecher Lectures, which were delivered at Yale in the spring of this year, I received an invitation to give six lectures on the relation of Christianity to International Subjects, in DePauw University, Indiana. At first I felt that the task was beyond me. I am no expert either in politics or economics. The time at my disposal was extremely limited, and much of it was already arranged for. Yet on second thought I resolved to accept the invitation with which DePauw had honored me. There are questions of the most vital importance on which every man must form an opinion. The bearings of these questions are not confined to the regions of expert knowledge, and there is a place for the impressions of the man on the street—his general sense of moral values, his common sense view of relative importances, and the free play of his conscience upon the questions of the hour as he understands them. It is in his name and from his point of view that I have prepared these lectures.

They were delivered from fragmentary notes, and the form they took owed much to the wonderful kindness and hospitality of the

audiences. I shall never forget the thrill of those evenings in DePauw, when the response was so immediate and so inspiring, and the most abstract discussions seemed to change to personal confidences, given and received. But when it came to writing out the book in cold blood, and without the inspiration of the friendly atmosphere of the lecture hall, the task assumed a far more formidable aspect. It had to be performed amid the confusion and distractions involved in my removal from Edinburgh to New York, and without access to many books of reference which in other circumstances I would have consulted.

Meanwhile, the political and international situation was changing from day to day, with the rapidity of a mountain torrent, and an opinion might be antiquated almost before the ink in which it was written had dried. In view of all this, I must trust to the indulgence of the reader, in the hope that he will find in the little volume at least some reminders of a very stirring time, and that the general argument and point of view may be applicable still, even when the detail of their application may have changed.

Some of the subjects of these Lectures have already been dealt with in the Lyman Beecher Lectures, though in slightly different form. Several of the present series were delivered also

at Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, and the friends who heard them there, as well as the congregation of Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, where they were delivered during the present winter, will permit me to associate them with those in DePauw as I thank them all for the welcome they accorded me — a welcome so cordial and so generous that it has been a permanent enrichment to my life.

JOHN KELMAN.

New York, March, 1920.

CHAPTER I

REDEDICATION

BEFORE the war had ended there had already come upon the conscience of earnest men in every land a sense that the future life into which peace would lead us must not be identical with, or even very similar to, that to which we had been accustomed in former days. The Great War has been so searching, and has penetrated so thoroughly into every nook and corner of human interest and enterprise, that it must have wrought very serious changes in many of the aspects of life. Now that the peace has come, we find ourselves bewildered by the number of elements, expected and unexpected, which are entering into the reconstruction of society.

In Edinburgh during the spring of last year there was inaugurated in the churches a movement called the Mission of Rededication. That Mission, which created considerable interest, dealt with many different questions, not religious only, but political, social, and economic, and it has left results both in the teaching and in the practice of men. The word *Rededication* is striking and very provocative of thought. It at once puts us into the line of

history, and reminds us that this is by no means the first dedication that has been attempted. Casting one's eye along the line of the past, one sees the great historical dedications of Israel in the Wilderness, Solomon's Temple, the outset of the Crusades, the Wars of the Covenanters, Plymouth Rock and the James River, the American Revolution, and the Great War. In all of these men felt that there had come upon them a new sense of life's solemn and commanding opportunities, and in each particular case they dedicated themselves to some specific task. Now, however, there is a widespread feeling that things are farther on than they were on any of these former occasions, and that there is a greater living chance, if only we may be able to avail ourselves of it, for changing things forever. The final end of war has actually seemed to be in sight, and some of us have not yet lost the vision of it, nor the faith that that vision may be realized. The new world arising out of the ashes of the old will undoubtedly have cleared itself of many hampering conditions, and there seems to be an actual prospect of realizing many of these also. When one views the League of Nations in its widest scope, which is, indeed, the only complete or understanding view to take of it, one feels overwhelmed by the stretch of its idealism, and can hardly believe that we have come to the

point of attempting to arrange for and organize so mighty an affair.

Yet so it is. This generation cannot shift its responsibilities without losing altogether the solemn sense of historical unity. Our dead lie upon every battlefield, and behind them the vast company of the dead of other wars, and of all the other men and women who, in their generation, strove to realize ideals which had revealed themselves to them. There is in Edinburgh a legend of the ancient Castle, that a bugler blowing the "last post" on a wild and stormy 31st of March, centuries ago, was killed there and thrown down the rocks; and the legend tells that every 31st of March those that have ears to hear can hear the sound of a fifth bugle, whose notes linger long over the sleeping city. The dead bugler comes back to continue his challenge to living men. When we remember the dead it is well ever to remind ourselves that they without us cannot be made perfect, and that they are waiting in their silent places to see how we shall take up their unfinished work, and what we shall make of it.

It is altogether fitting, therefore, that at such a time as this we should bring out into clear light all that is most sacred in our lives, our minds, and hearts, and dedicate it anew to high ends for future days. In doing this we are able with peculiar vividness to realize the

unity of history and to see our own efforts and ideals in a higher light because of what they have meant in days gone by.

With all this in our minds we come to the great task of the rededication of our own lives. Again we remember that this is not the first time of dedication. We have all been dedicated before; indeed, so far as our personal religious history is concerned, we have been dedicated far too often. When we turned consciously and deliberately to God, at the first celebration of the Communion, or on the occasion of the death of friends very greatly beloved, we have all undergone several such experiences, and about each of them there has always been a sense of conscience accusing us of unfaithfulness to former dedications. Had the early dedication of our lives been complete and deep enough, we would not have had so far to travel back in order to renew our vows. It is right at such a time as this that we should very particularly consider the reasons for the failure of former dedications in so far as they have failed. We shall probably all find that there are two main reasons for those failures.

The first of these is that our dedicated things were left lying stored and inoperative. We set aside certain purposes and memories, and solemnly laid them on the altars of our spirit, and then turned back from that sacramental

act to a life in which the dedicated things were to a large extent forgotten. Such dedication is conceived of too much as static rather than dynamic. It represents a judgment rather than a purpose, an emotion rather than a vital impulse. It is laid aside reverently in the region of dogma, instead of being led out into the field of living experience.

The second reason for such failure is that often our dedications are too general, and therefore meaningless. They express a real desire to be better men and women, whose spirits are more faithful to the highest things, but they do not particularize what these things are, nor examine what practical points of conduct are involved. In a word, they lack point, and in all that concerns conduct that is a fatal lack. Now the War has put point upon everything. It has forced us all back from generalities to that which is concrete and definite. Our aspirations in such former experiences were often little more than excellent copy-book sentiments to which, of course, we assented, but which never entered the region of practical conduct. Now we feel ourselves seized as it were by the throat, and as we seek another dedication an imperious voice demands of us, "What exactly do you mean?" It is necessary for us now to examine all our convictions and principles, in order that we may

ascertain of them also what their exact meaning is. If our dedication is to be a mere generality to-day, we simply court a repetition of former disappointments. The solemn moment will leave us unprepared for any advance in the future, and when we come to face the pressing questions that will be on us before we know, we shall find ourselves, mentally and spiritually, "all over the place."

Before we state to ourselves definitely the meaning of our dedication it will be well for us to go to the root of the matter, and ask what we mean by the word "dedication" itself. It is a great word, which we are accustomed to utter with reverence. How noble it seems! How little it often signifies! Come, let us bring it to a point. What is the "dedicated spirit," and what does it involve?

Obviously, in the first place, it must involve limitation. In young days we all have passed through a stage in which we understood the words of Robert Browning in *Pauline*:

"I am made up of an intenses life,
. . . a principle of restlessness
Which would be all, have, see, know, taste, feel, all."

It is not long, however, in the case of all who are dirigible in the course of life, before we learn that this radiant vision is but the figment of young enthusiasm. It is not given to mortals

to enter fully into every phase of life, and we soon discover that we cannot know everything, nor feel, nor think, nor do everything either. The first requisite for a satisfactory dedication, then, is to select something which we *shall* know and think and feel and do. In other words, to mark out our province.

Here we touch upon the vexed question of the two rival ideals for education. The university education of older days, prescribing its fixed number of subjects identically the same for all students, has been replaced by the modern arrangement of optional courses in which each student specializes along some particular chosen lines. The danger of the new plan is that you may easily produce by it uneducated experts, people who know their own narrow business thoroughly, but who do not know it in relation to the wider world. Such uncultured specialization is a real danger which must be guarded against at the present time. But, on the other hand, we have reached a period in the world's history when mere broad culture is not sufficient to meet the demands of the day. Life is asking us all certain very definite questions, and it is incumbent upon every one who would serve his generation rightly to select for himself some limited area in which he chooses to specialize, and to which he dedicates his powers of intellect and action. This

holds good in the choice of a profession, a choice which will be facing many of you very soon, if it has not confronted you already. There are all sorts of reasons which present themselves to a young man or woman in favor of or against this profession or that, and it is here that one of the great dangers in education arises. One will choose a profession because it appears to him more honorable, or more respectable socially, or more likely to provide him with quick returns in money than another. Another will take for the principle of choice the extreme opposite of this, and sensitive consciences have been often tempted to settle the big choices of life upon the principle that one should always choose the more self-denying or strenuous course. These principles of decision are equally misleading. When thinking of the dedication of a life, neither social position, nor money, nor self-denial are questions of first importance. The great question is that of efficiency as it applies to the particular nature of the person deciding. What can you do best? What does your habit of mind lead you toward doing? That will be your best contribution to the public welfare, and that should be the principle of your choice. In a later lecture we shall revert to this.

A similar snare lies set for the feet of every earnest spirit, in the promiscuous desire of

doing good. We want to help and bless our fellow men, and we have not realized that it is possible for none of us to do good to everybody. The result is often a life broken into fragments of good endeavor, and scattered over innumerable small attempts which neither link on with one another into any concerted whole, nor, indeed, achieve any completeness even along their own various lines. Again it is necessary to mark out your province, by selecting those whom life has given you as the subjects of your special service. In a word, clear up the matter of your possibilities and your limits, and then work within these limits with all your might. Find out what you stand for, and stand for that. This is the first great law of dedication.

In this there is already involved the second consideration, namely, originality. We all desire to be original, but some try to be so in very curious fashions. One of the commonest of these fashions at the present time is that of achieving originality by contradicting obvious and proved truths. I need not remind you that anyone can do that without any great display of genius or much expenditure of effort; but I would like to point out to you that a considerable amount of what passes for genius and brilliancy in current literature, upon analysis turns out to be little better than the exercise

of this smart trick. Originality does not consist in differing from others, but in thinking things out for yourself. It matters little whether you agree with others or differ from them. Every truth that passes through your own personality, and goes out upon the world from you, will have something of that personality communicated to it and lingering in it. The great thing is that you should refuse the tyranny of fashion and the habit of thinking through other men's minds. "Ye are bought with a price, be not the slaves of men." The price has been bitter and costly in the lives of your comrades. At least answer it by shaking yourselves free, that you may stand independent and think for yourselves. Dedicate your life, not only to certain projects that you wish to accomplish but to that point of view which is distinctively your own, and to that set of convictions which you have found to dominate your conscience. In a word, find out what you stand for and stand for that.

Let us now ask what this means in four different departments of our life and interest:

1. *Personal Religion*

In this the new dedication will, on the one hand, link each of us in with the historic Christian faith, and on the other hand it will discover for us what our individual aspect of Christian-

ity must be. These two are well embodied in that interesting word *sacramentum*. Familiarized to us in its English form of *sacrament*, it has a history of peculiar suggestiveness. In classical Latin it meant the military oath sworn by the soldier that he would be faithful to the Roman army and empire; but when it was taken over into the early Latin of the Church it assumed the new meaning of a mystery, the disclosure of hidden spiritual realities within or along with visible and tangible things of sense. In our partaking of the sacrament both these meanings are implied, and in all dedications of the spiritual life each of them is present.

On the one hand such a dedication necessarily involves the great loyalties. The faith of the fathers and the saints has a claim upon every dedicated spirit, and in our dedication we link ourselves on to that holy succession. "What they believed, I believe; what they hoped, I hope: whither they are arrived, by Thy grace, I trust I shall come." In these great words of Thomas à Kempis he has handed on to us a splendid formula for the expression of the supreme loyalties involved in all Christian dedication.

Yet, on the other hand, this dedication is one's own, and a man expects to perceive hidden mysteries which no one else can see as he sees them, but whose vision is always more or less determined by his own spiritual powers as well

as by his personal qualities and experience. Thus, even in the matter of belief we cannot hope to retain all the details of the creed of those fathers and saints who have gone before us. In the swift changes of thought which accompany the development of the times, and which new learning must always necessarily produce, it is necessary that the statement and interpretation of Christian truth should be elastic enough to assume the necessary changes of form. We cannot dedicate ourselves to a point of view which was possible only to those who accepted the scientific and critical conceptions of, say, the fourteenth century or the fifth. The Christianity which claims us is that upon which the light of to-day is beating; and our testimony, while it will always revere the great testimonies of the past, cannot possibly be in all details identical with any of them. As a matter of fact, there will be in a man's dedication to-day a double element. If it be as solemn and comprehending a thing as it ought to be, he will revere much that he does not literally believe; but, at the same time, he will have discovered a central core of living beliefs which mean absolutely everything to him. I remember passing through the vestibule of a large and richly built hotel much frequented by business men. In that vestibule, among many palms and other beautiful plants,

there was a collection of fine white marble statuary. The statues were reproductions for the most part of ancient Greek ones, and it was amusing to notice how these men, in a general sense prizing the beauty and the change from ordinary pursuits which the statues of that vestibule afforded them, yet passed out and in, busy upon a few vital interests of their own, not in the remotest degree connected with art of any kind. Such a vestibule is the entire creed of some men, crowded with fair but alien forms. It offers a bosky retreat for the spirit, but it has no connection with any vital interest of life. Doubtless in the creed of all men there will be such a vestibule, but the imperative thing is to discover what part of its beauty and its ideas are really vital to the life and thought of each one of us, and then to count that and that alone our living creed, to which we dedicate our lives. In some, this living core of faith still remains considerable in extent; in others it has been reduced to an extremely small number of statements. This central faith, found not now from dogma but in experience, and accepted without reserve, is at least enough for a man to live by.

2. *The Church*

Next to personal religion in a day of dedication there must recur to all loyal spirits

the thought of that organized expression of the Christian faith represented for them by the church with which they have been connected. The present time is one which should quicken all our church loyalties, and recall us to the greater thoughts of church life which have commanded the imagination of so many generations. It is a common saying that the Church has failed, and that the War has finally published that failure to the world. I have spoken elsewhere about this measureless fallacy, and I need not repeat the repudiation of a thing so obviously untrue. The church to-day is greater than she ever was before, and she retains all those possibilities of spiritual reality and effectiveness which led the apostle of old to call her by the sublime name of the Body of Christ. That body is immortal and has the power of rising many times from the tomb. It may be buried, as it has been buried time and again, in the earth of formality and superstition and the ambitions of ecclesiastical men; but it will always rise again in some form or other from the dead, with new powers for meeting the exigencies of a new day. Indeed, the church is like that temple of Philæ which stood for many centuries on its island in the Nile, and to which pilgrims came from all quarters of the land to pray to the river god for floods and harvests. It stands there still, but it is

now submerged. The raising of the waters by the great dam at Assouan has permanently and abundantly fulfilled the prayers that were offered there, and the temple has passed away in the fullness of the answer to its own prayers. So will it be with the Church of Christ. Those benefits to humanity for which the church stood long ago, in days when there was no other institution which could supply them, have been in many instances taken over by other agencies, and to that extent the church has ceased to be required. As in these instances she has been submerged in the fuller supply of her own gifts, so it may be that in the end all those spiritual blessings that she has brought to the earth will be supplied in fuller measure, and they that see the City of God will see no temple therein. But that day is still far ahead, and while man's need remains unsatisfied and his thirst unslaked, the church will ever stand upon the earth for the supply of the water of life.

While we thus disclaim the accusation that the church has failed or that it is going to fail, let us be candid in regard to those things which have suggested such a view to hostile critics. Two things especially need such attention.

(1) **Denominationalism.** In this respect the experience of the War has done a great deal toward rectifying erroneous impressions and

undue emphasis. Some men went out to the front with very strong convictions as to the exclusive validity of their own orders, and many others brought to their new experiences extraordinarily strong prejudices in favor of their own denomination. At the front they were drawn close together, and discovered, in men belonging to different churches from their own, high spiritual gifts and an obviously valid power of ministry and call to it. They saw such men at their work and felt the reality and effectiveness of much that they had formerly thought of only to criticize. Besides that, and more potent, was the fact that they and their brethren alike were standing close to the grim realities of the battlefield, the hospitals, and the innumerable graves of the dead. The reality which they felt in this was of so very different a quality from that which they had felt in the questions that had divided them previously, as in many cases to sweep away all such prejudices, and change entirely the perspective and proportion of their views. The impression left upon the minds of many of us was that the denomination to which a man belongs is ultimately a matter of temperament rather than conviction, and that all sectarian prejudice is an instance of temperament masquerading as conviction. Man's spirit is not guided by abstract principles as a rule, but

far oftener by the subtler forces of temperament, strengthened by spiritual experience. So we came to believe that there would always be, in all time, many varieties of church life and forms of worship. There seems no reason to suppose that men will ever cease to group themselves into such classes as ritualistic and non-ritualistic, or broad and narrow churchmen. And the one thing that is demanded is the widest charity in every church which will admit that there are those whom some other form of worship will suit better than that which it supplies, and will rejoice in the variety of operations of the Spirit to meet the infinitely various spiritual needs of men. Wherever it is possible we should stand not only for unity of spirit but for union of organization. Anyone can see the lamentable waste, not of money only, but of enthusiasm and effort, which is caused by the overlapping of rival churches between whose principles there is no essential difference. Thus, for the mere sake of economy, all possible unions are to be welcomed. But, on the other hand, there are matters which divide certain churches from one another which run so deep that an attempted union would only emphasize the lack of real unity. In such cases it is surely wiser that each should preserve its own individuality as a separate body of believing men. The one great demand

is for the ending of the spirit of exclusiveness. Arrogance of any sort is one of the chiefest dangers in the Kingdom or the Church of Him Who told His disciples to learn of Him because He was meek and lowly of heart: and there has been no such cause of spiritual arrogance in church history as the violent contentions of one denomination against another for the exclusive possession of the truth. It is impossible to speak too strongly about this. "*Delenda est Carthago*": and exclusive arrogance is our Carthage which must be destroyed.

(2) Efficiency. We must lay upon our conscience, above all else, the demand for efficiency in our church work and life. In order to produce and sustain efficiency it will be necessary continually to keep our eyes upon the appeal which the church is making to the men and women of the successive generations, in view of their present phases of thought and life. Especially in a time like this, when new conceptions are crowding in upon each other in every department of social, public, and private life, must it be necessary to keep revising the whole situation. There never can be a time when we shall be justified in taking our church methods and messages for granted, as things which have gone on edifying people from time immemorial, and shutting our eyes to the question whether these are bringing us

a living grasp of the problems of the present hour. The churches tend always to lapse into the somnolent life of spiritual clubs, which may be excellent places of luxury for the elect, but which have no meaning for the live world of men and women around them. A great American preacher, contrasting the hard and upright pews when he began his ministry with the luxurious sofas on which his congregation heard his later words, told them that when he began to preach there the congregation burst forth into the eager doxology, "Praise God from whom all blessings flow," while now they expressed themselves in the pathetic notes of "Art thou weary, art thou languid?" The spiritual club must always become weary and languid, but that is an abnormal thing in Christianity. The rest which Christ promises to his followers is not a still or idle rest: it is a peace that garrisons the hearts of men girded for aggressive work. Thus it behooves us to-day to clear our decks for action.

