BEING

ADDRESSES DELIVERED IN INDIA DURING THE GREAT WAR

(1916 & 1917)

BY

J. F. WORSLEY BODEN, M.A.,

ATTACHED SUPPLY AND TRANSPORT CORPS; AUTHOR OF *Freedom's Battle.*

BOMBAY:

PUBLISHED BY G. CLARIDGE & Co., AT THE CAXTON WORKS.

'Now by all concurrence of signs.....God is decreeing to begin some new and great Reformation.....What does He then but reveal Himself to His servants, and, as His manner is, first to His Englishmen: I say, as His manner is, first to us, though we mark not the method of His counsels and are unworthy.'

JOHN MILTON.

PREFACE.

To sundry requests for copies of one or another of my addresses, delivered in the Garrison Church at Rawal Pindi during the past year, I think I can best reply by putting together the following collection. By this means I am enabled also to show some appreciation of the action of the Bishop of Lahore, who did me the honour of licensing me as a lay reader in his diocese ; and of that of the Reverend A. B. F. Cole and the Reverend J. E. H. Williams, successive Chaplains of Rawal Pindi, at whose invitations the first three addresses and the remainder, respectively, were delivered.

The places and circumstances of their delivery are not, perhaps, unworthy of remark. The congregations which heard them included, on occasions, some of those officers, both Civil and Military, on whose labours in so large a measure depend the peace and stability of this country. But they were mainly composed of British troops whose duty it is to garrison India when their fellows are fighting and sometimes falling at the Front. Theirs appears a less splendid, as it is certainly a more monotonous rôle ; and it is in some degree this circumstance which must determine a preacher's insistence on the value of service in whatever sphere, and on the truth proclaimed in Milton's line, and nowhere better illustrated than in the maintenance of the Indian Empire in these days, that

'They also serve who only stand and wait.'

Such merits as may be found in the following pages I must attribute chiefly to my friendship—better described, perhaps, for this purpose as 'discipleship'—of some years' standing with the Dean of Durham, to whom my

obligations are far from being adequately shown by occasional references in the text or in footnotes. Here I must also thank my friend, Mr. Noel Mason, sometime Scholar of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, and of the Military Accounts Department, for much valuable help in reading the proof sheets. For the many defects which the reader will discover I must plead the preoccupation and the interruptions which are inseparable from the life of a Supply Officer.

J. F. Worsley Boden.

Rawal Pindi,
September, 1917

CONTENTS.

FAMOUS MEN.[1]

Let us now praise famous men and our fathers that begat us....Their seed shall remain for ever and their glory shall not be blotted out. Their bodies are buried in peace; but their name liveth for evermore.

Ecclesiasticus, XLIV, vv. 1, 13, 14.

The career of a great man evokes an inevitable interest which is enhanced if that career should have played a part in our own national history. History and biography are strangely intertwined, and admit of no final separation; and if it be for a moment conceded that history is, in Gibbon's phrase, 'little more than the register of the crimes, follies and misfortunes of mankind,' it must be acknowledged with corresponding generosity that the lives of individual men furnish many exceptions to that drab and depressing record.

It hardly requires that I should remind you that yesterday was the anniversary of the great naval battle which brought to an end an important phase, and in some large measure determined the course, of the Napoleonic wars. In the naval history of that European struggle of little more than a hundred years ago—the series of wars which alone were comparable in magnitude and manner to the present—Nelson's victory at Trafalgar on October 21st, 1805, was the principal and concluding event: and the death of the victorious Admiral has hallowed its memory for all time in the hearts of Englishmen.

[1] At Parade Service, West Ridge, and at Evensong, Christ Church, Rawal Pindi, October 22, 1916; for the Anniversary of Trafalgar.

If we cast our thoughts back to the dark days of Napoleon's early ascendancy after the declaration of war between England and France, we find the English Admiral, Horatio Nelson, about to emerge upon the plane of his most memorable achievements. In the Mediterranean, ten years before, he first attained distinction for his feats of seamanship. It was there, at Calvi, that he lost an eye—the eye whose blindness afterwards saved the British fortunes at Copenhagen,—and there that he realized that land engagements were not his forte, that his proper sphere was on the sea. When it became clear that Napoleon had thrown down the challenge to Europe—when

> 'Out of the South and over the Sea
> A gunner had travelled, a king to be'—

Nelson proved himself the true successor of Drake and Blake, and the greatest master of naval warfare in his generation. On his appointment to the command of the Mediterranean Fleet, in 1798, it was not easy, in the language of Admiral Mahan,

> 'to foretell the sudden ascent to fame, the burst of meridian splendour with which the sun of his renown was soon to rise upon men's eyes, and in which it ran its course to the cloudless finish of his days.'

But in the same year the Battle of the Nile saved India and the British dominions of the East from the aggressive designs of the future Emperor of the French. It was the first of Nelson's decisive victories: and the star of his ascendancy was not to set until the Admiral met his death in his own Flagship in the hour of victory and bequeathed to his country a legacy of renown in 'the trophied strength of Trafalgar.'

This is not the place for any considered enquiry into the precise military significance of Nelson's victory. Suffice it to say that although the practical annihilation of the French and Spanish Fleets did not prevent the continuance of the great war through nine long years, it yet put an end to all question of naval rivalry. England's supremacy at sea was unchallengeable, and the rest of the struggle was fought out on the Continent. To the British Fleet—then as now—the debt of the British people and the civilized world was immeasurable, and the memory of Nelson stands as a relic of a former greatness—a greatness undiminished, and a reminder in the days of renewed conflict of the precious heritage of our empire of the sea.

The issue at stake in the French wars, of which the anniversary of Trafalgar so sharply reminds us, was virtually the issue of the present. It is true that nationality—the idea of nationality as we know it and trace its growth in the course of modern history—had hardly emerged from the toils of Revolutionary France, and was not to take material shape in new measures of self-government—the nationality of Greece, the independence of Belgium or the growth of constitutional government in the German Principalities—for more than a decade after Waterloo and the Congress of Vienna. The Nation was still in a great measure overshadowed by the State. But the issue was virtually the same. It was defined by the English Prime Minister, William Pitt, in words of which every syllable is true to-day. Asked in the House of Commons to state in a sentence the cause for which England was contending, he replied in a single word, 'Security': and he also said:—

> 'We must remember that it is not for ourselves alone that we submit to unexampled privations. We have for ourselves the great

> duty of self-preservation to perform; but the duty of the people of England now is of a higher and nobler order. We are, in the first place, to provide for our security against an enemy whose malignity to this country knows no bounds..... But our still higher exultation ought to be that we provide not only for our own safety, but hold out a prospect to nations now bending under the iron yoke of tyranny of what the exertions of a free people can effect.'

'A free people!' Freedom is the core of British Imperialism, and its justification. The security of freedom for herself and her allies, faithless as they were in the days of which we have been speaking, faithful as they are to-day, and for other peoples, the oppressed and down-trodden beneath the heel of the ruthless repudiator of faith—this is, now as then, the primary strength of the British case.

To-day, as throughout the course of our history, we cannot but believe ourselves to be a nation peculiarly privileged. We do not as a people publicly invoke the Almighty in the fashion of the monarch who now figures as our principal enemy; but we may fairly think that we are a chosen race, that British Imperialism has indeed a divine sanction for its emancipating value, for its positive utility as an enlightening and civilizing influence. But this privilege cannot be regarded as unconditional; and it might well be argued that the condition of our imperial rule is the maintenance of the British Fleet. For whatever might have been said of the necessity of the Fleet in time past, whatever prophecies we could have made of the consequences—for India, Africa or the Islands of the Sea, apart altogether from our security at Home—of its

absence or abandonment, the war has proved its indispensability beyond argument. And yet we cannot admit that this is the complete assurance of our enduring strength.

We speak, as a race, with confidence even when the world is almost in the melting-pot. We are conscious of strength. 'Humility,' it has been said, 'is a good schoolmaster, but a bad fighting leader.' Confidence is plainly the reverse. National confidence is good like the salt, but 'if the salt hath lost its savour wherewith shall it be salted?' Confidence is not inconsistent with that humility which is due from us all in the presence of Him in whose power it is to shatter confidence in defeat and the might of armaments in the dust of empires. Our tenure of what we hold dear, of the glorious heritage of empire, of the priceless privilege of a free people, we must account as conditional upon our 'interpretation of national privilege in the terms of national duty.' The solidity of the nation, never more pronounced than under the testing fire of war, is yet dependent upon the soundness and integrity of its component parts—of each individual man, each in some sense the master of his fate, each the trustee of his own soul, each required to discern and 'do out the duty,' which lies to his hand.

Perhaps the secret of our success as an Imperial Power lies principally in the practical expression of the sense of individual duty which is the real characteristic of a religious race. As a nation we have our shortcomings—in imperial affairs we have sometimes shown them,—we have made our blunders, we have sometimes exploited the savage for profit, we have sometimes hustled the Oriental. But it is, perhaps, imperially that we have made our greatest contribution to the world's political progress which is the growth of political liberty. The secret of liberty is obedience to law, or, in other words, the

performance of duty. 'So speak ye,' said St. James, 'and so do as men that are to be judged by a law of liberty.' We read the records of our race, the long 'pageant of service and sacrifice,' and take new courage, confident of the future of our national Christianity, while examples are being renewed of the faith of those old masters of war and peace, whose sense of duty was the assurance of their country's safety.

> 'Let us now praise famous men and our fathers that begat as..... These were honoured in their generations and were the glory of their times..... Their bodies are buried in peace, but their name liveth for evermore.'

The obligation, however, goes deeper and further than we have yet implied. The national security is but instrumental in the great scheme to which as Christians we must needs commit ourselves. And in that scheme there is a place for those who do not come within the category of 'famous men,' who have fought their fight and finished their course in obscurity, of whom it is written that

> 'Some there be which have no memorial; who are perished as though they had never been, and are become as though they had never been born.'

For it is the case that accomplishment is limited by opportunity. It is intolerable to suggest that the lesser and, perhaps, forgotten triumphs of Christian loyalty are not secure of their recognition and reward in 'the world which sets this right.' This world showers its favours upon kings and statesmen and such as merit war's majestic recompense. Great services deserve great rewards, but it is by service that distinction is properly

measured. Yet Christian loyalty is expressed in simple not less than in magnificent ways,

> 'In little nameless unremembered acts
> Of kindness and of love.'

For Christian loyalty is owed, through the channels of manifold service, to the beckonings of the Christian's conscience, to the claims of his country and the needs of his fellow-men, and through all and above all to Him, who was the perfect Man, who 'did out His duty,' and drained the bitter cup, 'who, being in the form of God counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the Cross.'

LAODICEAN LUKEWARMNESS.[1]

John to the seven churches which are in Asia.

Revelation I, v. 4.

And to the Angel of the Church of the Laodiceans write: These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God; I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.

Revelation III, vv. 14, 15, 16.

The vision of the seer of Patmos furnishes an invaluable glimpse of the childhood of Christianity. 'The seven churches which are in Asia' present a variety of characteristics which have rarely failed to mark the Christian society, and serve to illustrate the changelessness of human nature in continually changing environment. Of the peculiarities of the seven churches, that of Laodicea is not the least suggestive; Laodicean lukewarmness is almost proverbial. It is not uncommonly the case that the Bible is rendered more intelligible by a reference to the secular history of persons and places that figure in the sacred writings. Laodicea is assuredly a case in point. Like others of the seven churches, Laodicea was first a prosperous city. Unlike Sardis or Smyrna, however, the growth of Laodicea was postponed until the Christian era; most of its wealth was not accumulated until the Roman dominion came to include the province of Asia. An interesting light is thrown upon Laodicea in the first

[1] At Parade Service, Chaklala Camp, 3rd Sunday in Advent, December 17th, 1916.

century by the great historian of the Roman Empire. Of the eleven cities mentioned in the following passage it is certain that five were identical with the same number of the seven churches :—

> 'Under the reign of the Cæsars the proper Asia contained five hundred populous cities, enriched with all the gifts of nature and adorned with all the refinements of art. Eleven cities of Asia had once disputed the honour of dedicating a temple to Tiberius, and their respective merits were examined by the Senate. Four of them were immediately rejected as unequal to the burden ; and among these was Laodicea, whose splendour is still displayed in its ruins. Laodicea collected a very considerable revenue from its flocks of sheep, celebrated for the fineness of their wool, and had received, a little before the contest, a legacy of above four hundred thousand pounds by the testament of a generous citizen. If such was the poverty of Laodicea, what must have been the wealth of those cities, whose claim appeared preferable, and particularly of Pergamus, of Smyrna, and of Ephesus, who so long disputed with each other the titular primacy of Asia ? '[1]

The admitted wealth of Laodicea provides a useful commentary upon the seer's vision. The concentration upon commercial interest, and the self-satisfaction with its results, produced, in those who had come to form a

[1] *Vide* Gibbon, *Decline and fall of the Roman Empire.* (ed. Bury), Vol. I., p. 49.

