

N. J., Rev.  
 s. McCune 5  
 P. Church  
 Diller Dill 5  
 J. R. Dill  
 D. Trum  
 and Mrs  
 chard El  
 Mrs. M  
 Willson  
 J. Mar  
 Thoma  
 J. W  
 rick  
 ss M  
 Edga

# The Christian Statesman

Homiletic Review  
 460 East 23d St N Y

Vol. XLI. No. 3.

MARCH, 1907.

Whole No. 1486.

## CONTENTS:

### THE OUTLOOK

An Opportunity—Jamestown Exposition—Prosperity—Our  
 Public Schools—Opium Traffic in China—Kongo Affairs  
 —Thorough Going Christianity—Public School and Public  
 Morality—Standard Oil—Inter-Church Temperance  
 Council—Inauguration of Gov. Bechtel—Alaska-Yukon-  
 Pacific Exposition..... 65-70

### EDITORIAL ARTICLES AND NOTES

National Reform Contributions—The Kingdom in the S. S.  
 Lessons—Studies in Christian Citizenship—Week of Prayer  
 for Sabbath Observance..... 71-72  
 The Kingdom in the Covenant with Abraham..... 72-76

### CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES

Marriage and Divorce, Dr. Geo. W. Robinson..... 76-82  
 A Visit to Washington, Dr. H. H. George..... 82-83  
 Correspondence: Letter from Secretary J. M. Wylie..... 84-85

### OUR YOUNG PEOPLE

Why He Wasn't Accepted—The Sin of Vulgarity—Penny-  
 Peep Shows—Reading..... 85-87

### THE NATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENT

The Moral Ends of the State, Dr. McAllister..... 88-92  
 The Harrisburg Convention, Dr. Stevenson..... 92-94  
 Books and Magazines, R. C. W..... 95

PUBLISHED BY THE

## NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION

Room 603 Publication Bldg.,

209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.

\$1.00 A YEAR.

10 CENTS A COPY

# The Christian Statesman

Vol. XLI.

MARCH, 1907.

No. 3.

## The Outlook

The famine in China is another opportunity for us to show how much we as a people are permeated by the principles of Christianity. A

**An Opportunity.** nation as well as a man is known by its fruits;

and if in this hour of need we extend generous helping-hand, the Chinese people and nation will the more easily recognize the true value of the Christian faith.

A public protest has been issued by certain members of the Advisory Board of the Jamestown Exposition against the prominence of military attractions on the program of the exposition.

**Jamestown Exposition.**

It seems that such attractions are to be made the dominant feature of the exhibition, and that the aim of those in charge, at least somewhat officially stated, is to present "a good living picture of war with all its enticing splendors." The protesting members of the board were not aware of this purpose when they consented to serve. There is good ground for their protest; and while a navy, and a strong navy, would seem essential to our country for years to come, we agree with the *Homiletic Review* that the military and naval part of the program ought to be kept down to the modest measure which corresponds to our non-military and non-

naval character and history and to the prominent role which our country ought to continue to play in making armies and navies less and less necessary hereafter.

The *World Almanac* for 1907 gives the grain production for 1905, in the United States as 2,700,000,000 bushels of corn, 693,000,000

**Prosperity.** bushels of wheat, and 953,000,000 bushels of

oats, not to mention other cereals. It is almost impossible to grasp the meaning of such stupendous figures. No other country in the world ranks with us, in wheat production at least; Russia in Europe coming second with 451,000,000 bushels. Truly God is giving us a good physical basis for national development! The recent year has been one of great business prosperity. May it not be said of us as a nation: "Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked!"

The questions of the moral element in education and the use of the Bible in the public schools are emphasized by recent figures as to our

**Our Public Schools.**

common school enrollment and attendance. The total number enrolled is 16,468,000; that is, nearly twenty per cent of our entire population is enrolled in our public

# The National Reform Movement.

## STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP

### V.

#### The Moral Ends of the State.

BY THE REV. DAVID M'ALLISTER, D.D., LL.D.

In discussing the aims or ends of the state, the distinction carefully drawn in a former study between the institution of the state and any existing state should be kept in mind. Objects or ends in some respects quite diverse may be desirable and attainable in different existing states, according to their peculiar circumstances and varying degrees of development. But the ideal ends of the institution of the state, or the great purposes for which the ideal state is intended and adapted are definite and always the same, and should be determinable by a sound political philosophy.