We have already spoken of this in connection with that working creed which is the essential part of our belief. Let us apply it also to the matter of organization. It has often seemed to me that the vision of Ezekiel had an interesting bearing upon the matter of church organization. In that vision the prophet saw the chariot of the Lord, and there were wheels

in it, and as it were a wheel within a wheel. We all know that chariot, and most of us have sometimes been at our wits' end to manage the complication of wheels in the church machine. The fact is that most churches have too many wheels in them, and in order to bring our church life back to reality there is a good deal that ought to be stopped. There is no harm in wheels, but then, like the prophet's, there ought to be eyes in the wheels so that the church may see whither it is going; and there ought to be the Spirit of the Lord in the wheels, that effective and purposeful Spirit which can never inhabit or direct useless machinery. Whenever any part of the church organization has become obsolete it should be cut off or changed. You may have met occasionally the ancient church member who is proud of the fact that he has been a regular attendant of the Young Men's Meeting for forty years — and is now almost its only attendant. One respects such a man for his fidelity, but wishes that he had also been granted some corresponding sense of humor. There is no virtue or advantage in perpetuating any society for a day longer than it is living and serves a definite purpose. The preliminary duty in all church organization is to clear off every piece of surplusage, and to end everything that is effete: then with keen eyes to scrutinize the present situation, to

strengthen and adapt all existing organizations which can be useful in present circumstances, and to invent new ones where they are required.

In this plea for reality we have been dealing only with outward things, but reality always includes idealism as well. Realism is the most unreal thing in the world. The high ideals which the church was created to proclaim, the essential message which she is there to tell — these are the supreme questions for her reality and her effect. If, indeed, God has broken silence and given to men in his church definite words to proclaim to their fellows, all else should be held in subordination to the full and effective proclamation of those words. This is a matter for the conscience both of minister and congregation, and we who preach should continually see to it that the thing we say is vital, and is such that we can reverently regard it as the authentic Word of the Lord. All else is of secondary importance to that; and in our rededication we should examine ourselves concerning our message, and certify our consciences that, so far as we are able to judge, it is indeed the Word of God.

3. *The Social Outlook*

In such a day as this it is imperative that we should all realize as we never did before

that no man liveth unto himself. Indeed, one of the chief effects of the War upon most men's minds has been the expansion of the idea of personality. We are personal within various circles of shorter or longer radius. The most intimate view of personality is that of the individual interests and purposes and destinies which are determined by our own personal and individual life. But there is also a personality which is determined by the conditions of home, the wider circles of friendship, of fellow-workmen, and so on; and beyond that there is the personality which is part of our society, and which is determined for each of us by the social, economic, and moral conditions of every other member of that society. We cannot separate ourselves from men, nor cease to identify ourselves with their social well-being, without ceasing to be fully personal ourselves. The hermit who cares for none of these things is a human being whose personality has shrunk. Only he who lives in the questions of his day and the common interests of mankind can claim to be in the larger sense personal.

This means, of course, that each of us is called upon to take his share in the play of thought and conscience that is operating around him. The two points at which this necessity needs to be most clearly defined are at present those of home and labor.

Many things are to-day threatening the sacredness and, indeed, the security of home life. On the one hand the changed conditions of life are leaving less time and leisure for the cultivation of the old and sacred home loyalties, and the relations between parents and children are in serious danger on that account. On the other hand the complexities of the marriage problem have given rise to many theories, and in some quarters to a very distinct propaganda, which threaten the old loyalties and tend toward a view of marriage which would make it little better than a temporary and convenient contract.

In regard to labor, amid the bewildering multitude of problems which are clamoring for solution to-day, one can clearly see one or two fundamental principles which must be included in the dedication of every Christian man.

On the one hand there is the just demand for a living wage and for equality of opportunity. By a living wage more is meant than a wage which shall be sufficient to keep body and soul together. It must include room in every life for human interests, for beauty and joy and love. Equality of opportunity, as distinct from the impossible demand for equality of possessions, means that every human being shall have a full chance of making the utmost of himself and of developing his powers.

On the other hand, justice and the welfare

of society demand protection for the government of the people by the people, and not by any section of the community. They demand that no organization in any country shall overpower the elected government of that country, or tyrannize in its own interest over the nation's liberties and rights.

These are but two examples out of a multitude which might be cited. The world at the present time is in a state of great upheaval. In wartime, strikes which hampered the fighting of men in the field and endangered their lives, taking advantage of their heroism for the selfish ends of men who stayed at home, were certainly among the most despicable phenomena of any age. But now, in the universal restlessness, amid the innumerable strikes that are taking place for any reason or for none, it has become imperative to get down to bed-rock principles. The immediate cause of the restlessness is, of course, the psychological effect of the War, with its dislocation of all ordinary ways of living and thinking. But these things are symptoms of far wider and deeper facts, and there is a widespread sense of inequality in the distribution, not only of the good things of life, but of the opportunities for living in any full and adequate sense. Now, it is impossible that Christian men can in the act of rededication avoid the responsibility for clear thinking

upon these matters. It is not enough to talk bitter generalities about Bolshevism. It is a time not for invective but for understanding. We have too long kept our minds and consciences in water-tight compartments, as if justice or love could ever be confined to any one region of human life. I know a city that is built upon several ridges of hill with deep hollows lying between them. The architects of former days bridged these hollows in order to provide a level street running from the suburbs to the center of that city. By a kind of natural gravitation the misery and crime of the city sank to its lower levels, which became a sort of moral swamp or morass, festering with the decay of human life. But many of the citizens daily crossed the arches as they went to and fro from business, and thus managed to live apart from the wretchedness which had invaded their town. That city is like too much of our modern life. We have been content if we fulfilled respectably our duties to our smaller and narrower personality, and we all have our arches which permit us to remain in ignorance of disagreeable social facts. We have our comfortable houses, and we show them to our friends with pride, saying, "My house." Not until we have gone to the meanest hovel in our town, and heard amid its misery the voice of conscience say, "This is your

house," have we faced the truth of modern life. The strike is your strike, the revolution is your revolution; and at the present day there is no hiding-place so remote or so secure as that a man with any living conscience of Christianity can take refuge in it from the call of his fellow men. Any dedication which, in a world like the present, omits all reference to social conscience and effort, will have a strange reception when it goes up to heaven as the fit offering of a man who owes his life to the blood and death and sacrifice of millions of laboring men.

4. *The International Situation*

The widest circle within which to conceive of our personality is, of course, the international one. As we shall see in a future lecture, the War has done nothing to break down the loyalties of true patriotism, but it has demanded that patriotism shall be no longer exclusive. International problems are the business of every man who is capable of reading a newspaper, and until he has included them in his dedication he cannot have in any case completed it. The points at which these affect us most directly at the present time are two:

(1) Our Duty Toward the Vanquished. The collapse of the Central European Powers, and the five years which preceded that collapse, have left many lands in a condition of the most

appalling misery that has ever been known on earth. The hunger, disease, and death that are everywhere to-day in Europe, except in one or two favored lands, are a far more clamant fact in the situation than any other that could be mentioned. We do not ask for any preference or favor to the vanquished over the others; but it is demanded from the conscience of every Christian man that he shall not eat his own bread in contentment, nor shall he dare to give thanks to God for it, until he is doing something toward the feeding of those who, by hundreds of thousands, are starving to death.

There is a further duty that we owe to the vanquished. No country will lie crushed forever; and they too, whenever they show that it is possible to trust them, must necessarily be admitted to the comity of nations. Every one who pays any attention to the facts of the case must necessarily see that this is so. Now, it is possible to pour contempt upon our fallen enemy, and to continue our reproaches so that he will become further embittered, and will secretly plan future revenges and prepare means to execute them. Those for whom your only attitude is contempt, are not likely by that treatment to be made fitter for the duties which you are already demanding of them in view of future days. The need for self-respect in the vanquished is as important almost as the

need for bread, and it were well if we were on the outlook for all opportunities of fostering it. We should welcome all expressions of a change of mind in our former enemies. We should, as soon and as far as it is possible to do so, trust them to act on different principles in the future. In the meantime this will only be possible when it is safeguarded by sufficient guarantees of good faith; but everything should certainly be done to hasten the time when that intolerable situation will be over, and we shall all be striving for a common future of human well-being.

(2) Of the League of Nations I shall speak in a future lecture, but this I shall say to-day. There are those who ask "What is the use of all this talk of Utopia, when so many people have only hovels to live in?" And the answer is that if this Utopia does not come, we shall not have even hovels to live in, but only graves. The ferocity and the extent of the devastation of human life and property in the late War are such as to make the vision of a future war more frightful than any conception of hell that has ever been imagined by man. The only thing that stands between us and that appalling outlook is some arrangement which will be effective for universal peace, and that also must enter into our dedication. It has been abundantly published by those who know the situation best, that the League cannot be

manufactured either by statesmen or experts of any kind, but that if it is ever to be operative it must be the expression of the whole conscience and opinion of the people of every land. He who in private conversation or in public speech does anything to bring this great ideal into contempt, or to discourage men from hoping in it, is taking upon himself the most serious moral responsibility that can well be imagined. Our influence may be small and our sphere narrow, yet each one of us may do his part in accustoming the public mind to think in terms of a League of Nations, and so preparing the way for the coming of such a League.

In all this lecture I have tried to suggest directions in which our rededication should be made. Let us not be satisfied with any mere expression of good dispositions, moral, political, or religious. Let us think out things all along the line, and dedicate our lives to certain clear views and definite purposes. Men and women so dedicated, and knowing what they are dedicated to, are the center and source of public opinion in every land. This clarity and determination in our thought and purpose to-day is the first duty laid upon us all. The past enjoins it, the present needs it, the unborn are waiting for it, and God trusts us that we shall not fail them.

CHAPTER II

THE RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO
PATRIOTISM

THERE are many false conceptions of patriotism, and they have done deep injury to the public life of the present time. We have all heard of the patriotism which is mere jingo, which stands for "one's own country right or wrong," and develops into blind race hatred, the fruit of ignorance and poverty of imagination. Apart from still more serious objections to this false ideal, there is the fact that it is simply provincialism. It has been well said that "the unstrained, fully realized consciousness, just as a matter of course, that the region beyond one's horizon is as rich, as colored, and as practicable, as the region that happens to be within it, is liberty." It is obvious that patriotism of the narrower sort is a most noxious vice passing itself off as a virtue. True patriotism differs from jingoism radically and completely. It has an open eye to the faults as well as to the good qualities of one's own land, to its defects as well as to its nobilities: it regards one's own land as a blessing and not a curse to other lands, and seeks to establish its

relations with the world on a basis, not of domination, but of help.

Patriotism had its origins in very distant primitive times. It began as the enlargement of home and its intimate circle. In one way or other the struggle for existence extended the family bonds to a larger number of persons, and established the family ideal on a greater scale. For purposes of war and defence, for advantages for the huntsman the agriculturist and the trader, such an extension was absolutely necessary, and gradually it spread to the tribe, the race, and the country. In the early history of civilization these larger companies of men, cemented by race affinity and common origin, had assumed such power over the imagination and thought of the individual that each man tended to regard his own country as the only object of service or of affection, while he looked askance at men of every other race. The lingering relics of this barbaric point of view are seen in the jingo patriotism of to-day.

In the world which Christ entered, those who lived in the land of Palestine were caught, as it were, among three patriotisms. First there was the Jewish, with its narrow and intense belief in itself as the only people of religion and of destiny. Then there was the Roman, which had spread through all the known

world its huge loyalty to the empire, deifying its emperors as an outward expression of the fact that the imperial idea was already divine. Besides these there was the Greek patriotism, whose empire was that of the mind, and whose loyalty was that of all cultured spirits throughout the world. Among these three rival patriotisms Jesus lived, and the general impression of his attitude is that it was singularly indifferent to them all. He entered the Jewish world at a time of fierce hatreds. The memory of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabees turned Jewish men bitterly against the Greek culture, while the memory of the more recent Roman conquest was gall and wormwood to the nation, and the whole country of Galilee was perpetually threatening new rebellions. All this was embittered by the policy of the Herods, who adopted the Greek culture and fawned upon the court of Rome. When they would fain have imposed this point of view upon the nation they were met by the stern denunciation of their subjects, who held that such friendship of the world was enmity against God. It was further embittered also by the system of publicanism, in which Jewish men became tax farmers under the Roman government, and thereby incurred the stigma of treason, which was affixed upon them relentlessly by patriotic Jews.

In the spirit of Jesus there was much that

ran counter to all this. He proclaimed himself the Son of Man, and stood aloof from petty hatreds of every kind. He refused utterly to become a partisan, and insisted on doing justice to outsiders in that land of so many bitter hatreds. He carried his independence to such a length that those who desired him as a political leader actually tried to resort to force in their attempts to make him a king. As to the Romans, he made many friendships among them, and showed no animosity to the Roman rule. He excuses his Roman judge, and understands how little he can comprehend of the situation he is there to deal with. He speaks words of highest praise to Roman centurions, and says of the soldiers who tortured him on the cross, "They know not what they do." When brought to a definite issue upon the point of tribute, he tells men to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and generally gives an impression of one whose policy it is to accept the facts of his time and country without resistance. As to the publicans, it was his friendship with them which constituted one of the chief reasons for the hatred and persecution with which he met. He saw in them not merely renegade Jews, but the bitter recklessness of the outcast, the pathos of vulgarity, and the miseries that often go with riches. Pitying them and understanding them, he

became known as the Friend of publicans and sinners. As to the Greeks, he had, indeed, nothing in common with Herodism, and his words about them that wear soft clothing are scornful and contemptuous. But it was not because they were foreign that he despised them, but because their degenerate Hellenism was so petty and so contemptible in comparison with his own ideal of the Kingdom of God. When Greeks came to visit him one can see evident traces of a mutual attraction, and the record of their conversation is one of the happiest of all the stories of his contact with men. Over all lesser loyalties, including them all in so far as they were worthy, but excluding all their bitter partisanship, there floated in his mind and imagination the great ideal of the kingdom of heaven and the brotherhood of men; and in such a time as his this necessarily demanded the weakening of lesser patriotic ideals that the higher loyalty might be supreme.

There must be added to this the recollection of the personal idiosyncrasy of Jesus. The nomad instinct was among the deepest parts of the inheritance of Hebrew men, and one can see in Jesus many traces of that detachment which is so deeply ingrained in the people of Eastern lands. When he said that "foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head,"

he spoke of that which in him was of choice rather than of necessity. Such a nature is strongly individualistic, and it was not unnatural that the first conception of Christianity was confined pretty exclusively to the personal relation of individual souls with God. In the early church this swiftly degenerated into the abuses of asceticism, which shocked the Roman conscience. Turning its back upon public duties of all kinds, it created the same problems of diminishing population (owing to the practice of celibacy), and of lives withdrawn from the service of the state, whose modern counterparts are presented by the self-indulgent practices and habits of certain classes among the wealthy.

Yet there are undoubtedly strong elements of patriotism in the thought of Jesus. To the woman of Samaria he claims that salvation is of the Jews, and is obviously ready to stand up for His own country as against all others when its distinctive rights are challenged. Nor could anything more clearly express the bitter sorrow and passionate affection of the patriot's heart than His late words about the doom of Jerusalem.

The early Christian Church presented to the world an unintelligible spectacle, and the expression of the Roman bewilderment was its accusation against the church of the hatred

of the human race. No stronger nor more sweeping charge was ever made against an institution, and it was due to the church's preference of the Kingdom of God to the kingdoms of this world. Readers of *Marius the Epicurean* will remember how in early Christianity the new Rome superseded the old imperial enthusiasm with a spiritual vision impossible for any but the initiated to understand. It is true, as Professor Dill has said, that the early Christian was a citizen of two cities. Yet the spiritual vision of the City of God was commanding, and it undoubtedly did extinguish for a time the light of the earthly vision in many souls. St. Paul himself manifested throughout his writings a significant indifference to earthly ties and associations, and this tended rather to increase than to diminish as the persecutions of the first centuries succeeded one another.

The indifference was increased also by two other causes. The first of these was the expectation of the immediate end of the world. Early Christendom lived upon tiptoe, expecting the momentary return of Christ to take over the government of the earth. To men in this mood nothing mattered very greatly except their relation with Christ; and bonds of patriotism, no less than those of the family itself, undoubtedly were much relaxed. The second

cause for the diminished hold of patriotism upon the early Christians was the identification of patriotism with the Roman gods. Roman patriotism has been defined as "loyalty to the gods who had kept by them all through their history"; and from the Roman point of view Gibbon's words are not inaccurate that "every Christian treated with contempt the superstitions of his family, his city, and his province." At first this state of mind was treated by the Roman people with incredulous astonishment. It was impossible for their minds to conceive such a point of view. But the astonishment swiftly changed to fierce resentment, and the apprehension of every imaginable danger to the state and to the world. From the point of view of the Christians, the kind of patriotism which they rejected was an intolerable bondage. By its insistence on the worship of that in which they had no belief, it refused them liberty of thought and speech and worship. Thus, as against the Roman patriotism, Christianity meant for them all that was involved in intellectual and spiritual freedom, and that glorious liberty of the children of God was dearer to them than any country, dearer even than natural ties of blood and of affection.

It would be, however, a false reading of history to say that it was the spirituality of

the early church which opposed patriotic sentiments. The two were really quite compatible, and, as a matter of fact, whenever persecutions were relaxed, patriotism was at once restored. When finally Rome was Christianized, patriotism in Christians, both in the form of loyalty to Rome itself and to their own particular town and province, immediately revived. The Christian apologists emphatically defend the attitude of Christian soldiers and citizens on this point. Christianity proved itself averse to patriotism only when loyalty to one's country was clearly anti-Christian. When that obstacle was removed in any instance, Christianity at once returned to its patriotic loyalties, enjoining all to "do their duty to the fatherland of earth, while ever mindful of the fatherland of souls."

In the subsequent development of Christianity in all the lands it conquered, the idea of a chivalrous connection between patriotism and religion was strong and constant. Rough as the forms of it may have been, yet we see it developing steadily in every land. The Wales of the Arthurian Cycle, Dante's Florence and Elizabeth's England, all reveal the noblest spirits combining the two ideals. Indeed, as regards Elizabeth, it has been noted that on her accession Protestantism became the accepted religion of the nation, so that it came to be

the duty of every loyal citizen to uphold it. Roman Catholicism thus became identified with political revolts and with the enemies of England, while Protestantism became identified with her lovers and supporters. In this instance we see patriotism taking over even the ideals of individual churches and blending with them. In the Puritan days it was the same. The Scottish Covenanters offer a brilliant and conspicuous example, and I need not remind you how deeply the two elements have blended in America, and how clear that fact has been in all the American wars.

A curious point emerges here. In many wars both sides have identified their particular patriotism with religion and Christianity. This apparent contradiction need not, however, perplex us. Each of the warring nations has a vision of certain great loyalties, including gratitude to their land for all its benefits, the sense of honor to that which is their own by birth, and all the romantic associations which have strengthened and intensified these bonds. Every one of these elements is in itself a Christian sentiment. The mistake arises in the judgment of proportion passed upon the particular causes for which the war is being waged. That is, of course, a different matter, and it does not necessarily interfere with the genuineness either of the religion or of the patriotism.

The Christianity of each nation which takes part in a war takes on special characteristics which belong to national associations. These particular features of national life and loyalty get mixed up with the larger ideal, so that everything which can claim to be patriotic seems also to be religious. It is only on such grounds as these that one can understand the utterances of so large a body of the German pastors and professors, and especially of such spiritually minded men among them as Professor Herrman of Marburg, which astonished all the thinking world during the Great War. It is to be noted that small and persecuted states have shown a special tendency to identify God with their own national fortunes, rather than with international or imperial conceptions of the world. God and God's righteousness are continually on their side. That is, righteousness as they see it and on their scale of proportions. In many cases they see it accurately and their scale is just: but it cannot be denied that sometimes they may be blind to larger international considerations, which also must be taken account of if one would form an adequate judgment.