Christian community, a not unfamiliar form of compromise. Religious accommodation to the pleasant things which are certain and at hand, rather than a rule of conduct based upon serious conviction of a future which seems perhaps doubtful and distant—this familiar phenomenon seems to have been a characteristic of Laodicea. And the Spirit's commission to the seer disclosed the austere message of truth by reference to the contemporary prosperity and self-complacence of the citizens :

> ' Because thou sayest I am rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing ; and knowest not that thou art wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked : I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire'—(not, observe, the gold of the merchants)—' that thou mayest be rich '—(with the riches of true religion) :
>
> ' and white raiment '—(not the glossy-black wool of the sheep for which the city was famous and on which its prosperity had been largely built)—but ' white raiment '—(the symbol of purity)—' that thou mayest be clothed and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear :
>
> and anoint thine eyes with eye-salve '—(not the Phrygian powder which was a specific of a neighbouring medical school and was probably prepared at Laodicea)—' that thou mayest see '—(in the unclouded light of religious truth.)

The whole passage is a repudiation of all that hinders righteousness. It is not the fact of wealth, but the method of obtaining it ; not the fact of commercial activity, for

that is an unquestioned sign of healthy national life, but the concentration on the attainment of personal profit at all costs, which are the sources of hindrance. The motive determines the method, and it is the method which reveals most plainly the genuineness or futility of personal religion. Riches cannot be confined, I think, to the narrow meaning of money. They must properly signify the attainment of designs or the satisfaction of wants, which may or may not be purchased with money, but are generally as a matter of fact facilitated by it. To 'trust in the multitude of his riches' may well mean, in the words of the Psalmist, that man will 'strengthen himself in his wickedness'; and it is reasonable to argue that such trust in 'riches,' or belief in the goodness and sufficiency of the non-religious ends which they may imply or make possible, must tend to produce in the professing Christian exactly that form of compromise which is described as 'Laodicean lukewarmness.'

In the worst event these 'riches' mean no more than self-surrender to appetites and passions, but their true character must sooner or later reveal itself in emptiness. The moral sphere no less than the economic is subject to a law of diminishing returns, and the consequence of its action is nowhere better illustrated than in Matthew Arnold's lines on Ancient Rome:

> 'On that hard pagan world disgust
> And secret loathing fell;
> Deep weariness and sated lust
> Made human life a hell.'

The easy stages of descent into the ultimate abyss of moral depravity of whatever kind must needs be forbidden to the Christian from the outset. In the moral sphere there can be no compromise. Laodicean lukewarmness

is the negation of Christian vitality. 'I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot. I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.'

There is, however, another aspect of compromise in no way to be identified with the lukewarmness of Laodicea. Compromise is not necessarily an evil or even a weakness. Not seldom it is of the essence of Christian charity. But indulgence in the bad compromise tends to exclude the exercise of the good. The attempt to accommodate moral laxity and the profession of religion is attended by an indefensible dualism. External religious practice then ceases to be evidence of a religious life. There becomes a disastrous divorce between morals and devotion, and men are drawn together in sects and cliques by the sympathy of partisanship, not by the zeal for righteousness.

In this regard I think there is a particular lesson for us as churchmen—or, indeed, for all who profess allegiance to one or another form of organized or ecclesiastical Christianity. Two tendencies are discernible, and, by comparison, illustrative of the point in question: *first*, that of the devout Christian who may seem to be a lukewarm churchman, and, *secondly*, that of the lukewarm Christian who is yet an apparently enthusiastic churchman. The one finds in institutional Christianity only a remote reflection of the Gospel by which he seeks to order his life: the other may be compounding an unprincipled private life by rigorous observance of arbitrary ecclesiastical rules.

These are perhaps extreme cases. Yet they serve to illustrate two divergent tendencies, of the existence of which I think we must all be conscious. We are apt to be lenient towards those who do not offend our own prejudices, and tolerant even of moral lapses, both in ourselves and our

friends, which do not appear to infringe external principles, or are not directly connected with the predilections which we have exalted into principles, in the sectarian sphere. It was said by the late Samuel Butler—

> 'Heaven is the work of all the best and kindest men and women. Hell is the work of prigs, pedants and professional truth-tellers. The world is an attempt to make the best of Heaven and Hell.'[1]

'Prigs, pedants and professional truth-tellers'—an unpleasant company in which we would rather not be numbered! Yet the phrase is not, I think, too severe a description of the devotees of institutional observances which are the substitution for, and not the expression of, the good life—the life which is lived in the performance of duty, irrespective of particular ecclesiastical allegiance. It is the case that some of those who do live that good life do not even call themselves Christians; some profess devotion to our Saviour, but cannot find Him in His church, some who do their duty do not escape the stigma of the heretic, and are sometimes repudiated in favour of the drunkard or the moral leper who conforms to what are hardly more than technical rules.

Such inconsistency and apparent injustice must needs have marked the human direction of the Christian Church. Institutionalism necessitates some degree of authority beyond the individual conscience, and since man is a gregarious animal it is likely to survive. Yet one cannot but be conscious of its weakness, and of the ecclesiastical tyranny which it tends to foster. An undue stress is readily laid upon particular ecclesiastical allegiance; unhealthy rivalries and jealousies are too commonly

1 Vide *The Note-Books of Samuel Butler*.

cultivated between Christian swho, by tradition, temperament or fashion, find themselves, as it were, in different camps: whereas it is hardly open to question that the Kingdom of God consists of those in whose common life the call of God goes not unanswered. The Christian religion is essentially personal. To each of us the appeal comes as it came from the Spirit to the Laodiceans:

> 'Behold I stand at the door and knock. If any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him and sup with him, and he with me.'

The answer of the faithful is expressed in the zealous discharge of daily duty, in the cultivation of the good life.

I shall not seem, I hope, to strike a note of national arrogance, if I seek, in conclusion, to illustrate my thesis by a reference to the national character. It is the case, I think, that the spirit of compromise is one very real characteristic of the English race, and that the chivalrous performance of duty is another. The compromise is not the lukewarm accommodation of good and evil, but the generous mutual concession of the final consequences of conflicting opinions held by upright men on either side. The natural sense of justice imposes restraint, and the concentration upon practical duties absorbs the energy, and provides the solution, of controversy which might else prove disastrous. I take leave to borrow the fine words of the Dean of St. Paul's, spoken in Westminster Abbey during the present war:

> 'For the present we must drink the cup that our Heavenly Father has given us, and if things go badly we must remember that the true greatness of England has always been a moral and spiritual greatness founded,

> above all, perhaps, on a definite and recognizable type of character—the lay religion of the English gentleman. This I most earnestly hope we shall always cherish, with its fine flowers of honourable dealing in war as well as in peace, of justice, kindliness and respect for the rights of others. It is the best thing that, as a nation, we have to give to the world.'

There, in the national character, while we preserve it, is a negation of Laodicean lukewarmness; there, in the course of trivial rounds and common tasks, not less than in responsible duties, it is possible for us all to make answer to the Spirit's appeal:

> 'Behold I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me. To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches.'

CHRISTMAS AND WAR.[1]

Mercy and Truth are met together; Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other.

Psalm LXXXV, v. 10.

When the last Sunday in Advent falls on Christmas Eve our preaching must be determined rather by the coming festival than by the season which is practically past. It is not, perhaps, the easier course, because the coming of Christmas, the festival of peace and good-will, in the midst of the mighty conflict which seems to be the contradiction of those ideas, must bring many disconcerting reflections to the considering mind. Questions are raised which seem to go to the root of the problem of Christianity in the world. A considered answer would be impossible in the time at our disposal; but there is one line of thought which I think we may fitly follow on this Christmas Eve.

I have chosen for my text a verse from one of the Christmas Psalms, which seems to me to sum up in a remarkable fashion our conception of the event which we commemorate to-morrow. The traditional story of our Saviour's birth has been hallowed through many generations of believers, and still appeals to our imagination. The Angels' proclamation—

> 'Glory to God in the highest,
> And on earth peace, good-will towards men'—

[1] At Parade Service, Chaklala Camp, Christmas Eve, 1916.

accords with the picture which my text proposes—

> 'Mercy and truth are met together;
> Righteousness and peace have kissed each other.'

And this is exactly what seems never to have been fulfilled through nineteen centuries of Christianity. Christian history, Ecclesiastical history, European history (as you will, for they all cover much the same ground), are for the most part the records of struggle, of a succession of differences and rivalries, differences of race, creed and language, fierce contentions and armed conflicts. The latest, the most extensive and, as we are inclined to think, the fiercest of these is now raging—the very negation, as it seems, of Mercy, Truth, Righteousness and Peace.

I do not propose to weary you by stating for, perhaps, the thousandth time the arguments, which you know as well as I, by which we justify our part in this conflict. As a nation we have a strong case, quite as strong as when we led the European Coalition against the last great oppressor of Europe—Napoleon. We may fairly think that we are fighting to suppress the forces which prohibit the blessed state described by the Psalmist in the text. But the process is painful: men feel that both themselves and others dear to them are suffering undeservedly, and are led to ask in bewilderment, disappointment and dismay: 'Does not God defend the right?' To those, however, who read history, this attitude of despair is at once familiar and untenable. The stormy days of the French Revolution seemed to contemporary minds to have brought a new era, to which the happiness of the past could never return. Talleyrand is reported to have said that no one who had not lived before 1789 knew the sweets of life. We are tempted sometimes to repeat his judgement with reference to the year 1914. But the life of the world

proceeds in cycles, a slow process of hardly perceptible progress; and periods of destruction have been as necessary as the intervening stages of recovery, renewal and advance. It is only by taking long views, or regarding long processes that we can expect to find the presence of justice in the scheme of things. For, if apparent injustice produces despair, we cannot rightly forget either that history abounds in examples of measureless tyranny, of savage hordes devastating the lands of peaceful folk, or that such affliction is allowed not necessarily as a punishment, but perhaps as a fulfilment of the principle enunciated in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that—

> 'Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.'

The argument from national or international appearances does not really go deep enough. For since nations are composed of individuals, a national spirit is either the sum of individual spirits, or partly a blend of different spirits and partly the resultant force of spirits at variance. It sometimes represents a numerical majority, but sometimes a minority; for the majority is not always a majority of number, but sometimes of power, as in the case of a single tyrant who with a small but disciplined army bends a nation to his will. Even in the most united and consolidated nations you can count on a proportion of dissentients. This is true to some extent even in modern Germany, which presents the phenomenon of mechanical unity in a degree probably unparalleled in history. 'I do not know,' said Burke, the wisest of our political mentors, 'I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people.' The course of action is determined by the most powerful, not necessarily the most righteous, faction. Christianity has to make its count

with powerful forces which are opposed to it, and cannot finally be judged in the conditions of collective action.

For the Christian religion is essentially personal. To the heart and conscience of the individual the appeal of Christ must make its first approach; and the coming of Christmas reminds us of the simple and unpretentious form which it takes. If in the perplexities of an international upheaval, or in the dark days of national distress, men are tempted to lose heart and to descry, as they think, the failure of Christianity, Christmas will at least remind them of the overwhelming difficulties which might have seemed to beset the path of Him who 'came to visit us in great humility,' the little Child who was born in a manger because there was no room in the inn.

'There was no room for them in the inn.' That story of exclusion so truly describes the life of the Founder and the after-fate of His religion in the world, that it is surely forgetfulness of history which alone can permit the suggestion that any special failure is now disclosed. Organized Christianity as represented in the Churches has indeed failed to avert in these days what in past history it has not seldom been its *métier* to produce. The aggressive creed which once attended the international aspirations of the Catholic Church has now been adopted by the German State. But with neither of these manifestations can Christianity claim any proper connection. To speak of the failure of Christianity is a confession of our our unfaithfulness. To redeem the failure is first to set ourselves the difficult task of self-reformation. If mercy and truth have not met together, if righteousness and peace have not kissed each other, in the sanctuary of our own hearts, it is most probably because we have allowed the influences of external distress, or the forbidden lust of vengeance, to harden us against their entry. 'There was

no room for them in the inn.' The simple story of the Nativity is perhaps the most remarkable prophecy which the Bible offers of the course of Christian history.

For those who give entry to the Christmas gifts; for those who find in the coming of Christmas the renewal of Christian courage and the light of Christian love—whatever be the tumult of the world or the thunder of war—for them at least it will be the case that—

> 'Mercy and Truth are met together;
> Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other.'

It is in the individual sphere rather than the international that the peace can be realized which the Lord came to bring. It has always been the case that 'the earth is full of darkness and cruel habitations'; that is true of the days of peace as well as the days of war; the darkness and the cruelty are only less manifest in peace, and international perils appear to be more terrible. Yet those are the perils which are now paramount, and we must strive to face them in a Christian fashion. When war is abroad, and multitudes are stricken with desolation, when the heavens are clouded with the smoke of battle, and Christmas seems perhaps a mockery, the Christian may yet find the peace of Him who came to bring it, not the peace of selfish complacency, but the peace of inward conviction, and fulfil in his own small sphere the vision of Milton's ode *On the Morning of Christ's Nativity*:

> 'No War or Battail's sound
> Was heard the world around,
> The idle spear and shield were high up hung;
> The hooked chariot stood
> Unstained with hostile blood,

The trumpet spake not to the armèd throng,
And Kings sate still with awfull eye,
As if they surely knew their sovran Lord was by.'

