



The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1918

THE TERMINOLOGY OF LOVE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

II*

The story of the Septuagint usage of the terms for love is almost told by the simple statistics. The verb ἀγαπᾶν occurs in the Septuagint about two hundred and sixty-six times, φιλεῖν about thirty-six times, ἐρᾶσθαι only three times, and στέργειν just once. Even this does not give the whole state of the case, for in the majority of its occurrences φιλεῖν is used in the sense of "to kiss." It occurs only sixteen or seventeen times with the meaning of "love." That is to say, this word, the common word for love in the classics, is used in the Septuagint in only a little more than five per cent of the instances where love falls to be mentioned: in nearly ninety-five per cent ἀγαπᾶν is used. Here is a complete reversal of the relative positions of the two words.

In more than a third of the instances in which φιλεῖν is used of loving, moreover, it is used of things—food or drink, or the like (Gen. xxvii. 4, 9, 14, Prov. xxi. 17, Hos. iii. 1, Is. lvi. 10), leaving only a half a score of instances in which it is employed of love of persons. In all these instances (except Tob. vi. 14, where it is a demon that is in question) it is a human being to whom the loving is ascribed. The love ascribed to him ranges from mere carnal love (Jer. xxii. 22 [paralleled with ἐρασταί], Lam. i. 2, Tob. vi. 14, cf. Tob. vi. 17), through the love of a father for his son (Gen. xxxvii. 4), to love for Wisdom (Prov. viii. 17, xxix. 3, Wisd. viii. 2). Cremer drops the remark: "In two passages only does φιλεῖν stand as perfectly synonymous with ἀγαπάω,

* The first portion of this article was published in the number of this REVIEW for January 1918: pp. 1-45.

CHRISTIANITY AND HUMANITARIAN PATRIOTISM

Patriotism is the love of country. An individual does not find himself one among all the individuals of mankind; he comes into life one in a family, soon finds himself one in a community, and later one in a larger community, his country. There are sacred obligations that bind one to wife or husband, to parents and children, to brothers and sisters; and to recognize these obligations and fulfil them, cultivating the appropriate affections, gives to human life a sort of sacredness, while to disregard these obligations is to profane that life. So in the community and the nation there are sacred relations which it is degrading and debasing to disregard. Patriotism, a sort of exclusive love for one's country, is an inescapable obligation.

Patriotism requires a broader affection than the love of one's own family. For a man to stop short with the utmost loyalty to his family, and be indifferent and disloyal to his country, is to fall short of his obligation. So also patriotism is itself too narrow to be all-comprehending; it must be comprehended in a broader loyalty, humanitarianism, or love for all mankind.

There is no real conflict between these obligations,—loyalty to family, to country, and to humanity. Each has its absolute demands and also its limitations. No outward claim can require a man to violate his personal integrity or veracity. Loyalty to country or to mankind can never require him to be unfaithful to his wife. Humanitarianism can never require treason. These loyalties are harmonious; and no man can live the full and beautiful life who is disloyal to humanity, to country, or to family.

Most men of the better sort recognize their obligations to family and to country, but many of them have not accepted their obligation to the broader community of mankind. This obligation we may call humanitarian patriot-

ism, as recognizing the obligation to humanity while still accepting the special obligation to country.

Now the question we wish to consider is the relation of Christianity to this humanitarian patriotism.

Undoubtedly they are compatible, and more than compatible. Christianity teaches that all mankind are one family, bids men worship a Savior who died for all men, and enforces the duty of loving one's neighbor as oneself. It would be absurd to restrict this obligation to individuals of the same country. Christianity approves a humanitarian patriotism, and affords sufficient motives for the practice of it.

Christianity, however, is not merely another name for this humanitarian patriotism as many assume, but modifies it, and gives it a very definite form and content.