The outstanding feature of modern public life is the rapidity with which the world has been internationally organized in recent years. Labor, science, industry, sport, foreign mis-

sions and practically all other human interests, have felt the same impulse from local to international ideals and habits of thought. In June, 1913, there was held in Brussels a Congress of International Associations, and an international monthly magazine was published which contained a list at that date of no fewer than four hundred such associations. This is one of the most important facts with which modern statesmanship has to reckon. Lord Bryce, in his address to the International Congress of Historical Studies, has said that whatever happens in any part of the world has now a significance for every other part. Abraham Lincoln expressed the same view in his day, and now it has become almost a commonplace of statesmanship.

The War has, of course, increased the meaning and the spread of internationalism to an enormous extent, and the steadily increasing rapidity of intercommunication, which has now resumed its former course after five years' interruption, will continually tend toward international *rapprochements*.

These international ideals necessarily appeal to Christianity, which, being the gospel of humanity, has always taken for one of its chief watchwords the ideal of the brotherhood of men. The modern movement is in the line of that faith which in early days transcended

all barriers separating the Gentile from the Jewish world. From the first the Christian ideal was the enthusiasm of humanity, whose obviously broad and generous theory of life has all along been adopted by intelligent Christians. In the words of Mr. J. H. Oldham, "Christianity from its very nature transcends national differences."

Such views, however, exaggerated and parodied by non-Christian political propagandists, have become definitely antagonistic to the patriotic ideal. Dr. Johnson's well-known formula that "patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel" had not been without many modern echoes whose virulence is often untempered by the doctor's wit. Many such quotations could be given. One British writer, for instance, recently stated, in recantation of his former doctrines, that he would prefer an invasion of Great Britain to the coming in of Universal Service. Another writer quotes Maude's book on Tolstoy to the effect that patriotism is like a suit of armor put on by a young man, which no longer fits him in his maturity, and that it is already a gigantic superstition which is fast becoming a hypocrisy. We are told that it obscures our vision, burdens our belief, causes blood to flow in torrents, and has become a perennial spring of hatred, malice, and evil-speaking. Finally we are assured that our

welfare lies in the unification and brotherhood of men, that the superstitions which divide men must be destroyed, and that among these superstitions none is worse than patriotism. The net result and impression of all this, after we have allowed for exaggeration and heat, is that patriotism must be considered as old-fashioned, a virtue long out of date and hopelessly behind the times.

Yet, after all this is said, we cannot but remember that the main work of Christianity is the redemption of human nature in its completeness, and that it is the protector rather than the destroyer of human instincts. All the troubles and dangers of society in the past have been due to what Matthew Arnold calls "the undue preponderance of single elements." Noble causes which have seen the world with but too single an eye, have ignored and assailed elements on the other side which were equally true to human nature, and by doing so have sealed their own doom. The mark of Jesus Christ is his insistence upon the completeness of our manhood. If crushed, instinct tends to become gangrenous, and to corrupt and poison the whole system of the body politic. Out of every clash of social ideals Christianity in the end emerges, larger than the particular emphasis of the hour, for the preservation of the perpetual human elements, some of which are

always threatened by violent temporary reactions. I believe that the corporate spirit as embodied in the nation is one of those perpetual elements, and that Christianity will ultimately be found defending and not assailing it. That it is an instinct which has a very deep hold upon normal human nature will hardly be denied by any of its critics. The response which the publication of *The Man Without a Country* drew forth in America and Britain was very remarkable, and these sentiments still hold their own. There is something in us all, or at least in almost all, which justifies Scott's famous lines about a man's sentiments toward "his own, his native land." A curious instance occurred some years ago, in which a man of education and good social standing found himself for some trivial offense suddenly within the cognizance of the police. He told afterward the story of his feeling when the policeman's hand touched his shoulder to claim him. The sudden revolution which occurred within him upset the very foundations of his life, and he perceived as in a vision the significance of the fact that his own nation had turned against him. To be in prison in a foreign country may be an inconvenience, or a jest, or even an honor; but when your own land judges you adversely, when all that you have honored and held dear casts you out, the consequent de-

spair reveals suddenly the grip of the patriotic instinct upon the heart. For "the country is in itself an entity. It is a Being. The Lord God of Nations has called it into existence, and has placed it here with certain duties in defense of the civilization of the world." These words remain permanently true. No nation can afford to do without this sentiment, and no man can afford to do without it. The man without a country, presenting a spectacle of one poor individual pitted against a century of the life of the United States of America, will remain to the end of time significant.

It may be replied that the instinct of patriotism is irrational. Why be loyal to this land in particular? Other lands may be greater than our own, with larger opportunities, more spiritual aspirations, and more effective organization. Why should we not choose the land which is best all round, in these and other respects, and call that our country? Let us admit for the time being that the instinct is irrational. I am by no means on the side of those who of recent years have originated what might almost be called a cult of irrationality, but one has to remember that these writers have been taken seriously. Benjamin Kidd, in his *Social Evolution*, made so strong an attack upon the practice of putting one's faith in

reason as to force the thinking world to revise its whole conception of the relation of reason to faith. Now, the main point of Kidd's book is that religion depends always upon irrational sanctions, and that its demands, which it always has been able to enforce upon faith and conscience, are ultra-rational in their appeal. Personally I am far from subscribing to this doctrine in its entirety, but there is no question whatever as to the importance of that which is entirely beyond the scope of reasoning, in determining conduct and establishing principles of faith. We are asked why we should give our loyalty and devotion to this land in particular, and the answer is simply because it is *our* land. The same thing is true in regard to the family. Why should we be loyal to this particular man because he happens to be our father, or set this particular child who happens to be our own child above the children of other people in our esteem? It is not that these are absolutely the best persons in the world, for there may be other fathers or other children whose moral character is superior to theirs. Nor can we justify our preference by the belief that these are the wisest, or the cleverest, or the kindest of parents and children. The obvious answer that we make to the whole perplexity is, "This father is your father and this child is your child." Nature has assigned

these and no others to you as your parent or your child. Your loyalty to them may be as irrational as anybody likes to call it, but it is a fact, and it will never cease to be a fact while your human nature remains sound and normal. Certain extreme forms of Socialistic theory have ignored this, and pressed their rationalism to the length of the subversion of the family ideal. In much recent literature about marriage problems and all that these involve in connection with the family, there has been a tendency to revolt from all the old loyalties and to subordinate the security of homes to the convenience and pleasure of individuals. Mr. Chesterton's well-known answer is summed up in three words, "loyalty to life." There could not be a better expression of that instinct, which cuts through all sophistries however plausible, and appeals to wholesome natures, apart altogether from reasons that can be given and argued.

If this be so, patriotic and family loyalty is not irrational after all. If it is a deep and essential element in human nature, which asserts itself independently of any reasoning *pro* or *con*, then we may take it for granted that deep and essential reasons ultimately will be found. Nature is very wise and in the end is sane, and she can give a reason for the faith which she asks men to place in her. We shall

now turn to some of those reasons which lie behind patriotic loyalty.

1. The Larger Cosmopolitan Brotherhood is too large a unit for all the purposes which it requires to serve. We admit its claims so far as they go, and we admit the advantage of a wider outlook than that of mere family and country, and the duty of a sense of brotherhood with all the world. We admit also that to the end there will be a state of unstable equilibrium and necessary compromise between the larger and smaller ideals which we shall find ourselves compelled to cherish. As Matthew Arnold has pointed out, each nation is in need of elements which abound in some other nation, and the narrow kind of patriotism which would refuse all such accessions to our national inheritance would be a wanton impoverishment of the spirit. Besides all this, we simply cannot escape the wider brotherhood even if we would. Historically, the touch of one nation with another has always been the meeting place of various streams of ideas; and the blended stream has flowed from that point, not only richer for the contact, but vitalized by it and fuller than the sum of the two national streams that met. Our British patriotism, for instance, involves loyalty to at least ten different national ideals, for it is extraordinarily composite, and retains elements of everything that went to its making.

All this tends to the necessary cosmopolitanism which must exist in every rightly balanced mind. Yet that wider unit can never take the place of or expel our loyalty to the nation. It has been proved abundantly by experience that there is a point beyond which the expansion of loyalties simply will not work. There are certain limits within which our human forces have to be confined if they are to be effective for practical ends. Beyond these limits the forces grow diffuse and futile. If you have so much water and no more, you may send it down the valley in a narrow channel or allow it to expand into a broad lagoon, but in the one case you will be able to utilize it for practical purposes which you wish to achieve, while in the other case it will accomplish nothing. All ideals of every kind have their limits within which alone they can work effectively, and the worst enemies of each ideal are those who try to push it beyond its limits and expect it to do effective work so.

Of altruism this is notoriously true. As a matter of fact, one does not love one's fellow men with any great intensity unless these are in the nearer groups. A railway accident near our home will cause profound emotion in almost everybody, but we read without any such emotion of a similar railway accident which has happened to take place on the other

side of the world, in a country which we have never seen and with which we have no personal connection. To love one's fellow men as such is indeed a Christian commandment, but it has required the whole strength of men's personal attachment to Christ to make it possible to obey that commandment, and it has been well said that it is only for His sake that one is able to do it at all. To love our neighbor as ourself is apt to be nothing more than a pious generality, and the young man's question, "Who is my neighbor?" is eminently pertinent. Christ has given an incalculable increase to men's power of imagining, and has flung the horizon of our sympathies far out beyond its former limits; yet the facts remain, and all the most important work of humanitarianism is done, not on the circumference, but near the center. The strength and patience and loyalty with which we can face the wider problems depend mainly upon the intenser feelings which we experience in the regions nearest to the individual.

First in intensity comes the marriage bond, which still remains the ultimate basis of all other fidelities. Next to that there is the loyalty to one's family and friends, known to the Romans as *pietas*; and, third, there is our feeling to our own land and the patriotic traditions and loyalties upon which that feeling

rests. These are human nature at the heart of it. By these chiefly human society stands or falls, and by forcing out the bond further afield one is apt to find that all the loyalties are growing weaker. In a word, these three loyalties are the source from which the force for the wider enterprise of cosmopolitanism is supplied. It is a very interesting fact in illustration of this statement that the most successful missionaries have generally been exceptionally patriotic men and women. One has only to read the lives of such men as Livingstone, Mackinnon of Damascus, or Stewart of Lovedale, to realize how true this is.

The danger of neglecting this bed-rock fact of human nature is that of importing into our public life the element of *ὕβρις*, that insolence, or presumptuous disregard of the facts of nature, which goes with an eye fixed only on far-off things. He that loveth not the nation which he hath seen, how shall he love the nations which he hath not seen? He cannot love them. He can let his imagination indulge itself among them, but he will always be more or less of a spiritual tourist, without those responsibilities which attach to his immediate neighborhood. It is by bearing the actual and obvious responsibilities of his life that a man's disposition will be tempered and trained so as to be able rightly to cope with further and wider

ones. The only true fire of altruistic enthusiasm burns from within outward. Thus our argument is that cosmopolitanism is too big and vague an ideal for practical purposes. It tends to a cheap and easy humanitarianism, which is generally ineffective. Humanity at large does not mean much to any of us, and does not ask much from us. But our own land does ask much — it asks very many and very definite things. He who disparages patriotism in favor of the larger unit may very well find that, consciously or unconsciously, his transference of loyalty involves the shirking of definite responsibilities. In other words, our good feeling toward mankind in general must begin somewhere, and it will be always wisest and soundest when it begins near home and not at the antipodes, among the men we know best and not those we know least.

It may be added that this has been proved on many occasions to be historically true. Greece produced her best art in the time of her narrow patriotic enthusiasms. Afterward, in the days of a wider and more diffused culture, her originality died out. The intense loyalty of the early Roman days is another example. When she achieved world-wide empire Rome had indeed seized upon an idea of unparalleled magnificence, but even that sublime idea proved itself unable to keep her loyalties alive.

2. A second argument for the rationality of patriotism is the consideration that patriotic loyalties are, in the last analysis, neither more nor less than the repayment of lawful debts. This is a point of view which cannot be ignored, because it is this which best defines Christian patriotism and reveals its special qualities. The past has done much for us, and the only way of discharging our debt to the past is to pay it over to the future. A large part of this debt is due to our own land and must be paid to that land. This, as it seems to me, is not in the least irrational. The debt is not an affair of fantastic honor, but of plain and common honesty which no one can afford to avoid or neglect. In four different ways this debt may be detailed:

(1) Your land has fought for you. Even the shortest tour that we take in any of the older lands conducts us from battlefield to battlefield where men have laid down their lives in multitudes as the price that had to be paid for the freedom and prosperity which are the inheritance of their successors. This debt must be paid, not in vain boasting about the glory of ancient battles, but in the acceptance of discipline as the law of our own life. We hold our liberties, our comforts, and our very selves, from hands that were wet with blood when they passed them on to us. There has been

of late years a very distinct tendency toward that worship of comfort which demands that everything shall be made easy for everybody, and the love of pleasure was certainly tending to soften the fiber of human nature. Lord Morley has expressed this in memorable words: "Far the most penetrating of all the influences that are impairing the moral and intellectual nerve of our generation . . . with new wealth come luxury and love of ease, and that fatal readiness to believe that God has placed us in the best of all possible worlds, which so lowers men's aims and unstrings their firmness of purpose. Pleasure saps high interests, and the weakening of high interests leaves more undisputed room for pleasure." The Great War has indeed put a fearful check upon any such tendency, but one must remember that in the reaction after great wars there is always a special danger of falling deeper into those evil ways which the war for the time has reversed. Not in the war only, but to the end of time, it remains true that there is no royal road which leads anywhere worth getting to, and that the flowery paths of life are always apt to end in the eternal bonfire. Thomas Carlyle's demand for obedience will never cease to find an answer in the consciences of wise men: "Were your superiors worthy to govern and you worthy to obey, reverence for them were even your only

possible freedom." Not in the army only, but all along the line of life, there will be places in which imposed and unchallenged discipline will be necessary. There is no inherent objection to blind obedience. Until a man is competent, his obedience cannot be too blind. No man has any right to hold any position he cannot occupy for the public good, nor to enjoy any privilege he cannot use for the public benefit.

In fact, the first need is not to enjoy oneself or to assert one's rights; it is to find oneself, and that can be done only through discipline and many defeats. We soon discover that we cannot all be firsts, and he who does not love his work well enough to do his very best in the second place or the third is no true patriot. To take a licking and wait your time is the mark of a wise pupil in the school of life. Such discipline seems to be the only way in which we can make any presentable return to a land that has fought for us on many fields.

(2) Your land has educated you. In my own country of Scotland we know all about that. It is a land where the parish schools have had their "lads o' pairts"; where fishermen will discuss intelligently the high politics of the day while they mend their nets; where your plowman will talk philosophy to you, and your gardener discuss evolution, and your gravedigger expatiate upon predestination; where the

diker, building or repairing the walls between the fields, will take from his pocket at meal-times his Latin grammar, or will read theology in the dark of the evening by the light of a knotted fir branch. Scotland has been rooted and grounded in knowledge. Its education has not been merely a cramming with facts, for it has been taught to think. Its education has not been a thing plastered on to it from the outside, but has been the expression of its inner self, springing from a sense of personal worth, and an impulse to communicate its gifts to others. America may justly make an equal claim.

How shall we pay our debt to such a land? Obviously, the first answer must be that if in the past she has struggled toward education in such fashions as those just mentioned, the least we can do is to accept our inheritance of education and be educated. Our land has written; what do you and I read? She has striven in the sweat of her brow toward knowledge; how much and how thoroughly do we know? But we cannot pay our debt to our land by any theoretical education. Efficiency is demanded of us, all along the line of labor. We should be impatient of all policies of "muddle through," which have cost some of us so dear in the last five years, and should insist for ourselves and others upon good work-

manship as the first demand of industry, regarding all questions of payment as means toward the grand end of excellent productivity. Lord Rosebery has said that "a man who breaks stones on the road is, after all, serving his country in some way. He is making her roads better for her commerce and her traffic." And if a man asks himself sincerely and constantly the question, "What can I do, in however small a way, to serve my country?" he will not be long in finding an answer. These words remind us of the familiar lines of Robert Burns:

"A wish that to my latest hour
 Will strongly heave my breast,
 That I for puir old Scotland's sake
 Some useful plan or book might make,
 Or sing a sang at least."

To be ashamed of cheap success, and to heighten our standard of what success in life really means, to remember that "the demands of our God are hard on every human candidate for a career" — these things are included in the honest payment of our debt to our land.

(3) Your land has suffered for you. The words of Robert Louis Stevenson are perhaps not too strong, when he said of Scotland: "Poverty, ill-luck, enterprise and constant resolution are fibers of the legend of this coun-

try's history. The heroes and kings of Scotland have been tragically fated. The most marking incidents in Scottish history — Flodden, Darien, or the '45 — are still either failures or defeats; and the fall of Wallace and the repeated reverses of the Bruce combine with the very smallness of the country to teach, rather, a moral than a material criterion for life." What is so pre-eminently true of Scotland is in its degree true of every country. In large measure all men owe their lives to the pain of their motherland, and spring to life in their own generation out of centuries of struggle, self-denial, and suffering.

The only way of paying this particular debt must be by relieving suffering as it still remains around us. We cannot go back through the centuries and minister to the dead; but we who are what we are by reason of their pain, nobly endured, must find their heirs in those around us who are suffering to-day. The miseries of any land are the worst enemies of patriotism. They have in the past called it forth, and produced much of the finest history in doing so; but that is no excuse for any generation permitting them still to torture fellow human beings unrelieved. The sweet uses of adversity are the business of Providence; the business of man is ever to end or to mitigate adversity. In our time this is notoriously true. We all know the magnificence of the response that the

working men of the Allied Nations made to the call of the Great War, but it is only some of us who realize that in many of our works and factories there is a strong feeling that the workers have nothing to defend, a feeling which is sapping the very life of patriotism. Lord Curzon not long ago in weighty words expressed this: "You cannot run an empire on empty stomachs. You cannot sustain an empire with discontented citizens. You cannot preach an empire to poverty-stricken homes. If you wish to call upon the patriotism and idealism of the people, you must consider how to make things easier for them in the conditions of their everyday life." The same truths hold of a republic.

(4) Your land has believed. Great battles have been fought in every country upon religious causes. It is easy to see the grotesqueness of some of these, and the wild exaggeration of the importance of certain of the points fought for, yet the root of it all was faith; and, however exaggerated its expression, the priceless thing that is to be found in the past is the great convictions by which men lived. Truths were dearer than advantages; truth was more precious than life.

In asking how this debt may be paid back, we are faced with the question, What are *your convictions and mine?* What are we willing to

live for without compromise and without questioning? For faith is ultimately at the root of all social problems, as it is also at the root of character. It is faith which makes the struggle seem permanently worth while, and it is faith alone in which a land will ultimately remain great. Thus patriotism, while it does not necessarily involve the perpetuity of an ancient national creed, yet does absolutely demand that every true citizen shall retain from the past, and express in his own fashion, a sufficient bed-rock of conviction to enable him to build upon it a worthy house of life. The words of Browning are preeminently applicable:

“ Here and here did England help me; how can I help
England? say.

Whoso turns as I, this evening, turn to God to praise
and pray.”