#### CRITICISM OF MONTESQUIEU.

The celebrated French writer, Montesquieu, while admitting that all states have in general the same end, "to sustain themselves," as he expresses it, assigns to each a particular controlling object. He also distinguishes between the various prevailing aims of different forms of government. (De l'Esprit des Lois, book xi., chapter 5). If this be understood only of actual aims of existing states, which aims are to be judged as worthy or unworthy by the standard of the true idea of the state, the distinction must be admitted. But when such differences are accepted as inherent in the idea of the state, as right in themselves, and in harmony with the principles of political philosophy, an earnest protest should be entered against the admission. (Compare Stahl's "Philosophie des Rechts," vol II., part ii., 149.)

#### IDEA OF THE STATE DETER- MINES ITS ENDS.

The conception entertained of the state itself will always suggest corresponding ends. Writers who declare the state to be a necessary evil logically confine its functions and aims within a limited material-

istic sphere. By some authors, as Burke so happily expresses it, the state is "considered as nothing better than a partnership agreement in a trade of pepper and coffee, calico or tobacco." ("Reflections on French Revolution," p. 143.) The low *laissez faire* and *laissez aller* doctrine of the state, that lets subjects of government do and go as they please, can furnish no high and worthy ends of its being. Other writers who take a somewhat higher view of the state, admitting it to be a beneficent institution for the protection of person and property, restrict its purposes to those of "a watchdog at the door of the citizen." Even Paul Janet, the accomplished author of the "History of Political Science in Its Relations with Morals," says that "the object of government is to prepare men imperceptibly for that perfect state of society when laws and the government itself shall become useless." This is making it "the duty of the state to prepare for its own decease." (See Prof. Willoughby's "Nature of the State," pages 322, 340.)

#### NO MORAL ENDS FOR THE SECULAR STATE.

The secular idea of the state excludes it from the sphere of morality. It sharply draws the line of separation between rights and morals, either by attempting to supply a so-called "independent morality" no way connected with religion or divine authority, as Coignet ("La Morale Independente," 172, 173), or by distinguishing between "the moral order" and "the social order," while admitting that morals are necessarily based upon religion, as in the system of Prof. Bertauld. (See his "L'Ordre Social et L'Ordre Moral," 3.) On this secular theory that separates between rights and law, on the one hand, and on the other hand morals and duty, as based on the authority of the divine law of the Supreme Ruler, there can be no consistent admission that the state has any proper moral ends at all; but as will be seen hereafter, some of the advocates of this secular political philosophy are far from being consistent with themselves when they come to determine the

true or highest conceivable purposes of the state.

**MATERIAL AND ECONOMIC ENDS OF THE STATE.**

It is agreed on all hands that the proper sphere of the state includes material and economic purposes. The true idea of the state connects it necessarily with a definite territory. The protection and development of its material resources must therefore be included in its aims. So also the protection of the person and property of its citizens and subjects is another end of the same kind. The regulation of home trade and internal communication, and of foreign commercial relations, comes as a matter of course within its sphere and aims. These ends of the state include questions of morals, it is true. The adoption of a sound financial policy, with a national currency possessing the full value of an honest standard, involves the application of moral law to the conduct of the state. But such economic aims need not be discussed in this connection. It is enough to note that the state, like individual man, is a moral agent under moral law, even when pursuing material and economic aims.

**DISTINCTIVELY MORAL ENDS OF THE STATE.**

The state, however, is more than an economic society. It is pre-eminently a jural society—that is, a collective, social being having to do with what are called rights. It defines and protects the rights of persons. It has rights of its own to be determined and maintained. It defines crime and fixes the degree of its punishment. It undertakes to train the minds of immortal beings, as well as to defend their bodies. Its laws and institutions generally have an educating power. It determines family relations, and thus also to a large extent the influences which bear upon the birth and moral training of children in the home. Here are aims and purposes as distinctly moral as any of the ends of individual or family life can be.