KINGSHIP AND SERVICE.[1]

I exhort that supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgiving be made for all men; for kings, and all that are in high place; that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity.

I. *Timothy* II. vv. 1, 2.

The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say, Lo here! or There! for lo, the Kingdom of God is within you.

S. Luke XVII. vv. 20. 21.

Seven years ago, on May 6th, as perhaps I need hardly remind you, His late Majesty King Edward VII was gathered to his fathers, and our present King and Emperor began to reign. The anniversary of Accession Day might not in normal times suggest quite so directly the subject of our preaching. To look back only seven years is hardly to reflect on past history. But the times are abnormal in such an intense degree that to look back only a few years take us into a past as remote as it has come to seem almost irrelevant. In the retrospect of the reign of King George V the days of peace and the days of war are sharply divided. The great contrast between the two suggests that we have already entered upon a new age. In a few short years the world has suffered a change which, as we think, can never be effaced.

Of course, it has not uncommonly been a characteristic of great crises in history, that contemporary opinion has falsely expected them to yield immediate and excessive

[1] At Parade Service, Christ Church, Rawal Pindi, May 6th, 1917, being the anniversary of the King's Accession.

results. According to whether opinion is hopeful or despairing, it is apt to exaggerate its expectations either of a golden age or of a legacy of irredeemable disaster. Too much, certainly, is sometimes expected of the great conflict in which we are all in some measure engaged. The paradox that we have gone to war to make an end of war has in some quarters been done to death. To suggest that the present is to prove the last of the wars of history is so to misread all the lessons of history as, according to human calculation, to be ridiculous.

Yet it is the case that no previous crisis has taken quite so universal, or perhaps so portentous, a form as the present. In so far as every effort has its corresponding effect, some tangible and probably permanent result may be expected from this titanic struggle. On the one hand, our enemies, who broke the peace, are exerting themselves to an extent which it is neither right nor wise to underrate. No device of the Devil, whether intellectual, scientific, or inhuman to the point of bestiality, has been left untried in the scheme of subjugating the world. On the other hand, the British Coalition, compelled to resist this scheme and to provide the forces of emancipation, while slow to adopt the more doubtful courses which might seem to neutralize the value of its case, is united for a single end—the defeat of the principle which is the evil genius of Germany. Professor Jacks, writing in the *Hibbert Journal*,[1] spoke no more than the truth when he said of the war, that 'Politically it has united us against the Germans. Spiritually it has united us against the Devil.' The effort of Germany has produced the unity of the rest of the world. The consequent united effort of the Allied nations, if, as we hope and pray and firmly believe, it be triumphant, can hardly fail to produce even more. If only it lead

[1] October 1915, p. 9.

through the defeat to the disillusionment of Germany, it will have been productive of lasting good, and even at the price of passing loss will have been amply justified. Loss is often the price of liberty, and it cannot be doubted that the awakening of the enemy to the truth of things will prove a new security of the liberties of Europe and the world. But the process, as we know, is cruel: the high gods, in ancient phrase, are pitiless; and it is only that intolerance of tyranny which is bred in the very bones of the race which makes that process tolerable.

> 'In our halls is hung
> Armoury of the invincible knights of old;
> We must be free or die who speak the tongue
> That Shakespeare spake; the faith and morals hold
> That Milton held. In everything we are sprung
> Of earth's first blood, have titles manifold.' [1]

These reflections are not irrelevant on a day when we are invited to think of the responsibilities of kingship. The King is lord of an empire vast beyond the dreams of its early builders. The burden which indirectly it is his to bear is incomparably greater than we can fairly picture in the case of those outstanding makers of England's greatness, the Plantagenets or the Tudors. For although he rules through Ministers of State, it is impossible to think of his responsibility being thereby diminished. His known affection for all his people would disallow any suggestion of such diminution. I incline to think that the sense of responsibility would tend to grow as the discovery of wrongs unrighted was not accompanied by the liberty of action which would be required to right them. Duty, which in a King is constitutionalism in matters of State must be sometimes peculiarly irksome, not least because

[1] *Vide* Wordsworth, *England* 1802.

it requires inaction. We think of King George V as before all else a duty-doing monarch. It is chiefly, I imagine, for that reason that, at a time when other monarchies seem to be tottering, he has been able to sustain and even to extend the loyalty to the principle of monarchy, and the person of the monarch, throughout the British Dominions and the English-speaking world. His duty to his people is repaid by their devotion. In the picturesque language of Thomas Fuller, the King may be said to be 'rich in having a plentiful exchequer of his people's hearts.'[1]

Yet we know how good and duty-doing men are sometimes misunderstood and misrepresented. In the days before the war, when the currents of political strife were running high, the central historic principle of the monarchy seemed at times to be obscured by the ephemeral idols of party feeling. A duty-doing and constitutional monarch is at a disadvantage in the crises of national disunion. He cannot take sides; and what hinders the monarch is often an advantage to the rogue. I remember hearing it said, at the time of the failure of the Irish Home Rule Conference in 1914, by one whose acquaintance with His Majesty had given him opportunities of observing, which are denied to most of us, that the King possessed just those virtuous characteristics—a high sincerity of purpose, a single-minded affection for his subjects, an unwavering desire for their welfare, and an earnestness in the pursuit of it, combined with that rectitude of intention expressed in the refusal to follow the morally doubtful, though perhaps potentially successful course,—which in times of revolution 'send constitutional monarchs to the scaffold.'

---

[1] This quotation is borrowed from a sermon preached in Westminster Abbey, on the occasion of the death of Queen Victoria, by the present Dean of Durham.

Those days of so-called peace are over. The days of threatened national disintegration have given place to a national unity which is intensified by the misery of men and nations. Unity grows out of the womb of sorrow, and is now expressing itself in a loyalty which, always inherent in the English race, is perhaps at the present time unparalleled. Precisely because we are conscious of this loyalty we ought surely to invest it with the sacredness which we attach to the solemn moments of communion with Him who is the King of Kings. 'I exhort that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all men; for kings and all that are in high place; that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity.'

Our prayer for 'kings and all that are in high place' is comprehensive of all who bear responsibility. So praying, in some sense we are also praying for ourselves. But we cannot properly consider our prayer as confined to the few moments when we make our special supplications. A life of prayer is not a life of apparently feeble inactivity upon our knees; it is a life spent in the active performance of duty. To borrow the language of Mr. Gladstone:

> 'I care not to ask if there be dregs or tatters of human life, such as can escape from the description and boundary of morals. I submit that Duty is a power which rises with us in the morning and goes to rest with us at night. It is co-extensive with the action of our intelligence. It is the shadow which cleaves to us, go where we will, and which only leaves us when we leave the light of life.'[1]

[1] *Vide* "Vatican Decrees."

Or again, to carry the idea a step further, in the words of John Stuart Mill:

> 'A virtuous human being assumes the exalted character of a fellow-labourer with the Highest, a fellow-combatant in the great strife, contributing his little, which by the aggregation of many like himself becomes much, towards that progressive ascendancy and ultimately complete triumph of good over evil which history points to.' [1]

Whatever be the doubt which is besetting, or the affliction which seems overwhelming, or the disappointment of unattainable desire, which come like a barrier between ourselves and that tranquil and quiet life of the Spirit which in our hearts we know that we desire—whatever it be, it is best overcome by determined concentration on the plain requirements of practical duty. 'The Kingdom of God is within you.' It is personal goodness which will finally survive: the rest is only passing like a shadow.

We are thinking to-day of the King and the special responsibilities of kingship in these difficult and dangerous days. But here, in India, in our smaller spheres, it is thus, by faithful devotion as well to the less exacting as to the more commanding claims, that, with our Indian fellow-citizens and fellow-soldiers—in some cases also, as we may rejoice to remember, our Indian fellow-Christians—we can best serve the great commonwealth of those nations which own allegiance to the British Crown. It is thus also, and hardly otherwise, that we can be accounted as having done anything to hasten the Kingdom of God. The storms of external strife need not exclude that tranquil and quiet life within, which is the condition of our sustaining

---

[1] *Vide* "*Three Essays on Religion.*"

the responsibilities and 'doing out the duty' in the state of life to which we have been called.

'The Kingdom of God is within you.' Listen to an application of the text as it has been finely done by a master:

> 'Wherever men serve the weak and the wayward with chivalrous courtesy; wherever they curb their own base appetites and subdue their lives to the law of purity; wherever they suppress their personal ambitions for the larger and longer interest of the State; wherever they "do out the duty" of their station in the teeth of misconception and neglect; there Christ is marching forward to victory, setting up visibly on the earth his Kingdom of Righteousness.'[1]

'The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say Lo here! or There! for lo, the Kingdom of God is within you.'

---

[1] H. Hensley Henson, D.D., Dean of Durham, in a sermon preached before the University of Oxford on 'The Kingdom of God' (November 2nd, 1913, All Souls' Day): *Vide* "*Notes of My Ministry*," p. 89.

VOCATION AND MINISTRY.[1]

In the year that King Uzziah died I saw the Lord.....And I heard the voice of the Lord saying, Whom shall I send and who will go for Us. Then I said, Here am I, send me. And He said, Go.

Isaiah VI, vv. 1, 8, 9.

Trinity Sunday has been called 'the Festival of Christian Orthodoxy.' The doctrine of the Trinity was reached by the Church in its attempt to correlate the problem presented by the Founder with its own collective and individual experience. 'Here,' observes an acute and considering scholar, 'is its sure foundation and the secret of its wonderful vitality. . . . . It is a key which fits the lock, an hypothesis which explains the facts, a solution which leaves nothing unsolved, and in the region of theological speculation it holds the field.'[2] The truth remains through the process of restatement, and shines more brightly when older forms of its expression, which served their age, have been discarded. On the day when the Church's calendar provides for the commemoration of a doctrine and not, as on other festivals, of an historical occurrence, it is not unfitting that we should affirm the principle of theological progress, and admit the wisdom of Erasmus when, in an older age of transition, he declared that 'By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.'

---

1 Christ Church, Rawal Pindi, Trinity Sunday, June 3rd, 1917, at Evensong.

2 *Vide* H. Hensley Henson, D.D., Dean of Durham, *The Creed in the Pulpit*, p. 266. The sermon on *Isaiah's Vision*, from which this quotation is taken, I have freely used as a guide, and have interpreted, as I hope, fairly, in the composition of the earlier part of this discourse.

The words of the text not only admit of an obvious application in practical life which I will ask you to consider later, but also provide an example of progressive interpretation. The sixth chapter of Isaiah which was read as the first lesson, and the eighteenth chapter of Genesis which is an alternative Old Testament lesson for Trinity Sunday, were appointed with particular reference to the newly-formulated doctrine of the Trinity. It appears that by a process of unsound anachronistic reasoning it was thought to find in the Old Testament the proofs of a doctrine which was inseparable from the New Testament and the Christian era. We now know that the belief in one God is the conclusion of a process of evolution from polytheism. A belief in a number of divine or semi-divine beings presided over by God Himself seems to have disclosed itself more than once in the Old Testament, as in other old-world religious literature ; and from this belief Hebrew religion was slowly delivered by the progressive teaching of the prophets.

To the early Church, before the days of the new learning and the newer study of comparative religion, the Old Testament seemed to contain evidences of the ' Three in One and One in Three,' the formula of explanation of the Godhead at which the Church had lately and laboriously arrived. Both Isaiah's vision and the story of the visit of the three men to Abraham had naturally been understood by contemporary minds as revelations of God through several persons of the ' host of heaven '; They were as readily assumed by the primitive Church to be positive manifestations of the Holy Trinity itself in the sense and fashion in which the Godhead had come to be defined. These two chapters were regarded as nothing less than ' proof-texts ' of the newly-formulated doctrine, and were freely used as such in the championship of the orthodox

faith. That is the reason, apparently no longer valid, why these lessons were originally chosen for public reading in the churches on Trinity Sunday.