These, then, are the ways in which it is fitting that we should repay our debt to the past; but while we are making such repayments it is impossible for anyone to throw off the thought of how they came to be due. They belong to the direct line of our country's history; and the noblest men in any country do these things and cultivate such character, not merely as men at large, but as men of a certain land which has laid upon them definite bonds of honor to act in these ways.

CHAPTER III

INDIVIDUAL AND NATIONAL MORALITY

BENEATH the obvious ethics of the late situation — the broken treaty with Belgium, the atrocities committed under the name of frightfulness, and the Pan-German policy of empire, with its imposition of German *kultur* upon less favored nations — there is one fundamental difference of opinion. The extreme advocates of pacificism applied the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount with rigorous literalness to the situation between the warring nations, and denied that there is any distinction between individual and national morality. The Prussians, on the other hand, founded their whole polity on that distinction. Their argument practically was: "The laws of morality are different for nations from those which govern men as individuals. We are, in this war, acting as a nation. Therefore we need have no respect for moral law, and can do anything we please." The choice between these two positions is a grim one, and the problem of finding a trustworthy *via media* is certainly one of the most difficult tasks in casuistry that has ever been presented to man.

For the Prussian expression of it we might quote many well-known passages from Bernhardt's book, *Germany and the Next War*, which presented in a popular form the philosophy which dominated the national mind. Bernhardt sometimes hesitates to carry his principles to their full length. Yet the general argument is quite clear. For the state the one virtue is power, the one sin feebleness. Therefore, in the end, everything is right which gives or increases national power. Thus the argument merges all morality for a nation in the one great end of war, namely, success.

By the way, Bernhardt quotes and founds upon Machiavelli. Machiavelli is on much surer ground. He is emphatically not hampered with a conscience. *The Prince* is secure from all questions of right or wrong. They never once occur to him. He is detached as the wind — the heartless wind which overturns navies, or cleanses cities from the plague. Taking for his fundamental belief the baseness of man, he goes on through long stretches of dispassionate immorality to state his case: "Therefore a prince cannot, nor ought he, to keep faith when any such observance may be turned against him." "It is necessary for a prince, wishing to hold his own, to know how to do wrong, and to make use of it or not according to necessity." And so on.

If Henry Morley's explanation be correct,¹ surely we have here one of the most remarkable of the ironies of history. According to him, Machiavelli wrote it all in satire. Personally, he was and remained a man keeping faith, loyal and poor all his life, living decently in the country with his wife and five children. He wrote for the corrupt Lorenzo an account of what a man like Lorenzo, wholly void of principles, should be and do, if he "would be master of his country's liberties, and would confound all duties of the children of men in the one object of self-aggrandizement." If this be so, truly there must have been much laughter of the gods in the time of the Seven Years' War.

But this is beside the point. The Prussians appear to have accepted Machiavelli frankly and in all seriousness, as the authority upon national as contrasted with individual morality. If Bernhardt could not always go with him all the way, there were plenty of others who could and did. The weakness of German thinking before the war was exaggeration. It saw one principle and carried it out ruthlessly to such lengths that its truth became a lie. It did not see it in its relations, nor in the light of any modifying considerations. But the world is not made so simply as that. It is very complex.

¹ See his introduction to Machiavelli's *History of Florence*.

In view of the havoc wrought by this exaggeration, it was inevitable that some of those who felt the savagery of it all should be tempted to go to the opposite extreme. Nothing could be more natural than the simple reversion to the Sermon on the Mount as the final solution for all such difficulties. Take that as the Christian law for nations under the present and all other possible periods, and you at once end all controversy. But this also is too simple a policy, and it involves the misunderstanding not of the Sermon on the Mount alone but of the whole mind and speech of Jesus. Those who adopt it are holding the sword of the Spirit by the blade and not by the hilt. Jesus was essentially a poet. When one says that, some people are apt to shake their heads, as if there were an antithesis between poetry and truth. There is indeed an antithesis between the poetic and the pedantic view of things, and in poetry literalism can never be at home. The sensitive delicacy of thought and feeling which characterizes a poet's vision of things is always liable to perversion by the meticulous. It is impossible for some persons to understand anything otherwise than in minute literalness, and there seems to be no argument that will convince such minds. Christianity has suffered many things from such literalists. For want of allowance for the poetic element in Christ's speech,

many who accepted his words literally have found themselves continually being led down blind alleys, and filled with the discouragement of constant and inevitable failure. Others, rejecting his words upon the same fallacy of literalism, have passed by the whole teaching of Christ as doctrinaire and in the clouds. The fact is that life is too complex for language, and that the poet's exaggeration is the only way in which some truths can be expressed at all. This being so, it is a perfectly justifiable policy to state one side of a truth so vividly, strongly, and exclusively, as to make sure that it at least will never be forgotten, and to trust the intelligence of readers and hearers to understand.

Thus, in the familiar parable, the mustard seed is described as the least of all seeds, but, in order to vindicate the veracity of Jesus, it is not necessary to search for some unheard-of variety of mustard seed which is smaller than the spore of ferns. The dogma of Transubstantiation was invented by literalists because Jesus, before His death, said of the bread at the last supper, "This is my body." When we are told to take no thought for food or clothes or any of the exigencies of tomorrow, and when non-resistance is enjoined upon us concerning property and violence, one sees the vision of an ideal world appearing, towards which the spirit must ever strive to approach, but which

cannot be completely entered here. It is a world of things rich and strange, which draws men after it, saving them as they follow on. But the words in which alone it can be expressed are not the words of this world's usage. Other sayings there are, such as that which lays down the hatred of father and mother as a necessary condition of discipleship, which must be regarded as detonating words whose object is to stir men's thought and imagination, rather than literal injunctions involving the reversal of any possible standards of human life.

The literal appeal to the Sermon on the Mount rests on the ignoring of one great fact. That fact is that, in the present condition of human society, public and national moral standards are lower than those of private individuals. Not only are they lower, but they must and ought to be lower, if we are to deal justly with the situation. This fact has been expressed crudely and objectionably. Bishop Magee's saying is well known, that "it is not possible for the state to carry out all the precepts of Christ. A state that attempted to do so could not exist for a week." Mr. Lecky's words are not less forcible: "In practical politics public and private morals will never absolutely correspond. . . . In different nations [the national code] is higher or lower, but it will never be the exact code on which men act in

private life. It is certainly widely different from the Sermon on the Mount." Such statements taken by themselves are inaccurate and misleading, yet they are the attempt to express forcibly a view which is obviously correct. This is the view which Mr. Fielding Hall also expresses in his saying that "the government is always behind the soul of a people." It is this fact, startling as it may be to many, which we must face directly to-day, if we are to arrive at any helpful teaching for the present and the future situation. Let us, then, first of all glance at a few of the more important reasons which may be adduced in favor of it.

1. Public and national morality must be fixed mainly in accordance with the standard of the average man. National morality is expressed in legislation, and it is evident that just and stable legislation must represent the mind and will of the majority of the people. This is one of the axioms of democratic government. But this means that legislation can never represent the highest ideals of the highest men in a nation. It can only represent the conscience of the average man. To force it, by introducing into the statute book laws by which the saints of a land try to govern themselves, is always and utterly impossible. It is unjust to the majority of the citizens, and in this case the paradox is true — *summa jus summa injuria*.

In practice, any legislation which could thus be forced upon a nation would be morally as well as politically disastrous.

This becomes clear when we remember that in every nation, as things actually stand, there are three classes:

(A) The idealists and saints.

(C) The criminals and moral degenerates.

(B) Between these two, and forming in every nation the vast majority, there is the middle class, average man, representing many shades of opinion and practice, higher and lower. In an autocratic or bureaucratic state, legislation is forced upon the majority, and if those in power choose to have it, so they may enforce the laws of the idealist. Yet this will always be regarded as tyrannical, and such government will never be secure. In a democratic state such legislation would not only be tyrannical, it would be impossible. For the majority make the laws, and idealistic laws are above the average man's present capacity, above his convictions, above what he understands, and consequently above his will. If, by some *coup d'etat*, catch vote, or other such chance circumstance, laws of this kind are passed, the result will necessarily be pernicious. Good and stable government must have behind it the conscience of the nation. There is no greater curse than that of enforced ideals. They lead directly to

all manner of fraud and abuse. They corrupt legislation by making it impossible to carry it out.

Illustrations to enforce this argument are to be found on all hands. On the largest scale you have the tragic spectacle of those nations which have of recent years attempted forms of government which were in advance of the national stage of moral progress. Turkey, Persia, and Russia introduced parliamentary government before they were ready for it, and in each case it has been a notorious failure. China has been experimenting in republican government, as yet with like result. In regard to morals, the huge experiment of prohibition in the United States only became possible after long-continued and graduated experiment in individual States, whose results convinced the majority that the prohibition law was desirable.

In this I am referring chiefly to normal conditions in a time of peace. In the stress of war much that is abnormal may become necessary for the time being, and such measures as the suspension of the rules of trades unions, and conscription itself, may be legitimately enforced. But these and other such laws can only be enforced in wartime in virtue of the fact that the country has for the time surrendered its right of judgment to those whom it has trusted with the management of the war. It is will-

ing for the stress of the moment to obey their judgment implicitly, but when the war is over it resumes its own right of legislation. Of course enforced temporary legislation may make discoveries, and may so commend its enforced laws to the general conscience that they will become permanent by vote of the nation afterward, and this will be one of the best fruits of any war. Still, the general principle is true, that in normal conditions the only legitimate standard of legislation is the will, not of the elect, but of the majority, the average man.

2. The nation is the trustee for its individual citizens. "It is probable," says Lecky, "that the moral standard of most men is much lower in political judgments than in private matters in which their interests are concerned." "It is always hazardous to argue from the character of a corporation to the characters of the members who compose it." "Large bodies," says Macaulay, "are far more likely to err than individuals. The passions are inflamed with sympathy; the fear of punishment and the sense of shame are diminished by partition. Every day we see men do for their faction what they would rather die than do for themselves. It is the nature of parties to retain their original enmities far more firmly than their original principles." Certainly, all boards, commit-

tees, public companies — not excluding church courts — tend to act upon a standard lower than that of the private individuals who compose them.

Macaulay has adduced for this fact the lower set of reasons, but there are also higher reasons. The trustee is bound by obligations from which the individual is free. Take, for example, the question of armaments. Nobody can fail to see the extravagant waste which these involve. Yet that waste has been enforced upon the nations as trustees of the safety of their citizens. It may be quite legitimate for an individual, obeying what he understands to be the highest law, to talk of putting himself in a defenseless position, and taking the risk. But the nation is the trustee of all its institutions, of all its men, women, and children. It cannot act with the same freedom as the individual possesses, for such action may involve the betrayal of the trust committed to it, and no crime is greater than the betrayal of such a trust. In such cases there sometimes will rise the clash of two consciences—the conscience which would make us as individuals surrender everything rather than fight for our rights, and the conscience which demands that we shall protect those whose defense has been intrusted to our charge. Surely it is evident that the latter conscience is that which should prevail.

For we are here confronted with the whole question of rights, and the morality of insisting or declining to insist upon them. The individual may find that his highest ideal of conduct leads him to renounce his rights in certain given circumstances. But it does not follow that a nation is justified in following a similar course. The nation is the guardian and trustee of the individuals whose fate depends upon its action. We are commanded to turn our own cheek to the smiter, not the cheeks of those whose guardians we are pledged to be. To demand that a Christian nation ought not to claim its rights and to insist upon them is an utterly immoral demand.

3. National morality is necessarily clogged by tradition. It must move slowly, because of the accumulated complexity of the legislative machinery, and the far-reaching relations of each enactment with ancient institutions involving innumerable individual cases. The individual is free, as the nation is not, to think out things for himself, to throw off custom and tradition, and to follow what new lines of guidance appeal to him as right. In this case it is well that the nation is thus hindered. At the present time we have a large number of clever and influential individuals thinking and writing rather wildly. The nation may be far behind the best of these in progressive morality, but

at least its immobility is a defense against much dangerous and irresponsible experimenting. When men rush at high speed from one phase of morals to another, and write books in advocacy of each phase as they pass through it, it is just as well, for instance, that the marriage laws of England, unsatisfactory and unintelligent as some of them are, nevertheless are slow to change. The complications of state legislation in America offer an interesting and relevant example here. Everybody knows the variety of local laws in the United States, which makes it extremely difficult for anyone crossing the continent to be sure that at all times he is keeping the commandments. Yet there is a very high value in this somewhat extraordinary state of matters, if we regard America as a great laboratory of legislation, out of whose countless experiments there will come moral wisdom for the future.

4. By far the most important reason for the point for which I am arguing has still to be mentioned. It is the distinction between The State and states. I believe that it is loose thinking round about this particular point which is responsible for most of the confusion and much of the error which have characterized the discussion of this subject. Writers and speakers have been in the habit of talking about "The State" as if it were an entity as

clearly defined and as definitely understood as the individual. It has been supposed that "The State has no determinate function in a larger community, but is itself the supreme community, the guardian of the whole world and not a factor within an organized moral world." From this it is but a step to Bernhardt's position, that while the individual is responsible to the state, the state, being the highest social unit, is responsible to no one, but demands the utmost service and sacrifice from all individuals.

The usual reply which has been made to this by Christian opponents is the question, — "Is there, then, no God to whom The State is ultimately responsible?" But that is not the matter at present before us. All such theory as this which we have quoted ignores the fact that The State, about whose powers and relations so much controversy has been waged, is a conception of purely imaginary existence. As a matter of fact, there is no such thing as The State except in the minds of theorists. The State for each man is really a state, namely his own nation and its government — Germany for the Germans, Britain for the British, America for the Americans. Public morality means for each individual the law of his own particular nation. There are other nations, some of them in rivalry with

his own, and there is always the possibility of these rival national interests and principles bringing the world into a welter like the present.

It is easy to say, "Let all such rivalries cease." But in dealing with rival states the problem is unfortunately more complex than that which arises between individuals. It is the duty of the individual to be friendly, humane, and generous to all; and he may find it to be his duty to sacrifice himself for his friend, or even for his enemy. But no such law of sacrifice can justly be applied to states. That is where all those are in error who, either in America or in England or elsewhere, have advocated the policy of throwing down defenses, abolishing navies, disbanding armies, and trusting to God. It is easy to be rhetorical about the nobility of perishing in such a cause, if matters came to the worst; but the fallacy which underlies the whole argument is precisely that of regarding sacrifice as a noble thing for a nation in the same way as it may be for an individual. Sacrifice for a nation may simply be breach of trust. The nation's first duty is to defend its people and their interests against the cupidity, fraud, or violence of other states. Carried to an un-intelligent extreme this view of national morality will give you on the one hand the German maxim, "Live dangerously"; on the other

hand it will be expressed in such proposals as those made to the effect that German trade shall after the war be excluded from all markets of the world. No one is likely ever again to adopt the former proposal seriously. As to the latter, the futility of that ought to be apparent. Germany is a living national force demanding expansion. If you screw down the lid upon that boiler the future question is only one of time — the explosion is certain.

But these extremes do not falsify the principle which they exaggerate. While no state can be permitted to tyrannize over another state in such fashions as these, in virtue of its stronger power — that is, while there are limits beyond which the rivalry of nations must not be allowed to go — yet that rivalry is a legitimate and necessary fact which must be reckoned with in discussing national morality. The morality of The State is and must be the morality of *a* state, part of whose moral obligations is to hold its own against other states. This is necessarily a lower standard of morality than that of the individual, who is, if he chooses to be so, free from such obligations.

The sum of this whole argument is the proposition that the standards of public morality are necessarily lower than those of individual morality, for these four reasons:

- (1) The state must legislate for the average

man and not for the highest man, in order to carry out its essential principle that legislation must be the expression of the conscience and the will of the majority.

(2) The state, being the trustee of its individual citizens, must make the protection of their rights its first duty.

(3) The state, being bound by traditions from which the individual is free, has not the same powers of immediate action in new directions.

(4) The State is really *a* state, whose obligations are not those of private morality, but are defined partly by its relations to other states and its duty of defending the rights of its citizens against their aggression.

All this must be taken into account when we are considering the present demand that we must Christianize the social order and bring the whole domain under the rule of Christ. To that demand every Christian must consent, but it must also be remembered that that demand does not and cannot mean that precisely the same rules can at the present moment be applied to the public as to the private problems of life.

Well, let us face this situation. Here is the state, whose moral standards are necessarily lower than those of its best individuals and which is nevertheless invested with an

authority over these as well as over all others of its citizens. This authority is real, and admittedly legitimate and necessary. Without such authority the life of the community would be impossible, for its function is to insure justice, peace, and protection to the individual citizen and to defend his rights. But he who expects political and social benefits is bound to expect along with them corresponding political and social obligations. We cannot all have our own way independently, or else everything would at once fall into anarchy and chaos. Each must sacrifice something of what he considers to be the best way if there is to be corporate life at all. He may hold that the morality imposed upon him by the state is not so high as to reach his own individual standard, but it is in general his duty to work with it loyally, though for him it is but a second best. While he is accepting protection and other state benefits, it is in general his duty to be loyal to the state. He has, indeed, many other loyalties — to his party, his class, his trade union, etc., each in its own province — but he is immediately and primarily subject to the state, and must count that the first authority. The state cannot, indeed, control or alter his principles, but it can determine his actions. When his ideals are higher than the state's, he may still hold these, work for the propaga-

tion of them, and do all he can to leaven public opinion so that the state will ultimately adopt them. But meanwhile it is his duty in practice to subordinate private opinion to loyal service to the state.

It is true that this obligation has its limits. On all questions of freedom in religious faith and confession, the battle has been fought out and won for the individual conscience. But beyond that there is a wide region within which the state may legitimately impose its inferior morality upon the higher individual conscience. A recent author has said that Christianity demands that no man do anything of which his conscientious judgment is not persuaded. This statement, however, undoubtedly needs qualification. A man may be persuaded that the drink traffic and war are immoral, and yet may be living in a land where he is forced to enjoy state benefits which are paid for by the customs and excise, and the protection of an army for whose maintenance he pays taxes. These are but two out of many instances in which the public welfare demands the subordination of private views. We all have to work under many conditions which we would change if we had power to do so. Without that power, which rests on public opinion, any breaking off or mutiny is dangerous and may imperil the state. Open rebellion is justified

only in cases where it has sufficient backing to give it a reasonable chance of success; without such a chance it is simply murder and suicide. Private isolation is always dangerous, in that it weakens the general authority of the state. An individual confronted with such an alternative must always ask, Which is the greater injury and wrong, to fall in with a course which I as an individual would not feel myself at liberty to take, or to injure or imperil the larger interests by disaffection? This is an entirely legitimate question, for morality is, so far as its detailed precepts go, essentially relative and not absolute. The mere act of killing, for instance, is in itself neither right nor wrong. In all ordinary circumstances it is wrong, but in self-defense or in the defense of one's wife and children it may become not only right but the most sacred of duties. In view of this fact of relativity, it becomes the more clear that in certain cases where, in the interests of public welfare, the state requires action which would not have commended itself to the individual conscience, the individual may and ought to subordinate his own opinions to those of the state.

In further enforcement of this view it may be added that there is always the possibility that the conscientious opinion of the individual may be mistaken. In a pretty wide reading of the transactions of recent tribunals I have often

been reminded of that old Scottish moderator who prayed, "O God, grant that we may be right, for thou knowest that we are very positive." Self-will is apt to personate conscience, and it can do this so subtly as to deceive the very elect. In an hour of conflict like the Great War, surely the moral issues are so stupendous that the individual objector may well pause before setting up his private judgment against the safety of his nation and the triumph of righteousness over unspeakable wrong.