One direction in which Christianity limits humanitarian patriotism, and even condemns it as inadequate when regarded as an end in itself, is Godward. Christianity believes in God as being above man as well as in God as dwelling in man, in a God, who is transcendent as well as imminent. While requiring each man to love his neighbor as himself, it requires him to love God with a still greater devotion. This loyalty to God is consistent with humanitarianism, with patriotism, and with loyalty to family, but demands supremacy for itself. To serve man cannot take the place of serving God; to serve man is not the whole of serving God.

As long as we live, whether before or after death, we must live in close contact with God because we live in God's world. We are perpetually religious as well as perpetually social. Morality is not the whole of righteousness. There can be no permanent peace while we are at war with God. Nor was God made for man, but man for God.

Another direction in which Christianity limits humanitarianism, and shows it to be inadequate and incomplete in itself is manward. Nothing is really good when looked at apart from God; God alone is the good of man. All else is good for man only as God is enjoyed in it. Man is

an animal, but to enjoy animal good as if he were only an animal is for man an evil. Man is rational, but to enjoy rational good as if he were but rational is for man an evil. Man is social, but to enjoy social good as if he were but social is for man an evil. Man is religious, and to cut him off from God by engaging him in the lower exclusively is to starve and destroy him as man.

All this is true of man in society as well as of the individual. Human society without God can never attain to its best, and can not even maintain what we may call its less than best for any length of time. It gradually but inevitably sinks to a lower and lower level. Christianity denies the possibility of either individual or social salvation to the Godless.

The third respect in which Christianity limits humanitarianism, and proves it to be inadequate, is churchward. I am using the word church in the Pauline sense of the society of men who are united in Christ by being vitally united to him. In him men meet God; and only in him can they satisfy God's demands upon them, and only in him can they find God as their good. Christianity declares Christ to be the head of his people, the church. The surest of all efforts at betterment therefore is the one which endeavors to bring men into living union with Christ and his people, and to perfect them in this social unit and organism. The church in this sense is the humanity that is to be, the permanent mankind; and it is to inherit the fruits of all the toils of body and mind and spirit done through the ages in and by individuals and institutions.

Now not all men become incorporated in this immortal mankind and thus share in the salvation, social and individual, possible to man; and those who miss this incorporation miss all, and perish. Hence a humanitarianism that labors for mankind rather than for the elect of mankind, and counts itself a failure if any perish, and destroys all in the vain effort to save all, is in conflict with Christianity. Christianity seeks to do good to all men, and passionately

seeks the salvation of all by their engrafting into the body of Christ, but lives and works on and on, sustained in all failures by the sure expectation of eternal life for the church, and guided in its selection of endeavors by the growing manifestation who are of this imperishable mankind. An indiscriminate humanitarianism must be impatient with Christianity.

Humanitarianism, therefore, will impeach the Christ of Christianity. It will, first of all, impeach his deity. As man, he is too attractive to ignore; he is himself the Great Humanitarian; he has captivated the heart of mankind. But as God, mere humanitarianism has no use for him and thrusts him aside. And its method of opposition is to drown the assertion of his divinity by its loud praise of his humanity. Humanitarianism will impeach his atonement. There is no place for atonement where there is no God other than the better elements of human nature. If sin is misfortune, the cross is folly. And humanitarianism will impeach the lordship of Christ. That a man who died two thousand years ago should claim as God the right to command our obedience today is intolerable to those who have no God except the better nature in men.

Humanitarianism will seek to save men by means of the external. Its method of salvation is through perfection of environment. Sanitation and education take the place of regeneration and the Holy Spirit; the correction of economic and political evils will regenerate the world.

Humanitarianism will ignore the after-death. It knows too little of what comes after death to allow the life before death to be made a means for the improvement of the conditions of the life after death,—if there be any. It looks forward to the humanity of the future, of future generations, and uses individuals during their little stay in the quarries of this life to do their little task on the rising and eternal pyramid of humanity. The individual lives on in the future only as he now “does his bit” in building up that future; but once gone, he is gone utterly, whether Shake-

speare or Washington, and can never come back to take his place in that social structure which his life and labors helped to erect. Consequently humanitarianism will passionately insist either on equality of opportunity for all to share in the good of before-death, seeing there is no rectification of wrongs in the after-death, or, seeing that all who are, must be sacrificed for those who are to be, it will immolate the mortal multitudes for the upbuilding of immortal institutions, and for the sake of *efficiency* it will organize society into a military despotism, or else will endeavor to combine *equality* with *efficiency* in a social and political structure where all are happy and none are free.