But because Isaiah's vision cannot be made to admit of a Trinitarian reference, it must, none the less, be treated as an historical event in Isaiah's life. So regarded, it discovers a new fitness on Trinity Sunday which has become by custom the principal day on which the bishops perform what is, perhaps, the most important of their duties. On an Ordination Sunday, when numbers of men (though necessarily few in war time) enter the vocation of the Church's ministry, and thus signalize the conclusion of the process by which every ordinand is guided who makes his choice with sincerity, it cannot be unprofitable to think of Isaiah's vision as telling 'the secret history of every true ministry.' Isaiah's vision opened the career of the greatest of 'the goodly fellowship of the prophets'; and he recalled it as coinciding with a critical occurrence in the national history—'In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord. . . . And I heard the voice of the Lord saying, "Whom shall I send and who will go for Us?" Then I said, "Here am I, send me." And He said, "Go."' The scene has been described as a part of Isaiah's autobiography. It was certainly the crisis of his life, the event which stood between his more or less secular past and his future divinely-appointed prophethood. It is also supposed to have marked a stage in the evolution of prophecy. According to the late Professor Cheyne, of Oxford, in *The Prophecies of Isaiah*:

> 'The immediate object of the vision was to set before Isaiah the ideal of prophecy as a life work, as opposed to the primitive view connecting it too closely with isolated ecstatic moments. Isaiah stands in consequence of

> this revelation between two schools of prophecy. . . . Isaiah, so far as we know, had but one vision, but that gave him a stimulus and a theme for his whole ministry.'[1]

Spiritual experience is the determining factor in Divine vocation. The voice of the Lord may come in a single great experience like Isaiah's, or in the repeated beckonings of the individual conscience. It may be supposed that in one form or another it comes to many, perhaps most men. For although in thinking of Isaiah's vision we have chiefly in our minds its suggestiveness of the ordination of the clergy, yet we cannot exclude ourselves from the obligations of discipleship. It is, however, the case that these obligations do weigh in a particular fashion on the clergy. The difficulties of discipleship, which are common to us all, are often increased by the conditions of the clergyman's life. If it be urged on the one hand that the function of priesthood has received an emphasis at the expense of that of prophethood, an emphasis which has tended to bind on the clergy something of the character of a professional caste, and to effect and widen a breach between themselves and laymen, it is also the case that the difficulties of the clergy are often enough not fairly understood by their lay brethren. Their function of prophethood, their claim to speak 'in the name of the Lord'—not as a priest to layman, but rather as a man to men—which takes its authority from a Divine commission, which again has been disclosed and communicated in spiritual experience, is too often rendered unintelligible. Preaching and practice offer a target for much criticism which is not always charitable or even just. As a layman myself, I may perhaps not unfitly enter a plea for the

---

[1] Op. cit., quoted.

clergy ; and I would ask you to remember that the earnestness and devotion of the clergyman are wonderfully dependent on evidences of the same qualities in his congregation. Give me leave to repeat a summary of some of the difficulties of the clergy as it was put by an honoured Anglican preacher, the Dean of Durham, in a sermon which I heard five years ago at Westminster :

> 'On any showing these are no easy days for the Christian minister. His work must be done for the most part without the stimulus of the general confidence or the comfort of the general goodwill. He is hard pressed by forces which are not the highest. The course of politics does not help him ; and there is a price to be paid for the smile of society which he may not rightly or safely pay. External difficulties go along with internal perplexities. It is not easy for the Christian preacher to be at once candid and charitable, self-respecting and considerate, obedient to the Divine vocation and loyal to the ecclesiastical system, a witness and a pastor, a learner of new truth, and a guardian of the unchanging faith. What can sustain any man in a situation so difficult, under embarrassments so extreme ? What but the conviction, living and fresh to-day as when it flashed on his spirit with compelling force so many years ago, that God has called him to this ministry, God and none other.[1]

'I heard the voice of the Lord saying, "Whom shall I send, and who will go for Us ?" Then I said, "Here am I, send me." And He, said, "Go."'

[1] Op. cit, p. 275.

Divine vocation is not, however, the monopoly of the clergy, except as it concerns the form of their life's work and their official duties. The layman is no less commissioned. He too has received the Divine summons to a life of discipleship. It has been remarked with fitness that confirmation is the ordination of the layman. Perhaps it is the case that the layman, as a general rule, is concerned more with practical conduct than with religious speculation or doctrines of belief which are especially associated with Trinity Sunday. *His* life is spent for the most part, or ought generally to be spent, in the execution or direction of practical duties. But it is the function of personal experience and of the collective witness of many personal proofs to decide how far the faithful execution of such duties helps, and is helped, by a definite acceptance of the claims of religion as expressed in the article of public worship. Statistical proofs are never trustworthy in the spiritual sphere where motives and convictions are as necessarily paramount as they are generally undisclosed. But when other occupations seem to so great an extent to exclude from the lives of men the forms of public profession of their faith, it will not, I apprehend, be thought uncharitable to suggest that it is less the occupations which come within the category of duty than those which rather might be called distraction, which hinder our public witness to the faith which we profess. It is not, I think, excessive to say that Christianity is actually at work in duty-doing men even when they do not profess it ; and faithfulness in the one sphere will often bring faith, or the recovery of lost faith, in the other.

Religion has, after all, its surest witness in the ungrudging performance of duty. Its expression in churchmanship takes its validity from its expression in practical life. Faith must needs find company in works.

Especially in these days of war, the words of the Lord find their ready application: 'We must work the works of Him that sent Me, while it is day. The night cometh when no man can work.' We cannot now afford to be idle or to grumble at our lot. We need to scrutinize our occupations and to concentrate on those which come within the category of duty. Nothing can properly exclude religion unless it be the performance of those duties which are its true expression. Preoccupation is legitimate only with occupation which is imperative. The prayer of Sir Jacob Astley before the Battle of Edgehill is surely a pattern for us all: 'O Lord, Thou knowest how busy I must be this day. If I forget Thee, do not Thou forget me. March on, boys.'

It is, I say, a pattern for us all, because it proclaimed the essential transcendence of religion in the life of the suppliant; it assumed that the day's work was a righteous business, that the work of the soldier could claim the authority of religious sanction and commission. It recognized in the extremities of action the necessity of His presence, 'without Whose help all labour is ineffectual, and without Whose grace all wisdom is folly.'[1]

This assumption alone permits the supplication. To invoke the Lord's co-operation in a work of iniquity would be a mockery. For that reason there is a certain honesty about those who refuse to confess their religion by publicly gathering with the faithful, because they have not as yet set about the difficult business of trying to lead a new life which involves a refusal to follow the old. For the Divine commission formulated in the unequivocal injunction, 'Go,' must yet include a negative. To do the Lord's bidding is to refuse to do the Devil's. You cannot lead

[1] From a private prayer composed and used by Dr. Johnson, *Vide* Boswell's *Life*.

a life of dual attachment, accepting the Divine vocation and yet giving play to the forces of evil. In the moral sphere the truth of the saying is attested: 'No man can serve two masters.' What every man, sooner or later, discovers in the world is patent to the Christian from the outset. He cannot always attain to his ideal, but he knows full well how respect for the laws of Christ is the guarantee against that disabling serfdom to other masters which not merely invalidates his religious profession, but also, and necessarily, undermines his capacity in the wider sphere of practical life. Every act of resistance to the syren songs of appetite and passion brings us one step nearer to the full enfranchisement of spiritual liberty: every concession to those allurements drags us down by a corresponding gradation into the abyss of moral slavery from which Christ would set us free. 'With freedom did Christ set us free,' said the great Apostle; 'stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage.'

It is only the full franchise of Christian citizenship which can give immunity from the slavery of uncontrolled desire with all its undermining and dispiriting influences. But the exercise of that franchise, the liberty of obedience in Divine vocation, can do much more for us than give immunity. It carries us on to successive planes of spiritual ascendancy, and determines our ultimate independence of the conditions of this 'bourne of time and space.' It proclaims the triumph of character over circumstance and makes even the oppression of the world tolerable and the performance of monotonous duties a succession of triumphant declarations of war. For those who have accepted the Divine commission, who are trying to follow their Master on 'the divers planes of human life,' we know that the struggle is often very hard indeed: but if they have taken up the cross in sincerity they may be sure

that Christ Himself is near, that He knows their sorrows, and marks their every step :

> ' Never a sigh for passion or for pity,
> Never a wail for weakness or for wrong,
> Has not its archive in the Angels' city,
> Finds not its echo in the endless song.' [1]

This assurance is a bulwark of Christian courage and a prop of Christian perseverance. It sustains the struggle through doubt and certainty, through brightness and obscurity, and at length permits the great exclamation of St. Paul : ' From henceforth let no man trouble me ; for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus.'

[1] Myers : *Saint Paul.*

A SECRET OF SUCCESS.[1]

I returned and saw under the sun that the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong.

Ecclesiastes IX, v. 11.

This strange statement of the Preacher's experience seems at the first flush to contradict our own. Surely a race commonly goes to the swiftest runner; the chances of victory in battle are generally, it might be thought, with the stronger force. That the race is to the swift and the battle to the strong seems to be a commonplace of fact, proved in history and proved again in the happenings of these days. To reconciling with appearances the statement that 'the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong' it seems to be necessary both to modify its reference, which we have assumed to be general, and to appeal to its context. It is manifest, I think, on reflection that there are circumstances in which the statement contains the truth. The capacity for speed and the possession of strength are paramount in a savage state of society: but their value is diminished with the progress of civilization and, except in so far as they are accompanied and directed by intelligence and skill, tends actually to disappear. For an illustration we may turn to Francis Bacon's essay on 'Vicissitude.'

> For the conduct of war (he wrote), at first men rested extremely upon number; they did put the wars likewise upon main force and valour, pointing days for pitched fields

[1] At Parade Service, Christ Church, Rawal Pindi, St. John the Baptist's Day, June 24th, 1917.

> and so trying it out upon an even match: and they were more ignorant in ranging and arraying their battles. After they grew to rest on number rather competent than vast, they grew to advantages of place, cunning diversions and the like, and they grew more skilful in the ordering of their battles.[1]

So in all departments of life brute strength, alike individual and collective, tends to become less important, skill in using and directing it more important until it is often the case that intelligence with or without bodily strength is the dominating factor in civilized society.

To take another illustration from a familiar form of sport: When I was rowing in a college boat up at Cambridge about ten years ago, I remember a rowing coach so heartily tired of adjuring an undisciplined crew to keep their eyes in the boat that he pulled them up and delivered them a lecture from the river bank on the respective duties of the cox and the crew. 'The cox,' he said, 'must look about him and use his intelligence. You,' turning to the crew, 'you are there to use your brute strength and your ignorance.' The direction was not strictly true, because the speed of the ship depends as well on the swing and the level feather as on the leg drive. But it was true in the sense that intelligence is pre-eminently required of the cox. The work of a good crew may well be wasted without skilful steering. A good cox might enable an indifferent crew to succeed against better crews, and so conceivably illustrate the statement that 'the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong.'

But is that what the author of Ecclesiastes intended to convey? In our attempt to reconcile the text with our accustomed mode of thought we have certainly

[1] *Vide* Essay *Of the Vicissitude of Things.*

wrenched it from its immediate context. We must remember that the burden of Ecclesiastes may be summed up in the exclamation 'Vanity of vanities! All is vanity!' That is the spirit in which, I think, we must regard as having taken place the composition of the sentence: 'The race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong.' So far from suggesting that the race is actually to the slow and the battle to the weak, the writer was really indulging in a reflection on the predominance of chance. In some measure, we may think, he spoke from the experience of a long life which had perhaps impressed him with the inconsequent workings of what he was led to call 'Chance.' If we must needs disallow that doubtful word and perforce read into earthly existence the working of a Divine Providence and definite purpose, it yet remains the case that the sacred writer had mastered and sought to proclaim an important aspect of the truth. He perceived a Power at work which does on occasions deny the race to the swift and the battle to the strong, a Power widely acknowledged though but dimly comprehended among the ancients.

The Latin poet, Horace, ascribed to the high god the source of human vicissitude, in words of which I will attempt the following translation:

> 'He is able to change the lowest with the loftiest, and God makes of no account the mighty man, and brings to light the things that are hidden: Fortune, the grasping goddess, with a shrill whirring (of her wings) is wont to carry the crown of honour from one man, and delights to place it on another.'[1]

[1] *Vide* Horace *Odes I.*, xxxiv, ll. 12 ff.

'Valet ima summis,
Mutare et insignem attenuat deus
Obscura promens; hinc apicem rapax
Fortuna cum stridore acuto
Sustulit, hic posuisse gaudet.'

The pagan view appears in the Gospel in the familiar lines of the *Magnificat*:

> 'He hath put down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted the humble and meek. He hath filled the hungry with good things: and the rich He hath sent empty away.'

'The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong.' But it is not by chance but by subordination to the will of God that 'the meek shall inherit the earth.' So in common life it is less by force, which is fortuitous, than by a disciplined intellect, which is more certain and more shrewd, that success is attained. Not by force unconditioned but by an intelligent and sparing use of it, do men secure the objects of their desire. War is an appeal to force, but pure force fares ill in the days of scientific warfare. A physically weak man who can shoot straight is worth half a company of men of powerful build and strong constitution who have no skill with the rifle but can only beat about with a bludgeon. There is no need to multiply examples of what is plain; and since our time is short I must ask your attention while I attempt briefly to point my moral.