**SUBORDINATE AND HIGHER ENDS.**

The higher ends of the state, as of the individual moral beings of which it is composed, must always be moral. Aristotle grasped this idea clearly when he affirmed the true end of the state and its true life to lie in the

pursuit of virtue, just as in the case of the individual. (See his "Politics," book vii.) There may be great diversity in the analysis of the subordinate or proximate ends of the state. There may be given, as by Holtzendorf, "der nationale Machtzweck," "der individuelle Rechtzweck" and "der gesellschaftliche Culturzweck," that is, the ends of national power, individual liberty and associated culture. ("Principien der Politik," pages 219 and following.) Or from an historical standpoint the proximate ends of actually existing states may be subject to change, as Prof. Burgess represents them. ("Political Science," 85-89.) But the ultimate end, towering over all that is proximate and subordinate, is the moral perfection of the nation and its people. (Compare Bluntschli's "Lehre vom modernen Stat," vol. I., 361.)

**PRACTICAL BEARING OF SUCH ULTIMATE END.**

Let a nation set before itself such a high and ultimate end, and what Secretary Root said in his address before the Kansas City Commercial Club, Nov. 19, 1906, must follow—"that the same rules of right conduct which obtain in our individual intercourse with each other apply also to our internal political action and the exercise of the powers of self-government. We realize that what is wrong and to be condemned in the conduct of man to man is wrong and to be condemned in the conduct of public officers and in the conduct of politicians. In the relation between nations, which the great body of the people now control, there should be a general all-prevailing and controlling sense that the same rules of conduct ought to be followed. Nations have souls and consciences as truly as individuals. The life of the just and faithful and kindly man, who is respected and beloved by his neighbors, is the type of what every citizen should wish his own country to be in its relations to all other nations." (Christian Statesman," Jan., 1907, p. 1.)

**THE STATE BOTH A MEANS AND AN END IN ITSELF.**

The position is sometimes taken that the state is a means to an end, and again, that it is an end in itself. Both statements are true. And both are essential to a full view of the moral ends of the state. The state, like the Sabbath, is for man's welfare.

And the welfare of mankind includes the highest possible advancement of the individual. But, as we have seen in a former study, the state is man in the collective development of his social nature. Its highest aims will include, therefore, its own moral advancement for the sake of the individual, and the moral advancement of the individual for the state's own sake, and both for the glory of Him who is Lord of both the individual and the state. (Compare Rothe's "Theologische Ethik," vol. II., section 428, and vol. V., section 1149; also Marheineke's "Theologische Moral," p. 243.)

THE STATE BEING PROPERLY  
DEFINED AS "ORGANIZED MAN-  
KIND," THE CHIEF END OF MAN  
WILL BE ALSO THE HIGHEST END

of the state. Thomas Carlyle gladly acknowledged his indebtedness to the first answer in the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism, that "man's chief end is to glorify God." This is the teaching of the Scriptures. (See 1 Cor. 10:31; 1 Peter 4:11.) As Bishop Huntington has so happily given the thought expression, "Human Society" in its true manifestations, with all the influences acting upon it, with all the educating forces and ennobling ideas planted in it, "is an illustration of God's character and purposes, . . . because God himself has seen fit to inspire and enlighten it with his own Spirit, through his own Messiah." ("Divine Aspects of Human Society," 43.) Thus the state, with its rich endowments, and held true to its chief end, shows forth the glory of God more resplendently than the starry heavens. What a manifestation of heaven on earth will it be when these terrestrial principalities and powers that were created by the Lord and for him shall cast their crowns before his throne, saying, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for thou has created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." (Col. 1:16; Rev. 4:10-11.) All the high ends of the state, such as the repressing and punishing of evil-doers and the encouraging of them that do well (Rom. 13:3-4; 1 Peter 2:14), and the serving in its own proper sphere of the best interests of the church (Isaiah 60:12), are included in this one chief and highest end.

BURKE'S CELE-  
BRATED STATE-  
MENT.

Perhaps no expression of the high moral ends of the state has been more admired than that of Edmund Burke: "It is a partnership in every virtue and in all perfection. As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born. . . . Without civil society man could not by any possibility arrive at the perfection of which his nature is capable, nor even make a remote and faint approach to it. . . . He who gave our nature to be perfected by our virtue, willed also the necessary means of its perfection. He willed therefore the state." ("Reflections on the Revolution in France," 143, 144, 146.)

NO ANALOGY  
WITH CHAR-  
TERED COM-  
PANIES.