Hitherto we have been considering things as they are and have been: let us now turn to the consideration of things as they may yet become. In discussing the reasons for our assertion that the standards of public morality are lower than those of private morality we found the strongest of these reasons to lie in the fact that there is no such concrete thing as The State, but only *a* state in rivalry with other states. Is there, then, no way in which it might be possible to materialize The State, and so, by removing or restricting the element of rivalry, to raise the standard of public morality toward that of the highest individual conscience? It is an ancient hope and a persistent one. Above all the actual states, with their allied or conflicting interests, floats ever the dream of the City of God, the ideal state. Plato's *Republic*, Augustine's *City of God*, More's *Utopia*, Bacon's

New Atlantis — these and many other such idealisms of the corporate life of men upon the earth have handed down the undying hope to those who to-day are attempting to forecast the reconstruction of society. Perhaps the most significant of them all is Dante's *De Monarchia*, that great plea for a single universal temporal monarchy, coexistent with the spiritual monarchy of the church. It was his way of conceiving the true imperialism, supra-national and with divine sanctions — an imperialism in which one nation should no longer grudge nor refuse the welfare of another nation, but all should cooperate for the larger well-being of the world.

To-day that dream is again shining before the eyes of men. It has been conceived in vague and misty shapes, expressing itself, sometimes simply, in the cry for an end of wars. Again it would embody itself in such conceptions as a federation of European nations, a union of English-speaking peoples, an international police which shall limit armaments, and use force only to prevent any nation from preparing itself to break the peace and attack a weaker nation. Perhaps the most obvious form which it took was the suggestion that the *entente cordiale* and its allies should form themselves into a permanent nucleus; and this developed into the still larger

conception of a League of Nations, to which even Germany in time might come in, for the doing of justice and the consideration of claims. We shall deal with this subject in a later lecture. The War is over and the League is as yet an unrealized dream, although we have the promise, and some of us still have the hope, of its realization. Of one thing we may be very sure: national life and national moralities will remain, and patriotism will always be one of the supreme forces in the development of the human race. Yet, while that seems clear, it does appear to be possible that something larger may emerge, capable of restraining patriotism from its dangerous tendencies toward war, and at the same time capable of determining international relations authoritatively.

It is true that even in this supra-national center of authority the government will still remain "behind the soul of the people," and public standards of morality will continue to be lower than those of the highest individuals. Yet, for the questions it has to decide, the new authority will be able to reach far nearer to the level of the individual conscience than any one state can possibly reach to-day. When state rivalry is eliminated from the highest authority, much that is noblest in the consciences of individual men will come to its own. In this way the conception of The State as the supreme

authority may be realized. It will not indeed be regarded as supreme in the sense in which Prussia conceived it, without reference to God; but it will be regarded as supreme in the sense that it will be subservient to God alone. It will not be supreme, as the Prussian state is, under the master idea of power, in consequence of which it became the monstrous and bloody idol in whose worship men and nations lost their souls. It will not even be supreme under the master idea of justice, as most states have professed to be in modern times. Love will be its master ideal. How such a future is to be brought about, it is not yet possible to prophesy, but it is surely high time to think. It does seem as if, in view of such hopes, we were moving toward the fulfillment of the great promise that the kingdoms of the world shall become the Kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ. For the Kingdom of Heaven in its ultimate realization is just a form of society in which the highest individual ideals are at last made applicable to public institutions.

The most important practical question for us all in this connection is the question, What are the forces that can be used to raise the standard of public morality nearer and nearer to the standard of private morality? And the answer is that if, along the whole line of our interests and efforts, we were all to take this

as a conscious aim, there is not a single existing institution which might not be used as a means toward the desired end. *As individuals* we all have high responsibility for this, primarily by adopting the highest possible ideals for our own character and so indirectly leavening society, and then by propaganda which will in every legitimate way forward and spread those higher conceptions of life by which we, individually, have chosen to live. *The church* is supposed to stand for the highest idealism in the direction both of public and private character, but it would be well if the church were more consciously to adopt this policy, and to state more clearly both to itself and to the public its definite aim at the raising of public morality nearer to the standards of private. The Church must ever work for the most part upon individuals. But it should bear in mind that the Government shall be upon the shoulder of its Lord. While, like its Master, it must often refuse to interfere in political disputes directly, yet it is its duty so to influence individuals as to bring His principles ultimately to bear upon the state. *The press* will always wield a mighty influence for good or evil in all such matters, and an incalculable amount of good might be done through the press if it were definitely to pledge itself to these aims. The newspaper is not a device for the amusement of the people,

a chessboard on which the game of popular politics is played. It is a wonderful instrument of education, which may, if it so choose, bring the noblest ideals home to the conscience of the nation. As regards *the state*, while it is true that legislation can never venture far above the average morality of the nation, yet it may always tend to go above rather than below that average. The State should be Adventurer as well as Administrator, within certain limits of possible advance. The temptation of all politicians is to appeal to the baser side of their constituents, or at least to the side which is morally more commonplace and less ideal. They should regard themselves not merely as servants but as educators of the people; and in doing so, they will certainly be excused if they go judiciously beyond their election programs instead of falling, as is so often the case, lamentably below them. Probably, however, the strongest of all the forces that may be used toward these high ends is that of *education* in schools and universities. We have seen in Germany but too terrible an example of the degradation of the standards of public morality being systematically carried on in an education which aimed at the fostering of the crudest kind of illegitimate patriotism. Let the schools give clear teaching upon this and cognate subjects, and set the mind and conscience of every

adolescent citizen at work upon them, and there is no question that the distance between the standards of public and private morality might be enormously diminished within even one generation.

In these and many other ways it is possible to go a great length in this direction, and no duty could be more pressing at the present time. There is, as we have stated, the most serious danger in attempting to force ideals; but there is an equally serious duty and necessity for cultivating them most assiduously. The Kingdom of heaven is an ideal which tends to draw all men after it if their eyes are kept looking in its direction, and the supreme duty of all who have influence upon others of whatever kind is to direct their eyes thitherward.

NOTE 1

In discussing the question of public and private morality we have presupposed the normal conditions of a time of peace. In war everything suddenly becomes abnormal. New moral values and judgments are introduced and old ones abrogated, so that in many instances the crimes of peace become the virtues of war. This need not surprise us. It is an axiom of ethics that all the detail of moral precepts is necessarily relative and dependent upon the circumstances of the case. In war many of

the relations of individuals to one another are reversed and abnormal, and the detailed application of the precepts of morality are changed accordingly. To bring about such a change is the heaviest moral responsibility possible to man. Those who provoke war, or wage it without moral necessity, are guilty of an unspeakable crime. The rest must accept the situation for which the aggressor alone is responsible, and act on the new principles which it evolves.

Yet here again the German habit of exaggeration must be combatted. War does not reverse all moral principles. There remains a morality of war. Germany has disavowed any such morality. She has swept the Ten Commandments and all the Christian virtues overboard, and boasted of the principle that anything is legitimate which leads to victory. That is the course which ruined Germany. We have seen that to legislate upon the standard of the idealists and saints is disastrous; but to legislate upon the standard of the criminals and moral degenerates is devilish.

It is true that, in such an ethical upheaval as war produces, it is extremely difficult to draw the line and fix the standard of the *interim* applications of morality to details. All previous Peace Conferences and International Conventions have been trying to do this, with the curious result that they have given the impres-

sion rather of associations for redefining the rules of war than for establishing peace. All the results that they have achieved were calmly disregarded by Germany, who went on with her gas, her Zeppelin attacks upon civilians, her bombardment of unfortified cities, her sinking of unarmed ships, her inhuman cruelties practiced in the name of frightfulness, and her cynical dismissal of a sacred treaty under cover of the "Scrap of Paper" epigram. In this she was consistent in the thoroughness of her reversal of moral standards. Yet all the civilized world repudiates and disclaims her conception that war has no standards of morality left to it at all. Where then can we find such standards?

I believe we owe them to the playing grounds of our public schools. The one principle that remains firm in the hearts of all the noblest of the fighting men is that of sportsmanship. It is true that this will never yield a perfectly consistent code which may be written out in black and white, like the terms of an international agreement; yet it is to be remembered that in the whole of life such compromises are continually necessary. Life reaches out beyond all our theories and judgments of it, and the only absolutely consistent persons are some of the inhabitants of our lunatic asylums, who carry their fixed idea ruthlessly out to its

furthest ends. The great principle of our boys' and young men's morality is that of playing the game. It is the one unfailing appeal to any audience of British or American young men. It is an unwritten law and probably an unwritable one. But it is deep in these nations' hearts. We were proud of it in the sports of former days, but we never dreamed that it would count for so much in the most tragic hour the world has ever seen.

NOTE 2

When we come to consider the League of Nations we shall see that that is the most considerable attempt that the world has ever made toward the realization of the ideal of drawing up the standard of public to that of private morality. We must not, however, count entirely to that agency, but must definitely set before us the aim of this unification, in our education both in schools and universities, and as part of the new program of the church. The moral development of nations must ever be attained through the patient handling of individuals, until public opinion has been affected. Owen Wister and Benjamin Kidd have shown how amazingly the ideals of the German nation could be changed for the worse within one generation by systematic education. It must also be remembered that Prussia has

had only two hundred years of civilization, as compared with the many centuries through which Britain and America have been learning the same lesson. Now, we must all together accept it for our steady aim, to work out high national ideals through individual consciences, by means of the inculcation of a high standard of honor in all the relations of life. Such experiments as the modern coordinate school and the Woman's Auxiliary Army Corps, which appeared to many conventional minds so daring as to be dangerous, have already proved themselves extremely successful in introducing high standards as to the relations of the sexes. The system in schools and colleges which substitutes, as far as that is possible, trust for supervision, has met with the same success. It is to be hoped that through these and similar agencies there may be implanted in the rising generation a contempt for "graft," and a sense of the vital necessity for honor whether it seems to pay or not, which may work wonders upon the public life of future days. All such attempts are bound to meet with opposition from people who will either say that this or that system has never been used before, or who will foredoom any such attempt by the dogmatic assertion that it will not work. To the former, one may reply confidently that if it were true that such attempts have not been tried before,

then the sooner they are begun the better; to the latter, pointing to the results of experiments already tried, we are able already to reply that such systems do work.

CHAPTER IV

A LEAGUE OF NATIONS

THE eyes of the whole world have been turned of late to the construction of a League of Nations, which would be the perfect realization of the conception of the state discussed in the last lecture, and the perfect form toward which all the minor attempts at that realization which we have already noted would finally merge. The Conference of Paris has come and gone, and the League of Nations is included in the Treaty of Peace. In the confused and transition stage of the world's history through which we are passing, there is a widespread tendency to regard the League of Nations enterprise as a failure. Some look upon it as already a dream of the past, while others look forward to the future, expecting a speedy end to all its high-sounding promise. I am bold enough to believe that so far from being in any sense a failure, it has already been able to establish in the conscience of the world a new set of demands that shall never again be forgotten, and to point toward an altogether unprecedented set of possibilities for the fulfilling of these demands. The

subject is, of course, an extremely wide one, and all that is proposed in this present lecture is to point out some general considerations which are apt to be overlooked, and yet without which the idea of the League cannot be understood. I shall not attempt to deal with the economic side of this vast question, but shall, rather, confine myself to that which directly concerns war and peace. The economic developments must largely be left to shape themselves as the need for such adjustment arises from time to time.

The first thing to note about the League of Nations is that it is not only an unusual but a unique conception. By this I do not mean merely to reiterate the well-known words, "The world has dreamed of lasting peace before, but wishing for it is one thing, willing it another." Apart from this fact that the world has come to a further stage in the definiteness of its determination to achieve this thing and to achieve it now if it be possible, there are essential differences in the thing itself from anything else that has ever been before the judgment of the world.

The issues are to-day at once simpler and more complex than they have been in any of the former various peace proposals and discussions that have taken place. All that has ever been said against an inconclusive peace holds good now. The terms of peace were indeed stern,

but not more so than was absolutely necessary, in view of the spirit of the enemy. Nations recover from great catastrophes, and there is no security for the future without the absolute defeat of that spirit in the Central Powers which was responsible for this war. When that spirit has changed, many things may be altered and many relaxations made; but until that change has taken place these would be not only premature but supremely dangerous.

In considering the uniqueness of the present League of Nations we must also remember that this is not the time for following precedents but for making them. The hour of history and the conditions of the world are unique, and the arrangements which must be made for these must be equally so. We have not been fighting merely Prussian militarism, but the whole system of international diplomacy and ideals which has obtained throughout the past among European nations.

The League of Nations has sometimes been regarded as a repetition of the Holy Alliance. There is no ground for this whatever, except the entirely unreal one that both attempts claimed to have for their object the final ending of war. But the league which was formed after the fall of Napoleon by the sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, had nothing in common with the present League. It was nominally

formed to regulate the relations of the states of Christendom by the principles of Christian charity, but it soon proved to have for its real object the preservation of the power of the existing dynasties. Its collapse and failure have no bearing whatever upon the fate of the present League. Again, General Smuts, before he had accepted the League idea and worked it out into his very remarkable and able draft in detail, stated on one occasion that the British Commonwealth was the only League that has ever existed. As a matter of fact, the British Commonwealth is as radically different from the League of Nations as the Holy Alliance itself was. Again, in many utterances of distinguished men one has found statements to the effect that the nations included in the group of the *entente* and its allies, if they were to band themselves permanently together, would realize the idea of the League of Nations. Such statements are the result of an inadequate grasp of the unique elements in the present League, and they have thrown much confusion upon the whole subject. It is quite true that any such groups of nations as might be allied together in the British Commonwealth, or in the band of the *entente* and its allies, or in the English-speaking races, or in an alliance between America, France, and Britain, would be valuable in the highest degree, but they would

be valuable only as a basis for further and more complete union. If America, France, and Britain definitely set their hearts upon the realization of the League, it will at once become possible, and to the extent to which these three nations have accepted the idea it has become possible already; but any partial alliance of whatever kind can only insure the possibility of permanent peace by leading on to that fuller union of the League of Nations which, as we have already said, is unique.

The great question which the League is facing is the end of war. President Wilson has said that "The people of the world want peace, and they want it now," and has called the ending of war "This final enterprise of humanity." Wars have always hitherto ended in compromise, and it has been the chronic mistake of nations and of men to imagine that that compromise was the final solution. In 1853 there was a firm conviction in England that war was over forever. In 1854 the Crimean War broke out. Dr. Clifford has pointed to the failure of all those enterprises which in the past have sought to end war. Commerce has been again and again trusted to fulfill this end, and, in such conspicuous instances as the Crusades and the International Exhibition of 1851, it has tended rather to create wars than to end them. Anarchism has been advocated by

Tolstoy and others as the one agent that can accomplish the great end, and the present tendency in some quarters is towards a colossal repetition of past experiments in anarchy. It is amazing that any intelligent man can look in that direction for such an end. The whole of history and the very make of human nature proclaim its futility. Disarmaments have been attempted in various nations, and international conferences such as that of The Hague have been held, but these were swept overboard by the great wave that broke in 1914 upon the world. The lesson of all these facts is this, that "the one thing that will produce disarmament is a sense of security, and the League of Nations will produce that." It is for lack of a sense of security that all attempts to end war hitherto have failed, and nothing which is not able to restore and perpetuate that sense of security need attempt that mighty task.

When we come to consider the League of Nations with a view to ascertaining what those elements are that make it unique, and encourage us to hope from it for results which no past attempt has been able to secure, we touch the heart of the whole business. It is free from all party cries of any kind, for it has been adopted by Laborists, Radicals, Old Liberals, Unionists, and Conservatives in Britain, and by

many of the leading minds, both Republican and Democratic, in America. Further, it has nothing whatever to do with the principles or the policy of pacifism, for its chief advocates have been men who not only believed that the Great War was the duty of the nations which sought to defend the liberties of the world, but actually undertook much responsibility for the management of that war. In one sense we are all pacifists. No sane man who knows the facts could be found who would advocate war as such, and who does not desire the final ending of it. But in another sense there are many of us who believe that pacifism has been among the greatest hindrances to peace that the world has had to reckon with, and that the War itself, as circumstances were at the time, was the only road by which the world could travel toward any peace which would be either just or permanent.

The two main points on which to concentrate attention in seeking for the unique character of the League of Nations are:

1. The Universal Pooling of International Interests.¹

¹The word "pooling" needs to be guarded from misunderstanding. It does not necessarily imply the merging of all the national interests and defensive forces, nor the removal of these from the command of the nations which contribute them. It means the uniting of them for a common purpose upon which all are agreed.

2. A Common Armed Force for Policing the World.

1. *The Universal Pooling of International Interests*

President Wilson said in Manchester that "the United States of America will join no combination of power which is not a combination of all of us." When he said that, it was impossible for him or for anyone to foresee how very complicated and difficult a matter such a universal combination is. The lesson of the past months is not that it is impossible ever to hope for such, but a profound conviction that it must necessarily come gradually, and that it cannot by any possibility be rushed. While we fully admit that, and in virtue of it wait in hope for the ultimate consummation, yet we must not forget that until the League is complete and all civilized nations are included in it, it cannot really exist at all, nor can the results of its imperfect beginnings be fairly judged. Until all the peoples are united it cannot possibly be safe to complete the work of disarmament. We all remember the groaning and dismay with which we viewed the spectacle year by year of enormously increasing armaments and saw no end to it except universal financial ruin or a stupendous war. The war has come, and it is to be hoped that the world

has learned its lesson. If we are going to disarm, or even if we are going to cease the mad rivalry of former days in national armament, we must have security against aggression. All armaments are either a guard or a threat to frontiers. The one and only safeguard in this matter will ultimately be found to be the universal pooling of national armaments.

This definitely implies that Germany sooner or later must be brought into the League of Nations. Until she and all other great nations have joined it, the League, as we have already stated, will not yet begin to exist. At the same time we must go on preparing for it. It cannot possibly be born in a day, but must come gradually and, as it were, piecemeal; and it will take great patience and calm wisdom of judgment to see this imperfect instrument gradually being constructed, and to expect from it little or no result until it is complete.

For very obvious reasons it would be impossible to admit Germany to it as yet. Under the old régime, Bethmann Hollweg on November 9, 1916, said, "Germany is ready at all times to join the Union of Peoples and even to place herself at the head of such a Union as will restrain the disturber of peace" — a statement which being otherwise translated, meant simply, "Will you walk into my parlor?" said the spider to the fly." It is perhaps unnecessary

now to remind ourselves that this was the man who had already acquired notoriety as the author of the "Scrap of Paper" epigram. At the time when he uttered the proposal above quoted, Turkish Pan-Turanianism was destroying its million and a half of Armenians, preparations were on foot to carry Belgian citizens by the thousand into slavery, university students from Britain were already at work in German salt mines, and a virulent propaganda was being actively conducted both in Italy and America. The subsequent Brest Treaty showed the value of any such offer as Bethmann Hollweg's. The fact is that in that offer the German chancellor had not meant the same thing as the American President. It is well known that Germany has always hated internationalism in the past, and it is impossible to conceive imperial Germany in any true League of Nations. In 1918, Erzberger constructed a sketch of a League of Nations which would have satisfied him. That was just before the final defeat of Germany, and when it was examined it turned out to be no League of Nations at all, but simply a sketch of German terms of peace.

Now, let us clearly face the situation. In such matters as these there can be no word of letting by-gones be by-gones. We are dealing with the most frightful dangers to unborn

generations in every country, and any sentimental forgiveness would be an unchristian and insane forgiveness. Here, as everywhere else, conversion must be demanded as a condition of forgiveness. Nations may be converted as well as individuals. Germany was converted to the principles that led her to her doom within two generations, as we have seen. She must be brought back to such a state of mind as will make it either safe or righteous to entrust her with the responsibilities of a place in the League of Nations, before any well-wisher to humanity could venture to propose her admission.