Force and intelligence, it is true, are complementary: each must in some measure utilize the other; each serves also as a corrective of the other. But while there is little general likelihood of men's using intelligence to the exclusion of force, there is a decided danger of their using force to the exclusion of intelligence. Government must rest ultimately on force, and as each of us is in some degree an instrument of Government, our official authority is derived from the right of appeal to force. But for that very reason we can generally, and ought to be able to, dispense with it, or at least to act on the assumption

that it is not required. Human life is, after all, a matter of mutual trust which is inevitably weakened with every suspicion of coercion. Although unhappily we cannot always assume complete faithfulness—and a consequent vigilance for the shortcomings of other people is imperative in every human system—it is yet required that we try to exercise the spirit of trustfulness and charity. This will express itself in a refusal to believe the worst without the fullest evidence, in a sustained appeal to the better side of the characters of men, in patience with their weakness rather than in hasty or violent denunciation of their mistakes, in the policy of moral suasion rather than the policy of force. There is a moral obligation to be intelligent; and although reasonableness is sometimes silenced for a time by impetuosity or force, it must yet in the long run be upheld. Moral and intellectual reasons for action or restraint are not understood by men to whom violence alone appeals or who imagine that brute force is the solution of all differences; yet it is in accord with our Christian profession to exercise patience in the face of misunderstanding and suspicion, and perseverance in spite of the prospect of failure or of such oblivion as that of the poor wise man whose wisdom delivered the city from a great king, and of whom it is said that 'no one remembered that same poor man.'

On St. John the Baptist's Day we must needs take thought of the pattern of self-suppression disclosed in him who was our Lord's precursor, who loyally disowned the authority which was not his and readily proclaimed the real Messiah who, as he knew, was soon to supersede him. When the soldiers in their turn brought to him their problems with the question, 'And we, what shall we do?' he replied in a sentence which may serve to point the moral of my words to you this morning: 'Do violence to no

man, neither exact anything wrongfully and be content with your wages.' This instruction, 'Do violence to no man,' from which the second seems naturally to follow, 'neither exact anything wrongfully,' cannot be taken to condemn all use of force. If St. John the Baptist had intended to exclude the violence of war he would surely have adjured the soldiers to leave the army. But in the fashion which is properly Christian, he accepted existing institutions and gave the advice which would serve to make them work as well as possible. So also he cannot be thought to have condemned the use of force in self-defence or for the protection of the weak, but rather the habit of overbearing tyranny and the selfish coercion or exploitation of people who stand at a disadvantage.

In quoting that answer to the soldiers, I assure you that I am preaching as much to myself as to you. For those words have their unfailing application throughout human life, and especially, I am sure, in the extremities of the hot weather in this country. Where self-control, as most of us find, is a real difficulty, and our patience is tried to the uttermost in a variety of trivial issues, the use of force is as tempting as it is assuredly undermining to character. Hastiness of temper may serve to bring satisfaction to the desire of the moment, but is always condemned in that court of sweet reasonableness into which in calmer moments we bring the calendar of our actions. Then we find, too often, that we have sullied our reputation with our fellows, that we have forfeited a part of that power over self which is always so difficult to recover, that we have fallen short of our Christian standard and besmirched the fair name of the religion which we profess. O then, when our Christian conduct is so vigilantly watched, when our lapses, even on trivial occasions, are taken for signs of failure, let us not forget that violence stands

condemned both by reason and by religion; that in the language of Burke, the wisest of our modern instructors, 'Temper is the enemy of policy'; that in Apostolic phrase, 'The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.'

RIGHTEOUSNESS AND JUDGEMENT.[1]

Are your minds set upon righteousness, O ye congregation: And do ye judge the thing that is right, O ye sons of men?

Psalm LVIII, v. 1.

Judge not, and ye shall not be judged.

St. Luke VI, v. 37.

The verse of the Psalm and the words of the Gospel seem to involve a contradiction. The first, though set in the form of a question, is a virtual rebuke. It presumes a negative answer and amounts to an injunction to follow righteousness and to judge the thing that is right. The second figures as a prohibition of the exercise of judgement under pain of suffering the consequences in the shape of some counter-judgement. A distinction already suggests itself between two uses of the faculty of judgement, but the actual line of demarcation in practical life is not always easy to determine.

1. To 'judge the thing that is right' is a part of the operation of setting our minds upon righteousness. To lead an upright life is not an inconsequent process conducted only on instinct; it is the product of an ordered scheme in which certain stern and governing truths or principles are applied to the problems and crises of existence. Sometimes, perhaps, they are applied on instinct, but generally with deliberation or judgement. 'Instinct,' as Falstaff said, 'is a great matter'; but he was a coward

[1] At Christ Church, Rawal Pindi, on the 4th Sunday after Trinity, July 1st, 1917, at Evensong.

on instinct: and instinct which dictates with natural wisdom the course of personal comfort or safety may well find itself opposed by the better judgement by which man rises superior to the beasts, and one man superior to another. If, as we must needs think, the exercise of this better judgement is a product of religion, and in its finer manifestation, as the Christian must further suppose, a witness of *the* religion, then the results of its application must be estimated *ex hypothesi* by reference to the standard implicit in the system, though that standard is never wholly reached by spiritually frail and ever-sinning human souls, because it is the standard set by Him who was 'in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.'

It is manifest, then, that the judgement which can determine the thing that is right cannot be exercised entirely without external reference. How then shall it be exercised without an apparent infringement of the command, 'Judge not and ye shall not be judged.'? It will be conceded, I suppose, that in order to judge the thing that is right we must take some account of the world around us. In setting our own house in order we shall be guided in some measure by the prevailing standard. In order to correct our own shortcomings we shall not be altogether mistaken in studying our neighbour's. If in the process we sometimes find our own defects reflected in other people, if we are allowed to 'see ourselves as others see us'—and so learn one salutary lesson,—we shall often at the same time find opportunities of emulating virtues which they possess and we do not. We shall conclude, I think, that such judgement ought to be exercised even at the risk of being judged ourselves.

2. There are certain phases or fashions in the exercise of judgement, however, which so plainly violate the injunction, 'Judge not and ye shall not be judged,' as to bring

the censorious judge under the reproof implied in the searching question : 'Are your minds set upon righteousness, O ye congregation ; and do ye judge the thing that is right, O ye sons of men ? ' The implied reproof which takes a definite shape in the next verse, ' Yea, ye imagine mischief in your hearts and stir up strife all the day long,' may fairly be held, I think, to include all manner of excessive enthusiasms and arrogancies which disclose themselves either in a self-regarding and virtuous yet offensive superiority, or in an equally pompous parade of pseudo-altruism which impertinently proposes the reform and uplifting of the world in general by an enforced approximation to the standard of the affected person himself. Of this phenomenon I will adventure some illustrations which are partly suggested by the war.

[2] i. A relevant example presents itself in the absurd infatuation of a great people to whom we have owed much in the past but of whom it is difficult to speak temperately at the present time. Even those of us who knew but little of Germany before the war, have been led, since its outbreak, to study something of her history and characteristics. I do not propose, therefore, to weary you with what is sufficiently well known. I am concerned with a particular manifestation of what I think may be called an intolerable exercise of judgement. The German philosopher Fichte, in his *Addresses to the German Nation*, published in 1808, during the period of Napoleon's domination of Prussia, is said to have ' inculcated the conception of the State as the incorporation of a special ideal which could not be destroyed without loss to the Universe.' [1] Viewed in a white light, unclouded by our present prejudice, this theory would seem to be sound in the case of every nation. The loss for one nation of a high ideal of the State,

[1] Vide Von Hügel, *The German Soul*, p. 97.

in which, for example, admitted privilege was accompanied by confessed responsibility, would be a general loss. The general standard would be deprived of one of its buttresses. Fichte, unfortunately,—according to Baron von Hügel, whose luminous study of *The German Soul* is perhaps unequalled among the many works on the subject, which the war has evoked—in his addresses proceeded to

> 'couple this major premise of worth and standard straightway with a minor premise of fact and of existence, *viz.*, that the German people is *the* people: that the Germans stand to all West European peoples and civilizations of non-Teutonic speech as does the true, the genuine and the intrinsically precious to the false, the insincere and only contingently useful—useful when these non-German peoples furnish materials and occasions for their elaboration by the German people.' [1]

The catastrophe of the European war is not only the climax but the retributive consequence of this doctrine, after further development than Fichte can have contemplated. Fichte's concern was the recovery of German freedom and the attainment of German unity in the dark days of the Napoleonic ascendancy. As a writer in the *Edinburgh Review* observes, 'If we seek an analogy to Fichte in the later history of the century, we shall find it not in Treitschke but in Mazzini.' [2]

The original conception, however, and its later developments provide, I think, valuable examples, at least by implication, of excessive and degenerate judgement. A high ideal becomes cramped and distorted by a mind

[1] Op. Cit., pp. 97, 98.
[2] April 1917, p. 292. *The Perils of Hubris.*

and outlook so self-regarding as to assume that the rest of the world can hope to prosper or even to endure only so long as it conforms, approximates or ministers to that particular ideal of that peculiar people.

[2] ii. The war will provide us with another example of a tendency to hasty and extravagant judgement on a point which concerns us all as members of the National Church. It cannot be said of the English race that it is likely or even liable to suffer the infatuation which has overtaken the German people. It is acknowledged that the Englishman is in some respects less thorough than the German. His lack of thoroughness, indeed, becomes a positive virtue when it disallows the brutal and intolerable means which are justified (*sic*) by the German end.[1] Baron von Hügel is probably sound when he expresses the doubt whether 'the pure Englishman is capable of such concentration (as the German) and consequently of such irritation and vehemence when, thus concentrated and strained, he is strongly and persistently opposed.'[2] There is in the English character an essential justice and balance which, independently of the fact that our territory has not suffered like that of some of our Allies, has kept us wonderfully free from panic or hatred. Yet that very lack of thoroughness, which has contributed with other national traits to save us from the excesses and aberrations of Germany, has also tended, by expressing itself in a lack

---

[1] I find this point expressed as follows by Mr. Edward Jenks in the July *Hibbert Journal*, p. 638, (The Englishman and his Law):

'. . . . . the Englishman, *more suo*, has never formulated any definite theory of the relationship of the State to the individual, or the community as a whole, but has contented himself with treating practical problems as they arise, according to more or less unconscious principles of action. This method has undoubtedly its drawbacks; but it has at least preserved the average Englishman from that peculiar form of insanity which has made the present struggle one of unexampled ferocity, and which bids fair to convict a nation, which, not long ago, had indisputable claims to respect, of a deliberate attempt to wreck the civilization of Europe.'

[2] Vide *The German Soul*, p. 146.

of the spirit of research, to put numbers of people under the influence of enthusiasts whose patriotism is undoubted, but, as one is led to think, secondary to their prime enthusiasm. I speak of tendency rather than widespread manifestation, of a danger rather than a generally established fact. Yet it is the case that the way is open for any worker of policy with the gift of skilful presentation or advertisement to secure a following, and if only he bring his case into line with the pardonable disgust which now attaches to everything German, he will gain the ear and, perhaps, command the continued attention of many persons among the less informed and the less enquiring.

Within the ecclesiastical sphere there have been signs of an attempt to make sectarian capital out of appearances. Yet it is no part of the true patriotic *métier* to proclaim in the delinquencies of the enemy the catastrophe of the version of Christianity which is that of your ecclesiastical rivals. To deduce from Prussian paganism the failure of all the Churches which accepted the Reformation is both a travesty of Christian charity and a violation of sound logic. The argument seems to ignore the fact that the ecclesiastically heterogeneous composition of the British Coalition is balanced by more or less corresponding division in the Central European Alliance. In so far as Churches count in that alliance, the Roman Catholic Church is heavily preponderant, and if it be argued that Germany is fighting the battle of Protestantism then we are confronted by the amazing spectacle of Austria, 'her creature and ally,' the principal stronghold of the Papacy, not to mention the large Roman Catholic element in Germany itself, figuring as a champion of the Reformation against the Nationalism of which the Reformation was itself an early expression!

If any observation is to be made in this region—because appearances do not justify conclusions,—it is that

the imperialism of Germany is modern in date but almost mediæval in spirit. Its morality is a reaction to that of the Papal international system from which the Reformation delivered our forefathers; a recrudescence of that which accompanied and largely achieved the Catholic reconquests of the Counter-Reformation. The essence of Protestantism is the exercise of individual inspiration; and it appears to be rather by the exclusion of Protestant principles than as their consequence that the moral collapse of our present enemies is to be explained. But this counter-argument is properly independent of our proposition. The example of extravagant judgement points to the obligation of research and the weighing of evidence before pronouncement; of setting our minds upon righteousness, which means the pursuit of truth and justice, as the essential factor in judging the thing that is right.