Humanitarianism fastens on tendencies and movements of our time, and seeks to capture and control them. A distinctive tendency of our time is the socialistic. Socialism is the movement toward the thorough reorganization of society in such a way that all individuals without distinction shall be assigned each to his proper place for the good of the social whole. Then each individual will become the servant of the social whole, and will obey it, work for it, and be fed and trained by it. No man will own anything, not even himself, but society will own all persons and all goods.

Socialism is making its appeal effective. In Germany, autocratic, in Russia, democratic, it is in control; and in the countries of the Allies it is constantly winning concession after concession. We may hang its guerillas of the I. W. W., but we come to terms with its armies of organized labor. We are socializing the railroads and other public utilities; we are socializing fuel and food; we are socializing man power. Socialism is the one sure victor of the Great War.

Democracy is not socialism. The socialized society may be controlled by an autocratic few or by the democratic all. A democratic society is controlled, not by a class or caste, but by all acting together as equals. The democratic mass may commit the actual administration to a monarch, to a

few agents, or to many agents, but the initial and final authority is in the whole people acting together as equals.

Democracy is making its appeal effective. All the Allies are democratic, or think that they are democratic, unless it be Japan; and they are fighting to "make the world safe for democracy." Everywhere the tendency is toward a more democratic constitution. If the Central Powers were to win the war, this tendency to fuller and completer democracy would be arrested; but this is the reason why they cannot win the war. The spirit of the age is against them.

Internationalism is the movement toward universalizing socialism and democracy. It stands over against imperialism, which would universalize socialism and autocracy. One of these two must win out in this war, and the currents run toward internationalism.

The universalizing of education is a necessary means of making socialism and democracy effective. Even autocracy would educate all into docile efficiency. This movement will therefore receive a great impetus, whatever the outcome of the war. Social service, seeking especially to uplift those who are naturally or economically or morally inferior to the average well-to-do; missions to regions and groups, otherwise beyond the reach of uplifting influences; and propagandism of beliefs and views that are thought to be uplifting,—all these must be named among the tendencies of our time. Altruism threatens to render such terms as religion and piety obsolete, and such terms as righteousness rare.

Now into this stream of tendencies the humanitarianism, or humanitarian patriotism, of which we are speaking, can come and, precipitating certain elements, color the whole stream with its own peculiarity, and become the dominant element. By emphasizing its own altruistic principle, it vindicates socialism as the best way to abolish poverty and secure the general welfare, reënforcing this conclusion by its stress on environment. Denying sin and guilt, it traces all the evils of society to controllable conditions, and becomes

a passionate champion of salvation by efficient organization. It thus sanctifies socialism, and then uses it as a means of promoting its own progress.

More congenial still is this humanitarianism with democracy; for they both lay emphasis on the dignity of human nature, on the worth of every man as man. Stressing the dignity of human nature as such, democracy makes little of external differences of condition and fortune, and demands respect for the individual man. It thus lays a basis on which to demand participation in the government by every one as essentially the equal of all the rest, in one breath demanding the equality of all in power and in opportunity. And by denying all divine authority it gets rid of every form of ecclesiastical authority and of the divine right of kings as well, and thus opens the way for the calling of all to share equally in the government of all.

When humanitarianism has made the socialistic and the democratic tendencies its servants, all else will follow. It will control education, making it universal and anti-Christian. This it can the more easily do in America, seeing that we have separated the state and the church; and as a matter of fact humanitarianism regards the state without religion as all the better qualified thereby to educate all its citizens, and therefore aims to deprive the church of all educational functions.