There are, indeed, signs that such conversion has begun, and these should be welcomed and cherished in every possible way. The German people have discovered the delusions which had been put upon them, and there seems to be a very true reaction, accentuated by defeat and shame and a desire to think and act differently, on the part of some of her former spokesmen. When that is completed, when Germany has found a form of government which may be relied upon for future stability, and when the new Germany has given evidence of good faith and good will — then, and not till then, can the League of Nations be made complete. Supposing that in the meantime preparations for it have gone forward as they have already been

planned in Paris, we may hope that when the time shall come for the entrance of Germany, the League, including all the civilized nations of the world, will suddenly prove an effective instrument for guarding the world's peace forever.

America also must come in. I am anxious to avoid all questions of American party politics, but yet I trust I may be permitted to say a few words on this momentous question. For her own sake America must come in. She lives under the beneficent shadow of such men as Washington and Lincoln, and their spirit lives on in her. But these were men of the far horizon. They were not local politicians, but world-statesmen. It is impossible to conceive of these men staying apart from this universal ideal, which would make impossible for ever such evils as those which they devoted their lives to end. As to the future, no man can see far into the years, nor anticipate the destinies of nations. Yet certain it is that no land on earth can long remain in isolation. The dawn is ominous, and the morrow will bring new combinations and massed forces against which a united civilization must be prepared to stand. Even for her own sake America must come in — but how much more for the world's sake! No alliance which other nations might achieve

could be effective without her. To tell the other allies to go on with the League of Nations upon their own account is to ask for an impossibility. Without America there can be no League of Nations. Its universality is its unique characteristic without which it can never exist.

The reasons for America's hesitation are not only intelligible, but many of them are entirely reasonable. Any fair-minded judge can understand her reluctance to have European powers interfering with her action, say, in such affairs as her relations with Mexico. Still more can we understand her refusal to send troops across the world to aid in settling every little difference between European or Asiatic states. But all that is asked is that in case of local disputes all the world shall declare itself against the aggressor, not that all the world shall take action and resort to arms. In cases where the matter in dispute is small, there will be no call nor need for universal action: and if any matter should assume world-wide proportions, America will never hesitate to play her part.

One sometimes hears phrases which are courteously intended, but which seem to me to be dangerous. Britain and her European allies are told that in their hour of need America was glad to come to their help, but now that the danger is over she would not further interfere with their affairs, but would retire and no

longer hamper them in their settlements. Americans! my brothers! when men talk like that I fear your courtesy more than I have ever feared your blame. This whole situation is misunderstood by such speakers, and they do not realize the meaning of the universal League. The League of Nations is not interference; it is the union of the world.

As to the detail of possible joint action which may be involved, I do not wonder at your hesitation, especially as the decision has come upon you at so very difficult a time. No British man who knows the situation will misunderstand or grudge you the most voluminous examination and discussion of the points involved. Viscount Grey's letter voices in magnificent clearness and truth the best mind and feeling of British men. As to the ultimate result of your deliberations I cannot and I do not entertain any doubt whatever.

2. A Common Armed Force for Policing the World

In the late war the nations came together for the defense of the world, each bringing as much as by the strongest measures it could induce or compel into its service. But how clumsy, how late, and how costly a business it all was! and, above all, how illimitable! Each nation stretched out after the last man she

could secure, and no one knew how many would be needed before the end. The new idea which has come to us with the League of Nations is that it shall be made effective by a sea and land police force, armed with all the most powerful weapons procurable. Four things are necessary for this force. First, it must be made irresistibly strong, so that no private individual national enterprise would dream of competing with it. Second, it must be recruited by volunteers only, the volunteers being drawn from each nation up to the limit of a quota fixed by all. Third, munitions and arms for arming this force must be produced only in national arsenals, and all manufacture or sale of these by private firms or companies must be abolished. Fourth, the international police force must always be mobilized and ready to check the first beginnings of aggression upon the shortest possible notice. Such a police force would exclude national jealousy, for all interference with the existing conditions of any nation would be done at the initiative, not of a rival nation or group of nations, but of the world.

Many points of difficulty confront the League of Nations, and we need not be surprised at that. Anything conceived on such a huge scale must necessarily be difficult. Where so

many minds and interests are involved, and so many men are educated and prejudiced in various opposing directions, we need not look for an easy task in the reconstruction of the world. On the whole the progress that has been made is surprising, and if people everywhere will be patient and far-seeing enough to take the large view and concentrate on the essential elements, the thing may be done sooner than many of us expect.

The first point of difficulty that used to be urged against it was the opposition of France, which was expected and prophesied. We need not now go into that belated subject further than to remind ourselves that it was looked upon by many as an insuperable barrier at the outset, and that it absolutely disappeared.

The second point of difficulty was in connection with the strategic points of the world. Take the British strategic points for example. Under the conception of pooled interests and a limited international police, it might be expected that Britain would be asked to give up her sole control of Gibraltar, Suez, and other such points, and it is difficult to see how a League of Nations could possibly be brought into being except upon a basis of the internationalizing of these. In view of such a possibility it should be remembered that Britain is not asked to give up any such points to an-

other nation or to a group of nations, but to merge them in a supernational control in which she retains her own share. It would be impossible to bring forward any valid reason why this sacrifice, if it is to be regarded as sacrifice, should not be made. Nor would it be in any real sense a loss to Britain. From such points as the Rock of Gibraltar, much of their significance has already been taken away by the invention of aircraft and submarines. In regard to the surrender to the International League of the Suez Canal, it is to be remembered in compensation that the Kiel and the Panama Canals must come under the same principle of internationalization. In fact, on all such subjects we are apt to transfer to the details of the new situation, conceptions to which we have been accustomed under the old. Were the nations in rivalry as they are to-day, then no loyal British man would consent for a moment to the surrender of any strategic point: but if the world can be unified, and that unity permanently secured by the arrangements of this League, that alters the matter entirely. It would then be no longer in the interest of any nation to claim exclusive rights in the strategic points which were absolutely necessary to it of old.

A third difficulty that has often arisen in the minds of men is that of the relative status

of the great navies of the world. In this respect our very victory has threatened British naval supremacy. It has been said, "If Britain could write into international law the power of destroying hostile and neutral commerce, which it did in 1916, then no European power could dispute with her." The revelation that the British navy gave to Britain the power of life and death over other nations awakened the world to a new view of things which was extremely far-reaching and has already had consequences. To every naval power it may seem strange and disconcerting that the League of Nations should propose a pooled navy for the maintenance of the world's peace, in which it, like the rest of the powers, should only have a share. However large that share might be, some will fear that it could not awaken the sentiments which are so dear to seafaring nations and which have expressed themselves in so much of poetry and prose in their literature. But the facts must be faced. Without the League, in the rivalries of future years, one can only look forward to ruinous competition in rival shipbuilding for the purposes of war, whose immediate effect would be financial disaster, and whose ultimate end loses itself in sheer horror. Under the League each Power would require a naval quota proportionate to the demands of its physical and political geog-

raphy. Thus the naval requirements of each nation of the world would be limited within reasonable compass. There would be no rivalries in shipbuilding, and yet the pooled navies would be amply sufficient for all possible contingencies that might ever arise.

A fourth point of difficulty which has often been urged against the League of Nations is that of those who tell us that any such arrangement is going to substitute cosmopolitan for patriotic ideals. In a former lecture we have already discussed this point, and maintained that patriotism must always remain the most powerful and commanding of large-scale social ideals. Among other reasons for this belief it was there stated that the cosmopolitan ideal gives us a unit too large and vague to raise anything equivalent to the enthusiasm associated with patriotic loyalty. Here it need only be added that there is no such absolute contrast between patriotism and cosmopolitanism as is sometimes supposed. The leading advocates of the League of Nations are among the foremost patriots of their time, and they evidently intend that the patriotic ideal must still remain strong as ever in the new cosmopolitan arrangement. Dr. Clifford has said that "each nation will remain independent, self-determining, sovereign and free, save in those matters expressly and freely

given up on entering the compact of international comity." In other words, the League of Nations proposes to pool the national interests only for specific purposes, and leaves the essential nationality of each intact. "The question is not really between nationalism and internationalism, but between disorderly and orderly internationalism." We have been trying in the past to solve international problems with national machinery, and that must always fail. By passing over to the international League some matters which were formerly nationally managed, we shall each surrender something, but we shall gain infinitely more, and all those causes which have incited patriotic loyalties in the past will continue to render his own country dear to every man of good will and right mind. The new arrangement will certainly cost each nation something, but sooner or later we must all learn that the words, "He saved others, himself he cannot save," apply to nations as well as to individual men; and it will ultimately be found that the only possible salvation, even for oneself, is to be achieved through the saving of others.

As regards America, this aspect of the question presents some extremely difficult and intricate problems, bearing upon the Constitution of the United States. The new proposals have

appeared to some to give ultra-democratic powers to America's representation in the League of Nations. It is not for me to express any opinion on such matters, which are outside my province or my knowledge. I admit that on such vital questions the utmost care and the fullest deliberation are imperative. Yet I may be permitted to remark that one of the chief glories of the League is its adaptability, and that some way can be found of so arranging matters as to safeguard America from any such danger to her Constitution. Certainly you will not find us or any of your allies slow to understand the delicacy of the situation.

But the end in view is so colossal, so vital to the well-being of every nation and of the world, that I am certain the true heart and resolute conscience of America will not fail to find means for so supreme an end. The world trusts you for this: it is the greatest trust that has ever been committed to you in all your history.

After all these considerations have been discussed there remains one which is in the end overwhelmingly the greatest point to be considered on this subject: What is the alternative to the League of Nations? We admit that before the League can come into operation it will have to encounter immense difficulties, but this is a case in which huge difficulty is confronted by blank impossibility. Without the

League, the situation of the world is absolutely desperate. In the first place there are such considerations as those which have been already touched upon regarding the rivalries between the navies of different nations, and the ruinous cost of competition in construction. Then there are many side issues, like that, for instance, of Zionism, and the occupation of Palestine by the Jews. It is probable that some arrangement will be made whereby Mr. Arthur Balfour's forecast will be fulfilled, in which he gave his sanction to the prospect of a national settlement of the Jews in Palestine. This cannot, of course, mean that all the thirteen and a half millions of Jews will remove to Palestine and occupy its territory, but it probably will mean that Jerusalem will become in some sort the Jewish headquarters for the world, uniting the scattered fragments of Judaism not only into a religious but a political whole. Palestine is the focus of the world geographically. It is the center whence Jewish influence in future days could immediately touch all the continents of the eastern hemisphere. A concentrated national power, backed by the enormous wealth which would be represented by the Jewish headquarters at Jerusalem, might easily become a grave menace to the future peace of the world. Various safeguarding measures have been proposed, but it is very

questionable whether these would have any adequate or permanent power to check such dangers as might arise. Under a League of Nations a concentration of Jewish influence in Palestine would be safe, because it also would form part of the League, and would share with the rest of the nations at once their responsibilities and their limitations. Without that we might soon find that we were facing a new and serious danger.

The insidious and almost world-wide spread of Bolshevism is another fact that must be reckoned with in the immediate future. It is a secret power, as yet little known. On the one hand it is feared by many as a power that threatens life, liberty, and humanity in general. On the other hand many welcome it as the liberator of the world. For my own part, without necessarily fixing upon the whole system the worst crimes which have been committed in its name, it appears to be a system under which the powers of government are committed to those elements in the community which are least qualified to use them intelligently. Of this at least there can be no question, that at the present time it is an international and world-wide influence. As yet it can only be dealt with in each nation according to that nation's lights and powers. There is no unity in the world's attitude to it or plan for

dealing with it. Surely, it is evident that the only way in which the world can either judge it justly or defend itself against its attack, must be by some international and world-wide institution such as the League of Nations.

There is also the question of the next war. Mr. H. Stead has quoted responsible opinion to the effect that the expenditure upon armaments after the Great War will be ten times as large as it was before. We have already touched upon this often but it is impossible to give any adequate conception of the meaning of it. Without the League of Nations, the next war will come. There is no alternative whatever between universal disarmament to the extent which the League proposes, and ultimate war. The *status quo* is not now a living alternative: it cannot be maintained for a day. But if a next war does come, it will be beyond all the power of words to describe its horror. It has been said that "another world-war would mean the extinction of civilization," and the words are not too strong. Science has not completed its work in rendering war terrible. When the armistice was proclaimed, it seemed that science was only on the threshold of infinite discoveries in destruction. The League of Nations bristles with difficulties, but surely there is no one, unless he be possessed with suicidal mania, who would not prefer to

accept it, however difficult, rather than to accept the destruction of the world. Now is the moment, as Viscount Grey has said, when "the world must learn or perish." The prospect is more dismal than Dante's Inferno, if wars are to go on increasing in ferocity upon the earth. For such a life it is not worth while to breed children in any land. It was well worth while to breed them and send them forth upon one glorious sacrifice which would save the world to the end of time; but if that sacrifice is to be in vain, and the destruction of each generation in its youth is to be the normal and continually repeated prospect of our homes, then it were better that the race should perish at once from the earth. There is a danger to-day of our having the trophies of victory, but the battle lost. Those who will think carefully over the present situation will agree with Sir Edward Grey that "the past struggle is in vain if the League of Nations is not secured." Therefore this League is in the strictest sense practical politics; indeed, it is the only practical politics before the judgment of the world. In December, 1918, Mr. Wilson said in London that while at first he had been accused of being academic in his interest in the League, now we find the practical leading minds of the world determined to get it. No such constancy and unity of purpose has ever

been witnessed in the world before. As time goes on we see more clearly the new difficulties and complexities that arise, but it is our first duty not to let these arising difficulties blind our eyes to the momentous issues which we are facing in the immediate future.

It is, however, in connection with Christianity that we reach the highest ground for considering the League of Nations. The Prince of Peace is still the Lord of the world, and it is in the light of his will that all considerations of peace must finally be judged. Had the church demanded a patched-up peace, as some claimed that she ought to have done, during the last five years, she would have betrayed Christianity. Now she will betray it if she does not forward the influence of the League of Nations, for this is essentially a Christian ideal. Indeed, it is the only Christian ideal before us at the present time. The spirit expressed in the balance of power and in secret diplomacy was essentially a selfish and unchristian spirit, which every now and again suddenly revealed itself as an unblushing worship of the devil. We have experimented with all the ideals of paganism. In the League of Nations we are coming back at last to Christ, to see whether the world may not learn of him. As we shall see in a future chapter, the League of Nations

indorses the wider church outlook which has long been expressed in her foreign mission enterprise. The alternatives before the world are either Christ or a godless civilization, which is infinitely worse than any heathenism. The League of Nations definitely accepts the golden rule as the law of its being and the object of its labors. One of your countrymen has said, "We are actually adopting the ideal of the world-wide Kingdom of God as a national policy, pledging our Republic to the unselfish teachings of the Son of Man." There never was a time when Christianity had so remarkable an indorsement from the best political authorities as today. In theory the church has given her sanction. Now is the time for practice. If she is to show herself a living force in the present generation, she must not only agree to but must champion this great ideal.

Against all this it is sometimes urged that the tendency to war is characteristic of human nature, and that on this account there is no real chance of the end of wars upon the earth. Longinus long ago asserted that "strife is good for mortals," and Bernhardt has most abundantly indorsed his statement. There will always be two types of mind upon this subject. It has been said that to Napoleon war was a splendid game, while to Wellington it was a stern duty to be got through as quickly as

possible. But that it is an essential element in human nature, which can never be eradicated or replaced, is an assertion which runs contrary not only to the whole genius of Christianity but to any scientific view of the evolution of the race. To those who on any ground believe in an ultimate decency of things, war is necessarily doomed. To those who believe in an intelligent and realizing way in Christianity, the question resolves itself into a very simple issue. We may grant a certain truth to the assertion that war is inherent in human nature, which derives this among its many mingled inheritances from the brute; but we must ask the further question, Is Christ or is he not a match for human nature? Can he manage it, and lead it out from the slime of its origins into the nobility of its destiny? Upon that question depends our belief in the failure or success of Christianity. For believers in Christ, to ask that question is already to answer it. We have ground for believing that there is a limit to the reign of brute human nature, that Christ transcends it, and that His ideals, which have already conquered its cruder forms, will ultimately triumph over all things and lead mankind out into the glory and nobility of the sons of God.

Hitherto we have only treated of the League of Nations on its negative side, as a movement

which has for its object the end of war. It remains to be pointed out that this is by no means its only content and intention. In its positive, as contrasted with its negative aspects, it has still a closer alliance with Christianity. No Christianity which is merely negative is worthy of the name. Christ's great contention with the Pharisees was for a positive as contrasted with a negative faith. To be a Christian is not to be a man who does not do this and that, although there have been those whose main idea of Christian manhood was a catalogue of things which it would not permit a man to do. It is only when we come past the negative out into the positive side of Christianity that we see it in its rich fullness and promise; and, all along the line, the League of Nations strives to keep pace with it in this. It aims not merely at the end of war between nations, but at the establishment of love and good understanding. Intelligently conceived, it deals not merely with alliances and treaties, but with the spirit which underlies all such agreements. It would establish good will as the foundation of all relations, and it would interpret the brotherhood of nations, not merely in the sense of tolerance and the absence of aggressive wrong-doing, but as a positive friendship and intercommunion for the purposes of mutual aid and the furtherance of each

other's interests. One of the consequences of this positive spirit is that it proposes to deal with the economic and industrial problems of the world, and to deal with them from this point of view. In all these ways it is seeking not a negative end merely, but the positive establishment of good relations; and in doing this it is showing itself to be imbued with the essential spirit of Christianity as revealed by Jesus Christ.

It will be obvious that the task it has set itself is indeed a most comprehensive and far-reaching one. It is no wonder if, with such ends in view, the new order will take some time to find itself and establish its position. When one feels overwhelmed and discouraged by the thought of so gigantic a program, it is a comforting reflection that the League of Nations is not conceived as a thing fixed and stationary. Lord Robert Cecil has pointed out one of its greatest merits, in his explanation that it is an elastic conception, which may be modified so as to deal with new situations and requirements as they arise. Its first task will probably be to codify international law in a more complete and authoritative fashion than that in which it has been already codified by Fiore or by Borchard or by The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907. Even if its codifications were complete — which they are not —

they would still remain in need of sanctions which would be able to enforce them. Such sanctions the League of Nations provides, as we have already seen; and its elasticity enables it to face the future in the confidence that, as new contingencies arise, it will be able in virtue of its universality and its safeguards to face these also.

There are some who imagine that they have only to speak the word "Utopia" in order to discredit any such scheme as this. Their attitude has perhaps been provoked by those who have in the past coquetted with ideals, and recklessly uttered high-sounding words. Utopia may either stand for εὐτόπος or οὐτόπος — "the place of well-being" or "the place that does not exist." For my part I am not afraid of the word, nor of the power of God in his providence to call things that are not as though they were, and so to create them. When in faith Christian men are sufficiently daring to trust God to that extent, they will certainly have their reward. One remembers the words of Cleon, that Paul's doctrine "could be held by no sane man"; and one remembers also that the madresses and the wildest idealisms of an age live on, while its practical sanities and materialistic politics die daily into oblivion. In any case, this League of Nations is the greatest act of faith the world has ever seen,

for it believes that Christ's kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and that his dominion is to all generations. It has dared to believe in the power of Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER V

STATESMANSHIP IN FOREIGN MISSIONARY
WORK

IN the bewildering number and rapidity of the changes that have come over every aspect of modern life, none is more striking and none will ultimately show more far-reaching results, than the transformation of our view of Foreign Missions. A few years ago foreign missionary enterprise belonged to the region of sentiment: now it has been transferred to that of statesmanship. Formerly Christian thought wandered out in a romantic and irresponsible way among lands far distant, and the result was infinitely picturesque, but in many cases it was hardly taken seriously beyond the inner circles of the devout. Somewhere in the infinite distance there was a missionary, dressed in clerical garb, sitting under a palm tree with black gloves and a Bible, surrounded by a touchingly grouped band of more or less naked savages. Piety was graded then, as it is still in many quarters, and the picture of the missionary under his tree appealed only to extremely religious people. To the ordinary man, who was religious enough to satisfy his

conscience along the usual lines, this was entirely a work of supererogation. To-day every intelligent believer in Christianity knows that such a view as that is not only unchristian but is also obsolete. He knows also that mere zeal is not all that is required for effective work in the foreign field, nor is he much moved by such curious motives as the desire to hasten the end of the world and the coming of Christ by completing the preaching itinerary of the world. Instead of that he takes foreign missions seriously as a necessary department of all real statesmanship.