[2] iii. I will ask your indulgence while I suggest one further example of immoderate judgement which comes, perhaps, nearer home. The admittedly deplorable habit of excessive drinking is naturally shocking to temperate men, but can hardly be held to justify the frenzied fanaticism of many temperance reformers. To brand as intrinsically evil what in fact is injurious, not in proper use but by abuse, is an illustration of the not uncommon practice of attacking a system instead of what is no more than a by-product of the system. Personal abstinence on the ground of conscientious conviction is as laudable an example of the desire to 'judge the thing that is right,' as the attempt to coerce other men to do the same is a plain violation of the social rule implied in the injunction, 'Judge not, and ye shall not be judged.' To abstain from alcoholic liquor for the period of the war is doubtless a creditable way of contributing to the national economy; but the virtue of the habit is connected rather with the personal conviction

which prompts it than with any form of pressure or persuasion, save through the always salutary process of example. But to utilize the occasion of war and the national extremity for the furthering of what are factional ends is, of course, entirely subversive of the patriotism which distinguishes war-time abstinence.

We must all agree, I think, that the language of temperance reformers is often highly irrational, and suggests a sense of moral superiority to the generality of well-intentioned folk who do not feel called to pursue the path of asceticism and so-called enlightenment. Much of their language can indeed be justified only by the old ascetic doctrine of the intrinsic evil of matter. If 'the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof,' how shall we presume to proscribe any of its products for their intrinsic evil? The individual will rightly shun what he finds dangerous for himself; and the public conscience will rightly exert itself for the enactment of laws regulating the use of what becomes evil by abuse. But a large liberty is properly given to individual taste and judgement. Browning's lines in *Bishop Blougram's Apology* will bear recital:

> 'You find
> In these the pleasant pastures of this life
> Much you may eat without the least offence,
> Much you don't eat because your maw objects,
> Much you would eat but that your fellow-flock
> Open great eyes at you and even butt,
> And thereupon you like your mates so well
> You cannot please yourself, offending them—
> Though when they seem exorbitantly sheep,
> You weigh your pleasure with their butts and bleats
> And strike the balance. Sometimes certain fears
> Restrain you—real checks since you find them so—
> Sometimes you please yourself and nothing checks;

> And thus you graze through life with not one lie
> And like it best.'

When all allowances have been made for the operation of precept and example, it is yet the right of private judgement to determine for the individual whether he shall abstain or whether continue to indulge in a practice which we cannot pronounce to be wrong and which certainly has the sanction of Christian tradition.

3. 'Judge not, and ye shall not be judged.' Surely we have, all of us, a task difficult and exacting enough in working out our own salvation as we plod along the course of human life. To each of us comes the direction to be interpreted in practice—

> 'Judge not, and ye shall not be judged:
> Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned'—

and the assurance to be accepted and proved—

> 'With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again'—

and the warning against hypocrisy to be observed—

> 'How canst thou say to thy brother, "Brother let me cast out the mote that is in thine eye," when thou thyself beholdest not the beam that is in thine own eye. Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye.'

Of each of us it is required that he make sure of the right conduct of his own life before attempting judgement on his neighbours. A quiet example of upright living is more valuable than many gratuitous precepts, or the pursuit of a policy of fussy and irritating propaganda. It is not, perhaps, sufficiently realized by many devout believers that Christianity is the most versatile of all

religions. Being wholly independent of external system it flourishes under every variety of political institution and the cycles of social fashion. It transcends the distinctions of sects and churches and discovers itself in its rich and varied fulness alike in Catholic and Protestant, Churchman and Nonconformist, Ultramontane and Modernist. The Gospel admits of a larger liberty of application and expression than is ever discovered to individual prejudice. The lives of Christian men, amid the changes and chances of the age-long centuries, are the sure witnesses of its versatility and the pledge of its independence of terrestrial trappings.

'Judge not,' therefore, 'and ye shall not be judged.' Turn we to the conduct of our own lives and see to it that we merit no searching criticism, nor fail ourselves through any idle dereliction of our personal duty. With St. Paul we cannot but admit the proper condition of our competence to exercise moral judgement or to attempt an influence for righteousness in public life: 'I therefore so run, as not uncertainly; so fight I, as not beating the air: but I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage: lest by any means, after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected.'

OBEDIENCE AND SACRIFICE.[1]

Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.

I. Samuel XV, v. 23.

The declaration of the Prophet, familiar to us from this morning's Old Testament lesson, seems to set in some contrast two qualities which we are accustomed to reverence. Obedience, of course, we were taught from childhood to regard as a primary duty ; sacrifice, which with the growing years we came to understand as self-denial, is always one of our hardest tasks. Obedience and sacrifice in our own lives are often indeed identical. What then are the peculiar conditions in which, while obedience is extolled, sacrifice is condemned ? Why did Samuel, speaking as the Prophet of the Lord, reprove Saul, the King of Israel, in these terms, 'Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams'? You have already heard the story in the lesson this morning. Suffice it, therefore, to say that Samuel was commissioned to convey to Saul the Lord's command to smite the Amalekites and destroy them. Saul went out with his army and carried out his orders, but with a reservation ; he did not entirely destroy the Amalekites and all that they had. Samuel, therefore, was again commissioned to find Saul and convey to him the Lord's judgement for this omission. We may think the fate of the Amalekites

[1] At Parade Service, Christ Church, Rawal Pindi, on the 5th Sunday after Trinity, July 8th, 1917.

very brutal and uncivilized, and suppose that if Saul could have pleaded considerations of justice and mercy against the destruction of women and children, he would have merited the Lord's approval for a man morally advanced before his time. But no such plea was relevant or admissible. For the only exception to the literal execution of the order was made in respect of Agag the King, who was taken captive, and the prize cattle—'the people spared the best of the sheep and of the oxen to sacrifice unto the Lord thy God.' 'Wherefore then,' asked Samuel in reply to Saul, 'didst thou not obey the voice of the Lord, but didst fly upon the spoil, and didst evil in the sight of the Lord?'

Saul seems to have stood convicted not only of disobedience but of hypocrisy. The case for disobedience is plain and proved. That of hypocrisy is possible but not absolutely determinable. The validity of the charge might be said, I think, to vary inversely with the degree of truth contained in the assertion that the cattle were preserved for the express purpose of sacrifice to the Lord. If that plea were genuine the charge of hypocrisy would give way only to reveal the depth of superstition in which the execution of formal rites must claim priority even if it imply rebellion. But it may not have been genuine; if the cattle were preserved not for sacrifice but with even less virtuous intention, to satisfy the lust of loot, then the charge of disobedience would be doubly damning. For Saul would then stand convicted of having falsely used a religious plea to cover an admitted crime.

Saul, however, repeated his explanation a second time in a process which accords with our experience of the world—for when men are convicted on a main count, they have a way of emphasizing what may pass for extenuating circumstances, in the hope of receiving lenient treatment,

but at the risk of being found liars and so appearing fools as well as knaves—Saul, I say, repeated his explanation a second time, and Samuel took him at his word. Samuel assumed, for argument's sake as we say, the genuineness of the intention to offer the prize cattle in sacrifice, and delivered his judgement accordingly :

> 'Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the word of the Lord ? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being King.'

The stories in the Old Testament, which are a part of the past history of Palestine, may seem to be of little importance to us Englishmen in the twentieth century. In the case of some of them we must accept the conclusions of modern scholarship, and treat them as legendary and not historical. But they will never lose their value while their moral lessons admit of interpretation in the terms of our own time. I, therefore, appeal to you to consider with me for a short time an application of the Prophet's judgement to the lives of us men, Englishmen and Christians, in these days.

'To obey is better than sacrifice.' To do the will of God is better than to go through empty forms of religious observance. That, perhaps, is a plain translation of the Prophet's declaration. The sacrifices or offerings of beasts which played so prominent a part in ancient religious worship, as revealed both in the Bible and in classical literature, were the accustomed mode of atoning for sins

and doing honour to the gods of ancient belief. They reached their purest form among the Jews in the worship of Jehovah, and gradually came to be understood as having their validity in the primary adoption of a right spirit in man himself. As David confessed in the 51st Psalm :

> 'The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit : a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.'

And the old system was done away by the great sacrifice of our Lord Himself, who fulfilled the Law and was offered for the sins of the whole world 'on that terrible day when the sun was darkened over Calvary and Man was rejected of men.' [1]

Yet the progress of Christianity in the world has not been untrammelled by the lingering ideas of paganism. The pursuit of Christian truth has ever been hindered by the inherent superstitions of the human race. After nineteen centuries it is still the case that what we call institutional religion is liable to be abused by men who mistake the form for the substance. To take a simple illustration : the excellent practice of going to church, which is rightly considered a Christian duty, is apt sometimes to be treated as the end and aim of churchmanship, if not as the whole duty of churchmen. I am far from saying or suggesting that church-going is anything other than obedience to the word of the Lord, but if it is not accompanied by those Christian habits of life outside which it presupposes and ought to assist, it surely becomes an empty form. When attendance at Church ceases to be part of a reasonable system of religious life and loses connection with conduct, it becomes a false offering and seems to correspond with the form of sacrifice which the Prophet

[1] The quotation is from Mr. G. K. Chesterton in *The Defendant*.

of Israel condemned. Church-going is valuable as the expression of the sustained desire to lead a Christian life rather than as an incident of conformity or the fulfilment of the formal requirements of our profession. It is important, then, that as we 'go forth to our work and to our labour' we should render that obedience to the will of God, and conduct our lives according to that standard, which our presence in church is held to signify.

But if the validity of our churchmanship is conditional upon our carrying our Christian profession into common life, it is equally required that we bring to church a right conception of the Object of our worship. Our obedience as Christians is due to the true God in the person of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who remains approachable in spite of all the differences of sects and churches which may seem to have obscured the truth in elaborate systems. It is personal discipleship which is the supreme condition of religious sincerity. Personal devotion to Christ Himself, unwavering obedience to the Law of Christ—that is the real secret of our religion, the secret proclaimed in the life and teaching of that sanest of preachers, Robertson of Brighton. He had no patience with the substitutes which are offered by sectarian enterprise for the true Bread of Life :

> 'Anything but Christ, (he said scornfully)—the Virgin, the Church, the Sacraments, a new set of our own resolutions ; any or all of these will the heart embrace as a means to holiness or acceptance rather than God's way. You may even persuade men to give up their sins if they may do it without Christ ; as teetotalism can witness.' [1]

[1] *Vide "Life and Letters ;"* edited by Stopford Brooke (1865). Quoted in *Robertson of Brighton* by the Dean of Durham, 1916.

Truly, the words of the Prophet have not lost their truth or their relevance in the Christian Church : ' Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.'

If, however, the smoke of the burnt-offering and the fat of rams in the ancient sacrifice continue in different dress to play a delusive part, it is yet the case that sacrifice has drawn from Christianity another and a nobler sense. Christian obedience is continually expressed in the article of personal sacrifice, in the surrender of lower things for higher, of worse for better, of comfort for efficiency, of pleasure for intellectual improvement, of ourselves for our fellows. It is the power of Christ's religion actually to make the harder way the more acceptable. I am not thinking of obedience of the properly military type, for that is not optional and is, therefore, not a matter of moral virtue. But when the ' law of liberty ' applies, and the choice is open at the parting of the ways, then there can be no doubt as to which is God's way, and which is what we call the Devil's, that is, the course prompted by the force of evil which is resident within us. The one calls to service, the other to indolence ; the one to edifying use of our leisure moments, the other to fruitless or even vicious waste of precious time ; the one to life, dying indeed but perpetually renewed, the other to the catastrophe of an alluring but dreary death. When Ulysses's companions, weary of accompanying him on his wanderings, were greeted by the Lotos-eaters,

> ' They sat them down upon the yellow sand.
> Between the sun and moon upon the shore ;
> And sweet it was to dream of Fatherland,
> Of child, and wife, and slave ; but evermore
> Most weary seemed the sea, weary the oar,
> Weary the wandering fields of barren foam.

Then someone said, "We will return no more";
And all at once they sang, "Our island home
Is far beyond the wave; we will no longer roam."

. . . . .

Hateful is the dark blue sky,
Vaulted o'er the dark blue sea.
Death is the end of life; ah, why
Should life all labour be?
Let us alone. Time driveth onward fast,
And in a little while our lips are dumb.
Let us alone. What is it that will last?
All things are taken from us, and become
Portions and parcels of the dreadful Past.
Let us alone. What pleasure can we have
To war with evil? Is there any peace
In ever climbing up the climbing wave?
All things have rest, and ripen toward the grave
In silence; ripen, fall and cease:
Give us long rest or death, dark death, or
dreamful ease.'[1]

That is the cry of men who not merely have lost hope, but are drifting, as it were, on a midnight ocean with anchor and compass lost, and are yet content with it. It proclaims the weak surrender of the persevering will, and discloses not the despair which issues in reckless violence and a divine discontent, but the despair of placid resignation which hardly possesses the spirit of rebellion while it has quenched the spirit of obedience. It ignores the claims of duty, and forgets the solemn truth contained in the words of St. John: 'The world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.'

[1] *Vide* Tennyson, *The Lotos-eaters*.