It will of course make internationalism its own, and establish a supnation on a humanitarian basis. It can no longer have before its eyes the fear of the God who came down to Babel and scattered mankind into separate nations.

Then social service will take the place of worship, and institutions like the Red Cross and the Y. M. C. A., on its purely social side, will displace the churches. The diffusion of socialism and democracy will supersede foreign missions and home missions. And the propaganda of this new philosophy, this new religion, if we can call it by this name, through schools and missions, through the press and theatre and every other agent of publicity, all under the direction of a socialistic government, will become a matter of course.

One of two results will follow. The movement will be wrecked by the dissensions of conflicting interests and especially by the resistance of individuals and groups demanding independence and freedom. For there is an inherent antagonism between the socialism of the times and liberty; between supernational socialism organizing a world government and the liberty of peoples; between national socialism and individual liberty. And this antagonism will wreck the present movement toward a socialistic and democratic supernationalism. Or else the movement will succeed, and humanitarianism will obtain universal power. Once it does this, religion and the church will be crushed out by force as pests to society. Then will come back the days of martyrdom; for the saints of Christ must be free both to live their religion and to teach it to their own children and to others. Rather than surrender this freedom they will have to show that Christians still know how to die.

But why should the church stand by, and let humanitarianism undo the progress of centuries and force Christianity to begin its world mission all over again? Is it not possible for the true Christianity to take possession of these movements and tendencies and purify them to its own uses?

Christianity is by nature intensely propagandist. Two things weaken it as a propaganda in our times, its divisions and its emphasis on beneficence. But if Americans and Japanese, so different politically, can yet unite politically as against a common foe, why may not all the branches of the Christian faith unite in promoting the Christian faith as against anti-Christian philosophies and faiths and infidelities? Only let this cooperation be cooperation in propagating the common faith, and proceed from zeal for the common faith and not from indifference to the treasury of truth. And as to beneficence, we must convince ourselves anew that to teach the truth committed to us is the highest and most necessary beneficence. While we must not neglect to feed the hungry and nurse the sick, let us believe with intensity of conviction that we have something better

to give than bread or healing. In this right appreciation of our mission let us seize the advantage of the trend to the use of propaganda, and, by surpassing all other isms in our zeal and diligence as advocates of our beliefs, arrest again the attention of men by a return of enthusiasm in turning the world upside down, and convince them that we at least believe in our religion.

This will mean, of course, not only an increase of zeal and efficiency in the religious education of our children, but also in the prosecution of missions both in foreign lands and to the unevangelized in home lands; and it will mean that in our missions we put evangelizing and catechising first, and relief second. It will mean also that we enter every place where beliefs are formed and use every agency for forming them,—propagandist societies like the N. E. A. and R. E. A., and books and periodicals; and that we everywhere oppose the propaganda of humanitarianism, challenging its principles and positively asserting and applying the principles of true Christianity. Particularly we must write text-books, works of fiction, editorials, etc., and be as aggressive as are the advocates of destructive criticism or of Christian Science.

Especially must we enter the schools, the grammar and high schools, the colleges and universities, the normal and professional schools, strenuously combatting, on scientific grounds anti-Christian teachings that put on the guise of science, on historical grounds anti-Christian teachings that put on the guise of history, and especially on psychological grounds anti-Christian teachings that put on the guise of psychology. This we can do effectively, not by assuming an attitude of bigoted intolerance or of petty criticism, incompetent because ignorant, but by the intelligent, open and fair use of argument and testimony. Not one public institution should be permitted to teach what is really contrary to Christianity, without having that false teaching challenged and refuted by scholars of equal eminence and of superior poise and intelligence. Christ has a right to the testimony of his friends in the sanhedrins of learning.

Social service is not to be neglected by the church, but rather magnified. Wherever there is want and suffering, wherever injustice and oppression, there we should be, and there to serve. We should gladly cooperate with those who are not Christians, in political and social reforms, and in every sort of beneficence and social betterment; but this we should do as under Christ, giving to him the credit of our sympathies and motives. Our Christ is really the inspiration of the altruistic service of our times, even when done by those who do not acknowledge him; and why should we who know him and adore him ever fail to confess him in all our service for humanity?