Statesmanship means neither more or less than common sense upon a large scale. Its fundamental demand is a clear view of all things of which it takes cognizance. Pfeleiderer has said that "in order to conquer the world the first thing necessary is to get a correct view of the world," and it is this which modern foreign missions accept as their first task. In 1899, the late Dr. Stewart of Lovedale, then moderator of the Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, advocated, in his moderatorial address, what he called a "policy of missions." The phrase created much interest at the time, but the majority of those who heard or read his speech confessed that they did not fully understand what he meant by it. The great Missionary Conference of 1910 helped to clear

up the situation, and interpreted much that he had advocated; and since then it has been gradually dawning upon Christian men everywhere that the foreign mission enterprise must be accepted as a definite policy and reckoned with in the statesmanship of the world.

The first aspects of any such view as this must concern certain questions of detail. In the first place, in the choice of the field we have to distinguish between races that have a future before them and races which are obviously dying out. The means of reaching the population of the world with Christian propaganda are lamentably limited, and since we cannot at the present time hope to reach all, we must select those among whom we shall labor. Under these circumstances it is necessary to consider the future value of the various races. Work among those which are soon to become extinct has been, and is, heroic in the last degree; but statesmanship demands that the gospel shall be sent to the fountainheads of future civilization, and to lands which will in a generation or two exercise the strongest influence upon the world. If it be objected, as it used to be, that there is an irreverence in counting heads in this fashion, surely the answer is clear enough. As individual souls all men may be equally valuable to Christianity; but, as a mere matter of numbers, is it

not wiser and more effective to win ten thousand people for Christianity than ten? And, as those who are employing foreign missions as an instrument of the Kingdom of Christ, must we not see to it that that instrument is employed in the places where it will ultimately do most work?

A second matter of detail is the choice of missionaries. In the days when missions were a sentiment the only requirements for a foreign missionary's career were piety and zeal. But, when one comes to reflect upon it, it is surely obvious that the work of a foreign missionary is one of the most highly specialized of all the professions, and that further qualifications are necessary to insure fitness for effective work in it. The only reasonable principle upon which a man should choose his lifework must be his fitness for the special lines and tasks which he purposes to face. It is better to sweep a crossing perfectly than to preach a crusade badly, for the world is permanently benefited only by those labors, of whatever sort, which are well performed. In making the choice of a profession many things must be taken into account, but the paramount consideration must be the call of God as revealed in the nature, the tastes, and the powers of the individual for work along particular lines. Anyone who knows the history of foreign missions must see how widely

this principle is proved by the effect of mission work upon the workers. There have been those who found in the foreign field that they had no special aptitude for the work they had undertaken; and it would be impossible to imagine circumstances more terrible in their discouragement, or lives more shattered in their adventure, than foreign missionaries who discovered too late that they were equipped only with zeal and not with fitness for their difficult and complicated task. On the other hand, who does not know of the magnificent effect in character which is produced by foreign mission work upon those who prove really fit for it? Men and women who previously had shown no very distinctive gifts, have in countless instances developed into superb evangelists, surgeons, explorers, educators, and administrators, as they rose to the opportunities given to their latent powers, and proved their fitness for the enterprise they had undertaken. Lines are drawn deep upon such faces, for their work is arduous and exacting, but they are the lines of greatness of manhood and womanhood.

Third, a very essential part of statesmanship in the whole business of foreign missions is that of patience. There has sometimes been a craving for immediate results which has brought disappointment abroad and criticism at home. The statistics of conversions and

baptisms are no sort of measure of the effectiveness of the work achieved. In many lands the baptism of a convert has meant his ostracism and has deprived him of any means of making a living, yet complaints have been made that an insufficient number of conversions were tabulated in the returns sent home. It is extraordinary that it did not strike the critics that it would be wise in such lands to provide agencies whereby converts could be assured of a living and kept from starvation. The consequence in such cases has been that countless conversions have been achieved while no open profession was made. As one missionary has put it, "Many a Christian will rise in the last day from a Mohammedan grave." It was with such things in mind that Jesus spoke of his doctrine and kingdom as leaven working secretly and unobserved, but yet eventually to leaven the whole lump. There are many kinds of lie, but everybody knows that statistics may easily be the very worst kind of all, and it is well that all who are interested in foreign missions should remember that. One of the most touching of all missionary stories is one concerning the late Master of Balliol. A certain Geronimo of Genoa, having heard that the Australian aborigines were the lowest type of savages of the earth, went out and worked among them for twenty years without making a

single convert or even an approach to one. The story was told to Dr. Jowett, and he replied very earnestly, "I should like to have been that man."

A fourth consideration is the necessity for distinguishing between causes and effects, and putting the stress of our work upon the former rather than the latter. Heathenism, with all its miseries and superstitions, is due to certain easily ascertained causes. The peoples are perishing from lack of knowledge, and from lack of ability to deal with existing conditions. The practical intelligence and directed will of such peoples have never been trained to play upon their life as it actually is, and the whole superstitious *incubus* of heathenism is the result. This fact should give us the point of view from which to look at educational and medical missions as agencies in the foreign field. There is a tendency to consider these as more or less secular, and to set up over against them the purely evangelistic missions as the ideal type. But in a land of gross ignorance and universal unhealed sickness, the evangelistic mission is to a large extent dealing with results while the causes remain untouched. It is a profound mistake to imagine that educational and medical work is to be regarded as in any sense a bribing of the people to come and receive religious instruction, by offering them

benefits which they can understand. These are really no bribes, but the direct attack upon the causes of heathenism; and they should in every case be encouraged to go hand in hand with the evangelistic teaching which they are rendering possible and fruitful.

The fifth matter which must be included in this survey is the necessity for appreciating the value of pagan worship. To laugh at it, to rail at it, or still worse to ignore it, is fatal policy. To regard it as the work of devils is to be ignorant of human nature and the origins of human faith. It is not in vain that centuries of worship, however mistaken or imperfect, have engaged the heart and mind, and, to some extent, the conscience, of all the races of mankind. None of the races has lived in vain, and none has worshiped in vain. Each has discovered something in its worship which has increased its national value and its spiritual wealth. We in the restless and hurrying West, where peace in any deep sense has almost died out, may well turn with a sigh to the calm that still broods over the Eastern mind. We who have ceased to wonder at anything, sated with the miracles of modern science, may well view with reverence the spectacle of childlike peoples who wonder at everything. We with our Western commercialism may surely confess that we have something to learn, of beauty

and gentleness and simplicity, from nations less fortunate in respect of positive faith. In a word, our task is not to bring God to foreign countries in our ships, but to find Him there already, and to reveal him to those children of His to whose homes we go. We should introduce Christ to them as the true Interpreter of their own ideals, the Appreciator of their own endeavors in the religious life. We are not there to westernize the East, as if Jesus had said, "Suffer the little white children to come unto me." We are there to fulfill rather than to supplant the imperfect life of pagan lands, to show them by their very virtues and beauties the sad and tragic lack and failure that are theirs, and to supply that lack out of the fullness of Jesus Christ.

No point of view is more easily parodied than this. "Quite so," says a certain type of man. "Let us appreciate the reality of all religions, and leave each nation to its own — Buddhism for the Buddhist, Mohammedanism for the Mohammedan, Christianity for the Christian." I need not say that the appreciation of other religions of which we have spoken does not mean this, or any other such cheap and foolish thing. The whole difficulty, and yet the whole value, of thought on such subjects, lies in fine distinctions which require a certain delicacy of mind and a certain amount of pains-

taking thought to make and to preserve. It is one thing to say that the religion of each land has a value of its own, and it is quite another thing to say that the religion of any land is sufficient for the spiritual needs of men. There is nothing comparable with Christ in all the world, and the more precious any substitute for him is, the more imperatively do we hear the cry of the human heart for just that which He alone can give. Christ is not a rival of the gods of the lands, to be weighed over against them as greater or lesser than they. Literally, "He judgeth among the gods," as the old phrase has it; and among them, as among men, he comes for *κρίσις*. In his light we see the relative worth and beauty of the various heathen cults, and the same light that shows us their beauty shows us also the deep defects of each one of them.

The trouble with them all is this, that their conception of the Highest has become localized, and so, hopelessly dwarfed. The curse of heathenism everywhere is the curse of local gods. The consequent religion is bound to be petty, wanting in imagination, and full of the immorality of a favoritism which can be secured by bribes or lost by giving offense to the touchy gods. The great business of the Christian missionary is to delocalize the gods of the heathen, and to reveal instead of them the

one God over all, blessed forever, revealed in Jesus Christ — in Jesus Christ, who is neither a child of the East nor the West, but is the Son of Man forever. Seen thus in His light, it is safe to gather and preserve the true and beautiful elements in all attempts at worship, and it is easy to reinterpret these in a nobler and more helpful way than had been possible in any heathen worship.

Turning now to the more general consideration of our subject, we find that the war has complicated the whole problem of foreign missions in many ways. It has been said often that it must necessarily have presented a very perplexing spectacle to heathen lands. Christianity had come among them as a gospel of peace, and had set itself on every mission station to end family disputes and tribal feuds. It seems natural to ask and difficult to answer what justification will be possible for the church to present to heathen men who are perplexed by the spectacle of a war between Christian lands, compared with which the most violent of their native conflicts have been but children's games. Yet, on the other hand, it must be remembered that we are apt to underrate the intelligence of pagan minds. The non-Christian troops at the front understood quite well the meaning and necessity of the war, and the spec-

tacle of it presented no difficulty to them. They had not accepted our teaching, but they understood that we were fighting for that which we had taught, and that our entire warfare was in order to preserve alive the principles of Christianity upon the earth. Indeed, the chief difficulty and stumbling-block of this kind which has presented itself to the pagan mind of modern times has not been the Great War, which was fought for obvious and unquestionable principles. It has been the war which, in its incessant guerrilla fashion, unfortunately has been waged between certain of the Christian churches on the mission field. We may trust the intelligence of mankind to understand the Great War, but what reason is there why they ought to understand any worthy principle in that infinitely little war? Punch's famous picture of half-naked savages singing their own version of Handel's great anthem, "Why do the *Christians* rage so furiously together?" is one which ought to cause intolerable shame to every Christian heart. Any bitterness between Christian people in foreign lands, or any strife either upon ecclesiastical or individual grounds among missionaries, is capable of undoing years of patient labor in the building up of faith; and any statesmanlike view of the foreign mission enterprise of to-day must necessarily view with the stern-

est condemnation the pettiness and disproportion which have sometimes characterized the church's handling of ecclesiastical questions on the foreign field.

One effect of the war has been the broadening of the horizons of the average man. Young men who in former days would have lived and died without visiting any lands but their own have now learned something at least of the width of the world, and the spirit of adventure has come upon them. It must be this which is accountable, in part at least, for the extremely interesting fact that the soldiers in the allied armies so often manifested an interest in foreign missions. Few men would have ventured to think beforehand that a missionary address would be welcomed in a hut or camp: yet there was no kind of lecture to which they would listen with greater eagerness. The reason for this must have been that they had already seen a wider world, and come to believe that there actually were heathen lands. They had now met and fought side by side with men who worshiped strange gods, and the whole fact of paganism, instead of being a fairy tale of parsons, had exhibited itself as an actual piece of the live world which passed before their own eyes.

On a colossal scale the lands have mingled. At the moment when men of Christian lands

have been taken out by the million into a nearer contact with heathen countries, these countries have wakened into a totally different life of ideals and of prospects from that which they ever had before. Even before the war the world was waking. China was trying to waken, stretching her hands and opening her eyes for a moment, as it were, after the long deep sleep of centuries. Japan was already broad awake, and most keenly alive to her own secular interests. India was beginning to put in her claim for a larger and fuller development of self-government and native rule. The Mohammedan world was already the most active missionary force on the face of the earth, and was propagating the faith of the Prophet in many lands with a thoroughness and success which were bound to have serious consequences in the future. While these things were going on, commerce and diplomacy, easier means of travel together with swifter means of communication, were linking up the world into one, and making it impossible for any man anywhere to be completely independent of any other man. As the result of all these forces, the phenomena of the Crusades and the Renaissance were being repeated and exaggerated before our eyes. New governments were rising upon all sides, most of them premature and all of them precarious. It

took Britain more than a thousand years to bring her parliamentary system to its present very imperfect condition, but nation after nation of the Near and Far East leaped for the top of the ladder, and imagined it could manage parliamentary government by a mere decree. In every case it turned out that the ancient East had adopted the methods of the West too suddenly, and had failed with them. But that does not mean that the failure must necessarily be permanent, or that some adaptations of the one form to the other may not end in a stable constitution. As we have seen before, great civilizations have already risen at the meeting-points of East and West, and this may prove to be the case again on a scale hitherto unparalleled. We had entered upon a period which was essentially creative, when the Voice which sounded over all the lands kept repeating the solemn words, "Behold, I make all things new."

Such judgments of the importance of one's own generation are apt to be exaggerated. Every day and period bring novelties to those who live in it, and because they have not seen such things before, they hail them as the very Day of Judgment and the restitution of all things. He who takes a wide survey of history soon learns that every day is a day of the Lord, and does not take too seriously the esti-

mate of contemporaries when they judge the novelties of their own time. But even before the war we had come to see that we were living in an altogether exceptional and peculiar epoch. Civilization had reached a point whose critical importance no man could possibly exaggerate. Never in the history of the race had there been anything comparable with it, and the immediate alternative, from the Christian point of view, was the universal spread of an absolutely irreligious civilization or the conquest of the earth by Jesus Christ. The War, breaking forth at such an hour, furiously increased and hastened the play of these tremendous forces. We in the West suddenly discovered how intimately the nations to whom we send our missionaries are bound in with our own destiny in the immediate future. To-day we are discovering how deeply we are entangled already in questions which concern the relations of Christian with non-Christian lands; and as yet, especially in connection with Japan and China, no solution has been found to some of the most ominous and fateful problems with which the world ever has been confronted. New problems are also arising in consequence of the threatened withdrawal or restriction of Christian education in India by the British government. But Christ holds the balance between two alternatives. Either this War is

the last of the Crusades, preparing the way for that reconstruction of the kingdoms of the world which Christ called the kingdom of Heaven, or else the War is the blast of the last trumpet, announcing the dissolution of all things and the end of the human story upon the earth. Which of these two alternatives is to be the true one depends entirely upon the measure in which we of this generation can bring the principles of Christ to bear upon the international politics of our time. He must be blind indeed who does not perceive the essential connection between statesmanship and foreign mission work to-day.

When we ask for practical applications of these ideas, and seek for an answer to the immediate question, "What part can you and I take in these matters?" the first obvious answer leads us back to the League of Nations. Here is, ready to our hand, the proposal of a machinery which is to be at once universal and Christian. Its principles are identical with those of Christ, and it is the first time in politics that this could be said of any large piece of statesmanship. In the League of Nations we have seen government baptized with the Holy Ghost, returning to the earth, not in the form of a world-empire of force, or of a league and bond of empires, but as that Kingdom of God

which Christ lived and died to establish. But, as we have seen, Christ, who first preached the Kingdom of God upon the earth, is the only source of the wisdom that can manage it. The universal League of Nations is only safe or possible or true to its essential idea so long as it is universally Christian. No land which does not from its heart accept the principles for which Christ stood can safely be intrusted with a place in this new government of the earth. Christianity is presupposed in the League from first to last, and the more clearly that fact is perceived and acknowledged by those who are responsible for its promulgation, the sooner we may expect to arrive at some stable and permanent condition. In the light of all this we can see the urgent need of foreign mission work today. It is already almost too late.

In the second place, we who call ourselves Christian nations must take cognizance of our own religious point of view. We have said that missionary enterprise goes out to foreign lands in order to delocalize the gods of the heathen; but they who do such things must see to it that they have first delocalized their own God. As a matter of fact, the God of Christian lands has in many cases become identified with strictly limited sets of interests there. Not confessedly but unconsciously, Christians

have often worshiped him as the God of their own sect, church, or party, and failed to realize that religion has other aspects than those in which they may happen to have seen it. Until Christendom in all its various branches has recognized that the Love of God is as wide as humanity and all human interests, and that the compassions of God and the appreciations of Christ are over every man and all that concerns him throughout all the countries of the earth, we shall not be fit to achieve the Christianization of the world.

In the third place, a new call is made upon us to take note of the other agents that are operating in the foreign field besides those of Christian missions. The missionary enterprise must now with a new thoroughness adjust its relations with international politics, industry, and commerce. We must realize that the merchant and the diplomatist are missionaries wherever they go, spreading the service either of God or of the devil across the lands; and we must begin our attempt at the influencing of the ends of the earth in our own offices, and beside our own firesides and cradles, from which these missionaries are to go forth. No man should be allowed to leave a Christian land for any sort of service in a land as yet unchristianized until his mind has been imbued with such high, humane, and yet sensible ideas of the

relations of men of different civilizations, as will insure that his work and influence abroad will be worthy of the Christian name and will forward the Christian life.

Lastly, it must be borne in mind that there is demanded of us all a higher appreciation, not only of man as man, apart from his nationality and antecedents, but a higher appreciation also of Jesus Christ. There are subtle and mysterious connections between the various parts of the Kingdom of God, and it is probable that the prosperity of foreign mission enterprise depends directly upon the spiritual condition of the land that sends it forth, and especially of the professed Christianity of that land. It is for us to cherish and to spread abroad a profounder belief in the incomparable value of Christ our Master for the salvation of the world. Our interpretation of Christ may be good enough for establishing a life of faith and hope in our own souls, and yet may be ill-adapted to conquer and to triumph over the vast forces of the world. Defective faith of this kind is hindering the work of every missionary in the foreign field; and every increase of faith in the churches of Christendom is forwarding the advent of the Kingdom of Christ abroad. It is for us more and more to read the charter of the Kingdom in the face of the King, to believe in Christ so fully and

generously that we cannot be contented until we have shared his benefits with every human being in the world; and continually to measure our estimate of the value of foreign mission enterprises, not by the poor standards of apparent success, but by the debt we personally owe to him, and the unspeakable appeal to every honest conscience of every opportunity of paying that debt.

CHAPTER VI

BRITAIN TO AMERICA

THE occasion on which these lectures were delivered in the spring of last year was one which brought to the lecturer a unique opportunity of coming in contact with many different types of university life in the United States. From Harvard and Yale he passed to universities in the Middle West — Delaware, DePauw, and Cincinnati — and everywhere met with the same abundant welcome, and felt the same keen delight in the contact with every one of these varied spirits of university life. To a British man, traveling thus over large areas of the States, the first feeling is that of an almost incredible hospitality and kindness. He is welcomed personally and taken for granted as a friend before he is even known; and, to use a colloquial phrase, “it is up to him” to justify the frank trust and confidence which have been extended to him in so generous a welcome. Yet there seemed to be indications of something deeper and more significant than even this instinctive good will, which is so characteristic of the American reception of strangers. The political and commercial relations between

our two lands offer some of the most complex and even dangerous problems in the world. Yet he who travels among the university circles of America cannot fail to discover a tendency toward a closer union than has for many years subsisted between our countries, a new fondness for the old land and a new willingness to meet cordially in frank approach. To-day I wish to give you some sort of an idea of how an average British man thinks about all this. Some of my impressions may be erroneous and others disproportioned, but they are impressions founded upon a pretty wide contact with American men and minds, and I give you them to-day in perfect frankness for what they are worth.

First of all I think you will agree with me that it is time for us to go back beyond the American Revolutionary War in order to find the origins of things. After all, that war was not the beginning of the heavens and the earth, and much had happened before its lamentable outbreak. Certain books seem to have been written as if history began in 1776, or at least as if the history of the relations between America and Britain began then. Let us remember that long before that war tore us asunder we were united in a common fight for freedom. The liberties of Europe, guaranteed in the Magna Charta, in the establishment of

the great guilds, and in all the early battles of its age-long struggle, were common to us both. The foundations of freedom were laid by your fathers and ours, fighting and working side by side, and the instincts which prompted them and the ideals which appealed to them remain the deepest instincts and the highest ideals of men of good will on both sides of the Atlantic. The seas were wider then than they are now and more estranging, and men who crossed them became alienated from those who remained on the other side, through lack of contact and the impossibility of frequent interchange of the ideas under whose dominance life is carried on. When the Revolutionary War broke out, it was not a war between our two peoples at all. The finest intellect and the vast mass of the conscience and opinion of the British people were entirely against it. Burke was against it, and so was Pitt. It is not fair that it should be remembered as an expression of the mind of my nation, although it was waged in my nation's name.

There have followed after it one hundred and fifty years of varied history in both our lands. In one sense we were too far away from one another, and in another we were too near akin; and the result was a tendency toward misunderstanding which has poisoned much of our relations with each other. We have often

irritated one another and we have often misunderstood one another. In the Civil War the British attitude to America was such as to satisfy neither the North nor the South, and such instances as that of the Alabama, and later on that in connection with Venezuela, were fraught with terrible danger. Even in the present war in its earlier phases, such matters as our blacklisting arrangements, our censorship, and our searching of ships, were bound to cause friction of a dangerous kind. When later on you discovered how necessary some of these arrangements were, not to our safety only but to your own, I think they may be said to have passed completely out of mind. When, after the long and inevitable time of waiting, you were able at last to come into the war unitedly and effectively, not only these recent estrangements, but all others that had gone before them, were wiped out forever in our brotherhood in arms.

The debt was mutual and we have both paid in full. We got our chance first, and I think you will acknowledge that we took it satisfactorily. We were called upon to give the lead, and without calculating chances we sent our 'contemptible little army' across to the field. You know what our navy did for the guarding of the seas, the provisioning of troops, and the blockade of the enemy. There were times when we

held the lines against the armies of Germany with a single thinly-manned front trench, and our guns answered a twenty-four-hours bombardment with their allowances of half-a-dozen shells a day. Yet by the grace of God we held the lines. They were your lines as well as ours, for, as you know very well to-day, the menace which threatened our extinction would not have ended there. The final objective of the enemy was on your side of the Atlantic.

Then you got your chance, and you and we, cooperating brought the legions of America to the European battlefields. I was with your first fifty thousand in Gondrecourt in 1917, and I wish I could tell you how deep a debt of gratitude we owe to them. We had been fighting for three years, and our dauntless troops were hanging on grimly; but the mud had entered into the very soul of them, and they were weary to death. They went out, led by high ideals that flamed like beacons calling them to service and to sacrifice for the noblest ends that man can achieve or strive after. But in dreary monotony and discomfort, relieved only by periods of deadly and horrible danger, men cannot retain the clear vision of the ideal lights of life. Your coming relit our lamps. We remembered what we were out for, and knew again that it was worth while, and blessed God for your coming. In 1918,

during the most dangerous months of all the war, at the time when our undaunted general sent forth the one message of the kind that ever reached the ears of British soldiers during those five years, telling them that our backs were at the wall, we stood against the awful floods of the enemy. There was no element which so strengthened us thus to stand, as our knowledge that you were with us, that you would not leave us till this thing had been seen through, and that, while we had lost well-nigh a million men, you would continue the steady stream of reinforcements so long as a man from America was required in France. I need not speak to you of Chateau Thierry, St. Mihiel, and, above all, the Argonne. That was a campaign that will be recorded among the great events of battle on the earth, a record of which any country might well be proud.

As to the present situation, God knows it is complicated enough, and I am not now going to discuss it in all its bearings. All that I would like to point out is this: that any misunderstandings which may arise are due to details which are of relatively no importance. Personal criticisms of the character and conduct of statesmen, in this connection or in that, need concern us little, though in an hour like this they are apt to confuse the issue by drawing away men's attention from the things that really

and permanently matter. To us you have stood for two things which have nothing whatever to do with party politics, either American or British. First, you have stood for the essential principles of the League of Nations, of which I have already spoken to you; and, second, you have stood for the return of simplicity in diplomacy and the end of secret treaties. Late events in Italy and in China and elsewhere have shown the dire danger of the old methods of diplomacy in Europe, and especially of secret treaties. It has been said that it was inconsistent in the Peace Conference to conduct its business in secret while objecting to the secrecy of former diplomacy, but these are totally different matters. All business must be conducted in secret until it is ready for presentation to the public. There is no possibility of carrying through anything anywhere, on a large or small scale, while the whole world is looking on and making comments. To the end of time men who have to conduct affairs will be bound to claim that they shall do their business among themselves alone, until it is ready for complete presentation to the criticism and the judgment of the public. But the point on which we must insist to-day is that it shall be completely presented when it is ready for presentation. We demand that there shall never again be reserva-

tions in the publishing of completed diplomacy between nations: that never again shall nations, knowing only as much as the diplomatists see fit to tell them, be suddenly confronted with documents which have been kept secret, which nullify the effect of the things they knew, and which may, indeed, entirely change the situation. This aspect of the present day is of supreme importance. It is not concerned with this or that awkward situation in the history of politics. It is a matter of principle, and it has introduced fresh and direct moral considerations into a region which, it must be confessed, had previously been singularly devoid of them.

There have been certain difficulties of a more or less political character which have tended to foster suspicion and hesitation into the mutual approach between us. From the British side there were misgivings, mostly of a rather vague kind, founded upon the different point of view which characterized American as contrasted with British mentality. Our whole history, and the conditions of our national life, had in some respects put us apart, and it was impossible but that we should view certain questions that arose, in very different lights. Some British men were afraid that America would demand changes, or would seek to produce them, which we were not prepared to make. Especially was this the case in regard

to the interpretation of democracy. On the whole it may be safely said that the American interpretation of democracy demands greater liberty for the collective state, and allows less to the private individual, than the British interpretation of it does. This radical difference is of very far-reaching importance, and it will prevent the two lands from ever adopting identical institutions in many things. Everyone who has traveled in both countries will recognize many details which would be only possible in Britain, and others which must be equally confined to America. All this, and the traditions and sentiments which cling around the memory of a throne on the one side and of a republic on the other, gave cause for certain anxieties in British minds. It is with profound thankfulness that one can view the situation to-day, perplexed and difficult as it is. You have not demanded of us impossible modifications. You have made allowances for our differing institutions, and large numbers of matters which seemed fraught with danger have passed away in a quite astonishing unanimity.

On the other hand, there were difficulties that seemed to threaten from the American point of view. Your soldiers were brought in contact with the visible greatness of the British Empire, and a great many of them realized for

the first time how great it is. It is not to be wondered at that American men should have hesitated, lest they were being called in to rehabilitate the British Empire in the hour of its danger, and thus to become accessories to British greatness. It was quite reasonable that you should hesitate before accepting so ambiguous a situation.

To all this, however, there is a clear and simple reply, and in virtue of that reply the threatened dangers entirely disappear. It is true that you did come to our aid at a moment when the resources of the British Empire were taxed to their very utmost point, and we shall be eternally grateful to you for coming. Believe me, we know the value of the thing you did, and never till the end of time shall it be forgotten. Yet I do not think that any of us mistook the meaning of your coming, or accepted it in any sense of which you would not fully approve. The cause for which you and we alike were fighting was so great as to swallow up the consideration of the fortunes of our individual nations altogether. It was the cause of world-wide democracy and freedom, of eternal humanity and righteousness. These are greater than the British Empire. They are greater than the American Republic. They are as great as the human race itself. They are the rescript of the will

of God for man, in which you and we are but humble and honored instruments.

Then, again, it must be remembered that the British Empire has understood itself in an increasingly democratic sense. There was a time when imperialism and jingoism were practically synonymous, but that time has long gone by. Even then, in the early days of the empire, the true measure of its greatness was the help and benefit it brought to the lands which it included; and while our past history is no more free from blemishes and immoralities than the history of other countries, yet we can truly say that, upon the whole, the object pursued by Britain in other lands has not been to exploit them but to benefit them. It may be replied that in many cases they did not desire our benefits, and that it is tyrannous to force even benefits upon lands that do not desire them. To this the reply has been made by the empire itself. Had its members viewed the mother country in this light, they would not have come to us from every region where our flag has flown, nor have laid down their lives by thousands in willing sacrifice for the safety and the victory of British arms.

Now, when the war is over, we are in such a welter of politics that it is impossible to see very clearly any distance into the future, but one thing is absolutely certain, and that is that

our relations with all our colonies are being democratized in a fashion which has never been seen on earth as yet. They will share our councils upon all crucial and important matters as they never yet have shared them. The whole conception of empire will more clearly found itself upon generous and altruistic aims, and will more definitely disclaim any notion of exploiting the earth for selfish ends.

From the point of view of religion there has all along been a very great deal in common to our two countries. The Puritan stock was certainly as strong a leaven as ever was hidden in the lump of any national life, and to this day, even among non-religious Americans, one can see the effect of it in many respects. On the other hand, America has faced the world during all her history along distinctively practical and modern lines, and you have not been without a race of religious teachers who have applied the same principles to their religious thinking, and founded schools of distinctively humanist thought. These two schools, side by side, have corresponded with the narrower and broader schools of religious teaching in the old country, but until recently there has been wanting that most characteristic of all our British religious institutions, the fusion of the two in a humanist evangelicalism. To-day there

appear to be signs that this is coming in America also, and that the present hour, with its manifold upheavals, is that in which it is to appear. In such an hour men feel the necessity for getting away from formulæ and words, hallowed by custom, but no longer applicable. In their search for reality they seek to combine all the results of modern scientific methods with a religious earnestness equal to that of the older and narrower days. The war seems to be fusing the religious spirit of the United States of America into something which is at the same time broadly human and passionately evangelical.

These are all interesting aspects of matters political and religious in which we differ and agree, but the real question between us, after all, is one of temperament. Alliances are all very good, and are sometimes urgently necessary, as they were in the late war. Differences of opinion may be reconciled as time throws new light upon old questions. But the real question deep in the heart of all our relations is, Do we love one another or do we not? What is the real feeling of your land to mine, and mine to yours? The chief dangers lie in suspicions and misunderstandings which hold back the affection of nations and leave them apt to quarrel. Even commercial differences are not so dangerous as temperamental

ones. Rival traders understand one another, and although there may be sore feeling over this transaction or that involving loss on one side or the other, yet in the give and take of commerce a *modus vivendi* may be arrived at. But who shall bring together the differing souls of the Oxford Don and the Buckeye or the Hoosier? The one is reticent beyond belief, and camouflaged at every moment under masses of pretended indifference: the other, frank and hearty as God's mountain winds, warm-hearted, approachable, and approaching. These races talk a different language, and they think far differing thoughts. Now, however, all these men have fought side by side, and the incidents of the long war will not be forgotten in this generation. There is an island in the west of Scotland, the Isle of Islay, famous in the annals of the war for two great shipwrecks. When from the wreck of the *Tuscania* the corpses of the American dead were washed ashore, a flag was needed under which they might be borne to their burial. On one of the bodies there was found a silk handkerchief in the pattern of the stars and stripes. The girls of the island brought out all they possessed of garments, red, white and blue, and after working all night they finished at the dawn of day a gigantic American flag, under whose cover the bodies were laid to rest. On the same

island the *Otranto* was driven ashore, and young boys from the cottages plunged time and again into the raging waters, until they had saved many of the drowning. It is by such things that men live, by such things that nations are born; and there is more significance in one such tale as these than in many treaties. The great question of the hour is how we shall preserve through the difficult times of peace that unity of heart which, in so many instances, the War has evoked. It was a day of great emotion when Londoners saw the American flag hoisted for the first time on Westminster Tower, and many of us discovered then the value of the union of the English-speaking peoples. We had been talking about the League of Nations and doing our best to secure it for the world, but then we began to realize that the League of Nations has a center which is already and immediately achievable. If Britain and America stand together, a united power is formed which can absolutely dominate the world in the interests of freedom and of high ideals. Other nations may for a time secede, but no one of them, nor any group of them, is strong enough to stand against our combination. We are the central steel bands that reenforce the concrete of the League of Nations, and no greater responsibility was ever laid upon man, than ours is to-day in virtue of that fact.

When we ask what all this practically means, and what Britain asks of America at the present hour, I am reminded of that former visit, three years ago, when I answered that question by the request for men and money and ships. These things you supplied in profuse abundance, and your timely lavishness brought the war to a speedy termination. Thank God, the need for these is over, and now our requests are different.

In the first place, we ask for opportunities of mutual knowledge and understanding. With the ocean between them, men and nations will inevitably fall asunder. When we look into each other's eyes, and come to know each other's hearts, we soon find how much good will there is beneath whatever seeming estrangement. Men of all sorts, and in all possible capacities, should cross the Atlantic at the present time — politicians, business men, ministers of religion, professors and students from the universities. The more exchanges we have among these and all other classes of the community, the better for the world; and every organization for mutual exchange ought to be regarded as a matter of high politics and encouraged to the utmost.

In the second place, the rearrangement of the world will have to be organized in many quarters under the system of mandatory

protectorates, in which stronger nations undertake the responsibility for weaker ones during the present stress. In many quarters in America there is adverse criticism of the idea of America interfering further than she can help, in European politics. Far be it from me to venture to express any opinion as to the Monroe Doctrine, or to give any advice about it to an American audience, but I do venture with great earnestness to plead that you will not withdraw from cooperation with us in some of the regions where we have been fighting together, but will take your share with the rest of us in mandatory powers. There are certain regions where you can do this as no other nation can. In the Balkans, in Macedonia, in Constantinople, and in Armenia it may be said without fear of contradiction that no European nation enjoys such prestige as you do. Your whole contact with these lands has been of the missionary kind. The things which have introduced you to that part of the East are your mission schools and Red Cross hospitals. In the confusion of European affairs which prevails at present, no European nation could accept mandatory powers in any of these regions without some risk of suspicion of territorial or other desires and ambitions of a selfish kind. No such suspicion would attach to you, and I do very earnestly trust that you

will see your way to take some such share as this in the work of reorganizing the world, and administering certain territories. You would not wish to give advice and yet withdraw from the responsibility of acting on it. You have given us much advice. You have advised some of the wisest and noblest courses that the world has ever seen advocated, but that advice of yours involved high responsibilities and serious dangers. May we not count upon you to see this thing through, and to stand side by side with us as we seek to carry out into practice those ideals for which we owe so large a debt to you?

In the third place, there is the whole social problem with its enormous industrial and economic complications. In the backwash of the war the world is restless, and all that seething mass of dissatisfaction and sense of injustice which has been smoldering for many years has burst suddenly into flame. On both sides of the Atlantic it is now realized that in many respects the social order is going to change. At such an hour it is of supreme importance that you and we should stand and face these things together. No Christian conscience is satisfied with the social order as it has been or actually is. On the other hand, it will take all the wisdom and all the conscience of our united statesmanship and experience to create

a social order founded upon justice and stable for the future.

In the fourth place, we ask you for the precious gift of your idealism. Perhaps the greatest contrast between America and Britain lies just here. We are both idealists, but we differ in this, that while you are always hitching your wagon to a star, you always tell us the name of the star and point to its guiding light. We too have stars for our wagons, but it is a national point of honor to pretend that we have none! When you came to us in the day of our distress and proclaimed to the war-weary men in Europe the ideals that had brought you across the sea, we may not have received you always with effusion; but in our hearts we loved that star, and blessed God for those who reminded us of the things which had brought us also out. A British man cannot express his ideals for himself, but, in the stout heart of him, he is grateful to any one who will express them for him. We are a peculiar people, and we are apt to be offensive when we meet with anything in the way of spread-eagle, or conscious rectitude which is not backed by deeds. But, if you proclaim your ideals, you also make them good, and that makes all the difference. We can remember the boasting of the Germans, and the high-sounding words that were meant to terrify the world. These

words sound contemptible enough now, when we remember the midnight flight of the emperor who so freely used them, and the surrender of that fleet which was to do such mighty things. You made good your ideals and you rekindled ours, once again reminding the world that ideals are the real powers in life, the real makers of history. These things you did in war, and we beseech you to continue to do them in peace. Let us, each in our own peculiar fashion, live consciously for the highest things we know, and dedicate ourselves to such living. Your franker expression will find deep echoes in our hearts and consciences, and will tend to keep us up to our best.

If I am not mistaken, it is the case that the main lesson of your own Civil War, the lesson which after fifty years seems to hold its essential meaning, is this, that freedom and unity must necessarily go together. When kindred men fall apart, their separation impairs the freedom of both parties. If that was seen in the relations of the North and South in 1861, how much more evident is it to-day, upon the large scale of East and West? In such an hour one sees clearly the supreme value and necessity for this high union of hearts. We are both out for democracy, although we define it in somewhat different terms, and in this ultimate ideal and aim we are united. It is lesser things that

divide us; the great things, the ideal things, continually unite our lands and hearts.

Think of the bonds that bind us, and then ask who shall separate us who are bound with such bonds. To begin with there is the bond of blood. And although you have fused the blood of many nations into the great American people, yet you have managed so to absorb it as to produce a new race, enriched by contributions from all the world, but still keeping for its main characteristic that democratic and freedom-loving quality for which we and you together stood throughout the struggles of early centuries. We have also a common language, and that counts for something. It must be remembered, indeed, that many of the bloodiest wars have been fought between men speaking the same tongue. Yet, if the union be truly one of hearts, we shall be able the better to consolidate it and to understand one another because we need no interpreter. It is true that words have different values in American usage from those they bear in Britain, and that will always tend toward misunderstandings between unfamiliar representatives of each land. The need is all the greater for that system of exchanges for which I have already asked that in this literal sense we may the more fully understand one another's speech.

There are other bonds, however, greater

and more effective than these to-day. The bond of a common service to the world, which sprang from a common conscience, and was sealed in the blood of a common sacrifice, may well provide us with a common purpose as we go forth into the future days. Only let us keep clear before our eyes, let us write deep upon our conscience and our will, the supreme necessity for understanding, mutual allowance, and agreement. It is the greatest day that ever dawned on earth, and the most fateful hour of that day has now struck. Its opportunity and its responsibility are almost terrifying to contemplate. The fate of the world's future hangs mainly upon our unity. The blood shed in the past by many of the noblest of our sons demands it. It demands an intelligent grasp of the significance and of the necessity for our fellowship, and a passionate determination on the part of us all to retain and further it. For high ends in his own great purpose God has made one again at last. That which God hath joined together let not man put asunder.

Проект «Биологическая память человека»



1 1012 01014 1747