For obedience demands a fiery faith, in the face of the counsellors of comfort; and sacrifice shines in splendour, even amid the gloom of personal loss. Faith is often content to work in obscurity, and the splendour of sacrifice is perhaps no more than a hidden splendour, revealed only to the person who makes it. It shines abroad, of course, on fields of battle, where a man who faces great odds to save the life of another rightly receives his meed of public acclamation. But it is not in war time only, or in the sphere of war, that examples of sacrifice are most common or necessarily most valuable, for in war time they become in some sense fashionable; the public eye is then more vigilant, the public heart more sympathetic. In other forms of public life examples are found, when men take their stand on principles which they believe to be right and for which they are ready, if need be, to suffer. Think of St. Peter's declaration before the Jewish ecclesiastical authorities at Jerusalem: 'We must obey God rather than men'; of Luther, before the Diet of the Emperor Charles V at Worms, justifying his challenge to the great Church of authority and tradition: 'It is neither safe nor right to go against conscience, here I take my stand: I can do no otherwise; so help me God.'; of Dean Stanley, in the last century, defending the cause of the persecuted Bishop Colenso; or, still more recently, of Colonel Picquart facing the ruin of his career to save Dreyfus. Yet sacrifice, perhaps, is not the least intense where it is most obscure; where one will risk his life in trying to relieve the pain, and brighten the closing days, of a friend who is dying of an incurable and contagious disease, or another will struggle on through long years of poverty supporting, perhaps, a widowed mother out of scanty earnings. There is no end to the opportunities of service and sacrifice even in the least pretentious lives.

To us, in India, such opportunities are manifold in daily life ; our relations with the Indian, with our Indian servants, will often provide a test of some severity. But they are not, perhaps, easier to accept on account of an ungenerous climate which saps our energy and tries our tempers and makes us less disposed to think of our fellows. Yet we have much to thank God for in these days in India, and if we think of some who are less fortunate than ourselves, in some cases, perhaps, of absent friends at Home, or of others at the Front, or of others, again, in the extremities of captivity in Germany, we shall be more likely to discover the secret of happiness ourselves. Some there are, surely, to whom we ought to write a cheerful line of greeting or of sympathy, a letter all too long put off ; others, perhaps, who need our help in other ways, in money or material things ; and others again, if not all, who need our prayers in these times of anxiety and sorrow. Let us not forget them, or forget that our loyalty to Christ is best expressed in doing the duty which lies nearest to our hand : that obedience to Him who died for us sometimes requires the sacrifice of ourselves and our comfort for others and for Him. For ' the world passeth away and the lust thereof : but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.'

STRENGTH IN WEAKNESS.[1]

When I am weak, then am I strong.

II. Corinthians XII, v. 10.

St. Paul's paradox discovers the secret of his amazing career; and since it proclaims a truth which is of the essence of the Christian life, I take leave to adopt for our preaching the familiar theme which illustrates it and is suggested by this morning's lesson from the Acts of the Apostles. A Jew of learning and position, of the straitest sect of the Pharisees, an Hebrew of Hebrews, and a citizen, not by emancipation but by birth, of the great empire which ruled from Rome the extremities of the then known world, St. Paul was chosen to be the first great Christian Missionary, the Apostle of the Gentiles. All the advantages of birth and training, all the privileges of position, were subordinated and applied to the service of his Master: he stands out as the very personification of the principle *noblesse oblige*, and provides a conspicuous fulfilment of the Divine declaration: 'To whomsoever much is given, of him much shall be required.'

But set against his advantages and, in fact, arrayed on the side of the studied hostility which his ministry met at every turn, were those bodily infirmities which he must have found so incapacitating. The chief of these was that 'thorn in the flesh' which has been the subject of much speculation and is probably to be identified with the hideous disease of ophthalmia. The 'ugly little Jew,'

[1] At Parade Service, Christ Church, Rawal Pindi, 7th Sunday after Trinity, July 22nd, 1917.

in M. Renan's phrase, was a great spirit in isolation, the object of intelligible hatred but unmerited contempt. Much, indeed, was required of him; more, much more, than he could have done without the strength and stay, the help and comfort, of Him whose name he was charged 'to bear before the Gentiles, and kings and the children of Israel.' So in Myers's poem he makes his confession:

'Christ! I am Christ's! and let the name suffice you,
Ay, for me too he greatly hath sufficed:
Lo, with no winning words I would entice you,
Paul has no honour and no friend but Christ.'

The biography of St. Paul is given us in the Acts of the Apostles; yet the story is there but half told. We read the record of his journeys, of his trials before Proconsuls and Magistrates and the Jewish Sanhedrin, of persecutions and sentences put into execution which would have tried the bodily strength of a Herculean giant. Yet the impression is incomplete until we turn to one of the Epistles, where a gleam of the Apostle's autobiography lights the story of his perilous career. For St. Paul, who hated vanity and shrank from anything which looked like boasting, was driven by the envy and hatred of lesser men to recite the tale of his afflictions and his endurance in a larger catalogue. He first asserts his essential equality with his detractors:

> 'Whereinsoever any is bold (he says) I am bold also. Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so am I. Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool) I am more'—

And here follows what is, perhaps, the most wonderful piece of biography in all literature—

> 'in labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one'—(thirty-nine stripes, with a scourge of six strands of hide forming two thongs, was the statutory Jewish scourging, which is reported to have been so severe that criminals sometimes died in the process)—'thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of water, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Beside those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches.'

Do you think that among all the chronicles of man there is a single parallel to that record of sufferings, all accumulated within the short space of twenty years?

In the list of 'perils' is that of which we read in the lesson this morning. St. Paul had been arrested at Jerusalem through the ecclesiastical prejudice of the Jews who, securing little satisfaction from the even-handed justice of the Roman Law, conspired under a curse to put him out of the way. As before Gallio, the Roman Magistrate at Corinth, when Greek culture and Roman justice rose superior to the prejudices of Jewish religion and set free that 'bent, ophthalmic, nervous, unknown Jew, against whom all other Jews seemed, for some inconceivably foolish

reason, to be so infuriated,'[1] so, in the hands of Lysias, Paul was suffered to escape the death which his countrymen had designed.

The Liberal Christian, reflecting on the life of St. Paul, can never suppress the sense of gratitude to the secular authorities for their refusal to be influenced by the worst passions of religious bigotry. Even the moral cowardice of Pilate, twenty-five years earlier, did not prevent his making some attempt to secure justice for our Saviour. But, in the language of the present Dean of St. Paul's,

> 'There is no crime of which the religious fanatic is not capable. In the service of orthodoxy the honourable man will resort to cunning and deceit, the pious and charitable woman will carry her fagot to a heretic's burning. Our Lord Himself, we may be sure, would have fared not a whit better at the hands of the Spanish Inquisition than when the Sanhedrin tried him. And as I am speaking to religious people, it can never be superfluous to protest against the hateful spirit of intolerance which has been the curse and reproach of our religion from the first. All other sins Christianity has diminished; this one it has augmented. The average Christian would be utterly incapable of recognizing his Lord if he encountered Him among his theological opponents, or outside his own body.'[2]

This vigorous language has its obvious application to the Jews' attitude to St. Paul. But before every Roman

---

[1] The quotation is from Farrar's *Life & Work of St. Paul*.
[2] *Vide* W. R. Inge, D.D., *All Saints' Sermons*, p. 37.

tribunal St. Paul had the supreme advantage of Roman citizenship. His claim, if he chose to use it, was unanswerable : *Civis Romanus Sum,* 'I am a Roman Citizen : ' and he could secure the full measure of Roman justice.

Through the energy and what we should call the chivalrous and sporting spirit of Lysias, the Commanding Officer of the Garrison, St. Paul was enabled to escape the fury of the Jews and to take his trial at Cæsarea. His peril had been extreme, and even then was far from being over ; a lesser man might well have surrendered and broken up under the strain : but St. Paul had a spirit of steel ; and what moves us most as we read the continued story of his trials, there at Jerusalem and afterwards before Felix and Festus, the successive Procurators of Judea, is surely the supreme confidence and the undaunted energy with which, amid all his afflictions, St. Paul recites his history and proclaims his faith. The courage and endurance are almost superhuman. They are indeed unaccountable apart from the fact that he had received his commission direct from God, that he was assured that he was a chosen vessel, that he knew what his duty was and that he would be given strength to do it. 'And the night following (his last night in Jerusalem) the Lord stood by him, and said, "Be of good cheer, Paul, for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome." '

But the help he was given was the help he sought. To St. Paul in the first century, as to us in the twentieth, not only was a life of duty a life of struggle, not only could it not be carried out without his Master's help ; but the very process of seeking help was a struggle too ; and unutterable weariness the exercise of faithful supplication—

> 'How have I knelt with arms of my aspiring
> Lifted all night in irresponsive air,

Dazed and amazed with overmuch desiring
Blank with the utter agony of prayer!

. . . . .

Ay for this Paul, a scorn and a despising,
Weak as you know him and the wretch you see,—
Even in these eyes shall ye behold him rising
Strength in infirmities and Christ in me.'

'When I am weak, then am I strong.' For all men the truth of St. Paul's paradox can be proved again. It matters not what is the form of personal weakness; for all men are weak, and strength is only comparative. It is indeed the case that the strongest, as we reckon, are not seldom the most conscious of their weakness. But if only men *are* conscious of it, and so prepared for the assaults which the forces of evil take advantage of to deliver, then they can translate it into strength, and so demonstrate the power of religion which is ever made manifest in weakness. Men's armour fails them more often, I am sure, in the places where they think it strong than where they know it to be weak; for the converse of the text is also true: When I am strong, then am I weak. Under the test of experience, the pain of affliction or the fire of temptation, a superficial belief in personal strength and patience is often corrected, bitterly corrected, by a confession of infirmity and failure.

> 'To speak truth,' wrote the shrewdest man of the world who ever lived, 'no man knows the lists of his own patience; nor can divine how able he shall be in his sufferings, till the time come (the perfectest virtue being tried in action): but I would (out of a care to do the best business well) ever keep a

guard, and stand upon keeping faith and a good conscience.' [1]

'Ever keep a guard, and stand upon keeping faith and a good conscience.' That may well serve to point the application of the Pauline pattern in these days of difficulty and stress. When none of us can rightly neglect the claims of duty, when we are faced with the obligations of energy in action, of patience in enforced inaction or suspense, of useful employment of our leisure, of courage in affliction and watchfulness at all times, and we seem scarce able to sustain the struggle, there will come to us if we need it and our efforts have earned it, the supreme assurance as it came to St. Paul from the Lord: 'My grace is sufficient for thee; for my power is made manifest in weakness.' And then, with new confidence and strength implanted, we shall experience perhaps in some dim fashion the Apostle's thrill: 'I take pleasure in weaknesses, in injuries, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong.'

[1] *Vide* Bacon, Essay on *Death*.

HIS ENGLISHMEN.[1]

Multitudes, multitudes, in the valley of decision: for the day of the Lord is near in the valley of decision.

Joel III, v. 14.

'The valley of decision' is a figure which may be thought perhaps to illustrate not unfitly the conditions of the Great War at the opening of its fourth year. 'The valley of decision'—the phrase is plainly portentous; it suggests precisely the supreme consequence which attaches to the issue of the present struggle. The triumph of the British Coalition is the promise, as we think, of righteousness for all who ensue it, and of freedom for all who are threatened by the military despotism of a great people, as determined in purpose as it is powerful in arms.

1. It has become a commonplace to speak of the cause of the Allies as the cause of justice and righteousness; but the statement is not for that reason the less true. We are all probably familiar with the cynical qualification that in going to war we bowed to the necessity of self-defence, and had no option; and most of us, I expect, are acquainted with the argument, not generally employed outside Germany, that we actually took up arms with the object of national aggrandizement. The latter, of course, is entirely invalid; the former is valid only in the limited sense in which it is obvious. Excluding considerations of honour, we may admit that the necessity of self-defence compelled recourse to war; even so, it was no self-seeking action,

[1] At Christ Church, Rawal Pindi, on the 9th Sunday after Trinity, August 5th, 1917, at Evensong; being the first Sunday of the fourth year of war.

but nothing less than the vindication of national self-respect. As a nation, doubtless there are many faults which may be laid to our charge, but in this matter of declaring war three years ago our action was honourable and our hands were clean. Our place in the war is consistent with our previous foreign policy, and has been described, admirably as I think we shall all agree, as 'the finest piece of national righteousness of which the nation has ever in modern times shown itself capable.'[1] In respect, therefore, of the cause and action of Great Britain and her Allies we must needs dismiss the idea of humiliation as entirely irrelevant. We did what it would have been a standing blot on the national escutcheon to have refused, and are prepared to abide by our action. I have often thought that the desire of most Englishmen, and the actual course which they have so readily followed, were wonderfully suggested in the dying speech of Julian, the great Emperor known as the Apostate, who perished after leading the Roman arms and consolidating the Roman dominions up to the Tigris :

> 'Detesting the corrupt and destructive maxims of despotism, I have considered the happiness of the people as the end of Government. Submitting my action to the laws of prudence, of justice and of moderation, I have trusted the event to the care of Providence. Peace was the object of my counsels as long as peace was consistent with the public welfare ; but when the imperious voice of my country summoned me to arms, I exposed my person to the dangers of war, with the clear foreknowledge..... that I was destined to fall

[1] From a sermon preached in Hereford Cathedral on October 8th, 1916, by Dr. Hastings Rashdall, now Dean of Carlisle.