We must be really and abundantly humanitarian, enthusiastic in every service to humanity. To preach truth without showing goodness is to injure the truth. Here is where we who know Christ as Lord can meet all workers and all sufferers in a practical way and command their respect; and it is treason to Christ when his living epistles, which are to be known and read of all men, reveal no trace of his compassion for human need. Christ among the thinkers of the world must not be severed from Jesus among the sick of Galilee.

But what about such a movement as internationalism? Let us recognize, that Christianity sets up the ideal of peace among the nations and preaches the brotherhood of all the race; that it demands justice from all to all, whether individuals or nations, and especially cares for the poor and weak; and that a universal union really able to secure peace and justice and to do away with war, would delight the Christian to the heart. We may therefore favor the union of all the nations in a supranation for the protection of the weak and for the peace of all.

Only we must not forget that a union of resources in a spirit of pride, as if thereby the Great Humanity might get rid of dependence on God, will bring again confusion and division. The righteous and reverent may unite; the unjust and proud must remain divided into hostile nations.

We must not forget to guard against the absorption of other divine institutions by the state. Both the church and the family must be conserved. At the basis of all divine institutions is the family, consisting of the husband and wife and their children. Every attempt to undermine the family, by denying to it the full exercise of its functions, or by subjecting it to the church or to the state to the loss of its own freedom in its own proper sphere, imperils the social basis of the higher civilization, and must be resisted at every sacrifice and without compromise.

Out of the family sprang the state, the organ of action of the larger community and the organ of social justice. Then out of the state, as the holy nation of Israel, sprang at last the church, the separate society of Christ's people and the institute of religious truth. Now the preservation of the church separate from the state in both organization and function, and free to develop its own life and to fulfil its own function, is necessary and must be guaranteed at any and every cost. The middle institute between the family and the church, the state, threatens to absorb the functions of both, and this danger must be guarded against.

And we must not forget that there is another peril in the expansion of the state proposed by internationalism. Here some distinctions may be made. The *nation* in the sense in which we speak of France or Great Britain or the United States as a nation is not the whole of that divine institution strictly designated as the state. The city as an organized government, the county, and all local governments, are of the state. When therefore we think of the state as the institute of social justice, we must not substitute national government for the state. The state embraces the national government, but also local governments, and likewise international or supernational government so far as such may properly exist; and national government theoretically is no more a divine institution than is municipal government or international government.

But just as the township government has almost disap-

peared in the United States, and our municipal and county governments are of decreasing importance as compared with what we call the State, and our States of decreasing importance as compared with the national government, so there is danger that a supernational government, once organized, will tend to absorb more and more the functions of government, until nations lose their independence and individuality. This danger must be guarded against by making the international government strictly the organ of action by mankind as a whole and by limiting its power over nations to their protection from one another's injustice, and by greater emphasis upon the sacred right of freedom for each in the exercise of its own proper function, whether the supernational, the nation, or the local government, whether the state, the church, or the family, and whether society or the individual. But there must be located somewhere the authority and power to prevent wars among the nations and protect nations in their freedom and independence, a function that national governments have proved themselves unable to discharge; and some sort of superstate is the only possible instrumentality for the exercise of this kind of justice.

Christianity therefore must not oppose the present trend to internationalism, but promote it, purify it and save it from suicide. To oppose it is to suspend the practice of the brotherhood of man, and to hurt the cause of Him who draws all men unto Himself. But to accept this tendency to internationalism, or supernationalism, and to inject into it the Christian principles of reverence and justice and brotherhood is to win possession of a mighty agency for replacing anti-Christian humanitarianism with Christian humanitarianism.

This brings us to the more difficult question of democracy. To democracy understood as denial of human obligation to God, or as affirmation of the right of the people, or of a majority, to do a wrong, Christianity must stand forever opposed. No less must it oppose the denial of

authority to parents over children, or of authority to government over subjects.

But the essential of democracy is universal equality in franchise and eligibility. A pure democracy would not admit all to office, but would make all equally eligible to office; it would not make all equally influential in determining who should hold office, but would make all equal as electors. Democracy is the antithesis of caste, of hereditary difference in franchise and eligibility. This principle is not anti-Christian. On the contrary, Christianity makes all men essentially equal, because Christ died for all and in the gospel is offered to all, and dignifies each man with the highest individual responsibility, the responsibility of deciding for himself whether to accept Christ or to reject him. While Christianity does not affirm democracy, it makes the mind hospitable to the claims of democracy by implanting in it the appreciation of the dignity of the individual man.

The other essential of democracy is freedom, the right of every one to freedom and to education for freedom. This right to freedom in no way releases a man from his obligations to individuals and to society, or society from its obligations to him; but first among the obligations which society owes the individual is to respect and protect his freedom. The precise extent of the freedom of the individual it is not easy to define, but at least two affirmations may be made,—that the individual has the right to freedom in choosing what to be and do insofar as he does not interfere with the rights of others, and that as he grows in wisdom and character his freedom enlarges. Nothing can justify the limitation of any one's freedom but his incapacity to use it or his misuse of it to the infringement of the liberty of others; and when his freedom is limited because of his present incapacity, those who limit it are in duty bound to be aiming to prepare him for restoration to liberty. Without this passion for liberty democracy would be the shell of a fossil. And this principle of freedom, if not

explicitly asserted in the Christian teaching, grows so naturally out of its whole concept of man that Christianity at least predisposes to democracy. The open door before every man to sonship with God is his emancipation.

Humanitarianism, on the other hand, really tends to the denial of democracy. Denying to man responsibility great enough to require the atonement of the Son of God for the expiation of his sin, it cannot appreciate the real grandeur and dignity of man as a free personality. With its one-sided concern for the external advantages of life, it cannot give supreme value to freedom and to its development by the possession of the franchise and of eligibility, but will always value the comforts of life above freedom in living. With its attention directed to the ills of the suffering and the weak, it can evolve a practical pity for the unfortunate, but not a genuine reverence for all. Humanitarianism would discrown man of his glory in order to save him from his weaknesses; but Christianity would save him from his sins into his full glory as a free personality. Thus Christianity promotes democracy by developing the love of liberty and respect for liberty.

We come finally to the hardest problem of all, that of socialism. The first difficulty is to determine what socialism is. It is certainly of the essence of socialism to place the emphasis upon society, man in the aggregate, as distinguished from the individual man, as it is of the essence of individualism to magnify the importance of the individual as distinguished from society. If two men differed in this, that one of them set more by society and the other by the individual, the first would call the second individualistic, while the second would call the first socialistic. A man is an individualist to those who make more of society than he does, and a socialist to those who make more of the individual than he does. Socialism, then, strives for a higher appreciation of society than prevails at the time. This then is the first principle of socialism, the high appreciation of society as distinguished from the individual.

One may think of society as the mere resultant, in its influences, of the individuals that compose it, without thinking of it as an organic whole. A man who thus thinks of society would hardly be called a socialist, however important he might consider society. For it is not society that socialism makes so important, but society organized and directed to ends, organized society acting as an organism. Here also men differ. Some would organize society for more ends than would others, and some would organize society more thoroughly than would others. The second principle of socialism is consequently its emphasis on the thorough organization of society for comprehensive ends.

A third principle of socialism has to do with the use of force. Those who would discard the use of force altogether are so few that we may leave them out in this discussion, and make the use of force in organizing society and the use of force by organized society, and its use so far as necessary to effect thorough organization and successful operation, a fundamental of socialism.

Socialism, then, is the relatively high appreciation of society thoroughly organized by force and using force, as an agency for effecting human welfare. In other words, socialism believes in making the state more comprehensive in its functions and more effective in its operation. The principles of socialism are not necessarily anti-Christian, but its advocates may show themselves to be anti-Christian by the manner of their application of them.

Christianity believes in the individual, and in the liberty of the individual to be himself and live his life. It does not even seek to save the individual against his own consent. If socialism in practice undertakes to deny this individuality and to exert compulsion on the individual, even for his own good and the good of society, without developing his individuality and giving free play to his liberty, then socialism becomes despotic, anti-democratic, and anti-Christian. Only when force is necessary in training the individual for freedom or for the defense of society against his

abuse of it, is it right to use force upon the individual; for, society has its rights and obligations in relation to the individual, and the individual has his rights and obligations in relation to society, and neither may transgress these ethical limitations without trespass.

So too the family has its functions, and its own sphere of rights and obligations, and no government, however benevolent its intentions, may without trespass transgress the sacred dignity of the family. The church likewise has its own sacred sphere of rights and obligations, into which the state may not without trespass enter. Even the lesser divisions, from the neighborhood up to the great nation, have each its own sphere, into which the superior government may not rightfully enter; nor can there ever be a supnation with the right to do anything and everything, but such a supnation must forever stand limited in its functions by the rights of the lesser political divisions.

This doctrine of inalienable rights for the individual, for the family, for the church, and for the lesser included states as against the larger including state, is flatly denied by some extremes of socialism; and these extremes must be resisted to the death. It is against the church first of all that such extreme socialism will direct its assaults; and the Christianity of the time must meet these assaults and defeat them, or the liberty of the smaller communities, of the family, and of the individual, will perish in one all-comprehensive despotism.

But Christianity, still imbued with the zeal for social justice, and still conscious of its mission to the weak and the poor, the Christianity of Jesus, the Friend of the outcasts of society and of those done to death by the caste of culture, of wealth, and of power, the Christianity which has taught the brotherhood of man through all its history and held up before men the unfading hope of the ideal brotherhood that is yet to be, this Christianity cannot stand by and admit that any evil is without remedy, or oppose the more thorough organization of the state for the more effective

promotion of social justice, seeing that it is the very mother of the conception, and that the world itself has in our day, by improved means of intercommunication, become one great city instead of many dissevered peoples.

Let Christianity come to socialists with a tenderer sympathy and a more sensitive insight into the causes of suffering and wrong, with a deeper passion for social justice, and with a greater faith in the ability of the rightly organized state to do away with social injustice, than socialism possesses, and help them build a state that will be an efficient instrument of the many for securing the conditions of well-being for all instead of an instrument of the few for securing the conditions of wellbeing for some. Let Christianity come to democrats with a profounder sense of human rights and of the dignity of the individual man than ever mere humanitarian democracy can teach, and help them to end the crime of the ages, the exploitation of the many by the few. Let us build a superstate that will protect all peoples against criminal nations, and in every nation a state that will protect the church, and the family, and the individual, in their rightful spheres of liberty. Let us see that the heritage of intellectual and material wealth accumulated by mankind through the toil of the ages is so far given to all, that all shall receive the finest and broadest culture that they are capable and willing to receive, and have the conditions of the higher living. Let us search out the evils that are, and the evils that threaten to be, and let us not rest till those are cured and these are prevented, so far as cooperating intelligence can cure and prevent, without destroying human freedom and righteousness. Let us not rest content with any good for ourselves, so long as any of our human brothers are destitute of that good. . And let us advertise our best, even Jesus Christ, by our own saved lives and by our grateful testimony, to all men with a zeal no other ism can show.

But all this is impossible, if we surrender Christianity to humanitarian patriotism, even though it speak like Jesus, and though it praise him more than the multitudes at his

triumphal entry. It is the Christ that must be our Savior and Lord, the Christ that died for our sins and rose again for our justification, this Christ the Son of God, now living and reigning. The deadliest enemy of our time to the Christianity of Jesus Christ is the mere humanitarianism which admires Jesus as a man but refuses to adore Christ as the Son of God.

F. P. RAMSAY.

Kansas City, Mo.