The analogy often urged between the state and incorporated companies will not hold. These "artificial persons," as Blackstone terms them ("Commentaries," vol. I., 123), are created by the state and have their legitimate ends specified in their articles of incorporation. They are thus directly accountable to the state which gives them their being and assigns to them their limitations. It is a very shallow political philosophy which ranks the state in this order of social beings. It may be asked what human power charters the state or specifies the ends of its being? According to the true idea of the state, its divine origin and the ultimate source of its authority, as maintained in preceding studies, it is directly accountable to God for the attainment of its high moral ends.

BROAD MEAN-  
ING OF "GENER-  
AL WELFARE."

All our written constitutions include "the general welfare" as an end of the state. This means the welfare of all the people and includes their welfare as moral beings. Banking and manufacturing companies are chartered with no such broad and comprehensive end in view. They have specific financial and industrial ends. The state determines the particular ends of all such "artificial persons," with a view to the highest welfare of the state itself and all its people. If any of these incorporated societies prove detrimental to the general wel-

fare, as is too often the fact, the state is under obligation to deprive them of the life which it bestowed. As the state is over these organizations, so God himself is over the state. It is directly accountable to him. It should hold the organizations it has chartered to the faithful pursuit of the legitimate ends of their incorporation. And in like manner God will hold the state accountable for the attainment of the end for which he has chartered it—the highest moral welfare of its citizens, or what Bluntschli terms “die geistige Erhebung des Volks, [the spiritual uplift of the people.]” (See his “Allgemeines Statsrecht,” vol. I., p. 70.) Dr. Thomas Arnold expresses the same highest end of the state as “the setting forth God’s glory by doing His appointed work.” (Lectures on Modern History,” p. 34.)

HIGHEST MORAL ENDS MUST BE CHRISTIAN.

Admitting that the Christian religion is the only true religion, and that no state can exist without moral ends of some kind, and that

all moral purposes must be determined by religious ideas, it follows that the highest moral aims of the ideal state must be Christian in their character. Any existing state, having the knowledge of Christian teaching, is under imperative obligation to have supreme regard to the Christian standard of morals in seeking its own highest ends. In this connection Dr. Martensen has well said: “Nothing is more unreasonable than the view that the state, the most comprehensive of all earthly institutions, and one which so decidedly plays a chief part in the world’s history, should be withdrawn from the influences of Christianity and thus excluded from the transformation of things temporal which Christianity is designed to effect. The necessity for the Christian character of states is mainly founded on the fact that the state does not exist for the sake of this or that subordinate aim, but for the sake of human nature itself; that its vocation is to furnish and work out all those external conditions which are indispensable to the general development of human culture and prosperity.” (“Christian Ethics [Social],” p. 98.)

MORAL AIMS OF NON-CHRISTIAN STATES.

It is not denied that some of the moral ends of the institution of the state may be pursued and attained in non-Christian nations. Even a pagan state that according to the light of

nature protects person and property and seeks the general welfare, like a pagan family conforming to nature’s law of monogamy, is God’s institution for good to man. But there is no justification for the great cause of Christian missions, unless states as well as families and individuals are to be evangelized, and thus educated to the acceptance of Christian aims. (See Matt. 28:18-20.) Von Mohl is right in contending that the Christian standard does not apply until the nation is evangelized; but this admits the obligation resting on all states possessing the light of the gospel of Christ to learn and follow out their highest moral ends according to its teachings. (Comp. “Encyclopaedic der Statswissenschaft,” p. 90; also Martensen’s “Christian Ethics,” p. 99.)

PAPAL DOCTRINE OF AIMS OF THE STATE.

One of the extremest advocates of papal claims is Thomas Aquinas, who argues in substance as follows for the subjection of

the state to the Pope of Rome: The proper ends of the state are material and economic. These lower aims must be subordinate to the highest of all aims which are given only to the church. Therefore the state stands in subordination to the church and her earthly head, the Pope. As the two swords of power or authority, both civil and ecclesiastical, are given by God to Peter and his successors, the authority of the Pope alone is directly from God, and that of the civil ruler indirectly from Him through the Pope, as Constantine’s from Sylvester. (See “De Regimine Principum,” book iii., chapters 1, 6, 10; Stahl’s “Philosophie des Rechts,” vol. I., 61-65; Janet’s “Histoire de la Science Politique dans ses Rapports avec la Morale,” vol. I., 381-401; Dunning’s “Political Theories, Ancient and Medieval,” 206, 207.)

THE ERROR OF AQUINAS’ THEORY.

The Scriptures, on the other hand, derive the authority of the state, as seen in our last study, directly from God. God gives the church

her authority for her own distinct ecclesiastical purposes. And just as directly does he give the state its authority for its own distinctive ends. While political and ecclesiastical ends differ widely in many respects, yet both include moral ends under the same moral law in its different applications. The true solution of the problem of church and state is for each institution to promote faithfully its own high-

est ends. In this way there will be no corrupting union and no infringement of one upon the other. When the church usurps the sword, given by God only to the state (Romans 13:4), the horrors of the inquisition are the logical result. Roman Catholicism, as officially proclaimed by Pope Boniface's Bull "Unam Sanctam," of 1302, with its doctrine of two swords and such harmonious teachings as those of Aquinas, and his disciple who supplemented his teacher's writings (compare Prof. Dunning's "Political Theories, Ancient and Medieval," 216-217; also Janet's "Histoire de la Science Politique," vol. I., 411), leads to the same practical evil as infidel socialism. It deprives the state of its inherent ground for the punishment of the evildoer, and leaves penal laws without a true foundation, and society without any means of defending itself against imminent dissolution. (Comp. Adolphe Frank's "Philosophie du Droit Penal," 76.) By another extreme the infidel separation of the juridical from the moral, which even to-day seems to be regarded in some quarters as an advance in political science, distorts the true theory of civil law, deprives the state of its dignity and robs its sovereignty of all vitality. (Compare Trendelenburg's "Nurrecht auf dem Grunde der Ethik," p. 20.)

This study may find a suitable conclusion in showing that the admission of moral ends of the state is fatal to the separation sometimes insisted on between rights and morals, or the separation of the social from the moral order. For example, when Prof. Willoughby admits that one of the aims or functions of the state is to promote the general welfare morally as well as economically and intellectually (see "The Nature of the State," p. 345), his theory excluding the legislative action of the state from the domain of morals (see pages 113, 114), and affirming that "divine or moral sanctions can have no application to political matters" (see pages 52, 53), receives a staggering or rather annihilating blow from his own hand. Again, when Prof. Burgess declares the ultimate end of the state to be "the perfection of humanity," and affirms that "this end is wholly spiritual" and that "in it mankind, as spirit, triumphs over all

fleshly weakness, error and sin" ("Political Science," vol. I., p. 85), the query naturally arises, how can this high moral end be reconciled with his accepted principle "that the state can do no wrong?" (See p. 57.) If the state neglects its ultimate end can it be said to be doing no wrong? And how much greater the wrong if its action is in direct opposition to its high moral and spiritual aim? Rejoicing to agree with these honored authors in ascribing high moral ends to the state, we submit to every candid student of political science that such ends harmonize best with the Christian doctrine of the state as a moral being under moral law, deriving its existence from God, and accountable to Him who is the ultimate source of its authority.

#### LITERATURE.

The following books and articles may be referred to by students wishing to pursue this study: Burgess' "Political Science," vol. I., 83-89; "The State," by Pres. Wilson, chapter 16; "The Nature of the State," by Prof. Willoughby, chapter 12; Woolsey's "Political Science," vol. I., 208-243; Tayler Lewis' articles in "Christian Statesman," from June 15, 1870, to Jan. 2, 1871; Bishop Huntington's "Divine Aspects of Human Society," especially lectures 1-4; Lieber's "Political Ethics," book ii., chapter 5; "National Reform Manual," chapter 4; Dorner's "System of Christian Ethics," sections 75-78; Martensen's "Christian Ethics [Social]," sections 45-48; Gladstone's "The State in Its Relations with the Church," vol. I., chapters 2 and 3; Holtzendorf's "Principien der Politik," book iii.; Bluntschli's "Statslehre," chapter 1, sec. 5; also his "Allgemeines Statsrecht," book v., chapters 1-4; Stahl's "Philosophie des Rechts," vol. II., part ii., sections 36-39; Von Mohl's "Encyklopaedie der Staatswissenschaften," pages 71-90; Rothe's "Theologische Ethik," vol. II., sections 428-436; vol. V., sec. 1149; Posada's "Derecho Politico," vol. I., 251-286; Taparelli's "Diritto Naturale," vol. I., 252-254.

#### The Harrisburg National Reform Convention

This convention, held in the hall of the Board of Trade, February 14 and 15, was a signal and gratifying success. Secretary J.