> by the sword. I now offer my tribute of gratitude to the Eternal Being who..... has given me, in the midst of an honourable career, a splendid and glorious departure from this world ; and I hold it equally absurd, equally base, to solicit or to decline the stroke of fate.' [1]

2. It is now generally agreed that although the war may yet be prolonged, the issue is not to be doubted. With the reservation then that the final achievement of victory is still dependent on the combination of tenacity and perseverance, of 'doubly redoubling strokes upon the foe,' with our present confidence and hopefulness, we shall do rightly to consider the future. We suppose that we shall have gained that 'security' which the great Prime Minister, William Pitt, pronounced to be the cause for which we were fighting against Napoleon—'security,' as he added, in words of which every syllable is as true to-day as when they were spoken, 'against a danger, the greatest that ever threatened the world.' How then shall we make use of it ? Can we reasonably count on its permanence, or will it be only passing ? Will our enemies remain a menace to the safety of ourselves, our children and our children's children ? Or will the end of the war make possible the establishment of that Kingdom of God on earth which is already contemplated in some minds ? Or again, shall we have substituted within our own coasts new perils for old ? These are questions which insistently suggest themselves ; and although they do not readily admit of answers either easy or precise, yet there are a few germane considerations which are certainly the concern

---

[1] *Vide* Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, (ed. Bury), Vol. II, pp. 515, 516.

of religion. To these I would invite your courteous attention.

[3] i. There is evidence enough in history of the rejuvenating power and adaptable temper of Prussia since the establishment of the new monarchy at the opening of the eighteenth century. From a lingering germ at the end of the war she may rebuild that military despotism in which Lord Acton discerned clearly the approaching danger:

> 'Government so understood (he said at Cambridge in 1895) is the intellectual guide of the nation, the promoter of wealth, the teacher of knowledge, the guardian of morality, the mainspring of the ascending movement of man. That is the tremendous power, supported by millions of bayonets, which grew up . . . . at Petersburg and was developed by much abler minds, chiefly at Berlin; and it is the greatest danger that remains to be encountered by the Anglo-Saxon race.'[1]

This remarkable prophecy serves to indicate alike the strength and the weakness of modern Germany. The strength, which has proved itself beyond question, is found in that national unanimity following an enforced unity which, by the suppression of individual liberty, is at the same time the source of weakness. This suppression of the individual is, I think, one of the chief evils against which the war will have warned us. A people to whom in the past the world was accustomed to look for originality and intellectual productivity has of late confined its pro-

---

[1] *Vide* "*Lectures on Modern History*, p. 289 (Peter the Great and the Rise of Prussia).

ductive ingenuity to material well-being and the aim of excelling all other nations in material wealth and military power. It is the fulfilment of the process, acutely but sadly prophesied by Nietzsche after the Franco-German War of 1870, of 'the uprooting of the "German mind" for the benefit of the "German Empire."'[1] This process, as we know, has been accompanied by a large growth of national prosperity which has reacted upon the Germans in a fashion peculiarly disastrous.

A docile people has accepted, in spite of the prophetic warnings of the better Germans of the past, the policy directed from above ; and hitherto that policy seems to them to have paid. Because the general level of well-being is ascribed by its participators to the new Imperialism—so I think we rightly read the situation—everything is subordinated to the narrow conception of the State which has been dictated by authority. The voice of intellectual self-respect is silenced in the interests of imperial might ; the spirit of religion is quenched save as a formal instrument of imperial efficiency.

[3] ii. It is one of the plainest issues of the war whether imperialism, as we have known it in history, and as it has been developed by Germany, will ever again command the respect of the general conscience, or whether it is doomed to the extinction which its incompatibility with the principles of Christianity, even as disclosed in the Middle Ages, would seem to require. Germany has indeed achieved a reaction ; for it is in some sense a mediæval ideal which the German Imperialism has disclosed in modern dress, the half-civilized ideal of domination equipped with the newest devices of modern science. Will our enemies have learned the vital lesson that not the secret

[1] Quoted in the *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1917, p. 288 (The Perils of Hubris).

only, but the sole justification of empire is that the peoples who compose it should enjoy better government, greater liberty, more opportunities of liberal education, more political consciousness leading to a share in the Imperial Government, in a word, greater possibilities of leading intelligent and self-respecting lives than would be possible without it? This is the claim of nationality and the sole condition of its acquiescence in any imperial scheme. Will our enemies, I say, have learned this lesson, or will they persist in spurning it as a mere manifestation of weakness? Of the kind of imperialism which we may call legitimate, the British Empire provides the best example, the German the negation. It is not, perhaps, extravagant to say that the one figures as a covenant of mutual service; the other as a scheme of tyrannical supremacy: the one permits and encourages the growth of personal freedom; in the other the subservience of the subjects ministers to the inflated ambitions of a ruling caste. There is no question as to which is the more Christian; and the action of the Central European Powers, in spite of all the misery in which it has engulfed the civilized world, has rendered undeniable service in uniting all other nations in a protest of conviction which is in accord with Christian righteousness and, as we must needs think, derived from the indwelling germ of Christianity.

[3] iii. It is, perhaps, humiliating that the resources of civilization do not provide for the settlement of all international disputes without recourse to war. Yet it is the case, as even von Treitschke admitted, that with the progress of civilization wars do tend to become fewer and shorter.[1] It has been increasingly realized, with an understanding to which the present conflict has imparted new convic-

1 *Vide* '*Lectures on Politics*' (Selections translated by A. L. Gowans) pp. 25, 26.

tion, that violence is not the part of reasonable men, that the possession of might is not the warrant for the oppression of the weak or the forcible application of collective greed. And it is, perhaps, the real weakness of most of the schemes which have been promoted for the preservation of peace that they have not been able to dispense with the means of making it compulsory.

Autocracies on the one hand, and extreme forms of democracy on the other, give the rein to violence—the one by pursuing the individual policies of rulers, which are not consistent with the general welfare, the other by allowing play to the inflamed passions of unreason. In times of disturbance and transition these extremes tend to present themselves as the sole alternatives. The admitted failure of one suggests immediate recourse to the other. Moderation is the standing difficulty, a difficulty which is at the root of all enduring political strife. To finding a solution, perhaps the English spirit of compromise has gone nearer than anything else. But we believe that the only sure guarantee of a middle course between absolutism, on the one hand, and what Lord Acton always called 'the revolution,' on the other, lies in a more resolute acceptance of Christian principles, and especially of the Christian spirit of forbearance. What we know to be the guarantee of moderation must surely be the best assurance of peace. External systems which require forcible application can never be more than makeshifts. A right spirit in the hearts of men is the only safeguard which is not a makeshift ; it is the sole security against the misuse of all the other safeguards, the mere existence of which is often the condition of new conflagration. If then it be true that an international federation for the preservation of peace is still to prove a chimera ; if, in the language of Lord Castlereagh's Memorandum in reply to that of the

Russian Cabinet at the Conference of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818),

> 'The problem of a Universal Alliance for the peace and happiness of the world has always been one of speculation and hope, but it has never yet been reduced to practice, and if an opinion may be hazarded from its difficulty, it never can'; [1]

this war has at least discovered, if discovery were needed, the kind of imperialism which tends to provoke international disturbance, and the kind of imperialism which tends to prevent it; the one which is doing the Devil's work, and the other which, I think we may fairly say, works in the service of God.

4. In view of these reflections I think we shall rightly judge that all systems which suppress the voice of individual inspiration, either by converting men into machines, which obey every motion of a dictator's will, or by reflecting in official policy the passions of an ignorant populace, are bound sooner or later to foster violence. History seems to show that this is true alike in the national and in the international spheres. To say this is not to advocate any literal or wholesale disarmament; for nobody who reads history can be tolerant of such folly. But it is to express anxiety that the spirit which is at work in every form of national organization may be the spirit which, while it is prepared to defend its nationality, is yet the spirit which seeks peace and ensues it; which puts national self-respect before the cult of the kind of greatness which is a survival of barbarism; and cares even more, perhaps, for that personal liberty which is not always secured by modern forms of democracy, but is nevertheless the surest

[1] *Vide* Alison Phillips, *The Confederation of Europe*, where this Memorandum is given at length, p. 181.

bedrock of a sound national life and the sole condition of all progress. For while the conduct of war admittedly requires obedience to supreme authority, it is yet the case that a vital factor, if not the most vital factor, is the willing service of every individual, the readiness to spend and be spent in a cause which we must needs identify with the purpose of the Highest. Stronger still becomes the argument when it is transferred from the time and process of war to the coming reconstruction of society. Then even more will the nation require the intelligent co-operation of all its members. We recall Sir David Ramsay's reply to Lord Rea, which is quoted somewhere by Carlyle : ' God mend all,' said his lordship. ' Nay, by God, Donald, we must help Him mend it.' In the coming days of peace, perhaps, will come the strongest test of that ability in action and power of restraint which we associate with the English character.

> ' We are a people yet.
> Tho' all men else their nobler dreams forget
> Confused by brainless mobs and lawless Powers ;
> Thank Him who isled us here, and roughly set
> His Saxon in blown seas and storming showers,
> We have a voice with which to pay the debt
> Of boundless love and reverence and regret
> To those great men who fought and kept it ours.
> And keep it ours, O God, from brute control ;
> O Statesmen, guard us, guard the eye, the soul
> Of Europe, keep our noble England whole,
> And save the one true seed of freedom sown
> Betwixt a people and their ancient throne,
> That sober freedom out of which there springs
> Our loyal passion for our temperate kings ;
> For, saving that, ye help to save mankind
> Till public wrong be crumbled into dust,

And drill the raw world for the march of mind
Till crowds at length be sane, and crowns be just.'

5. 'Multitudes, multitudes, in the valley of decision: for the day of the Lord is near in the valley of decision.' On such an occasion as the present it may not be unprofitable, if we have a care to interpret 'national privilege in the terms of national duty,' to recall the stirring language of Milton in another age of crisis and perplexity:

> 'Now by all concurrence of signs, and by the general instinct of holy and devout men, as they daily and solemnly express their thoughts, God is decreeing to begin some new and great period in His Church, even to the reforming of Reformation itself; what does He then but reveal Himself to His servants, and as His manner is, first to His Englishmen; I say, as His manner is, first to us, though we mark not the method of His counsels and are unworthy. . . . . Methinks I see in my mind a noble and puissant Nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks: Methinks I see her as an Eagle muing her mighty youth, and kindling her undazl'd eyes at the full midday beam; purging and unsealing her long abused sight at the fountain itself of heav'nly radiance, while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amaz'd at what she means, and in their envious gabble would prognosticate a year of sects and schisms.'

---

[1] Tennyson, *Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington*.

Once again, as in so many crises of history, it is 'His Englishmen' that God has chosen to lead the nations through 'the valley of decision'; to bear rescue and restoration to His suffering creatures, and to bring them out of all places where they have been scattered in the 'cloudy and dark day.' Yet the might of the nation, which in its best sense we celebrate to-day, must depend, if it is to endure, on the faithfulness of personal religion. There, in the heart of the faithful, is fought out the age-long conflict of right and wrong; there, in the light of the individual conscience, is found the decision which, in company with many more, is to mould the conscience of the nation itself. There is determined the course of conduct which follows the direction of an Unseen Guide; there the human spirit sees the light of truth, which beckons through the maze of terrestrial perplexity,

'The light that never was on sea or land.'

There he finds abiding comfort and renews the strong conviction of his faith, that though 'the world passeth away and the lust thereof,' yet 'he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.'

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY G. W. AND A. E. CLARIDGE AT THE CAXTON WORKS,
FRERE ROAD, BOMBAY, FOR THE AUTHOR.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

FREEDOM'S BATTLE: Being Historical Essays Occasioned by the Great War.

The Times.—Forcible studies of the politics and larger strategy of the war as seen in the light of historical parallels or contrasts drawn both from classical and modern times, and pointing a moral for the present.

The Spectator.—Of special interest is "A Plea for Nationality." "The true nationality," says Mr. Worsley Boden, "discloses itself in a national self respect, unconscious of any national mission of aggressive conquest, but quick to resist with the force of arms the grasping ambitions which can lay no claim to the support even of the doctrine of 'legitimacy.'" Another particularly attractive essay is that entitled "A Chapter of Ancient Imperialism," dealing with the war between Athens and Sparta, when "a Power almost wholly naval was opposed to a Power almost wholly military."

The Times of India.—Suggestive and scholarly studies of the political antecedents of the present campaign.....Mr. Boden, who is a disciple of Acton, more than once institutes a comparison between the Great War and its prototype of the eighteenth century.....This little volume will be found stimulating and attractive. It stands out as an example of clear thinking in the midst of the mass of confused and vague generalities on the political aspects of the struggle with which the market is flooded.

BOMBAY: CLARIDGE & CO.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO.